

THE ANALYTIC METHODS OF GRODDECK AND JUNG IN LIGHT OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF NATURE.

Marco Balenci (*)

ABSTRACT

The philosophy of nature as Jung's background has been overlooked, despite its relevance for understanding the roots of analytical psychology. The German psychoanalyst Georg Groddeck shared such a background, so that a comparison is possible between his clinical view and Jung's. It is shown that natural philosophers Paracelsus, Johann von Goethe and Carl Gustav Carus had a major impact on Jung and Groddeck. Both of the latter followed Carus's theory of a creative, superindividual, and compensatory unconscious -continuing the *Naturphilosophie* tradition and rejecting reductionist biophysical medicine. Groddeck and Jung's holistic perspective led them to advocate natural healing, face-to-face dialectical analysis, and the uniqueness of each treatment. Thus, they were against using techniques, and instead established general methods for analytic therapy. Groddeck's thinking was closer to Jung's than to Freud's in both theory and practice. Therefore, two alternative strands should be considered within psychoanalysis: Freud's classical drive theory and Groddeck's underground two-person psychology. Thereby, Jung's analytic descendants and the relational psychoanalysts who stemmed from Groddeck's ideas could be regarded as 'cousins' due to the similarities arising from their common origin in the philosophy of nature.

Keywords: Carl Gustav Carus; Georg Groddeck; Goethe; Jung; Jungian analysis; Naturphilosophie; Paracelse; analytic attitude; analytic technique.

RESUMEN

Se ha pasado por alto la filosofía de la naturaleza como trasfondo de Jung, a pesar de su relevancia para comprender las raíces de la psicología analítica. El psicoanalista alemán Georg Groddeck compartió esos antecedentes, por lo que es posible una comparación entre su visión clínica y la de Jung. Se muestra que los filósofos naturales Paracelso, Johann von Goethe y Carl Gustav Carus tuvieron un gran impacto en Jung y Groddeck. Ambos siguieron la teoría de Carus de un inconsciente creativo, supraindividual y compensatorio -continuando la tradición de la *Naturphilosophie* y rechazando la medicina biofísica reduccionista. La perspectiva holística de Groddeck y Jung los llevó a defender la curación natural, el análisis dialéctico cara a cara y la singularidad de cada tratamiento. Por lo tanto, ambos estaban en contra del uso de técnicas y, en cambio, establecieron métodos generales para la terapia analítica. El pensamiento de Groddeck estaba más cerca del de Jung que del de Freud tanto en la teoría como en la práctica. Por lo tanto, se deben considerar dos corrientes alternativas dentro del psicoanálisis: la teoría clásica de las pulsiones de Freud y la alternativa psicología bipersonal de Groddeck. Así, los descendientes analíticos de Jung y los psicoanalistas relacionales que surgieron de las ideas de Groddeck podrían ser considerados como "primos" debido a las similitudes derivadas de su origen común en la filosofía de la naturaleza.

Palabras claves: Carl Gustav Carus; Georg Groddeck; Goethe; Jung; análisis junguiano; filosofía de la naturaleza; Paracelso; actitud analítica; técnica analítica.

INTRODUCTION: NATURE AND UNCONSCIOUS

According to Jung (1923, para. 907), ‘the unconscious is the residue of unconquered nature *in us*’ and the contents of the collective unconscious are also ‘the nature in us’ (Jung 1928/1931a, para. 739; italics in original). He stated: ‘analytical psychology is a reaction against the exaggerated rationalization of consciousness which, seeking to control nature, isolates itself from her and so robs man of his own natural history’. This inner nature is rejected by reason, giving rise to a conflict that -to Jung (ibid. 1928, para. 290)- analytical psychology aims to resolve by integrating consciousness with the natural spirit. This is therefore to be considered a key aim of Jungian analysis.

The roots of these ideas lie in the past. In the mid-1800s, you can find the idea of a deep and archaic level of the unconscious in the theory of Carl Gustav Carus (1846/1851, p. 69), who called it *absolute unconscious*. The concept of natural spirit is much older, dating back to Paracelsus, but it had already been present in ancient philosophy and medicine. In fact, there is a common thread that starts from antiquity, reaches Paracelsus, and then arrives at Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Carl Gustav Carus, and Eduard von Hartmann. This tradition of the philosophy of nature – along with Friedrich Nietzsche, and other philosophers like Immanuel Kant and Arthur Schopenhauer – most influenced Jung.¹

Indeed, Henri Ellenberger (1970, p. 728) wrote: ‘Perhaps the most important of his [Jung’s] sources are to be found in Romantic philosophy and in the Philosophy of Nature’. Such a background was shared by Georg Walther Groddeck, a German physician and the founder of modern psychosomatic medicine (Balenci 2018, 2021).

THE PHILOSOPHY OF NATURE’S THREE ERAS

The philosophy of nature has been developing for over two millennia and has a central underlying theme -the doctrine of the essential unity of God, soul and nature. It is divided into the historical periods of the Pre-Socratics, the Renaissance and Romanticism. In Jung’s work there are references to all three classical eras of natural philosophy (Arzt 2008, pp. 14, 16).

Pythagoras’ and Heraclitus’ notions of quaternity and enantiodromia are enough to understand the relevance of Pre-Socratics for Jungian psychology. Their conception that man is a microcosm in the macrocosm was taken up by Renaissance natural philosophy. Both leading figures of the German Renaissance, Jacob Boehme² and Paracelsus, influenced Jung (Arzt 2008).

Philippus Aureolus Theophrastus Bombastus von Hohenheim, known as Paracelsus [1493-1541]

Paracelsus is acknowledged today as the first modern medical scientist and the main exponent of alchemical medicine. Of Swiss origin, he followed the Florentine physician Marsilio Ficino’s Neoplatonism,³ according to which ‘all corporeal activity derives from a non-corporeal vital principle joined to matter’ (Pagel 1958, p. 218). Vitalism is the core of Paracelsus’ natural philosophy. It was adopted by German vitalist biology of the 1800s, which affected Jung’s cultural formation. Jung particularly studied Hans Driesch’s theory and moved away from classical vitalism, taking on a peculiar neo-vitalistic vision (Nagy 1991, pp. 247-64; Oddo 2005).

Paracelsus also applied ‘the principle of the complementary pairs of opposites’ (Jacobi 1942, p. xlvii) -a cornerstone of analytical psychology. As a natural philosopher, he wrote: ‘The world is as God created it’, hence the macrocosm and the microcosm ‘are only *one* thing, *one* being’. In this holistic perspective, Paracelsus sees ‘man as a part of nature’; ‘he is the microcosm, and thus carries in him the whole firmament with all its influences’. According to Paracelsus, ‘love for the patient ... should be the physician’s first virtue’ in regard to the practice of the medical profession, while concerning theory, the ‘book of medicine is nature itself’ (Paracelsus 1942, pp. 14, 19, 39, 154, 69, 86. Italics in original). Paracelsus’ medicine was based on the fundamental concern to integrate the human being into the universe. Even his philosophy had only one object -nature (Bloch 1974, p. 67).

Paracelsus was named *Lutherus medicorum* for his medical revolution and because he wrote in German instead of Latin. He took the doctor's personality and the 'healing word' deeply into consideration (Jacobi 1942, p. lxxv), recognizing the immense importance of psychic factors in diseases. Paracelsus used dreams, not only as a tool for medical diagnosis, but also to study their cathartic function and their prophetic and supernatural character (Allendy 1937, pp. 91-92). He proposed that there were natural causes for mental illness, epilepsy, and hysteria, thus siding against the prevailing idea of demonic possession. Furthermore, Paracelsus distinguished between the animal soul and the specifically human soul, which correspond respectively to the unconscious and conscious minds (ibid., pp. 86-89).

