

Literature and Psychoanalysis: Reciprocal Insights

April 26, 2008

2:30 PM

The Philoctetes Center

Levy: Francis Levy
Nersessian: Edward Nersessian
Charney: Maurice Charney
Hartmann: Geoffrey Hartmann
Lothane: Zvi Lothane (moderator)
Schwaber: Paul Schwaber
Skura: Meredith Anne Skura
A: Speaker from audience

Levy: I'm Francis Levy, Co-Director of the Philoctetes Center. Dr. Edward Nersessian is the other Co-Director. Welcome to *Literature and Psychoanalysis: Reciprocal Perspectives*. Now I'm very pleased to introduce Zvi Lothane. Dr. Lothane is Professor of Psychiatry at Mount Sinai School of Medicine, as well as a psychoanalyst and member of the American and International Psychoanalytic Associations. Dr. Lothane is known for his ground-breaking book, *In Defense of Schreber: Soul Murder and Psychiatry*, his research into the life of Sabina Spielrein, and papers on the psychoanalytic method. Dr. Lothane will moderate this afternoon's panel and introduce our other distinguished panelists.

Lothane: Thank you, Francis. I'm excited and happy to be here. We have an illustrious panel, which I'm going to introduce presently.

Maurice Charney, with the tie, is a Distinguished Professor of English at Rutgers University. He is past president of the Shakespeare Association of America and the Academy of Literary Studies. He has written widely on Shakespeare, the theory and practice of comedy, and psychoanalytic approaches to literature and film. His most recent book is *The Comic World of the Marx Brothers*. A former Fulbright Professor at the Universities of Bordeaux and Nancy, he is also a recipient of the medal of the city of Tours, in France.

Next to him is Geoffrey Hartmann, Sterling Professor Emeritus of English and Comparative Literature and Senior Research Scholar at Yale. He has held distinguished visiting appointments at many universities in the U.S. and abroad, and is a Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy and a Chevalier, Ordre des Arts et Lettres, of the French Ministry of Culture. Among his other awards are the Christian Gauss Prize for *Wordsworth's Poetry*, and the René Wellek Prize for *The Fateful Question of Culture*, and the 2006 Truman Capote Prize for *The Geoffrey Hartman Reader*. His latest book is *A Scholar's Tale: Intellectual Journey of a Displaced Child of Europe*. He is a Co-founder of the Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies and continues as its Project Director.

Paul Schwaber is Professor of Letters at Wesleyan University and former Director of the College of Letters, Wesleyan's undergraduate major in Western literature, philosophy and history. He is the author of *The Cast of Characters: A Reading of Ulysses*. He and his wife, Rosemary

Balsam—whom I know well—edit the *JAPA Review of Books*. He is a past Editorial Board member of the International Journal of Psychoanalysis and currently serves on the Editorial Board of the James Joyce Quarterly and the Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies. Dr. Schwaber is also a practicing psychoanalyst.

Meredith Anne Skura is Libbie Shearn Moody Professor of English at Rice University and author of *The Literary Use of the Psychoanalytic Process*, *Shakespeare the Actor and the Purposes of Playing*, and *Tudor Autobiography: Listening for Inwardness*.

I prepared some introductory statements, which is eight pages long—no, seven-and-a-half. But I was told to abbreviate, so I'll abbreviate. A few things I must say, however. There is an affinity and a romance and a rivalry between psychoanalysis and literature. Both tell stories about mankind. Both describe the outer and inner lives of persons. Both analyze and interpret. Unconscious processes are the wellspring of both. Freud himself embodied both. He had a good education. His prose had the immediacy and the lucidity of Goethe, and in 1930 he got the Goethe Prize. Freud's ideas about mankind came from Shakespeare, Ibsen, Dostoyevsky, and he said at the beginning of his *Odyssey*, "I'm surprised that my case histories read like short stories, but it is not my fault. It's the nature of the material."

His next step was to develop a method of studying hysteria and dreams, free-association. He got that from literature too, from Schiller and Ludwig Borne. Years later Freud wrote, "Before the problem of creative artists analysis must at last lay down its arms." In 1903, the Annus Mirabilis of 1903, two love stories were published: one was Jensen's *Gradiva* and the other was Shreber's *Memoirs*. He learned about *Gradiva* from Stekel and about Shreber from Jung. He also studied Leonardo. But the best analysis for me from the literary point of view is the one we're going to discuss today.

I'm going to skip the précis of *Gradiva*. I assume that all of you read it. But I'll tell you something about Wilhelm Jensen. I think in Jones he is misidentified as a Danish author, but he was a North German author. A few things about his biography, which is not very well known: he was a bastard of the mayor of the city of Kiel and a servant girl, and adopted at age three by a childless professor of botany and his wife. After studying medicine he devoted himself to philosophy and literature, authoring some 150 novels and novellas, many of which deal with the themes of misunderstood love, loss of the beloved through separation or death. Jensen confessed that such themes relate to the death, at age eighteen, of his youth flame, Clara Louise Adolphine Witthöfft, which affected him for the rest of his life. At age twenty-seven, he married Marie Bruhl, a daughter of a converted Jew, and his philo-Semitic views are evident in his 1869 novel *The Jews of Cologne*, the story of the Black Death, the AIDS of 1348. He said to Stekel that he never heard of Freud, but he may have read about the unconscious in Carl Gustav Carus.

Now, I'm going to skip the method of Jensen and Freud, because this will come out in the discussion. But I'll say that what's before us is a methodological question: what can psychoanalysis and literature learn from each other? Who teaches whom? This afternoon we'll look for some of the answers in discussing *Gradiva*. But let me read to you, as the end of my remarks, this statement from Freud himself in *Gradiva*:

“Perhaps we’re doing our author a poor service in declaring his work to be a psychiatric study. The truth is that no truly creative writer has obeyed this injunction. The description of the human mind is indeed the domain which is most his own. He has from time immemorial been the precursor of science, and so too of scientific psychology. The difference here between states of mind described as normal and pathological is in part a conventional one. And in part so fluctuating that each of us probably crosses it many times in the course of a day. Thus, the creative artist cannot evade the psychiatrist, nor the psychiatrist the creative writer. And the poetic treatment of a psyche, it would seem, can turn out to be correct without any sacrifice of its beauty.”

In this spirit we are ready to begin our discussion. Who would like to jump in? Please feel free to jump in any time you want. It’s free association time.

Skura: Why don’t you go ahead?

Schwaber: Well, I’ll jump. You’re going to jump?

Hartmann: I’m going to jump in, perhaps in a semi-provocative way, by saying that this essay is really an extended footnote—pun intended. I say it partly seriously, because even though I had read Freud’s *Gradiva* a long time ago, I didn’t find personally very much concerning the reciprocity or reciprocal benefit of psychiatric or psychoanalytic and literary study. And yet it intrigued me. I think it is a superb work of literary criticism. Sure, it has psychoanalytic content when it comes to the dreams. It has, in other words, an interest in affirming certain rules that govern the methodology of dream analysis. But the question that still is in my mind: what does it do beyond that?

I answer that question in two ways, although I won’t elaborate in order to get a discussion started. One is that there’s an extraordinary style of feeling—Freud himself calls it ‘form feel’—in the way he practices. I think that’s very important, even if he doesn’t analyze it beyond a paragraph I found in Fleiss. It might interest some of you, at least the ones here who are immediately talking. I’ve translated that, in which he says, talking about the dream book in 1899 to Fleiss: “I’ve had some problem with form here. I feel that basically I have failed, or there’s some defect in my form in exposing what I want to say about dreams.” There’s the question therefore that arises concerning the relation of form and content. That is, the content being the dream and the unconscious, and how do you manage that? How do you get a mastery of this material? This is something that Freud raises himself, and that is, I think, very interesting how he right from the beginning is very concerned with form and identifies it as form feeling. So that is one thing.

