

EDITOR'S NOTE

DIE VERDRÄNGUNG¹

(A) GERMAN EDITIONS:

- 1915 *Int. Z. ärztl. Psychoanal.*, 3 (3), 129-38.
 1924 *Gesammelte Schriften*, 5, 466-79.
 1946 *Gesammelte Werke*, 10, 248-61.

(B) ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS:

- 'Repression'
 1925 *Collected Papers*, 4, 84-97. (Tr. C. M. Baines.)
 1957 *Standard Edition*, 14, 141-58. (Translation, based on that of 1925, but very largely rewritten.)

The present edition is a reprint of the *Standard Edition* version, with some editorial modifications.

In his 'History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement' (1914d), Freud declared that 'the theory of repression is the corner-stone on which the whole structure of psychoanalysis rests'; and in the present essay, together with Section IV of the paper on 'The Unconscious', which follows it (p. 183 ff.), he gave his most elaborate formulation of that theory.

The concept of repression goes back historically to the very beginnings of psychoanalysis. The first published reference to it was in the Breuer and Freud 'Preliminary Communication' of 1893 (*P.F.L.*, 3, 61 and n. 1). The term '*Verdrängung*' had been used by the early nineteenth-century psychologist Herbart and may possibly have come to Freud's knowledge through his

teacher Meynert, who had been an admirer of Herbart.¹ But, as Freud himself insisted in the passage of the 'History' already quoted, 'the theory of repression quite certainly came to me independently of any other source'. 'It was a novelty', he wrote in his *Autobiographical Study* (1925d), 'and nothing like it had ever before been recognized in mental life.' There are several accounts in Freud's writings of how the discovery came about: for instance, in the *Studies on Hysteria* (1895d), P.F.L., 3, 351-3, and again in the 'History'. All these accounts are alike in emphasizing the fact that the concept of repression was inevitably suggested by the clinical phenomenon of resistance, which in turn was brought to light by a technical innovation - namely, the abandonment of hypnosis in the cathartic treatment of hysteria.

It will be noticed that in the account given in the *Studies* the term actually used to describe the process is not 'repression' but 'defence'. At this early period the two terms were used by Freud indifferently, almost as equivalents, though 'defence' was perhaps the commoner. Soon, however, as he remarked in his paper on sexuality in the neuroses (1906d), P.F.L., 10, 71, 'repression' began to be used quite generally in place of 'defence'. Thus, for instance, in the 'Rat Man' case history (1909d) Freud discussed the mechanism of 'repression' in obsessional neurosis - i.e. the displacement of the emotional cathexis from the objectionable idea, as contrasted with the complete expulsion of the idea from consciousness in hysteria - and spoke of 'two kinds of repression' (P.F.L., 9, 76-7). It is, indeed, in this wider sense that the term is used in the present paper, as is shown by the discussion towards the end of it on the different mechanisms of repression in the various forms of psychoneurosis. It seems pretty clear, however, that the form of repression which Freud had chiefly in mind here was that which occurs in hysteria; and much later on, in Chapter XI, Section A (c), of *Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety* (1926d), P.F.L., 10, 322 ff., he proposed to restrict the term 'repression' to this one particular mechanism and to revive

'defence' as 'a general designation for all the techniques which the ego makes use of in conflicts which may lead to a neurosis'. The importance of making this distinction was later illustrated by him in Section V of 'Analysis Terminable and Interminable' (1937c).

The special problem of the nature of the motive force which puts repression into operation was one which was a constant source of concern to Freud, though it is scarcely touched on in the present paper. In particular there was the question of the relation between repression and sex, and to this Freud in his early days gave fluctuating replies, as may be seen at many points in the Fliess correspondence (1950a). Subsequently, however, he firmly rejected any attempt at 'sexualizing' repression. A full discussion of this question (with particular reference to the views of Adler) will be found in the last section of "'A Child is Being Beaten'" (1919e), P.F.L., 10, 189 ff. Later still, in *Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety* (1926d), especially in Chapter IV, and in the earlier part of Lecture 32 of the *New Introductory Lectures* (1933a), he threw fresh light on the subject by arguing that anxiety was not, as he had previously held and as he states below, for instance on pp. 153 and 155, a *consequence* of repression but was one of the chief motive forces leading to it.¹

1. The distinction between repression and the 'disavowal' or 'denial' ('*Verleugnung*') by the ego of external reality or some part of it was first discussed by Freud at length in his paper on 'Fetishism' (1927e), P.F.L., 7, 353 and n. 1. See also p. 227 below.

