

\_\_\_\_\_

TITLE A STUDY ON THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE  
ORDERING DISCUSSION ON JUDAISM AND FREUD

1. May circulate [ ☒ ] ) Not necessary  
 ) for Ph.D.  
 2. Is restricted [ ☐ ] for \_\_\_\_\_ years. ) thesis

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. yes no

3/16/84  
Date

Michael Matheson  
Signature of Author

Library  
Record

Microfilmed \_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Library Staff Member

**A Study on the Historiography of the  
Ongoing Discussion on Judaism and Freud**

Michael Matuson

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion  
Cincinnati, Ohio  
1984

Referee, Dr. Alvin J. Reines

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for Ordination

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DIGEST.....	i - ii
CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTORY ESSAY .....	1 - 22
CHAPTER TWO - FREUD AND ANTI-SEMITISM .....	23 - 41
CHAPTER THREE - FREUD AND PARENTAL SHAME .....	42 - 50
CHAPTER FOUR - FREUD, ROME, AND MOSES .....	51 - 73
CHAPTER FIVE - FREUD, CHRISTIANS AND CHRISTIANITY .....	74 - 91
CHAPTER SIX - FREUD, JEWS AND JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS .....	92 - 106
CHAPTER SEVEN - CRITIQUE AND SUMMARY .....	107 - 112
FOOTNOTES .....	113 - 129
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	130 - 131

## DIGEST

This study examines the impact of Judaism on the development of Sigmund Freud's phenomenology. It maintains that Freud's disciplined and scientific methodology is not inconsistent with certain strains of Jewish thought and emphases of Jewish religious culture. We have endeavored to identify these strains and emphases and show how they impacted on Freud's efforts to lay bare the fundamental principles that govern the human psyche. To realize this goal we have surveyed the ample and timely literature addressing these issues.

Chapter One serves as an introductory survey of Freud's religious thinking. This introduction is divided into five parts; I) a review of Freud's early Jewish education; II) a study of Freud's understanding of the nature and role of religion; III) Freud's concept of God and the psychological implications engendered by belief in a supernatural deity; IV) a survey of what Freud thought Judaism to be and V) what Freud thought Christianity to be.

Chapter Two outlines the impact of anti-Semitism on Freud's Jewish identity. It investigates Freud's efforts to assimilate into the general culture and the frustration he endured by being blocked by anti-Semitism. This chapter also delineates Freud's tension generated by his biculturality and ultimately his commitment to a Jewish identity with which he felt secure.

Chapter Three examines Freud's family dynamic as it was assailed by the sociological changes and anti-Semitic movements of the day. In addition this chapter investigates Freud's relationship with his father and how this relationship led to the discovery of the Oedipal Complex.

Chapter Four deals with Freud's conflicted feelings regarding his emerging Jewish identity. It chronicles his obsession with Rome and Michelangelo's statue of Moses. This chapter also outlines the genesis of Freud's preoccupation with the Moses figure, culminating in his last great work, Moses and Monotheism.

Chapter Five sketches Freud's often stormy relationships with Christian associates, especially Jung. We find in Freud's relationship with Christians many telling insights regarding Freud's views on Christianity and mysticism.

Chapter Six adumbrates Freud's relationships with Jews and Jewish organizations. It examines the essentially Jewish membership of the early psychoanalytic movement as well as Freud's motives for his active involvement with the B'nai B'rith. This chapter also alludes to Freud's notion of a common psychic structure evidenced by Jews.

Chapter Seven provides an overview and critique of the various sources cited in this work. It concludes with summary statements regarding the nature of the ongoing discussion on Judaism and Freud.

## CHAPTER ONE

In his profound novel, The White Hotel, D. M. Thomas observes, "If a Sigmund Freud had been listening and taking notes from the time of Adam, he would still not fully have explored even a single group, even a single person."<sup>(1)</sup> Thus is the towering figure of Sigmund Freud invoked whenever there is an attempt to fathom the complexities of human life and motivation. The quotation cited is significant for its biblical reference: Freud assumes almost mythic proportions, an omniscient chronicler, scrupulously observing human activities from the inception of human life. It is a natural but facile inclination to cast Freud in the role of a person who transcends history, yet so he remains in the modern imagination; a fantastic, mystical figure who has charted the deep currents of that which ferments beneath our conscious awareness.

I say it is a natural inclination for Freud to be idealized, for his disciplined efforts to lay bare the governing principles of the human psyche have fundamentally changed our perceptions of ourselves. I contend the inclination to idealize Freud is facile for it is this propensity for myth-making that Freud strove so diligently to understand and expose.

