

A FREUD'S DREAM ANALYSIS

THE FATHER, A REMARKABLE MAN?

S. Parmentier

Sabine Parmentier
Ph.D.,
Espace analytique, Paris

Abstract: In a letter to Fliess, Freud speaks about his father, as a character which has nothing in common. Though, the dreams and most particularly “my father as Garibaldi, point out under an elevated image, some very low, vulgar, scurrilous, even filthy thought. The comparison especially with Marie-Therese, associates him to a “wench”. The Latin formula of the dream “*Moriamur pro rege nostro*” compresses the entire ambivalence on which is built this dream.

Key words: death, dream, father, son, saddles, self-analysis, subjective approach of analyst and of the analysant.

In the foreword of the second edition of *Traumdeutung*, from 1908, Freud states: “For me this book has another signification, a subjective signification, which I didn’t know until the work was finished. I understood that it was a piece of my self-analysis, my reaction at my father’s death, the event the most important, the loss the most heart-rending of a man’s life” (1). At that time, Freud had not lost yet any children and no other relatives except his brother, who died at a small age and which appears in some of the dreams from *Traumdeutung*. His reaction at the death of his daughter Sophie, his “Sunday child”, and then at the death of his grandson Heinerle is well known: “Beyond the pleasure principle” reflects this.

Freud was the first whom used the term of self-analysis, as well as he was the first who concluded that this thing was impossible. There are some extracts from the letters to Fliess, regarding this subject: “That of my patients whom preoccupies me most is my self (...) this analysis is the most difficult than any other one and it is that which paralyses my power to expose and to communicate the notions already acquired”(2).

His attitude regarding his own analysis varied with the difficulties, passing by exaltation moments, as the one from the 3-rd october 97: “Till four days my self-analysis, that I consider as indispensable at the understanding of all the problems, is going on even in my dreams and provides me the evidences and the informations the most valuable” (3) , or that from the 15-th october: “My self-analysis is really what is for the moment the essential and promises to have the highest importance for me” (4); or from the 31-st october, “I can’t give you any idea of the intellectual beauty of this work” (5).

We all, we have met in our analysis moments like this; and also the moments of depression, of uncertainty and acute inhibition, like that of which Freud speaks in the letter from 25-th juin 97: “Never I was hit by such an intellectual paralysis. Moreover I suffered a kind of neurosis. Strange states which the unconscious could not perceive (...) It appears to me to be like in a cocoon. God knows what beast will go out” (6).

What is sure is that the death of the father the 23-rd october 1896 played an important role in Freud’s self-analysis. Otherwise, the dreams of the father dead are numerous in the Traumdeutung and their analysis is dispersed all the long of the book. In the letter from the 26-th October 96 he writes to Fliess: “Yesterday we have burried my old father in the night of 23-rd. Till the finish he showed himself the remarkable man that he always was” (7).

Let’s examine this last affirmation. Among the dead father dreams, there is one – the unic – which was supplemented at each edition. It is the dream “my father as Garibaldi” or in other words “my father, this hero”:

”My father played, after his death, a political role to the Magyars; he united them politically. I see here a little picture, rather distinct: a crowd as in Reichstag; a person standing in front of them on one or two chairs (Stuhl), others people around. I remember that on his death bed he was very resemblant to Garibaldi and I was happy that this promise was accomplished” (8).

This dream is first presented like an absurde dream and is followed by a taking up of the interpretation of count Thun’s dream which finished on the criticism which rouse in a child as a reaction to the paternal authority. The dream comment is than taking up to illustrate the problem of intellectual work in the dreams. Freud mentions than, by the way of satisfaction sentiment that his second son to whom he gave the name of “an illustrious historic charcater” – a feature of megalomania but also a kind to say “I was a better father than my father” – Oliver soiled his swaddling clothes (9). It is not the only cause of the dream: in the letter to Fliess from 9-th december 99, Freud writes this: “Two of my patients have reproached themselves the cares that they gave to their parents and the death of them, showing to me in this way that my dreams at this subject are typical. In cases like this, the reproaches result from a desire of revenge, from the joy of the happened dammages, from the satisfaction provoked by the excretion difficulties (urine and faeces) of the invalids. An angle indeed unknown by the psychism”(10).

