

The reception of Dr Ludwik Jekels’ “apostolic activity” to promote psychoanalysis in Poland before the outbreak of World War I. Part 2

Edyta Dembińska, Krzysztof Rutkowski

Department of Psychotherapy, Jagiellonian University Medical College

Summary

The paper sets out to present Doctor Ludwik Jekels’ activity for the development of psychoanalysis in Poland between 1909 and 1914. The second part of the paper focuses mainly on the period of 1911–1912 when Ludwik Jekels was the most active in promoting psychoanalysis. The article also includes the discussion of Jekels’ book publications including two translations of Sigmund Freud’s works and the first Polish publication on psychoanalysis entitled *Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda (An Outline of Freud’s Psychoanalysis)*. The reactions of the scientific circles, particularly those associated with the Lviv School of Psychology, were also analysed. The access to previously unpublished sources allowed the authors, for the first time, to report on Jekels’ educational activity in Krakow and Lviv. The sources also gave insight to Jekels’ completely unknown actions to promote psychoanalysis in Cieszyn Silesia. Jekels’ lectures were followed by a wide range of reactions from the public with the medical community increasingly criticising psychoanalysis. The pinnacle of Jekels’ activity was the Second Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists and Psychologists organized in Krakow in 1912. It was the culmination in the discussion on the place of psychoanalysis in the Polish science. The paper presents the participants of the psychoanalytic session with a special focus on Dr Jekels’ contribution, the way how psychoanalysis discussion was conducted and the effects of the congress on further development of psychoanalysis. In conclusion an attempt was made to assess the overall significance of Dr Jekels’ activities in Poland.

Keywords: psychoanalysis, history of psychotherapy, Ludwik Jekels

Introduction

In the subsequent years of 1911-1912 Jekels made a lot of effort to promote the psychoanalytical idea in Poland and translate Sigmund Freud’s works into Polish. He independently put into practice the programme of psychoanalysis public promotion which he proposed in 1910 and which was rejected by his Viennese associates.

Due to his activities related to psychoanalysis he stayed on a temporary basis in Krakow at the then Kilińskiego Street 17 [1] (since 1912 the street has been called al. Słowackiego). At that time the area was very popular with the artists of Krakow e.g. Stanisław Wyspiański and Stanisław Przybyszewski lived there. It was a prestigious neighbourhood which was the fastest growing construction investment area in the very centre of Krakow.

The publication of Freud's "Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis" translation and its reception

In April 1911 the Polish translation of the book "Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis" was published. These were lectures delivered by Freud at Clark University in the United States [2]. Thus, Jekels became a translator of Sigmund Freud's work which was first published in the Polish language. Considering the importance of the event, the choice of work for the publication could not have been accidental. Freud's lectures included in the "Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis" were addressed to laymen and they were written in a very accessible manner. Their publication could have increased the general interest in psychoanalysis in wider social circles which were not limited solely to physicians and psychologists. Jekels specified the motives for the publication of the work in its introduction: "The translation (...) aims to draw attention of our society members who have a deeper need for causality to this scientific field which is partly unknown and partly underrated" [2, p. 1]. Jekels also posted a copy of the book to Freud who expressed his contentment in a letter dated 7th April 1911: "My deepest gratitude for the introduction to the Polish literature which I received yesterday. Regrettably, I could not read anything more than the preface which is not only brief but also laudatory"¹ [3]. Freud's effort to read the preface in Polish suggests his contentment. Freud also wrote that: "Let us see whether that land (Poland) will turn out to be more accessible than the German one"² [3]. This statement additionally supports the argument that the publication was one of the initiatives to get Polish people interested in psychoanalysis.

The book was generally well received by literary and psychological critics. In May 1911 the publication was reported in "Ruch Filozoficzny" (a journal for philosophers, psychologists and teachers published in Lviv) [4] and "Nowa Reforma" (Krakow daily) [5] but the report was not accompanied by any additional commentary. The first review of the work was published only in 1912. The reviewer, Dr Bronisław Bandrowski, who was a Polish philosopher and psychologist working as a pre-secondary school teacher in Lviv, wrote about "the heated debate on psychoanalysis which is currently under way" [6, p. 125]. He pointed out to the strong social interest in psychoanalysis and the discussion around it which was not only limited to professional circles. The reviewer appreciated Jekels' selection emphasising that "a series of lectures in which Freud

¹ Translated from German into Polish by Grażyna and Gregor Glodek

² Ibid.

himself presented his views in a concise and popular manner can ideally be used to familiarise the intelligent audience with it" [6, p. 125]. He also praised the quality of the translation which resulted in "the book being read in an easy and interesting fashion" [6, p. 126]. He made several critical observations related to the terminology used. Curiously enough, he was not fond of using the term "trauma" and "psychological trauma" which is a completely natural term nowadays. Bandrowski belonged to the Lviv School of Psychology (also known as Lviv-Warsaw School) centred around prof. Kazimierz Twardowski. He was the only school representative who was favourable towards psychoanalysis. Probably Bandrowski's positive attitude stemmed from his interest in experimental psychology and the knowledge of foreign publications related to psychoanalysis i.a. articles published in "American Journal of Psychology". Bandrowski also had the opportunity to meet C. G. Jung directly when he heard his lecture on child psychoanalysis at the First International Pedagogical Congress in Brussels in 1911 [7]. Bandrowski gained so much interest in psychoanalysis that on 8th June 1912 he made a presentation "On Psychoanalysis from a Psychological Standpoint" at the gathering of the Polish Philosophical Society in Lviv [8]. Unlike other Lviv philosophers e.g. Adam Stögbauer or Stefan Błachowski who accused psychoanalysis of scientific deficiencies, he argued: "Psychoanalytic theories generally withstand the test of postulates that need to be put forward by all hypotheses" [8].

In 1913 in the monthly "Biblioteka Warszawska" a very flattering book summary was published [9]. The author, Waclaw Dunin, who was a Warsaw lawyer and journalist, reiterated the role of Jekels' translation on the promotion of psychoanalysis, "a movement little known in our country" [9, p. 377]. The conclusion was also favourable towards psychoanalysis: "In a neurotic century like ours and in a society where neurosis is making frightening progress, a work on psychoanalysis which sheds a new light on that field may bring a significant advantage" [9, p. 379].

A brief note on the publication was made in 1911 in "Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse" [10], which was one of the leading psychoanalytic journals with a distinctly didactic nature. The challenging task which Jekels had to face of "translating very complex psychoanalytical terminology into a foreign language" [10] was emphasised in the note. The reviewer, Bernhard Dattner, claimed that Jekels coped perfectly with the task.

A completely different view was presented by Adam Stögbauer who was a Polish philosopher and psychologist employed at the University of Lviv Library. He also represented the Lviv School of Psychology. In the paper "From the Way to Secrets of a Soul" published in February 1912 he presented the premises of the psychoanalytic theory on the basis of Jekels' translated work [11-13]. He expressed not a very positive view on psychoanalysis itself with a caveat that it was created by physicians and "because of that it suffers from a purely theoretical elaboration of the concept" [11]. He wrote: "As we mentioned already, psychoanalysis as a theory presents serious deficiencies. It is rather the first provisional generalisation of experience gained and experiments done still with gaps, arbitrariness and ambiguity. I also think that

this theory overestimates the role of sexuality mainly due to excessive extension of this concept. In the end its creators are not only physicians but they are not philosophers either. Hence, the inability to build the theory in line with the rules of this art. This superficial synthesis suffices them to clarify certain facts and gain orientation in them. Theoretical elaboration of it no longer lies within the scope of their needs” [13, emphasis by E.D., K.R.]. Such assertions about psychoanalysis were very characteristic of Twardowski’s students. Stefan Błachowski and Leopold Wołowicz formulated their criticism in a similar tone. However, one may wonder why Stögbauer assessed Jekels’ translation in such a definitely negative and unjustified manner when he claimed that: “The Polish translation of Freud’s brochure is poor. The translator struggles not only with terminological difficulties, but also the Polishness of his Polish language leaves much to be desired” [13]. The last sentence might suggest anti-Semitic views of the reviewer.

