

talk is something else. Psychoanalytically speaking, Freud may be seen as coaching Martha, as telling her what he expected from her. He expected her to continue helping him become a self-confident, courageous man and continue in strengthening his faith in his own value and in giving him new hope and energy to work when he needed it most, just as he wished his mother had done—and do so by becoming his intellectual companion. Jones (1958) writes that Freud sought “fusion rather than union” with Martha, but fusion based on Martha becoming molded into a “comrade in arms.” Jones also documents that Martha steadfastly resisted these manipulative efforts.

Freud apparently felt that Martha would change once they were married, because he initially tried discussing his patients’ cases with her, but this practice quickly ceased as Martha made it clear that she would run his household and bear his children, but that he would have to turn to someone else for anything more. And so Freud did, his first intellectual companion being Minna Berneys, Martha’s sister, who moved in with the family in late 1896. Next came Emma Eckstein, a former patient who Freud was training as a psychoanalyst at the time of the botanical monograph dream. Many more female intellectual companions would follow, culminating with Freud’s youngest daughter, Anna.

So this thematic plane concerns Freud’s vengeful resistance to buying Martha her favorite flowers because a longstanding grievance that was probably brought into prominence by something Martha said to indicate that she in effect sided with Königstein. Freud’s goal involves achieving revenge in a manner that does not provoke Martha’s retaliation. The dream opens with a reference to the situation and then goes on to deal with it. Lacking specific information on how Freud interpreted the memories he mentioned, I will appeal to common sense.

It is not difficult to imagine the lesson Freud took from Frau L.’s episode and the bearing this memory had on Freud’s situation with his wife. If Frau L. could become upset upon concluding that forgetfulness in buying flowers meant a diminishment of love on her husband’s part, so could Martha. This memory thus contains the warning that Martha might soon become upset at Freud’s forgetfulness. The memory that Martha recently chatted with Frau L. adds a sense of urgency to the need for a solution because even if Frau L. did not relate the husband-forgetting-flowers story to Martha, she certainly might the next time they met, which could cause Martha to connect forgetfulness to resentment on Freud’s part, if she hasn’t done so already. To perhaps indicate that things haven’t yet escalated to a crisis stage, Freud includes the memory that she continues buying him artichokes and preparing them for him.

This is one possible scenario based on Freud’s stated associations. It assumes that Martha’s critical attitude was not related to Freud not buying flowers. Another possible scenario would have Freud putting caustic commentary from Martha about his hobbies together with the fact that Martha has not made artichokes recently and concluding that Martha is already upset and would become even angrier, should Frau L. tell her the husband-forgetting-flowers story. In yet another scenario, Freud might have supposed that she is already upset because Frau L. told Martha the husband-forgetting-flowers story and her interpretation of it. The latter two scenarios convey much more of a sense of urgency, and quite possibly one of them was used by Freud to motivate himself to change his manner of revenge. It should be noted that the three scenarios differ in the way the same memories have been interpreted and organized. This is one kind of organizational change I referred to in outlining my concept of the normal night of sleep.

Upon experiencing the colored plate, a memory of pulling an artichoke apart leaf by leaf becomes activated. This action could correspond to either Martha preparing artichokes for Freud or to Freud pulling an artichoke apart while eating it. In either case, the memory is one of life as normal. Freud provides no further insight into the circumstances surrounding this memory, but theoretical considerations suggest that the memory corresponded to a time when Freud successfully soothed Martha's feelings, leading her to make Freud his favorite meal. Thus, the memory in the dream would function as an expression of confidence that Freud's solution will work—Martha will be soothed, and life with her will continue on a normal basis without concern for womanly reprisals.

At first glance, Freud's dream associations seem to jump from warnings to the aftermath of a solution having been found, with the solution itself being absent. This perception persists until one considers the possibility that the solution, like the proverbial 500 lb elephant in the room, may have escaped notice even though it was staring one in the face. The key lies in recognizing that dreams have the purpose of motivating dreamers to take specific actions upon awakening, and we know of at least one thing Freud did the next day—he wrote down his associations to the dream, and did so initially in a very peculiar way. He begins the analysis of the dream with the subject of Martha's flowers and then starts the analysis anew. It is as if he had something he wanted to get off his chest before settling down to interpreting the main body of the dream. What he wanted to get off his chest is indicated too by his delving unnecessarily into the matter of his resentment toward his wife.

