



Recherches en psychanalyse
Research in Psychoanalysis

From One Myth to the Other: From *Totem and Taboo* to Overview of the Transference Neuroses

Patrick Merot

IN **RESEARCH IN PSYCHOANALYSIS 2016/1 No 21** , PAGES 70 TO 84

PUBLISHER **ASSOCIATION RECHERCHES EN PSYCHANALYSE**

ISSN 1767-5448

DOI 10.3917/rep1.021.0070a

Uploaded: 06/16/2016

Article available online at

<https://shs.cairn.info/journal-research-in-psychoanalysis1-2016-1-page-70?lang=en>



CAIRN · INFO

Discover the contents of this issue, follow the journal by email, subscribe...
Scan this QR code to access the page for this issue on Cairn.info.



Electronic distribution Cairn.info for Association Recherches en psychanalyse.

You are authorized to reproduce this article within the limits of the terms of use of Cairn.info or, where applicable, the terms and conditions of the license subscribed to by your institution. Details and conditions can be found at cairn.info/copyright.

Unless otherwise provided by law, the digital use of these resources for educational purposes is subject to authorization by the Publisher or, where applicable, by the collective management organization authorized for this purpose. This is particularly the case in France with the CFC, which is the approved organization in this area.

From One Myth to the Other: From *Totem and Taboo* to *Overview of the Transference Neuroses*

D'un mythe à l'autre : de Totem et Tabou à Vue d'ensemble des névroses de transfert

[Online] May 31, 2016

Patrick Merot

Abstract:

While *Totem and Taboo* and *Overview of the Transference Neuroses* are worlds apart, there is a common point in their inspiration, since each of these texts highlights a founding myth. Therefore, this article will compare them in order to show how one of these myths has become absolutely central in Freudian thought, while the other holds an ancillary and almost shameful place. How are we to understand such divergent theoretical destinies? Returning to what is at stake in these two texts, which are practically simultaneous, we maintain that extending the elaboration of the myth that is put forward in the *Overview* would have led the founder of psychoanalysis to fundamental revisions to his metapsychology, which in 1915 Freud was not ready for.

Résumé:

Si tout oppose *Totem et Tabou* et *Vue d'ensemble des névroses de transfert*, il demeure quelque chose de commun dans leur inspiration, puisque chacun de ces textes fait surgir un mythe fondateur. Il s'agit donc de les rapprocher, afin de constater qu'un de ces mythes est devenu absolument central dans la pensée freudienne, alors que l'autre y a une place accessoire et quasi honteuse. Comment comprendre des destins théoriques aussi divergents ? Reprenant l'ensemble des enjeux inhérents à ces deux textes pratiquement concurrents, l'auteur soutient que prolonger l'élaboration du mythe proposé dans la *Vue d'ensemble...* aurait conduit le fondateur de la psychanalyse à des remaniements de fond de sa métapsychologie, auxquels, en 1915, Freud n'était pas prêt.

Keywords: myth, epistemology, metapsychology, phylogenesis, Darwin, Robertson Smith

Mots clés: mythe, épistémologie, métapsychologie, phylogénèse, Darwin, Robertson Smith

Plan:

Totem and Taboo, a Scientific Book

Overview of the Transference Neuroses, the Phylogenetic Temptation

Why Did Freud Abandon the Overview of the Transference Neuroses?

The author:

Patrick Merot, PhD

Psychiatrist, Psychoanalyst (Association Psychanalytique de France)

13, avenue Charles V
94130 Nogent-sur-Marne
France

Electronic Reference:

Patrick Merot, "From One Myth to the Other: From *Totem and Taboo* to *Overview of the Transference Neuroses*", *Research in Psychoanalysis* [Online], 21 | 2016/1 published May 31, 2016.

This article is a translation of *D'un mythe à l'autre : de Totem et Tabou à Vue d'ensemble des névroses de transfert*.

Full text

Copyright

All rights reserved

Conflict of Interest Statement

Patrick Merot declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

In their form, *Totem and Taboo* and *Overview of the Transference Neuroses* are worlds apart, but there is a common point in their inspiration which, for each of the two texts, highlights a founding myth. One of these myths has become central to Freudian thought, while the other holds an ancillary, almost shameful, place. How are we to understand such divergent theoretical destinies? Trying to answer this question by comparing the two texts will also allow us to penetrate into the inner workings of Freud's approach with respect to his epistemological position and the question of the scientificity of psychoanalysis.

Let us say a word about what distinguishes these two texts formally: their length, with *Totem and Taboo* stretching to nearly two hundred pages, while *Overview of the Transference Neuroses* is just a few pages long; their degree of completion: on the one hand we have a full book, on the other a mere sketch. Indeed, there is nothing similar about them at the level of their writing. *Totem and Taboo* was begun at the start of the year 1911¹, and for over two and a half years Freud worked relentlessly on his book, with which he would soon identify with totally – “I am entirely *Totem and Taboo*” – and which he would end up choosing as the most beautiful thing he had ever written.² Contrary to this, the *Overview of the Transference Neuroses* took just four weeks of the year 1915 to draft, and was left aside for several years and ultimately forgotten.

The *Overview* was part of a vast project that emerged approximately one year after the publication of *Totem and Taboo*, comprising twelve lectures intended to take stock of psychoanalytic knowledge. Freud worked on this from November 1914 until the summer of 1915. Its themes were defined and the texts in question were drafted, but as we know, in the end only five were published.

Three texts appeared in 1915: “Drives and Their Fates”, “Repression”, and “The Unconscious.”

Two texts would be published two years later, in 1917³: “Metapsychological Supplement to the Theory of Dreams” and “Mourning and Melancholia.”

The fate of the seven other texts is still the object of various different hypotheses. *Overview of the Transference Neuroses* was thought lost until it was discovered in 1983 by Ilse Grubrich-Simitis among the Ferenczi papers that had been conserved by Michael Balint.

One can read a precise echo of the development of this text – besides the letter to Ferenczi that accompanies it – in Freud's correspondence with Abraham, and then a further echo in his correspondence with Lou Andreas-Salomé. In spite of the red tape that the letters had to get through due to the war, each new version is commented on by Lou Andreas-Salomé. In 1919, she was still hoping that the initial project would come to fruition,⁴ and was saddened when she learnt from Freud himself that he had abandoned the idea: “I cannot reconcile myself to the fact that the metapsychology has not yet been published in book form,” she wrote to him in September 1919.⁵ What is noteworthy in these exchanges is that despite the confidence that Freud shows in the opinions of his admirer, at no point during those years would he ever speak to her about the *Overview of the Transference Neuroses*.

