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In 2016, Adele Tutter, M.D., Ph.D. (hereafter 'Tutter') and Léon Wurmser, M.D. (hereafter 'Wurmser') co-edited their joint volume entitled Grief And Its Transcendence: Memory, Identity, Creativity (hereafter 'Grief'). Each is a physician/psychoanalyst and renowned individual author. Their front cover features a photograph of the adult Freud with his daughter Sophie Freud Halberstadt before her demise. Unlike the broader focus of another Book Reviewer (Schwartz, 2016, pp. 1274-1282), the following critique is circumscribed by the individual contributions of co-editor Tutter.

Tutter (2016a) authored Grief's “Prologue: Give Sorrow Words” (pp. xxv-xlili) and co-edited Part III (sub-titled “History, Ancestry, Memory”) embracing Chapters 12-14 (pp. 131-194). The volume’s Chapter 13 entitled “Sudek, Janáček, Hukvaldy, and Me: Notes on Art, Loss, and Nationalism under Political Oppression” (2016b, pp. 149-188),¹ solely authored by Tutter (ibid., 2016b), included endnote #5, to wit:

“...The only mention of Janáček in the English language psychoanalytic literature are from Chipman 2000, who compares his late creativity to that of Jean Sibelius, and Ginsburg and Ginsburg, 1992 who find Janáček of interest for his proximity to Sigmund Freud, born only two years after Janáček in the same village of Příbor, not five kilometers from Hukvaldy. Like Janáček, Freud also referred to Hukvaldy

---more than once---as his ‘Paradise’...” (p. 185) [underlining for emphasis].

“Paradise in the Life of Sigmund Freud: An Understanding of Its Imagery and

1
“Me,” the culminating word in Tutter’s (2016b) leading title in the aforesaid essay, laudably memorializes--in textual sub-sections 25-30 (pp. 178-185)---a devoted daughter’s poignant autobiographical homage to the memory of her deceased father (i.e., Antonín Tutter). Paradoxes” was co-authored by L. M. & S. A. Ginsburg (1992).² What ensues is a 1st person rejoinder to Tutter’s dismissive comment above-quoted. Also duplicated for further scrutiny is the edited transcript of a pre-publication ‘peer-review’ of quarter-century vintage.³ The otherwise dormant communiqué---readily retrievable in our electronic era---merits a belated “2nd life!” As a consequence, the photography of Václav Buriánek, Ph.D. (hereafter 'Buriánek')---a psychologist/psychoanalyst who subsequently became a member of the Czech Psychoanalytic Society---has been serially revivified (i.e., fns. 2 & 3, loc. cit. infra). Tutter presumably was thereby enabled to preview Buriánek’s Příbor-sited photography.

Buriánek’s Fig. 4 (ibid., p. 292) portrays a likely scene for the infantile tableau of the sloping meadow---albeit incompatible with the so-called ‘Gmunden hypothesis’ of Swales---where the ‘yellow dandelions’ in the adult Freud’s famous ‘screen memory’ may have initially bloomed during the Spring of 1859. Buriánek’s Fig. 5 (ibid., p. 294) reproduces a ‘bird’s eye’ view of Příbor coupled with a 19th-century drawing of a foot-bridge spanning the Lubina River; also depicts local religious statuary he photographed.

Figs. 1 & 2 (ibid., pp. 286-287) duplicate a set of 1879 topographical maps from the Library of Congress. Fig. 3 (ibid., 288) is a replicated 1866 illustration by Gustave Doré of ‘Milton’s Paradise Lost.’ Fig. 6 (ibid., p. 295) is a composite copy of a pair of landmark-views supplied by Director Bohumír Volný of the Leoš Janáček Memorial in Hukvaldy. An aboriginal cave and ruins of a medieval-castle (ibid., pp. 295-296) are still evident in proximity to the youthful domains of Sigismund and Leoš. Buriánek, again deserves credit, for supplying the top frame of the lithographic drawing depicted in Fig. 7 (ibid., p. 296). Fig. 9 (ibid., p. 298)

³ See https://www.academia.edu/35569655/Peer_Review_Critique_for_Ginsburg_1992 for detailed pre-publication précis of anonymous peer-review dispatched to co-authors by Editor of The International Review of Psycho-Analysis. replicates the Signorelli fresco entitled Il Paradiso (‘The Paradise’) at The Freud Museum (i.e., accession #LDFRD 5124).

Readers of Grief are left to gauge the reach of Tutter’s (op. cit., 2016b) above-excerpted overview (i.e., endnote #5) vis-à-vis another comment she articulated in her earlier ‘Prologue’ (op. cit., 2016a) that “In a fortuitous concordance, Janáček was born in Hukvaldy not two years before Freud was born in Příbor, a stone’s throw away” (p. xxxvii).

