Tadej Troha

On The Primal Scene

HYPNOSIS REVISITED

It is a commonplace in the history of Freudian thought that psychoanalysis proper began at the moment Freud finally abandoned the technique of hypnosis. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that it was Freud himself who in his own account of the history of the psychoanalytic movement set the ground of what was to become a doxa.

> The theory of repression is the cornerstone on which the whole structure of psycho-analysis rests. It is the most essential part of it; and yet it is nothing but a theoretical formulation of a phenomenon which may be observed as often as one pleases if one undertakes an analysis of a neurotic *without resorting to hypnosis*. In such cases one comes across a resistance which opposes the work of analysis and in order to frustrate it pleads a failure of memory. The use of hypnosis was bound to hide this resistance; *the history of psycho-analysis proper, therefore, only begins with the new technique that dispenses with hypnosis*.[1]

Hypnosis, as he put it in another text from the same year, deserves gratitude "for having brought before us single psychical processes

of analysis in an isolated or schematic form," thereby giving "us the courage [...] to create more complicated situations in the analytic treatment."[2] In this perspective, the transition from the one to the other technique appears completely linear. The new technique would not only prove to be an improvement over the failures of hypnosis. It could at the same time be seen as a further development of the latter, one that assumed all of its essential objectives and thus allowed Freud to leave the archaic, undeveloped stage in the past.

There is, however, an alternative line of thought present in Freud's texts, one in which hypnosis keeps reappearing, reminding Freud of the fact that the development of psychoanalytic theory is just as non-linear as the development of the psyche of his patients. In its most condensed form, it is given in 'Analysis Terminable and Interminable':

> Hypnotic influence seemed to be an excellent instrument for our purposes; but the reasons for our having to abandon it are well known. No substitute for hypnosis has yet been found.[3]

It is quite telling that this remark relates to Freud's very last great case history, precisely the one we would expect to display the accomplished stage of the new technique. The case that should have become the ultimate proof of its effectiveness proved to be a demonstration of its inherent hazard – the hazard of becoming static, of closing itself, of turning itself inward.

According to Freud, the patient "remained for a long time unassailably entrenched behind an attitude of 'obliging apathy'. He listened, understood, and remained unapproachable." As the Wolf-Man himself put it in his memoires, he "felt [himself] less as a patient than as a co-worker, the younger comrade of an experienced explorer setting out to study a new, recently discovered land."[4] The patient was obviously convinced that he was part of an unbinding theoretical dialogue, an equal partner in what he conceived of as scientific communication. However, the Wolf-Man failed to notice that the other partner in the dialogue had already disappeared and mutated into a mere material support of his own *objet a*. The effects of transference therefore manifested only after Freud's additional gesture, i.e. after his announcement that he would bring to a close the apparent dialogue to eliminate the remaining minimum of his own personal presence.

> I determined – but not until trustworthy signs had led me to judge that the right moment had come – that the treatment must be brought to an end at a particular fixed date, no matter how far it had advanced. I was resolved to keep to the date; and eventually the patient came to see that I was in earnest. Under the inexorable pressure of this fixed limit his resistance and his fixation to the illness gave way, and now in a disproportionately short time the analysis produced all the material which made it possible to clear up his inhibitions and remove his symptoms. All the information, too, which enabled me to understand his infantile neurosis is derived from this last period of the work, during which resistance temporarily disappeared and the patient gave an impression of lucidity which is usually attainable only in hypnosis.[5]

Here, Freud suggests a somewhat unexpected analogy between the brand-new technical measure and the old, long abandoned technique – which, also, seemed to find a way to bypass the resistance and to isolate the pure historical cause of the present condition. However, there is an important difference between the two. In hypnosis, the absence of resistance was limited to the state of hypnosis itself, while in the second case, the absence produces a situation which is much more difficult to keep under control; for the latter is, in principle, interminable – despite the disappearance of the resistance being only temporary.