It is the intent of this study to examine the impact of Judaism on Freud's struggle to discover the origins of myth and religion. I maintain that certain strains of Jewish thought and emphasis of Jewish religious culture played a significant role in Freud's understanding of the human psyche. I will endeavor to identify these strains and emphasis and show how they were manifested in Freud's life and theories.

This introduction will serve to highlight themes more fully developed in the body of this work. An initial survey of Freud's religious thinking provides a context for much of what follows. This introduction is divided into five parts; I) a review of Freud's early Jewish education; II) a study of Freud's understanding of the nature

and role of religion; III) Freud's concept of God and the psychological implications engendered by belief in a supernatural deity; IV) a survey of what Freud thought Judaism to be; V) what Freud thought Christianity to be.

### I. FREUD'S EARLY RELIGIOUS TRAINING

Although there is a dearth of information regarding Freud's early years there is enough to get a sense of the religious climate of Freud's family and his early religious instruction. Freud virtually begins his autobiography with these terse lines, "I was born on May 6, 1856, at Freiberg in Moravia, a small town in what is now Czecho-Slovakia. My parents were Jews, and I have remained a Jew myself."<sup>(2)</sup> That statement " ... I have remained a Jew myself." is not gratuitous, indeed it is a bold assertion.

For baptism stood as an invitation and temptation to all Jews who encountered Western civilization. As Heine once put it, baptism was an 'admission ticket to European civilization' for the Jew. Baptism held out the promise of the removal of the obstacles that stood in the way of success.<sup>(3)</sup>

Freud's public declaration of his Jewishness is a telling statement of his steadfastness against the tide of conversion.

In accordance with Jewish tradition on the eighth day of his life Freud was circumcized. To mark the festive occasion Jacob Freud (1815-1896), wrote the following Hebrew inscription in the family Bible:

My son Shlomo Sigismund, may he live, was born on Tuesday Rosh Hodesh Iyar (5)606, 6:30 p.m., on May 6, (1)856. The moהל was Reb Shimshon Frankel of Ostrav, . . . godparents wee Reb Lippe and his sister Mirel Hurwitz, children of the rabbi of Czernowitz. The Sandek was Reb Samueli . . .<sup>(4)</sup>

This brief inscription is the only reference to religious observance in the Freud household during their stay in Freiberg. The family moved to Leipzig but their sojourn there was brief and yields no information concerning the religious atmosphere of the Freud family. A more substantial picture emerges after their move to Vienna.

Although there are not records extant concerning the family's synagogue attendance nor any information indicating Freud celebrated a mar mitzvah there is evidence that the major Jewish holidays were observed in the Freud household as late as 1874, when Freud was in his second year of medical studies.(5) It is also recorded that Jacob Freud conducted the traditional Passover Seder with ease and was able to recite the Haggadah from memory. It is clear, however, that Jacob Freud did not observe the dietary laws, at least not after the family moved to Vienna.(6) "Freud's childhood home was typical of Jewish families in liberal Austria adjusting to the prevailing influences of secular life."(7)

The Freud household reflected the tension between Jewish tradition and the cosmopolitan values of the Haskalah. There was no strict adherence to Jewish ritual for, as Sigmund Freud noted, his father, "had been estranged from his native (Chasidic) environment."(9) Still, though Jacob Freud was by no means an Orthodox Jew, "he was not indifferent toward his Jewish heritage. He spend considerable time reading the Talmud and Torah in the original."(10)

Through his father, Freud cultivated a deep appreciation for the Bible.(11) Apparently Freud began to study the Bible at the age of seven as indicated by the Hebrew inscription in the Philippon Bible presented to Freud on his thirty-fifth birthday by his father:

Mr Dear Son Shlomo  
At the age of seven the spirit of the Lord began to move you  
And spoke to you: Go read the books I have written  
And there will break open to you the fountains of wisdom,  
knowledge and understanding.  
The Book of Books is the well that the sages digged  
And (in which) the lawgivers taught knowledge and justice.  
The vision of the Almighty you saw, you heard, and yo . ventured.  
You ascended and rode upon the wings of the spirit.  
From then on that book was hidden like the Broken Tablets  
In an Ark with me.  
On the day you attained your thirty-fifth birthday  
I bound it in a new leather binding  
And named it "Spring up, O well—sing yet unto it"  
And dedicated it to your name and for a remembrance of love.

