

**INTRODUCTION TO “THE MEANING OF ILLNESS:  
SELECTED PSYCHOANALYTIC WRITINGS.”**

**Lore Schacht**

Looking back over his life at 64, Groddeck wrote: I run a sanatorium which is visited by people who do not find help in other places. Sometimes I am lucky with these difficult cases, sometimes not. I am a pupil of Schweninger, who was, perhaps, the greatest doctor of the last century. Following in his footsteps I suddenly found myself, without knowing it, faced with the necessity of evaluating unconscious processes in the treatment of organic diseases. When a few years later I came upon Freud's works I had to give up the idea that I was a discoverer myself, not without a struggle. For it became apparent that I had first read about these in a notice in the daily paper *Rundschau*. The only achievement I can claim for myself with some justification is the introduction of a knowledge of the unconscious into the treatment of all patients, and particularly those patients who suffer from organic illnesses, and that I am as aware as Freud that psychoanalysis is a world-wide affair and only partly a medical affair and that its tie-up with medicine is a disaster. I do not have a title, but there are people who love me and I have insights which make my life harmonious in so far as that is possible at all. I cannot send a prospectus of my small clinic -15 rooms- where I am assisted by my wife, not only in the household. There is no prospectus. My charges are adjusted to the means of my patients, in the treatment I rely on my head and on my hands and on the view that every patient has his or her own illness and that the person who wants to help them has to practice the saying: *nil humanum a me alienum esse puto* (I believe that nothing human is strange to me) and also on the exhortation: Children, love one another! I have patients of all kinds; I am not a specialist, but a general practitioner with the knowledge and experience gathered in an active professional life. And I may perhaps be allowed to say that I have not forgotten during my life as a doctor that man's true profession is to become a human being.<sup>1</sup>

This is an extract from a letter written by Groddeck to Hans Vaihinger, Professor of Philosophy, on May 8, 1930, in which he also discussed his father's doctoral thesis '*De morbo democratico nova insaniae forma*', and argued that Nietzsche had probably known it.

Walter Georg Groddeck, born on October 13, 1866, the youngest son of a physician, in Bad Kösen, grew up in a household where the memory of his maternal grandfather, the literary historian Koberstein, was held in high esteem and where up to the Seventies of the last century many well-known scholars of German literature used to meet. From childhood on he knew that he was going to be a doctor, too, by his father's wish.

When his father lost his money in 1881 through a series of miscalculations, the family moved to Berlin.

I barely scraped through the final exams of my grammar school in March 1885 because I was an unruly schoolboy and my teachers were less satisfied with my conduct than they were with my knowledge. I was to study medicine, and as my father did not have the means to finance my studies at a university and was favourably impressed by the medical training course offered by the army since he knew one of our best military doctors, Oberstabsarzt Villaret, the intention was to send me to one of the military medical schools. When I arrived in Berlin where my father was working as a slum doctor I was told that I had applied too late and would not be able to start until the autumn. ... In order not to waste all

that time I put myself down for a lecture course in Chemistry; if I remember rightly I went three times and one of the lectures I remember clearly, it was about arsenic; but my father believed that the most useful thing I could do was to sit in on his consultations with his patients. Under the pretext of making notes and writing out prescriptions on his dictation I was assigned a chair next to his desk from where I was able to watch all that was happening. These were the early days of the general health insurance scheme, my father had applied to be a general practitioner in the scheme and day in day out there was now a constant stream of bakers, bricklayers, and other workers pouring into his consulting rooms and seeking to confirm their admission into the scheme. This was quite an entertaining experience for me, my father loved talking to these people and asking them questions about their lives and their opinions, and I acquired some insight into working-class life and into the struggle between the employers and the people who were only considered hands working for the firm; important as this was for my personal development, there was something else that influenced me even more though I did not know how to appreciate it at the time: I got to know the medical profession not by meeting sick patients, but by meeting healthy people. This proved to be of invaluable importance to me ... At that time moreover, the event occurred that jolted me out of my dreamlike existence and gave my career its decisive direction: my father had a stroke while treating patients.<sup>2</sup>

Apart from the influence exerted by his father Groddeck's medical career was shaped decisively by his meeting with Ernst Schweningen as a student and by later becoming his assistant.

Schweningen (1850-1924) had achieved fame as Bismarck's personal physician and held a teaching post at the Kaiser Wilhelm Universität in Berlin from 1894. His method of treatment was based on the idea that the doctor was merely the catalyst who starts off the therapeutic process. He was opposed to the use of drugs and specially favoured diet, hydrotherapy, and massage. After finishing his tour of duty as a military doctor, Groddeck went to Baden Baden to become the assistant of Schweningen whom he had known since his student days. In 1900 he set up a clinic of his own there. Because his reputation quickly spread beyond Baden Baden he soon established a flourishing practice. His domestic life was less happy at first - his marriage in which there was a child ended in separation, and because of his Swedish assistant, who had worked with him since 1915.

Groddeck began to write. Apart from articles on medical questions, he contributed to the arts page of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* and even wrote novels later on (*Ein Frauenproblem*, 1903; *Ein Kind der Erde*, 1905; *Die Hochzeit des Dionysos*, 1906). He was also interested in social problems and gave regular talks at the workers' community centre in Baden Baden. He also initiated the founding of a consumers' cooperative.

In his essay 'Georg Groddeck als Sozialreformer und Mensch' (Georg Groddeck as social reformer and human being), Michael Pichler writes:

In Spring 1912 the consumers' cooperative that could be considered Dr. Groddeck's work was able to open its first shop. But the enterprise had yet to be put on a firm basis, since the business community was trying its hardest to prevent it from succeeding. The doctor always thought up new ways and followed them in his own thorough fashion. For example, he hit on a very effective publicity method. He announced a series of talks on the theme: 'Health and Sickness', held in the Bletzer Brewery, at first in a small room nicknamed 'cigar box' on account of its shape. There was only a small group of friends of the doctor's and members of the consumers' cooperative in the beginning. But the first talk proved so interesting and fascinating that the second talk drew such crowds that the cigar box was full to capacity. For the third talk the garden room had to be used, and all the following talks were so well attended that all the available chairs in the building had to be brought in to seat the audience. The series proved a great and lasting success, not only for the doctor, who was pleased by it, but also for the consumers' cooperative. The discussions which followed every lecture made these evenings particularly interesting. When the series came to an end after twelve talks there was general disappointment. The talks were published in 1913 as a book by Hirzel in Leipzig, under the title