Jung (1929a, 1941, 1942) wrote three papers on Paracelsus, particularly dealing with a comparison between the alchemical stages and the process of psychic individuation. Jung (1942, para. 237) called Paracelsus 'a pioneer ... of empirical psychology and psychotherapy'. The first to write about psychotherapy in alchemical medicine had been René Allendy⁴ (1912, p. 96), who held that Paracelsus had 'indicated the therapy addressed to the spirit (psychotherapy)'. In fact, psychotherapy was the intended treatment for *diseases of the soul* in alchemical medicine, a practice existing from the time of Pythagoras (ibid., pp. 129-131).

Groddeck (1894) had also shown interest in Paracelsus by writing an article on him in a medical journal. He was the favourite pupil of Ernst Schweninger, the most prominent doctor in Germany at that time because he was a university professor of dermatology and the personal physician of the Imperial chancellor Otto von Bismarck. Groddeck followed Schweninger's naturopathic medicine. Thus his treatments were mainly massage, hydrotherapy, and diet.

Paracelsus was, in fact, an innovator who:

“declared that many diseases originate in psychological causes, and that all intemperances of the mind and emotions lead not only to the immediate discomfort of the body, but, by corrupting man's psychic nature, cause some of those ailments most difficult to diagnose and treat. (Hall 1964, p. 19)

Groddeck came to specialize in treating these kinds of ailments. Accordingly, he set up a clinic in Baden-Baden for chronically ill patients in 1900. Groddeck always followed the teachings of Paracelsus, Gottfried Rademacher and Schweninger -great empirical physicians. Thus, his patients were his main source of learning (Will 1987, p. 19).

Johann Wolfgang Von Goethe [1749-1832]

The most important figure for the transition from Paracelsus to Romanticism -the third stage of natural philosophy- was Goethe (Steiner 1911), who created the character of Faust from traits belonging to Paracelsus – a fact that Jung (1942, paras. 145, 154) himself detected. Goethe knew Paracelsus' philosophy in depth, having studied it along with theosophical and alchemical writings (Bishop 1998, p. 135). Nature was an absolute central topic for Goethe (1958, pp. 138-43), so much so that his fundamental idea was 'the view that God is inseparably within Nature and Nature inseparably within God' (Goethe, trans. in Sherrington 1949, p. 48). He introduced the terms *Morphologie* and *Urbild* (archetype) into biology. Goethe (1958) applied the principle of totality both to nature and the human being. His pantheistic conception of nature transiently affected university student Sigmund Freud⁵ (Bishop 2009, pp. 9-32; Nicholls 2010), but had a lasting impact on Jung and Groddeck.

Much has been written about Goethe's fundamental importance to Jung, starting with the family legend that Jung was a descendant of Goethe (see notably Ellenberger 1970; Bishop 2008, 2009). After his reading of *Faust*, Jung (1961a, pp. 82, 113, 252) regarded Goethe as a 'prophet', the 'godfather and authority' in his enterprise to deepen 'one idea and one goal: namely, to penetrate into the secret of personality'. Jung felt that Goethe and himself were gripped by the same centuries-old 'process of archetypal transformation'. He also regarded his own study of alchemy as a sign of his 'inner relationship to Goethe'. Finally, it should

be underlined that the literary works which most influenced Jung were Goethe's *Faust* and Nietzsche's *Zarathustra* (Arzt 2008, p. 23).

Groddeck's maternal grandfather was the director of Nietzsche's high school and Groddeck himself knew Nietzsche's sister, Elisabeth Förster-Nietzsche (Goldmann 1985, p. 112). Nietzsche's works had a great influence on Groddeck, whose psychosomatic ideas were close to the speech of Zarathustra 'The Despisers of the Body'. Moreover, Will (1985, p. 157) pointed out a remarkable analogy between Nietzsche's *Selbst* (Self) and Groddeck's *Es* (It). Goethe was important to Groddeck as well⁶. In particular, Groddeck widely used Goethe's term *Gottnatur* (God-nature) from 1909 to mean the totality of the human being (Groddeck 1909; see von Röder 1961). After the beginning of his correspondence with Freud in 1917, Groddeck expressed this notion with the word *Es* (It) as more neutral and pragmatic (Groddeck 1923, pp. 216-217; see Will 1985, p. 158). Balenci (1993, 2018) has shown the closeness of Groddeck's *It* and Jung's *Self* as terms to denote the microcosm, the totality of the human being, and 'the god within us'. These two concepts are remarkably indebted to Nietzsche's thought⁷ and the philosophy of nature. Therefore, *It* and *Self* are conceived as psychosomatic and include the principle of totality – although this is not present in Freud's theory.

Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling and Carus's Naturphilosophie

The Romantic philosophy of nature -known as *Naturphilosophie*- began at the end of the 18th century with Schelling (1797/1803), according to whom nature and spirit are an indissoluble unity. Consequently, it is possible to understand nature if one also resorts to the spiritual laws of *Weltseele* (world soul). This current of thought originated in Germany as a reaction to the physico-chemical materialism of the Galilei-Newton tradition. *Naturphilosophie*'s exponents supported holism and vitalism in biology, building on the previous stance of Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz who understood nature as a whole (Mayr 1982, pp. 128-31). Moreover, they advocated the principle of the unity of man and nature, as Paracelsus had done, affirming the correspondence between microcosm and macrocosm (Bloch 1974, p. 75).

As a matter of fact, 'the study of living organisms from the Renaissance to the nineteenth century was largely in the hands of the medical profession' (Mayr 1982, p. 105), to the point of elaborating philosophical-speculative reflections on natural sciences. This is represented by Carl Gustav Carus [1789-1869], who developed a complex system of *Naturphilosophie*, where nature is holistically considered 'as one vast and infinite life' (Carus 1819, pp. 225). From 1829 to 1846, Carus developed a psychology that was associated with the study of nature (Marquard 1987, pp. 169-178). In his system, knowledge of the psyche constitutes the key access to the essence of the world (Cera 2014). Carus was Goethe's friend, director of Dresden obstetric clinic, university professor, comparative anatomist and personal physician to three kings of Saxony. His aforementioned theory of the unconscious was the first to be systematic and to make the unconscious central (Bell 2010, pp. 156, 166).

Carus's position overturns the role of reason of Cartesian derivation by attributing the primacy of mental life to the unconscious, even with regard to creativity. In fact, Carus (1846/1851, p. 27) wrote: 'the forms of the unconscious force are infinitely superior, both in terms of inner perfection and efficiency, to anything the conscious mind can produce'. According to him, the unconscious is nature within us; it has an uninterrupted *life force* and a close connection with the general world. Hence, in the unconscious there is *nature's healing power*. Carus (1846/1851, p. 87) stressed the therapeutic value of 'the marvellous and mysterious stirring of unconscious life, that "healing power of nature", that "physician in man", which slowly undermines illness, inducing a "crisis" that frequently restores health with astonishing rapidity by means of a strange reversal of organic activity'. As a supporter of Romantic medicine, Carus rejected reductionism and mind-body dualism. He saw the human being as a *living whole* (Carus 1851, p. 2), thus advocating a holistic approach to both the patient's body and soul.

This was precisely the stance of Groddeck, who also shared Carus's view that the doctor treats patients, but they are healed by nature. The Latin sentence '*Natura sanat, medicus curat*' was Groddeck's (1913) favourite principle, after the tradition of natural philosophy. Indeed, Hippocrates, inspired by Egyptian

hermeticism, had established the principles of *Natura Medicatrix* and of *Enormon* -the spirit in the organism (Allendy 1912, pp. 76, 86). Many centuries later, Paracelsus (1942, p. 91) wrote: 'Nature is the physician, not you. From her you must learn, not from yourself; she compounds the remedies, not you. ... Everything external in nature points to something internal; for nature is both inside man and outside man'. Groddeck (1923) and Jung (1931, para. 81; 1946, para. 524; 1951, para. 252) carried this idea of natural healing forward.