From your father, who loves you an eternal love  
Jacob son of Rabbi Shlomo Freud  
In the capital city of Vienna, on the 29th of Nisan (5)651,  
May 6, (1)891.(12)

Freud said of these early years of Bible instruction:

My deep engrossment in the Bible story (almost as soon as I had learned the art of reading) had, as I recognized much later, an enduring effect upon the direction of my interest.(13)

The interest of which Freud speaks was the desire to understand something of the "riddles of the world . . ."(14) and suggests Freud's early exposure to the Bible had had significant impact on his subsequent development. It is clear from this inscription that Jacob Freud attributed his son's success "in unsealing some of the mysteries of the human soul to his early study of the Scriptures."(15) The inscription is also significant for it being written in florid Hebrew, it strongly suggests that Freud could read and understand Hebrew "since, it would seem, Jacob Freud expected his son to undersatnd it."(16)

There is another significant account concerning Freud's early religious instruction at home. Amalia Freud (1835-1930), although probably from an orthodox home, had, like her husband, assimilated the cosmopolitan values of the Haskalah, yet maintained like Jacob, some belief in a personal God. There is ample evidence of her great love for her first born, Sigmund, and she assumed some responsibility for his early religious education. This is Freud's account of his earliest memory of religious instruction at home:

When I was six years old and was given my first lessons by my mother, I was expected to believe that we were all made of earth and must therefore return to earth. This did not suit me and I expressed doubts of the doctrine. My mother thereupon rubbed the palms of her hands together — just as she did in making dumplings, except that there was no dough between them — and showed me the blackish scales of epidermis produced by the friction as proof that we were made of earth. My astonishment at this ocular demonstration knew no bounds and I acquiesced in the belief which I was later to hear expressed in the words: Ov bist dernatur einen Tod schuldig! ('Thou owest Nature a death').(17)

Much can be gleaned from this rich passage. First, Freud began to study the Bible intensively at a very young age and his mother played an active role in his education. Second, there is reflected in this passage an early glimpse of Freud's skepticism and his willingness to accept empirical evidence despite personal reservations. Last, this passage hints at an early understanding of the implications of death.

Freud's formal education at gymnasium deepened his interest in the Bible. During Freud's school years religious education was compulsory in the schools of Austria both public and private. "The 'ideas' of 'religion' and 'morality' were considered by the governmental authorities to be the 'focal point' of the student's general education." (18) During this time, possibly as early as 1865, but certainly through the years 1871-1873, Freud was greatly influenced by his religious instructor Samuel Hammerschlag (?-1904).

Hammerschlag directed the school of religion of the Viennese Jewish community and tried to imbue his students with the humanitarian ideals central to Jewish teaching.

He argued that the particular features of Judaism, 'the unique, spirited characteristics that ethnic origin, language, or religion have bestowed upon a particular group,' were meaningless if they did not refer to the universal truths of mankind. (19)

It is clear that Hammerschlag was attuned to the liberal tenor of the constitutional era in Austria. However, it should be noted that Hammerschlag greatly valued knowledge of Hebrew and emphasized the study of Jewish history and Bible in his curriculum. (20) Apparently, these lessons were lost on the young Freud,

In recalling his instructor's accomplishments, Freud neglected to mention the attention Hammerschlag paid to the unique characteristics of Judaism. The stress Hammerschlag placed on the Hebrew language, for example, little affected this student. Instead, Freud was grateful for his instructor's ability to present the material in such a way as to inspire his students 'beyond the limitations of (narrow) nationalism and dogma.' (21)

Freud's own recollection of his early religious education is evidenced in an excerpt from a letter written to his wife in September, 1909, while attending a celebration at Clark University.

My youth happened in a period when our free-minded teachers of religion placed no value on their pupil's acquisition of knowledge in the Hebrew language and literature. This part of my education was therefore quite neglected, which I often regretted later.(22)

To summarize Freud's early Jewish education we may say that his pre-gymnasium instruction was conducted primarily by his father, Jacob Freud. Jacob faced the problem of assimilation as the ideals of the Haskalah began to undermine traditional Judaism. Jacob Freud moved away from Chasidic Judaism and located himself in the mainstream moderate Reform Judaism of Vienna. He did not keep the dietary laws nor probably the Sabbath but he did observe the major Jewish festivals and devoted himself to Bible and Talmud study. Sigmund Freud's early interest in the Bible was encouraged by his parents. He seemed to have exhibited an early skepticism regarding the veracity of the Biblical account of the creation of mankind.

Jacob's enrollment of Sigmund in a Jewish private school suggests a special concern that he receive a good background in Jewish tradition. While studying at the gymnasium he was positively influenced by his religious instructor Samuel Hammerschlag. Freud seemingly internalized the universalistic humanitarian ideals of Hammerschlag as well as his ethical view of the Bible but rejected those aspects of the curriculum which seemed to him particularistic and dogmatic.