Freud was certainly aware of the contrast, so the analogy amounts not to the absence of resistance as such but to the lucidity that emerged as a result of this opening and which not only relates to an unexpected ability to reproduce the past cause – like it did in hypnosis – but also pertains to the continuous production of the material in the present. It is worth repeating that the decision to determine the fixed time limit by which analysis would end was based on previously establishing and managing the transference. Whereas hypnosis functioned as an auxiliary technique, as an instrument of treatment that was substantially isolated from the treatment as such, transference expands over the whole treatment and can be thought of as co-extensive with the analytic situation, or better, as its organisational principle. In this view, the history of psychoanalysis begins with the abandonment of hypnosis; the history of psychoanalysis proper, however, is nothing but the process of conceptualising the transference.

With the Freudian sequence of this history being condensed in the five great case histories, it is hardly surprising that the problem of

transference already appears in the first case, in 'Dora'. However, it is crucial to note that its recognition and theorisation appears as belated, only in the postscript, as a theoretical compensation for Freud's practical oversight: "I did not succeed in mastering the transference in good time," Freud admits.

> "Owing to the readiness with which Dora put one part of the pathogenic material at my disposal during the treatment, I neglected the precaution of looking out for the first signs of transference, which was being prepared in connection with another part of the same material a part of which I was in ignorance."[6]

It was, in fact, not Dora herself but the transference that was one step ahead of Freud at this point – and it was precisely this delay that Freud was eager to prevent in the later analyses. The almost triumphant tone that accompanied his description of setting the fixed time limit in the Wolf-Man case could thus be explained by his belief in finally being able to master the transference and himself being the one to use transference as the means to bring the analysis to conclusion. Considering this, it is quite telling that the 'heroic gesture' is in fact an almost verbatim reproduction of Dora's words in the last session:

> She opened the third session with these words: 'Do you know that I am here for the last time today?' – 'How can I know, as you have said nothing to me about it?' – 'Yes. I made up my mind to put up with it till the New Year. But I shall wait no longer than that to be cured.' – 'You know that you are free to stop the treatment at any time. But for today we will go on with our work.[7]

The heroic gesture of fixing the time limit is therefore an invention of Freud's first great case history. In his first reaction to the given ultimatum, Freud still managed to keep up with his position. Later in the session, however, the plural pronoun "we" he used in his response was increasingly revealed to be nothing but a wishful phantasy. The more the session approached the end, the longer Freud's interventions were becoming, and finally it was in fact him 'going on with their work'. The end of the analysis is thus a full-page long and almost comical monologue that attempts to provide a convincing interpretation of what Dora's illness was about. To give an extract, it goes like this:

> May you not have thought that [...]. And that now he [...]. But you told me yourself [...] So you too wanted to wait for him [...]. I imagine that this [...]. You have not even got the right to assert [...]. After all, you did not let him finish his speech [...]. And I think that is why [...]. So it must have been [...]. You will agree that [...]. I know now – and this is what you do not want to be reminded of – that you did fancy that Herr K.'s proposals were serious, and that he would not leave off until you had married him.[8i]

One could well argue that it was precisely this ending that pushed Freud towards recognising the significance of 'transferences' (transference then still being a plural concept) as the "inevitable necessity" of any analytic situation. "It is easy," Freud argues, "to learn how to interpret dreams, to extract from the patient's associations his unconscious thoughts and memories, and to practise similar explanatory arts: for these the patient himself will always provide the text." Transference, however, is the segment of the analytic situation that first has to be detected, or better, which first has to be constructed as an object.