Jung and Groddeck followed Carus's theory of a compensatory and therapeutic unconscious, and continued the tradition of *Naturphilosophie* (Balenci 2021). When Jung was in the psychoanalytic movement, his perspective of a compensatory function of the unconscious was considered a controversial innovation (Haynal & Falzeder 2011, p. 184). Jung's closeness to Carus regarding the healing power of the unconscious was highlighted by Odo Marquard (1987, p. 176). As for Groddeck, it has always been obvious that his cultural path started from the thought of Goethe and Carus: 'Groddeck was strongly influenced by Goethe's *Naturphilosophie* like Carl Gustav Carus' (Will 1987, p. 178; see Bell 2010, p. 158). According to Alexander and Selesnick (1966, p. 392), Groddeck's view was 'essentially similar to that of Carus'. Hans Schaer (1946, p. 33) was probably the first to understand that Jung was closer to Carus's theory of the unconscious than to Freud's. In 1948, Robert Eisler (1948, p. 348) detected Carus's priority over Jung 'to recognize the existence of a superindividual, ancestral layer in our memories, common to all mankind'. We have to wait until 1970 when James Hillman (1970) and Henri Ellenberger (1970, p. 729) wrote about Carus's significance to Jung. Hillman acknowledged Carus:

as a precursor of Jung... they are both holists, attempting to penetrate with their vision through the phenomena to the archetypal background of life. Both are indebted to Kant and Goethe. Both paid especial attention to the philosophy of nature; Carus in all his works, Jung mainly in his studies in alchemy. Both conceived man's link to nature to be through the unconscious psyche. (Hillman 1970, p. 10)

Hillman also argued that it is not possible to see Jung's roots without the background constituted by Carus and the philosophy of nature. Hillman (ibid.) believed that one of the main difficulties in understanding the thought of Jung lay in 'this very lack of context'. More recently, Thomas Arzt (2008, p. 16) spoke of the erroneous intellectual-historical placement of analytical psychology, whose 'natural-philosophical aspects have so far been kept hidden from a wider audience'.

Nevertheless, most of Jung's biographers and scholars have continued to ignore this background. Even a book (Nagy 1991, p. 259) specifically 'about the philosophical and historical background of Jung's psychology, particularly in the nineteenth century' did not address Carus at all.⁸ Conversely, Sonu Shamdasani (2003, pp. 164-67, 174-75) noted the relevance of Carus to Jung. In his paper devoted to the relationship between analytical psychology and *Naturphilosophie*, Arzt (2008) concluded that Jung must be placed entirely in line with the philosophy of nature. Hence, Jung has been a philosopher-doctor (Baudouin 1975, pp. 300-02) and the most modern representative of *Naturphilosophie* (Arzt 2008, p. 16; Miranda 2018, p. 154).

Jung read Carus as a student and then remained interested in his theory, mentioning it twenty-three times in his writings from 1930 to 1959. He espoused it in his 1933-1934 course at the *Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule* (Swiss Federal Institute for Technology) in Zurich. In his Lecture 4 on 10 November 1933, Jung (1933-1934, pp. 31-33) said that Carus:

"was not an empiricist, but a philosopher and a pantheist, influenced by Schelling. His main achievement was the development of a comparative psychology Carus was the first to speak of the 'unconscious', and his writings comprise highly modern points of view on it The key to real psychology can be found only in the dark. Mental illnesses and creativity also originate in the unconscious. Carus regards the unconscious as human will and intelligence assuming a cosmic extent. (Jung 1933-1934, pp. 31-33)

Why did Jung wait until 1930 to quote Carus? It is likely that in the years of the creation of analytical psychology Jung did not wish his ideas to be compared with Carus's, which are similar to his own. However, in so doing, Jung facilitated the narrative of being Freud's pupil. Although Jung had always turned against the widespread idea that his theory derived from Freud's, only late in life he claimed: 'My conceptions are much more like Carus than like Freud' (de Angulo 1952, p. 207). Unfortunately, Carus has been forgotten in the history of German psychology (Bell 2010, p. 156) and there are still hardly any translations of his books. It can be assumed that this situation has shifted the focus even more to Freud, helping to increase the Freudocentric view of Jung.

GRODDECK AND JUNG WITHIN THE NATURPHILOSOPHIE TRADITION

This historical path through the philosophy of nature has shown that both Jung and Groddeck belong to such a tradition. Conversely, after a transient interest in Goethe's *Naturphilosophie*, Freud turned to the growing current of scientificity represented by Hermann von Helmholtz's medicine (Amacher 1965; Sulloway 1979; Makari 2008). When Groddeck was a student, he did the opposite: physico-chemical physiologist Emil Du-Bois Reymond was his favourite teacher but, in the end, he followed the holistic physician Schweninger (Martynkewicz 1997, pp. 92-95).

At the turn of the twentieth century, German-speaking Europe was at the centre of the clash between Enlightenment and Romanticism. Whereas Freud chose the first, Groddeck and Jung took sides against scientificity and the absolutism of rationality (Grotjahn 1945; Martynkewicz 1997; Shamdasani 2003; Balenci 2021). These two *Weltanschauungen* are characterized by opposing notions: mechanicism vs. organicism, reductionism vs. holism, causalism vs. finalism; lastly, with regard to the main analytic concepts, there is Freud's Ego versus Groddeck's It and Jung's Self (Balenci 2018).

This basic difference should be deemed as more important than other reasons that have been considered for the rupture between Freud and Jung. Without minimizing personal and typological causes or specific theoretical disagreements, Freud's extraneousness to Naturphilosophie represents a fundamental fact: his ideas and goals were different from Groddeck's and Jung's. Confirmation comes from the evidence that one finds no mention of Paracelsus and Carus in the entire work of Freud. There are only two quotes from von Hartmann and one from Schelling regarding dreams (Freud, 1900). Freud mentioned *Naturphilosophie* four times as a conception of the past that has been overtaken by scientific medicine.

However, even Freud's theories have philosophical foundations, despite his 'attempts to distance psychoanalysis from philosophy' (Gödde 2010, p. 286; see Brann 1970). According to Marquard (1987), the origin of concepts such as defence, fixation, regression, repression, resistance, and sublimation comes from *Naturphilosophie*. Marquard showed that basic categories of psychoanalysis are philosophical, in spite of Freud following Helmholtz's School in order to create a scientific discipline. Actually, for Günter Gödde, Freud's 1890s metapsychology derived from the convergence of that materialistic thought with the psychological philosophy of Gustav Theodor Fechner, Wilhelm Jerusalem and Theodor Lipps. From 1919 moreover, some ideas from Schopenhauer and Nietzsche became part of Freud's late work (Gödde 2010). Hence, Freud rejected Schelling and Carus's holistic *Geist-Natur* and his concept of nature came from Schopenhauer and Nietzsche's *Wille-und-Drang-Natur* -an instinctive nature (*Triebnatur*) that is opposed to reason (Marquard 1987, p. 227; note 152, pp. 441-44).

It is necessary, therefore, to recognize two distinct lines of depth psychology: Jung's and Groddeck's represented a continuity with the philosophy of nature; whereas Freud's was built on a reductionist approach. Deriving from different *Weltanschauungen*, these analytic lines gave rise to two therapeutic conceptions, each with its own characteristics. Groddeck and Jung saw the unconscious as an intellect smarter than consciousness and a spring of creativity, following Carus's vision. Since Théodore Flournoy was one of Jung's theoretical references from the time of his dissertation and later a 'fatherly friend' (Jung 1961a, p. 201), it should be highlighted that Flournoy's view was also characterized by attributing 'non-pathological and creative components' to the unconscious (Shamdasani 1998, p. 118; see Witzig 1982). In contrast, Freud's rationalism regarded the Id as negative and chaotic (Laplanche & Pontalis 1988, p. 198).⁹

Jung and Groddeck shared the idea that the content of consciousness corresponds to the opposite in the unconscious (Ellenberger 1970, p. 844). Their idea of the unconscious respected the inner wisdom that is expressed through symbolism in dreams and even disease. To Groddeck (1922, pp. 166), ‘the symbol is a means by which the unconscious guides consciousness’ and symbolization is not the result of intrapsychic conflicts related to repression, as it was for Freud. It could be argued that Groddeck’s concept of the symbol is intermediate between those of Freud and Jung, because Groddeck often interpreted symbolism in sexual terms, although at the same time he stressed its innate features (Grotjahn 1945) and teleological meanings (Groddeck 1926a, p. 211). Without explicitly referring to a collective level like Jung, Groddeck (1923, p. 54) wrote: ‘Symbols ... belong to the inalienable estate of man; indeed, one might say that all conscious thought and action are the unavoidable consequence of unconscious symbolization, that mankind is animated by the symbol’.

