ABSTRACT

On August 26, 1898, Sigmund Freud wrote Wilhelm Fliess a guarded account of his recent failure to recall the surname of Julius Mosen, “the poet who wrote Andreas Hofer (‘Zu Mantua in Banden’ [To Mantua in Chains]’). . . . According to the author, at the time of the Mosen lapse, Freud’s fratricidal sense of guilt over having ‘killed’ his infant brother Julius was evoked, as well as his intention to redeem himself by instituting a brotherly world where anti-Semitism is unknown. But before setting others free from their religious chains, Freud would deliver himself from the Law—by taking his stand before his personal totem, Michelangelo’s Moses, in The Church of St. Peter in Chains. Viewed through the prism of psychoanalysis, at the time of the slip, in addition to the concomitant filial sense of guilt and fear of Yahweh’s visitations regarding his intention to destroy Judaism, all of the above was also repressed: Freud’s ‘killing’ Julius in his birthplace, Freiberg, Moravia; the related fratricidal sense of guilt and resolve to redeem himself by delivering der Kinder, other Juliuses (and Sarahs), from the scourge of anti-Semitism; and, in order to get on with his secret messianic ambition, his intention to set himself free from the Law before Moses/Moses. Like Andreas Hofer, Freud was a freedom fighter, only secretly so.

Our analysis of instances of the uncanny has led us back to the
old animistic conception of the universe. This was characterized by the idea that the world was peopled with the spirits of human beings . . . by the attribution to various outside persons and things of carefully graded magical powers, or ‘mana’ . . . It seems as if each one of us has been through a phase of individual development corresponding to the animistic stage in primitive men, that none of us has passed it without preserving some residues and traces of it which are still capable of manifesting it. (Freud, 1919, “The ‘Uncanny’,” 240)

[Breuer] told me he had discovered that hidden under the surface of timidity there lay in me an extremely daring and fearless human being. I had always thought so, but never dared tell anyone. I have always felt as though I had inherited all the defiance and all the passions with which our ancestors defended their Temple and could gladly sacrifice my life for one great moment in history.


My Dear Ones:

Kennenst du das Land wo die Citronen bluhen? [Know'st thou the land where the lemon trees bloom?]...The darkest green...belongs...to orange and lemon trees with green fruit, and when I stand up and look down into the garden I can see on the farthest trees the orange-yellow balloons ‘im dunkin Laube gluhend [And oranges like gold in leafy gloom].’

One of these trees has achieved a strange color effect...


In this paper, the author intends to show: at the time of his failure to recall the surname of the German-Jewish poet Julius Mosen, Sigmund Freud’s fratricidal sense of
guilt over having 'killed' his infant brother Julius was evoked, as well as his intention to redeem himself by instituting a brotherly world where anti-Semitism is unknown.

Freud's only mention of the Mosen name lapse (Anzieu, 1986, 358-9) is a guarded account which he penned soon after to Wilhelm Fliess, then his best friend and confidant:

. . . You know how you can forget a name and substitute part of another for it; you could swear it was correct, although inevitably it turns out to be wrong. That happened to me recently with the name of the poet who wrote Andreas Hofer ("Zu Mantua in Banden [To Mantua in Chains]. . . "). It must be something with an au--Lindau, Feldau, of course, the man's name is Julius Mosen; the "Julius" had not slipped my memory. I was able to prove (i) that I had repressed the name Mosen because of certain associations; (ii) that infantile material played a part in the repression; and (iii) that the substitute names that were pushed into the foreground were formed, like symptoms, from both groups of material. The analysis of it turned out to be complete, with no gaps left; unfortunately, I can not expose it to the public anymore than my big dream. . . Letter of August 26, 1898; in Freud, 1985, 324).

The reconstruction offered in this paper approximates, the author believes, the essence of Freud's withheld reading of the Mosen slip. For ease of presentation, the author has broken down into components the above censored account.

The year before (1897), Freud discovered that he is a Cain, a brother killer:
. . . I greeted my one-year-younger brother (who died after
a few months) with adverse wishes and genuine childhood
jealousy. . . his death left the germ of [self-]repoaches in me.

