CROSS-ROADS. POLISH STUDIES IN CULTURE,
LITERARY THEORY, AND HISTORY 20

Paweł Dybel

Psychoanalysis – the Promised Land?

The History of Psychoanalysis in Poland 1900–1989

Part I. The Sturm und Drang Period. Beginnings of Psychoanalysis in the Polish Lands during the Partitions 1900–1918

PETER LANG

CROSS-ROADS. POLISH STUDIES IN CULTURE,
LITERARY THEORY, AND HISTORY 20

Paweł Dybel

Psychoanalysis – the Promised Land?

The book is the first systematic study of the beginnings of psychoanalysis on Polish lands in Galicia (Austria-Hungary) and Congress Poland (Russia) during the partitions of Poland in the years between 1900 and 1918. The birth of the movement was presented on a broad cultural background, as an element of the assimilation processes among Polish Jews. At the same time, Freud's and Jung's theories began to gain popularity in Polish medical, philosophical, artistic and literary circles. By 1918, over a dozen articles on psychoanalysis had been published in Polish scientific and philosophical journals. Freud himself was vitally interested in this process, sending Ludwig Jekels to Krakow in the role of – as he wrote – an "apostle" of his theory in the circles of the Polish intelligentsia.

The Author
Paweł Dybel is a professor at the Pedagogical University in Cracow and a scholar of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, the Kosciuszko Foundation and others. In his research work he follows the links between psychoanalytical theories and contemporary philosophy. He also conducts research on the history of psychoanalysis in Poland.

www.peterlang.com

Psychoanalysis – the Promised Land?

Cross-Roads.

Studies in Culture,
Literary Theory, and History

Edited by Ryszard Nycz

Volume 20

PETER LANG

Paweł Dybel

Psychoanalysis – the Promised Land?

The History of Psychoanalysis in Poland 1900–1989

Part I. The Sturm und Drang Period. Beginnings of Psychoanalysis in the Polish Lands during the Partitions 1900–1918

Translated by Tomasz Bieroń

PETER LANG

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

The Publication is funded by Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Poland as a part of the National Programme for the Development of the Humanities. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Ministry cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

NATIONAL PROGRAMME
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMANITIES

Translated by Tomasz Bieroń
Proofreading by Jodi Greig
English edition by Paweł Dybel and Jodi Greig
Cover illustration: © Shutterstock.com/Evgeniy Shvets

Printed by CPI books GmbH, Leck

ISSN 2191-6179
ISBN 978-3-631-79865-2 (Print) • E-ISBN 978-3-631-80222-9 (E-Book)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-80223-6 (E-Pub) • E-ISBN 978-3-631-80224-3 (Mobi)
DOI 10.3726/b16146

PETER LANG
Open

Peter Lang – Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Warszawa · Wien

This publication has been peer reviewed.

www.peterlang.com

Observing the approach both of scholarly spheres and the intelligent public to psychoanalysis, one notices that it has many more opponents and critics than followers. I think not many areas of human knowledge confront so many prejudiced judgements as Freud's psychoanalysis, even from serious scholars.

Ludwik Jekels, *Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda*

[…] What I have reported proves beyond any doubt that Freudianism, although conceived independently, joins the main currents of contemporary thought. There are debates on irrationalism and rationalism, integration and analysis – these are supplemented with what can to some extent explain them, namely the issue of the relationship between consciousness and unconsciousness, and that means that Freudianism has a future ahead of it.

Karol Irzykowski, *Freudyzm i freudyści*

English Translation by Tomasz Bieroń, correction by native speaker Jodi Greig

English Edition: Paweł Dybel and Jodi Greig

Academic work financed under the programme of the Minister of Science and Higher Education entitled "National Programme for Development in Humanities."

Contents

From the author. A bibliographic note

1 Information about the publishing series

This book, published in Polish in 2016, offers the first comprehensive discussion on the influence of Freud's and Jung's theories on the Polish intelligentsia in the period of the partitions in the early 20th century, from 1900 to 1918.[1] I am now working on a second volume, which will encompass the period between 1918 and 1945, that is the twenty years of the existence of the Second Polish Republic and the wartime years. Until now, only short articles or encyclopedic entries on this subject have appeared in journals or dictionaries, usually of a general and purely informative nature.[2]

My book launched a publishing series issued by the Kraków University Press Universitas called *The History of Psychoanalysis in Poland*, in which some dozen volumes are to appear until 2021, reflecting the work of the research team created in 2014 under the purview of a grant from the "National Programme of the Development of Humanities," financed by the Ministry of Sciences and Higher Education. In the successive volumes, several of which have already been published, the history of psychoanalysis in Poland will be presented by various authors from many perspectives: that of the history of Polish psychiatry and psychotherapy, the history of literature, in the political and historical context, and from the perspective of Polish-Jewish reception of psychoanalytical works written in Yiddish and Hebrew in interwar Poland. The wide scope of this research is intended as an introduction to more detailed studies in the future, which will require numerous searches, interviews, and access to archives scattered all over the world, for the history of the reception of psychoanalysis in

1 The period of partitions in the history of the Polish state lasted from 1795, when the Polish First Republic, ruled by the nobility, was divided between Russia, Prussia, and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, until November 11, 1918, when independence was proclaimed and the Second Polish Republic was established. It lasted until September 1939, when the next partition of the Polish state between Nazi Germany and the USSR took place.

2 They include: Krzysztof Pawlak, Zbigniew Sokolik, "Historia psychoanalizy w Polsce," *Nowiny Psychologiczne*, No. 4 (1992), pp. 83–89; Katarzyna Walewska, "Breve histoire de la psychanalyse en Pologne," in: *Les Lettres de la Société de Psychanalyse Freudienne*, Vol. XIV (2005), pp. 104–107; Jan Malewski, "Psychoanalyse in Polen," in: *Die Psychologie des 20. Jahrhunderts III: Freud und die Folgen*, Vol. II (1977), pp. 117–118.

20th-century Poland still includes a number of uncharted territories as well as themes which should be explored.

2 Publications on the history of psychoanalysis in Poland after 1989

There are several reasons behind the fact that, in the decades-long period since World War II, no major scholarly work on the history of psychoanalysis in 20th-century Poland has been written. One of them was the paranoid suspicion of the local communist regime towards psychoanalysis, which treated psychoanalysis as a reactionary bourgeois theory incompatible with Marxist-Leninist political and social doctrine. And the communists were much helped in promoting this attitude among Polish academics and intellectuals by the charges that psychoanalytical theories were "unscientific," charges leveled by scientistically minded researchers advocating a neo-positivist understanding of science. The strategy of the Polish regime in this context was the same as the approach to psychoanalysis in other countries of the Soviet bloc.

Only after the breakthrough produced by the Solidarity movement in 1989 was it possible to undertake wider research on various trends in Polish culture and science of the 20th century which had little to do with the Marxist-Leninist tradition as it was then conceived. Making use of the research opportunities and access to materials abroad which were then becoming available, I wrote an article for the *Res Publica Nowa* journal entitled "Urwane ścieżki, z dziejów psychoanalizy w Polsce zaborów i międzywojnia" (Broken trails, from the history of psychoanalysis in Poland during the partitions and in the interwar period, 1997, no 5), where I presented the history of psychoanalysis in Poland against a broad cultural and historical backdrop. Two years later the article was published in German in the *Psyche* magazine.[3] A few years later Bartłomiej Dobroczyński wrote the book *Idea nieświadomości w polskiej myśli psychologicznej przed Freudem* (The idea of the unconscious in Polish psychological thought before Freud, Kraków 2005), a heroic attempt at reconstructing the history of the

3 Paweł Dybel, "Unterbrochene Wege. Die Geschichte der Psychoanalyse in Polen," *Psyche*, No. 11 (1999), pp. 1160–1187. A shortened version of this article appeared in the American online magazine *PsyArt* as "A Note on the History of Psychoanalysis in Poland," September 2000. Fourteen years later *Psyche* published my second article on this subject, which was also a kind of introductory project for this book: Paweł Dybel, "Die Psychoanalyse – ein gelobtes Land? Zur Kulturgeschichte der psychoanalytischen Bewegung in Polen," *Psyche*, No.3 (2014), pp. 216–247.

concept of the unconscious as it functioned in Polish psychology and psychiatry before the appearance of Freud's theory. He also demonstrated to what extent this intellectual tradition led to a positive reception of Freud's theory in the Polish medical community in the early 20th century.

But the real breakthrough came only a dozen years later. A few months after the publication of my book *Psychoanaliza – ziemia obiecana? Dzieje psychoanalizy w Polsce 1900–1989* (Psychoanalysis – The Promised Land? The History of Psychoanalysis in Poland in 1900–1989), vol. 1, a large two-volume monograph by Lena Magnone entitled *Emisariusze Freuda. Transfer kulturowy psychoanalizy do polskich sfer inteligenckich przed drugą wojną światową* (Freud's Emissaries: The Cultural Transfer of Psychoanalysis to Polish Intellectual Circles before World War II, Kraków 2016) appeared; it offered ample and previously unknown bibliographic information about Polish and Jewish "emissaries of Freud" in the Polish lands during the partitions and in the interwar period, with detailed summaries of specific books and articles. In the same year, the publishing series on the history of psychoanalysis in Poland was enriched with *Od Jekelsa do Witkacego. Psychoanaliza na ziemiach polskich pod zaborami 1900–1918. Wybór tekstów.* (From Jekels to Witkacy: Psychoanalysis in the Polish Lands under the Partitions in 1900–1918. A selection of texts, Kraków 2016) edited by Bartłomiej Dobroczyński and the undersigned. It contains short biographical notes and a selection of the most interesting texts by Polish psychoanalysts and psychiatrists from this period inspired by Freud's and Jung's theories. A few months later, a similar two-volume selection of texts edited by Lena Magnone, called *Psychoanaliza w Polsce 1909–1946* vol. I, II (Psychoanalysis in Poland 1909–1946, Warsaw 2016), was published.

Subsequent books from the series came out in 2017. The first was my work *Mesjasz, który odszedł. Bruno Schulz i psychoanaliza* (The Messiah who Left: Bruno Schulz and Psychoanalysis). In this book I attempted to show how deeply this Polish-Jewish writer was inspired, although unconsciously, by Freud's claims about the "polymorphism" of human sexual drives, providing a poignant literary testimony to the validity of his theories of masochism and fetishism. In the same year, Universitas published a collection of articles entitled *Przywracanie pamięci. Polscy psychiatrzy XX wieku orientacji psychoanalitycznej* (Restoring memory: Polish 20th-century psychiatrists of the psychoanalytical orientation, Kraków 2017), which I edited, and was devoted to most eminent Polish psychoanalysts and psychiatrists with psychoanalytical inclinations (Ludwik Jekels, Ludwika Karpińska, Eugenia Sokolnicka, Adam Wizel, Jan Nelken, Gustaw Bychowski, Maurycy Bornstein (Bornsztajn), Roman Markuszewicz, Salomea Kempner, and Hanna Segal). The texts contained in this volume present

the academic achievements and biographies of these figures against the broad historical, social, and cultural background of Poland under the partitions and in the interwar period.

Finally, the book by Mira Marcinów called *Historia polskiego szaleństwa w XIX wieku* (The History of Polish Lunacy in the 19th-Century, Gdańsk 2018) was published (outside of the Universitas series) in 2018, discussing various texts by 19th-century Polish psychologists and psychiatrists. Now we come to the two most recent books from the series. The first is Bartłomiej Dobroczyński's and Mira Marcinów's *Niezabliźniona rana Narcyza* [The Unhealed Wound of Narcissus], where the authors tried to look at Polish psychoanalysis from a different perspective than the one chosen by myself and Magnone, citing a large number of previously unknown writings and thus opening another field of discussion within this research area. The second is a collection of articles, which I edited, on the connections between Polish Modernist and interwar literature and psychoanalysis; analyzed from this angle are selected works by leading Polish writers from these periods: Karol Irzykowski, Stanisław Przybyszewski and his daughter Stanisława Przybyszewska, Bolesław Leśmian, Maria Kuncewiczowa, Witold Gombrowicz, Michał Choromański, Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz, Jan Brzękowski, Emil Zegadłowicz, and Jan Lechoń (*Powinowactwa z epoki. Związki polskiej literatury modernizmu i międzywojnia z psychoanalizą* [Affinities from the Era. Relations between the Polish Literature of Modernism and the Interwar Period and Psychoanalysis]).

The recent publishing boon for works on various aspects of the influence of Freud's, Jung's, and Adler's psychoanalytical theories on Polish intelligentsia in the period from 1900 to 1949 raises the question of the significance of these impacts in the broad context of Polish scholarship and culture at that time.

Were they of a rather superficial nature, constituting just a weak reflection of what was going on in Austria, Germany, Switzerland, or France? Or perhaps the interest in the theories of these authors had more profound roots and resulted in a number of regional interpretations and ideas which today are worth recalling and rethinking? In any case, the nearly 200 articles and the dozen or so books on psychoanalysis by Polish authors published during this period provide us with quite ample research material, and they are worth looking at from this angle.

It is no accident that this Universitas series is entitled "The History of Psychoanalysis in Poland" rather than "The History of Polish Psychoanalysis," for such a thing practically did not exist at the time both in the everyday and the institutional-legal, sense of the term. In any case, it did not exist in the sense we mean when we speak today about American, British, or French psychoanalysis, each of them having distinct features and practiced by numerous groups of

psychoanalysts belonging to psychoanalytical societies established in these countries. In addition, these psychoanalysts were also members of the International Psychoanalytical Association. In contrast, no Polish psychoanalytical association was created in Poland under the partitions or in the interwar period, despite attempts by Jekels, Sokolnicka, and Bychowski, and those Polish psychiatrists who were inspired by psychoanalysis whose therapeutic practice belonged to societies in other countries (Jekels, Nunberg, Sokolnicka, Nelken, and Bychowski). This, however, does not mean that there was nothing interesting happening in the context of how psychoanalytical theory was influencing the medical, pedagogical, and literary communities. On the contrary, its impact was very clearly noticeable, although limited to select groups. First of all, we should mention a group of psychiatrists who tried to conform to the methodical recommendations of Freud and sometimes Jung in their therapeutic practices. In addition to those mentioned above, these psychiatrists included Adam Wizel, Karol de Beaurain, Stefan Borowiecki, Tadeusz Bilikiewicz, Maurycy Bornsztajn (Bornstein), Wacław Matecki, Norbert Praeger, Roman Markuszewicz, and Stefan Higier, to name only the most important figures. Pedagogical journals published a number of works on using Freud's and Adler's theories in the educational process; some literary critics and historians of literature eagerly invoked these theories; and writers made pronouncements about them (Stanisław Przybyszewski, Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz, Bruno Schulz, Witold Gombrowicz, Emil Zegadłowicz, and others).

In the coming years, the series "The History of Psychoanalysis in Poland" will be supplemented with subsequent volumes on the reception of psychoanalysis in Poland in the Yiddish- and Hebrew-speaking communities, as well as on the subject of the Holocaust, and the history of psychoanalysis in communist Poland after World War II. These volumes are intended to not only fill the gaps in our knowledge on the influence of psychoanalytical theories on the Polish and Jewish intelligentsia under the partitions and in the interwar period, but also to encourage reflection on the role they played in this time in shaping the cultural self-knowledge of these communities and the role they could play today.

Introduction to the English edition

Psychoanalysis in Poland during the partitions and its emancipatory ideals

Speech is a powerful lord, which by means of the finest and most invisible body effects the divinest works: it can stop fear and banish grief and create joy and nurture pity. […]
The effect of speech upon the condition of the soul is comparable to the power of drugs over the nature of bodies. For just as different drugs dispel different secretions from the body, and some bring an end to disease and others to life, so also in the case of speeches, some distress, others delight, some cause fear, others make the hearers bold, and some drug and bewitch the soul with a kind of evil persuasion.

Gorgias, *Encomium of Helen*

1 Emancipatory claim of psychoanalysis and the "cauldron of ideas" in Central and Eastern Europe

The researcher who starts writing a book about the history of psychoanalysis in a country like Poland faces a unique challenge. This challenge stems from the fact that psychoanalysis appeared in the late 19th and early 20th century in Vienna as a form of therapy which, while recognizing the transformation of the patient's self-knowledge through talking as one of its effects, in the long run assumed the transformation of the self-knowledge of the society in which this patient was functioning. This approach implies that the effect of this type of therapy understood as a talking cure is not limited to its impact on the mental life of the patient subjected to analysis. Neither is it limited to asking to what extent analysis of the patient is a challenge for psychoanalysis as such, forcing the analyst, for example, to modify his own theoretical assumptions and methods.

This also raises the question of the role that psychoanalysis, conceived as the art of talking to the patient in a particular way, has played or should play in transforming the cultural self-consciousness of a given society. If a researcher writing on the history of psychoanalysis in a given country or cultural area does not pose such questions, he loses sight of that which has always constituted the foundation of psychoanalysis as the form of therapy proposed by Freud, which underwent various changes and assumed different shapes and versions. If such

issues are not raised, the researcher would not be able to account for the relationship between psychoanalysis as a unique form of mental therapy and its emancipatory claim regarding individual and collective self-knowledge.

Having said that, it is the combination of both these claims – their assessment escaping the rigorous criteria used in empirical sciences – which underlies the fact that psychoanalysis, unlike other modern forms of therapy, attracted so many arguments, controversies, doubts, and questions in the 20th century. This is tellingly evidenced by the fact that each year we see a spate of books and articles whose authors attempt to prove that this theory is full of inconsistencies and contradictions and is a kind of scientific fraud. At the same time, we get a roughly equal number of books and articles positing the exact opposite claim. Their authors argue for the epoch-making role of psychoanalysis as compared to all previous psychological and psychiatric traditions, and for its later dynamic development, which resulted in the proliferation of many concepts and trends. They also point out that some of its claims and theoretical ideas even today may become a genuine source of inspiration for practitioners of various scientific disciplines.

These discrepancies in the interpretations and evaluations of psychoanalysis in part result from the fact that in Freud's work we can find arguments both for treating psychoanalysis as a natural science with empirical foundations and for perceiving it as a special kind of hermeneutics based on the interpretation of dreams, mistakes, or symptoms, and its ultimate aim being a change in the patient's self-understanding. In addition, the analyst's ability to talk to the patient in an adequate manner, an important element of therapy, does not succumb to precise empirical procedures and criteria. Such criteria are largely useless for assessing the impact of the analyst's words on the patient's mind. Can the new kind of understanding which the patient acquires during analysis through insight into what has been repressed into the unconscious be objectively captured? And more generally, how should we approach the close connection between therapy and self-understanding which is assumed here? Does it have anything in common with science in today's conception of the term?

The problem with defining the status of psychoanalysis as a science results from the fact that it is difficult to verify empirically the therapeutic and social effects of transforming the patient's self-awareness through conversation. For what do we mean when we say that the patient changed his self-understanding as a result of therapy? In what sense does this change allow him to cope with his disorders and problems better? How can we measure and verify it all? We are on shaky ground here and using empirical criteria will not make things much easier.

Such skeptical questions about psychoanalysis were – and still are – asked by researchers who say, like many other forms of therapy, it should be guided by the epistemological ideals of modern science. One of the first people to ask such questions was Ludwig Wittgenstein, also Viennese. At first, Freud's theory reportedly fascinated him, and according to some he even wanted to become a psychoanalyst himself. But he finally concluded that psychoanalysis was a pseudo-science which had become popular only because its founder seduced the imagination of the masses by acknowledging the key importance of sexuality and gender.[4]

In fact, Wittgenstein claimed, Freud offered the masses a kind of modern myth disguised as science, which contained the promise of "salvation" of individuals from neurosis by developing a new attitude towards the whole realm of instinctive drives, especially the sexual. But the task of science is not to create myths and thus produce false self-awareness, but to provide solid, empirically grounded knowledge about humans and the world.

But can we really say that every type of knowledge which cannot be squeezed into the epistemological ideals of science conceived in the neo-positivist vein should be regarded as a myth? Must it by definition be a pseudo-science? Would a psychoanalytically emancipated society of the future, as projected by Freud and later by his disciples, be necessarily based on a false self-awareness instilled into it by representatives of this trend?

Eli Zaretsky definitely would disagree with such a view, for he believed that the revolutionary social potential of Freud's theory in this domain resulted from Freud's endowment of the concept of the unconscious with an individual, private character. This was in line with the profound changes occurring at that time in Western European societies as a consequence of the rapid development of the market economy and which found their expression in the breakdown of traditional forms of family life:

> The founding idea of psychoanalysis, the idea of dynamic or *personal unconscious,* reflected this new experience of personal life. According to that idea, stimuli that came to the individual from the society or culture were not directly registered but were first dissolved and internally reconstituted in such a way as to give them personal, even

4 Wittgenstein makes this claim in his lectures, arguing that the pronouncements of psychoanalysis cannot be adequately verified scientifically. See L. Wittgenstein, "Conversations on Freud," in: *Lectures and Conversations on Aesthetics, Psychology and Religious Belief* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967). Wittgenstein's position on Freud is the subject of Frank Cioffi's book: see Frank Cioffi, *Freud and the Question of Pseudoscience* (Chicago: Open Court, 1998).

> idiosyncratic, meanings. Thus, there was no direct or necessary connection between one's social condition and one's subjectivity. Equally important, Freud's idea of the unconscious signalled the absence, under modern conditions, of any pregiven fit or harmony between larger, public patterns of cultural symbolism and the private, inner symbolic worlds of individuals. The idea of the unconscious marked a lived sense of disjuncture between the public and the private, the outer and the inner, the sociocultural and the personal.[5]

According to Zaretsky, Freud's unconscious implied a new understanding of human subjectivity, which was more consistent with the individual's liberation from the pressures of familial, professional, social, and religious relations, and expanded the range of possible decisions regarding the individual's life. Human subjectivity's social existence clearly fell into two spheres, the private and public, characteristic for societies shaped by the so-called Second Industrial Revolution. This term, introduced by Zaretsky, refers to new social phenomena that attempted to produce a counterweight for the impersonal world of the market and found their expression in the emergence of "the 'new' (or independent) woman, the emergence of public homosexual identities, and the turning of young people away from a preoccupation with business and toward sexual experimentation, bohemia, and artistic modernism. In the period that initiated […] roughly from the 1880s to the 1920s, new urban spaces and media – popular theater, music halls, the kinetoscope – provided reference points from which individuals could imaginatively construct extrafamilial identities."[6] Based on similar assumptions, the interpretative perspective of the American historian allows for new insights into the role that Freud's theory played at the turn of the 20th century in relation to the societies of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy during its period of transformation under the influence of the market economy. It seems, however, that this author goes too far in assuming that the level of advancement of these changes and related social transformations was similar to that in the United States and Western European countries. In fact, these changes had just begun in Central and Eastern Europe, and their effects had been limited to narrow aristocratic, middle-class, and artistic elites.

Therefore, Zaretsky's proposal to look at the influence of Freud's theory in the countries and provinces of the region in the period up to the outbreak of World War I, when its impact was particularly strong, needs to be corrected, because the Second Industrial Revolution was in its introductory phase in Central/Eastern

5 Eli Zaretsky, *The Secrets of the Soul. A Social and Cultural History of Psychoanalysis* (New York: Vintage Books, 2004), pp. 5–6.

6 Zaretsky, *The Secrets of the Soul*, p. 5.

Europe, which meant that old traditions, religions, and customs remained very important. In a word, the influence of the existing "patriarchal" cultural tradition played a significant role in shaping relations within the family, in professional life and in the structure of political and administrative power. For most nationalities inhabiting the Habsburg Monarchy, it was above all the influence of a cultural tradition shaped by Catholicism, while for the overwhelming majority of the Jewish community it was the influence of the Judaic tradition.

It should also be emphasized that it was not just in the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy, but in all of Central and Eastern Europe that agricultural regions dominated at that time, with a small percentage of the population living in cities. Industrializing processes had only just begun and engaged certain segments of the population. Poverty, often extreme, was widespread, and semi-feudal relations prevailed in the countryside, while the emerging working class was brutally exploited, which caused the spread of radical attitudes among it, supported by leftist intellectual circles. This was accompanied by intensifying assimilation processes among the Jews and the enrichment of some of them, which increased social resentment and anti-Semitic sentiments.

Cultural backwardness was particularly drastic in Galicia, which was inhabited by Poles, Ukrainians, and Jews, and formed one of the poorest provinces of the Monarchy (the Austrian partition). The situation was no better in the Congress Kingdom, that is in the Russian partition, where only as late as the end of the 19th century major industrial centers appeared: in Warsaw, Łódź, and Białystok. In all three partitions pro-independence movements gained momentum, which led to the exacerbation of ethnic conflicts (e.g., between Poles and Ukrainians in Galicia). Added to that was the growing influence – related to processes of assimilation and emancipation among Jews – of Zionist groups promoting the idea of founding a Jewish state in Palestine. Moreover, socialist and social democratic ideas enjoyed growing popularity among the more progressively inclined part of the Polish and Jewish intelligentsia. Particularly popular in these communities was the Polish Socialist Party (PPS), whose agenda combined left-wing causes of equality and social justice with pro-independence ideas.[7] In opposition to it, the

7 The Polish Socialist Party was a pro-independence political group with a socialist and working-class agenda (classified as a left-wing organization). It was founded in November 1892 and remained one of the most important political forces in Poland until 1948. Almost throughout the communist period, it functioned as an independent party in exile. One of its leading figures and leaders was Józef Piłsudski.

right-wing National Democracy party was founded by Roman Dmowski, showcasing a clearly anti-Semitic and anti-German profile.[8]

Leftist intellectuals, usually associated with the PPS and often coming from Jewish families assimilated into Polish culture, constituted the majority of the first Polish psychiatrists of psychoanalytical orientation: Ludwig Jekels, Herman Nunberg, Helena Deutsch, Maurycy Bornstein (Bornsztajn)[9], Jan Nelken, Mira Gincburg, and Eugenia Sokolnicka. Some of them, especially those who studied in Warsaw, were directly involved in politics and were persecuted by the tsarist regime (Nelken, Bornstein, Gincburg). The situation was similar whether one was in Vienna, Hungary, or in Russia, where most representatives and supporters of psychoanalysis were also ideologically affiliated with leftist circles and some were directly involved in political activities.

The spread of various political ideas in the culturally backward regions of Central and Eastern Europe to which the "Polish lands" of the Austrian and Russian partition belonged[10] constituted the paradox of the social and cultural situation in this part of the continent. At the turn of the 20th century, a veritable "cauldron of ideas" bubbled, leading to the political and social mobilization of the intelligentsia and the middle class. One result of this was an increase in ethnic and social antagonisms and a deepening of political and cultural divisions within these groups.

It is in the context of this "cauldron of ideas," rather than the economic and civilizational processes which Zaretsky calls the Second Industrial Revolution, that we should analyze the beginnings of the psychoanalytical movement in the entire region. This movement was joined mostly by Jewish graduates of medical studies, who perceived Freud's theory not only as an innovative scientific theory offering a new mechanism for human mental life and as a proposal for a new method of therapy for mental disorders, but also as a theory which, when

8 National Democracy, also known as the national movement or the national camp (the popular name "Endecja" came from the abbreviation ND), was a political movement with a nationalist ideology formed in 1887. Its main ideologist and co-founder was Roman Dmowski, who during World War I – in opposition to Piłsudski – advocated an alliance of Poles with Russia.

9 In the twenties Maurycy Bornstein changed his name into "Bornsztajn".

10 The term "Polish lands" refers to the territories which before the partitions (1772–1795) belonged to the First Polish Republic, that is the Commonwealth of Both Nations, Poles and Lithuanians, in the East, covering the area of later Austrian Galicia, almost half of its inhabitants being Ukrainians, as well as today's Belarus, Latvia, and some Russian lands. This term only has a historical sense, now obsolete.

implemented in therapeutic practice, would lead to a fundamental change in the functioning of the "economy" of human mental life in terms of the role played by sexual drives and aggression. This would open the way to the emergence of a human being who would be able to cope better with the threats generated by these drives. And in the longer term, it would allow for the emergence of a new psychoanalytically enlightened society and emancipate it not only regarding sexuality, but from anti-Semitic prejudices.

These first-generation Freudian psychoanalysts, coming in large part from Galicia, assigned a crucial role to the emancipatory claim contained in Freud's theory. For them this constituted the fundamental difference between psychoanalysis and other psychiatric and psychological concepts popular at the time. And this difference determined the particular attractiveness of Freud's theory for young adepts of medicine from Jewish families assimilated into Austrian or Polish culture (or both). They saw in it, just like in Marxism, social democracy or Zionism, a concept holding the promise of fulfilling their emancipatory hopes and desires, the promise of producing a new human who would be emancipated from himself, and a society which would be based on the principles of equality and social justice. Only if we consider this social and political dimension implicitly contained in Freud's theory can we understand why it was so attractive to young Jewish graduates of the medical sciences.

2 Psychoanalysis and Polish Modernism in literature

Let us return to the Polish cultural context, crucial for this book. The assimilation of Jewish communities in Galicia and the Congress Kingdom in the 19th and early 20th century occurred mostly through studying Polish literature, through reading its classic works and getting acquainted with its dominant trends. This was possible thanks to the existence of an extensive network of primary and secondary schools whose language of instruction was Polish, and a few Polish universities in Galicia, above all in Lviv and Kraków. It was much worse in the Russian partition, but Polish schools (private educational facilities and universities with classes in Polish) also existed there. The worst situation in this respect was in the Prussian partition, where the policy of Germanization targeting the Polish population was a major strategic aim of the government.

As for the Jews who attended Polish schools in Galicia, not all of them found Polish literature of the Romantic period to their liking. For example, Martin Buber, who attended a Polish school and wrote his first texts in Polish, said that he was more attracted to the idealist German philosophy than to the literature

of Polish Romanticism. Therefore, in his youth, he possessed a somewhat more German than Polish cultural identity.

In any case, at the turn of the 20th century, modernist ideas dominated Polish literary circles, presided over by Nietzsche and Schopenhauer – treated more as writers rather than philosophers – and by the native Romantic literature. These ideas found a telling expression in the work of writers from the Young Poland period. One of the initiators of this trend was Stanisław Przybyszewski, who up until 1898 had lived in Berlin, where he assumed the mantle of the leader of the German-Scandinavian artistic bohemia. He wrote his first literary works in German, and, besides Nietzsche, embraced Freud's theory as one of his main sources of inspiration.[11] Fascination with Romantic literature is also clearly visible in the case of Ludwig Jekels. In his book entitled *An Outline of Freud's Psychoanalysis*, the first work on Freud's theory published in Polish (and one of the first overall), he quoted a significant excerpt from Adam Mickiewicz's drama *Dziady* (Forefathers' Eve), one of the most important works of Polish Romantic literature:

> Wisemen say "dream is back to life recalled."
> Cursed wiseman, all!
> Can I not distinguish dream from memory?
>
> Adam Mickiewicz, *Forefathers' Eve*, Prologue[12]

11 In his autobiography, Stanisław Przybyszewski wrote, for example:

> I imagine what a bizarre paradox all my reasoning seems to all of you, and yet given that official science starts to proclaim theories which I have been promoting for 30 years, it is by no means sterile.
>
> The great psychologist Freud in Vienna weaves the rich and interesting patterns of his theories on the same loom, and a few years ago I had this satisfaction that at the congress of psychologists in Vienna my *De profundis* was quoted as an insightful description of what twenty years later was to be called *Dämmerungszustand* in German psychiatry.
>
> O, qualis artifex pereo!
>
> Being a madman myself, I would have really made a great psychiatrist. Throughout my life I have been rummaging in those unknown, possessed, insane, crazy states of the human soul, so despite myself I had to be infected with the madness of my heroes […].
>
> Stanisław Przybyszewski, *Moi współcześni* (Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1959), pp. 166–167.

12 Adam Mickiewicz, *Forefathers' Eve*, trans. Charles S. Kraszewski (London: Glagoslav Publications Limited, 2016).

Quoting this excerpt from the masterpiece of Polish Romantic literature, Jekels was aware of its crucial role in shaping the cultural consciousness of the Polish intelligentsia. He certainly also knew that one of the main points of Mickiewicz's poetic program – as well as of Polish Romanticism as a whole – was the vindication of the importance of dreams in the spiritual biography of a person. This approach was in line with the views of the "Master from Vienna" as presented in his book about dreams. Its main claim, after all, was that dreams had "sense." This affinity of the native Romantic tradition and psychoanalysis probably also explains why the first Polish texts in psychoanalytic literary theory were overwhelmingly devoted to works by Mickiewicz and Słowacki, not to mention the book by Gustaw Bychowski on Słowacki, the most important interwar work in literary studies written from a psychoanalytical perspective.[13]

Pointing at Mickiewicz's distinction between memory and dreams, Jekels wanted to illustrate for the Polish reader the crucial importance attached in Freud's theory to notions determined by drives, and which have their roots in events from youth. It is not a coincidence that Polish physicians, in their first articles on Freud's psychoanalysis, emphasized the key role of his theory of dreams and the role of imagination in the mental structure of the individual. This theme is discussed most exhaustively in a paper Jekels delivered at the first Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists, and Psychologists which took place in 1909 in Warsaw. This event could be considered the beginning of the reception of Freud's psychoanalysis in this community. The paper started with the following claim:

"The basis of Freud's theory of psychoneuroses is the view that the causes of the disease are unconscious sets of representations, symbolised by a physical or mental symptom of the disease. As far as the nature of these sets is concerned, psychoanalytical examination shows that we always deal with the representations that remain in sharp conflict with the rest of the individual's consciousness."[14]

A similar claim was made by Herman Nunberg, who made his first major public appearance at the Second Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists, and Psychologists in 1912 in Kraków, where he gave a fiery lecture on Freud's

13 Gustaw Bychowski, *Słowacki i jego dusza. Studium psychoanalityczne* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo J. Mortkowicza, 1930); second edition: ed. Danuta Danek (Kraków: Universitas, 2002).

14 Ludwik Jekels, *Leczenie psychoneuroz za pomocą metody psychoanalitycznej Freuda, tudzież kazuistyka,* in: „Neurologia Polska" (Warszawa) 1910, special issue: „Prace 1go Zjazdu Neurologów, psychiatrów i psychologów polskich odbytego w Warszawie 11–12–13 października 1909 r., ed. Adam Ciągliński and others p. 613.

theory of dreams.[15] Jan Nelken, associated with the workshop of Carl Gustav Jung in Burghölzli, focused on analyzing the symbolism in the fantasies of schizophrenics and claimed that his analysis did not lead to "the creation of individual symbolism, but to the recreation of entire systems of symbols from the ancient world, that is an individual in a state of strong introversion recreates the sets of thoughts, feelings, and desires of the whole race, which, long ago repressed from collective consciousness, were revived in the symbols contained in myths, cults, etc."[16] Consequently, participants of the Congress less familiar with Freud's and Jung's theories might have gotten the impression that psychoanalysis dealt mostly with schizophrenic fantasies of the mentally ill and with dreams. It corresponded to the neo-Romantic atmosphere of Young Poland prevailing at the time in the Kraków artistic community. Another thing is that, because of its specialized nature, the Congress did not arouse much interest in this community. Its most prominent member was Stanisław Przybyszewski, who was deeply convinced that it was him rather than Freud who first discovered "the unconscious."[17] But there was one exception: Karol Irzykowski made an appearance at the Congress. This outstanding literary critic was also the author of the novel *Pałuba. Sny Marii Dunin* [*The Hag. The Dreams of Maria Dunin*]. This book, published in 1902, contained a number of themes showing an amazing affinity with Freud's *The Interpretation of Dreams*.[18] Inspired by what he heard at the Congress about psychoanalysis, Irzykowski later wrote the article "Freudianism and Freudists" in which he stated that the theory of the Viennese psychiatrist had a great future ahead of it.[19]

But of crucial importance in Polish Romantic literature is another topos that, to an equal degree, influenced the way Freud's theory was read by Polish

15 The paper was later published as: Herman Nunberg, "Niespełnione życzenia według nauki Freuda," *Neurologia Polska*, Vol. III, No. 1 (1913), pp. 1–13.

16 Jan Nelken, "Badania psychoanalityczne chorób nerwowych," *Neurologia Polska*, Vol. III, No.1 (1913), p. 251.

17 Stanisław Przybyszewski was a leading Polish writer of the Young Poland period. In 1898 he arrived in Kraków from Berlin, where he had been a leading representative of the local bohemia. He gained fame in Germany with his essays on Chopin, Nietzsche, Wiegeland, Munch, and Hamsun.

18 Irzykowski's presence was noted by Ludwik Jekels in his report from the Congress for the *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse*. See Ludwig Jekels, "Vom II. Polnischen Neurologen- und Psychiater-Kongreß in Krakau (20. Bis 23 Dezember 1912)," *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse,* No. 2 (1913), pp. 191–192.

19 Karol Irzykowski, "Freudyzm i freudyści," *Prawda*, No. 2–6, 8–9 (1913), pp. 1–2; reprinted in: *Kronos*, No. 1 (2010), pp. 215–229.

psychoanalysts during the partitions and in the interwar period. It is the topos of the transformation of the Romantic hero, who at first is a young man unhappily in love, but becomes aware that his main task in life is to fight for the freedom of his country. This topos is captured in *Forefathers' Eve* in the key scene of the protagonist's transformation from Gustaw into Konrad, and it appears in the dramas and poetry of Juliusz Słowacki. In the works of Mickiewicz, this theme also serves as the foundation for the concept of Messianism, which assigned to Poland the role of "Christ of Nations." According to this idea, the Polish people were to shed the yoke of the occupiers through their relentless fight for independence and thus bring freedom to other European nations deprived of their own statehood.

Mickiewicz tried to implement this messianic idea by creating Polish legions in Italy and Turkey, with one detachment composed of Jews. But it soon turned out that the idea had little chance of success in the political reality of the time. Interestingly, the messianic idea developed by Mickiewicz strongly influenced not only the Polish intelligentsia, but also the new Jewish Messianism which later emerged in Galicia and was based on the Jewish return to Palestine.[20]

It is not a coincidence that when we follow the reception of Freud's theory by the Polish medical community in 1909–1939, our attention is drawn to numerous discussions on the emancipatory claim contained within it. As I have already said, Freud's theory assumed a radical change in self-knowledge, both that of the patient and of society as a whole. This view was first explicitly posited by Ludwika Karpińska (Luise von Karpinska), a Polish psychologist and philosopher connected with the Jungian and Viennese circles, probably analyzed by Freud himself. She saw a parallel between the type of self-knowledge acquired by the analyzed patient and the emergence of a "new type of man." This is how she writes about the human being of the future, transformed by psychoanalysis: "This type of man will be internally more free, stronger, more persevering in facing hardships, more indulgent to others and more demanding of himself, because he will understand that both evil and good flow from the deepest layer

20 Today, very rich literature on this subject exists. Maria Janion wrote about the links between Mickiewicz's Messianism and Jewish Messianism in her article "Legion żydowski Mickiewicza," in: *Bohater, spisek, śmierć. Wykłady żydowskie* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo: W.A.B, 2009), pp. 223–258. A few decades later, after their initial propagation, Mickiewicz's messianic ideas will be invoked by the first Zionist activists in Poland during the partitions (i.e., Mordechaj Bentova). See Elkana Margalit, "Social and intellectual origins of the Hashomer Hatzair youth movement 1913–1920," *JOC*, No. 2 (1969), pp. 25–49.

of his essence rather than being dependent on hostile external powers."[21] Of course, one can be skeptical of Karpińska's view that a "deepened" knowledge of the human mind brought about by Freud's theory would lead to the birth of a "new man" who will be more resistant to hardships and will prevail over his own aggression. In fact, Freud never made such direct and unambiguous pronouncements on this matter. Nevertheless, basing his concept of psychoanalytical therapy on assigning a crucial role to unconscious sexual and aggressive drives in mental disorders and proposing that the patient should change his own attitude toward them, he clearly assumed a change in the patient's self-knowledge during therapy. It was expected that after the analysis the patient would better comprehend the nature of his desires and the conflicts produced by them.

Due to this assumption, Freud was later faced with the question of how far psychoanalysis could influence the transformation of society. He himself was very restrained on this subject and tried to avoid formulating radical claims. But the fact that this was how his theory was interpreted by many of his students and followers was not accidental. Finally, since he had proclaimed – just like Nietzsche – the death of God and religion and proposed a new "strategy" in dealing with instincts, he could not fail to assume a radical change in the functioning of society. Psychoanalysis was expected to change everything, but before it could happen, it had to take deeper root in society. According to the author of *Totem and Taboo*, this was only a question of time.

3 The beginnings of psychoanalysis in the Polish lands and the assimilation of Jews

The first period of the influence of psychoanalysis on Polish intelligentsia, from 1909 to 1918, was during the partitions when the Polish state did not exist. As I have already mentioned, its followers were mostly young Jews assimilated into Polish culture, usually graduates of medical studies from the Austrian partition (Galicia) and the Congress Kingdom. In their case, assimilation generally meant Polonization, which resulted either from 19th-century patriotic familial traditions (Eugenia Sokolnicka, Maurycy Bornsztajn) or from the aforementioned fact that they grew up in a Polish environment and received an education in Polish schools and universities. There, they not only mastered Polish, but also gained knowledge about Polish cultural traditions, with which they

21 Ludwika Karpińska, "O psychoanalizie," *Ruch Filozoficzny*, Vol. IV, No. 2 (1914), pp. 33–38.

identified. Other factors, psychological, environmental, familial, and so on, were often at play too. But in the Prussian partition, due to the brutal policies of Germanization forced on the Polish population (the prohibition on using Polish in schools, the absence of Polish universities, and so on), such possibilities did not exist. As a result, the assimilation of Jews in the Prussian partition meant their Germanization. Moreover, unlike the Jewish population in Galicia and Congress Kingdom, which was overall very poor, in Prussia assimilated Jews formed a wealthy and well-educated segment of the German middle class. Therefore, their assimilation up until World War I was very rapid and successful.[22]

Another important factor was the fact that in all the partitions, especially the Russian one, almost all of the Polish intelligentsia was involved in underground pro-independence activities. And in Galicia, due to the wide-ranging autonomy of the province, Polish-language literary and cultural life flourished. These historical and cultural contexts allow us to understand why a significant number of assimilating Jews were Polonized, despite the fact that no Polish state existed at the time. These were very often reciprocal processes, which is well-illustrated by the words of Helena Deutsch, who was born in Przemyśl under the Austrian partition:

> In the period leading up to World War I, Poland was a vortex of clashing social trends. In my immediate surroundings, contradictory ideologies appeared in three generations of my ancestors, who bore the heavy burden of being a Polish Jew. […] In some families religious orthodoxy was deeply ingrained, while in others you could have an Orthodox grandfather, but also a completely assimilated grandson considering himself Polish. These assimilated young people took an active part in Polish political demonstrations, national holidays and the like, and there were even those who joined in sporadic acts of resistance against the Austrian Empire.[23]

Deutsch speaks here about the divisions within Jewish communities in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, where the Polish independence movement was not as strong as in the Russian partition. This explains why almost all psychoanalytically oriented psychiatrists getting their medical education in this partition were involved in political activities and belonged to left-wing underground organizations. We could name here Wacław Radecki, the aforementioned Bornstein and Nelken, as well as Karpińska, Sokolnicka, and Gincburg.

---

22 This was the result of a deliberate immigration policy towards Jews pursued by Prussian kings in the 19th century. One of the key elements of this policy was the introduction of property qualifications for every Jewish immigrant.

23 Helen Deutsch, *Confrontations with Myself* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1973), p. 83.

This left-wing approach, often combined with elements of social and cultural liberalism, will be characteristic also for the interwar Polish psychiatrists with a psychoanalytical orientation: Adam Wizel, Tadeusz Bilikiewicz, Roman Markuszewicz, and the most eminent of them all, Gustaw Bychowski.

When pointing out the crucial role of the Romantic theme of the protagonist's transformation in shaping the national identity of the 19th-century Polish intelligentsia, we should also note that in the literature of Positivism, that is the epoch which succeeded Romanticism, this theme assumes a new form. After the defeat of the 1863 uprising, which resulted in thousands of its participants being exiled to Siberia, the period of the Positivist fascination of the Polish intelligentsia with the discoveries of the natural sciences and scientific-technological progress began. The Romantic hero turns from an indomitable warrior, fighting for the independence of his country, into an intellectual and a social activist obsessed with raising the level of education in society and establishing a system of health care accessible to all.

The national hero is now a doctor working "at the grassroots" of social existence. He is ready to treat the sick for free, often risking his own health. When, for example, I read in Phyllis Grosskurth's monograph on Melanie Klein that her father, a doctor from Lviv, traveled from village to village during a typhoid fever epidemic and treated people for free, the idea of "grassroots work," popular among the Polish intelligentsia at the time, automatically springs to mind.[24] And I vividly see the figure of Judym from Żeromski's *Ludzie bezdomni* [Homeless people], a young doctor from a Jewish family who puts a sign on the door of his office saying that he will receive patients without charging them. Or when I learn that, after his wife's suicide, Jekels sold his sanatorium in Bystra – apparently for quite a modest sum – to the Group of Polish Miners from Karvina, who arranged a House of Health for – as the text on the information board informed – "their sickly wives and daughters wasted by chlorosis."[25]

At the turn of the 20th century, the situation changed to a certain degree, namely the underground independence movement became more active, especially in the Congress Kingdom. As a result, the two models of the hero, Romantic and Positivist, merged. The new role model for the Polish intellectual was an independence fighter who was also an ardent social activist, and who believed in the idea of "organic work" and advocated left-wing causes of equality

24 Phyllis Grosskurth, *Melanie Klein: Her World and Her Work* (New York: Knopf, 1986).

25 Such information can be found in the history of the Bystra hospital. See http://www.szpitalbystra.pl/index.php/o-nas/historia.

and social justice. He considered selfless service to society, utilizing his skills and knowledge, as patriotic activity.

The influence of these ideas was particularly visible in the pedagogical, philosophical, and medical communities. This was the period of the pre-eminence of great social activists in Polish science and medicine, involved in the development of health care and raising the level of hygiene in Polish society. We should name here Edward Abramowski, who was also – along with Kazimierz Twardowski from Lviv – the greatest Polish psychologist at the turn of the century. Incidentally, he was the author of the work *Experimental Research on Memory*, with two volumes devoted to the subject of the "unconscious."[26] He understood this term quite differently than Freud, but his works prepared the ground for a wide-ranging interest in psychoanalysis in the Polish medical community. Another great physician and social activist was Ludwik Natanson, who pointed out the important role of unconscious determinants in conscious behavior and thinking.[27] This figure deserves particular attention in the context of our analysis, because he initiated the construction of the Jewish Hospital in the Warsaw district of Czyste, having for several decades collected funds from private persons. In the interwar period, this hospital was the main center of psychoanalytical thought and practice in Poland.

Finally, we should mention Adam Wizel, the doyen of Polish psychiatry, who at the end of his life in the 1920s took an interest in psychoanalysis. Wizel was also involved in the efforts to build the aforementioned hospital, and its first buildings were constructed in 1902. In 1906, along with Samuel Goldflam, Wizel founded the Society for the Care of Poor, Neurotic and Mentally Ill Jews, and in 1908 had a part in the establishment of the well-known institution for mentally ill Jews, the famous "Zofiówka," in Otwock, Warsaw. In the 1930s its director was the psychiatrist Jakub Frostig, inventor of insulin shock therapy for schizophrenia and a person analyzed by Fenichel.

Writing about the beginnings of the reception of psychoanalysis in "Polish lands" during the partitions, I strongly emphasize this social and cultural context, because it makes it easier to understand the importance of social activism, sometimes combined with pro-independence political involvement, in the biographies of early Polish psychoanalysts and psychiatrists of Jewish origin. It also

---

26 Edward Abramowski, *Badania doświadczalne nad pamięcią* (Warsaw: E.Wende i S-ka, 1910), Vol. I–III.

27 Ludwig Natanson, *Teorya jestestw idiodynamicznych*, (Warszawa: W drukarni J. Bergera, 1883).

highlights the extremely difficult conditions for therapeutic work during the partitions, as well as in the interwar period; these people often lacked adequate material resources and equipment (of course, this was also associated with the fact that the so-called Second Industrial Revolution as understood by Zaretsky was still in its initial phase here).

In this situation, the involvement of the Polish and Jewish medical community in social activism was a natural attempt at compensating, at least to some extent, for the terrible condition of the clinical infrastructure. This community was characterized by a unique ethos in this respect. In one of his articles, Jan Nelken quotes statistical data on the number of inhabitants of particular Austro-Hungarian provinces per psychiatric ward bed. In other provinces this number was usually between 600 and 1100, while in Galicia there were 6,494 inhabitants per bed.[28] The situation in the Russian partition did not look any better, and it concerned hospitals both for the Polish and Jewish populations. Adam Wizel wrote about this in 1899:

> The deficit of lunatic asylums is a great social evil in our country […]. Each of our psychiatric wards serves as a shelter for a huge number of patients who are not eligible for hospitalization. […] Today, a patient with acute psychosis who could be cured knocks in vain at the hospital gates. He cannot get there, because his place is occupied by a demented mental cripple […]. And the sick person goes away from the hospital and waits for a free bed until he himself becomes a demented mental cripple.[29]

This disastrous state of the health care system persisted in Poland in the interwar period. Zofia Podgórska-Klawe writes about the conditions that prevailed in the psychiatric wards of Warsaw hospitals in the 1920s: "The state of psychiatric wards was the worst. […] In addition, they were hugely overcrowded. During an inspection it turned out that often two patients were put in one bed and under one blanket."[30] It also happened that patients were laid on the floor on mats, in the corridor, and even on the stairs. There were conflicts and even fights between patients, and the police sometimes had to intervene. Such working conditions were difficult to imagine for the Austrian members of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society. No wonder that native psychiatrists often had

---

28 Jan Nelken, "O potrzebie państwowego Zakładu dla umysłowo chorych zbrodniarzy w Galicji," *Lwowski Przegląd Lekarski*, No. 42 (1913), pp. 667–671.

29 Adam Wizel, "Ze spraw szpitalnych," *Medycyna*, Vol. XXVII, No. 12 (1899), pp. 274–277, Vol. XXVII, No. 13, pp. 298–300.

30 Zofia Podgórska-Klawe, "Szpital Starozakonnych w Warszawie," part 2, *Pamiętnik Towarzystwa Lekarskiego Warszawskiego*, 2008. https://docplayer.pl/5161017-Zarys-historii-szpitala-wolskiego-dawniej-szpitala-starozakonnych-na-czystem.html.

to deal with psychotic, deeply disordered patients completely unable to function in society.

These difficulties were exacerbated by poor social awareness of the importance of various forms of mental therapy for the functioning of the community. The very idea of visiting a psychiatrist degraded the individual in the eyes of the people around him, and such a person was subject to social exclusion. This state of social awareness in the context of mental disorders was suggestively expressed by Roman Markuszewicz in his funeral address for Adam Wizel:

> […] Psychiatrists are still working in much too-difficult conditions, our society shows too little understanding of psychiatry, of this field of the medical sciences which combines knowledge of both the human body and soul – and therefore it should be the pinnacle of the medical sciences, but in fact it is a poor relation. And therefore the life of the psychiatrist is difficult: for he has to struggle not only against the tough problems which he constantly encounters in his scholarly activity – but he must also overcome the indifference of society towards those whom people contemptuously call "loonies."[31]

These circumstances, of both an objective and subjective nature, were due largely to the fact that in the interwar period Poland was an economically backward agricultural country where the middle class (in the Western sense of this term) was only starting to emerge. And even this was mostly thanks to the economic activity of the Jewish population. Using Eli Zaretsky's terminology, Poland was a country which, unlike its Western counterparts, did not have a Second Industrial Revolution. According to Zaretsky, the importance of this revolution for the popularity of psychoanalysis in the West was because it gave the individual the freedom to decide about his personal life, especially the sexual sphere.[32] This does not mean that the middle class indulged in sexual behaviors incompatible with the rigorous approach to the whole sphere of sexuality espoused by the Church (promiscuity, visits to brothels by men, the diversity of sexual positions, using various contraceptives, frequent changes of partners, premarital sex, and so on). On the contrary, they were treated as something obvious and natural in "social practice." And perverse behaviors, the sexual harassment of women, the

31 Roman Markuszewicz, "O działalności naukowej ś.p. D-ra Adama Wizla" (a paper delivered on December 17, 1928, at a meeting of the Psychological Section of the Warsaw Philosophical Society), *Medycyna*, No. 17–18 (1929), p. 261.

32 Zaretsky, *The Secrets of the Soul*, pp. 15–115.

sexual abuse of children by adults, and other such behaviors constituted taboos. People often knew about them, but they simply tried to ignore them.[33]

But in the sphere of public life and officially declared attitudes, there was evident pressure from the cultural Superego, rigorously shaped by religious tradition. Succumbing to its impact, people treated sexuality as an expression of a biologically rooted striving for procreation, and it was held to be of secondary importance in the realm of human mental experience. This was clearly manifested in the manner in which Freud's claims about sexuality were received in the Polish interwar academic community: he was accused of crude "pansexualism" and subjected to devastating criticism.

So Zaretsky is clearly correct when he says that the changes in social consciousness (and subconsciousness) which took place under the impact of the Second Industrial Revolution in the United States and Western European countries were among the key factors that, at least since the 1920s, had led to the popularization of psychoanalysis among the middle class in these countries. This means that although his hypothesis is problematic in the context of the early "Viennese" period of the emergence of the psychoanalytical movement and its spread in Central and Eastern Europe, it explains very well the later shift of the center of gravity in the development of this movement in Western European countries and the United States.

In the Polish and Jewish societies of the interwar period, this "Western," liberal, self-aware approach to this sphere of the individual's private life was characteristic only for an elitist, well-educated, and wealthy bourgeoisie with liberal-leftist views. Czesław Miłosz perceived this very clearly when he said in an article for the *Piony* journal from 1932 that "Freudianism and liberated sexualism" was the "ideological menu" of the "fat Polish and Jewish bourgeoisie," but it was alien for the petty bourgeoisie.[34] This explains why in interwar Poland a psychotherapist who wanted to use the "talking cure" in his private practice could not count on many patients. Sexual matters were generally treated as "embarrassing"; they were instinctively associated with something dirty and sinful, and in addition they were considered to be of little importance for the various complications of human mental life. Another problem is that we know very little

33 This prudish and hypocritical attitude towards sexuality in Polish bourgeois circles in the interwar period is described by Kamil Janicki in his book *Epoka hipokryzji. Seks i erotyka w przedwojennej Polsce* (Kraków: Ciekawostki Historyczne, 2015).

34 See Czesław Miłosz, "Dwa fałsze et co.," in: *Przygody młodego umysłu*, ed. Anna Stawiarska, (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak, 2003), pp. 56–57.

even about those few patients, mainly Jews, who were subjected to psychoanalytical treatment (or its elements) – for the simple reason that an overwhelming majority of them were murdered during the war. In any case, the preserved accounts of Bychowski, Bornsztajn, Matecki, or Markuszewicz from their therapies show that they attempted to follow the methodological requirements of Freudian psychoanalysis.

4 Where did Freud come from?

Let us return to Karpińska's statement on the development of a new human personality through psychoanalysis. Freud, as I have already mentioned, never spoke so radically about the man of the future transformed by psychoanalysis, although this idea certainly appeared on the horizon of his theory. This is evidenced not only by his numerous comments in his articles and letters or by his later works in social and cultural theories. The numerous continuations of his theory also testify to this, such as the ideas of Wilhelm Reich or Herbert Marcuse, where psychoanalysis was expected to play – along with Marxist theory – a crucial role in transforming the economic and political order in Western European and American societies.

This emancipatory claim is of key importance for understanding the dynamic development of psychoanalysis in Central and Eastern Europe in the first half of the 20th century, because, as I have also mentioned, it was attuned to large-scale assimilation among Jews. Young representatives of the Jewish community, usually from petty bourgeois families, saw higher education as a basic means to gain a higher social status and to assimilate with people from different ethnic backgrounds. Since the easiest way to a career and social respect was through the professions of physician and lawyer, young Jews stormed the doors of medical and legal departments. Members of the Vienna psychoanalytical society centered around Freud came mostly from the medical profession.

In their case, the fascination with the therapeutic method proposed by Freud, assuming a change of the patient's attitude to the instinctive foundations of his mental life – and thus a change of his self-understanding – was combined with the hope that in the future this would lead to the emergence of a new, psychoanalytically emancipated type of man, who would be free from the negative influences of these drives, or at least neutralize them to some extent. In a word, the emancipation of the individual from his drives was to be followed by a collective emancipation of the whole society. Jewish medical students saw the emancipatory claim of psychoanalysis as an extension of the emancipatory strivings and ambitions of which they were an embodiment. One can say that the particular

attractiveness of Freud's theory in their eyes came from the fact that this theory assumed a transformation of self-awareness, not so much in the horizontal perspective, or through the individual's adaptation to his environment, but in the vertical perspective, namely through a change in the functioning of the whole "economy" of his mental life. The change should be profound, affecting not only the surface of consciousness, but also reach into the unconscious instinctive roots of the human mind.

This leads to the conclusion that a crucial role in the emergence and development of the psychoanalytical movement in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, and then in its spread into other countries of the Central and Eastern European region, was played by the emancipatory strivings of assimilated and assimilating Jewish communities. This factor was marginalized in Zaretsky's monograph. Due to the fact that the Second Industrial Revolution in particular regions of the Monarchy was only beginning and in some areas, for example in Galicia, semi-feudal economic relations still prevailed,[35] we can hardly speak about radical changes in general social consciousness as described by Zaretsky in *The Secrets of the Soul*.

For this reason, only a small part of the Viennese population could undergo the form of therapy proposed by Freud. The category of potential patients was even narrower in Budapest, Prague, Lviv, Kraków, and Warsaw. In short, there was a very small group of patients ready to take a reflexive-critical approach to their own "personal unconscious."[36] The lack of patients corresponded with the academic and social isolation of the psychoanalytical movement, formed by a small group of young Jewish doctors treated very suspiciously by the university and bourgeois circles. Moreover, most members of this movement showed left-wing political sympathies, which was not very popular among the bourgeoisie in the Habsburg Monarchy, so the academic and social isolation was exacerbated by political isolation.