The father on one or two chairs (Stuhl) makes us to think to “Struhlrichter” judge of jury. The father was a judge very severe for his son all the long of his life: not only he warned him against the “prostitutes” – which is equivalent with an interdiction – but he took himself advantages from the life, because he had at least three women. Freud met Martha in 1882 and he will marry her finally in 1886. He has thirty years. In 1895, after nine years of marriage, was born their sixth child, despite all the cautions that he could take (coitus interruptus, coitus reservatus) about which is so much matter in the papers of 1895 and 1896. These practices are otherwise

unpleasant and anxiogene, the first sources of the present neurosis, in our days disappeared – thanks to the appearance of the contraception. Freud was the supporter of a simple and efficacious contraception allowing a normal sexual life to the young people.

But, to return to the facts, the couple takes in 1895 the decision of not procreating anymore. Freud, who lived 82 years, benefited from a sexual life of 9 years. In another dream of dead father (August, 1898), the dream of Count Thun, we see appearing the mockery not only about the paternal interdiction regarding the prostitutes' frequentation but also regarding the author of the threat, the father himself, whom after benefiting from the life, prohibited this for his son. The lack of respect towards the father hid already behind the pious figure another, licentious and pleasure-loving.

The first paragraph that Freud adds to the commentary of this dream "my father as Garibaldi" dates from 1909. It is about that on the thought "if the father was living, what did he say?" He has not the right to judge anyone, because himself took the part of pleasure from the life during his existence.

Freud adds a last paragraph in 1919 on the indifference of the dreamer which is the figuration in the dream of his ambivalence. Between the two, he attached in 1911 the following paragraph: "... a man whom took care of his ill father and who has a lot suffered at his death, has, a few times after this death, the following absurd dream: his father was again living and spoke to him as usually, but, strange thing, he was dead though and he didn't know this. We can understand this dream if after "he was dead though" we add "as a consequence of the dreamer's wish" and after "he didn't know this" we add "because the dreamer made this desire". The son had, during the time that he took care of his father, wished frequently his death; more exactly he had this charitable thought: "The death could make a finish to his suffering". During the mourning that followed, unconsciously he reproached himself this desire dictated by the compassion, as if by this he really contributed to shorten the patient's life.

The wakening of the infantile tendencies against the father allows the expression of this reproach under the form of a dream, but just the total opposition between the source of the dream and the thought of the wakeful nights could make this dream absurd” (11).

It must be explained another element of the dream: the Magyars. The Kingdom of Hungary passed, in that moment, through a very acute political crisis. Freud lived in “a country for genius” made by a multitude of inconceivable contradictions. Like Musil wrote in “The man without quality”: “About this Cacanica (12) now swallowed, how many curious things could be said! (...) The constitution was liberal but the regime was clerical. The regime was clerical but the inhabitants were free thinking people. All the bourgeois were equal in front of the law, but not all the people were bourgeois. The parliament made from its liberty an usage so impetuous that it was preferable to keep it closed; but there was also an exception law which allowed to ignore the parliament; and each time that the entire State was prepared to enjoy the benefits of the absolutism, the Crown decreed that the society will begin to live under a parliamentary regime. Between other many singularities of the same kind, it must be mentioned also the national altercations (...) These altercations were so violent that the State machine stopped many times in a year because of that; but in these intervals and the rest of the State, each one managed itself as good as he could, and all the people were reacting like nothing was wrong” (13). The Hungarian crisis created really just such a moment, a between two of the power, to which the citizens accommodate themselves without any problems.

This crisis was owed to a systematic parliamentary obstruction which had touched a kind of legality suspension: in 1875 the chief of the Radical-nationalist Party, Koloman Tisza became prime minister and with the aid of his finance minister Koloman Szell, had reestablished the economic situation. But the emperor who was also king of Hungary imposed in 1885, as prime minister the baron Deszo Banffy, a member of the Governmental Party. Even

he was the President of the deputies chamber – or maybe because of it – Banffy meet a systematic opposition and he finished by fighting in a duel with an opposition deputy. After his resignation, Koloman Szell will become the new prime minister. The second Christian names of Freud father was Koloman. Moreover, Szell is pronounced as the french “selles” (Stuhl).