Being representations of totality and wholeness, Self and It are linked to the notion of holistic health. The Self constitutes the source and goal of the individuation process, in which individuation is considered by Jung (1940/1950, para. 234) a form of ‘natural transformation’. He (Jung 1917/1926/1943, para. 187) asserted: ‘This natural process of individuation served me both as a model and guiding principle for my method of treatment’. Jung (1931, para. 82) also stated that, when the results are not satisfactory, the analyst ‘must follow nature as a guide ... developing the creative possibilities latent in the patient himself’. For his part, Groddeck (1926b, p. 126) saw the therapeutic process as conducted by the patient’s It: ‘in the treatment itself it is not the doctor who is the essentially active partner, but the patient. The doctor’s chief danger is Hybris’. In agreement, Jung wrote:

“the therapist is no longer the agent of treatment, but a fellow participant in a process of individual development. ... No longer is he the superior wise man, judge, and counsellor; he is a fellow participant who finds himself involved in the dialectical process just as deeply as the so-called patient. (Jung 1935a, paras. 7-8)

Even in his mature view, Jung advocated an attitude of humility: ‘It cannot be assumed that the analyst is a superman just because he is a doctor and possesses a theory and a corresponding technique’ (Jung 1961b, para. 497).

JUNG’S AND GRODDECK’S ANALYTIC METHODS

Since Groddeck and Jung believed treatment should be tailored to each patient, *method* -and not technique- is a better term to refer to them (Will 1987, p. 141; Baudouin 1975, p. 233). Such a personalized style for every analytic therapy makes it impossible to apply a technique, but leaves room for the general criteria of a methodology. ‘Jung was an unusually skilled psychotherapist who took a different approach with each one of his patients according to their personality and needs’; he felt equally at ease speaking with people of every social condition (Ellenberger 1970, p. 681). Groddeck treated rich guests in his clinic and poor outpatients with the same dedication, adjusting his fees based on their economic circumstances.

Groddeck (1923, p. 120) was firmly convinced ‘that for the It there is no distinction between organic and mental, and consequently that if the It can be influenced by analysis, even organic diseases can, and in certain circumstances must, be treated psychoanalytically’. Therefore, he combined all medical treatment with analysis. If one thinks about Freud’s (1912) technical recommendations, the contrast is stark. Yet, Groddeck was called ‘wonder doctor’ since he was able to heal chronic and severely ill patients (Grossman & Grossman 1965, p. 58; Will 1987, p. 143).

Groddeck was admitted to the Berlin Psychoanalytic Society in 1920, where he was an outsider because of his unorthodox ideas and therapeutic methods. However, he was esteemed by Otto Rank and many second generation psychoanalysts such as Erich Fromm, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, Ernst Simmel, Heinrich Meng, Karen Horney and Karl Landauer (Will 1987, p. 177). Simmel (1926) wrote an article defending Groddeck’s courage and ‘wildness’. When Groddeck approached the psychoanalytic movement, Jung was already out of it. Nonetheless, both of them attended the Schule der Weisheit (School of Wisdom) -a centre for global

culture in Darmstadt, Germany. Its organizer, *Naturphilosophie* scholar Count Hermann Graf Keyserling (1910), invited Groddeck and Jung to lecture. Keyserling (1934, p. 13) called Groddeck a philosopher of nature, reporting that he had addressed the School on ‘several occasion’. In 1927, Jung gave a lecture on *Die Erdbedingtheit der Psyche* (The Earth Conditioning of the Psyche), which was published in two papers (1928/1931b, 1928/1931c). Groddeck and Jung met at this conference in Darmstadt through Keyserling’s mediation. Groddeck commented on the encounter, criticizing Jung’s interpretations and mythology in a letter to Keyserling on 10 September 1928 (Fuechtner 2011, pp. 89, 94, 96).

In spite of that, Groddeck’s vision was similar to Jung’s, even if he always remained a member of the International Psychoanalytic Association (Balenci 2018, 2021). Indeed, both Groddeck and Jung were critical of reductionist science and kept their findings on a hypothetical level and not as principles or doctrines. They also shared personal features such as being Protestant and interested in religious matters. Nevertheless, there were significant differences between them as well. Groddeck put the clinical role of the doctor at the forefront: ‘Our task is less that of thinking up valid theories than of finding working hypotheses that are of use in treatment’ (Groddeck 1917, p. 128). Hence, he had no interest in creating a psychology such as Jung’s. Moreover, Groddeck remained aligned with Carus’s Romantic idea of the unconscious to the point of minimizing the importance of consciousness and rationality, whereas Jung ‘never forgot the importance of usual consciousness’ (Hillman 1970, p. 13), thus differentiating himself from Carus. In fact, Jung had learned from his psychiatric experience that the unconscious can be obscure and destructive.

Groddeck and Jung discovered the pre-Oedipal period and the fundamental role of the mother-child relationship. They also focused on the maternal transference, whereas only the father was relevant for the psychoanalysts of their time (Makari 2008, p. 354). According to Groddeck (1925, p. 102), from birth, love and hate are directed to ‘first the mother, then again the mother, and once more the mother, and next to her the father, brothers and sisters and anyone else’. Therefore, the treatment deals mainly with the patient’s capacity to transfer both positive and negative feelings: ‘The most important of them is the transference from the mother to the doctor, and next, that from the father’ (ibid., p. 104).

You can see the starting point of Melanie Klein’s theory in these sentences of Groddeck, who introduced the concept of ‘uterus envy’ and the maternal breast’s psychological significance (Hristeva & Poster 2013). In fact, Klein found out about his ideas through Sándor Ferenczi, her Hungarian analyst. Ferenczi had known Groddeck since 1920, and was greatly influenced by him in therapeutic practice (Fortune 2002). Thereby, Ferenczi learned from Groddeck a new analytic approach, characterized by the importance of emotionality, the adoption of a spontaneous attitude, the creation of a maternal space and a dialectical relationship (Will 1994, pp. 727-32). Under the influence of Groddeck and Otto Rank¹⁰, Ferenczi wrote the works that made him famous (Haynal 2002, p. 87). Ferenczi also developed Groddeck’s findings, which the latter was not interested in theorizing (Fortune 2002; Poster 2009; Hristeva & Poster 2013). Indeed, Groddeck was focused on ‘treating patients’ (Freud & Groddeck 1988, p. 78; see Grotjahn 1945, p. 11).

Groddeck’s technique was entirely different from Freud’s (Collins 1951a, p. 9). The fundamental task of psychotherapy -for Groddeck (1928, p. 218)- was ‘the tracing and dissolving of resistance’.¹¹ As a chronic disease specialist, he set out to awaken ‘the patient’s will-to-health’ (Collins 1951b, p. 25) and concentrated on the treatment of resistance, ambivalence and secondary morbid gain. This clinical experience convinced Groddeck (1926b, pp. 125-26) to avoid interpretations, since they may ‘give a handle to the resistance’ and make analysts acquire ‘that God-Almighty feeling which attributes infallibility to all our claims’.