Nasamecu (Natura sanat, medicus curat -nature heals, the doctor cures) and subtitled 'Der gesunde und kranke Mensch' (The healthy and sick person).<sup>3</sup>

The book *Nasamecu* marks the transition between two phases in Groddeck's life, the phase during which he was Schweninger's pupil, and the phase in which he tried to be Freud's pupil. The book is written, on the one hand, in homage to his teacher Schweninger whose therapeutic principles are commemorated in the title (Natura sanat, medicus curat). It contains, on the other hand, a criticism of psychoanalysis which Groddeck at the time knew by hearsay only. In 1913 Groddeck at last began to read Freud, *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* and *The Interpretation of Dreams*. On May 27, 1917, he decided to write Freud a letter. This turned into a long letter, the longest he ever wrote to Freud; in it he outlined his main ideas in a systematic and lucid way such as he hardly ever achieved again, and he asked Freud whether he should consider himself a psychoanalyst or whether he was going beyond psychoanalysis. Freud's answer came quickly, on June 5, 1917:

... I understand that you are requesting me urgently to supply you with an official confirmation that you are not a psychoanalyst, that you do not belong to the members of the group, and will be able to call yourself something special, and independent. Obviously, I am doing you a service if I push you away from me to the place where Adler, Jung, and others stand. Yet I cannot do this; I have to claim you, I have to assert that you are a splendid analyst who has understood for ever the essential aspects of the matter. The discovery that transference and resistance are the most important aspects of treatment turns a person irretrievably into a member of the wild army. No matter if he calls the unconscious 'It'. Let me show you that there is no need to extend the concept of the unconscious in order to make it cover your experience of organic illnesses....

This is the beginning of the remarkable relationship between Freud and Groddeck in which Groddeck insisted on calling himself Freud's pupil without really playing the part. The fact that he never gave up his own opinions particularly the concept of the It which he had found a long time before he met Freud and which he put forward with self-confidence, did not prevent Groddeck from revering Freud as the great master; he even seemed to long for permission to revere him. The ideas of Freud's which he used and applied in his work remain essentially limited to those mentioned in his first letter to Freud, namely the ideas of the unconscious, of transference and of resistance. Yet his admiration of Freud went far beyond this:

Allow me in conclusion to say something about Freud. His work, his discoveries of the unconscious, of resistance and transference have been compared to the discoveries made by Copernicus. This may be a useful comparison for scholars.

But he did more for us as human beings. He discovered that apart from the human languages of sound and gesture there are hundreds of other languages a thousand times more important and true than the former, means of communication which bring people closer to each other. In the context of world history Freud did something that can only be compared to the work of the founders of religion if we have to make a comparison at all. He taught people new ways of understanding one another, he brought them closer together, he built a thousand bridges across the gap that separates human beings from each other, he gave to those who followed him a newer, deeper, happier, more childlike way of living, a new kind of loving and a new kind of believing. To know is to doubt, to believe is not to doubt. In science Freud forced us to doubt and reexamine everything we thought we knew up to then.

In our personal lives he brought us a belief, the belief in loving one another. He increased in us the ability to get to know each other which results spontaneously and inevitably in a greater human love and respect for others, it reduces the compulsion to lie, offers the possibility of a greater freedom of living and reduces anxiety. I am glad I know him.<sup>4</sup>

Unique in the relationship between Freud and Groddeck is the fact that Freud continued to show interest in and concern for Groddeck's writings until Groddeck's death in 1934, that he defended him against other analysts and gave his permission to publish his works in spite of the reservations he had against them or mentioned about them to other people. An example is the following passage from a letter to Oskar Pfister, dated February 4, 1921:

I energetically defend Groddeck against your respectability. What would you have said if you had been a contemporary of Rabelais? Poor Rank will have to be my scapegoat more often now.<sup>5</sup>

Pfister wrote back on 14 March:

I understand very well that it is impossible for you to think otherwise. The state of mind that leads you to encourage Groddeck is exactly the same as that which made you the discoverer and pioneer of psychoanalysis. But, with the best appeared will in the world, I cannot adopt your view, as indeed you do not expect me to. But there is a big difference between Rabelais and Groddeck. The former remains within his role as a satirist and avoids the error of putting himself forward as a savant. Groddeck, however, wavers between science and belles lettres ....

To which Freud replied, on 23 March:

... I was delighted with your remarks about Groddeck. We really must be able to tell each other hometruths, i.e. incivilities, and remain firm friends, as in this case. I am not giving up my view of Groddeck either, I am usually not so taken in by anybody. But it does not matter.<sup>6</sup>

Of the psychoanalysts such as Ernst Simmel, Karen Horney and Frieda Fromm-Reichmann who came to admire Groddeck, Sandor Ferenczi enjoyed the most lasting friendship with him. Suffering from severe nephrosclerosis, he had become a patient of Groddeck's on the advice of F. Deutsch in 1921.<sup>7</sup> He was soon able to go home with all his symptoms cured, and used to take regular 'therapeutic holidays' with Groddeck in Baden Baden.

Many analysts were critical of Groddeck and yet on the occasion of Groddeck's sixtieth birthday there was an article in the *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* by Ernst Simmel, who writes, among other things:

When we think of Groddeck as members of the International Psychoanalytic Society we remember the day when he first appeared in our midst in person during the conference at The Hague. He went up to the platform and announced: 'I am a wild analyst.' He was right. Yet one should understand the word 'wild' in a way that is different from the usual meaning of a psychoanalyst who launches into therapy with mentally ill patients without any training let alone a trace of understanding for the spirit of psychoanalysis. Groddeck may call himself wild -as a member of our movement who owes his training to nobody except himself. He may be called wild because of his passionate nature which wants to help where others have resigned or are hiding their impotence behind the mock techniques of exact diagnostics. His nature is the source of that 'wildness' which has enabled him, a fanatic of the art of healing, thanks to his unique gifts, to apply successfully Freud's discoveries about the unconscious psyche in the fight against organic illnesses. Groddeck's wildness is also the courage to pursue singlemindedly one goal, it is the absolute truthfulness which he sees embodied in Freud. Groddeck's wildness is also the hatred with which he fights the old fashioned medical practices by which, before Freud, the doctor was placed in the centre of the healing situation instead of the patient,

out of a kind of medical narcissism. We believe that a wildness of this kind should not be criticised, particularly when it is accompanied by such blessed innate artistic gifts as in the case of Groddeck.