If the main claim of Zaretsky's book was true, namely his claim that there is an affinity between Freud's concept of the "personal unconscious" and the notion of an individual liberated from family ties and the pressure of tradition by the Second Industrial Revolution, the psychoanalytical movement in Vienna and particular regions of the Monarchy had no right to emerge and to develop.

---

35 Larry Wolff writes about this in his book *The Idea of Galicia. History and Fantasy in Habsburg Political Culture* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2010), pp. 308–350.

36 See Zaretsky, *The Secrets of the Soul*, pp. 15–40.

So where did Freud and the psychoanalytical movement around him come from? The genealogy of this movement is similar to the pedigree of many other scientific theories whose authors propose a radically new discourse within a given discipline, undermining the existing conceptual paradigms. Such discourses provide new perspectives for looking at the issues at hand and explain them better than existing theories; at first, such a discourse provokes widespread criticism, but then gradually gains acceptance in a given academic community and finds a growing group of supporters. We are dealing here with a process which basically took place in the sphere of scientific thought, and its course looked more or less as it was described in Thomas S. Kuhn's famous book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*.[37]

In the case of Freud's psychoanalytical theory, the underlying understanding of the relationship between the system of consciousness and the unconscious was of decisive importance, as it led to a completely different perception of the whole "mental apparatus" and a new recognition of particular mental phenomena and the relationships between them (dreams, symptoms). It was followed by a new method, developed by Freud, of conducting therapy, also quite distinct in its assumptions from contemporary mainstream psychiatry and psychotherapy.

From this perspective, the issue of social changes taking place under the impact of the Second Industrial Revolution was of secondary importance, in part for the simple reason that in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy these transformations were still in the incipient stage. The fact that, as it later turned out, an important determinant of Freud's concept of the unconscious was its individual, personal nature, which implied the idea of an agent "free" from familial influences and religious tradition, could not yet correspond with the free-market changes in the Habsburg Monarchy and the emergence on a mass scale of a new middle class with a liberal approach to sexuality. The Freudian concept of the unconscious was in line with these transformations, but it was essentially a product of his theoretical thought, rather than an effect of cultural and economic transformations in the Monarchy.

An important role in the later development of the psychoanalytical movement was played by the processes – increasingly intense in the second half of the 19th century – of assimilation and emancipation of Jewish communities under Austro-Hungarian rule. Massive enrollment of younger Jews and Jewesses in the medical departments of Vienna, Budapest, Prague, Kraków, Lviv, Warsaw,

37 Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

and Russian cities, on a scale incomparable to that in Western countries, was the foundation for the dynamic development of the movement. That was the distinguishing feature of the spread of psychoanalysis in Central and Eastern European medical communities, and this process concerned mostly young Jewish graduates of medical departments at universities in this region (and in Switzerland), rather than the widely respected professorial class which usually subscribed to completely different forms of therapy. In this region, the process fundamentally differed from the way in which, according to Kuhn, new scientific theories usually emerge within a given discipline.

This should also explain the "incomprehensible" fact that in the Habsburg Monarchy, that is a country which was then at the periphery of free-market economic and cultural processes, a tendency emerged which in its assumptions seemed to correspond to the cultural and social transformations occurring at this time in the United States and Western Europe. And this found its telling illustration in the 1920s, when Germany, France, Great Britain, and the United States became the main centers of the psychoanalytical movement.

The birth of the psychoanalytical movement in Vienna and its spread to other urban centers in the Habsburg Monarchy and the neighboring countries was an unusual event, in the sense that the movement's main foundation was the intellectual capital brought by representatives of assimilated Jewish communities in Central and Eastern Europe. This intellectual capital materialized very quickly through the constant enrichment and modification of Freud's theoretical insights and ideas with a number of new approaches and refinements. And also, of course, through the emergence of various rival proposals, which Freud usually disavowed and rejected (Stekel, Adler, Tausk, Rank and, of course, Jung). This dynamic development and the emergence of a number of new theoretical ideas within it was enabled by the fact that psychoanalysis was a completely new discipline still in the process of formation, not yet solidified institutionally and not subjected to strict methodological rigor. This opened a space for various types of innovation, leading in time to the emergence of a psychoanalytical discourse using its own terminology, quite distinct from all other discourses prevailing in psychiatry and psychotherapy at the time. It was, to use Foucault's term, a discourse with a separate *episteme*, incomparable to the *episteme* of other discourses from that era; its authors and followers started to obsessively protect its distinctiveness, for good and for bad. This is why this peculiar *episteme* of psychoanalysis, which could not be forced into the epistemological patterns of neo-positivist science, so badly irritated Wittgenstein, Popper, and others. And still irritates the heirs of this philosophical tradition.

But if we look at it within the wider context of cultural and social transformations which, along with the dynamic development of capitalist economic forms, took place above all in Western countries (but not in the Habsburg Monarchy), it turns out that Freud's theory, with its concept of the "personal unconscious," was in tune with these transformations. His concept assumed that the patient, as a free agent, was capable of taking a critical approach to his dependencies on others, which lay at the source of his disorders, and of radically changing his relations with them. The effectiveness of this type of therapy was based largely on the extent to which interpersonal relations – with family, friends, and colleagues – in a given community allowed the emancipation of the individual from his dependencies.

In the countries of Central and Eastern Europe we can hardly speak about the emergence of this type of modern society, which influenced the situation of the psychoanalytical movement in the region. On the one hand, the movement was part of modernization and supported it, but on the other hand, since these processes were very weak and the movement was made up mostly of young, emancipated Jews, it soon acquired an elitist and self-enclosed character. It became a kind of curiosity with practically no chance of taking root outside the milieu of the wealthy Viennese bourgeoisie. This was the main reason for the social isolation of the movement's representatives, exacerbated by anti-Semitism, ubiquitous in the entire Habsburg Monarchy and later growing throughout Europe until the 1930s.

So in order to understand this peculiar situation of the psychoanalytical movement in Central and Eastern Europe, it is necessary to reverse the perspective adopted by Zaretsky and to point out that the movement, paradoxically, first emerged in countries where the Second Industrial Revolution was still in its infancy. The trend was several decades ahead of the time when its actual social and cultural rooting took place. Its underlying theory of human mental life and the form of therapy derived from it assumed such a picture of the agent/patient, of the free personal I, which in Central and Eastern Europe did not yet exist on a mass scale. Therefore, the overwhelming majority of potential patients were not mentally prepared for active, creative participation in this form of therapy, also because of the pressure of existing traditions and family ties. This same factor resulted in a strong resistance to this form of therapy.

We will find an abundance of testimonies confirming the widespread dislike or even hostility to the movement, if we study the statements on this subject made by leading representatives of the academic community in Vienna and the reactions to the initial efforts by Sándor Ferenczi to establish a psychoanalytical society in Budapest. The situation in Polish psychiatry was different, because

during the two congresses held in 1909 and 1912, some dozen papers on psychoanalysis were delivered by Jekels, Nunberg, Nelken, Karpińska, Borowiecki, and others. The very fact that so many supporters and sympathizers of Freud's and Jung's theories could be found in the Polish medical community was something exceptional for the era. But overall, the Polish intelligentsia and bourgeoisie in Galicia and the Congress Kingdom were also very suspicious of psychoanalysis as a theory and therapeutic practice. A telling illustration of this is provided by Nunberg's words on the failure of his and Jekels' attempts to introduce analytical therapy to the sanatorium in Bystra. In his reports for the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society, he wrote that one of the reasons for Jekels' closing of this sanatorium was the dramatically decreasing number of patients ready to undergo this type of therapy.[38] Another reason was the failed attempt (strongly encouraged by Freud) by Jekels – and later Sokolnicka – in 1919 to found a Polish psychoanalytical society in Warsaw.

The situation in the interwar period was no better. This was caused, on the one hand, by the emigration of such leading figures of the movement as Jekels, Nunberg, and Sokolnicka, and on the other hand, the departure from the systematic practice of psychoanalytical therapy by Karpińska, de Beauraine, and Nelken. They abandoned their previously intense contacts with the psychoanalytical milieu centered around Freud and Jung, and turned their interests to other specialities and trends in contemporary psychology and psychiatry. It should be remembered that in the interwar period, Poland was essentially an agricultural country with 80 percent of the population living in the countryside and with only small industrial centers, while the middle class was somewhat limited. At the same time, about 80 percent of the three-million-strong Jewish population lived in poverty and was hostile to any emancipatory and assimilatory processes. At that time, privately practicing a psychoanalytical form of therapy bordered on heroism in Poland.

No wonder that psychoanalysis was mainly practiced in hospitals, and the patients were usually deeply disturbed schizophrenics completely unable to function socially. These were the type of patients dealt with by a group of psychiatrists in the Jewish Warsaw Hospital in Czyste, the main center where Freudian therapy was practiced in the interwar period. The group included Gustaw Bychowski, Maurycy Bornsztajn, Władysław Matecki, and Roman Markuszewicz, whose work and achievements I will describe in more detail

38 Herman Nunberg, Ernst Federn, eds., trans. H. Nunberg, *Minutes of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society*, Vol. II (1908–1910), (New York: 1974).

in the second volume of this work. Like in most cases in Vienna, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Russia, they all came from assimilated Jewish families, and made an important contribution to the development of Polish psychiatry and psychotherapy. Just like in those other countries, they sympathized with the political left and hoped for transformations of the collective consciousness through psychoanalysis, which was expected to lead to the gradual emergence of a new type of society which would not only be sexually emancipated, but also liberated from aggression. This hope broke down in the 1930s with the wave of anti-Semitism sweeping across Europe, which in Poland found its expression also in regulations limiting access to universities and a number of occupations for Jews. However, the time of greatest despair came in September 1939, when after the military defeat of Poland, the Hospital in Czyste and the Asylum for Mentally Ill Jews in Otwock were attacked. All patients were murdered on the spot, while Jewish doctors and their assistants were resettled to the ghetto, where within the next two years most of them died of starvation and various infectious diseases. But I will write more about this matter in the second part of the book.

I Historical background of the birth of psychoanalysis in Poland

I was born into a Polish-Jewish milieu at a time when the process of assimilation was in full swing. But the Jewish tendency to create a separate, closed, religious society within the larger society was also still operating. Caught into this conflict and ambiguity, I usually identified more with the romantic "suffering, enslaved Poland" than with my Jewish background. Anti-Semitism all around me tipped the scales further. In short, I wanted to be Polish. The influence of the budding Zionist nationalistic movement was not an important factor at the time of my childhood.

Helena Deutsch, *Confrontations with Myself. An Epilogue*

While I was in Cracow, I came into close contact with members of the Polish Social-Democratic Party and espoused their cause. Many of friends and colleagues, both Jews and non-Jews, subscribed to the Party's programme, and like them, I accepted some rather dangerous assignments at its behest. Along with other Jewish members of the Social-Democratic Party, I anticipated that, with the solution of the social problem would come, automatically, the solution of the Jewish question. Since I felt more and more that I was a Jew, and belonged with my fellow-Jews in their struggles, it is not easy for me to understand how it happened, nevertheless, that I bypassed the Zionist movement.

Herman Nunberg, *Memoirs. Recollections, Ideas, Reflections*

The Jews, wherever they live, assimilated to a larger and smaller degree – they assimilated in France, Germany, England, America etc., but to us, Polish Jews, it is by no means unimportant with whom Polish Jews assimilate, we want them to assimilate with the Polish nation, that is that they would become Polish.

Adam Wizel, "Asymilacja czy polonizacja?", *Izraelita 1910*

1 Introduction: The winding paths of Polish psychoanalysis between 1900 and 2015

To write about the history of psychoanalysis in Poland is to walk backwards in time along one of the most winding paths in our cultural tradition. Moreover, in the last decades this path has almost completely been forgotten, while slightly before that, in the 1950s, it was suppressed for ideological reasons. To write about this history is also to follow the equally complicated, sometimes tragic fates of those who first broke ground along these trails. Human fates intertwine here with the fates of the theory and the movement. There is no doubt that practicing psychoanalytical theory in the Polish lands during the partitions, and then in the interwar period and under communism, was – although in each of these periods for different reasons – a truly heroic enterprise.

An eloquent testimony to this is the bitter words of Ludwik Jekels, who, in his book on Sigmund Freud's psychoanalysis (1912), the first publication in Polish on this theory, complained about the widespread misunderstanding of its assumptions, taking issue with the prevailing prejudices and false ideas on psychoanalysis:

> Observing the approach both of scholarly spheres and the intelligent public to psychoanalysis, one notices that it has many more opponents and critics than followers. I think not many areas of human knowledge confront as many prejudiced judgments as Freud's psychoanalysis does, even from serious scholars. Because it should be their duty to use this special method employed by Freud to conduct experiments and thus to scrupulously study whether the mental phenomena discovered by him really exist and whether there indeed are relationships between them which psychoanalysis perceives. But instead of this experimental approach, which in this matter is the only acceptable one, they are content with an a priori "no," although disguised in sundry scientific robes and seemingly logical arguments.[39]

This resistance to psychoanalysis on the part of Polish scholars and the "intelligent public" was not something exceptional at that time. While in Vienna and a few other cities of Austro-Hungary there was a strong, affluent middle class, whose representatives were ready to endure the peculiarities of psychoanalytical therapy, in the Polish lands[40] such people were much harder to come by. Not only did the average Polish member of the middle class approach the novelties from

39 Ludwik Jekels, *Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda* (Lwów: Polskie Towarzystwo Nakładowe, 1912), p. 2.

40 This term refers to the lands of the former First Republic, that is, the territory of the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the partitions.

Vienna with much suspicion, but also among the Jews, predominantly Orthodox (and poor), psychoanalysis did not find many patients. It was, after all, a product of an assimilated Austrian Jew, who treated it as a new method of psychotherapy springing from the European scientific tradition, and he was strongly critical of the Jewish religious tradition and distanced himself from it. To make matters worse, he treated all religion as an illusion, perceiving it as the only effective instrument that checked the human drives of aggression and destruction.

Naturally, the psychoanalytical movement in the initial period of its existence was created by Jews who, like Freud, came from assimilated communities and were usually medical students or graduates.[41] But it should be remembered that in Central and Eastern Europe such people were a small minority among the Jews. This was noticeable especially in Galicia and in other Polish lands, as well as in Russia. At the turn of the 20th century and in the interwar period, large-scale emancipation and the assimilation of Jews living in these areas – and in Central Europe as a whole – were only beginning.

In any case, these first adepts and advocates of psychoanalysis had been mentally shaped by European scientific and cultural tradition. Like Freud, they treated psychoanalysis as a modern scientific theory claiming universal validity. So if the label of a specifically "Jewish" science was stuck to Freud's theory, this resulted mostly from the fact that, because of the peculiar nature of assimilation, which in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy gathered impetus in the second half of the 19th century, Freud exerted an extremely powerful influence on the young generation of emancipated Jews. They saw psychoanalysis as a great chance to enhance their status in contemporary society, in which, due to rapid cultural changes, various types of neuroses, especially hysteria, and all kinds of frustration became rampant. It opened huge opportunities for development in psychiatry and various forms of psychotherapy, and the psychiatric profession began to gain authority in bourgeois circles. In the case of psychoanalysis, there were also hopes for the transformation of society, leading not only to a greater tolerance and openness to various manifestations of human sexual life, but also to a decrease of conflict and aggression in interpersonal relations.

If we consider Freud's theory in the context of contemporary ideas about science shaped by the Positivist tradition, we will see that many of its elements

41 As Dennis B. Klein says, in the initial period after 1906, the psychoanalytical movement centered around Freud consisted exclusively of Jews. See Dennis B. Klein, *The Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytical Movement* (New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1981), p. 7.

corresponded to these ideas. In addition, Freud consistently emphasized that psychoanalysis was a science with strong empirical foundations, meeting the criteria prevailing in the natural sciences. This belief is also apparent in Jekels' statement quoted above, where the scientific "empiricism" of psychoanalysis is juxtaposed to the "a priori" argumentation of its critics. So the fact that in the initial period it was mostly young Jewish representatives of the medical professions who joined the psychoanalytical ranks was a result of the peculiar nature of assimilation processes in the Habsburg Monarchy at the turn of the 20th century. It was definitely not a consequence of psychoanalysis as such being a specifically Jewish science, which would in turn favor a peculiarly Jewish approach to sexuality.

Nevertheless, opponents of psychoanalysis often resorted to this "argumentation," claiming that its supposed "amoralism" in sexual matters was closely related to the fact that it was a typically "Jewish" science. Such judgments, with clearly anti-Semitic overtones, must have been widespread at the time, if Karol Irzykowski felt inclined to make an ironic comment on this subject. In his article *Freudyzm i freudyści* (Freudism and Freudists) he mocks all those who identified Freud's theory with promoting the slogans of "free love" and absolute amoralism: "An anti-Semite would even be happy to concoct the sophisticated line of argumentation that since Freud is a Jew, his emphasizing the sexual element in everything comes from his Jewish nihilism, because those who don't have their own country cling to such non-national issues and impose them on other people by force."[42] Later in this article, Irzykowski emphatically demonstrated the absurdity of this type of interpretation of psychoanalysis.

The distrust towards psychoanalysis coincided with skepticism – arising from social and religious considerations – towards its anthropological assumptions, expressed mostly by representatives of the Church and circles associated with it. Later, in the 1930s, this was supplemented by "criticism" from native nationalist groupings with fascist leanings, which saw in psychoanalysis a strongly suspect Jewish gnosis, dealing with filthy aspects of the human soul. One telling illustration of this was the hostile shouts of nationalists during the defense of a postdoctoral thesis by the most distinguished Polish interwar psychoanalyst, Gustaw Bychowski. What they held against him was that in his book about Juliusz Słowacki, published in 1930, he had made a "blasphemous" claim that this Polish national bard harbored unconscious incestuous feelings towards his mother.[43]

---

42 Irzykowski, "Freudyzm i freudyści," *Prawda*, No. 2–6, 8–9 (1913); reprinted in: *Kronos*, No. 1 (2010), p. 223.

43 See: Bychowski, *Słowacki i jego dusza.*

It should be emphasized, however, that many ardent supporters of psychoanalysis appeared among the Polish intelligentsia. They came mostly from medical, philosophical, and literary-artistic milieus. They did not treat psychoanalysis only as a slightly lurid "novelty" from Vienna, but they took it quite seriously as a scientific theory revealing previously unknown secrets of the human soul and opening new therapeutic perspectives. In the interwar period, this group was joined by literary scholars and pedagogues who not only looked to the psychoanalytical theories of Freud, but also of Adler and Jung, for sources of inspiration in developing new concepts for educating children and youth. In the years of war and occupation, all Polish representatives of this tendency who had remained in the country, predominantly Jewish, were murdered by Germans and Soviets. They found death in ghettos, concentration camps, Soviet prisoner-of-war camps, and labor camps. And when after the war Poland became a communist country under Soviet tutelage, psychoanalysis, a "bourgeois science," was removed from the curriculum at the universities and its private practice was forbidden. Those few of its supporters who survived the war (they can be counted on the fingers of one hand) were forced to renounce their youthful mistakes and to practice Pavlov-style psychology.[44] In practice this was the only chance for them to continue working as a doctor or an academic.

The first attempts at reactivating the psychoanalytical form of therapy appeared in postwar Poland only in the late 1950s, but since psychoanalysis was still under the Communist curse, they assumed clandestine forms. For this reason, the first proponents of this theory in Poland were to a large extent self-taught (Zbigniew Sokolik, Jan Malewski, and Michał Łapiński). Fascinated with the theory of Freud and his descendants, they tried to explore its secrets and practice it on their own (of course unofficially), and after 1956 they established contacts with more experienced colleagues from Hungary and Czechoslovakia. These contacts took the form of almost conspiratorial private meetings, consultations, and supervisions.

44 In postwar Poland this process was slightly delayed. It was only at the Congress of Polish Psychiatrists in Wrocław in 1950, entitled "The Materialist-Dialectical Foundations of Psychiatry," that psychoanalysis and other non-Marxist currents in psychology were subjected to criticism. One of the targets of this criticism at the Congress was the coursebook by Maurycy Bornsztajn, *Wstęp do psychiatrii klinicznej. Dla lekarzy, psychologów i studentów* (Łódź: Księgarnia Ludowa Łódź, 1948), written from psychoanalytical positions.

With time, starting from the end of the 1960s, a quite vigorous, gradually more numerous – but also increasingly diverse[45] – psychoanalytical community started to emerge. It consisted mostly of graduates of psychology and medicine, who were often working for government institutions and attempted to employ the psychoanalytical method (or its elements) in their psychotherapeutic practice, for obvious reasons not using this label officially (e.g., the Rasztów center near Warsaw founded by Jan Malewski and later run by Jerzy Pawlik). There was also an increasing number of people who underwent professional training abroad and then practiced various types of psychoanalytical therapy (Katarzyna Walewska, Wojciech Hańbowski, Elżbieta Bohomolec, Katarzyna Schier, Anna Czownicka, Ewa Wojciechowska, Ewa Modzelewska, and others). In the late 1980s, the last barriers put up around psychoanalysis by the communist system broke down. You could "openly" organize psychoanalytical seminaries, universities started to offer classes in psychoanalysis, and national and international conferences were also organized.

But the real breakthrough took place in 1989. Polish psychoanalytical circles were able to establish contacts with representatives of the psychoanalytical movement in the West and other countries without any political – and ideological – constraints. Both in public institutions and privately, psychoanalytical therapy could be practiced. There was a growing interest in various forms of psychoanalysis among Polish philosophers and humanists, mainly the younger generation of scholars. This change was greatly influenced by the wide range of opportunities for Polish scholars to travel abroad for scholarships and internships at Western universities and other scientific institutions, as well as by unlimited access to the latest literature. It later found an eloquent expression in a spate of publications, books, and articles focused on psychoanalysis (Andrzej Leder, Jan Sowa, Szymon Wróbel, Lena Magnone, the author of this book, and others).

There were also the first books of Polish psychoanalysts, who – on the basis of their therapeutic experiences – offered reflections on the mental condition of contemporary Polish society, its dominant pathologies, and their sources.[46] All

45 I mean here the emergence of groups endorsing an approach close to psychoanalysis in Jungian or Lacanian versions.

46 You could name here such publications as Wojciech Hańbowski, *Tożsamość psychoanalityka i inne studia przypadków*, Sopot 2013; Katarzyna Walewska, *Progi narodzin*, Kraków 2011; Katarzyna Schier, *Piękne brzydactwo. Psychologiczna problematyka obrazu ciała i jego zaburzeń*, Warszawa 2009.

this means that we are seeing the germs of an psychoanalytically inspired current of critical reflection on the so-called difficult issues related both to our attitude to our history and to the threats coming from contemporary civilization and culture.

2 The curse of communism and disputes over the psychoanalytical *episteme*

The fate of psychoanalysis in 20th-century Poland is therefore a tragic history, perhaps even the most tragic when compared to the histories of other scientific movements in this country. The paths of this movement reflect, as in a kind of a distorting mirror, the tragedy of recent Polish history, through its ups and downs, with which they are inextricably bound. But this means that any attempt to explore them is a hugely important venture. It is not only an attempt at mapping one of many uncharted areas in our recent cultural traditions, but it is also a kind of repaying our debt to those who took up the pioneering task of instilling in Polish society a new way of thinking about human mental illness, human sexuality, education, and attitudes to our individual and collective past.

A book on the history of psychoanalysis in Poland is not only about psychoanalysis itself. The history of psychoanalysis is part of a comprehensive picture of Polish culture in the 20th century, of its transformations, new tendencies, disputes, arguments, and artistic, literary, political, philosophical, and religious debates. From its very beginnings psychoanalysis was something more than a form of therapy based on a specific theory of the human mind. It was founded on a new anthropology, a new image of the society of the future and of culture, and a new approach to aesthetic issues and art.

Therefore, when writing about the history of psychoanalysis in Poland, you cannot ignore the fact that representatives of this trend were also strongly involved in the struggle to transform the self-knowledge of Polish society and to give a new form to the national culture, bringing it closer to modern Western European tradition. They criticized the traditional social model with the dominant position of the father in the family, they urged for a debate on a new model of educating children and young people, they raised the questions of anti-Semitism and racism, they took up the "sensitive" issues of sexual pathologies and the sexuality of children and women, and they opted for a more open approach to ethnic minorities and all forms of cultural otherness. All this automatically brought them closer to the left side of the political scene in Poland during the partitions and the interwar period; incidentally, after the May Coup of 1926, the Polish left was largely marginalized, while some of its leaders, headed by a group

regarded by the regime as political enemies, were subjected to various types of repressions (e.g., locked up in the detention camp in Bereza Kartuska[47]).

But of key importance was the fact that after the murder of almost all psychoanalysts of Jewish origin by the Germans and Soviets, the psychoanalytical community practically ceased to exist. After 1945, the only psychoanalysts who survived the war were Roman Markuszewicz, who died in 1946, Maurycy Bornsztajn (Bornstein),[48] who died in 1952, and Tadeusz Bilikiewicz, who joined the Communist Party and eagerly (though probably not quite sincerely) subscribed to Pavlov's theory in psychiatry.

After the Congress of Polish Psychiatrists in 1950, psychoanalysis was officially banished by the communist regime and its ardent supporters in psychology and psychiatry. In addition, domestic humanities and philosophy were almost completely cut off from new Western concepts and trends, so they knew very little about the influence of various theories and versions of psychoanalysis on ethnology, literary studies, social sciences, cultural sciences, theories of art, aesthetics, and other branches of scholarship. Of course, such a state of affairs resulted mainly from the fact that from 1948 until 1956 the so-called Marxist-Leninist approach was promoted in practically all academic disciplines. And later it coexisted with ideologically neutral – and therefore tolerated by the regime – tendencies grounded in Positivism and Neo-Positivism, whose representatives charged psychoanalysis with being "unscientific" and discredited its cognitive and therapeutic value.

This "tolerance" of the communist regime for this type of argumentation in psychiatric and psychotherapeutic circles resulted also from the fact that instead of talking to the patient, it promoted politically safe forms of treatment such as pharmacotherapy ("pills") or surgical interventions. Meanwhile, psychoanalysis assumes that an important element of therapy is the transformation of the patient's self-knowledge through a conversation during which interpretations of

47 Bereza Kartuska was a detention camp founded by the Polish Sanacja regime on the initiative of Józef Piłsudski. The camp existed in 1934–1939. It was created in order to isolate as well as mentally and physically torment political opponents from various groups, including members of the National Democracy, the communist and peasant parties, as well as Ukrainian nationalists. Prisoners were sent to the camp by way of an administrative decision, without a judicial verdict and without the right of appeal. The use of torture was a permanent feature of the treatment of prisoners.

48 Maurycy Bornsztajn's family name was Bornstein. Under the latter name he published his articles in Polish and German until 1920. In the 1920s he Polonized it as "Bornsztajn," emphasizing his Polish identity.

his dreams, slips, and symptoms are suggested to him. And this naturally implies his reflexive and critical approach to the whole social, cultural, and sometimes even political sphere. Moreover, such a form of therapy is difficult to control politically. It is obviously impossible to "objectively" determine what the analyst was talking about with the patient. Perhaps they both spoke critically about the regime and the system? Perhaps they planned some protest or coup? Unless you tap all the psychiatric offices…

The ultimate effect of all these factors in the communist period was the emergence of the view in Polish academic and intellectual circles that psychoanalysis was an anachronistic trend and that since the times of Freud nothing important had happened in it. Moreover, since no one conducted major research into the history of the movement and its impact on Polish culture between 1900 and 1939, there was a widespread opinion – in the light of latest publications, a completely false one – that at the time it was a quite marginal trend with hardly anyone taking it seriously.[49]

Today, of course, the discussion on the scientific status of psychoanalysis, on its position in the context of the epistemological assumptions of the natural sciences and humanities, assumes a new form, quite different from the one prevailing throughout the 20th century, when the controversies regarded mostly its hermeneutic-phenomenological and natural-science assumptions.[50] As a result, the so-called emancipatory claim of psychoanalysis is conceived differently. From early on and up to the 1960s, this claim was based on the assumption that the expected effect of psychoanalytical therapy is a profound change in the

49 The fact that in that period the trend was vigorously discussed by Polish academics and intellectuals is demonstrated in such thoroughly documented source publications as Paweł Dybel, "Urwane ścieżki czyli z dziejów psychoanalizy w Polsce zaborów i międzywojnia," in: *Urwane ścieżki. Przybyszewski – Freud – Lacan* (Kraków: 2001), pp. 17–46; Bartłomiej Dobroczyński and Paweł Dybel, eds., *Od Jekelsa do Witkacego. Psychoanaliza na ziemiach polskich pod zaborami 1900–1918. Wybór tekstów* (Kraków: Universitas, 2016); Lena Magnone, *Emisariusze Freuda. Transfer kulturowy psychoanalizy do polskich sfer inteligenckich przed drugą wojną światową,* (Kraków: Universitas, 2016); Mira Marcinów, *Historia polskiego szaleństwa w XIX wieku* (Gdańsk: słowo/obraz/terytoria, 2018); Bartłomiej Dobroczyński, Mira Marcinów, *Niezabliźniona rana Narcyza* (Kraków: Universitas, 2018).

50 I wrote about it in my article "Das Wissen vom Unsinn. Die Frage nach dem wissenschaftlichen Status der Psychoanalyse," in: *Die Grenzen der Interpretation in Hermeneutik und Psychoanalyse,* ed. Hermann Lang, Pawel Dybel, Gerda Pagel (Würzburg: Königshausen&Neumann, 2014), pp. 29–72.

patient's attitude towards himself and the people around him.[51] Only then can you speak about its curative effect. Such an approach implies that psychoanalytical therapy is closely intertwined with the sphere of cultural ideas and values regarding human self-understanding. And these ideas and values are determined historically, so they cannot be verified on the basis of "objective" empirical data, as is the case in the natural sciences.

As a result, the effects of psychoanalytical therapy can be assessed only in terms of the extent to which it gives the patient a better understanding of his problem concerning his attitude to himself and others which lies at the source of his disorder, and the extent to which this kind of self-knowledge allows him to cope better with this problem and rebuild his relations with others. On the other hand, the epistemological value of the theory itself should be assessed in terms of the extent to which its claims and insights reveal something important about the structure of human mental life, the mechanisms of human drives, the origin of sexual identity, etc. Insights of this kind are related to the historically shaped cultural and social self-knowledge of the patient, forcing him to take another look at its basic components, so no wonder that psychoanalytical theories inspired representatives of such disciplines as the social and political sciences, cultural studies, ethnology, and cultural anthropology. Not to mention the "unscientific" – but very important for the landscape of 20th-century European thought – philosophical tendencies such as phenomenology, hermeneutics, philosophical anthropology, or poststructuralism. It is mainly in these disciplines that psychoanalytical theories became an important source of inspiration, because of the new philosophy of man, the theory of interpretation, and the philosophy of culture implicitly contained in it.

This close relationship of psychoanalysis with the social and cultural context, which it attempts to influence by changing the patient's self-knowledge, can be clearly seen if we look at the history of this movement in Poland. Perceiving the sources of many neuroses to be rooted in a too-restrictive approach to the sphere of human sexual life, which was grounded in widely accepted cultural prohibitions and norms, Freud's theory urged people to ask questions about the sources of social differences and conflicts, and the cultural origin of female hysteria, it questioned the dominant model of raising children, and it shed new light on society's attitude to persons with non-heterosexual orientations. This in

51 This way of understanding the emancipatory claim of psychoanalysis is clearly stated in Jürgen Haberman's book *Knowledge and Human Interests*, translated by Jeremy S. Shapiro, Boston, 1972.

turn placed its supporters in strong opposition to prevailing views and notions on all these issues, bringing them into arguments with defenders of the Church doctrine, in which ideological elements could often be heard.

Such an attitude was not only a matter of the "personal" views of the representatives of the trend, but it was rooted in the concept of man contained in Freud's theory, in his references to the cultural sphere and in his vision of a psychoanalytically "enlightened" future society. Similarly, the fact that practically all leading Polish psychoanalysts and psychiatrists of psychoanalytical orientation displayed left-wing sympathies resulted from the peculiar alliance between Freudian psychoanalysis and Marxism, an affinity which had existed from the very beginning. Representatives of both these trends, despite their often-diverging approaches to the questions of revolution, sexuality, and social emancipation, were brought together by a critical recognition of the self-knowledge of the traditional patriarchate or bourgeois society and the belief that this self-knowledge should be radically changed. Of course, they differed in their visions of how this change should come about and which elements of this self-knowledge should be first subjected to a radical revision.

3 The psychoanalytical movement in Poland during the partitions and in the interwar period

Thus, the study of the history of psychoanalysis in Poland has an important ideological aspect, because it raises questions about the shape of native cultural self-knowledge inherited from tradition. It is also impossible not to engage in the contemporary debate on the attitude of Polish people to their past and the disputes over the shape of today's culture. For the history of psychoanalysis in Poland is not only an important element of our 20th-century academic tradition, mainly in psychiatry, pedagogy, and literary studies; of major importance is also the fact that once we carefully scrutinize it, we will look differently at the mental condition of contemporary Polish society and its problems, often not so distant from those haunting Poland a few decades back. It will also allow us to place the current discussions and disputes on such questions as methods of raising children, sexual education in schools, equal rights for women, or the attitude to persons with a different sexual orientation within a wider historical perspective. When I started this research, my academic colleagues often reacted with astonishment when I told them, for example, that between 1900 and 1939 in medical journals alone there were more than 100 high-quality publications on the psychoanalytical ideas of Freud, Adler, and Jung, and there were also many texts in journals devoted to literary theory, pedagogy, culture, and literature. And the

books discussing various aspects of these theories numbered more than a dozen. When writing this book, I wanted above all to show that, starting from 1900, psychoanalysis enjoyed a growing popularity in the medical community, and then among teachers, literary theorists, and writers. And these were the circles which since the early 19th century shaped the cultural identity of the Polish people. These milieus formed the very core of the Polish intelligentsia – this was a natural legacy of the partitions.

The first eloquent testimony to this interest in psychoanalysis were the events at the first Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists, and Psychologists in Warsaw, where the first papers on psychoanalysis were delivered and later published in the leading medical journal *Neurologia Polska*.[52] One of the speakers was Ludwig Jekels, and Freud's theory was also mentioned by such people as Tadeusz Jaroszyński, Marycy Bornsztajn (Bornstein), and Adam Wizel. The period up to 1939 saw the publication of an impressive number of academic articles and books about Freud's, Adler's, Stekel's, and Jung's psychoanalysis, not to mention several translations of their works and other foreign texts on psychoanalysis. In addition, critical commentaries, discussions, and disputes only enhanced this popularity.

The authors of works on psychoanalysis not only reconstructed the fundamental assumptions of the ideas of its main proponents (Freud, Adler, Stekel, and Jung), although texts of this type did prevail. The theoretical side was often illustrated with examples drawn from the authors' clinical practices, besides important events from patients' biographies containing also the sociocultural and sometimes even political contexts of the era. They also recorded the existential problems, inhibitions, depressions, antagonisms, and conflicts typical for Polish and Jewish society during the partitions and in the interwar period. Today, these medical histories provide extremely valuable material for psychiatry, but in equal measure for sociology, history, and cultural studies.

We find in these texts a direct or indirect answer to the question of what was so fascinating in Freud's theory for the first psychoanalysts in the Polish lands; these were often not just issues of a purely academic nature. Their authors saw in psychoanalysis also a theory allowing for the emergence of a new type of man, capable of better controlling his drives thanks to the development of a new approach to sexuality. They believed that a wide-scale application of this theory

52 Władysław Gajkiewicz, Adam Wizel, eds., *Prace I-go Zjazdu Neurologów, Psychiatrów i Psychologów Polskich odbytego w Warszawie 11, 12 i 13 października 1909 roku* (Warszawa: Skład Główny Z.Wende i S-ka, 1910).

would significantly reduce the occurrence of various types of mental diseases, neuroses, and psychoses. This was accompanied by the belief in the possibility of the emergence of a new type of society, emancipated from its inhibitions, traumas, harmful views, and prejudices.

Psychoanalysis was thus a movement which strengthened the modernizing tendencies among urban dwellers and intelligentsia, for its representatives and supporters overwhelmingly advocated liberal and left-wing ideas. Their aim was to turn Poland into a truly modern democratic state, in which particular ethnic groups, preserving their autonomy, would enjoy equal rights; in which poverty and huge financial differences (and the antagonisms resulting from them) would disappear; and in which a new, more liberal and also more rational – based on the achievements of science – attitude to the whole sexual sphere would emerge. These ideas guided the thinking of perhaps the greatest "promoter" of psychoanalysis in the interwar period, Grydzewski, who regularly published articles, reviews, commentaries, and other texts on psychoanalysis in the *Wiadomości Literackie* journal, opting for a more "enlightened" model of Polish society. Supporters of psychoanalysis joined the struggle to shape Polish society anew, hoping for a long-term victory in this battle.

There were also authors who pointed out to what extent psychoanalysis had become a source of inspiration for representatives of such disciplines as pedagogy, cultural sciences, social sciences, anthropology, literary studies, and aesthetics (Ludwig Jekels, Ludwika Karpińska, Gustaw Bychowski, and Stefan Borowiecki). Its claims and insights concerning the darkest sides of the human soul were also seen as an important source of artistic inspiration (Stanisław Przybyszewski, Bruno Schulz, and Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz).

It is enough to leaf through medical, philosophical, literary, or pedagogic journals from the time to see that texts on psychoanalysis regularly appeared in them. These dissertations usually started with extensive discussions on various aspects of Freud's theory, so that a Polish reader who did not have access to original publications and who did not know German could learn about its basic tenets and assumptions. There were also the first translations of Freud into Polish, which also began to appear very early and were of quite good quality. It is worth emphasizing that Polish translations belonged to the first translations of Freud in the world (more about all these publications, including the bibliography, in Chapter 2, paragraph 4 and 6).

Generally speaking, it seems that if we take into account the number of publications and public appearances (e.g., at various medical and psychological conferences) on the subject of psychoanalysis and translations of texts in this area, its reception in the Polish lands during the partitions and in the interwar

period was particularly intense.[53] During the partitions this was obviously influenced by such factors as the geographic and cultural proximity of Vienna in the Austrian partition, as well as the widespread command of German among Polish academics and intellectuals, especially in the medical community. These milieus, as I already mentioned, had a special position in the social consciousness, grounded in the Polish cultural tradition. It was mainly their members who shaped the cultural self-knowledge of Polish society during the partitions. These communities were generally of a progressive nature, having since the 1870s combined the cause of national liberation with raising the general level of education (the Polish variant of Positivism). Their status resulted mostly from the crucial role they played in preserving a sense of national identity and cultivating tradition.

In the early 20th century, the idea of modernization, inherited from the positivist tradition, gained currency in large sections of these communities. Psychoanalysis, not only as new method of therapy, but also because of its underlying conception of the human mind, society, and culture, was one of the theories spreading the idea of modernization in Polish society. After all, its author invoked the human capacity for rational distancing oneself from prejudices and various instinctive determinants of mental life. So the modernization process was to be based on human mental faculties, without the intervention of divine, mystical forces usually invoked by religion. Psychoanalysis certainly was one of those scientific trends which, thanks to its emphasis on the role of critical self-reflection, greatly intensified the process of "disenchanting the world" in European societies, at least in the form in which Max Weber presented it in his works. In this case, it meant acting for the secularization of the spiritual life of man, who should instead learn to cope with his problems on his own, aided by a doctor-psychotherapist. It was supposed to be accompanied by an analogous secularization of social life, which should be guided by principles developed by man himself.

Polish supporters and sympathizers of the movement came from intellectual circles, whose representatives undertook various actions for the sake of the so-conceived modernization process. Their role in initiating and enhancing

53 Of course, during the partitions it concerned mainly Galicia, but psychoanalysis found many supporters also in the Congress Kingdom. They were fewest in the Prussian partition, where, as I mentioned, the rights of the Polish population to cultivate their traditions, acquire education in their native language, establish their own institutions, etc., were limited to the largest extent. And the relatively small, but wealthy Jewish community was already overwhelmingly Germanized at that time.

this process was very similar to that played at that time by advocates of psychoanalysis in other countries of Central Europe, mainly Hungary, Bohemia, and Slovakia. This is illustrated very well by Adam Bžoch in his book about 20th-century Slovak psychoanalysis: "It places a kind of mirror in front of the modernizing society, on the cultural periphery of Europe reflecting the attitude of the emergent social elites to modernization and social change."[54]

As in these countries, in the Polish lands during the partitions and in the interwar period this pro-modernization social elite constituted only a small percentage of the total population. As a result, its educational efforts and its influence on shaping the self-knowledge of the public had a limited reach, embracing only the better-educated urban strata. It is enough to recall that the urban population in interwar Poland was just 20 percent of the total, and the general level of education was very low, with as much as a 23 percent rate of illiteracy.

4 Vanishing traces of memory and uncharted areas of the past

When studying the history of psychoanalysis in Poland, one also encounters obstacles of an objective nature. They are associated with the existence of many "uncharted areas" in the history and achievements of the movement.

Naturally, if you browse through various books in Polish from the turn of the 20th century, through articles in Polish medical, philosophical, and literary journals (published mainly in the Austrian and Russian partitions), if you explore the records on lectures about psychoanalysis in Kraków, Lviv, or Warsaw, it turns out that this material is – as I already said – astonishingly abundant. But many items are difficult to find today, if only because numerous library collections and archives from that time are still not ordered and incomplete, while some materials have been lost or destroyed. Others are rarities for book lovers and you have to look for them in libraries on other continents.

Moreover, we often do not know the various biographical details of Polish analysts which would be important for a better understanding of their academic and therapeutic careers, and even their individual fates (we do not know, for example, the date and circumstances of the death of Leopold Wołowicz from Lviv, the author of one of the first Polish-language works on Freudian psychoanalysis; and we do not know what he was engaged in after 1927[55]). We only

54 Adam Bžoch, *Psychoanalyse in der Slowakei. Eine Geschichte von Enthusismus und Widerstand* (Giessen: Psychosozial-Verlag, 2013), p. 9.

55 See Leopold Wołowicz, *Jeden z problematów psychoanalizy Freuda*, (Stryj: publisher August Olbrich, 1912).

know that he was a teacher in one of the Lviv secondary schools and that he was associated with a group of philosophers centered around Kazimierz Twardowski, founder of the so-called Lviv-Warsaw School. We often do not know the significant circumstances and details of their therapeutic work in the community in which they were operating. Their life paths often break off, and it is difficult to find witnesses who could tell us something more about them. This applies above all to analysts and the supporters of psychoanalysis who were of Jewish origin and who were murdered during World War II or died of emaciation or diseases in ghettos, labor camps, and concentration camps (Jan Nelken, Norbert Praeger, Estera Markinówna, Władysław Matecki, Salomea Kempner, Józef Kretz-Mirski, and others). And those who "miraculously survived" (Roman Markuszewicz and Maurycy Bornsztajn) could practice psychoanalysis after the war only to a very limited degree (and only until 1950). And their descendants who are still alive and could tell us something about them are scattered all over the world and are difficult to find, and year by year, month by month there are fewer of them left.

During this research one is often confronted with an experience similar to that which happened to those archeologists who discovered beautiful rooms with excellently preserved wall paintings in the underground canals of Rome. Once they came in contact with air, they started to discolor and vanish. In any case, history does not know the concept of a perfectly preserved image of a bygone era that would be resistant to time and oblivion. This image begins to fade and change its color at the very moment of its creation, parts of it immediately crumble, fall off the wall, and are no longer possible to reproduce. Sometimes other images are superimposed on them and they merge, forming new configurations of people, things, and events.

As people depart, the image of the historical world they lived and acted in fades irretrievably. And no one is able to recover its original flavor and color. In addition, instead of "hard," empirically verifiable data confirmed by eyewitnesses, the researcher is often confronted with comments, opinions, rumors, or anecdotes which are difficult to check. He often has to rely on speculation and guesswork.

Many of these events have passed into oblivion forever along with the protagonists of that time, many materials have been destroyed by the turmoil of two world wars, and what's left is often scattered in libraries across the world – in Austria, Russia, the United States, Germany, France, Brazil, Australia, etc. Fragments of this story are still alive, just as they were handed down by grandparents and parents, cultivated in a new cultural environment as the memory of a family pedigree. But these also fade away with time.

This is, of course, not a unique experience. Every historian has to deal with it, the only difference being the scope of the erased memory, faded traces, destroyed

materials, difficulties in reaching witnesses of events or archives. When years ago, driven by simple curiosity, I carried out a small study on my own, looking for the first traces of the influence of Freud's theory on the Polish intelligentsia and artistic and literary circles, I was painfully confronted with all these difficulties.

Moreover, they were associated with the deep skepticism and resistance of a large part of the academic community to dealing with the history of psychoanalysis in Poland, as well as the difficulty with precisely defining the "object" of this research. But then, to my genuine amazement, in the University Library in Warsaw I discovered lots of materials testifying to a vigorous interest in Freud's theory within Polish psychiatry and the medical circles in Galicia and Congress Kingdom, as well as among writers, artists, and philosophers. And later, when I started to explore the interwar period from this angle, it turned out that more than 200 articles on Freud's, Adler's, Jung's, and Stekel's theories had been published in Polish medical journals. What is more, a large percentage of the articles and books boasted very decent academic rigor, although they were mostly reviews and reconstructions.

Compared to that, the postwar period, when Poland was ruled by the communist regime fighting against psychoanalysis as a "bourgeois science," was a real disaster. Scholarly rectitude in the presentation of the assumptions and main claims of the supporters of psychoanalysis – as well as genuine arguments and discussions with them – were replaced by pseudo-critical works written from Marxist-Leninist positions, obviously commissioned by the regime's functionaries. The goal which the authors of these texts set before themselves was to expose the erroneous assumptions of the theories of Freud and his successors, who had purported to treat various pathologies of human mental life without exploring their actual class-based causes. Academic works whose authors attempted to write honestly about various aspects of the influence of psychoanalysis in Poland, mainly on historians and writers, could be counted on the fingers of one hand.[56]

56 One of these was Jerzy Spein's essay "Bruno Schulz wobec psychoanalizy," *Studia o prozie Brunona Schulza*, Kazimiera Czaplowa, ed., Prace Naukowe UŚ in Katowicach, No 115 (1976), pp. 17–30, and Stanisław Burkot, "Od psychoanalizy klinicznej do literackiej," *Rocznik Naukowo-Dydaktyczny WSP w Krakowie*, No. 68 (1978), pp. 133–157. One should also mention the book by Zofia Rosińska, *Psychoanalityczne myślenie o sztuce* (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1985). But practically the only significant attempt at a synthetic review of the history of psychoanalysis in Poland was a brief, few-page article by Krzysztof Pawlak and Zbigniew Sokolik, "Historia psychoanalizy w Polsce," *Nowiny Psychologiczne,* No. 4 (1992).

The result of my research at that time was the essay *Urwane ścieżki* [Broken-off trails], which opened my book under the same title. It was conceived as a "preliminary diagnosis" meant to encourage others to take up more systematic research.[57] In the meantime, over a dozen years or so, a number of books, articles, and dissertations appeared, their authors exploring the origins of psychoanalysis in Poland. They were both representatives of the older generation of researchers (Edward Fiała, Stanisław Burkot, Danuta Danek, and Bartłomiej Dobroczyński), and increasingly numerous members of the younger one. Articles were written about the life and work of particular psychoanalysts (Jolanta Żyndul and Jarosław Groth),[58] about the presence of psychoanalysis in the literary press of the interwar period, mainly the *Wiadomości literackie* journal (Lena Magnone), or about its influence on literary criticism (Marek Lubański). Other young authors attempted to describe the work of particular writers from the psychoanalytical perspective (Czesław Dziekanowski, Magda Bartosik, Katarzyna Bonowicz, and Lena Magnone), and yet others tried to use it for historical and sociopolitical analysis (Jan Sowa and Andrzej Leder). A few interesting works on the philosophical and theoretical aspects of psychoanalysis also appeared (Szymon Wróbel and Andrzej Leder).

This clearly demonstrates that there was a change in the approach to psychoanalysis and its history in Poland among the younger generation of researchers. This situation creates quite a different backdrop for this current book compared to the one that existed at the time of my writing *Urwane ścieżki*. It is certainly a much more "friendly" situation, but the author of this work has to confront new expectations on the part of the younger generation of researchers and readers, who are much more familiar with psychoanalytical ideas and their influence on contemporary philosophy and the humanities than two decades ago.

5 Is psychoanalysis a science? – a never-ending dispute

The interest in psychoanalysis first emerged in the Polish medical community, mainly among psychiatrists and, to a lesser degree, psychologists, where in the early 20th century the first supporters of Freud's theory appeared, such as

57 Dybel, "Urwane ścieżki." This article was also published in German: Dybel, "Unterbrochene Wege."

58 In the meantime, a book with extensive articles on the biographies and achievements of Polish psychiatrists of psychoanalytical orientation operating during the partitions and in the interwar period was published. See Paweł Dybel, ed., *Przywracanie pamięci. Polscy psychiatrzy XX wieku orientacji psychoanalitycznej* (Kraków: Universitas, 2017).

Ludwig Jekels, Herman Nunberg, Ludwika Karpińska, and Karol de Beaurain. They saw in it not only a promising methodological proposal for curing neuroses, but also a theory penetrating the deepest corners of the human soul and revolutionizing existing views on this subject. In the interwar period, this theory would acquire many new advocates in the Polish medical community. It would also arouse the wider interest of other scholarly groups, such as pedagogues or philosophers. And finally it would become an object of interest for critics and historians of literature, as well as writers, who would often express their views on it. The former frequently with praise and enthusiasm (Juliusz Kleiner, Gustaw Bychowski, Bolesław Miciński, Jerzy Stempowski, and Stefania Zahorska), the latter usually with reserve or even critically (Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz, Bruno Schulz, Witold Gombrowicz, Maria Kuncewiczowa, Zofia Nałkowska, Michał Choromański, Emil Zegadłowicz, Jan Brzękowski, Antoni Słonimski, Julian Tuwim, Czesław Miłosz, and others[59]).

There was nothing unusual in this. The interest in psychoanalysis in Vienna, Budapest, Zurich, or Berlin, to name only the most important centers of the psychoanalytical movement in the early period of its existence, developed in a similar way. This was due to the fact that psychoanalytical therapy did not confine itself to the doctor's office, but since it took the form of a conversation with the patient, it related to various aspects of his private and social life and concerned cultural traditions or even political issues. This was the source of its special position among contemporary psychiatric and psychological theories. It was a theory which, although founded on the psychiatric and psychological tradition of the 19th century, transcended this tradition in the direction of philosophy and the humanities, thanks to its interdisciplinary nature.

The emergence of the psychoanalytical movement in Poland cannot, therefore, be treated in isolation from the way it spread and gained popularity in such countries as pre-war Austria (Austro-Hungary), Germany, Switzerland, or Russia. Just like in these countries, the criticisms targeted at the theories of Freud and his successors were basically twofold. On the one hand, there were ideologically and culturally motivated charges, and on the other hand, people argued

59 The names mentioned belong to leading Polish writers, poets, and playwrights of the interwar period. It should be emphasized, however, that at that time the influence of psychoanalytical theories on this community was much smaller than on German and Austrian writers. See Tomas Anz and Christine Kanz, eds., *Psychoanalyse in der modernen Literatur. Kooperation und Konkurrenz* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1999). Not to mention the influence of psychoanalysis on French literature, which started in the 1930s.

against psychoanalysis from scientistic positions, questioning its claim to being scientific.

In the first case, the charges were usually made by representatives of conservative bourgeois circles, seeing Freud's psychoanalysis as a deadly threat to their notions about the family, the model of raising children, and sexuality. In the second case, as I already said, the critical argumentation came mostly from representatives of the natural sciences, empirically oriented psychology, or the scientistic currents of philosophy (philosophy of language, philosophy of science, and logic), who at best saw psychoanalysis as a kind of pseudoscience, unable to meet the criteria of verifiability of scientific knowledge.

The dispute over how the scientific value of Freud's theory should be assessed continues to this day. Recently, every year we see several books whose authors proudly proclaim to the world that they finally exposed the pseudoscientific nature of Freud's theory. At the same time, however, every year there is a number of books proposing new readings of Freud's work, pointing at its interesting motifs or aspects previously overlooked by the interpretative tradition. Their authors show that these themes have inspirational value for contemporary humanities and philosophy. Regardless of which side we support in this dispute, its very existence more than a hundred years after the publication of *The Interpretation of Dreams*, where Freud presented the first version of his theory, testifies to its amazing vitality.

6 Psychoanalysis and leftist thought – two assimilations

One of the main reasons for the wide-ranging and rich impact of this theory, which went beyond psychology and psychiatry, was a new vision of human mental life which Freud proposed was the basis of the therapeutic method (the conversation with the patient). This vision questioned previous understandings of man's mental workings. Of ground-breaking importance was the claim that a crucial role is played by the unconscious (*das Unbewusste*) in the human psyche, conceived as a system of repressed "instinctive representations" (*Triebvorstellungen*), which have been cut off from consciousness and are available to it only indirectly, in the form of its pathological derivatives (dreams, slips, and symptoms).

This claim profoundly complicated the existing vision of human mental life in psychology and philosophy. For according to this claim, the human mind is composed not only of actually or potentially conscious "instinctive representations," but also of which the subject is not and never can be conscious. And that is not all. Freud also claimed that these unconscious instinctive representations remain in conflict with the conscious ones. Consequently, the patient's therapy,

although it should lead to his becoming conscious of some repressed instinctive representations, can never result in a complete transparency of his consciousness. And he is never able to completely remove all the conflicts which underlie consciousness, but remain unconscious, because they have been repressed. Therapy may only make the patient realize their nature. In short, psychoanalytical therapy may enable him to cope with these conflicts better.

In this form, Freud's theory became a real challenge both for psychology and psychotherapy, and for philosophy and other disciplines in the humanities. One of the reasons for that was that, assuming the transformation of the patient's self-knowledge as an important element of the therapy process, it contained a clear emancipatory claim. After all, the patient was expected to change his attitude to his own sexual drives and aggressions, and consequently to adopt a new attitude to his own past. This, in turn, implied a change of his attitude not only to himself, but also to others.

As a result, the task of "curing" the patient became closely related to the requirement of transforming his traditional social relations. This caused Freud to write a number of texts in which he reflected on the possibility of transforming collective self-knowledge on the basis of psychoanalysis and prompted him to interrogate the position of human beings in culture. The appeal to liberate the patient's mental life from the traumas of the past and the symptoms produced by them turned into an appeal to "emancipate" entire human communities through psychoanalysis.

The emancipatory claims contained in Freud's psychoanalytical theory were taken up in the interwar period by representatives of the Frankfurt School in Germany and became an important element of its social philosophy (Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Erich Fromm, and others). As a rule, they were combined with Karl Marx's theory, which resulted in original critical discoveries regarding everyday social awareness, fighting prejudices, and superstitions produced by tradition. A separate place should be awarded to the works of Wilhelm Reich, who believed that the fundamental task of contemporary social and political thought was a synthesis of psychoanalysis with Marxism.[60]

60 See such works as Wilhelm Reich, *Dialektischer Materialismus und Psychoanalyse* (Kopenhagen: Verlag für Sexualpolitik, 1934); *Massenpsychologie des Faschismus: zur Sexualökonomie der politischen Reaktion und zur proletarischen Sexualpolitik* (Kopenhagen, Prag, Zürich: Verlag für Sexualpolitik, 1933).

The elements of political and social thought contained in Freud's works inspired mostly authors with left-wing attitudes, from Trotskyist communists through socialists to advocates of social democracy. An overwhelming majority of disciples of Freud and continuators of his theory also displayed clearly left-wing sympathies. This was associated with the fact that both Marxism and psychoanalytical thought contained the emancipatory cause of transforming existing social reality, although this was often quite differently conceived. In both cases theoretical claims and postulates were based on the hope of the emergence of a new, socially and sexually "enlightened" society in which social inequalities would be eliminated, human sexual life would not be so harshly repressed, and all nationalisms, racist views, and above all anti-Semitism would vanish. Nunberg writes about it explicitly in his memoirs, going back to the Kraków period of his career, when he was a member of the Polish Social Democratic Party: "Along with other Jewish members of the Social-Democratic Party, I anticipated that, with the solution of the social problem would come, automatically, the solution of the Jewish question."[61]

But characteristically, Nunberg immediately adds that because he later started to increasingly identify with his Jewishness, he cannot quite understand now, remembering this period years after, why he did not join the Zionist movement. And he explains it with his youthful rebellion against his father, who strongly supported this movement.[62]

It seems, however, that at the time he still ardently believed in the success of the social democratic ideas and projects for the solution of the Jewish question. This is why he was not yet mentally ready to make such a radical U-turn. According to the belief which dominated among the left, the first incomplete emancipation of the Jews in bourgeois society, defined by the rules of the capitalist free-market economy, was to be followed – after the establishment of a socialist (or communist) society – by a second emancipation, this time total and genuine.

It would be enough to introduce common ownership of property and abolish social inequalities, and then anti-Semitism would simply vanish. Everything looked straightforward and beautiful. Unfortunately, reality turned out to be

---

61 Herman Nunberg, *Memoirs. Recollections, Ideas, Reflections* (New York: Psychoanalytic Research and Development Fund, 1969), p. 16.

62 This is how Nunberg writes about it in his diary: "Since I felt more and more that I was a Jew and belonged with my fellow-Jews in their struggles, it is not easy for me to understand how it happened, nevertheless, that I bypassed the Zionist movement." Nunberg, *Memoirs*, pp. 16–17.

much more complex, and anti-Semitic prejudices were far more deeply engrained than just at the level of capitalist market competition.