Following Herbert Silberer (1914, p. 216), Jung (1917/1926/1943, paras. 128-140) considered two kinds of interpretations that he called analytical and synthetic. Nevertheless, Jung did not elaborate on this topic due to his standpoint that every patient should be treated ‘as individually as possible, because the solution to the problem is always an individual one’ (Jung 1961a, p. 163). Consequently, the level at which the interpretation should focus comes from the patient’s attitude-type and emotional situation (Dieckmann 1979, pp. 165-82). In therapeutic process, therefore, both Groddeck and Jung attributed greater importance to the relationship than to interpretation. Thus, their approach was more maternal than paternal, and highlighted the usefulness of the countertransference.

Power in the analytic relationship is one of the main differences between Groddeck's and Jung's methods compared to the Freudian technique. The latter was conceived within a drive theory. It was structured on a subject-object scientific observation, achieved through the couch -a tool raised to the level of an 'iconic status' (Friedberg & Linn 2012). The couch creates a setting in which the therapist's superior position is extreme (Haley 1963, p. 72) and radically conflicts with Jung's and Groddeck's dialectical approach to analysis. In fact, they did not use it. Jung claimed that it is the analyst's:

duty to accept the emotions of the patient and to mirror them. That is the reason why I reject the idea of putting the patient upon a sofa and sitting behind him. I put my patients in front of me and talk to them as one natural human being to another, and I expose myself completely and react with no restriction. (Jung 1935b, para. 319)

Jung (1946, p. 171 and note 16) saw the use of the couch as the analyst's defence. Recent physiological research on mirror neurons has shown that the empathic processes are activated by embodied simulation and facial expressions (Gallese 2009, Iacoboni 2009). Since the couch prevents visual and nonverbal communications, it is a depriving factor for patients (Lingiardi & De Bei 2011). Therefore, Jung's and Groddeck's therapeutic arrangement has turned out to be scientifically sound. Their dialectical view of analysis introduced a *two-person paradigm* that has supplanted Freud's one-person psychology even in the psychoanalytic field (Rudnytsky 2002, p. 143), setting the stage for current relational approaches.

THE KINSHIP OF ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY WITH GRODDECK'S STRAND OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

It is known that Jung reluctantly created a school. Groddeck also did not want to have disciples; but his therapeutic method -characterized by mothering, a dialectical conception of the analytic relationship and countertransference as a tool- had a significant influence on some younger members of the Berlin Institute and on the Budapest Psychoanalytic Society (Grotjahn 1966, p. 319; Rudnytsky 2002, p. 177; Fuechtner 2011, p. 66; Hristeva & Poster 2013; Poster, Hristeva & Giefer 2016). Until recently, relational psychoanalysis had only been considered as a heritage of the Hungarian school. On the contrary, it owes a great deal to Groddeck's concept of It (Rudnytsky 2002, p. 192) and to his therapeutic practice (Will 1994; Fortune 2002). In fact, Ferenczi (1930, pp. 123-125) himself explained that he used two techniques: namely the classical 'method of frustration' and the approach of maternal indulgence learned from Groddeck¹². That is why the current of theoretical and clinical thinking which followed the cooperation between Groddeck and Ferenczi was called the *Baden-Baden–Budapest branch of psychoanalysis* (Balenci 2021).

Actually, Groddeck was a 'progenitor' of relational psychoanalysis, attachment theory, and the Independent tradition of object relations theory (Rudnytsky 2002, pp. 98, 143). Andrew Samuels (1985, pp. 9-11) named those who were exponents of these orientations -such as Michael Balint, Wilfred Bion, John Bowlby, Ronald Fairbairn, Melanie Klein, Heinz Kohut, Margaret Little, Harold Searles, René Spitz and Donald Winnicott- as unknowing Jungians. Their theories have been much followed by analytical psychologists, in search of clinical indications which Jung deliberately did not provide (Cambray & Carter 2004, p. 120). The 'unknowing Jungians' belonged to the Baden-Baden–Budapest branch of psychoanalysis (Balenci 2021), which can be added as a *psychoanalytic filiation* to the peculiar family tree traced by Falzeder (1994), starting with Freud and the first psychoanalysts. It should be pointed out that this kind of research involves 'tracing lines of thought back to their origins A history of ideas, however, cannot be separated from a study of the persons who conceived these ideas' (ibid., p. 170).

Since Jung and Groddeck belonged to the philosophy of nature tradition and their therapeutic views were similar, Jung's analytic descendants could be regarded as 'cousins' of the members of the Baden-Baden–Budapest branch of psychoanalysis, which originated from Groddeck's ideas and has particularly focused on clinical practice, as he did.

Hence, two different strands should be considered within psychoanalysis: Freud's classical drive theory and Groddeck's underground two-person psychology. They are not additive but alternative. Relational psychoanalysis stemmed from Groddeck, but this fact has not yet been recognized. For instance, Erich Fromm, Harry Stack Sullivan and Clara Thompson are seen as the founders of the American interpersonal psychoanalysis school (Mitchell & Aron 1999, pp. ix-xiv) without acknowledging that Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, Erich Fromm and Clara Thompson had learned Groddeck's therapeutic approach from Groddeck himself. Groddeck was 'the first to introduce the maternal perspective into psychoanalysis', developing his clinical practice into a form of mothering. His *maternal turn* 'influenced directly Ferenczi, [Karen] Horney, Fromm-Reichmann and, through them and their followers, generations of psychoanalysts in both theory and practice' (Hristeva & Poster 2013, pp. 228, 233, 251) -including John Rosen and Harold Searles, famous analysts working with psychosis. It is interesting to note that there are several quotes from Jung in Rosen's (1953) work and that Searles's analytic style was similar to Jung's (Sedgwick 1993).

NATURAL PHILOSOPHICAL AND FREUDIAN LINES OF PSYCHOTHERAPY

Face-to-face treatment has been customary among relational psychoanalysts, as Groddeck and Jung did. These latter's therapeutic methods have great similarities, so much so that it seems appropriate to consider them as alternative to the Freudian technique. Nevertheless, in the history of psychoanalysis and analytical psychology, Jung and Groddeck's dialectical psychology and Freud's drive theory have been mixed, despite the current of which they are part. Even though they are alternative models, many post-Jungians have used theories and techniques without paying too much attention to their different basic assumptions. In contrast, it would be necessary to verify the possibility of integration through an epistemological critique.

It has been shown that Jungian analysis belongs to the natural philosophical line of psychotherapy. Accordingly, a therapeutic style should remain within this framework in order to be considered Jungian: namely, it should be dialectical and addressed to the patient's individuation process. However, such an analyst's disposition cannot be achieved by any technique because it involves emotional features like spontaneity and non-defensiveness. That is why Jung (1929b, para. 172; 1935a, para. 23; 1945, para. 198; 1951, para. 239) always focused on the therapist's personality and attitude towards patients to the point of identifying with them (Balenci 1987; Sedgwick 1993, p. 128). No shortcuts are possible. Ultimately, dialectical analysis is a human relationship in the consulting room. Thus, such a procedure requires that any adoption of techniques should be carefully personalized and not used as simple tools. Indeed, Jung (1926/1946, para. 203) wrote: 'The real and effective treatment of neurosis is always individual, and for this reason the stubborn application of a particular theory or method must be characterized as basically wrong'. Since Jung (1943, para. 240) was convinced that the curative effect comes from the personality, not from knowledge nor technical skill, it follows that the therapist's psychic disposition is key (hence Jung's emphasis for training analysis). How to reconcile this stance with natural healing?