Nevertheless, it seems that the projected writings had been drafted, because Freud wrote as much to several of his correspondents. However, if the five essays that were finally to be published correspond to Freud's expectations, the others undoubtedly never got beyond the state of a first sketch. In any case, when he announced the slated publication of the five texts to Abraham, he added, “the rest I am keeping for myself.” And when, having received the last two texts, Lou Andreas-Salomé alluded in a

letter to the other chapters, to the “ones which were already finished,” Freud responded to her rather sharply: “What has happened to my *Metapsychology*? In the first place it has not yet been written.”⁶ He says that if what had already been written were to be followed by further contributions, then this would lie in another direction, and he announces in the course of the year leading up to 1920: “A first example of this will be found in an essay of mine entitled ‘Beyond the Pleasure Principle’ [...]”⁷

In actual fact, in 1917, when he decides to entrust the editor with “Metapsychological Supplement to the Theory of Dreams” and “Mourning and Melancholia,” which had been written in 1915, he declares to Ferenczi that, “the rest may be kept quiet.”⁸ Silence, then, is indeed what best expresses Freud’s position in relation to these further writings. It is thought that he destroyed them. Therefore, it is this silence that we have to break through in our examination of this re-found text.

What justifies the comparison between *Overview of the Transference Neuroses* and *Totem and Taboo* is the completion of this short essay which puts forward the construction of a “prehistoric” myth following the same model as *Totem and Taboo*. During the time the project was alive, Freud was still very involved in all the readings and the reflections that went hand in hand with the drafting of *Totem and Taboo*. It is of great interest, therefore, to examine what might have played a role in the different treatments that Freud gave to these two myths.

The comparison of these two texts needs to be attempted. One of them is a voluminous work, the fruit of long elaboration, and came to be constantly promoted as one of the pillars of analytic theory, quoted, and referenced in later works; and the other is a short text, unpublished, forgotten even by its author, lost and miraculously found again forty-five years after Freud’s death, edited against his wishes, and which was to hold no place in the coherence of the Freudian oeuvre. This dissymmetry between writing and fate needs to be understood in order to clarify Freud’s thought processes, and all the more so, given that the two texts are supported by a number of epistemological reflections. Therefore, first of all, we need to go back to the texts to read them methodically and to try to show how Freud proceeded in *Totem and Taboo* to make it a scientific book, and the reason why the *Overview...* has remained an inspired piece of writing, but little more than that.

***Totem and Taboo*,⁹ a Scientific Book**

We know how he initiated this research, at a time that was a strong creative period, and that he felt sufficiently assured of his discoveries to venture into this new domain of applied psychoanalysis.¹⁰ Freud shares with Jung the intuition that psychoanalysis furnishes the keys to understanding the universe of beliefs, even though they adopt opposing approaches: Jung advances into individual psychology on the basis of the psychology of peoples. This methodological divergence will soon be covered up by fundamental divergences that became irremediable towards the end of the drafting of *Totem and Taboo*.

People usually quote the announcement of Freud’s major criticism of Jung from the Preface to the 1913 edition of *Totem and Taboo*. Indeed, this was the moment at which Freud was intent on acting upon the divergence that had arisen between them. But this “methodological opposition” that psychoanalysis brings to the study of the psychology of peoples presents, in Freud’s own words, two fronts: Jung represents the internal opposition; and symmetrically to this internal front, Freud indicates an external front, represented by a name, that of a German psychologist and philosopher, Wilhelm Wundt. In 1906, Wundt had published an “extensive work” (which by the end of his life would stretch to ten volumes), in which he “applies the hypotheses and working methods of *non*-analytic psychology to the same purposes.”¹¹ Freud’s criticism of Wundt will concern one particular point: that of making do with a postulate of a fear of demons, without examining the nature of these demons. Otherwise, however, Wundt provides Freud with a compendium of observations that he will use to support his

remarks. In the first two chapters, Wundt's works will be among the most cited studies. Freud's decision to cite this author in the Preface is undoubtedly due to the eminent position that his oeuvre had acquired at that time, because dialogue is pursued throughout *Totem and Taboo* with a whole troop of anthropologists. The author whose name crops up most frequently, from the first chapter to the last, is Frazer, whose major work *The Golden Bough* offers Freud a mine of references.

One can read *Totem and Taboo* as a long preparation to the "purple passage" – the development on the primal horde – which will lie at the center of the fourth chapter, the very same chapter that Freud considered to be the most successful, and the chapter in which his borrowings from scientific authorities hold a considerable place. But before coming to that point, the first three chapters, which were drafted and published successively, were constructed in the same manner, drawing support from an immense number of citations.

The schema on which Freud's argumentation is organized in these different chapters turns out to be highly dissymmetrical: the specifically psychoanalytical developments cover a fairly limited place, in order to make room for the necessary exposition of ethnological theses. It was only after having allowed the ethnologists to have their say that Freud introduced, in a systematic manner, a follow-up, a protest, a clarification, an opening that draws on psychoanalysis. Clearly this discretion was strategic: in the end, the contribution of psychoanalysis is considered to be essential, but the construction is still a striking one and, furthermore, an entirely visible one, because the passage from the first phase to the following one is marked with an explicit articulation by Freud himself, as we are going to illustrate shortly.

It comes as no surprise that, thereafter, throughout the whole length of *Totem and Taboo*, the reader is sometimes buried under a veritable flood of quotations. Freud, who had read all the literature on the subject, and which we may note was an absolutely contemporary literature (he seized upon the cutting edge research of his time), makes use of it as an immense reservoir of material that he will dip into at will. Besides, more often than not, he does no more than reproduce long extracts of the information he has found. He explains himself on this matter in a note, right at the start of the third chapter, in which he anticipates the reproach, which in truth is a paradoxical one, that could be leveled against him for not citing these authors in their entirety, authors whom he draws on while explaining the necessity of not quoting his sources at length. He sends the reader in a cursive manner to the works of Spencer, Frazer, Lang, Tylor, and Wundt "from which all that I have to say about animism and magic is derived", which will be treated in this chapter¹², and he adds that "my own contribution is visible only in my selection both of material and of opinions."¹³ This remark, which seems to go without saying, is nevertheless essential when it comes to understanding Freud's relationship with the different bodies of work that he is using, which are open quarries from which he will extract the material that interests him.

Thus, if we come back to the text itself we find the following:

Chapter 1: After nineteen pages dedicated to "The Horror of Incest" in primitive peoples, largely drawn from the writings of Frazer (and of Wundt, and of many others in a more fragmentary way), he introduces a second section that over three pages gives the analytic reinterpretation of the ethnologists' observations, writing that "the knowledge of hidden animistic motions that psychoanalytical observation procures from human beings taken individually allows us to add yet further motivations to these."

