

# PREFACE TO THE FRENCH EDITION

## PREFACE TO THE FRENCH EDITION

*This preface outlines the history and options of an editorial undertaking which, since it took shape gradually over a ten-year period, could naturally not be brought up to date in every detail. I hope that what follows will answer most of the questions of readers taken aback by such and such an omission or such and such an editorial decision. My most important concern, however, is that these remarks should help elicit the indispensable additions and corrections that it is to be hoped will be submitted as time goes on.*

To participate in the step-by-step construction of an international dictionary of psychoanalysis is a strange adventure, marked not only by enthusiasm but also from time to time by disillusion. The process might well be compared to the education of children, a realistic view of which (sometimes attributed to Freud) asserts that one may be almost certain that one's hopes will not be fully realized. All the same, the years I spent with the editorial board assigning and patiently gathering in the more than fifteen hundred articles comprising this work, and the subsequent years preparing all this material for publication, have been among the most exciting I have known. One reason was the variety and cordiality of the international connections that the project created; another was the growing awareness of the vigorous multifacetedness of psychoanalysis as a whole, which has been evolving for over a century now within so many different nations, languages and cultures.

The charge of dogmatism, too often leveled at psychoanalysis, simply evaporates in face of the heterogeneity apparent to anyone who explores the many ways in which psychoanalytic theory and practice are understood and experienced around the world. Freud's metapsychological concepts, which he called "*Grundbegriffe*"—a set of foundations few in number but solidly anchored—have constantly demonstrated their usefulness, and they have endured almost unchanged. On the other hand, most Freudian, post-Freudian or even para-Freudian notions are like so many living organisms—ever prone to modification, and tending to be forgotten and (sometimes) resurrected; above all, they are subject to divergent interpretations, reflecting the element of the unforeseeable that is inevitably present for any analyst who refuses to be tied down by rigid theoretical models. Such divergences result too from the lessons of clinical practice and the temporary or permanent changes which that experience imposes on analytic theory; they are the traces of an empirical inquiry that has continued unabated from Freud's earliest tentative explorations to the confrontation with life as it is lived today. The coexistence in this dictionary of ideas that are oftentimes in contradiction with one another, or that have been developed in different ways from one continent to another, is testimony to their main characteristic: they are provisional conceptual tools, and their ephemeral quality indicates that in psychoanalysis, in one sense at least, everything always remains to be discovered, for the questions asked are forever being posed anew.

Once the idea of this dictionary had been conceived, based on the principle of a diversity of viewpoints, I proposed to the publishers, Calmann-Lévy, that an editorial board be formed, to be made up of recognized colleagues belonging to French psychoanalytic schools of differing orientations. I owe a great debt of gratitude to the friends who constituted that small group: Professors Sophie de Mijolla-Mellor, Roger Perron, and Bernard Golse, joined during the first stages by Dr. Jacques Angelergues. They all made vital contributions during those crucial early days. It is in their name, moreover, that I shall now describe our work methods and the route we took.

At a very early stage, thanks to a letter announcing our plan, we won the allegiance of a number of distinguished psychoanalysts. They became a kind of support committee, and their prestige lent weight to our approach to potential contributors. Simultaneously, we solicited the participation and counsel of not a few researchers known to us from our years as practitioners of psychoanalysis; we were also able to draw on connections built up over the fifteen-year existence of the International Association for the History of Psychoanalysis (IAHP). In this way a group of “advisors” was assembled, each of whom was asked to assume responsibility for a particular segment of our vast field of operations, to suggest to the editorial committee those concepts or individuals that they felt should absolutely be included as entries in the panoramic vision of the dictionary, and to identify the authors who in their view would be the best fitted to write those articles. Their advice was gratefully received and closely followed.

At the same time, we consulted a good number of indexes of existing psychoanalytic works in order to reach a first list of concepts; and the IAHP’s *Revue Internationale d’histoire de la psychanalyse* (International Review of the History of Psychoanalysis; discontinued in 1992) was a good source in determining which figures or events were the most frequently cited. In 1995 and 1996, at our editorial committee meetings, we debated all the proposed topics thus accumulated, rejecting some and adding others, until we arrived at a list that, truth to tell, was never completely finalized until the very last days before the manuscript was delivered. Our choices were made in a collegial spirit, before each of us was put in charge of a variable number of entries to assign to their respective authors along with general composition and format guidelines intended to impose some measure of uniformity on the immensely varied material to be produced.