Were there then implications to Freud's early religious education? A number of writers seem to think so. Ernest Jones in his exhaustive biography of Freud was led to believe that Freud only took the ethical impulses of his early training. He writes,

When Freud spoke of his having been greatly influenced by his early reading of the Bible he can only have meant in an ethical sense, in addition to his historical interest.(23)

Jones also points out an interesting facet of Freud's personality, "... an exquisite oscillation between skepticism and credulity ..." (24) This quality is reminiscent of Freud's early recollection of his reaction to his mother's proof of man's creation from the Earth.

My thesis is that Freud transmitted to the study of human behavior the same value, intensity, and thorough concentration that his ancestors committed to the study of the Torah, and that there are certain resemblances in methodology that Freud may have acquired from his upbringing.(25)

Grollman in his detailed exposition of Freud's Jewish roots from a sociological perspective, Judaism in Sigmund Freud's World, shows how thoroughly Jewish influences permeated Freud's upbringing. He further contends that rampant anti-Semitism in Austria served to intensify Freud's attitude toward, and identification with, his Jewishness.

David Bakan seeks to place Freud within the framework of Jewish mysticism. Thus Bakan asserts,

We believe that Freud often wrote with obscurity, that he was motivated, consciously or unconsciously, to hide the deeper portions of his thought, and that these deeper portions were cabbalistic in their source and content.(26)

Rainey in his careful study of Freud's family history and early Jewish instruction, Freud as Student of Religion, asserts,

The life of the family was characterized by polarities. They were Jews in predominantly Roman Catholic Vienna. Jacob was probably a member of the Reform group in a Jewish community split between the strictly Orthodox and those of his persuasion. Within the family itself there was Freud's agnosticism over against his father's Jewish piety ... The situation was clearly one of 'creative tension,' that is to say, a tension which sharpened one's sensibilities to certain problems and constrains one to come to terms with certain issues.

A host of questions must have surrounded Freud's student years. For example, how do the traditions of Judaism exemplified by his father measure up to the major ideas of Greek and Roman civilization encountered in the Gymnasium?(27)

These themes and authors, as well as others, will be discussed in greater detail in the body of this work.

Before we move on there remains one more, somewhat unusual aspect of Freud's early religious education. As we have pointed out the earliest accounts of Freud's religious instruction originate from the period in which he lived in Freiberg.

In Freiberg Freud had a Czech nurse maid known as Nannie. This elderly woman was Catholic. She would take young Freud to mass and spoke freely to him of various primitive notions of her faith including God, heaven and hell. So impressed was young Sigmund by this experience that he used to preach fiery mock sermons at home.

He was about three at the time and appears to have forgotten the lessons in a few years. However, on the journey to Leipzig he showed that he retained one of the sterner portions of his Nanny's 'Catechism.' When he was gas jets for the first time in the train station, they reminded him of 'souls burning in hell.' Nothing is known of his parents' response to this precocious venture into Christian homiletics and doctrine.(28)

In the year 1958 Nannie was dismissed for theft. There is some evidence Freud keenly felt the loss and there are writers who believe that Freud's negative attitude toward religion to the circumstance of losing Nannie at a tender age.(29)

## II. FREUD ON RELIGION

In this section of our introduction we will examine Freud's view regarding the nature of religion. In the previous section was observed that Freud's early interest in religion was characterized by some degree of conflict. This conflict was manifested in Freud's relationships with his father and his teacher of religion, and was also reflected in his socio-environmental situation, being Jewish in predominantly Catholic Vienna. Freud experienced internal conflicts as well, and these conflicts, as we have noted earlier, might be characterized as that "exquisite oscillation between skepticism and credulity." Kung points out that Freud

... was seized in his early years by a strong bent toward speculation on the riddle of the world and of man, but again, oddly enough, he resisted this inclination: 'As a young man I felt a strong attraction towards speculation and ruthlessly checked it.'(30).

One wonders how successful Freud was at exorcising his speculative bent. For virtually his entire career he was drawn to the study of religion up to his death in 1939. There were some deep existential factors involved in Freud's study of religion and

they were fueled in no small measure by his ambivalence toward his interest in the occult.