Martha was a hopeless case; there was no question of winning her interest in Freud's intellectual life. The only issue was how to continue exacting revenge in a way that would not attract Martha's notice, thereby avoiding a domestic squabble or retaliation on Martha's part. The solution that Freud arrived at was to switch his manner of revenge to one that Martha would never notice. He would buy her cyclamens the next day to allay her suspicions and then take revenge by publicly declaring his resentment toward her in a book he knew that neither she nor her friends would ever read, his book on dreams.

Continuing with the Dream Book

Freud relates the experience of seeing the dreamed monograph lying before him to a letter he had received from Fliess the day before in which Fliess had said, "I am very much occupied with your dream-book. I see it lying finished before me and I see myself turning over its pages."

"How much I envied him his gift as a seer! If only I could have seen it lying finished before me!" Freud says at this point in his associations. Freud expresses the wish of seeing the book completed so ardently because, as he indicated in his March 10 letter to Fliess, at the time of the dream, work on the dream book "has come to a halt again, and meanwhile the problem has deepened and widened. It seems to me that the theory of wish fulfillment has brought only the psychological solution and not the biological—or, rather, metaphysical—one."

Freud had long suspected that dreams were disguised wish fulfillments and became convinced of it two and a half years earlier in analyzing the dream of Irma's injection. Now, as he started systematically applying that notion in the dream book, he was finding that there was more to dreaming than he had supposed. The initial confidence that had fed his desire to write the book at this

time had therefore become undermined. To make matters worse, Freud's work on the dream book had been roundly criticized by Königstein.

The dream opens with Freud perusing a book in the same manner Fliess described in his letter. So in the blended mental space that gave rise to the dream, the dreamed book also refers to the dream book Freud was writing. The unresolved issue forming the basis for the second thematic plane, therefore, concerned whether Freud should continue working on the book or begin developing a whole new approach to fame and fortune. Once again, the decision has already been made, and the function of the dream is merely to build emotional support for it.

Freud restarts his analysis of the dream by mentioning a monograph on cocaine he had written in 1884. He does not tie this memory to any specific dream element; however, Grinstein (1961) indicates that the dried specimen may refer to cocaine, because cocaine is derived from the dried leaves of the coca plant. So it is possible that the memory of the cocaine monograph could have been associated with this element, particularly since Freud specifically relates two other cocaine-related memories to the dried specimen. One pertains to an eye operation Freud's father underwent for glaucoma, which was performed using a cocaine solution as a local anesthetic. The other involves having read a copy of a *Festschrift* written by pupils celebrating the jubilee of their teacher and laboratory director. Among the laboratory's claims to distinction enumerated in this book was the fact that Karl Koller, Freud's friend and a fellow intern at the University of Vienna's General Hospital during their medical student days, had at that time discovered that cocaine could be useful as a local anesthetic in eye surgeries. This discovery made Koller famous among eye surgeons throughout the world virtually overnight. Two student memories not relating to cocaine were also associated with the dried specimen; a third such memory was associated with the colored plate, as was a cocaine-related memory.

Freud claims that the cocaine monograph was valuable because it set Koller on the path to discovery, which was not true. He then continues the pursuit of revisionist history by saying, "I had myself indicated this application of the alkaloid in my published paper, but I had not been thorough enough to pursue the matter further." Freud in fact did not speak of the drug's possible use as an anesthetic in eye surgeries; he merely suggested its "occasional use as a local anesthetic, especially in connection with affections of the mucous membrane" (Byck, 1974, p. 73).

Freud took even greater steps toward revisionism years later, when he claimed that it was his wife's fault that he was not famous at an early age. He said then that he was induced to neglect performing the simple experiments that would have verified cocaine's suitability for eye surgeries because he had to rush off to be with his then fiancé, who was living in another city. As Jones indicates, he traveled to see Martha nearly three months after having finished his paper, which would have left him more than enough time to do the needed experiments (which took Koller only one hour to perform [Bernfeld, 1953]). These evasions would indicate that the events surrounding the cocaine monograph held an important place in Freud's life.

They were important because his cocaine research was integral to a get-rich-and-famous scheme that nearly paid off beyond Freud's wildest dreams. Freud knew from personal experience that cocaine had a numbing effect. He probably also knew of eye surgeons' desperate need for a local anesthetic. All he needed to do was make the connection between the two, as Koller did, perform a few obvious experiments, and instant fame would have been his. The lesson Freud took from this memory was that his get-rich-

and-famous-scheme technique could bring him the fame he desired; all he needed to do was be more thorough in following through, and success could conceivably come. In a sense, then, the lesson learned in association with the cocaine project was all Freud needed to encourage himself to continue with the dream book. Freud, however, doesn't rely on this memory alone. Instead, he bolsters this intellectual conclusion emotionally through memories of humiliations that resulted from lapses of thoroughness.