Since almost a third of the entries commissioned were written in languages other than French, our commitment to an international approach was indeed undeviating, but there is no denying that this dictionary was conceived and realized by psychoanalysts trained and practicing in France. The selection of topics and the content of the entries may well reveal a somewhat “French” cast of mind. How indeed could it be otherwise? But it is my sincere hope that foreign readers will adopt an actively critical attitude in this connection, by suggesting, even contributing, additions. Nothing could be more in tune with our desire for the widest possible opening onto the world at large.

On the other hand, of course, by opting for a great diversity of contributors we risked losing a sense of unity, and unity is reassuring. We were quite aware that alert critics were bound to underscore the lacunae, the inadequacies, even the outright contradictions that would appear among entries written, say, by a French author, an English or American analyst, and a colleague from South America—each loyal, moreover, to a particular theoretical orientation. Similarly, the very topics chosen by our advisors must perforce reflect their personal judgments rather than ours. Occasionally we editors proposed additional subjects, but by and large we allowed the advisors’ selection to stand, out of respect for the agreement we had with them; in any event, it would have ill behooved the editorial board or the editor-in-chief to claim a knowledge superior to that of the advisors whom we had chosen as our guides in the matter.

It should be noted that despite our request that authors abide by specified space limitations, some were so carried away by their attachment to their assigned topic that they turned in longer contributions than anticipated. In some cases we were obliged to ask for significant cuts, and I should like to thank all contributors concerned for their good-natured and prompt acquiescence to what were surely painful self-amputations. As for those who found it easier to abide by our space constraints, their contributions were retained unmodified, at the risk of giving readers the mistaken impression, in view of disparities of length, that we meant either to downplay or to highlight some particular concept or individual.

Such editorial changes to submitted manuscript as we made were minor, concerned chiefly with formal aspects (style, ordering of paragraphs, standardization of references, etc.). In no case was any kind of censorship exercised by me or by any member of the editorial board, and no important revision was made without first suggesting it to the author concerned. It was out of the question that any article be published in seriously modified form without the writer's full approval. All articles are signed, and while the editors are responsible for their publication in the context of this dictionary, they belong in the moral and literary senses to their individual authors. With this in mind, each contributor had a contract and was remunerated appropriately, the main purpose being to acknowledge his or her authorship and to keep our collaboration, friendships notwithstanding, within a clearly legal framework.

Let me reiterate, as a last point, that this dictionary was created over a period of years. As with all such enterprises, and especially one involving so many contributors sprinkled across the globe, it was bound to be overtaken here and there by events, with no realistic prospect of a complete updating prior to publication. We must hope that such time-related shortcomings will be rectified as future editions appear.

Why is a dictionary of psychoanalysis needed? Interestingly, it was rather late on in the history of psychoanalysis that the call for a clearer definition of Freudian terms, whose precision was threatened by their wider and wider currency, was first heard. The teaching offered before the Second World War at the Berlin and later at the Vienna Institute of Psychoanalysis certainly helped show up the need for analysts in training to have to hand a work that, though not a manual, would furnish precise information on a still vigorously evolving body of theory. The fact that Freud lent his support to the idea, coupled no doubt with the anxiety aroused by the defections and misapplications then plaguing the young discipline of psychoanalysis, provided added impetus.

Thanks to Richard F. Sterba's *Reminiscences of a Viennese Psychoanalyst* (Detroit: Wayne State U. P., 1982), we are acquainted with the circumstances under which the first tentative attempt to compile a dictionary of psychoanalysis was made:

In 1931, at the suggestion of A. J. Storfer, I had undertaken the task of writing a psychoanalytic dictionary (*Handwörterbuch der Psychoanalyse*). Storfer actually began this work with the definition of a few terms beginning with the letter A, but he found the task too time consuming. He asked me to continue the work with him, to which I agreed. It was a project for which my experience in 1925 and 1926, working on the index of the *Gesammelte Schriften von Sigmund Freud* (Collected Works of Sigmund Freud) was an enormous help. Soon, however, Storfer lost interest in or courage for the enormous project and dropped out of our partnership. As ransom for dissolving the partnership, he gave me the index galleys and typescript pages and all of the eleven volumes of the *Gesamtausgabe*. I carried on the work alone. The dictionary was supposed to appear gradually in sixteen issues, of which the first was published on the occasion of Freud's eightieth birthday, 6 May 1936.