But the fact is that if we look at contemporary political groupings in Europe from this angle, we will see that only left-wing parties were free from anti-Semitism (although not all of them).[63] They usually rejected the idea of the nation underlying modern nationalisms, that is the idea of a community based on bonds of blood. From there it was only a short step to promoting racist criteria, which later actually took place. Therefore, anti-Semitic attitudes, directed not only against orthodox Jews, but also assimilated ones, dominated among supporters of these groups. Such attitudes were an inseparable part of their outlook, even if they were not always explicitly formulated. It repeatedly affected Freud and the advocates of his theory in Vienna, while Helena Deutsch wrote about it succinctly in the Polish context.[64]

On the other hand, left-wing parties, promoting the elimination of social inequalities, usually distanced themselves from the idea of the nation or rejected it altogether. What was important for them was the supranational social solidarity in the struggle against capitalist exploitation rather than blood affinities. No wonder that the first psychoanalysts of Jewish origin active in the Polish lands usually directed their political sympathies towards the left. Similar attitudes could be observed among members of various sections of the psychoanalytical movement in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Russia, or Germany. Identifying with the left were Herman Nunberg (he belonged to the Social Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania, SDKPiL) and Ludwik Jekels,[65] Adam Wizel and Helena Deutsch, who was also personally involved with the leading

63 In an interview on her book *Tajemnica pana Cukra. Polsko-żydowska wojna przed wojną* (Warszawa: Wielka Litera, 2015), where she presented various manifestations of anti-Semitism in Poland of the 1930s, Anna Kłys says: "In fact, it can be said that only the left - workers, intellectuals, artists - did not display anti-Semitism, or even did the opposite. Sensitivity, a sense of social justice does not have any political color, but was more often present among the left." Anna Kłys, "Tajemnica pana Cukra. Polsko-żydowska wojna przed wojną," *Gazeta Wyborcza*, March 11, 2015 (dzieje. pl), and online: http://dzieje. pl/ksiazki/tajemnica-pana-cukra-polsko-zydowska-wojna-przed-wojna (October 12, 2015). Well, more often, but not always. An eloquent example of anti-Semitic attitudes in the Polish Socialist Party (PPS) is given by Helena Deutsch, who wrote that herself and her Jewish colleagues were rejected as members.

64 Deutsch, *Confrontations with Myself*.

65 A good example of that was Jekels selling his sanatorium in Bystra to a local workers' co-operative, as I already mentioned in the introduction. See information about it in: https://www.niedziela.pl/artykul/57184/nd/Mozna-inaczej

activist of the Polish left in the interwar period, Herman Lieberman. Maurycy Bornsztajn and Jan Nelken were particularly active in this field at the turn of the 20th century. The former was a member of a chapter of Józef Kwiatek's Polish-Jewish socialist organization and took part in the famous manifestation in April 1894 commemorating the hundredth anniversary of the Jan Kiliński uprising (he was even arrested afterwards and kept for three weeks in the Pawiak prison in Warsaw). The latter was associated with the Polish Socialist Party (PPS); in 1896 he was banished from his university for his political activities and later he was arrested more than once. Roman Markuszewicz subscribed to left-wing political views, and similar proclivities were demonstrated by Władysław Matecki and Norbert Praeger, although these two were not directly involved politically. And Hanna Segal, who after World War II made a career in Great Britain as a psychoanalyst, in the 1930s was a member of the PPS youth group.

7 Psychoanalysis and the "stigma of being a Polish Jew"

When, years ago, I wrote a short essay on Polish psychoanalysis, I started with an anecdote on the origins of Freud's first name. In the 15th century, the ancestors of his family had fled from persecution from Cologne to Poland, where successive generations lived for several centuries, to move in the 19th century to Moravia and later to Vienna. When living in the First Polish Republic, they enjoyed privileges which the Jewish community at the time could not even dream about in any other European country. To commemorate the happy period of the times of King Sigismund, Freud's family cultivated the tradition of naming first male descendants Sigismund. We do not know what Freud himself thought about this genealogy of his first name. In any case, this anecdote found an administrative confirmation, because in the registry office in the Czech Pribor "Sigismund" is mentioned next to Freud's Jewish name Szlomo.[66]

Of course, this is just an anecdote, which probably points to a purely mythical relationship of Freud with the Polish cultural tradition. We will find no other clues of this type in his biography. But in the context of our reflections on the history of psychoanalysis in Poland, it assumes particular significance. Because if we follow the family pedigrees of Freud's first pupils, those who formed the foundations of the Psychoanalytical Society in the 1920s in Vienna, we will find that they usually traced their roots to the former lands of the First Polish

66 This anecdote can be found in Ronald W. Clark, *Freud: The Man and the Cause* (New York: Easton Press, 1980).

Republic, regardless of whether they considered themselves Jews, Austrians, Ukrainians, Russians, Hungarians, or Poles.

It is worth noting that although the latter were not very numerous in the immediate surroundings of Freud (on the other hand, psychoanalysts of Polish extraction, such as Ludwig Jekels, Herman Nunberg, Helena Deutsch, and Beata Rank, were particularly influential in the Psychoanalytical Society), the popularity of his theory in the Polish medical community at the time was simply astounding. An eloquent testimony to this is the fact that at the Second Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists, and Psychologists in 1912 in Kraków two separate panels were set up with papers on psychoanalysis, delivered in Polish by Jekels, Nunberg, Jaroszyński, de Beaurain, Karpińska, and others. They sparked fierce discussions during which Freud's theory was treated with utmost seriousness, even if some physicians harshly criticized it. This would be unthinkable among physicians in Austro-Hungary and Germany, where psychoanalysis was castigated by the medical community as "unscientific."

How should we explain this phenomenon? According to statistics from that time, the profession of doctor – besides that of lawyer – was the occupation of choice for most sons, and sometimes even daughters, of emancipated Jewish families in Galicia and the Congress Kingdom. These were so-called free professions, where your career did not depend on various types of administrative constraints and traditional hierarchical arrangements, but on your actual abilities and talents. Significantly, they were held in high social esteem.[67]

Psychoanalysis added another factor, namely the completely new form of therapy built by Freud and his students from scratch – a form in which the analyst had to rely largely on himself. It could potentially be practiced by anyone sufficiently familiar with its rules and techniques. Moreover, Freud gradually came to believe that in order to become a psychoanalyst it was not necessary to have a medical education, for a few years of training under the supervision of experienced analysts from the Society would suffice.

This was a theory which, like Marxism, assumed a radical transformation of human beings and in the longer term of the whole society. It was believed that once the multiple prejudices regarding the sexual sphere withered away, sources of all kinds of aggression would be successfully eliminated. This included

67 Based on the statistics from that time, Zbigniew Fras writes that "the domination of the Israelites in the free professions, that is, among lawyers and doctors, was particularly visible. In 1910, every attorney and every third physician in Galicia was a Jew." See Zbigniew Fras, *Galicja* (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 2003), p. 217.

aggression based on ethnic and religious conflicts, of which anti-Semitism was one of the most significant manifestations. It seems that it was these latter factors which attracted the younger Viennese physicians from emancipated Jewish families to Freud's psychoanalytical theory. And it was an almost "magical" influence, if we consider the fact that until 1905 all members of the Psychoanalytical Society founded by Freud were Jews.

It seems that the same factors were at play in the Polish medical community. Under the Austrian and Russian partition it was physicians of Jewish origin who displayed particular interest in Freud's theory. The social foundation for this development was provided by the intensifying assimilation processes among the particularly numerous Jewish communities inhabiting the Polish lands at that time. They saw the spread of psychoanalysis as a chance for the emergence of a new type of man and a new type of human character, which would dominate in the society of the future. It was to be a society without prejudices – and the attendant aggression – and without social inequalities. In this new psychoanalytically enlightened society, all kinds of nationalisms – and the anti-Semitism shadowing them – were to die a natural death.

Of course, these were just semiconscious projections regarding the desired shape of the society of the future. The social and cultural reality of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and Russia – with the Polish lands belonging to them – was far removed from this ideal. Anti-Semitism was not only rampant, but with the emergence of new nationalist groupings it adopted completely new and alarming forms. This led to the slow growth of nationalist conflicts of a new type. This must have generated a sense of a deep chasm between the actual state of affairs and the desired, projected ideal state of society in the future.

This antagonism often coexisted with a conflict of another type, namely the conflict between the fascinations with leftist ideals for the society of the future, where all ethnic differences and divisions would fade away, and the emergent Zionist movement, whose followers and leaders championed the idea of founding the state of Israel. The nature of this conflict is eloquently illustrated by the words of Nunberg quoted above: due to his leftist views he was skeptical of Zionism, but on the other hand he jealously regarded his Jewish colleagues leaving for Palestine in order to found a Jewish state there.[68]

But there were also physician-analysts who came from emancipated Jewish families, but strongly identified with the culture of one nation, the nation surrounding them, and they constantly emphasized their patriotism, often in an

68 Nunberg, *Memoirs*…, p. 17.

exaggerated way. Some regarded themselves as Austrians and were ready to die for the Emperor, while others saw themselves as Ukrainians, Hungarians, or Poles. If we follow the biographies of Jewish analysts from Freud's closest environs, we will see that even when they came from the same city – for example, from Lviv – they had different national and cultural identities.

This proves that the assimilation processes at the time were very complex and diverse, and did not follow one dominant pattern. At the same time, some members of assimilated Jewish families remained Orthodox, others became Zionists, and still others, rejecting national identity altogether, turned to left-wing parties. The huge divergence of the processes and divisions observed in this period is well illustrated by the following words of Helena Deutsch:

> In my immediate environment, conflicting ideologies had been transmitted through three generations of ancestors who had borne the stigma of being Polish Jews. Even when one left the ghetto it took a long time to cast off the effects of this invisible mark. […] In some families, religious orthodoxy extended over several generations, though in others a grandfather would still be deeply rooted in orthodoxy and the grandson assimilated to the point of complete identification with the Poles. The assimilated young people took an active part in Polish political demonstrations, festivals, etc., and there were even some who joined in the short-lived outbreaks of revolt against the Austrian Empire.
>
> The Zionist movement had not yet developed a wide following when I was young. Politically active Jews, when not involved in assimilation through Polish patriotism, or when frightened by the ever-lurking Polish anti-Semitism, turned towards the Polish socialist movement.[69]

Due to the complexity and diversity of these processes, the question of the cultural and national identity of the first generation of psychoanalysts active in the Polish lands, as well as those gathered around Freud, acquires an extraordinary poignancy. At the same time, the example of these people shows that someone's national and cultural identity may assume many different configurations and mutual relations, which not only do not have to overlap with his "civic" identity, but also do not have to be in harmony with each other. Moreover, they can also change substantially over time.

It is a question of particular significance for this dissertation, because it is, after all, a text on Polish psychoanalysis. For what is in this case the meaning of the term "Polish psychoanalysis"? Who should be included in this tradition and who should not? What criterion of Polishness should be used? It seems that if you take

69 Deutsch, *Confrontations with Myself*, p. 92.

this perspective when following the lives and achievements of psychoanalysts born in the Polish lands (but then what does "Polish lands" mean?) and in one way or another associated with Polish cultural tradition, all issues raised above will return with particular force. I will come back to this question in further parts of this dissertation. First, I would like to outline a general historical and cultural background, which will allow us to better comprehend the emergence of Freud's psychoanalytical theory and founding of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society in the early 20th century.

8 The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy from the turn of the century and the paths of Jewish assimilation

Historians of the region now called Central Europe have long been fascinated by the phenomenon of the cultural and scientific flourishing in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, which started in the second half of the 19th century. The center of this flourishing was Vienna, which became, along with Paris and Berlin, one of the most important European cultural centers and projected its influence on all the regions of the Empire. And especially on Galicia, or the former Polish lands which now had become part of the Austrian partition. One of the causes of this flourishing was the skillful (but also full of cynical sophistication) ethnic policy of successive emperors and their administrations, awarding to particular provinces inhabited by various nations a far-reaching autonomy of which they could not even dream in the Russian Empire or Prussia (and later in the German Reich). As a result, each nation could cultivate its own language and cultural tradition within the bounds of the Monarchy, and Polish language could be used in government offices along with German. At the same time, because in the Habsburg Empire there was no intense Germanization policy combined with the brutal discrimination of other nations (like in Prussia and then in the German Reich), it was easier for the more educated strata of the population to identify with German culture. People were ready to get acquainted with it and admired its achievements, and they voluntarily learned German. As a result of this policy, in various spheres of public life in the Monarchy – from the political scene and administration to culture, education, scholarship, and art – a peculiar melting pot emerged, with processes of identification running in various directions and identities often arranging themselves in the most bizarre configurations.

According to Carl E. Schorske, Vienna owed its dynamic cultural, scholarly, and artistic development in the second half of the 19th century to the emergence of a liberal middle class in the Habsburg Monarchy, which produced a new

cultural elite.[70] Its distinctive feature was the constant exchange of ideas between the particular artistic, scholarly, political, business, and professional groups forming it. This was possible thanks to the fact that in Vienna in this period "the salon and the café retained their vitality as institutions where intellectuals of different kinds shared ideas and values with each other and still mingled with a business and professional élite proud of its general education and artistic culture."[71]

Due to the relative coherence of this elite, in which the separation of these groups had not yet occurred and everyone knew each other, it was not alienated from social reality. Consequently, it could act as a crucible in which new ideas, notions, and theories sprung up and new political views crystallized, exerting a strong influence on social reality. But towards the end of the 19th century, the first symptoms of the decline of the liberal middle class appeared. In the political arena, these symptoms manifested on the one hand as the victory in 1895 of the right-wing, nationalist, and openly anti-Semitic Karl Lueger's party, and on the other hand the establishment of the Socialist Party. This was accompanied by the growing popularity of the Zionism among the Jews, both assimilated and Orthodox, who inhabited the Habsburg Monarchy.

In the area of culture and art, the revolt against the paternalistic culture of the liberal middle class intensified, resulting in various new trends in psychology, art history, music, literature, architecture, painting, and politics. According to Schorske, this was a rebellion of the young generation which had all the hallmarks of a "collective Oedipal revolt" targeted at the classical liberalism of their fathers, founded on irrefutable authorities: "What they assaulted on a broad front was the value system of classical liberalism-in-ascendancy within which they had been reared. Given this ubiquitous and simultaneous criticism of their liberal-rational inheritance from within the several fields of cultural activity, the internalistic approach of the special disciplines could not do justice to the phenomenon. A general and rather sudden transformation of thought and values among the culture-makers suggested, rather, a shared social experience that compelled rethinking. In the Viennese case, a highly compacted political and social development provided this context."[72] This broad context of the crisis of traditional bourgeois liberalism and the pursuit of radical transformations in

70 Carl E. Schorske, *Fin de siècle Vienna. Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1980), p. XXVII.

71 Schorske, *Fin de siècle*, p. XXVII.

72 Schorske, *Fin de siècle*, p. XXVI.

scholarship, culture, and art is perfectly aligned with Freud's psychoanalysis and its claims – revolutionary for that time – regarding the structure of human mental life. An eloquent testimony of these pursuits is his main work, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, published in 1900.

It is an extraordinary work, for it not only touches upon the most personal aspects of its author's life, but also reveals from the inside various jealously guarded "secrets" and taboos of Viennese society from the turn of the century. What preceded the creation of this work, as Schorske writes, was Freud's long struggle within the Austrian social and political reality, in which he assumed various roles: "of a scientist and a Jew, a citizen and a son." As a result of these experiences, in his book about dreams "[…] Freud gave this struggle, both outer and inner, its fullest, most personal statement – and at the same time overcame it by devising an epoch-making interpretation of human experience in which politics could be reduced to an epiphenomenal manifestation of psychic forces."[73]

But in order to understand how it was possible at all that Freud could play all these four roles and finally, after obtaining the long-desired title of professor, break through into the academic elite of Vienna (although he was not welcome by everyone there), we should look at his struggle in the context of the assimilation processes among the multi-million-strong Jewish community in Austria, which had intensified since the 1860s. For once, the liberal bourgeoisie gained the dominant position in the Habsburg Monarchy; representatives of the Jewish community gradually made their presence felt in political life, administration, scholarship, science, culture, and art.

It would not have been possible on such a scale without the "tolerant" policy of the Imperial regime in Vienna towards particular nations, as a result of which they gradually gained wide-ranging powers within autonomous regions. A large part of the Jewish community inhabiting the Monarchy, especially the middle class, saw it as a chance for social advancement, and over time its representatives virtually dominated some professions and sections of industry and trade. As Steven Beller writes, one researcher conducted a kind of thought experiment in which he envisioned Vienna from that time without Jewish-run restaurants, cafes, department stores, all kinds of institutions, etc. It turned out that it would be such a crippled and miserable picture that Vienna would in no way resemble the city from the turn of the century that we recognize today.[74]

---

73 Schorske, *Fin de siècle*, p. 183.

74 See Steven Beller, *Vienna and the Jews. 1867–1938. A Cultural History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Moreover, in the case of emancipated Jews the identity processes mentioned earlier were often even more complex under the Habsburg Monarchy than in other nations. When they took place, say, in a Polish or Hungarian environment, the Jews, while remaining citizens of the Habsburg Monarchy where German was the official language, went to Polish or Hungarian schools and automatically immersed themselves in the culture of these countries. As a result, they became Polonized or Hungarianized, at the same time remaining loyal Austrian citizens with an excellent command of German. But they often preserved a strong sense of their Jewish roots. This multilayered, heterogeneous nature of their identity meant that its particular elements formed diverse configurations. Some of these people felt to be above all Jews, but for some individuals, the Polish, Austrian, Ukrainian, Hungarian, or other part of their identity dominated. In addition, these configurations often changed fundamentally over the course of their lives. Or they possessed a double or even triple identity, its constituent parts sometimes clashing with each other.

In his book on the Jewish community of the Vienna in 1867–1938, Steven Beller says that although this group experienced intense assimilation processes and a large segment of it adopted a modern, secular lifestyle with its attendant notions and values, its representatives always maintained a strong sense of being Jews. In other words, although they often regarded themselves as Austrians (and their lifestyle and mentality were virtually undistinguishable from that of their fellow Austrians), they always preserved a sense of their distinctive Jewishness in some form.

Beller's chief argument is that this sense arose from various manifestations of anti-Semitism which Austrian Jews encountered at every turn. So even if they did their utmost to be "true" Austrians, emphasizing it to the point of appearing "more Catholic than the Pope," behind this outer appearance there was a strong memory of their Jewish descent.

Of course, this attitude is nothing unusual. We often see similar behaviors in many nationalities which, after settling in some foreign country, try a little too hard to look similar to its native citizens, erasing all traces of their origin (as is the case with many Poles in Germany). Moreover, as Beller argues, there was a particular hostility towards Jews in Austrian society, therefore even the assimilated ones preserved a strong sense of their distinctiveness. So on the one hand, they regarded themselves as Austrians and loyal citizens of the Monarchy, honoring the Emperor, but on the other hand, they were treated as inferior and strongly suspect "others" by their Aryan neighbors. However, they remained Jewish in their hearts. Beller provides one more argument, claiming that the assimilation of Jews in Europe of the second half of the 19th century was quite different from

assimilation processes taking place in other ethnic groups. According to Beller, "[…] the presence in the family past of Jewish ancestors was liable to mean that one started with a view of the world which was substantially different from that of others who were not of Jewish descent. Seen in this way, the assimilation, far from producing a complete merger with the surrounding populace, was in itself a Jewish phenomenon. Therefore anyone who was a product of this assimilation can be included as Jewish, and that must, of necessity, include converts and so on."[75] Beller justifies such a broad approach to assimilation with the subject of his study, aimed at a systematic and comprehensive presentation of the role and position of the Jews in Vienna between 1868 and 1938. It is therefore understandable from the methodological point of view.

But one more argument could be added here, lurking somewhere in the background of the author's reflections. Until the 18th century, the Jewish community in European countries had a peculiar status, incomparable to the status of other minorities or ethnic groups living within the same state. It was mainly due to the fact that their distinctiveness was based on their religion. This was the main source of cultural distinctiveness of Jewish Europeans; it produced their characteristic customs, dress, appearance, etc. In short, "being a Jew" meant above all being a follower of the Judaic religion, just as "being Christian" meant professing the Christian faith, regardless of all the differences between particular confessions. As a result, even in the Middle Ages or during the Renaissance, when the concept of the nation in the modern sense of the term did not yet exist, Jews in the religious sense of the word had completely different relations with the sovereign than representatives of the knightly, bourgeois or peasant estates. But in the First Polish Republic, where they formed a very large minority, they constituted what amounted to a separate estate, with their own governance and parliament. And their submission to royal authority was based on quite different principles than in the case of other estates.

It should be added here that this purely religious foundation of Jewish identity resulted in the deep hostility of their Christian neighbors, who did not tolerate this distinctiveness. Consequently, Jews were regularly subjected to various acts of violence, including mass slaughter. In this case, the source of conflicts was the antagonistic relation between the two religions, already evident at the level of theological assumptions. This relation formed one of the main sources of anti-Semitism, later supplemented with diverse cultural and social factors. For this reason, the antagonism between the Jewish community, founded mostly

75 Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, p. 13.

on religion, and its social and cultural surroundings had a characteristic nature, not comparable to other antagonisms, which were of a social, ethnic, or cultural nature. It even differed from antagonisms between members of various Christian confessions. This is where the peculiarity of the sense of "being a Jew" lies; initially it was based on an awareness of a profound religious distinctiveness. Only later were new kinds of antagonisms superimposed on it, associated with the emergence of nationalist ideologies in 19th-century Europe.

Beller's claim that you cannot look at the process of Jewish assimilation in isolation from the awareness of who their ancestors were becomes more comprehensible if you take into account the crucial role played by religion in shaping the cultural distinctiveness and separate identity of Jews. The memory of this distinctiveness, even in the case of assimilated groups, could never be completely erased. It was preserved also when orthodox Jews started to perceive themselves as members of a nation in the modern sense of the term. Zionism – in this context Jewish nationalism based on the idea of building a Jewish state in Palestine modeled on European states – was an especially radical manifestation of this phenomenon.

However, for assimilated Jews who regarded themselves as Austrians, Poles, or Hungarians, the memory of their separate religious and cultural roots was present, usually somewhere in the background and more or less pronounced. Or these new national identities could coexist with Jewish identity in the modern sense, but this was less frequent and difficult to sustain. A classic example of this two-way attitude is provided by Helena Deutsch, one of the leading figures of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society of whom, as rumors would have it, Freud was particularly fond (she was called *Liebling Freuds*, "Freud's favorite," in these circles):

> I was born into a Polish-Jewish milieu at a time when the process of assimilation was in full swing. But the Jewish tendency to create a separate, closed, religious society within the larger society was also still operating. Caught in this conflict and ambiguity, I usually identified more with the romantic "suffering, enslaved Poland" than with my Jewish background. Anti-Semitism all around me tipped the scales further. In short, I wanted to be Polish. The influence of the budding Zionist nationalistic movement was not an important factor at the time of my childhood. My father's social position helped to give me a sense of belonging in Polish society. Wilhelm Rosenbach was a prominent lawyer and a scholar in international law. He exerted considerable influence […].[76]

76 Deutsch, *Confrontations with Myself*, p. 30.

These memories clearly show that the high social status of her father and his authority among the Poles had a decisive impact on the emergence of Helena Deutsch's Polish identity. One should note that it was also a choice made to spite her mother, who exerted pressure on her to identify with German culture (in a cruel twist of irony, during World War II she was hiding from the Germans in Warsaw cellars and paid them off with what remained of the family's wealth).

Obviously there were also extreme examples of assimilated Jews violently renouncing their own Jewishness, explaining it in different ways. Such was the case, for example, of Otto Weininger, whose extreme misogyny was accompanied by anti-Semitism. Such attitudes and ways of thinking embodied the logic of modern European nationalism. It changed one's perspective on everything, both on the "positive," that is the accepted, and the "negative," or the rejected forms of identity. This way you could be a Pole, Austrian, German, or Jew as a member of a specific national community or not belong to it at all. But in the second case, you simply were a member of another national community, based on the same criteria of belonging associated with race, religion, culture, or blood.

On the other hand, orthodox Jews openly preserving their traditional religious form of identity did not subscribe to the logic spreading along with all kinds of nationalisms. Therefore they were seen as a bizarre, self-enclosed, and anachronistic caste by the majority of "enlightened" society, who thought in secular and nationalist terms. As a result, the chasm between them and this society dramatically widened. Their separateness as a social group which self-defined in primarily religious terms became even deeper. Consequently, anti-Semitic attitudes started assuming a new form, motivated not only religiously or economically, but also nationalistically. Over time, these elements, mutually reinforcing each other, produced a deadly cocktail. Therefore, antagonisms between the Poles, Ukrainians, and Austrians on the one hand and the Jews on the other had a structurally different form than antagonisms between members of these three nationalities.

The picture of the process of Jewish assimilation becomes further complicated if we look at it from the perspective of profound civilizational changes which started in Western Europe in the second half of the 18th century and embraced practically all national, ethnic, and social groups. Considered from this angle, it was a process closely related to the emergence of a new type of society and state in Europe, with the rules of belonging defined in a completely new way. The sources of this process should be sought both in economic transformations (the appearance of the free-market model) and in the main ideas of the Enlightenment. Of crucial importance were the ideas of equality and freedom, assuming the necessity of liberating humans from the burden of prejudices and traditions and of

building a new type of nationally homogenous society, where cultural and religious antagonisms and differences would vanish.

From this perspective, the process of Jewish assimilation resulted from the pressure exerted on them by a new "secular" form of European culture, which it assumed mainly under the impact of Enlightenment ideas that were gradually introduced in the political and social practices of particular states. In other words, this process was an inherent part of this culture, and one of its consequences was the emergence of profound differences between Jewish identities in the various countries of Europe. The most significant development here was the appearance of Zionism, where a new understanding of Jewishness and the idea of the Israeli state were faithful copies of various forms of nationalism nascent in the countries of Europe.

In this sense, both Zionism and the processes of Jewish assimilation were produced by changes in European culture mentioned above. Of course, due to the aforementioned factors, assimilated Jews very often preserved elements of their previous identity, but this assumed diverse forms. It often happened, for example, that in the second or third generation of assimilated families the parents did not speak to children about their Jewish descent. Or if the children knew anything about it, they did not regard it as particularly important. Only as a result of constant confrontations with violent anti-Semitic attacks did many assimilated Jews start to value their Jewishness (the case of Hannah Arendt). Therefore, many assimilated Jews later joined the Zionist movements.

9 Psychoanalysis – a Jewish science?

If I devote so much space to the processes of Jewish assimilation in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, it is because these processes took place in equal measure among the Jews living in Polish social and cultural surroundings in Galicia and in the Congress Kingdom. And if all members of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society were Jews in its first years of the existence (it was founded by Freud in 1902), you could also find people of Polish descent there. Of course, some of them regarded themselves also (or exclusively) as Austrians, Hungarians, Czechs, Poles (like Jekels or Deutsch), etc. It differed from individual to individual. Above, I tried to indicate the social and cultural sources of this phenomenon, which were very similar for each of these groups, for they concerned the civilizational processes occurring in the whole Habsburg Monarchy and embraced the Jewish community living in it.

For example, when the province of Galicia acquired greater autonomy, the Polonization tendency gathered momentum among the Jewish community. In

equal measure, although for other reasons, similar processes could be observed in the second half of the 19th century in the Russian partition, the region where such people as Nunberg, Bychowski, Wizel, and Nelken were born. As I already mentioned, very important in this context was the fact that very many young Jews from the lower strata of the emergent middle class studied medicine and became physicians. They saw psychoanalysis as a new, not yet institutionalized and therefore non-hierarchical form of therapy (in fact, they were the ones who established a hierarchy here), within which they would be able to demonstrate their abilities. Moreover, this new form of therapy was based on the belief that it could lead to a profound transformation of the patient's self-understanding. As a result, the patient would relate in a radically different way to himself and others, at the same time now able to control his sexual drives and aggression more effectively than before (the idea of rearing a new, psychoanalytically enlightened human being).

Later came the belief in the possibility of building a society based on this new model of interpersonal relations.

These were the main reasons which attracted many young medical students from assimilated Jewish families to the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society. As they formed an overwhelming majority in this organization, many opponents of psychoanalysis claimed that it was a typically "Jewish" science preoccupied with the causes of mental disorders of the Jews themselves (patricidal and incestuous tendencies expressed in the hypotheses of the Oedipus complex, various kinds of sexual perversions, aggression, etc.). It was impossible to overlook the clearly anti-Semitic overtones of this argumentation; as a "Jewish" science, psychoanalysis was a strongly suspect theory dealing with the filthiest and darkest aspects of the human mind, and instead of curing them, only led to the moral depravity of the patients.

Perhaps also as a reaction to this kind of "argumentation" and rumination, in the 1950s we saw the first serious academic attempts of tracing overt or hidden elements of Jewish influence in Freud's theory. The most significant of them was David Bakan's book *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition* (Boston 1958). It launched the now-rich interpretative tradition analyzing Freud's work from this angle.[77] Within this tradition, the purported "Jewishness" of

77 This tradition includes such books as Emanuel Rice, *Freud and Moses: The Long Journey Home* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990); Dennis Klein, *The Jewish Origins of the Psychonalytic Movement* (Chicago: Praeger Special Studies, 1981); Peter Gay, *A Godless Jew: Freud, Atheism and the Making of Psychoanalysis* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987); Sanford Drob, "Freud and the Chasidim: Redeeming the Jewish

psychoanalysis is regarded as something good; it is indicated how much Freud owed to the tradition of Jewish religious thought, with which he must have had wide-ranging, although probably indirect and random, contact at home. Although he did not know Hebrew or Yiddish and distanced himself from Jewish religion (and all religion in general), various elements of his theory bear distinct traces of the influence of this tradition.

It is argued, therefore, that the way Freud defined the relation between the conscious and the unconscious, as well as his method of interpreting dreams and symptoms (the logic of argumentation, establishing relations between particular elements of a dream, and the emphasis on the sexual aspect) show astonishing affinities with the Jewish mystical tradition, especially with the Kabbalistic interpretation of being. This leads to the conclusion that psychoanalysis is a science or a peculiar type of knowledge which predominantly belongs to the tradition of Jewish thought, for its assumptions and methods of inference and interpretation are evidently of a "Talmudic" nature. They are indistinguishable from a logic of reasoning which is exclusively Jewish and deeply rooted in the religious tradition of the Jews.

This way of interpreting Freud's theory certainly pointed to a different way of looking at many of its aspects, revealing a new dimension. But it seems that treating it only as a direct extension or perhaps even a peculiarly secular version of the Jewish mystical tradition is a huge exaggeration, since such an approach is hardly substantiated in the available biographical and textual material. Looking from this perspective, you lose sight of the most characteristic feature of Freud's theory: the multiplicity of its scientific and philosophical sources of inspiration. This approach is just as one-sided as the work of those authors who read Freud's theory exclusively in terms of its relationships with the tradition of German Idealism and Romanticism or the tradition of the Enlightenment and Positivism.

In addition, treating Freud's theory as a modern manifestation of Jewish thought, you assign it to the category of culturally regional conceptions. This means giving ammunition to all its opponents who claim, for example, that the obsessive preoccupation of Freud with sexuality, including the Oedipus complex, is peculiarly Jewish and does not feature in other societies or cultures. Moreover, it is incompatible with what Freud himself thought about his theory,

---

Soul of Psychoanalysis," *Jewish Review* Vol. III, No. 1 (1989). In Poland there was Robert Stiller's article "Freud i żydowska tradycja mistyczna," www.gnosis.art.pl/numery/gn02stillerfreudizydtradmist.htm (accessed October 10, 2015).

being deeply convinced that its sources lay in the European tradition of the Enlightenment (British empiricism), and that this was universal. It is like saying that German Idealism expresses certain distinct features of the German cultural tradition and hence its meaning is largely – or exclusively – confined to this context. Consequently, this doctrine can only be comprehended and practiced by Germans themselves. Such views have already appeared in history and are somewhat ominous.

Naturally, you can always counter such arguments by saying that Freud did not fully realize how much he owed to the tradition of Jewish theology, although he had not studied it and had at best indirect contact with it. In fact, the argument goes, this influence, although hidden, was profound and decisive for the ultimate shape of his theory. Such claims contain a grain of truth, but at the same time they lose sight of the multiplicity of scientific, philosophical, literary, and cultural sources of Freudian psychoanalysis. Today, in the light of hundreds of works and articles on this subject, this is obvious, not to mention the type of education that Freud obtained and his numerous statements on his inspirations and on the scientific status of psychoanalysis.

When we follow Freud's biography in terms of his attitude to the tradition of Jewish culture and religion and to the Zionist movement, the emergence of which he witnessed, we can clearly see that this attitude was deeply ambivalent and cannot be reduced to one positive or negative formula.[78] In addition, it fundamentally changed over time. This issue is very accurately presented and richly documented by Jacques de Rider in his famous work *Modernité viennoise et crises de l'identité*.[79] He shows that the initial pro-Austrian attitude of Freud, related to his desire to assimilate into German culture, gradually broke down, also due to the painful experiences with various manifestations of anti-Semitism in academic circles and everyday life. Consequently, he started to emphasize his Jewish roots and reflect on the influence of the Jewish tradition on his theory. More interestingly, de Rider also shows to what extent this change of attitude was

78 This ambivalence is most emphatically seen in Freud's last book, *Moses and Monotheism*, in which he claims that Judaism, due to its particular national character, is a dead religion. And he also points at the Egyptian sources of the Mosaic religion.

79 See Jacques de Rider and his famous work *Modernité viennoise et crises de l'identité*. See the English translation: J. Le Rider, *Modernity and Crisis of Identity. Culture and Society in Fin-de-siècle Vienna*, New York 1993, in particular *Part IV. Crises of Jewish Identity*, pp. 187–250.

characteristic for assimilated Jewish milieus at the time and closely related to the birth of the Zionist movement.[80]

Particularly interesting in this context are those comments by Freud where he voices his belief that the peculiar method of reasoning underlying the psychoanalytical theory is a significant embodiment of his "intellectual constitution." This, in turn, is of "racial" origin, or that it follows from a biologically grounded way of thinking developed by Jews over the millennia of their history. This belief finds its eloquent expression in Freud's letter to Karl Abraham, who was strongly skeptical in the matter of admitting Carl G. Jung to the Psychoanalytical Society. Freud attempts to convince his colleague that, from a strategic point of view, Jung's intellectual non-Jewishness is an asset rather than a disadvantage:

> Be tolerant, and do not forget that really it is easier for you to follow my thoughts than it is for Jung, since to begin with you are completely independent, and then you are closer to my intellectual constitution through racial kinship, while he as a Christian and a pastor's son finds his way to me only against great inner resistances. His association with us is therefore all the more valuable. I was almost going to say that it was only by his emergence on the scene that psychoanalysis was removed from the danger of becoming a Jewish national affair.[81]

Two things are of note in this excerpt. The first is Freud's words about "racial kinship," reflecting his repeatedly expressed view that over the millennia of human history, people internalized various, at first purely external, prohibitions, notions, and ways of thinking, which became biologically

---

80 Incidentally, a similar process could be observed among assimilated Jewish circles in Galicia and the Congress Kingdom. The paradox of this process was that it originated in assimilated Jewish communities and primarily concerned them. It was, so to speak, a side effect that it also influenced orthodox Jews, in part of which a new type of national identity began to overlap with traditional religious and cultural identity. Assimilation processes and their diversity in both the Congress Kingdom and Galicia are excellently illustrated in such books as: Alina Cała, *Asymilacja Żydów w Królestwie Polskim (1864–1897). Postawy, konflikty, stereotypy* (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1989); E. Prokop-Janiec, *Pogranicze polsko-żydowskie. Topografie i teksty* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2013); Z. Kołodziejska, "*Izraelita*" *(1866–1915) – znaczenie kulturowe i literackie czasopisma* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2014); E. Prokop-Janiec, ed., *Polacy – Żydzi. Kontakty kulturowe i literackie* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2014).

81 Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham, *The Complete Correspodence of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham 1907–1925. Complete Edition*, Ernst Falzeder, ed., trans. Caroline Schwarzacher (London, New York: Routledge, 2002), p. 38.

grounded, so to speak. In other words, it is an assumption that phylogeny affects ontogeny. In Freud's theory, it found its perhaps most emphatic expression in the concept of "organic repression." Freud conceived this as a type of repression which initially is imposed on man, or his mind, from the outside, but then it becomes internalized and is inherited by the organism (body) from generation to generation.

Today this view, very popular in the scientific circles of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century, is regarded as anachronistic and widely rejected as unconfirmed by empirical research. It is seen as at best a kind of mythopoeic explanation of the origin of certain phenomena rather than a coherent hypothesis which can be empirically verified.

But this excerpt could be read slightly differently, ignoring the Darwinist prejudice underlying it. In fact, it expresses Freud's belief that the psychoanalytical way of reasoning has profound roots in the Jewish cultural tradition developed over the millennia, characterized by a distinct way of thinking regardless of its actual religious substance. In this sense, the otherness of Jung's psychoanalysis is cultural; having been raised in the Christian tradition, Jung has a completely different kind of intellectual sensitivity than Jews. Therefore, when adopting the psychoanalytical way of thinking he has to overcome a number of "resistances" connected with his own intellectual constitution shaped by the cultural tradition in which he grew up. But it does not mean, of course, that because of his "racial" otherness he will never adopt this way of thinking.

The second interesting issue – ignored by de Rider in his interpretation – is that Freud perceives Jung joining the psychoanalytical movement – a Christian – as something very important strategically. This would clearly show, Freud says, that psychoanalysis was not "a Jewish national affair," but a theory which could convince people who are not of Jewish origin, including prominent representatives of science.

So if Freud believes that the way of reasoning and inferring that underlies his psychoanalytical theory is rooted in the Jewish tradition, he also thinks that this style contains some universal elements which can be adopted by people raised in other cultural traditions. Consequently, his theory will eventually become part of the general cultural heritage.

This belief accompanied Freud throughout his life. It clearly came to the fore in his famous sarcastic words to his pupils while traveling by ship to the United States: "They don't know that we're bringing them plague!" Psychoanalysis is a plague, because like every pestilence it does not recognize the division into races, nations, and cultures. It was born, in part, on the foundation of the tradition of Jewish thought, but it contains something that goes beyond the particularity of

this tradition. Consequently, it can infect anyone, regardless of what cultural tradition has shaped them.

I emphasize this moment because it eloquently shows Freud's intellectual openness. He obviously wanted to avoid the transformation of the psychoanalytical movement into a self-enclosed sect consisting of Jews alone, considering the questions of the unconscious, sexuality, and human drives in isolation. He believed that it would contradict the universal status of the concepts and terms of his own theory, which concerned the human mind "as such" and remained valid for all types of societies and cultures. Psychoanalysis was to become a common legacy of all human communities and cultures, not just the Jewish or European ones.

In the light of the extremely rich interpretative tradition concerning the origins of Freud's theory, its sources seem to be multiple, scientifically, philosophically, and culturally. On the one hand, Freud repeatedly emphasized that the prototype of true science was for him the model developed in the tradition of British empiricism and then of Positivism. This meant that psychoanalysis belonged primarily to the natural sciences. But on the other hand, Freud's theory of interpreting dreams and symptoms could be perceived as a new kind of hermeneutics. Seen from this angle, psychoanalysis was closer to the methodology of the humanities. In addition, the main argument for the validity of the Oedipus complex hypothesis and its universality was for him literature and myth rather than clinical data, and he labeled his theory of drives as psychoanalytical "mythology." Moreover, he wrote in German and had an amazingly extensive knowledge of German culture, including its humanist tradition and philosophy, as he repeatedly showed in his works, pointing at the writings from this culture as an important source of his theory. No wonder that authors of the most important works on the origins of this theory, such as Bruno Bettelheim and Odo Marquard, perceived the obvious influences of the Romantic tradition and German Idealism in it.[82] Freud was also familiar with European literary traditions. This is evidenced by numerous references in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. They by no means played an ornamental role. Not to mention the fact that his case histories sometimes read like artistic fiction rather than scientific treatises or essays.

82 I mean primarily such works as Bruno Bettelheim, *Freud and Man's Soul* (New York: Knopf, 1982); Odo Marquard, *Transzendentaler Idealismus. Romantische Naturphilosophie. Psychoanalyse* (Köln: Verlag für Philosophie, 1987).

In Freud's work we can find claims and excerpts which can be used to justify each one of these diverse interpretations. As a result, researchers tracing the sources of inspiration for his theory argue even today which one should be accorded the crucial role, and which produced the most interesting and innovative elements of his theory.

These arguments result from the heterogeneity of Freudian discourse, which combines elements of all these overlapping traditions. They sometimes reinforce and complement each other, but at other times they are antagonistic or even mutually exclusive. This makes me believe that if you aspire to a reliable picture of the role and significance of these diverse traditions in the process of building psychoanalytical theory and its successive Freudian versions, you should take into account the complex relations between those traditions rather than pinpoint just one of them.

An impressive openness also characterized Freud's attitude to the ancient sources of European cultural traditions. It is worth noting that, unusually so for the intellectual culture of his time, he was particularly fond of ancient Egyptian culture. In his doctor's office in Vienna, figures of sphinxes and other souvenirs from Egypt scowled at patients, artifacts which he passionately collected, spending a lot of money on them. The most eloquent testimony to this fascination was the aforementioned book *Moses and Monotheism*. The principal claim of this essay, namely that Moses was an Egyptian, was deeply offensive to orthodox Jews. Not to mention the fact that Freud described Judaism as a dead religion, which because of its parochialism had to lose against the universalist message underlying Christianity.

But it would be rash to conclude that Freud deprecated the tradition of Judaism and that it did not matter to him. After all, although he reinterpreted it, the biblical history of the Jewish nation, its mythical leader, and its God were regarded as being of crucial importance for European culture. And his claim that the new "Egyptian" God of Moses triggered the development of abstract thinking among Jews implied that their contribution to European culture and their place in it – with its philosophy and modern model of science – could not be overestimated.

The essay about Moses clearly showed Freud's ability to take a critically distant approach – if he deemed it necessary in the name of scientific honesty – towards any tradition, including the one which was closest to him. The demand for such distance followed from the methodological appeal grounded in the Enlightenment model of European science: the researcher should be able to distance himself from all his pre-existing beliefs if he concludes that they could be an obstacle in discovering the real essence of a given phenomenon, sequence

of events, or process. This far-reaching self-criticism in approaching the most deeply engrained prejudices in the researcher's consciousness was regarded as the fundamental condition for the credibility of scientific procedure. Developing such distance towards himself and his own past was also a task to be undertaken by the patient during his therapy. Considered from this perspective, the psychoanalytical approach, where the most intimate and also the most deeply rooted representations and thoughts were objects of critical reflection, was a more radical version of this attitude.

Such an approach was grounded in the philosophical tradition of European rationalism (the postulate of critically distancing yourself from your own prejudices and traditions), where it was regarded as a necessary condition for reaching the objective truth of cognition and self-discovery. The claims of psychoanalysis regarding the deep, unconscious structures of human mental life and the laws of cultural development in history were to attain the same status. The prototype of this truth was to be mythical stories dating back to ancient times, for in those times people had not yet developed sophisticated mechanisms of repression and of masking the repressed content. That is why Freud decided that the most emphatic testimony to the universality of the Oedipus complex was the story of the creation of the world and of its gods in Greek mythology, which swarmed with incestuous and patricidal acts and all kinds of crimes.

In his eyes, Greek mythology was the third antique source of European culture. In this way, paradoxically, a model of practicing science inherited from the Enlightenment tradition which proclaimed the necessity of the researcher distancing himself from his prejudices, made Freud recognize the universality of truth contained in ancient myths. Psychoanalysis itself was also supposed to contain these types of truths. It was meant to be a modern scientific theory comprising a number of fundamental claims on man and his culture which, while questioning their accepted understanding, were at the same time to maintain their validity across the world. In other words, psychoanalysis was to be "supranational," to speak about man as such rather than, say, man as a European. So any claim about psychoanalysis being a "Jewish" science embodying the mentality and way of thinking of Jews is as equally bizarre as the claim that Einstein's theory of relativity is "Jewish."

The fact that, in its initial period, the Psychoanalytical Society founded by Freud was formed exclusively by Jews should be seen as resulting predominantly from the specific social and cultural circumstances in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy at the turn of the 20th century, and it would be wrong to create a kind of national mythology around it. The later history of psychoanalysis, which spread to other countries and continents like a "plague" and was practiced by

people of different nationalities raised in different cultures, eloquently testifies to the universalist claim underlying Freud's theory.

10 What does "Polish psychoanalysis" mean?

The above reflections lead us to the question of what the terms "Polish psychoanalyst" and "Polish psychoanalysis" could mean in this context. It arises not only because many psychoanalysts of Jewish origin born in the Polish lands functioned very well in the German linguistic environment, and today it is difficult – at least on the basis of extant records – to say to what extent they regarded themselves as Poles and identified themselves with Polish culture. Of equal importance is the fact that many of them, even if initially they functioned in a Polish milieu, later settled in Vienna, where they acquired their psychoanalytical education at the very "source" and wrote exclusively in German (Jekels, Nunberg, Deutsch, and others). In the 1930s, they were forced to emigrate, mainly to the United States, where they started to publish their texts in English. So how should we define them? As Polish, then Austrian, and still later American psychoanalysts?

This dilemma is best illustrated by the differences in defining the nationality of these analysts in the Polish, German, French, and American versions of Wikipedia. Just a few years ago, in the Polish version you could read that Jekels was a Polish psychoanalyst, in the German one he was called an Austrian analyst, and in the American version he became American. Recently the authors proposed a "compromise" version informing the readers that he had been a Polish-Austrian-American analyst. Of course, this sounds quite hilarious. Nevertheless, if we look at Jekels' texts written first in Polish, then in German, and finally in English, which coincided with his work in Lviv and Bystra, then in Vienna, and finally in America as an exile, such a "compromise" accurately reflects Jekels' functioning as an analyst in these three periods of his life and in three different cultures.

There is another solution to this dilemma, namely treating national or cultural identity as secondary and saying that Jekels was simply a psychoanalyst. After all, according to Freud himself – as we saw in the excerpt from his letter to Abraham – psychoanalysis was to be supranational and supra-cultural. For this reason, in 1911 Freud sent Jekels to Kraków and Lviv, and in the 1920s to Sweden with the task of promoting his theory in the Scandinavian countries. Consequently, besides his work in "the Polish lands," Jekels also contributed to the promotion of psychoanalysis in these countries. Of course, this does not mean that we can also describe him as a Swedish or Scandinavian analyst. Especially because he did not write any texts in Swedish.

But if Jekels, probably because of his radical leftist views – first socialist and then outright communist – most likely did not attach particular importance to his national identity (especially in the later period of his life, when his attitude to the people and events around him was profoundly pessimistic),[83] a sense of nationality in the cases of other analysts played an important role. Eugenia Sokolnicka and Helena Deutsch provide telling examples.[84]

The former (née Kutner) grew up in Warsaw in an assimilated Jewish family, engaged for generations in the struggle for Polish independence; in 1863 her grandfather apparently fought in the uprising against the Tsarist regime in the Russian partition, but this has not been definitively confirmed. In any case, she absorbed strong patriotic feelings at home and preserved them for the rest of her life. But she went down in the history of psychoanalysis primarily as the founder of the psychoanalytical movement in France and – with Marie Bonaparte – the psychoanalytical society there. Which, by the way, she had unsuccessfully attempted to do in Poland in 1917–1919.[85]

Helena Deutsch was born in Przemyśl and emphasized her association with Polishness throughout her life. For a long time she was in a relationship with a Polish attorney (also of Jewish origin), Herman Lieberman, a prominent political activist, a PPS deputy in the interwar period, and Minister of Justice in Władysław Sikorski's government-in-exile. Her already-quoted diary, written

83 But caution should be exercised in this case as well. Gustaw Bychowski, for example, in his report to Polish readers from the famous psychoanalytic conference in Marienbad in Germany in 1936, writes that "he met a Pole, Jekels." So Polishness was an important hallmark for both of them at this conference. By the way, in the same report Bychowski is very flattering about Lacan's speech about the mirror stage. See Gustaw Bychowski, "XIV Międzynarodowy Zjazd Psychoanalityczny w Marienbadzie (sierpień 1936)," *Polskie Archiwum Psychologii*, Vol. IX (1936), pp. 175–176.

84 Another example is, of course, Hanna Segal, a leading figure of British psychoanalysis. Except that her psychoanalytic activity begins only after World War II in Great Britain. Therefore, because she belonged to another generation of psychoanalysts, I do not mention her in this context.

85 A lot of information on this subject is provided by Jarosław Groth in his excellent article "Przyczynek do historii polskiej psychoanalizy – Eugenia Sokolnicka," *Polskie Forum Psychologiczne*, Vol. XVIII, No. 1 (2013), p. 115, based on the correspondence of Otto Rank with Freud at this time. It resulted from the fact that a psychoanalytical group was being established in Warsaw, but for some unknown reasons (resistance of the medical community – internal disputes and divisions?) it did not happen. In any case, this correspondence clearly shows that Freud was very keen on establishing a psychoanalytic society in Poland.

towards the end of her life, is an invaluable source of information about the Polish period of her biography.

She describes her childhood years in detail, drawing an honest picture of the deeply ambivalent relations between Poles and Jews in Przemyśl, and writes about her own dilemmas in this context. She also emphasizes that, despite the manifold manifestations of anti-Semitism which the Jews experienced from the Poles, she preserved her Polish identity, although it sometimes required a lot of resilience on her part. The reason she could do so was perhaps that she was capable of looking at these conflicts from a critical distance and noticed to what extent the "popular" Polish version of anti-Semitism was fueled by the demagoguery practiced by right-wing parties and the peculiar interpretation of Crucifixion promoted by representatives of the Church:

> […] It was unavoidably plain to me that in the struggle against exploitation the peasants made the Jew their scapegoat. He was conceived of as a type of devil who sucked away their savings for his own advantage. For them the Jew was indeed the immediate exploiter, but behind him is still the peasants' own near-deity, the aristocratic *szlachcic*. […] One should not forget that the peasant, usually illiterate, took his religious ideas whole-cloth from the village priest, a figure of enormous influence, whose interpretation of the New Testament was laced with literal-minded bigotry. Every Sunday the flock was vigorously reminded that it was the Jews who crucified Christ.[86]

Deutsch's account is particularly significant due to her crucial position – next to Jekels and Nunberg – in the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society, where she was Freud's assistant and ran the Training Institute. She also made an important contribution to the psychoanalytical theories of "sexual difference," studying primarily the issue of female sexuality. *The Psychology of Women*[87] is regarded as her most important work; it offers a number of innovative insights on the female mind, developing and modifying Freud's claims on this subject. Today this work is considered one of the most significant, classic psychoanalytical texts on this issue. Along with later writings by Hanna Segal, Helena Deutsch made the greatest contribution to psychoanalytical theory among all psychoanalysts of Polish origin.

At the same time, however, neither Sokolnicka nor Deutsch wrote a single psychoanalytical text in Polish, although records show that in many cases they conducted psychoanalysis in Polish. So how should we categorize them? Can

86 Deutsch, *Confrontations with Myself*, pp. 34–35.

87 Deutsch, *The Psychology of Women* (New York: Grune&Stratton, 1944) Vol. I; Helen Deutsch, *The Psychology of Women* (New York: Grune&Stratton, 1945), Vol. II.

we call them Polish psychoanalysts, despite the fact that their contribution to the history of Polish psychoanalysis was virtually nothing? Sokolnicka's main achievements were connected with founding the psychoanalytical movement in France, while Deutsch was active in this area first in Austria and then in the United States. So perhaps it would be more accurate to call the former a French psychoanalyst, and the latter an Austrian and later American psychoanalyst?[88] But this approach, ignoring the issue of their national identity, which in their case was strong, would also be a simplification. Even when they are called "Polish psychoanalysts," one should remember that this label concerns mostly their national identity rather than their legacy or their work as psychoanalysts. The situation was radically different in the case of Herman Nunberg or Tola Rank, who for a time practiced psychoanalysis during the partitions in the Polish lands and wrote their first psychoanalytical texts in Polish. Not to mention Jekels, if you consider his wide-ranging clinical, publishing, and translation work in Lviv and Bystra.

Yet another type of problem arises in the context of a large group of psychoanalysts who came from Jewish families, were born in the Polish lands, spoke Polish, got their education in Polish schools, but emigrated at a very early stage of their lives. These individuals often published nothing in Polish, and to make matters worse, we know very little (or nothing) about their sense of identity, their attitude towards Polish culture, etc. But even if they admitted to strong ties with Polish culture (e.g., the American Wikipedia claims that Rudolf Loewenstein was a Polish psychoanalyst), like Deutsch or Sokolnicka, they never published anything in Polish. Or sometimes it was just a handful of texts, as in the case of Mira Gincburg in Switzerland. When preceding the term "psychoanalyst" with an adjective defining their nationality, one should be very cautious, if only because such adjectives are ambiguous – they may refer to someone's national identity or to someone's contribution to psychoanalytical literature of a given country. Or to both.

Martin Buber's biography provides a good illustration of the fact that questions of national and cultural self-definition at the turn of the 20th century in Galicia and the Congress Kingdom were complex and fluid. He first attended a Polish

88 The authors of Wikipedia entries are also evidently struggling with this problem. In the Polish version Sokolnicka is a Polish psychoanalyst, in the French and German ones simply a psychoanalyst, and in the American version she is a French psychoanalyst. Deutsch, in turn, is a Polish psychoanalyst in the Polish version, an Austrian-American one in the American version, and in the French version she is an American psychoanalyst of Polish origin.

school and avidly read Polish Romantic literature, and later wrote his first texts in Polish. Then he found that he was more attracted to German culture – especially German Idealism – and started writing in German. Still later, in the 1930s, he became fully immersed in the Judaic tradition, and today he is regarded as a prominent Jewish theologian.

It seems that although in the case of many analysts born under Austrian and Russian partitions the term "Polish" is much exaggerated (if legitimate at all), you can hardly ignore this group in a work on the history of Polish psychoanalysis. Especially because some of them later made big careers in the psychoanalytical movement, preserving their Polish cultural identity to a lesser or greater extent. They not only spoke excellent Polish and were deeply familiar with Polish literature, but sometimes they conducted psychoanalysis in Polish. They included Rudolf Loewenstein, co-founder of the French Psychoanalytical Society, who analyzed Jacques Lacan and taught him psychoanalysis, and was himself analyzed, among other people, by Sokolnicka; Zofia Morgenstern, who created the psychoanalytical movement in France in the interwar period; Beata (Tola) Rank, translator of one of Freud's works into Polish; Mira Oberholzer (Gincburg), co-founder of the Swiss Psychoanalytical Society and author of several texts in Polish; Sophie and Berta Bornstein; and dozens of others. Although it would be difficult to associate the psychoanalytical achievements and clinical work of this group with the tradition of Polish psychoanalysis (it had an at best marginal importance in the context of their entire legacy), this group forms an important background for this tradition, tied to it via various threads.

It is difficult, therefore, to find a clear-cut criterion which would lead to a precise definition of the term "Polish psychoanalyst." The principal reason is that in the early stages of the movement, up to 1918, the Polish state did not exist. Therefore, the first analysts and authors of texts on psychoanalysis, who either regarded themselves as Poles or wrote in Polish and were culturally associated with Polish traditions, were citizens of foreign countries – Austria Hungary, Russia, and Germany. So you can only speak about a psychoanalytical movement in "the Polish lands" in the sense of the partitioned lands which once belonged to the First Polish Republic.[89]

89 The term First Polish Republic is used by historians in relation to the so-called Poland of the nobility, a state whose beginnings are usually identified with the hypothetical date of the baptism of Mieszko I (966) and its end with the third partition between Prussia, Russia, and Austria in 1795. Because from the 15th until late 18th century, the First Republic was also composed of lands inhabited mostly by the Belarusian,

Secondly, many psychoanalysts active in "the Polish lands" and writing in Polish had a dual, and sometimes even triple cultural identity, its individual components forming diverse configurations. Relations between these components could significantly vary. In addition, they changed over time due to some biographical or historical events, moving away and so on. In many cases we must resort to speculation, for the available records are scant or almost nonexistent. Especially in Galicia, the national and cultural "polymorphism" was a widespread phenomenon. The administration was Austrian, both Austrian and Polish schools existed in cities and towns, there were two Polish universities, the Ukrainian population was as numerous as the Polish one (about 44 percent), while the Jewish populace was almost 10 percent. So it is not surprising that many assimilated Jews often had a dual cultural identity, Polish and Austrian, not to mention the traditional religious Jewish identity they to a greater or lesser extent preserved.

A good illustration of this is the article by Bertha Pappenheim, the famous patient of Josef Breuer, about whom Freud supposedly said that she was the true creator of the psychoanalytical method (!).[90] In her charity work for Jewish women in Galicia, Pappenheim had an opportunity to take a closer look at the complex ethnic relations and identity processes there. She emphasized in her article that "the individuality of the land, in its mixture of German-Austrian-Polish, and Jewish elements, has a very definite character."[91]

Larry Wolff, who quoted these words in one of his books, notes that this cultural amalgamation was even more complex, for you should also mention the Ukrainians, who constituted almost half of the entire population.[92] In any case, due the multicultural and multinational nature of the region, the assimilation of the Jews took three parallel courses: Polish, Austrian and, less frequently, Ukrainian.

Ukrainian, and Russian population and other nations, the term "Polish lands" is obviously ambiguous and simply means lands belonging to the said state.

90 This is a patient who in Breuer's and Freud's *Studies on Hysteria* appears under the pseudonym Anna O. She supposedly referred to the method of therapy used with her as the *talking cure* [in English in the original], which Freud considered to be an excellent description.

91 Berta Pappenheim, "Zur Lage der jüdischen Bevölkerung in Galizien. Reiseeindrücke und Vorschläge zur Besserung der Verhältnisse" (1904), in: *Sisyphus. Gegen den Mädchenhandel – Galizien*, H. Heubach, ed. (Freiburg: 1992), p. 44.