Not only was he capable of believing, momentarily at least, in the return of departed spirits; he also could believe in omens and numerology, and unconsciously perform 'sacrificial acts.' Naturally this skeptical student of human behavior did not welcome the proclivity toward 'superstitious' belief he recognized in himself.(31)

Ernst Simon suggests that Freud's retention of the strict ethical standards of Judaism, without their theological foundations, may have been one factor in his own neurotic difficulties, and that this would have had a significant effect on his interest in religion.

The God Freud rejected was a deity of conceived of as deistic, i.e., a supernatural entity who created the universe and yet was separate from it. This God could contravene natural law by performing miracles and reveal His will to people as binding law. Salvation, in this view of deity, could only be attained by subservience to the God. Freud thought belief in such a theistic concept of God created a submissive and dependent relationship to an exalted father substitute which was a projection of the unconscious and was nowhere verified by reality. As such, belief in a theistic God was for Freud an illusion based on a neurotic wish.

Freud never provided an explicit definition of religion as, "a collective compulsive neurosis."(32) Borne out by other authors Rainey employs the following broad definition for the term religion, "Religion is man's relationship to a power, or powers, which he believes to be superhuman and of decisive import for his existence-a relationship often expressed in myths and rituals."(33) Kung declares that Freud deduced the demands of religion as being above reason and wholly beyond its claims. Freud responded to this demand by asking, "Am I obliged to believe every absurdity? And if not, why this one in particular?"(34) In time Freud was to make a critical analysis of religion and ask about the source of the inner strength of religious ideas. His answer would be that the essential tenets of religion

are not precipitates of experiences or end results of our thinking but, illusions fulfillments of the oldest, strongest and most urgent wishes of mankind. The secret of their strength lies in the strength of those wishes.(35).

We now turn to a brief overview of Freud's work to derive the process by which he arrived at this understanding.

By the end of 1896, nearly a decade prior to his first publication "Obsessive Acts and Religious Practices" certain major themes regarding religion are clearly manifest. As Rainey states,

By 1896 his thought is probably beginning to focus specifically on obsessional neurosis, and the basic thesis of his 1907 essay - the interrelationship between obsessional ceremonials and religious ones - may have already been in mind.(36)

There is also evidence indicating that Freud's concept that repression played a crucial role in the formation of religious ritual was "discovered" by him prior to his 1907 essay.(37)

In 1907, Freud, then fifty-one years of age, published a paper "Obsessive Acts and Religious Practices" in which he traced the correlation of "obsessive acts in neurotics and those religious observances by means of which the faithful give expression to their piety."(38) Resemblances were noted between religious rituals and the compulsive neurotic urge to perform fixed ceremonials.

Whether it originates in an obsessional neurosis or legitimate religious systems, the ritual act springs from an inner constraint, a compulsion which is tinged with fear of a misfortune or punishment following the omission or the incorrect execution of the rite ... common to both actions is a strong, unconscious feeling of guilt. They differ, however, in that in one case it is mainly the sexual tendencies which are repressed and in the other the egoistic and aggressive tendencies dangerous to society. Freud sums up the difference by saying that if the obsessional neurotic seems to make something like religion just for his own personal use, religion can be described as an obsessional neurosis affecting the general mass of people.(39)

One of the most important points raised in this essay becomes crucial to a discussion of Freud and religion, namely that individual neuroses are functional equivalents of certain public and cultural institutions, such as those that pertain to religion and morality.

... The neuroses themselves have turned out to be attempts to find individual solutions to the problems of compensating unsatisfied wishes, while the institutions seek to find social solutions for these same problems.(40)

Thus, the major idea Freud proposed in the 1907 essay was mutual relationship between obsessional neurosis and religion, the former being occasioned by unconscious compulsions of a sexual nature and the latter by aggressive and anti-social tendencies. In both cases there emerge a set of rituals which in consciousness serve the function of supporting the repression of a prohibited desire.

In 1912 Freud published four essays as a book, Totem and Taboo. In this monograph Freud expanded upon his original premise established in the 1907 essay and developed a more thorough psychological explanation of religion. He summed up the theme in his autobiography:

The father of the primal horde, since he was an unlimited despot, had seized all the women (of the clan) for himself; his sons, being dangerous to him as rivals, had been killed or driven away. One day, however, the sons came together and united to overwhelm, kill, and devour their father, who had been their enemy but also their ideal. After the deed they were unable to take over their heritage since they stood in one another's way. Under the influence of failure and remorse they learned to come to an agreement among themselves; they banded themselves into a clan of brothers by the help of the ordinances of totemism, which aimed at preventing a repetition of such a deed, and they jointly undertook to forgo the possession of the women on whose account they had killed their father. They were driven to finding strange women, (outside the clan) and this was the origin of the exogamy which is so closely bound up with totemism. The totem meal was the festival commemorating the fearful deed from which sprang man's sense of guilt (or 'original sin') and which was the beginning at once of social organization, of religion and of ethical restrictions.(41)

