Goethe, Heine, and Schiller could be guilty of brutal atrocities. When the Germans occupied Rostov-on-Don in the summer of 1942, they immediately began massacring Communists, psychiatric patients, and eventually Jews. Spielrein was seen, at the time, heart-broken, galloping toward her family's destruction. When they were murdered, Sabina was 56, her daughter Renata 28, and her daughter Eva 16. Launer (2014) concludes his book with the words, "Blessed be their memory," which is a common Jewish mourning phrase translated from Hebrew.

Launer describes the Spielrein material as a "collection of flickering fragments" from which one can only guess at the whole mosaic. Launer proposes a critical edition of all of Spielrein's writings, diaries, and correspondence, which he believes would make for more fascinating reading than a biographer could ever hope to provide. While Launer's own work is a fascinating read, his proposal deserves support.

***Juhani Ihanus, PhD,*** is an Associate Professor of Cultural Psychology at the University of Helsinki and an Associate Professor of the History of Science and Ideas at the University of Oulu. Dr. Ihanus has published books and articles on psychohistory, cultural and clinical psychology, and the history of psychology. He is also an international member of the Psychohistory Forum. Dr. Ihanus may be reached at juhani.ihanus@helsinki.fi.

**References**

Spielrein, Sabina (1920). On the question of the origin and development of speech. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1*(1), 359-360.

Spielrein, Sabina (2019). Children's drawings with eyes open and closed (Judith Gresh & Pamela Cooper-White, Trans.). In Pamela Cooper-White & Felicity Brock Kelcourse (Eds.), *Sabina Spielrein and the beginning of psychoanalysis* (pp. 295-300). Routledge. (Original work published 1931) ❑

# Echoes, Expansions, and the Beholder's Share: Response to Symposium Responses

**Inna Rozentsvit**—Psychohistory Forum

*Abstract: This "response to the responses" to the symposium article*

*"Women's Voices in Psychoanalysis: Erased or Forgotten" synthesizes the diverse and vital perspectives offered by contributors. These reflections affirm psychohistory as a transdisciplinary field and method, where individual voices, theoretical lenses, and lived experiences—each a unique "beholder's share"—enrich our shared understanding of forgotten or silenced histories of women across generations.*

*Keywords: "beholder's share," erasure phenomenon, feminist critique, marginalization, psychoanalysis, psychohistory, symposium, transdisciplinary, women's issues*

I am deeply grateful to the contributors who engaged so thoughtfully with my symposium article, "Women's Voices in Psychoanalysis: Erased or Forgotten." Each response expands the conversation in meaningful and distinctive ways, underscoring both the complexity and urgency of examining the historical, psychological, and neurobiological dynamics that have shaped the marginalization of women in psychoanalysis and related disciplines. The commentaries, ranging from clinical critique to historical expansion and personal narrative, reveal a plurality of psychohistorical and psychoanalytic lenses through which the erasure and recovery of women's voices can be examined.

Tom Ferraro's response, provocative in tone and scope, underscores the role of systemic structures and cultural momentum in shaping psychoanalytic visibility and success. His critique invites us to reconsider the very metrics by which influence is measured and valued. While I would not frame this as a "race," I appreciate his honesty in naming the tensions that persist in the field, especially regarding recognition, ambition, and gender.

Susanne Bleiberg Seperson's essay widens the lens beyond psychoanalysis into sociology, reminding us that the marginalization of women is not unique to our discipline but part of a broader pattern across intellectual domains. Her invocation of "expanding the canon" is particularly resonant, as it challenges us not only to recover forgotten voices but also to reshape our institutions, curricula, and publishing practices to make lasting space for them.

Dorothea Leicher's contribution roots our discussion in lived experience and community. Her emphasis on the "*tissue of relationships*" that sustain women's intellectual labor resonates with Carol Gilligan's insights into relational self-definition and moral reasoning. Dorothea's insistence on naming and remembering mentors, colleagues, and quiet influences reminds us that lega-

cy is not only about publication but also how we live, listen, and lead.

Juhani Ihanus's very poetic piece serves as a moving testament to Sabina Spielrein's enduring intellectual power. Though not a formal response, his meditation on her inner life and cultural afterlife continues the very work this symposium set out to do: to reanimate voices silenced by circumstance, politics, or neglect.

By synthesizing the insights of these responses, we reaffirm psychohistory as a method enriched by individual experience, theoretical rigor, and relational depth. Together, they demonstrate the rich plurality of lenses through which we conduct psychohistorical inquiry. This diversity of thought, style, and disciplinary perspective reaffirms for me that psychohistory is not a monolith but a transdisciplinary field and method, one that thrives through the integration of psychology, psychoanalysis, history, sociology, neurobiology, the arts, and personal testimony. Each contributor brings a unique "beholder's share" to this collective endeavor, helping to amalgamate a fuller, more inclusive understanding of both individual and collective histories.

Let us continue to listen carefully, not only to the loudest voices but also to those that history almost forgot. They still have much to teach us. I remain grateful to all who joined this conversation, deepening our collective effort to remember, reimagine, and restore the voices of women once consigned to silence.

***Inna Rozentsvit's*** biography can be found on page 143. ❑

**[Editor's Note: Phyllis Chesler's (pp. 222-226) and Paul H. Elovitz' (pp. 164-168) articles are part of this symposium but were moved to more relevant sections of this issue.]**

# Women's Contributions to Psychoanalysis

## Psychohistory's Failure to Attract Enough Women Leaders

**Paul H. Elovitz**—The Psychohistory Forum

*Abstract: The author recounts several events related to psychohistory in which women were shunned or underappreciated. He reflects on his own*