

Part I published in International Forum of Psychoanalysis, 16 (No. 1):12-27, 2007; Part II 16:81-94.

10/3/18

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

Zvi Lothane

Summary:

Part 1:

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

Summary part 2:

The author presents biographical facts of Sabina Spielrein's life after 1911, following her graduation as medical doctor from Medical School of Zurich University and the completion of her doctoral dissertation and publication of her landmark paper on destruction as a forerunner of becoming. Spielrein joined the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society and continued to publish important papers. In 1923, at the insistence of her family and urged by Freud's dreams of her success, she returned to Russia to see those dreams dissipate both due to the politics of the Russian psychoanalytic movement and later the repression of psychoanalysis in Russia. Stalin's terror and purges killed her brothers and finally the German invasion killed her and her daughters. In addition, the author documents the various Spielrein myths described in part 1 and their glaring self-contradictions in the still growing secondary Spielrein literature, both in the professional press, the popular press, and the entertainment media. The data presented are not only of interest as historical but contain important lessons for the practice of psychoanalysis as a profession.

INTRODUCTION

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

We need to distinguish further between a chronicle and a history: the former lists the events, the latter describes both the events, i.e., the external or material reality, and the internal, or psychological reality of actors in events, i.e., their emotions and thoughts, their motives, supposals, and fantasies. Freud's addressed these problems by offering a crucial distinction between material and psychic reality: "phantasies possess *psychical* as contrasted with *material* reality, and we gradually learn to understand that *in the world of the neuroses it is psychical reality which is the decisive kind*" (68:368; Freud's italics). Is Freud's dictum limited to neuroses or does it apply to life writ large as well? More tellingly, in his 1910 "biographical study" of da Vinci, Freud conjectured that Leonardo's childhood memory of a bird striking him on his lips was nothing but "a phantasy, which he formed at a later date and transposed to his childhood" (68:82), with no historical evidence for such a guess. Clearly, Freud favored fantasies over facts. But *are* fantasies more decisive than facts? Are not both equally important in the search for historical *truth*? Does not external reality matter? Besides, invoking 'fantasy' as the only counterpart to material reality poses the danger of neglecting other psychological facts: there are *public* events and there are the *personal experiences and evaluations* of the events, in addition to fantasies formed either before or after the event; thus, to understand the *meaning* of a life, of a person, we need to give equal importance to both. Moreover, fantasies do not spring from nowhere, they are themselves derivatives of prior experiences: symptoms derive from memories of traumatic events and conflicts, dreams -- from day residues, both emerging in consciousness as *transformations*, by unconscious dynamisms, as a conscious manifest dream or daydream content. To paraphrase a famous saying of Kant: events without fantasies are empty, fantasies without events are blind.

As fantasies became the staple of psychoanalysis it was easy to slip into regarding the main purpose of psychoanalysis, whether therapeutic or applied, as *interpreting* the varieties of fantasy, at the expense of *finding* the truth of the historical facts of a life. In the 1980's it became fashionable to debate the merits of narrative truth vs. historical truth, as expounded, for example, in Donald Spence's 1982 book *Narrative truth and historical truth. Meaning and interpretation in psychoanalysis*, whose main thesis I critiqued as follows: "On the ruins of Freud's method of free association, the basic instrument for achieving the goal of the person's examined life with its symptoms, dreams, and

transferences, Spence has erected a new method ... derived from a brand of literary criticism heavily influenced by French structuralists. Brutally stated, Spence's thesis runs as follows: because free association is in the patient is unreliable, ... and because memory is fallible and the interlocutors in the psychoanalytic dialogue gullible, one should give up the hope that the classical technique is capable of generating a true story of the patient's past. ... Because the patient's recollecting cannot be the source of valid *historical truth*, there is no choice but to make do with a substitute, i.e., *narrative truth*. This second-choice narrative truth is strictly the achievement of the analyst, an exercise of his or her professional competence. The analyst fabricates the likely story and imposes it upon the patient" (69:63-64); "the analyst sacrifices historical truth to narrative truth, also called the narrative fit. The latter is true 'because plausible', because 'there is no evidence against it'; ... the analyst creates a statement that is 'coherent and sayable', 'finding a narrative home' for the patient's 'anomalous happening'. The 'narrative closure' takes away the 'strangeness and mystery' from the patient's sayings. Such a construction 'acquires narrative truth in the process of being created', it 'not only shapes the past -- it *becomes* the past' (italics in the original). Such constructions are 'gratefully accepted by the patient; they give him explanation in place of uncertainty, and they sometimes lead to further recall' "(69:71-71). Lives of persons and collectives presents a continuous interplay of facts and interpretations of facts, and both are important, as they are in medicine, law, politics, and science. By contrast, analysts at times seems to be caught in their own counter-transference: interpretations displace facts and take on a life of their own such that rather than analyzing fantasies the analyst is actually spinning them. A good interpretation should illuminate connections between facts but should not replace historical facts. Moreover, the primacy of interpretation belongs to the analysand, not the analyst, the latter acting as a Socratic midwife, a facilitator, rather than arbiter of truth (78, 79, 80).

Ever since the publication of Carotenuto's book about her in 1980 historical facts turned into narrative fictions, or myths, have cast a shadow on the legacy of Sabina Spielrein both in the professional literature and in the popular press and plays. Here are some myths that fly in the face of the historical record: 1. Spielrein was schizophrenic or psychotic while an inmate in the hospital and seduced Jung; 2. After her discharge she was treated by Jung in his private analytic practice; 3. That during the alleged analytic treatment Jung abused Spielrein sexually and thus crossed a professional boundary; 4. That this behavior caused a scandal which then was a cause of the breakup of the Freud-Jung friendship. I have debunked these myths in previous publications and focus here on other facets of the remarkable Spielrein-Jung relationship. I have also presented historical facts vs. narrative fictions in another remarkable story, that of Paul Schreber (70, 71, 72).

NO SEX BETWEEN SPIELREIN AND JUNG

Prior to my discussion of Elisabeth Márton's moving docudrama "*Ich hieß Sabina Spielrein*" (1) following its screening at the meeting of the New York Psychoanalytic Society on 11 March 2003, I conducted an impromptu unscientific poll: I asked the audience for a show of hands as to whether in their opinion Sabina Spielrein and C. G. Jung consummated sexual

intercourse during their love relationship that Sabina Spielrein defined as “poetry.” The number of the yeas and the nays was split approximately half and half. Márton’s film is ambiguous regarding this question or who seduced whom. How could the yea-sayers be so sure? In the secondary literature about their relationship wild conjecture has overtaken sober knowledge of historical facts. Some went even further: in the play *The Talking Cure* by Christopher Hampton (2) produced in London there is an implied defloration scene of Spielrein by Jung with red blood stains on the sheets. A film in the making, *Where Love Reigns* (2005), is said to be "based on the true story of Sabina Spielrein, a Russian Jewish patient, who in 1904, at the age of 19, was referred to Dr. Carl Jung. During her treatment, she and Jung would embark upon a passionate and forbidden love affair", inspired by Snoo Wilson crude play, *Sabina*, where Jung reassures Sabina he has enough condoms. Renate Höfer (3) is sure that Spielrein not only fantasized about having Jung’s child but had actually become pregnant and had a miscarriage. What considerations moved the nay-sayers? My own opinion as nay sayer, based on the written testimony of the protagonists, a close reading of the *Freud-Jung Letters*, and documents I found in Geneva, is that, at the very least, there is reasonable doubt that sexual intercourse was part of the relationship (4, 5, 6, 7).

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

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

and gave us president Bush; only in England could we have the obsession with the sex life of the royals. No such sensation surrounded the loves of French prime minister Mitterand.

Among psychoanalysts, who may harbor prejudices about sexual behavior like everybody else, the projection of a sexual relationship between Spielrein and Jung has been enhanced by a concern endemic to the profession: the breach of the rule of sexual abstinence, or as it is now called, boundary violations during treatment. Such violations are not just countertransference on the part of the analyst, and Freud was clear on that in 1915 : For the doctor, ethical motives unite with the technical ones - to restrain him from giving the patient his love" (8:169). That statement was made by Freud years before it became a requirement that analysts undergo a personal analysis as part of their training. By that time he may have had in mind the relationship between his favorite son Ferenczi with Gizella Palos and her daughter Elma (41:203-223), where the authors are repeat the old myths about Spielrein.

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

Well: I cannot help complaining of a faithless lover. ... Four and a half years ago Dr. Jung was my doctor, then he became my friend and finally my "poet," i.e., my beloved. Eventually, he came to me and things went as they usually do with "poetry." He preached polygamy, his wife was supposed to have no objection, etc., etc. Now my mother receives an anonymous letter that minces no words, saying she should rescue her daughter, since otherwise she would be ruined by Dr. Jung. ... I kept absolutely mum. ... There is reason to suspect his wife. ... My mother writes him a moving letter, ... begging him not to exceed the bounds of friendship. Thereupon his reply: "I moved from being her doctor to being her friend when I ceased to push my own feelings into the background. I could drop my role as a doctor the more easily because I did not feel professionally obligated, for I never charged a fee. ... Therefore I would suggest that if you wish me to adhere strictly to my role as doctor, you should pay me a fee as suitable recompense for my trouble. ... My fee is 10 francs per consultation. I advise you to choose the prosaic solution, since that is the more prudent one and creates no obligation for the future." ... How terribly insulting that must have been for my mother (9:93-94).

Firstly, it is unthinkable that sex could have taken place while she was at Burghölzli, where Jung lived with his wife and two children -- where would this have occurred: in

Spielrein's hospital room, in a hallway, on the grounds? Secondly, after Spielrein left Burghölzli there was *no* ongoing analysis either on or off the couch, neither five, three, or once a week, complete with free associations and fees paid. Spielrein did *not* complain to Freud that Jung abused either therapy or transference: "I am analytical enough, know myself well enough, and am sure that for me infatuation a distance would be best" (9:92). Thirdly, I do not find Jung's letter callous, just business-like. Thus, since powerful sexual emotions in the transference and countertransference are as radioactive today as ever before, and since ethical boundary violations by analysts and analysands remain a recurrent problem in many places, it is much easier and safer to project such misconduct onto the dead than openly discuss it among the living, especially when the persons involved are prominent members of the psychoanalytic community.

The projection of an ethical scandal has been complicated by another: that of casting Spielrein in the role of victim and Jung in the role of abuser. I have disproved this thesis, too, again based on Spielrein's own testimony: "we are either equally guilty or not guilty" (6:260). On this matter there is unanimity between myself and Prof. Wolfgang Eckart, chief of the Department History of Medicine at Heidelberg University, even though he was the supervisor of the feminist doctoral dissertation about Spielrein (48). When the victim is a small child and the perpetrator is an adult, abuse is not in doubt; when two adults are involved, both participants may play the dual role of victim and perpetrator. This faulty logic is used by von Petersdorff (10), citing Ferenczi's famous 1932 paper, "Confusion of tongues between adults and the child" about adults sexually traumatizing small children (44). But Spielrein was no child !¹ Was Spielrein Jung's victim because he, and not a young man, was her first love and aroused her passionate love? Was he her victim when he mistakenly concluded that she was spreading malicious rumors about him which subsequently proved to be wrong? Last but not least, Spielrein was also unjustly blamed for the breakup between Freud and Jung (11) and nothing could be further from the truth, as proven by Freud's letters to Jung (4, 13), or to Spielrein after she married in 1913 (see below), and by the real reasons for this breakup: Jung's denial of Freud's libido theory and the dispute over the interpretation of Schreber (14).

Let me for a moment play the devil's advocate and agree with Jung that Spielrein fell in love with him during her treatment, i.e., in Burghölzli, and not he with her, as he claimed in his unpublished report of 25.9.1905, written after Spielrein had left the hospital: "In the course of her treatment the patient had the *bad luck to fall in love with me*. She continues to rave blatantly to her mother about this love and her secret spiteful glee in scaring her mother is not the least of her motives. Therefore the mother would like, if needed, to have her referred to another doctor, with which I naturally concur (15:121-122; emphasis added; translation by Z. L.) (6:255). Jung does not ask the question but I shall: was Spielrein experiencing genuine love or was it merely transference love? Transference as unreal, make-believe love, as Freud said, "eine falsche Verknüpfung" (a false connection), was experienced and discussed by Freud in 1895 in the *Studies on Hysteria*; countertransference was also experienced then, but it would first be so named in 1910.

Jung does not explain the nature of Spielrein's love for him. He only considers the erotic content and intent of this falling in love and seems oblivious of its possible hostile meaning and intention. But on his own showing, the twenty year-old Spielrein has created an oedipal triangle with the purpose of provoking and taunting her mother and Jung and thus making trouble for both. The mischievous acting out in the transference is very much in evidence, and it was amply documented by Jung in Spielrein's clinical chart (16). However, there is no indication that she ever actively seduced or forced Jung to love her, although she expressed such an association in one of Jung's association experiments (16). By the way, it was this 1905 report, and not any motive to cause trouble between Freud and Jung, that gave Spielrein the idea to write to Freud on 30.5.1909 requesting an audience.

Ten years later Freud would analyze more incisively the nature of make-believe, i.e., transference falling in love:

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

severity to the test, so that, if he should show signs of compliance, he may expect to be taken to task for it. But above all, one gets an impression that the resistance is acting as an *agent provocateur*; it heightens the patient's state of being in love and exaggerates her readiness for sexual surrender in order to justify the workings of repression all the more emphatically, by pointing to the dangers of such licentiousness (8:163).

Aggression is not yet a fully appreciated motive in Freud's theories, but as a moralist and practicing analyst he is very much aware of it, and it is here acknowledged under the rubric of resistance, clearly an aspect of the negative transference. Jung was not blind to the fact of aggression, either, and the success of Spielrein's treatment as inpatient was not only due, as he wrote to Freud in a letter of 23.10.1906, of "treating an hysteric with your method" (18:6) – actually, in those early days rather with Breuer's method, as happened with Anna O., but also due to Jung's ability to withstand *agent provocateur* Spielrein's trying chicaneries, to endure her aggressive behavior with patience and sympathy, to help her resolve the sizable aggressive component of her neurosis and guide her to recovery: termination of treatment and matriculation at Zürich University School of Medicine. He was later her teacher in medical school and instructor of her dissertation with which she graduated as doctor in medicine. Eventually she would become a Freudian, not a Jungian, psychoanalyst and a member of the Vienna and Geneva Psychoanalytic Societies.