1. See below, p. 162. A full discussion of this will be found in the first volume of Ernest Jones's biography (1953, 407 ff.).

REPRESSION

ONE of the vicissitudes an instinctual impulse may undergo is to meet with resistances, which seek to make it inoperative. Under certain conditions, which we shall presently investigate more closely, the impulse then passes into the state of 'repression' [*Verdrängung*]. If what was in question was the operation of an external stimulus, the appropriate method to adopt would obviously be flight, with an ~~instinct~~ flight is of no avail, for the ego cannot escape from itself. At some later period, rejection based on judgement (*condemnation*) will be found to be a good method to adopt against an ~~instinctual~~ impulse. Repression is a preliminary stage of condemnation, something between flight and condemnation; it is a concept which could not have been formulated before the time of psychoanalytic studies.

It is not easy in theory to deduce the possibility of such a thing as repression. Why should an ~~instinctual~~ impulse undergo a vicissitude like this? A necessary condition of its happening must clearly be that the ~~instinct's~~ attainment of its aim should produce displeasure instead of pleasure. But we cannot well imagine such a contingency. There are no such ~~instincts~~ satisfaction of an ~~instinct~~ is always pleasurable? We should have to assume certain peculiar circumstances, some sort of process by which the pleasure of satisfaction is changed into displeasure.

In order the better to delimit repression, let us discuss some other instinctual situations. It may happen that an external stimulus becomes internalized – for example, by eating into and destroying some bodily organ – so that a new source of constant excitation and increase of tension arises. The stimulus thereby acquires a far-reaching similarity to an instinct. We know that a case of this sort is experienced by us as *pain*. The aim of this

pseudo-instinct, however, is simply the cessation of the change in the organ and of the unpleasure accompanying it. There is no other direct pleasure to be attained by cessation of pain. Further, pain is imperative; the only things to which it can yield are removal by some toxic agent or the influence of mental distraction.

The case of pain is too obscure to give us any help in our purpose. Let us take the case in which an instinctual stimulus such as hunger remains unsatisfied. It then becomes imperative and can be allayed by nothing but the action that satisfies it; it keeps up a constant tension of need. Nothing in the nature of a repression seems in this case to come remotely into question. Thus repression certainly does not arise in cases where the tension produced by lack of satisfaction of an instinctual impulse is raised to an unbearable degree. The methods of defence which are open to the organism against that situation must be discussed in another connection.³

Let us rather confine ourselves to clinical experience, as we meet with it in psychoanalytic practice. We then learn that the satisfaction of an instinct which is under repression would be quite possible, and further, that in every instance such a satisfaction would be pleasurable in itself, but it would be irreconcilable with other claims and intentions. It would, therefore, cause pleasure in one place and unpleasure in another. It has consequently become a condition for repression that the motive force of unpleasure shall have acquired more strength than the pleasure obtained from satisfaction. Psychoanalytic observation of the transference neuroses, moreover, leads us to conclude that repression is not a defensive mechanism which is present from the very beginning, and that it cannot arise until a sharp cleavage

1. [Pain and the organism's method of dealing with it are discussed in Chapter IV of *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1920g), p. 301 ff. below. The subject is already raised in Part I, Section 6, of the 'Project' (1950a [1895]), and in the closing paragraphs of *Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety* (1926d), p. F.L., 10, 331-3.]

2. [In the 'Project' (1950a [1895]), Part I, Section 1, this is termed the 'specific action'.]