While we psychoanalysts are busy and have to be busy learning everything Freud discovered and keeps on discovering in psychoanalysis and discussing and teaching these things in our 'school', i.e. in our societies, while we have guidelines and have to set guidelines for our therapeutic activity, Groddeck can do without these because his extensive work with organically sick patients is without parallel so far. He uniquely fits the distinction made by the philosopher Georg Simmel between artist and scientist: 'The scientist sees because he knows, the artist knows because he sees.' We know or seek to know what we can get by learning. Groddeck sees and knows without making this detour.<sup>8</sup>

In 1934, Groddeck left Germany on the advice of his friends in order to escape arrest by the Gestapo. He had an invitation from the Swiss Psychoanalytical Society to give a talk. He gave the talk 'Vom Sehen, von der Welt des Auges und vom Sehen ohne Augen' (Vision, the World of the Eye and Seeing without the Eyes)<sup>9</sup>. A few days later he died in a clinic in Knonau, Switzerland, having suffered his first heart attack in 1930 and another one shortly before his trip to Switzerland.

## **GRODDECK'S WRITINGS**

Groddeck's writings contain an extraordinary wealth of ideas which are sometimes formulated very briefly, almost aphoristically, or illustrated by one clinical example alone, until they get taken up again in a later work. Because of this peculiarity, ideas appear, may appear in a fragmentary form in several essays without ever being dealt with extensively elsewhere. Groddeck's thoughts seem to have been in permanent flux although most of the time they were concentrated on one and the same basic idea, his concept of the It. Yet there is not the consistent arguing out of an idea nor the construction of a coherent theoretical system.

Groddeck's style is of such brilliance and beauty that one is inclined to present him in an introduction like this through his own words mainly, in order not to misrepresent or dilute and fragment the specific quality of his thought. Yet occasionally there is a marked discrepancy between his brilliant exposition of ideas and passages in which he seems to get lost in a labyrinth of etymological derivations by which he hopes to justify and confirm his speculations. The present selection consists mainly of his theoretical and psychoanalytical writings, leaving out, among other things, his psychoanalytical novel *Der Seelensucher* (The Seeker of Souls), 1921, and his biographical essays.

In the following pages I shall outline Groddeck's most important themes in the sequence adopted for this book.

## **ORGANIC ILLNESS**

Groddeck claimed to have come to the psychiatric and psychoanalytic treatment of patients with chronic organic illnesses by way of being a practising physiotherapist, and he has often been called the founder of psychosomatic medicine. This is an honour he would probably have shrugged off since he was keen on showing that there was no basic difference between organic and mental illness. In his first letter to Freud he outlined his main ideas about the nature of organic illnesses and put forward the suggestion that the distinction between body and mind is only verbal and not essential, that body and mind are one unit, that they contain an It, a force which lives us while we believe we are living.

Encouraged by the interest Freud showed in him, he wrote and published the essay 'Psychic Conditioning and the Psychoanalytic Treatment of Organic Illness' (pp 109-31 below) in the very same year; it was reviewed by Ferenczi in the *Internationale Zeitschrift*, and contains the following remarks. The It can choose the soul or the body, it manifests and makes itself understood not only in dreams but also in the physiognomy, the behaviour or in a serious organic illness.

It may set up conditions in which the pathogenic agent becomes effective, if it considers that an illness will serve a purpose (p 112 below).

The It ties a person down, if necessary, it saves him by illness from dangers of a more serious nature than danger of life can ever be, it forces him to certain activities by certain disabilities, to rest through heart disease or tuberculosis (pp 115-16 below).

Groddeck maintains, for instance, that headaches are one of the most widespread and well-known methods used by the It to immobilise thoughts and drives, that short-sightedness can serve as a means to spare a person the sight of objects unbearable to him and, conversely, that the long sight of the elderly helps them symbolically to make death appear far off.

The idea of illness being of use to the person suffering from it, even enabling him to express himself or to understand himself, is put most lucidly in the essay 'The Meaning of Illness' (pp 197-202 below). Yet it is not restricted to organic illness alone:

We have become very careless in our use of the label neurosis and have completely lost sight of the fact that illness is not an evil in itself but always a meaningful process and not infrequently brings out forces which are only effective within the context of being ill.<sup>10</sup>

Groddeck differentiates neither between organic and mental illnesses nor between health and illness. For him health is only one form of It manifestation. The It decides on whether a person is ill, healthy, or recovering from an illness. Thus Groddeck's conception of illness has to be understood in the context of his efforts at understanding the great unknown, the It:

For me, the question of psychogenesis does not exist. Illness is a sign of life, and even the most celebrated scholar knows nothing about the causes of its origin and as little about the causes of its disappearance. One can only fantasize about that. Since the terms 'psyche' and 'physis' are used in medicine without any further thought, since it is impossible to get human thought habits away from their beaten tracks, I thought up the term It. I liked the indefiniteness about it -X would have been too mathematical, and X, moreover, demands a solution, my It, however, suggests that only a fool would try to understand it. There is nothing there to understand. Yet since the It is the most important thing about people, everybody who uses it says: we do not understand anything about life, we can only live it. All definitions are thus made null and void, they have nothing but a momentary meaning, are only justified in so far as they are useful. One cannot build on definitions as if they were foundation stones, and it is not the task of science to construct since the structure of life is there and is indestructible unless it changes by itself. Everything is changeable, therefore definitions are changeable, too, and the more so the wider their frame of reference.

So far I cannot find any meaning in the word psychogenesis.<sup>11</sup>

## **GRODDECK'S CONCEPT OF THE IT**

In his early book, *Hin zur Gottnatur* (Towards God Nature), Groddeck wrote in 1912 already:

There is no such thing as an I, it is a lie, a misrepresentation to say: I think, I live. It ought to be: it thinks, it lives. It, i.e. the great mystery of the world. There is no I.<sup>12</sup>

'The great mystery of the world' is also called 'Gottnatur' (God Nature) by Groddeck, an expression he got from Goethe:

What more can man gain from life  
Than have God nature revealed to him:  
How it turns matter into spirit  
How it makes the creations of the spirit live on.<sup>13</sup>

In his Christmas letter of 1922 Freud writes:

I think you got the It (in a literary, not an associative way) from Nietzsche.

Groddeck himself writes retrospectively, in a letter to a doctor patient dated June 11, 1929<sup>14</sup>, that he used the term the It 'in connection with Nietzsche and for reasons of convenience'.

From the first, Freud refused to understand the It in the way in which Groddeck wanted him to see it. Already in his first letter to Freud Groddeck went so far as to say that the It, as a force by which man is being lived even if he believes to be living himself, manifests itself as much in his thoughts and emotions, his organic and mental illnesses, as in the external appearance of man, and he drew attention to the fact that Freud's concept of the unconscious had to be widened in order to allow the psychoanalytic examination of physical illness. Freud's answer was: 'There is no need to extend the concept of the unconscious in order to make it cover your experience of organic illnesses.'