In fact, the Freud father suffered from a total intestinal obstruction the last weeks before his death. This is, says Freud, the point of departure from “all kind of irreverent thoughts”: the reminiscence of a story said by a college comrade who lost his father dead in the street and whom, after he was brought home and undressed, let the people see that he had a stool (Stuhl), after his death. It must also be remembered that Freud, and often the analysts after him, speaks about him through his patients – here is the reminiscence of an old story in relation with the situation lived by Freud himself. The thought of the dream is more base than the figuration do not shows.

The dream is built on this opposition between the elevated images and the base thoughts which they cover: the intestinal obstruction that suffered the father before his death become the parliamentary obstruction of the deputies, worried to defend their liberties: the incapacity of the father to manage his business in an acceptable manner is disguised under the mask of the heroic founder of the modern Italy; the contradictions between the latent thoughts and the manifest figuration are those of Austria itself, which named it as Austro- Hungarian monarchy, but which all the world named Austria.

“The little picture” is in fact an engraving from an illustrated Austria history and which shows Maria-Therese ahead of the Presbourg Diet that made Freud associate this to the scene of “*Moriamur pro rege nostro*”.

A plunging in the history of the Saint Empire Romano-Germanic which fell down in 1804 under the napoleonic knocks, which was named The Austrian Empire till 1876 when it became The Austro-Hungarian Empire, is needed here. At the beginning of the XVIII-th century, in 1711 took place an event which will change the configuration of the Europe for three

centuries: the emperor Joseph the first, died suddenly after only four years of reign, leaving behind him as heiresses two girls in low age. The elector from the Saint Empire turned over his brother Charles who became emperor, had an only purpose for forty years of reign, but to which he subordinated his entire politics: to ensure the indivisible succession of the State, divided between his daughter Maria-Tereza and the successors in direct line. He gave an edict in 1713 The Pragmatic Sanction which he made signed during his life by the Big Electors, whom engaged themselves to choose as emperor the husband of Maria-Tereza, Francis Stephen duke of Lorraine: the imperial crown, couldn't go to a woman, remained nevertheless in the family. The agreement signed was not an obstacle for Frederick the II-nd of Prussia and also for the electors from Saxony and Bavaria to dispute the imperial crown to Maria-Tereza, immediately after the death of the emperor, during the succession war of Austria (1740-1748). Due to the help of the Presbourg Diet, Maria-Tereza succeeds to reject the invaders. Though, the Hungarians were more than the rest of the empire in the impossibility to choose Maria-Tereza empress and queen of Hungary (traditionally the emperor was chosen also king of Hungary). Indeed, if the imperial crown couldn't go to a woman was a simple habit, while the crown of Saint Stephen- the crown of Hungary – was submitted to the salic law which removed the women from the succession and the Hungarians were very severe at this subject. We understand here the first meaning of the formula "Moriatur pro rege nostro": the death rather than to choose a woman. And in the same time the Hungarians solved the problem of the succession in a more subtle and elegant way than the rest of the Empire: because they could not choose Maria Tereza, the legitimate heiress, as queen, they will choose her as KING, making in this way a distinction between the symbolic body of the king – always man, as the libido to Freud – from the real body, incarnated in a woman. This is the second meaning of the formula "Moriatur pro rege nostro, Maria-Tereza". The succession war of Austria and the help of Hungarians during it will finish to

the creation of the German Empire in a hand, and of the double monarchy in the other hand, with all the consequences which followed: the creation of the national States supported by Napoleon III-rd, the war from 1914, the Third Reich etc.

Maria-Tereza was a great empress and a great king, one of those enlightened tyrants of the XVIII-th century whom did a lot of things to transform the world that they enherited, between others the recognition of the citizens equality in front of the law, indifferent of their religion. That fact permits to Freud, some hundreds of years after, to make his studies in medicine. It is what, till than and until our days, put each Juish in front of a choice to make: to integrate himself with the price of the renouncement to the religion of his fathers, or to exclude himself, to close on the religious community.

If we are pursuing the opposition between the elevated images and the base thoughts which they cover: the comparison between Maria-Tereza and the father of Freud is not in the favour of the last one: the father is nothing but a “little female – see the episod with the cap throwed in the mud – a coward, who not only that he didn’t realised anything, and didn’t do anything great, but who, at the finish of his life, behave himself as the little Oliver whom soiled his swadling clothes. The only throne which he had was that of a child which makes his needs.