The preface to the first issue was the facsimile of a letter Freud wrote to me. When I had finished the letter A of the dictionary, I had given a copy to Anna Freud and asked her to submit it for Freud's scrutiny. After a short while I received this letter from Freud, which I quote here in English translation: "Your 'dictionary' gives me the impression of being a valuable aid to learners and of being a fine

achievement on its own account. The precision and correctness of the individual entries is in fact of commendable excellence. English and French translations of the headings are not indispensable but would add further to the value of the work. I do not overlook the fact that the path from the letter A to the end of the alphabet is a very long one, and that to follow it would mean an enormous burden of work for you. So do not do it unless you feel an internal obligation—only obey a compulsion of that kind and certainly not any external pressure” (pp. 99–100; Freud’s letter translated by James Strachey, *Standard Edition*, Vol. 22, p. 253).

In the wake of this first effort, and very soon in the case of North America, there appeared several dictionaries, or lexicons presenting select passages from Freud’s writings, designed to help define psychoanalytic concepts for analysts in training in the institutes; some went further, offering explanations meant to make psychoanalytic theory more accessible to the general reader. Important works falling under this general rubric are the *Glossary of Psycho-Analytical Terms* published under the editorship of Ernest Jones in 1924, a harbinger of the *Standard Edition*; the lists generated by the French Commission Linguistique pour le Vocabulaire Pschanalytique in 1923–24; or the *New German-English Psycho-Analytical Vocabulary* of 1943. It is also well worth citing the *Encyclopedia of Psychoanalysis* edited by Ludwig Eidelberg (New York: Free Press, 1968) and Charles Rycroft’s idiosyncratic *Critical Dictionary of Psychoanalysis* (London: Nelson, 1968).

In France, the initiatives of Daniel Lagache began as early as the 1950s, with the start of a dictionary in installments published in Maryse Choisy’s journal *Psyché*, and they culminated in that matchless work tool, the *Vocabulaire de la psychanalyse*, by Jean Laplanche and Jean-Bertrand Pontalis (Paris: PUF, 1967; translated as *The Language of Psycho-Analysis*, London: Institute of Psycho-Analysis/Hogarth, 1973). It should be borne in mind, however, that Laplanche and Pontalis’s in-depth study was restricted for the most part to the concepts of psychoanalysis as developed in Freud’s work alone.

Later French dictionaries of psychoanalysis were also intentionally circumscribed in one way or another. Pierre Fédida’s *Dictionnaire abrégé, comparatif et critique des notions principales de la psychanalyse* (Paris: Larousse, 1974) is a case in point. Some works pointed up the theoretical contributions of Jacques Lacan, such as the *Dictionnaire de la psychanalyse* edited by Roland Chemama and Bernard Vandermersche (Paris: Larousse, 1993; expanded edition, 1998), or Pierre Kaufmann’s *L’Apport freudien* (The Freudian Contribution). Kaufmann’s book (Paris: Bordas, 1993) is presented as a psychoanalytic encyclopedia rather than a dictionary, which would presumably be more condensed. In fact, despite the inclusion of a few biographical sketches, very brief, and limited to the main figures in the history of psychoanalysis, the work does not display the diversity and world-wide scope what we have pursued in our own dictionary. Nor does it deal with the principal concepts developed on the basis of practices derived from or collateral to psychoanalysis, such as those of Jungian analytical psychology.

Outside France, noteworthy titles—among many others which we have made no attempt to inventory here—include *A Dictionary of Kleinian Thought* by Robert K. Hinshelwood (London: Free Association Books, 1989), the *Bibliographisches Lexicon der Psychoanalyse* of Elke Mühlleitner (Tubingen: Diskord, 1992), and Dylan Evans’s *Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis* (London: Routledge, 1996), the first restricted to Kleinians, the second to members of the Vienna Society between 1902 and 1938, and the third to the thought of Jacques Lacan. More recently, in the United States, Burness E. Moore and Bernard D. Fine have edited *Psychoanalysis: The Major Concepts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), which elaborates in a distinctly encyclopedic manner on some forty major psychoanalytic themes.