Groddeck cannot give an answer to the question, what is the It? He contents himself with distinguishing the various manifestations of the It. Thus the Ego, consciousness, any human expression of life, be it physical or mental, healthy or unhealthy, are all manifestations of the It.

After reading the first chapters of Groddeck's work, *Das Buch vom Es* (The Book of the It), Freud wrote on April 17, 1921:

I understand very well why the unconscious is not enough to make you consider the It dispensable.

And, at Christmas 1922:

Do you remember, by the way, how early I accepted the It from you? It was a long time before I made your personal acquaintance, in one of my first letters to you. I made a drawing there, which will soon be published in almost the same form.

On March 25, 1923, after the publication of *The Book of the It* Freud congratulates Groddeck and continues:

The work, moreover, argues the theoretically important point of view which I have dealt with in my own forthcoming work *The Ego and the Id*.

Groddeck, after receiving Freud's *The Ego and the Id*, which was published in the same year as his own *Book of the It*, set about answering in a highly critical way on May 27, 1923, 'as godfather, present at the christening'. In the comparison he uses there he calls himself the plough, Freud the farmer who is ploughing:

The plough, which has finally through hard experience come to the conclusion that it is not an Ego, tends to consider the concept of the It as an illusion produced by the It. At least it cannot decide to do without the assumption that every cell has its own consciousness and thus possesses independent

discharge. The Ego, in its opinion, is apparently not even able to control the motility of voluntary muscles, much less that of the intestines, kidneys, heart, or brain. In doing this it does not deny the Ego or the Superego. Yet they are merely tools for it, not existing entities. I have the impression that the farmer remains in the region of the so-called psyche, at least for the time being, and can perhaps ruin a number of ploughs without producing a big harvest. In other words, the plough considers the farmer a little obstinate. But then it only has the brains of a plough.

Before writing this letter to Freud, Groddeck apparently allowed some time to pass, as he had written to his wife on May 15, 1923:

*The Ego and the Id* is pretty, but quite uninteresting for me. In reality it was written to appropriate secretly loans made by Stekel and me. And yet his Id is of only limited use for the understanding of neuroses. He ventures into the realm of organic illness only in a very sneaky way, with the help of a death instinct or destruction drive taken from Stekel and Spielrein. He disregards the constructive aspect of my It, presumably to smuggle it in next time. Some of it is quite amusing.

In a later work, 'The It and Psychoanalysis', 1925, Groddeck writes, among general ideas about the conference mania of his (and our) time:

The beginning of man who is the object of my scientific inquiries, is fertilisation. Whatever originates there I call the It of man. This term aims to describe the uncertain, uncertifiable nature of this entity, the miracle.... to study and understand this It that builds up our personality according to a completely planned blueprint, that gives it consciousness, the illusion of thought and reason, and an ego awareness, imprints the notion of guilt and punishment into it, builds cathedrals as well as houses on sand and castles in the air, teaches us to love and to invent murder weapons, is one of the oldest preoccupations of man. One could say he never did anything else. All our efforts and all our strivings are directed towards this It. And in order to study it scientifically, methodically, we have to observe its manifestations and learn the language it speaks.... When one reads Freud attentively, without preconceived notions and without bothering about repressions, one soon discovers that his concept of the psyche is the same as mine, namely of a manifestation of life, and emphatically not the system 'conscious' which so far it has been held to be, but the system 'unconscious' and, absolutely dominating both, the It. Freud knows that this psyche is not the opposite of physics, not at all, but only another form of life. In order to know this it does not need his verbal assurance, it can be read between all the lines of all his works published so far. For him there is just as little division between body and soul as there is for me and every human being. But for the purposes of his profession as a specialist of mental illness he named these things in different ways, more appropriate to his purposes, and confined himself apparently to the fields of neurosis and psychosis. But he really believes in the It as does and did and will do everybody, in the past, the present, and the future.<sup>15</sup>

Freud, for his part, writes on June 18, 1925:

Everything from you is interesting to me, even if I may not follow you in detail. I do not, of course, recognize my civilized, bourgeois, demystified Id in your It. Yet you know that mine derived from yours.

In 'Traumarbeit und Arbeit des organischen Symptoms' (The effects of dreams and of the organic symptom), 1926, Groddeck writes:



Freud honoured me by drawing attention to me in his book *The Ego and the Id* as the person who was the first to use the 'the It' and said that he had taken it over from me. This is true, except that the term 'It' as used for my purposes was unusable to him and he turned it into something different from what I meant. As far as I can see he chose the expression in order to illustrate his ideas about his conception of what he calls topic. Yet he has not changed the nature of psychoanalysis with it, neither adding nor subtracting anything. It remained what it was, the analysis of the conscious and of the repressed parts of the psyche. But the It cannot be analyzed whether it is Freud's Id or mine which share a common name, any more than can Ferenczi's Bios.<sup>16</sup>

In order to point up the difference between Freud's and Groddeck's conceptions, English translations of Groddeck's 'Es' use the word It in contrast to Id for Freud's 'Es'.

A later discussion of the It in which Groddeck -pointing out other important themes- stresses the bisexuality of man, his use of symbol and of language as particular manifestations of the It, is found in his last book, *Der Mensch als Symbol* (Man as Symbol).

In the ten years since I last put forward some hypothetical thoughts on the human It nothing has happened that would induce me to give up this often tested approach or to make decisive changes in my ideas about it. I maintain the position that everything human is dependent on this infinitely mysterious entity and I also persist in maintaining that nobody can fathom the depths of the It. And yet I can say a few things about those manifestations of the It which have not received much attention so far. I also consider it necessary to emphasize that the Ego is one of these manifestations. In the *Book of the It* I explained to the best of my ability what I mean by this.

Another form of the It which is more accessible to me I want to call the dual nature of the It. All human life can be seen as simultaneously male and female, child and grownup.

The It, moreover, manifests itself as independent and as mutually dependent in the life as a whole as in the parts of a living human being's existence, or, in other words, there is apparently a similar relation between the whole human being and the cell or even smaller entities, the tissue, the individual organ or part of the body as was expressed by the terms macrocosms and microcosmos in former times to describe the universe and its parts. And finally the symbol as manifestation of the It permeates all human life.