--Letter to Wilhelm Fliess, October 3, 1897 (Freud, 1985, 268.)

As both McGraw (1986, 291) and Anzieu (1986, 358-9) intimate, “infantile material" suggests strongly that Freud’s fratricidal sense of guilt over his infant brother Julius’s death was evoked at the time of Mosen slip. After making the dreadful discovery, Freud, in spite of himself, continued to believe: when he was 23 months old, his ill wishes had killed his baby brother Julius, who died at either six or eight months of age (no one seems to know the exact age). Tormented, Freud secretly resolved to redeem himself by instituting an enlightened secular world where der Kinder, other Juliuses (and Sarahs) live in peace with their neighbors and can move freely across frontiers. In other words, at the cost of Judaism, this tormented Cain would redeem der Kinder from the scourge of anti-Semitism—and, in so doing, redeem himself.

I can not expose it to the public anymore than my big dream. . .

Freud’s “big dream” never did surface. According to Max Schur (1966, 75), this lost dream “must have been something 'political" (in Freud, 1985, p. 318-9, n.1). It can not have escaped Schur that Freud’s concern over the scourge of anti-Semitism informed the dream. In this regard, consider Freud’s penned response to Fliess’s expressed reservations about Freud’s including his “big dream” in The Interpretation of Dreams:

So the dream is condemned. . . . Let me know at least which topic
[in the dream] it was to which you took exception and where you
feared an attack by a malicious critic. Whether it is my anxiety, or Martha, or the Dalles [poverty or misery in Yiddish], or my being without a fatherland?

(letter of 9 June 1898; in Freud, 1985, 315, italics added.)

Two years earlier In his 1886 famous political tract, The Jewish State, Theodor Herzl (1896, 1988) referred to anti-Semitism as Judennot, the misery of the Jews. Clearly, Freud’s concern over anti-Semitism informed his “big dream.” And given that this lost dream is associated in Freud’s mind with his (withheld) analysis of the Mosen slip, it is reasonable to conclude that Freud’s concern over that scourge is implicated in the Mosen lapse as well. The previous year, on 8 April 1897, Good Friday, Emperor Franz Josef reluctantly confirmed as Mayor of Vienna, the first politician ever to have been elected on an anti-Semitic platform (the Christian Social Party) “I say who is a Jew,” Herr Doktor Karl Lueger (Lewis, 1986, 95-6).

The ferocious anti-Semitism in "fraternal" France vis-à-vis the Dreyfus Affair in the Land Declaration of the Rights of Man, is for Freud, as it is for Herzl, a harbinger of the misery to come. In The Interpretation of Dreams, Freud (1900) acknowledges that his (undisclosed) thoughts about Captain Dreyfus on Devil’s Island informed the following dream-image of Cliff in Bocklin Style (date unknown):

A man standing on a [steep] cliff in the middle of the sea, in the style of [the painter] Bocklin. (166)

James Strachey omitted translating the significant adjective, "steilen" (steep). The precipitous fall of Captain Dreyfus wasting away on Devil’s Island over a fraudulent
charge of treason, selling military secrets to the Germans (December 1894), signifies for Freud the precarious standing of Jews in Christendom: each a potential Dreyfus.

"Zu Mantua in Banden [To Mantua in Chains] . . . ."

In a letter to Fliess dated October 23, 1898, Freud (1985, 332), after mentioning his longing for Rome, alludes in the next sentence to his “big dream.” This proximity, according the ‘contiguity rule’ of psychoanalysis (Freud, 1905 [1901], 39), indicates: Freud’s Rome longing and his “big dream” are intimately related. And given that this lost dream is associated in Freud’s mind with the Mosen slip (cf. “I can not expose [my analysis of the Mosen slip] … anymore than my big dream”), it is reasonable to assume: at the time of slip, Freud’s Rome longing was stirred up. But how is Freud’s messianic ambition tied to his longing for Rome? The answer is: before setting others free from their religious chains, and so deliver der Kinder from anti-Semitism, Freud must, he understands, set himself free from the Law or Torah in The Church of St. Peter in Chains (cf. above, “in Banden [in Chains]”) before Michelangelo’s Moses, which Pope Julius II had commissioned for his tomb (cf. Julius Mosen, the poet’s name). The Church of St. Peter in Chains was built to house the two chains which fell from Peter’s wrists after the angel had awakened him in the night in his Jerusalem prison cell. Unlike Peter, Freud would set free himself free from his chains, his Jewish chains, the Law.

