THE EARLY HISTORY OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS.*

By Ernest Jones, M.D., F.R.C.P.

It is rare for someone at my time of life to be in a position to make really original contributions to knowledge, though it does occasionally happen. More often we feel that we have something to offer that is generally called the "wisdom of experience," but it is a gift that a younger generation is apt to look at askance. There is, however, one field in which old age has an undisputed prerogative, and that is in being able to recall happenings in which younger people could have had no share. I propose to-day to confine myself to this modest claim and I shall be content if the illustrating of it arouses some interest in you.

Although the Royal Medico-Psychological Association has honoured me by electing me one of its few honorary members, an honour I very highly appreciate, I have to confess the startling fact that the present occasion is the nearest approach in my life to my attending any of its meetings, and this although I held at one time the position of a professorship of psychiatry. I mention this uninteresting, though curious, personal fact because it will serve as an introduction to what I have to say about past eras.

The reason for it has been that psychopathology of the neuroses, which has been my main interest, was then the domain of the neurologists, not of the psychiatrists, and it was from neurology that I moved on into it. Psychiatrists of the present day, with their intensive scientific training and wide range of knowledge can hardly form any picture of the low level at which their branch of medicine subsisted in my early days. There was, of course, no special training for budding psychiatrists, or alienists as they were then called, and no thought of any diploma to show that they had taken some interest in their subject ; and very few indeed took any interest. I remember a satirical friend of mine, himself an amateur psychologist, asking me once what alienists discussed at their meetings : "I suppose they read papers on an improved variety of Chubb lock."† When I was holding a resident appointment at University College Hospital, an Asylum Superintendent whom I had met telephoned saying he had a vacancy on his staff and could I think of anyone who would be willing to fill it. He added : "I don't expect him to be interested in insanity, but he must be able to play cricket with the patients." I understand that the terms of such appointments are considerably more onerous nowadays.

Nor did medical students fare any better in acquiring any knowledge of psychiatry. They were supposed to attend six lectures in the hospital and six demonstrations of cases in the asylum. Very few attended more than one

* A paper read as a Maudsley Bequest Lecture, at the Royal Medico-Psychological Association, 31 July, 1953.

† The Notes and News section of the *Journal of Mental Science* of the time will supply factual information as to the subjects discussed at alienists' meetings.—*Editors.*

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.100.418.198 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of either and we took it in turns to sign up for friends at the others. If any students travelled as far as the asylum, playing games with the patients and cracking jokes with them was more to their taste than attending to the incomprehensible demonstrations. If they entered medical practice with some knowledge of the legal formalities needed to certify an insane person they had done all that they felt their duty demanded.

At this point I have, with your permission, to become a little autobiographical. I began my medical life as a neurologist, and although none of my contributions in that field would be remembered nowadays I am glad to think that some of the results have been silently incorporated into text books. My interest in the subject was early and extremely intense, so doubtless it had a neurotic origin. In the dissecting-room my teachers told me I was wasting my time acquiring an unnecessary detailed knowledge of brain anatomy, but I evidently felt that that part of the body was more likely than any other to yield the secrets that were perplexing me, about the nature of the soul, the purpose of life, and the means of controlling our animal nature. When a hospital student, I managed to work at Queen Square as a clinical assistant, and to continue in this position for some years even when holding resident appointments in my own hospital. I have vivid memories of the great men of those days who are but names to you: Charlton Bastian, Sir David Ferrier, Sir Victor Horsley, whose house surgeon I was, and many others. Sir William Gowers was a very great neurologist who was reported, no doubt apocryphally, to have maintained in an exalted mood that every day he had an infinite number of new ideas every one of which would make the reputation of an infinite number of neurologists. His real interest was in promulgating the use of Pitman's phonography among the medical profession and he published a periodical for this purpose which he mainly wrote himself. It happened that I had taught myself this shorthand at the age of twelve in a single week of intensive study—another profitable neurotic manifestation—and one day he observed me making notes in it. From that moment my fortune, so to speak, was made, and he showed me every kindness and help. Then there was the still greater Hughlings Jackson, to whom everyone looked up as the father of neurologists. He was one of the most modest men I have ever met. I remember his saying to me one day, with his hand on my shoulder: "If you want to understand epilepsy it would be best to forget everything that has been written about it and begin all over again." It was on a par with his famous prediction "If you want to find out about insanity you must first find out about dreams," one which has largely come true in our time. His name cannot be revered too much in the history of medicine.