The other thing—just to expose myself quickly while there is a limited interest having to do with the hermeneutics of dream analysis in *Gradiva*—there’s a much deeper interest in what might be called dream pedagogy, how Freud is still part of the *bildungs couture*, in which you use everything, often a self-education, including dreams, to develop yourself. Of course he’s doing it in a medicinal way, but I would make a distinction between the hermeneutics of dream analysis and dream pedagogy. But I’ll leave it at that, although I have one more thing to say. Not now—later, after some others have talked.

Skura: I think that it's amazing, because what I thought on rereading this—of course, I had read it also many, many years ago, and at that time it didn't seem too interesting because I was reading *Interpretation of Dreams* and all the cases, and this didn't seem particularly to add anything. But what I thought this time was if I am going to teach students about Freud I am no longer going to try to get pieces from the *Interpretation of Dreams*. I'm going to use this, because this is a perfect condensation. So without knowing all of this, that's how I reacted to *Gradiva*.

Hartmann: I remember you were saying in your book of some years ago that Freud's various statements—"The poets were there before me," et cetera, and, "The sciences weren't there before the poets' achievement"—you quoted another type of statement, that he didn't mean that the poets discovered the naked unconscious, but that the poets were there before psychoanalysis and really discovered, in their own way, a newer pointing about the discourse of psychoanalysis. That I think goes in the same direction as our responses to *Gradiva*.

Charney: Well, I may be the only negative voice here, but it seems to me that Freud's long discussion of *Gradiva* is in a way simplified, because it's too much a kind of decoding of the subject matter, the symbolism. I mean the contrast between the latent and the manifest meaning. Freud goes through this, but it's obvious to a reader without Freud that this is the kind of interpretation you will come up with, and I think, for example, there are certain aspects of literary criticism that are really left out in Freud's discussion. One is that Freud is not very sensitive to language and the way that language is expressive and the way that there's some kind of connection between meanings that are repeated more than once, language and words, and some of the ambiguity of the language and words. That's one large area that I think a literary critic would want to develop that's not in Freud's analysis.

Another very large area it seems to me Freud doesn't do anything with is the intellectual basis of Jensen and *Gradiva*. In other words, the kind of story, the novella, that he thought he was writing, and the fact that this kind of story is indebted to other writers. I know that the subject of sources can be a very unsatisfying one, but there is a larger sense of a kind of cultural context of *Gradiva* that is left out in Freud, and I think would really enrich the discussion of this very interesting novella. In other words, I see a lot of ways you could take this further, following a psychological and psychoanalytic reading, but you could take it much further than Freud does. Freud seems to be oversimplified. It said to me things that seem very obvious.

Schwaber: Well, it seems to me that when Freud writes, especially well on into this first decade of psychoanalysis, he tends to write in two different ways. One is to popularize, and he seemed to me in the *Gradiva* piece to be writing for people who didn't know a lot about psychoanalysis. He was illustrating psychoanalysis by way of the story, and therefore telling the story again and showing how the dreams could be read and showing how the psyche could be understood and how they lived happily ever after. All of that was serving a purpose of public education, you might say.

He obviously also writes in ways that are intended for other potential psychoanalysts or other actual psychoanalysts, and in those particular cases he's a little bit more technical. And when he is technical he tends to find that he's embarrassed by how literary he is. Zvi referred to the case studies on hysteria, which read like short stories. *The Interpretation of Dreams*, unlike *Gradiva*,

is really an invitation to serious readers to follow out, and it's written in the style of a scientific article. The first chapter is reviewing the bibliography, right? And then he goes on through a series of chapters and ends with his first expansive theory of mind. In that work it seems to me he's proceeding in a way that is trying to communicate empirical evidence for the ideas he is developing. He's taking the reader through it slowly. He also is, in spite of himself maybe, presenting himself as a very forceful narrator. In other words, he's a persona. It's possible to approach that text as a literary critic and say there is a narrator here who is inviting you to agree with him or disagree with him or follow him or be impressed by him, but who is trying to earn your confidence for this last chapter, in which he's going to try to say, this is the way the mind works.

Now it seems to me that that kind of burden, that he has a desire to be a conquistador scientifically and he has a desire to educate a broad public, are tensions in his work often—maybe not in the meta psychological essays, but it's often a tension with him, and it seems to me what makes him a very good writer.

Lothane: I think that's a very important point, that in this essay he tried to introduce science to the wider public. It is indeed a semi-popular text. But I would like to say how impressed I am that—there are two things here: number one, he follows the author very closely. He does not stray from him and add something, like he did in other analyses, as in Shreber or Leonardo. He's very faithful to Jensen, and he's surprised how much Jensen has insight about the dream dynamics. What you mentioned earlier, the manifest of the latent content, is indeed such a basic idea because it applies to everything across the board. All people that come to analysis or treatment present a manifest content, and the latent content is yet to be discovered, the same as with a dream.

Freud was also compared to Conan Doyle, and in a sense Jensen gives us a kind of a puzzle, a detective story. Here comes this archeologist who is in love with a sculpture, and the sculpture is a manifest content. Behind it is a torrid love story. Jensen uncovers it through a therapy-like thing between Zoe Bertgang, which is a translation of Gradiva. Bertgang is one who walks resplendently, and Zoe is Gradiva revived. It is a torrid story, and the proof of it, which I omitted earlier, I will now produce. Just give me a moment. It's rather interesting because it has to do with Anna Freud, that in 1910, when she was fifteen, she writes to Freud as follows, from vacationing in Bistrai—and I'm very grateful to Robert Stewart, who gave me this source. Writes Anna: "Dr. Jekels is very nice with us and speaks much about you. He does not want, however, to lend me the *Gradiva* without your explicit confirmation."

Why is Papa insisting that the daughter not read the story? Because it's about love and sex. Coming back to the idea of the manifest and the latent, it is a torrid love story. And about Freud's method of dream interpretation, I think it's the basis of his science, because he believes that free association is really the way to get to what is determined and not what is random. The analogical/pedagogical method of dream interpretation was actually Jung's, and Freud was very much against it. He said, "I'm being scientific," but the point is at the same time as he's scientific he's also literary. And to answer you, if you read *The Interpretation of Dreams* and Freud's associations, they reveal a whole world of culture, the culture he came from. It's really like an autobiography embedded in *The Interpretation of Dreams*.

Skura: Well when you say that—you mentioned Conan Doyle—we've got here now scientific, pedagogical, and a kind of Conan Doylian goal. The piece right next to *Gradiva* in the collected works has to do with psychoanalysis and legal testimony, and the way in which the two of them proceed along very similar lines.

Lothane: The one preceding it is also *Creative Writers and Daydreaming*.

Skura: That I think is very different.

Lothane: Very different and also very important to us.

Hartmann: Let me jump in at this point to say I'm not at all negative quite in the way that Maurice is negative towards Freud. By now we can get beyond—we don't need popularization. I'm standing in the present moment, not just appreciating a past achievement—that was said, and that was great. I appreciate certainly the pedagogical form which everybody, especially Schwaber, has talked about. But I'm deeply intrigued by *Gradiva*, and my puzzlement is why am I so deeply intrigued? I think he has caught something, because I recognized the genre, but a bit later. I think there's something going on in Freud. That is, we are trying to find—or I was trying through this feeling of intrigue, to find a story that Freud is telling about himself. Perhaps that's what you meant by autobiographical. It has something to do with Zoe's function in all this, which he picks up and follows. Zoe, life, according to the name, then leaving out for a moment the *Gradiva* play with names, which is almost too literary. We're almost too used to it. Her function surely is that of a proxy psychoanalyst.