3. [It is not clear what 'other connection' Freud had in mind.]

has occurred between conscious and unconscious mental activity – that the essence of repression lies simply in turning something away, and keeping it at a distance, from the conscious.¹ This view of repression would be made more complete by assuming that, before the mental organization reaches this stage, the task of fending off instinctual impulses is dealt with by the other vicissitudes which instincts may undergo – e.g. reversal into the opposite or turning round upon the subject's own self [cf. pp. 123-4].

It seems to us now that, in view of the very great extent to which repression and what is unconscious are correlated, we must defer probing more deeply into the nature of repression until we have learnt more about the structure of the succession of psychical agencies and about the differentiation between what is unconscious and conscious. [See the following paper, p. 190 ff.] Till then, all we can do is to put together in a purely descriptive fashion a few characteristics of repression that have been observed clinically, even though we run the risk of having to repeat unchanged much that has been said elsewhere.

We have reason to assume that there is a *primal repression*, a first phase of repression, which consists in the psychical (ideational) representative of the instinct² being denied entrance into the conscious. With this a *fixation* is established; the representative in question persists unaltered from then onwards and the instinct remains attached to it. This is due to the properties of unconscious processes of which we shall speak later [p. 191].

The second stage of repression, *repression proper*, affects mental derivatives of the repressed representative, or such trains of thought as, originating elsewhere, have come into associative connection with it. On account of this association, these ideas experience the same fate as what was primarily repressed. Repression proper, therefore, is actually an after-pressure.³

1. [A modification of this formula will be found below on pp. 208-9.]

2. [See the Editor's Note to the previous paper, p. 107 ff.]

3. ['*Nachdrängen*.' Freud uses the same term in his account of the process in the Schreber analysis (see next footnote), and also in his paper on 'The Unconscious' (see below, pp. 183 and 184). But, on alluding to the point more than twenty years later in the third section of 'Analysis Terminable and Interminable' (1937d), he uses the word '*Nachverdrängung*' ('after-repression').]

REPRESSION

Moreover, it is a mistake to emphasize only the repulsion which operates from the direction of the conscious upon what is to be repressed; quite as important is the attraction exercised by what was primarily repressed upon everything with which it can establish a connection. Probably the trend towards repression would fail in its purpose if these two forces did not co-operate, if there were not something previously repressed ready to receive what is repelled by the conscious.¹

Under the influence of the study of the psychoneuroses, which brings before us the important effects of repression, we are inclined to overvalue their psychological bearing and to forget too readily that repression does not hinder the instinctual representative from continuing to exist in the unconscious, from organizing itself further, putting out derivatives and establishing connections. Repression in fact interferes only with the relation of the instinctual representative to one psychological system, namely, to that of the conscious.

Psychoanalysis is able to show us other things as well which are important for understanding the effects of repression in the psychoneuroses. It shows us, for instance, that the instinctual representative develops with less interference and more profusely if it is withdrawn by repression from conscious influence. It proliferates in the dark, as it were, and takes on extreme forms of expression, which when they are translated and presented to the neurotic are not only bound to seem alien to him, but frighten him by giving him the picture of an extraordinary and dangerous strength of instinct. This deceptive strength of instinct is the result of an uninhibited development in phantasy and of the damming-up consequent on frustrated satisfaction. The fact that this last result is bound up with repression points

1. [The account of the two stages of repression given in the last two paragraphs had been anticipated by Freud four years earlier (though in a somewhat different form) in the third section of the Schreber analysis (1911c), P.F.L., 9, 205-6, and in a letter to Ferenczi of 6 December 1910 (Jones, 1955, 499). See also the footnote added in 1914 to *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900a), *ibid.*, 4, 698 n. 2.]

REPRESSION

the direction in which the true significance of repression has to be looked for.