My attempt at examining all these manifold forms of the It was prompted by a rather single-minded and idiosyncratic preoccupation with works of art and language, apart from the pressures of everyday life and work.

The term 'unconscious' is not synonymous with 'It'. Unconscious material was originally conscious at some time, the unconscious presupposes the existence of the brain. Yet the It exists before the formation of the brain, the brain is an instrument of the It by which it opens up certain rather limited areas of existence to our thought for unknown reasons while taking care that the brain deludes us into believing all sorts of strange notions which are peculiar to man, such as the belief in an I. I repeat: It and unconscious are two totally different concepts -the unconscious is a part of the psyche, the psyche a part of the It. Thus psychoanalysis is not identical with an examination of the It. The It is man himself in all his vital manifestations and as such it is neither freely accessible to psychoanalysis nor to any other method of examination, yet there are ways which lead us very close to the It and the best of these, the closest approach to the target, is psychoanalysis.<sup>17</sup>

Groddeck discusses human bisexuality in many of his writings. He discovered that, although bisexuality plays an important part in analytical theory,

yet it is not seen as one of the fundamental phenomena, as the focal point of all human existence and thought. Bisexuality has been talked about for quite some time, to be sure, and the woman's desire to have male sexual organs and to behave like a male sexually and in other ways, and the man's desire to be a woman, to conceive, be pregnant, give birth are important issues in the theory and practice of interpretation of the unconscious. Yet the assumption remains that a man is a man and a woman a woman. The curious thought that in reality man is without female attributes and woman without male, that it is possible to be all man or all woman, creeps into this line of thought and the impression is that the whole thing is rather indecent could or should be overcome. The possibility that man is female and male-female is repressed.<sup>18</sup>

## THE SYMBOL

Grodder's conception of the symbol can only be understood in the context of his interpretation of the It as he himself kept emphasizing:

And finally the symbol as manifestation of the It permeates all human life<sup>19</sup>.

Grodder considers man's compulsion to symbolize to be an expression of the It and not of conscious thought. Conversely, all conscious thought and action is an inevitable consequence of unconscious symbolizing. Grodder's dictum that man is lived by the It is paralleled by the other dictum that man is lived by the symbol, from his very beginnings. While the grown-up has difficulties in gaining insight into the interaction between the symbol and the It, the child has this insight spontaneously.

We are compelled by the repressive forces of human life and of our man dominated environment (education etc.) to fantasize about the real. Originally we are not dealing with the world of objects, but with symbols. So far little interest has been shown in the methods by which the newborn child learns about his environment and in his reaction to it. If I try to imagine what I might have experienced in the womb, I come to the conclusion that I must have considered everything that belonged to my world as a part of my own self; the self and the environment of the self were one and the same thing. This symbolic way of thinking may be changed somewhat by the event of birth, but judging by the behavior of babies in their first months of life I have to assume that the infant still thinks largely in symbols during the main learning period of his life, the first hours, days and weeks: a spoon is not a spoon to the child but a hand, a door not a door but a mouth, a bed not a bed but a womb, etc. Our conscious and appeared unconscious thinking never rids itself completely of these early notions -which are retained almost unchanged by primitive cultures. Until the end of our lives our understanding is tied to the symbol. No matter how rational we are we cannot help it: a window will remain an eye, a cave a mother, a pole a father.

We also see man and his parts in symbolic ways as we did when we were children. Once we knew from experience that the head is a whole and a part at the same time, an independent and a dependent entity, that man is a symbol for the head and that the head is a symbol for man. The symbol does not describe the similarities between two objects; in the symbol two objects are thrown together, they become one. Because we think and feel symbolically, are, in short, tied to the symbol as to something belonging to human life, it is possible to look at everything in human existence symbolically.<sup>20</sup>

With this conception of the symbol as part of the whole and as a key to 'the mysteries of human life'<sup>21</sup> Grodder takes up thoughts he had already in 1912 about an idea of Goethe's:

He (Goethe) showed science a new way, the way to see the part in the whole, to conceive of the apparent whole as a symbol of the universe, to see symbolically the whole world in a flower, an animal, a pebble, the human eye, the sun, to recreate from this flower, to renew, to explore the world of objects not analytically, but by taking it in as a whole.<sup>22</sup>

It was not without good reasons that Groddeck entitled his last, unfinished book, *Man as Symbol*. He had announced it in a letter to Freud on February 7, 1932:

It is a book in which the idiosyncrasies of language and fine art are used to prove how close the connections between symbol and life have always been. Medicine, particularly in the first part, will only be loosely linked to it, yet at the same time I want to discuss the influence of the symbol on the whole of the organism and its individual parts -either in a volume on its own or in individual pamphlets.

One of Groddeck's favourite themes was *seeing*. The 1917 essay 'Psychic Conditioning and the Psychoanalytic Treatment of Organic Disorders' (pp. 109-31 below) already contained a discussion of the psychodynamics of seeing and explored the causes of near-sightedness and long-sightedness. He chose the same theme for his first talk to the Psychoanalytic Society during the congress at The Hague (see his letter to Freud, September 11, 1920). The last lectures he gave before his death in Germany, England, and Switzerland were on the subject of seeing that interested Groddeck all his life. The manuscript of these, written down in 1932, had the title 'Vision, the World of the Eye, and Seeing without the Eye'. As early as 1917 he wrote:

The ancients thought of the poet as blind; and it makes sense that his eyes have to look inwards.<sup>23</sup>

Groddeck's ideas about seeing centre in man's ability to combine the rational exploration and understanding of the world with an almost mystical experience of inner vision. He himself combined in his personality an inclination for accurate clinical observations of surprising vividness with a constant search for inner truths -he is scientist and philosopher in one, as Lawrence Durrell, in a brilliant essay written in 1948<sup>24</sup>, presented him. Groddeck talks about two essential ways of seeing:

The outside inwards way of seeing is the one which is normally called vision. The inside outwards way of seeing is the dreamer's, the visionary's way. This phenomenon is also present in normal vision, and seeing is thus a mixture of external and internal images.<sup>25</sup>

## **GRODDECK, THE DOCTOR**

Groddeck thought of himself first and foremost as a doctor who strives to cure his patients. In 1917 he announced firmly that he was not interested in constructing a theory but in doing therapeutic work:

Our task is less that of thinking up valid theories than of finding working hypotheses that are of use in treatment.<sup>26</sup>

In a letter to Freud, dated April 1923, he rejects any claim to having disciples and maintains that his talent is essentially 'one for treating patients'. Later, in his memoirs, he calls it his 'need to be a doctor'<sup>27</sup>.

