Dear D. Rahut,

You are an obstinate, or at least pertinacious, fellow. It is not Terencezi's "enthusiasm" but his madness I am so fond of adventure and I am sure he would be grateful to me.

It is so long now that mine forgotten which were your papers were. I have just got from Basic Books and felt books of Terencezi. Thank you soon then.
We are looking forward to your next visit with the Bride and rest of the letters (or rather, copies) I am very hand at work.

[Signature]

[Name]
28th October 1952.

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Flat,
Alsted,
Mr. Backhurst, Sussex.

Dear Dr. Jones,

The blurb will be printed with your corrections as contained in your last letter.

This autumn I gave two lectures to the third year students on Ferenczi and his work. I used this opportunity to read the four undecided papers very carefully once again and I bore in mind all the time your suggestion about editing them.

Although it is quite obvious that in one or other aspect Ferenczi was carried away by his enthusiasm for a new idea, I do not think this would justify our meddling with his writings. The fact is that all these four papers contain a real wealth of new ideas, admittedly revolutionary in their times, but now for the greater part accepted and incorporated in our everyday technique. This fact in itself rules out the possibility of excluding them altogether. On the other hand, I think it would be a disservice to the history of science to perpetrate on Ferenczi what Bowdler tried to do on Shakespeare. Just as much as Shakespeare ought to be studied and appreciated at his best and at his worst, so I think Ferenczi has the right both to his greatness and to his mistakes.

So I come to the proposition to include all these four papers in the form in which they were published in the Journal, and to restrict my function as editor to calling attention in a preface to justified criticisms against them. I hope you will agree to this proposition.

With kind regards to Mrs. Jones and to yourself,

Yours sincerely,