One participating memory concerned a time when Freud's father came down with glaucoma, which happened a few months after Koller's discovery. As Freud looked on, Königstein operated while Koller administered the cocaine anesthetic. The next day, Koller commented to Freud that this case had brought together all three of the men who had a share in the introduction of cocaine, himself, Königstein, and Freud. This memory should be judged in connection with the Festschrift memory, which Freud mentions next in his associations. The Festschrift celebrated Koller's discovery; pointedly, however, there was no mention of Freud. The conjunction of the two memories at once confirms Freud's contribution to Koller's discovery and points up the fact that his participation had faded from public memory at the time of the dream. Incidentally, Freud's contribution was not his cocaine monograph, but the fact that he introduced Koller to cocaine's numbing effect by using Koller as a guinea pig in his experiments.

The poignancy of this conjunction to Freud is suggested by a daydream he had the morning after the dream. He imagined that if he ever developed glaucoma, he would travel "incognito" to Berlin to have eye surgery done at Fliess's home. The physician would then extol the benefits of cocaine in such surgeries in his presence, not knowing that his patient was someone who had a hand in introducing cocaine for this purpose. This daydream expressed denial on Freud's part, because there would have been no need to remain incognito, since even if the surgeon knew his name, he probably would not have associated it with the introduction of cocaine for eye surgeries.

Freud continues the theme of thoroughness with two painful memories from his student days. When Freud was in secondary school, the headmaster asked students to clean out the school's herbarium, which had been infested with small worms. Freud volunteered to help, but the teacher apparently didn't have much faith in Freud doing a thorough job, so he handed him only a few sheets, thereby humiliating Freud. Another humiliating memory related to Freud being put in jeopardy of doing poorly on a preliminary examination in botany during his college years upon failing to identify a crucifer, evidently because he had not been thorough in preparing for the test.

After beating himself up for a lack of thoroughness, Freud ends the dream on a positive note in relation to the colored plate. Freud recalls that he has long been proud of his "hankering for thoroughness," as exemplified by his practice during his medical student years of buying monographs containing the proceedings of medical societies, rather than contenting himself with hashed-over summaries by authors who may not be describing subjects correctly or in sufficient detail.

It would have been helpful to Freud at this point if he had brought to mind an example of this hankering for thoroughness that was more pertinent to the dream book. Actually he does mention such an association, although not in connection with the colored plate. In his concluding remarks, he alludes to his analysis of the dream of Irma's injection (quoted below). This was the first dream he analyzed thoroughly, and in doing so confirmed what he had long suspected, namely, that dreams could be interpreted as wish

fulfillments. It is supposed here, therefore, that this memory was associated with the colored plate.

In conclusion, the second thematic plane concerns Freud's decision to continue with his get-rich-and-famous-scheme approach to success in terms of the dream book. This decision is supported with the memory that thoroughness would have made the difference between spectacular success and humiliating failure in a similar endeavor. The resolve to be more thorough is then stiffened through the memories of stinging humiliations that came because of intellectual carelessness and the bracing realization that thoroughness is a trait Freud always valued and that this trait led him to an important discovery with respect to dreams.

As with the interpretation of the first thematic plane, the conclusions reached with respect to the second plane are in accord with something Freud did the next day. In offering an interpretation of the dream, Freud wrote: "Once again the dream, like the one we first analyzed—the dream of Irma's injection—turns out to have been in the nature of a self-justification, a plea on behalf of my own rights ... What it meant was: 'After all, I'm the man who wrote the valuable and memorable paper (on cocaine)' In both cases what I was insisting was: 'I may allow myself to do this.'" The discussion here reaches a conclusion that is similar to the one reached by Freud, with the difference that nothing hinges on the cocaine monograph being valuable or memorable, which is a plus, because it was neither. Additionally, the dreamed remembrance of the Irma dream could have played a part in inspiring Freud to analyze the botanical monograph dream the next day.