But who does the curing? Groddeck is deeply convinced that it is not the doctor but the It. For Groddeck the doctor is less of a therapist and more of a servant. The word treatment may lead the doctor to assume that he can determine and guide the process of healing. But in reality it is the It that decides on that:

As the It uses something from the environment as a cause for an illness, so it takes something from the environment to cause recovery when it wants to manifest itself in a state of health. It treats itself...

There is thus no right or wrong treatment. This and this alone explains the reason why most illnesses cure themselves without a doctor, why many people recover more readily when treated by an old shepherd or clairvoyant or magnetopath than by a university professor.<sup>28</sup>

I shall quote from another essay in which Groddeck discusses his ideas of therapy:

(1) I consider the psychoanalytic method not as the method but would like to say that every method is right and that I myself use any method that works no matter what name or technique it may follow.

(2) I almost never depend solely on the psychotherapeutic method in its widest sense in my treatment though I always use it. I know that this reduces the value of my experiences for others and that I would feel in the dark, too, if I didn't find a balance in the wealth of my experience. In the long run I believe that the It is the point to tackle in treating both mental and physical illness, and that this It can use a laparotomy or a dose of digitalis in a psychological way and suggestive or analytic approaches in a physical way.

(3) ... my 20 years of psychoanalytic activity have taught me to believe that efforts at making repressed material conscious may often have a therapeutic effect, yet as often such results do not occur and conversely there are many cures without any attempt at treating unconscious or repressed material. It is a question of convenience whether a specific case is tackled by analytical or by other methods<sup>29</sup>.

Massage, the exploratory touching of the body, was always an essential aid to easing the symptoms of illness for Groddeck. Hermann Graf Keyserling<sup>30</sup> describes in the chapter on Germany of 'Spectrum of Europe' his impressions of Groddeck as a physician and as a human being:

The greatest magician among the psychoanalysts and without doubt the most important human personality of them all was Georg Groddeck. I met him in Sweden in 1924 and was immediately fascinated by his veritably diabolical face that looked at me as if from a fiery furnace of hell and yet was so full of deep goodness. My heart went out to him in an almost maternal way, for I felt the enormous vulnerability of this soul which protected itself by spikiness and playacting. As long as he lived he came to Darmstadt regularly and never in my life have I had better praise than from Groddeck in a letter shortly before his death: 'You are the only person who never hurt me. I am grateful to you for this.' We got to know each other because of Groddeck's promise to cure me within a week of a recurrent phlebitis with boils which other doctors had believed not curable. I travelled to Baden Baden to Groddeck's clinic and lo and behold the wounds healed, the swellings on the leg disappeared, and at the time of writing I have not had a relapse. Groddeck's treatment resembled his appearance, it was a kind of carefully directed hellish pain. My leg literally boiled, and his special kind of massage during which he conducted an analysis based on my expressions of pain was a technically controlled form of torture. Yet in the case of patients who found him congenial Groddeck achieved miracles. As an analyst Groddeck was the most incredible catalyst such as I have never considered possible. He said hardly anything. Yet all that needed to be liberated in me came spontaneously to my mind in his presence. I owe to this meeting with Groddeck the first insights into the deeper significance of my mother experience. It is difficult to describe in detail what it was that made Groddeck's Wei Wu so magical. On the whole it probably was his own completely relaxed naturalness. With all this he was, of course, like all analysts I know, an unresolved analytical case, yet otherwise he possessed a genuinely Lao Tse like elusiveness. Because of this he couldn't help being a liberating agent for other people; in his presence I found one image after the other pouring into my consciousness and yet Groddeck had hardly asked a question.

Groddeck sums up his attitude when he says:

My task is not to teach, it is not to help, to give or take responsibility, the doctor's profession is only concerned with the moment, the doctor has to be, not to act. The more his being is stressed the more the doctor is instead of *does*, the easier it will be for the patient to use him. For us it is not a matter of 'we ought to' but of 'we are'.<sup>31</sup>

One is reminded of the essay 'Language' (pp. 248-63 below) when Groddeck mentions to Freud, on October 17, 1920, the ancient wisdom 'that words put chains on thought', and already in 1912 he discussed the possibilities and the limitations of language critically. He had called language the 'vehicle of culture', and yet he had also pointed out how impossible people find it to give words to their essential experiences, and had further argued that in language the falsification of truth begins. This essay from Groddeck's pre-analytical period is of special interest because it contains or hints at themes which Groddeck took up again in his later writings. Here we find the beginnings of his idea of the It and his closeness to Goethe's thoughts. Groddeck here talks about his great reverence for the poet which is important for his later literary work. The inclusion of this essay at the end of this selection may help us trace Groddeck's thought back to its origins.

## WRITINGS WHICH COULD NOT BE INCLUDED

... People are so stupid that they expect one still to remember at the end of a lecture what one said in the beginning. They do not want to know that the human mind is mobile and yet this mobility is the only thing of interest. I enjoy jumping from subject to subject since I have become too stiff to jump over physical obstacles...<sup>32</sup>

As I said in the beginning, Groddeck had the ability to introduce and deal associatively with several subjects in the framework of one essay. Only a full reading of his work will thus do justice to the wealth of ideas scattered through its pages. In this selection some very important articles had to be left out, for instance the essays in his house journal, *Die Arche*, written for the patients of his clinic, in which he tries to elucidate organic symptoms, organic processes by applying psychoanalytic techniques. These clinical papers are concerned with the following organic illnesses in particular: headaches, arteriosclerosis, the formation of kidney stones, and constipation.

Furthermore, Groddeck's highly original writings on literature and the fine arts unfortunately had to be left out of this selection. They consist of a first series of literary lectures on Ibsen's plays which Groddeck gave around 1910 in Baden Baden and in which he concerns himself particularly with the interpretation of female characters (see Freud's letter of October 28, 1917 and Groddeck's answer in November). In his later works on artistic themes Groddeck tries to prove that the It manifests itself not only in sickness and health, but in language and gesture too:

Every year the belief -or rather superstition- that psychoanalysis is an affair for doctors, that it is a kind of psychiatric treatment which should be used for the patients' best, is growing in strength. I consider it a necessary duty to fight against this erroneous belief by lecturing and writing, for if this opinion becomes prevalent -and unfortunately there are many people who defend this position- the world would be deprived of the most precious thing Freud gave it. The study of the unconscious -which is a possible translation of the term psychoanalysis- is an affair of all mankind and its use in medicine is only a small fraction of all that this study consists of. In order to make this clear I chose the four pieces of literature mentioned in the announcement -*the Ring of the Nibelungs, Peer Gynt, Faust, and*