Chapter II: This is the most clinical chapter. Freud develops the initial intuition that founded his step of opening psychoanalysis towards ethnology: the similarity between the major symptom of obsessional neurosis – the prohibition on touching being the paradigmatic example – and the taboo that, in animistic religions, organizes the relationship with the world of objects. There is nothing hypothetical about this comparison because it is based on anthropological observations that have been carefully

documented and which are still relevant. Freud unfolds his arguments. He contributes to ethnographic theories here by showing the presence of a very active *ambivalence* in the sociological situations described by the ethnographers, just as it is present in neurosis. Freud's exposé is constructed in the same way, in two phases, with a slightly larger place given to psychoanalytical developments, which nevertheless still remain a minority.¹⁴

The discursive scheme I have indicated could be said to repeat, with small variations, across all the chapters. It will be enough for us to take the third section as a fresh example, with the notion of *ambivalence*, in which Freud looks again at the observations on the three major ethnological domains in which taboo appears:

- *the treatment of enemies*: with six pages of ethnographic observations that end with three lines (p. 41) that recall the analytical hypothesis;
- *the taboo upon rulers*: seven ethnographic pages (p. 41-48) followed by three pages over which the analytical hypothesis is specifically developed (p. 49-51), with a point of articulation between them: "So far so good; but the technique of psychoanalysis allows us to go into the question further [...]";
- *the taboo upon the dead*: first there are six pages (p. 51-56) on the taboo from the ethnological point of view, followed by one page (p. 56-7) introduced by: "As was only to be expected, obsessional neurotics behave exactly like savages in relation to names"; finally, there are three pages (p. 57-59) on spirits, followed by three pages that amplify the subject, stressing that "the study of psychoneurotic disorders suggests a more comprehensive explanation" (p. 59).

Chapter III: In the third chapter, the authors who have thus far been quoted receive reinforcement from Salomon Reinach, another major touchstone for Freud. This learned man was a French archeologist and a specialist in the history of religions. An exact contemporary of Freud,¹⁵ he authored *Culte, mythe et religion*, which was published in 1905. He was also the author of an 1899 lecture entitled "Du tabou au totem" ["From the Taboo to the Totem"] (which initially bore as a title a formula that is even closer to the one Freud was to choose: ["Totems et Tabous"] ["Totems and Taboos"]).¹⁶ Freud sets out a few criticisms of Reinach that have to do with two points that are essential to an analytical perspective: he makes no mention of exogamy (p. 107) and he does not look at the factor of descent from the totem (p. 113). Lastly, Freud draws on Mauss, taking up his theses on magic in their entirety. After a little over ten pages on which he embraces the theses of ethnologists, there are two pages on which he reintroduces the analytical dimension of desire and of the omnipotence of thought. Between the two developments, he introduces the reference to psychoanalysis through the usual articulation: "it will be easy to arrive at a satisfactory explanation of magic by carrying the associative theory further and deeper."

Finally comes the fourth chapter, in which we meet again Frazer, Wundt, and Reinach, but the base of Freud's anthropological references is enriched by two major authors: Charles Darwin¹⁷ and William Robertson Smith.

Freud's discovery of the works of W. Robertson Smith,¹⁸ even though he had already undertaken the drafting of *Totem and Taboo* and published the first two chapters, was a real find. When he was becoming acquainted with Smith's book *Religion of the Semites*, he declared to Ferenczi¹⁹ that he found in this author "the best confirmations" of his hypotheses on the totem. W. Robertson Smith is also cited numerous times in the last part. No less than a dozen occurrences are noted in the index to the text.

Chapter IV: In the fourth chapter, Freud still gives pride of place to a reminder of ethnological theses, but he proceeds a little differently in his way of presenting them. After a first section that contrasts Frazer and Reinach in order to amplify the problematic of exogamy and descent, he deals in the second part with this dual question by venturing to go back to the source, offering an inventory of the various theories he has looked at. But this time he chooses not to dwell over those that he feels closest to,

opting instead to set out all the known theories, contrasting them with one another. If we draw up a list of the authors that Freud quotes, reminding ourselves briefly and approximately of their theses, we come to realize both the enormity of the work that Freud undertook and his eagerness to inscribe his own theory into the scientific corpus of his time. Listing the authors whose thought he sums up in a few lines has a dizzying effect.

Thus, in order to clarify the question of the origins of totemism, he mentions:

- the nominalist theories of Vega, Müller, Pikler, Spencer, Avebury, Fison, and Lang;
- the sociological theories of Reinach, Durkheim, Heddon, Frazer (for his second and third theories), Spencer and Gille;
- the psychological theories of Frazer (first theory), Wicklen, Boas, Hill-Tour, and Wundt;
- concerning the question of exogamy and its relation to totemism, he cites Frazer, Durkheim, Lang, Mac Leman, Morgan, Howitt, Spencer, Westermarck, Hellis, and Atkinson.

No doubt there is a little mischief in the concern for exhaustiveness that Freud shows in wanting to treat the question in this way, because for Freud it is not a matter of drawing any dominant orientation in the ethnologists' positions from this 22-page section, but, on the contrary, of showing that no agreement has been reached and that one can get lost in all of this.

This is how he prepares the opening of the third section, which begins with the triumphant words (which are very different from his protestations of humility set out in other passages from *Totem and Taboo*): "Into this obscurity one single ray of light is thrown by psychoanalytic observation."²⁰ This third section then advances the most complete conclusion that Freud has come to after this long path of several years, and he is able to write that this "expression used by these people, of which the anthropologists have been able to make very little and which they have therefore been glad to keep in the background"²¹ is in fact the precise point at which things become clear, and which psychoanalysis can, all in all, understand: "The totem animal is the father."

The fourth section of this fourth chapter is the one where he will make good use of his reading of W. Robertson Smith, which supplements, for Freud, his older and deeper knowledge of Darwin. This section, and the three that will follow (5, 6, and 7) are the culmination of Freud's long path where, with veritable lyricism, he synthesizes all that has slowly been built up over the previous chapters.

Let us go over what is involved here. Freud has at his disposal Darwin's theory of the primal horde, in which a leader imposes his authority, or rather his force, on the whole of his rivals for the possession of women; a horde in which succession occurs through violence: the elimination of the now weakened leader of the horde by a rival who surpasses him.

By reading W. Robertson Smith, he discovers that now he has at his disposal the theory of the sacrificial meal, in which the shared consuming of the animal sacrificed to a god takes place.

Freud's stroke of genius is thus to bring the two theories together around one part of the hypothesis of the killing of the father by the united brothers (the leader and rival are identified to a father) – which I shall call *the augmented Darwinian hypothesis*²² – and on the other hand the commemoration of this murder in a sacrificial meal (the animal in the place and the stead of the father) – which I shall call *the augmented Smithian hypothesis* – two hypothesis that are unified thanks to the reference to the Oedipus complex.²³ In this way, he concludes by forging the myth of the primal horde.

On the very last pages of the final section, Freud will complete his theoretical construction with considerations on the transmission of the memory of this murder via the genealogical route, via phylogenetic transmission.