Freud's concept of the primal horde was based in large measure on Darwin's view that man had originally lived in packs or hordes and also on W. Robertson Smith's studies which asserted that the sacred action or rite of killing the totem animal was the central element of religion. Freud added to these views of what had occurred in reality, the notion of psychological motivation, namely that religion is based ultimately on the Oedipus complex, Freud was roundly criticized for this theory by anthropologists, historians and theologians. "Even among the most ardent disciples,

the theories of Totem and Taboo were subject to criticism and censure." (42)

Simon speculates that Totem and Taboo served to uncover the mythological foundations of religion and prove Freud's initial insight "that religious phenomena are to be understood only on the model of the neurotic symptoms of the individual..." (43)

In his essay of 1919, "The Uncanny", two of the superstitions which Freud analyzed, belief in the return of the dead and in the import of seeing one's double, were among those he himself held. It has already been pointed out that Freud felt a marked ambivalency toward his interest in the occult. Rainey contends that this essay was to some extent Freud's efforts to analyze his own superstitions, fully convinced he could lay bare their psychological roots. Thus we find Freud saying,

We—our primitive forefathers—once believed that these possibilities were realities, and were convinced that they actually happened. Nowadays we no longer believe in them, we have surmounted these of modes of thought; but we do not feel quite sure of our new beliefs, and the old ones still exist within us ready to seize upon any confirmation. (44)

Freud's main critical work on religion, The Future of an Illusion (1927) was the first of a series of studies which became his main preoccupation for the rest of his life. These studies include Civilization and Its Discontents (1930) and finally his last great work Moses and Monotheism, (1939).

In The Future of an Illusion Freud looked beyond religion rites and historical perspectives and attempted to analyze the nature of religious ideas.

Religious ideas are teachings and assertions about facts and conditions of external (or internal) reality which tell something one has not discovered for oneself and which lay claim to one's belief. (45)

The basis of this claim rests, according to Freud, on three principles, 1) the demands of faith, 2) the fact that our ancestors believed and 3) we have ancient texts which serve as proofs of a reliable tradition. Freud refuted these claims by asserting that

we rely on faith because we are really aware of the fact that the claims of religion are uncertain and without foundation. Why then do we believe? Freud's answer is, religion serves to answer our deepest wishes.

The wishes of the childishly helpless human being for protection for life's perils, for the realization of justice in this unjust society, for the prolongation of earthly existence in a future life, for knowledge of the origin of the world, of the relationship between the corporeal and the mental. (46)

Freud said that religious beliefs repressed fulfillment of wishes originating in the feelings of helplessness of childhood which were never fully resolved. Freud said religion and ceremonial practices could mitigate guilt feelings about aggressive behavior but ultimately was a neurotic method for coping with human conflicts. Still Freud regretted the inability to believe in God for he claimed disbelief led to mental anguish.

In Civilization and Its Discontents, he continued the line of reasoning he established in The Future of an Illusion.

The deprivation of a need for religion for the child's feeling of helplessness and the longing it evokes for a father seems to me incontrovertible, especially since this feeling is not simply carried over from childhood days, but is kept alive perpetually by the fear of what the superior power of the fate will bring. (47)

Freud saw life as a difficult, painful and ultimately tragic endeavor unrelieved by anything resembling divine compassion. All man could do is face the void with courage and honesty.

These insights form the crux of what Freud thought religion to be. Religion arose out of the oldest, strongest, and most urgent wishes of mankind. Religion is an attempt to master the sensory world in which we are situated by means of the wishful internal world within us which we have developed as a result of biological and psychological needs. (48)

We will not discuss Freud's last work, Moses and Monotheism in this introduction, rather we will examine this work in greater detail in the body of this thesis.

### III. FREUD ON GOD

We have seen that Freud thought religion to be the "...fulfillment of the oldest, strongest, and most urgent wishes of mankind." Freud thought God to be the embodiment of those most urgent wishes. He saw in the belief in God an attempt to identify with an all powerful father figure who could and would intercede on behalf of humankind to save us from our own inadequacies and from the terrible threats assailing us from life itself. He further contended that this was a neurotic wish since,

...in reality man can, if not save himself, at least help himself, only by waking up from childish illusions and by using his own strength, his reason and skills. (49)

As early as 1910, in his article on Leonardo da Vinci, Freud linked belief in God with the desire for a father substitute.