In the meantime several of my friends were holding positions in various asylums around London, and I don't think all of them were good cricketers. One of them, Bernard Hart, who was then at Long Grove Asylum, has since made a distinguished name for himself as a psychiatrist, or perhaps I should say as a philosopher of psychiatry.* I used to spend many Sundays in the wards

* The medical staff of Long Grove at the time included Hubert Bond, Henry Devine, Thomas Beaton and Edward Mapother! Their views on the " dangerous cattle " entrusted to their care are on record in numerous publications.—*Editors.*

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.100.418.198 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with those friends, familiarizing myself with the various manifestations of insanity in the hope of gleaning some understanding of what it was all about. The man who befriended me most was Dr. F. W. Mott, the real Father of the Maudsley Hospital. I used to accompany him regularly on his visits to Claybury Asylum where he had established the first laboratory in any London mental hospital. His interests, however, were centred in neuropathology and he had little clinical or psychological aptitude. Not that his attitude was a negative one in the latter respect; he wrote me a letter in June 1910, when I was in Canada, congratulating me on "spreading the knowledge of Freud's valuable work." Nor must I forget W. H. B. Stoddart, a lasting friend of mine who was then resident at Bethlem.

When a few years later I attended a number of intensive courses at Kraepelin's Psychiatric Institute in Munich a new world opened up to me. There I found that mentally afflicted patients, instead of being regarded as dangerous cattle to be safely locked up and fed from time to time, were studied with absorbed interest from every point of view. Apart from the famous Kraepelin himself, for whom I did not, I may say, acquire any special respect, there was a large and elaborate staff who held daily meetings with demonstrations and discussions. Plaut was there conducting his serological researches into general paralysis, Alzheimer, a modest and delightful man, was then the greatest authority on histology of the brain, and there was a bevy of psychologists, both clinical and experimental. The year after I spent some months in Munich doing work on associations in the psychological laboratory, histological research under Alzheimer and of course attending the clinical demonstrations. All this gave me an entirely different idea of what psychiatry was, so when Sir William Osler suggested to me that I take charge of the Psychiatric Clinic the Ontario Government were proposing to open in Toronto I gladly accepted. There I made good friends with the leading personalities in the United States. Adolf Meyer, August Hoch, Morton Prince, James Putnam and others, but the psychiatric climate in Canada itself was at that time not much more propitious than in England, so after four years home-sickness took me back again to London where there were by then stirring signs of interest in psychopathology. In fact there was then a Psycho-Medical Society under the guidance of T. W. Mitchell and Douglas Bryan.

I have said that in those years psychopathology was thought to be the preserve of neurologists, not of psychiatrists. That was doubtless in deference to the popular belief that neurologists, being concerned with the nervous system, were the proper people to cure "nerves," as neurotic conditions were then called. I have often thought how embarrassing it must have been for such highly qualified experts in their own field to find they had to make a livelihood by treating for the most part entirely different affections of the nature of which they could have understood literally nothing. But somehow they managed to cope with that strange situation, which shows how adaptable human nature really is. The ignorance concerning psycho-neurotic conditions in the early years of this century was truly abysmal. The only people who thought they might have a mental aspect were a few hypnotists. Milne Bramwell in Yorkshire had made some excellent observations on the nature of hypnosis and in

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.100.418.198 Published online by Cambridge University Press