In his 1914 essay, “The Moses of Michelangelo”—initially published anonymously at his insistence—Freud (1914) will state, and understandably so, “no other piece of statuary has ever made a stronger impression on me than this [Moses]” (213). For, as we shall see, the world’s greatest representation of Moses is not a mere prop for
Freud to deliver himself from the Law but a symbol in the same manner that the bread Jesus of the Eucharist is a symbol for Roman Catholics, such as his Czech nanny for whom the Host or Communion Wafer is Christ: Moses is Moses. In other words, Michelangelo's 8 ft., 4 in. tablet-bearing horned Moses is Freud's personal totem, the Biblical Moses himself, possessing all of that Great Man's qualities, including his awful radiance or mana (below).

In his interleaved copy of the 1904 edition of The Psychopathology of Everyday Life, Freud (1901, 260, in note 3) will jot (for his eyes only) "--My own superstition has its roots in suppressed ambition (immortality) . . ." And to arouse the superstitious tendencies of this impious striver who aspires to usurp the mantle of Moses--both as the new moral authority ("Know Thyself") and as the deliverer of his people—there is no more fitting work of art than Michelangelo's Moses whose angry scorn is fixed "upon … the mob which can hold fast to no conviction [the Israelites dancing around and worshipping the Golden Calf]], which has neither faith nor patience, and which rejoices when it has regained its illusory idols" (Freud, 1914, 213). That is to say: when Freud's messianic ambition is stirred up, and in turn excites his "superstition" or superstitious tendencies, Michelangelo's terrible Moses is Moses.

After Julius died, and with Amalie Freud overcome with grief (just the month before, she had lost her younger brother, also named Julius), Freud's Czech nanny became in all but name little Sigis mother in Freiberg, Moravia (now Pribor, the Czech Republic). Until she was discharged for stealing several months later, often she took her two year-old charge to Freiberg's Mariae Geburt (The Church of The Nativity of Our Lady), after which he told Jakob and Amalie "all about God
Almighty " (Freud, 1985, 371). In this tiny Catholic city of Freud’s birth, a statue inspired by Michelangelo’s Moses was stationed in its town square. Purportedly a representation of the post-exilic Hebrew Prophet Zechariah, this imposing figure writes on a stone tablet and wears a helmet with horn-like projections (Blum, 1991, 514-5).

And if in Freiberg's Mariae Geburt, bread, a Communion wafer, can be Jesus, what was to keep, in the lively mind of young Sigi, the stone prophet in its town square from being Zechariah? And, similarly, decades later, in the mind of an ambitious older Sigmund, what's to keep the huge, horn-crowned marble prophet in Rome from being Moses? His dreaded pilgrimage to Moses/Moses in the gloomy Roman chamber of that venerable Prophet calls up for Freud Aeneas's perilous descent, in Italy, into the underworld (cf. Andreas Hofer, the subject of Mosen’s poem). But only up to a point would Freud follow in the footsteps of that legendary Trojan. In order to save his homeless people, Aeneas made his perilous descent into the underworld to receive instructions from his father, Anchises. Freud, on the other hand, in order to save his homeless people, would make his perilous descent into his underworld, The Church of St. Peter in Chains, to destroy the Instructions of his Ur-father Moses: the Torah. [In Moses and Monotheism, Freud (1939) will assert, “this one man Moses . . . created the Jews” (106.).] And, like his classical double, this Aeneas would come armed, armed with a Golden Bough.

“It must be something with an au--Lindau, Feldau. . .”.