> Nevertheless, transference cannot be evaded, since use is made of it in setting up all the obstacles that make the material inaccessible to treatment, and since it is only after the transference has been resolved that a patient arrives at a sense of conviction of the validity of the connections which have been constructed during the analysis.[9]

At this early stage of theory, the conviction of the validity can only be arrived at after the transference has been resolved. Transference, strictly speaking, is thus nothing but an instrument for establishing new connections, whereas the conviction itself is a function of the external situation. In contrast, the later notion of analytic construc-

i Dora's response translated comedy into a melodrama: "Dora had listened to me without any of her usual contradictions. She seemed to be moved; she said goodbye to me very warmly, with the heartiest wishes for the New Year, and – came no more." (Ibid. 108-9) – And as is well known, the melodrama repeated itself as a *Witz*: "On a date which is not a matter of complete indifference, on the first of April (times and dates, as we know, were never without significance for her), Dora came to see me again: to finish her story and to ask for help once more. One glance at her face, however, was enough to tell me that she was not in earnest over her request." (Ibid. 120-1)

tion is precisely an attempt to think transference and construction as homologous: transference is itself already a construction, the construction is internal to transference, its internal repetition, and consequently, the conviction of its validity can only appear from within the transference.

THE 'ULTRA-CLEAR' RECOLLECTIONS

The general Freudian response to the question of the validity of the analytic construction is well known. The patient's 'yes' counts only if it is given indirectly, only if it is followed by an immediate acceleration of the production of new memories that supplement and expand the construction. However, in the last part of the 1937 'Construction in Analysis' paper he adds some remarks "which open up a wider perspective":

> I have been struck by the manner in which, in certain analyses, the communication of an obviously apt construction has evoked in the patients a surprising and at first incomprehensible phenomenon. They have had lively recollections called up in them – which they themselves have described as 'ultra-clear' – but what they have recollected has not been the event that was the subject of the construction but details relating to that subject. For instance, they have recollected with abnormal sharpness the faces of the people involved in the construction or the rooms in which something of the sort might have happened, or, a step further away, the furniture in such rooms – on the subject of which the construction had naturally no possibility of any knowledge.[10]

To this remark we should add some further remarks. Firstly, the opening of a wider perspective should not be understood separately from his general response. This "surprising and at first incomprehensible phenomenon" is only the most extreme version of the indirect confirmation. Secondly, the patients' description of recollections as "ultra-clear", überdeutlich, is not simply a predicate of these recollections, but rather signifies the impossibility of giving any substantial predicate. Thirdly, it is obvious that Freud himself is not convinced of how to evaluate these phenomena.

> These recollections have themselves led to nothing further and it has seemed plausible to regard them as the product of a compro-

> mise. The 'upward drive' of the repressed, stirred into activity by the putting forward of the construction, has striven to carry the important memory-traces into consciousness; but a resistance has succeeded, not, it is true, in stopping that movement, but in displacing it on to adjacent objects of minor significance.[11]

This judgment nevertheless holds true only if taken in the register of interpretation. In order to grasp the excess of their significance over the meaning, or better, in order to express the *je-ne-sais-quoi* of these phenomena, Freud opts for another discursive strategy. In line with his usual procedure when faced with phenomena that he feels cannot be adequately represented in the usual scientific fashion, he introduces an analogy.

> These recollections might have been described as hallucinations if a belief in their actual presence had been added to their clearness. The importance of this analogy seemed greater when I noticed that true hallucinations occasionally occurred in the case of other patients who were certainly not psychotic.[12]

When he yields to this line of thought, this leads him to the question of whether hallucinations themselves might perhaps relate to an actual event in the patient's earliest childhood, so that "there [would] not only [be] method in madness, as the poet has already perceived, but also a fragment of historical truth." However, we should perhaps steer this line of thought in the other direction and contaminate 'normality' with the elements of psychosis. In this sense, the 'ultra-clarity' of the recollections itself, which cannot be interpreted or taken as a sign of belief, can be taken as an intra-mnemonic hallucination, which bears witness to another subject within the subject – not to the subject of belief in the reality of memory, but to the subject of the certainty of its current presence. Although the patient is well aware that what it concerns is a memory of a past event, he perceives the recollection as factual, as if it were occurring in the present. And it is precisely the certainty thereof, the sense of reality, which is of another order, unattainable by conventional memory. These recollections affirm the construction – however, not by adding new content, but by repeating its very formal mechanism. And as far as we hold to the hypothesis that construction is an inner repetition of transference, we seem to be faced with a series of paradoxical formations that have three features

in common: it is impossible to determine their author/agent; it is impossible to install them in the frame of linear time, they are simultaneously in the present and in the past (perhaps this is the ultimate meaning of Freud's 'timelessness' of the unconscious); and their mode of existence is repetition.