London Lloyd Tuckey was practising suggestive therapy. But these were looked at very askance by the medical profession, and their activities were regarded as closely akin to quackery. For the science of neurology had decided that such conditions were disorders of the brain, not of the mind, and therefore it was the brain that had to be treated. A common explanation of them was that the speed of modern communication brought about by the building of railways imposed an excessive stress on cerebral functioning and exhausted the brain cells. These, therefore, had to be replenished by good feeding and the administration of phosphates, since it was known that the nervous system contained a higher proportion of phosphorus than any other part of the body. The Weir Mitchell treatment, devised twenty years before, fitted in admirably with this point of view. It could be carried out by anyone familiar with diseases of the brain. Sir Victor Horsley, for example, the celebrated brain surgeon, ran a nursing home in the Isle of Wight which he used to visit periodically to observe the progress, or otherwise, of his neurotic patients. As for hysteria, the drug *par excellence* was still valerian, dating from the days when its odour was believed to be obnoxious to the womb, which vied with the brain as the seat of the trouble. I found it very amusing when this magic property was dissipated by the administering of pure valerianic acid, the advantage of which was that it was odourless.

I will recall here two memories concerning hysteria. My friend Wilfred Trotter once remarked to me that hysterical convulsions were a great mystery I should try to unravel. He added: "One sees only the blood trickling under the door, but we know nothing of what tragedy is being enacted inside." What insight when contrasted with the teachings of my seniors! Three years later, when I had learned something about the extraordinarily complex nature of those tragedies, I was present at a lecture Dr. Mott delivered at the Maudsley Hospital. He demonstrated a very complicated case of conversion hysteria, doing nothing, however, beyond describing the physical symptoms. I fell into a reverie about the intricately beautiful construction that must lie behind that façade, and I imagined to myself that Mott was mistaking for a hovel what was really a magnificent palace. It was not for that reason, nor indeed for any other good one, that I did not enter that hospital again until last year when I delivered an address there.

I had been very familiar with the cases of multiple personality described in America by William James and Morton Prince and with the huge French literature on hysteria, the beautiful observations of Binet and Féré and the ingenious experiments of Pierre Janet. But in all the observational work that had been done I missed any concern with the dynamics of the processes in question, any explanation of what brought them about and what they all represented in the patient's mind. Trotter himself was inclined to regard psychoneuroses as disorders of social relations, of the "herd instinct" with which his name became associated. His idea was that certain people were so sensitive that they found various experiences and conflicts intolerable and directed their emotions into neurotic manifestations. I could find, however, no way of applying his herd instinct theory clinically. So I continued with investigating patients' memories under hypnosis in the hope of elucidating the intolerable

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.100.418.198 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nucleus, rather on the early Breuer-Freud lines. At that time I did not know of any other work being done in this direction. I remember being able to cure a case of complete amaurosis until we got to a point where the patient could see everything except his wife's face, a fact which was a distinct clue to the pathogenesis.

Then in 1905 Freud published his Dora analysis, the first of his post-neurological writings I came across. I hurriedly learned enough German to follow it and also read his *Studies in Hysteria*, which of course had not yet been translated. The *Interpretation of Dreams* I read only a year or two later. What impressed me most to begin with was that there was a man who actually listened to his patients, a thing I had never heard of before. It was evident that every single utterance of their's was taken into account just as if it was a physical sign in clinical medicine. Then there was the matter of symbolism, and his freedom in admitting the significance of sexuality, both of which I had been prepared for by my reading in anthropology and comparative religion. Above all there was Freud's constant search for meaning, purpose, motivation, just what I had been wanting. So I became a willing adherent of the new doctrines.

In that year, 1905, forty-eight years ago, I ventured on the practice of psycho-analysis. I well remember my first case, the first one to be analysed outside of German-speaking countries. She was the wife of a well-known New York neurologist, but I may add it was not he who sent her to me. As a result of the analysis she procured a divorce, and her husband pursued me with considerable venom after I had moved to America a couple of years later. He was sure to turn up whenever I read a paper at a meeting or congress and counter it with abusive remarks about the evils of psycho-analysis. It was my first experience, and certainly not the last, of finding that adverse criticism of psycho-analysis was not always as objective as it pretended to be.