The double meaning of the formula “Moriatur pro rege nostro” on which Freud makes associations, compresse in its own the double sense on which all the dream is built.

In the comment he made on the dream of anatomic preparation, Freud writes: “in the dream a strange task was given to me by the old Brucke: to prepare my own basin, I do not feel the horror which must be tied to this operation. This is a realisation of a desire from more than a point of view. The preparation symbolises the inner analysis that I accomplished in a way by publishing the book about the dreams. This was, in fact, so unpleasant that

I postponed the printing of the manuscript more than an year. Now it makes daylight, the desire to can pass over the inhibitory sensation.”(14). How could I pass over? There is the answer: “I give anything to can communicate the complete solution of all these enigma. Unfortunately, I cannot do this, I cannot as the dream/ non vixit, to sacrifice peoples that I like, to my ambition. (...) I shall be content with choosing, here first, than a little further, some elements of the dream” (15).

In the letter from 6-th august 99 Freud justifies himself “To make an omelet, you must break the eggs. In the rest, them (the dreams) are humana and humanoria, nothing really personal, that is nothing personnement sexual” (16). At last, in the letter from 6-th September 99 he explains: “I tried to avoid the sex problem, but the dirth is inevitable and asks to be treated humanly” (17). Freud refuses therefore to sacrifice his friends and his own sexual life (Martha, Minna, the masturbation). It is, he will say to Theodore Reik later, “una cosa privatissima”.

Always balancing between the private and the public, and in the reason of this balancement, Freud has always affirmed the particular place which had for him the Traumdeutung. Thus in the letter from 28-th May 1899 he writes: “None of my works will be more mine: it is my own rubbish hollow, my plant and, otherwise, una nova species mihi” (18). This new species of self will not only permits him to write to Fliess: “All that work, made a lot of good things to my psychic, I am, in a manifest way, more normal than 4 or 5 years ago; ” (the letter from 2-nd March 1899) (19) and also to define in a durable way, the health as the capacity to work and to enjoy the life, as he will develop this in 1926 in “ The profane analysis”.

The subjective approach of Freud, his self-analysis that he declare sometimes impossible / the letter 75 from 14-th November 97 (19) – appeared thus in the Traumdeutung as a puzzle with dispersed pieces which must be rebuild. This subjective approach is also that of each analysant and of all the analysts whom in exposing themselves in what it is most intimate,

in taking the risks of exploring their past across the dreams and in reconstituting the puzzle of their life, learn to not fear the underground powers or the rejection -: "Flectere si nequeo Superos, Acheronta movebo".

References:

- [1] FREUD,S. : Die Traumdeutung, Studienausgabe, Band II,Fischer Verlag, Francfurt am Main,1972, p.24; trad. Meyerson, p.4.
- [2] Id.: Lettres à Wilhelm Fliess.1887-1904, P.U.F.2006, p.331.
- [3] Id.ibid. p.339.
- [4] Id.ibid. p.342.
- [5] Id.ibid. p. 349.
- [6] Id.ibid. pp.321-322.
- [7] Id.ibid. p.357.
- [8] Id.- op.cit. p.414; éd. Meyerson p.364.
- [9] Id. ibid.p.421; éd.Meyerson, pp.380-381.
- [10] Id. –Lettres, p.495.
- [11] Id. op.cit. pp.418-419: trad. Meyerson p.366.
- [12] K.K.“Kaiserlich-Koeniglich”, mais aussi “K und K” “Kaiserich und Koeniglich”.
- [13] MUSIL,R. : L’Hommme sans qualités, Paris, Seuil, tomeI, pp.38-39.
- [14] FREUD,S. : op.cit.pp.436-437 ; trad.Meyerson pp.386-387.
- [15] Id.ibid. : pp.410-411 ; trad. Meyerson pp.360-361.
- [16] Id. – Lettres, p.464.
- [17] Id.ibid. p.469.
- [18] Id.ibid. p .448.
- [19] Id.ibid. p.441.
- [20] Id.ibid. p.357.