*Struwwelpeter*- as material for my talks, and in order not to make people think that I was dabbling in aesthetics I called these pieces textbooks. Yet this does not mean that I intend to give a course in psychoanalysis, with the help of these textbooks. Psychoanalysis cannot be taught, for the simple reason that it is innate in all of us, that it is a human ability like seeing or hearing. I rather feel like a bookseller who is asked for his advice about what books to read in order to be informed on this or that subject, a question which is indeed often put to me, because of the interest in psychoanalysis. And I must say that none of the current textbooks will inform you as easily, simply and thoroughly about the nature of psychoanalysis as will these four works of literature.<sup>33</sup>

*The Ring of the Nibelungs* turns into a textbook on the Oedipus complex. On *Faust* he writes, in a summary, that it is a confession and understanding of the fact that human beings are lonely and each a world to himself. The famous German children's book *Struwwelpeter* he considers a complete collection of all symbols, and a sensitive presentation of the childish mind as a description of the dual world in which the child is living, as an evocation of the irrational world which grown-ups find almost inaccessible.

In his essay on *Peer Gynt* he discusses the concept of the self. This essay is perhaps the most personal work of Groddeck's. He identified so deeply with the Peer Gynt character who turns into a 'troll' that, as the author of *The Book of the It*, he signed the letters to his lady-friend Patrick Troll.

The essay attempts a confrontation of I and Self. In the course of this it arrives at a definition of the Self which is based on the conception of the It. Groddeck had insisted in many previous articles on man's duty to confront his self. In 1926 he wrote:

Our time uses the words selfish and egocentric as if it were the biggest character weakness to possess one of these qualities or to cultivate them. I have no right and no inclination to go into the moral and ethical implications of selfishness, but as a physician I have to say that I find it horrifying how little people care for themselves, even the so-called selfish and egocentric persons, and they least of all since their lives are usually a permanent escape from themselves; it may be right to assume that they serve their ego or what they consider their ego, yet this ego serving is in reality the result of a great fear of their selves, a turning away from the self, from their deepest emotions. For the doctor's work it would be desirable if people showed more interest in themselves, in the manifestations of the It, for the mute and yet so insistent entreaties of their innermost soul which strives desperately to get a hearing and clamours for attention in a thousand ways, in actions, dreams, and the symptoms of illness, and I would think that these phenomena which the doctor can see so clearly, deserve to be examined by the moralists, too, for a change.<sup>34</sup>

A year later Groddeck argues that the child is much nearer to self-knowledge and points to the developing egoconsciousness as an obstacle to self-knowledge:

Know thyself! Formally speaking this is an advice, an admonition to strive for self-knowledge, but in reality it is merely a confirmation of the fact that a person who knows something about himself is a special tool in the hand of the universe, of God Nature, that he has special gifts and potential for action similar to those which all human beings possess at a certain age, i.e. during childhood. Children are the best teachers and if you do not become like children you will not enter the kingdom of heaven. Self-knowledge is not knowledge of the Ego, but knowledge of our Self, our It. For me, there is no doubt that as long as the human Ego consciousness is still weak man knows more about his Self, his It, than from the moment onwards when he uses the ominous word 'I'. This word is like a pair of spectacles, an indispensable unavoidable pair of spectacles which forces us to see everything, particularly our Self, in distortion or embellished and which was given to us by God Nature in order not to be like God.<sup>35</sup>

Since Groddeck developed his ideas on Man's attitude towards his self in the Peer Gynt essay at particular length, I would like to quote from it some more:

Peer Gynt can regard his 'self' as an object, he can 'vaere dig selv'; he can also 'vaere sig selvnok'. If we try to translate the 'vaerl dig selv' we must not say: 'Man, be thyself!' but 'Man, be a thou, a thou to thyself, or, by all means, be a self to yourself. Stop being an "I".' Try to confront yourself the way a child does. Make yourself a part of the great whole, the universe. Deal with yourself on the basis of the knowledge that you are not an 'I', but a 'thou'. If the oft-repeated words 'dig selv' are taken in this sense, all the difficulties of interpretation fall away, since Ibsen allows Peer Gynt to speak of his self or thou (though this is not the same thing) instead of his 'I'. It is, of course, not possible to make this clear in a stage representation, it would become too clumsy, yet one can learn to understand it at home and then the performance will not lead one astray. Yet as it is at the moment the play does not make sense.

It should be obvious to everyone that the self is not identical with the ego, for the ego is something entirely personal and in essence illusory, something existing only in our own imagination. It comprehends only a very small part of a man. The self on the other hand is the whole man. We all know it, yet none of us lives in accordance with our knowledge, for we are all under the spell of the ego idea....

We all fancy we must have a core at the centre, something that is not merely shell; we would like to hold within us some specially aromatic kernel, to be a nut which holds the eternal, the sacred. And we do not realise, cannot realize, that we have in fact no kernel, but are ourselves, from the outermost peel to the innermost minutest leaf, that the peel self is our own self, that we are onions. But in the onion every leaf is its essential nature. The onion is genuine right through, and it would be bad, rotten, if it tried to grow a kernel different from the rest, and to destroy the peel as though it were something false, something apart from its onion nature. Peer understands this at first only intellectually. His heart wants to despair, his heart is keen on being a whole man, a man with a kernel.<sup>36</sup>

## **GRODDECK AND PRESENT-DAY PSYCHOANALYTIC RESEARCH**

Groddeck was seminal in many ways. There are, first, his ideas about the nature of organic illness and about health, about therapy and the importance of resistance in this, and his ideas about psychoanalysis as an important instrument in research. Yet there are many other themes which Groddeck discussed that are topical again, for instance the importance Groddeck assigned to the good relationship between mother and child. In this context it may be interesting that Groddeck insisted on man's need to play. In a letter to the woman who later became his wife he wrote:

It is quite unimportant what we play with as long as we play, and people who cannot play, who long for unobtainable playthings instead of making a living doll from a handkerchief, are rather stupid. Those who like their own stupidity may keep it, in God's name. Everybody should have his own pleasure. (6.4.1916)<sup>37</sup>

The possible role of psychoanalysis in obstetrics Groddeck mentioned to Freud in his letter on November 8, 1923:

There is still a lot to be learnt about the mother's and the baby's psyche as well as about the practice of obstetrics.

It entirely depends on the reader how Groddeck's ideas will strike and possibly affect him. Some may be irritated if not repelled by many of his more abstruse thoughts and by the way he jumps from idea to idea.