In 1907 I made Jung's acquaintance at the International Congress of Neurology in Amsterdam and later that year visited him in Zurich. We there discussed the feasibility of holding a special congress to discuss Freud's work, and he arranged one for the following April in Salzburg. I have given a full account of the first psycho-analytical congress elsewhere, so will not repeat it here. Brill of New York and myself were the only non German-speaking analysts to attend it. There was one other British visitor besides myself, Wilfred Trotter. It was the occasion when I first met Freud himself, an event I had greatly looked forward to. As an example of Freud's wide range of interest I may quote his first remark to me when I was introduced to him. He said : " From the shape of your skull you can't be an Englishman ; you must be a Welshman." Whether he divined this from my cranium, which I very much doubt, or from my name and perhaps facial expression, what struck me about the remark was that it was the only occasion I ever found anyone in Austria or Germany who knew of the existence of my native country. Freud was then fifty-one years old. His build and complexion were those of someone who lived a sedentary life. He had quick, restless, almost nervous movements. His expression was slightly anxious but mobile and very observant. His dark brown eyes were perhaps the most prominent feature, quickly darting here and there with a very penetrating

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.100.418.198 Published online by Cambridge University Press

glance. His paper was the first on the agenda, and he delivered it without any notes. It was a description of a case of obsessional neurosis, which he published later, one that has been called that of "the man with the rats." He spoke for three hours and so interestingly that we were all surprised to find what time had flown. Then he paused, saying: "I am sure you have heard enough." We protested, so he resumed the account of the case and went on for another hour. That he could hold an audience in this fashion was both because of the novelty of what he had to say and also his extraordinary gift for orderly presentation.

After the Congress I spent a few days in Vienna with him and then moved on to Budapest to see Ferenczi, his leading adherent. Except during the war I visited Vienna once or twice a year, sometimes spending a couple of months there. In spite of an undefinable inner reserve Freud was very easy of approach, and he was a great talker—often till two or three in the morning. This sometimes embarrassed me, since I knew that his first patient was at eight in the morning and that he had a hard day's work in front of him. He was also a good correspondent, and I possess some six hundred letters he wrote to me with, incidentally, five thousand he wrote to other friends or relatives.

Perhaps you would now like to hear a little about some of Freud's early supporters. He had worked quite alone for several years, but about 1902 a small number of those who attended his University lectures began to take a serious interest in his ideas and they used to meet at his house once a week to discuss their experiences in attempting to put his methods of treatment into practice. Most of them did not pursue the study very far after their initial interest was exhausted, but by the time I first attended these meetings in 1908, there were several who have since made a name for themselves. Among the oldest members were Adler, Federn, Hitschmann and Stekel.

Sadger, who joined in 1906, used to take shorthand notes of the sessions with his patients, a practice Freud frowned upon. He was an uncouth person. Once when he was placed next to a strange woman analyst at a banquet he fidgeted for a while and then began the conversation with the question: "Do you busy yourself with masturbation?" a phrase which in German is still more ambiguous. Stekel was a more interesting person; he was a thoroughly good fellow at heart and a very agreeable companion. He had no scientific conscience so no one placed much credence in the experiences he reported. It was his custom to open a discussion on whatever the topic of the day might be with the remark: "Only this morning I saw a case of this kind," so that Stekel's "Wednesday patient" became proverbial. He was a fluent writer and would have made a successful journalist; in fact he earned his living for some years in that way. More important, however, was the fact that he was a very gifted psychologist, with a remarkable flair for detecting the hidden meaning of the patient's communications. Unfortunately this was combined with very deficient critical judgment, so that after a few years his uncontrolled speculations brought about a complete separation from other psycho-analysts. The next to join the group was Adler, who later achieved a reputation by providing a much simpler theory of the mind than Freud's, one that many people eagerly

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.100.418.198 Published online by Cambridge University Press

accepted with relief as a pleasanter alternative. He was a surly and even sulky person, always with a grievance, but when I met him many years later I was pleased to observe that success had given him a much more benign appearance. Freud had, rather unwisely, tried to appease him by making him President of the Vienna Society in his place, but this did not serve for long. He was by nature a social reformer, or perhaps educator, and he was quite deficient in any psychological insight. He never even glimpsed what went on in the unconscious part of the mind, which no one could have said of Stekel.