Skura: That's what he says.

Hartmann: Yes, that's what he actually says. But then what is the mythic background? You talked about Freud as a persona, but mainly as a pedagogue, I take it. What is the mythic background of this psychoanalytic function, that is, of dream pedagogy? If you posit as part of Freud's background and the fact that he's intrigued with the sculpture in the same way that Jensen is, you find yourself going back as far as Winckelmann. I'm not going to talk about Winckelmann, but it is important that there's a whole German common ideal of classicism that develops, and of classical form.

Lothane: And Schliemann.

Hartmann: And Schliemann later as an archeologist. If I may, let me just read two sentences of what he writes to Fleiss in, I think it's September, 1899. This is when he's composing the dream book. It's my translation: "Somewhere in me there lodges a piece of form-feeling, an appreciation of beauty as a type of perfection, so that in my dream book a circuitous strutting with indirect words and sentences squinting at thoughts have seriously offended one of my ideals. I'm surely not wrong when I characterize my deficiency of form as a sign of a faulty mastery of the subject matter."

I find this very intriguing that he wants to master the dream material, and doesn't want that to contaminate the, let's call it for a moment the Winckelmannian ideal of noble simplicity and serene greatness, you know, of tranquility. However much there's pain and however much there's tumult in the mind, it mustn't affect the form of art. I think to some extent he is working

that out, and he's working it out through the story plot, too, and so the fact of proxy analysis—I don't want to talk too long, but later on I want to make a suggestion about the mythic type behind the proxy psychoanalyst.

Schwaber: It's a very interesting thing that you point to, and I'm sure he was dissatisfied, but it seems to me that the dissatisfaction was present all the way through because of the way in which he was thinking. He wasn't only teaching. He was thinking his way through that book, and by the end of the book he is saying the dream was inspired ultimately by an infantile wish. He didn't really get into infantile sexuality until five years later in his publications, so it seems to me that he was himself dealing with resistance to the idea of infantile sexuality and discovering it circuitously by way of the dream book. It also seems to me that it's characteristic of his style of intellection throughout his career that he strives to summarize, strives for conclusion, and always undermines it, never quite finds it, is always revising. That seems to me to be why it's so exciting to read through his works.

Charney: I'm surprised that you characterized my point of view as negative.

Hartmann: I thought you did.

Charney: No, not at all.

Schwaber: We heard you say it.

Charney: Well, maybe I said it.

Lothane: He's allowed to negate his own negativity.

Charney: I meant it metaphorically, you know? I'm very fascinated by reading the *Gradiva*, and Freud's own investment, and he's tremendously interested and excited by writing this, and the discovery. But I was speaking only of the essay as a piece of literary criticism, and what you might want to add to it. Just to go back to the things that I said before, the whole method seems too subject matter oriented. It's too much translating specific images and symbols into their so-called total meaning, and that's what I object to is that it seems reductive.

Schwaber: He does exactly what in the dream book he says you shouldn't do. You should listen for associations. You shouldn't just interpret as if you know the answer with a key.

Hartmann: But supposing you wanted to translate into something literary the process of psychoanalysis, and especially to transform it into a mythical work of art, that is, a work of art that has mythical characters in it. How would you feature the analyst? Some of you were talking about the Israeli series *Treatment*, not exactly mythical. But I think you said that the dream book, and others have said it too, is autobiography. It's really to be seen within the genre of autobiography. Now, you're going to write a fiction—you are Freud. You're going to write a fiction, and you want to maintain an impersonality which classical literature, and especially mythical literature, gives you. I'm not really seriously asking us to give plot structures here, but I think this intrigues me as I read it. I feel a mythic background to this, which is partly because it is set in Rome and so on. But I think that this answers a little bit what you said, or your negative feelings towards the literary part of Freud, even though you put it in terms of analysis or non-

analysis of the ambiguities of language, with the exception of the play of names. But there is such a thing as a very strong plot coming through in this.

Skura: It would have to be somebody guiding you to the underworld.

Hartmann: Exactly. Someone who leads you into the underworld, the unconscious, but who also, in this case, leads you out of it. Isn't that part of our attraction to the figure of Zoe? She's clearly, as he himself says, a proxy psychoanalyst, and she's a kind of female Hermes who leads someone through a certain indulgence, or time of indulgence of the delusion, leads that person back into life, into flesh and blood and so on, so that the figure—I might as well throw it out. I'm sorry if I'm being didactic. That figure would be called a psychopomp, which is a terrible phrase—psychopomp, like a crazy French fireman, right? [The psychopomp is usually Hermes, who is the messenger between mankind and the gods and who does the ferreting between. It seems to me that she has a Hermes function in that respect. And that I think is what moves me so much in the story, and I find that too very literary.

Charney: I think it's very much a nineteenth-century—I mean you used the word mythic. It's a very romantic story, and it's very much a story of transformation that somehow it comes to this wonderful, happy ending as it were.

Hartmann: Right.

Charney: But the characters are transformed, almost magically, through some kind of close study of the images that surround their lives.

Skura: Yeah, I'm just wondering whether it would have to be the underworld. I mean you could think of *Pygmalion* in a way.

Hartmann: You also could think of *Pygmalion*, yeah.

Skura: It's a transformation, metamorphosis kind of story. If you go back, almost all myths might have a similar—there might be two or three foundational myths.

Hartmann: But the psychoanalytic process here is not *Pygmalion*, although it may have that effect, right.

Skura: That's true.

Hartmann: How to understand the process in mythic terms, or the equivalent of that—

Skura: As a guiding step.

Hartmann: The guiding, the indulgence in the delusion, the tolerance of the delusion, the time element and the function of that.

Lothane: I would like to resonate to what you're saying. It's the part that I omitted from reading, but Freud makes here two analogies. He's also trying to enlighten mankind about repression. He put repression on the map, and he compares repression to being buried in the ashes of Vesuvius,

so that the method of analytic excavation, through free association, is indeed a metaphorical excavating the past to learn about the present and to plan for a better future. But in connection with Maurice's point about the romantic story I'd like to bring in, like you brought in Fleiss, another contemporary tributary to the story, which is from Jung and Sabina Spielrein. By December 1906 Jung had already presented to Freud anonymously that he's treating this girl, and Freud says to him in December, which means already after having written *Gradiva*, "Essentially one might say the cure is affected by love, and actually, transference provides the most cogent, indeed the only unassailable proof, that neuroses are determined by the individual's love life." Now Zoe Bertgang does here something which could be likened to Marguerite Sechehay's method of symbolic realization. She enters the drama—and Freud calls it '*inszenierungen*,' which is a staging—and she shares the delusion with the patient, like an analyst shares the delusions with a patient too, or whatever he presents. And through this she cures him, by being open and tolerating the craziness, and at the same time doing the psychopompic function of leading him out of the labyrinth, so to speak.

Hartmann: That would be parallel, certainly.

Skura: Well it might explain—oh, sorry.

Hartmann: No, no, go ahead.

Skura: Why *Gradiva* is so much more compelling than *Creative Writers and Daydreaming*, which is flimsy by its side.

Hartmann: I agree with you on that, yes. In a way it engages our interest. Certainly she manages the disillusion wonderfully, I mean it's not a rough disillusion.