The present dictionary differs markedly in fact from all its predecessors in the field, including Elizabeth Roudinesco and Michel Plon’s *Dictionnaire de la psychanalyse* (Paris:

Fayard, 1997) or the collected psychoanalytic articles of the French *Encyclopaedia Universalis* (1997).

It is the only work that presents not just some nine hundred concepts or ideas, but also three hundred and sixty biographies of eminent psychoanalysts from around the world, one hundred and seventy of their most noted works, and fifty countries where psychoanalysis has taken root; more than a hundred entries deal with events that have punctuated the history of psychoanalysis in its multifarious lines of development; the institutions that have embodied that development are likewise described in detail, as are the contributions of movements, such as analytical psychology and individual psychology, which stemmed from psychoanalysis.

A chronological approach was a guiding principle, and even if it could not be followed in every single entry, our contributors were urged to hew fast to a historical perspective. Only thus can theoretical choices be relativized so that they lose their rigidly fixed character and reveal themselves to be variable according to time and place. By offering a dais to a large number of psychoanalysts of different theoretical and practical persuasions, moreover, we hoped to arrive at a kind of overall picture that was contradictory precisely because it was alive—a candid shot, as it were, of psychoanalysis today, complete with the more or less conflict-prone schools in the context of which it has developed up to now and, it is to be hoped, will continue to evolve in the future. Our intention was to distinguish our dictionary as clearly as possible from works written by a small number of collaborators expressing the point of view of a particular psychoanalytic group or tendency.

All the same, it must be understood that we believe unequivocally that psychoanalysis was conceived and has developed in the context of Freudian ideas. The reference to Freud is cardinal in this work, and other theoretical and practical options have a place here only insofar as they have a direct or indirect, temporary or permanent connection with Freud, with Freud's history, or with the history of the psychoanalytic movement that Freud founded.

Psychoanalysis was created as the twentieth century opened, and it developed along with that century, affecting its historical, cultural and moral character by reason of the new way of thinking it represented. The reader should not therefore be surprised to find entries here whose subjects are writers, philosophers—even a literary movement like Surrealism, or such events as the First and Second World Wars. But in such cases we chose not to offer a detailed and biographical or historical account, or a complete account of an individual's work, but rather to confine ourselves to the subject's relationship to psychoanalysis. This also makes it possible, however, to trace the ways in which the sound and fury of the world reverberated within psychoanalysis, causing it to change or readapt. It should be remembered, too, that if psychoanalysis has a closer intimacy with the individual's psychic suffering than do other approaches, this is attributable to the intense personal involvement of those who helped refine its powers; for this reason we paid particular attention to the biography of the pioneers and their chief successors. Readers who find certain biographical details merely anecdotal are urged to bear in mind that no theoretical proposition should be entirely detached from the conscious and unconscious life of its originator, and this goes for Freud as much as for anyone else. We have nevertheless refrained from any hasty or "wild" interpretations of individual figures: nothing could be more radically at odds with the psychoanalytic approach than to pass judgment on a human being in just a few lines.

It was indeed never the mission of this dictionary to rank individuals or tendencies. Of course, it is impossible to avoid assuming criteria of worth, but even these cannot claim to exist sub specie aeternitatis; rather, they are mainly reflections—setting aside the enthusiasm of a particular author for his or her subject—of the spirit of the times or of geogra-

phical context. The articles concerned with Jung or Jungian notions were thus assigned to colleagues belonging to the societies of analytical psychology. Matters Adlerian were handled likewise. And topics relating to a Sándor Ferenczi, Melanie Klein, Jacques Lacan or Françoise Dolto were entrusted to writers close to them and their ideas. All is not told—and gossip hounds are likely to be disappointed. In our view, a dictionary such as this is neither holy writ nor pamphlet, but a kind of mirror held up to the time of its writing, bearing all the signs of that time's fashions and conformities, and addressed to future generations, who with the benefit of hindsight will assuredly be able to read far more between the lines than is discernible to us.