AFTERWARDSNESS REDOUBLED

How, then, are we to understand the primal scene from the Wolf-Man case from this perspective? The primal scene was constructed – by both the analyst and the analysand – on the basis of a dream that occurred at the age of four and which, again, was marked by the same lasting "sense of reality" we have just discussed and which, according to Freud's dream theory, attests "to an occurrence that really took place and was not merely imagined." The dream of the wolves sitting on the tree actually plays a double role: on the one hand, the analysis of the dream triggers the emergence of the construction in the course of the treatment; on the other hand, the dream is not simply a recollection of the primal scene, but the means of its activation.[ii]

Freud's discovery of this double causal link between the dream and the primal scene corresponds to, or is a consequence of, his decision, in the published record of the treatment, to focus exclusively on the *infantile* neurosis – despite the fact that the material at his disposal could only have been the Wolf-Man's current condition, which, in turn, was "to be regarded as a condition following on an obsessional neurosis which has come to an end spontaneously, but has left a defect behind it after recovery." To put it differently, the current condition had no autonomous determination, but was essentially a *Folgezustand nach einer spontan abgelaufenen, mit Defekt ausgeheilten Zwangsneurose*, a sequela of the infantile neurosis, i.e. a further complication that followed its faulty recovery. The instalment of retroactivity (*Nachträglichkeit*, 'afterwardsness') as the inner momentum of the primal scene nicely demonstrates Freud's break with his views in the period of cathartic treatment, presented in *Studies on Hysteria*. While the cathartic

ii "We shall further bear in mind that the activation of this scene (I purposely avoid the word 'recollection') had the same effect as though it were a recent experience. The effects of the scene were deferred, but meanwhile it had lost none of its freshness in the interval between the ages of one and a half and four years. We shall perhaps find in what follows reason to suppose that it produced certain effects even at the time of its perception, that is, from the age of one and a half onwards." (Freud 2001 (1918b): 44-5)

treatment aimed at intervening in linear causality by erasing the effects of the original trauma, the analytic construction – as the means of intervening into retroactivity – argues for the absolutely binding and irrevocable character of the *intrinsically retroactive* trauma.

The retroactive character of the primal scene "in the interval between the ages of one and a half and four years" is fully recognisable in the following sentences:

> What was essentially new for him in his *observation* of his parents' intercourse was the conviction of the reality of castration – a possibility with which his thoughts had already been occupied *previously*. (The sight of the two girls micturating, his Nanya's threat, the governess' interpretation of the sugar-sticks, the recollection of his father having beaten a snake to pieces.) For now, he saw with his own eyes the wound of which his Nanya had spoken, and understood that its presence was a necessary condition of intercourse with his father.[13]

While other parts of the text seem to imply that the primal scene is split between the *observation* of coitus and its deferred understanding at the age of four, in this case observation itself adopts a retroactive quality. All the events Freud listed in brackets happened after the scene took place, but logically precede the observation. The paradox is that the "reality of castration" chronologically precedes possibility: by observing the event at the age of one and a half, the Wolf-Man recognises the reality of castration, the possibility with which his thoughts had already been occupied *previously* – but in fact later. To put it in speculative terms: in the register of the primal scene, *reality* is a condition of the possibility of *possibility*.