Jekels’ apostolic mission: Krakow, Lviv and Cieszyn Silesia

The mission to promote psychoanalysis in Poland was not only limited to the translation of Freud’s work. In 1911 Jekels delivered a series of lectures which aimed to bring psychoanalysis closer to different circles. Only scarce press releases about the lectures in Krakow and Lviv were preserved. It is clear that he delivered two lectures on 29th and 30th April 1911 entitled “On Freud’s Psychoanalysis” at the seat of the “Promień” Association in Krakow [14] and two more lectures “On Psychoanalysis” delivered on 20th and 21st May 1911 “at the request of the ‘Życie’ Association in Lviv” [15]. The “Promień” and “Życie” organisations brought together the progressive academic youth associated with the Polish Socialist Party and its revolutionary fraction. Presenting lectures at the headquarters of the progressive academic organisations was Jekels’ deliberate action which he previously planned in his own programme of psychoanalysis popularisation. On 19th May 1911 “Kurier Lwowski” reported that the lectures would take place at the seat of the “Życie” Association at Lindego Street 6 [16]. However, another location of the Physics Institute at Lviv University at Długosza Street 8 was reported on 21st May [17]. The reason for the change of venue was not given. The latter location was also confirmed by Jekels himself in a letter to Freud (“I have made appearance with a lecture open to everyone in the lecture theatre of the Institute of Physics”³) [18]. The lectures “were previously announced in newspapers and posters”⁴ [18]. In press releases Jekels was referred to as “a disciple of prof. Freud, a well-known researcher in psychology” [16] and “a disciple and translator of works by Freud, a genius researcher” [17]. The lectures were addressed to “wide circles of intelligentsia, and physicians and teachers in particular” [16]. However, Jekels was not satisfied with the response he received as he wrote: “The audience of proper

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

seriousness and deep interest was not simply there. The colleagues of our profession were missing but the chairs were filled with teachers of both sexes and intelligentsia"⁵ [18]. Sadly, the reactions of the audience were not recorded but they were nowhere near enthusiastic. When in 1912 Jekels published the lectures delivered in Krakow and Lviv as "Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda", he complained about the audience's lack of understanding of Freud's theories [19, p. 1].

More data can be found on the presentations he made for physicians. One of them was a lecture entitled "On a Decisive Factor in the Patient and Doctor Relationship" which took place in July 1911 at the Eleventh Congress of Polish Physicians and Naturalists in Krakow [20, pp. 515-516]. The presentation was made within the neurological session. Jekels was also very active in the discussion which followed the first presentation on neuroses by Dr Tadeusz Jaroszyński. He questioned the presenter's focus on Babiński's theory and disregard of Freud's theories. He also reiterated that "Babiński's theory does not teach about the essence of neurosis" [20, p. 512]. In his presentation Jekels discussed the theory of psychoanalysis, "Freud's theories of sexuality" and demonstrated on numerous examples that "the relation of a child towards parents is of sexual nature" [20, p. 515]. Then he moved on to discuss the notion of transference which he defined as follows: "A physician substitutes parents in unconscious fantasies of an ill individual and it is where the sexual shade of the patient's attitude to the physician comes from" [20, p. 515]. The content of the presentation is regrettably known solely from the summary which means that the quite valuable clinical material demonstrated by Jekels to support psychoanalytical theories including the illustration of transference was lost. The summary of Jekels' lecture and medical response to it was also published in "Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse" [21]. The identical content appeared as a publication in the memorial book of the Eleventh Congress of Polish Physicians and Naturalists. Jekels was probably the author of the German translation.

Many critical voices were heard in the discussion which followed the presentation. Dr Rychliński, whose approach towards psychoanalysis underwent radicalisation since 1909, emphasised "the harmfulness of psychoanalysis which sometimes stimulates dormant sexuality" [20, p. 515]. Dr Maksymilian Blassberg, an internist employed at the Jewish Hospital in Krakow, wondered whether the symbolism with its freedom negates the value of psychoanalysis. Henryk Halban, a professor of neurology and psychiatry at the University of Lviv, questioned the value of psychoanalysis completely and considered "the examination of sexuality with this method to be simply harmful" [20, p. 515]. Dr Adam Rydel, who was professor Piltz's associate at the Neurological-Psychiatric Clinic at the Jagiellonian University, was the only individual with a favourable approach to psychoanalysis. On the one hand, he recognised Freud's genius but on the other hand he had doubts whether "a physician is capable of avoiding the influence of his own complexes on the conclusions drawn in a psychoanalytical examination" [20, p. 515]. Jekels responded to the opponents that "the subjectivity of

⁵ Ibid.

psychoanalysis is not greater than that present in other scientific fields” and “behind all intellectual caveats against psychoanalysis, personal complexes which can easily be detected during analysis are hiding” [20, p. 516]. The reactions to Jekels’ presentation suggested that the approach towards psychoanalysis of medical circles became more radical since 1909.

The only surviving letter from Jekels to Freud provided information on completely unknown areas of Jekels’ popularising activities. In 1911 Jekels delivered several lectures on psychoanalysis in the medical and pedagogical circles of Cieszyn Silesia [18]. The previous sources suggested that Jekels promoted Freudian ideas only in large academic centres of Warsaw, Krakow and Lviv. However, it seems natural that he also undertook initiatives in local communities where he lived and worked for many years. On 11th May 1911 he gave a lecture at the session of the Association of East Silesian Physicians in Cieszyn (Verein Ostschlesischer Ärzte in Teschen). The Association of East Silesian Physicians was established in 1893 by Dr Hermann Hinterstoisser of Salzburg, a director of the General Hospital of Evangelical Church in Cieszyn [22]. Hinterstoisser was a prominent doctor (surgeon and gynaecologist) who similarly to Jekels graduated from the University of Vienna. He contributed to the high scientific level of the institution which he ran and he also initiated scientific meetings of physicians. Hinterstoisser’s activity also had negative sides, especially for local community members who identified with Poland as he was seen as an Austrian patriot acknowledged for the promotion of “German identity” in Cieszyn and its environs. At the turn of the nineteenth century into the twentieth the majority of the Cieszyn and Bielsko population was German speaking [23]. The entire Cieszyn Silesia, where generally the Polish population was dominant, witnessed strong national tensions. These tensions could be observed in local circles of intelligentsia, particularly among the professional groups of physicians and teachers. They were also present in journals. In the Polish press Jekels’ sanatorium was presented as a Polish institution which should be protected from being Germanised at all costs.

The Association of East Silesian Physicians in Cieszyn was an organisation of pro-Austrian medical professionals who were the most numerous group in Cieszyn Silesia. Few Polish doctors were affiliated in the Association of Physicians of Bielsko, Biała and the surrounding area [23]. Therefore, Jekels’ lecture in May 1911 was addressed to German-speaking physicians and had to be delivered in that language. Jekels selected a scientific association with a higher number of members and a greater academic prestige guaranteed by Dr Hinterstoisser. Additionally, the “pro-Austrian” community was more receptive to therapeutic novelties which originated in Vienna. On this occasion Jekels was fully content both with the attendance and the audience reaction. He wrote to Freud: “The interest of the physicians, who attended the lecture en masse and represented mainly the older generation of medical brothers, was considerable. Once the lecture ended, a lively discussion followed and everyone was so fascinated by the Freudian view of our psychic processes that I was invited to deliver another paper” [18]. Whether the intention was materialised has not been established so far.

Jekels intended to deliver another lecture in June 1911 at the session of the Pedagogical Society in Bielsko (Pädagogischer Verein in Bielitz) [18]. Like the Association of East Silesian Physicians, this local teachers' organisation affiliated with the National Association of Teachers of the Austrian Silesia in Opava (Österreichisch-Schlesischer Landes-Lehrerverein in Troppau), comprised of German speakers and published reports on its activity in German in the journal "Schlesisches Schulblatt." Polish teachers belonged to the Polish Pedagogical Society (PTP) whose main branch was located in Cieszyn and had its own journal "Miesięcznik Pedagogiczny" [24]. Jekels again decided to give a lecture on psychoanalysis for the German-speaking community. The decision might have been dictated again by practical reasons such as willingness to influence favourable listeners. Polish teachers did not trust any theories which originated in the Austrian capital but welcomed the views of their compatriots who resided in Galicia or the former Kingdom of Poland. It is difficult to judge today whether Jekels' strategy brought the intended effect as the detailed content of the lectures delivered in Bielsko and Cieszyn and the reactions of the audience, teachers in particular, are unknown.