92 Wolff, *The Idea of Galicia. History and Fantasy in Habsburg Political Culture*, p. 315.

Thirdly, it was not without significance that Freud himself understood psychoanalysis as a scientific theory of a supranational nature. In his eyes, it was neither Jewish nor Austrian, not even Central European, but had the status of a universal theory. In time, it was to become a common good for the entirety of mankind. From this perspective, the issues of the national, ethnic, or even religious identity of psychoanalysts were of secondary importance. Like the first Christians, they were to be above all emissaries for the new psychoanalytical truth about man and culture, proselytizers of the new method of therapy, expected to spread it across all continents.[93] Just like in the case of Christ, underlying this teaching was an obvious emancipatory claim: the emergence of a "better" type of man, more skilfully controlling his aggression. Like with the first Christians, the nationality of the analyst and patient did not matter at all. Obviously, the path to this "improvement" was to be completely different than in Christ's teachings. The crucial role was to be played by a new approach – developed by the patients during analysis – towards instinctive representations repressed into the unconscious, mostly of a sexual or aggressive nature.

This does not mean that there is no point in speaking today about Austrian, French, British, American, Israeli, or Polish psychoanalysis. After all, in each of these countries specific psychoanalytical traditions in the native language developed, psychoanalytical societies were founded, specific tendencies gained predominance, and so on. But all these traditions should be treated as variants of psychoanalysis as such. In the final analysis they are important only insofar as they contributed something significant to its general development. Psychoanalysis does not differ in this respect from such trends of contemporary science or scholarship as structuralism, existentialism, phenomenology, or Marxism, in which various "national" versions and variations also evolved over time.

But nevertheless, structuralism is still structuralism, existentialism is still existentialism, phenomenology is still phenomenology. And psychoanalysis is still psychoanalysis.

Ultimately, we should recognize as Austrian, British, or Polish psychoanalysts, primarily those people who were working for the development of psychoanalysis in their respective countries, wrote in their native language, and predominantly conducted therapy in it. What counts is above all the professional or cultural rather than national identity of the analyst. Although, as I already said, the latter

93 Incidentally, the first emissaries of Christianity in ancient times were also Jews who "betrayed" the Mosaic religion and, in a sense, their nation, becoming followers of Christ, Saint Peter and Saint Paul among them.

should never be completely ignored. For example, Nunberg (not to mention Jekels) could definitely be treated as a Polish psychoanalyst, considering his work as an assistant in Professor Jan Piltz's clinic in Kraków, his early articles on Freud's psychoanalysis written in Polish, and the fact that he delivered his lectures and papers and conducted therapy in Polish. However, as he moved to Vienna after the outbreak of World War I, living there throughout the 1920s, he should also be considered as an Austrian analyst. Still later, when in the 1930s he emigrated to the United States and became active in the psychoanalytical society there, he became an American analyst. By the same token, Stanisław Przybyszewski in his early Berlin period can be treated as a Pole who was also a leading representative of German Decadent movement.

11 The dilemmas of assimilation and Zionism

Since the vast majority of psychoanalysts (or psychiatrists fascinated by Freud's theory) active before 1914 in the Polish lands came from assimilated Jewish families, their national identity was built on the foundation of their traditional religious Jewish identity, to which, mostly depending on their political views, they had different attitudes. In this respect, the processes in question were no different from those which occurred among Jews in the remaining regions of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy or in Russia, which I described at the beginning of this chapter.

The historical course of these processes in the second half of the 19th century and later shows significant analogies to those described above. A good illustration of this evolution is provided in the already-quoted work *The Idea of Galicia* by Larry Wolff. The author gives the example of the Polish-Jewish *Ojczyzna* [Fatherland] magazine published in Polish that promoted Polonization in the 1880s. But in 1886 its publisher, Alfred Nossig, "converted" to Zionism and in 1892, in the annual journal *Przyszłość* (*The Future*), decided that Polonization as an idea was "pretty much worn out." Henceforth, he started to promote the idea of the Jews returning to Palestine and founding their own state there.[94] As a result, "Jews sought to establish a national identity of their own within the province, organizing a Jewish National Party of Galicia."[95]

A similar process could be observed in the Congress Kingdom. Until the 1880s, leading representatives of the Jewish integrist movement in the Russian

94 Wolff, *The Idea of Galicia*, pp. 313–315.
95 Wolff, *The Idea of Galicia*, p. 313.

partition regarded themselves as Poles of the Mosaic confession. A good example of this was the Jewish magazine published in Polish called *Jutrzenka* [*The Dawn*] (closed down by censorship for supporting the January Uprising) and *Izraelita* [*Israelite*], continuing this line in a veiled form. In 1910, the magazine published an article by Adam Wizel significantly entitled *Asymilacja czy polonizacja* [Assimilation or Polonization], where he supported the Polonization of Jewish communities living in Poland:

> Assimilation, taken literally, means becoming similar, and in this specific case it signifies the desire of Jews to become similar to the native Polish population in terms of language, customs and culture.
> Assimilation so conceived is nothing other than the *Polonization* of the Jews, which should be clearly and openly stated.[96]
> By striving to raise the cultural level of the Jews, wanting to instill elements of contemporary European culture in them, we by no means intend to assimilate them with any community which might be at hand, but only with the Polish national group, which means that assimilation as we conceive it directly leads to the Polonization of Jewish masses.
> And if so, the term assimilation, as too vague, should be completely rejected and unambiguously replaced with the term Polonization.[97]

Striking in Wizel's argumentation is the fact that he perceives the assimilation of Jews, meaning their Polonization, as the most effective way of bringing them within the scope of influence of European culture. The political message was unequivocal: the Jews were not to Russify, for that would pull them away from Europe, but to Polonize, for this was their best way to enter the path of cultural development – meaning participation in science and scholarship, in democratic forms of political life, in art, etc.

This appeal becomes more understandable if we take into account the completely different situation of Jews in the Congress Kingdom as compared to their lot in the Prussian/German partition and even under Austrian rule. Nevertheless, Wizel's words are very significant, for they were pronounced by a Polish Jew deeply immersed in the tradition of European culture, very well-educated and an authority in academic circles. And he expressed this view with a deep concern about the future fate of Jewish communities, firmly believing that unless they quickly Polonized, they would become a marginal ethnic group with an archaic mentality and no one would take them seriously. In a word,

---

96 Wizel, in line with the rules of Polish orthography, uses the form "jew" in its religious sense rather than "Jew" which refers to ethnicity or nationality.

97 Wizel, "Asymilacja czy polonizacja?" *Izraelita*, No. 4 (1910), p. 1.

Polonization of the Jews was for Wizel tantamount to their Europeanization and hence to the possibility of playing a significant role in the future Polish state. Or at least within Polish society, to which they would become culturally similar without rejecting – as should be emphasized – the faith of their fathers.

Wizel envisioned the future Polish state as democratic and tolerant towards all religions, not forcing anyone to change his faith. The main factor unifying Jews and Poles in this state was to be the same cultural identity founded on the Polish language. In the same article, Wizel deprecatingly spoke about Yiddish, calling it a "dialect," all the more undesirable, as for Poles it sounded similar to the language of their enemies (that is German, of which, according to Wizel, Yiddish was a poor caricature). Polishness for Wizel – the identification with Polish culture – equaled Europeanization, that is complete emancipation, and he saw Yiddish, serving to maintain the traditional religious identity of Jews, as the main obstacle hampering this process. The future was to show to what extent the reality of interwar Poland embodied these ideas.

Zionist ideas also became increasingly popular among the Jews in the Congress Kingdom. More and more intense anti-Semitic sentiments were an important factor of this polarization in Jewish communities. On the other hand, the idea of founding their own state and becoming a nation in the modern sense of the word was hugely attractive. Therefore, many Jews who previously had built their identity on religion started to regard themselves as Jews in the modern national sense.[98]

This clearly shows to what extent the emergence of Zionism changed the attitude of some Jewish groups to assimilation, introducing a new element to it and decisively influencing its course. The paradox of this situation was that the idea of rebuilding the Jewish state in Palestine referred on the one hand to the religious tradition of the Jewish nation, and on the other hand to the modern understanding of the concept of the nation. So this idea was a legacy of European thought. But the growing popularity of this idea largely resulted from the intensification of anti-Semitic attitudes within European societies from the late 19th century, which perceived themselves more and more as "national."

This produced the paradoxical fusion of assimilation and Zionization among Jews, because despite the fact that they were diametrically different, they were produced by the same cultural processes and the same way of thinking. Although ideologically similar, they were completely incompatible and at the same time

98 See Zuzanna Kołodziejska, "*Izraelita" (1866–1915). Znaczenie kulturowe i literackie czasopisma* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2014), pp. 123–130.

led to an increase of anti-Semitic feelings. In the eyes of the Aryan population, the fact that the Jews, who had built their identity on religious tradition, suddenly wanted to be a nation in the modern understanding of this word and be treated in the same way as other nations, was psychologically difficult to accept.

Added to that was ordinary social resentment associated with the fact that, as a result of the industrialization of European societies and the assimilation processes fueled by this transformation, increasingly numerous groups of emancipated Jews were entering prestigious professions previously reserved for Aryans. What is more, this also meant a significant improvement of their material situation. Representatives of the petty bourgeois circles perceived this development as a threat to their own status, while the working class and the peasants, also resentful, saw it as a violation of the long-established order and the main source of their misfortunes. And when nationalist parties of all kinds started telling them that they should enjoy special privileges and rights as "native" Austrians, Germans, Poles, Ukrainians, and so on, they became equally suspicious and hostile to orthodox Jews, who founded their identity on religion, and to assimilated Jews regarding themselves as Austrians, Germans, Poles, or Ukrainians.

The only opportunity to break away from the vicious circle of rival nationalisms was offered by left-wing parties, promoting the idea of a supranational and classless society. No wonder that, like Zionism (although ideologically the very opposite), they attracted many assimilated Jews, who saw this "third way" as a real opportunity to change their situation.[99] This is where an overwhelming majority of VPT members invested their political sympathies, seeing a profound affinity between the idea of class emancipation of previously marginalized and economically exploited social strata and the idea of shaping a psychoanalytically enlightened man who would have a much greater control over the "economy" of his instinctive life.

12 Psychoanalysis and the anti-Semitic climate of Vienna

All the developments and processes described above define the direct social and cultural background of the birth of the psychoanalytical movement in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and in the whole of Central and Eastern Europe. The bourgeois circles in the Monarchy took a hostile and distanced view of this movement, contemptuously regarding it as "Jewish," and this term perfectly

99 Naturally, there were also parties which tried to combine leftist and nationalist ideas, and one of them would later become very strong in Germany and Austria in the 1930s.

illustrates the hostility – laced with anti-Semitism – of these groups towards Freud's theory, which, to make matters worse, in academic circles was treated as something alien to contemporary psychology and psychiatry, as well as to scholarship as a whole. The main reason was Freud's claim that man, encouraged during analysis to directly confront the "representations" of sexual drives repressed by him into the unconscious, should strive towards a more open approach to the whole sphere of his sexual life, subject to excessive repressions in contemporary society. This view undermined a number of social taboos and prohibitions sanctioned by the puritan tradition and supported by the Church, and that attracted great suspicion on the part of usually conservative bourgeois circles throughout the entire Monarchy. In addition, the very fact that therapy took the form of the patient talking to the physician, with various sensitive details of the patient's intimate life being discussed and "reworked," seemed to defy the fundamental rules of decency.

In his memoirs from the Vienna period of his life, where he paints a picture of the political scene in Austro-Hungary at the turn of the 20th century, Richard F. Sterba points out that anti-Semitism defined the agenda of the two main parties from that time. The first was the Christian Social Party, closely associated with the Catholic Church and supported by the majority of society. In this party, "the fundamental anti-Semitism of the Church was combined with the traditional hostility of society towards the Jews."[100] The other grouping, the Great-German (*Groß-Deutsche*) Party, was anti-Semitic in the spirit of modern nationalisms, while the writings of its leader, Georg Ritter von Schönerer, were imbued with a fierce hatred of the Jews and later became a source of inspiration for Adolf Hitler. The only major party which was not anti-Semitic was the Social Democratic Party founded by Viktor Adler and fiercely opposed by the other two. Its members were mostly workers and representatives of secular-minded leftist intelligentsia.

If no openly discriminatory laws against the Jews were introduced at the time, it was only because the Emperor had the right to veto parliamentary acts, including those which could exacerbate the antagonisms between particular ethnic groups within the Monarchy. This meant also laws with obviously anti-Semitic intent, curtailing the rights of Jews. Therefore, trying to remain within the general guidelines of the political strategy chosen by the Emperor, the government conducted a policy aimed at mitigating all kinds of ethnic conflicts which

100 Richard W. Sterba, *Reminiscences of a Viennese psychoanalyst* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1982), p. 10.

could lead to the disintegration of the Monarchy. So it was little wonder that when after the lost war this "neutralizing" factor no longer existed in Austria, the policy of the new state became openly anti-Semitic, which was accompanied by a growing hostility towards Jews throughout society. After the Anschluss of 1938, this hostility exploded with an unprecedented force, finding its expression in the import of discriminatory laws from Germany, more brutal than any previous administrative and legal acts directed against the Jews.

An analysis of the political context in which the VPS (Vienna Psychoanalytical Society) was established in the early 20th century and in which it was active until the 1930s throws additional light on its functioning within Austrian society. From the very start, it worked in a hostile bourgeois environment, which saw psychoanalysis as an alien abscess on Austrian (German) culture. In the 1930s, Hitler, enthusiastically supported by the Austrians, managed to excise this abscess. A good illustration of this was a tragicomic situation which took place after World War II. When American tourists, visiting Vienna in droves, started asking the municipal authorities about the house of a certain Sigmund Freud, no one in the Town Hall had any idea who they were talking about. Pointing at this hostile social and cultural context in which the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society functioned makes it easier to understand the fervor with which its members defended the basic assumptions of Freud's theory, seeing its wide-ranging implementation as a chance to build a new society in the future, free from anti-Semitism and all forms of aggression. Psychoanalysis was to be an effective antidote to the spread of these attitudes. This belief was the source of leftist sympathies among the society's members. Some of them, like Wilhelm Reich, tried to combine the vision of the psychoanalytical emancipation of man with the Marxist project, while others joined left-wing parties or collaborated with them. It was only in the 1930s that some psychoanalysts from Freud's closest circle – especially Jekels – started to realize that their faith in the imminent transformation of social self-knowledge thanks to psychoanalysis had been illusory, and they became deeply pessimistic. Others, including Freud himself, did not seem to perceive the actual scale of the threat resulting from the combination of anti-Semitism and right-wing nationalist political ideology. There is no doubt that the hostile sociopolitical context defined from the outset the essential context for the functioning of the VPS. And this context indirectly influenced everything that Freud and his supporters claimed about human sexuality, narcissism, aggressive drives, and the appeal to develop a new attitude towards them. Psychoanalytical therapy was not only about treating patients suffering from various kinds of mental disorders. Its ultimate effect was to be the emergence of a new type of man (and in the longer term of a new society), sensitive to ideas and values

which the conservative part of society found difficult to accept. Psychoanalytical therapy contained an element of the struggle to produce this new man and this new society and to emancipate it from its own instincts. Only in such a society could the other emancipation and assimilation – the true ones – of the Jews take place, with traditional national and social divisions disappearing.

The antagonistic relationship with conservative bourgeois circles in the Monarchy, resulting from the emancipatory claims of psychoanalysis and its sociopolitical nature, was accompanied by another, purely scientific conflict. As I already mentioned, it was the conflict between the hermeneutic method employed by the analyst-therapist which Freud proposed, based on interpreting pathological mental phenomena (dreams, slips, and symptoms) and deduction, where critical reflection coexisted with pure speculation, and the dominant beliefs of contemporary psychology and psychiatry regarding the scientific criteria which any theory of the human mind, its disorders and therapies, should fulfill. These beliefs were based on the model of scientific validity adopted in the natural sciences, where all claims are supposed to be empirically verifiable. According to representatives of these sciences, Freud's psychoanalytical theory did not fulfill these criteria. The dispute about psychoanalysis as "science" or not and on how its peculiar status should be understood is still ongoing.

13 A cultural transfer of psychoanalysis?

Freud's conviction about the universality of the theory and form of therapy he proposed led to his intense efforts at promoting psychoanalysis in various European countries and on other continents. Consequently, Freud and his pupils gradually developed a complex procedure of training future psychoanalysts, embracing regular supervisions. At the same time, they organized seminars and lectures, created a number of purely psychoanalytical journals where they published articles and posted information about important events in the movement, and organized and supported other publishing. A great emphasis was placed on translations. In the initial period, Polish analysts from Galicia and to a lesser extent from the Congress Kingdom were particularly active. The first articles on Freud's theory and translations of his texts started to appear in Polish medical magazines, lectures were given, patients were treated, and so on. Jekels played the leading role here, but he was bravely supported by Nunberg, Władysław Radecki, de Beaurain, and Karpińska.

Since Freud wrote in German, there is a temptation to describe this type of work, that is the presentation of his theory to the Polish medical community and to the general public, in terms of "cultural transfer." This term was introduced by

two French researchers, Michel Espagne and Michael Werner, who attempted to describe the complex relationships between various cultures influencing each other. Starting from the concept of transfer, they tried to describe the exchange and circulation of knowledge between Germany and France in the 19th century, emphasizing the processes of synthesis and fusion of various points of view, hybridization, and mutual impact.[101] They juxtaposed this approach to the traditional comparative method, where cultural phenomena are treated as separate wholes and the focus is on highlighting differences and similarities between them. This approach was in line with a new political trend launched in the 1950s by the leaders of West Germany and France, aimed at a reconciliation between the two nations and at building solid foundations for political cooperation and a wide-ranging cultural exchange based on the principles of equality and partnership. In the context of the 19th-century tradition of French and German culture, this approach was justified inasmuch as they indeed influenced each other in many areas, and it was relatively easy to show their mutual impact.

But if we employ the "transfer" of Freud's psychoanalytical theory into Polish culture, we will immediately see that the relationships between the participants of this exchange were not symmetrical, that the transfer was virtually a one-way street. As Freud wrote in German, his works belonged to the culture of the entire German-speaking area, of which Austria (or Austro-Hungary) was only a part. Of course, one can say that the basic cultural point of reference for his theory was Austrian culture (or in fact the Viennese culture from that time), but this term should be understood only metaphorically here. Especially because, as we already mentioned, the sources of his theory were manifold (he stressed, for example, the role of British empiricism, he liked to invoke English literature, and so on), and on top of that he endowed it with a universal, supranational character. In this case, the "cultural transfer" consisted in acquainting the Polish reader, mainly through lectures, articles, and translations, with the principal assumptions of his theory. Of course, in the context of the Polish cultural tradition all these elements acquired a slightly different meaning and were interpreted in a peculiar way, if only because Polish psychology already possessed some concepts which in a sense had prepared the ground for a positive reception of Freud in the Polish psychological and psychiatric milieus.[102] Moreover, all reviews of Freud's

101 Michele Espagne, "Les transferts culturels franco-allemands" (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999); *Transferts. Les relations interculturelles dans l'espace franco-allemand, (XVIII^e^ et XIX^e^ siècle)*, M. Werner, M. Espagne, eds., (Paris : 1988).

102 Bartłomiej Dobroczyński wrote about this in his book on the concepts of Polish psychologists and psychiatrists, who were using the term "unconscious" or its

theory contained elements of interpretation, inevitably imbued with the existing tradition of Polish psychology and psychiatry, where the concept of the unconscious (or, to be more precise, of the "subconscious," for example in the works of Edward Abramowski) already functioned. Hence these discussions contained some new emphases and reformulations, while examples from therapeutic practice invoked by the authors often referred to a typically Polish social and cultural context. But you can hardly speak here about any impact of this tradition on the Viennese psychoanalysts gathered around Freud or on Austrian culture at the time. Consequently, you cannot say that there was a "cultural transfer" in the sense of circulation of ideas and mutual inspirations. The only thing a researcher (who wants to follow the relationship between these two traditions) can do is attempt to show that there were certain analogies and affinities between some conceptions of 19th-century Polish psychiatry and psychology, and elements of Freud's theory. But even here one should be very cautious.

Likewise, caution is recommended when you follow the sometimes-astounding analogies between Freud's theory of dreams and some literary works from the Young Poland period (e.g., Karol Irzykowski's *Pałuba* or early essays and novels by Stanisław Przybyszewski from the Berlin period). For these analogies concern works whose authors knew very little or nothing about this theory when they wrote them. So we can hardly speak about its impact on these works, for the affinity resulted from the general spirit of the era.

Espagne's and Werner's theory of "cultural transfer" is problematic also in its assumptions. It assumes that all transfer of cultural ideas and values occurs in the sphere of pure thought through mechanisms of mutual influence, entering into various kinds of heterogeneous relations. As a result of this, "amalgams" of new theories, their mixtures and alloys, are formed within two different cultures. The achievements of one culture penetrate the other and over time they imperceptibly become its inherent part. Of course, this is a two-way process. This picture is no doubt very attractive intellectually, if only because it is so idyllic. But the problem is that the mechanisms of repression, exclusion, or degradation of what is "uncomfortable" or unacceptable for a given culture are also at work here. In practice, we will rarely see the "partnership-like," symmetrically mutual influences of one culture on another.

Possibly, since it harmonized with the political line chosen in the 1950s by Konrad Adenauer and Charles DeGaulle, Espagne's and Werner's theory met

---

counterparts already in the 19th century; Bartłomiej Dobroczyński, *Idea nieświadomości w polskiej myśli psychologicznej przed Freudem* (Kraków: Universitas, 2005).

the expectations of the political elites on both sides. Nevertheless, even if we agree that it points to an important aspect of the process where different cultural traditions influence each other, it presents it in a one-sided way. It ignores the inevitable antagonism, ruthless struggle for domination, and profound conflict of ideas and values. It is enough to recall Friedrich Nietzsche, who, in his early works, perceived the relationship between German and French culture in the context of the 1871 war, claiming that military victory should be followed by German domination in the arena of cultural ideas.

Nietzsche's argumentation, corresponding with the spirit of *Kulturkampf*, may seem less pleasant to us. And also one-sided, because it emphasizes only the aspect of rivalry or conflict between cultures, assuming its "either-or" resolution. It usually comes to the fore in a situation where two different cultures which have been alien to each other come in contact and start to influence each other. All existing differences between them, above all mutually exclusive ideas and values, are "stimulated," launching a struggle for domination between the ideologies and axiologies of these cultures. The resulting conflict is an inevitable consequence of such close contact. The rivalry between two different cultures may be accompanied by a "transfer" of their differing ideas and values, which their representatives often do not notice (or do not want to notice). But this process goes along with other processes, diametrically opposed to such "transfers" and usually prevailing.

Discussed in this context, Espagne's and Werner's theory certainly makes us sensitive to an important aspect of the mutual influence of different cultures which occurs side by side with conflict and struggle. Nevertheless, in history we usually deal with a very "asymmetrical" impact of one culture on another, with the total domination or even destruction of the other side or a fully receptive attitude of one towards the other. In such situations, the "transfer" in the sense of a free circulation of certain ideas between two cultures does not occur or is of secondary importance. Moreover, the aspect of conflict and struggle is present in every encounter between two different cultures.

What is more, in the case of Freud's theory, we are dealing with an atypical situation, because – like in Marx's theory – it is founded on a universalist emancipatory claim assuming the necessity of transforming the very foundations of the cultural self-knowledge of European societies. It also questions the assumptions of many philosophical and scholarly traditions which to a large extent shaped this self-knowledge. This questioning concerns, among other things, the attitude of man to his own sexuality, which leads to a number of pathologies in his mental life, because it is subject to too many constraints and repressions. Consequently, besides the promotion of psychoanalysis as a theory and a form of therapy, there

is the necessity to develop a new model of raising future generations, which will result in the emergence of a new type of "enlightened" society and so on.

We can hardly even speak about a "transfer" of some ideas and values in one direction, for this term implies the previous consent of the seller and the buyer of a given product. Meanwhile, those who spread psychoanalytical ideas and attempted to instill them in various groups did not treat them just as an attractive product which should be marketed, to put it in quasi-economic terms. They saw their work as a kind of mission aimed at making their contemporaries believe in the universal "truth" contained in Freud's and Jung's theories, which concerned human life as a whole in all its aspects and dimensions. Therefore, this truth should gradually become the birthright of all humankind. No wonder that it was closer to the way in which followers of a given religion attempt to preach in a given community than to a strictly scientific approach, where "missions" usually play a secondary role. It inevitably meant that the preachers of psychoanalysis encountered – just like the preachers of new religious ideas – a strong and violent opposition from the usually conservative representatives of the European bourgeoisie, based on moral, religious, or political considerations. So when Freud – as will be discussed in more detail later – sent Jekels to Kraków and wrote to him that it was an "apostolic" mission, this jocular term in fact had a deeper meaning which should be read literally today. Yes, Jekels was to be an apostle of psychoanalysis among the Polish intelligentsia and persevere in his endeavor regardless of any possible resistance, harassment, and aggression.

14 Jews and Poles – two Messianisms?

For this reason, it is also difficult to accept the picture of the first Polish analysts of Jewish origin active in Galicia and the Congress Kingdom (and later also in the interwar period) presented by Waldemar Pawlak and Zbigniew Sokolik in one of the first postwar texts on the history of psychoanalysis in Poland.[103] They claim that the cultural identity of these analysts was determined by their culturally ingrained sense of belonging to the "chosen people," which was in sharp conflict with the analogous form of the identity of the Poles shaped during the partitions. As we know, since the times of Romantic Messianism they also regarded themselves as the "chosen people," enjoying special privileges from God (or actually from the Mother of God). This approach assumes that we are dealing with the "narcissism of small differences" described by Freud, when nations, which on the

103 Pawlak, Sokolik, "Historia psychoanalizy w Polsce," pp. 83–90.

one hand have a lot in common, but on the other hand differ in certain "details," are particularly hostile and aggressive towards each other.

The problematic aspect of this approach is that these Polish physicians-psychiatrists from assimilated Jewish families saw themselves as emissaries of a certain universal knowledge which did not offer special privileges to anyone. Including to those who preached it. This constituted the fundamental difference between their identity structure and traditional Jewish religious identity. In their eyes, psychoanalysis was a modern scientific theory whose claims and discoveries related to man "as such" rather than to some "elected" group or nation particularly suited to it.

Already in its assumptions psychoanalytical theory rejected building identity on belonging to a selected national or social group. This is clearly seen in the early works of Jekels, Nunberg, or Nelken, who strongly emphasized the universality of psychoanalysis. For instance, Jekels said in his *Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda* (A word on Freudian psychoanalysis) that, due to the reduction of mental elements to instinctive ones, psychoanalysis played a similar role in psychology as chemistry did in popular notions on the structure of the material world. While psychology stops at the superficial layer, "psychoanalysis penetrates through all these mental layers, down to the powerful drives constituting the essence and foundation of the whole mental system, and sees the properties of these drives as causes determining even the most complex mental manifestations."[104]

For Jekels psychoanalysis is above all a science which – like the natural sciences – tries to discover the actual reasons of mental phenomena and finds them to be determined by drives. Therefore, its practitioners are emissaries of a new scientific truth on the human mind and culture, and this truth retains its validity for all human individuals.

In his profound belief that psychoanalysis reveals the deepest dimension of human mental life, which will make it possible to solve all its "mysteries," Jekels strongly resembles Doctor Szuman from Bolesław Prus's novel *The Doll*.[105] Szuman represents a type of Darwinist scientist obsessed with a peculiar *idee fixe* that the chemical analysis of the components of human hair will make it possible to "objectively" determine the properties of all human races. Szuman is deeply

104 Jekels, *Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda*, p. 9.

105 *The Doll* is a classic novel of Polish Positivism, its plot taking place in the second half of the 19th century in the Russian partition, mainly in Warsaw. See Bolesław Prus, *The Doll*, trans. David Welsh and Anna Zaranko (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

convinced that so-called love is just a matter of the reproductive drive and everything else which is said about it in literature and art is pure fraud and humbug. If Prus moved the plot of his novel a few decades forward, Doctor Szuman would certainly be a psychoanalyst, who would pronounce views similar to those of Jekels and be equally convinced that Freud's claims on the unconscious and its instinctive foundations disperse the darkness surrounding the mysteries of human soul.

The example of these two figures – one fictional, one real – fascinated with contemporary scientific theories, perfectly illustrates the new type of self-knowledge proper to assimilated Jews who chose an academic career. Its most important distinguishing feature was a profound belief in the universality of scientific truth, which does not recognize any specially privileged groups and nations. Such a claim was also rooted in Freud's psychoanalytical theory, which in this respect – just as in Marxism – deviated from traditional Jewish identity based on a sense of being divinely elected. In the same way, it also turned against the traditional "messianic" form of Polish identity which emerged in the Romantic period. No wonder that orthodox Jews treated it with equal suspicion and hostility as other forms of European science and scholarship. A good illustration of this can be found in the biography of Gustaw Bychowski's father, Zygmunt: when his father learned that he had become a university student, he renounced him and told him to leave home. Only years later he forgave him for his "betrayal" of Jewish tradition and reconciled with him. In the interwar period, Zygmunt Bychowski was a respected neurologist, as well as a leading Zionist activist in Poland.

But in a sense we can say that in light of the assumptions of psychoanalysis, all representatives of the human race were the "chosen people." Because each man, regardless of his nationality, race, or culture, was potentially capable of developing a new attitude to the instinctive sphere, different from the one imposed by tradition. This belief in the possibility of the profound transformation of human personality and hence a better use of the creative energies produced by the libido is repeatedly pronounced by Freud and his supporters. It was one of the most socially captivating versions of the myth of modernity.

II The *Sturm und Drang* period 1909–1914

> *The widespread interest in psychoanalysis is demonstrated by the very fact that both specialist periodicals and the daily press published articles about it on this occasion.*
>
> Ludwig Jekels, [A report on the Second Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychologists and Psychiatrists (1912, Kraków) for the *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse]*

1 Nunberg's memoirs: The Three Emperors' Corner in Będzin

In my book *Urwane ścieżki*, I began my account of the history of Polish psychoanalysis with an excerpt from Herman Nunberg's memoirs, where he described his wanderings with his father in the ruins of the Piast Castle in Będzin, whence he could see the border of the three partitions:

> I was born in 1884 in Bendzin, a small town in Poland, and spent my early childhood years there.
> Bendzin is located at what was known at that time as the *Drei Kaiser Ecke* ("Three Emperors' Corner"), because that was where the borders of Germany, Austria, and Russia met. It was in the part of Poland that had fallen to Russia after the third partition.[106] Ruins of an old castle dominated the valley in which the town was located; I can still remember how my father used to take me up to these ruins, to show me the beautiful view of the countryside. There were many legends woven around the castle; these legends stimulated fantasies in me, which must have become grafted onto my infantile sexual fantasies.[107]

From the perspective of Polish history, the place Nunberg writes about in this excerpt had extraordinary symbolic power. Therefore, the "discovery" of the book with his memories in Freud's library in Vienna profoundly moved me at the time. For here is a future key figure of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society, and also a close friend of Freud, who describes the country of his childhood, where he is confronted every day with traces of its former glory.[108]

---

106 The third partition of Poland took place in 1795 and led to the total erasure of the Polish state from the map of the world.

107 Nunberg, *Memoirs*, p. 1

108 Herman Nunberg later played a key role in the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society. *Allgemeine Neurosenlehre auf psychoanalytischer Grundlage* (Bern, Stuttgart: Verlag

When you read Nunberg's memories, written in the 1950s in American exile, the striking thing is that Będzin was for him a true *Heimat*, his small homeland dwelling somewhere in his heart, with which he felt a deep bond for the rest of his life.[109] Probably this was partly connected with the fact that he had good memories from his youth spent in Poland. He writes: "[…] I must also stress that I did not have to suffer personally, at this time, from anti-Semitism; on the contrary, I was accepted without any reservations by my non-Jewish colleagues, and I had many non-Jewish friends."[110] What is more, Nunberg later describes the huge impression made on him by his few-years-long stay in Częstochowa, where he could personally observe the crowds of pilgrims who succumbed to religious ecstasy when the image of the Virgin Mary was unveiled:

> The source of my deepest impressions at that time was the monastery inside the fortress. In it was housed the "Black Madonna," the most revered shrine in all of Poland. The monastery with its altar and the picture of the Madonna; the candles, the incense and the church rituals – all these stimulated new fantasies in me, which probably became linked with the earlier fantasies of my childhood in Bendzin.
>
> I have especially vivid recollections of the processions of pilgrims who would come from all over the country during the summertime and converge on the monastery. As many of these pilgrims as could find room in the church would prostrate themselves before the altar; the rest lay prone on the ground in front of the church. It was almost impossible to go past the church without stepping on someone. Even now, these scenes of what I can only describe as violent piety remain unforgettable.[111]

Notably, Nunberg stresses here for the second time that the images and scenes he watched, strongly affecting his infantile imagination, fused with his earlier sexual fantasies. This juxtaposition of the experience of religious worship of holy images and sexual fantasies is, of course, rather peculiar (you can see the impact of Freud's theory of infantile sexuality here). However, this is not the most important thing in this context. What is striking is the position Nunberg takes towards these experiences. It is neither the position of a believer identifying with

---

Hans Huber, 1932) is regarded as his most important work. It was very highly rated by Freud, who wrote an enthusiastic introduction, claiming that it was a comprehensive and very reliable presentation of the psychoanalytical theory of neuroses.

109 We ought to mention the rich patriotic tradition among the Jewish population living in Będzin, which overwhelmingly supported the uprisings in 1831 and 1863. Some of its representatives actively participated in them, others supported it financially. See YivoBleter [YivoPages] 1933, volume 5, p. 174.

110 Nunberg, *Memoirs*, p. 17.

111 Nunberg, *Memoirs*, pp. 1–2.

the pilgrims nor the position of a total outsider looking in at such manifestations of religious worship with the cool eye of a skeptic. For although a nonbeliever, Nunberg is deeply convinced of the profound psychological importance of such religious experiences. They hold something captivating for him – hence they should not be shrugged off. As such, they became deeply ingrained in his memory. Nunberg's memoirs clearly show that although he was Jewish, he also had a Polish cultural identity. His attitude towards the manifestations of the worship of the Black Madonna are the very opposite of the "narcissism of small differences." Paradoxically, it seems that this form of identification was made possible by the universalist claim lying at the basis of psychoanalysis. That is why Nunberg's Polish identity did not contain any elements of nationalism or exceptionalism, but simply meant a bond with the cultural tradition of the country he was born, raised, and educated in. The religious symbolism of Polish Catholicism was for him just one of many forms of religious symbolism, so he was able to appreciate its universal human appeal, even if he clearly distanced himself from the "claim to truth" contained in it.[112] In the same way, at later stages of his life, his Austrian and American identities probably overlaid Nunberg's Polish cultural identity, for he gradually "grew into" the cultural tradition of the countries to which he emigrated, if only because he spoke the local language, wrote articles in it, and so on.[113]

112 A very similar approach to the religious symbolism of Polish Catholicism was characteristic for Helena Deutsch. In her autobiography, she writes how on Sunday mornings the servants, unknown to her parents, took her and her siblings to the church for Mass, where "in one corner of the church was a painting of the Black Madonna of Czestochowa, the patroness of motherhood. I don't know why I venerated her especially. I bought a little picture of her, not knowing that she was supposed to be a helper in the various problems of motherhood, including those of unmarried mothers. This picture, painted by a Polish artist, still hangs in my house today." Deutsch, *Confrontations*, pp. 64–65.

113 Because of the split of Nunberg's biography between the Polish, Austrian, and American periods, in biographical notes and dictionaries we encounter various descriptions of his nationality. According to the Polish Wikipedia, he is called a Polish-American physician and psychiatrist, while in the Jewish Virtual Library he is described as a "U. S. psychiatrist." However, according to the German Wikipedia he is called a "Polish psychiatrist." Since this concerns many other psychoanalysts born on Polish soil during the partitions, such discrepancies often appear in their cases. Not to mention some blatant mistakes (e.g., defining Eugenia Sokolnicka as a Czech psychoanalyst).

Nunberg's case is, I think, typical for the multiple identities of many Polish psychoanalysts and psychiatrists of Jewish origin, who often wrote the first academic texts in Polish, participated in congresses and various discussions in the Polish lands, etc., and later emigrated and started to function in other cultures and languages. After all, it was in Częstochowa, and later in Kraków and Bystra, that Nunberg started to practice psychoanalysis with Jekels, gave lectures, and so on. He also wrote his first texts in Polish. One of them, the best known, was delivered as a paper during the Second Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychologists, and Psychiatrists, and later published in the *Neurologia Polska* journal.[114]

2 The psychoanalytical breakthrough: Two congresses of Polish doctors

One of the first mentions of psychoanalysis in Polish medical literature can be found in Karol Rychliński's work *Istota natręctwa myślowego* (The essence of mental compulsion).[115] He writes there about a theory of drives proposed by a certain "Freund," "a great mind" of our time, whose works open new paths in treating neuroses. It starts quite inauspiciously, with a slip of the tongue. But if we take into account that *Freund* means friend in German, it probably reflected the positive attitude of the book's author towards the Viennese psychiatrist. Of course, only if we interpret this mistake in the Freu(n)dian way.

The first important sign that Freud's psychoanalysis was gaining popularity among Polish psychiatrists was the First Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychologists, and Psychiatrists in Warsaw in 1909. Ludwig Jekels delivered a paper entirely devoted to Freud's psychoanalytical theory, entitled "Treating psychoneuroses with the use of the psychoanalytical method." He presented Freud's views on hysteria as having its source in repressing sexual representations, and on dreams and slips as showing profound structural affinities with neurotic symptoms. The lecture was delivered from Freudian positions, which was strongly emphasized in his final point, where – pre-empting expected criticism – he stated that in order to become a supporter of analysis you "have to experience it in all its details" and he accorded a "philosophical importance" to it. And criticism did appear: it came from Adam Wizel, who recognized the innovative nature of Freud's method, but objected to the pansexualism preached by the

114 Nunberg, "Niespełnione życzenia według nauki Freuda."

115 Karol Rychliński, *Istota natręctwa myślowego* (Warszawa: Księgarnia E.Wende i S-ka, 1909).

Vienna psychiatrist and the excessive role of suggestion from the doctor during therapy. Interestingly, other participants of the discussion – Karol Rychliński (author of the Freu-n-dian slip), Ludwika Karpińska, and Witold Łuniewski[116] – defended Jekels' paper, speaking enthusiastically about psychoanalysis. Extensive references to Freud can also be found in Tadeusz Jaroszyński's lecture "On the matter of psychotherapy," where he presented various contemporary psychiatric theories on hysteria. Speaking approvingly about the assumptions of psychoanalysis, he claimed, however, that its author studied very peculiar cases of "Freudian hysteria," so his method was not universal.[117] This paper also sparked a heated discussion, which focused on the question if universal application of the psychoanalytical method was possible. It was striking, however, that both sides of the dispute treated this theory as a serious challenge for contemporary psychology and psychiatry, disciplines which could not be ignored. Particularly notable was the fact that the organizers of the Congress, calling themselves "Freudians," sent a telegram with greetings to Freud and Jung (!).[118] This is confirmed in Freud's letter to Jung where he writes: "A few days ago I received from the first Congress of Polish Neurologists a telegram of homage signed, 'after violent debate,' by seven illegible and unpronounceable Poles. The only one of them known to me is Dr. Jekels; Frau Dr. Karpinska, I hear, has studied with you. I have never heard of the five others; I note the names for your information: Luniewski - Sycianko - Kempinski - Chodzko – Rychlinski."[119] When writing down these tongue-twisting names of Polish psychiatrists and telling Jung to remember them, Freud evidently looks ahead into the future. Because for him, these people might become pioneers of psychoanalysis in the Polish medical community.

---

116 In the interwar period, Witold Łuniewski was a leading figure in Polish psychiatry. In 1919–1939 he was the director of the mental hospital in Tworki and a co-founder of the State Institute of Special Education. He was also the Grand Master of the Freemasonry Grand National Polish Lodge(!).

117 Both lectures later appeared in the collective volume containing conference materials entitled *Prace I-go Zjazdu Neurologów, Psychiatrów i Psychologów Polskich odbytego w Warszawie 11, 12 i 13 października 1909 roku*, Władysław Gajkiewicz, Adam Wizel et al., eds. (Warszawa: Skład Główny Z.Wende i S-ka, 1910).

118 The photocopy of Jung's telegram can be found in the collections of the Library of Congress in Washington. It was sent in German, and the English translation can be found in the Library of Congress, Washington, C. G. Jung Papers, and online: lccn.loc.gov/mm95003873 (accessed December 12, 2015).

119 *The Freud/Jung Letters. The Correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung,* William McGuire, ed., trans. Ralph Manheim, R. F. C. Hull (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974), p. 253.

And the remark "after a violent debate" signals that not all participants of the Congress were happy with this initiative. This becomes understandable in light of the heated arguments after Jekels' presentation. Filip Marcinowski comments on this event in his article about the Congress:

> What is most surprising about the lively discussion prompted by Jekels' paper is the positive attitude of the participants of the Congress to Freud's propositions, because the differences of opinion between their supporters and opponents haven't yet crystallized. The most critical among the speakers was Wizel, who over the years changed his view about psychoanalysis and used it himself. Rychliński, Karpińska and Łuniewski, authors of the telegram to the creator of psychoanalysis, made enthusiastic comments. The psychiatric section, in which both papers were delivered, formulated a motion that the keynote speech at the next Congress of Neurologists, Psychiatrists and Psychologists should be entitled "Freud's views on neuroses, mainly on hysteria, and his psychoanalytical method," which was later passed by the Congress.[120]

The author is right to say that in this first period of the reception of Freud's theory in Polish medical circles, attitudes on it were not yet crystallized, whether enthusiastic or critical. This was due to the fact that Freudian psychoanalysis was still poorly known by most participants of the discussion at the Congress, so they based their positive or negative judgments on rather superficial readings and on the opinions of others. Many of them would later radically change their approach to psychoanalysis. Wizel would embrace it, as we already said, but Witold Łuniewski, later director of the mental hospital in Tworki, would become skeptical of it. And Karpińska would become involved in "psychotechnics" after the war.

Freud's and Jung's theories aroused considerable interest among the participants of the Congress, who were ready to hear more about them during the next one. Moreover, they must have been deeply convinced that these concepts were crucial for contemporary psychology and psychiatry, for otherwise there would not have been a motion for the keynote speech at the next Congress to be devoted to Freud's psychoanalysis. Incidentally, such an appeal was unusual at the time, if we look at the attitude to psychoanalysis in the medical community in Austro-Hungary, Germany, and other European countries.

In the following year, as a kind of aftermath to the Congress debates, the Neurological and Psychiatric Section of the Warsaw Medical Society organized

120 Filip Marcinowski, "By popchnąć naprzód świadomość ducha i leczyć jego zboczenia," in: *Na drogach i bezdrożach historii psychologii,* Teresa Rzepa and Cezary W. Domański, eds. (Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, 2014), p. 217.

a meeting devoted to Freud's concept of hysteria (lectures were given by Tadeusz Jaroszyński, Władysław Sterling, Maurycy Bornsztajn, and Ludwik Jekels).[121]

At the Second Congress, which took place in 1912 in Kraków and was the second milestone in the integration of the Polish medical community, a separate section on psychoanalysis was established, with eight lecturers (Ludwig Jekels, Herman Nunberg, Karol de Beaurain, Ludwika Karpińska, Jan Nelken, Stefan Borowiecki, Władysław Radecki, and Bronisław Bandrowski). Discussions on the papers dominated the second day of the conference.[122] The speakers focused on presenting specific issues taken up by the psychoanalytical movement and on their own positions concerning them.

The first three papers underlined the compatibility of various aspects of Freud's theory with the findings of contemporary psychology. The session was opened by Stefan Borowiecki's speech "Psychoanalysis and its criteria." In the interwar period, this young doctor headed the Faculty of Psychology at the Poznań University and was highly esteemed by his colleagues. He pointed out that, despite the crucial role awarded by psychoanalysis to the interpretation of symptoms, which may attract charges of subjectivity, it also features objective criteria, as evidenced by similar interpretations of symptoms by various analysts and converging diagnoses regarding the future of the patient. He stated at the end that "no previous method embraces the entirety of mental life in such a way, reaching to its most profound secrets, as the psychoanalytical method does."[123]

Ludwika Karpińska pointed to the similarities between Freud's and Herbart's theories, which according to her were that both these psychiatrists assumed the separate and irremovable nature of unconscious mental states. For Karpińska, a great discovery of psychoanalysis was that it showed affinities between the psychological structures of the child, the neurotic and the savage, and it made it possible to explain various phenomena of the collective mind. These comments

121 From the meeting of the Neurological and Psychiatric Section of the Warsaw Medical Society [March 19, 1910], *Zbl. Psychoanal.* 1 (1911), pp. 269–270; and from the meeting of the Neurological and Psychiatric Section of the Warsaw Medical Society [May 7, 1910, *Zbl. Psychoanal.* 1 (1911), pp. 428–430].

122 Significantly, a similar picture emerges from the extensive account on the Congress in *Ruch Filozoficzny* (Vol. III, No. 2, pp. 25–31), the journal edited and published by Kazimierz Twardowski. The author of the report was Bronisław Bandrowski, one of the speakers at the Congress, who, despite his own skepticism towards psychoanalysis, admitted that the discussions around it formed one of the main subjects of debate.

123 Stefan Borowiecki, "Metoda psychoanalityczna Freuda i jej kryteria," *Przegląd Lekarski*, No. 53 (1914), pp. 31–32, 494–497, 502–506.

are of special importance to us today, if we recall that Bronisław Malinowski was later inspired by Freud's theory in his anthropological studies.[124]

Bronisław Bandrowski confronted the results of Freud's theory with the findings of other contemporary psychological theories and said that if you formulated the former in the terminology used by the latter, there would be no significant differences between them. It was particularly evident in the case of the so-called associationist hypotheses, that is, the emphasis on the affective foundations of various mental associations.

Subsequent papers were devoted to more detailed issues. The first was Jekels' speech entitled "*Libido sexualis* vs. character and neurosis," where he analyzed the issue of mental bisexualism. He invoked Freud's theory of erogenous spheres, which could be divided into specifically female and male, and therefore could be regarded not only in their biological, but also psychological aspect. This was probably the first Polish attempt at looking at the phenomenon of sexual difference from the "gender" angle. Not to mention that the question of human bisexualism fascinated some Polish Modernist writers from the era and found its expression in the androgynous myths they proposed (Stanisław Przybyszewski and Tadeusz Miciński).

The question of the relationship between the biological and mental aspects of human existence in Freud's theory was also taken up by Wacław Radecki, who represented the Jungian orientation in Polish psychoanalysis. Karol de Beaurain's paper ("Symbol") explored the areas from the borderline of Freud's and Jung's theories. He saw the foundations of all kinds of symbolism in infantile mentality. He regarded symbolism as a manifestation of the child's "primal language."[125]

In his paper "Psychoanalytical studies of nervous disorders," Jan Nelken presented the methodological problems connected with psychoanalytical treatment of psychosis, relating them to elements of Jung's, Freud's, and Eugen Bleuler's theories. Nelken's clinical examples of psychotic disorders and the way he interprets them are of particular note. His remarks on the linguistic

124 Ludwika Karpińska's paper was later published under her Germanized name and surname (Luise von Karpinska) in a German version entitled "Über die psychologischen Grundlagen des Freudianismus," *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse*, No. 4 (1914), pp. 306–326.

125 This paper was also published in a German version under the title "Über das Symbol und die psychischen Bedingungen für sein Entstehen beim Kinde," *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, No. 5 (1913), pp. 431–435. But in the same issue it was sharply criticized by Sándor Ferenczi.

associations of psychotics are especially interesting. For example, he quotes a patient who said:

> He is a priest Eli. A few days later, he stereotypically repeats the following sounds for hours: Eli, eli, eli…sa, sa, sa … beth, beth, beth… Some moments later he explains that these sounds form the name Elisabeth and interprets the whole symptom as follows:
> Eli – a Jewish priest who did not scold his son for his sexual excesses and was punished for this with death.
> sa – his (Fr.)
> beth – 1) bete (Fr.)-. An animal, the animal element in man, a girl.
> 2) beten (German) – to pray.
> Here are the patient's conclusions: 1) "Elisabeth" is Eli's girl. 2) Eli prays to "Elisabeth." Finally, it should be noted that "Elisabeth" is the name of the patient's mother. We infer from that 1) the multiple conditioning of the symptom, 2) the polarization of the patient's feelings towards his mother, 3) the Oedipus complex. The analysis of other symptoms fully confirms these conclusions.[126]

According to Nelken, this example deserves attention, because the patient unknowingly conducts his own "analysis," relying on a seemingly absurd play with the morphology of the word "Elisabeth." This playing with word particles provides the analyst with invaluable guidelines for diagnosing the sources of the disease, which in this case lie in a disturbed relation of the patient to his mother. The peculiarities of the patient's language would be analyzed in the same vein by the Lacanian school, concentrating on significant relations between the morphological components of his speech.

The psychoanalytical session closed with Nunberg's paper "Unfulfilled wishes according to Freud's teachings." It was devoted to the eponymous crucial term from Freud's theory of dreams. Nunberg strongly emphasized the role of dream fantasies in human mental life, indicating that the primal striving for pleasure was revealed within them. It is particularly evident in the mentality of the child, and in the behaviors and mythologies of primitive peoples. It also occupies a prominent place in artistic creation, making ample use of fantasy. In this way, Nunberg pointed at the significance of Freud's findings for a better understanding of various cultural phenomena and the process of artistic creation. Referring to Freud's book about dreams, he very cogently presented the basic assumptions of his general theory of human mental life. It was probably for this reason that Nunberg's paper opened the issue of *Neurologia Polska* containing the conference materials.

126 Nelken, "Badania psychoanalityczne chorób nerwowych," p. 147.

Three positions clearly emerged from the discussion on the "psychoanalytical" papers: enthusiastic, represented by Jekels, Nunberg, and Bornsztajn; moderate, that is, containing some criticism, but appreciating the importance of certain aspects of Freud's theory (Tadeusz Jaroszyński and Jan Mazurkiewicz); and unambiguously "critical," regarding it as worthless (Izydor Feuerstein, Stefan Rosental, Antoni F. Mikulski, and Witold Rubczyński). But the very fact that the Congress committee allowed such a large number of papers on psychoanalytical theories was extremely meaningful. Moreover, the Congress and the disputes on psychoanalysis which dominated its proceedings attracted the attention of the contemporary Polish press, which widely commented on it. Not hiding his great satisfaction, Jekels wrote in his report for the *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse*: "The widespread interest in psychoanalysis is demonstrated by the very fact that both specialist periodicals and the daily press published articles about it on this occasion."[127]

It should be emphasized that an interest in psychoanalysis on such a scale was unthinkable at the time in the Austrian and German medical communities. The main reason for this, in addition to an overt or covert anti-Semitism, was the predominant scientistic approach of a positivist pedigree, which meant that organic causes of mental disorders were primarily sought and research focused almost exclusively on that area. This meant that the views of Freud and his supporters were usually subjected to devastating criticism. One professor went so far as to say that Freud's theory did not deserve to be a subject of academic discussion at all, but it should be dealt with by the criminal police. Such criticisms were very painful to Freud. In one of his letters to Wilhelm Fliess, he bitterly comments on the negative reaction of the Viennese medical community to his lecture on neuropsychoses: "My lecture met with a cold reception of these dunces. They may kiss me somewhere, to put it mildly."[128]

It was partly for these reasons that Freud closely followed the academic discussions about psychoanalysis in the Polish medical community. Especially that in 1912 (sixteen years after the lecture quoted above), he was deeply

---

127 Ludwig Jekels, "Vom II. Polnischen Neurologen- und Psychiater-Kongreß in Krakau," *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse*, Vol. 1 (1913), pp. 190–192. Bartholomäus Gregor Czarnecki, German *Spätaussiedler* from Cieszyn, reports extensively on these congresses and meetings of Polish neurologists and psychiatrists. See Bartholomäus Gregor Czarnecki, *Ludwig Jekels (1867–1954) und die Anfänge der Psychoanalyse in Polen* (Tübingen: Medizinische Fakultät Universität, 2006).

128 Sigmund Freud, *Briefe an Wilhelm Fließ 1887–1904,* Jeffrey M. Masson, ed. (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 1986), p. 193.

convinced of the universal nature of his theory, which should become a "common good" in the future and gain full citizenship in the academic community. And therefore the fact that there were such vigorous disputes on psychoanalysis in the Polish medical circles in Galicia (but also in the Congress Kingdom) was of particular importance for him, for it could be used in the promotion of the movement throughout the entire Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and in other countries.

Freud's interest in how his theory was received in the Polish medical community is evidenced by his letter to Jekels sent in the immediate context of the Second Congress in Kraków – and after Jekels' book on psychoanalysis was published in Poland.[129] He writes there: "Since you promise to come to Vienna soon, please accept my congratulations on the publication of your book and my words of gratitude for all your efforts for our cause."[130]

There were two main reasons for the particular openness of Polish psychologists and psychiatrists to psychoanalysis. First, a number of conceptions on the structure of the human mind concerning the important role of "subconsciousness"[131] had already appeared in Polish lands. One of them was the theory of Edward J. Abramowski, the greatest authority in Polish psychology at the time, who in his *chef d'oeuvre Badania doświadczalne nad pamięcią* (Experimental studies on memory, Warsaw 1911) devoted the whole second volume to this term. Actually, the meaning of the term "subconscious" and the place awarded to it within the human mind differed fundamentally from Freud's approach. Nevertheless, it prepared the ground for this approach to be taken seriously by the Polish psychological and medical community, even if many of its members raised several objections to it.[132]

Second, this group – as I already mentioned – included many (about one-third) physicians of Jewish origin, and for a significant number of them psychoanalysis was something more than just one of many interesting scientific

129 It is, of course, Ludwik Jekels' *Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda*.

130 Sigmund Freud's letter to Ludwik Jekels' from March 11, 1912, Siegfried Bernfeld Papers, Library of Congress, Washington.

131 As I have already written, this was how the German *das Unbewusste* was translated, and it was the accepted translation throughout the interwar period. It is also significant that in some articles the concepts of the unconscious and unconsciousness were already used. This was due to the fact that there was no established translated terminology for the various key terms of Freud's theory.

132 The importance of this tradition is demonstrated in a convincing and well-documented way by Bartłomiej Dobroczyński in his book *Idea nieświadomości w polskiej myśli psychologicznej przed Freudem*.

theories.[133] Such analysts as Jekels and Bornsztajn associated it with a kind of social mission, consisting not only in treating mental disorders, but also in the profound transformation of the whole "economy" of the functioning of instincts in the human mind. And it was this emancipatory claim of psychoanalysis, engrained in its vision of the man of the future as more open and tolerant to his sexual desires, and hence free from various inhibitions and manifestations of aggression, which had such a strong attractive force. It raised hopes for creating a new type of society, where the mutual hostility of different ethnic groups would vanish. Above all, it would be a society "emancipated" from its anti-Semitism, for it would recognize its irrationality.

3 Jekels' sanatorium and his "apostolic" mission in Kraków

The first signs of interest in Freud's work among Polish physicians appeared much earlier, in the 1890s, before the publication of Freud's first major books and articles, including *The Interpretation of Dreams*. The first widely known promoter of Freud's theory, who later attempted to use it in his clinical work, was Jekels. He ran a medical practice in a sanatorium (health resort) for neurotic patients established in 1897 in Bystra (Upper Silesia). The sanatorium was very popular and the largest group of patients were Poles. They included famous Polish public figures, such as the well-known painter Julian Fałat (he even gave Jekels one of his watercolors), the writers Maria Konopnicka and Gabriela Zapolska, and Józef Piłsudski, who visited Bystra in 1902 with his wife Maria.[134]

The sanatorium, which Jekels bought thanks to his wealthy wife, occupied an area of 28 hectares including the park and the adjacent areas, and offered treatment for various types of ailments, ranging from stomach complaints to

133 It is worth noting that the percentage of Polish doctors of Jewish origin was at that time very similar to that among Austrian and German physicians (about 50 %). This phenomenon was undoubtedly related to the fact that in the second half of the 19th century the assimilation and Polonization processes of the Jewish population in the Polish lands began to gain momentum.

134 Józef Piłsudski (1867–1935). Polish social and independence activist. From 1892, a member of the Polish Socialist Party and later its leader; from November 11, 1918, the Supreme Commander of the Polish Army, in 1918–1922 the Head of State, the first Polish Marshal (1920); leader of the Sanacja camp after the May Coup (1926). He had a decisive influence on the internal and foreign policy of the Polish state from 1918 to 1935.

circulatory ailments and heart diseases.[135] It seems that Jekels' first attempts to use the psychoanalytical method in treating patients took place after 1905 at the earliest. It was in that period that he started to regularly attend Freud's lectures at the Vienna University. And later, having established regular contacts with Freud and other Viennese psychoanalysts, he also became familiar with the practical side of Freud's theory.[136] It was also then that Nunberg, who also treated his patients using the psychoanalytical method, started to come to the sanatorium every summer.

Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient records or other testimonies which would allow us to reliably establish when and to what extent Jekels and Nunberg started to employ psychoanalysis in Bystra. But it was definitely not in 1897, and later it could have only concerned a narrow group of patients. Therefore, it is an exaggeration to call Jekels' sanatorium in Bystra "psychoanalytical" in the strict sense of the term.

Some indication can be found in Nunberg's words that the sanatorium "was very well attended until he began to practice psychoanalysis," because most patients preferred traditional forms of therapy (baths, massages, etc.). Nunberg concludes that Jekels' "adherence to psychoanalysis became a financial disadvantage for him."[137]

It follows from this that the reduction in the number of patients resulted from Jekels deciding at some point that only the psychoanalytical form of therapy was worthwhile, and taking care of hundreds of patients, most of whom expected a

---

135 Some idea about the curative techniques used by Jekels can be glimpsed from an essay by Lena Magnone, who attempts to reconstruct them from the memoirs of Gabriela Zapolska. It seems that at least in this case they had very little in common with psychoanalysis. See Lena Magnone, "Polskie przestrzenie psychoanalizy. Zapolska w Bystrej," *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, No. 2 (2011), pp. 49–63.