Certainly, there is something fastidious in our reminder of this argumentative pathway, but we are extracting an essential datum from our explication of method: here, Freud shows a veritable tenacity in inscribing psychoanalysis into the science of his time, drawing on what this science offers so as to move

forward only on the basis of what is necessary to his hypothesis. His force of conviction is constructed in the search for the greatest possible proximity with the scientific knowledge that is at his disposal. Never again will Freud venture so far into this kind of approach, and none of his other works will show a comparable effort to solicit acknowledgement from the contemporary scientific world.

So, just as Freud's theoretical effort in this fourth part is absolutely colossal, and the construction of his hypothesis is enshrouded in every possible authority, one cannot help but be struck by the few words that open the fourth chapter which, far from being triumphant, are very modest. It matters little whether he is sincere here, or whether he is pursuing a strategy: here he adopts the stance of a scientist. Far from claiming to have explained the alpha and the omega of religion, he assures us that his hypothesis will have to find a place among others, and that for him it is not a question of tracing "the origin of anything so complicated as religion to a single source."²⁴ At the same time, he justifies the necessity of a certain methodological reductionism: for psychoanalysis to be acknowledged as one source among others, one is "compelled – and is, indeed, duty bound – to lay all the emphasis upon one particular source [...]."²⁵ And this same modesty can be found in a last epistemological remark: regardless of the result he has come to – "the high degree of convergence upon a single comprehensive nexus of ideas" – Freud reminds us of the fragility of all these hypotheses and underlines that this result "cannot blind us to the uncertainties of my premises or the difficulties involved in my conclusions."²⁶

It is true that this remark also allows him to immediately re-launch the debate and to try to reinforce the solidity of his construction, on two points. The first one touches on "the hypothesis of a group psychology." Without him specifying as much, he is returning to what had introduced *Totem and Taboo* in the Preface and, by arguing for the existence of a psychology of peoples, he is making implicit reference to Wundt and his psychology of peoples. The second point, which is treated in a highly cursive fashion, is that of permanence throughout the generations of psychical states that he has described, and thus of the heredity of memory.

So, a swift yet exhaustive reading of *Totem and Taboo*, a book that one can unreservedly designate as a work of psychoanalytical anthropology, strikingly shows the way in which Freud constructed his theory: Turning to constant support from scientific knowledge, with psychoanalysis only coming in at the end of the day to bring the supplement that allows a new meaning to be given to observations from this new domain.²⁷

So, what could we now add concerning the *Overview of the Transference Neuroses*?

Overview of the Transference Neuroses,²⁸ the Phylogenetic Temptation

The twelfth essay was the one whose methodology and inspiration were closest to that of *Totem and Taboo* in its phylogenetic dimension. The parallelism between the fate of the species and the fate of the drives, which had already been mentioned in the *Three Essays*, then developed in *Totem and Taboo*, is at the center of the *Overview of the Transference Neuroses*, and is even amplified, on the one hand, to the point of including the geological history of the earth, and on the other, by adding to the study of the neuroses the study of psychoses, or narcissistic neuroses.

In so doing, the *Overview...* eludes its own program, contrary to the published essays that fit perfectly into a general usefulness, a metapsychology, no doubt just like the other unpublished essays that one can suppose, given their titles, corresponded to the initial intention. The *Overview...*, with its project that Freud qualified as a synthetic one, is, one might say, a meta-metapsychological essay.

Here, it is not a matter of going over the content of the text, any more than we looked at the detail of the proposals in *Totem and Taboo*. It will simply be a question of reading the text from a different angle, the angle of its insertion into the scientific field, so as to emphasize the differences between this text and *Totem and Taboo*.

First of all, a reading of this kind will point out that in the very first line Freud is announcing that what is at stake for him is to carry out a piece of work that would synthesize what had been learnt about the transference neuroses: “an attempt at gathering.” Therefore, it was not about producing a new oeuvre, but rather of taking up what had been dealt with in previous exposés and his writings on the subject. But this program would be swamped by the scale that the phylogenetic hypothesis was to take: it was no longer a synthesis but really a new path that he was opening up. Furthermore, there is another swamping that is correlative with the first: the program that was announced concerns only the transference neuroses, but the final text leaves this field behind and dedicates a great deal of space to the narcissistic neuroses.

In the first part of the *Overview...*, we need to pause on the moment at which the first reference to phylogenetics appears, with an argumentation concerning the problematic of acquisition vs. constitution. For Freud there is only one possible hypothesis for the origin: it is not a given, but an experience. He writes that, “[...] one can justifiably claim that the inherited dispositions are residues of the acquisition of our ancestors.”²⁹ Affirming this origin is something self-evident for Freud. He asks, “Why should the process that creates disposition on the basis of experience cease precisely at the individual [...]?”

This questioning introduces the phylogenetic perspective in the guise of a “widening of the horizon.”³⁰

But it is at this point of the text that things will take a different turn. Up until now, Freud had made an inventory of the distinctions between the different transference neuroses, but here he constitutes them into a group – which is characterized by one common feature: the object relation – in order to contrast this group with another, that of the narcissistic neuroses. Thus, he goes from internal criteria to external criteria. And it is the opposition between these two groups that prompts Freud to move forward in his exploration of phylogenetics.³¹ Thus far, he had made do with affirming the principle of an inheritance, and now he will try to trace its history. Next, he introduces a “fantasy”, modulated to the highest degree: What he has just written is boring. By way of compensation, he asks for the reader’s “patience,” and leaves behind the critical spirit in favor of fantasy. He tells us that, “unconfirmed things are presented, merely because they are stimulating and open up distant vistas.”³²

Then comes a reference to Ferenczi: “I know only the single attempt of Ferenczi, who makes use of [psychoanalytical] experiences for this purpose.”³³ This allows him to undertake the major history that shows how the development of the ego reproduces human history, and how the development of libido reproduces phylogenesis, a widening of perspective into which he integrates the narcissistic neuroses.³⁴

We are familiar with the central point of this evolution, the onset of the Ice Age, which is identified as the external cause that lies at the origin of the inscription of predispositions to neurosis in the human species. In an impeccable unfolding of his argument, Freud mentions the installation of anxiety neurosis, then hysterical neurosis, then obsessional neurosis, which correspond to a host of consecutive steps following the Ice Age.

But tracing this evolution in its entirety also entails speaking about the point of departure of the phylogenetic succession, the moment that precedes the experience of the geological and climatic catastrophe. Freud evokes this by drawing on Dr. Wittels³⁵ – a psychoanalyst from the Vienna circle – who “first expressed the idea that the primal human animal passed its existence in a thoroughly rich milieu that satisfied all needs, echoes of which we have retained in the myth of the primeval paradise.”³⁶ This evocation of a primeval paradise, which is very rare in Freud’s work, only lasts seven lines, but it is enough to set up the hypothesis that before the Ice Age, which saw the arrival of dispositions to the three neuroses, human beings, besides the happiness of living in abundance, knew nothing of neurosis. The myth that Freud’s text invents is the following: a primeval paradise followed by an Ice Age that brings to an end a period of abundance, and which will entail a whole series of adaptations in the human species.