Jung (1912, para. 437) compared analytical treatment to Socrates' method during the period when he was examining the divergences that would have removed him from the psychoanalytic movement. Jung (1913/1955, para. 519) then held the idea that 'Analysis is a refined technique of Socratic maieutics' -namely a dialectical procedure with the etymological meaning of assistance to promote a natural process (*μαϊευμαί*). In this perspective, the analyst's task is to facilitate the natural process of individuation through a dialectical relationship. This role accords with Groddeck's approach. Indeed, his motto was 'Become who you are!', taken from the Greek poet Pindar via Nietzsche. In the context of such a *Weltanschauung*, one cannot be surprised that Groddeck also devised the foundations for the obstetric practice of natural childbirth. However, the way in which Groddeck's analytic insights have been received by successive generations of psychoanalysts still needs to be properly studied. Furthermore, the changes that Jung's conception of treatment has undergone over the years should also be investigated. In fact, post-Jungians have extensively used techniques from other schools and mostly seem to have forgotten analytical psychology's roots in the philosophy of nature.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, F.G. & Selesnick, S.T. (1966). *The History of Psychiatry: An Evaluation of Psychiatric Thought and Practice from Prehistoric Times to the Present*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Allendy, R.F. (1912). *L'alchimie et la médecine: étude sur les théories hermétiques dans l'histoire de la médecine*. Paris: Bibliothèque Chacornac.
- Allendy, R.F. (1937). *Paracelse: le médecin maudit*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Allendy, R.F. (1948). *Le symbolisme des nombres: essai d'arithmosophie*, 2nd ed. Paris: Chacornac Frères Editions.
- Amacher, P. (1965). *Freud's Neurological Education and its Influence on Psychoanalytic Theory*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Arzt, T. (2008). 'Analytische Psychologie und Naturphilosophie'. In *Jung heute*, eds. D. Klein & H. Weyerstrass, (pp. 14- 28). Troisdorf: dieterklein.com Verlag.
- Balenci, M. (1987). 'Evoluzione del concetto di identificazione del terapeuta col paziente nella letteratura psicoanalitica'. *Giornale Storico di Psicologia Dinamica*, 21, 75- 94.
- Balenci, M. (1993). 'La storia dell'Es di Groddeck e il Sé junghiano'. In *Forme del sapere in psicologia*, ed. G. Antonelli, (pp. 169- 83). Milan: Bompiani.
- Balenci, M. (2018). 'Totality in Groddeck's and Jung's conception: Es and Selbst'. *International Journal of Jungian Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19409052.2018.1474127>. Hard version 2019: 11, 1, 44- 64.
- Balenci, M. (2021). 'Jung's and Groddeck's analytic practice: Alternative methods that have prevailed over Freud's psychoanalysis'. *International Journal of Jungian Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1163/19409060-bja10010> Hard version 2022: 14, 1, 20- 46.
- Baudouin, C. (1975). *L'oeuvre de Jung et la psychologie complexe*. Paris: Payot.
- Bell, M. (2010). 'Carl Gustav Carus and the science of the unconscious'. In *Thinking the Unconscious: Nineteenth-Century German Thought*, eds. A. Nicholls & M. Liebscher, (pp. 156- 72). Cambridge, UK & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bishop, P. (1998). 'Paracelsus, Goethe, Jung: reading Jung aesthetically'. *Spring*, 64, 135- 58.
- Bishop, P. (2008). *Analytical Psychology and German Classical Aesthetics: Goethe, Schiller, and Jung*. Vol. 1, *The Development of Personality*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bishop, P. (2009). *Analytical Psychology and German Classical Aesthetics: Goethe, Schiller, and Jung*. Vol. 2, *The Constellation of the Self*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bishop, P. (2014). *Carl Jung*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Bloch, E. (1974). *La philosophie de la Renaissance*. Paris: Payot.
- Brann, H.W. (1970). 'Freud as philosopher'. *The American Imago: A Psychoanalytic Journal for the Arts and Sciences*, 27, 2, 122- 39.
- Cambray, J. & Carter, L. (2004). 'Analytic methods revisited'. In *Analytical Psychology: Contemporary Perspectives in Jungian Analysis*, eds. J. Cambray & L. Carter, (pp. 116- 48). London & New York: Routledge.
- Carus, C.G. (1819). 'The kingdoms of nature, their life and affinity'. In *Scientific Memoirs, Selected from the Transactions of Foreign Academies of Science and Learned Societies*. Vol. 1, ed. R. Taylor, (pp. 223- 54). London: Richard & John E. Taylor, 1837.
- Carus, C.G. (1846/1851). *On the Development of the Soul*. Part 1: *The Unconscious*, trans. R. Welch. Thompson, CT: Spring Publications, 2017.
- Carus, C.G. (1851). *Physis. Zur Geschichte des leiblichen Lebens*. Stuttgart: Scheitlin.
- Cera, A. (2014). 'Psyche e Physis. Uomo e mondo nel pensiero di Carl Gustav Carus'. In *Nature. Studi su concetti e immagini della natura*, ed. A. La Vergata, (pp. 89- 117). Pisa: Edizioni ETS.
- Collins, V.M.E. (1951a). 'Georg Walther Groddeck, 1866-1934'. In G. Groddeck, *The world of man*, trans. V.M.E. Collins, (pp. 5- 11). London: Vision Press.
- Collins, V.M.E. (1951b). 'Translator's preface'. In G. Groddeck, *The Unknown Self*, trans. V.M.E. Collins, (pp. 13- 29). Plymouth, UK: Vision Press, 1989.
- de Angulo, X. (1952). 'Comments on a doctoral thesis'. In C.G. Jung *Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*,

- eds. W. McGuire & R.F.C. Hull, (pp. 205- 18). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Dieckmann, H. (1979). *Methods in Analytical Psychology: An Introduction*, trans. B. Matthews. Wilmette, IL: Chiron Publications, 1988.
- Eisler, R. (1948). *Man into Wolf: An Anthropological Interpretation of Sadism, Masochism, and Lycanthropy*. Redditch, UK: Read Books, 2013.
- Ellenberger, H.F. (1970). *The Discovery of the Unconscious*. London: Fontana Press, 1994.
- Falzeder, E. (1994). 'The threads of psychoanalytic filiations or psychoanalysis taking effect'. In *100 Years of Psychoanalysis: Contributions to the History of Psychoanalysis*, eds. A. Haynal & E. Falzeder, (pp. 169- 94). *Cahiers Psychiatriques Genevois*, Special Issue.
- Ferenczi, S. (1930). 'The principle of relaxation and neocatharsis'. In *Final Contributions to the Problems and Methods of Psycho-Analysis*, ed. M. Balint, (pp. 108- 25). New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1980.
- Ferenczi, S. & Groddeck, G. (2002). *Correspondence 1921-1933*, ed. C. Fortune. London: Open Gate Press.
- Ferenczi, S. & Rank, O. (1923). *The Development of Psycho-Analysis*, trans. C. Newton. Mansfield Centre, CT: Martino Publishing, 2012.
- Fortune, C. (2002). 'Georg Groddeck's influence on Sandor Ferenczi's clinical practice as reflected in their correspondence 1921-1933'. *Psychoanalysis and History*, 4, 1, 85- 94.
- Freud, S. (1900). *The Interpretation of Dreams*. SE 4- 5.
- Freud, S. (1912). 'Recommendations to physicians practising psycho-analysis'. SE 12.
- Freud, S. & Groddeck, G. (1988). 'Correspondence (1917-1934)'. In *The Meaning of Illness*, ed. L. Schacht, (pp. 31- 108). London: Karnac.
- Friedberg, A. & Linn, L. (2012). 'The couch as icon'. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 99, 1, 35-
- Fuechtner, V. (2011). *Berlin Psychoanalytic: Psychoanalysis and Culture in Weimar Republic Germany and Beyond*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- Gallese, V. (2009). 'Mirror neurons, embodied simulation, and the neural basis of social identification'. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 19, 5, 519- 36.
- Gödde, G. (2010). 'Freud and nineteenth-century philosophical sources on the unconscious'. In *Thinking the Unconscious: Nineteenth-Century German Thought*, eds. A. Nicholls & M. Liebscher, (pp. 261- 86). Cambridge, UK & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goethe, J.W. von (1958). *Teoria della natura*, ed. M. Montinari. Turin: Boringhieri.
- Goldmann, S. (1985). 'Das zusammengefallene Kartenhaus. Zu Bernd Nitzschkes Aufsatz über die Herkunft des "Es"'. *Psyche*, 39, 2, 101- 24.
- Groddeck, G. (1894). 'Theophrastus Bombastus Paracelsus ab Hohenheim'. *Hygieia*, 7, 188- 90 (published under the pseudonym of Caius).
- Groddeck, G. (1909). *Hin Zu Gottnatur*. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Groddeck, G. (1913). *Nasamecu. Natura sanat, medicus curat. Der gesunde und der kranke Mensch gemeinverständlich dargestellt*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel Verlag.
- Groddeck, G. (1917). 'Psychic conditioning and the psychoanalytic treatment of organic disorders'. In *The Meaning of Illness. Selected Psychoanalytic Writings by Georg Groddeck*, ed. L. Schacht, (pp. 109- 31). London: Karnac, 1988.
- Groddeck, G. (1922). 'The compulsion to use symbols'. In *The Meaning of Illness. Selected Psychoanalytic Writings by Georg Groddeck*, ed. L. Schacht, (pp. 158- 71). London: Karnac, 1988.
- Groddeck, G. (1923). *The Book of the It*, trans. V.M.E. Collins. Mansfield Centre, CT: Martino Publishing, 2015.
- Groddeck, G. (1925). 'The It's work in transference'. In *The Unknown Self*, trans. V.M.E. Collins, (pp. 96- 104). Plymouth, UK: Vision Press, 1989.
- Groddeck, G. (1926a). 'The "It" and the Freudian theory'. In *Exploring the Unconscious*, trans. V.M.E. Collins, (pp. 208- 14). Plymouth, UK: Vision Press, 1989.
- Groddeck, G. (1926b). 'Headaches'. In *The Unknown Self*, trans. V.M.E. Collins, (pp. 119- 30). Plymouth, UK: Vision Press, 1989.
- Groddeck, G. (1927). *Goethe's Faust*. In *Exploring the Unconscious*, trans. V.M.E. Collins, (pp. 179- 207).

