

PIERCY, M. (1964). "The effects of cerebral lesions on intellectual functions: a review of current research trends." *Brit. J. Psychiat.*, 110, 310-352.

STRAUSS, A., and WERNER, H. (1939). "Finger agnosia in children." *Amer. J. Psychiat.*, 95, 1215-1225.

WHAT THEY REALLY SAID

DEAR SIR,

Dr. Stafford-Clark kindly sent me a copy of his letter to you (*Journal*, June 1967, p. 683) about the review by Dr. Flanagan (*Journal*, April 1967, p. 453) of my book, *What Jung Really Said*. Perhaps I may be allowed to comment.

He is mistaken in saying that neither Jung nor Freud ever claimed to have subjected the other to a personal analysis or to have received one at the other's hands. Jung made this claim in his *Face to Face* interview with John Freeman in 1959:

"Freeman: Tell me, did Freud himself ever analyse you?"

Jung: Oh yes, I submitted quite a lot of my dreams to him, and so did he.

Freeman: And he to you?"

Jung: Oh yes.

Freeman: Do you remember now at this distance of time what were the significant features of Freud's dreams that you noted at the time?"

Jung: Well, that is rather indiscreet to ask. There is such a thing as a professional secret.

Freeman: He's been dead these many years.

Jung: Yes, but these considerations last longer than life. I prefer not to talk about it." (1)

Again in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, Jung writes: "The trip which began in Bremen in 1909 lasted for seven weeks. We [Freud and Jung] were together every day, and analysed each other's dreams." (2) It was Freud who suggested the analysis. He asked for Jung's help because of certain symptoms. Freud suffered from "troublesome complaints" which he called his "neurasthenia". (3)

Dr. Stafford-Clark says that I devoted almost two pages to challenging three-and-a-half lines from his book, *What Freud Really Said*, in which he wrote: "There is an amusing, but almost certainly apocryphal tale about an attempt at mutual analysis between Freud and Jung which supposedly contributed to their ultimate disagreement and separation." It is true that these pages, in addition to other material, contain, *en passant*, my criticism of his statement; but their main subject-matter is Jung's hypothesis of the collective unconscious and its origin (4). This was derived, though much later, from one of several dreams Jung produced during this analysis with Freud. Jung attached great importance to this dream and its

consequences. Of Freud's failure to understand it, Jung writes: "I did not regard this as any reflection upon him . . . it was a human failure, and I would never have wanted to discontinue our dream analyses on that account. On the contrary, they meant a great deal to me, and I found our relationship exceedingly valuable." (5)

Dr. Stafford-Clark seems to infer that because the "experiment" did not continue after the trip, it simply petered out. This inference is unjustified. The analysis ended because Freud, having submitted a dream to Jung, declined to supply him with additional details. There was a pause, writes Jung, and then to his surprise Freud answered, "But I cannot risk my authority!" "At that moment," Jung continues, "he lost it altogether. That sentence burned into my memory; and in it the end of our relationship was already foreshadowed. Freud was placing personal authority above truth." (6)

The termination of his friendship and collaboration with Freud, while regretted by Jung, did not drive him into "bitter schism". On the contrary, he saw that it raised an important psychological problem: why had the break occurred? His study of this problem resulted later in the systematic description of his typology.

Dr. Stafford-Clark may not have thought it likely that Freud and Jung would have engaged in mutual analysis or that such a brief interchange should be so described. Nevertheless he would probably agree that the significance of an analysis is not measured by its length.

I am sorry Dr. Stafford-Clark considers my reference to his remarks about the Freud-Jung analysis to be "an uncharacteristic lapse into tendentious factionalism". I suppose this means that he thought I wanted to perpetuate the division between Freudian and Jungian ideas. I had no such intention. My purpose was to correct his misunderstanding by stating the facts. I feel sure that had he been aware of these facts he would not have looked upon the matter as "a fairly trivial incident", nor would he have dismissed it by saying "Freud and Jung swapped dreams".

E. A. BENNET.

99 Harley St., W.1.

REFERENCES

1. Extract from a Studio copy of the *Face to Face* interview.
2. JUNG, C. G. (1963). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. London: Collins and Routledge & Kegan Paul, p. 154.
3. JONES, ERNEST (1953). *Sigmund Freud, His Life and Work*. London: The Hogarth Press, Vol. 1, p. 186.
4. BENNET, E. A. (1965). *What Jung Really Said*. London: MacDonald, p. 71 et seq.
5. JUNG, C. G. (1963). *op. cit.*, p. 154.
6. — (1963). *ibid.*, p. 154.