In the next part of the text, with constant reference to Ferenczi, Freud will set out the details of this parallel: “We might have come so far in completing a program envisioned by Ferenczi ‘to bring the neurotic types of regression into harmony with the stages of human phylogeny’.”³⁷ Thus the transference neuroses correspond to the Ice Age and concern first and foremost the history of the child – “a portion of the children bring along the anxiousness of the beginning of the Ice Age and are now induced by it to treat the unsatisfied libido as an external danger,”³⁸ and then that of women and of mothers – “The limitation [the abstinence] must have affected women more severely than men, who were less concerned about the consequences of sexual intercourse”³⁹ – then that of men – “As a reward for his power to safeguard the lives of so many helpless ones he bestowed upon himself unrestrained dominance over them [...]”⁴⁰

In a second stage, Freud pursues the parallel with the narcissistic neuroses, not without forcing his reader to perform a certain intellectual gymnastics. The greatest surprise that Freud holds in store for his reader in his onto-phylogenetic parallelism is to maintain, counter-intuitively, that the most significant disturbances will correspond to the weakest temporal regression: the domain of the narcissistic neuroses will correspond to the period that comes after the horde, and echoes the misfortunes that will befall the sons. Indeed, Freud presupposes a rejection during this stage on the part of the sons and their castration by the father – a reference to *Totem and Taboo* – in which he sees the event that returns as a trace in *dementia praecox*.⁴¹ Then comes the regrouping of the brothers, and the place of homosexuality, with an echo of this moment appearing in individual histories in mania / melancholia.

There are three successive narratives on these originary phases, which are thus a return to what had been acquired in *Totem and Taboo*. Then come three supplementary hypotheses, in order to respond to the difficulties that this construction runs into.⁴² The conclusion of the text will be a final appeal to caution when turning to phylogenetic dispositions.

Why Did Freud Abandon the *Overview of the Transference Neuroses*?

Freud abandoned this *Overview of the Transference Neuroses* very quickly, in a move that is reminiscent of his abandonment of the *Project*: a text written feverishly, offered to the opinion of another – this time it is Ferenczi, who comes in the place of Fliess – and which soon became foreign to its author, to the point that he no longer made any mention of it, but which still harbors a certain number of ideas that will reappear, spread out across other texts. The commentary by Ilse Grubrich-Simitis, which we heartily recommend, offers an extremely detailed and convincing study of what became of this text.

What reasons lie behind Freud’s abandoning of this text? He provides some of them. To several of his interlocutors, he mentions a “lack of good cheer” (for example, to Lou Andreas-Salomé⁴³) and it has to be understood that he is alluding to the discomfiture that the war was giving rise to, and the absence of his three sons who had been mobilized. We should think of this, then, as a failing of inspiration: does he not speak, once again to Lou Andreas-Salomé,⁴⁴ confirming the suspension of the project, of the “sporadic” nature of his inspiration? But clearly this explanation is just a superficial one. With the text that we now have at our disposal, perhaps we can put forward reasons that bear on the thesis itself, and not on external factors.

It is certain that Freud’s abandonment of this text is not due to any reservation concerning the affirmation of phylogenetic inheritance. In this text, this affirmation conforms perfectly to convictions that he expresses elsewhere, even though it does take on a grandiose dimension. He will develop these convictions further when he makes explicit reference to Lamarck in his exchanges with Ferenczi, first of all during these same years (1916-1917), and then at the instigation of Groddeck’s theories, even going so far as to entertain writing a book on the theoretician of evolutionism.⁴⁵ In this we coincide with the

position taken by Patrick Lacoste who, in the Afterword to the French edition of the *Overview of the Transference Neuroses*, recalls that, “the phylogenetic hypothesis is surely present throughout his life’s work.”⁴⁶ To illustrate the force of this point of view in Freud’s thought I will take as my example, among a thousand others, the exchange that he has during this period with Lou Andreas-Salomé on the history of a child with a serious plant phobia.⁴⁷ When she asks his opinion, he replies that the case in question seems, in his opinion, to fall outside the usual observations and that, faced with such an enigma, “we must have recourse to the witch Prehistory or Phylogenesis.” So, here we have phylogenesis as what comes as the immediate response to what psychogenesis cannot explain. We may underscore the formula “witch Prehistory of Phylogenesis,” rather than Prehistory or Phylogenesis.⁴⁸

That said, whatever his inner conviction might have been, when he came to draft his *Overview of the Transference Neuroses*, Freud showed some hesitation. During the drafting of *Totem and Taboo*, he had been accompanied by the reading of the works of anthropologists, and the discovery of Smith had put fresh wind in his sails for the fourth chapter of his great book. Even if the *Overview...* is fairly short, on reading it one can only be struck by a particular difference in relation to *Totem and Taboo*: the total absence of any scientific reference. Whereas we have underlined the difference in format between the two pieces of writing, it is in their epistemological dimension that the greatest change is to be found. The observation is that much stronger given that Freud was writing the *Overview...* just a few years after *Totem and Taboo* – two years separate the end of one and the start of the other – so he was still steeped in its readings. Admittedly we are looking at a mere sketch here, and we can understand that Freud was going as quickly as possible in his writing: indeed the first part of the manuscript is written in a telegraphic style. The references to *Totem and Taboo* in the text are very succinct, even implicit, yet they function as a reminder for a reader like Ferenczi who already knows all the developments. However, there are no new references, even indicative ones; there is not the slightest hint that would allow one to think that some development might be possible in a later version. Whereas Freud was able to draw support from an overabundant literature for *Totem and Taboo*, it seems that he found nothing of the like for the *Overview...* Only Ferenczi’s text sparked the flame of inspiration (we know that this was the article from 1913 on “Stages in the Development of the Sense of Reality”⁴⁹). The most original contribution in the *Overview...* is the idea of a primeval paradise, which, as Ilse Grubrich-Simitis suggests, is not only a variation on the myth of the horde, but truly another Freudian myth. One can think that Freud was lacking the anthropological and historical support that he had exploited to write *Totem and Taboo*. There was no way that the literary scientific work of Wittels, whose full title translates as “Everything for Love: A Poem of the Primitive World,”⁵⁰ could bring any scientific guarantee.⁵¹ And Ferenczi remained an author of the inner circle, not of the non-analytical scientific world. Could Freud, just two years after he made that considerable effort to inscribe psychoanalysis into the scientific field of his time, allow himself to publically launch such reverie? He might have run the risk of seeing his whole oeuvre discredited.