Plymouth, UK: Vision Press, 1989.

- Groddeck, G. (1928). 'Some fundamental thoughts on psychotherapy'. In *The Meaning of Illness. Selected Psychoanalytic Writings* by Georg Groddeck, ed. L. Schacht, (pp. 211- 34). London: Karnac, 1988.
- Grossman, C.M. & Grossman, S. (1965). *The Wild Analyst. The Life and Work of Georg Groddeck*. New York: George Braziller.
- Grotjahn, M. (1945). 'Georg Groddeck and his teachings about man's innate need for symbolization'. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 32, 9- 24.
- Grotjahn, M. (1966). 'Georg Groddeck, 1866-1934: The untamed analyst'. In *Psychoanalytic Pioneers*, eds. F. Alexander, S. Eisenstein & M. Grotjahn, (pp. 308- 20). New York & London: Basic Books.
- Haley, J. (1963). *Strategies of Psychotherapy*. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Hall, M.P. (1964). *Paracelsus: His Mystical and Medical Philosophy*. Los Angeles, CA: Philosophical Research Society.
- Hartmann, E. von (1869). *Philosophie des Unbewussten. Versuch einer Weltanschauung*. Berlin: Carl Duncker.
- Haynal, A.E. (2002). *Disappearing and Reviving: Sándor Ferenczi in the History of Psychoanalysis*. London & New York: Karnac.
- Haynal, A.E. & Falzeder, E. (2011). 'The Swiss'. In *100 Years of the IPA. The Centenary History of the International Psychoanalytical Association 1910-2010: Evolution and Change*, eds. P. Loewenberg & N.L. Thompson (pp. 182- 95). London: International Psychoanalytical Association.
- Hillman, J. (1970). 'Introductory note: Carus and Jung'. In *C.G. Carus (1846/1851), On the Development of the Soul. Part 1: The Unconscious*, (pp. 5- 13). Thompson, CT: Spring Publications, 2017.
- Hillman, J. (1973). 'Plotino, Ficino e Vico, precursori della psicologia junghiana'. *Rivista di Psicologia Analitica*, 4, 2, 322- 40.
- Hristeva, G. & Poster, M.F. (2013). 'Georg Groddeck's maternal turn: Its evolution and influence on early psychoanalysts'. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 73, 3, 228- 53.
- Huskinson, L. (2004). *Nietzsche and Jung: The Whole Self in the Union of Opposites*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Iacoboni, M. (2009). *Mirroring People. The Science of Empathy and How We Connect with Others*. New York: Picador.
- Jacobi, J. (1942). 'Paracelsus: His life and his work'. In *Paracelsus, Selected Writings*, ed. J. Jacobi, (pp. xxxvii- lxxii). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Jung, C.G. (1911). 'A criticism of Bleuler's theory of schizophrenic negativism'. CW 3.
- Jung, C.G. (1912). 'New paths in psychology'. CW 7.
- Jung, C.G. (1913/1955). 'The theory of psychoanalysis'. CW 4.
- Jung, C.G. (1917/1926/1943). 'On the psychology of the unconscious'. CW 7.
- Jung, C.G. (1923). 'Psychological types'. CW 6.
- Jung, C.G. (1926/1946). 'Analytical psychology and education'. CW 17.
- Jung, C.G. (1928). 'The relations between the ego and the unconscious'. CW 7.
- Jung, C.G. (1928/1931a). 'Analytical psychology and Weltanschauung'. CW 8.
- Jung, C.G. (1928/1931b). 'The structure of the psyche'. CW 8.
- Jung, C.G. (1928/1931c). 'Mind and earth'. CW 10.
- Jung, C.G. (1929a). 'Paracelsus'. CW 15.
- Jung, C.G. (1929b). 'Problems of modern psychotherapy'. CW 16.
- Jung, C.G. (1931). 'The aims of psychotherapy'. CW 16.
- Jung, C.G. (1933-1934). *History of Modern Psychology: Lectures Delivered at ETH Zurich. Vol. I, 1933-1934*, ed. E. Falzeder. Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2019.
- Jung, C.G. (1935a). 'Principles of practical psychotherapy'. CW 16.
- Jung, C.G. (1935b). 'The Tavistock lectures'. CW 18.
- Jung, C.G. (1940/1950). 'Concerning rebirth'. CW 9i.
- Jung, C.G. (1941). 'Paracelsus the physician'. CW 15.