With respect to our handling of Freud's works, we decided that the best way to avoid entanglement in the thickets of editions and translations around the world was to adopt as our basic system of reference the chronological bibliographical tags updated in Ingeborg Meyer-Palmedo and Gerhard Fichtner's *Freud-Bibliographie mit Werkkonkordanz* (Frankfurt on the Main: S. Fischer, 1989). Our "Freud Bibliography" lists works of Freud according to this system; in each case the title is given in German and in English, along with a reference where applicable to the *Gesammelte Werke* and to the Standard Edition. It should be noted that we list only those works of Freud that are mentioned in the dictionary. Similarly, the "General Bibliography" is confined to works referred to in the text, and is in no sense intended to replace Alexander Grinstein's *Index of Psychoanalytic Writings* (New York: International Universities Press, 1956-75).

"A strange adventure," I wrote at the beginning of this preface, and the reader will perhaps have surmised on the basis of the above description of our *modus operandi* that the going was not always painless, or without its conflicts and clashes, even its moments of despondency. Yet we were always boosted by encouraging words from friends and colleagues who had got wind of our project in its earliest days and, from near or far, followed its progress throughout. Nor did we ever relinquish the conviction that this dictionary would answer a clear need in the analytic profession and among students or researchers who would find it to be a tool unlike any produced thus far.

If there is such a thing as a "language of psychoanalysis," albeit one considered opaque at times by its critics, we are confident that the present work will show it to be neither a wooden nor a dead language. It has grown up from roots shared by all psychoanalysts, but, as the range of our entries shows, from these common origins have sprung a variety of "dialects." Each of them—Adlerian, Jungian, Rankian, Ferenczian, Lacanian, or Bionian—has developed in its own way, and inevitably affected the others in the process. Each, to a greater or lesser degree, has weathered conflict, or eclipse and revival—testimony to a salutary psychoanalytic "heteroglossia," and to the kind of freedom that stimulates thought. The infinite variety of human beings, the diversity of their personal histories and the complexity of a psychological approach that encompasses the dimension of the unconscious can never be forced into the mold of a hypostasized language or submit to the dictates of some Big Brother preparing the "Newspeak" dictionary.

You think, I dare say, that our chief job is inventing new words. But not a bit of it! We're destroying words—scores of them, hundreds of them, every day. We're cutting the language down to the bone. . . .

Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it. Every concept that can ever be needed will be expressed by exactly one word, with its meaning rigidly defined. . . . Every year fewer and fewer words, and the range of consciousness always a little smaller (George Orwell, 1984. London: Secker and Warburg, 1987 [1949], pp. 53–54, 55).

*Alea jacta est.* This work is now in the hands of its readers. They are invited to handle it as they will. To contribute notes or offer corrections. To convey to us their critical thoughts and to suggest topics they would like to see dealt with in the future. Such active expressions

of interest would be the best possible reward for me personally and indeed for all those who have lent their hand over these last years to this portrait of psychoanalysis in the world of today.

ALAIN DE MIJOLLA  
PARIS, JUNE 19, 2001

# INTRODUCTION TO THE AMERICAN EDITION

## INTRODUCTION TO THE AMERICAN EDITION

Psychoanalysis is over 100 years old. Over the course of the 20th century, many new terms and concepts have been added to Freud's original constructs. This evolution has occurred not just in Vienna, Berlin, or Europe, but rather, all over the world. Consequently, new ideas have been formulated throughout and across the increasingly far-flung psychoanalytic community, and despite the existence of an international organization with a rich scientific program, regularly published journals, and an abundance of meetings and exchanges, the language of psychoanalysis is not as uniform as one would expect. Some concepts are understood differently and more importantly, have varying implications in different parts of the world. Other ideas are highly developed and given special status in some countries, while they are unknown or rarely utilized in others. To complicate matters further, schools of thought have developed with variant degrees of deviation from Freud's metapsychology.

A student entering the field of psychoanalysis today has a more difficult task than students of previous generations, in that there is much more to learn and understand, and a greater imperative to be in communication with colleagues in other parts of the world. To integrate the disparate concepts elaborated in different parts of the world, today's practitioner and anyone interested in the history of psychoanalysis must know, understand, and be capable of evaluating many divergent ideas and theoretical constructs. Well-informed dialogue among colleagues from different countries with other perspectives demands that psychoanalysts have a resource—a handbook, so to speak—that provides a brief, concise, but nevertheless sufficiently rigorous exposition of the lexicon of the field.