136 The first meeting of Jekels with Freud in the last decade of the 19th century was not very successful. Jekels went to Vienna to promote his sanatorium in the local medical community and, during a conversation with Freud, introduced him to his methods of treating neuroses. Freud was supposedly sympathetic to it, but he said that Jekels' method had little to do with psychoanalysis. Jekels, however, was so impressed by the meeting that he decided to deepen his knowledge about psychoanalysis. With time, during his next regular visits to Vienna, he became one of Freud's closest and most trusted associates, also enjoying extraordinary esteem among psychoanalysts in Poland.

137 H. Nunberg, E. Federn, ed., Minutes of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, Vol. II: 1908–1910 New York 1974; Vol. III: 1910–1911 (New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1967).

quite different approach from himself and his assistants, was a pointless effort and an unnecessary burden. So he was ready to sacrifice the traditional way of running the health resort, which offered prospects of financial profit, for the sake of regular contact with Freud and the Vienna psychoanalytical circles.

The way the health resort functioned is perhaps reflected in Minna Bernay's (Freud's sister-in-law) skeptical opinion of its atmosphere. In 1910 she visited Bystra with his daughter after Freud accepted Jekels' invitation, in order to see if this place was "worthy of him." In a letter to Freud she wrote: "At present the health resort bursts at the seams and they are forced to cram people in nearby houses." She also complained that "there is no one here I could exchange a word with" and that "they are so antipathetic and nervous in the most hideous way,"[138] and she added that the very sight of the patients repulsed her. She was equally critical of Jekels himself, saying bluntly that the patients "are incidentally no more abhorrent to anyone than the doctor himself, he courses every arrival."[139]

Equally critical was Anna's letter to her father, where she wrote: "The people at the establishment are very disagreeable and they stare at us as they cannot imagine what we are doing here."[140]

Let us admit that these opinions were simply devastating. It is difficult to judge today if they resulted from the excessive expectations of the two women or from the fact that the health resort really was overcrowded and that Jekels found it difficult to cope with the overwhelming burden of running it. In any case, it is not surprising that after reading the letters from his sister-in-law and his daughter, Freud abandoned the plan to visit Bystra and decided to go on holiday with his family in Holland.

However, even if we assume that somewhere around 1904–1905 (and definitely later) Jekels and Nunberg used elements of psychoanalytical therapy with some patients, it certainly was not the first undertaking of this type in Europe – as Pawlak and Sokolik say in their article on the history of Polish psychoanalysis.[141] In 1898, a psychiatric hospital in Burghölzli (a district of Zürich), later famous across Europe, was founded. It was run by Eugen Bleuler, a psychiatrist

138 Minna Bernays, "Letter from Minna Bernays to Sigmund Freud, July 18, 1910," in: *Sigmund Freud Minna Bernays Briefwechsel 1882–1938*, ed. A. Hirschmüller (Tübingen: Edition Diskord, 2005), pp. 255–256.

139 Bernays, "Letter from Minna Bernays to Sigmund Freud, July 23, 1910," p. 260.

140 Anna Freud, "Letter from Anna Freud to Sigmund Freud, July 13, 1910," in: *Sigmund Freud – Anna Freud: Correspondence 1904–1938*, Meyer-Palmedo I., ed., (Cambrigde: Polity Press, 2014), p. 30.

141 Pawlak, Sokolik, *Historia polskiej*, p. 91

open to psychoanalysis (incidentally, many Polish psychiatrists later gained their experience and knowledge there, as described in more detail below). Another such project was the sanatorium in Baden-Baden founded in 1900 by Georg Groddeck in the Marienhöhe Villa. In the interwar period the third major psychoanalytical center was a clinic in Berlin run by Karl Abraham (operating since 1920). Another one was the *Haus Sielbeck* sanatorium (Holstein province) established in 1907 by Johann Jaroslaw Marcinowski, a German psychoanalyst from Wrocław with Polish roots.

Against this background, the sanatorium in Bystra appears quite modest. Moreover, in 1905 Jekels was confronted with a family tragedy, namely his wife's suicide. Bartholomäus Czarnecki, a German *Spätaussiedler* (late settler) from Cieszyn, writes in his dissertation – relying on testimonies of inhabitants of Bielsko – that there were two versions of this tragic event. According to the first one, Jekels' wife fell in love with a captain who stayed in Bystra as a patient and did not reciprocate her feelings, and according to the other she became profoundly depressed when a local theater refused to stage her trashy play.[142] In any case, this tragedy no doubt left a deep mark on Jekels' personality. Minna Bernays' letters and Gabriela Zapolska's memoirs paint a picture of a young doctor extremely confident in himself and his diagnoses, as well as very arrogant and disrespectful towards his patients.[143] However, a very different picture of a timid and modest man with a pessimistic outlook emerges from later memories of Jekels' friends and colleagues.[144]

---

142 Czarnecki, *Ludwig Jekels*, p. 24. The author of this work tried to find the grave of Jekels' wife in Bystra. It turned out that a few decades after her death no one had any idea where it was. It should be added that the credibility of the second version was undermined by Lena Magnone in her book *Emisariusze Freuda*, where she suggests that the play by Jekels' wife was staged in Lviv.

143 On the basis of the memories of the latter, Lena Magnone reconstructed the curative methods used by Jekels at the time. It seems that, at least in this case, they had little to do with psychoanalysis. The author also traces the entire course of the treatment, during which Jekels evidently made a wrong diagnosis, sarcastically rejecting Zapolska's suggestion that the cause of her stomach problems may have been a tapeworm ("You have a tapeworm in your head!"). But when, unluckily, this suggestion was confirmed, the writer put the tapeworm in a jar and displayed it with undisguised satisfaction on her bedside table during Jekels' daily visits. Magnone, "Polskie przestrzenie…," p. 55.

144 Such a picture of Jekels is painted, for example, by Richard Sterba, who writes: "He was always very serious and sometimes bitter. In any case I don't remember him ever laughing." Richard Sterba, *Reminiscenses of a Viennese Psychoanalyst*, p. 137.

Be that as it may, his wife's death must have greatly influenced Jekels' later decision to sell the sanatorium. This was when he started to regularly travel between Vienna and Bystra, which did not leave him too much time for managing the health resort, so in 1910 he closed it down, and two years later he sold it (probably quite cheaply) to a group of Polish miners from Karvina. In the same year he moved to Vienna, and underwent analysis with Freud, later becoming one of his closest associates. Once Poland regained independence in 1919, his visits to his home country became sporadic.

But perhaps the most effective period of Jekels' work in terms of his contribution to Polish psychoanalysis was between 1911 and 1914. It was connected with the "apostolic" mission entrusted to him by Freud, who in 1911 sent him to Kraków. The aim of the mission was to familiarize the local medical community with psychoanalysis, also by giving a few lectures.[145] He was probably also tasked with establishing a Polish psychoanalytical society in some indefinite future.

Freud must have attached particular importance to Jekels' mission in Galicia. This is clearly evidenced by his words from a letter to Jekels sent on December 5, 1911: "Thank you for all your efforts. We owe all our successes in Poland to your work. I am curious how your clinicians will react to psychoanalysis. The joy over the news about your apostolic work in Kraków is slightly overshadowed by the fact that you can't simultaneously participate in our evening meetings […]."[146] Unfortunately, the "apostolic" mission of Jekels, in the spirit of spreading a new faith, ended in failure. It turned out that despite a number of lectures he was unable to attract a sufficient number of physicians to psychoanalysis in order to establish a society similar to the one in Vienna. Echoes of this failure are to be found in the bitter words of Jekels which open his *Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda* (quoted above). He complains about the lack of understanding of psychoanalysis among the "intelligent public." But the failure of his undertaking raises a number of questions to which it is difficult to find a clear answer today. For even

145 Edyta Dembińska and Krzysztof Rutkowski, in their article "Rozwój psychoterapii jako metody leczenia zaburzeń psychicznych na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim i w Krakowie do wybuchu I wojny światowej," *Psychiatria Polska*, No. 20 (2015), pp. 1–12, succeeded in identifying two of those lectures. The first was entitled *O czynniku decydującym w stosunku pacyenta do lekarza* [About the factor determining the attitude of the patient to the physician] and delivered in July 1911 at the Eleventh Congress of Polish Physicians and Natural Scientists in Kraków. The second was entitled *O psychoanalizie Freuda* [About Freud's psychoanalysis] and given in February 1912 at a meeting of the Kraków Medical Society.

146 Siegfried Bernfeld Papers, Library of Congress, Washington.

if the reaction of a large part of his listeners was unfavorable to psychoanalysis, it seems that Jekels should not have had difficulties with finding a few or even a dozen physicians ready to join a native psychoanalytical society. Especially because in that time, up to the 1920s, psychoanalytical societies with just a few members appeared across Europe. In just one hospital, the Clinic of Psychiatry and Neuropathology at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, headed by Professor Jan Piltz, several assistants – mentioned above – were fascinated with Freud's and Jung's theories and used elements of the psychoanalytical method in therapy. There was Ludwika Karpińska and a few psychiatrists and neurologists from Warsaw, as well as a whole group of physicians clearly sympathetic to psychoanalysis – as evidenced by the telegram sent by the First Congress to Freud and Jung, signed by a group calling themselves "Freudians" (besides Jekels and Karpińska, they were Rychliński, Łuniewski, Sycianko, Chodźko, and Kępiński). And if we look through the titles of papers and panel discussions at the First and Second Congress, it turns out that the list of people speaking favorably about psychoanalysis was quite extensive.

It should be noted that no rigorous requirements and criteria had been developed allowing a given psychoanalytical group to found a society and receive a license, thus becoming part of the International Psychoanalytical Association. They were defined by the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society in the 1920s.

But perhaps Jekels – and Freud – hoped for something more, expecting that the lectures would enjoy a much better reception in the medical community than they really did? Or perhaps Jekels simply lacked organizational skills in implementing this venture, and his lectures, in which he used unfamiliar psychoanalytical terminology, were not very comprehensible for his listeners? But these are only unverified hypotheses and speculations. The fact remains that his attempt at founding a Polish psychoanalytical society in Kraków ended in failure.

4 First translations of Freud and the first Polish publications

Jekels continued his mission as Freud's "apostle" in Galicia until the outbreak of World War I. Its objective, tangible effect was the publication of his book and the translations of a number of Freud's works (*O psychoanalizie Freuda* [*About Freud's Psychoanalysis*], Lviv 1911, *Psychopatologia życia codziennego* [*Psychopathology of Everyday Life*], Lviv 1912, with Helena Ivánka). The interwar period saw the translation – with Marian Albiński – of *Trzy rozprawy z teorii seksualnej* (Three Treatises on Sexual Theory, Leipzig-Vienna-Zurich 1924) and the second edition of *Psychopatologia…* (1924). All these books were financed by the foundation of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society. It was yet more eloquent proof of how

much Freud and his Viennese colleagues wanted to popularize psychoanalysis among Polish doctors.

Alongside all this, in those years Jekels delivered papers at congresses of Polish neurologists and psychiatrists, published several articles, took part in various discussions with Polish physicians, and gave lectures. His regular visits to his home country were interrupted by the outbreak of the war. After the end of the conflict the situation was radically different. The psychoanalytical community in Kraków was dispersed, while the Warsaw group of physicians in the Jewish Hospital in Czyste (Adam Wizel, Gustaw Bychowski, Maurycy Bornsztajn, and others) gained in importance and Nelken settled in Warsaw as a military psychiatrist. From today's point of view, the rich psychoanalytical legacy of Jekels in Polish is worth noting. His book, articles, and translations of Freud's works created a foundation for a wider reception of psychoanalysis among Polish intellectuals and academics. They introduced at least two generations of Polish readers into the "mysteries" of Freud's theory. Appreciating his merits in this field, Freud wrote in one of his works: "It is principally due to L. Jekels that psychoanalysis has been introduced to Polish scientific and literary circles."[147]

It should be emphasized that between 1912 and 1914, in parallel with Jekels' works and translations, Polish medical publishers issued a number of books and articles exclusively or partly devoted to psychoanalysis. One could even say there was an explosion of interest in Freud's theory in this community. All these works were of an introductory nature, their authors attempting primarily to discuss the basic assumptions of Freud's theory and focusing on the aspects which they considered the most important. But they also formulated various objections and criticisms. Nevertheless, these were pioneering works in Poland, aimed at familiarizing the domestic readers (first of all from the medical community) with the fundamental elements of this theory.

Tadeusz Jaroszyński's *Odczyty kliniczne* (Clinical readings) and *Przyczynek do nauki o psychonerwicach* (A contribution to the science of psychoneuroses, Kraków, 1913)[148] should be mentioned; the author tries to interpret numerous cases of various types of neuroses along psychoanalytical lines. The extensive dissertation by Leopold Wołowicz, *Jeden z problematów psychoanalizy Freuda*

147 Sigmund Freud, "On the History of Psycho-Analytic Movement," in: *Standard Edition*, James Strachey et al., eds. (London: The Hogarth Press, 1966), Vol. XIV, p. 25.

148 T. Jaroszyński, *Odczyty kliniczne* (Warszawa: Druk T. Kowalewskiego, 1912); *Przyczynek do nauki o psychonerwicach. (Analiza 35 przypadków histerii, neurastenii, nerwicy lękowej i psychastenii)* (Kraków: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1913).

(One of the problems posed by Freud's psychoanalysis)[149], deserves mention; the author was a member of the group of Lviv philosophers centered around Kazimierz Twardowski, and he said in the introduction that his task was to "critically examine the assumptions of the psychoanalytical orientation, which, as its supporters would have us believe, not only has a theoretical significance for philosophy, but also a practical meaning for medicine and – which also interests me very much – for education."[150]

What is remarkable about this statement is that the author first names the theoretical significance of psychoanalysis for philosophy. This sequence eloquently shows that Freud's theory was interpreted at that time in a wider context than just psychiatry (or psychology).[151] At the same time, importantly, it was probably the first attempt in Poland to formulate the answer to the question, what is the meaning, if any, of psychoanalysis for pedagogy?[152] Therefore, Wołowicz's dissertation can be considered pioneering in relation to many works of Polish and foreign pedagogues and psychiatrists who would take up the issue of the relations between psychoanalysis and pedagogy in the interwar period.

The article itself was a thorough – testifying to the author's familiarity with German literature on the subject – attempt at presenting various meanings of the term "repression" (*die Verdrängung*) in Freud's theory. Towards the end, Wołowicz contrasted one of these formulations, in which "repression" means "mental de-intellectualization" of a given representation, with Edward Abramowski's theory of consciousness (and subconsciousness), calling this process "recognizing emotionally not-indifferent phenomena."[153]

In 1912 *Neurologia Polska* published an extensive – almost 50 pages in length – review of Freud's *Die Traumdeutung*, written by Franciszka Baumgarten, where she also quotes her own interpretations of patients' dreams in the Jewish Hospital in Czyste in Warsaw.[154] It is a true rarity in the whole literature on this work, since many years passed before its importance was fully recognized.

---

149 Wołowicz, *Jeden z problematów psychoanalizy Freuda*.

150 Wołowicz, *Jeden z problematów psychoanalizy Freuda*, p. 4.

151 Later, in the interwar period, Karol Irzykowski would, for example, accuse Władysław Tatarkiewicz of completely ignoring Freud's theory in Tatarkiewicz's "History of Philosophy."

152 Wołowicz, *Jeden z problematów psychoanalizy Freuda*, p. 5.

153 Wołowicz, *Jeden z problematów psychoanalizy Freuda*, p. 15.

154 Franciszka Baumgarten, "Teoria snu Freuda," *Neurologia Polska*, Vol. II, No. 2 (1912), pp. 1013–1062. The author was born in Łódź as the daughter of a Jewish manufacturer. She studied literature, philosophy, and psychology at the Jagiellonian University. At

A separate place should be awarded to Stanisław Trzebiński's article *O teorii Freuda i psychoanalizie* (About Freud's theory and psychoanalysis),[155] probably the first dissertation on Freud which appeared in Polish under the Prussian partition (the article was based on a paper delivered by the author in 1911 in the Polish Medical Society in Kyiv). Trzebiński, later a leading representative of the so-called younger Polish school of philosophy of medicine and in the interwar period a professor at the Vilnius University, focused on reviewing studies on hysteria published by Freud together with Breuer, as well as on *The Interpretation of Dreams*. He defends Freud against charges of pansexualism, saying that his concept of "infantile sexuality is so extensive that it contains virtually all positive feelings having their source in the physical experiences of the child. For this category includes not only the feeling of pleasure, experienced by the child when you swing it on your knees or in the cradle, but also its satisfaction experienced during (previously held back) defecation or the sensation caused by bathing. […] Similarly, if all pleasant bodily sensations are sexual sensations, then sexuality ceases to exist as a separate category, merging completely with the concept of a pleasant feeling in general."[156] This reading of the Freudian concept of infantile sexuality contrasted with traditional views on the subject which dominated among the general public and in the medical community of that time. These views partly resulted from the fact that projected onto the concept of infantile sexuality was a narrow concept of adult sexuality, which – as Trzebiński rightly notes – distorted the sense of Freud's claims. In the final part of his article, he criticizes the general level of the "polemic" surrounding Freud's theory, writing: "On the one hand, it was usually characterized by a reckless and fanatical zeal of proselytes and on the other hand by a contempt typical for people who don't want to understand that they might exist a point of view different from theirs, or with an indignation striking the notes of sentimental – and to a smaller or larger extent hypocritical – prudery."[157] Reading these words, we can only guess what heated debates must have been going on around psychoanalysis at the time and what arguments of the heaviest caliber must have been waged against it. The main subject of controversy in these discussions were the views of

---

the beginning of World War I, she moved to Berlin and in the 1930s she continued her academic career in Switzerland.

155 Stanisław Trzebiński, "O teorii Freuda i psychoanalizie," *Nowiny Lekarskie*, Vol. 10 (1912), pp. 587–589.

156 Trzebiński, "O teorii Freuda i psychoanalizie," p. 589.

157 Trzebiński, "O teorii Freuda i psychoanalizie," p. 589.

representatives of the movement on infantile sexuality and on the sexual basis of various types of neuroses.

The attitude to these questions was the main criterion of the division into the three groups we spoke about above: the "enthusiastic," unreservedly accepting Freud's claims on the matter; the "moderate," its representatives believing that sexuality did not always explain neuroses; and the "critical," a priori precluding any significant role of sexuality in the development of the child and in the emergence of neurosis.

Looking at the two Congresses of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists, and Psychologists (the third was to be held in 1914 in Lviv, but did not take place because of the war) and the number of academic publications, first translations, lectures, and press articles, we can conclude that between 1909 and 1914 a genuine breakthrough occurred in the interest in Freud's theory in Polish medical communities. Solid foundations for developing this theory in the interwar period were laid, because despite the fact that Jekels, Nunberg, Sokolnicka, Deutsch, and a few others (Radecki, Baumgarten, and Mira Gincburg) left the country, a rather large group of psychiatrists remained and continued their work in free Poland. We should name here Stefan Borowiecki, Jan Nelken, and Maurycy Bornsztajn, who in the early 1920s were joined by Tadeusz Bilikiewicz, Roman Markuszewicz, Władysław Matecki, Norbert Praeger, and Gustaw Bychowski, who later became a leading figure of the movement. And such psychiatrists as Adam Wizel, Natalia Zyberlast-Zandowa, or Stefan Higier, who initially were very critical towards Freud's psychoanalysis (this is clearly seen in the discussions during the First and Second Congress and in medical journals' commentaries), but later gradually accepted the theory and practice. It should be emphasized that all the doctors listed above were at the forefront of Polish psychiatry and they often held key management positions in the hospitals and clinics where they worked. The first works on psychoanalysis written from pedagogical positions were also published (Albert Dryjski, Józef Kretz-Mirski, Estera Markinówna, and Jan Kuchta).

5 The psychoanalytical plague. Centers of psychoanalysis in Kraków and Warsaw

The leaders of Polish neurology, psychology, and psychiatry between 1900 and 1914 were doctors who started their academic careers in the best academic centers and clinics in Western Europe – mainly in Switzerland, Germany, Austria, and France, but also in Russia (in the last case because in the Russian partition every Polish physician who wanted to obtain a diploma had to do

an internship in a Russian clinic). And they often had their first experiences and developed their knowledge there. For example, Jan Piltz, founder of the Psychiatry and Neuropathology Clinic at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, the most modern institution of this type in interwar Poland, gained his clinical experience with such persons as Eugen Bleuler in Switzerland and Jules Dejérine in France;[158] Edward Flatau, a world-class neurologist, gained clinical experience in Moscow and then worked for many years in Berlin in the Institute of Emanuel Mendel and Hermann Oppenheim, and after his return to Poland he became head of the neurological ward of the Jewish Hospital in Czyste; Samuel Goldflam, also an outstanding neurologist and co-founder of the Scientific Pathological Institute in the Hospital in Czyste, had acquired his clinical experience in Berlin and with Jean-Martin Charcot in Paris; Zygmunt Bychowski, a leading figure of Polish neurology, studied in Austria and in Germany; Jan Mazurkiewicz got his professional experience at the University in Graz and in the *Asile Saint Anne* clinic in Paris, and after returning to Poland he held a number of management positions in Warsaw universities and clinics.

These are just a few select examples from the academic biographies of leading figures of Polish neurology and psychiatry, both under the partitions and in the interwar period. They illustrate to what extent the Polish medical community maintained close relations with the best academic centers and clinics in Europe. Its leading representatives were very much familiar with new Western theories, movements, and tendencies in these fields and had practical experience acquired abroad.

Interestingly, the first advocates of psychoanalysis in Poland obtained their education and clinical experience at the same prestigious universities, clinics, and research centers where they became familiar with different approaches of a scientistic nature (experimental psychology, approaches typical for neurology, and so on). Some of them tried to combine them. Many of them held prestigious positions after returning to Poland. For example, Adam Wizel, the long-time head of the Mental Diseases Ward in the Jewish Hospital in Czyste, had been on an internship with Charcot in Paris; Jan Nelken worked for a time in the famous Burghölzli clinic and then, as a military doctor, became director of the Psychiatry Ward at the Center of Sanitary Training in Warsaw; Herman Nunberg

158 It should be noted that his students included Stefan Borowiecki and Tadeusz Bilikiewicz, who in the interwar period would be counted among the top Polish psychiatrists inspired by psychoanalysis. Karol de Beaurain would also be his assistant for some time.

studied medicine at the Zürich University, and he gained his therapeutic experience in Burghölzli where he met Eugene Bleuler and Carl Gustav Jung, and later, after a short stint in Professor Piltz's Kraków clinic, became a leading figure of the psychoanalytical movement in Vienna; Karol de Beaurain also studied medicine in Zürich and specialized as a psychiatrist in Munich, and later became an assistant in Professor Piltz's clinic; Maurycy Bornsztajn first studied neurology and psychiatry with Mendel and Oppenheim in Berlin, and later with Emil Kraepelin in Munich, and after returning to Poland he worked as Flatau's assistant and in 1908 became head of the Psychiatry Ward of the Hospital in Czyste; Ludwika Karpińska studied philosophy in Berlin and psychology in Zürich, and in 1920 became director of the Municipal Psychological Institute in Łódź; Wacław Radecki studied at the Geneva University and still as a student became an assistant in the Psychological Laboratory of Théodore Flournoy, while after the end of World War I he organized the Psychological Institute at the Free Polish University; and so on. Ludwik Jekels, Helena Deutsch, and Eugenia Sokolnicka gained their psychoanalytical education in Vienna and later became leading figures of the movement.

All these doctors fluently spoke German, which, due to the extraordinarily dynamic development of medical sciences in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, was at the time a genuine *lingua franca* of the medical profession in Poland and abroad. German was not only the language of two of the partitioning powers, but also (and above all) the language of the most prestigious research and clinical centers, which were located in German-speaking countries. Not to mention the academic literature in this language. Some of these people were also fluent in French (A.Wizel, W.Radecki), and in both these languages they published articles in leading medical periodicals of these countries. This eloquently shows that the psychoanalytical "plague" reached Poland by the same route as other scientific theories popular in contemporary neurology, psychology, and psychiatry. The infection could be contracted not only in the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society, but also – if not primarily – in the scientific centers and clinics of Switzerland, where completely different clinical approaches were also taught. The most important role was played by the famous Bleuler's clinic in Zürich (Burghölzli), that had since 1905 been engaged in intense cooperation with doctors from Professor Jan Piltz's Clinic of Psychiatry and Neuropathology at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków. Incidentally, Piltz founded the clinic in Kraków on the basis of his previous experiences in the Burghölzli clinic, where he had been August Forel's assistant and later, at the request of Bleuler, restructured the clinic. He turned out to be an excellent organizer. It was partly due to his mediatory role and support that his assistants listed above – Stefan Borowiecki, Jan Nelken, Herman

Nunberg, and Karol de Beaurain – gained experience in this Swiss clinic. One of the effects of their studies and internships there was their familiarizing themselves with the psychoanalytical theories of Freud and Jung. As Edyta Dembińska and Krzysztof Rutkowski write, "thanks to their experiences in the Burghölzli clinic Piltz's assistants 'got infected' with psychoanalysis and then returned to their parent institutions and used it in treatment."[159]

As a result, in 1909, the doctors in the ambulatory used psychoanalysis for understanding the causes of the patient's symptoms, and in 1912 they employed psychoanalysis on a regular basis, as mentioned, for example, by Henryk Nunberg in his autobiography.[160]

We should add – as I already mentioned – that in conservative social and ecclesiastic circles psychoanalysis often gave rise to suspicion and resistance. This is clearly demonstrated by an anecdote told by Nunberg:

> During one staff meeting, Professor Piltz was called away to the telephone; when he came back, he asked which one of us was treating a certain girl in the outpatient department. I said that I was the one. The girl, whom I had in psychotherapy on a psychoanalytic basis, was the sister of the bishop's cook. After each session with me, she would be questioned by her sister as to what we had been talking about. When her sister found out what we discussed, she became very upset and complained to the bishop; he in turn called up the Professor and demanded that that sort of treatment stop immediately. Despite the protests of all my colleagues, Professor Piltz solved the problem by taking the patient into psychotherapy himself.[161]

Unfortunately, we do not know what the therapeutic effects of this change were. Notable here is the understandable indignation of Nunberg at the intervention of the bishop, who as a complete outsider and an absolute layman dared to interfere with the process of the patient's treatment. On the other hand, the suggestion of both writers quoted above that the psychoanalytical method was commonly used by a group of Piltz's assistants is very much exaggerated. This method was used by at most a few of them, and we do not even know to what extent it was compatible with Freud's (or Jung's) recommendations and to what extent it was,

---

159 Dembińska, Rutkowski, "Rozwój psychoterapii," p. 3.

160 Dembińska, Rutkowski, "Rozwój psychoterapii," p. 3. I will take the opportunity to add that when Piltz received the call from the bishop, who was indignant that his female cook was subjected to psychoanalytical treatment, Piltz called all the employees of the hospital to his office and asked which one of them conducted the therapy. And when Nunberg stepped forward, Piltz said that from then on he would be treating this patient.

161 Nunberg, *Memoirs*, p. 13.

so to speak, "lay psychoanalysis." And we know from other sources that Jan Piltz himself was skeptical towards psychoanalysis (as discussed in more detail below), while the way other employees of the clinic introduced conversation with the patient into the therapy process seems to have very little to do with the psychoanalytic approach. (Conversation was treated as an additional measure aimed at improving the mood of the bedridden patient, which resembled more closely the method of persuasion used by Janet and other psychiatrists than it did psychoanalysis.)

Dembińska and Rutkowski are certainly right when they say that this group of Professor Piltz's assistants' turn to psychoanalysis was influenced by their internships in the Burghölzli clinic. After their stay there, they became staunch supporters of psychoanalysis and tried to use it in a "methodical" way in their clinical practice. The question arises: what did they see that was so interesting, not to say fascinating, in Freud's and Jung's theories? Especially because these theories were far removed in their assumptions and methods of treatment from everything offered by other orientations and concepts popular at the time. What prompted them to oppose the views prevailing in the medical community (and elsewhere) at the time and to support this model of therapy or to strongly emphasize what they held to be its positive and innovative aspects?

In their article, Dembińska and Rutkowski point to the profound changes in European psychiatry at the time. The interest in psychoanalysis in the Polish psychiatric profession had its roots in the late 19th-century emergence of psychotherapeutic techniques founded on suggestion, both in the form of hypnosis and when the patient was awake. It was also in this era that the very concept of psychotherapy started to be used. But these techniques did not prove very successful, because not all patients succumbed to hypnosis and if they did, the improvement of the patient's mental state was temporary and the symptoms soon returned. The career of psychoanalysis in the psychiatric profession was due to the fact that its creator and his pupils proposed a new approach to the patient, which on the one hand, as based as it was on talking to the patient, was more sophisticated methodically, more laborious and time-consuming, but on the other hand seemed a better prospect for a permanent removal of symptoms than other forms of therapy. And it was not just simple conversation, like, for example, in the therapy model proposed by Piltz, where conversation was only meant to improve the patient's mood, and in fact played a secondary role. In psychoanalysis it was of crucial importance, but it also fundamentally differed from all kinds of everyday talk. During a conversation with the patient the analyst had to carefully observe all his symptomatic behaviors, pronouncements, and slips, and also to overcome the patient's resistance and induce him to speak about his dreams,

and then the role of the analyst was to carefully interpret all these things from the point of view of instinctive drives which had been repressed into the unconscious and now revealed themselves indirectly in a linguistic (or quasi-linguistic) form and usually were of a sexual or aggressive nature. And finally, he had to skilfully communicate his interpretation of the symptoms to the patient, which usually was in conflict with the patient's previous self-understanding, and to persuade him that this interpretation was correct. So the technique of conducting conversation during psychoanalytical therapy was a multistage process, where you had to overcome various forms of resistance in the patient. The analyst had to display great perceptiveness and interpretative creativity, as well as use a number of specific techniques, such as the technique of loose association. Considered from the methodological angle, the form of therapy proposed by Freud was incomparable to all that was on offer from other psychiatric and psychotherapeutic theories from the turn of the 20th century. For many, its attractiveness consisted in the underlying theory of human mental life, assuming the existence of a newly conceived unconscious "system" in which various socially and culturally unacceptable instinctive representations, containing the most fundamental and hidden desires of the individual, were repressed. Although the concept of the unconscious had been put forward earlier, for example by Helmholz or Fechner, none of them awarded the crucial importance to it as did Freud, who saw it primarily as the location of repressed sexual desires. This raised the hope that getting to know this mysterious "system," deeply hidden in the human mind and not easily accessible empirically, would allow us to solve many mysteries of human mental life, which the existing psychology and psychiatry could not adequately explain. And it also placed psychoanalysis in an antagonistic position vis-a-vis widespread views on sexuality and its role in human life, which attracted some people and caused indignation in others. The former certainly included Jekels, who said, commenting on his impressions of Freud's lectures in Vienna (which he had attended since 1905), "Although I had studied with the leading medical authorities of the time, the world that was opened to me in Freud's lectures was totally unknown to me. An enthusiasm I had never experienced before made me go to Vienna year after year."[162]

It seems that the turn of the 20th century was a period when intellectual, academic, and artistic elites were eager for various types of novelties. It was a time of expecting imminent and profound changes which would open new,

162 Edmund Bergler, "Ludwig Jekels, M. D., 1867–1954," *Bulletin of the American Psychoanalytic Association* No. 10 (1954), pp. 831–832.

bright prospects of a better life for humanity. Hence the huge popularity among intellectuals of the writings of Marx, Nietzsche, and Arthur Schopenhauer, as well as the philosophy of Henri Bergson, which was permeated with existential optimism.

In addition, there were social and cultural factors related primarily to the intensified assimilation processes among Jews inhabiting the "Polish lands." A crucial role was played here by the vivid interest in psychoanalysis among young Jews with a medical education. For them, it was a theory which proclaimed not only the necessity of transforming the patient's self-knowledge in the process of therapy, but also of changing traditional forms of identity in the collective consciousness. Such an approach coincided with the growing leftist tendencies and aspirations to modernize Polish culture among Polish intellectuals and academics. Psychoanalysis, like the socialist theories built on the foundations of Marxist economic thought, seemed to open the possibility of a radical transformation of social self-knowledge and to propel the emergence of a new type of society, more just, progressive, and mentally sound than the previous one.

Particularly receptive to the psychoanalytical concepts of Freud and Jung was the younger generation of emancipated Jews from Central and Eastern Europe who invaded the ranks of the traditional bourgeoisie, where, however, they were by no means accepted with open arms. This perhaps explains their strong belief in the imminent transformation of man, society, and economy – a transformation that would lead to full assimilation, causing the disappearance of all visible and invisible barriers. This would mean that they would no longer live in the unbearable state of suspension between their native religious tradition, to which for many there was no return, and the enlightened middle-class society, which largely still saw them as intruders and strangers. The second assimilation, the genuine one, was to come with the implementation of emancipatory ideas, contained in these philosophical and scientific theories, in cultural and social space. As we know, history was soon to brutally crush these hopes.

The particular popularity of psychoanalysis in the Kraków psychiatric milieu between 1909 and 1914 was due to a combination of factors. These were first of all "objective" factors, such as the growing interest in psychotherapy in this community and widespread use of new psychotherapeutic methods (mainly hypnosis). The essential role of Jan Piltz as the organizer and head of the Clinic of Psychiatry and Neuropathology at the Jagiellonian University should be also emphasized. But in his views on "modern psychiatry" he was situated at the opposite pole in relation to psychoanalysis and all "humanistic" forms of psychotherapy based on conversation (suggestion, persuasion, and so on). This is clearly demonstrated by an excerpt from his speech inaugurating this faculty in 1905, when he said: "The

foundation of modern psychiatry, as a natural science based on experiment […] is the opinion and fact that the brain forms the organic background to all mental acts; that every change in the state of our consciousness is accompanied by a certain change in the central nervous system and that mental disorders are just symptoms of certain pathological changes in the brain."[163] Later in the lecture, Piltz claimed: "It is impossible to separate mental from nervous symptoms and it is unreasonable to consider mental symptoms as something special, detached. The soul, mental symptoms, the activity of the brain and nervous activity are all synonyms. There are no mental symptoms without nervous activity, just as there is no nervous activity without mental symptoms (Forel)."[164] It would be difficult to find something more removed from the psychoanalytical approach to the relation between the "activity of the brain" and "mental symptoms," for in psychoanalysis the latter are perceived as autonomous in relation to the former. Hence Piltz concluded his lecture by saying that psychiatry could not be detached from neuropathology, because these two areas were closely connected with each other. And this was the way to approach mental disorders in the faculty founded by Piltz – which was eloquently confirmed by the name he proposed. His methodological recommendations for behavior towards the patient in the clinic also had very little to do with psychoanalysis; for example, he held the view that the very act of putting the patient in bed (*Bettbehandlung*), as well as summer baths, already had a therapeutic effect on him.

But despite all that he still hired assistants fascinated with psychoanalysis – like Borowiecki, Nelken, Nunberg, and de Beaurain – which probably resulted from the fact that although his approach to it was critical, he granted it a legitimate place in psychiatry. Especially when he stayed in Burghölzli and worked with Bleuler, he must have almost tangibly felt how popular it was among the young assistants in this clinic. After all, Bleuler himself tirelessly promoted psychoanalysis up to around 1905. Not to mention Jung. So Piltz, perhaps against his wishes, contributed to its popularity among physicians in Kraków, supporting the studies and internships of his young collaborators in Burghölzli, from where they returned "infected" with the new theory and method. Yet another factor was the proximity of Vienna, which meant that various "novelties" from there, also scientific, very quickly reached the academic, artistic, and literary circles in Kraków.

---

163 Jan Piltz, *Stanowisko psychiatryi w rzędzie innych nauk lekarskich, oraz nowoczesne jej zadania i cele,* (Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1905), p. 4.

164 Piltz, *Stanowisko psychiatryi*, p. 12.

Another medical community in which the interest in psychoanalysis was then equally strong was in Warsaw. This is clearly evidenced by the pronouncements of representatives of this community at the First Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists, and Psychologists in 1909 in Warsaw and later during the psychoanalytical panel discussions there.

Maurycy Bornsztajn and Franciszka Baumgarten came from this milieu, and Eugenia Sokolnicka promoted psychoanalysis within it for almost two years (1917–1919). As we already said, in the interwar period this group was joined by Gustaw Bychowski, Władysław Matecki, and Roman Markuszewicz.

A key role in promoting psychoanalysis in the Congress Kingdom was the Jewish hospital founded in 1902 in the Warsaw district of Czyste, where world-class specialists in neurology and psychiatry worked as doctors and researchers. Heads of particular wards were also admirably open and tolerant towards using the psychoanalytical method. Although their personal view of it – just like of Piltz in Kraków – was often skeptical (e.g., Flatau, Goldflam, and initially Wizel), they accepted it as one of the current methods of treatment. This was clearly evidenced by the fact that when retiring, they often designated its ardent supporters their successors. This was the case, for example, of Maurycy Bornstein (Bornsztajn), who early on declared himself an advocate of psychoanalysis as the most effective method of therapy, and yet in 1904 became an assistant of the neurologist Flatau and later, with his recommendation, was appointed head of the Psychiatry Ward.[165] In 1916, Bornstein published in Polish three extensive case histories written from the Freudian perspective. What brought them together was the fact that they were all, as he said, typical "escapes into psychosis" as conceived by Freud. The protagonists of these histories were Polish Jewesses, patients of the Hospital in Czyste, who due to various traumatic events in their lives became schizophrenics and lost touch with reality.

In the stories of these Jewish women, related by Bornstein, various traumatic events transpired which evidently had triggered their mental disorders. These events were related to various predicaments in their personal lives or to terrifying scenes during the anti-Jewish pogroms they had witnessed. The latter appear in the story of the first patient, who saw in her visions

> miserable, starving Jews and opposite them peasants with axes. She said that good times had arrived for Jews, that those who boycotted Jews would perish. During the day she

165 I have already mentioned that Maurycy Bornsztajn used the original family name Bornstein in his publications until the 1920s. Then he used the Polonized version, writing it down in line with its pronunciation.

> said to bring her the most pious Jewish women with biblical names and told them to pray. […] During a stay with her parents (three weeks) the patient had a lot of visual hallucinations: "she saw on the wall a pig on one side and a Jewish sign (folded hands) on the other; she saw a lot of wild and domestic animals, insects; all of them walked around the room; she was not afraid at all; everyone else fled […]." After returning to Piotrków she calmed down a little, she remembers that she spoke a lot, that she called herself a "victim of a boycott."[166]

Presenting this case, Bornstein takes into account the wider cultural and social background of the patient's psychosis, that is, the sudden deterioration of Polish-Jewish relations, previously harmonious, in the early 20th century ("earlier there was 'unity', today there is a split, and she is a 'victim of a boycott'"[167]). What is striking, though, is that he does not relate the poignant image of terrified, miserable Jews and "peasants with axes" to the Łódź pogrom which had occurred three months before, in the summer of 1913, precisely when the patient's psychosis erupted.

The question arises, of course, what the sources of this concealment (repression?) by Bornstein, a Jew with a strong Polish identity, were. In any case, the cultural and social background of the case history and its analysis presented by him, consisting of deeply antagonistic Polish-Jewish relations in the Congress Kingdom of the early 20th century (pogroms, calls made by the National Democracy politicians to boycott Jewish stores, and so on), plays an extremely important role here.

There is also the theme of the patient's desire for Polish-Jewish reconciliation, accompanied by a personal recollection of love for a man named "Szyjuś." But this love did not find its culmination in marriage, as her beloved "had a baptised brother." Here the crucial role was played by religious prescriptions strictly enforced by the Jewish community, prohibiting marriages with non-Jews. This is where the inner split of the patient came from: she regretted her unconsumed love for a Polish boy, but on the other hand "she could not get tainted." However, because "more than one time she tainted herself with this desire, in order to erase this youthful sin in psychosis she wants to send money to a rabbi who is starving; she sorts men and women, she chooses the most virtuous, the most devout."[168]

This is the right context for the interpretation of a scene in the patient's hallucinations in which "her bed stands in water."[169] The water clearly symbolizes

---

166 Maurycy Bornstein, *O odrębnym typie rozszczepienia psychicznego (schizothymia reactiva)* (Warsaw: E.Wende i S-ka, 1916), p. 16.

167 Bornstein, *O odrębnym typie*, p. 21.

168 Bornstein, *O odrębnym typie*, pp. 25–26.

169 Bornstein, *O odrębnym typie*, p. 16.

the Torah, which guarantees the spiritual purity of the patient, her separation from the world of non-Jews, and possesses supernatural qualities. As Bornstein comments, in this way the patient "creates in her psychosis a bliss for Jews in general and for herself in particular, opposed to the hard, cruel reality which she partly puts aside and partly tolerates alongside her desired reality."[170]

The case described and analyzed by Bornstein clearly illustrates to what extent the psychoanalytical method, focusing on the world of the patient's visions, dreams, and hallucinations, accounted for the broad cultural and social context to which they symbolically referred, often in an indirect and veiled way. Without this background, the content of all the hallucinations and visions of the psychotic patient would simply be incomprehensible.

Such an approach had its roots in Freud's and Jung's belief that the patient's mental life was essentially autonomous from its physical foundations. Bornstein fully identifies with this conviction and writes: "Not denying even for a moment the seriousness of anatomic and chemical research, the new direction, assuming that all things psychological must have their source in the psyche ('Alles Seelische aus dem Seelischen'), introduces research – independent from those previous studies – on the psychological emergence and explanation of particular symptoms and their sets, it tries to understand them from the position of a given individual, his mental structure, his life experiences."[171] This view on the relation between human mental life and the human body is diametrically opposed to the one expressed by Jan Piltz in his lecture from 1905 inaugurating the Clinic of Psychiatry and Neuropathology at the Jagiellonian University. Proclaiming a close dependence of the mental sphere on what goes on in the patient's brain, Piltz invoked the theory of Kraepelin, a founding father of pharmacotherapy and psychosurgery. Bornstein criticizes this theory, claiming that a much more fruitful approach is "subjective psychology" which "aims at elucidating the *origin*, the genesis, of the content of the mind in mental patients related to the experiences of a given individual […]."[172] According to Bornstein, this was also the position of Freud, who assumed the existence of unconscious content in the human mind and so was capable of reaching its most profound layers.

This dispute continues in psychiatry to the present day, when it assumes new forms. But regardless of which position we believe to be the most credible in

170 Bornstein, *O odrębnym typie*, p. 26.
171 Bornstein, *O odrębnym typie*, p. 4.
172 Bornstein, *O odrębnym typie*, p. 5.

this argument, one thing is certain: psychoanalytical case studies where the content of the patient's mental experiences is considered in the context of his biography, taking into account his broad social and cultural background, provide today an invaluable source of historical knowledge on the mental condition of particular social groups living in a given period. Bornstein's case study of the psychotic Jewish woman from Łódź most tangibly shows the dramatic nature of Polish-Jewish relations in the early 20th century in the Congress Kingdom, where tendencies towards "reconciliation" and assimilation were thwarted by strong antagonisms, fueled by the Polish National Democracy and by the partitioning powers. Independently of this, these tendencies found fertile ground in centuries-old stereotypes and prejudices about Jews prevailing in Polish society. Meanwhile, the influx of Jews to the Congress Kingdom caused by Tsarist repressions and pogroms in Russia and Ukraine resulted in an increase of conflicts and tensions. The complex and deeply ambivalent nature of Polish-Jewish relations in the interwar period is also well-illustrated by other case studies presented by Bornstein and other psychiatrists from the Hospital in Czyste (N. Praeer, W. Matecki, and others).

But regardless of these institutional factors active in Kraków and Warsaw, an important role in the increasing interest in the psychoanalytical method was played by purely scientific as well as personal factors. One of them was the fascination with the peculiar nature of this method. It attracted the younger generation of Polish psychiatrists with its innovative, original form. An important role was also played by the peculiar mythology which had grown around the concept of the unconscious and the meaning awarded to the sexual aspect of human mental life. This raised hopes that this method would produce much better therapeutic effects than methods employed previously.

We should mention that the advocates of psychoanalysis in the Polish psychiatric profession included physicians of non-Jewish origin. Like the Poles of Jewish descent, they were fascinated mostly with the innovative character of Freud's method, which, as they believed, promised much more curative effects than other forms of therapy. We suspect that an important role was played by its "Romantic" aspect, closer to the approach of the humanities and expressed in focusing on the patient's mind ("soul") and not just on biological underpinnings. Moreover, psychoanalysis seemed to reach the deepest "mysteries" of the patient's mind hidden in his unconscious, which was in line with the existing tradition of Polish psychology and psychiatry, where – as Bartłomiej Dobroczyński showed in his book quoted above – this concept (more precisely, the concept of subconsciousness which was akin to it) played an important role in 19th-century theories.

All these factors contributed to the fact that the list of Polish physicians fascinated with psychoanalysis who did not come from assimilated Jewish families, if you compare it to an analogous list in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy or in Germany, was quite long: Borowiecki, Jaroszyński, Rychliński, Radecki, de Beaurain, Karpińska, Trzebiński, Bilikiewicz, etc. They were attracted by the "universalist" message of psychoanalysis, whose emancipatory claim was ingrained in anthropological assumptions related to the functioning of the human mind as such.

The particular popularity of psychoanalysis among Polish psychiatrists in Kraków and Warsaw (we should also add Lviv and later Bystra, because of Jekels' work) during the partitions provided the foundation for further development of this tradition in the interwar period, continued by the physicians named above. They were to be joined by representatives of the younger generation, such as Gustaw Bychowski, Roman Markuszewicz, and Tadeusz Bilikiewicz, and still later by Władysław Matecki, Norbert Praeger, and others. The center of gravity as to doctors practicing psychoanalysis would shift to Warsaw.

In Polish historiography, there have been few works on the function of psychoanalysis in Polish psychiatry during the partitions and in the interwar period. These were mostly very general reviews, like the article by Pawlak and Sokolik or *Urwane ścieżki* written by the author of this book.[173] We also have a number of short biographical texts devoted to the life and work of individual psychiatrists. The first monographic work was Bartłomiej Dobroczyński's *Idea nieświadomości w polskiej myśli psychologicznej przed Freudem* (The idea of the unconscious in Polish psychological thought before Freud).[174] We should also mention the extensive chapter on Polish psychoanalytical traditions in the book *Historia polskiej myśli psychologicznej* (The history of Polish psychological thought) written by Dobroczyński and Teresa Rzepa.[175]

We also have the article by Edyta Dembińska and Krzysztof Rutkowski, in which they point to the interest in psychoanalysis among the young assistants at the Jagiellonian University clinic headed by Jan Piltz in the early years of the 20th century. This text also shows the important role of the numerous contacts of this community with the Burghölzli clinic, and Jan Piltz's openness to psychoanalysis and his contact with this institution.

---

173 Dybel, "Urwane ścieżki."

174 Dobroczyński, *Idea nieświadomości*.

175 Dobroczyński, Rzepa, *Historia polskiej myśli psychologicznej*.

Although the article is confined to psychiatrists from Kraków and covers the period until 1914, it is particularly noteworthy that it shows the interest in psychoanalysis in this circle against the background of the origin and development of Polish psychiatry, richly documenting it with historical sources. This work eloquently demonstrates that the turn towards psychoanalysis as a method of therapy was not an accident and a question of individual preferences of particular researchers among Kraków psychiatrists. Without knowledge of this tradition in Kraków psychiatry, we could not fully understand the position and importance of the native advocates of psychoanalysis in Polish psychiatry of the interwar period.

6 Contribution of Polish psychiatrists to the international psychoanalytical movement. Foreign publications

The fact that virtually all Polish psychoanalysts were fluent in German meant that there were numerous publications in this language. In the case of Jekels, Nunberg, Deutsch, and Sokolnicka, it was understandable, because only thanks to regular publishing in prestigious psychoanalytical and psychiatric journals could they maintain their leading positions in the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society. But Jekels, partly because he was tasked by Freud with popularizing psychoanalysis in Scandinavian countries and with other kinds of work, did not publish much after 1914. His foreign writings are almost completely confined to a collection of essays published towards the end of his life in English.[176] Of particular note was the article about Napoleon Bonaparte and interpretations of literary works, for example, of William Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. In these articles, he faithfully applied Freud's claims on laws governing history and those related to literature. At the same time, it is hard to find any references to Polish cultural tradition within them. As for Nunberg, he wrote a number of books, of which the *Allgemeine Neurosenlehre auf psychoanalytischer Grundlage* (see above), with Freud's introduction, brought him the greatest fame. It should also be noted that he was the editor of four volumes of *Protokolle der Wiener Psychoanalytischer Vereinigung*, which are now an invaluable source for studies on the history of psychoanalysis. In American exile he published several more books, partly composed of articles previously written by him in German (including *Practice and Theory of Psychoanalysis. A Collection of Essays,* 1948, and *Principles of Psychoanalysis. Their Application to Neurosis,* 1955). All these works were theoretical and constituted

176 Ludwig Jekels, *Selected Papers* (London: International Universities Press, 1952).

an important contribution to the development of the psychoanalytical method. Eugenia Sokolnicka published very little, and her early work, a pioneering effort in children's psychoanalysis (more about it in the second part of the book), is regarded as her most important text. Finally, Helena Deutsch became famous for her aforementioned work, namely *The Psychology of Women* (vol. 1, 1943; vol. 2, 1945 London), and she published a number of treatises on neurosis.

All these works are important if we consider them from a historical perspective. They were written in German or English when their authors were in exile and are strictly theoretical, which makes them part of the history of psychoanalysis as a "supranational" tendency. It is difficult to consider them as belonging to the Polish tradition of psychoanalysis, especially because references to the Polish cultural tradition or even to some external Polish themes do not appear in them at all. Therefore, while signaling their importance in the context of the history of the movement – as well as expressing the hope that one day they will be translated into Polish – I do not discuss them in this book.

But articles in leading psychoanalytical periodicals published by psychoanalysts later associated with Polish academic or clinical institutions have a completely different status. In many cases they were translations or slightly modified versions of articles published or delivered as papers in Polish, which meant that they were available to a wider audience and often became the subject of lively discussions in the medical community. In this sense, they can be regarded as part of the history of the native psychoanalytical movement.

This is the case of Karol de Beaurain's article "Symbol. Rozbiór wartości psychologicznej symbolu. Symbol w pierwotnej formie myślenia" (The symbol. Dissecting the psychological value of the symbol. The symbol in primitive forms of thinking). This paper was delivered at the Second Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists, and Psychologists in 1912, and a year later was published in *Neurologia Polska* as well as in a German version entitled "Über das Symbol und die psychischen Bedingungen für sein Entstehen beim Kinde" on the pages of *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse*.[177] De Beaurain invokes Freud's view that "the symbolic way of expressing oneself is proper to archaic thinking."[178] Then he presents his own theory, saying that he conceives the symbol as a "substitution of specific representations by different ones which are associated with them on the basis of similarity."[179] To make his view more

177 de Beaurain, "Über das Symbol."
178 de Beaurain, "Über das Symbol," p. 131.
179 de Beaurain, "Über das Symbol," p. 1.

credible, he quotes Darwin's example of the child who saw a duck in the water and called it "quack," and then used this name for all flying animals, that is birds and insects, and for all fluids, like water and wine.

The child's behavior, concludes de Beaurain, is related to the fact that it still has a limited perception of the properties of the objects it sees. Therefore, both duck and wine are "quack." This association seems incomprehensible to an adult, as does the child's statement that "soda water tastes like numb feet." And the reason that the child forms associations in this way results from the fact that capturing similarities is much easier than perceiving differences, or separate properties of a given object. For example, in the language of primitive peoples there are many names for the same animal depending on the context it is encountered in.

De Beaurain concludes his remarks with the claim, this time inspired by Herbert Silberer, that the source of creating symbols is the perceptive ineptitude of the subject, that is, his inability to clearly perceive differences between objects. Therefore, the symbols dealt with by psychoanalysis result from necessary natural laws. For the subjects who create them display an inadequately developed capability for abstract thinking, that is, capturing specific properties of a given object and differentiating them from others.

The article was criticized in the same issue of the journal by Sándor Ferenczi, who in a short text entitled "Zur Ontogenese des Symbols" said that de Beaurain presented the "ontogenesis" of the symbol in a simplified way. Ferenczi did not question the credibility of de Beaurain's interpretation of the way children create symbols. His doubts concerned whether the author accurately captured the peculiar nature of symbols dealt with by psychoanalysis. According to Ferenczi, "psychoanalytical symbols are awarded in the consciousness a logically unjustified affective position, about which it has to be analytically said that they owe their affective overestimation to their unconscious identification with another thing (representation) which this affective surplus in fact relates to."[180]

In other words, the symbol is an overt substitution for something that remains hidden. Consequently, equating one thing with another (e.g., a duck with wine in the word "quack") is not a symbol in the psychoanalytical sense. Only when "[…] as a result of cultural pressure one part of the equation is repressed and another part, hitherto less important, is endowed with an affective surplus of meaning and becomes a symbol of what has been repressed. Originally equated semantically were the penis and the tree, the penis and the church tower. Only when the

180 Sándor Ferenczi, "Zur Ontogenese des Symbols," *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse*, Vol. I, No. 5 (1913), pp. 437–438.

interest in the penis had been repressed, the tree and the church tower became excessive objects of interest; they became symbols of the penis."[181] In other words, for Ferenczi the concept of the symbol in psychoanalysis had a much more complex structure than the one suggested by de Beaurain. At the same time, however, the simplified approach of the Polish analyst allowed Ferenczi to clearly demonstrate the difference between the approach to the symbol in psychoanalysis and in other theories popular at the time. In any case, the very fact that de Beaurain published his work in one of the first issues of the journal that today enjoys an iconic status – and that it triggered a discussion in the community (Freud himself noted this text, although not without a hint of sarcasm) – was a great success for the young doctor. Unfortunately, the list of his major foreign publications ends with this text.

Incidentally, we may ask how much of these reflections on the creation of symbols by the child was generated by "Staś," then a youngster brought by his father in Zakopane for a psychoanalytical session to de Beaurain?[182] For may we not suggest that something of the logic of "loose" infantile association can be found later in Witkacy's theory of Pure Form? But more about that later.

Of incomparably greater importance were foreign publications by Jan Nelken, then a young adept of psychoanalysis, who in the interwar period would become a military doctor and in 1940 would be murdered by the Soviets in Katyń. Nelken was perhaps the most original, as well as a very promising, representative of the first generation of Polish psychoanalysts. Employed in Piltz's clinic beginning in 1908, a year later he started working as an assistant in Burghölzli. He quickly gained the recognition of Bleuler and especially of Jung, taking part in the latter's research on the relations between mythology and fantasy in schizophrenia. This work resulted in three articles by Nelken, one of them published in Polish (see below).

The first, "Über schizophrene Wortzerlegungen," opened one of the first issues of *Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse*,[183] which was a significant mark of recognition for the young author from Kraków/Zürich. The short text was a brilliant

181 Ferenczi, "Zur Ontogenese des Symbols," p. 438.

182 "Staś" is Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz, a prominent writer of the interwar period, included today, along with Bruno Schulz and Witold Gombrowicz, in the trinity of its greatest classics. In the West, especially in the United States and France, his dramas were very popular in the 1970s. He was perceived as a playwright in many respects akin to Artaud.

183 Jan Nelken, "Über schizophrene Wortzerlegungen," *Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse*, Vol. II, No. 1 (1912), pp. 2–5.

attempt at analyzing peculiar word games practiced by schizophrenic patients. The article was based on the same case to which Nelken had referred in an article from the previous year entitled "Psychologische Untersuchungen an dementia-praecox Kranken" and which was presented in Polish at the Second Congress in Kraków.[184]

Nelken's main claim was that the absurd language created by schizophrenics was not just a manifestation of "language madness" (*Sprachverwirrtheit*), as Kraepelin maintained, or "verbal lettuce" (Forel). They should be seen instead as containing some sense, he said, you just need to unravel the peculiar "logic" of linguistic associations which guides the schizophrenic. Then you will be able to discover the main "problem" that has become the source of the disorder. Nelken also claims that the pattern followed by this "logic" of associations is similar to that which shapes the symbolism of dreams, jokes, and verbal slips, as presented by Freud in his works and demonstrated by Jung in his analysis of paranoid dementia. He also invokes the works of Hanns Sachs and Alphonse Maeder.

Further in the article, Nelken attempts to unravel the meaning of the peculiar verbal "games" of the schizophrenic, which are based on breaking down particular words into their constituent parts and endowing them with completely new meanings. He claims that this procedure is in its own way coherent and consistently reveals the peculiar structure of the patient's world and the "problem" with which he struggles. This problem is of an Oedipal nature and is related to incestuous fantasies which have dominated the patient's world of representations. To overcome these fantasies, the patient creates his own "theory of sperm," which is an "apology of renouncing ejaculation in order to suppress incestuous feelings directed towards his mother and sister."[185] Further fantasies feature God, his father as a goat with a bull's head, the Mother of God, the Pope, the devil, and other figures or things forming the most peculiar configurations. Significantly, the patient himself simultaneously acts in them in diametrically opposed roles, which illustrates the split in his mind.

> He is God and Satan, he serves Virgin Mary and is taken in bondage by the devil. Even single words are interpreted by him in an ambivalent way, for example
> (II) Mor = Rom (a string of associations: Queen of Heavens, Virgin Mary, Catholicism, the Pope)

---

184 Nelken, "Badania psychoanalityczne chorób nerwowych," pp. 140–147. In its German version the article was entitled "Psychologische Untersuchungen an dementia-praecox Kranken" and was published in the *Journal für Psychologie und Neurologie*, No. 17 (1911), pp. 174–185.