In this perspective, two further elements from the analysis are of major significance. One can recall that at one moment in the period before the introduction of the primal scene, a memory of the seduction by his sister emerged, which Freud interpreted as an event that offered the patient a passive sexual aim. The obvious reading of this event as one disturbing the linear development, supposedly aiming at

the active sexual aim, seems entirely plausible.[iii] Its role, however, is more ambiguous. It seems, namely, that we should view his seduction by his sister as the affirmation of his already passive attitude in observing the primal scene. This allows Freud to locate the derailment of the patient's sexual development already in the primal scene, which he defines – in line with its retroactive character – as the *second* seduction:

> [The sexual development of the patient] was first decisively influenced by the seduction, and was then diverted by the scene of observation of the coitus, which in its deferred action operated like a second seduction.[14]

It appears then that the observation of the scene is essentially passive. However, towards the end of the treatment – i.e. after the time limit has been determined – a "kind of recollection" emerged from a very early age, "timidly and indistinctly,"[15] of a nursery-maid, which soon produced a proper recollection of a scene of the maid, Grusha, "kneeling on the floor, and beside her a pail and a short broom made of a bundle of twigs; he was also there, and she was teasing him or scolding him."[16] The further material, produced in the analysis, "fitted together spontaneously"[17] and filled in the gaps: her scolding was the threat of castration, reacting to him having micturated on the floor. Freud's analytic translation, moreover, provides a significant turn of perspective regarding the primal scene:

> When he saw the girl on the floor engaged in scrubbing it, and kneeling down, with her buttocks projecting and her back horizontal, he was faced once again with the posture which his mother had assumed in the copulation scene. She became his mother to him; he was seized with sexual excitement owing to the activation of this picture; and, like his father (whose action he can only have regarded at the time as micturition), he behaved in a

iii "But his seduction gives the impression not merely of having encouraged his sexual development but of having, to an even greater extent, disturbed and diverted it. It offered him a passive sexual aim, which was ultimately incompatible with the action of his male genital organ. At the first external obstacle, the threat of castration from his Nanya, his genital organization, half-hearted as it still was, broke down (at the age of three and a half) and regressed to the stage which had preceded it, namely to that of the sadistic-anal organization, which he might otherwise have passed through, perhaps, with as slight indications as other children." (Ibid. 108)

> masculine way towards her. [...] The action of the two-and-a-half-year-old boy in the scene with Grusha is the earliest effect of the primal scene which has come to our knowledge. It represents him as copying his father, and shows us a tendency towards development in a direction which would later deserve the name of masculine.[18]

Still, if the action (*Aktion*) in the scene with Grusha is the first effect of the primal scene, it is by no means its realisation – it is, strictly speaking, not an effect of the primal scene we have been discussing, i.e. the one that was activated at the age of four. It might be that this recollection served Freud as confirmation of the reality of the primal scene. However, such "active" interpretation of the scene (where the observer sees himself as the seducer-to-be) is just as insufficient as its 'passive' counterpart.

In the specific case of the Wolf-Man, a patient marked by strongly ambivalent character traits, the primal scene itself had to be "structured like the Wolf-Man." According to Freud, the patient's psyche was characterised by three fundamental traits: a) "his tenacity of fixation," b) "his extraordinary propensity to ambivalence," and c) "his power of maintaining simultaneously the most various and contradictory libidinal cathexes, all of them capable of functioning side by side".[19] In order to produce a material record of the formation of the subject's disposition, then, the primal scene had to be structured in such a way that it corresponded to the above-mentioned traits – yet in a different register. The Wolf-Man's tenacity of fixation found its echo in the inherent retroactivity (or better, *Nachträglichkeit*, "afterwardsness") inscribed within the primal scene itself. His propensity to ambivalence was presented as originating in the more structural ambivalence of the active and the passive. And lastly, his ability to simultaneously maintain the contradictory libidinal cathexes turned out to be a consequence of the oscillation between identification with the father and the mother in observing the primal scene. It is, again, crucial to keep in mind that the primal scene is a construction, and is, as such, essentially resistant to any interpretation. Yet this feature is nothing but another expression of its ability to capture the peculiarities of the case, which "were revealed by the psycho-analytic treatment but were not further elucidated."