Jekels' intensive educational work must have had an impact on his engagement in the health resort work. Although he wrote about this period: "I handled the psychoanalysis of my clinical patients in an equally eager manner" [18], in the summer season of 1911 for the first time Jekels hired Dr Herman Nunberg as his associate [18; 25, p. 13]. While the health resort earlier employed other associates who were assisting in the treatment of the growing numbers of patients, the employment of Nunberg had a different significance. He was the first individual who also had the knowledge of psychoanalysis and was capable of applying it in therapy. Jekels found this fact sufficiently important to report it to Freud in May 1911: "In the spa except for me, Dr Nunberg, a former student of Bleuler and Jung, is well familiar with this method" [18]. Nunberg graduated from the University of Zurich in 1908 and completed his PhD studies under the supervision of C. G. Jung. His PhD dissertation was entitled "Über körperliche Begleiterscheinungen assoziativer Vorgänge" ("On the Physical Side Effects of Associative Processes") which he defended in 1910 [26]. As a student he worked at the Burghölzli Psychiatric Clinic where he came into contact with psychoanalysis. Having completed his studies, he was an associate in psychiatric clinics in Schaffhausen and Berne, and in the middle of 1911 he returned to Krakow and applied for a position at professor Piltz's clinic [26] where he worked from the autumn of 1911 at the latest (he presented the first patient on 7th November 1911) [27]. Owing to his acquaintance with Jekels, he was introduced to Freud, most likely in 1911. He reported on the event: "On the occasion of a visit to Vienna, I had been introduced to him [Freud] by Dr Jekels, and that first meeting with Freud had left an indelible impression on me" [26, p. 18].

In 1911 Jekels was also active outside Poland but on a less intense basis than he was in the previous years. Between January and March he regularly participated in the sessions of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society [28] and in September he took part in the Third Psychoanalytical Congress in Weimar [29]. Freud's letter dated 5th December 1911 explains how busy the year for Jekels was. Freud wrote: "Thank you

for your invaluable efforts. The success in Poland is solely the fruit of your hard work. I am curious as to how your clinicians will ultimately respond to $\Psi\alpha$ [psychoanalysis]. The awareness that you will not be able to participate in our evenings any more (...) has taken away from me a great deal of pleasure I have drawn from your simply apostolic activity in Krakow”⁶ [30]. The clinicians mentioned could be both physicians from the Neurological-Psychiatric Clinic of the Jagiellonian University and members of the Krakow Medical Society.

The choice of Krakow for Jekels’ activities was most suitable as it was a city in Poland with the only academic circles who were favourable to psychoanalysis. Previously mentioned Dr Rydel was their representative. The Neurological-Psychiatric Clinic led by professor Piltz was an institution modelled on Swiss clinics. Owing to the contact with Burghölzli clinic, professor Piltz’s associates had a direct contact with psychoanalytical practice and they did not only become its followers but they also started to apply it in treatment once they returned to Poland e.g. Stefan Borowiecki, Jan Nelken, and Herman Nunberg [31]. In 1911 Dr Stefan Borowiecki and Dr Herman Nunberg, who were psychoanalysis followers, worked in the clinic. In the outpatient setting psychoanalytic psychotherapy was used with some patients. Establishing lasting cooperation with this environment was extremely important for Jekels as he could even hope to create the Polish branch of the International Psychoanalytic Association. Jekels must have felt pressurised as he remembered Freud’s discontentment when C. G. Jung had difficulties with creating a working group in Zurich in 1910. Meanwhile, 1911 ended but Jekels could not boast about any success in establishing the Polish working group.

The subsequent year was decisive for the professional development of Jekels and abounded in important decisions. On 28th February 1912 he made a presentation “On Freud’s Psychoanalysis” at the session of the Krakow Medical Society [32]. The presentation focused not only on typical themes related to unconsciousness, sexual repression and psychosexual development but Jekels devoted much of his time to the development of psychoanalytical techniques from the cathartic method to the technique of free associations. The discussion of this lecture on 6th March 1912 was likely to shed a tinge of bitterness and ultimately discouraged Jekels from further intensive work in favour of psychoanalysis in Poland. During the discussion Jekels was attacked by two Krakow physicians, Dr Eisenberg (probably Filip Eisenberg, a bacteriologist) and previously mentioned Dr Maksymilian Blassberg. Like Jekels, they were both of Jewish origin. Jekels summarised their disapproval and superior treatment in one sentence: “Resistance and the disapproval of psychoanalysis were projected onto the speaker and his presentation” [33, p. 258]. Dr Blassberg argued that Jekels only presented his “individual angle of view” of psychoanalysis which resulted in Freud’s theories “coming out as intuitive forms of fantasy and the presenter further separated them with the Chinese wall from the official psychology” [33, p. 258]. He dubbed psychoanalysis

⁶ Ibid.

as "an experimental methodological outburst in scientific psychology" [33, p. 258]. Dr Eisenberg criticised the speaker for the ignorance of other philosophical and psychological theories which deal with unconsciousness and dreams. He recognised some value in psychoanalysis ("In Freud's science there is some kernel of truth and numerous thought-provoking observations"). However, he had doubts and reservations about the basic premises of psychoanalysis i.e. "dominating influence of sexual factors on the entire psyche" and "the science on child sexuality" [33, p. 258]. Jekels responded not only during the session but also in a summary published in "Przegląd Lekarski" in which he complemented his response with supplementary comments since he considered that "they can make a significant contribution to illuminating the disputed points" [33, p. 258]. He reiterated mainly the difference in understanding the unconscious by philosophy and psychoanalysis.

The author of the first Polish book on psychoanalysis

The critical reaction to the lectures on psychoanalysis were not a novelty for Jekels. It is suggested by the preface in the work entitled "Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda" (An Outline of Freud's Psychoanalysis) which was published in March 1912. It offered a summary of Freud's most significant works in an accessible manner. Jekels wrote that "I believe I should justify the publication of the outline (...) As something happened which usually happens to great ideas. Very recent unfamiliarity of Freud's psychoanalysis was substituted with its complete or partial misunderstanding. (...) in very scarce cases did I come across significant comprehension of such a momentous science. The lack observed by me made me publish the said lectures which I delivered in Krakow and Lviv last year. (...) Observing the references to psychoanalysis made by the scientific circles and intelligent audience, it can be noted that psychoanalysis is faced with much more opponents and critics than followers. (...) This is only resistance of affective nature" [19, pp. 1-3]. Thanks to this very modest book we know the content of Jekels' lectures today.

Jekels' first lecture and the first two chapters of the book were to serve as an introduction to the subject of psychoanalytic concepts. Jekels briefly explained the differences between contemporary psychology and psychoanalysis. He also pointed out the significance of drives in the functioning of the psyche and the principle of determinism by making references to Jung's associative experiments. He then endorsed his preliminary claims with examples of dream analysis based on Freud's "The Interpretation of Dreams" and "On Dreams." In the subsequent part of the lecture he focused on other manifestations of the unconscious life: erroneous activities. In this part of the lecture (and book) he cited for the first time a case study which originated from his own observations. He reported on a young female who had bad experience of her first marriage and she would deliberately express a tirade against men which was followed by her unconscious humming of the tune of longing for her husband.

Jekels deliberately started to discuss the mechanisms characterised by psychoanalysis from the concepts embedded in the everyday routine of every person so that

they were easily comprehensible for listeners or readers without clinical experience. He wrote: "Contrary to the accepted way (...) of presenting these elusive and complex concepts by sketching the historical development of our science, I did not select hysteria, which was the starting point for the entire psychoanalysis, to be at the top of my lectures. I selected dreams instead. Although it entails some difficulties, I took this path because in dreams and erroneous activities I could use examples which in no way could be used in the other field due to the enormous size of the neurosis analysis" [19, p. 55]. The break with Freud's tradition of teaching psychoanalysis demonstrated that Jekels did not admire his teacher with fanaticism as he would be criticised of doing.

On the second day of lectures and in the last chapter of the book, Jekels discussed the issue of neurosis starting with the ambiguities related to the background of hysteria and continued with the classic history of psychoanalysis origins (Charcot and Janet's research on hysteria and Dr Josef Breuer's clinical experience with the famous patient Anna O.). He discussed the mechanism of conversion, repression and resistance, demonstrating that the same mechanisms appear not only in neurosis but also in dreams or erroneous activities of the healthy psyche. When illustrating what the symbolism of a neurotic symptom consists in, he characterised the second case study from his own clinical practice. Then he discussed the methodology of the psychoanalyst's work such as applying the basic rule (free association) and analysing dreams and erroneous activities. After presenting these notions, he was ready for the sceptical reaction and disbelief coming from the audience as evidenced by the words "My gentlemen, I do not doubt that all that I have told here yesterday and today seems to some very fantastic, perhaps very witty, or maybe even a combination of some genius qualities which, despite its genius, can be very misleading" [19, p. 71]. The introduction was required to move onto more contentious facets of psychoanalysis such as sexuality including the sexuality of a child. Jekels postulated after Freud that the cause of any neurotic symptom was "the sexual wish from the patient's childhood" [19, p. 72], while sexual and non-sexual issues may be actually present at the level of repressed experiences. From this experience only psychoanalysis can lead to finding repressed sexual experiences from childhood. Jekels then discussed a child's psychosexual development, the mechanisms leading to perversion and neurosis as well as various manifestations of sublimation related to adult sexual drive. Concluding remarks in "Szkic psychanalizy Freuda" refer to changes in social functioning which should occur based on the data gathered from psychoanalysis. Jekels advocated changes in the way children are brought up but above all he promoted the liberalisation of sexual life. He also expected that psychoanalysis would pave the way to a new manner of individuals' functioning in which "duty and coercion will give way to the will" [19, p. 92].