Because Virgil, the singer of Aeneas, was born near Mantua (cf. “Zu Mantua . . .”), this Italian city is often referred to as the great poet’s birth place.[In The Divine Comedy, Dante addresses Virgil's shade as "Courteous Mantuan soul." (Dante, Hell,
Though it was from an oak tree that Aeneas plucked his Golden Bough, the substitute name “Lindau” --as in the linden or lind tree-- is a fitting token of Aeneas’s hell’s charm whose “leaves [a]nd pliant twigs are all of gold” (Virgil, *The Aeneid*, 1983, Bk. VI, 12): adorning a lind tree are small yellow flowers; Au, of course, is the symbol for gold. And his "Lindau" or hell’s charm, Freud has already secretly plucked: the Oedipal origins of the idea of God.

The year before, on May 31, 1897, Freud mailed Fliess Draft N, a working paper in which he, for the first time, alludes to the Oedipus complex. Twenty-six days earlier, on May 5th, Freud had written Fliess:

> Another presentiment tells me, as though I already knew—but I know nothing at all—that I shall soon discover the source of morality. . .. (Freud, 1985, 245; italics added.)

Seven months later, on December 3, 1897, Freud will write Fliess, and apparently for the first time, about his “longing for Rome,” tying this longing to his “schoolboy” identification with the Semitic avenger, Hannibal:

> Incidentally my longing for Rome is deeply neurotic. It is connected with my schoolboy hero-worship of the Semitic Hannibal. . . . I have no more reached Rome than he did from Lake Trasimene. Since I have started studying the unconscious I have become so interesting to myself. It's a pity that one always keeps one's mouth shut about the most intimate things.

> "The best that you know you must not tell to boys."
The Oedipal beginnings of the idea of God is "the best" that Freud knows, and "must not tell to boys," not even Fliess. For in this secret theoretical knowledge Hannibal/Freud has, he trusts, his mighty weapon to crush that seed-bed for anti-Semitic, the Roman Catholic Church. Here it is worth noting a relevant slip of the pen, Freud's unwitting substitution in *The Interpretation of Dreams* of the name of Hannibal's younger brother (Hasdrubal) for that of Hannibal's father (Hamilcar Barca).

Hannibal's father, Hasdrubal, made his boy swear before the household altar to take vengeance on the Romans. Ever since that time Hannibal had had a place in my phantasies (Freud, 1900, 197).

Given the context (Freud's 'avenging Hannibal' identification), this slip of penning Hannibal's younger brother's name (Hasdrubal) instead of Hannibal's father's (Hamilcar) amounts to a veiled confession: it was to my younger brother Julius—and not to my father, Jakob (who did not defend himself when the Christian hooligan ordered him into the pavement after knocking his new Shabbos hat off his head)—that I vowed "to take vengeance on the Romans"; that is, on the new Romans, the Roman Catholic Church.

"something ending in an au-... Feldau"

Armed with his Golden Bough or "Lindau," Aeneas descended into the underworld to the home of the righteous dead or Manes, Elysium's Golden Fields or "Feldau":

Where souls take ease among the Blessed Groves
Wider expanse of high air endow

each vista with a wealth of light. (Virgil. 1983, B. VI.)

Freud’s Golden Fields, The Church of St. Peter in Chains, is his battlefield. For, there, this striver would engage Moses/Moses (and also do battle with himself). Helpful here is Freud’s gloss in The Interpretation of Dreams regarding his Rome longing: “the wish to go to Rome had become in my dream-life a cloak and symbol [Deckmantel und Symbol]” (Freud, 1900, 196-7; [G. W. II/III, 202]) for a number of ...passionate wishes.” Bent on assuming Moses’s mantle (cf. “Deckmantel”), Freud would face that terrible Symbol, Moses/Moses, whose radiance-emitting visage, as Freud well knows, is fully exposed, not cloaked with a veil or “Decke,” (cf. “till Moses had done speaking with [the Israelites at the foot of Mt. Sinai], he put a veil on his face” (Exodus 34:33; [“legte er eine Decke auf sein Angesicht”], Luther’s Bible, 2 Mose 34). In Luther’s Bible, which Freud references in his works, “den Mantel” denotes the supernatural cloak of Elijah which Elisha assumed after Elijah “went up by a whirlwind into heaven”: “He [Elisha] took up also the mantle [”den Mantel“] of Elijah . . . (II Kings 2:13 [2. KONIGE 2:13]).

In Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego, Freud (1921) refers to the destructive power of the supernatural radiance or mana transferred from Yahweh on to Moses which so horrified the Israelites at the foot of Mt. Sinai: Even Moses had to act as an intermediary between his people and Jehovah, since the people could not support the sight of God; and when he returned from the presence of God his face shone--some of the mana [cf. Mantua] had been transferred on to him. (125)
Eight years earlier, in Totem and Taboo, Freud (1913), commenting on mana’s extraordinary supernatural destructive potential, states:

The source of taboo is attributed to a peculiar magical power which is inherent in persons and spirits and can be conveyed by them through the medium of an animate objects. [According to the anthropologist Northcote W. Thomas Freud continues:] ‘Persons or things which are regarded as taboo may be contact . . . Thus, kings and chiefs are possessed of great power, and it is death for their subjects to address them directly, but a minister or other person of greater mana than common can approach them unharmed . . ‘ (Freud, 1913, 20.)

Freud was born in a caul, a sign that he is destined to become “a great man” (Freud, 1900,192). Does he then superstitiously believe, as I suspect, that he may be one of those fortunate few, special individuals who possess “greater mana than common,” and so might withstand the awful radiance or mana of Moses?:

This power is attached to all special individuals, such as kings, priests or newborn babies, to all exceptional states as the physical states of menstruation, puberty or birth, and to all uncanny things . . . (ibid., 22, Freud’s italics)

But if his mana is no match for that of Moses, then woe to this transgressor:

...rulers must be guarded against . . . . because they are vehicles of the mysterious and dangerous magical power [mana] which is transmitted by contact like an electric charge and which brings death and ruin to anyone
who is not protected by a similar charge  (ibid., 41)

Relevant here also is the famous passage of “The Moses of Michelangelo,” which Freud will begin on Christmas Day 1913, and complete on New Year’s Day, 1914:

. . How often have I ... essayed to support [standzuhalten]

the angry scorn of the hero’s [Moses’] glance [Blick des Heros]! Sometimes I have crept cautiously out of the half-gloom of the interior . . . (Freud, 1914, p. 213 [G.W II/III,.175])

In an earlier paper, regarding this passage, the author stated:

According to The New Cassell’s German Dictionary, (1962) Blick

("glance") means "touches of light," and Blicken, in addition to meaning "to glance," means "to shine." (Cf. Exodus 34: 30: "And when Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses, behold, the skin of his face shone; they were afraid to come nigh him.") And in the Cassell’s edition of 1914, the year that "Der Moses Des Michelangelo" was published, we find that anblitzen, which stems from the same root, in addition to meaning "to cast a furious look upon," means "to throw a ray upon." This mysterious and terrible force or mana is comparable, then, to lightning or Blitz. (Lippman, 2003, 33)

Schur (1972, 57) suspects that Freud suffered a coronary thrombosis in the spring of 1894. Did Freud, then fear, by the time of the slip, that his constitution would not be
able to withstand the mana of Moses/Moses? In the Middle Ages it was believed that linden trees ("Lindau") shielded one from thunderbolts (Herder, 1986). Did Freud know this? Or that "Charlemagne [742-814] propagated its planting [linden] against lightning" (Vries, 1976, 299)? (Cf. above, mana "...may be compared to objects charged with electricity . .. tremendous power which is transmissible by contact.") Or that it was under the linden tree that "judgment was pronounced" (Ibid., 299)?

In The Divine Comedy, with which Freud had an easy familiarity (McGrath, 1986, 303-4), Virgil's shade, acting as Dante's guide to the underworld, informs Dante: because Moses "did not have baptism," his shade had been suspended in the Golden Fields (that is, until Jesus descended and lifted Moses's shade to Paradise). Did Freud then fantasize, perhaps fleetingly, encountering Moses/Moses in the Golden Fields of classical lore?