This reaction would be nothing new; it recalls the indignation and criticism which Groddeck aroused on his first appearance at the International Psychoanalytical Congress in The Hague, in 1920.

Groddeck's importance to psychoanalysis is manifold. Through his encounter with Freud he has become a part of the history of psychoanalysis. What is particularly remarkable is that Freud continued to encourage and support this very ingenious and original thinker and therapist in spite of the personal difficulties the correspondence testifies to. Clearly Freud's genius was able to understand and tolerate the very different genius of Groddeck.

It is important to keep in mind what Groddeck's real intention was:

It is more advisable to initiate than to exhaust a theme. This, at least, is the way my talent works.<sup>38</sup>

The writings collected in this anthology are chosen from the four volumes of Groddeck's writings published by Limes Verlag: *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Literatur und Kunst* (1964), *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Psychosomatik* (1966), *Der Mensch und sein Es* (1970), and *Der Mensch als Symbol* (1973).

*Der Mensch und sein Es* contains, apart from the correspondence between Groddeck and Freud, further letters by Groddeck, twenty articles from the 1920's, mostly published in *Die Arche*, a magazine for the patients in his clinic, and finally some biographical writings and essays. The volume *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Psychosomatik* contains essays which had been published before, in psychoanalytical or psychotherapeutic journals or in *Die Arche*. There are also a number of unpublished works, whose titles were chosen by the editor of the German edition. The volume *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Literatur und Kunst* contains writings from Groddeck's pre-analytic period, from his analytic period, and finally extracts from Groddeck's last book, *Der Mensch als Symbol*, which was published in full in 1973.

The editor thanks Vision Press for permission to reprint V.M.E. Collins' translation of 'Clinical Communications' and 'Massage and Psychotherapy' from *The Unknown Self* and *Exploring the Unconscious* respectively. Special thanks to the editors of the German editions, in particular for being able to use the footnotes and comments to the correspondence between Groddeck and Freud.

With the exception of the letters from Freud to Groddeck dated 5.6.1917, 8.2.1920, 25.3.1923 and 21.12.1924 which were published in English in *Letters of Sigmund Freud, 1873-1939*, edited by Ernst L. Freud (London, The Hogarth Press, 1961; New York, Basic Books) the correspondence between Groddeck and Freud is published in English for the first time in this volume.

A number of biographical details were taken from Carl M. Grossman *The Wild Analyst* (New York, George Braziller, 1965; London, Barrie and Rockliff).

**Published in:**

<http://www.pep-web.org.rproxy.sc.univ-paris-diderot.fr/document.php?id=ipl.105.0001a>

*Volver a Bibliografía Georg Groddeck*  
*Volver a Newsletter-14-ALSF*



## Notas al final

- 1.- Letter to Professor Hans Vaihinger, May 8, 1930, in *Der Mensch und sein Es*, pp. 125-6.
- 2.- 'Erinnerung an den Vater' (Memories of my father), *Der Mensch und sein Es*, pp. 400-02.
- 3.- *Der Mensch und sein Es*, pp. 421-2
- 4.- 'Das Es und die Psychoanalyse nebst allgemeinen Ausführungen zum damaligen wie heutigen Kongresswesen' (The It and Psychoanalysis with general remarks about congress mania then and now), *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Psychosomatik*, pp. 161-2.
- 5.- *Psycho-Analysis and Faith: The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Oskar Pfister*. Translated by Eric Mosbacher (London, The Hogarth Press). p. 80.
- 6.- *Ibid*, pp. 81-2.
- 7.- See Groddeck's letter to Freud, December 4, 1921.
- 8.- *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, 1926.
- 9.- See pp. 172-196 below.
- 10.- 'Lebenserinnerungen' (Memoirs), *Der Mensch und sein Es*, p. 271.
- 11.- 'Vom Unsinn der Psychogenese' (The Nonsense of Psychogenesis), *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Psychosomatik*, p. 164.
- 12.- *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Literatur und Kunst*, p. 28.
- 13.- Was Kann der Mensch im Leben mehr gewinnen,  
Als dass sich Gottnatur ihm offenbare:  
Wie sie das Feste lässt zu Geiste verrinnen,  
Wie sie das Geistgezeugte fest bewahre.  
Johann Wolfgang von Goethe.
- 14.- *Der Mensch und sein Es*, p. 120
- 15.- *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Psychosomatik*, pp. 154-9.
- 16.- *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Psychosomatik*, p. 209.
- 17.- *Der Mensch als Symbol*, pp. 5-6.
- 18.- 'Das Zwiesgeschlecht des Menschen' (Human bisexuality), *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Psychosomatik*, pp. 256-7.
- 19.- *Der Mensch als Symbol*, p. 6.
- 20.- *Der Mensch als Symbol*, p. 7.
- 21.- 'Vision, the World of the Eye, and Seeing without the Eye', p. 175.
- 22.- 'Language', p. 252 below.
- 23.- 'Psychic Conditioning and the Psychoanalytic Treatment of Organic Disorders', p. 115 below.
- 24.- *Horizon magazine* (London), vol. XVII, No. 102, edited by Cyril Connolly, June 1948.
- 25.- 'Vision, the World of the Eye, and Seeing without the Eye', p. 174 below.
- 26.- 'Psychic Conditioning and the Psychoanalytic Treatment of Organic Disorders', p. 128 below.
- 27.- *Der Mensch und sein Es*, p. 267
- 28.- 'Das Es und die Psychoanalyse ...', *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Psychosomatik*, p. 218.
- 29.- 'Über die psychische Behandlung der Nierensteinbildung' (Psychiatric Treatment of Kidney Stone Formation), *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Psychosomatik*, p. 218.
- 30.- See Groddeck's letter 18.12.1924, Freud's letter 21.12.24, Groddeck's letter 13.6.1925 and Freud's letter 18.6.1925.
- 31.- 'Erziehung' (Education) *Der Mensch und sein Es*, p. 154.
- 32.- Letter to Frau von Voigt, his later wife, 10.4.1916.
- 33.- 'Der Ring' (The Ring), *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Literatur und Kunst* p. 135.
- 34.- 'Verstopfung als Typus des Widerstands' (Constipation as a type of resistance), *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Psychosomatik*, p. 185.
- 35.- *Erziehung* (Education), *Der Mensch und sein Es*, p. 252.
- 36.- 'Peer Gynt', *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Literatur und Kunst*, pp. 182-8.
- 37.- *Der Mensch und sein Es*, p. 101.
- 38.- *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Psychosomatik*, p. 388