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

At a first glance it certainly does not look as if the patient's falling in love in the transference could result in any advantage to the treatment. No matter how amenable she has been up till then, she suddenly loses all understanding of the treatment and all interest in it, and will not speak or hear about anything but her love, which she demands to have returned. [...] There is a complete change of scene; it is as though some piece of make-believe had been stopped by the sudden irruption of reality - as when, for instance, a cry of fire is raised during a theatrical performance (12:161).

Even so, Freud argues,

We have no right to dispute that the state of being in love which makes its appearance in the course of analytic treatment has the character of a 'genuine' love. If it seems lacking in normality, this is sufficiently explained by the fact that being in love in ordinary life, outside analysis, is also more similar to abnormal than to normal mental phenomena (12:168).

While Plato was first to regard love as a form of madness, it was left to Freud to discover that all love, inside or outside treatment, is colored by transference. For like love, transference is not limited to the analytic relationship, for it plays a role in all relationships at all times. Transference is as ubiquitous as bacteria in the air. It is only in the laboratory that bacteria are studied under the microscope for the purpose of diagnosis and treatment. Similarly, it is only in the special conditions of the analytic treatment that transference is observed, studied and analyzed for the purpose of freeing the patient from the shackles of his or her infantile relationships. In my view the love of the 34 year-old Jung and 24 year-old Spielrein was real and genuine, not just a play in the theater of the mind, when they switched from friendship to love in late 1908 or in early 1909, even if it was affected by their unresolved transferences. No matter who made the first step, or who seduced whom, which cannot be reconstructed from the documents, the former patient and doctor ended having a real, passionate, but essentially platonic love relationship, based on Spielrein's definition of "poetry" as tenderness short of coitus (4, 20); if this is granted, then 'platonic' here means expressions of affection accompanied by necking, i.e., kissing and hugging, and it also means agape, or love write large (5).

Their love was from the outset beset by social obstacles for both: Spielrein had dreams of conquering a married man so that they could have a mixed germanic-Jewish child named Siegfried; Jung never promised to leave his wealthy wife to marry a Jewish girl, preferred to remain an adulterer, i.e., to commit marital infidelity toward his wife Emma and mother of his children. It is for this reason -- knowing how passionate Spielrein's love for him was and not wanting to leave his wife -- that Jung would have been careful not to engage in sexual intercourse, for this would make Spielrein's

involvement with him all the more demanding and all the more difficult to sever if and when he decided to do so. It is uncertain whether before their love episode Jung had already been promiscuous – he was described as such by Spielrein in 1910 in her diary, citing another Jewish young woman from Russia who wrote her doctoral thesis under Jung's chief Bleuler: "When I was out walking, I met Frl. Aptekmann. She was once a patient of my friend's and is now 'one of the many' " (9:17). She also wrote to mother in 1909 that "He preached polygamy, his wife agrees, etc, etc." (7). Jung himself referred to his promiscuity as Poligamy; but rather than to search for his motivation, he attributed it to the ideas and influence of his former patient and collaborator, the notorious Austrian psychiatrist Otto Gross, as Jung states in a letter of 25.9.1907:

Dr. Gross tells me that he puts a quick stop to the transference by turning people into sexual immoralists. He says the transference to the analyst and its persistent fixation are mere monogamy symbols and as such symptomatic of repression. The truly healthy state for the neurotic is sexual immorality. Hence he associates you with Nietzsche. It seems to me, however, that sexual repression is a very important and indispensable civilizing factor, even if pathogenic for many inferior people. [...] I feel Gross is going along too far with the vogue for the sexual short-circuit, which is neither intelligent, nor in good taste, but merely convenient, and therefore anything but a civilizing factor (18:90).

Gross' critique of conventional sexual hypocrisy had a counterpart in Freud's subversive of view of "civilized' sexual morality" in 1908, that sound almost like Wilhelm Reich two decades later, Freud would ultimately agree with Jung that sexual repression is the price mankind has to pay for culture, at least in the Western world. But can we believe Jung draping himself in the mantle of Judeo-Christian morality while at the same time wanting to be a Dionysian pagan dreaming of other women, or, via Groß's comparison with Nietzsche, indirectly accusing Freud of advocating free sex? Freud certainly did not, and a comparison of Freud's and Jung's sexuality bears a relationship to these themes. In 1909 Freud was 53, and (according to Jones) has not been sexually active since the birth of his last child Anna, never got romantically involved with his ex-patients, and had no mistresses. He went through an intense process of self-analysis of his own incest complex

and made the Oedipus complex into a pillar of his theories of sexuality and love, of disorder and character development, and of Freudian ethics, anthropology, and theory of culture. Jung, on the other hand, presumably kept his incest complex under repression, broke with Freud over his de-emphasis of sexuality in Schreber (14) and the revision of the concept libido, and ultimately developed a mystical theory of culture, and by all appearances, did not practice what he preached. One more difference between the two titans of psychoanalysis related to the incest-complex: both harbored a latent homosexual conflict and Jung confessed having a crush on Freud (14), but achieved a different resolution: Jung was homophobic and refrained from treating homosexual patients, Freud remained tolerant towards homosexuality.

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

My parents, actually my mother, took pride in the 'purity' and 'naiveté' of their daughter; my women friends, too, did not want to 'soil' me by means of explanations [of sexuality]. In the high school, out of consideration for good manners, mating among animals was eliminated from the teaching of science. Finally, my 'innocence' pleased me myself and I retained a certain fear of becoming impure as a result of knowledge [of sexuality]. Thus it happened that during my university studies I learned about sexual matters from lectures in zoology. (20:144).

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

JUNG'S MARITAL PROBLEMS

Three months after Jung first anonymously mentioned Spielrein to Freud as a difficult case (18:7), he confessed to having a problem with infidelity in a letter dated

29.12.1906, in response to Freud's analysis of Jung's dream initially misrepresented by Jung as a patient's dream:

You have put your finger on the weak points in my dream analysis. I do in fact know the dream material and the dream thoughts much better than I have said. I know the dreamer intimately : he is myself. The 'failure of the rich marriage' refers to something essential that is undoubtedly contained in the dream, though not in the way you think. My wife is rich. For various reasons I was turned down when I first proposed; later I was accepted, and I married. I am happy with my wife in every way (not merely from optimism), though of course this does nothing to prevent such dreams. So there has been no sexual failure, more likely a social one. The rationalistic explanation, 'sexual restraint', is, as I have said, merely a convenient screen pushed into the foreground and hiding an *illegitimate sexual wish* that had better not see the light of day. One determinant of the little rider, who in my analysis at first evokes the idea of my chief, is the wish for a boy (we have two girls). (18:14; emphasis added).

What failure could Jung be referring to? Surely not the fact that he had married a rich wife. Is this not a displacement from his real neurotic sexual problem: his obsession with "polygamy", i.e., the temptation of promiscuity, the forbidden fruit of infidelity, which he admitted to Freud on a number of occasions? It has been asserted that the reason Jung originally approached Freud because of Spielrein. The just quoted passage points to a different motive: he turned to Freud because of his sexual neurosis, his Don Juan complex. However, he did not ask Freud to analyze him as his patient, as he should have, whether out of pride or because he did not really want to give his womanizing up. Like the First Analyst, the Swiss "crown prince" did not have the benefit of a personal analysis, unlike Sandor Ferenczi, Freud's Jewish favorite son, who met Freud in 1908, a year after Jung, and was later analyzed by Freud; the latter, did not, however, prevent Ferenczi from having problems with female ex-patients. It is not that Jung's sexual wish was illegitimate, it is his adultery that was illegitimate. Firstly, it was a transgression against one of the Ten Commandments, "Do not commit adultery," delivered by God to Moses on Mount Sinai and reaffirmed in the Gospel (Luke, 18:20); secondly, in spite of the wide-spread practice of the double standard in Europe of those days, a man could keep mistresses but a woman was not permitted to have lovers, and in many jurisdictions adultery and fornication were illegal and grounds for divorce. But can his affair with Spielrein be considered adulterous even in the absence of coitus? Not legally but emotionally so, at least the way Emma Jung saw it .

More than three years later, Jung tells Freud in a letter of 30.1.1910:

During the time when I didn't write to you I was plagued by complexes, and I detest wailing letters. This time it was not I who was duped by the devil but my wife, who lent an ear to the evil spirit and staged a number of jealous scenes, groundlessly. At first my objectivity got out of joint (rule 1 of psychoanalysis : principles of Freudian psychology apply to everyone except the analyser) but afterwards snapped back again, whereupon my wife also straightened herself out brilliantly. Analysis of one's spouse is one of the more difficult things unless mutual freedom is assured. The prerequisite for a good marriage, it seems to me, is the license to be unfaithful. I in my turn have learnt a great deal. The main point always comes last : my wife is pregnant again, by design and after mature reflection. (18:289)

Like Galileo's defiant "eppur si muove," Jung is still unrepentant about infidelity. But who was Emma jealous of? It appears the Jungs had a big fight, but was Emma threatened by her husband? She was now pregnant for the third time and Jung may have been sexually frustrated. It is not clear whether the talk of freedom for both parties meant that he gave his wife the same right to unfaithfulness as he had claimed for himself in the next breath. At any rate, it was she who made the jealous scenes and it was he who arrogated to himself the male—and egoistic—prerogative of the double standard. Men tend to view an unfaithful wife as debased by her infidelity and themselves as deceived, or as robbed of their rightful possession. By contrast, an unfaithful husband is a hero in his own and other people's eyes and will be idolized as a virtuoso of the bedroom (at times even by his own wife), as long as the marriage stays intact. Thus, social fidelity and keeping up the appearances is seen as more important than sexual fidelity per se. If there was ever any doubt—or hope—in Spielrein's mind of getting Jung for herself as a husband, the third pregnancy sealed the marriage of Carl and Emma Jung as permanent. In due course, after the noise of the affair with Spielrein has died down, Emma Jung would accept the permanent extramarital arrangement between her husband and his ex-patient and student, Antonia Wolff (13). By the way, one should never analyze one's own wife, or vice versa; and the rules of analysis—and other ethical principles as well—*do* apply to everybody, analysand and analyst alike: the double standard cannot be tolerated in analysis. Above all, as I argued (6), in representing his affair with Spielrein to Freud predominantly as a problem in treatment, thus using treatment as a plausible rationalization, Jung got Freud to play along with this deception and avoided delving into

the reasons for his personal problems. But his romantic relationship with Spielrein was his problem in real life, not in therapy, and that relationship was ended by a reality shock: the aforementioned anonymous German letter received by her mother. I suspect Jung dropped hints to Emma and was thus an accomplice in sending that letter, in order to put an end to the love affair. Sabina's mother subsequently had a confrontation with Jung and thereafter she persuaded the daughter to give Jung up (4). The thunderbolt woke Spielrein from her unrealistic dreams and hopes, even though the "poetry" continued sporadically for some time after and the friendly epistolary relationship lasted until 1919. Perhaps even without that anonymous letter (which I suspect might have been known to Jung before it reached its destination), Spielrein might have eventually seen the light anyway and walked away from a hopeless relationship. The complexes cast a long deep shadow on Jung. Half a century after the Junges first visited the Freuds in Vienna in 1907, when Jung was now 82, four years before his death, he would tell a visitor from America named Billinsky that Freud's sister-in-law Minna Bernays confided in him that she and Freud had a sexual relationship, a story that later appeared doubtful to some and truthful to others, like the allegation of sex between Jung and Spielrein. Was Jung still seeking to be on equal footing with Freud after all these years? Was this a revenge of a man with a guilty conscience? By the way, the story became a justification for a sizable sensational secondary literature, both about Freud and Bernays, based on the "cherchez la femme" formula of the true and tried *roman à clef*.

As already noted, the love of Spielrein and Jung was both a passionate encounter framed by what the Greeks called *agape* and *philia*; it also contained for both transference meanings rooted in their respective oedipal constellations. It is to these that we now turn. We can thus ask further: What were the desires and dynamics that fueled this love and accounted for the powerful attraction that they felt for each other? What did they seek from each other? What were the facets of their personalities that drove them to each other? We shall seek answers in Freud's papers of 1910 (22), 1912 (37), and 1918, his "Three contributions to the psychology of love (*Liebesleben*)," as well as in statements by both protagonists, while keeping in mind that the woman was a Jewess and the man a Christian.

SEX, LOVE, AND THE OEDIPUS

In the fateful year 1909 Jung published a paper on father-child dynamics (47), inspired by his encounter with Spielrein and Gross, and containing a few interesting case histories, in which Jung reworked some of Freud's earlier ideas but did not break new ground. In 1909 Freud published his papers on family romances (21) and in 1912 on the Oedipus complex (37), two interrelated psychoanalytic concepts. These concepts were central attempt to explain the dynamics, or the necessary love preconditions (Liebesbedingungen), as he called it, of various forms of sexual behavior in health and disease as related to monogamous marriage and its breach: choice of spouse, promiscuity, infidelity, jealousy, homosexuality, and, not to be overlooked, the role of egoistic and power motives as well. Neurotic engaged in spinning family romances, said Freud, show :

a quite peculiarly marked imaginative activity [...] the familiar day-dreaming which persists far beyond puberty. If these day-dreams are carefully examined, they are found to serve as the fulfillment of wishes and as a correction of actual life. They have two principal aims, an erotic and an ambitious one - though an erotic aim is usually concealed behind the latter too. At about the period I have mentioned, then, the child's imagination becomes engaged in the task of getting free from the parents of whom he now has a low opinion and of replacing them by others, who as a rule, are of higher social standing (21:238).