Skura: Right.

Hartmann: I find that quite remarkable. There's just no question that even though this is the most indulgent Freud, the most pedagogical, the most vain—can we say it that way? Here and there the old moralist comes through when he says that basically, I'm paraphrasing, our sexuality is the debt we have to pay to life. Sexuality is the debt we pay to life. Now at least you can interpret it as simply that you have to get children for life to go on, but the tonality of that is very different. The anxiety that surrounds sexuality and the repression is the under-theme of this book, right? You mentioned a passion, and so despite his urbanity in the charm, it seems to me, of what Zoe does and so on and so on, he never loses sight of the thesis that where there's anxiety there has been repression, some kind of absolute equation.

Charney: I think we should take up some other—besides *Gradiva* Freud wrote very interestingly about other writers, especially Shakespeare. I think that the things he says about Lady Macbeth, for example, or about *King Lear* and *The Merchant of Venice* are in a way more sophisticated and more developed than his remarks on *Gradiva*. You said that it's a kind of popularization. It works perfectly, but it's very limited. I think in speaking about Shakespeare he was getting into some more profound suggestions of why the characters—for example, Lady Macbeth—what makes Lady Macbeth interesting or fascinating.

Skura: Can you explain how what he says about Lady Macbeth is sophisticated?

Charney: He tries to understand Lady Macbeth as a tragic character, and I think just this idea of wrestling with the idea of tragedy and all of its meanings—at the beginning of the play she says to Macbeth she has no qualms. She says, “A little water clears us of this deed.” And at the end of the play she’s the one who really goes mad and cannot really bear. I think the madness of Lady Macbeth really interested Freud. Somehow it went outside of the boundaries, as it were, and it presented, to my thinking, a more complex subject than Freud—I’m not negative about *Gradiva*, it’s very exciting, but it’s in a way simplified. Everything is so obvious. There are a lot of dimensions that you could pursue beyond what Freud wrote. I think when he came to Shakespeare, which presented a more difficult subject than Jensen, that he just engaged fuller complexity of his interpretations.

Hartmann: Again, I don’t think it’s simple in terms of the psychoanalytic process and thinking about it. He is still working on that: what exactly does the psychoanalyst do? How does he effect his task, how does he finish his task? Interesting, of course, that you bring Jung in. My first reaction in rereading *Gradiva* was that this is Jungian story, just as there are Jungian dreams. It’s not a Freudian story. What you said seems to indicate almost if the real subject of the psychoanalytic process in the sense of how is a person to be confronted, to be brought in, an enlightenment of the person—how much time do you have to spend in the unconscious and bringing the unconscious up, from that point of view, from the psychopompian point of view. I wonder whether he wasn’t in the end addressing Jung. You mentioned that having the Spielrein case, that is an admonition. This is on Jung’s territory giving him an admonition, because he says somewhere towards the end, this is what I’ve been talking about, who love is roused. But the doctor has to be careful that this doesn’t happen to himself. He doesn’t put it quite so bluntly. Doesn’t he say that at one point?

Lothane: That’s very important, what you’re saying here, because when they started the correspondence their different views about the role of sexuality were obvious from the very beginning. Jung says to him, “I am not convinced about your theory about the sexual fear of neuroses.” And Freud said, “Beware of the naivety of occultism.” Now which is the scarier stuff, the occult stuff or sexuality? And don’t forget that there is also another element here. Most people who come for any kind of treatment, or who face themselves in any kind of way, begin with the problem of anxiety. Something has scared them out of their mind, and how do they deal with this scare?

To respond to you, Maurice, I think there is a depth both to *Gradiva* and *Lady Macbeth*, because *Lady Macbeth* is made sick by her fantasy. Macbeth says at one point towards the end, “Present fears are less than horrible imaginings.” In other words, if you look at the polarity of perception and imagination it’s the imagination, which is called *la folle du logis* by Malebranche, which scares us into being neurotic, psychotic, you name it. Hanhold is psychotic. He dreams of being in Pompeii and seeing *Gradiva*, and he wakes from the nightmare. So it’s the issue of the fear of sexuality, because Norbert Hanhold is a repressed hysteric. He avoids women. He is ahead in archeology, but there’s nobody in his life. But underneath there is this undercurrent of the repressed desire, which comes out through the fantasy of the sculpture—and *Pygmalion* is very appropriate here—and then Zoe Bertgang gets him out of it.

Charney: I was very interested in what you said about Jung, because it seems to me that Freud could never really get rid of the ideas of Jung that seemed to penetrate, that you’re born with

some kind of predispositions, or you're born with some kind of mythic overtones—I don't think the *tabula rasa* really works well for Freud—the idea that there's a kind of Jungian archetype that underlies reality. I think that must have fascinated Freud. In other words, you don't start with nothing. You start with sort of being human and the characteristics of human beings.

Hartmann: It's interesting, at this point I don't think Jung actually had developed the archetype.

Lothane: Yeah, that came much later.

Hartmann: But you can take the psychopomp and say that's the archetype. Freud is there before Jung. But let me throw something else out here. I was joking still about the footnote, the extended footnote. This is a really light-footed proceeding in terms of style, and yet even here there seems to be a mythic underground, namely the idea of the nymphs—in Freud's postscript of 1912 he identifies the person figured on the statue as one of the hours, personified hours. And these are said to be—I'm just quoting the postscript—deities of the fertilizing dew. Now, make what you wish of the fertilizing dew, but the nymphs, who are often these deities, although nymph is a very large category and much could be said about it—also A.B. Warburg talked about that, and many other things which could be brought in. These nymphs are characterized by their gate often. That is, not by any particular way of the foot, but rather by being so light-footed that only the grass bends slightly, and all you see is the trace. Just as a fantasy I think that Freud really wanted to be light footed in this case, but the deities of the fertilizing dew show the other side of it, the reality principle side, let's say.

Skura: But it's curious what Freud did not do to *Gradiva*, which would be even more, I think, simple than the work is itself and fit more into your objections. That is he did not psychoanalyze Jensen. Maybe he couldn't have. Maybe he didn't know about his life and the loss of somebody coming to life again, but it could have been a really reductive analogy between what this author's dream, fantasy, really was—namely, that a woman who died when he was quite young could come to life again, and then what actually happened in the work. And Freud didn't do that. He didn't make it that simple.

Lothane: He did a little bit of that. He was fixated on the foot of *Gradiva*, and he said that Jensen must have been a foot fetishist.

Skura: That's right, he said that. Maybe that was the introductory note. But none of his other novels had feet.

Lothane: He didn't know anything about his former life. But actually, there is something. Even when Freud says fanciful things he's very often prescient about the deeper issues. After the first dream, where Hanhold sees himself in Pompeii, he says, "He mourned the loss of someone dead." That is a theme in Jensen, lost love and re-found love, so that Freud still has some feel for the author.

Nersessian: I wonder if the participants couldn't also leave *Gradiva* alone for a little moment and talk about what is the relationship between psychoanalysis and literature interpretation today: what's happening, and whether there is a role for it or not.

Lothane: Very good.

Schwaber: Let me take a swat at that. The issue came up before about what role does Zoe play, and how is what she does in the story like what an analyst does, and the idea of the guide into the underworld that Freud obviously took very seriously. How do you render a long-term process into a short narrative that conveys something of the experiential feel of the process? That's something that has bedeviled psychoanalysis. It started out bedeviling Freud: can't sound like short stories, I'm writing scientific stuff. On the other hand, in spite of himself, he kept writing, and his case studies are far more dramatic, far more ranging than analysts now allow themselves to do. Right? And ever allow themselves to do, as far as I know. You know, Britannia waives the rules. Freud just did what he wished to do. He was very effective, and we still study those case studies because they're like literature, because they have the power of literature and convey something about the living person and the process of finding out about them.