Reverting once more, however, to the opposite aspect of repression, let us make it clear that it is not even correct to suppose that repression withholds from the conscious *all* the derivatives of what was primarily repressed.¹ If these derivatives have become sufficiently far removed from the repressed representative, whether owing to the adoption of distortions or by reason of the number of intermediate links inserted, they have free access to the conscious. It is as though the resistance of the conscious against them was a function of their distance from what was originally repressed. In carrying out the technique of psychoanalysis, we continually require the patient to produce such derivatives of the repressed as, in consequence either of their remoteness or of their distortion, can pass the censorship to give without being influenced by any conscious purposive idea and without any criticism, and from which we reconstitute a conscious translation of the repressed representative — these associations are nothing else than remote and distorted derivatives of this kind. During this process we observe that the patient can go on spinning a thread of such associations, till he is brought up against some thought, the relation of which to what is repressed becomes so obvious that he is compelled to repeat his attempt at repression. Neurotic symptoms, too, must have fulfilled this same condition, for they are derivatives of the consciousness which has, by their means, finally won the access to the consciousness which was previously denied to it.²

We can lay down no general rule as to what degree of distortion and remoteness is necessary before the resistance on the part of 'the Unconscious' (below, p. 194 ff.)]

2. [In the German editions before 1924 the latter part of this sentence read: 'Welches sich den ihm versagten Zugang vom Bewusstsein endlich erdampft hat'. This was translated formerly 'which has finally . . . wrested from consciousness the right of way previously denied it'. In the German editions from 1924 onwards the word 'wom' was corrected to 'zum', thus altering the sense to that given in the text above.]

part of the conscious is removed. A delicate balancing is here taking place, the play of which is hidden from us; its mode of operation, however, enables us to infer that it is a question of calling a halt when the cathexis of the unconscious reaches a certain intensity — an intensity beyond which the unconscious would break through to satisfaction. Repression acts, therefore, in a *highly individual* manner. Each single derivative of the repressed may have its own special vicissitude; a little more or a little less distortion alters the whole outcome. In this connection we can understand how it is that the objects to which men give most preference, their ideals, proceed from the same perceptions and experiences as the objects which they most abhor, and that they were originally only distinguished from one another through slight modifications. [Cf. p. 87.] Indeed, as we found in tracing the origin of the fetish,¹ it is possible for the original instinctual representative to be split in two, one part undergoing repression, while the remainder, precisely on account of this intimate connection, undergoes idealization.

The same result as follows from an increase or a decrease in the degree of distortion may also be achieved at the other end of the apparatus, so to speak, by a modification in the condition for the production of pleasure and unpleasure. Special techniques have been evolved, with the purpose of bringing about such changes in the play of mental forces that what would otherwise give rise to unpleasure may on this occasion result in pleasure; and, whenever a technical device of this sort comes into operation, the repression of an instinctual representative which would otherwise be repudiated is lifted. These techniques have till now only been studied in any detail in jokes.² As a rule the repression is only temporarily lifted and is promptly reinstated.

Observations like this, however, enable us to note some further characteristics of repression. Not only is it, as we have just shown, *individual* in its operation, but it is also exceedingly

1. [Cf. Section 2 (A) of the first of Freud's *Three Essays* (1905d), P.F.L., 7, 65-8 and footnotes.]

2. [See the second chapter of Freud's book on jokes (1905c), P.F.L., 6, 47 ff.]

mobile. The process of repression is not to be regarded as an event which takes place *once*, the results of which are permanent, as when some living thing has been killed and from that time onward is dead; repression demands a persistent expenditure of force, and if this were to cease the success of the repression would be jeopardized, so that a fresh act of repression would be necessary. We may suppose that the repressed exercises a continuous pressure in the direction of the conscious, so that this pressure must be balanced by an unceasing counter-pressure.¹ Thus the maintenance of a repression involves an uninterrupted expenditure of force, while its removal results in a saving from an economic point of view. The mobility of repression, incidentally, also finds expression in the psychological characteristics of the state of sleep, which alone renders possible the formation of dreams.² With a return to waking life the repressive cathexes which have been drawn in are once more sent out.

