

Although John was inspired by Freud, he was not about to let him rule the roost. His book on the Wolfman shows him combining the work of psychoanalytic interpretation with the evidence demanded by the historian and the subtlety of literary criticism to wring out from the case everything that it could reveal. Recently, looking through some old files I recalled that, long before this book, John pursued his research in Vienna. He in Vienna, I in Cambridge, began a lengthy correspondence, gradually and a bit ambitiously pretentious, beginning to think of ourselves as reliving the vivid intellectual and personal journeys of Freud with his corresponding interlocutors. But it was indeed an interesting correspondence to both of us, and it reminds me of John's importance to my thinking over many years.

I think again of that photo, fully aware of John's later, more professorial stature: a bit more portly, a bit more bent, a bit wizened in the face, a bit slower in gait – well, we have all come to look like that. But I also think that he never lost that inspired youthfulness displayed in the early photo, and I am sure that his many friends, colleagues and students share my view that here was a man inspired by scholarly curiosity, which he willingly and rewardingly shared with us. So, once again, I say to John: 'Stop fooling around; we have work to do. Where did Freud ...? What did he mean by ...?'

Karl Figlio is Professor in the Centre for Psychoanalytic Studies, University of Essex, UK.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03060497.2016.1155868>

A brief memory of John Forrester

Robert Hinshelwood

University of Essex, Colchester, UK

I knew John only slightly, but over many years. He was important in heading a significant department at Cambridge on the history of psychoanalysis. I recall an important moment for me when, in 2004, I had detailed conversations with him about becoming editor of the Journal *Psychoanalysis and History*. Ten years earlier I had established the journal with Andrea Sabbadini, who took on the role of editor, while I did the publishing of the journal. By 2004 Andrea had done a 10-year stint – quite enough, I agreed; so I had to find a new editor. There was not a big field of possibles, and John was far and away *the* candidate for the new editor.

He did not make it difficult to discuss the possibility with him, but he was very cautious about thinking about it. He knew it would curtail somewhat his own research, and he was even then working on his *Freud in Cambridge* (still to be published). I remember we had a long walk one summer's afternoon, three circuits of Queens Square in London, to discuss the implications and the workload; and after thinking it through, a month later a leisurely lunch in his college in Cambridge. I kind of knew he was keen, but it was a great relief when he did finally commit himself to take on the role.

I was very grateful indeed for his decision, as I knew it would be the making of the journal, which would then be established with his editorship. In the end I was grateful, too, that he had so carefully thought about it, and it left me with confidence that he knew what he was taking on and he believed he could do it well – and mostly perhaps that after careful thought he considered the journal worth taking on. His

gracious style and his careful thought left me with an indelible impression of his stature – and therefore the loss to the field, as well as the loss of a reliable colleague.

Bob Hinshelwood is Professor in the Centre for Psychoanalytic Studies, University of Essex, UK.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03060497.2016.1144682>

John Forrester – reminiscences

Andrew Samuels

University of Essex, Colchester, UK

I first met John at the famous ‘Speculations after Freud’ conference at the end of the 1980s. There was a desultory discussion about mind and body, and he got up and said, ‘I am fed up with Descartes-bashing!’ It was the best kind of intellectual iconoclasm. Not many have the knowledge, standing and Chutzpah to make such interventions.

That is why there is such a sense of sadness about John’s death, as well as the huge recognition and appreciation, personal and professional, that he is receiving. I feel it, and all the colleagues and friends passing the news and talking about him – they feel it too. Reminiscences like this one are bound to be inadequate.

My main memories of John concern the weird and maverick London Psychoanalytic Forum that he and I were on, together with Malcolm Bowie (RIP), Jacqueline Rose and Sonu Shamdasani. What a mix! We had fun. He was wicked. But he was always brilliant. In fact, he was one of the most brilliant people I have known.

This grouping put on some amazing conferences, and I recall one of them delivering a strong collective riposte to Hannah Segal, who was speaking, and to other homophobic psychoanalysts. John was political and hard-nosed about it when he wanted to be.

He was generous, too, and I have some specific memories of this. Asking him for a biblio reference, or for a confirmation of something – he was quick and apropos. Some of his research into little-known aspects of Freud’s life was utterly compelling reading.

And the encouragement he gave to us in the Centre for Psychoanalytic Studies at Essex, including supporting something he was not personally connected to (the Jungian studies components), was essential to getting our Centre going. I always found his comments on Jung and analytical psychology worth listening to, and he had read quite extensively in this area. Hence, in his role as the External Assessor, he fully backed our Jungian Masters degree. At the time, this was not only the only such degree in the world, but was one of the very few places to host critical and informed discussion of Jung.

So – it has been a massive loss on the human and on the scholarly levels.

Andrew Samuels is Professor of Analytical Psychology, University of Essex.
www.andrewsamuels.com
www.mwsamuels.com

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03060497.2016.1155867>