Now it seems to me that psychoanalysis has been really hamstrung by the insistence—the appropriate insistence, which starts with a medical insistence—upon confidentiality. You can't write enough about the specifics of a person to run the risk of revealing who they are. You have to find alternatives, very much in the spirit, it seems to me, of the way Aristotle talked about literature. You have to find a way of doing a mimesis of the process, find a way of conveying it actually in the form of short stories, you might say, or even in the form of modern short stories, in which the narrator and the analyst are participants. Some people say equal participants, but you have to allow for the analyst's subjectivity at least, and the struggle for the analyst to be disinterested in what he hears—empathic, but disinterested, not biasing.

It seems to me that the issue that is being presented here couldn't be more contemporaneous as a problem for psychoanalysis. It may not be a problem for literature, but it's a problem for psychoanalysis. I think it's also a problem for literature because literature has often lots of fascination with complexities of character. I think that's a problem because that's what I'm interested in. But for psychoanalysis, how you find your way to a kind of art that conveys experience—I don't think our field has wrestled with that. It certainly hasn't solved the problem. You run into the problem of, well, if you do that you're writing fiction, which equals lies. But if you're writing something that conveys truthfulness you're not writing lies. You're writing crafted fiction.

Nersessian: Or the other side of what you're saying: that the fact that psychoanalysis has become increasingly more complex and our appreciation of the relationship within the psychoanalytic process has become more sophisticated, that this kind of interpretation of a work of literature is really impossible today, because there's certain assumptions that are made which are based on your theory, and you just apply that theory. Then you can make very similar interpretations or develop very similar theoretical lessons, like Freud does here, for many works of literature, and it creates a situation where there's no distinction between different works. So today it's very difficult to do this, as opposed to when he did it, a little over 100 years ago.

Schwaber: It's one thing to just sort of say this illustrates the Oedipus Complex, or this illustrates guilt after fantasy of murdering father, as in the case of Lady Macbeth. But it's another thing to try to write criticism, or try to write analysis, that conveys the process, conveys the uncertainty, conveys the suspense, the confusion, and is able to convey it interestingly enough so that the reader could bear it the way an analyst can bear it, the way a patient can bear it, after all. I had a patient say to me after a particularly rough session last week, "Is that a way to send me off into

making twenty-nine matzo balls for Passover?” You know, one has to live with these unresolved issues and suspenses.

Lothane: Have you started analyzing twenty-nine?

Schwaber: She really meant twenty-seven, and now we’re getting into it.

Skura: But if you go the other way, instead of asking how can literature help psychoanalysts explain the process, or any given instance of a process, if you go the way Freud went in the first place, although he always acknowledged the poets doing something first and doing something for him, really the way he always went was to take the literary text and psychoanalyze. It seems to me you can psychoanalyze any text, and that there is not a question about that.

Nersessian: That’s the problem.

Schwaber: What do you mean by psychoanalyze?

Skura: You can find something out about the person who wrote the text that maybe even the person didn’t know. You can get information in a new way. There is a method for reading that text which is different from the method you use if you’re solely interested in getting the manifest information in that text, so that if you read it psychoanalytically you can get new information. I don’t know what you’d be interested in doing with that new information, but you can always get it. It just so happens that of all the possible texts to read that way literature often produces the most interesting results, because writers are often doing something quite similar to what analysts do, whereas people writing other texts are doing different things. Maybe this is just a provocative statement, but I don’t see there’s any question that you can psychoanalyze, you can use psychoanalytic methods to read literary texts.

Schwaber: But I’m not talking about reading a literary text to speculate about the biography or the creative idiom of the writer. I’m talking about trying to enter into the knots of difficulty in comprehending what’s going on in the text and the interactions—

Skura: Same thing.

Lothane: Perhaps you might also say something about what attracts the reader to read novels or to read psychoanalytic stories. What do they get out of it?

Skura: Right. Same thing. Literature is a machine for reenacting, or it’s a stage for reenacting a kind of mental dynamic, which starts with the author, gets embodied in this text, and then is re-embodied in the reader. So that what you’re interested in is working that dynamic out, and psychoanalysis gives you a method of reading which helps you work out that dynamic.

Charney: But I think in all of this discussion, particularly by people who are psychoanalytically trained, it’s really leaving out the formal dimension, and that disappears and everything is surrendered to the interpretation, point for point, of what the text means in relation to the writer. There’s entirely another dimension, and I think that’s the part that I’m really looking for. For example, in Norman Holland’s book on psychoanalytic interpretations of Shakespeare, which

sums up about at least fifty years of psychoanalytic interpretations of Shakespeare. If you read the book from beginning to end you will learn very little about Shakespeare.

Skura: But that was written in 1965.

Charney: Yeah, but he's summing up all the literature that went before. You learn very little about the language of the plays, about the formal qualities of the plays.

Skura: But think about what Lionel Trilling says. What he says is the way poems work is the way minds work, and that is what Freud discovered when he was talking about dream work and how to interpret the results of dream work. Then Freud studies the mind to see how ideas are condensed or displaced or symbolized or represented by puns. He may be analyzing the dream, but you can use that method to analyze a whole literary text.

Charney: Yeah, but I still think there's something left out. If you go back to Shakespeare, for example, and one of the things that doesn't really occur in Norman Holland's summary of Shakespeare criticism—. Shakespeare wrote many very different kinds of plays, depending upon the writers whom he was imitating, like Plautus or Livy—

Skura: Why did he pick Plautus rather than picking Terence? And why did he pick this play by Plautus and why did he change it to add this at the end and that at the beginning? By thinking about the new form he created you can learn something which might have many different meanings, one of which is relatively unconscious, or psychoanalytically approached.

Nersessian: How does one know that? How does one know why he chose this as opposed to that? How could one know that?

Skura: Well, I happen to be working on a book about Shakespeare's sources.

Charney: One of the answers to that question is that he wanted to go Plautus one better.

Skura: It could be.

Charney: I mean he wanted to write a better play than the plays he read of Plautus.

Hartmann: I wonder what 'better play' would mean?

Charney: Well actually, Plautus does not have a very poetic imagination, in none of his plays. Shakespeare wanted to introduce poetic elements, complications that aren't in the source. There's a sense—but this is true of other sources that Shakespeare used, like a Lyly. He wanted to write a play like John Lyly, but a better play than Lyly ever wrote. I think there's a formal argument that lurks on the other side of psychoanalytic interpretation, because it's the relation to intellectual and cultural sources and traditions and things you are reading and things which make a strong impression on you, really has a very large bearing on what you're writing.

Schwaber: But why wouldn't the formal aspect of a text or a play be taken seriously by somebody who was fascinated by the psychoanalytic meanings of a text. You were talking about tragedy before. Lady Macbeth is a tragic character. How come in the tragedies the characters are

studied in such depth that they're given interior monologues, dramatic monologues? They recite so that we can follow what they're thinking, and nobody else on the stage knows what they're thinking. It's just us, the reader and the text, or the reader and the character. It seems to me that that particular maneuver is part and parcel of the dignity and the fascination of these tragic characters, and suggests that insofar as we identify them we are also empathically or imaginatively perceiving ourselves as tragic characters in the sense that everybody is tragic, in the sense that everybody is caught up in mortality. It's a question of how you live your life and how you exit it that Lady Macbeth represents, that Hamlet represents, among other things.