Finally, we must not forget that after all we have said very little about an *instinctual* impulse when we have established that it is repressed. Without prejudice to its repression, such an impulse may be in widely different states. It may be inactive, i.e. only very slightly cathected with psychical energy; or it may be cathected in varying degrees, and so enabled to be active. True, its activation will not result in a direct lifting of the repression, but it will set in motion all the processes which end in a penetration by the impulse into consciousness along circuitous paths. With unexpressed derivatives of the unconscious the fate of a particular idea is often decided by the degree of its activity or *excitement*. It is an everyday occurrence that such a derivative remains unexpressed so long as it represents only a small amount of energy, although its content would be calculated to give rise to a conflict with what is dominant in consciousness. The quantitative factor proves decisive for this conflict: as soon as the basically obnoxious idea exceeds a certain degree of strength, the conflict becomes a real one, and it is precisely this activation

1. [This is discussed further on p. 183 f. below.]

2. [Cf. *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900a), Chap. VII (C), P.F.L., 4, 721-2. See also below, pp. 232-3.]

that leads to repression. So that, where repression is concerned, an increase of energetic cathexis operates in the same sense as an approach to the unconscious, while a decrease of that ~~cathexis~~ operates in the same sense as remoteness from the unconscious or distortion. We see that the repressive trends may find a substitute for repression in a weakening of what is distasteful.

In our discussion so far we have dealt with the repression of an instinctual representative, and by the latter we have understood an idea¹ or group of ideas which is cathected with a definite quota of psychical energy (libido or interest) coming from an ~~instinct~~. Clinical observation now obliges us to divide up what we have hitherto regarded as a single entity; for it shows us that besides the idea, some other element representing the instinct has to be taken into account, and that this other element undergoes vicissitudes of repression which may be quite different from those undergone by the idea. For this other element of the psychical representative the term *quota of affect* has been generally adopted.² It corresponds to the instinct in so far as the latter has become detached from the idea and finds expression, proportionate to its quantity, in processes which are sensed as affects. From this point on, in describing a case of repression, we shall have to follow up separately what, as the result of repression, becomes of the *idea*, and what becomes of the instinctual energy linked to it.

We should be glad to be able to say something general about the vicissitudes of both; and having taken our bearings a little we shall in fact be able to do so. The general vicissitude which overtakes the *idea* that represents the instinct can hardly be anything else than that it should vanish from the conscious if it was previously conscious, or that it should be held back from consciousness if it was about to become conscious. The difference is not important; it amounts to much the same thing as the difference between my ordering an undesirable guest out of my

drawing-room (or out of my front hall), and my refusing, after recognizing him, to let him cross my threshold at all.¹ The *quantitative* factor of the instinctual representative has three possible vicissitudes, as we can see from a cursory survey of the observations made by psychoanalysis: either the instinct is altogether suppressed, so that no trace of it is found, or it appears as an affect which is in some way or other qualitatively coloured, or it is changed into anxiety.² The two latter possibilities set us the task of taking into account, as a further instinctual vicissitude, the *transformation* into *affects*, and especially into *anxiety*, of the psychical energies of *instincts*.

We recall the fact that the motive and purpose of repression was nothing else than the avoidance of displeasure. It follows that the vicissitude of the quota of affect belonging to the representative is far more important than the vicissitude of the idea, and this fact is decisive for our assessment of the process of repression. If a repression does not succeed in preventing feelings of displeasure or anxiety from arising, we may say that it has failed, even though it may have achieved its purpose as far as the ideational portion is concerned. Repressions that have failed will of course have more claim on our interest than any that may have been successful; for the latter will for the most part escape our examination.

We must now try to obtain some insight into the *mechanism* of the process of repression. In particular we want to know whether there is a single mechanism only, or more than one, and whether perhaps each of the psychoneuroses is distinguished

1. This simile, which is thus applicable to the process of repression, may also be extended to a characteristic of it which has been mentioned earlier: I have merely to add that I must set a permanent guard over the door which I have forbidden this guest to enter, since he would otherwise burst it open. (See above [p. 151].) [The simile had been elaborated by Freud in the second of his *Five Lectures* (1910a).]

2. [Freud's altered views on this last point were stated by him in *Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety* (1926a), especially at the end of Chapter IV and in Chapter XI, Section A (b); *P.F.L.*, 10, 263-4 and 320 ff.]

1. [*Vorstellung*.] See footnote 2, p. 176.]