185 Nelken, *Über schizophrene*, p. 2.

2. Mohr = devil (a string of associations: Queen of Heavens, Mother of God, the Pope, father)
(II) T = arrow = Amor = love and death
(IV) (Elisa)beth = bete (slut) or beten (the holy, to pray) (an ambivalent assessment of his mother)[186]

This ambivalence in the treatment of individual words reflects a deep split in the mind of the patient, who is unable to cope with his incestuous strivings. This prompts him to create a kind of schizophrenic myth, where this cleavage is revealed on the symbolic plane through endowing the same words and word fragments (and even letters) with oppositional meanings. Lacan would say that this case very clearly testifies to the lack of the ordering of symbolic functions of the name of the father in the patient's mental life. Therefore, the patient is unable to cope with his incestuous desires towards his mother and sister, and his desperate attempt to build a peculiar phantasmagorical mythology around this problem also fails. The world of schizophrenic myth he creates is as profoundly split as the ego of its creator. Seen from this perspective, Nelken's linguistic analysis seemed truly pioneering in relation to what Lacan was to propose 40 years later, equipped with all the instruments and concepts of the structuralist tradition.

The second article by Nelken was entitled "Analytische Beobachtungen über Phantasien eines Schizophrenen" and appeared in the *Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschung*.[187] He presented an extensive case study, which he had described in the first article. It turned out that his patient went through several stages of the disorder, consisting of alternating paranoid stages and catatonic attacks. The exuberant schizophrenic fantasies recounted by the patient were full of divine figures, mythical monsters, half human, half animal, there were elements of sun worship closely resembling the Mithra cult, and so on. Based on clinical records, Nelken reproduced in great detail the peculiar world of schizophrenic hallucinations, attempting to uncover the mechanism which produced this world and diagnose the function it played in the patient's life. He says: "If the paranoid stage is still an unsuccessful attempt at sublimation, the catatonic attack means the complete replacement of reality by the unconscious. In this sense, the catatonic attack of the patient leads to

186 Nelken, *Über schizophrene*, p. 3.

187 Jan Nelken, "Analytische Beobachtungen über Phantasien eines Schizophrenen," *Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschung*, Vol. IV (1912), pp. 504–562.

far-reaching dissociation. […] All the psychosis, and in particular the catatonic stage, appears as an attempt to cure all the mental conflict. Escaping into the disease, the patient begins to abreact."[188] So the patient's psychosis functions as a kind of compensation for desires which he could not satisfy in real life. Incestuous desires, finding their outlet in diverse schizophrenic fantasies regarding the patient's relations with the figures of father, mother, or sister, come to the fore. In the patient's fantasies, they are transformed into divine (or devilish) figures, with terrifying scenes of rape, castration, murder, and so on, sometimes including the patient himself. It is slightly reminiscent of the initial scenes of Greek mythology about the creation of gods and people, which Freud invoked in his interpretation of the Oedipus myth. But towards the end of his article, Nelken refers primarily to Jung's view that "psychopathological symbolism is nothing other than the symbolism of prehistory and antiquity. According to Jung, the soul consists in this sense of historical layers, and the oldest layers correspond to the unconscious."[189]

The most amazing thing here was that the schizophrenic mythology which the patient created for himself, his family, and the world was reminiscent in its symbolism and the events it narrated to mythical legends known from the histories of all cultures, although the patient had never heard of them (e.g., the Mithra cult). There is an inescapable analogy with another "great" schizophrenic immortalized by Freud – the famous case of President Daniel Paul Schreber. But comparing these two cases is a subject for a separate article.

In any case, Nelken's text, in which he focused on the precise description of a case history and the recreation of the fantasy world of a schizophrenic, attempting to interpret this case in accordance with the assumptions of Jungian psychoanalysis, is today of more than just historical significance. It is one of the first texts of this type which appeared in psychoanalytical literature and immediately attracted the attention of the whole community, although critical opinions appeared too.

Most importantly, Jung valued the works of his "student" – as he called him – which he eloquently demonstrated, for example, in his letters to Freud and to Sabina Spielrein.[190] Moreover, when Viktor Tausk criticized Nelken's article about

188 Nelken, "Analytische Beobachtungen über Phantasien eines Schizophrenen," p. 559.

189 Nelken, "Analytische Beobachtungen über Phantasien eines Schizophrenen," p. 561.

190 See "The Letters of C. G. Jung to Sabina Spielrein," in: *Sabina Spielrein, Forgotten Pionieer of Psychoanalysis,* C. Covington, B. Wharton, eds., (New York, 2003), pp. 33–60; and *Sigmund Freud, Carl G. Jung, Briefwechsel*, William McGuire, Wolfgang Sauerlander, eds., (Frankfurt am Main: T. Fischer Verlag, 1984).

schizophrenic fantasies in *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse*, Jung argued with this criticism and defended the article's claims.[191]

During his stay in Zürich, the young assistant from Kraków got involved in creating the *Internationale Psychoanalytische Vereinigung* (today it is primarily known under its English name, the International Psychoanalytical Association) and was the first Pole to become a member. He also took an active part in various psychoanalytical congresses organized in Switzerland in Germany. Particularly innovative – and attracting the attention of the whole of the psychoanalytical community – were his attempts at analyzing the language of schizophrenics, which we spoke about earlier, and at demonstrating the extraordinary analogies between the world of the representations and archaic cosmogonies. These efforts were noted by Freud himself. One proof is Freud's comment in the book *On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement*, where he mentions Nelken's paper at one of the congresses and writes about him flatteringly, without naming him: "Further investigation into dream-symbolism led to the heart of the problems of mythology, folklore and the abstractions of religion. A deep impression was made on all hearers at one of the psycho-analytical Congresses when a follower of Jung's demonstrated the correspondence between schizophrenic phantasies and the cosmogonies of primitive times and races."[192]

It is also notable that Freud's famous text on Schreber's case, written slightly earlier in 1910–1911,[193] shows many analogies concerning the structure of a schizophrenic patient's world to Nelken's text published a year later.

It seems that the subsequent professional career of Nelken, who after World War I became a military doctor and settled in Warsaw, allowed him to avoid the entanglement in the later conflict between Freud and Jung. In addition, this change, to some extent enforced by historical circumstances (the outbreak of the war and Nelken's work in the garrison hospital in Lviv, and after the war in Warsaw), shifted his research interests in the direction of forensic psychiatry

191 Carl G. Jung, "Eine Bemerkung zur Tauskschen Kritik der Nelkenschen Arbeit," *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse*, No. 3 (1913), pp. 285–288.

192 Sigmund Freud, "Zur Geschichte der psychoanalytischen Bewegung," in: *Gesammelte Werke,* Vol. X, (Frankfurt am Main: T. Fischer Verlag, 1999), p. 76. English translation: S. Freud, "On the History of Psycho-Analytic Movement," in: *The Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud*, 24 volumes, James Strachey et al., eds., trans. Joan Riviere (London: The Hogarth Press, 1953–1974) Vol. XIV, pp. 7–66.

193 See Sigmund Freud, "Psycho-Analytic Notes on an Autobiographical Account of a Case of Paranoia (Dementia Paranoides)", in: *Standard Edition*, Jame Strachey et al., eds. (London: The Hogarth Press, 1958), Vol. XII, pp. 3–82.

and analyzing mental disorders of civilians triggered by the war. And the change probably was also conditioned by purely material considerations, for it would be difficult for Nelken to make a living from private psychoanalytical practice.[194] But it should be emphasized that his interest in psychoanalysis was still evident in his works published during the interwar period, and he often invoked Freud and Jung (more about this in the second part of the book). But he was not a prodigious writer then. His work in the military and other duties probably consumed too much of his time. If Nelken had managed to continue his professional career in Burghölzli and in Kraków, he would certainly have become one of the leading figures of the psychoanalytical movement. It does not mean that his texts written between 1919 and 1939 do not deserve attention. There are several real gems among them.

Ludwika Karpińska (1872–1937), an outstanding Polish psychologist, who in the interwar period continued her academic and professional career in Łódź, also has many foreign publications to her credit. She started in 1910 by publishing her doctoral thesis in experimental psychology, which she defended at the Zürich University and entitled *Experimentelle Beiträge zur Analyse der Tiefenwahrnehmung* (Leipzig 1910). The work was largely the result of her cooperation with Jung on association processes, and its supervisor was Friedrich Schumann, professor of philosophy in Zürich. Karpińska presented her own views on associations between representations (both before and after she lectured on that subject in Warsaw and Kraków).[195]

Karpińska was one of the first women who participated in the meetings of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society, but she did not join it. What distinguished her from other members was that, besides a medical education (namely psychological), she also had philosophical schooling acquired in Berlin. She was a well-known figure in society, and in one of his letters to Ferenczi, Freud jokingly called her the "Polish lady philosopher."[196]

---

194 It does not mean that he did not practice it at all. There is, for example, a record of his psychoanalytical sessions with the Polish interwar poet Jan Lechoń. See: Bartłomiej Dobroczyński, "Pod słońcem Tanatosa," in: *Przywracanie pamięci. Polscy psychiatrzy XX wieku orientacji psychoanalitycznej,* Paweł Dybel, ed. (Kraków: Universitas 2017), pp. 297–380.

195 Slightly later she published excerpts of her doctoral thesis in Polish: see Ludwika Karpińska, "Badania doświadczalne nad kojarzeniem wyobrażeń," *Przegląd Lekarski*, No. 43–47 (1912), pp. 603–604, 617–619, 635–637, 647–649, 677–679.

196 Ernst Falzeder, Eva Brabant et al., eds., *Sigmund Freud – Sándor Ferenczi. Briefwechsel* (Wien: 1993), Vol. 1–2, 1912–1914.

In subsequent years, Karpińska published two articles in the *Internationale Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Psychoanalyse*. The first was entitled "Ein Beitrag zur Analyse >>sinnloser<< Worte im Traume" and concerned Freud's book on dreams. She presented her own interpretations of dreams using the Freudian method. Her intent was to demonstrate "that important questions of a personal nature hide behind seemingly meaningless words appearing in the dream, that our ways of reacting in life emerge from profound layers and that they to a huge extent correspond to forms shaped in childhood."[197] The article drew the attention of Freud himself, who referred to one example of a dream quoted by Karpińska in his *Interpretation Of Dreams*.[198]

In 1913 she also published the short article "Beiträge zur Psychopathologie des Alltagslebens" in *Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse*. Karpińska described examples of her own slips (wrongly recorded names, forgetting names, destructive acts, and symbolic acts), subjecting them to her own psychoanalytical interpretation in the Freudian spirit. These examples were meant to confirm the theory presented by Freud in *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* concerning the conditioning of these acts by content repressed into the unconscious.[199]

The third treatise published by Karpińska, perhaps the most significant, was entitled "Über die psychologischen Grundlagen des Freudianismus"[200] and was a German version of the paper *Psychologiczne podstawy freudyzmu* [Psychological foundations of Freudianism], which she had delivered at the Second Congress in Kraków and then published in *Przegląd Filozoficzny* in 1913.[201] The significance of this text was that in her comparison of Freud's psychoanalytical theory to the psychology of Johann Friedrich Herbart, Karpińska was the first person to point out the psychological sources and foundations of the former.[202]

---

197 Luise von Karpinska, "Ein Beitrag zur Analyse >>sinnloser<< Worte im Traume," *Internationale Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Psychoanalyse*, No. 3 (1913), p. 170.

198 Sigmund Freud, "The Interpretation of Dreams," in: *Standard Edition* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1953), Vol. IV/V, p. 309. (Freud quotes here the example of the senseless verbal formation given by Karpińska in her article, namely *Svingum elvi*).

199 Luise von Karpinska, "Beiträge zur Psychopathologie des Alltagslebens," *Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse*, No. 6 (1913), pp. 309–312.

200 Luise von Karpinska, "Über die psychologischen Grundlagen des Freudianismus," *Internationale Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Psychoanalyse*, No. 4 (1914), pp. 305–326.

201 Luise von Karpinska, "Psychologiczne podstawy freudyzmu," *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, No. 4 (1913), pp. 508–526.

202 In his monograph on Freud's work, Ernest Jones assessed Karpińska's article in a similar way; see *Sigmund Freud: Life and Work*, Vol. I, *The Young Freud 1856–1900* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1972), p. 124.

Karpińska starts her article with a claim that there is an essential affinity between psychoanalysis and experimental psychology, for both make use of objective material, such as facial expressions and the behavior of the persons studied, and draw conclusions about his mental processes from that. In both cases, an important role is also played by subjective material, meaning self-reports by the subject, who "[…] is asked to focus his attention, in the sense of being ready to accept what is revealed in his consciousness, and then describe to us the state of his consciousness induced by a given stimulus."[203]

Further into the article, Karpińska states that there is a "profound analogy" between Herbart's and Freud's theories because "[…] they both emphasize the necessity of recognizing unconscious mental states as mental causal links for understanding the phenomena of consciousness and relations between them. States of consciousness are for both of them a kind of sum result of mental forces struggling under the threshold of consciousness, ensconcing themselves or mutually fuelling each other."[204]

The main difference between Freud and Herbart is that for the latter the fundamental mental units are representations, while "affective mental elements" play that role for the former. Consequently, if "*Herbart* created the dynamics of representations, *Freud* creates the dynamics of affects."[205]

Starting from this assumption, Karpińska attempts to describe subsequent parts of Freud's theory – his theories of the mental apparatus, of hysteria, of art, of dreams, and of culture. She says towards the end that for Freud determinism in fact means a teleological explanation of mental phenomena, that is the result is for him the achieved goal and the condition is the motive. The article ends with the following conclusion: "Freud's psychology is of little importance for explaining purely intellectual acts […] Psychoanalysis turned out to be the best method to study living expressions of emotions."[206]

In fact, none of Karpińska's claims have withstood the test of time. The relationship between psychoanalysis and experimental psychology is illusory and based on a very superficial interpretation of Freud's approach (e.g., Karpińska completely ignores the role of linguistic interpretations of the patient's statements during psychoanalytical therapy). It is also difficult to agree today with her claim that the relationship between consciousness and the unconscious in Freud's

203 Karpińska, "Psychologiczne podstawy freudyzmu," p. 509.
204 Karpińska, "Psychologiczne podstawy freudyzmu," p. 511.
205 Karpińska, "Psychologiczne podstawy freudyzmu," p. 512.
206 Karpińska, "Psychologiczne podstawy freudyzmu," p. 526

theory is similar to that promoted by Herbart; Herbartian functionalism as interpreted by Karpińska's was alien to Freud. As for treating Freud's psychoanalysis as a theory of affects and maintaining that it was of little importance in explaining intellectual processes, this testifies to complete incomprehension on her part.

But it has to be said that Karpińska was not alone in this approach. Many researchers looked at Freud's work in a similar way, starting from a very narrow understanding of language and of the "mental." In these readings, dreams, slips, and symptoms appeared as a kind of game of affects rather than linguistic or quasi-linguistic phenomena in various relations with the patient's cogito.

Ultimately, perhaps the most interesting idea contained in Karpińska's article appears in its final section: "And if now, returning to the symbolic language of Freud, we imagined our soul torn in its depth into two parts, as Freud presents it – into a bright and dark one, recognized and condemned, good and evil – into Ormuzd and Aryman, we could capture the content of this psychology through the title of one of Żeromski's most beautiful novellas: 'Aryman Gets His Revenge.' "[207] Well, yes, it is the revenge of the unconscious, the dark realm of the repressed, stirred in its unfathomed depth during analysis by the words of the analyst. *Acheronta movebo.* But we should add that this sentence appears only in the Polish text; it would be vain to look for it in the German version. But who in Austria and Germany had heard of Stefan Żeromski then…[208]

7 Psychoanalysis and the emancipation of women

When you follow the beginnings of the psychoanalytical movement, it is striking that although in the first years of the existence of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society (founded in 1908) it consisted exclusively of men, women gradually started to play an important role. The percentage of female psychoanalysts, authors of major theoretical works and patients in the 1920s, significantly exceeded their number in other medical specialties, not to mention other professions. Reconstructing the role of women in the psychoanalytical movement, Lena Magnone writes: "Although psychoanalysis only offered them the role of hysterics, that is as an object of research, it very soon became also a real and accessible career path. […] No other profession was as feminized as psychoanalysis in its beginnings, although […] as late as 1907 the participation of women

207 Karpińska, "Psychologiczne podstawy freudyzmu," p. 526.

208 Stefan Żeromski (1864–1925) was a leading writer of Polish Modernism, the Polish intelligentsia of this era was raised on his books on historical and cultural-social topics.

in the Wednesday meetings […] was not taken for granted by everyone […]."[209] This phenomenon is confirmed today by numerous historical and theoretical works on this subject. But we should also add that it partly resulted from the fact that from the very beginning women – and generally all patients – were by no means treated as "objects of research." This was excluded by the very dialogical nature of psychoanalytical therapy, where a central role was played by conversation, engaging the whole personality of the patient. Coming to the fore during this process were both his (or her) repressed recollections of scenes from childhood and traumas in their relations with others, and his (or her) views shaped by the culture and social environment in which he (or she) had been raised. Consequently, already during the first analytic sessions conducted by Freud – which is eloquently shown by Lisa Appignanesi and John Forrester in their book *Freud's Women* – the patient was not an "object of research," but a talking agent whose statements and behaviors were interpreted by the analyst from the perspective of the sense contained within them or the sense towards which they pointed in a veiled way.[210] One condition of successful therapy was the change of the patient's attitude towards his/her sexuality and aggression, recognizing the actual shape of his/her usually repressed desires and hence eliminating their negative influence on his/her personality and relations with others. This implied a radical change of the attitude of the patient towards himself/herself, his/her own past, and other people. The patient was expected to rework, and thus liberate himself/herself from the traumas of his/her past which had paralyzed him/her internally and made him/her dependent on others. Only then could he/she to some extent become a "free" agent, at the same time capable of criticizing his/her own behavior towards others. Ultimately, what happened during therapy was indirectly or directly related to the patient's self-understanding, which by its very nature could not be objectified, but was constantly interacting with the analyst's interpretations.

Moreover, precisely because the patient engaged his/her entire mental life in therapy, reworking everything that he/she spoke about to the psychoanalyst, it automatically placed him/her in the position of an agent relative to the analyst, rather than someone treated as an object of research or experiment, which would

209 Lena Magnone, "Emancypantki, socjalistki, psychoanalityczki. Kobiety w ruchu freudowskim na początku XX wieku," in: *Kobiety i historia. Od niewidzialności do sprawczości*, K. Bałżewska, D. Korczyńska-Partyka, A. Wódkowska, eds., (Gdańsk: Uniwersytet Gdański, 2015), p. 44.

210 See Lisa Appignanesi, John Forrester, *Freud's Women* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1992).

reduce the therapy to diagnosing the type of disorder from which the patient suffered. On the basis of this diagnosis, supported by a laboratory analysis of the composition of his physiological fluids and an interview concerning his bodily and mental ailments, the patient would be given the right medicines. In contrast to this objectifying approach psychoanalytical therapy was an event where the patient, consciously or unconsciously resisting the interpretations or diagnoses of the analyst, usually concerning his attitude towards himself/herself and his/her relations with others, indirectly influenced the course of therapy. His/her resistance was not just an obstacle, but it forced the analyst to ask the question about its actual sources, which were usually located in the social space of his/her relations with others. And this opened up the prospect of achieving progress in therapy. This peculiar analyst-patient relation in psychoanalytical therapy was, and still is, its essential distinguishing feature. Consequently, this type of therapy has a circular structure, with both participants of the session influencing each other through their statements and behaviors.

At the same time, the analysis of the patient influenced psychoanalysis as a theory, often forcing the analyst to modify and transform it in accordance with his experiences during therapy. This was how Freud's psychoanalysis was born, as it was difficult to separate what was his own idea and what he owed to the resistance and ingenuity of his patients.

This was evidenced by the later history of psychoanalysis. A large percentage of psychoanalysts started their professional careers as patients, with women dominating among them, especially in the early years. Freud realized relatively soon to what extent analysis could serve as a good introduction for the patient to his future as an analyst. Of course, this was only if he had the gift of analytical thinking and if he wanted to become an analyst. Partly because of this, Freud said in *The Question of Lay Analysis* that an analyst did not necessarily have to be a person with a medical education.[211] The important condition was having gone through therapy with an experienced analyst. Gender was not important, Freud said. This was how Sabina Spielrein and Lou Salome, and among Polish representatives of the movement Helena Deutsch, Eugenia Sokolnicka, Mira Gincburg, and Beata (Tola) Rank became psychoanalysts.

The openness of psychoanalysis concerning gender was accompanied by the fact that as a young scientific discipline it had not yet produced permanent and rigid hierarchical structures, as in the majority of medical disciplines, not to

211 Sigmund Freud, "The Question of Lay Analysis," in: *SE*, Vol. XX, pp. 177–258.

mention philosophy, mathematics, physics, or the humanities. For it belonged to the so-called free professions, as it was a private activity.

The fact that psychoanalysis had developed within the medical sciences was conducive to a large number of female graduates of the medical sciences (and these studies were particularly sought by women) later becoming psychoanalysts. One reason was that it was not easy for them to find jobs as doctors. In fact, completing these studies was for them an additional safeguard in case they did not succeed in psychoanalytical practice. Should this happen, they could always try to find a job in a hospital or a clinic. Analysts without a medical diploma were in a much worse situation. Eugenia Sokolnicka realized this in a particularly painful way when she was in exile in France, where the lack of a medical diploma prevented her from getting a job in a hospital.

Of some significance was also the fact that the years of the emergence of the psychoanalytical movement coincided with a period when the doors of universities, hospitals, and clinics were opened to women in successive European countries. Universities and clinics in Switzerland were in the vanguard of this process, and consequently training with Bleuler and Jung was undertaken by dozens of women, including a particularly large number of Jewesses from the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, at least a dozen of them born in the Polish lands. Studying and getting a profession was for them the only chance of getting away from their provincial surroundings and gaining independence. Helena Deutsch pointed this out in her memoirs, writing that her escape from home in a way forced her father to finance her studies. She wrote that thanks to her escape she became a pioneer of modernity in the eyes of other girls in her native Przemyśl: "There were other girls who felt the same impulse that I had, yet didn't know how to carry it out, and my leaving home became a signal and an encouragement. Following my 'demoralizing' example, six brave girls from good families brought themselves to the point of leaving their comfortable homes in the course of the next year."[212]

However, if we look from a social and cultural perspective, women who decided to become analysts largely came from very similar milieus as men (the Jewish middle class with liberal views and usually leftist leanings, partly or completely assimilated with their cultural and social surroundings), but their existential and professional paths certainly seem much more dramatic, if only because of the law which was in force in Germany and Austria that stated if the husband was a working man, the woman should resign from her job. Generally

212 Deutsch, *Confrontations with Myself*, p. 28.

speaking, the professional situation of women in European societies of the time was much more difficult, subject to various discriminatory regulations, which often directly influenced the fate of female analysts. All this despite the fact that in the psychoanalytical movement itself there was full equality in this matter, and on top of that, it was a genuine breeding ground for left-wing female revolutionaries and feminists.

Freud's theory, some of his dubious claims about female sexuality (the image of the woman as a castrated man with the resultant contention that penis envy formed the foundations of her mental structure) notwithstanding, closely related her sexuality to the different anatomic structure of the female body. Consequently, her sexuality turned out to be fundamentally different from the male one. If we add the fact that Freud criticized various forms of cultural repression of sexuality, emphasizing that it concerned mostly women, we will see that all elements of his theory promoted the process of female sexual emancipation. As Magnone writes, "the first Freudians were without exception *new women* [in English in the original], liberated women enjoying a much greater personal independence and sexual freedom than most contemporary representatives of the middle class."[213] However, if we look at their biographies, their personal life was often very complicated, full of romantic disappointments, break-ups, divorces, bouts of depression, suicides, and so on. A good illustration of this is the biography of Sokolnicka, who after an uncompleted analysis with Jung and Freud was evidently unable to cope with her personal relations, as her assertive behavior created constant conflict.

The requirement introduced in the 1920s that each candidate had to go through precisely defined professional training in which the decisive role was played by an experienced training analyst, and the fact that the psychoanalytical community in Vienna and in other countries was not very numerous, resulted in a situation where family ties often had a great influence on one's professional career. Consequently, this community gradually became self-enclosed, looking at themselves as new types of intellectuals and academic elite, with access for "outsiders" becoming increasingly difficult. In addition, the discourse developed in this community, full of idiosyncratic terms and concepts, made issues discussed there largely incomprehensible to laypeople. And not just for the wider petty-bourgeois public, which usually associated Freud's theory with "shocking" claims about human sexuality, but also for the academic psychiatric and psychotherapeutic community. On the other hand, the gradual institutionalization

213 Magnone, "Emancypantki," p. 47.

of the movement, especially once it embraced most European countries and invaded other continents, seemed inevitable. The special role of the "family" factor resulting from the esoteric character of the movement consisted not only in the fact that to a much larger degree than other professions the movement was formed by dozens of "psychoanalytical" couples, for example, Helena Rosenbach and Felix Deutsch or Beata Minzer and Otton Rank. Psychoanalytical work was also often continued by the younger generations of daughters, sisters, cousins, and so on; their later career within the movement often made possible by the knowledge transmitted by their father or mother. But usually it was fathers who played the role of "supervisors" for their spouses, daughters, or relatives. Their position within the movement was dominant in the first decades of its existence. An obvious and classic example is the later career of Anna Freud. It was not an exception; it rather confirmed the rule.

8 Polish Jewesses in the international psychoanalytical movement

If we take a closer look at the biographies of female psychoanalysts born during the partitions in the "Polish lands," it will turn out that practically all of them – with one exception (more about that below) – chose emigration and joined psychoanalytical communities in other countries. Neither Deutsch nor Sokolnicka, although they emphasized their Polish identity, wrote a single psychoanalytical text in Polish. The former had only sporadic contact with her home country after leaving for Vienna, and her contribution to the movement in Poland after it regained independence was practically nil. As for the latter, her efforts aimed at founding a Polish psychoanalytical society between 1917 and 1919 was a significant, but unfortunately unsuccessful, episode. Sokolnicka played a much greater role in promoting psychoanalysis in France and establishing a psychoanalytical society there. If we look at her work from this perspective, it would be more legitimate to call her a French rather than Polish psychoanalyst.

Beata (Tola) Rank (Minzer) went down in the history of Polish psychoanalysis for her translation of Freud's *The Interpretation of Dreams*,[214] was later active as a psychoanalyst in Vienna, and then emigrated to the United States. It is worth emphasizing that although she had gained extensive knowledge about the psychoanalytical theory much earlier (partly at the side of her husband and through participation in the VPS meetings), she decided to become a psychoanalyst only

214 Sigmund Freud, *O marzeniu sennym*, trans. Beata Rank (Leipzig–Vienna–Zurich: 1923).

after she underwent analysis with another Polish Jewess – Mira Gincburg (later Oberholzer) – during her stay in Switzerland. The sessions were held in Polish.

Much more impressive in this respect is the output of the female psychoanalyst who was much less famous internationally, namely Franciszka Baumgarten, a Polish Jewess born in Łódź as the daughter of a textile manufacturer. As a young girl, she was fascinated with socialist ideas and became involved politically. In 1905, she studied literature, philosophy, and psychology at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, continued her studies in Paris, and in 1911 she defended her doctoral thesis on *Die Erkenntnislehre von Maine de Biran. Eine historische Studie* in Zürich.[215] Still later, during her stay in Germany, she became interested in experimental psychology and in 1911 she became a pupil of Hugon Münsterberg, the founder of psychotechnics.

Between 1911 and 1914, Baumgarten gave lectures on psychotechnics in Łódź. In 1912, she published an extensive article on Freud's *The Interpretation of Dreams* in *Neurologia Polska* (see above). This publication was particularly significant, because at that time it was one of the most important commentaries on this work and also an attempt at defining her own critical position towards it. And it was impressively long (about fifty pages).

In 1914, after the outbreak of the war, Baumgarten returned to Berlin and until 1924 was active in the field of applied psychology. Later she moved to Switzerland, where she married Moritz Tramer and carried out scientific research until the end of her life. She died in 1970. It should be emphasized that during her stay in Germany and Switzerland, Baumgarten remained in regular contact with her home country, in the 1920s and 1930s publishing articles in *Kwartalnik psychologiczny*. She also published three books in Polish, translations of works originally written in German.[216] After the war she wrote a book about Janusz Korczak in German, entitled *Janusz Korczak – der polnische Pestalozzi.*[217]

Although her numerous articles and books written in Polish and published in Poland distinguished Baumgarten's work from the achievements of other female psychoanalysts with Polish roots, except for her early article on Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* it would be hard to define her writings as psychoanalysis

215 Franziska Baumgarten, *Die Erkenntnislehre von Maine de Biran. Eine historische Studie* (Zürich–Krakau: Buchdruckerei von A.Kozianski, 1911).

216 See Franciszka Baumgarten, *Kłamstwo dzieci i młodzieży* (Warsaw: Nasza Księgarnia, 1927); *Badania uzdolnienia zawodowego* (Lwów-Warszawa: Książnica Atlas, 1930); "O charakterze i jego kształceniu," *Kwartalnik Psychologiczny*, No. 3 (1937).

217 Franziska Baumgarten-Tramer, *Janusz Korczak – der polnische Pestalozzi* (Düsseldorf: Rochus Verlag, 1965).

in the strict sense of the word. Admittedly, some elements of thinking, acting, and interpreting proper to psychoanalysis would appear in her later works. However, in her professional and academic work she was much more strongly connected with Switzerland and Germany than with Poland.

Strong connections with the Polish psychoanalytical tradition can be also observed in the case of the Polish-born (in Płock) Salomea Kempner, who after completing her medical studies in Switzerland and a short stay in Vienna, in 1923 joined the German psychoanalytical community in Berlin. Only in 1935, when as a "foreign Jewess" she was ousted from the Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft (German Psychoanalytical Society) and prohibited from practicing psychoanalysis, she moved – after failed attempts to emigrate to Switzerland – to Warsaw. But she kept shuttling between Warsaw and Berlin, where until 1938 she conducted secret training analyses in Wilhelmsdorf. In 1939, after the German army entered Warsaw, she was resettled to the ghetto, where she died in January 1943 of pneumonia. There are suggestions that between 1939 and 1943 she conducted therapeutic work in the ghetto, but they have yet to be confirmed.

Salomea Kempner went down in the history of Polish psychoanalysis primarily thanks to her translation – with Witold Zaniewicki – of Freud's masterwork *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, which she translated as "An introduction to psychoanalysis." This book, edited by Gustaw Bychowski, was used by several generations of Polish students, and until late 20th century it was the best-known of Freud's works in Poland and ran into several editions.

The Kraków-born Bornstein sisters, Stefania and Berta, who as little girls moved with their parents to Berlin, were also connected with the community of German psychoanalysts. After acquiring psychoanalytical training, they trained in special needs education and infantile psychoanalysis. Later, after being excluded from the German Society, they joined the VPS. In subsequent years, Stefania went to Prague and organized a psychoanalytical group there, while Berta settled in Vienna in 1929, where she worked with Anna Freud, and later she emigrated to the United States. Considering her publications and work, in this case the connection with Polish psychoanalysis was purely symbolic.

The same applies to Salomea Isakower (née Rettich), who graduated in medical studies in Kraków and then moved to Vienna, where she worked in psychiatric clinics. Later she emigrated with her husband to Great Britain and then to the United States.

Another female psychoanalyst from the "Polish lands" later connected with the German psychoanalytical community is Michalina Fabian Roth (née Endelman). She was born into a Jewish family in Warsaw in 1900. After a failed relationship with Polish painter Marcel Słodki, she married the dentist Ewald

Fabian and settled in Berlin, where she studied psychiatry. In 1935 she emigrated with her husband to Prague, where she received psychoanalytical training with Otto Fenichel. When the Germans entered Prague, she fled with her husband to France, and from there to the United States.

We should also mention Sophie Morgenstern, who was connected with French psychoanalysis; this Polish Jewess from Grodno had been analyzed by Sokolnicka and specialized in infantile psychoanalysis. Although her analysis presumably was conducted in Polish (and Morgenstern herself probably analyzed Polish exiles and their children in Polish), it would be difficult to indicate any significant Polish elements in her psychoanalytical work. She was active primarily in Paris and published her texts in French.

We should also mention the numerous group of Polish Jewesses who acquired their psychoanalytical training mainly in Switzerland. There were about a dozen of them altogether. Most of them were born in the Congress Kingdom (or in the Jewish communities functioning among Poles in Russia, Lithuania, and Belarus), and as young girls they usually went to Swiss universities, practiced in local hospitals and clinics, and were professionally active in this country.

One such Polish Jewess was the aforementioned Mira Oberholzer (Gincburg), born in Łódź, where she attended a secondary school for girls. In 1901, at the age of seventeen, she went to Switzerland to study medicine. In 1905, she came back, and due to her left-wing leanings became engaged in politics in Silesia. She was fascinated with the ideas of socialist revolution and was active in the Polish national liberation movement. After the failure of the 1905 revolution she returned to Zürich, where she continued her medical studies and took part in meetings of the Freudian society run by Eugen Bleuler and Carl Gustav Jung, listening to their lectures. In 1911, encouraged by Max Eitingon, she went to Berlin and became the first woman to be admitted to the Berliner Psychoanalytische Vereiningung. Later, however, she associated her professional and academic career with the Swiss psychoanalytical community, from which her husband came, and in 1938 they emigrated together to the United States, where they opened a private practice.

Mira Oberholzer-Gincburg throughout her life maintained a very strong emotional attachment to Poland, repeatedly visiting her home country in the interwar period. It is possible that she published some works in Polish, but confirming that today would require a laborious sifting through the archives.

We often know little or nothing about the relationships of other female analysts with Poland, except that they were born on Polish soil. Their total number in all countries of Western Europe was as high as thirty. But this is still a very preliminary estimate. Getting reliable information about them would require

separate studies, finding various types of documents and still-living members of their families or people who knew them. For obvious reasons, this is a difficult task today.

9 Doctor-sergeant Karpińska – a paramedic in the Legions

From the whole first generation of Polish female psychoanalysts, only Ludwika Karpińska, always signed as Luise von Karpinska in foreign publications, would return to her home country for good. Interestingly, unlike Sokolnicka and Deutsch, she did not become a member of the VPS, although she took part in its meetings and published a number of papers in its journal, which was edited by Freud. Between 1909 and 1912 she wrote several enthusiastic texts about psychoanalysis in Polish, and was one of the leading promoters of the movement in Galicia.

Karpińska studied psychology at the philosophy department in Berlin and in Zürich. Zürich was also the place where in 1910 her doctoral thesis *Experimentelle Beiträge zur Analyse der Tiefenwahrnehmungen* (see above) was published. This work was the result of her cooperation with Jung and Bleuler. Karpińska was virtually the only woman who, in this early period, regularly collaborated with the Polish psychoanalytical community and, in addition to her foreign publications, also wrote a number of texts in Polish. It is worth noting that during the partitions Karpińska was active in Polish national liberation organizations. When the war broke out, in 1914 she joined Piłsudski's Legions and was a paramedic in the Carpathian Brigade, and later she took part in the defense of Lviv. In recognition of her prowess and merits, she was raised to the rank of sergeant in the First Infantry Regiment of the Legions.

As in the case of Nelken, the outbreak of the war interrupted Karpińska's promising academic career. It should be emphasized, however, that her decision to join the Legions was a particularly heroic act. On the one hand, it was in line with the 19th-century tradition of Polish patriotism, when women from the intelligentsia started spreading the idea of independence and engaged in conspiratorial work. They also took over many educational duties for men, who often died in uprisings or were exiled to Siberia or imprisoned. This process intensified at the turn of the 20th century, when various underground independence organizations sprang up in the Congress Kingdom and Galicia (Mira Gincburg from Łódź – see above – joined one of them).

On the other hand, Karpińska's decision was unusual inasmuch as she made it of her own free will as a more than forty-year-old woman standing at the threshold of an academic career. She was, after all, an excellently educated "Polish

lady philosopher" with a doctoral degree, which at the time was extremely rare. Not to mention her significant academic achievements of international renown. And yet she decided to sacrifice all that for the sake of active struggle for independence. She was ready to become an "ordinary" paramedic and bear all the hardships and dangers of front line fights, inspired by the hope that this time they would bring about the long-desired independence of Poland. She was later awarded with the Independence Cross and the Cross of Valor for her pro-independence activities. Her husband, Marcin I. Woyczyński, also a legionnaire, was Józef Piłsudski's adjutant doctor.

It is a bit ironic that, once she took a job in the psychotherapy center in Łódź after the war, Karpińska turned to classical psychology and became head of the Municipal Psychological Laboratory. She conducted research on mentally and physically disabled children, developing questionnaires for schools for children with special needs. She also supported psychotechnical research, a branch of the psychology of labor (testing intelligence from the point of view of being fit for a given profession), organizing a research team in Łódź. It is very likely that she maintained regular contact with Franciszka Baumgarten, whose research preferences evolved in a similar direction. Her interest in psychoanalysis seemed to be a closed chapter in her life. In a short posthumous review of Dr. Ludwika Karpińska-Woyczyńska's private and professional life, Maria Więckowska, a close collaborator of the deceased, does not mention the early period of her psychoanalytical fascinations at all.[218]

Presenting the achievements and the striking biography of Karpińska, it is impossible not to mention a dramatic event two years before her death, when she already was seriously ill. The authors of the two articles mentioned above write about it extensively. In 1935, Karpińska was unexpectedly arrested under the suspicion of spying for the Soviet Union and spent several weeks in the Pawiak prison. The pretext for her arrest was her contact with Soviet psychiatrists and her participation in the 7th Psychotechnical Congress in Moscow in 1931 – a number of other psychiatrists from Poland also took part. Piłsudski (and his

218 Detailed information about the life and psychiatric activity of Ludwika Karpińska we can find in the articles of: Edyta Dembińska, Krzysztof Rutkowski, "Ludwika Karpińska, 'Polish Lady Philosopher' – a forgotten forerunner of Polish psychoanalysis," *Psychiatria polska*, No. 27 (2015), pp. 1–12 (online: www.psychiatriapolska.pl) and Jarosław Groth, "Na pograniczu psychologii i pedagogiki – czyli życie i działalność Ludwiki Karpińskiej-Woyczyńskiej," *Studia Edukacyjne*, No. 33 (2014), pp. 279–303. See also: Maria Więckowska, "Dr. Ludwika Karpińska-Woyczyńska. Wspomnienie pośmiertne," *Polskie Archiwum Psychologii*, No. 93 (1936–1937), pp. 170–173.

right-wing colleagues), with whom Karpińska and particularly her husband had maintained close and friendly relations, probably did not like her contact with left-wing educational activists (Stefania Sempołowska) and defenders of political prisoners (Wanda Wasilewska). But the search of her home and cross-examinations in the court did not produce any evidence against her, so after a few weeks she was released. This episode must have been a great personal and professional tragedy for Karpińska and her husband. First, it meant the breakup of their long friendship with Piłsudski and the loss of his trust. This was mainly due to the fact that in the 1930s the Marshal became increasingly suspicious towards the political left and all representatives of the democratic opposition, employing more and more drastic forms of repression against them. Perhaps his consent for Karpińska's arrest resulted from the carefully planned intrigue of his military colleagues, who wanted to remove Woyczyński from his position as the Marshal's adjutant doctor. And Woyczyński did resign on the day of his wife's arrest. Second, the charge of spying for the Soviet Union cast a shadow on all of the previous patriotic activity of Karpińska and her husband, which was quite admirable. Third, this episode eloquently shows how far Piłsudski had become removed from the ideas of the Polish Socialist Party, of which he was once a member, and how the Second Republic ruled by him became in the 1930s a police state with many hallmarks of a dictatorship. And fourth, when Karpińska was charged, she was already seriously ill and had practically abandoned professional work. In any case, this episode is still to be more precisely explained by historians, because now we have to make do with conjectures, hypotheses, and speculations.

This review of the first generation of female psychoanalysts born in the "Polish lands" shows that regardless of how much they felt attached to the Polish cultural tradition, which some of them knew very well thanks to studying at Polish universities, schools, or elitist boarding schools for girls (B. Rank, S. Kempner, H. Deutsch), their professional life – except for Karpińska – was mainly connected with the medical circles in the countries they emigrated to. Hence their contribution to the history of Polish psychoanalysis, that is their work and publications in their home country, was negligible. All in all, there are two translations and a few texts in Polish… nothing more.

Of course, from the historical point of view the existence of such large group of female Polish Jewish-psychoanalysts in the countries of Western Europe is an interesting social and cultural phenomenon worthy of further study. In addition, it defines an important context for the history of Polish psychoanalysis in the period of the partitions and between the wars. Especially because we can speak about similar groups of Jewish female psychoanalysts with Russian, Czech, or

Hungarian roots. The countries they emigrated to, that is Switzerland, Germany, Austro-Hungary (later Austria), France, and Great Britain, being more advanced and industrially developed, at the time provided much better prospects for social advancement for young people than the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. It was a natural social process, which, by the way, had a lot of common features with today's emigration of millions of young people from Poland to Western countries.

Here their involvement in psychoanalysis was distinguished primarily by the strong desire of these young, ambitious girls to take up medical studies. But it was also conditioned by the limited possibilities (see above) for women to work in many professions, especially Jewish women. Being a physician or a therapist provided a much better prospect for an independent professional life than other professions. Moreover, it was a highly prestigious occupation. And it gave these women financial and existential independence. But it obviously was also very risky, for everything depended on finding a sufficient number of patients ready to pay for treatment.

At the same time, the examples of the private and professional lives of these women very clearly shows some distinguishing features of the psychoanalyst's "lifestyle," which we already spoke about when following the origins and development of the "male" psychoanalytical movement in Vienna around Freud. First, the women who became psychoanalysts were usually Jewesses studying medical sciences, which were particularly attractive for them. Second, coming mostly from assimilated and emancipated Jewish families in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, they often moved to other cities and other countries, which meant that they often had a dual or even triple national and cultural identity, which was subject to various reconfigurations. So identity was in a way flexible, changing with the cultural surroundings of these women. In the 1920s in Austria, Jekels was no longer a Polish, but rather an Austrian psychoanalyst, and once he emigrated to the United States, he became an American psychoanalyst, publishing a selection of his most important essays in English. Third, if we look at their work and achievements in national terms, we will see that they contributed primarily to psychoanalytical traditions in those countries where they were professionally active and with which they inevitably identified.

And fourth, all these identity transformations were helped along by history. Or to be more precise, by the political changes going on in the 1930s in Germany and Austria, where, partly thanks to anti-Semitic slogans, the Nazis took power with the almost 100 percent support of their societies. Consequently, virtually all Jewish female psychoanalysts – and males too – previously active in these

countries were forced to emigrate, either to other European countries or to the United States. And thus they became British or American psychoanalysts.

As for the specializations they chose, it is striking how many of them went for infantile psychoanalysis, making a huge theoretical and clinical contribution to that area. Others tried to combine the psychoanalytical approach with those trends in psychology which had a social aspect (e.g., psychotechnics) and with social work as such. At this juncture, the biographical path of Polish-Jewish female psychoanalysts crosses with the path of the paramedic in the Legions, Dr. Ludwika Karpińska-Woyczyńska. And this was not a coincidence.

This multiple or heterogeneous form of cultural and national identity also marked the male representatives of the movement. This is related to the fact that psychoanalysis was treated by them as much more than just another scientific theory. It was their fundamental distinguishing mark, a kind of new scientific religion of a universal nature, with whose help they wanted to radically transform the human race and the world. Psychoanalysis was a brand burnt into their foreheads. All national or cultural forms of identity merged with this brand, so they were in a sense secondary, but also closely intertwined with it, either as "equals" or forming identity configurations with various "layerings" and structures. As psychoanalysts, they essentially functioned in the space between various cultures, identifying with them, but also moving between them and maintaining an adequate distance towards them. Who was Freud? A Jew? An Austrian? A citizen of the world? Each of these terms certainly fit him, although they mean different things. But they also narrow down what he is for us today. He was – is – primarily the Psychoanalyst, maker of the theory which in many ways changed our thinking about man, about the disorders of his mental life, about social mechanisms, and about culture.

III The first fascinations: The reception of psychoanalysis in Polish philosophy and the humanities

Over the last few years, the development of psychoanalysis has gathered such impetus that you have to devote yourself to it exclusively in order to master it. Psychoanalysts, who besides an overwhelming number of physicians include representatives of diverse professions such as psychologists, philosophers, pedagogues, parsons, art historians, ethnologists, philologists, etc. form the International Psychoanalytical Society (Internationale psychoanalytische Vereinigung) with chapters in Vienna, Zürich, Berlin and New York.

Ludwika Karpińska, *O psychoanalizie*

1 Kazimierz Twardowski's *Ruch Filozoficzny* and psychoanalysis

Starting in 1912, the first signs of interest in psychoanalysis in Polish philosophical and literary circles appeared. This resulted, on the one hand, from the fact that the Freudian theory of mental life, emphasizing the crucial role of the unconscious, was a challenge for 19th- and 20th-century philosophical concepts, which operated exclusively on the concept of consciousness, and on the other hand, because therapy based on talking to the patient, where an important role was played by the interpretation of his dreams, slips, and symptoms by the analyst, was closer to the humanities. No wonder that a lot of space was devoted to psychoanalysis in the leading Polish philosophical journal *Ruch Filozoficzny*, edited and published in Lviv by Kazimierz Twardowski. This Lviv philosopher, a friend of Husserl and founder of the so-called Lviv-Warsaw School, very attentively followed everything that went on in psychology, a newly emerged discipline, in which not only philosophers, but also representatives of various sciences, placed their hope.[219]

219 It is worth mentioning that Twardowski, with great commitment and passion, sought to create a separate psychological laboratory in Lviv and set it up as a university faculty. He was, as Teresa Rzepa and Bartłomiej Dobroczyński write in their book

Moreover, in the early 20th century Freud's psychoanalytical theory found more and more followers, which did not escape Twardowski's attention. And although he was very skeptical of it, in his magazine he published articles, sometimes very enthusiastic ones, on this theory.

His student Stephen Baley later tried to explain this openness of Twardowski to psychoanalysis through some outstanding features of his personality. Baley, who in the interwar period was to write two interesting articles about Słowacki using elements of the psychoanalytical method, writes about his master:

> […] He also had an admirable tolerance for bold psychological theories and hypotheses. In this respect, the way he spoke about unconscious psychological phenomena seems significant to me. He pointed out that there were no compelling arguments which would force us to accept them. But he was not indignant at those who accepted their existence and built their psychological theories and systems on them. I remember very well that although after hearing Twardowski's lectures I came to the conclusion that the existence of unconscious mental phenomena was doubtful, thanks to the same lectures I realized the whole attractiveness and profundity of the hypotheses assuming their existence. […] When at a certain stage of my interest I attempted to explain some views contained in the writings of Słowacki using the psychoanalytical method, Twardowski, although he was not an advocate of psychoanalysis, showed much interest in my work and helped me to publish it.[220]

In an interesting article about Baley, a Ukrainian researcher from Lviv, Stepan Ivanyk, tries to answer which elements of Freud's theory might have intrigued Twardowski. And he says that although in the epistemological sense he seemed to be located on the opposite pole of Freud, he must have valued in this theory the careful observation of mental phenomena and, if necessary, a readiness to change existing conceptual schemes. For Twardowski was a stranger to rigid, dogmatic adherence to established conceptual distinctions, which in his view had to be constantly modified in accordance with empirical findings.[221]

It seems that there is a lot of truth in this argumentation. It shows Twardowski as a mature scholar, open to concepts which ideologically were completely alien

---

Historia polskiej myśli psychologicznej, the creator of not only the philosophical, but also the psychological Lviv School. See Rzepa, Dobroczyński, *Historia polskiej myśli psychologicznej*, p. 128.

220 Stefan Baley, "Kazimierz Twardowski a kierunki filozofii współczesnej," *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, Vol. XLI (1938), p. 344.

221 Stepan Ivanyk, "Psychoanaliza w szkole lwowsko-warszawskiej: Stepan Baley o motywie endymiońskim w twórczości literackiej Tarasa Szewczenki i Juliusza Słowackiego," *Logos i Ethos*, Vol. 1, No. 32 (2012), pp. 43–62.

to him, but at the same time, almost intuitively, he perceived a huge cognitive potential in them. Therefore, as the Polish-Ukrainian psychologist Baley notes, when Twardowski presented the assumptions of Freud's theory in his lecture, he did it in such a way that, despite his critical approach, he aroused interest in this theory even in those listeners who had been total strangers to it before.

The most eloquent example of this extraordinary openness of Twardowski to psychoanalysis was, as we already said, his readiness to publish articles about it in *Ruch Filozoficzny*, written both by its supporters and scholars with a more skeptical approach.

In 1912, *Ruch Filozoficzny* published Stefan Błachowski's article entitled *Problem świadomości u Freuda* [The problem of consciousness in Freud's writings] with a significant editorial note: "We publish this article to welcome the Second Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists and Psychologists, with Freud's theory being one of the main points on its agenda."[222]

Invoking Twardowski's distinction into the object and content of representation, the author of the article writes a critique of the Freudian approach to the relationship between consciousness and "subconsciousness," attempting to prove that it is based on a logical error. The alleged fallacy is that Freud treats the "unconscious processes" as "devoid of any qualities" if they belong to "subconsciousness," but possessing them when they are regarded as belonging to "preconsciousness," concluding that they *can* become objects of consciousness. This means that some processes sometimes have qualities and sometimes not. So we are dealing with an evident contradiction here. But Błachowski admits that from the psychological point of view, "Freud is right in accepting pre-consciousness in which unconscious mental processes both with and without qualities occur; such processes may become and do become objects of consciousness. Translating it into the language of normal psychology, it means that all that we are conscious of is the object of our consciousness."[223] This argumentation clearly demonstrates that the author of the article firmly remains within the traditional bounds of the "philosophy of consciousness." In his view, we can speak about mental processes only if they can potentially become an object of consciousness. Therefore, he can accept Freud's view that if unconscious mental processes pass into pre-consciousness, they become an object of consciousness. But the claim that alongside it there might be some unconscious mental processes inaccessible

222 Stefan Błachowski, "Problem świadomości u Freuda," *Ruch Filozoficzny*, Vol. II, No. 10 (1912), pp. 205–208.

223 Błachowski, "Problem świadomości…," p. 206.

to consciousness is not acceptable to him. Hence he treats them as identical and charges Freud with contradiction.

Of course, the problem is that, according to Freud, there is an irremovable difference between unconscious processes occurring in the "subconsciousness" (that is the unconscious) and those which have become an element of pre-consciousness. For it is only the latter which may become conscious. This distinction is crucial for his concept of the "subconscious," which implies that there are processes in the human mind which remain outside the bounds of consciousness. And this is absolutely unacceptable to the author of the article, faithfully clinging to Twardowski's distinctions.

This discussion allows us to demonstrate very clearly the sources of the criticism later targeted at Freud's theory by the Lviv-Warsaw School. The main obstacle to its recognition was the impossibility of accepting the distinction we described. Also unacceptable was (and still is) the very thought that in the human mind there might exist some processes which for inherent reasons cannot become an object of consciousness.

However, this is not the most important thing in this case. What is striking in Błachowski's approach is that in criticizing Freud's theory he treats it with utmost seriousness. It is clear that his aim is a scholarly debate rather than ridiculing his antagonist at all costs (as would repeatedly happen later). Moreover, the very fact that the editors decided to publish this text with the note quoted above clearly demonstrated that they recognized this theory, and its domestic supporters, as serious partners in the debate.

More proof of this open approach was the publication in 1913 of an extensive report from the Second Congress, in which the author of the article – and one of the speakers in the psychoanalytical section – Bronisław Bandrowski briefly presented the issues taken up in particular papers and debates, focusing especially on speeches devoted to psychoanalysis.[224] And in 1914, just before the outbreak of the war, the magazine published an enthusiastic article about psychoanalysis written by Ludwika Karpińska.[225] She presents the development of psychoanalysis since the publication of Breuer's and Freud's *Studies on Hysteria*, lists psychoanalytical journals, and describes the most basic features that testified to the originality of this theory. Strikingly, she emphasizes the fact that the

224 Bronisław Bandrowski, "Psychologia na II zjeździe neurologów, psychiatrów i psychologów polskich," *Ruch Filozoficzny*, Vol. III, No. 2 (1913), pp. 25–31.

225 Ludwika Karpińska, "O psychoanalizie," *Ruch Filozoficzny*, Vol. IV, No. 2 (1914), pp. 33–38.

psychoanalytical movement was formed by people from various professions, not just physicians, but also "psychologists, philosophers, pedagogues, parsons, art historians, ethnologists, philologists etc." – in a word, humanists of all sorts.[226]

This demonstration of the openness of psychoanalysis to various academic and professional communities whose representatives could have successfully acquired the education and knowledge entitling them to professional practice goes hand in hand with the view which Freud himself proclaimed some dozen years later in his "The Question of Lay Analysis."[227] This view was closely related to the "claim to universality" we already mentioned. For if psychoanalysis reveals universal truths underlying the human mind and what follows from that is a theory of the origins of culture and laws governing it, it "affects" everyone regardless of his profession. Its gates are open to all who want to fathom its mysteries. It is only a matter of sufficient enthusiasm, eagerness to discover oneself and others, and courage in reaching the most hidden corners of one's mind.

Later in the article, Karpińska emphasizes that "the psychology of occultism, iconography, characterology, psychology of religion, psychology of scientific, philosophical and artistic work, psychology of aesthetic delight and ethical commandments, mythology and folklore, legal history, social psychology and ethnology, psychology of the child, pedagogy and so on owe to psychoanalysis numerous new insights and more profound takes on familiar positions."[228]

Pointing at the presence of researchers representing various academic disciplines, especially humanists, in the psychoanalytical movement goes hand in hand with the impact of psychoanalysis on these disciplines, which allows them to reformulate many crucial issues. All these processes and phenomena have their source in the fact that "the psychoanalytical movement inherently strives to deepen our knowledge of ourselves, for honesty with ourselves and hence to trigger an internal revolution and create a new type of man. This will be a man more internally free, stronger, more persevering in enduring hardships, more indulgent of others, but more demanding of himself, because he will understand that both evil and good flow from the deepest layers of his essence rather than being dependent on hostile external powers."[229] This is a concise summing up of all the hopes placed by the followers of the movement in the new vision of man underlying Freud's theory. This new man will have a better knowledge of

226 Karpińska, "O psychoanalizie," p. 33.
227 Freud, "The Question of Lay Analysis."
228 Karpińska, "O psychoanalizie," p. 34.
229 Karpińska, "O psychoanalizie," p. 37.

himself, that is his instinctive life. This knowledge will come from the fact that he will be ready to relentlessly confront himself with what was repressed by him into the unconscious and had its source in sexual drives and aggression. The new form of self-knowledge offered by psychoanalysis will be accompanied by a "freer" attitude towards himself and a more "indulgent" approach to others. He will abandon his restrictive attitude to his own sexual drives and attendant fantasies, and he will be much more tolerant of the behaviors of others.

His notions on the origins of the concepts of good and evil will undergo a fundamental change too. He will no longer see their sources in some external, transcendent powers inherent in being – for example, in some divine or demonic creatures – but in himself. He will be responsible for his deeds primarily to himself rather than to some outside force, such as God. This also means that he will not be able to shift responsibility for his evil acts on others or to some external power, such as Satan.

It can be clearly seen here that such a reading of the anthropology underlying Freud's theory implied a radical change in the approach to the questions of morality and ethics. This approach was to combine a greater openness and tolerance towards various manifestations of human sexuality with a new type of moral rigor. This approach would assume that it is above all the individual himself who is responsible for his acts rather than some power external to him. Such a psychoanalytically enlightened ethical agent would no longer be mechanically guided by religious commandments ("because this is the right way"), but would act in accordance with internal imperatives. They would be rooted in his reflexive and critical attitude towards himself, they would result from discovering the instinctive powers within himself, from thinking about them and distancing himself from them.

This interpretation of Freud's theory made his followers criticize common notions of morality and ethics. Emphasizing the individual's responsibility to himself for all his faults, desires, and acts, they recognized a new type of ethical agent in this theory. This was a typically modern agent – deeply believing in his own cognitive capabilities, assuming an attitude of critical reflection towards himself and others, believing in the salutary power of rational insight, and of mastering the instinctive forces in himself.

From today's point of view, we can say that this was a grossly one-sided reading, in its optimism concerning the possibility to develop a new type of rational attitude of man towards himself and his own drives and hence mastering them. For in Freud's works the process of this "transformation" of the individual's spiritual sphere due to analysis was much more complex and dramatic. According to Freud, it led to the emergence of a new type of "compromise" between the

individual and the destructive powers inherent in his sexual drives and aggression, rather than their complete subordination. And this "compromise" was fragile, constantly threatening to break down.

The basic trait of man's social being in culture was his "discontent" (*das Unbehagen*), the constant rift between the objects of his drives and what culture imposes in the form of various constraints and norms.[230] In any case, in highlighting Freud's appeal to develop man's new attitude to his own sexual drives and aggression and hence attaining a new understanding of ethics, advocates of psychoanalysis inevitably came into conflict with the approach to morality and ethics proclaimed by the Catholic Church. In the interwar period, this led to frequent critical pronouncements by the clergy on the subject of psychoanalysis.

2 Irzykowski – the Polish forerunner of Freud?

If Twardowski, the most eminent Polish philosopher of this period, despite all his skepticism, maintained an admirable openness towards psychoanalysis, the leading literary critic of the time and later of the interwar period, Karol Irzykowski, was downright enthusiastic about it. This is clearly evidenced by his essays on Freud's theory published in 1912–1913.[231] He preceded all other Polish literary scholars, as it was only in the interwar period that articles with psychoanalytical interpretations of literary texts would appear. At the same time, Irzykowski's essays on Freud's theory confirmed Baley's claim that the growing popularity of psychoanalysis among psychiatrists also began to trigger interest among representatives of other scientific disciplines and make an impact on them.