So the formal aspect of it is part of the meaning. I've written on Joyce's *Ulysses*. The varieties of narratives from chapter to chapter in that text are very important to try to comprehend. He has to teach you how to read him, chapter after chapter. But invariably they reveal something about the feelings involved of the characters as being depicted in that particular moment of the text. The form is part of it. It's not separable from the story or the character or the reader's experience with it. How that relates to biography of the writer—that seems to me to be much more speculative, although there are marvelous biographies of writers, but it's usually by people who study all these letters and sources and can piece together a sense of the person.

Hartmann: Paul, do you think, though, that the kind of formal analysis you're describing is to enrich it or to augment it in some way, that psychoanalysis is valuable?

Schwaber: Do I think—?

Hartmann: Do you think psychoanalysis as a discipline is valuable to throw light on the formal features you have just mentioned?

Schwaber: Sure. I also think that psychoanalysis as a discipline is interested in the form and shape of an hour, in when a patient gets agitated and when a patient isn't agitated, when a patient goes silent, when a patient turns around on the couch and says, "Screw off."

Hartmann: Sure. But notice how you're expanding the concept of form to cover almost anything that happens in a mentally complex situation.

Skura: You can find meaning in the form, but I think maybe what Maurice is asking is can you help explain why that form is beautiful?

Schwaber: I don't think it's necessarily beautiful. I think it's being effective—if it is being effective. Sometimes it doesn't work.

Charney: What you said is very interesting and very moving, but another thing about Joyce is that you want to know not about Joyce's life experience, but—I mean if you put what Joyce was reading and what he was interested in, that's part of his life experiences, and that's the part that seems to drop out of psychoanalytic study of literature in general, the kinds of intellectual and cultural sources—

Schwaber: It might very well. You know, it doesn't drop out of psychoanalytic clinical work, obviously: the way in which a person has internalized mother, father, culture, siblings, all of that, childhood, current aims and purposes. It's built necessarily into the very texture of the process.

Psychoanalytic scholars or psychoanalytic literary critics can use psychoanalytic experience in all sorts of ways, it seems to me. Harold Bloom talks about the way in which influence works upon poets, one from the other. Walter Jackson Bate wrote about influence in a slightly different way, but the notion that poets are aware of other poets when they write their own and try to write original poetry is a great subject.

Hartmann: That introduces really a kind of relationship between persons. That is, in a sense you personalize, or make each a dramatic persona in literary history, which I like very much. You know, where they are relationships, family relationships, and so you get into family analysis as it were. Obviously everybody agrees that it's a really complex process, and I didn't quite understand your intervention, but you thought that by now there are so many theories, competing theories—

Nersessian: No, it's not there's so many competing theories, but—two things. One, it seems to me Freud wasn't really using the *Gradiva* in order to interpret the story. He was using it as a tool to teach psychoanalysis, and it seems to me at that time there was a need for him to use what is available and public to try and explain what psychoanalysis is about. That is different from using psychoanalysis to interpret the text, which would be the thing that is not, I don't think, in Freud's mind. So I was saying given the complexities that have emerged in our understanding of the mind through the psychoanalytic work, it is very, very difficult to really analyze psychoanalytically anything, expect in so far as you can apply theories, psychoanalytic theory to it. You can't apply psychoanalytic theory to a patient. You have to analyze the patient, but since you don't have that data in the way you have it in the clinical situation, any attempt at analyzing a story or a text or a writer would be insufficient, would be inaccurate.

Hartmann: I'm not sure.

Lothane: I'd like to ask the panel another question. Freud said that every creative writer is a neurotic, and every neurotic has a subjective feeling that if he were a writer he could write a book about himself. So how do we square these two?

Hartmann: What do people do who have written books about themselves?

Charney: Freud must have been using the word neurotic in a very general way to refer to just about everyone.

Skura: I want to go back to the possibility of analyzing a text, which can't talk back to you and cannot react to your interpretation. It depends on how much you know about the writer. This is one of the reasons that I was driven to find out about Shakespeare's sources, because you want to have as much information about what was going on all around the writer as you can. You don't know what Shakespeare noticed, and what his day residue might have been. I could find out a lot about what was going on in 1591, but the play that Shakespeare wrote was not influenced by all of it. How do I know what it was influenced by? Well, if you look at the text you see, oh this line here comes from here, and this is an exact reproduction of events that we know took place over here. Since they're echoed in the text we assume there might be some kind of connection. And you can begin to do almost like free association. Shakespeare is not here to free associate, but if I fill my head with things that he knew I might be able to make those free associated connections.

It's going to be inadequate. It's going to be extremely limited. But it will tell you more than it would if you just went about reading it with literary critical tools rather than also psychoanalytic tools. So you can make a difference.

The second thing I would say is that both literature and psychoanalysis, or both literary criticism and psychoanalysis, have become extremely rhetorical. That is, extremely conscious of the dialogue between the analyst and the patient, or the text, as only part of a bigger three-dimensional dramatic scene in which the author speaks with a consciousness of an audience. The text is a kind of tool in a rhetorical exchange. So too is psychoanalysis much more conscious of the rhetorical exchange between the text, the patient and the analyst, so that what analysis knows about what governs that rhetorical situation can be helpful to a literary critic to figure out the rhetorical situation with a literary text.

Charney: Well, Meredith, you're one of the best—

Hartmann: Stop there.

Charney: —critics of psychoanalysis in literature, so whatever objections I might have to some, I definitely don't have them about you. You're impressive because you're trying to see that this is a complicated and not easily answered problem. I think that's really the heart of the matter, that you can't give simple answers.

For Paul, I wanted to ask you an embarrassing question, like do you ask your patients what they're reading or what movies they've seen, or only about what they're dreaming about or what their fantasies are?

Schwaber: I try not to ask but to wait.

Charney: Touché.

Nersessian: But they tell you anyhow hopefully.

Schwaber: Their silences speak too, but that's different still. If I could just add a minor addition to what you're saying, since what you said is absolutely gold, but it's also true of a complicated text. If you want to understand something about Leopold Bloom from the course of that day it really helps if you know what he's thinking about at 8:00 a.m., where he is at 5:00 p.m., how come he's in the red-light district at 11:00 or 12:00 p.m., and that affords an opportunity for psychoanalytic understanding, which has to be processive and has to be persuasive because of all the information you bring in. Or people will say, "That's nonsense." Or, "Why is this a better interpretation than that," which is always a good question.

Hartmann: It is possible that psychoanalysis as a process and a discourse—discourse because it's part of the process—runs along parallel lines with literary discourse as it has developed. Parallel lines never meet, but who knows, maybe in some kind of mathematics they will meet. Because I find almost no difference except that essential difference that you have a specific obligation towards the patient. Maybe we by analogy have to ask ourselves what is the patient in terms of literary process and literary discourse, but it's a little bit harder. You can say the student, but the relationship is obviously different.

Concerning the parallelism and the distinctiveness within the parallelism, what Meredith said, and to some extent Paul, and you've hinted at it too, is perfectly correct. You need associations of some kind. You can't associate, or find the associations of someone who is dead, but there are ways, freed of that—the dead man—that you can produce associations, namely literary associations.

Skura: Yes.

Hartmann: That's what most of us do, in fact. I'm trying to indicate what runs parallel, so that going back to *Gradiva*, while that is not the most complex and interesting work of art around, actually, whether Freud could have done it or not—and he didn't do it—there are very significant literary associations, and you mentioned it from the beginning, which he didn't use, going back to the Romantics. You were right about this, because you can really trace back this tale, popular as it is, to a genre which had its beginning—at least one of its beginnings, a recognizable beginning—with the gothic tale. That is end of the 18th century, but since we are within the German tradition it is Schiller's *Geisterseher*, sometimes translated *The Apparitionist*.