2. [*Auffekterung*.] This term dates back to the Breuer period. Cf., for instance, the last paragraphs of Freud's paper, 1894a, and the Editor's Appendix to it.]

by a mechanism of repression peculiar to it. At the outset of this enquiry, however, we are met by complications. The mechanism of a repression becomes accessible to us only by our deducing that mechanism from the *outcome* of the repression. Confining our observations to the effect of repression on the ideational portion of the representative, we discover that as a rule it creates a *substitutive formation*. What is the mechanism by which such a substitute is formed? Or should we distinguish several mechanisms here as well? Further, we know that repression leaves *symptoms* behind it. May we then suppose that the forming of substitutes and the forming of symptoms coincide, and, if this is so on the whole, is the mechanism of forming symptoms the same as that of repression? The general probability would seem to be that the two are widely different, and that it is not the repression itself which produces substitutive formations and symptoms, but that these latter are indications of a *return of the repressed*¹ and owe their existence to quite other processes. It would also seem advisable to examine the mechanisms by which substitutes and symptoms are formed before considering the mechanisms of repression.

Obviously this is no subject for further speculation. The place of speculation must be taken by a careful analysis of the results of repression observable in the different neuroses. I must, however, suggest that we should postpone this task, too, until we have formed reliable conceptions of the relation of the conscious to the unconscious.² But, in order that the present discussion may not be entirely unfruitful, I will say in advance that (1) the mechanism of repression does not in fact coincide with the mechanism or mechanisms of forming substitutes, (2) there are a great many different mechanisms of forming substitutes and (3) the mechanisms of repression have at least this one thing in

1. [The concept of a 'return of the repressed' is a very early one in Freud's writings. It appears already in Section II of his second paper on 'The Neuro-Psychoses of Defence' (1896b), as well as in the still earlier draft of that paper sent to Fliess on 1 January 1896 (1950a, Draft K).]

2. [Freud takes up the task in Section IV of his paper on 'The Unconscious', below, p. 183 ff.]

common: a *withdrawal of the cathexis of energy* (or of libido, where we are dealing with sexual instincts).

Further, restricting myself to the three best-known forms of psychoneurosis, I will show by means of some examples how the concepts here introduced find application to the study of repression. From the field of *anxiety hysteria* I will choose a well-analysed example of an animal phobia.¹ The instinctual impulse subjected to repression here is a libidinal attitude towards the father, coupled with fear of him. After repression, this impulse vanishes out of consciousness: the father does not appear in it as an object of libido. As a substitute for him we find in a corresponding place some animal which is more or less fitted to be an object of anxiety. The formation of the substitute for the ideational portion [of the instinctual representative] has come about by *displacement* along a chain of connections which is determined in a particular way. The quantitative portion has not vanished, but has been transformed into anxiety. The result is fear of a wolf, instead of a demand for love from the father. The categories here employed are of course not enough to supply an adequate explanation of even the simplest case of psychoneurosis: there are always other considerations to be taken into account.

A repression such as occurs in an animal phobia must be described as radically unsuccessful. All that it has done is to remove and replace the idea; it has failed altogether in sparing unpleasure. And for this reason, too, the work of the neurosis does not cease. It proceeds to a second phase, in order to attain its immediate and more important purpose. What follows is an attempt at flight – the formation of the *phobia proper*, of a number of avoidances which are intended to prevent a release of the anxiety. More specialized investigation enables us to understand the mechanism by which the phobia achieves its aim. [See p. 185 ff. below.]