The way we have recalled Freud’s approach in *Totem and Taboo* brings out the difficulty that he encounters there. We need to remind ourselves of the fundamentals of Freud’s epistemological position.⁵² Certainly, he was open to the imaginary dimension and he validates this detour in this same text. In *The Interpretation of Dreams*, he cites at length a letter from Schiller to Körner⁵³ in support of the fecundity of free association. Freud makes a plea in favor of due place being accorded to unwanted thoughts, which Schiller words as follows: “Where there is a creative mind, Reason – so it seems to me – relaxes its watch upon the gates,” and one should accept, continues Schiller, “the momentary and transient extravagances which are to be found in all truly creative minds.” It should also be remembered that Freud wrote in “Beyond the Pleasure Principle:” “It is surely possible to throw oneself into a line of thought and to follow it wherever it leads out of simple scientific curiosity, or, if the reader prefers, as an *advocatus diaboli*, who is not on that account himself sold to the devil.”⁵⁴

But once this moment of abandonment to the omnipotence of thought has succeeded in bringing forth the most audacious and fanciful ideas, one has to restore full rights to reality. It is then that the opinions that have been put forward can undergo criticism and, if need be, revision. These opinions need to be critiqued and revised if new observations now invalidate the initial observations. In *Totem and Taboo*, Freud mentions Frazer's approach as a model, when Frazer boasts of being able to change opinion when the results of research require it. Freud quotes Frazer's "admirable comment" that, "I have changed my views repeatedly, and I am resolved to change them again with every change of evidence, for like a chameleon the candid inquirer should shift his colors with the shifting colors of the ground he treads."⁵⁵

Indeed, for Freud, to construct a theory it is not enough to let creativity have free rein and to give oneself over to free associations. The theory still has to be submitted to the requirements of reason.⁵⁶

Let us not forget that the metapsychological essays open with "Drives and Their Fates", a text that begins with a full page of epistemological considerations in which, while justifying the necessity of the researcher to accept a phase of obscurity – these new ideas "must initially have a certain degree of indeterminacy about them"⁵⁷ – and then, pointing out that any observation is organized by the prior thought of the observer, Freud underlines the precedence of observation over theory: "Only after a more thorough investigation of the relevant empirical field can we formulate its basic scientific concepts more precisely [...]."⁵⁸

It appears that, in the *Overview of the Transference Neuroses*, the fanciful aspect takes up all the room, and that the aspect of being put to the test is not given any attention at all.

There is perhaps a last reason why Freud abandoned his hypotheses; a reason that, it would seem, has never been underlined by the commentators on this text. And it is with this last examination that the present text shall conclude.

The new myth that Freud offers in the *Overview of the Transference Neuroses* is that of a primeval paradise and of the catastrophe of an Ice Age. It is not to be confused with the myth of the primal horde that follows it.

Freud took up the idea and the words of Ferenczi, and it will be noted that in this version of the myth, which returns to the Biblical narrative, the notion of sin and sexual guilt have disappeared; it is nature, the transformations of the earth's crust, the advance of the ice field, that oust man from his paradise. Man is not the victim of his conduct, but of exterior elements. Ferenczi underlines this strongly: "The tendency to further development, to adaptation, etc., [would depend on the other hand], only on external stimuli."⁵⁹

Now it is clear that if Freud had published this text he would by the same stroke have been validating this new version of the onto-phylogenetic parallel, and he would have been modifying the economy of the metapsychological model, which he was then turning into the heart of psychoanalysis. The model that is entirely organized around the father – in the conclusion of *Totem and Taboo* – would have had to integrate a prior phase of the father, prior to the murder and prior to the horde.

In the reconstruction induced by the myth of the *Overview...* there is virtually a reshaping of psychogenesis in its entirety and a displacement into the time of the origins of the neuroses, because:

- From this point forth, the phylogenetic sequence that corresponds to the killing of the father and the father's vengeance over the sons, that is to say, the Oedipus complex and what becomes of it, is no longer the sequence that, *mutatis mutandis*, corresponds to the transference neuroses, but rather to the most serious pathologies, narcissistic neuroses, dementia praecox, paranoia, and mania / melancholia.

- The transference neuroses, for their part, find their origin in a very different context than that of the Oedipus complex, with the Ice Age.⁶⁰

- And finally – our third remark – there would be an impact on the onto-phylogenetic parallelism, due to the hypothesis of a prior phase, that of a paradise, the paradise in which *a fortiori* any of the neuroses can be found. But Freud does not speak about this impact.

This is all the more striking given that in this text Ferenczi⁶¹ looks at a much larger problematic, in which the phylogenetic remarks are merely points appended to the conclusion. Freud transformed an appended idea into a central theme. At the heart of the text, Ferenczi found the words of the *Project*: the problematic of the specific action and the intervention of the *Nebenmensch* (he mentions “the aid from without, of which the child has no suspicion whatsoever” p. 57). He speaks at length about the presence of the maternal in ontogenetic inheritance, which for him begins with intrauterine life:

With the same right by which we assume the transference of memory traces of the race’s history on to the individual, indeed with more justification than this, we may assert that the traces of intra-uterine psychical processes do not remain without influence on the shaping of psychical material produced after birth.⁶²

On the contrary, a particular difficulty arises for Freud with the place of women in the sequence he had reconstructed, a difficulty that is not new for him: “vicissitudes of women in these primeval times are especially obscure to us.”⁶³ He acknowledges this problem, and resolves it, without conviction, through recourse to bisexuality.

Finally, Ferenczi also advances, on the basis of the observation of a very young child with its mother, a possible genesis of the religious attitude, within a metonymic dimension:

From the uncertainty regarding the arrival of the satisfaction it gradually dawns on him, to be sure, that there are also higher, “divine” powers (mother or nurse), whose favor he must possess if the satisfaction is to follow closely on the magic gestures.⁶⁴

Freud does not mention any of this.

We shall conclude with the following remarks: even though, in the *Overview...*, Freud constructed a myth that called upon the maternal, he chose to develop nothing of this. It is in this respect that it is in continuity with *Totem and Taboo*.⁶⁵ Thus, besides the reasons that we pointed out at the very start and which no doubt remain decisive, one can come up with one last reason that constituted an obstacle to the unfolding of the ideas put forward in *Overview of the Transference Neuroses*: to pursue the elaboration of the new myth would have led to reshapings of his metapsychology which, in 1915, when he was trying to make a synthesis of it, Freud was not ready for.