In the Golden Fields, Aeneas’s attention is directed by his father, Anchises, to the future line of his son Julius (Iulus Ascanius), the Romans-- a line that's "just --not by constraint of law, but by choice."-- (Virgil, The Aeneid, Bk VII, 202, ll. 200-1). And were all to go according to plan, Freud, too, would have his own enlightened ‘Julius’ or ‘Julian’ line--and which he will allude to in his 1927 attack on religion, The Future of an Illusion:

`... New generations, who have been brought up in kindness
and taught to have a high opinion on reason, and who have experienced the benefits of civilization at an early age . . .will feel it as a possession of their very own and will be ready for its sake to make the sacrifices as regards work and instinctual satisfaction that are necessary for its
preservation. They will be able to do without coercion from their
leaders-- (8)
. . . As honest smallholders on this earth they will know how
to cultivate their plot in such a way that it supports them.
By withdrawing their expectations from the other world
and concentrating all their liberated energies into their life
on earth, they will probably succeed in achieving a state of
things in which life will become tolerable for everyone and
civilization no longer oppressive to anyone. Then, with one
of our fellow-unbelievers [the poet Heinrich Heine], they will
be able to say without regret:
"We leave Heaven to the angels and the sparrows." (50)

The realization of his passionately longed-for ‘Julius’ line would undo Freud’s
‘killing’ Julius--for so long as this enlightened brotherly line lives, Julius lives! By itself,
this—its grandest promise-- makes his mighty Golden Bough, the Oedipal
beginnings of God, suspect as a scientific construct. Self-aware as he is, Freud, in all
likelihood understands that his Golden Bough may be, itself, what he will proclaim God
to be, a mere wish fulfillment. For in addition to undoing his having played Cain to
Julius’s Abel, this revolutionary notion promises: the realization of his avenging
Hannibal fantasy, the destruction of the Church; the deliverance of der Kinder from
anti-Semitism; self-redemption; and, by becoming the new moral educator or Lawgiver
("Know Thyself"), immortality. Is he then just another deluded messianic pretender?

“Zu Mantua in Banden [To Mantua in Chains]” (another look)
By the time Freud pens his guarded account of the Mosen slip on August 26, 1898, Herzl’s detractors were denouncing the Zionist leader as a false messiah—a characterization, Freud understands, which could very well apply to him. (The first major Zionist convention, the Second Zionist Congress, will convene three days later in Basle, Switzerland.)

In View of the Tiber (date unknown), one of his dreams “based upon a longing to visit Rome,” his analysis of which he withholds, Freud looks out of a railway carriage window at the bridge in front of the Castel Sant’Angelo, the Pont Sant’Angelo—a bridge favored by messianic pretenders, such as Shlomo Molcho who sat by the bridge. His path to martyrdom prefigured that of the hero of Mosen’s poem, “Andreas Hofer”: in 1532, two years after proclaiming himself Messiah at Rome, Molcho, on orders of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, was taken to Mantua in chains, where, after being condemned by the Inquisition, he was burned at the stake; similarly, almost three hundred years later, the heroic subject of Mosen’s poem, Andreas Hofer, on orders of Napoleon, was taken in chains to Mantua, where, after undergoing a sham trial, he was executed by a firing squad on 20 February 1810. To the very end, in the face of execution, Molcho and Hofer remained steadfast.

Though no evidence exists showing that he was familiar with Molcho, the author suspects that Freud, by the time of the slip, was familiar with the amazing life of this son of Conversos who became “famous in the annals of Jewish history and martyrdom as Solomon [Shlomo] Molcho, the pseudo-Messiah.” (Roth, 1932, 68). Freud’s beloved instructor in the Jewish religion, Professor Samuel Hammerschlag, if for no other purpose than to caution his students at the Sperl Gymnasium against false
messiahs, probably lectured on these pretenders, including Molcho. Regardless, as part of his preparation for Moses/ Moses and out fear that he is just another deluded pretender, Freud would have studied the lives and careers of the various false messiahs, including Molcho’s. In Totem and Taboo. Freud (1913, avers, "obsessional neurotics behave exactly like savages in relation to names." (56). Accordingly, they believe there is "a transcendental connection between all bearers . . . of the same name" (112)—including, one would presume, those bearing the name Shlomo-- such as Sigismund Schlomo (after Jakob’s Hassidic father, Schlomo). That he is an obsessional neurotic, Freud will acknowledge to Jung in his letter of September 2, 1907 (Freud and Jung, 1974, 82).