The next member to join was Hitschmann, who still practises analysis in Boston. So he and I have been practising analysts longer than anyone else, even fourteen years longer than Freud was. His writings on the obsessional neurosis are still perhaps the best we have. About the same time came Federn, who died a painful death in New York last year. His contributions to the psychology of ego functioning are outstanding. A year later Otto Rank joined the group and became for many years its extremely efficient secretary. He was a very capable person administratively, and his labours in the early days of the publishing firm Freud founded in Vienna were simply stupendous. He did everything, bought the printer's type and the paper, saw everything through the press and then tied up the parcels and took them to post himself. He had an uncanny flair for the interpretation of literary, legendary and mythological material ; he said to me once he found it so easy that it almost bored him. He was the first lay analyst, and with his entry into clinical work began to find difficulties in applying his knowledge of the unconscious which had seemed so easy to him in other fields. Intellectual appreciation is a very different matter from affective appreciation. Rank was devoted to Freud and was of great personal assistance to him, especially during the hard years of the first World War. Not long after it was ended, however, he tried to simplify psycho-analytical theory by making everything centre on one factor, and one not easy to investigate objectively, his well-known idea of the birth trauma.

At this point I will leave my more personal memories and say something about the early beginnings of psycho-analysis. What I have to say is based on researches I have been carrying out in the last few years on the data of Freud's early life and the genesis of his ideas, and they will, I think, be new to most of you. Freud has been regarded as a revolutionary genius who introduced novel and disturbing ideas. The first half of this sentence is doubtless true, but the second half needs qualification. As a result of my researches I came to the unexpected conclusion that hardly any of Freud's early ideas were completely new. Perhaps the two for which novelty can best be claimed—both, it is true, of great importance—were his theory of the dissociation of affects from ideas and his explanations of dream life. We shall see, however, that this conclusion in no way detracts from his originality, since this had another provenance.

Let us consider the ideas that are generally thought to be most characteristic of him, especially in his early period. They are his division of mental processes into two classes, which he termed primary and secondary respectively ; his insistence on the reality and importance of unconscious mental processes and

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.100.418.198 Published online by Cambridge University Press

on the conflict between them and conscious ones ; the significance of sexuality first in the aetiology of the neuroses and then in life in general ; the existence of infantile sexuality ; the nature of unconscious symbolism ; the phenomena of repression and resistance ; the employment of free association as a therapeutic method ; the significance of childhood experiences for later life ; the rigid determinism of mental life ; the constancy principle which asserts the tendency to revert to a previous state ; the activity of two censorship barriers in the mind ; the concept of summation of excitations ; the idea of somatic compliancy as in hysterical conversion ; and the fundamental importance of the pleasure principle in mental life. This is a formidable list of ideas, which I cannot discuss here in detail, and yet it can be shown that there are broad hints of all of them in the writings of previous workers with which Freud was thoroughly familiar.

It is a curious fact that the idea of an unconscious mind was much more familiar and widely accepted in the nineteenth century than in the twentieth. Poets had of course long observed that their inspiration often proceeded from some inner source unknown to them, and many philosophers, Schopenhauer being prominent among them, had on theoretical grounds often postulated its existence. So did respectable people in our own profession, such as Sir Samuel Wilks, whom I remember as President of the Royal College of Physicians fifty-five years ago. The arguments in favour of its existence had been perhaps most fully marshalled in von Hartmann's well-known *Philosophy of the Unconscious* in the eighteen-sixties. In the early part of the twentieth century, however, a fierce opposition arose against the very idea, and both philosophers and psychologists joined in asserting that anything that was not conscious must be physical, as Carpenter had maintained in his phrase "unconscious cerebration." That may very well be true, but if so it must be equally true of conscious processes as well, for the fact remains that both are describable only in the same language and cannot be distinguished except in the one respect of consciousness being present or absent. Among the many outbursts I recall in this empty controversy there was one particularly fierce one by the psychiatrist Dr. Charles Mercier, an able man and a pungent satirist. With scathing ridicule he likened the idea of an unconscious mind to a navigator appealing to an imaginary "outboard" attached to his ship and ascribing to it all the faults in navigation or strange happenings he was unable to account for.