Such behavior could only be explained by the dynamics of incest complex, or, euphemistically, the oedipus complex, as Freud outlined in the First Contribution (22). Addressing the problem of " 'the 'necessary [pre]conditions for loving' which govern people's choice of an object, and the way in which they bring the demands of their imagination into harmony with reality" (22:165), Freud invoked the Oedipus complex to explain four character types of love-object choice among men, among them a type of man dominated by "the precondition that there should be 'an injured third party'; it stipulates that the person in question shall never choose as his love-object a woman who is disengaged - that is, an unmarried girl or an unattached married woman - but only one to whom another man can claim right of possession as her husband, fiance or friend"

(22:166). Implicit in this formulation was that a woman could similarly only fall in love with a man that belongs to another woman. Another form of love-object choice was the second precondition ... to the effect that a woman who is chaste and whose reputation is irreproachable never exercises an attraction that might raise her to the status of a love-object, but only a woman who is in some way or other of bad repute sexually, whose fidelity and reliability are open to some doubt ... This second necessary condition may be termed, rather crudely, 'love for a prostitute' " (22:166). What is most startling of all to the observer in lovers of this type is the urge they show to 'rescue' the woman they love. The man is convinced that she is in need of him, that without him she would lose all moral control and rapidly sink to a lamentable level (22:168).

These emotional attitudes and behaviors were a "derivation from the mother-complex"(22:170), i.e., the split image of the mother into a madonna-like figure, "a person of unimpeachable moral purity" (22:170) and a whore. As a result, the man "begins to desire his mother herself in the sense with which he has recently become acquainted, and to hate his father anew as a rival who stands in the way of this wish; he comes, as we say under the dominance of the Oedipus complex. He does not forgive his mother for having granted the favor of sexual intercourse not to himself but to his father, and he regards it as an act of unfaithfulness" (22:171). It became important to understand how "unconscious incestuous fantasies" affect overt behavior in men and women. Ferenczi (39) accordingly described the reverse negative side of this dynamics in "family romances of degradation" according to which well-born individuals displayed a kind of a "nostalgie de la boue" and could only feel comfortable in the company of servants and persons of a lower social status.

In the Second Contribution (37), starting with the attempt to elucidate the dynamics of anesthetic men and frigid women, Freud continued to develop, within the frame of a general psychoanalytic psychology of the tender and sensuous currents in the love life of mankind, an development and maturation of the libido: from the primary infantile love object choice of the original dyadic relationship with mother to its transition to the triadic, or triangular, relationship with both parents, and later its

resolution as adaptive or maladaptive forms of adult love life. For the woman, the oedipal love choice of the father meant the wish to bear his child.

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

"The whole sphere of love in such people remains divided in the two directions personified in art as sacred and profane (or animal) love. Where they love they do not desire and where they desire they cannot love. They seek objects which they do not need to love, in order to keep their sensuality away from the objects they love. [...] The main protective measure against such a disturbance which men have recourse to in this split in their love consists in a psychical *debasement* of the sexual object, the overvaluation that normally attaches to the sexual object being reserved for the incestuous object and its representatives. As soon as the condition of debasement is fulfilled, sensuality can be freely expressed, and important sexual capacities and a high degree of pleasure can develop (22:183)

The attraction of Spielrein and Jung for each other could be seen as an example of one of the above described types of oedipal dynamics: (1) both experienced social failure, for the relationship presented social obstacles for both; (2) the accompanying conflicts and emotional storms constituted a regression to earlier unresolved oedipal conflicts, including dependency conflicts. It is known that Jung's family romances included a fantasy that he was a bastard great grandson of Goethe. I have not researched Jung's relation to his mother, or his incestuous fantasies, or how these determined his promiscuity. Upon the birth of his son Franz he expressed ambivalent emotions in a letter of 3.12.1908 to Freud: "Heartiest thanks for your congratulatory telegram. You can imagine our joy. The birth went off normally, mother and child are doing well. Too bad we aren't peasants any more, otherwise I could say : Now that I have a son I can depart in peace. A great deal more could be said on this complex-theme" (18:184). But we are left in the dark about the details. This ambivalence may still be operating three years later in a letter of 18.5.1911 in which Jung complained again, even more sarcastically than before, about his family conflicts: "All is well with us, except for the worry (another false alarm fortunately) about the blessing of too many children. One tries every conceivable trick to stem the tide of these little blessings, but without much confidence. One scrapes along, one might say, from on menstruation to the next. The life of civilized man certainly does have its quaint side."(18:424) It might be safe to speculate that in such a constellation,

young Spielrein, both virginal and vivacious, was a welcome relief after a wife both physically and emotionally exhausted, or perhaps even aged, by pregnancies. Also, might it perhaps lend support to Jung's denial of coitus, given his chronic dread of pregnancy: why would he risk getting Spielrein pregnant? She could, however, be attractive as "the foreign woman," the whore-like seductress, a foil to the unimpeachable purity of Jung's own wife.

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

Just recently Junga finished his paper that created such a stir, 'Über die Rolle des Vaters im Schicksale [sic!] des Einzelnen' [47], in which he shows that the choice of the future [love] object is determined in the first relations of the child with his parents. That I love him is as firmly determined as that he loves me. He is for me a father and I am a mother for him, or, more precisely, the woman who has acted as the first substitute for the mother (his mother came down with hysteria when he was two years old); and he became so attached to the [substitute] woman that when she was absent he saw her in hallucinations, etc, etc. Why he fell in love with his wife I do not know ... Let us say, his wife is 'not completely' satisfactory, and now he has fallen in love with me, a hysteric; and I fell in love with a psychopath, and is it necessary to explain why ? I have never seen my father as normal. His insane striving 'to know himself' is best expressed in Jung for whom his scientific activity is more important than anything in this world... An uneven dynamic character coupled with a highly developed sensibility, a need to suffer and to be compassionate 'ad magnum' [to the fullest]. You can do to him and get from him anything you want with love and tenderness. Twice in a row he became so emotional in my presence that tears just rolled down his face! If you could only hide in the next room and hear how concerned he is for me and my fate, you would be moved to tear yourself. Then he starts reproaching himself endlessly for his feelings, for example, that I am something sacred for him, that he is ready to beg for forgiveness, etc. I cannot quote the exact phrases for it is a bit sentimental, but you can well imagine everything. Remember how dear daddy was apologizing to you exactly in the same manner ! It is unpleasant for me to quote all those self-reproaches he addressed to himself, because we are both either equally guilty or not guilty. Look, how many female patients have been to see him and, without fail, each one of them would fall in love with him but he could only act as a physician because he did not love in return! But you know how desperately he struggled with his feelings! What could one have done? He suffered through many nights thinking about me. We also considered the possibility of separating. But this solution was rejected as not feasible because we are both living in Zurich... He felt responsible for my fate, and howled as he pronounced these words... he did not want to stand in the way of my happiness And he had reasons to fear for my future (in case we separated). - This conversation took place almost two weeks ago and we both felt literally

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

The question is only how my intellect is going to relate to this whole story and the trouble is that the intellect does not know how to relate. I should not be writing about him and his family but about me. The question for me is whether to surrender with all my being to this violent vortex of life and to be happy while the sun is shining, or, when the gloom descends, to let the feeling become transferred to a child and science, i.e., the scientific activity that I love to much? Firstly, who knows how this story will end? 'Unknown are the ways of the Lord'. Anyway, today's youth looks at these matters differently and it is very possible that I will fall in love again and will have success, i.e., I will find myself a husband. - But don't you forget that this is still very far in the future and therefore, do not worry. *So far we have remained at the level of poetry that is not dangerous, and we shall remain at the level, perhaps until the time when I will become a doctor, unless circumstances will change* (4).

It is amazing how Spielrein has matured since 1905, not only as a human being but as an insightful depth psychologist. She understood the oedipal transference nature of the attraction between her and Jung, and not only as sexual but as an enactment of a neurosis of destiny determined by the reciprocal fit of their respective parental character identifications: Jung with his mother, she with her father, an important extension of the libidinal dynamics delineated by Freud. She also made it very clear what she meant by poetry and the boundaries she set on physical expression of romantic passionate emotions. It is surprising, however, that in this analysis of Jung, Spielrein is silent about the other powerful factor in their mutual attraction: her being a Jewess and Jung a Gentile, and the role the attraction of Jewish women to Gentile men played in the lives of mother and daughter and, vice versa, the impact on her of Jung's own "Jewish complex".

JEWS AND GENTILES

In her diary Spielrein tells that "Mother was very much afraid of falling in love with a Christian or of being loved by a Christian. What happened ? One man who perished out of unhappy love for her was a Christian, a respected figure in Saint Petersburg: she told him that she would never marry a Christian, because that would destroy her parents; the next day he shot himself" (9:23).

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

In Totem and Taboo (24), Freud's response to the mystical anthropology of Jung's 1912 Transformations and Symbols of the Libido, after discussing the nature of taboo in primitive cultures and how the transgression against it was punishable by death, was to define the taboo psychologically, as something sacred, forbidden, unclean and uncanny (unheimlich), the latter combining the qualities of both foreign and dangerous. Among the taboos none was more important than incest, qualified by him interchangeably as horror, barrier, taboo and prohibition of incest, to be avoided and resolved by exogamy:

One of the reactions to the parricide was after all the institution of totemic exogamy, the prohibition of any sexual relation with those women of the family who had been tenderly loved since childhood. In this way a wedge was driven in between a man's affectionate and sensual feelings, one still firmly fixed in his erotic life today. As a result of this exogamy the sensual needs of men had to be satisfied with strange and unloved women" (25:141)

While the taboo of incest was seen by Freud as the foundation of marriage as a social institution and of civilized society, there was a common denominator to exogamy, in the narrow sense, within the primitive clan, and in the wider sense, across tribal and national boundaries in civilized societies. With the help of this dynamic Freud also explained "being in love ... somewhat in the sense of Bernard Shaw's malicious aphorism ... that being in love means greatly exaggerating the difference between one woman and another" (25: 140). By the way, one of the reasons for primitive exogamy was the dearth

of females in the clan and the need to for conquest of women of other clans. A famous exogamous conquest of women was the rape of the Sabine women perpetrated by the Romans. Was Jung thinking of his falling in love with in Sabina Spielrein as his private rape of the Sabine-woman ?

In his last great essay published in 1939 in its finished form, *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud completed the arc of *Totem and Taboo and Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* :

It must be supposed that after the parricide a considerable time elapsed during which the brothers disputed with one another for their father's heritage, which each of them wanted for himself alone.[...] The first form of a social organization came about with a renunciation of instinct, a recognition of mutual obligations, the introduction of definite institutions, pronounced inviolable (holy) - that is to say, the beginnings of morality and justice. Each individual renounced his ideal of acquiring his father's position for himself and of possessing his mother and sisters. Thus the taboo on incest and the injunction to exogamy came about (26:82).

The incest-complex was here once more given its social raison d'être: united with group dynamics it is the foundation of the social contract and of civilized society. But the tension between social order and the temptation of the taboo remain. Psychologically, the taboo was for Freud also symbolic of the ambivalent split between something originally desired and later prohibited. As a result, the prohibition is honored as much in observance as in the breach: whatever guilt and punishment are associated with breaking the taboo, the pleasure gained by the aggression of breaking the taboo often appears worth the danger. A propos, Freud's identification with Moses may refer to the recurrent symbolic slaying of the father and the repetition of orthodoxies and heresies in the history of the psychoanalytic movement: rivalries, fights, secessions, and persecutions: the stories of Stekel, Adler, Jung, Rank, Lacan, and their latter-day derivatives (27, 66).

Does the drive to exogamy explain Jung's polygamy? Or the great crisis? Not entirely. Does it explain Spielrein's and Jung's Jewish complex? Let us consider some of its aspects in both. In a letter to Freud of 20.6.1909, Spielrein analyzed Jung's "Jewish

complex” which she traced to Jung’s attraction to Freud’s daughter Mathilde, whom Jung would have met in Freud’s home in 1907:

In the course of an analysis it turned out that so-and-so many years ago Dr. Jung had been fond of a dark-haired hysterical girl called S.W., who always described herself as Jewish (but in reality was not). [...] This girl was deeply rooted in him, and she was my prototype. It is also significant that right at the beginning of my therapy Dr. Jung let me read his dissertation, in which he described this S.W. Later on he would sometimes turn reflective when I said something to him; such and such a women had spoken in just this way, etc. And it was always this girl! Now in his fear he has forgotten everything about that; he comes to Freud and looks for an excuse and help. He recalls that Freud's daughter once appealed to him so much, and now the easiest way to obtain the father's favor is to explain the matter as a transference of the affinity with your daughter. You will certainly understand, Professor Freud, that it is completely irrelevant to me whether his love for me is a transference from Fr. S.W. or X. Freud; the latter transference would even be more to my liking, for ... (9:105)

Spielrein’s breaks off her analysis in midstream. She is also silent about the motives for her own wish to have a Gentile for a father of a interracial son bearing the name Siegfried. Was this her defense against incestuous emotions she experienced against a younger brother? Or was she dreaming of merging the Jews and the Gentiles in bonds of love everlasting? And now comes Jung’s own confession to Freud about his “Jewish complex” in the important letter of 4.6.1909, where finally, three years after first referring to Spielrein anonymously on 23.10.1906, he identifies her as “Spielrein”: "As I have indicated before, my first visit to Vienna hat a very long unconscious aftermath, first the compulsive infatuation in Abazzia, then the Jewess popped up in another form, in the shape of my patient. Now of course the whole bag of tricks lies there quite clearly before my eyes. During the whole business Gross's notions flitted about a bit too much in my head."(18:229)

The secret is out: Jung is prisoner of the fatal enchantment of Jewish women and of his victimization by Spielrein! He is brimming with deceptions, rationalizations, and paranoid fears: "Since I knew from experience that she would immediately relapse if I withdrew my support, I prolonged the relationship over the years and in the end found myself morally obliged, as it were, to devote a large measure of friendship to her, until I saw that an unintended wheel had started turning, whereupon, finally broke with her. She was, of course, systematically planning my seduction, which I considered inopportune.

Now she is seeking revenge. Lately she has been spreading a rumor that I shall soon get a divorce from my wife and marry a certain girl student ... I need hardly say that I have made a clean break" (18:228-229). Above all looms a basic fact: the exotic Spielrein, as an enactment of some mysterious unconscious foreplay, i.e., his dimly understood mother complex exerts upon him the added uncanny fascination via the taboo of the foreign, different, and mysterious Jewishness.