- Jung, C.G. (1942). 'Paracelsus as a spiritual phenomenon'. CW 13.
- Jung, C.G. (1943). 'The gifted child'. CW 17.
- Jung, C.G. (1944). *Psychology and Alchemy*. CW 12.
- Jung, C.G. (1945). 'Medicine and psychotherapy'. CW 16.
- Jung, C.G. (1946). 'Psychology of the transference'. CW 16.
- Jung, C.G. (1951). 'Fundamental questions of psychotherapy'. CW 16.
- Jung, C.G. (1961a). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, ed. A. Jaffé. New York: Vintage Books, 1989.
- Jung, C.G. (1961b). 'Symbols and interpretation of dreams'. CW 18.
- Keyserling, H.G. (1910). *Prolegomena zur Naturphilosophie*. München: J.F. Lehmann Verlag.
- Keyserling, H.G. (1934). 'Georg Groddeck †'. *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 14 Juni 1934. In G. Groddeck, *The World of Man*, trans. V.M.E. Collins, (pp. 12- 14). London: Vision Press, 1951.
- Kramer, R. (2019). *The Birth of Relationship Therapy: Carl Rogers Meets Otto Rank*. Giessen: Psychosozial-Verlag.
- Laplanche, J. (1981). *The Unconscious and the Id*, trans. L. Thurston & L. Watson. London: Rebus Press, 1999.
- Laplanche, J., & Pontalis, J.B. (1988). *The Language of Psycho-analysis*. London: Karnac.
- Lingiardi, V. & De Bei, F. (2011). 'Questioning the couch: Historical and clinical perspectives'. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 28, 3, 389- 404.
- Makari, G. (2008). *Revolution in Mind: The Creation of Psychoanalysis*. London: Duckworth Overlook.
- Marquard, O. (1987). *Transzendentaler Idealismus, Romantische Naturphilosophie, Psychoanalyse*. Köln: Verlag für Philosophie Jürgen Dinter.
- Martynkewicz, W. (1997). *Georg Groddeck: una vita*, ed. G. Stoccoro. Milan: Il Saggiatore, 2005.
- Mayr, E. (1982). *The Growth of Biological Thought: Diversity, Evolution, and Inheritance*. Cambridge, MA & London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Miranda, P. (2018). 'Carl Jung, the early years (1900-1921): A short introduction'. *Diálogos Junguianos*, 3, 2, 154- 64.
- S.A. Mitchell & L. Aron (eds.) (1999). *Relational Psychoanalysis: The Emergence of a Tradition*. Hillsdale, NJ & London: Analytic Press.
- Nagy, M. (1991). *Philosophical Issues in the Psychology of C.G. Jung*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Nicholls, A. (2010). 'The scientific unconscious: Goethe's post-Kantian epistemology'. In *Thinking the Unconscious: Nineteenth-Century German Thought*, eds. A. Nicholls & M. Liebscher, (pp. 87- 120). Cambridge, UK & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oddo, L. (2005). 'Aspetti del confronto fra la biologia vitalistica e la teoria junghiana'. In *Psicologia analitica e teorie della mente: Complessi, affetti, neuroscienze*, eds. L. Aversa et al., (pp. 619- 34). Milan: Vivarium.
- Pagel, W. (1958). *Paracelsus: An Introduction to Philosophical Medicine in the Era of the Renaissance*. Basel & New York: S. Karger.
- Paracelsus (1942). *Selected Writings*, ed. J. Jacobi. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Poster, M. F. (2009). 'Ferenczi and Groddeck: Simpatico: Roots of a paradigm shift in psychoanalysis'. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 69, 3, 195- 206.
- Poster, M. F., Hristeva, G. & Giefer, M. (2016). 'Georg Groddeck: "The pinch of pepper" of psychoanalysis'. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 76, 2, 161- 82.
- Röder, D.E. von (1961). 'Georg Groddeck's Philosophie des Es'. *Zeitschrift für Philosophische Forschung*, 15, 131- 38.
- Rosen, J.N. (1953). *Direct Analysis: Selected Papers*. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Rudnytsky, P.L. (2002). *Reading Psychoanalysis: Freud, Rank, Ferenczi, Groddeck*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Samuels, A. (1985). *Jung and the Post-Jungians*. London & New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Schaer, H. (1946). *Religion and the Cure of Souls in Jung's Psychology*, trans. R.F.C. Hull. London:

Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951.

- Schelling, F.W.J. von (1797/1803). *Ideas for a Philosophy of Nature as Introduction to the Study of This Science*, trans. E.E. Harris & P. Heath. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Sedgwick, D. (1993). *Jung and Searles: A Comparative Study*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Shamdasani, S. (1998). 'From Geneva to Zürich: Jung and French Switzerland'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 43, 1, 115- 26.
- Wiley Online Library
- Shamdasani, S. (2003). *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology. The Dream of a Science*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sherrington, C. (1949). *Goethe on Nature & on Science*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Silberer, H. (1914). *Problems of Mysticism and its Symbolism*, trans. S.E. Jelliffe. New York: Moffat, Yard & Co., 1917.
- Simmel, E. (1926). 'Georg Groddeck for his sixtieth birthday'. In G. Groddeck, *The Unknown Self*, trans. V.M.E. Collins, (pp. 5- 12). Plymouth, UK: Vision Press, 1989.
- Steiner, R. (1911). 'Von Paracelsus zu Goethe'. In *Von Paracelsus zu Goethe. Der Geist in Natur und Mensch*, (pp. 5- 32). Bad Liebenzell: Rudolf Steiner Ausgaben, 2013.
- Sulloway, F.J. (1979). *Freud, Biologist of the Mind: Beyond the Psychoanalytic Legend*. New York & London: Basic Books.
- Will, H. (1985). 'Freud, Groddeck und die Geschichte des "Es"'. *Psyche – Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, 39, 2, 150- 69.
- Will, H. (1987). *Georg Groddeck: Die Geburt der Psychosomatik*. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Will, H. (1994). 'Ferenczi und Groddeck. Eine Freundschaft'. *Psyche – Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, 48, 8, 720- 37.
- Wittels, F. (1931). *Freud and His Time*. New York: Liveright Publishing Co.
- Witzig, J.S. (1982). 'Theodore Flournoy – A friend indeed'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 27, 2, 131- 48.
- Wiley Online Library
- Google Schola

(*) Marco Balenci. Associazione Italiana di Psicologia Analitica, Florence, Italy. He is a Jungian analyst, member of the Italian Association for Analytical Psychology (AIPA), the American Psychological Association (APA), and the International Association for Analytical Psychology (IAAP). His research interests are mainly directed to the history of analytic concepts and Jungian psychosomatics; he is also the author of the chapter "Il Sé" (The self) for the *Trattato di Psicologia Analitica* edited by Aldo Carotenuto, and translated into Italian the biography of Anna Freud by Elisabeth Young-Bruehl. He performs his private practice in Florence.

Contact: marco.balenci@gmail.com

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A shorter version of this paper was presented at the International Association for Jungian Studies/ Duquesne University Conference, March 18-21, 2021. I thank Prof. Roger Brooke, the conference chair.

Published in: *The Journal of analytical psychology*, 67(3), pp. 860-883, July 2022.

DOI: 10.1111/1468-5922.12822

Electronic version: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1468-5922.12822>

Volver a Artículos sobre Georg Groddeck
Volver a Newsletter-21-ALSF-ex-75

Notas al final

- 1.- About Jung's philosophical education, see Shamdasani (2003, pp 197-202) and Bishop, 2014, pp 53-63)
- 2.- See Bloch 1974, pp 77-96
- 3.- On the relevance of Italian Neoplatonism for Jungian psychology, see Hilmamm (1973)
- 4.- Jung (1961a, p. 249) began to understand the nature of alchemy after reading *The Secret of the Golden Flower*, a Chinese text of Richard Wilhelm had sent him in 1928, Jung (1944, para. 332) recognized Silverer's (1914) priority in the study of alchemical symbolism. Jung did not quote Allendy (1912, 1937) about alchemy and Paracelsus, but he mentioned a book by Allendy (1948) on the symbolism of numbers.
- 5.- However, Freud always recognized Goethe as a master writer (See Wittels 1931, pp. 3-46. Ellenberger 1970, pp. 447,466, 540)
- 6.- In a letter to Freud, Groddeck (Freud & Groddeck, 1988, p. 99) stated: 'I was brought up in Goethe workshop'. Groddeck also wrote a psychoanalytical papers on Goethe's Faust (Groddeck, 1927) .
- 7.- See Groddeck (1926a); Huskinson (2004)
- 8.- In Nagy's (1991, pp. 5, 132-133) book you can only find hints of *Naturphilosophie* and the foundations of Jung's unconscious that are attributed to Schopenhauer and von Hartmann (p. 234). However, von Hartmann's (1869) *Philosophy of Unconscious* was based on Carus's theory (Jung 1933-1934, pp. 33, 35; Ellenberger 1940, p. 208; Cera 2014, p, III note 43)
- 9.- For a detailed comparison between Freud's Id and Groddeck's It, see Laplanche (1981, pp. 142-66).
- 10.- Ferenczi and Rank (1923) wrote a book that criticized classical analytic technique (see Kramer 2019, p. 19)
- 11.- Resistance was also fundamental to Jung (1911, p.199)
- 12.- See also Ferenczi's letter to Groddeck on 9 June 1923 (Ferenczi & Groddeck 2002, p. 49) Ferenczi was associated with the group of Eugen Bleuler and Jung in Zurich before coming to Freud in Vienna (Haynal & Felzeder 2011, p-182)