According to Anzieu (1986), the dreams in the "Rome" series "date from . . . December 1896--January 1897" (183). Freud then may have dreamt View of the Tiber some months before his guilt over Julius’s death surfaced. Nevertheless (presuming that unconscious motivation is a reality): Freud, from childhood on, was impelled to redeem himself. In this regard, consider Freud and Martha's first home (1886-1891), an apartment in the House of Atonement. Commissioned by Emperor Franz Joseph on the site of a theater where over four hundred burned to death (Gay, 1988, 58), the rent went to support the orphaned children (Ruitenbeek, 1973, 146). [Freud and Martha moved to Berggasse 19 after their third child, Oliver, was born.] It is then possible that this redemption-striving Cain—some time prior to the surfacing of his guilt—subconsciously fantasized establishing a world where anti-Semitism is unknown.
In early January, 1898, several months before the Mosen lapse, Freud had a relevant dream set in Rome. According to Freud, My son, the Myops was “constructed on a tangle of thoughts provoked by a play I had seen called Das neue Ghetto” [Freud had seen this play dealing with modern anti-Semitism on opening night (Freud, 1985, 293) but does not mention this; nor does he identify the playwright, Theodor Herzl]:

The Jewish problem, concern about the future of one's children [der Kinder], to whom one can not give a country of their own, concern about educating them in such a way that they can move freely across frontiers. (Freud, 1900, 442.)

In My son, the Myops, Freud is in Rome “sitting on the edge of a fountain . . . greatly depressed and almost in tears” (441). Associating, Freud (442) recalls Psalm 137, the famous lament describing the bitter anguish and despair of the Israelites during the Babylonian Captivity, the first line of which he quotes: “By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept” (translation of Luther's version). In all likelihood, the Psalm’s last three vengeful, vitriolic verses (7-9) do not escape Freud:

Remember, O Lord, the children of Edom in the day of thereof.

O daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed; happy shall he be, that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us.

Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones.

Over time, Edom in Hebrew literature came to signify Israel's enemies, especially Rome (Alter and Kermode, 1987, 333); to Freud, Edom signifies Christian Rome. By destroying the Law, or the Torah, Freud would “rase [Christendom] . . . even to the
In other words, by dashing the 'stones,' by destroying the Tablets of the Law, Freud would destroy the Church, that seedbed for anti-Semites (cf. "dasheth thy little ones against the stones"), and thereby eliminate anti-Semitism: no Law, no Judaism, no Christianity, no miserable anti-Semitism. First, however, this impious hero understands, he must take the train for Rome and, there, defiantly take his stand before Moses.

On September 2, 1901, Freud (accompanied by his brother Alexander, ten years his junior) at long last enters the Eternal City. Three days later, on Thursday, September 5, armed with his Golden Bough, he crosses the threshold of the Church of St. Peter in Chains, and there, in that gloomy church, with dread and hope, comes face-to-face with Moses. Remarkably, he prevails. And comes away with something more precious than the patriarch Jakob's limp, the mana of Moses. Or so he superstitiously supposes:

The source of taboo is attributed to a peculiar magical power which is inherent in persons and spirits and can be conveyed by them through the medium of inanimate objects. . . . The strangest fact seems to be that anyone who has transgressed one of these prohibitions himself acquires the characteristic being prohibited—as though the whole of the dangerous charge had been transferred over to him. . . .
(Totem and Taboo, 1913; p. 20; p. 22; my italics)

In the fall of the following year (1902) Freud gathers disciples, and he is on his way to becoming FREUD.

Six years later, on the evening of April 15, 1908, or the fiftieth anniversary of Julius's death, on Freud's carried motion, the Psychological Wednesday Society is renamed the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society (Nunberg and Federn, 1906-1908, 373). He, thereby, secretly dedicates the psychoanalytic movement to the memory of Julius, a movement which would establish his--and Julius's--Promised Land, a boundless peaceable brotherly world where der Kinder, at long last are free to develop their talents and satisfy their needs.