A different facet of Jung emerges when oedipal dynamics combine with projections about Jewish sexuality when (in the aforementioned letter of 25.9.1907, just before praising Gross' immorality), he says this about Max Eitingon (1881-1943), another Jewish doctor who came to work and study at Burghölzli: "I consider Eitingon a totally impotent gasbag - scarcely has thus uncharitable judgement left my lips than it occurs to me that I envy him his uninhibited abreaction of the polygamous instinct. I therefore retract "impotent" as too compromising. He will certainly never amount to anything; one day he may become a member of the Duma."(18:90)

In this mini-fragment of free-association (proof that Jung is using the correspondence as a substitute for a therapeutic analysis with Freud, without declaring it to be so), Jung ambivalently projects on Eitingon, six years his junior, both extremes of sexual performance: sexual inhibition and impotence and sexual prowess and promiscuity, both related to an unresolved Oedipus complex. Did Jung experience occasional impotence? I don't know, but it is not unheard of among civilized men. He surely shows where his true desires are: in contrast to the pious talk about Gross' immorality, he envies the younger man's opportunities to enjoy women without guilt. These associations also reveal two often seen factors: the trans-racial and trans-cultural, invidious and idolatrous, fetishizing of men of the other race as hypersexed and hyperpotent, here the Gentile seeing the Jew in a manner similar to the American white man seeing the black man; it is also a putdown of the potential rival for Freud's admiration and love. For Max Eitingon has since 1907 been a member of the "Wednesday society", the future Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, thus the first Freudian from abroad. According to Bair (61), „Jung was even more envious when Eitingon returned from Vienna and boasted of having attended several meetings of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society in January 1907. He had met privately with Freud and was full of anecdotes about the intimacy of their personal meetings, long

walks, and the intense conversations that later came to be known as the first training analysis“ (61:107). In due course he would become the sixth member of the famous/infamous “Committee” of overseers of analytic orthodoxy, and in 1910 a founding member, with Abraham, in 1910 of the Berlin Psychoanalytic Society, later the German Psychoanalytic Society and the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute. He would play an important role in the history of German psychoanalysis under the Nazis and emigrate in 1934 to Palestine, to found there the future Israel Psychoanalytic Society (27, 66). The other facet of Jung’s deprecation of Eitingon with as member of the impotent Russian parliament, just after having retracted the comment about impotence, is that it betrays a thinly-veiled anti-Semitism towards a Jew seeking the limelight of fame.

The following question thus comes to mind: did Spielrein suspect any tinge of anti-Semitism in Jung’s attitude towards her and does she reassert her solidarity with her Jewish origins? There is no clear indication. Was Freud aware early on of this streak in Jung? Probably, based on a number of Freud’s reactions, starting on 14.6.1912, to the news of Spielrein’s coming to Vienna, then her marriage in 1912 to the Russian-Jewish physician Pavel Sheftel:

Dear Frau Doktor,

I look forward as October approaches to receiving your decision about coming to Vienna in order to break your dependence on Jung (9:116). So you are a married woman now, and as far as I am concerned that means that you are half cured of your neurotic dependence on Jung. Otherwise you would not have decided to get married. The other half still remains; the question is what is to be done about that. My wish is for you to be cured completely. I must confess, after the event, that your fantasy about the birth of the Saviour to a mixed union did not appeal to me at all. The Lord, in that anti-Semitic period, had him born from the superior Jewish race. But I know these are my prejudices (9:116-117) My personal relationship with your Germanic hero has definitely been shattered. His behavior was too bad (9:118) I am sorry to hear that you are consumed with longing for J., and this at a time when I am on such bad terms with him, having almost reached the conclusion that he is unworthy of all the interested concern I have bestowed on him. [...] I gather that you are composing your thoughts, which is bound to

benefit the child. That is the right course. [...] You will also find it easier now to be content with being restricted to just one man (9:119-120). I am glad to hear that you are quite rightly beginning to use your spare time in order to come to terms with the present and with life. Let us hope that this bad period will save you an analysis. I can hardly bear to listen when you continue to enthuse about your old love and past dreams, and count on an ally in the marvelous little stranger.

I am, as you know, cured of the last shred of my predilection for the Aryan cause, and would like to take it that if the child turns out to be a boy he will develop into a stalwart Zionist. He or it must be dark in any case, no more towheads. Let us banish all these will-o'-the-wisps! (9:120) Well, now, my heartiest congratulations ! It is far better that the child should be a "she". Not we can think again about the blond Siegfried and perhaps smash that idol before his time comes (9:121) Of course I want you to succeed in casting aside as so much trash your infantile dreams of the Germanic champion and hero, on which hinges your whole opposition to your environment and to your origins; you should not demand from this phantom the child you must once have craved from your father (9:122)

Freud's portrayal of Jung as a "phantom" is a far cry from the way he wrote to him in 1909: "It is strange that on the very same evening when I formally adopted you as eldest son and anointed you - in partibus infidelium - as my successor and crown prince, you should have divested me of my paternal dignity, which divesting seems to have given you as much pleasure as I, on the contrary, derived from the investiture of your person" (18:218). Clearly, Freud's father/son oedipal transference does not fully explain the anointment and investiture of Jung as his crown prince and heir, for investiture is a social institution of paternal authority and office. Similarly, the idea that Spielrein originally wanted a child from her father and therefore one from Jung, a mix of oedipal transference and neurotic dependence, even if true, is insufficient to explain her attraction to Jung. It was easier for Freud to accept the loss of Jung as a result of the inevitable symbolic murder of the father: Freud had done this to his father-like mentors Breuer and Fliess (the former actually 14 years older, the latter two years younger than Freud). Later Freud was

the murderous father in reacting competitively to a number of sons: Stekel and Adler before Jung, Tausk, Ferenczi, and Rank after; but he had plenty of substitutes lined up. For Spielrein Jung was replaced by a much less glamorous husband.

The reason why Jung appeared so fascinating and glamorous to Freud and Spielrein is as much because of his uncanny otherness as due to his intellectual aura and a promise of greatness, thus an appeal to their narcissism. He certainly lived up to this promise of greatness. Spielrein came from a privileged, educated and partly assimilated Jewish family: as Madame Jung, Spielrein would have shared in his glory and fame. As Freud's heir apparent, Jung offered Freud the much sought-after legitimacy and credibility in a Gentile world in which Jews were still a target of anti-Semitic propaganda and persecution. In these letters to Spielrein Freud proudly, nay, defiantly reaffirms his Jewish identity and solidarity with Jewish causes. He remained a Jew proud of his heritage all his life. No, psychoanalysis was never a Jewish science, but Aryan and Jewish identifications themes would play out fatefully between Freud and Jung in the 1930's.

When first writing to Jung about Abraham prior to meeting the latter Freud does not directly ask Jung if the man is a Jew but uses an circumlocution: "By the way, is he a descendant of his eponym?" (18:80) Later he defends Abraham's being "inhibited": "I believe he is prevented from unbending by preoccupations that I understand only too well."(18:109) In gossiping to Jung about Jones, Freud again avoids the word "Jew": "I find the racial mixture in our group most interesting; he is a Celt and consequently not quite accessible to us, the Teuton and the Mediterranean man"(18:165). Freud is quite direct, however, in telling Jung why he needs him:

My selfish purpose, which I frankly confess, is to persuade you to continue and complete my work by applying to psychoses what I have begun with neuroses. With your strong and independent character, with you Germanic blood which enables you to command the sympathies of the public more readily than I, you seem better fitted than anyone else I know to carry out this mission (18:168). We are certainly getting ahead; if I am Moses, then you are Joshua and will take

possession of the promised land of psychiatry, which I shall only be able to glimpse from afar (18:197).

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

Be tolerant and do not forget, that actually you have it easier than Jung to follow my thoughts; for firstly, you are completely independent, and secondly, in your intellectual temperament you are closer to me thanks to the racial background we share, whereas he as a Christian and a pastor's son is only able to find his way against the obstacle of considerable inner resistances. For that reason his adherence [to our cause] is all the more valuable. (28:47) We Jews have it altogether easier since we do not possess the mystical element. [...] Might it not be, that it is the shared Jewish traits that attract me to you? I suspect that in myself it is the hidden anti-Semitism of the Swiss, which is spared me, is projected upon you with greater intensity. I just want to say, that we Jews, when we wish to make a contribution somewhere, usually develop a measure of masochism and should thus be ready to accept injustice done to us. Otherwise, it does not work. Rest assured, that if my name were Oberhuber, my discoveries would have met with much less resistance. (28:57) The opportunity to show what we are capable of will come, even if we should not be successful in this case. Be optimistic! Our ancient Jewish stubbornness would prove itself superior this time as well. (28:72) Jung is now [1913, Z.L.] in America. His bad theories do not compensate me for his unpleasant character. He is imitating Adler [...] (28:137) So we are finally rid of the brutal holy Jung and his followers. (28:180)

Was Freud also thinking of Spielrein's Jewishness and its role in the relationship, both before, during and after the crisis with Jung in 1909? It is hard to imagine he had no thoughts at all about it; but whatever he missed then he made up for in his letters to her in 1913. Jung, too, was bitter after the breakup: writing to his Swedish colleague and analyst Poul Bjerre he said: "I have until now not been an anti-Semite, but now, I think, I am becoming one" (29:87). For me, Jung's has been a rather a parochial, garden-variety kind of anti-Semitism, not much to get worked up about, and certainly no collaborator with the Nazis (62).

(Break here: to be continued).

Part II

SPIELREIN'S LIFE IN BRIEF

By way of an epilogue, here is a sketch of Sabina Spielrein's life. Sabina (Sheyve) was born on 7 November 1885 in Rostov-on-Don, the first child of Nikolai (Naftali or Naftul) Arkadievich (Aaronovich) Shpil'rain (ca. 1861-1938) from Warsaw, an affluent importer and trader of agricultural products who emigrated to Rostov in 1883, and to Eva (Khava) Markovna (Mordechayevna) née Lublinskaia, a dentist; they were married in 1884. They changed their Jewish first names to Gentile forms. Her father rose from poverty to become an agronomist. Since he showed great scholastic promise, he was sent to Germany to study advanced economics. In addition to Polish, Russian and most probably Yiddish, he was fluent in German, English and French and also read Latin and Greek (73). „Nikolai was known in town for his strong personality and original thinking. He never shook hands with people, went outdoors without wearing hat or topcoat, always bathed in cold water, was a vegetarian and liked the outdoors. He liked to wander in the Alps and took his family on trips across Germany. He admired German culture. As a parent he was both fair and severe. The children were educated in a number of languages and every day of the week was devoted to speaking another language, German, English or French, and nobody was allowed to speak another language that day.“ (73) After the revolution he campaigned against illiteracy and was a trader for the Soviet government. The mother was the daughter of Rabbi Mark Liublinskii from Yekaterinoslav. She practiced as a dentist until 1903 and later devoted herself to home and family in their large townhouse at 97 boulevard-like Pushkinskaya street. After the first-born Sabina Jan was born in 1887, Oskar (Isaak) in 1891, Emilia in 1893, and Emil in 1899. The father raised his children with an iron fist to become high achievers. As a child and adolescent, Sabina was both submissive and rebellious. Sabina spent the years 1890—1895 in a Fröbel kindergarten in Warsaw where she learned to speak a number of languages. Upon return she was privately tutored and also attended high school. The death in 1901 due to typhoid of her younger sister Emilia caused her prolonged grief and was followed by conduct disorders. In 1904 she graduated with a gold medal from the all-girl Yekaterinskaia Gimnasia in Rostov and like other rich daughters of Rostov she was sent to study in Switzerland. Finally father's toughness yielded its bitter fruit: Spielrein became incapacitated by her neurosis and required inpatient treatment. After a short stay in a private hospital in Interlaken she was transferred to the famed Burghözli Asylum

where she became Bleuler's and Jung's patient on 17 August that year. Nine months later Spielrein was cured, matriculated at Zurich University medical school, where she studied from 1905 until graduation in 1911 with an 80 page dissertation on the analysis of a schizophrenic woman. Already as a medical clerk she treated patients at the Burghözli and was trained by Jung in psychiatry, psychotherapy, and psychoanalysis. On 11 October 1911 she became the second woman member of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society and on 29 November, at its scientific meeting, she presented "On transformation", published in 1912 as her landmark paper *Die Destruktion als Ursache des Werdens* (destruction as a cause of becoming), duly acknowledged by Freud in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* as an inspiration for his concept of the death instinct.

In the winter of 1911/12 she traveled to Rostov and lectured on psychoanalysis to the Rostov medical society. There she met the Jewish Rostov veterinary physician, Dr. Pavel (Fayvel) Naumovich Sheftel whom she married on 1st June 1912. She gave birth to her first-born daughter Irma Renata on 17 December 1913, in Berlin. In 1914, with the outbreak of WW I, Dr. Sheftel was drafted and Spielrein stayed in Europe. She worked in psychiatric centers in Zurich (Bleuler) and Berlin (Bonhoeffer) and practiced psychoanalysis. After Berlin she lived in Munich and studied music, composition, mythology, and art history. The family fortune was lost in the 1917 revolution and thus the source of funds for Sabina. Practice was not easy, either, and she repeatedly asked Freud for patients to her, incurring a harsh rebuke: "You have also become *meshugge* [yiddish for crazy, Z.L.] and with the same symptoms like your predecessor [Jung, Z. L.] ... And your argument according to which I have not yet sent you any patients? This is exactly the same as with Adler..." (41:403). In Russia these were hard times in the aftermath of the revolution. After a period in Lausanne and Chateau d'Oex she settled in Geneva, taught psychology at Institut Jean-Jacques Rousseau, analyzed Jean Piaget, inspiring many of his future ideas in the field of child development with her paper "Zur Frage der Entstehung und Entwicklung der Lautsprache" (the question of the origin and development of spoken language). (20) She became a member of the Swiss Psychoanalytic Society, worked in the laboratory of the Institut headed by Freud's Swiss champion, the eminent professor Édouard Claparède, where she also left all her diaries and letters, serendipitously found in the cellar in 1977. While still in Europe, she heard of

her mother's death in 1921. In 1920 Spielrein took part in the 6th International Psychoanalytical Congress in The Hague and her photograph taken there adorns the cover of the 2003 Spielrein volume (10).