The review of the book was published in "Ruch Filozoficzny" and authored again by Bronisław Bandrowski who started it with a compliment for Jekels describing him as "an eager fellow worker and promoter of Freud's ideas" [34]. The reviewer praised the stylistics of the content ("It is written in a popular, lively and brief manner and it is read with interest") as well as "skilful and brief" depiction of psychoanalytical theories.

On the other hand, he observed that Jekels in his publication did not go beyond what Freud said. Bandrowski only criticised one chapter of the work in which Jekels presented the relation of psychoanalysis and psychology disregarding the achievements of other psychologists with similar views. He contributed it to "the staunch worship" [34]. He concluded the review with a wish of "new publications from the psychoanalytical camp. Those that would not cease at the follower's stand" [34].

A glowing review of Jekels' book was also published in "Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse" [35]. It was authored again by Bernhard Dattner who wrote on Jekels' motivation: "In the preface to the outline on Freudian analysis he thinks he should apologise. For he came to the conclusion that because of him, the previously unknown matter of psychoanalysis became incomprehensible, and especially the aspect of internal context of sleep, neurosis, jokes, sexuality, etc. which is the least frequently discussed in publications. The burdensome fact pushed him to publish a collection of lectures given by the author in Krakow and Lviv"⁷ [35].

The discrepancy between the original content of the foreword and its interpretation by the reviewer draws the immediate attention. Jekels definitely did not apologise and he attributed the lack of proper understanding of psychoanalysis to the audience "affective resistance". Dattner might have known Jekels' subjective view and unconsciously revealed it in his review. The reviewer appreciated the way in which the psychoanalytic theory was presented "from the analysis of dreams to the explanation of the basics on the science of neuroses". He believed that such way was innovative, provided greater clarity and aroused the least resistance at the same time. He praised the selection of examples used to depict the psychoanalytic theory with those authored by Jekels himself being "impressively good" [35]. In conclusion he expressed hope that Jekels "would continue his pioneering work in equally perfect manner as he did so far" [35].

Stefan Błachowski (a philosopher, a psychologist of the Lviv School and a student of psychology at the University of Göttingen) wrote a much less flattering review of Jekels' work in "Ruch Filozoficzny" in December 1912 [36]. In the paper "Freud's Issue of Consciousness" Błachowski criticised the theory of psychoanalysis from logical and psychological stands. He argued that "a psychological system based on logical errors may not claim the title of a scientific theory" [36, p. 206]. He also made references to Jekels' "Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda" which was recently published. As Bandrowski, he made the fundamental objection to Jekels' "dogmatic faith" in Freud's theory. He pointed out to Jekels' own hypothesis that consciousness "like all other organs [developed] as a result of the adaptation to the social form of being" [36, p. 208]. Błachowski considers this theory of Jekels as "a fairly impossible thing" adding that "here the disciple overtook the master considerably" [36, p. 208]. By no means is the comment positive as it is a clear highlight of Błachowski's negative opinion on the psychoanalytic theory. "Kurier Lwowski" referred to Błachowski's review saying that "the observations in the critical-logical section might be too hasty" [37].

⁷ Ibid.

The author's one-sided philosophical argument which referred psychoanalysis only to "Twardowski's subtle distinctions on object and content of imaginings" was noted [37]. Clearly, critics of psychoanalysis could be characterised by a similar fanatical and narrow perception of the new theory as they accused its supporters of demonstrating. Most representatives of the Lviv School of Psychology expressed an astonishingly consistent critique of psychoanalysis (Stögbauer, Wołowicz). They might have been inspired by professor Twardowski's approach (their teacher). It should also be noted that Twardowski's disciples acquired the knowledge of psychoanalysis mostly from Jekels' publications.

Once Jekels' "Szkic" was published, Sigmund Freud wrote to Jekels: "Please accept my best wishes on publishing your book and gratitude for all your efforts for the sake of our mutual cause. Please do not take it to your heart that the mundane fate did not spare you this time. Fortune is fickle" ⁸ [38]. The last sentences pose an interpreting challenge as they might have referred to an unsuccessful discussion on psychoanalysis at the session of the Krakow Medical Society several days earlier. Krakow psychiatrists who were psychoanalysis supporters did not participate in the discussion. As they were most likely not even present at the meeting, Jekels might have felt left alone as the only promoter of Freudian ideas in Krakow and probably in Poland as well. Despite his efforts, he did not manage to consolidate a group of Krakow psychoanalysts around his efforts. He was not even supported by Herman Nunberg. Probably due to the feeling of being left alone and the incapability of establishing the Polish branch of the psychoanalytical society, Jekels was forced to make radical decisions whose final consequences ensued in the autumn of 1912.

In-between Krakow and Vienna. The Second Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists and Psychologists in Krakow and its aftermaths

In 1912 the health resort in Bystra was under Jekels' management for the last season and it was still intensively advertised in the daily press, particularly in Warsaw⁹ [39]. The relationship between Jekels and Freud became even closer and he probably was also close to other members of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society. In August 1912 Freud wrote to Dr Sabina Spielrein: "Your letter would have been a great surprise had I not spoken to Dr Jekels a few days before leaving Karlsbad and been told the great news. So you are a married woman now..." [40]. At the beginning of August 1912 Jekels sold the health resort to a consortium managed by the mayor of Cieszyn. It was supposed to serve as a spa for Polish miners of Karviná [41]. In October 1912 he started psychoanalysis with Freud probably in relation to the symptoms which occurred after his wife's death [42]. Also, from October onwards he attended regularly

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Contrary to Dybel's claim [63], Jekels' health resort was not shut down in 1910. If the claim was accurate, Herman Nunberg would not have had an opportunity to assist Jekels in the health resort in 1911 and 1912.

the sessions of the Psychoanalytic Society in Vienna. On 18th December 1912 for the first time he presented the paper "Ein Fall von Versprechen" ("A Case of Speech Slip") at the society session [43]. His short presentation was later published in "Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse" [44]. In November he settled down permanently in Vienna and became one of Freud's close associates and ultimately his friend [28]. Jekels himself perceived his subsequent relationship with Freud as purely professional. He wrote: "I underwent analysis with Freud, my private and social contact with him became less close as a matter of course and was reduced to that of a professional and scientific one" [45]. We have already written several times about possible motives for Jekels moving to Vienna. Professional motivation seems the strongest argument. Jekels desired to be exclusively a psychoanalyst and give up his career as a health resort physician. He also longed for belonging to a group of physicians who will be similar to him and finding their understanding of the views and work he had. Only the relocation to Vienna could offer him that.

1912 was a significant year for Jekels for one more reason. At the end of December, the Second Congress of Polish Neurologists, Psychiatrists and Psychologists took place in Krakow. Its one of the four main themes was psychoanalysis (others included psychoelectrical phenomena, vestibule function and the role of internal secretion in psychiatry and neurology). Granting this rank to Freudian theory at the congress was a great achievement of Jekels. The congress was advertised not only in philosophical and medical journals but also in dailies and popular science magazines. Wincenty Kosiakiewicz, a journalist writing under the pseudonym of Dr Voks, enthusiastically discussed the theory of psychoanalysis in the journal "Świat" in connection with the upcoming congress and added: "Dr Jokeles deals with the issue in our country" [46] (regrettably, Jekels' surname was recorded with a mistake not for the first time). Certainly not everyone expressed such flattering comments related to the upcoming congress as it is sufficient to refer to the critical review by Błachowski in "Ruch Filozoficzny" [36].