How much of the change from the one century to the next was connected with Freud's having for the first time revealed the actual *content* of the unconscious it is hard to say, but it certainly did not improve matters, and it was much more comfortable to continue in the belief that only noble inspirations arose from unconscious cerebration, the rest being the product of Freud's evil mind.

Similarly with the division of the mind into two great classes. That had often been proclaimed on theological and philosophical grounds. Man's higher nature and his lower animal nature were familiar conceptions, and Meynert, Freud's chief in the Psychiatric Institute in Vienna, had attempted to express the division in anatomical terms. According to him the moral part of man was served by the cerebral cortex and his immoral part by the basal ganglia.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.100.418.198 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It was indeed Freud's friend Breuer who clearly effected the distinction between what he called the free-flowing energy of the primary mental processes and the bound or inhibited energy of the secondary ones, an idea which Freud maintained represented the deepest piece of insight in psychology.

What is called the Herbartian psychology was dominant in Vienna at the time of Freud's youth, and his teachers, particularly Exner and Meynert, were fully imbued with it. Herbart, seventy years previously, had clearly enunciated the idea of unconscious mental processes and also their incompatibility and conflict with conscious ones. He actually used the word "*verdrängt*" (repressed) to describe their being extruded from consciousness. He postulated further two thresholds in the mind and these correspond very closely with the two censorships Freud held exist between the unconscious and preconscious and between the preconscious and consciousness respectively. As for psychological determinism, to which Freud adhered so firmly all his life, Herbart had written "Regular order in the human mind is wholly similar to that in the starry sky." Herbart also held that the body responds to affects to a varying extent in different people, and described this by the term "physiological resonance," one which must remind one of Freud's "somatic compliancy" in conversion hysteria.

Since all these ideas were in the air it does not seem very important to ask from which teacher Freud acquired them. Some have insisted on his debt to Meynert, others to Breuer, and so on. But in the course of our researches a very interesting fact has come to light. Dr. Bernfeld, whose recent death we greatly deplore, found that Freud's school in Vienna had preserved all the records of that distant period, and he was able to resuscitate a complete list of his fellow-pupils, of Freud's position in class in every year, his examination marks in the various subjects, and even the text-books prescribed for his reading. Now in his last year at school one of these was a book on psychology by a man called Lindner, who maintained that no other ideas in psychology were worth considering besides those of the great Herbart, and he described them in full. So Freud must have been imbued with them from his very boyhood.

Fechner, whom Freud greatly admired, continued in the same tradition. Freud in his writings ascribes to him the constancy principle which plays a central part in his own doctrines. It was evidently connected with the Mayer-Helmholtz doctrine of the conservation of energy. The idea of "threshold" plays a central part in all Fechner's writings and it was he also who likened the mind to an iceberg whose course is determined not only by the winds that affect the surface but by the currents in the depths that move the submerged nine-tenths. Fechner, whose name is familiar to you all in the Weber-Fechner logarithmic law of sensations, made a gallant attempt to fulfil Herbart's dream of a mathematical psychology, one in which the elements were to be stated in terms of measurable quantities. This was also a dream of Freud's for some time, but unfortunately—or perhaps fortunately—he was no good at mathematics. A relic of it is his conception of affects as definite quantities which in time would prove measurable.

Meynert, the teacher he thought most highly of, followed on the same lines. It was perhaps from him that Freud got the idea of summation of excitations,

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.100.418.198 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a concept Meynert often used. It was almost certainly from the observation of Meynert's amentia, nowadays called acute hallucinatory psychosis, that Freud first got the idea of wish-fulfilment in psychopathological processes. Griesinger, another psychiatrist, was imbued with all the ideas we have just mentioned. In his opinion the unconscious was mainly affected by impressions emanating from the internal organs and consciousness by those from the outer world. This was exactly Freud's own view.