By 1923 she finally yielded to calls from parents, brothers and husband to return to the homeland. Remarkably, that, in contrast to her brothers and radical Russian-Jewish women living in Switzerland at that time, such as Vera Eppelbaum and Esfir Aptekmann, Spielrein did not become active either in Russian or Soviet politics (29). A search for her photograph in the soviet secret service archives came up with nothing (M. Reshetnikov, personal communication); only a questionnaire she filled out upon entering the Soviet Union in 1923 was found (40).

She first went to Moscow, not to Rostov, to her husband. It appealed to her own dream to build a new Russia. Freud gave her a double message in his note of 9.2.23: "Your plan to go to Russia seems to me much better than my advice to try out Berlin. In Moscow you will be able to accomplish important work at the side of Wulff and Ermakov" (9:127). By then organized psychoanalysis was making steady progress in Russia thanks to its founding fathers Ivan D. Ermakov, Moisei (Moshe) V. Wulff (who would later emigrate to Tel Aviv), Y. V. Kannabich and Vera F. and O. Yu. Schmidt, and the support of Jew Leon Trotsky in the Soviet Government. However, she was going to work, not going back to her husband. In spite of her superior qualifications and reputation Spielrein was apparently, due to envy, cold-shouldered by the leaders in Moscow. It was not the picture Freud had painted for her. She read some lectures at the State Institute of Psychoanalysis, worked as a physician-educator and pediatric psychologist (pedolog) in a school, was head of the section on child psychology at Moscow University and had an appointment at the State Psychoanalytic Institute and also in the State Children's Home and Laboratory "International Solidarity", a first of its kind in the world research institution, where she joined Ermakov's and Wulff's assistants R. A. Averbuch, V. Belousov and B. D. Fridman (74). She taught a course, "The psychoanalysis of unconscious thinking" and led the "seminar of child psychoanalysis." New stars were rising in Moscow, the likes of L. Vygotski and neuropsychologist A. R. Luria. Both were at first interested in psychoanalysis but later, whether due to personal disillusionment or official pressure, denied its importance for psychology. Perhaps Spielrein was not able to accept such a development, remaining committed to her old analytic ideals. For about a year and a half Spielrein lived with her daughters in the university residence in downtown Moscow. She then decided to walk away from these jobs and in 1924 she returned to Rostov and to her father and family. She could have gone back to Europe, but chose to stay there. Perhaps Spielrein continued to love Jung after her marriage, in reality and not just as an unresolved transference; but we do not know.

After his return to Russia in 1914 Dr. Sheftel took up with another woman with whom he had a daughter, Nina Pavlovna in 1924 (40:214; 81). After ten years he rejoined Spielrein in Rostov and on 18 June 1926 their second daughter, Eva, was born, two years younger than her step-sister from the other woman. The Sheftels now resided with their two daughters in three rooms in the rebuilt carriage house of the old family town house

but essentially lived separate lives. In one of the rooms, the step-daughter's remembered, there was a couch; if she practiced analysis after 1930, it would have been at great risk to herself. Spielrein worked as school medical psychologists to give the daughters a decent education. It was a hard life filled with privations and she aged prematurely: she was remembered as an old, bent woman, wearing old-fashioned clothes and shoes. The husband was regarded as average but inferior to her intellectually; he was also emotionally ill, dying of a heart attack in 1937. Thereafter, as told by Etkind, Spielrein did something most courageous: she approached her husband's second wife and proposed to her a pact of friendship and a promise to take care of each other's children in case one predeceased the other.

On 14 August 1925 Stalin's regime dissolved the State Psychoanalytical Institute (GPAI) and shortly thereafter International Solidarity, and launched the systematic repression of psychoanalysis (30; 81). On July 27 1930 the Russian Psychoanalytical Society was also abolished (81). In 1931 her last paper appeared in *Imago* (20). While in Moscow Spielrein was also unable to join forces with another branch of psychological science, developed by her middle brother. Her brothers were all university professors. The eldest Jan Nikolayevich **first studied music at the Conservatoire de Paris, later mathematics (publishing a text-book on vectorial analysis) and physics, graduated from the Sorbonne and Karlsruhe University**, became a physicist and later dean of the State Energy Institute in Moscow. His sister-in-law Sonia Ryss was the second wife of Karl Liebknecht, perhaps a ideological influence on him. He collaborated with other eminent scientists and intellectuals of his day, Pavel Florenskii, Igor Tamm, Yakov Frenkel (who studied with Röntgen) and Avram Yoffe. He was on his way of becoming a full professor. The youngest, Emil Nikolayevich was a biologist and zoologist and by 1936 dean of the biology department of Rostov State University. Emil's son, Evald Emilievich Shpilrain, is still professor of energy in Moscow and his son Vladimir Shpilrain now teaches mathematics at City University, New York. Oskar reverted to his Jewish name Isaak Naftulovich, graduated from Professor Windelband's philosophy department of Heidelberg University, studied with Wilhelm Wundt in Leipzig and became a leader in the field of psychotechnics which he learned from William Stern in Breslau (then Germany), which he now applied as a method of industrial psychology for raising productivity. In Berlin he was also befriended by the famous neo-Kantian Hermann Cohen (1842-1918), since 1912 professor at the Institute for Judaism in Berlin. Both Stern and Cohen shared Isaak's pride of being Jewish. In 1915 Isaak married Mme Pushtarewa and the next year his daughter Menicha was born. He may have been the brother who visited Freud in 1919 on his way to Russia. Isaak also joined the State Institute of Psychology and became chief of the section of psychotechnics. He had many publications in this field (31). He became corresponding member of the British Institute for Work Psychology. In 1929 he was a member of the delegation of the Soviet Union to the International Psychology Congress in New Haven, along with A. Luria and the great Ivan Pawlow. In 1931 he was host to the International Congress of Psychotechnics in

Moscow. Sabina Spielrein was also present and met there the son of the Geneva psychologist Claparède, with whom she worked and who kept all her diaries and letters, thanks to which we speak of her today. In 1932 Isaak became full professor and in 1933 he published with William Stern, Otto Lipmann and Michael Erdelyi the anthology *Prinzipienfragen der Psychotechnik. Abhandlungen über Begriff und Ziele der Psychotechnik und der praktischen Psychologie* (Fundamentals of psychotechnics. Essays on the concept and goal of p. and of practical psychology). Shortly thereafter the Nazis abolished Stern's professorship and he emigrated to the United States.

After the czarist persecution of the Jews reached new heights with state-fomented pogroms of 1905 and the blood libel Beilis affair of 1911, many Jews turned back to their Yiddish culture and heritage, and even more so thanks to ethnic tolerance after the Bolsheviks first seized power. Isaac Spielrein became an ardent Yiddishist and authored a small conspectus on teaching the Yiddish language: the author's first name was given as Itsche Maier (32). In the mid-1930's Stalin abolished psychology altogether. In 1935 Isaak was arrested as suspect of anti-Soviet propaganda and espionage and executed by a shooting squad.

The other two brothers were arrested in 1937, convicted and shot (30). Shaken by this and other catastrophes, the father, who fought against illiteracy, died on 17 August 1938 (81). Jan's wife was deported to a camp. Emil's father-in-law, his wife, and son Ewald escaped after the first attack of the Germans on Stalingrad. Emil's second son Mark died in battle at age 22. Isaak's wife and daughter Menikha survived in exile in Central Asia. All three brothers were posthumously rehabilitated after the 1956 speech of Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party.

Isaak's daughter Menikha Isaakovna Spielrein (1916—1998), a physiologist and biochemist, achieved fame as Sabina Spielrein's famous niece after she was discovered in 1982 in Moscow by the Swedish professor of Slavic languages Magnus Ljunggren. She had a perfect command of German and was a translator of psychoanalytic literature into Russian and after 1991 was invited to many cities in Europe. I corresponded with her until she had the stroke that later killed her. Menikha Isaakovna reminisced as follows:

Some time in 1923 Sabina said to my father, in my presence, that had she been allowed to see Lenin she would have certainly cured him. In November 1937 my father was in a concentration camp and my mother was exiled to Middle Asia. I could not remain in Moscow. After the arrest of Sabina's eldest brother, I decided to travel to Rostov, to my grandfather (Sabina's father and my father). I was met at the railway station by Sabina and her youngest brother Emil's wife. It turned out I arrived on the morning of the night when Emil was arrested. Upon being ushered into the room by Sabina, she asked me whether I believed what was being written in our newspapers about the cruelties perpetrated by Germans. She added, she had lived for many years in Germany and could not believe what is being printed in our

newspapers, since she knows the high level of the German culture, of the people who gave the world Goethe, Heine, Schiller and many well known and outstanding people. I told her that I believe what was written about the Germans, since two years earlier I had completed my training as a translator in the German department of the Foreign Languages Training Center. The teachers there were Communist emigrés from Germany who told us many stories and gave us underground literature from Germany, publications with descriptions of Nazi crimes. Obviously, I was unable to convince her. Otherwise Sabina Nikolaievna was by her upbringing a very well mannered, friendly, and gentle person. At the same time she was tough as far as her convictions were concerned – she could not be convinced of the contrary (33).

Cut off from contacts with the West, Spielrein did not understand what was going on in Germany nor was she aware of Jung's boundless admiration for the Nazis: inspired by Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, Jung, in an interview on Radio Berlin on June 26, 1933, told Dr. A. Weizsäcker:

The "Aryan" unconscious...contains explosive forces and seeds for a future yet to be born....The still youthful Germanic peoples are fully capable of creating new cultural norms....The Jew, who is something of a nomad, has never yet created a cultural norm of his own.... The "Aryan" unconscious has a higher potential than the Jewish; that is both the advantage and disadvantage of youth not weaned from barbarism... [which] has been explained as a morass of banal infantilism.... This suspicion emanated from Freud. He did not understand the Germanic psyche any more than did his Germanic followers. Has the formidable phenomenon of National Socialism, on which the whole world gazes with astonishment, taught them any better?' (34)

The above is both a rather banal anti-Semitic diatribe and a paean to a neo-pagan Nazi cult. But Jung made a grave miscalculation: Hitler and the Nazis did not intend to create a new uninhibited dionysian utopia. On the contrary, as Wilhelm Reich (1942) has shown, by 1933 "fascist irrationalism"— as embodied in the party program and energized by the "mass psychology of fascism" (35) — was repressing all forms of freedom: individual, sexual, political in the service of a blood-thirsty tyrannical state. Reich sought the root cause of fascism, or nazism, in the pathology of the social, not sexual, Oedipus complex: the authoritarian repression of childhood sexuality, the virgin-whore split, and the

authoritarian father-son relationship as the breeding culture of the Führer-principle. The infamous Nuremberg laws of 1935 prohibited intermarriage with Jews as a *Rassenschande* (racial defilement, resonating with *Blutschande*=incest), as breaking the *Blutschutzgesetz*, short for "law for the protection of German blood and German honor" and preventing the danger of contaminating the German "purity of blood" by the "filthy Jew." Until then the Jew was branded as "capitalist" and "usurer"; now it was the Jew as "sensual" "brutally lustful" monster defiling the pure body of the Christian girl, as depicted in the vulgar tabloid *Der Stürmer* published by that "modern 'sex reformer', sexual psychopath and criminal pervert" Julius Streicher (36:215). In addition, the Nazi blood-race-and-sex law prohibited the Jews from hiring of female help under 45 and showing the German flag. At the Nuremberg trials Streicher was condemned to be hanged for his crimes against humanity.

An interesting coda about Jung's anti-semitism can be found in Samuels (75): a letter Jung wrote in 1945, a few months after the end of WW II, to Mary Mellon, heiress of the Mellon fortune that endowed the Bollingen Foundation which published Jung's *Collected Works* in the USA:

You probably have heard the absurd rumor that I am a Nazi. This rumor has been started by Freudian Jews in America. Their hatred of myself went as far as India, where I found falsified photo's [sic] of mine in the Psychological Seminar of Calcutta University. It was a photo retouched in such a way as to make me appear as an ugly Jew with a pince-nez! These photo's came from Vienna! This rumor has been spread over the whole world. Even with us it has been picked up with such alacrity, that I am forced to publish all the things I have written about Germany. It is however difficult to mention anti-christianism of the Jews after the horrible things that have happened in Germany. But Jews are not so damned innocent after all – the role played by the intellectual Jews in prewar Germany would be an interesting object of investigation. (75:303—304)

We can feel pity for Jung as human and fallible, spouting such paranoid mish-mash: a world-wide conspiracy, started in Vienna, to depict Jung as an ugly Jew? Too good to be true. Of greater interest are the last two sentences. To despise the Jews for their anti-christianism, i.e., their refusal to be converted and remain faithful to their own traditions, has been the long-standing policy of the Catholic Church, with violent persecutions begun during the crusades, until it was officially overturned by Vatican II in 1965. But blaming the Jews for the Shoah, with the sinister implication that the Nazis were not so guilty after all, since the Jews weren't innocent either, of mass-murder and crimes against humanity?! Paradoxically, Jung is in good company here: after the war the noted philosopher Hannah Arendt, the Jewish mistress of the great philosopher and Nazi Party member Martin Heidegger, created a furore with the subtitle of her book about the Eichmann trial: "the banality of evil"; for evil and banal are a glaring *contradictio in*

adjecto, it is Eichmann and other Nazis who were banal, not the evil they wrought. In a letter to Karl Jaspers of 17.8.1946 she wrote: “Your definition of Nazi policy as crime (“criminal guilt”) strikes me as questionable”(76). Today, with the benefit of historical research and hindsight, with the survivors having become vocal about their experiences during the Nazi persecution, with the proliferation of the Holocaust literature, we have a better understanding of the chronic posttraumatic stress disorders of both victims and perpetrators. The Gentile-Jewish dynamics of the Arendt-Heidegger love story bear a certain resemblance to the Jung-Spielrein involvement (77).

Many Jews and Gentiles saw the writing on the wall and left Germany in 1933 and after. Neither Spielrein nor Freud, in spite of their great wisdom, were good judges of the present: they were partially blind to the looming Nazi horror, they did not want to leave. Were it not for Princess Marie Bonaparte’s rescue of Freud from Vienna in 1938, he might have perished in a Nazi concentration camp with his sisters. Spielrein paid with her life for not leaving in time.