In his essays, Irzykowski refers mostly to Freud's theory of dreams expounded in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. This was not accidental, because, as the writer found to his amazement, some themes appearing in his experimental novel *Pałuba* from 1903 (especially in its prologue entitled "The dreams of Maria Dunin") seem to go hand in hand with some of Freud's claims presented in his book about dreams. Irzykowski was adamant that when writing *Pałuba*, which he started in 1890s, he did not know this book (it was published in 1900), and we

230 Freud gave eloquent expression to these views in his well-known text *Civilisation and Its Discontents*, see Sigmund Freud, *Civilisation and Its Discontents*, in: *SE*, Vol. 21, pp. 64–145.

231 Karol Irzykowski, "Teoria snów Freuda," *Nowa Reforma*, No. 590 (1912), pp. 1–2; "Freudyzm i freudyści," *Prawda* (1913), pp. 2–6, 8–9; "Acheron duszy," *Świat,* No. 3 (1913), p. 1.

have no reason not to believe him. He said that he became familiar with Freud's books only some two or three years after *Pałuba* was published.[232]

In her article presenting Irzykowski's attitude towards Freud's theory, Lena Magnone shows some astonishing analogies and similarities between the "theory" of dreams implicitly contained in *Pałuba* and Freud's theory expounded in *The Interpretation of Dreams*.[233] She writes that the "name of one of the main characters in 'The Dreams of Maria Dunin' is Acheronta Movebo and originated from the same verse of *Aeneid* which Freud used as the epigraph for *The Interpretation of Dreams*. […] The plot of the novella is practically a record of curing a hysterical patient through an analysis of her erotic dreams"[234]; and in *Pałuba* itself the role of infantile eroticism is emphasized, the meaning of self-delusion in mental life is analyzed, and the eponymous "hag" element is remindful of Freud's "uncanny."[235]

But if we take a closer look at the two books, we will perceive equally profound differences between them. For example, the dreams and deformations of the conscious depiction of reality within them are recorded in a completely different way; the status of the unconscious and its relation to consciousness is differently conceived; the symbolic aspect of dreams is not analyzed as a puzzle whose hidden meaning has nothing to do with a represented shape; the novel's plot is in fact happening between waking and sleeping, etc. Irzykowski uses various means to make the plot of dreams "look like" what could happen in the awakened state. Freud is much more restrictive in this matter, highlighting the raw absurdity of dreams told by himself and others, he does not "embellish" them and he does not bathe them in a metaphysical aura of wonder and melancholy.

These significant differences convincingly show that when writing *Pałuba*, Irzykowski could not know Freud's book about dreams. But be that as it may, the analogies and affinities with *The Interpretation of Dreams*, even if general, external and not legitimizing claims about Irzykowski being Freud's intellectual equal, are astounding.

Besides *Pałuba*, particularly notable in the early writings of Irzykowski, where he referred to psychoanalysis a number of times, is his essay *Freudyzm i freudyści.*

---

232 He makes such a claim, for example, in a letter to Koniński, quoted by Kazimierz Wyka; see Kazimierz Wyka, *Modernizm polski* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1987), p. 195.

233 Lena Magnone, "Karola Irzykowskiego lacanowska lektura Freuda," *Kronos*, No. 1 (2010), pp. 203–214.

234 Magnone, "Karola Irzykowskiego…," p. 205.

235 Magnone, "Karola Irzykowskiego…," p. 205.

Lena Magnone analyzes this work in detail in her article. She points out that Irzykowski's understanding of Freud's theory of dreams captures its very essence. But it seems that the article's main claim, namely that Irzykowski interpreted Freud in a "Lacanian" way and hence was also a pioneer of such interpretations of Freud's work, the like of which would appear in the 1950s in France, goes much too far.

To begin with, the reading of Freud's theory in Irzykowski's essay was from the perspective of a traditionally oriented literary scholar guided by the rules of philological interpretation which were common in the early 20th century. Therefore, we can hardly speak about a pioneering interpretation anticipating the "poststructuralist" reading of Freud by Lacan. But the author is right in one point: the reading of Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* presented by Irzykowski is undoubtedly the most insightful of all native writings on this subject. One reason is that Irzykowski was the first to analyze Freud's work in a wider cultural context, pointing at the relations between his theory of dreams and literary and philosophical traditions. Although he is clearly fascinated with many themes in Freud's book and points to their originality, he tries to avoid writing about him from the position of a worshipper, assuming instead an attitude of critical distance. It allows him to show Freud's work in a comprehensive manner, pointing to its strengths and weaknesses. And so he avoids the evident simplifications which appear in all contemporary articles and books by Polish psychiatrists about Freud's theory of "explaining" dreams.

This does not mean that Irzykowski's interpretation, when confronted with the later history of the impact of Freud's work, does not raise several doubts from today's point of view. Let us take, for example, his charge that in his book Freud "takes into account the structure rather than the physiognomy of sleep, analysis rather than text."[236] What Irzykowski means is that by way of analysis Freud shows only the elements that build the dream, but not how it "looks." In other words, his analyses are too abstract and formalist, and consequently lose sight of the imagery present in the dream. For example, a precise analysis may allow us to perceive the structure of someone's face, but it will tell us nothing about its specific appearance. And we obviously cannot ignore it. Especially because, as Irzykowski notes, imagery is heterogeneous, for the "overt content of the dream" is composed not only of figures, things, and events, but also of "some mysterious fragments of images, splicings, shadings, and altogether they produce above all the problem of expression."[237]

---

236 Irzykowski, "Freudyzm i freudyści," *Kronos*, p. 220.

237 Irzykowski, "Freudyzm i freudyści," *Kronos*, p. 221.

This charge is simply false. What Freud tries to do by way of precise analysis of the dream's narrative is to find out in what way these "mysterious fragments of images, splicings, shadings" are related to each other, what their function and sense are in the context of the dream. Which means that it is an analysis of the dream's *text*, only conducted from the perspective of its linguistic structure. In contrast, Irzykowski understands the dream's "physiognomy" or "text" in a more traditional way, that is, as its "appearance" or, to use Roman Ingarden's term, its "represented world." He emphasizes its imagery. We had to wait for authors inspired by the structuralist tradition – such as Lacan and Jacques Derrida – to show that these "abstract" Freudian linguistic analyses of dreams were actually philological analyses of their texts in the strict sense of this word. Only thanks to them can we attain reliable insight into the "physiognomy" of dreams. Of course, this approach to the text, which was characteristic for structuralism and became fashionable in literary studies several decades later, was alien to Irzykowski, and we may suspect that he did not read Lacan either. Therefore, he did not treat Freud's meticulous linguistic analysis of dreams, slips, and jokes as "philological." For him, they belonged to the psychology of the dream and were mostly a subject of interest for psychiatrists. Freud's book about dreams and his interpretations of slips and symptoms were commonly read in this way at the time.

This approach, today anachronistic, is perfectly illustrated by the hypothetical example – used by Irzykowski as an argument against Freud – of a female patient dreaming about a red-flowered bough planted in her garden by some man. According to Irzykowski, Freud would interpret this image as an allusion to male genitals and would be completely satisfied with this explanation. But this is by no means certain. The specific meaning of the flowered bough in the patient's dream could only be determined by a precise "linguistic" analysis of the whole dream, taking into account the whole biographical context. It could then turn out that it means something completely different than male genitals. In other words, the decisive role in Freud's approach to symbols appearing in dreams was played by their "grammatical" function in the narrative of the dream, rather than any predetermined dictionary meanings. This is the method from "dream-books," where explanation is mechanical, in accordance with a previously available pattern. Moreover, the symbol could have been treated as an element of a puzzle, where visual analogies between the signifying and the signified (flowered bough equals genitals) by definition do not matter, for the focus is on the morphological form of the signifying.

Freud's original way of interpreting dreams, going against conventional wisdom, is perfectly illustrated by an interpretation of the famous dream of Alexander the Great, who dreamt of a drunk, dancing Satyr during the siege of

Tire. When Alexander summoned his fortune-teller to explain the dream to him, the man said that Satyr means here Sa Tyr, that is Tire (will be) Yours. So the fortune-teller, the obvious forerunner of Freud, ignored in his explanation both the visual form of the dream (flowers) and its implied (hidden) meaning (genitals), but pointed to what the signifying itself said. In this sense it is not so much Irzykowski interpreting Freud in the Lacanian way, but Freud as a Lacanian, running ahead of himself by several decades.

In short, Irzykowski evidently means the purely visual form of the flowers when he says: "[…] This bough with red flowers is genitals, but still these are flowers!"[238] But for Freud the flowered bough would not necessarily have to mean genitals or flowers, but something completely different, to be reached by way of a painstaking linguistic analysis. In Freud's book examples of such "Lacanian" interpretations of dreams, which have nothing to do with looking for the "underside" of the symbol's meaning, are legion.

Particularly notable are Irzykowski's remarks on the function played in Freud's theory of dreams by the return to scenes from early childhood and on the innovative nature of his theory of sexuality. Magnone is right to say that Irzykowski perceives much more than other native commentators in these theories. He brings out the profound drama of these scenes and the dual nature of the sexual drive, which has something deeply traumatic in it. Therefore, it can never be completely mastered or used for building a new, sexually liberated ego. But also in this case we can hardly speak about Irzykowski as being a forerunner of Lacan. Melanie Klein noticed something similar in Freud's theory of sexuality much earlier, developing this aspect of her concept of development stages in infantile psychology. In this context, Irzykowski is impressively insightful in his reading of Freud: this reading, free from any orthodox or worshipful overtones, puts to shame the interpretations of Polish Freudians.

Interestingly, Irzykowski points at the "egocentric" nature of dreams and tries to explain it by showing how the child shapes its image of itself in the early years of its life:

> Let us realize that every young man is the protagonist of his own life drama, that in his childhood years he usually experiences the roles of Robinson or at least a pupil who is given marks, he defines goals and tasks for himself, and attached to his development and acts is a certain importance by his surroundings. […] In the dream the curtain is lifted, the inner dramatic life nerve is uncovered, a ray from idyllic and innocent childhood pierces the drabness of commonplace events.[239]

238 Irzykowski, "Freudyzm i freudyści," *Kronos*, p. 221.
239 Irzykowski, "Freudyzm i freudyści," p. 222.

In a word, the dreamer is directly confronted with the genealogy of his own ego. Not only with traumatic scenes from childhood, but also with his will to power, which used to give him the "egocentric" sense of his infinite possibilities. According to Irzykowski, this constitutes the cathartic value of dreams discovered by Freud. But we should not forget that monsters also sometimes appear in dreams – we are haunted by nightmares from the past, often of sexual origin. In this context, Irzykowski points at the autonomous nature of the sexual drive captured by Freud in his *Three Treatises on Sexual Theory*. He discovers the innovative nature of this approach, which revolutionizes – and greatly complicates – existing views on humans and their sexual constitution. Irzykowski emphasizes that, according to Freud, "sexual pleasure is by no means only a spice or, as Schopenhauer claims, bait for the reproductive act, but something equally autonomous, having its own sources and goals."[240] This discovery, says Irzykowski, is not particularly welcome by various species of moralists, but if we only speak more about such "sensitive" issues, we will learn something more about human sexuality. He thereby distances himself from Freud's critics, mostly from the nationalist/right-wing circles, who took offense to his theory of sexuality. But soon after, interestingly, Irzykowski voices his criticism of those who came to the conclusion that people should live according to "laws of nature," that is, to be free from any restrictions in their sexual life. He also criticizes those analysts who base their therapy on recommending an intense sexual life to their patients.

We can clearly see that Irzykowski is intellectually independent in his approach to Freud's theory. He takes an intermediary position between its harsh critics who deny it any cognitive value and its advocates who perceive it as a kind of revealed knowledge which, if widely promoted, will bring humanity the desired liberation from all pathologies and constraints from various sexual pleasures. This is the context of his numerous objections and doubts concerning the alleged dangers resulting from an uncritical application of Freud's theory in therapeutic practice. It should be emphasized that formulating these objections, Irzykowski by no means wants to condemn Freud's theory wholesale or to show its "unscientific" character, as had been often done before (and after). He speaks only about the dangers which may be produced by this theory, that is, about such forms of its application which, if approached uncritically, may bring disastrous results. He claims, for example, that "in the hands of a bungler or a charlatan, the Freudian method may become a fraud, conscious or unconscious. Not every doctor has Freud's psychological intuition, and what is more, being the founder

240 Irzykowski, "Freudyzm i freudyści," p. 222.

of this theory, Freud can constantly correct and modify it in line with certain unexpected observations."[241]

Among these dangers, Irzykowski names "rummaging in someone else's soul, forcing the patient to make a confession and suggesting ready-made conclusions to him,"[242] basing analysis on "punning" linguistic associations (which will later start playing a crucial role in Lacanian psychoanalysis!) or "hunting" for the Oedipal complex in the patients. In a word, the danger is that therapy will turn into a method based on "innuendo and prosecution" and that conclusions concerning the causes of the disorder will be based on clues rather than hard evidence. To prevent the analysis from becoming a mechanical construction of an image of the patient's soul by the analyst on the basis of dogmatic assumptions, extraordinary care in formulating deductions and hypotheses is necessary, as well as openness to new experiences and, above all, the doctor's intuition. The later history of psychoanalysis, especially in the United States, confirmed these fears, for there were numerous instances of flagrant mistakes in diagnosing the causes of disorders and of the despotic imposing of "solutions" to the patients' existential problems, sometimes with disastrous consequences (Marilyn Monroe's analysis is a classic example).

Having formulated his objections and critical remarks and having summed up his position on Freud's theory, Irzykowski says that one of its most important achievements is seeing ethical issues in a new light. This was due to assuming the existence of the unconscious in human mental life, because "hidden, unconscious evil does the greatest damage. So the question is if people will be able to acquire instruments for making this evil conscious and thus for destroying it."[243]

If man stops denying the unconscious motives of his acts and starts to gain access to them by way of analysis, there is a chance that he will cease committing the same "evil" acts in the future. Therefore, psychoanalysis may have an important impact on the ethical behavior of man. This is because "the question of ethics becomes a question of honesty, and furthermore the question of wisdom, that is strength."[244] In other words, by assuming the existence of the unconscious in man, psychoanalysis offers him a new type of insight, in which he is confronted with the darkest corners of his ego, previously inaccessible to him. Therefore, as Irzykowski says in the conclusion of his essay, "Freudianism,

241 Irzykowski, "Freudyzm i freudyści," p. 223.
242 Irzykowski, "Freudyzm i freudyści," p. 223.
243 Irzykowski, "Freudyzm i freudyści," p. 229.
244 Irzykowski, "Freudyzm i freudyści," p. 229.

although self-conceived, is embodied in, and flows into, the main currents underlying contemporary thought. We have debates on irrationalism and rationalism, intuition and analysis – they are now accompanied and perhaps can be to some extent explained by the question of the relation between consciousness and unconsciousness. Therefore, Freudianism has a future ahead of it."[245]

Irzykowski's interest in Freud's theory and his favorable attitude to it was noted by Jekels. In his report on the Second Congress written for a Viennese journal, he invokes the article quoted above, in which the author "describes the most important works by Freud in a lucid way and points at the extraordinary importance of psychoanalysis. […] He is full of admiration for Freud's great honesty and theoretical genius."[246]

And that was no exaggeration.

3 Otton Hewelke – the image of Kornelia Metella in Zygmunt Krasiński's play *Irydion*

Irzykowski's claim that Freud's theory may be a good starting point for interpreting literary texts was an isolated judgment at the time. Polish literary scholars were not yet attempting to write criticism or literary theory inspired by the method of interpretation expounded by Freud in his book about dreams. It was only in the 1920s that the first articles written from a psychoanalytical perspective were published in Poland, usually concerning the works of Adam Mickiewicz, Juliusz Słowacki, and Stanisław Wyspiański. But this does not mean that in the period between 1900 and 1919 we cannot find any works of literary theory showing affinities with later psychoanalytical approaches.

One of these articles was Otton Hewelke's essay from 1903 on the figure of Kornelia Metella in Zygmunt Krasiński's play *Irydion*.[247] Hewelke was a doctor who worked in the Wola Hospital in Warsaw and died in 1919 in the last year of the war. In his essay, he painted a psychological portrait of the female protagonist of the drama, whose behavior bears, in his opinion, all the hallmarks of hysteria. Interestingly, Hewelke never invokes Freud in his article, but he quotes other

245 Irzykowski, "Freudyzm i freudyści," p. 229.

246 Ludwig Jekels, "Vom II. Polnischen Neurologen- und Psychiater-Kongreß in Krakau (20. Bis 23 Dezember 1912)," *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse*, No. 2 (1913), p. 192.

247 Otton Hewelke, "Kornelia Metella w Irydionie Krasińskiego," *Krytyka lekarska*, No. 3 (1903), pp.1–7. Zygmunt Krasiński was, along with Adam Mickiewicz and Juliusz Słowacki, a leading writer of Polish Romanticism.

popular authors from that time who shared Freud's view that the greatest writers are usually brilliant psychologists with insight into the most hidden regions of the human mind. Hewelke invokes, for example, the Austrian neurologist Moritz Benedikt, who claimed that poets were capable of insightful analyses of the human soul: "Not content with external manifestations, poets enter the hidden depths of the soul, observe the state of its internal life and reveal its secrets – mysterious sources and motives of human deeds – in the monologues of their protagonists, so often misunderstood and hence so variously commented on by critics, who are insufficiently prepared psychologically."[248]

Another common point with Freud's psychoanalysis is Hewelke's admiration of Krasiński's brilliant psychological intuition when drawing the figure of Kornelia: "He noticed and presented in an artistic form the matter of mingling of religious feelings and representations with feelings of an erotic nature, he marked their mutual influence and the resultant confusion in the life of the soul. This phenomenon only recently has caught the attention of specialists, that is psychiatrists and psychologists, and is still not very popular."[249] According to Hewelke, the close relationship between the religious and the erotic in the behavior of Krasiński's Kornelia became visible only in the late 19th century, along with the spread of female hysteria, which was taken up scientifically by psychiatrists such as Charcot and Paul Richer. The "spirit" of the era, from which Freud's psychoanalysis grew, again makes itself felt.

According to Hewelke, this paradoxical relation between religious and erotic feelings is revealed in Krasiński's drama with particularly force. The deification of Irydion by Metella, with obvious sexual underpinnings, was confronted here with her orthodox religiosity, which told her to remain a faithful daughter of the Church, in her eyes the only warrant of the "legitimacy" of her faith in God.

Hewelke sees this conflict as the cause of the hallucinations and illusions in Metella's mind. Their source is her overwhelming sexual desire, which is particularly evident in the scene when she feels Irydion's body in a loving embrace. Fighting against this desire, she falls into a swoon, so similar to an attack of hysteria: "Irydion's grip shakes her being with the force of a mental trauma. Under this impact, Kornelia falls into a swoon and wakes up from it in a kind of somnambulic state, where her will and apperception are suppressed […], and due to the simultaneous stimulation of sensory areas the impressions received are transformed into hallucinations and illusions."[250]

---

248 Hewelke, "Kornelia Metella w Irydionie Krasińskiego," p. 1.
249 Hewelke, "Kornelia Metella w Irydionie Krasińskiego," p. 2.
250 Hewelke, "Kornelia Metella w Irydionie Krasińskiego," p. 3.

Later in the article, Hewelke invokes contemporary scientific tradition, where the close relation between religious and erotic feelings was repeatedly invoked. He quotes the names of Richard von Krafft-Ebing, Ellis Havelock, Edwin Diller Starbruck, and others. Hewelke says that, thanks to his artistic genius, Krasiński noticed this relation much earlier. This is evidenced by the way in which he outlined the psychological picture of his heroine, who is defined by the conflict between erotic desire and religious emotions. Literature often anticipates what science discovers much later, says Hewelke.

Hewelke believes that the previous traditions of interpreting Krasiński's drama ignored the psychological nature of the conflict defining the heroine's behavior. Consequently, historians of literature such as Piotr Chmielowski and Stanisław Tarnowski had explained this work in a highly inadequate way.[251] Their comments trivialized the figure of Metella and her attitude to Irydion. Krasiński provided a portrait of a flesh-and-blood woman who experienced a genuine drama, torn between love and faith.

Hewelke's article is an interesting case of literary interpretation by a psychiatrist who uses contemporary psychological theories to look at this work from an unconventional perspective, perceiving an aspect of it which has been ignored by literary theorists. In the interwar period, there were more psychiatrists who took up the challenge of interpreting classic literary works from a psychological perspective. They included the psychoanalyst Gustaw Bychowski and the psychologist Stefan Baley, who was also no stranger to psychoanalysis.

Reading Hewelke's text, we see to what extent Freud's writings on the role of sexuality in human mental life invoked and developed certain ideas which had appeared in 19th-century psychology and psychiatry. The stylistic qualities of the text are also noteworthy, as it is written in a lucid and beautiful literary language permeated with the atmosphere of the era. Reading this text, we feel like a person looking at a bizarre, intricately carved artifact from the past, covered with a thin layer of patina. But this is exactly the reason it attracts our attention, and we set it on a prominent place on our bookshelf.

4 Karol de Beaurain and the "lay analysis" of Staś

Just as it is tempting to look in *Pałuba* for analogies and affinities with *The Interpretation of Dreams* – for this novel was partly based on notes from

251 Piotr Chmielowski and Stanisław Tarnowski were well-known Polish historians of literature with conservative views.

dreams – you can also point to the affinities of this book with those works by the writers of Young Poland (1890–1914) which were full of oneiric and visionary elements, especially in its early stage, which in the Polish tradition was called Modernism (1890–1900). We could name here such works as Stanisław Przybyszewski's *Requiem aeternam* and his other essays, the early poetry of Bolesław Leśmian, the poems and dramas of Tadeusz Miciński and other Young Poland poets, Stanisław Wyspiański's play *The Wedding*, and Wacław Berent's *Próchno* (Rotten Wood).[252]

Such a perspective is to some extent legitimate, but it inevitably must remain very general. We would be in a similar situation if we attempted to demonstrate that various psychological ideas appearing in the 19th-century tradition of Polish psychology and psychiatry – for example, the ideas of Bronisław Natanson (1821–1896) and Edward Józef Abramowski (1868–1918) – anticipated (or equaled) Freud's theory just because they contained the concept of the unconscious (or the "subconscious"), and accorded it an important place in human mental life. Comparing these diverging ideas and indicating that they formed a fertile ground for the reception of Freud's psychoanalysis – as Bartłomiej Dobroczyński does in his book[253] – is justified, but we should remain very cautious when seeking analogies and affinities with the latter. In both cases the devil is in the details. The fact that Polish literature from the turn of the century contained many visionary scenes and the plots of many novels, dramas, or poems seem to be set within a dream (or in some space in-between) allows us to say that it was expressive of the "spirit of the epoch," the same spirit which defined the context for Freud's book about dreams. Likewise, the hysterical behavior of the protagonists of Przybyszewski's essays and novels in some measure partakes in the atmosphere of the times in which Freud's theory of psychoanalysis was also born (after all, the latter supposedly said that he had written this book to cure himself from hysteria).

But this does not mean that we can speak about a far-reaching affinity between Przybyszewski's work and Freud's theory. If we take a closer look at the image of the "naked soul" emerging from Przybyszewski's essays and novels, we will see that there is a real chasm separating him from the Freudian perspective.[254]

---

252 These authors are leading representatives of Young Poland literature (1890–1914), which, invoking the visionary character of Romantic literature, remained in opposition to the literature of Realism and Naturalism.

253 Dobroczyński, *Idea nieświadomości w polskiej myśli psychologicznej przed Freudem*.

254 Karol Irzykowski captured this excellently in a review of *Moi współcześni*: "Freud spreads a net over the complications of life – while Przybyszewski in his dramas, if we treat them as an application of the theory of the naked soul, shows unambiguous,

Przybyszewski's concept of "naked soul," assuming its absolute transparency in its profoundest emotions and thoughts, has nothing in common with the "soul" of a dreaming person in Freud's approach, that is, with the unconscious. If only because there is no direct access to the unconscious and it has to be achieved through deciphering and interpreting the symbolic and visual layer of dreams, daydreams, or symptoms. Using this interpretation, the analyst aims to break the resistance of the dreaming person to recalling various events from his biography and also reach the meaning of the encoded form of this layer, which often takes the shape of a puzzle. Only then may he attempt to read the secrets of the dream. The "sense" of the dream so interpreted has little in common with its direct symbolic and visual layer.

Therefore, the structure of the human "soul" in Freud's writings is much more complex than Przybyszewski assumed. Przybyszewski believed that revealing all the soul's secrets requires only the "shameless" honesty of the writer. For Freud such an approach is sterile, because, contrary to appearances, it is to doomed to remain at the surface of the individual's mental life and ignore the indirect, veiled way in which the unconscious is present. When Przybyszewski says in *Moi współcześni* (My contemporaries) that in his early works he offered a picture of the human soul and sexuality equivalent to the Freudian one, and that it was due only to a whim of fortune that he did not enjoy similar fame, we can only see it as demonstrative of his megalomania.[255]

Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz, later called Witkacy and in the 1960s recognized as a world-class writer alongside Bruno Schulz and Witold Gombrowicz, had completely different experiences with psychoanalysis. He was the first Polish writer to be analyzed (in late 1911 and early 1912). Although it was a so-called lay analysis, as we may deduce from the extant records,[256] we may presume that Witkacy learned a lot about the main assumptions of Freud's and Jung's theories, especially the theory of the dream proposed by the former. The therapy was conducted by Dr. Karol de Beaurain, a psychiatrist trained in Switzerland and Germany and who later worked as an assistant in Piltz's Institute at the

uncomplicated people." Karol Irzykowski, "Pierwszy bilans Przybyszewskiego i jego autorehabilitacja," in: *Pisma rozproszone,* A. Lam, ed., Vol. 2 (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1999), pp. 142–143.

255 Stanisław Przybyszewski, *Moi współcześni*, p. 81.

256 Sigmund Freud used this term to describe all forms of psychoanalytic therapy in which the doctor did not strictly adhere to its methodological requirements and freely "enriched" it with his own ideas. See Freud, *The Question of Lay Analysis*.

Jagiellonian University.[257] This physician from Zakopane was fascinated with Freud's theory at the time and called himself a psychoanalyst, although he did not have any direct contact with the Viennese community (or at least we do not know anything about them).

Witkacy was sent to this new type of therapy by his father, a friend of de Beaurain, who was worried about the emotional distress of his son and his recurring depressive states. It seems that the therapy was not very helpful to the future writer. Witkacy himself was very skeptical of it and complained later that for some strange reason de Beaurain insinuated he suffered from the "embryo complex," which allegedly prevented him from growing up. And even if de Beaurain did succeed, at least partially, in relieving his patient's depression, the events which took place slightly later were definitely not conducive to his "recovery."

They included the suicide of his fiancée, partly provoked by him, in February 1914, and the military service in the Tsarist Pavlovsky Guard Regiment. Serving in this unit, Witkacy fought on the front line (he was severely wounded in the Battle of Stokhod) and in 1917 was an eyewitness to the outbreak of the Russian Revolution and the bloody events accompanying it. So he definitely "grew up" and became mentally independent from his father, but the price was that his tendency towards depression increased, which was reflected in his constant obsession with suicide, which he repeatedly mentioned in his letters.

But let us return to the diagnosis of the "embryo complex." It must have been de Beaurain's own idea, for this term does not appear in the writings of Freud or his students. And even if Witkacy laughed it away, there was undoubtedly a grain of truth in it. De Beaurain clearly wanted to make his patient aware that he had a complex of his authoritarian father, Stanisław Witkiewicz,[258] which prevented him from becoming fully independent mentally and artistically.

This is evidenced by Witkacy's later desperate attempts to emphasize his separateness from his father. One such attempt was military service, when after the outbreak of the war, against the will of his father, as a supporter of Piłsudski (and automatically also of the Polish alliance with the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy), he went to Saint Petersburg and joined the Tsarist regiment. This seemingly crazy idea was quite in the style of the future writer. Another eloquent gesture was

257 So he had to know Nunberg, Nelken, and other young psychoanalytically oriented staff of this faculty. See my comment on this subject in this book, pp. 72–73.

258 Stanisław Witkiewicz (1851–1915) was an outstanding modernist art critic, painter, and architect, creator of the so-called Zakopane style. At the turn of the 20th century, several villas were built according to his designs in Zakopane, then a famous resort, and a meeting place for the Polish aristocracy and the intellectual and artistic elite.

assuming the pseudonym "Witkacy," thus finding the "signifying" which clearly emphasized his separateness from his father on the symbolic level. Importantly, this "signifying" was suggested to him by no other than de Beaurain, who hoped that this would help the patient overcome his "embryo complex." The aptness of this ingenious pseudonym consisted of the fact that it was composed of the initial part of the surname ("Witk" and final part of the second name "Ignacy" ["acy"]). So the "lay" Zakopane psychoanalyst willy-nilly became a symbolic father for the future writer, the guarantor of his mental and creative autonomy.

Psychoanalytical therapy with de Beaurain certainly influenced Witkacy's later writings, although in an indirect way. We know that during the therapy "Boren" delivered a kind of lecture on the assumptions of Freud's theory and obviously the sessions must have concentrated on interpreting Witkacy's dreams. This interest in the world of dreams was certainly in tune with the atmosphere of the era (as I have already said), but at the same time the future writer must have been interested in the emphasis on the absurd form of dream imagery in Freud's theory, the linguistic idiosyncrasies of their narratives and the technique of free association. This influence was later reflected in some assumptions of Witkacy's theory of Pure Form in art and in the structure of the world of his dramas and novels.

In 1912, clearly under the influence of the therapy, Witkacy started to note down his dreams and tried to interpret them in his own way. This is evidenced in his letters to Helena Czerwijowska, the great love of his youth, to whom he writes about them directly. In one of them he says:

> When de Beaurain à propos a dream asked me about my attitude to you, I told him something like this: She is the only woman with whom I would be happy in the deepest sense of this word. Why does fate persecute me by making this woman black, and even if everything looked different, if she reciprocated my feelings, I could at best make her the most unhappy of women. When walking (quite recently) through a forest I thought with certain bitterness, why am I unable to love anyone? And suddenly I thought about you, that you are the only one I could really love. And again I saw that black hair and those black eyes of yours and I thought that there was some terrible curse hovering above me. Some awful masquerade, confusion of souls and wigs. A problem both profound and also a hair-styling one. And your eyes seemed to me extremely close and cursed forever. These things were there from the very beginning. I allow you to burst out laughing here, for it is partly worth it.[259]

259 Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz, *Listy I,* Tomasz Pawlak, ed. (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 2013), p. 206.

This suggests that de Beaurain treated the dreams recounted by Staś during their therapeutic sessions – clearly trying to imitate Freud in this matter – as a starting point for asking questions about the attitude of the young patient to persons appearing in the dreams. Even when it meant talking about very intimate issues.

Another testimony, this time indirect, are notes from dreams made by Bronisław Malinowski in his *Dzienniki zakopiańskie* [Zakopane diaries], clearly under the influence of Staś, and frequent allusions to the figure of "Boren" in the comments to the dreams and to some social events in Zakopane.[260] But more about this below.

Although Witkacy ridiculed de Beaurain's diagnosis for a long time (on the other hand, he proudly told the women who posed for portraits painted by him that he "went through analysis" in his youth, which inspired an almost religious awe in them), a true friendly bond must have developed between them. This is indicated in Witkacy's letter in which, devastated by his fiancée's suicide, he informs de Beaurain about his decision to go with Bronisław Malinowski on a research trip to Australia:

> Every moment is an unbearable torment. I am worthless. As a human I discredited myself. As an artist I destroyed myself. Now I took up an obligation to cure myself through traveling. But this kills what has remained of me. Anything beautiful that I see is like the most terrible poison. Why can't *she* see it, why did I waste her and the most beautiful love that has ever existed. I do not idealize it through death. I was unable to value myself. Because I was worthless. Now I have only love for her and only hate for myself. Death must come sooner or later, for it is impossible to bear this terrible torment for long.[261]

You write such words only to a close friend. Later, towards the end of the 1930s, Witkacy was to change his opinion about therapy with de Beaurain and in *Niemyte dusze* he expressed his gratitude for initiating him into the mysteries of psychoanalysis.[262]

---

260 Bronisław Malinowski mentions this in his memoirs of his stay in Zakopane in October 1912. See: *Dziennik w ścisłym znaczeniu tego wyrazu* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2002), pp. 143–292.

261 From a letter of Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz to Karol de Beaurain, 18–24 June, 2014.

262 See Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz, *Narkotyki - Niemyte dusze*, Anna Micińska, ed. (Warszawa: Państowowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1975). In this book, published after World War II, Witkacy makes a critical assessment of the cultural awareness of Polish society from a psychoanalytic perspective.

5 Exuberant libido in the Zakopane dreams of Bronisław Malinowski

Witkacy decided to go to Australia at Malinowski's behest, as Malinowski saw that his friend was devastated. Therefore, he recruited him as a photographer and draftsman in his research team traveling to New Guinea (and probably paying a lot of money for his company). Witkacy's friendship with Malinowski had started much earlier. In Malinowski's *Diary*, Staś is one of the main figures up to 1914.[263] Witkacy is particularly visible in Malinowski's *Zakopane Diaries*, which cover his life in Zakopane between September 1911 and January 1913, the time when "Staś" was undergoing psychoanalytical therapy with Dr. de Beaurain (September–October 1912). It is hard to imagine that Malinowski had no knowledge of it, especially because they both knew "Boren" well, being members of the Folklore Section of the Tatra Society founded in 1911.

In addition, Malinowski's notes clearly show that he adopted the "method" of taking down dreams from Staś, and this must have been connected with what de Beaurain suggested to his patient as an element of psychoanalytical therapy based on the recommendations of Freud himself. In an entry from August 11, 1912, Malinowski wrote: "Tonight I decided to recall the dreams according to Staś's recipe and I really dreamt a whole number of them."[264]

Other fragments suggest that their conversations revolved around Freud's book on dreams, or at least around some concepts from that book, which Staś probably borrowed from "Boren." Here is an example: "Staś about dreams: muffled, unpleasant complexes show up. *Muttterkomplex* [mother complex] […] – And then a few words about dreams again. […] – Tonight some immeasurably complicated dream. I dream that I wrote down a dream and I see the page in front of me; before that some long room; I dispose of something; some bald guy, the host, disturbs me in my writing.…"[265]

In another letter Malinowski writes: "I tell a dream to Staś: does Irenka appear in it because I spent a lot of time with her and then *suddenly cut off?* [in English in the original] or substitution; did I like her?"[266] More generally, it is striking that since August 1912, or the period when Witkacy was analyzed by de Beaurain, numerous accounts of dreams suddenly appear in Malinowski's diary, some of them with strongly erotic content. For example: "Today: erotic dream,

263 Malinowski, *Dziennik w ścisłym znaczeniu tego wyrazu*.
264 Malinowski, *Dziennik w ścisłym znaczeniu tego wyrazu*, p. 160.
265 Malinowski, *Dziennik w ścisłym znaczeniu tego wyrazu*, p. 232.
266 Malinowski, *Dziennik w ścisłym znaczeniu tego wyrazu*, p. 229.

wet (with Borain's complex), I am lying; breasts and sexual organs à la Naosia; a jolly brunette. Some clouds in the shape of battle torpedoes, quick. Erekman Shehm [?] having an affair where there is some awful tragedy with these cyclone winds. A huge museum, some stone idols. Borowiecki, who has been studying all this for an hour from an armchair and understands nothing, explains everything to me."[267] It could not be more clear: "wet dream (with Borain's complex)." Of course, he means de Beaurain and his obsessive search for complexes (of the embryo?) in his patients. What is more, the name of another well-known Polish psychiatrist appears here, namely Borowiecki, an ardent follower of Freudian psychoanalysis, who specialized in interpreting dreams. Here he is the person supposed to explain to Malinowski the sense of his dream.[268]

And to crown it all, a dream about Irena Solska: "At dawn (Tuesday) a dream about Solska: I am lying on her; realizing that I don't love her and don't like her; she says: never mind, I know you don't like me, but that's even better; I rub against her and I smell of a dog, from the outside (a memory of number 69 Hotel Royal?), I spurt; I have a sense that what I am doing is unethical, perfidious, and also that I don't like Solska – I don't even have the artificially induced lust stemming from disgust and perversion."[269]

Naturally, as it has been established (probably) beyond any doubt, in those years Malinowski did not know Freud's works; he began to study him intensely only in the 1920s. Information on his theory, on his book about dreams and on his method of therapy where records of dreams play a crucial role, probably came from "Boren" and Staś. And it was almost certainly a haphazard knowledge. But there is no doubt that what the later professor and world-famous anthropologist took down in *Dziennik zakopiańskie* from his dreams in the years when he was on the threshold of a great career, casts much light on the "corners" of his mental life: on the force of his exuberant libido, on his dramatic love experiences, sexual obsessions, profound dilemmas, and depressions. But above all, it perfectly fits the Young Poland atmosphere of the time, when alongside the works of Wundt

267 Malinowski, *Dziennik w ścisłym znaczeniu tego wyrazu*, p. 242.

268 The editor of the book mistakenly considers Borowiecki to be fictitious from the dream. But Borowiecki – Stefan Borowiecki – was a real-life person, a psychiatrist fascinated by psychoanalysis, working at that time as an assistant at Piltz's faculty the Jagiellonian University. Incidentally, it is also wrong to say that de Beaurain was the first Polish psychoanalyst. At the time there were at least several: Jekels, Nunberg, Sokolnicka, Baumgarten, Karpińska (who also spent some time in Zakopane), Radecki, and Nelken.

269 Malinowski, *Dziennik w ścisłym znaczeniu tego wyrazu*, p. 226.

and Simml the young future genius of world ethnology read Schopenhauer and Nietzsche as well as Polish Modernism: Tadeusz Miciński (*Bazylissa z Teofanu*) and Jerzy Żuławski (the novel *Eros i Psyche*). But there was also Romantic literature, especially the visionary poems and dramas of Juliusz Słowacki. And looming somewhere on the horizon was the theory of dreams postulated by a mysterious Jew from Vienna about whom Staś and de Beaurain had told him.

IV Psychoanalysis and the truth of sexuality

Truth is always good, […] and it concerns also the truth about sexual life. This claim will not be overthrown by any prudery, any moral hypocrisy. He who has recognized the huge importance of the sexual drive for all of culture, who, like the author of the present work, has studied for many years the relation between the problem of sexuality and culture from the point of view of medicine, anthropology, ethnology, literature and history of culture, he has not only the right, but also the duty to announce his findings, to publicly proclaim his views and to take a definite position on the pressing issues of the present day.

Ivan Bloch, *Das Sexualleben unserer Zeit in seiner Beziehungen zur modernen Kultur*

1 Psychoanalysis and the Church. Sexuality as an area of conflict

This review of writings demonstrating the avid, rich reception of Freud's theory in the Polish academic community in 1900–1918 under the Austrian and Russian partitions shows that it was most widespread and intense in the medical profession, primarily among psychologists and psychiatrists. The rest of the academic community – for example, philosophers and literary scholars – approached it with considerable interest, but also with considerable distance.

The news about this new theory – although it is difficult to verify it today – must have also reached a wider "intelligent public," although hardly anyone took it seriously here. We must remember that the medical journals and books to which texts on Freud were largely confined were addressed to a narrow group of recipients and were not widely available. At the same time, however, open lectures on psychoanalysis, delivered by such people as Jekels, Nunberg, and Karpińska, were held in cities like Kraków, Lviv, Warsaw, and Łódź; the daily press published various commentaries on it; psychoanalysis was discussed in cafes, appeared in gossip, and so on. One illustration of this is Jekels' letter to Freud (see above) in which the former proudly announces to the latter that newspapers widely covered the speeches on psychoanalysis at the Second Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists, and Psychologists. And finally, we know that in this pioneering period psychoanalysis as a form of therapy was

practiced – or at least its elements were included in therapy – by such people as Nunberg (in Częstochowa, Kraków, and Bystra); Jekels (in Bystra); Karpińska (in Zakopane); Jaroszyński (in Kraków); Bornsztajn (in Warsaw); and finally de Beaurain (in Zakopane).

Case studies appearing in the works of these psychiatrists often give us important insights into the mental condition of Polish society at the time. They can serve today as an excellent starting point for anthropologic, cultural, and sociological reflections. We can see, for example, that the very fact that the psychiatrist pointed to the excessive restriction of sexual drives as a source of his patients' mental problems created a situation of conflict with widespread notions perpetuated by tradition. It was the Church which stood behind these notions, with its concept of the "good Christian" (not to mention the "good Polish Catholic").

An excellent illustration of the enormous pressure exerted on various forms of secular authority by the Church is the story told by Nunberg in his memoirs (see above).[270] It is worth recalling briefly in the current context. Nunberg writes that, while working in Professor Piltz's clinic in Kraków, he conducted an analysis of a patient who was the sister of a bishop's cook. The patient told her sister everything that went on during the sessions, where conversation revolved around the problems of her sexual life. The sister repeated everything to the bishop, who was deeply indignant and called Professor Piltz, probably demanding punishment for the therapist who morally depraved the patient. Piltz found a diplomatic solution and announced to the bishop that from then on he would be treating the patient, and he did not take any disciplinary action against Nunberg.

Nunberg ends his account with a profound sigh: "Such was the power of the Catholic Church in Poland."[271] This was, of course, the power over the peoples' "souls," but through souls also power over their bodies. This was expressed in the Church acting as the last moral instance in assessing various kinds of behaviors in the public and private sphere (the Church had access to the latter thanks to the institution of confession), and especially those which concerned the sexual sphere. Psychoanalysis must have appeared particularly suspicious to the Church's representatives because of its "rival" claim to a deep transformation in the patient's self-knowledge. Adam Bžoch points this out in his book on the history of Slovak psychoanalysis, citing an example of criticism of psychoanalysis by the Slovak Catholic theologian Alexander Speszs. This claim "seemed to threaten the irrefutable sacramental status of confession and undermine the foundations

270 See, p. 84 of this book.
271 Nunberg, *Memoirs*, p. 13.

of institutionalized religiosity. The author [Speszs] feared that the analyst's sofa would eventually replace the confessional."[272] In a word, the Catholic Church feared that once psychoanalysis gained widespread social acceptance, the Church would lose its monopoly on influencing and supervising the souls of the faithful. So it was no accident that psychoanalysis was often harshly criticized by the clergy.

The Church also had a large share in shaping the contemporary model of raising children, which was repressive towards sexuality and condemned all forms of sexual behavior, including masturbation and homosexuality, which it stigmatized as a mortal sin. The sexual life of married couples was also subject to many restrictions: many sexual behaviors (e.g., certain positions) were prohibited, extramarital sex – especially by women – was harshly condemned, and church divorces were granted only in exceptional situations.

The effect was the spread of various neurotic disorders, especially the obsessive-compulsive disorder. The situation was similar in the remaining provinces of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, regardless of which Church – Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, Protestant, or Orthodox – held the dominant position in a given region. Only with this cultural context in mind can we fully appreciate the enormity of the challenge to public opinion and morality posed by Freud's views on sexuality, especially those expressed in *The Three Essays on Sexual Theory*.

Some idea about the serious disorders produced by the approach to sexuality imposed by the Church and sanctioned by society can be glimpsed from case studies found in the works of Polish psychiatrists from this period, and they are quite numerous (Jekels, Borowiecki, Jaroszyński, and others). They also provide valuable research material for sociologists and cultural scholars wanting to recreate the mental condition of Polish society in Galicia and the Congress Kingdom at the time on the basis of mental conflicts and disorders described therein.

2 An affair with a carter and an obsession with sin. Jaroszyński's case studies of the obsessive-compulsive disorder

A whole range of such examples is contained in Tadeusz Jaroszyński's work *Przyczynek do nauki o psychonerwicach* (A contribution to the study of

272 Bžoch, *Psychoanalyse in der Slowakei,* p. 46.

psychoneuroses).[273] The author attempts to classify psychoneuroses and repeatedly quotes Freud's pronouncements on this matter, as well as opinions of other leading psychiatrists from that time (Jean Martin Charcot, Ludwig Binswanger, Carl Gustav Jung, Józef Babiński, and others). For every type of such disorders he gives a number of examples from his own therapeutic practice, his patients being inhabitants of Galicia, usually of Kraków and its environs. Anxiety disorders are predominant: "According to Freud, this suffering usually appears in these persons who are not completely satisfied sexually, so it develops in fiancées, widows, abstainers (especially after previous sexual abuses), spouses using 'coitus reservatus' or 'interruptus' etc. – in a word, all those with a self-poisoning produced by the physiological substances secreted by the gonads."[274]

I do not recall Freud mentioning fiancées, widows, and abstainers in this context or using the term "self-poisoning" (at least in the sense given by Jaroszyński). But I will treat this comment as Jaroszyński's creative interpretation of Freud's belief, and I will take a closer look at two cases of anxiety neuroses, with elements of the obsessive-compulsive disorder. The first is the case of a 40-year-old married woman who

> comes from a relatively healthy family. […] She lives in the countryside, she has always liked horses, she often traveled alone with a carter; a few times, when she was 18, she let him get close to her and let him touch her genital parts. 12 years ago she got married, she has two healthy children. She married without love, she was frigid in her sexual acts. After the second child (seven years ago) the patient was very exhausted by the long childbirth and the memory of the occurrence above was revived in her, her guilt assumed huge proportions in her eyes and the patient began to torment herself with remorse; she became unable to work […].
>
> Two years ago the occurrence with the carter was repeated, allegedly it was a superficial touch of the genital parts by the penis. At that time and later her husband used protective measures during copulation. In the last year the patient became nervous, weak, like she was seven years ago. But a sharp deterioration occurred when she heard from one of her confessors that using protective measures during copulation was a sin and that "for such a sin there is no absolution." From that time on, she started to think and be afraid that [she would be refused absolution]. Because of that she made her confession a few times more and although her confessors calmed her down saying that she would always get absolution, for it is not a mortal sin […] – these thoughts and fears of being exposed to this great distress were so strong that the patient had to be sent to a sanatorium for

273 Tadeusz Jaroszyński, *Przyczynek do nauki o psychonerwicach, (Analiza 35 przypadków histerii, neurastenii, nerwicy lękowej i psychastenii)* (Kraków: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1913).

274 Jaroszyński, *Przyczynek do nauki o psychonerwicach*, p. 70.

> a second time. All day long the patient was consumed by the thought that she would not get absolution, she constantly thought that she was going to confess, speak about her sin, but that the confessor would not absolve her. Her husband promised her that there would be no intercourse or only intercourse without protective measures, but this did not calm her down, she was not certain if it would be really so and despite repeated assurances of friends and priests that confessors tolerated it if you had your doctor's permission – she constantly doubted if she might not come across a confessor who would be relentless in this respect.
>
> At the same time, the old occurrence with the carter was revived in the patient's memories, and especially the last such event (two years ago), and also in this context she started to be tormented by thoughts and uncertainty if this occurrence was adultery or not. She constantly pictured this moment, how this encounter looked, if it was full copulation or not, if seduction was possible at all in this position; to resolve this doubt, she did a number of "trials" with her hands, legs, torso, imagining the circumstances of this moment and wanting to assure herself that there was no full copulation after all. She calmed down for a moment, but then uncertainty was sparked again and the patient again checked in her thoughts and through simulation if copulation could have taken place.
>
> Repeated persuasions and explanations to the patient that her fears were unfounded, for copulation was impossible in these conditions and the question of absolution was repeatedly resolved, were not convincing for the patient; she often said that "her doubt is stronger than logic" and that she knew very well that her scruples were unjustified, and yet she was unable to chase away the thoughts haunting her and to order herself not to be tormented by them. This state lasted for a few months, the patient was also treated internally and through physical procedures; she finished treatment with some improvement.[275]

This example eloquently shows that restrictive moral prescriptions on sexuality grounded in Church doctrine may lead to deep complications in the mind of a woman wanting to adapt her behavior to these requirements. Lack of absolution for her sexual "vice" became a crucial problem, driving her into a deep anxiety neurosis.

It should be emphasized that in no case history described by Freud or his students we will find such an eloquent – as well as graphic – confirmation of his claim of the extraordinary "cruelty" of the punishing Superego, sanctioned through religious doctrine recognizing divine commandments and prohibitions as the foundation of all morality. We clearly see here a whole set of various factors listed by Freud which might have caused neuroses based on lack of sexual satisfaction:

---

275 Jaroszyński, *Przyczynek do nauki o psychonerwicach*, pp. 97–98.

- frivolous sexual behavior of an adolescent girl which is later treated as "premarital cheating"
- sexual frigidity of the patient in her relations with her – probably – much older husband
- limiting sexual relations with her husband or the use of "protective measures" by him, probably from a fear of conceiving another child
- "a momentary lapse" of the patient with a carter and the resultant remorse increased by the lack of absolution from a priest
- an added fear that she would not get absolution also for *coitus interruptus*, as well as for allowing her husband to use unspecified "protective measures"

We do not know, of course, to what extent the patient's insistence that there was no full intercourse with the carter the second time corresponded to reality and to what extent it was just an attempt to deny and repress what really occurred. But even if we assume her own "mild" version, it is striking that in psychological terms this attempt was clearly unsuccessful. The obsessive self-assurances that nothing serious had happened did not assuage her doubts or remorse. On the contrary, the more she tried to deny it and persuade herself that nothing happened, the stronger the doubts and remorse were. The pressure of the harsh Superego was so strong here that such self-justifications were meaningless from the Superego's perspective. Likewise, the first severe confessor who did not absolve her was the only one who counted in her self-assessment. She ignored the opinions of the more "tolerant" clergymen. Her sense of the huge burden of her guilt had its ultimate roots in the automatically responding Superego, and that was instilled in her by religion and looked with equal severity at all sexual desires and behaviors. From this perspective, the patient's guilt appeared to her as irremovable; she had no way of freeing herself from this feeling.

The second example is the case of a young boy constantly reproached and punished by his severe father. This example shows that a restrictive approach enacted by others, additionally sanctioned by religiously grounded notions of right and wrong, may lead to an obsessive-compulsive disorder. His father's reproaches were a grave concern for the boy:

> […] And once, when his father shouted unjustly at him, he had a kind of "attack"; he couldn't speak, he was all shaking, he cried spasmodically. […] A few days later, there was a retreat and confession, after which the illness developed. Namely, on the day after the confession the boy didn't go to Communion, but he wanted to "correct himself" with the confessor and before that could happen, he constantly asked the people around him about his every act to check if he was committing a sin. Since then, he hasn't gone to school (five weeks).
>
> The content which aroused the suspicion of sin in him was varied; for example, when he sat down, he was careful not to lean on his elbow, because this would destroy his

> clothes. When he went to his room, he was careful to avoid the rug, because this would ruin it unnecessarily. […] In every room, he looks around to see where the holy picture is, so that he won't stand with his back to it, for that would be a sin. […] He crossed himself before every dish and he regarded forgetting to do so as a sin. […] When asked questions, he often answers "it seems" – he adds that just in case, so that he wouldn't be lying if it turned out that it was otherwise. When standing close to a wall, he is careful not to breathe on it, because "puffing on the wall dampens and destroys it, and deliberate destruction is sin" […]
>
> The patient's intelligence is fully preserved. As to his scruples, he remains critical of them; he knows they are morbid, that he is "too preoccupied with them" – but he points out that "at times he is haunted by uncertainty" whether a given fact is a sin not – on the one hand he knows that everybody does the same and does not regard it as a sin, but on the other hand he is afraid that it is a sin after all, and so on. Two years ago he masturbated, but abandoned this addiction under the influence of religion and fear of sin.
>
> It is characteristic that the boy's conversation with the confessor in the presence of his doctor, and the declarations of both of them that such trivialities can't be a sin, did not calm the patient; on the contrary, they led to a slight deterioration: the very sight of the priest disturbed him, he later started to say that he hadn't told him everything, that he forgot many things he was uncertain about, and a few days later new scruples emerged. Only general treatment (isolation, hydrotherapy, psychotherapy), lasting about two months, was successful in bringing about a definite improvement in the patient's condition.[276]

We see that the boy's reaction to his father's reproaches and punishments was exacerbated by going to confession and by the presumably as-severe assessment of his behavior by the confessor. Consequently, the increased sense of guilt led to the strengthening of the dominant position of the boy's Superego, which started to terrorize him with its severity. The boy lost the ability to clearly differentiate what was a sin and what was not, and in his eyes potentially any behavior could be sinful. We may suspect that the punishment meted out by his father for his previous masturbation played a significant role here. Jaroszyński very generally mentions the "influence of religion," but it was certainly mediated by the father (and the confessor) and the various "educational methods" used at the time.

This case also clearly shows a typical set of factors which at that time and in that society must have played an important role in the emergence of persecutory anxiety neurosis. One of these factors was the rigorous model of education usually symbolized by the father and supported by religious representations. Of course, the institution of confession was also crucial, for if a given priest was intolerant, it could contribute to the deepening of the symptoms.

---

276 Jaroszyński, *Przyczynek do nauki o psychonerwicach*, pp. 99–100.

I quoted extensive excerpts from these case histories, for they emphatically illustrate the culturally grounded problems and resistances to the sexual sphere with which contemporary analysts had to deal. In such cases, attempts at making the patients aware that their excessive moral rigor and overwhelming sense of guilt were unjustified had to be accompanied by the task of developing a new approach to this sphere in the patients. The woman from the first story would have to notice, for example, that her "premarital betrayal" resulted from the sexual needs of the adolescent rather than her being "inherently" sinful. And that her later affair with a carter was clearly a consequence of the inadequate sex life with her husband and had little to do with "moral depravity." Likewise, the boy would have to notice in his early masturbation a sign of his adolescent sexual desire rather than a "sinful act" rooted in the "evil" of his individual nature.

In both cases, focusing therapy on this would inevitably lead to confrontations with the collective morality sanctioned by the Church and to questioning the "metaphysical" religious assumptions on which this morality was based. These case histories imply that Jaroszyński was perfectly aware of the main sources of his patient's problems. And yet he did virtually nothing to change the patients' attitude to their own sexuality. In the case of the woman, his argumentation – just as the argumentation of the "tolerant" confessors – was confined to a declaration that such sexual behaviors were not mortal sins and one should get absolution for them.

Meanwhile, the problem did not consist in deciding what the woman should get absolution for, but in finding a way of changing her attitude to her own sexual behaviors, so that she would stop perceiving them in terms of vice and sin. But that would shake the widespread notions of the moral aspect of these behaviors instilled in her by the Church and the people around her. As a believing and practicing Catholic, she was probably incapable of such a transformation of her own attitude towards these things, as well as their assessment. Especially because, as the case history suggests, she was more religious than her husband. After all, it was she who insisted that the intercourse was "godly," as prescribed by her confessors. This example emphatically illustrates the kind of problems our first psychoanalysts had to deal with in most of the patients and shows why the number of people ready to undergo such therapy was limited. In practice, it was confined to the most enlightened and liberal strata of the Polish and Jewish bourgeoisie, which constituted a very narrow, best-educated, and wealthy elite.

Remarkable in the second case is the fact that the obsessive-compulsive disorder erupted after the boy's confession during Retreat. The definition of what was right and wrong in his behaviors, as given to him by his confessor, was indisputable. We may presume that when hearing the boy's confession, the priest took

the side of his father, and consequently the boy's remorse reached a critical point. The obsessive-compulsive neurosis, manifested in exaggerated moral scruples, was in this case – like in the case of the woman – the result of repressing his sexual desires as "sinful." He too strived to suppress all manifestations of aggression towards others, which took place under enormous pressure from the severe father and his confessors, representing the harsh cultural Superego. And since in the eyes of the boy the priests represented unquestioned authority, he internalized the image of himself which they imposed on him, namely the image of a person with an innate proclivity for "sin." Once this image became an inherent part of his personality, any therapy which would question the authority of priests would encounter an insurmountable barrier in him. Especially that an analyst who dared to shift the therapy in this direction would certainly find no support for his actions in the boy's family.

Although Jaroszyński claims in both cases that, as a result of the methods employed ("isolation, hydrotherapy, psychotherapy"), the condition of the woman and the boy showed "some improvement," these vague comments are not very convincing. The value of these case histories lies mostly in the fact that in painting the portraits of both patients and the course of their illness, he unambiguously indicates their social and cultural sources. These examples clearly demonstrate that "curing with psychoanalysis" involved the emergence of a new type of society in Europe and America, in which there would be a fundamental change in the relations between the Church and government institutions, and in the vision of the Church's role in the public and private life of its members. And that – as Eli Zaretsky shows in his book[277] – became possible only once the Industrial Revolution assumed an advanced shape, when the increased mobility of working people liberated them from the pressure of family ties and local priests; but in Galicia, one of the most economically backward regions of the Habsburg Monarchy, these processes were only beginning.

The problem was not a matter of faith as such, but of the way particular Churches (in Europe mostly Christian) approached sexual life in their doctrine and social practices. Only later, starting in the 1920s, a clear polarization of positions emerged. This change was instigated by Protestant theologians and pedagogues, mostly from German-speaking countries such as Switzerland and Germany. Of crucial importance here were the works, very popular in the interwar period, of the Swiss theologian Oskar Pfister, who attempted to employ

277 See Zaretsky, "Part One. Charismatic Origins: The Crumbling of the Victorian Family System," in: *The Secrets of the Soul*, pp. 15–114.

certain elements of Freud's theory of sexuality in theology (the faith in the existence of a Christian Eros) and pedagogy.[278] But Pfister and other Protestant theologians were ready to accept only some aspects of Freud's approach to sexuality, and many of them invoked mostly Adler and Jung. This is illustrated by the position of the Polish Protestant Church in the interwar period, during which a minister from Cieszyn, Rudolf Kesselring, was a leading figure. His openness to questions of sexuality was obviously not unbounded, as demonstrated, for example, by his fierce attack on Emil Zegadłowicz's *Zmory*, in which he was as relentlessly critical of the novel as representatives of the Catholic Church. He charged the Silesian writer with promoting pornography and depraving his readers. I will take a closer look at this in the second part of the book.