That the sexual instinct is a prime motor in human life is an opinion that had been voiced by many thinkers, from Plato to Schopenhauer. And that it is a dominant factor in the causation of neurosis was a sentiment that had been felt rather than expressed throughout the ages. Hence the constant, though mistaken, advice to hysterics to get married. The very name hysteria, from the Greek for womb, betokens the same belief, although in the nineteenth century the last stage in prudery had displaced the lesion from there to the cortex. Freud himself related three occasions when he had been given broad hints of the sexual aetiology of hysteria, by Breuer, Chrobak and Charcot respectively. How thoroughly he had forgotton them is shown by his remarking in the late nineties on how surprised he had been to discover that aetiology in his patients and that none of his teachers had held such a view. It is very doubtful, however, whether these forgotton remarks played much part in the conclusions he had come to; they were based far more on his own clinical experience.

Nor was Freud the first to call attention to infantile sexuality. Apart from the fact that he once ruefully quoted to me, that every nursery maid knows about it, a children's specialist in Budapest, Lindner, had in the seventies of the last century pointed out that sucking at the breast has a double function in infancy, a nutritive and an erotic one.

The technique of free association for therapeutic purposes Freud evolved by slow degrees in the course of unravelling his patients' anamneses. But before then several writers had pointed out its value in the obtaining of ideas for literary purposes. One of these was Freud's favourite author in his adolescence, Ludwig Börne by name, and he had surely read the passage in question. Moreover, Dr. Zilboorg, whose erudition in medical psychology is unbounded, has recently called attention to an exposition of free association by no less a person than Sir Francis Galton in a number of *Brain* which Freud certainly possessed and read.

So we see that most of the elements that went to make up his later theory of the mind had been lying about in scattered places, ready for him to pick up and make use of. We also see here the difference between mere cleverness and the true originality of genius. What to the others had been little more than bright ideas were to Freud important conclusions to be taken with the utmost seriousness, to be carefully explored and tested and then woven into a comprehensive theory.

Perhaps the best illustration of this difference is the example of childhood life. When Wordsworth wrote that the child is father to the man he was simply voicing a piece of proverbial knowledge which everyone knew to be true. But no one knew *how* true it is before Freud traced in minute detail the connections between the earliest and often unconscious impulses of the infant and the later

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.100.418.198 Published online by Cambridge University Press

structure of the adult character. Think, for instance, how astonishing it would have seemed to Wordsworth to be told that whether someone was an optimist or a pessimist depended on how he had responded to his erotic enjoyment of sucking as an infant.

As is well known, Freud worked alone for several years. He suffered greatly from loneliness in those years, although the loneliness was more subjective than objective. Besides his wife and six children, to whom he was exceptionally devoted, he led a pretty full social life and had many excellent friends. The intellectual loneliness, which is what he specially minded, was partly relieved by occasional meetings with his great friend Fliess of Berlin and a regular correspondence with him. This has fortunately been preserved and published together with several manuscripts Freud sent him from time to time. They constitute an invaluable source for studying the early phases of Freud's ideas, the errors he at times fell into, and the modifications he gradually introduced. They have thrown a great light on the way in which those ideas were evolved.

His loneliness in the scientific circles of Vienna was, however, far from being a passive one. It could better be termed an active ostracism. Little reference was made to him in public, but Freud could hardly escape hearing in devious ways something of the things said of him in private. He was a crazy crank, a paranoiac with a diseased imagination that invented fantastic mental connections, and in any case he must have a very foul and unpleasant mind to talk and write about intimate topics with the freedom he did ; he showed none of the reserve and delicacy that properly kept such topics in the background. It could not have been agreeable to know that this was how his former colleagues from his old hospital thought of him, but Freud was big enough not to be crushed by it and to accept his inevitable fate. He went straight on with his researches, investigating one new field after another. He had the genuine humility of a great man and was not uplifted by any illusions about his work. He was confident that he was making some contribution to knowledge, though how important only posterity could judge. More valuable to him than this altruistic thought was the personal interest he derived from finding out new things, wresting for himself some of Nature's secrets. This delight in discovery for its own sake was perhaps his greatest pleasure in life.