No further clarification is possible: theory has reached its limit, and in the capacity of 'producing the impression' only analogies can come close to the construction. According to Freud, the last fundamental trait of the patient's psyche – or better, the 'trinity' of all three fundamental traits – belongs to "the general character of the unconscious, which in his case had persisted into processes that had become conscious."[20] Not only is the unconscious of the Wolf-Man unconscious – even the conscious part of his psyche acts in accordance with the same principles:

> So it was that his mental life impressed one in much the same way as the religion of Ancient Egypt, which is so unintelligible to us because it preserves the earlier stages of its development side by side with the end-products, retains the most ancient gods and their attributes along with the most modern ones, and thus, as it were, spreads out upon a two-dimensional surface [*in eine Fläche ausbreitet*] what other instances of evolution show us in the solid [*zu einem Tiefengebilde wird*].[21]

The essence of the Wolf-Man can only be described with the ultimate analogy, the one encompassing the unconscious as such. Considering the magnitude of this claim, it is hardly surprising that Freud tries to relativise the analogy, reducing it such that it related merely to the affective dimension of the patient's psychic apparatus, while "in the region of pure logic he betrayed, on the contrary, a peculiar skill in unearthing contradictions and inconsistencies."[22]

The attempt to relativise its scope, however, is compensated for by yet another analogy. In the very last paragraphs, after he had already reached the end of what he had to say about the case, Freud offers an analogy, which seems to serve him as the universal correlate to the former, to the one that articulated the pure singularity of the case.

> If one considers the behaviour of the four-year-old child towards the re-activated primal scene, or even if one thinks of the far simpler reactions of the one-and-a-half-year-old child when the scene was actually experienced, it is hard to dismiss the view that some sort of hardly definable knowledge, something, as it were, preparatory to an understanding, was at work in the child at the time. We can form no conception of what this may have

> consisted in; we have nothing at our disposal but the single analogy – and it is an excellent one – of the far-reaching instinctive knowledge of animals.[23]

Above, we have already shown that the construction is able to produce an ultra-clear recollection of a sort comparable to hallucination. Moreover, another analogy – the one we presented at the beginning – demonstrated the proximity of the reaction to the setting of the time limit and the state produced by the long-abandoned technique of hypnosis. The latter analogy, however, proves to be more than coincidental. Let us recall the passage from the *Introductory Lectures* in which Freud draws attention to the problem brought by the local liberation of the material from resistances occurring in hypnosis:

> That state was precisely able to withhold the existence of the resistance from the doctor's perception. It pushed the resistance back, making a certain area free for analytic work, and dammed it up at the frontiers of that area in such a way as to be impenetrable, just as doubt does in obsessional neurosis.[24]

A very similar metaphor appears once again in 'Analysis Terminable and Interminable', relating precisely to the Wolf-Man case. The success of the employment of the "heroic measure" of fixing the time limit, now called the "blackmailing device," proved to be an illusion. The "shrinking up" of his resistances, Freud writes,

> …cannot guarantee to accomplish the task completely. On the contrary, we may be sure that, while part of the material will become accessible under the pressure of the threat, another part will be kept back and thus become buried, as it were, and lost to our therapeutic efforts.[25]

While the first metaphor shows how avoiding the resistance in hypnosis deceives us as to the insistence of resistance – as it was dammed up at the frontiers and hence ceased to function as resistance, the second metaphor makes a further point. The subject in question is no longer resistance to the material but the fate of the material itself. Again, in the first metaphor the material condensed itself in the resistance-free area, and nevertheless remained "whole" – despite being falsely articulated, while in the second metaphor a certain part of the material be-

comes buried and lost for good. In the first case the loss is provisional and temporary, still allowing for a proper articulation at some future point; in the second case, it becomes irreversible. Some part of the material is *verschüttet*, remains 'blocked', 'entombed', 'buried alive' – and will only appear as 'spilling' over the other part of the material, thus 'overwhelming' the entire psyche.