The sessions of the Second Congress occurred in Krakow between 20th and 23rd December 1912 at the Neurological-Psychiatric Clinic run by professor Jan Piltz who was also the chairman of the congress committee [47]. The session on psychoanalysis started at 9 o'clock in the morning on 21st December 1912 [48]. This session devoted entirely to psychoanalysis was one of the most significant events in the history of Polish psychoanalysis before World War I. The session made it possible for everybody interested in psychoanalysis to present their views. When Dr Franciszek Chłapowski (a physician from Poznań and one of the founders of "Nowiny Lekarskie") later reported on the course of the congress at the medical faculty in Poznań, he said that the subject "related to the psychoanalytic method had the highest number of pre-registered speakers" [49]. The session was chaired by Dr Samuel Goldflam, a Warsaw well-known neurologist, who ran a private neurological practice in Warsaw at that time. The presentations were delivered by Dr Stefan Borowiecki (a psychiatrist and professor Piltz's associate), Dr Ludwika Karpińska (a psychologist residing in Zakopane at that time), Dr Bronisław Bandrowski (a philosopher and psychologist employed as a teacher in

a pre-secondary school in Lviv), Dr Ludwik Jekels, Dr Waław Radecki (a physician, psychologist and director of a psychological lab established at professor Piltz's clinic), Dr Karol de Beaurain (a psychiatrist and psychoanalyst who had a private practice in Zakopane), Dr Jan Nelken (a psychiatrist then employed in the Psychiatric Hospital in Kulparków) and Dr Herman Nunberg (a psychiatrist and professor Piltz's associate). The group was diverse as it consisted not only of physicians, who constituted the major representation, but also of psychologists and philosophers. They did not constitute a coherent circle that represented the interests of the Polish psychoanalysis. Many of them knew each other on a personal level (Karpińska, Jekels, Borowiecki, Nelken, Nunberg, Beaurain and Radecki) as a result of their professional activities. It is unknown whether they maintained closer contact or shared any activity to support psychoanalysis. Regardless, it is Jekels, Karpińska, Borowiecki, Nelken, Nunberg and Beaurain who could be regarded as the most significant representatives of the first generation of Polish psychoanalysts, mainly because of their contribution to the development of psychoanalysis not only in Poland but worldwide, too. Significantly enough, three of the speakers (Borowiecki, Nunberg and Radecki) were employed at the Neurological-Psychiatric Clinic of the Jagiellonian University run by professor Piltz who clearly was a psychoanalysis supporter.

Jekels delivered his presentation "Libido Sexualis, Character and Neurosis" as the fourth speaker in the psychoanalytical session [50]. The content of his presentation is known owing to its publication entitled "Einige Bemerkungen zur Trieblehre" ("Some Notes on the Science of Drives") [51]¹⁰ which was published in German in "Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse" in 1913. The paper sets out with a bold statement: "What I am missing in the summarising and main Freudian work entitled 'Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality' and in further detailed reports is such a point of view which I highlighted at the Second Congress of Polish Neurologists and Psychiatrists in Krakow" [51]. The theme of the presentation and paper was "mental bisexuality" according to Jekels. The basic thesis of the author is reduced to the statement: "The nature of the id [drive] (active or passive) is given by the erogenous zone, namely by the form of an organ that previously functioned as an erogenous zone" [51]. In Jekels' view the pin-shaped form of the erogenous zone, e.g. a penis, is linked to the drive of intrusion and penetration (active drive), whereas the drive of penetration reception (passive) is related to the tunnel build of the erogenous sphere (e.g. vagina, anus). In the subsequent part of the paper Jekels referred to male homosexuality recognising that there is no passive or active homosexuality. He believed that male homosexuality was always marked by passivity since each time "the anus is the purpose of the desire and it establishes an erogenous zone" [51]. At this point Jekels also discussed the identification with a sexual partner but the example was limited to male homosexuality: "A homosexual takes over both roles in the act of love as he is

¹⁰ Magnone [64] erroneously assumes that the presentation was never published. The translation, authored by Grażyna and Gregor Glodek, was published in "Psychiatria i Psychoterapia" [65]. The Polish quotations come from the translation.

both a subject and an object" [51]. The publication is difficult for the contemporary reader due to the lack of sex vocabulary at the time when Jekels created it and because it used expressions which are already heavily anachronistic today. On the other hand, the innovative and, above all, open-minded view of Jekels should be recognised as it occurred numerous years before Kinsey, Masters and Johnson.

Wilhelm Stekel's critical review published in "Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse" demonstrates how innovative Jekels' concepts were [52]. Stekel formulated a number of critical comments against Jekels' article. He rightly pointed out to the shortcomings in sexual knowledge at that time, which was clearly seen in Jekels' article. He wrote: "Anal eroticism does not play any more significant role here than in other neurotic individuals. Furthermore, all subtle playfulness between a man and a woman, which is of great importance in homosexuality origins and whose coherent picture was not created yet, are disregarded by Jekels"¹¹ [52]. He endorsed Jekels' postulate of the identification with a partner during sexual contact in male homosexuality. The view is still valid today although at present it covers all sexual contacts regardless of orientation. However, Stekel thought Jekels overestimated the importance of anal sex in male homosexuality. In support of his thesis, he used a pseudo-rhetoric and the assertions which boiled down to the view that "most homosexuals do not know an anal erotica". It is reminiscent of the arguments put forward by psychoanalysis opponents who claimed that "most children do not know eroticism". He attempted to undermine Jekel's argument about homosexual libido equivalence to heterosexual libido. Today the view is increasingly promoted by sexologists and the LGBTI community. Like Jekels at that time, they point out to the artificial and anachronistic division of homosexuality (also female one) into active and passive as well as the identification of passivity with femininity and activity with masculinity. The final sentence of Stekel's critical review was highly ironic. It suggested that Jekels' concepts would regress psychoanalysis to the organotherapy stage which was an old and erroneous treatment method (e.g. the removal of uterus or ovaries in hysteria treatment). Years later sexology admitted that Jekels was right. The attack on Jekels could have in fact been an attack on Freud and the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society. Stekel had been in conflict with Freud for two years and he resigned from the Society membership. Despite the pressure, he also refused to hand over the editor-in-chief function of "Zantralblatt für Psychoanalyse", which led to the suspension of the journal publication at the end of 1914.

The summaries of Jekels' lecture in "Przełąd Lekarski" and "Nowiny Lekarskie" (the content of both summaries is identical) were exceptionally brief: "Dr Jekels discusses mental bisexuality. In Freudian understanding of sexuality, male and female elements originate in primary sexual identities. Therefore, purely biological terms of 'male' and 'female' can be introduced into psychology. It can be understood by means of dream analysis" [53, 54]. The content of the lecture might have been more challenging for the audience if compared to his previous presentations. Bandrowski offers a slightly

¹¹ Translated from German by Grażyna and Gregor Glodek

more extensive summary of the presentation in "Ruch Filozoficzny" [50] but his views are in principle consistent with the previously reported summaries. The terms "male" and "female" are re-introduced without any references made to passive and active drives discussed in the article. It includes more information on the application of dream analysis to illustrate the psychological notions of "male" and "female." In dreams "the phenomena occur considerably intensified as sadism and masochism. Since a dream corresponds entirely to primary mental processes of childhood, it seems reasonable to conclude that the regular mental and sexual elements of male and female have an analogous origin" [50]. All summaries differ slightly content-wise from the published version, which may suggest that the paper was amended to some degree before its publication. The examples used by Jekels as illustrations of his claims were likely to have been removed. However, the footnote in the printed version clearly states that it is the lecture delivered at the Second Congress of Polish Neurologists in Krakow.

Jekels' presentation was a farewell to the role of "an apostle of psychoanalysis" in Poland. Interestingly, both the first and the last of Jekels' presentations in that role took place in Krakow. Owing to his efforts over the past years, psychoanalysis ceased to be a therapeutic method which was known only to a few individuals. Jekels' last presentation also heralded his evolution as a psychoanalyst. His earlier presentations depicted psychoanalysis tenets in an exceptionally accessible manner. This time Jekels' lecture was exclusively addressed to other psychoanalysts as for the first time he did not consider a varied level of expertise of the audience which attended the session. Jekels ceased to be solely a translator and a teacher of Freud's ideas which he was often criticised for in Poland. He demonstrated that he is somebody capable of developing those ideas. He also ventured into a polemic with Freud himself by claiming that he complements whatever the works of Freud and other psychoanalysts lack. He was no longer a Freud-absorbed disciple but an independently thinking psychoanalyst.