Without going into the story, it makes the case within the tale for the conversion of a Protestant northern German principality. The cliché is that the northerner is cold. You have to do something, why do you want to do something? Because the Catholic Church wants him to convert to Catholicism in order to take over regime change of the government of his petty principality. So the propaganda machine goes into action and plans that the prince is going to be enticed to an Italian journey, just as I think the actress—Ingrid Bergman played a wonderfully staid English woman in a Rossellini film—has to go to find herself and her sensuous being in Italy. The prince is going to be confronted with a series of wonders, all pointing to him—you have a destiny—so that his sense of wonder is going to be raised to such a point that he can accept Catholicism.

So you have already the journey to Italy as a very important ingredient. You have the sense of wonder, something uncanny, and we haven't talked about the uncanny, vis-à-vis this, as something uncanny happening. You can go to the tales of E.T.A. Hoffman, another sprouting of this. Not quite at the end of the line, but as part of that line you get to *Gradiva*, and it becomes intelligible. It doesn't become overlaid by all that, but these are the literary associations which really add. This is what I mean by parallel lines. Now as I say, luckily we can find the connections between the parallel lines. That's the best I can do in terms of answering that sort of question.

Charney: Certainly in Mann, you know?

Hartmann: In Thomas Mann, the *Death in Venice* is a wonderful example. You even get a psychopompic effect.

Levy: I just had one question. Maybe I'm sort of free-associating to what you're saying, but is there a distinction being made, in carrying on the point that you were making, between using psychoanalysis to interpret or look into the nature of an author's work—and Ed and I frequently argue about this, about what can be said and what cannot be said—but that the affinity between psychoanalysis and imaginative creations themselves—because, after all, we are free to say

anything we want about an imaginative creation. We may not be free to use the imaginative creation to say much about the author.

Hartmann: Why aren't you free?

Levy: Because of the fact that we can't make certain kinds of assumptions. We can't make assumptions about any existing human—what we don't know about human beings.

Hartmann: Because the imagination is still unexpressed. It doesn't have a formal product.

Levy: A Shakespearean character we can say anything that we wish to say about—

Hartmann: But we know there is an umbilical cord. And if there isn't you're going to provide it, right?

Levy: Yeah, yeah.

Hartmann: In some way you overcome that disparity. I think the disparity is there, but we overcome it, just as we personify, often, a work of art. But when we say Shakespeare we don't mean Shakespeare. We mean the corpus—unless I misunderstand you.

Levy: Well, we had a fantastically heated discussion about Samuel Beckett. The question is where do Beckett's characters begin and where does Beckett end, you know?

Hartmann: In terms of the author/narrator. I see. But that can be studied internally, certainly, the emerging of the characters with the character of the narrator, or the non-emergence of it. There's a spectrum there too, isn't there?

Charney: I thought you could carry this discussion one step further, because speaking about literature you're speaking about something that has obviously an overtone. What about the psychoanalysis of music? If you take a subject that's really abstract, how would you go about it? How would you go about speaking about meanings? It obviously is expressive and has meanings, but it doesn't have specific meanings like language or art.

Hartmann: You're pursuing a theme that we haven't touched, the issue of form, because formal elements are so important. I mean form as something to which you cannot attach immediately a meaning, and yet you know it's meaningful and pleasurable.

Lothane: The point is that the creative writer is a master of form, as distinct from every average kind of person, that he indeed is one who is creative in that way.

But let's now open the proceedings to questions from the audience. Please address them to the panelists.

A: I wanted to ask, to your very interesting question about how would you psychoanalyze music, how would you psychoanalyze painting? Let's say particularly abstract painting, which might be a little easier to psychoanalyze. But it leads me to say that psychoanalysis may be very dependent on words, although Jungians analyze the way people place things in sand trays and

things like that. That isn't really what I wanted to say, but I think it's a really interesting question that you raised at the last minute.

I wanted to address your question about how analysts can write more interestingly or truthfully about what they know about the chaos of the unconscious or how the unconscious comes to the surface and so on. I'm speaking as an artist, both interpretive—because I used to be a concert pianist—and as a poet and as an abstract painter. Analysts should think of themselves more as artists. You're all struggling, with Freud struggling against the short story writer in him, or against the writer, but you guys don't need to struggle. Psychoanalysis is an art, and some of you may find yourselves artists. Then you have a lot more tools at your disposal. Okay, now I'm giving a speech. But I had a lot of ideas while you were talking.

For instance, there is a French psychoanalyst named Nannette—Freto or something like that—who wrote a very famous paper on second-generation Holocaust survivors, and it was ahead of its time, and it turned out afterwards that she's invented the whole thing. You know you cannot tell the precise truth about your patient because it would be against confidentiality, but artists know that you must enlarge or enhance or even distort the truth to make the real truth clear, and that's what she did, in fact. And there are other ways. Narrative, conventional narrative, is not necessarily the way to do this. There's fragmented narrative—it's called *recit eclate* in French. It really comes closer to conveying the chaos of the unconscious. You know, forget cause and effect and just be an artist.

Schwaber: Well, first of all I agree with you. Second of all, that doesn't make it any easier.

A: But we're not talking about ease here. We're talking about how to convey a certain truth. And I'm saying if you stick to your methods of abbreviated vignettes and worrying about confidentiality you will never get there. You'll get there if you write art.

Schwaber: I think that you're right, but I think it's also very hard for people who are scientific in inclination to think of themselves as artists, and to give themselves permission to be artists, because they don't want to be thought to be liars. For example, Heinz Kohut got into terrible trouble writing a famous essay called "The Two Analyses of Mr. Z," and it turned out that Mr. Z was himself. It was revealed after his death, so it became really difficult to sort out the ethics of the situation, whereas if he had just written something and managed to keep the secret I guess it would have seemed to be a far more effective—

A: No, I think you should be out there with it.

Schwaber: But look, I'm talking about composing, not necessarily writing case histories based on an individual case. Composing, bringing things together, making up a story that in fact conveys something of the actual experience.

A: You might use poetic techniques—

Schwaber: Yeah.

A: Novel techniques, more up to date than even Freud had at his disposal. It's just a matter of how you think about yourself, and you can still be truthful, because art isn't art if it's not truthful, in my view.

Schwaber: Well, and then when you read a terrific novel you say, boy, that's true, right? You have that experience.

Hartmann: Something just occurred to me, maybe not following you up though, concerning what Paul said about Kohut getting into trouble after his death. That's interesting, how one gets into trouble after his death.

Charney: We're still talking about *Gradiva*.

Hartmann: That's right. It's like going into the underworld. But something about the future of psychoanalysis, in a partly jocular way on my part: if there are secrets to be kept—there's the confidentiality, which is presently the case almost totally, and remember that Freud, in the daydream essay, in so far as there's a theory there it depends really also on being ashamed of one's secret life—what happens if things become more and more public, and that distinction between secret life, private life and public life gets less and less? What role will psychoanalysis have do you think?

Schwaber: We're in the process of finding that out.

Hartmann: You want us to wait?

Schwaber: There's another dimension to storytelling within psychoanalysis, which has to do with confidentiality. The real nitty-gritty is discussed between people and supervisors. The actualities of particular cases are part of what in Judaic studies you would call 'oral tradition.'

Hartmann: Exactly, yeah.

Schwaber: The fact that there are such discussions are very important, but they are never published.