The first occupation of Rostov during WW II lasted from the 21 to the 29 of November of 1941 whereupon the Germans were repulsed by the Red Army. Even though other relatives fled the city, Spielrein made a fateful decision to stay. According to other witnesses, till the end she dismissed the tales of Nazi atrocities as Soviet propaganda. She was not the only one to be so cruelly deceived, as many others were in Russia and Poland, refusing to believe eye witnesses. Some commentators have seen in Spielrein’s behavior an acting out of her death instinct as described in her 1912 paper. To me such an interpretation amounts to wild analysis and a trivialization of her suffering and death. She may have been naïve, even careless, but I cannot in all honesty diagnose her as having suffered from a wish to be murdered. In the summer of 1942 Sabina and her daughters survived repeated German air raids (81). On July 27 1942 the Germans reoccupied the city. Last time Spielrein was seen in August marching with her daughters in a long column of some 27,000 Rostov Jews in the direction of the immense Zmeyevski ravine on the outskirts of Rostov where all were assembled and gunned down by Hitler’s executioners and thrown into the mass grave. Now a museum commemorating these events stands on the site. Thus disappeared a remarkable woman and pioneer psychoanalyst who once her own epitaph about being reborn as an oak whose name was Sabina Spielrein; she also wanted the following words be inscribed on her tombstone, in Russian: “And let young life play at the entrance of the tomb and let indifferent nature shine with external splendour”. (30)

THE SPIELREIN WARS

I first became aware of the Spielrein and Jung story (49) after Bruno Bettelheim (50) published in 1993 a review of the 1982 English version of Carotenuto's (9) 1980 original *Diario di una Segreta Simmetria - Sabina Spielrein tra Jung e Freud*. A somewhat modified version of this review was included in the 1984 English version of Carotenuto (51). Bettelheim accused Jung of dishonesty, of having betrayed Spielrein (citing Jung's self-description of "Schufterei"- knavery) and Freud of a complicitous coverup, which Freud admitted: "I made it appear ... Sherlock Holmes-like to guess the situation (which of course was none too difficult after your communications) and suggested a more appropriate procedure, something endopsychic, as it were" (18:234-235). In 1987 I shared Bettelheim's view of the sexual nature of the relationship and his indignation towards both men, especially Freud: "'endopsychic' clearly expresses the intent to deny the reality of the scandal, to condone Jung's exploitation of his patient, to make it appear that the woman simply dreamed it up... that it occurred only in her mind". (48)

Bettelheim claimed repeatedly that Spielrein's word "poetry" meant sexual intercourse and he criticized Carotenuto, because he "[took] great pains to convince the reader that Jung's relationship to Spielrein remained platonic; however, the documents strongly suggests that this was not so (51:XX)." However, Bettelheim's criticism was misplaced since Carotenuto expressed two contradictory opinions. For Carotenuto contradicted himself when he claimed : "For 'poetry' we must surmise a metaphorical significance know only to Jung and Sabina. A literary analogy can be found in Proust. Swann and Odette used the metaphor 'faire cattery' to express the physical act of possession (9:219)." In 1987 I followed Carotenuto's second opinion and strongly agreed with Bettelheim (49), that is that the relationship was indeed of sexual nature. I changed my opinion in 1999 based on the documents I found in Geneva : Spielrein herself defined poetry to mean absence of intercourse (4). After Carotenuto, the first to cast out on the sexual nature of the relationship were Brinkmann & Bose (52). The same doubt was also expressed by Bernd Nitzschke in his many faceted essay (53). Nitzschke analyzed the text by Carotenuto (9), Cremerius, another severe critic of Jung (12) and Bettelheim, and emphasized that Spielrein's treatment by Jung ended before their relationship deepened

and inveighed against the hackneyed opinion that Spielrein had been Jung's victim and viewed her as a strong woman. Nitzschke pleaded for a measure of "compassion for Jung as well who after everything was over wrote to Spielrein as follows : 'Once in a while one has to lose one's dignity in order to be able to survive altogether.' In this way Jung begs forgiveness for his betrayal for it was the condition for his ability to live and survive under the circumstances" (53:355). In 1993 John Kerr in his book (11) also doubted the sexual nature of the relationship. Unfortunately, Kerr did not make use of the additional Jung letters first published in the 1986 German edition of Carotenuto (12). After Kerr, the newly discovered documents were the 1905 report on Spielrein by Jung (16) and Spielrein's clinical chart (15). I used Minder's material in a paper I published in 1996 in order to present a more nuanced perspective on this story. (13) Recently Nitzschke, a sympathetic discussant of my work (54), erred that "Lothane unfairly, I think, cites Kerr as a star witness for the coital thesis in the case of Jung and Spielrein" (55:73), for nowhere did I make such a claim anywhere.

However, I specifically offered a defense of Spielrein against Carotenuto's diagnosing her as schizophrenic, imitating Jung's 1908 misdiagnosis of hysterical psychosis, and based on false analogies. Carotenuto argued that „in this case we can speak of psychotic transference (9:157), and in Jung's case, that the other's psychosis may dislodge some psychotic nuclei that often even a good analysis does not succeed in bringing to light. (9:159) Jung speaks of unstinting effort. The phrase seems to express Jung's boundless need to come to grips with his anima dimension ... what I have called psychotic countertransference" (9:160). I maintained this was „wrong and a ploy to exonerate Jung” (13:203). In 1999 I would agree with Carotenuto's right defense even if it was based on the wrong argument of psychosis. On a deeper level, Carotenuto sought to understand „the thought and analytical practice of C. G. Jung. [and] the analytical schematization to Jung's probable deeper motivations, [his] 'creative illness' (9:XII), [...] that the case of Sabina Spielrein is exemplary in that it demonstrates Jung's encounter with the image of the anima, an encounter that later most likely influenced his theories on the subject (9:XIII). And I would add: the anima theory, of the woman in man, and, by extension, man in woman, were also inspired by reading Paul Schreber's 1903 classic, his *Denkwürdigkeiten eines Nervenkranken*.

Kerr, following Carotenuto, also doubted the sexual nature of the Jung-Spielrein relationship; but he was wrong to claim that Spielrein had played an important role “ ‘at the center of the squall of distrust that led to the break with Freud’ (11:13), that the ‘most important aspect of the Spielrein affair was the change it occasioned in his [Jung’s, Z. L.] relationship with Freud’ (11:227), and that she ‘had innocently played the decisive role in fomenting this change’ (11: 386). In such tendentious conclusions Kerr has clearly sacrificed scholarship to sensationalism” (13:203, 14). The true state of affairs is depicted in the letters of Freud to Jung (13, 4) and Freud's letters to Spielrein after her marriage.

Curiously, in his 1986 Foreword the Freudian analyst Johannes Cremerius (55) continued not in the footsteps of Carotenuto but of Bettelheim, to claim that the 'tragic transference love between a patient and her analyst...[was] a terrible story, particularly in so far as it demonstrates the complicity of two men against the woman who has allowed herself to be seduced by one of them (55:63)." One could say, he was killing two birds with one stone: Jung was the (sexual) seducer but Spielrein allowed herself to be seduced. Cremerius also told the following story about : „When Carotenuto lectured about his book to the annual conference of the American Psychoanalytic Association on 18 December 1982, the main aspect of the debate was the assertion, in contradiction of Carotenuto, that Jung had had a sexual relationship with Sabina. A year later Bettelheim too took up this argument forcefully against Carotenuto.(55:72) As Cremerius saw it, „Carotenuto too understands Jung's behavior in this way. He interprets it as 'psychotic countertransference', since the patient is described as psychotic . Thus Jung is completely exonerated and his behaviour stands outside moral categories of judgement.' (55:75). The central problem for Cremerius was: „But is this really the important point? Is not the point of view expressed here, that the sexual act itself is the fundamental trauma, just a part of that ancient, paternalistic over-valuation of the hymen? Are not disappointment, betrayal, humiliation and the abuse of trust, and the destruction of dignity and self-worth, of more consequence for a young girl to whom all this has happened (55:73)? I have refuted Carotenuto and Cremerius in 1996, and in 2003: indeed, sexual trauma itself is defined by the whole person in the context of a life, as Breuer and Freud argued in 1893;

but sex or no sex, Cremerius had no evidence that Spielrein was a helpless victim, either; in fact, in 1999 I presented evidence to the contrary.

Initially the debates about Spielrein were mostly among men and women's voices were not heard. This changed in the decade of the 1990 with the publications of Stephan (45), Wilcke & Wackenhut (48) and Höfer (3), presenting Spielrein as a victim of Jung's abuse, followed by Richebächer (38) and Petersdorff (46). To say this was a feminist wave might sound biased, especially since men, too, had already been part of the chorus of indignation. Richebächer (38) kept up the rumor about "a suppressed scandal among early psychoanalysts"; but Jung and Spielrein were not involved in outpatient therapy, and there was nothing suppressed or repressed or public about it: The matter was only discussed in private letters exchanged between Spielrein, Jung and Freud. As I have shown (4), this was a misunderstanding and a panic reaction on the part of Jung based on guilt and, as he said himself, his paranoia. There were only Jung and his wife Emma, Spielrein and her mother, and Freud, who had communications about the matter; it never reached the public domain, so how can anyone call it a scandal? Richebächer also insinuated that the wish to prevent a "scandal" was the cause of Jung's decision to leave the Burghölzli. However, both Mr. Hoerni of the Erbgemeinschaft C. G. Jung Dr. Angela Graf-Nold (personal communication, New York, November 26, 2003) have stated that there is documentation that shows that Jung expressed his intention to resign to the hospital administration well before the events in question of 1909.

In 1997 I began to look for a publisher for a book about Spielrein. Princeton Press were interested at first but withdrew and then I started negotiations with Routledge, which came up against the same problem: the publishers would not meet the conditions of the copyright owner of the Spielrein archive in Geneva, Mme de Morsier, in spite of the transfer of the papers to Institut Jean-Jacques Rousseau in Geneva. Spielrein's heirs in Moscow, Menikha Spielrein and Evald Shpilrain, had no influence, nor could they prevail to have the papers returned to Russia. Last December I proposed to Prof. Evald Shpilrain and to Prof. Ovcharenko to publish the Russian diaries and letters in Russia. This project remains on hold and copyright matters are still unresolved.

In 2002 I received two invitations: from the American Jungian living in London, Ms. Coline Covington, to include my 1999 paper in an anthology she was publishing with

Routledge and from publisher Frau Traute Hensch, to write a foreword for the new reissue of *Spielrein* (10), and we both agreed on the new title. I did both (6, 7). In both situations I experienced a disappointment with the finished product.

In the final stages of preparation of her book Frau Hensch expressed some reservations concerning the conclusions in my Vorwort and chose the 1986 „Vorwort von Johannes Cremerius“ as the Vorwort, but without showing its date, so that it could easily be mistaken for a contribution made for the present edition. Moreover, she renamed my foreword as „afterword“, nothing to complain about, and followed it with an „Epilog“ by Frau Christa von Petersdorff. Epilog usually means the conclusion of a story, article or book, but this was an article published by von Petersdorff in 2000 (56) about boundary crossings in psychoanalytic treatment but wrongly using Sabina Spielrein as a classical example; in her bibliography she did not cite any articles by previous authors with the name Spielrein in the title. This argument has been repeated in the psychoanalytic literature countless times. Once again, the 2000 article (56) retells the Spielrein story starting in 1904 and repeats the facts and interpretations of Cremerius, as inspired by Bettelheim, with one sentence about her death in 1942. The name „epilog“, I suspect, was created by Frau Hensch. Since Frau von Petersdorff aligned herself with Cremerius, there were now two negative opinions stacked against one positive: me defending both Jung and Spielrein, Cremerius and von Petersdorff still attacking Jung as a traitor and abuser. Curiously, back in 1992 Inge Stephan viewed the 1986 Cremerius Vorwort as an attack on Carotenuto: "In the confrontation between Carotenuto and Cremerius, now as before, it is a matter of power and the 'purity' of the theory. For the second time, Sabina Spielrein becomes a plaything of competing interests and once again crushed between the warring parties" (45:84) – a plague on both their houses, the way Frau Stephan saw it.

Nitzschke commented on Petersdorff's "Epilog" as follows:

It means (and this fact is neatly concealed in this volume [i.e., 10]) she pulled out of the drawer an essay published three years earlier in the periodical *Topique* [56], added to it a few new references (including, surprisingly, contribution by Sibylle Volksmann-Raue [58], which contradicts everything that is so famously presented by von Petersdorff). And thus, anyone who wishes to create for himself

an image of Sabina Spielrein based on definitive convictions, can continue believing of Spielrein that 'death and destruction run like a black thread through her entire life', coupled with a hyper-definitive conviction about Jung and Spielrein that 'they paired off as victim and executioner' [57:136; translation Z. L.].

This impression is confirmed by comparing the von Petersdorff texts of 2000 and 2003: the first paragraph of 2003 has been corrected based on Volkmann-Raue (58) and the some paragraphs at the end have been omitted, otherwise both are the same. Citing Volkmann-Raue, as noted above, is curious for yet another reason, for she wrote:

The nature of the relationship between Spielrein and Jung has in the course of the last couple of years been the subject of most diverse speculative hypotheses. On the one hand, there was the dominant thesis propounded by Carotenuto and/or Cremerius [12:21] that a sexual relationship between the two took place after the period of treatment at the Burghölzli; on the other hand, there was the assumption of an abuse during treatment (e.g., [48, 3]). Both these theses were rebutted by Lothane (19:67) und Nitzschke (54:71) and other authors who doubts this thesis based on the available documents (58:64; translation Z. L.)