In the lively discussion which followed all the presentations in the psychoanalytical session, there are no other direct references to Jekels' lecture or other speakers. The discussion changed more into a debate on the position of psychoanalysis within medical sciences. The deliberations continued into the late afternoon hours and were chaired by Warsaw psychiatrist Dr Rafał Radziwiłłowicz, who mainly ran his private practice at that time. As "Kurier Warszawski" observed "the psychoanalytical method evoked the most contradictory views in physicians and psychologists. On the one hand, it has die-hard supporters but on the other hand it is faced with fierce opponents" [48]. Dr Jan Mazurkiewicz, the director of the Psychiatric Hospital in Kobierzyn, which was under construction at that time, definitely belonged to the group of opponents as he criticised psychoanalysis for "pansexuality" and "symbolism which allowed free explanations" [53, 54]. However, he also pointed out to the positive aspects of psychoanalysis such as psychic determinism and "a science of complexes which assists in explaining the content of disease symptoms (delusions, hallucinations, etc.)" [53, 54]. Mazurkiewicz's critical approach to psychoanalysis originated from his views on the aetiology of mental disorders and their treatment options. He expressed his views on

that subject as follows: "Sexual deviations, like other pathological symptoms, result from the perverse activity of the nervous system. For these reasons there is no discussion about the complete cure of symptoms of psychological origin not only with the psychoanalytical method but with any method" [53, 54]. Mazurkiewicz's radical view on the capability of mental disorder treatment may be astonishing as it was expressed by a psychiatrist. Fortunately for this field of medicine he was wrong.

Likewise, other neurologists and psychiatrists expressed criticism of psychoanalysis. Dr Izydor Feuerstein (sometimes used the surname of Fajersztajn), a neurologist from Lviv, questioned psychoanalysis for its one-sided approach to the explanation of neurosis origins (obsession and phobia) which disregarded the susceptibility of persons who suffered from it [53, 54]. Dr Stefan Rosenthal's criticism (a Polish neurologist and psychiatrist then employed at the Psychiatric Clinic in Munich) related to the fact that although the application of psychoanalysis in psychiatry "might have explained the psychotic content, it blurred the threshold between neuroses and a group of early dementia diseases" [53, 54]. It was a very important statement which suggested the acceptance of the symbolic meaning of psychotic content (Jung) which is sometimes undauntingly undermined even today. The criticism was limited to the argument that since schizophrenia and neurosis have symbolic content, they are therefore disturbingly close.

Dr Antoni Mikulski, a Polish neurologist and psychiatrist, the head physician at the hospital in Kochanówka, argued that "none of Freud's claims may not be regarded yet as proven" as the effects of psychoanalytical psychotherapy "are very unstable" [53, 54]. Dr Jan Jarkowski, Dr Józef Babiński's associate in Paris, appreciated the value of psychoanalysis in "observing the mechanism of mental processes" [53, 54] but as Babiński's disciple he could not recognise its significance in the treatment of neuroses, and hysteria in particular. He agreed that psychoanalysis is capable of treatment but only by means of suggestion to which only hysterical patients are susceptible to. He also concluded that the existence of sexual complexes is very common in the population and is not related to neurotic symptoms. Professor Witold Rubczyński, a Polish philosopher and the head of the Ethics Department at the Jagiellonian University, argued in turn that "the beginnings of art and aesthetic cognition do not have any or just a few common elements with sexual ones" [53, 54]. He did not see any sexual aspects in children's demeanour and questioned the notion of psychic determinism introduced by psychoanalysis.

Dr Tadeusz Jaroszyński remained as a moderate critic of psychoanalysis. However, he gradually started to observe more benefits of it such as "the introduction of psychic determinism into neurology and psychiatry, the pursuit to examine subconscious mechanisms in healthy and sick individuals, establishing the relationship between melting moods and moral conflicts and the construction of a sick psyche along with the determination of dynamic forces in the mental system" [53, 54]. He was still critical of the sexuality theory and "the fantasticality of symbol interpretation" [53, 54]. He also maintained his previous conviction that the indications for psychoanalytical treatment are rare.

Dr Maurycy Bornstein, the head physician of the psychiatric ward at the Orthodox Jewish Hospital at Czyste district in Warsaw, expressed his support for psychoanalysis. His views evolved from being initially moderately critical to demonstrating support of psychoanalysis. After World War I Bornstein became one of the most active promoters of psychoanalysis in Poland. He attributed “the psychoanalytical method with a great significance as it allowed to have insight into dark areas of pathological forms which were little known so far (compulsive thinking, anxiety disorders)” [53, 54] and it also “draws the attention to a sexual factor which releases early dementia” [53, 54]. In the view presented by the reviewer in “Kurier Warszawski” (the initials T. J. and the content of the report suggest that it was Dr Tadeusz Jaroszyński) Bornstein recommended psychoanalysis in “strict medical indications” [48], and in Bandrowski’s view “he attributed good therapeutic results [to it] in special cases” [50].

Less data can be found about comments made by other psychoanalysis followers. Bandrowski reported only that “Dr L. Jekels, Dr J. Nelken and Dr H. Nunberg undermined the caveats expressed against the psychoanalytical method” [50]. “Przegląd Lekarski” and “Nowiny Lekarskie” offer very limited details regarding the views they expressed. Jekels reiterated the curative and preventative superiority of psychoanalysis over other psychotherapeutic methods due to “freeing the intellect from affective admixtures” [53, 54]. Nelken demonstrated to the audience the analogy between hysteria theories created by Babiński and Freud, which could serve as a response to Dr Jarkowski’s arguments.

Jekels published the summary of the psychoanalytical session discussions in “Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse” [55]. However, it does not offer any new details and the part devoted to discussion is consistent with the reports from “Przegląd Lekarski” and “Nowiny Lekarskie.” Curiously enough, Jekels reported on the majority of presentations including his own in the psychoanalytical session by means of just one sentence. He did not add any original commentary. His greatest focus was on Nunberg’s presentation, which could suggest his more personal attitude to the speaker. Interestingly, it was Nunberg who recorded the reaction of the audience in the psychoanalytical session in a manner which was completely different from other reviewers. In his memoirs he wrote about the audience reaction to his presentation “Niespełnione życzenia według nauki Freuda” (“Unfulfilled wishes according to Freud’s science”): “It is astonishing how well the presentation was received by the audience of neurologists, psychiatrists and psychologists who knew completely nothing about psychoanalysis” [26, p. 14]. It cannot be denied that his recollection was the wishful (nomen omen) falsification of memory related to both the positive reception of presentations and the complete ignorance of the audience.

Karol Irzykowski in the paper “Freud i freudyści” (“Freud and Freudians”) offers a more realistic image of how the discussion went after the psychoanalytical session [56]. Irzykowski’s account, which was deprived of any courteous tone present in all other reports, demonstrates that the discussion between the supporters and opponents of psychoanalysis was conducted in a very emotional tone. Irzykowski reported on

the following situation: "When during one of the afternoon sessions Dr Jaroszyński briefly outlined the critique of Freud's theory and methods, Dr Nelken responded in such a sharp manner that Dr Radziwiłłowicz, who chaired the session, called on him twice to change the tone. At the second time he abstained from saying anything. Dr Jaroszyński also withdrew his retort and replied that the discussion was not conducted objectively. When the topic was exhausted, 'the majority' expressed gratitude to the chairman for chairing the discussion in an impartial way. Dr Nelken stood up and demonstratively expressed on behalf of the entire group thanks to Dr Goldflam, who was the chairman of the morning session" [56, p. 6]. The quoted passage suggests that Dr Radziwiłłowicz, who chaired the discussion, was biased and clearly favoured the views of psychoanalysis opponents who were dubbed as "the majority" by Irzykowski. It can explain why the voices of psychoanalysis supporters were scarce and recorded briefly when compared with the comments made by the opponents.

Based on the preserved reports, an incorrect conclusion that the discussion was dominated by the psychoanalysis opponents might be drawn. The views were almost exclusively expressed by physicians with the majority of opinions coming from psychiatrists and neurologists in that group. The arguments against psychoanalysis were more varied than those presented in 1909. Except for pansexuality and the freedom of symbol interpretation which were regularly raised, a lack of clear indications to apply psychoanalysis was observed. Even the psychoanalysis achievements such as the explanation of symptom content and origin, i.a. psychotic symptoms were used to question it. The medical community was not ready to accept the assumption that both a healthy psyche and a disordered one are governed by the same principles and that sexual conflicts might become the cause for neurotic and psychotic symptoms. No question about the decisive factors in developing a variety of symptoms as a result of similar conflicts was asked. Such a question would seem natural in the face of these findings. It was assumed a priori that psychoanalysis must be wrong. Such a view resulted predominantly from the excessive attachment to other theories related to the origin and treatment of mental disorders. Another significant aspect was the fact that there was no possibility of expressing views freely by psychoanalysis supporters. The discussion was led in such a way so that the persons who were not familiar with the subject would reject psychoanalysis under the pressure of the majority.