The following year in the second week of September, at the invitation of its President, G. Stanley Hall, Freud gives a series of five lectures on psychoanalysis at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts, then celebrating its 20th anniversary. On the evening after the fifth lecture, Freud receives an honorary doctorate. In his brief extemporaneous acknowledgement of this unexpected honor, the delighted recipient calls the occasion "the first official recognition our endeavors" (Gay, 1988, 207).

Afterward, in the Adirondacks with his "gold headed cane" (Gifford, 1972, 30), the new Doctor of Laws is at the top of the world--a recognition of consequence, at last!

Four years later, on Sunday, May 25, 1913, nine months after writing Jones about his enthusiasm for a "strictly secret" council--and four months after his final break with his erstwhile Johsua, Carl Jung, who was to have broken the down the walls of resistance of the Christians--Freud hands each of his worthy sons of the Committee an
ancient intaglio engraved with a scene from classical antiquity to be mounted into a gold ring like his. Gracing Freud's own stone, a Greek-Roman intaglio, is the head of Jupiter (Jones, 1955, 154), who sent Aeneas to the underworld. In the Jewish calendar this date is the eighteenth of Iyar or Lag b'Omer (5673), the thirty-third day of the Counting of the Omer (Sheaf). This feast day, Lag b'Omer, marks the end of a plague that was killing students of Rabbi Akiba Ben Joseph who, proclaiming him the Messiah, gave the Jewish warrior Bar Kochba (132-135 C.E. rebellion) his name, which means "Son of a Star," an allusion to the Messiah to come: ". . . there shall come a Star out of Jacob . . ." (Numbers 24:17)-- Jacob like Jacob Freud. (For Freud’s easy familiarity with Jewish holidays and their respective origins, see his July 23, 1882, letter to Martha Bernays, in E. L. Freud, 1960, 19; for Freud’s date-sensitivity, see Schur, 1972, 25, and also Jones, 1957, 379.)

Freud will give up the ghost at 3 AM, Saturday, September 23rd, 1939, or Yom Kippur, the Day Atonement. Two days earlier on the 21st-- the anniversary of Virgil’s death-- Freud, wasting away, with at most a few days to live, tells Max Schur "without a trace of emotionality or self-pity, and with full consciousness of reality": “You promised me . . . not to forsake me when my time comes. Now, it’s nothing but torture and makes no sense any more” (Schur, 1972, 529). Whereupon, Schur, keeping his promise, administers to his weary cancer-ravaged friend and the mentor the first of three morphine injections of three mg. doses, hours apart (von Unwerth, 2005, 189). From the death day of the singer of Aeneas to Yom Kippur is a time span bridging the two worlds of Sigmund Freud, that of the classical world and that of the Hebrew Bible.
Defiant to the very end, against Jewish tradition, Freud has himself cremated. His and Martha's ashes are in a Greek urn that was given him by Princess Marie Bonaparte, a great granddaughter of Napoleon's brother Lucian. Depicted on the urn are a man and a woman facing one another. The man is seated. In his left hand the man holds a staff, one that is appropriate for an Aeneas, a Moses, or even a "Star out of Jacob."

NOTE

In order to get on with his mission, Freud must not only set himself free from the Law; he must also surmount his Roman Catholic sensibility. Because he strives
ultimately for his own redemption, Freud understands that his Catholic tendencies, possibly stimulated by the Eternal City's powerful works of Christian art, could so overwhelm him in the center of Christendom that he would not be able to resist the temptation to accept Jesus Christ as his Savior: by the simple act of bending the knee he would be absolved from having ‘killed’ Julius. After all, In Rome, where everything would come to a head, Freud would be coming home, home to his Catholic nanny (and to her, to their, church). Behind a phobia, such as Freud’s Rome phobia, there is not only a fear but also a wish--and his wish to succumb to his long suppressed desire to accept Jesus as his Savior would have been reason enough for him to put off for four years visiting Rome, especially since conversion to Roman Catholicism holds out the seductive promise of being reunited with Julius in Paradise. In this regard, consider: several weeks after the Mosen name lapse, Freud will fail to recall the name of Luca Signorelli, “the renowned painter who did the Last Judgment in Orvieto, the greatest I have seen so far,” (Letter to Fliess dated September 22, 1898; in Freud, 1985, 326; italics added.)
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