The photographic œuvré of Josef Sudek became the subject of a 2013 paper Tutter published, viz: “Angel with a Missing Wing: Loss, Restitution, and the Embodied Self” (pp. 127-190). Her next composition (Tutter, 2015), entitled “Muse As Text: Janáček, Kamila, and the Role of Fantasy in Musical Creativity,” also speaks for itself. Borrowing from the cited work of John Tyrrel (2007),¹ Tutter thereafter (op. cit., 2015) characterized Janáček’s “fantasy based” creativity (p. 408) as linked to Kamila (née Urválková) Stösslová, a much younger married muse to whom his later life was devoted.

Freud, as a late adolescent lad, often traversed the Hukvaldy Forest Preserve while a guest of the Flüss family. Scenery in forests—–for Leoš and Sigismund (L. M. Ginsburg, 1987, pp. 468-486; 1993, pp. 155-169; 1994, pp. 517-546)—–reigned supreme throughout each of their fantasy lives. During successive summers, judging from sensitive letters addressed to close friends, daydreams romanticized within his sylvan “Paradise were again stirred. They centered upon the Flüss family’s matriarch (Frau Eleonore) and her eldest daughter (i.e., Gisela).

Apart from the historical figures Tutter (op. cit., 2016b) ‘head-lined’ in the title of her Chapter 13, Hukvaldy remains a place-name with stolid Czech ethno-nationalistic traditions. She plausibly characterized many of them as manifesting “a deeply rooted Franciscan animism: a

The site of *Grief*’s Chapter 12 is the rustic village of Příbor. The topic is this segment is *sub-*captioned “Jane McAdam Freud in conversation with Adele Tutter” (*passim*, 2016c). Their colloquy is entitled “Lost Wax to Lost Fathers: Installations by British Sculptor Jane McAdam Freud.” (pp. 133-148). Raised by the participants are issues pertaining to the viability of transmutative generational artistic talents.

*Grief*’s Chapter 14, written by Diane O’Donoghue under Tutter’s (*passim*, 2016d) co-editorship (*i.e.*, “Discussion of Part III”) and the *sub-*titled “Image, Loss, Delay” passage (pp. 189-194). The text of her paper is followed by a lone endnote: “Freud’s memories of his time in Hukvaldy are preserved in series of letters he sent during his visit in 1872 to his school friend, Eduard Silberstein…” (*ibid.*, p. 194, fn. 1). She thereby begins to bridge her colleague Tutter’s (*i.e.*, fns. 2 & 3, *loc. cit. supra*) debatable Příbor/Hukvaldy divide. In retrospect, it seems disingenuous to favor preordained templates for choosing amongst overlapping aesthetic themes and cultural patterns (Tutter, *op. cit.*, 2016b, p. 185, endnote #5).

Discernable melodies from Janáček’s operas have been cited as rhythmic with spoken Czech speech. An illustrative example is the native libretto he originally composed for *The Cunning Little Vixen*. Several realms of Janáček’s dramatized creativity and imagination, nonetheless, paralleled the world he shared with Freud. Each had occasion to pattern his fantasy-based resourcefulness upon the ‘heels’ of folkloric fairy tales, legends and diverse literary
Freud likewise respected fairy tales as a genre for focusing upon the fantasy realms of a culture (L. M. Ginsburg, 1993, p. 165). Once, he raved about the forested grandeur of an archaic wilderness in the Adirondack Mountains (Freud, 1909, pp. 29-30). Common to the ‘literary trains of thought’ of both Janáček and Freud was the parallel salience of sylvan imagery. Thereabouts, Freud often remarked that life is eternal. Genres. Looming in neighboring locales were aesthetically enchanting dreamscapes. Neither marginalized nor became dismissive of ostensibly shared-spheres of historiography while enjoying commonly-frequented woodland surroundings.

Although the L M. & S. A. Ginsburg (1992, op. cit.) publication cited Janáček’s musical compositions like Říkadla (pp. 299-300), Tutter is especially qualified to address the possible psychoanalytic significance of—merely citing a single example—the so-called “nursery rhymes” (pp. 399-400) such as Freud (1900, p. 196) distinctly recalled from his early infancy. For other psychoanalytically-informed historians, it is noted that documentation is readily available concerning the communications of Max Brod (1884-1968) with both Janáček and Freud.

From early childhood, Leoš and Sigismund likely perceived themselves as “outsiders” in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. Janáček was a casualty of ethno-national political repression; Freud was a casualty of anti-Semitism. Neither lived to experience the Holocaust nor the enormous historical transformations they portended. Contrasting linguistic gaps traceable to diverse etymologies of Yiddish/German/Czech vis-à-vis Slavic/Czech/German word-roots persist. Lastly, it is worth reminding readers that despite interim border reconfigurations in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, at least one of Freud’s daughters had been nourished by a non-German wet-nurse imported to Vienna from her homeland. Possibly, he too had been similarly nourished, in Rožnov, after Amalia’s recovery from his birth on May 6, 1856 (L. M. Ginsburg, 2010, pp. 701-706).
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