The impact of the congress on the development of the Polish psychoanalysis was surprising. On the one hand, strong voices from medical circles were heard that psychoanalysis failed to become a therapeutic method in medicine. Shortly after the congress Dr Chłapowski argued that "the final outcome of the discussion was not convincing for everyone" [48], whereas Dr Sycianko (who still demonstrated interest in psychoanalysis in 1909) claimed that psychoanalysis "suffered a defeat in Krakow as it can be concluded from the discussion" [48]. On the other hand, the medical professionals also offered more balanced views which were reflective of contemporary opinions that maintained that psychoanalysis is one of numerous methods "applied by

psychotherapist doctors” and the qualification to a specific psychotherapeutic method depends on individual needs of a patient [49]. The congress summaries including the psychoanalytical session were published in major dailies in Krakow, Lviv and Warsaw as well as in medical and philosophical journals.

The positive consequence of the congress was the occurrence of high number of publications on psychoanalysis, both those expressing genuine admiration and critical ones. The presentations of most speakers in the psychoanalytic session were published in serious medical journals (“*Neurologia Polska*”, “*Przegląd Lekarski*”), philosophical journals (“*Przegląd Filozoficzny*”) and psychoanalytical journals (“*Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse*”). De Beaurain and Karpińska might have been encouraged to send the papers to the last journal by Jekels himself. In his congress report Jekels announced the publication of Beaurain’s presentation “in extenso” [55]. The changes were commonly observed as early as in 1913 when Karol Irzykowski argued that “the number of ‘Freudians’ understood as ‘Freudianism’ followers is growing. They are here as well and we have a Polish psychoanalytical journal, too” [57]. Unfortunately, it was impossible to establish which journal he was referring to. The interest in psychoanalysis was growing so much that it made some psychiatrists anxious. Professor Mikulski who participated in the discussion as a psychoanalysis opponent argued after some years that “in 1912 the [psychoanalytical] offence on Poland started” [58, p. 85]. An anti-Semitic motive was observed in Mikulski’s comment that “It is Jews who predominantly spread psychoanalysis” [58]. Having analysed the source materials from the time before World War I, it seems that it was an isolated view. Anti-Semitism did not play a major role in the opposition which medical groups demonstrated towards psychoanalysis and Jekels’ activity. It was subject to criticism from both Poles and Jews and the main argument behind the critique was the significance given to human sexuality by psychoanalysis. Similar reception of psychoanalysis could be observed in other European countries.

Jekels’ activity in the promotion of psychoanalysis in Poland was also observed in 1913 when Freud’s “*Psychopathology of Everyday Life*” translated by Ludwik Jekels and Helena Ivanka was published [59]. The aims of the translators were outlined in the preface: “We had an eye for our nation not to be left behind other nations such as English, Russian, Dutch and Hungarian ones in which the entire series of translations of works by the author [Freud] suggest a great interest in the breakthrough and dynamically spreading science” [59, p. VII]. The translation was again addressed to the wider audience not limited to medical professionals only. They probably considered the comments from previous reviews and the translators asked the readers to be indulgent in terminology judgement: “For our justification we remind that it is about a new science. Therefore, new terms and auxiliary imaginings for which terminology is yet to be created. Considering this, we ask for indulgence” [59, p. VIII]. The review of the translation by Leopold Wołowicz (a philosopher and psychologist, a representative of the Lviv School of Psychology, employed as a pre-secondary school teacher), was published in 1914 in the monthly “*Książka*” [60]. Wołowicz knew Jekels’ earlier works

well and despite criticism he recommended that those with interest in psychoanalysis should get familiar with them. He described Jekels in slightly ironic terms calling him an "ardent Polish follower of Freudianism" [61, p. 7]. In the review he wrote that "I cannot justify the editing which was very careless. Printing errors which are not 'symptomatic' are too numerous. One cannot agree with many sentence structures and the newly coined terms used (...)" [60, p. 15]. The subsequent critique focused on punctuation, spelling mistakes and word inflections. At the same time, it is this review which reported on the readers' great interest in Freudian works ("Freud's works are sold out quickly" [60, p. 15]). Oblivious to his previous remarks, the author finally expressed hope that the translators will also publish "Interpretation of Dreams", which "would enable a wider circle of readers to get familiar with the views of the genius physician from Vienna" [60, p. 15]. All of that suggested that Jekels achieved what he aimed for as wide circles of Polish intelligentsia gained an interest in psychoanalytical theory and no critical publication could stop that process.

To sum up the period of Jekels' public activity between 1909 and 1912, Freud was fully right in the evaluation of Dr Jekels' work results. It is difficult to believe that only one person was responsible for all the achievements. Ludwik Jekels will be remembered in the history of Polish psychotherapy as the first psychoanalyst, the first translator of Freud's works which have been published with minor amendments to this day and the first Polish author of a book on psychoanalysis. Owing to the publications we can use numerous psychoanalytical terms which were translated by Jekels. His educational contribution in the form of lectures for physicians and wider audience should not be overlooked, too. The lectures offered among others the first case studies of patients who received psychoanalytical treatment. His activity led to the lively discussion on psychoanalysis not only in medical circles but also in philosophical, psychological, pedagogic and journalistic groups. It also led to the organisation of the first scientific session devoted to psychoanalysis in Poland. Jekels also prepared the ground for further development of psychoanalysis which occurred in the interwar period. Unfortunately, as is often the case with pioneering activities, Jekels' merits in paving the way for psychoanalysis were quickly forgotten by even the second generation of psychoanalysts working in the interwar period (e.g. Gustav Bychowski). It happened perhaps because Jekels sternly approached his accomplishments and relocated to Vienna with a sense of loneliness and defeat. The disappointment with the reaction of the Polish medical community referred to as "the scorn and professors' ridicule directed at Freud", made him stop believing that "scientific work under such conditions would be appreciated as a contribution to the development of the new science" [62, p. 434]. He was convinced that staying in Poland would be equivalent to professional isolation.

References

1. Freud S. Letter from Sigmund Freud to Ludwig Jekels, December 5, 1911. Washington, DC: Sigmund Freud Papers: General Correspondence, 1871–1996; Jekels, Ludwig; Photocopies, 1909–1917; mss39990, box 30; Manuscript Division; Library of Congress.
2. Freud Z. *O psychoanalizie*. Lwów: Altenberg; 1911.
3. Freud S. Brief von Sigmund Freud an Ludwig Jekels, 7 April, 1911. In: Czarnecki BG. ed. *Ludwig Jekels (1867–1954) und die Anfänge der Psychoanalyse in Polen*. Tübingen: Eberhard Karls Universität zu Tübingen; 2006. P. 87.
4. Ruch Filozoficzny. 1911; 1(5): 105.
5. Nowa Reforma. 15 May 1911; 30(220): 3.
6. Bandrowski B. *Sprawozdania. Zygmunt Freud Prof. Dr: O psychoanalizie*. Ruch Filozoficzny 1912; 2(7): 125–126.
7. Bandrowski B. *I Międzynarodowy Zjazd Pedologiczny*. Ruch Filozoficzny 1911; 1(9): 203–204.
8. *Wykłady, odczyty, referaty. Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne*. Ruch Filozoficzny 1912; 2(7): 139.
9. Dunin W. *Piśmiennictwo. Prof. Dr Zygmunt Freud. O psychoanalizie*. Biblioteka Warszawska 1913; 4(292): 377–379.
10. Dattner B. *Varia*. Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse 1911; 1(7/8): 376.
11. Stögbauer A. *Z drogi ku tajniom duszy (I)*. Kurier Lwowski. 11 Feb 1912; 30(66): 2.
12. Stögbauer A. *Z drogi ku tajniom duszy (II)*. Kurier Lwowski. 13 Feb 1912; 30(68): 2.
13. Stögbauer A. *Z drogi ku tajniom duszy (III)*. Kurier Lwowski. 14 Feb 1912; 30(70): 2.
14. Nowa Reforma. 28 April 1911; 30(192): 2.
15. *Wykłady, odczyty, referaty*. Ruch Filozoficzny 1911; 1(7): 158.
16. *We Lwowie. Wykłady o psychoanalizie*. Kurier Lwowski. 19 May 1911; 39(228): 4.
17. *We Lwowie. Wykłady o psychoanalizie*. Kurier Lwowski. 21 May 1911; 39(232): 2.
18. Jekels L. Letter from Ludwig Jekels to Sigmund Freud, May 29, 1911. Washington, DC: Sigmund Freud Papers: General Correspondence, 1871–1996; Jekels, Ludwig; Originals, 1909–1911, 1924; mss39990, box 30; Manuscript Division; Library of Congress.
19. Jekels L. *Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda*. Lwów: Polskie Towarzystwo Nakładowe; 1912.
20. *Księga pamiątkowa XI Zjazdu Lekarzy i Przyrodników Polskich w Krakowie 18–22 lipca 1911*. Kraków: Komitet Gospodarczy; 1911.
21. *Aus Vereinen und Versammlungen. Aus der IX. Versammlung polnischer Ärzte und Naturforscher. Neurologische Sektion*. Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse. 1913; 2(1): 54–55.
22. Lusek J. *Hermann Joseph Hinterstoisser (1861–1932) – dyrektor Szpitala Śląskiego w Cieszynie*. Acta Medicorum Polonorum 2013; 3(1): 3–11.
23. Brożek K. *Polscy lekarze na Śląsku Cieszyńskim na przełomie XIX i XX wieku (do 1920 r.)*. Medycyna Nowożytna 2002; 9(1/2): 85–109.
24. Bogus M. *Nauczyciele szkół ludowych Śląska Cieszyńskiego w XIX i na początku XX wieku – uwarunkowania prawne i zawodowe*. Czeski Cieszyn, Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo im. Stanisława Podobińskiego Akademii im. Jana Długosza w Częstochowie; 2013.
25. Lista uczestników. *Dziennik XI Zjazdu Lekarzy i Przyrodników Polskich w Krakowie*. 1911; 11(2): 13.
26. Nunberg H. *Memoirs. Recollections, ideas, reflections*. New York: The Psychoanalytic Research and Development Fund; 1969.