Hartmann: Yeah, right.

Lothane: But even the analysts who come to supervisors don't tell everything. They only tell what's politically correct.

Schwaber: They have unconscious too, imagine.

Lothane: Yes.

A: I'm struck by the fact that the delusion paper is quite early. It was done, what, 1907, and it's just a short seven years following the dream book. I'm wondering if the panel would like to address the question of the development of that quality as Freud developed over the years, and whether there's anything interesting in that connection.

Lothane: I can say something about that. The point is that for Freud delusion and dream are equivalent. Both have the same structure. They are unconsciously determined, and both have a manifest and a latent content. As you can see, the announcement of the panel, there is a complete parallelism between *traumbildung* and *wahnbildung*. Interpreting dream and interpreting delusion is the same process because they're created in a similar way and they're analyzed in a similar way. But maybe the panel would like to add to it.

Schwaber: It also has to do with symptoms.

Lothane: Same thing.

Schwaber: Those are explained the same way, yeah.

Hartmann: But delusion is when the dream reaches a certain extent in the conscious life.

Lothane: So does the dream. The dream has to be conscious to be told.

Hartmann: Right.

Schwaber: But the delusion is in waking life.

Hartmann: In waking life, right.

Lothane: That's why he says, in the essay on creative writers, that the delusionist—an old English word—and the hallucinator are a dreamer wide awake.

Hartmann: But there's also negative hallucination, which—

Lothane: That's something else.

Hartmann: I know it's something else, but when you do not recognize what is before your eyes you make it a negative hallucination. I think that enters somehow.

Skura: Not this one, but so many of the questions come down to the difference between truth and fiction, and here's a place where I think psychoanalysis might not have gone over the ground that literary critics have gone over the ground yet, because there seems to be such a clear distinction between truth and fiction. If you are a scientist there is a clear distinction. But if you try to make that distinction outside of science—I'm not just saying literature, but talking now about autobiographies. For a long time numbers of works were not considered autobiographies because they were fictional, but if you sit down and look at the whole pool you notice that even the most truthful autobiographies, of course, are partial fiction, and even the most fictional autobiographies have a grain of truth. If we can get more exact about discussing the degrees of difference, rather than getting upset that one is totally at this end or totally at that end, there might be some leeway for writing about cases. We've already benefited. I mean a lot of the autobiographies that I spent my time on were partial fictions, but which turned out to be in some ways more revealing than the official straight up and down kind of tight autobiography.

A: If we were to strip the analyst of his role as the analytic instrument, and if we were to strip the patient from his or her pathology, and we were to focus only on the intensity of the interaction that is produced by the attitudes and the demeanor of the analyst, we would then find very often that the patient is providing a literary text. Not formally so, but in essence full of grit, drama, great interest, novelty and so on, which could be theoretically, or hypothetically, taken out and made into stories, into novels, whatever.

Lothane: Right. Maybe the panel could address a related issue, which we did not mention much, which is the metaphor and the literary trope. Freud was creating a homology between literary tropes and the dream work. So displacement, condensation, et cetera, are actually the mechanisms of the metaphor itself. I think that's a worthy issue to consider.

Charney: I think one answer to that is that there's a different way of thinking in modern criticism. There's not a sense that things have one single identifiable meaning. There's a kind of range of meanings. So reading Freud, it seems somewhat old-fashioned. His views about the nature of language and expression, that in some way it's too meaning-oriented in the sense that the latent meaning is always translated into the manifest meaning, and there's a sense that there's no residue, there's nothing left over. I think that's the point that I've been trying to argue. I don't know about very successfully.

Nersessian: It seems old-fashioned because it is old-fashioned.

Charney: It's old-fashioned in its interpretation of language, of what language can mean. It relates to metaphor, the idea that it has some kind of identifiable—that it's a translation, a transfer in the literal sense between the figurative and the literal.

Schwaber: It's clearly logocentric, but it's also the case that there are more than one meaning. Dreams, for example, have any number of meanings. All of them seem to be relevant to potentially unpacking something. In fact, he says that the first dream you get in an analysis often can contain the entire life condensed into it, and you're only in the position to know that at the end of the analysis. It's true that he depends on words, but I don't think it's true that he was sort of tone deaf or—he was obviously very tuned into symbolic statements. He was not, apparently, fond of music, but he did go to the theater. And he liked to play cards.

Charney: He's not tuned into ambiguity. For example, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, he doesn't say there are twelve different interpretations of this dream. He gives you what he considers to be an adequate interpretation.

Lothane: No, you forget, it's the patient's association that determined that.

Nersessian: But it's also true that we're talking about 1907.

Charney: Right.

Nersessian: He said almost at the very beginning of his analytic work that these are going to develop until his death and then have developed significantly since then. And we're in 2008.

Lothane: But speaking of old-fashioned, let me also remind you that already in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, and in *Gradiva*, he doesn't only talk about words, he talks about emotions in a very important way.

A: My question is about ethics. I was just imagining myself as a patient of yours, say. If you wrote up my story I would be very, very angry. Obviously we wouldn't know what we know if Freud hadn't written, but when you're writing about today, on the question of privacy, is that brought into play, or do you think about that? If you're thinking about writing up someone's history, even if you give them fictitious names, it may well be that they recognize themselves.

Schwaber: Oh, of course.

A: I think there's an ethical issue that maybe hasn't been touched on yet.

Schwaber: Let me agree with you. It's an ethical issue, and analysts are very careful about it. You don't write up a case and just change the name. You essentially write up a dilemma, a kind of psyche, and you change all sorts of details. For example, I was talking about combinations. I was just thinking that I had a patient who, anytime I would go to call for him in the waiting room, was reading a magazine. Never looked up. Always was reading the magazine. It took a lot of curiosity about that for it to come out that I was too daunting for him and he didn't want to think about what was coming up, and he just wanted to put it all out of mind. It was enough that he had showed up. Now, I didn't write that case up. I used that particular issue of the waiting room as part of a case study that I wrote, which was about something else and based on several other patients, but a pattern that I had seen in my patients. So I do think in so far as I'm able to do that effectively it seems to me that we're talking about aesthetics and truth, and also trying to render, translate scientific, or heuristic, whatever psychoanalysis is, into something that can be read and perceived as something more than just an intellectual puzzle.

Levy: In answer to the problem you just brought up, I've been a longtime patient in psychoanalysis. I've been dying to have my analyst write me up.

A: You could write it up then.

Levy: I already have. It's in *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, the current issue.

Schwaber: That's not ethical.

A: There was a play a couple of years ago. I think it's David Margulies' play, where the writer takes the life of the writer that she's visiting and turns it into a story. And her teacher, the writer, says, "You've taken my life."

Levy: This is Janet Malcolm's whole thing that she's writing about, about the parrotism between biographers and their subject. It's very interesting.

Nersessian: I just wanted to comment on one thing, and then we need to wrap up. You mentioned emotion. There are three lines in this piece that Freud wrote in 1907 that took almost ninety years to prove experimentally about emotions.

Lothane: You won't tell us what they are?

Nersessian: I'd be happy to tell you. He says, "What is alone of value in mental life is rather the feelings. No mental forces are significant unless they possess the characteristic of arousing feelings. Ideas are only repressed because they're associated with the release of feelings which ought not to occur. It would be more correct to say that the repression acts upon feelings, but we can only be aware of this in their association with ideas."

The notion of feelings being repressed or pushed away or memorized independently has only been found in neuroscience since about '95, '96.

Lothane: I think we can say in closing that this panel has aroused a lot of feelings.