Letting Fliess Help

Freud seems to have unconsciously taken Fliess's imaginary perusal of the dream book to indicate that Fliess was coyly asking to see the current draft of it. This evidently prompted Freud to consider giving Fliess an opportunity to see it, and thus have the chance of criticizing the book in its current rough and unfinished state. The third thematic plane, I feel, concerns Freud's attempt to support a decision to cautiously take Fliess up on his veiled proposal.

This interpretation conflicts with that offered by Palombo (1988). He sees Fliess's language as suggesting an unconscious fantasy in which he, Fliess, is the author of the dream book. According to Palombo, "His vision of himself examining the volume reads like an unconscious appropriation of Freud's work, in Fliess's mind perhaps the joint product of their intellectual collaboration extending over many years." Palombo sees Freud as probably reacting to Fliess's letter with conflicted emotions since the letter "arrived at a time when Freud was in the midst of removing the last traces of Fliess's scientifically obscure speculations from his own thoughts and writing." In the March 10 reply to Fliess's letter, Freud said, "It was no small feat on your part to see the dream book lying before you," which Palombo interprets as possibly meaning, "This is my work. You could not have done it." In apparent confirmation of this interpretation, he quotes a portion of Freud's March 15 letter in which he says, "'I can [sic] let you see it in fragments,' as if to deny Fliess the opportunity to grasp it all at once."

Freud's friendship with Fliess has long been an embarrassment to Freudian psychoanalysts, particularly because of Freud's fawning attitude toward Fliess and his pronounced tendency to yield to him as an authority figure. This led sympathetic historians to present the last stages of their friendship as consisting of Freud disengaging himself theoretically from Fliess (Jones, 1953; Gay, 1988). More objective

scholarship (e.g., Breger, 2000; Sulloway, 1979) has shown that this was not the case, that in fact the exact opposite was true. With the collapse of his seduction theory, Freud was in no position to begin disengaging himself from Fliess's judgment and theoretical expertise.

As for Fliess's statement about the dream book, I see no basis for the conjecture that Fliess wanted to appropriate Freud's work. Apparently up to this point Freud had shown Fliess only isolated examples of dream interpretation. With his curiosity whetted, Fliess was asking obliquely to see more. This is evidently the way Freud interpreted Fliess's remarks, as a full presentation of Freud's statements on the matter in his March 15, 1898, letter shows: "The idea occurred to me that you might like to read my dream study but were too discrete to ask for it. It goes without saying that I would have sent it to you before it goes to press. But since it now has again come to a halt, I can just as well send it to you in fragments." Freud then goes on to describe the fragments that he is sending. Freud does not withhold anything from Fliess. He sent him everything he has, which would seem to contradict Palombo's interpretations, especially since from this point forward Fliess was intimately involved as the editor of the dream book.

Freud gratefully accepted this level of involvement, as can be seen from his May 18, 1898, letter: "I shall change whatever you want and gratefully accept contributions. I am also immensely glad that you are giving me the gift of the Other, a critic and reader—and one of your quality at that. I cannot write entirely without an audience, but do not at all mind writing only for you."

Nevertheless, at the time of the dream, Freud was somewhat concerned that Fliess would unfairly criticize the book and that this could have a discouraging effect on him, a supposition that might lead one to expect the memories Freud marshals to help motivate himself to be cautious in seeking Fliess's help would be of Fliess's unfair criticisms in the matter of similar projects in the past. Such an approach, however, would have precluded Freud from sending Fliess anything, and Freud desperately needed Fliess's help, as the May 18th letter shows. So what Freud assembled as warnings are other memories of unfair criticisms of unfinished projects that influenced Freud for better or for worse, depending on how Freud reacted in response.

An initial search of Freud's associations to the dried specimen turns up no memories of this type. The only memory that we have not yet used concerns an awkwardness regarding the payment of medical fees by medical professionals to their colleagues. Apparently, it was the custom then for Vienna-area physicians to not charge colleagues for services rendered to them and their family members. This practice Freud considered "awkward." Evidently the spirit of the custom was that it would cost physicians nothing in the long run to do this because fees that would have been paid to a particular physician at a particular time would be returned on average when that physician needed medical assistance. So it is difficult to see how there can be any awkwardness when the potential for full reciprocity existed. It would seem that what Freud found awkward was that the potential for full reciprocity did not exist in his case. In other words, physicians would feel obligated to provide Freud and his family with free medical services even though they would never think of asking Freud for the sort of help he provided. The awkwardness on Freud's part could have come, therefore, from his perception that the local medical community was critical of his psychoanalytic treatment.