There have been some attempts in the past to create a dictionary and a glossary of psychoanalysis; *The Language of Psychoanalysis* by Laplanche and Pontalis is one such major effort in this direction; another is the glossary prepared under the aegis of the American Psychoanalytic Association. However, neither of these two works, as useful as they have been, has been able to cover all the disparate concepts, and many analysts have felt the need for an international encyclopedia of psychoanalysis. This need has become even more acute as psychoanalysts have become increasingly interested in facilitating an international exchange of ideas.

When Dr. de Mijolla decided to embark on this project, he was undertaking a Herculean task, but one whose value is unquestionable. Naturally, it would be impossible for one person to develop such an encyclopedia alone, and therefore, it was essential that he obtain the help of psychoanalysts from all over the world. Thus, the 1569 entries in this volume are the work of many contributors, with some contributing more than one entry. While such an arrangement made the timely development of an encyclopedia possible, it also created difficulties in the achievement of a uniform style. On the other hand, there is an

important advantage to this way of proceeding, in that authors known to be experts on a particular subject could contribute an entry in their area of specialization, enhancing the quality of the entries.

A second challenge, and one more specific to the English edition, is the difficulty in translating from the original French text. The team working on this edition has done its best to make the translations as fluid and easily comprehensible as possible. Nevertheless, given the number of translators and the inherent difficulties of interpretation, there may occasionally be a certain degree of rigidity to the sentences or differences from entry to entry. The final product, however, manages to offer a text that is simultaneously eminently approachable and extremely useful.

It will also become clear upon perusing the dictionary that a substantial number of the authors are French. As a result, there is more material on areas of psychoanalysis that have either developed more fully in France or are mostly used by French analysts. This, of course, makes the dictionary a unique source for anyone interested in understanding specific notions and concepts that are prevalent in the thinking of French psychoanalysts. It does, however, engender less coverage of ego psychology, conflict theory, and relational theory by the French authors; moreover, the impression of a negative view of ego psychology, in particular, and American psychoanalysis in general may be an artifact of the composition of the group of contributors. This is not surprising, given the lack of acceptance of Hartman's views in France, particularly by Lacan. Additionally, the animosity that developed between Rudolph Loewenstein and Jacques Lacan had no small hand in the increasingly critical attitude taken by the latter towards ego psychology. Some in France consider ego psychology to be too close to the conscious, and perhaps even too superficial, and therefore are dismissive of it, a viewpoint for which the reader may see evidence in some of the entries. On the other hand, American analysts, if writing about French psychoanalysis, could possibly take a prejudicial attitude and accuse French psychoanalysts of doing "wild analysis." However, with the increase in dialogue and exchange between French and American analysts, these sorts of prejudices are diminishing, and the sharing of perspectives has enriched the members of both groups. As one example of such cross-fertilization, this current edition of the encyclopedia has attempted to present ego psychology and compromise theory in a more balanced way, with the addition of a number of new entries, such as that of Dr. Charles Brenner on modern conflict theory. In addition, to supplement those entries that refer too exclusively to French works, this edition has added a list of suggested readings with references to American sources, compiled by Matthew von Unwerth.

The reader may also notice that the biographies of some prominent psychoanalysts are not mentioned in this volume, as only deceased analysts are included. Unfortunately, some omissions are unavoidable in any reference work that attempts to be as comprehensive as this encyclopedia. Hopefully, the reader will find the addition of photos from the archives of psychoanalysis enlivening and enriching.

Finally, I would like to thank those whose beneficent help made this work not only possible, but even enjoyable. Alain de Mijolla is of course, first and foremost, not only for entrusting me with this task, but also for allowing me a free hand, to a large extent, and for trusting my opinion on those occasions when independent judgment was needed. Nathalie Duval was another important anchor, enormously supportive and unfailingly good-humored, even at the most difficult moments. Her staff, too, was of great help, always in the background, unassuming, but faithfully executing the necessary tasks to ensure the work could proceed smoothly. A special word of thanks goes to the editors and translators whose work could not have been easy, considering the amount of highly technical material that required faithful interpretation. I would particularly like to single out the work of Donald Nicholson-Smith who never ceased to amaze me with his understanding of the semantics of psychoanalytic