Early in the century he was joined by half a dozen adherents in Vienna. They were unimportant general practitioners, unknown in the scientific or professional world, and they were all Jewish. It was a small and modest beginning of a following, but better than nothing, and Freud made the most of it by instituting weekly discussions. In these circumstances how much he must have welcomed any sign of recognition from the world outside. There had been in England a few sympathetic reviews of his writings, by Mitchell Clarke, F. W. H. Myers and Havelock Ellis, but nothing at all in any other country. Before the first decade was over, however, two events in the outer world gave him great pleasure. The first was the news that the Professor of Psychiatry in Zurich and his assistant, Bleuler and Jung respectively, were not only taking his work with extreme seriousness, but had carried out controlled researches in experimental psychology that fully confirmed it. Moreover, they were

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.100.418.198 Published online by Cambridge University Press

extending his conclusions to a new field, that of insanity. In the spring of 1907 Jung came to Vienna to visit Freud, an exciting event for both of them. They had much to talk over together. In the following spring the first Psycho-Analytical Congress was held at Salzburg. It was a small affair, but, as some of you may have seen this week, such congresses have nowadays an attendance of many hundreds of analysts. The second event took place the year after. It was an invitation from Stanley Hall, the President of Clark College in Massachusetts, to deliver a course of lectures at the anniversary celebrations they were holding. I was present on that occasion also, and I well remember the poignant tone in which Freud thanked the President for what he called "the first official recognition of our endeavours."

It was by then becoming evident that Freud's work could no longer be simply cold-shouldered. The ignoring was replaced by a spate of so-called criticism, which in most cases extended beyond an expression of mere disbelief into the sphere of abuse. In Germany, in particular, this was expressed in the coarsest terms. Knowledge of Freud's work had at that time not extended far beyond the German language. An eminent professor of psychiatry expressed the view that a *cordon sanitaire* should be placed around this "psychical epidemic among doctors," and another one, at a congress in Hamburg shouted, with an appropriate bang of his fist on the table, that this was no occasion for serious criticism: "it is a matter for the police." In private talk there was, of course, even less restraint, and no occasion was missed for ribald jokes at Freud's expense. I was working at the Psychiatric Clinic in Munich just after Freud's paper on anal erotism appeared, and it was thought very funny to ask when it would become compulsory for everyone to have their erotogenic zones painted red so as to indicate their character.

Freud took all this quietly, although it naturally did not increase his respect for the objectivity of his German colleagues. He said to me once: "They may disbelieve my theories, but I am sure they dream of them."

Every country to which psycho-analysis has been new has one after the other been swept by storms of criticism and abuse, but they nowhere descended to the pitch of vulgarity that they did in Germany. Such storms die down in time, although one can never forget the unpleasantness of living through them, and they are then replaced by some degree of toleration, if not understanding. The history of startling novelties in science presents a characteristic curve, the first phase where they are derided as both erroneous and impious, a phase of tolerance, and then one where they appear to be quietly accepted as obvious or even old-fashioned. In that last stage, however, the apparent acceptance does not necessarily imply a real understanding. Einstein's theories, for example, are accepted by thousands of people who certainly cannot understand them. All that is a matter for the social psychologist. What the medical psychologist can contribute to our knowledge of the phenomenon is the discovery, in itself very difficult to appreciate properly, that there are many degrees in the process of belief or acceptance of an idea by the mind. Indeed, we commonly speak of doing lip service to a belief when we do not take it very seriously, a common enough occurrence in the field of religion. We now know that belief is far more of an affective process than a purely ideational one. In the stage

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.100.418.198 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of respectability that psycho-analysis has reached in England and America there is an increasing danger of the insight we have by such hard work gained into the nature of the unconscious mind becoming more superficial. I will conclude what I have had to say with a true story from analytic practice. On an occasion when a particularly striking piece of confirmatory evidence had emerged the patient exclaimed: "I knew that Freud's conclusion on this point was true, but I never knew until now *how* true."

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.100.418.198 Published online by Cambridge University Press