There are other contradiction and mistakes in von Petersdorff. She states: "Jung had treated Sabina in 1904 at the Burghölzli for psychotic hysteria (46:281). Spielrein was in Burghölzli until the spring of 1905 and it was Jungs Chef Bleuler who certified that Sabina Spielrein was treated for nervousness and hysterical symptoms (4). It was Jung who in 1907 changed the diagnosis into "psychotic hysteria" (10:244). Using the wrong diagnosis allows Frau von Petersdorff to repeat Carotenuto's opinion that Jung's love for Spielrein was due to a "psychotic countertransference" (46:289). Moreover, even though she writes of Spielrein as Jungs "former patient" (46:286), which Jung and Spielrein expressly state in their letters to each other, she mistakenly treats the relationship between Jung and Spielrein as an ongoing relationship between a "Psychoanalyst [and] a woman analysand" (46:284) and a breach of the rule of the "abstinence" (46:294). Writing in the spirit of Cremerius about the "complicity of the men against the woman," -- which she also calls "gang of men" or "good buddies", -- she cites as evidence a casual, unrelated to her argument, and humorous remark of Freud in letter Nr. 475 to Ferenczi, dated

16.5.1914: "... Spielrein is *meschugge* [crazy in Yiddish]" (S. 282). This is taken completely out of context: at that point Freud was on excellent terms with Spielrein and the context for the comment is adequately explained by the editors of the Freud/Ferenczi correspondence (59:555). She is also wrong to claim that Freud never mentioned Spielrein in connection with his theory of the death instinct. (46:289).

It appears that an entente cordiale was reached between Frau von Petersdorff and Frau Hensch, the former owner of Kore Verlag in Freiburg im Breisgau, for she also published the widely known book by Krutzenbichler & Essers (60), cited by von Petersdorff. Their chapter about Spielrein, based on Carotenuto (1986), contains a number of historical mistakes: Spielrein did not stay in Burghölzli "possibly until 1906 when she resumed her medical studies in 1907"(60:47): she left the hospital in 1905 and matriculated at Zürich University for the summer semester that year. They represent as fact Spielrein's "outpatient psychoanalytic treatment" citing Cremerius: "From the spring of 1908, an unusual relationship developed between the two : a stormy love-affair ensued, alongside the continuing treatment and concurrently with joint scientific work. It ended dramatically in June 1909." (55:68)". (K & E, S. 50) But Cremerius had no knowledge there had been a continuation of treatment after Spielrein left the hospital, and for sure no psychoanalytic treatment, either: Cremerius simply assumed there had been one, because there was transference and countertransference, even though, as well known, such dynamic factors are ubiquitous outside the framework of treatment, and both Spielrein and Jung repeatedly stated that Spielrein after 1905 was merely an ex-patient. On the other hand, *Liebesbeziehung* (love relationship) in German is ambiguous, but the tone here tends more towards sex than love. Cremerius deftly converted his interpretations into historical facts and Krutzenbichler and Essers simply copied this vicious circle. From here it is only one short step to the well known refrains: "the scandalous liaison" (60:50), so that "as a result of Freuds and Jungs ganging up Sabina Spielrein was sacrificed on the altar of power politics of the psychoanalytic movement". (60:57) But are not these authors, like others in the past and in the present, doing what they accuse the psychoanalytic power brokers of doing: exploiting an artificially created sensation and sacrificing Spielrein and Jung on the altar of rumor and scandal-mongering?

Their views were enthusiastically endorsed by Frau von Petersdorff. Even as I myself argued that it was Jung who started wooing Spielrein, Petersdorff is wrong to suggest,-- especially after she cites Jung's new letters where he tells Spielrein that she has "the esprit fort" (12:190) and begs her "for love and patience" because "now I am the sick one" (12:196), that Jung took advantage of her so that "on the basis of the omnipotence of the analyst over his patient the play with love becomes sadistic trickery." (46:286) I agree with Nitzschke that the words "the couple victim-executioner" (46:288) defames both Spielrein and Jung. Claus Barbie in France, and many others elsewhere, were executioners. With Nitzschke I also deplore von Petersdorff's sweeping conclusion that „like a black thread death and destruction run through her whole work and life“: many Jews made the wrong choices of not fleeing in time, but tens of thousands perished in the Shoah not because they had harbored a secret death wish but because they did not understand what was happening.

I was also surprised by Ms. Covington. In her anthology co-edited with Barbara Wharton she included, among others, the Cremerius Vorwort properly dated as from 1986, and the article by Richebächer as well. She chose not to comment on my chapter but the first sentence of her introductory Chapter 1 she writes: "Sabina Spielrein is perhaps best known for her love affair with Carl Jung. While it is debatable whether their relationship was actually consummated, it bore fruit for them both in giving rise to psychological insights and discoveries" (S. 1). Covington's choice of words betrays her prejudice: borrowed from French, in English "affair" carries the pejorative connotation of love-making: it suggests a love intrigue, an illicit love affair. She should have written: thanks to evidence presented by Lothane, there is reasonable doubt that their deep love relationship included sexual intercourse, as is still maintained in some quarters. Starting by saying that Spielrein is known for her love affair, which in English means sex, rather than saying Spielrein and Jung had great love for each other, betrays a woman's inclination to blame another woman. There is a culturally determined gender difference here: men and women have attacked Jung and Freud but men have not been critical of Spielrein, but some women have been subtly critical of the woman's seductiveness, rather like in the patriarchal story of Adam and Eve, irrespective of whether they viewed such behavior as real or imagined. There was nothing illicit in Spielrein's behavior towards

Jung. As a patient it was her right to act seductive, if she did. As a free woman she was free to love him. Since adultery means sexual unfaithfulness of a married person, it can only be said, in view of Jung's denials, that he was an adulterer in a technical, nominal, not literal, sense; or it can be said, he was unfaithful in his heart, he only suffered because he desired. Even if they had consummated sex, the question would still remain: was it illicit or immoral. Who should be the judge? I was far more surprised by the noted philosophy professor Viktor Ovcharenko (81), whom I met in Moscow twice. His valuable historical research is marred by misquoting my work and uncritically rehashing the old myths about Spielrein's "psychotic hysteria," her "prolonged ambulatory treatment by Jung up to 1909" and the "long transference-related love affair," "complicating the already complicated relations between Jung and Freud."

A similar odor of implied illicit sexual relations seems to emanate from the recent comprehensive and carefully annotated biography of Jung by Deirdre Bair (61), which I reviewed (62). Bair's book contains new details about Jung and Spielrein. Bair's documentation in Chapters 7 and 8 confirms and adds to my claim that Jung's marital conflicts were significant and that his relationship with Spielrein, irrespective of the problems it caused him, was used by Jung as a screen, a displacement and a distraction from what was really troubling him. According to Bair, by 1906 there was a "social crisis" and based on information from "a private source" Hedwig, chief's Eugen Bleuler's wife, cited "common hospital gossip that 'the Spielrein girl was throwing herself at Carl'. It was for Emma the last straw". (61:106) Contradicting that version, Bair notes that "though some at the Burghölzli could not resist such titillating gossip, most considered it harmless, because Emma [Jung, Z. L.] dismissed it so brusquely, even though Jung was seeing Spielrein privately" (61:108) While mentioning my paper of 1996 in her footnotes, without, however, citing the year and source, Bair surprisingly omits any mention of my article of 1999. She nevertheless confirms my observation, endorsed by Stingelin (63) in his review of my 1999 paper (4), that Spielrein "was not a paying patient ... [the] routine whereby she came to the Burghölzli several times each week for confidential talks that might have been deemed therapeutic sessions had she paid for them. These meetings almost always took place in Jung's laboratory or office, where others came and went freely. Sometimes when the weather was pleasant, they took

long walks on the grounds, where everyone could see them. Here, too, there was no privacy” (61:108) We do not know for a fact that all her talks were confidential: some may have just been chit-chat; but it supports my claim that until 1908, when Jung began pursuing Spielrein as intimate friend, there are no opportunities, nor any evidence, for any coital sexual relations between them. Moreover, Bair also tells us by 1907 “a new wrinkle appeared in the fabric of rumors about Jung’s alleged „womanizing“ when some of the Zürichberg Pelzmäntel (ladies in furs) began to invite the Herr Professor [Jung, Z.L.] to join them in discussion groups at their homes. At the university, clusters of these women formed a phalanx round him before and after each of his lectures; privately, several competed to see who could lure him to their homes for private consultations. No one at the hospital dared joke about this with Emma, nor about the constantly changing pattern of Russian and German women medical students [some of them Jewish? Z. L.] who sought the same tête-à-têtes as Spielrein and then proclaimed the same sort of attraction between the married doctor and themselves“ (61:109). Here Bair created a false equation: Spielrein was not any part of the Zürichberg Pelzmäntel, as I showed (4), her admiration for Jung was quite different, much more innocent, let alone Jung’s pursuit of her. Bair also confirms my emphasizing that Jung himself had exonerated Spielrein from spreading any sexual gossip about him, for another woman was found being the malicious gossip, when she writes „the diaries of several of the Zürichberg Pelzmäntel hint at other liaisons, and in one specific case, the woman describes in fairly graphic detail several ‚treatment session‘ in her home that became sexual encounters. These women exchanged gossip, and Emma’s sharp ear was attuned to it as well“ (61:181). I had also cited (4) Spielrein saying as much to in a letter to her mother. Bair concludes that „the marriage of Carl and Emma Jung had veered precipitously toward divorce in the few short weeks between the two experiments“ (61:113), i.e., association experiments that Ludwig Binswanger conducted on Jung as a subject that showed „an extremely, unpleasant‘ sex-related complex associated with ‚certain sounds‘, particularly the ‚sch‘ that occurred prominently through some tests“ (61:112), supposedly homophonic with the name Spielrein, not very strong evidence in my views. Be that as it may, instead of asking Freud for an analysis, Jung did not ask for analysis about his marital problems but repeatedly wrote about Spielrein, misrepresenting essential facts (6). Instead, as Bair

notes, “Jung’s way of dealing with his wife's unhappiness was to psychoanalyze her” (61:181), another boundary crossing, like supposedly treating a private patient without a fee: analyzing a member of your own family, as Freud would do with his daughter Anna. By the end of 1909 “Carl’s analysis of Emma mollified her enough to end the jealous tirades that he insisted were groundless ... In connection with his analysis of Emma, Carl decided she needed a vacation. As they often did, they left their three children in his mother and sister’s care. ... Within the month, Jung told Freud that Emma was again pregnant, ‘by design and after mature reflection’ [Bair cites this from “a private source, private archive”, p. 689]”. (61:181) Jung saved his marriage and saved the money he would have to pay Freud for his analysis. In summary: Bair’s suggestion of sex between Jung and Spielrein is no more than that, a posthumous rumor.

CONCLUSION

In 1910 Jung published “A contribution to the psychology of rumour” (64), approvingly cited by Freud. Apparently, it was inspired by the rumors that had been swirling around Jung and the women in his orbit. In addition to being a victim of malicious tongues, Jung was also victimized by the rumor machine in his own mind, i.e., his anxious reaction to them, thus believing Spielrein to have been the source of such rumors when she was not.

Jung cited a story of “a thirteen year old school girl Marie X. [who] had recently been expelled from school because she was instrumental in originating an ugly rumour ... an ambiguous sexual story about him” (64:35), inspired by a dream Marie dreamt. After analyzing the dream Jung came to the following conclusion:

The rumour has analysed and interpreted the dream. So far as I know, rumour has not been investigated in this capacity up to now. ... The material enables us to understand the structure of the rumour, but psychoanalysis cannot rest satisfied with that. We need to know more about the why and wherefore of the whole phenomenon. ... The effect of the dream can only be explained by its being “le vrai mot de la situation; that is, it gave suitable expression to something that was already in the air. It was the spark which fell into the powder-barrel. ... The class consisted of girls between the ages of twelve and thirteen in the midst of the prodromata of puberty. The dreamer herself was almost fully developed sexually and in this respect ahead of her class; she was the leader who gave the watchword for the unconscious and so detonated the sexual complexes lying dormant in her companions. (64:45—46)

Commenting about Spielrein, Freud was the first to use the explosives simile in the aforementioned letter to Jung of 18.6.09: “Remember Lassalle's fine sentence about the chemist whose test tube had cracked: 'With a slight frown over the resistance of matter, he gets on with his work.' In view of the kind of matter we work with, it will never be possible to avoid little laboratory explosions. Maybe we did not slant the test tube enough, or we heated it too quickly. In this way, we learn what part of the danger lies in the matter and what part in our way of handling it. (18:235) Freud's witty remark applies to real and to transference sexuality in equal measure: love and sex must be handled with utmost care, or else they might explode in ways completely unintended.

Most publications about Spielrein could fairly be characterized as based on rumors: stories or reports based on hearsay unsupported by authority or evidence for their truth, a paucity of facts spun into a plethora of fictions. When rumors are about living persons they easily turn into gossip, when remarks dropped in a conversation are either careless or of questionable veracity, but potentially damaging to a person's reputation. In the past, rumors would lead to witches' trials; nowadays they end up in courts. Rumors about dead persons give rise to fanciful history, to myths and legends that replace historical truth. As with rumors, someone in a position of leadership or influence may be the one who starts the rumor and others, under the spell of group dynamics, repeat it afterwards time and again, adding new layers to the spin.

Sometimes analysts tend to dignify their opinions, including those based on rumor and gossip, by calling them psychoanalytic interpretations. A good interpretation should not go beyond biographical facts, only illuminate the known facts by uncovering the hidden connections and meanings embedded in the story, not make up new stories. Freud warned against the latter kind of interpretation: »This sounds as though we allowed our ingenuity and caprice to play with the material put at our disposal by the dreamer and as though we misused it in order to interpret *into* his utterances what cannot be interpreted *from* them.« (65:12; emphasis added); otherwise analysis will become “wild analysis.” The activity of “interpreting” has one more function not considered fully by Freud: to address not only the content but also the intent of a word, a sentence, a paragraph, or, as Thomas Aquinas put it: quod auctor intendit – the actor's, the speaker's, the writer's intention, and to whom was it directed and with what purpose. What were the love

intentions of Jung and Spielrein? What were their creative intentions? Whom were they seeking to convince or convert? There is also a more mundane aspect to so-called interpretations: they reflect the various opinions, judgments, assessments of the wisdom and morality of other people's actions and characters, of the interpreters as judges. Jung and Spielrein had their intentions, the various judges – theirs. History, too, passes its judgments; but it also forgives.