1. [This is, of course, a reference to the case history of the 'Wolf Man' (1918b), p. F.L., 9, 233 ff., which, though it was not published till three years after the present paper, had already been completed in essentials.]

repression when we consider the picture of a true *conversion hysteria*. Here the salient point is that it is possible to bring about a total disappearance of the quota of affect. When this is so, the patient displays towards his symptoms what Charcot called '*la belle indifférence des hystériques*'.¹ In other cases this suppression is not so completely successful: some distressing sensations may attach to the symptoms themselves, or it may prove impossible to prevent some release of anxiety, which in turn sets to work the mechanism of forming a phobia. The ideational content of the instinctual representative is completely withdrawn from consciousness; as a substitute – and at the same time as a symptom – we have an over-strong innervation (in typical cases, a somatic one), sometimes of a sensory, sometimes of a motor character, either as an excitation or an inhibition. The over-innervated area proves on a closer view to be a part of the repressed instinctual representative itself – a part which, as though by a process of *condensation*, has drawn the whole cathexis on to itself. These remarks do not of course bring to light the whole mechanism of a conversion hysteria; in especial the factor of *regression*, which will be considered in another connection, has also to be taken into account.² In so far as repression in [conversion] hysteria is made possible only by the extensive formation of substitutes, it may be judged to be entirely unsuccessful; as regards dealing with the quota of affect, however, which is the true task of repression, it generally signifies a total success. In conversion hysteria the process of repression is completed with the formation of the symptom and does not, as in anxiety hysteria, need to continue to a second phase – or rather, strictly speaking, to continue endlessly.

A totally different picture of repression is shown, once more, in the third disorder which we shall consider for the purposes of our illustration – in *obsessional neurosis*. Here we are at first in doubt what it is that we have to regard as the instinctual

1. [Freud has already quoted this in *Studies on Hysteria* (1895d), P.F.L., 3, 202.]
2. [This is perhaps a reference to the missing metapsychological paper on conversion hysteria. See Editor's Introduction, p. 103.]

representative that is subjected to repression – whether it is a libidinal or a hostile trend. This uncertainty arises because obsessional neurosis has as its basis a regression owing to which a sadistic trend has been substituted for an affectionate one. It is this hostile impulse against someone who is loved which is subjected to repression. The effect at an early stage of the work of repression is quite different from what it is at a later one. At first the repression is completely successful; the ideational content is rejected and the affect made to disappear. As a substitutive formation there arises an alteration of the ego in the shape of an increased conscientiousness, and this can hardly be called a symptom. Here, substitute and symptom do not coincide. From this we learn something, too, about the mechanism of repression. In this instance, as in all others, repression has brought about a withdrawal of libido; but here it has made use of *reaction-formation* for this purpose, by intensifying an opposite. Thus in this case the formation of a substitute has the same mechanism as repression and at bottom coincides with it, while chronologically, as well as conceptually, it is distinct from the formation of a symptom. It is very probable that the whole process is made possible by the ambivalent relationship into which the sadistic impulse that has to be repressed has been introduced.

But the repression, which was at first successful, does not hold firm; in the further course of things its failure becomes increasingly marked. The ambivalence which has enabled repression through reaction-formation to take place is also the point at which the repressed succeeds in returning. The vanished affect comes back in its transformed shape as social anxiety, *emphal* anxiety and unlimited self-reproaches; the rejected idea is replaced by a *substitute by displacement*, often a displacement on to something very small or indifferent.¹ A tendency to a complete re-establishment of the repressed idea is as a rule unmistakably present. The failure in the repression of the quantitative, affective factor brings into play the same mechanism of flight, by means of avoidance and prohibitions, as we have seen at

1. [Cf. Section II (c) of the 'Rat Man' analysis, P.F.L., 9, 120.]

work in the formation of hysterical phobias. The rejection of the *idea* from the conscious is, however, obstinately maintained, because it entails abstention from action, a motor fettering of the impulsion. Thus in obsessional neurosis the work of repression is prolonged in a sterile and interminable struggle.

The short series of comparisons presented here may easily convince us that more comprehensive investigations are necessary before we can hope thoroughly to understand the processes connected with repression and the formation of neurotic symptoms. The extraordinary intricacy of all the factors to be taken into consideration leaves only one way of presenting them open to us. We must select first one and then another point of view, and follow it up through the material as long as the application of it seems to yield results. Each separate treatment of the subject will be incomplete in itself, and there cannot fail to be obscurities where it touches upon material that has not yet been treated; but we may hope that a final synthesis will lead to a proper understanding.

THE UNCONSCIOUS
(1915)