Bibliography:

- Andreas-Salomé, L. & Freud, S. (1972). *Letters*. London: Hogarth Press / Institute of Psychoanalysis. Blass, R. B. (2006). The Role of Tradition in Concealing and Grounding Truth: Two Opposing Freudian Legacies on Truth and Tradition. *American Imago*, 63, 331-353.
- Cotti, P. (2010). Travelling the path from Fantasy to History: The Struggle for Original History within Freud's Early Circle, 1908-1913. *Psychoanalysis and History*, 12, 2, 153-172.
- Durieux, M.-C., Félicie, N. & Parat, H. (2006). *Interdit et tabou*. Paris: PUF.
- Ferenczi, S. (1980). Stages in the Development of the Sense of Reality (1913). *First Contributions to Psychoanalysis*. New York: Brunner Mazel.
- Freud, S. (1986). *Vue d'ensemble des névroses de transfert* (1915). (Grubrich-Simitis, I. Ed. ; Lacoste, P. Transl.). Paris: Gallimard.
- Freud, S. (1987). Overview of the Transference Neuroses (1915). (Hoffer, A. & Hoffer, P. T. Transl.). In Grubrich-Simitis, I. (Ed.). *A Phylogenetic Fantasy: Overview of the Transference Neuroses*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Freud, S. (1991). Beyond the Pleasure Principle (1920). (Strachey, J. Transl.). *Penguin Freud Library* Vol. XI: *On Metapsychology*. Harmondsworth: The Penguin Press.
- Freud, S. (1991). An Autobiographical Study (1925). (Strachey, J. & A. Transl.). *Penguin Freud Library* Vol. XV: *The History of Psychoanalysis and Expository Works*. Harmondsworth: The Penguin Press.
- Freud, S. (2002). *Wild Analysis* (1937). (Bance, A. Transl.). London: Penguin Modern Classics.

- Freud, S. (2005). Drives and Their Fates (1915). *The Unconscious*. (Frankland, G. Transl.). London: Penguin Modern Classics.
- Freud, S. (2005). Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics, (1913). *On Murder, Mourning and Melancholia*. (Whiteside, S. Transl.). London: Penguin Modern Classics.
- Freud, S. (2006). *Interpreting Dreams* (1900). (Underwood, J. A. Transl.). London: Penguin Modern Classics.
- Levitt, C. (2010). Freud, Smith, and Feuerbach on Sacrifice. *Canadian Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 18, 20-42.
- Merot, P. (2014). « Dieu la mère », trace du maternel dans le religieux. Paris: PUF.
- Smadja, E. (2011). The Œdipus Complex, Crystallizer of the Debate between Psychoanalysis and Anthropology. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 92, 985-1007.
- Strenger, C. (2006). Freud's Forgotten Evolutionary Project. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 23, 420-429.
- Wittels, F. (1912). *Alles um Liebe; Eine Urweltdichtung*. Berlin: E. Fleischl.

Notes:

¹The first part was completed in January 1912; the second part in May; the third part in January 1913; the fourth part in June. That year, 1913, saw the publication of the four parts, brought together under the title *Totem and Taboo*.

²This remark was made to Ferenczi, during the summer of 1911.

³This publication has been planned for 1916, in Vol. IV of the *Zeitschrift*, but was differed due to the fact of editorial difficulties during wartime. Cf. Andreas-Salomé, L. (1970). *Correspondance avec Sigmund Freud*. Paris: Gallimard, note 111, p. 440.

⁴Not without reason, since Freud wrote to her on July 30th 1915 (one day before the famous letter to Ferenczi of July 31st 1915), discouraged and worried about his sons: "The product of these months will probably take the form of a book consisting of twelve essays, beginning with one on the drives and their fates. [...] The book is just finished [...]" International Psycho-Analytical Library, p. 32 (translation modified).

⁵Letter from Lou Andreas-Salomé to Sigmund Freud, August 25th 1919. International Psycho-Analytical Library, p. 100.

⁶Letter from Sigmund Freud to Lou Andreas-Salomé, April 2nd 1919. International Psycho-Analytical Library, p. 95.

⁷*Ibid.*

⁸Letter from Sigmund Freud to Sándor Ferenczi, November 20th 1917. *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi, Volume II, 1914-1919*, p. 249.

⁹Freud, S. (2005). *Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics* (1913), translated by J. Strachey. In (1958). *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Vol. XIII, Totem and Taboo and Other Works (1913-1914)*. London: Hogarth Press, p. 1-162; reprinted in (1991). *Penguin Freud Library Vol. XIII: The Origins of Religion*. Harmondsworth: The Penguin Press, p. 43-224; retranslated by S. Whiteside in *On Murder, Mourning and Melancholia*. London: Penguin Modern Classics.

¹⁰"The moment now seems right to set a new goal for work beyond individual psychology", Freud, March 1912, in the introduction to the first part of *Totem and Taboo* in the journal *Imago*. Cf. (1998). *OCF-P*, XI. Paris: PUF, p. 383.

¹¹Freud, S. (2005). *Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. *Op. cit.*, p. XIII.

¹²To these references on animism and magic we should add those of Mauss and Hebert, which Freud was acquainted with, and whose names he gives further on in the text. He uses their theses in their entirety, without perhaps fully acknowledging his debt to them.

¹³Freud, S. (2005). *Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. *Op. cit.*, p. 75.

¹⁴So it goes for the first section of this chapter, which is made up of a dozen or so pages of ethnographic reminders that are founded essentially on Wundt's writings, which are cited at length. The second section is then introduced by: "Anyone approaching the problem of taboo from the angle of psychoanalysis [...] will recognize [...] that these phenomena are far from unfamiliar to him" (p. 26), and he then treats, over the space of five pages (p. 26-30), obsessional neurosis and the *délire de toucher* (or "touching phobia"), and compares them, also over the space of five pages, to taboo (p. 30, 35).

¹⁵He later became director of the St.-Germain-en-Laye Museum.

¹⁶As Jean Laplanche indicates in the presentation of the French edition of (1998). *Totem et Tabou*. *OCF*, XI. Paris: PUF, p. 191.

¹⁷In his youth, "the theories of Darwin, which were then of topical interest, strongly attracted me": Freud, S. (1961). "An Autobiographical Study," (1925) translated by A. Strachey & J. Strachey in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Vol. XX*. London: Hogarth Press, p. 8.

¹⁸William Robertson Smith was a Scottish anthropologist (1846-1894) who developed a comparative study of religions. On this subject, see Levitt, C. (2010). Freud, Smith, and Feuerbach on Sacrifice. In *Canadian Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 18, p. 20-42.