This view finds support in a further metaphor. We have already called attention to Freud's understanding of the patient's current neurosis as *Folgezustand*, as the secondary complication of the provisional recovery. When he returned to the case in 'Analysis Terminable and Interminable', he already knew that his former view of the case was over-optimistic.

> The patient has stayed on in Vienna and has kept a place in society, if a humble one. But several times during this period his good state of health has been interrupted by attacks of illness which could only be construed as offshoots of his perennial neurosis. Thanks to the skill of one of my pupils, Dr. Ruth Mack Brunswick, a short course of treatment has on each occasion brought these conditions to an end. [...] Some of these attacks were still concerned with residual portions of the transference; and, where this was so, short-lived though they were, they showed a distinctly paranoid character. In other attacks, however, the pathogenic material consisted of pieces of the patient's childhood history, which had not come to light while I was analysing him and which now came away – the comparison is unavoidable – like sutures after an operation, or small fragments of necrotic bone. I have found the history of this patient's recovery scarcely less interesting than that of his illness.[26]

The perennial neurosis and its offshoots, residual portions of transference, pieces of childhood history, tearing like small fragments of necrotic bone: here, Freud manages to summarise all three phases of the case (the childhood neurosis and its sequela, the treatment and the recovery from the treatment itself), which find embodiment in strange objects that are at the same time necrotic and buried alive, dead and undead.

However, it would be false to interpret this outcome as the product of constructing the primal scene, but rather of Freud's attempt to use the primal scene as an instrument to bring the analysis to a

definite end. Should he rather withdraw from making another step? Should he rather recognise the primal scene – the singularity of the most singular case – as the only possible form of the "independent existence of the scheme" that he is searching for in the field of phylogenetics? Perhaps he should simply affirm the patient's subjectivisation of the primal scene in all its ambivalence and resist the temptation to impose on the Wolf-Man its 'active' or 'passive' interpretation. Instead of forcing the end, Freud should perhaps do what was even more unexpected and even less in line with his standard procedures. Perhaps he should go a step further in imitating Dora and quit the analysis himself, thus forcing the patient to contemplate the only image that he – otherwise a painter, drawing landscapes and still lifes – produced collectively, in the analysis, together with Freud.

---

1 Freud 2001 (1914d): 16
2 Freud 2001 (1914g): 148
3 Freud 2001 (1937c): 230
4 Gardiner 1973: 158
5 Freud 2001 (1918b): 11
6 Freud 2001 (1905e): 118
7 Ibid. 105
8 Ibid. 107–8.
9 Ibid., 116.
10 Freud 2001 (1937d): 266
11 Ibid., emphasis added
12 Ibid. 266-7
13 Freud 2001 (1918b): 45-6, emphasis added
14 Ibid. 47
15 Ibid. 90
16 Ibid. 91
17 Ibid. 92
18 Ibid. 92-4
19 Ibid. 118-9
20 Ibid. 119
21 Ibid.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid. 120
24 Freud 2001 (1916–1917): 292
25 Freud 2001 (1937c): 218
26 Ibid.

LITERATURE

Freud, Sigmund: "Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria", in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* VII. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis 2001 (1905e)

Freud, Sigmund: "On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement", in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* XIV. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis 2001 (1914d)

Freud, Sigmund: "Remembering, Repeating and Working-Through", in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* XII. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis 2001 (1914g)

Freud, Sigmund *Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis (Part III)*, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* XVI. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis 2001 (1916–17)

Freud, Sigmund: "From the History of an Infantile Neurosis", in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* XVII. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis 2001 (1918b)

Freud, Sigmund: "Analysis Terminable and Interminable", in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* XXIII. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis 2001 (1937c)

Freud, Sigmund: "Constructions in Analysis", in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* XXIII. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis 2001 (1937d)

Gardiner, Muriel (ed.) *The Wolf-Man and Sigmund Freud*, Penguin 1973