Psycho-analysis has made us familiar with the intimate connection between the father-complex and belief in God: it has shown us that a personal God is, psychologically, nothing other than an exalted father, and it brings us evidence every day of how young people lose their religious beliefs as soon as father's authority breaks down. (50)

It is significant to note that Freud himself, suffered a traumatic shock regarding his father. Jacob Freud dealt a shattering blow to the young Sigmund by candidly telling his son of his passive response to an anti-Semitic threat. Freud related the incident in The Interpretation of Dreams.

I may have been ten or twelve years old, when my father began to take me with him on his walks and reveal to me in his talk his views upon things in the world we live in. Thus it was, on one such occasion, that he told me a story to show me how much better things were now than they had been in his days. 'When I was a young man', he said, 'I went for a walk one Saturday in the streets of your birthplace; I was well dressed, and had a new fur cap on my head. A Christian came up to me and with a single blow knocked off my cap into mud and shouted: "Jew! get off the pavement!"' 'And what did you do?' I asked, 'I went into the roadway and picked up my cap,' was his quiet reply. This struck me as unheroic conduct on the part of the big, strong man who was holding the little boy by the hand. I contrasted this situation with another which fitted my feelings better; the scene in which Hannibal's father, Hamilcar Barca, 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. (51)

The impact of this incident on Freud's concept of God will be discussed within the

body of this work.

In essence then, Freud thought belief in God to be a submission and dependent relationship to an exalted father substitute that is based on the unconscious fantasy of hero worship. Further, Freud speculated that the harsh realities of life and death and the sacrifices one had to make to society were so overwhelming, only a glorious God could console one and make the sacrifices worthwhile. In The Future of an Illusion he wrote,

The gods retain their threefold task: they must exorcize the terrors of nature, they must reconcile men to the cruelty of Fate, particularly as it is shown in death, and they must compensate them for the sufferings and privations which a civilized life in common has imposed on them. (52)

#### IV. FREUD ON JUDAISM

We now turn to the intriguing question of what Freud believed to be Judaism. In the Preface to the Hebrew edition of Totem and Taboo (1930) he asks himself,

"What is left to you that is Jewish?" and continues "He (Freud) would reply, 'A very great deal, and probably its very essence.' He could not now express that essence clearly in words; but someday no doubt it will become accessible to the scientific mind.: (53)

Clearly Freud believed himself a Jew and that he maintained a great deal of what being Jewish meant, "probably its very essence." But the question remains, what for Freud constituted the essence of Judaism?

David Bakan claims that Freud's antipathy toward religion was actually a rebellion against Orthodox Judaism. He makes this claim by pointing out a significant event in Freud's life as related by Ernest Jones, "It is a curious fact that the only examination in his life at which he failed was in medical jurisprudence," upon which Jones comments the "deep impulses were driving him in another direction." (54) Bakan advances the idea the Freud was manifesting in his diffidence regarding jurisprudence his impulses "against Orthodox Judaism with its strong legalistic orientation." (55)

Ernst Simon also offers a fascinating hypothesis regarding Freud's aversion to

religious fundamentalism. As has been discussed Freud believed religion to be a result of an obsessional neurosis. There is some evidence that Freud himself suffered from this, since, according to Ernest Jones, Freud once remarked to Jung that "were he ever to suffer from a neurosis it would be of the obsessional type." (56) Simon suggests that Freud's own neurosis can be attributed in part to his Jewish heritage in that Freud retained much of the moral strictness of the ethic of Judaism while rejecting its theological underpinnings.

While it would be difficult to substantiate conclusively either of these hypotheses the preponderance of evidence seems to suggest that Freud's conception of Judaism was marked by a deep ambivalence concerning Jewish law. Still it seems clear that Freud thoroughly rejected the trappings of Orthodox Judaism.

If the essence of Judaism was not its law, how then did Freud understand his Jewishness, many authors including Aron, Bilu, Rohrl and most notably Bakan suggest the possibility of an essentially mystical and perhaps unconscious Jewish base to Freud's thought.

At the time of his fame, in 1925, Freud discussed with Rabbi Chayim Bloch the main currents in Judaism. 'We switched our conversation to a discussion of Hasidism and Kabbalah and Judaism in general, and he (Freud) showed himself as a lover of his people...' What made Freud dwell on Kabbalah and the Hasidic teachings is not hard to guess. He must have felt at home spiritually in these realms. (57)

Bakan observed when Freud wrote of his feeling of inner Jewish identity, and of sharing a common psychic structure with other Jews, he used the word heimlichkeit, the same word he used for the basis of his essay, "The Uncanny." (1919) In this essay Freud defines the uncanny to mean something terrifying leading back to something familiar and long known, but which had undergone repression only to later re-emerge. (58) Bakan claims this process sums up Freud's entire relation to Judaism.