3 Truth is always good. Wizel's diagnosis of "sexual impotence"

Another important clinical work whose author invoked Freud was Adam Wizel's book *Zaburzenia płciowe pochodzenia psychicznego* (Sexual Disorders of Mental Origin).[279] The book concerned "sexual impotence" in men, considered from the perspective of its mental causes and taking into account the distinct nature of female sexuality. The author, inspired in part by the research of Jean Martin Charcot, in whose famous clinic in Salpêtriére he spent eight months on a scholarship (1898), pointed out that "the science of sexual life," having been neglected for centuries, in the early 19th century "started to exuberantly flourish." And the reason for the previous slow development of this science was that it was

> seen as an attack on the moral and aesthetic feelings of humankind. It was feared that published works on sexuality, having penetrated to the general public, would cause a general scandal. It was also feared that widely known treatises on sexual perversions would exacerbate the already rampant sexual psychopathy by way of suggestion. […]

278 Oskar Pfister was associated with the psychoanalytic community in Zurich, in which the leading figures were Eugen Bleuler and Carl Gustaw Jung. From 1909, he also corresponded with Freud and the letters were published as *Psychoanalysis and Faith: The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Oskar Pfister (1900–1939)*, transl. Erig Mosbacher (New York: Basic Books, 1963). Very popular in the interwar period was his book in which he demonstrated the usefulness of psychoanalysis for theology and pedagogy, entitled *The Psychoanalytic Method*, transl. Charles Rockwell Payne (New York: Moffad Yard & Company, 1917). In 1919, he founded the Swiss Society for Psychoanalysis, in which he defended the openness of Freud to so-called lay analysis.

279 Adam Wizel, *Zaburzenia płciowe pochodzenia psychicznego. Studjum kliniczne i psychologiczne* (Warszawa: Wende i S-ka, 1914).

> Today, it is impossible for a doctor not to know the physiology and pathology of sexual life, but it concerns especially neurologists and psychiatrists, who will encounter abnormal manifestations of sexual life almost at every turn.[280]

This excerpt illustrates the growing awareness among Polish psychiatrists of the role of sexuality in treating mental diseases. This awareness emerged not only under the influence of Freud's theory, but in equal measure of other theories and tendencies appearing in the late 19th century, their representatives – such as Auguste Forel, Joseph Jules Déjerine, and Ernest Gauckler – pointing out the important role of sexual disorders in the etiology of mental diseases.

Wizel was perhaps the first Polish psychiatrist who, due to his fascination with the work of these authors, took such an open approach to the question of sexuality. No wonder that despite his considerable initial distance he later moved towards Freud's psychoanalysis. It should be highlighted that Wizel conceived his scientific work also as a kind of a social mission to spread scientific truth and subscribed to the statement of the well-known German sexologist, which he quoted:

> Truth is always good, […] and it concerns also the truth about sexual life. This claim will not be overthrown by any prudery, any moral hypocrisy. . He who has recognized the huge importance of the sexual drive for all of culture, who, like the author of the present work, has studied for many years the relation between the problem of sexuality and culture from the point of view of medicine, anthropology, ethnology, literature and history of culture, he has not only the right, but also the duty to announce his findings, to publicly proclaim his views and to take a definite position on the pressing issues of the present day.[281]

Like Bloch, Wizel believed that the proliferation of mental pathologies had its origin in transformations of contemporary culture, characterized by excessive "nervousness" resulting from the general striving for maximum effectiveness, financial profit, and a rapidly developing professional career. His works, on the one hand, contained elements of social criticism, especially concerning the dominant approach to the sexual sphere, and on the other hand expressed his hope for a fundamental transformation thanks to the spread of scientific knowledge on that matter and liberation of mankind from the mental diseases tormenting

---

280 Wizel, *Zaburzenia płciowe pochodzenia psychicznego*, pp. 1–2, 5.

281 Quoted in: Wizel, *Zaburzenia płciowe pochodzenia psychicznego*, pp. 3–4; Ivan Bloch, *Das Sexualleben unserer Zeit in seiner Beziehungen zur modernen Kultur* (Berlin: Louis Marcus Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1907).

it.[282] He was a man of great passion, immensely devoted to his medical vocation and full of faith in the transformation of universal social awareness.

4 Jekels' critique of cultural sexual morality

An equally critical attitude towards the "cultural sexual morality" is presented by Jekels, but he is unequivocally Freudian in his position. Interestingly, he starts his argument in *Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda* with emphasizing that "taming our sexuality is indispensable in the interest of culture and its further development, which we, psychoanalysts, recognize no less than others, and, since we conceive of culture as emerging from these repressions, we even put a special emphasis on it."[283]

Pre-empting possible accusations of psychoanalysts' amoralism in sexual matters, Jekels stresses that they do not make an appeal to abolish all restrictions in the sexual sphere. On the contrary, they regard them as necessary, for they see a culture-forming element in them. The problem is rather that

> our times, due to an extremely dishonest approach to the sexual question, an approach which Freud aptly describes as prudery mixed with lasciviousness, went too far and imposed, completely ignoring individual differences, many unnecessary constraints […]. So the numerous and still multiplying neuroses teach us that this excess of constraints to which sexuality is subject today has a very sad effect on our libido. And this disastrous influence affects us all the more severely, because other conditions – of an economic and social nature – also arrange themselves unfavorably in this respect.[284]

Invoking Freud's views, Jekels claims that prohibitions concerning sexuality shaped in the European cultural traditions have become too restrictive, and as a result sexually based neuroses proliferate in contemporary societies. At the same time, a healthy, natural approach to sexuality was replaced by prudery, excessive hostility and fear of it. Its reverse side is "lasciviousness," a perversely unhealthy fascination with sexuality. What springs to mind here is the role played in that era by houses of trysts and various forms of prostitution, which were on the one hand castigated as hotbeds of moral depravity and sin and on the other tacitly accepted by the bourgeois world. Not to mention various forms of sexual abuse, suffered especially by women and children, in familial

282 Adam Wizel expressed these views in his book *Wiek nerwowy w świetle krytyki* (Warszawa: G. Centnerszwer, 1896).

283 Jekels, *Szkic*…, p. 88.

284 Jekels, *Szkic*…, pp. 88–89.

and professional life, which were common knowledge, but people preferred not to talk about them.

It is also striking that Jekels points out conditions of "an economic and social nature." Further on in his argument, he quotes the opinions of the German sociologist Werner Sombart, who saw the emergence of large concentrations of the urban population in Europe and the United States as the source of the "depletion of personal relations" between people. According to Jekels, this was accompanied by the "depletion of our libido," because the bond between man and nature had been lost. One example of that, he says, is the direct and intimate relationship with domestic animals lost by urban people, but that is still observed among peasants.

Of course, it is an open question as to how today's defenders of animal rights (and even Freud himself) would respond to this argument, based on the assumption that there is a profound and unconscious libidinal bond between man and the animal world. According to Jekels, the existence of this bond is confirmed by an area of sexual pathologies called "zoerastia," or a perversion in which man copulates with animals. On the level of culture, this bond is manifested in the sublimated form of man taking animals under his care. According to Jekels, this bond is extremely important, for it allows man to maintain his libidinal relationship with nature, which can protect him from succumbing to various kinds of neuroses.

The book ends with the author's philosophical creed where he criticizes the "philosophers' views" on consciousness, saying that consciousness remains on the surface of human mental life. He claims, invoking Freud, that consciousness is a secondary organ serving the perception of selected qualities and allowing man to adapt to external reality. Consciousness is in fact an effect of a compromise between the individual and society and represents mostly the interests of the latter. Consequently, in the contemporary world consciousness is turned into agency, sanctioning various forms of coercion against the individual. It was reduced to the role of a means for mechanically imposing certain requirements sanctioned by tradition onto man, which leads to profound disorders in his mind, which are then totally overlooked by him.

According to Jekels, psychoanalysis offers a chance to "peel off the mask," or the neurotic consciousness of the individual produced by contemporary culture, a consciousness burdened with various unnecessary demands. Psychoanalysis, thanks to a thorough study of the unconscious motives behind human behaviors and feelings and, thanks to revealing their repressive nature, makes it possible to liberate the individual from the "coerciveness." Jekels sees psychoanalysis as "the dawn and scientific interpretation of this era of culture when our consciousness will rule supreme and will tame our drives – and a state will come which

was predicted by the unfortunately oft-misunderstood prophet and thinker Nietzsche, who said: 'Duty and coercion will be replaced by will.' "[285]

Such an understanding of the message of psychoanalysis is in line with Freud's famous postulate *Wo Es war soll Ich werden* (where there was It, there should be I) as it was conceived at the time. It assumes that once the individual becomes aware of the "coercions" which flow from the *Es* (It), a self-conscious "I" has to be established in its place. And this will make it see the actual nature of these coercions and liberate itself from them. The ultimate goal here is not to oppress consciousness, but to transform and strengthen it. It has to be a new type of consciousness, where man would overcome his alienation from his drives, subdue and master them. Quite unexpectedly, Jekels notices a profound affinity of the mission of psychoanalysis with Nietzsche's idea of "will to power," that is, a will liberated from all cultural restraints.

It is difficult to assess today to what extent the reference to Nietzsche was a tribute to the Polish reader, given the fact that the German philosopher was very popular at the time, and to what extent it resulted from Jekels' actual belief in the profound affinity of psychoanalysis' social mission with Nietzsche's project of transforming the foundations of culture through renewing the bond with Dionysian creative forces in life. But this is not the most important thing here. Of crucial importance is Jekels' view that, by freeing man from the "coercions" imposed by culture, psychoanalysis will be conducive to the recreation of his bond with nature and to strengthening the control of his consciousness/will over his drives. This belief assumes the possibility of a deep transformation of man's attitude towards his own instincts, resulting in his liberation from all kinds of neuroses which have their source in the oppressiveness of contemporary culture.

Jekels deeply believed in the emancipatory mission of psychoanalysis, leading to a change in the relations between the individual and society. This change was to mean that the human individual, freed from unnecessary cultural coercions, would be able to control his own drives and use their energy for various forms of his own activity in a much better way. Psychoanalysis was to lead to a transformation of the cultural self-knowledge of man, preparing for the arrival of an era when man, having abolished his alienation from nature (read: from his libido), would act in accordance with only those commands which are culture-forming and allow a harmonious coexistence with other members of society.

This optimistic approach was to break down in the 1930s. Drawing conclusions from the long years of his therapeutic practice, Jekels realized that not all cases

285 Jekels, *Szkic*…, p. 92

of neuroses may be cured and that often recovery is only partial. And there is no guarantee that the patient's symptoms will not return. Hence his repeated pessimistic claims that psychoanalysts promised to the patients more than they were able to give them. Of course, we may ask if this pessimism resulted from the excessive hope initially placed by Jekels in Freud's theory. If so, what were the sources of the advantage of psychoanalysis over other forms of therapy for Jekels? What can it give to the patient, despite all its defects and deficits, that the remaining forms of therapy are unable to deliver? It seems from the essays later published as *Selected Papers* that Jekels would answer this question by pointing out the peculiar type of self-knowledge offered by psychoanalysis to the patient. Although this self-knowledge does not cure him or make him happy, it opens him to the truth about himself. And given such high stakes, the "game" of therapy is worth playing, even if the truth is hard to accept.

But Jekels' pessimism seems to have other sources as well. One of them was the growing popularity in 1930s Europe – especially in Austria and Germany – of fascist parties and the attendant explosions of unrestrained aggression towards Jews. This was another failure of virtually all progressive movements from that time, whose representatives deeply believed in the curative power of scientific progress, in cultural enlightenment, and in gradual liberation of the social masses from the prejudices defining them. The Frankfurt School, Marxism, analytical philosophy, structuralism, phenomenology… the list could go on.

Epilogue: The promised land of psychoanalysis? On the eve of independence

Hidden, unconscious evil does the greatest damage. So the question is if people will be able to acquire instruments for making this evil conscious and thus for destroying it. It is a daily occurence that people deny the motives others insinuate to them. They wouldn't need to deny them if they knew the difference between the conscious and the unconscious.

Karol Irzykowski, *Freudyzm i freudyści*

The beginnings of the interest in psychoanalysis in the Polish medical and academic circles in the late period of the partitions (1900–1918) are closely related to the assimilation processes of the large Jewish population in Galicia and the Congress Kingdom, which began here on a large scale in the second half of the 19th century. It is no coincidence that an overwhelming majority of the first supporters of Freud's theory came from this group. In this respect, the beginnings of the movement in the lands inhabited by Poles did not particularly differ from how they looked in other regions of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Russia, or Prussia. It is worth emphasizing that particularly large Jewish communities originally lived in the lands of the former First Republic, and it was only in the 19th century that mass Jewish migration to the south – to the more economically advanced regions inhabited mostly by Austrians, Czechs, and Hungarians – began. This is well-illustrated by the fate of Freud's, Ferenczi's, and Klein's families, their ancestors, some of them Polish speaking, who inhabited the lands of Central Poland and Galicia, and in the 19th century moved to Moravia, Budapest, and still later to Vienna.[286]

The fact that psychoanalysis so strongly influenced – along with Zionist and left-wing Marxist ideas – the young generation of educated Jews entering the space of European culture, resulted from the fact that in all these movements and theories a strong emancipatory claim was present. Despite the sometimes-large differences in their "content," they were united by a common assumption, namely,

286 A picture of these migration processes of the Jewish community is provided by Larry Wolff in the aforementioned book *The Idea of Galicia*.

that effective implementation of these theories in social practice would lead to a deep transformation of the existing forms of consciousness and a new society would be built from scratch. A truly "scientific" justification was sought for such a task, although again every movement conceived it differently. In Freud's case, this found its expression in his obsessive desire to endow psychoanalysis with the status of a scientific theory akin to the natural sciences, for he believed that only then its findings and insights would acquire a universal nature and that a change in the cultural self-knowledge of the host society would be possible.

In this sense, psychoanalysis was a "promised land" for its supporters. But it was only one of many popular movements which offered prospects for a better tomorrow for the young generation of educated Jews. Opening the door to the hidden depths of the human mind, to instinctively determined human desires, it produced a dream about a new man who would be better able to shape the "economy" of his mental life. Reaching this "promised land" was to allow him to cope better with his sexual drives and aggressive instincts through neutralizing the negative effects of their impact.

As a result, all social divisions and hierarchies were to be fundamentally transformed, because when confronted with the unconscious, all existing historically and culturally motivated prejudices and superstitions, beliefs in the superiority of some social groups, races or cultures against others, lost their meaning. All kinds of parochial views withered away. All human individuals turned out to be "equal" in their unconscious sexual and aggressive desires, even if these desires found different external objects. And they were the source of identity differences of a sexual nature. But in accepting these differences, one could start to create a psychoanalytically emancipated society of a new type, which, equipped with knowledge about its unconscious, could more effectively use its energies and neutralize all threats related to these energies. It is particularly visible in the memoirs of Nunberg (see above), who directly states that he joined the Polish Social-Democratic Party – as did some of his Jewish friends – driven by the hope that its social agenda offered to abolish anti-Semitism in the relations between Poles and Jews.[287]

Psychoanalysis was a "promised land" in a dual sense: both as a new "methodical" way of reaching through therapy an area of repressed "representations" (*Vorstellungen*) hidden in the human unconscious, and as a theory capable of identifying the unconscious and making therapeutic use of this identification. Opening new, previously unknown spaces of his inner life to man, psychoanalysis

287 See Nunberg, *Memoirs*, p. 16.

shows him a world in which true "redemption" awaits him. Thanks to psychoanalysis, he will be able to free himself from all complexes, frustrations, inhibitions, and disorders.

Some elements of the belief that psychoanalysis allows the liberation of man from everything which, being repressed into his unconscious, constrains, hampers, and depresses him, could be recognized in the early texts of Freud. The emancipatory message present in them constituted the massive power of attraction and the fascination of his theory, unimaginable for us today. Jekels himself succumbed to it at the time. It is well-illustrated by one of the above-quoted biographical comments where he says that attending Freud's lectures in Vienna ushered him into a completely new world, incomparable to everything about which contemporary medical studies, psychology, and psychiatry spoke. People like Jekels, uncritically looking up to the Master and placing huge hope in the therapeutic effects of the theory proposed by him, spread it later in the spirit of an "apostolic" mission in various provinces of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Switzerland, Germany, Scandinavian countries, and Russia.

It was similar in the period from the beginning of the 20th century until 1918 in the Polish lands of the Austrian and Russian partition, where Freud's and Jung's theories gained considerable popularity in the native medical community. These theories found here their ardent supporters, who were fluent in German and read Freud's and his students' works in the original. But there were also plenty of critics, some questioning the scientific merits of these theories, others rejecting them for political and ideological reasons or because they were unable to accept their claims about human sexuality on moral grounds. Anti-Semitic prejudices often stood behind this criticism as well.

A crucial role in popularizing psychoanalysis (also in later periods) was played by Jekels' first translations of Freud's works into Polish and his book *Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda* (1911). Written from a "confessionary" standpoint, it was at the same time a skillful introduction to the basic assumptions of the theory of the Master from Vienna. In the same period, Polish medical, philosophical, and cultural journals started to publish the first articles about psychoanalysis. This was accompanied by a genuine interest in Freud's and Jung's theories among the intelligentsia and bourgeoisie, partly spurred by the fact that due to the liberal approach to human sexuality contained within them, which undermined existing notions, an aura of controversy and scandal grew around them. Heated debates were sparked in which widely differing opinions were voiced.

A good example of this is the considerable attention devoted to psychoanalysis by the daily press (lecture announcements, short commentaries, notes, etc.).

For this reason, the years between 1900 and 1914 could be called the *Sturm und Drang* period, when the Polish medical and philosophical community was vividly interested in Freud's theory, most of their representatives treating it as a serious scientific theory (even if a large part of it was skeptical).

One of the first significant testimonies to the influence of Freud's theory in the domestic medical community, of symbolic import, was the undertaking of psychoanalytical therapy (somewhere around 1905) by Jekels, as well as Nunberg visiting Jekels over the summer, in the Bystra Sanatorium in Upper Silesia. But it was only in 1909, when Jekels started to maintain regular contact with the group gathered around Freud in Vienna, that this influence became clearly visible. It made itself felt at the First Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists, and Psychologists, during which the first papers on Freud's theory were heard by around 300 people and later published in *Neurologia Polska*. The next year, short academic sessions on psychoanalysis were held in Warsaw and then recounted in the journal *Pamiętnik Towarzystwa Lekarskiego Warszawskiego*. And slightly later, between 1911 and 1914, the first translations of Freud into Polish appeared, and books and extensive articles on psychoanalysis were published (by L. Jekels, L. Wołowicz, T. Jaroszyński, and others).

Supporters of the movement marked their presence even more clearly at the Second Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists, and Psychologists in Kraków (1912), where one whole day was reserved for papers on psychoanalysis and discussions on its claims. This was unprecedented, for such a distinction granted to psychoanalysis at such a prestigious congress was unthinkable in the academic communities of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and in Germany, which were both permeated with the spirit of Positivist Scientism. Slightly later and in the first years after the war, a crucial role in the spread of the psychoanalytical idea was played, beyond Vienna, by Budapest, mostly thanks to the organizational skills and leadership of Sándor Ferenczi. The high point of the movement's development in Hungary was in 1918–1920, when left-wing parties took power and proclaimed the Hungarian People's Republic, and later the Communist Party of Hungary became dominant and promoted psychoanalysis across the social spectrum.

The third strong center, besides Vienna and Budapest, that experienced a flourishing of psychoanalytically oriented work before the outbreak of World War I, was the Burghölzli clinic near Zürich in Switzerland, supported by Bleuler and Jung. Many assistants from Jan Piltz's clinic at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków gained clinical experience there. And many Polish Jewesses studied or held internships at Burghölzli, partly because Switzerland was the first country in Europe where women were allowed to study at universities. Some of them

maintained intense contact with their home country and sporadically published articles in Polish (M. Gincburg and Fr. Baumgarten).

It should be emphasized that Freud's and Jung's theories were equally popular among physicians in the Congress Kingdom (mainly in Warsaw), that is, within the Russian partition, where the key role was later played by the Psychiatric Ward of the Jewish Hospital in Czyste (A. Wizel, M. Bornsztajn, G. Bychowski, and R. Markuszewicz). And it was also here that Eugenia Sokolnicka unsuccessfully tried to found a Polish psychoanalytical society during her stay in Warsaw between 1917 and 1919. Interest in psychoanalysis was also fueled by contact with the medical communities in Russia, where in the early 20th century it was becoming increasingly popular. Let us recall that in order to get a medical diploma, each Polish medical student had to undergo a few-months-long medical practicum in one of the hospitals or clinics in Russia.

In the period between 1909 and 1914, Polish-language medical and philosophical journals, as well as the cultural and literary press, published over twenty articles devoted to psychoanalysis. (There were also brief press comments and notes.) This is a truly impressive number if we compare it with contemporary publications in other countries. Besides publications in domestic journals, many Polish analysts and psychiatrists interested in psychoanalysis published in German, in leading Austrian, German, and Swiss psychoanalytical and medical magazines. This was partly due to the fact that from the late 19th century until the 1930s, Austria, Germany, and Switzerland formed the global center for medical sciences, especially psychology, psychiatry, and neurology.

No wonder that it was mainly there – sometimes also in France – that almost all Polish representatives of these sciences acquired their expertise and professional experience, including those who were particularly interested in psychoanalysis and attempted to practice it as a form of therapy. Many of them later continued their scientific and medical work abroad, and joined psychoanalytical societies in the countries they emigrated to. Some of them, like Jekels, Nunberg, Deutsch, and Sokolnicka, made important contributions to the international development of psychoanalytical theory with their books and articles, while others, such as Adam Wizel, Stefan Borowiecki, Jan Nelken, Maurycy Bornsztajn (Bornstein), and Gustaw Bychowski, returned to their home country and continued their psychoanalytical work there.

Psychoanalysis also started to be widely discussed among philosophers, mainly in the group of Lviv philosophers and psychologists centered around Kazimierz Twardowski, the greatest Polish philosopher of this period and one of the founders of the so-called Lviv-Warsaw School, which in the interwar period gained international renown (Bronisław Bandrowski, Stefan Błachowski,

Leopold Wołowicz, Stefan Baley, and others). A good illustration of the interest in psychoanalysis among this group is provided by the numerous articles published in the Lviv *Ruch Filozoficzny* edited by Twardowski. Although his attitude towards psychoanalysis was skeptical, he saw it as one of the crucial psychological and psychiatric movements of the era. Hence his journal published both critical and enthusiastic articles about psychoanalysis. It is enough to recall that some of the Polish female psychologists interested in psychoanalysis had a philosophical education (L. Karpińska, F. Baumgarten, and B. Rank); and leading representatives of the movement were intimately familiar with the tendencies in contemporary philosophy (A. Wizel, L. Jekels, S. Borowiecki, M. Bornsztajn, and young Gustaw Bychowski).

Karol Irzykowski, a leading Polish writer and literary critic of the era, was particularly interested in psychoanalysis and in 1913 published one of the most insightful essays on "Freudianism" at the time. The theory also aroused a growing interest in literary and artistic circles, as evidenced by what Stanisław Przybyszewski and Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz (Witkacy) said about it. The latter, when undergoing analytical therapy with the Zakopane psychoanalyst Karol de Beauraine, infected Bronisław Malinowski, the future ethnologist of world renown, with his precise "method" of taking down dreams. It was under the influence of Witkacy that in his diaries from that period he started to note his dreams with a startling Freudian literalness, even the sexually obscene ones. When several decades after his death the diaries were published in an English translation in the United States, they sparked such an outrage in the local puritan scientific community that they were censored (!!).

As can be seen from the above review of various forms of influence of Freud's and Jung's psychoanalytical theories on Polish medical, academic, and artistic circles in Galicia (the Austrian partition) and the Congress Kingdom (the Russian partition) between 1900 and 1918, it is a significant, but still largely unexamined element of the history of the psychoanalytical movement at the time. In its intensity and scope, this influence was comparable to that observed in Hungary, Switzerland, Russia, or Germany, that is, the countries in which the interest in psychoanalysis among doctors and academics was the strongest in this early period. One of the reasons, besides the emancipatory processes concerning the Jewish population discussed above, was the proximity of Lviv and Kraków to Vienna, which meant that all kinds of "novelties" from the capital of the Habsburg Monarchy very soon reached these cities. Another factor was the native psychological and psychiatric tradition, with its particular emphasis on the concept of the "subconscious" (Edward Abramowski and others). So even if Jekels, and later Sokolnicka, did not succeed in founding a Polish psychoanalytical society, the

fact remains that there were at least a dozen people interested in practicing psychoanalysis as a form of therapy in the Polish medical community, especially in Kraków and Warsaw. And they were potential candidates for members of such a society.[288]

In any case, it is not a coincidence that Freud attached such importance to promoting psychoanalysis in the Polish medical and intellectual communities in Galicia and the Congress Kingdom. Strong institutional foundations of psychoanalysis in these circles could significantly strengthen the position of the psychoanalytical movement among physicians and academics in the entire Habsburg Monarchy.

Until the 1920s, Freudian and Jungian psychoanalysis attracted the attention of Polish intelligentsia with its charm of novelty. Its main claims on the unconscious, the role of sexual desires in human life, elements of criticism of culture, and so on shocked and outraged some, but seduced and fascinated others. There were passionate discussions about them, people reflected on their credibility and asked to what extent they really made it possible to fathom these areas of the human mind which previously had been accessible only through poetic intuition.

Most controversies, criticism, and indignation were of course sparked by Freud's claims about sexuality, especially that of children. They struck at approaches to these questions that had been shaped by tradition and supported by the Church. The claim that you should separate procreation from pure pleasure in the human sexual drive; the hypothesis of the Oedipus complex, saying that the first object of the child's sexual instinct is his mother, and the first object of its aggressive instincts is his father; the belief that infantile masturbation is a natural manifestation of puberty; the claim that the first stirrings of sexual life may be observed in a few-month-old child and that they are "polymorphic" and hence they may become attached to various kinds of objects; a new look at sexual perversions, finding their origins in the structure of instincts – these and other claims undermined the foundations of the traditional approach to sexuality.

This was followed by a different assessment of a number of sexual behaviors proper to adults, such as premarital sex, promiscuity, treating various sexual positions prohibited by the Church as natural, emphasizing the role of "foreplay"

288 As it seems, Jekels and Sokolnicka failed to establish a Polish psychoanalytic society, because they did not have the required charisma, organizational talent, or the ability to attract others to their own ideas. But Ferenczi in Hungary apparently possessed these qualities, because he succeeded in founding a Hungarian psychoanalytical society, although initially he encountered the enormous resistance of the local medical milieu.

and engaging various body parts in it, and a different approach to homosexuality, widely treated as a "sinful" perversion. This led psychoanalysis to postulate that the child should be taught a completely different approach to the whole sexual sphere than the existing one – promoted by the family, Church, and school – from the youngest age. As a result, first attempts were made, inspired by Freud's, Jung's, and Stekel's psychoanalysis, to develop new models of educating children, the right of women to freely express their sexuality was recognized, which was in line with the causes of the feminist movement, and tolerance towards homosexual and bisexual behaviors was promoted.

The conflict with the conservative part of society on this issue was very extensive. The conflict had its sources in a different anthropology underlying psychoanalytical theory, which was incompatible with the concept of man as preached by the Church and as accepted by the majority of society (which did not mean that people behaved in accordance with these precepts in their daily life). The fundamental difference was that everything in human sexual life that the Church treated as the domain of sin and moral depravity, in the eyes of Freud and his continuators and students was a natural manifestation of human instinctive life. And if it led to mental disorders and pathologies, it required a therapeutic intervention rather than going to confession. This new approach to various manifestations of the patient's sexual life, absolutely secular, devoid of any metaphysical and religious elements, triggered frequent accusations of promoting profoundly immoral claims under a scientific guise, which Irzykowski ironically referred to in his article about Freudians. A good example of this was the intervention of a Kraków bishop (see above), whose cook told him about the "sinful" subjects raised by Nunberg during her sister's therapy sessions.

In response to all these charges, Polish advocates of psychoanalysis said that the moral rigor of the critics was hypocritical, because their own sexual behavior sharply contrasted with what they preached (L. Jekels, T. Jaroszyński, and A. Wizel). Worse, said the psychoanalysts, it was the traditional excessive rigor in the approach to human instinctive life which led to a number of pathologies in this area. Meanwhile, the psychoanalytical approach – which, incidentally, was in line with theories of sexuality which had been already developed in psychology and psychiatry – was based on an appeal to treat this domain of human mental life with greater tolerance and understanding. As a result, partly because the volume of the repressed content would be smaller, people would avoid many disorders and pathologies in their mental life. People simply had to better identify their sexual desires and start to live in accordance with them and the needs of their bodies, developing a new kind of "compromise" between these demands and the requirements of their social and cultural environment.

The outbreak of World War I interrupted these discussions for four years. The third congress of the Polish medical communities planned for 1914 in Lviv unfortunately did not take place. In November 1918, with the establishment of the independent Polish state, a new chapter in the history of psychoanalysis in Poland began. Physicians practicing psychoanalysis and its supporters expected that it would be a truly democratic state, in which a new social order, more just than before, would be built, and that assimilation processes among the Jews would be completed and that there would be a greater tolerance for everything and everyone different. And they hoped that psychoanalysis would acquire an even stronger position in the academic community and gain wide social acceptance. After all, in their eyes it was a theory revealing a completely new truth about man and culture. Therefore, they believed that its findings and achievements would inevitably become an element of the self-knowledge of the general public. What remained of these hopes, which were at least partly fulfilled, but which were broken for certain reasons … all this is the subject of the second volume of this book.

Bibliography

Abramowski, Edward. *Badania doświadczalne nad pamięcią*, Vol. 1–3. Warszawa: E. Wende i S-ka, 1910.

Anz, Tomas and Christine Kanz, eds. *Psychoanalyse in der modernen Literatur. Kooperation und Konkurrenz*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1999.

Appignanesi, Lisa and John Forrester. *Freud's Women*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1992.

Baley, Stefan, "Kazimierz Twardowski a kierunki filozofii współczesnej." *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, Vol. 41, No. 1, 1938, pp. 339–345.

Bandrowski, Bronisław. "Psychologia na II zjeździe neurologów, psychiatrów i psychologów polskich." *Ruch Filozoficzny*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1913, pp. 25–31.

Baumgarten, Franziska. *Die Erkenntnislehre von Maine de Biran. Eine historische Studie*. Zürich–Krakau: Buchdruckerei von A. Kozianski, 1911.

Baumgarten, Franciszka. "Teoria snu Freuda." *Neurologia Polska*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 1912, pp. 1013–1062.

Baumgarten, Franciszka. *Kłamstwo dzieci i młodzieży*. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia, 1927.

Baumgarten, Franciszka. *Badania uzdolnienia zawodowego*. Lwów-Warszawa: Książnica Atlas, 1930.

Baumgarten, Franciszka. "O charakterze i jego kształceniu." *Kwartalnik Psychologiczny*, No. 3, 1937.

Baumgarten-Tramer, Franziska. *Janusz Korczak – der polnische Pestalozzi*. Düsseldorf: Rochus Verlag, 1965.

Beaurain, Karol de. "Über das Symbol und die psychischen Bedingungen für sein Entstehen beim Kinde." *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, No. 5, 1913, pp. 431–435.

Beller, Steven. *Vienna and the Jews. 1867–1938. A Cultural History*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Bergler, Edmund. "Ludwig Jekels, M. D., 1867–1954." *Bulletin of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, No. 10, 1954, pp. 831–832.

Bernays, Minna. "Letter from Minna Bernays to Sigmund Freud, July 18, 1910." In: *Sigmund Freud Minna Bernays Briefwechsel 1882–1938*, ed. A. Hirschmüller. Tübingen: Edition Diskord, 2005a, pp. 255–256.

Bernays, Minna. "Letter from Minna Bernays to Sigmund Freud, July 23, 1910." In: *Sigmund Freud Minna Bernays Briefwechsel 1882–1938*, ed. A. Hirschmüller. Tübingen: Edition Diskord, 2005b, p. 260.

Bettelheim, Bruno. *Freud and Man's Soul*. New York: Knopf, 1982.

Bloch, Ivan. *Das Sexualleben unserer Zeit in seiner Beziehungen zur modernen Kultur*. Berlin: Louis Marcus Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1907.

Błachowski, Stefan. "Problem świadomości u Freuda." *Ruch Filozoficzny*, Vol. 2, No. 10, 1912, pp. 205–208.

Bornstein, Maurycy. *O odrębnym typie rozszczepienia psychicznego (schizothymia reactiva)*. Warszawa: E.Wende i S-ka, 1916, pp. 1–42.

Bornsztajn, Maurycy. *Wstęp do psychiatrii klinicznej. Dla lekarzy, psychologów i studentów*. Łódź: Księgarnia Ludowa Łódź, 1948.

Borowiecki, Stefan. "Metoda psychoanalityczna Freuda i jej kryteria." *Przegląd Lekarski*, No. 53, 1914, pp. 31–32, 494–497, 502–506.

Burkot, Stanisław. "Od psychoanalizy klinicznej do literackiej." *Rocznik Naukowo-Dydaktyczny WSP w Krakowie*, No. 68, 1978, pp. 133–157.

Bychowski, Gustaw. *Słowacki i jego dusza. Studium psychoanalityczne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo J. Mortkowicza, 1930; second edition: ed. Danek, Danuta. Kraków: Universitas, 2002.

Bžoch, Adam. *Psychoanalyse in der Slowakei. Eine Geschichte von Enthusiasmus und Widerstand*. Giessen: Psychosozial-Verlag, 2013.

Cała, Alina. *Asymilacja Żydów w Królestwie Polskim (1864–1897). Postawy, konflikty, stereotypy*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1989.

Cioffi, Frank. *Freud and the Question of Pseudoscience*. Chicago: Open Court, 1998.

Clark, Ronald W. *Freud: The Man and the Cause*. New York: Easton Press, 1980.

Czarnecki, Bartholomäus Gregor. *Ludwig Jekels (1867–1954) und die Anfänge der Psychoanalyse in Polen*. Tübingen: Medizinische Fakultät Universität Tübingen, 2006.

Dembińska, Edyta and Krzysztof Rutkowski. "Rozwój psychoterapii jako metody leczenia zaburzeń psychicznych na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim i w Krakowie do wybuchu I wojny światowej." *Psychiatria Polska*, No. 20, 2015a, pp. 1–12.

Dembińska, Edyta and Krzysztof Rutkowski. "Ludwika Karpińska, 'Polish Lady Philosopher' – a forgotten forerunner of Polish psychoanalysis." *Psychiatria polska*, No. 27, 2015b, pp. 1–12 (online: www.psychiatriapolska.pl)

Deutsch, Helen. *The Psychology of Women* Vol. 1, New York: Grune & Stratton 1944; Vol. 2, New York: Grune & Stratton, 1945.

Deutsch, Helen. *Confrontations with Myself*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1973.

Dobroczyński, Bartlomiej. *Idea nieświadomości w polskiej myśli psychologicznej przed Freudem*. Kraków: Universitas, 2005.

Dobroczyński, Bartłomiej and Paweł Dybel, eds. *Od Jekelsa do Witkacego. Psychoanaliza na ziemiach polskich pod zaborami 1900–1918. Wybór tekstów*. Kraków: Universitas, 2016.

Dobroczyński, Bartłomiej and Mira Marcinów, *Niezabliźniona rana Narcyza*. Kraków: Universitas, 2018.

Drob, Sanford, "Freud and the Chasidim: Redeeming the Jewish Soul of Psychoanalysis." *The Jewish Review*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1989 (online: http://thejewishreview.org/articles/?id=193)

Dybel, Paweł. "Unterbrochene Wege. Die Geschichte der Psychoanalyse in Polen." *Psyche*, No. 11, 1999, pp. 1160–1187.

Dybel, Paweł. "Urwane ścieżki czyli z dziejów psychoanalizy w Polsce zaborów i międzywojnia." In: *Urwane ścieżki. Przybyszewski – Freud – Lacan*, ed. Paweł Dybel. Kraków: Universitas, 2000a, pp. 17–46.

Dybel, Paweł. "A Note on the History of Psychoanalysis in Poland." *PsyArt, An Online Journal for the Psychological Study of the Arts*, September No. 7, 2000b. (online: http://psyartjournal.com/article/show/dybel-a_note_on_the_history_of_psychoanalysis)

Dybel, Paweł. "Die Psychoanalyse – ein gelobtes Land? Zur Kulturgeschichte der psychoanalytischen Bewegung in Polen." *Psyche*, No. 3, 2014a, pp. 216–247.

Dybel, Paweł. "Das Wissen vom Unsinn. Die Frage nach dem wissenschaftlichen Status der Psychoanalyse." In: *Die Grenzen der Interpretation in Hermeneutik und Psychoanalyse*, eds. Hermann Lang, Pawel Dybel, Gerda Pagel. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2014b, pp. 29–72.

Dybel, Paweł. *Psychoanaliza – ziemia obiecana? Dzieje psychoanalizy w Polsce 1900–1989*. Kraków: Universitas, 2016.

Dybel, Paweł. *Mesjasz, który odszedł. Bruno Schulz i psychoanaliza*. Kraków: Universitas, 2017a.

Dybel, Paweł, ed. *Przywracanie pamięci. Polscy psychiatrzy XX wieku orientacji psychoanalitycznej*. Kraków: Universitas, 2017b.

Dybel, Paweł, ed. *Powinowactwa z epoki. Związki polskiej literatury modernizmu i międzywojnia z psychoanalizą*. Kraków: Universitas, 2018.

Espagne, Michele. *Les transferts culturels franco-allemands*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999.

Ferenczi, Sándor. "Zur Ontogenese des Symbols." *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse*, Vol. I, No. 5, 1913, pp. 437–438.

Fras, Zbigniew. *Galicja*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 2003.

Freud, Anna. "Letter from Anna Freud to Sigmund Freud, July 13, 1910." In: *Sigmund Freud – Anna Freud: Correspondence 1904–1938*, ed. I. Meyer-Palmedo. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2014, pp. 30.

Freud, Sigmund. *O marzeniu sennym*. Trans. Beata Rank. Leipzig–Vienna–Zürich, Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1923.

Freud, Sigmund. "The Interpretation of Dreams." In: *Standard Edition*, eds. James Strachey et al. Vol. 4/5. London: The Hogarth Press, 1953.

Freud, Sigmund. "Psycho-Analytic Notes on an Autobiographical Account of a Case of Paranoia (Dementia Paranoides)." In: *Standard Edition*, eds. James Strachey et al. Vol. 12. London: The Hogarth Press, 1958, pp. 3–82.

Freud, Sigmund. "On the History of Psycho-Analytic Movement." In: *Standard Edition*, eds. James Strachey et al. Trans. Joan Riviere. Vol. 14. London: The Hogarth Press, 1966, pp. 7–66. [German: Freud, Sigmund. "Zur Geschichte der psychoanalytischen Bewegung." In: *Gesammelte Werke*. Vol. 10. Frankfurt am Main: T. Fischer Verlag, 1999.]

Freud, Sigmund. "The Question of Lay Analysis." In: *Standard Edition*, ed. James Strachey. Vol. 20. London: Hogarth Press, 1959, pp. 177–258.

Freud, Sigmund. "Civilisation and its Discontents." In: *Standard Edition*, ed. and trans. John Strachey. Vol. 21. London: Hogarth Press, 1961, pp. 64–145.

Freud, Sigmund. *Briefe an Wilhelm Fließ 1887–1904*, ed. Jeffrey M. Masson. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 1986. [English: *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess 1887–1904*. ed. Jeffrey M. Masson. Cambridge, MA, and London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985.]

Freud, Sigmund. *Freud Minna Bernays Briefwechsel 1882–1938*. Tübingen: Edition Diskord, 2005, p. 260.

Freud, Sigmund and Karl Abraham. *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham 1907–1925. Complete Edition*. Ed. Ernst Falzeder. Trans. Caroline Schwarzacher. London, New York: Routledge, 2002.

Freud, Sigmund and Sándor Ferenczi. *Sigmund Freud – Sándor Ferenczi. Briefwechsel*. Eds. Falzeder, Ernst and Eva Brabant et al. Vol. 1–2. Wien, Böhlau Verlag, 1993.

Freud, Sigmund and Carl G. Jung. *Sigmund Freud, Carl G. Jung, Briefwechsel*. eds. William McGuire, William Wolfgang Sauerlander. Frankfurt am Main: T. Fischer Verlag, 1984.

Freud, Sigmund and Oskar Pfister. *Psychoanalysis and Faith: the Letters of Sigmund Freud and Oskar Pfister (1900–1939)*. Trans. Erig Mosbacher. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Gajkiewicz, Władysław and Adam Wizel, eds. *Prace I-go Zjazdu Neurologów, Psychiatrów i Psychologów Polskich odbytego w Warszawie 11, 12 i 13 października 1909 roku*. Warszawa: Skład Główny Z. Wende i S-ka, 1910.

Gay, Peter. *A Godless Jew: Freud, Atheism and the Making of Psychoanalysis*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.

Grosskurth, Phyllis. *Melanie Klein: Her World and her Work*. New York: Knopf, 1986.

Groth, Jarosław. "Przyczynek do historii polskiej psychoanalizy – Eugenia Sokolnicka." *Polskie Forum Psychologiczne*, Vol. 18, No. 1, 2013, pp. 110–141.

Groth, Jarosław. "Na pograniczu psychologii i pedagogiki – czyli życie i działalność Ludwiki Karpińskiej-Woyczyńskiej." *Studia Edukacyjne*, No. 33, 2014, pp. 279–303.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Knowledge and Human Interests*. Trans. Jeremy S. Shapiro. Boston: Politz Press, 1972.

Hańbowski, Wojciech. *Tożsamość psychoanalityka i inne studia przypadków*. Sopot: Wydawnictwo GWP, 2013.

Hewelke, Otton. "Kornelia Metella w Irydionie Krasińskiego." *Krytyka lekarska*, No. 3, 1903, pp. 1–7.

Irzykowski, Karol. "Teoria snów Freuda." *Nowa Reforma*, No. 590, 1912, pp. 1–2.

Irzykowski, Karol. "Freudyzm i freudyści." *Prawda*, No. 2–6, 8–9, 1913a. Reprinted in: *Kronos*, No. 1, 2010, pp. 215–229.

Irzykowski, Karol. "Acheron duszy." *Świat*, No. 3, 1913b, p. 1.

Irzykowski, Karol. "Pierwszy bilans Przybyszewskiego i jego autorehabilitacja." In: *Pisma rozproszone*, ed. A. Lam. Vol. 2. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1999, pp. 139–146.

Ivanyk, Stepan. "Psychoanaliza w szkole lwowsko-warszawskiej: Stepan Baley o motywie endymiońskim w twórczości literackiej Tarasa Szewczenki i Juliusza Słowackiego." *Logos i Ethos*, Vol. 1, No. 32, 2012, pp. 43–62.

Janicki, Kamil. *Epoka hipokryzji. Seks i erotyka w przedwojennej Polsce*. Kraków: Ciekawostki Historyczne, 2015.

Janion, Maria. "Legion żydowski Mickiewicza." In: *Bohater, spisek, śmierć. Wykłady żydowskie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo: W.A.B, 2009, pp. 223–258.

Jaroszyński, Tadeusz. *Odczyty kliniczne*. Warszawa: Druk T. Kowalewskiego, 1912.

Jaroszyński, Tadeusz. *Przyczynek do nauki o psychonerwicach. (Analiza 35 przypadków histerii, neurastenii, nerwicy lękowej i psychastenii)*. Kraków: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1913.

Jekels, Ludwik. *Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda*. Lwów: Polskie Towarzystwo Nakładowe, 1912.

Jekels, Ludwig. "Vom II. Polnischen Neurologen- und Psychiater-Kongreß in Krakau (20. Bis 23 Dezember 1912)." Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse, No. 2, 1913, pp. 191–192.

Jekels, Ludwig. *Selected Papers*. London: International Universities Press, 1952.

Jones, Ernest. *Sigmund Freud: Life and Work,* Vol. I, *The Young Freud 1856–1900*. London: Hogarth Press, 1972.

Jung, Carl G. "Eine Bemerkung zur Tauskschen Kritik der Nelkenschen Arbeit." Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse, No. 3, 1913, pp. 285–288.

Jung, Carl G. "The Letters of C. G. Jung to Sabina Spielrein."In: Sabina Spielrein, Forgotten Pioneer of Psychoanalysis, eds. C. Covington and B. Wharton. New York: Brunner-Routledge, 2003, pp. 33–60.

Karpińska, Ludwika. "Badania doświadczalne nad kojarzeniem wyobrażeń." *Przegląd Lekarski*, No. 43–47, 1912, pp. 603–604, 617–619, 635–637, 647–649, 677–679.

Karpińska, Ludwika. "Psychologiczne podstawy freudyzmu." *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, No. 4, 1913, pp. 508–526.

Karpińska, Ludwika. "O psychoanalizie." *Ruch Filozoficzny*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1914, pp. 33–38.

Karpinska, Luise von. "Ein Beitrag zur Analyse >>sinnloser<< Worte im Traume." Internationale Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Psychoanalyse, No. 3, 1913, pp. 163–172.

Karpinska, Luise von. "Über die psychologischen Grundlagen des Freudianismus." Internationale Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Psychoanalyse, No. 4, 1914, pp. 305–326.

Klein, Dennis B. The Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1981.

Kłys, Anna. *Tajemnica pana Cukra. Polsko-żydowska wojna przed wojną*. Warszawa: Wielka Litera, 2015.

Kołodziejska, Zuzanna. "*Izraelita*" *(1866–1915) – znaczenie kulturowe i literackie czasopisma*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2014.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Magnone, Lena. "Karola Irzykowskiego lacanowska lektura Freuda." *Kronos*, No. 1, 2010, pp. 203–214.

Magnone, Lena. "Polskie przestrzenie psychoanalizy. Zapolska w Bystrej." *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, No. 2, 2011, pp. 49–63.

Magnone, Lena. "Emancypantki, socjalistki, psychoanalityczki. Kobiety w ruchu freudowskim na początku XX wieku." In: *Kobiety i historia. Od niewidzialności do sprawczości*, eds. K. Bałżewska, D. Korczyńska-Partyka, A. Wódkowska. Gdańsk: Uniwersytet Gdański, 2015, pp. 40–52.

Magnone, Lena. *Emisariusze Freuda. Transfer kulturowy psychoanalizy do polskich sfer inteligenckich przed drugą wojną światową*. Kraków: Universitas, 2016a.

Magnone, Lena. *Psychoanaliza w Polsce 1909–1946*. Vol. I, II. Warszawa: Fundacja Augusta hr. Cieszkowskiego, 2016b.

Malewski, Jan. "Psychoanalyse in Polen." *Die Psychologie des 20. Jahrhunderts: Freud und die Folgen*, Vol. 2, 1977, pp. 117–118.

Malinowski, Bronisław. *Dziennik w ścisłym znaczeniu tego wyrazu*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2002.

Marcinowski, Filip. "By popchnąć naprzód świadomość ducha i leczyć jego zboczenia." In: *Na drogach i bezdrożach historii psychologii*, eds. Teresa Rzepa and Cezary W. Domański. Vol. 3. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, 2014.

Marcinów, Mira. *Historia polskiego szaleństwa w XIX wieku*. Gdańsk: słowo/obraz/terytoria, 2018.

Margalit, Elkana. "Social and Intellectual Origins of the Hashomer Hatzair Youth Movement 1913–1920." *Journal of Contemporary History*, No. 2, 1969, pp. 25–49.

Markuszewicz, Roman. "O działalności naukowej ś.p. D-ra Adama Wizla." Medycyna, No. 17–18, 1929, pp. 261.

Marquard, Odo. Transzendentaler Idealismus. Romantische Naturphilosophie. Psychoanalyse. Köln: Verlag für Philosophie, 1987.

McGuire, William. ed. The Freud/Jung Letters. *The Correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung*. Trans. Ralph Manheim and R. F. C. Hull. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Mickiewicz, Adam. *Forefathers' Eve*. Trans. Charles S. Kraszewski. London: Glagoslav Publications Limited, 2016.

Miłosz, Czesław. *Przygody młodego umysłu*. Ed. Anna Stawiarska. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak, 2003.

Natanson, Ludwig. *Teorya jestestw idiodynamicznych*. Warszawa: W drukarni J. Bergera, 1883.

Nelken, Jan. "Über schizophrene Wortzerlegungen." Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1912, pp. 2–5.

Nelken, Jan. "Badania psychoanalityczne chorób nerwowych." *Neurologia Polska*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1913, pp. 145–155. [German: "Psychologische Untersuchungen an dementia-praecox Kranken." Journal für Psychologie und Neurologie, No. 17, 1911, pp. 174–185].

Nelken, Jan. "Analytische Beobachtungen über Phantasien eines Schizophrenen." Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschung, Vol. 4, 1912, pp. 504–562.

Nelken, Jan. "O potrzebie państwowego Zakładu dla umysłowo chorych zbrodniarzy w Galicji." *Lwowski Przegląd Lekarski*, No. 42, 1913, pp. 667–671.

Nunberg, Herman. "Niespełnione życzenia według nauki Freuda." *Neurologia Polska*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1913, pp. 1–13.

Nunberg, Herman. *Allgemeine Neurosenlehre auf psychoanalytischer Grundlage*. Bern Stuttgart: Verlag Hans Huber, 1932.

Nunberg, Herman. *Memoirs. Recollections, Ideas, Reflections*. New York: Psychoanalytic Research and Development Fund, 1969.

Nunberg, Herman and Ernst Federn, eds. *Minutes of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society*, Vol. 2. 1908–1910. Trans. H. Nunberg. New York: International Universities Press, 1967.

Pappenheim, Berta. "Zur Lage der jüdischen Bevölkerung in Galizien. Reiseeindrücke und Vorschläge zur Besserung der Verhältnisse." In: Sisyphus. Gegen den Mädchenhandel – Galizien, ed. H. Heubach. Freiburg: Kore Velag, 1992.

Pawlak, Krzysztof and Zbigniew Sokolik. "Historia psychoanalizy w Polsce." *Nowiny Psychologiczne*, No. 4, 1992 pp. 83–90.

Pfister, Oskar. *The Psychoanalytic Method*. Trans. Charles Rockwell Payne. New York: Moffat Yard & Company, 1917.

Piltz, Jan. *Stanowisko psychiatryi w rzędzie innych nauk lekarskich, oraz nowoczesne jej zadania i cele* [published lecture]. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1905, pp. 1–32.

Podgórska-Klawe, Zofia. "Szpital Starozakonnych w Warszawie - Part 1–2." *Pamiętnik Towarzystwa Lekarskiego Warszawskiego*, 2008. https://docplayer.pl/5161017-Zarys-historii-szpitala-wolskiego-dawniej-szpitala-starozakonnych-na-czystem.html

Prokop-Janiec, Eugenia. *Pogranicze polsko-żydowskie. Topografie i teksty*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2013.

Prokop-Janiec, Eugenia, ed. *Polacy – Żydzi. Kontakty kulturowe i literackie*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2014.

Prus, Bolesław. *The Doll*. Trans. David Welsh and Anna Zaranko. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Przybyszewski, Stanisław. *Moi współcześni*. Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1959.

Reich, Wilhelm. Massenpsychologie des Faschismus: zur Sexualökonomie der politischen Reaktion und zur proletarischen Sexualpolitik. Kopenhagen, Prag, Zürich: Verlag für Sexualpolitik, 1933.

Reich, Wilhelm. *Dialektischer Materialismus und Psychoanalyse*. Kopenhagen: Verlag für Sexualpolitik, 1934.

Rice, Emanuel. *Freud and Moses: The Long Journey Home*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

Rider, Jacques de. *Modernity and Crisis of Identity. Culture and Society in Fin-de-siècle Vienna*. New York: Publisher Continuum, 1993.

Rosińska, Zofia. *Psychoanalityczne myślenie o sztuce*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1985.

Rychliński, Karol. *Istota natręctwa myślowego*. Warszawa: Księgarnia E.Wende i S-ka, 1909.

Rzepa, Teresa and Bartłomiej Dobroczyński. Historia polskiej myśli psychologicznej. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 2009.

Schier, Katarzyna. Piękne brzydactwo. Psychologiczna problematyka obrazu ciała i jego zaburzeń. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR, 2009.

Schorske, Carl E. *Fin de siècle Vienna. Politics and Culture*. New York: Vintage Books, 1980.

Speina, Jerzy. "Bruno Schulz wobec psychoanalizy." *Studia o prozie Brunona Schulza*, No. 115, 1976, pp. 17–30.

Sterba, Richard W. *Reminiscences of a Viennese psychoanalyst*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1982.

Stiller, Robert. *Freud i żydowska tradycja mistyczna*. (online: www. gnosis. art. pl/numery/gn02stiller_freud_i_zyd_trad_mist.htm [accessed October 10, 2015])

Trzebiński, Stanisław. "O teorii Freuda i psychoanalizie." *Nowiny Lekarskie*, Vol. 10, 1912, pp. 587–89.

Walewska, Katarzyna. "Breve histoire de la psychanalyse en Pologne." *Les Lettres de la Société de Psychanalyse Freudienne*, Vol 14, 2005, pp. 104–107.

Walewska, Katarzyna. *Progi narodzin*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2011.

Więckowska, Maria. "Dr. Ludwika Karpińska-Woyczyńska. Wspomnienie pośmiertne." Polskie Archiwum Psychologii, No. 93, 1936–1937, pp. 170–173.

Witkiewicz, Stanisław Ignacy. *Narkotyki - Niemyte dusze*. ed. Anna Micińska. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1975.

Witkiewicz, Stanisław Ignacy. *Listy I*. ed. Tomasz Pawlak. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 2013.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. "Conversations on Freud." In: *Lectures and Conversations on Aesthetics, Psychology and Religious Belief*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Wizel, Adam. *Wiek nerwowy w świetle krytyki*. Warszawa: G. Centnerszwer, 1896.

Wizel, Adam. "Ze spraw szpitalnych." *Medycyna*, Vol. 27, No. 12, 1899, pp. 274–277, 27 (13), pp. 298–300.

Wizel, Adam. "Asymilacja czy polonizacja?" *Izraelita*, No. 4, 1910, pp. 1–2.

Wizel, Adam. *Zaburzenia płciowe pochodzenia psychicznego. Studjum kliniczne i psychologiczne*. Warszawa: Wende i S-ka, 1914.

Wolff, Larry. *The Idea of Galicia. History and Fantasy in Habsburg Political Culture*. Stanford California: Stanford University Press, 2010.

Wołowicz, Leopold. *Jeden z problematów psychoanalizy Freuda*. Stryj: Z drukarni Augusta Olbricha, 1912.

Wyka, Kazimierz. *Modernizm polski*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1987.

Zaretsky, Eli. *The Secrets of the Soul. A Social and Cultural History of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Vintage Books, 2004.

Index

Cross-Roads
Studies in Culture, Literary Theory, and History

Edited by Ryszard Nycz

Vol. 1 Małgorzata Budzowska: *Phaedra* – Ethics of Emotions in the Tragedies of Euripides, Seneca and Racine. Translated by Adriana Grzelak-Krzymianowska. 2012.

Vol. 2 Andrzej Zawadzki: Literature and Weak Thought. Translated by Stanley Bill (in consultation with Benjamin Koschalka). 2013.

Vol. 3 Maria Janion: Hero, Conspiracy, and Death: The Jewish Lectures. Translated by Alex Shannon. 2014.

Vol. 4 Grzegorz Grochowski / Ryszard Nycz (eds.): From Modern Theory to a Poetics of Experience. Polish Studies in Literary History and Theory. 2014.

Vol. 5 Anna Nasiłowska (ed.): Wisława Szymborska´s poetry. Choice of Essays. Translated by Karolina Krasuska and Jędrzej Burszta. 2015.

Vol. 6 Zdzisław Łapiński (ed.): "Miłosz Like the World". Poet in the Eyes of Polish Literary Critics. Translated by Grzegorz Czemiel. 2015.

Vol. 7 Włodzimierz Bolecki: *A World Apart* by Gustaw Herling. Translated by Agnieszka Kołakowska. 2015.

Vol. 8 Jakub Momro: Literature of Consciousness. Samuel Beckett – Subject – Negativity. Translated by Jan Pytalski and Cain Elliott. 2015.

Vol. 9 Katarzyna Majbroda: Clifford Geertz's Interpretive Anthropology. Between Text, Experience and Theory. Translated by Izabela Kołbon, Zuzanna Buchowska and Olga Ranus. 2016.

Vol. 10 Michał Głowiński: Myths in Disguise. Translated by Grzegorz Czemiel and Stanley Bill. 2018.

Vol. 11 Mikołaj Golubiewski: The Persona of Czesław Miłosz. Authorial Poetics, Critical Debates, Reception Games. 2018.

Vol. 12 Adam Dziadek: Somatic Criticism Project. 2018.

Vol. 13 Piotr Sobolczyk: The Worldview, the Trope, and the Critic. Critical Discourses on Miron Białoszewski. Translated by Jan Burzyński. 2018.

Vol. 14 Małgorzata Czermińska: The Autobiographical Triangle. Witness, Confession, Challenge. 2019.

Vol. 15 Krzysztof Trybuś: Romantic Memory. Studies from the Past and Present. Translated by Klara Naszkowska. 2019.

Vol. 16 Piotr de Bończa Bukowski / Magda Heydel (eds.): Polish Translation Studies in Action. Concepts – Methodologies – Applications. A Reader. 2019.

Vol. 17 Tamara Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz / Magdalena Rembowska-Płuciennik / Beata Śniecikowska (eds.): Understanding Misunderstanding. Vol.1: Cross-Cultural Translation. 2019.

Vol. 18 Tamara Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz / Magdalena Rembowska-Płuciennik / Beata Śniecikowska (eds.): Understanding Misunderstanding. Vol. 2: Artistic Practices. 2020.

Vol. 19 Wojciech Ligęza: World under Revision. The Poetry of Wisława Szymborska. 2019.

Vol. 20 Paweł Dybel: Psychoanalysis – the Promised Land? The History of Psychoanalysis in Poland 1900–1989. Part I. The Sturm und Drang Period. Beginnings of Psychoanalysis in the Polish Lands during the Partitions 1900–1918. 2020

www.peterlang.com