As in the case of Marie X., the sparks of history often fall on the powder keg of sexual problems and preoccupations of the living. Many of have projected their own anxieties about the explosive, nay, radioactive nature of sexuality and aggression, both in transference and real life situations, onto the story and texts of Jung and Spielrein. We should remain grateful to the protagonists of this drama for having provided us with an opportunity for an Aristotelian catharsis, like any good theater; but we should also try to be as fair as we can to the stories they left behind.

References

1. Márton, E. Ich hieß Sabina Spielrein (My name was Sabina Spielrein). Film produced by Helgi Felix Idé Film. Felixson AB, Sweden, 2002.
2. Hampton, C. The Talking Cure. New York: Faber, 2002.
3. Höfer, R. Sabina Spielrein (1885—1941). In *WahnsinnsFrauen:Zweiter Band*. Herausgegeben von Sibylle Duda und Luise F. Pusch. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1996; 156—186.
4. Lothane, Z. : Tender love and transference: unpublished letters of C. G. Jung and Sabina Spielrein. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 80, 1999; S. 1189–1204.
5. Lothane, Z. : Über zwei Arten von Liebe in der Psychoanalyse. In: *Psychoanalyse und Philosophie* 3, 2001; 41–44. Also as "Discussion" in : Covington, C. and Wharton, B., 2003; 214-220.
6. Lothane, Z. Nachwort. In: *Spielrein*, 2003.
7. Lothane, Z. Tender love and transference: Unpublished letters of C.G. Jung and Sabina Spielrein (with an addendum/discussion). In: Covington, C. & Wharton, B., eds.: *Sabina Spielrein: Forgotten Pioneer of Psychoanalysis*, 2003; 191-225.
8. Freud, S. Observations on transference-love, 1915; SE 12.
9. Carotenuto, A. A Secret Symmetry. Sabina Spielrein between Jung and Freud. New York: Pantheon Books, 1982. Originally published in Italy as *Diario di una segreta simmetria*, 1980.
10. Spielrein, S. *Tagebuch und Briefe / Die Frau zwischen Jung und Freud* Herausgegeben von Traute Hensch Veränderte, um das Nachwort von Zvi Lothane und den Epilog von Christa von Petersdorf ergänzte Neuauflage. Gießen: Psychosozial-Verlag, 2003.
11. Kerr, J. *A Most Dangerous Method, Freud, Jung, und Sabina Spielrein*, New York: Knopf, 1993.

12. Spielrein, S. Tagebuch einer heimlichen Symmetrie. Sabina Spielrein zwischen Jung und Freud. Hrsbg. von Aldo Carotenuto Vorwort Johannes Cremerius. Freiburg i. Breisgau: Kore Verlag Traute Hensch, 1986.
13. Lothane, Z. In defense of Sabina Spielrein. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis* 5, 1996; 203–217; also, in (41), pp. 81–109.
14. Lothane, Z. The schism between Freud and Jung over Schreber: its implications for method and doctrine. In: *International Forum of Psychoanalysis* 6, 1997; 103–115.
15. Minder, B. A document: Jung to Freud 1905: a report on Sabina Spielrein. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 2001; 46:67–72. (The German original first published in Gesnerus, 1993).
16. Minder, B. Sabina Spielrein. Jung's Patientin am Burghölzli. *Luzifer-Amor*, 1994; 14:55–127.
17. Freud, S. & C. G. Jung. Briefwechsel. Herausgegeben von William McGuire und Wolfgang Sauerland. Frankfurt/Main: S. Fischer, 1974.
18. The Freud/Jung Letters. William McGuire ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.
19. Lothane, Z. Zärtlichkeit und Übertragung – Unveröffentlichte Briefe von C. G. Jung und Sabina Spielrein. In: Karger, A., Knellessen, O., Lettau, G., Weismüller, C. : *Sexuelle Übergriffe in Psychoanalyse und Psychotherapie*. Göttingen (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 2001; 35–70.
20. Spielrein, S. *Sämtliche Schriften*. Freiburg i. Breisgau: Kore Verlag Traute Hensch; 1987.
21. Freud, S. Family romances, 1909; SE 9.
22. Freud, S. A special type of choice of object made by men (contributions to the psychology of love I), 1910; SE 11.
23. Freud, Z. 'Civilized' sexual morality and modern nervous illness, 1908; SE 9.
24. Freud, S. Totem and Taboo - 1912-1913; SE 13.
25. Freud, S. Group psychology and the Analysis of the Ego, 1921; SE 18.
26. Freud, S. Moses and Monotheism, 1939; SE 23.
27. Lothane, Z. The deal with the devil to „save“ psychoanalysis in Nazi Germany. In: Special issue (Volume 88 #2) of *The Psychoanalytic Review*, „Psychiatry, Psychotherapy, and Psychoanalysis in the Third Reich“, 2001; 88:195–224.
28. Freud, S., & Abraham, K. Briefe 1907-1926. Herausgegeben von Hilda C. Abraham und Ernst L. Freud. Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1980.
29. Ljunggren, M. Sabina and Isaak Spielrein. *Slavica Lundensia*. 2001; 21:19–95.
30. Ovcharenko, V. Love, psychoanalysis and destruction. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 1999; 44:355–373.
31. Shpil'rein, Isak Nikolaievich. Raboty Laboratorii Promyshlennoi Psikhotehniki NKT SSSSR. Pod obshchei redaktsiei I. N. Shpil'reina. I. Metody prikladnoi psikhologii v poslevoiennyi period. II. Laboratoria Promyshlennoi Psikhotehniki pri Narodnom Komisariate Truda (God raboty). Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Voprosy Truda, 1924.
32. Shpil'rein, Itsche Maier. Idish A konspekt fun a kurs in dem 2-tn Moskwer Meluchishn Uniwersitet. Moskwe: Varlag „Shul un Bukh“, 1926.
33. Spielrein, Menikha Isaakovna. Unpublished letter to Zvi Lothane of 20.XII.94.

34. Jung, C. G. Zur gegenwärtigen Lage der Psychotherapie. Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie und ihre Grenzgebiete, 1934. VII (1):1—16. Also in: Jung, C.G, 1978; Collected Works, volume XX, 165—166.
35. Reich, W. The Mass Psychology of Fascism. Edited by Mary Higgins and Chester M. Raphael, M. D. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1970.
36. Reich, W. The function of the orgasm Sex-economic problems of biological energy. New York: Orgone Institute Press, 1942.
37. Freud, S. On the universal tendency to debasement in the sphere of love (contributions to the psychology of love II), 1912; SE 11.
38. Richebächer, S. „Bist mit dem Teufel du und du willst Dich vor der Flamme scheuen?“ Sabina Spielrein und C. G. Jung: ein verdrängtes Skandalon der frühen Psychoanalyse. In: Specher, T., Hrsg., Das Unbewusste in Zürich Literatur und Tiefenpsychologie um 1900. Zürich: NZZ Verlag. 2000.
39. Ferenczi, S. Social considerations in some analyses, International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1922; 4:475ff - Soziale Gesichtspunkte bei Psychoanalysen. I. Der „Familienroman der Erniedrigung“. In: Bausteine zur Psychoanalyse, Bd. 2, S. 292—296. Wien: Internationaler Psychoanalytische Verlag.
40. Etkind, Eros nevozmozhnogo. (Chapter 5 is about Spielrein). St. Peterburg: Meduza, 1993; pp. 159--212.
41. Mahony, P., Bonomi, C., Stensson, J., eds. Behind the Scenes Freud in Correspondence. Stockholm: Scandinavian University Press, 1997.
42. Lothane, Z. Tenero amore e transfert: lettere inedite tra C. G. Jung e Sabina Spielrein. In: Studi Junghiani 6, 2000; S. 97–121.
43. Lothane, Z. Nezhnaia liubov i transfer: neopublikovannyie pis'ma K. G. Iunga i Sabiny Shpilrein. In: Vestnik psikhanaliza (Sonderheft Nr. 1), 2001; S. 87–106.
44. Ferenczi, S. Confusion of tongues between adults and the child. International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1932. 20:225ff - Sprachverwirrung zwischen den Erwachsenen und dem Kind (Die Sprache der Zärtlichkeit und der Leidenschaft). In: Bausteine der Psychoanalyse, III.Band, Bern: Huber, 1939; 511—525.
45. Stephan, I. 4. „Tauschobjekt zwischen Jung und Freud. SABINA SPIELREIN (1885—1941) Die Gründerinnen der Psychoanalyse: eine Entmythologisierung Sigmund Freuds in zwölf Frauenportraits. Stuttgart: Kreuz-Verlag, 1992; 83—87.
46. Petersdorff, C. v. Epilog, in: Spielrein, 2003; 281—295.
47. Jung, C. G. The significance of the father in the destiny of the individual, C.G. Jung, The collected works of. 1909; 4:301ff - Die Bedeutung des Vaters für das Schicksal des Einzelnen. Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschungen, 1909; 1:155—173.
48. Wackenhut, I. & Willke, A. Sabina Spielrein Missbrauchüberlebende und Psychoanalytikerin. Eine Studie ihres Lebens und Werkes unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer Tagebücher und ihres Briefwechsels. Inaugural-Dissertation, Medizinische Hochschule Hannover, 1994.
49. Lothane, Z. Love, seduction and trauma. The Psychoanalytic Review, 1987; 83-105.
50. Bettelheim, B. Scandal in the Family. The New York Review of Books, 1983.
51. Bettelheim, B. Commentary by. In:(9).
52. Brinkmann, E. & Bose, G. Sabina Spielrein. Marginalien. Berlin: Brinkmann & Bose, 1986;

- 215-223.
53. Nitzschke, B. «... denn die Wilde Sehnsucht macht mich fiebernd»: Sabina Spielrein als leidenschaftlich liebende Frau zwischen zwei Männern: C. G. Jung und Sigmund Freud. In: Nitzschke, B. Sexualität und Männlichkeit. Zwischen Symbiosewunsch und Gewalt." Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1988; 347-412.
 54. Nitzschke, B. "Poesie" und Prosa. Eine Nachbearbeitung zum Beitrag von Zvi Lothane über Sabina Spielrein und C. G. Jung. In: Karger, A., Knellessen, O., Lettau, G., Weismüller, C. : Sexuelle Übergriffe in Psychoanalyse und Psychotherapie. Göttingen (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 2001; 71-81.
 55. Cremerius, J. Foreword to Carotenuto's Tagebuch einer heimlichen Symmetrie - Sabina Spielrein zwischen Jung und Freud. Herausgegeben von A. Carotenuto. Freiburg/Breisgau:Kore, 1986.
 56. Petersdorff, C. v. Sabina Spielrein, patiente et analyste, dans sa correspondance avec Jung. Topique, 71, 2000; 69—85.
 57. Nitzschke, B. Buchbesprechung. Psychosozial, 27 (Nr. 96/Heft II), 2004; 131-136.
 58. Volkmann-Raue, S. In: Sibylle Volkmann-Raue, Helmut E. Lück: Bedeutende Psychologinnen. Biographien und Schriften. Weinheim:Beltz Verlag, 2002.
 59. The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi. Vol I, 1908-1914, Brabant, Falzeder and Giampieri-Deutsch, eds. Cambridge, MA:The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1993.
 60. Krutzenbichler, H. S. & H. Essers. Muß denn Liebe Sünde sein? Über das Begehren des Analytikers. Freiburg/Breisgau: Kore, 1991.
 61. Bair, D. Jung. A biography. Boston: Little and Brown, 2003.
 62. Lothane, Z. Review of (61). J Amer Psychoanal Assn, 2005; 53:317-324.
 63. Stingelin, M. Explosion im Psycho-Labor. Neue Dokumente zu C. G. Jung und Sabina Spielrein. Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Mittwoch, 3. Mai, Nr. 102 S. N 6, 2000.
 64. A contribution to the psychology of rumour. In:The collected works of C.G. Jung. Vol 4, Princeton:Princeton University Press, 1961; 35-47.
 65. Freud, S. New introductory lectures, 1933; SE 22.
 66. Lothane, Z. Power politics and psychoanalysis - an introduction. Internat Forum of Psychoanal. 2003; 12:87-97.
 67. Freud, S. Introductory lectures on psycho-analysis, 1917; SE, 19.
 68. Freud, S. Leonardo da Vinci and a memory of his childhood, 1910. SE, 11.
 69. Lothane, Z. A new metapsychology: psychoanalysis as storymaking. International forum for psychoanalysis, 1984; 1:63-84.
 70. Lothane, Z. In defense of Schreber Soul murder and psychiatry. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press, 1992.
 71. Lothane, Z. Seelenmord und Psychiatrie Zur Rehabilitierung Schrebers, 2004. Giessen: Psychosozial Verlag.
 72. Lothane, Z. Daniel Paul Schreber on his own terms, or how interpretive fictions are converted into historical facts, 2005. In: Holger Steinberg (Hrsg.) Leipziger Psychiatriegeschichtliche Vorlesungen. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, pp. 127-156.
 73. Ljunggren, M. Contributo alla biografia di Sabina Spielrein, 1984. Giornale Storico di Psicologia Dinamica, 8(16):49-60. The French version: Visages de Sabina Spielrein,

1984. Un article de Magnus Ljunggren présenté par Michel Guibal. *Espaces*, pp. 4-13.
74. Litvinov, A. V. *K istorii psikhooanaliza v Rossii*, 1994. Avtoreferat, unpublished dissertation.
75. Samuels, A. *The political psyche*. London: Routledge, 1993.
76. Arendt, H., & K. Jaspers. *Correspondence 1926-1969*. eds. Kohler L & Saner H. New York: (A Harvest Book), Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1992, p. 54.
77. Safransky, R. *Martin Heidegger Between good and evil*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
78. Lothane, Z. Listening with the third ear as an instrument in psychoanalysis, 1981; *Psychoanalytic Review*, 68:487-503.
79. Lothane, Z. The analyzing instrument and reciprocal free association, 1994; *Journal of Clinical Psychoanalysis*, 3:65-86.
80. Lothane, Z. A note on the psychoanalytic method: process interventions and formulaic interpretations Presentation at the IPA 2004 Congress in New Orleans, unpublished.
81. Ovcharenko, V. *Vekhi zhizni Sabya Shpilrein (milestones in the life of S. S.)*. <http://psychosophia.ru/Sabshp.pdf>.