- ¹⁹Letter of August 8th 1912, from Sigmund Freud to Sándor Ferenczi, quoted by Jean Laplanche in (1998). *OCF*, XI. *Op. cit.*, p. 191.
- ²⁰Freud, S. (2005). *Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. *Op. cit.*, p. 126.
- ²¹*Ibid.*, p. 131.
- ²²"There is, of course, no place for the beginnings of totemism in Darwin's primal horde." Freud, S. (2005). *Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. *Op. cit.*, p. 141.
- ²³Smadja, E. (2011). The Œdipus Complex, Crystallizer of the Debate between Psychoanalysis and Anthropology. In *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, issue 92, p. 985-1007.
- ²⁴"There is, of course, no place for the beginnings of totemism in Darwin's primal horde." Freud, S. (2005). *Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. *Op. cit.*, p. 100.
- ²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 100.
- ²⁶*Ibid.*, p. 157.
- ²⁷On the more recent developments from this "new domain," see Durieux, M.-C., Félicie, N. & Parat, H. (2006). *Interdit et Tabou*. Paris: PUF, "Monographies et débats de psychanalyse."
- ²⁸Freud, S. (1987). Overview of the transference neuroses (1915), translated by A. Hoffer & P. T. Hoffer. In Grubrich-Simitis, I. (Ed.), *A Phylogenetic Fantasy: Overview of the Transference Neuroses* (p. 1-72). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- ²⁹Freud, S. (1987). Overview of the Transference Neuroses. *Op. cit.*, p. 10.
- ³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 11.
- ³¹"How much the phylogenetic disposition can contribute to the understanding of the neuroses cannot yet be estimated. Part of it would also be that [our] consideration goes beyond [the] narrow field of the transference neuroses." *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- ³²*Ibid.*, p. 11.
- ³³*Ibid.*, p. 11.
- ³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 12.
- ³⁵According to Ilse Grubrich-Simitis, in note 57 to the French translation, the text in question is to be found in Wittels, F. (1912). *Alles um Liebe ; Eine Urweltdichtung*. Berlin: E. Fleisch (*Tout pour de l'amour ; un poème du monde primitif*).
- ³⁶Freud, S. (1987). Overview of the Transference Neuroses. *Op. cit.*, p. 13.
- ³⁷*Ibid.*, p. 16.
- ³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 14.
- ³⁹*Ibid.*, p. 15.
- ⁴⁰*Ibid.*, p. 15.
- ⁴¹The language disturbances and hallucinations of dementia praecox are interpreted as an attempt at cure.
- ⁴²Supplementary hypotheses were necessary in order to respond to the objection leveled by Ferenczi, who observed that castrated men cannot have a descent, and thus there cannot be a genetic inscription. Freud found a solution in the writings of Atkinson – a reference that is already present in *Totem and Taboo*, (*Op. cit.*, p. 142) – who considers that the youngest ones were spared by the father and cosseted by the mother, thus escaping a programmed extinction.
- ⁴³Letter from Sigmund Freud to Lou Andreas-Salomé, November 9th 1915. International Psycho-Analytical Library, p. 35.
- ⁴⁴Letter from Sigmund Freud to Lou Andreas-Salomé, April 2nd 1919. International Psycho-Analytical Library, p. 95.
- ⁴⁵For an analysis of Freud's "evolutionist" project, one may consult Strenger, C. (2006). Freud's Forgotten Evolutionary Project. *Psychoanal. Psychol.*, issue 23, p. 420-429.
- ⁴⁶In Freud, S. (1986). *Vue d'ensemble sur les névroses de transfert : un essai métapsychologique*. Edited by I. Grubrich-Simitis. Translated by P. Lacoste. Paris: Gallimard, p. 166.
- ⁴⁷Letter from Sigmund Freud to Lou Andreas-Salomé, May 29th 1918. International Psycho-Analytical Library, p. 80.
- ⁴⁸Should we read into Freud's formulation here a slight mental restriction, the sign of a certain ambivalence in relation to a solution that could only be a verbal solution?
- ⁴⁹Ferenczi, S. (1980). Stages in the Development of the Sense of Reality (1913). In *First Contributions to Psychoanalysis*. New York: Brunner Mazel, p. 213-239.
- ⁵⁰Wittels, F. (1912). *Alles um Liebe; Eine Urweltdichtung*, Berlin: E. Fleisch.
- ⁵¹Cotti, P. (2010). Travelling the path from Fantasy to History: The Struggle for Original History within Freud's Early Circle, 1908-1913. In *Psychoanal. Hist.*, Issue 12, p. 153-172.
- ⁵²For a complementary point of view, one can also read: Blass, R. B. (2006). The Role of Tradition in Concealing and Grounding Truth: Two Opposing Freudian Legacies on Truth and Tradition. In *Amer. Imago*, issue 63, p. 331-353.
- ⁵³Freud, S. (1953). *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900). In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. IV. London: Hogarth Press, p. 103.

⁵⁴Freud, S. (1955). Beyond the Pleasure Principle (1920). Translated by J. Strachey. In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. XVIII, (1920-1922): *Beyond the Pleasure Principle and Other Works*. London: Hogarth Press, p. 59.

⁵⁵Freud, S. (2005). *Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. *Op. cit.*, p. 108n.

⁵⁶Cf. the letter that he sends to Ferenczi on April 8th 1915 (quoted by Ilse Grubrich-Simitis in the *Overview.... Op. cit.*, p. 83) on the “mechanism” of creativity as the “succession of daringly playful fantasy and relentlessly realistic criticism.” If one were to inscribe Freud into a particular epistemological current, the place that he gives to invention would justify him being placed on the side of Feyerabend.

⁵⁷Freud, S. (1915). Drives and Their Fates. Translated by G. Frankland. In *The Unconscious* (2005). London: Penguin Modern Classics, p. 13.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁵⁹Ferenczi, S. (1980). Stages in the Development of the Sense of Reality, *Op. cit.*, p. 237, footnote.

⁶⁰“To summarize, we can say: If the dispositions to the three transference neuroses were acquired in the struggle with the exigencies of the Ice Age, then the fixations that underlie the narcissistic neuroses originate from the oppression by the father, who after the end of the Ice Age assumes, continues its role, as it were, against the second generation.” In *Overview.... Op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁶¹On 20 July 1915, eight hours after sending a letter containing a broad outline and eight days prior to sending the “complete” text, he writes: “I was considering alluding only briefly to the phylogenetic series with reference to your work and with fitting commendation of your fruitful and original idea about the influence of the geological vicissitudes. Now, however, you have given me the desire for a more extensive presentation.” Quoted by Ilse Grubrich-Simitis in the *Overview.... Op. cit.*, p. 93.

⁶²Ferenczi, S. (1980). Stages in the Development of the Sense of Reality, *Op. cit.*, p. 219-220.

⁶³*Overview.... Op. cit.*, p. 20. Cf. Freud, S. (1964). Analysis Terminable and Interminable (1937). Translated by J. Strachey. In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. XXIII. London: Hogarth Press, p. 225: “Without metapsychological speculation and theorizing – I had almost said ‘phantasying’ – we shall not get another step forward.”

⁶⁴Ferenczi, S. (1980). Stages in the Development of the Sense of Reality, *Op. cit.*, p. 228-229.

⁶⁵Cf. Merot, P. (2014). « Dieu la mère », *trace du maternel dans le religieux*. Paris: PUF, Le fil rouge.