27. *Posiedzenie lekarzy ambulatorium Kliniki Neurologiczno-Psychiatrycznej Uniw. Jagiell. w Krakowie. Posiedzenie dnia 7.XI.1911 r.* Przegląd Lekarski. 1912; 51(2): 42–43.
28. Nunberg H, Federn E. ed. *Minutes of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society*, Vol. III: 1910–1911. New York: International Universities Press, Inc.; 1974.
29. *Korrespondenzblatt der Internationalen Psychoanalytischen Vereinigung. Bericht über den III. Psychoanalytischen Kongreß in Weimar am 21. und 22. September 1911 im Hotel Erbprinz.* Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse. 1912; 2(4): 231–237.
30. Freud S. Brief von Sigmund Freud an Ludwig Jekels, 5 Dezember, 1911. In: Czarnecki BG. ed. *Ludwig Jekels (1867–1954) und die Anfänge der Psychoanalyse in Polen.* Tübingen: Eberhard Karls Universität zu Tübingen; 2006. P. 87.
31. Dembińska E, Rutkowski K. *Rozwój psychoterapii jako metody leczenia zaburzeń psychicznych na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim i w Krakowie do wybuchu I wojny światowej.* Psychiatr. Pol. 2016; 50(1): 247–259.
32. Sikorski. *Towarzystwo Lekarskie Krakowskie, posiedzenie z dnia 28 lutego 1912 r.* Przegląd Lekarski 1912; 51(13): 245.
33. Sikorski. *Towarzystwo Lekarskie Krakowskie, posiedzenie z dnia 6 marca 1912 r.* Przegląd Lekarski 1912; 51(14): 258–259.
34. Bandrowski B. *Sprawozdania. Jekels Ludwik Dr. Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda.* Ruch Filozoficzny 1912; 2(7): 126.
35. Dattner B. *Referate und Kritiken. Dr. Ludwik Jekels. Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda.* Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse 1912; 2(10/11): 612.
36. Błachowski S. *Problem świadomości u Freuda.* Ruch Filozoficzny 1912; 2(10): 205–208.
37. *Literatura i sztuka. Ruch Filozoficzny.* Kurier Lwowski. 19 December 1912; 30(585): 6–7.
38. Freud S. Brief von Sigmund Freud an Ludwig Jekels, 11 März, 1912. In: Czarnecki BG. ed. *Ludwig Jekels (1867–1954) und die Anfänge der Psychoanalyse in Polen.* Tübingen: Eberhard Karls Universität zu Tübingen; 2006. P. 88.
39. Reklama prasowa Sanatorium w Bystrej. *Nowa Gazeta.* 25 August 1912; 7(389): 8.
40. Freud S. Letter from Sigmund Freud to Sabina Spielrain, August 20, 1912. In: Carotenuto A. *A secret symmetry. Sabina Spielrain between Jung and Freud.* London–Melbourne–Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul; 1984. P. 116.
41. *Der Bautechniker.* 1912; 32(36): 894.
42. May U. *Freud's patient calendars: 17 analysts in analysis with Freud (1910–1920).* Psychoanal. Hist. 2007; 9(2): 153–200.
43. Nunberg H, Federn E. ed. *Minutes of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society*, Vol. IV: 1912–1918. New York: International Universities Press, Inc.; 1975. P. 138–139.
44. Jekels L. *Zur Psychopathologie des Alltagslebens. Ein Fall von Versprechen.* Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse 1913; 1(3): 258–260.
45. Jekels L. *Recollections of Freud (n.d.).* Washington, DC: Sigmund Freud Papers: Interviews and Recollections, 1914–1998, Set A, 1914–1998, mss39990, box 124; Manuscript Division; Library of Congress.
46. Voks. *Z rozwoju nauki polskiej. Zjazd grudniowy.* Świat. 27 April 1912; 7(17): 5–6.
47. *Zjazd Neurologów, Psychiatrów i Psychologów Polskich.* Kosmos 1912; 37(10–12): 750–751.
48. J.T. *II-gi Zjazd Neurologów, Psychiatrów i Psychologów Polskich.* Kurier Warszawski. 27 December 1912; 92(357).

49. Żniniewiczówna J. *Sprawozdanie z zebrania Wydziału Lekarskiego w Poznaniu z dnia 3.1.1913*. Nowiny Lekarskie. 1913; 25(2): 96–100.
50. Bandrowski B. *Psychologia na II. Zjeździe Neurologów, Psychiatrów i Psychologów Polskich*. Ruch Filozoficzny 1913; 3(2): 27–31.
51. Jekels L. *Einige Bemerkungen zur Trieblehre*. Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse. 1913; 1(5): 439–443.
52. Stekel W. *Referate und Kritiken. Jekels: Einige Bemerkungen zur Trieblehre*. Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse. 1914; 4(3/4): 183.
53. *II Zjazd Neurologów, Psychiatrów i Psychologów Polskich w Krakowie*. Przegląd Lekarski 1913; 52(5): 84–85.
54. *II-gi Zjazd Neurologów, Psychiatrów i Psychologów Polskich*. Nowiny Lekarskie 1913; 25(2): 100–104.
55. Jekels L. *Aus Vereinen und Versammlungen. Vom II. polnischen Neurologen – und Psychiater – Kongress in Krakau (20. bis 23. Dezember 1912)*. Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse. 1913; 1(2): 190–192.
56. Irzykowski K. *Freudyzm i freudyści I*. Prawda 1913; (2): 6–8.
57. Irzykowski K. *Acheron duszy*. Świat 1913; 7(3): 1–2.
58. Żeleński T. *Kurkiewy rosną w powagę*. In: Żeleński T. *Brewerie*. Warszawa: Księgarnia F. Hoesicka; 1926. P. 83–87.
59. Freud Z. *Psychopatologia życia codziennego*. Lwów: Altenberg; 1913.
60. Wołowicz L. *Dział sprawozdawczy. Prof. Dr. Zygmunt Freud. Psychopatologia życia codziennego*. Książka 1914; 14(7): 14–15.
61. Wołowicz L. *Jeden z problemów psychoanalizy Freuda*. Stryj: Drukarnia Augusta Olbricha; 1914.
62. *Ludwig Jekels (1867–1954)*. Psychoanalytic Quarterly 1954; (23): 434–435.
63. Dybel P. *Psychoanaliza – ziemia obiecana?*, part 1. Kraków: Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych „Universitas”; 2016.
64. Magnone L. *Emisariusze Freuda*, vol. 1. Kraków: Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych „Universitas”; 2016.
65. Jekels L. *Kilka uwag do nauki o popędach*. Psychiatria i Psychoterapia 2015; 11(4): 21–26.

Address: Edyta Dembińska
Department of Psychotherapy
Jagiellonian University Medical College
31-138 Kraków, Lenartowicza Street 14
e-mail: edyta.dembinska@uj.edu.pl