On the basis of our general knowledge concerning Jewish families who are moving into Western civilization, it is probably that Freud had a number of characteristically Jewish experiences, or experiences he probably felt to be associated with Jewishness, as a child. Later, with the entry into the secular world, this material is repressed because of

its incompatibility with the new ideas, concepts, and emotions which are generated by the larger culture.

...That also there should be a threatening aspect associated with the reminder of the old and the familiar is also completely understandable in less than psychological terms. For the old culture is not, at least not obviously, well suited for the new adjustments which have to be made. The threat of the old culture is the threat to the various hard-won adjustments to the new mode of life, which are tenuous enough-for they are superimposed upon a set of childhood experiences which are quite different. (59)

Thus Bakan asserts that Freud's Judaism was at once familiar and hidden and served unconsciously as the source for many of his insights. "It would not be unfair to characterize the whole of psychoanalysis, then, as the study of Heimlichkeit: that which is familiar and hidden." (60)

Earl A. Grollman in Judaism in Sigmund Freud's World suggests that the essence of Freud's Judaism was his conviviality with other Jews. But whatever the reasons-historical, sociological, psychological-group bonds did provide a warm shelter from the outside world. In social relations with other Jews, informality and familiarity formed a new kind of inner security, a "we-feeling," illustrated even by the selection of jokes and stories recounted within the group. It is what Freud called "the clear awareness of an inner identity, the secret of the same inner construction." (61)

Cuddihy in the Ordeal of Civility takes up this theme and explains the essence of Freud's Judaism thusly.

Freud preferred the company of other Jews. If, as Nathan Rotenstreich notes, a Jew is a Jew when he is with other Jews, then Freud remained a fairly full-time observant Jew. Freud's Jewishness was the company he kept. (62)

Both Grollman and Cuddihy maintained that ultimately Freud defined himself as a Jew. He felt estranged and alienated from Catholic Vienna, felt uncomfortable with Christians in general and however ambivalently, shared with his fellow Jew a sense of "us-in-the-midst-of-them, uncanniness." (63)

Another theory advanced to explain Freud's Judaism relates to his preoccupation with learning. A.A. Brill said of Freud, as quoted in Grollman,

He had an inordinate curiosity for knowledge and a stubborn perseverance in the pursuance of the same. To be sure, a strong desire for knowledge is no Jewish monopoly, but he did come from a people who even long before the diaspora were to drum into their male children that

'knowledge is better than perils.' (64)

Vetter also sees specific indications that Freud's attitude towards learning was indebted to Jewish culture, "The character of Freud's work was essentially intellectual. And it is precisely this type of work which is accorded the highest status in the Jewish hierarchy of values." (65) Vetter points out that Judaism's high regard for human reason and with the preservation of human life and the enhancement of the human condition served to inspire Freud. (66) Berkower, too, locates Freud within a Jewish milieu in which intensive devotion to study was held in the highest esteem.

I Freud's constant search for knowledge concerning human behavior he was carrying over to psychology the same spirit of scholarship that his forefathers applied to the Torah...(67)

Time and again Freud expressed his appreciation for the character traits his Jewishness had bestowed upon him, especially independence and honesty of thought and intellectual courage.

Nor is it perhaps entirely a matter of chance that the first advocate of psychoanalysis was a Jew. To profess belief in a new theory called for a certain degree of readiness to accept a position of solitary opposition...a position with which no one is more familiar than a Jew. (68)

Fromm finds in Freud's unflagging devotion to the power of reason the dual influence of the age of enlightenment and Judaism's respect for intellectualism. He finds Freud the intellectual heir of Spinoza and Kant, Rousseau and Voltaire all of whom fought for "a new, truly enlightened, free and human world." (69)

Freud's Jewish background, if anything, added to his embrace of the enlightenment spirit. The Jewish tradition itself was one of reason and of intellectual discipline, and, besides that, a somewhat despised minority had a strong emotional interest to defeat the powers of darkness, of irrationality, of superstition, which blocked the road to its own emancipation and progress. (70)

Klein notes that Freud went through some important changes in his Jewish identity during the mid 1880s. His identity as a Jew grew from a mere reaction to anti-Semitism to a deeper and more resonant resource indicating his growing strength and resoluteness. (71) It was at this time Freud recalled what his close friend Josef

Breuer had observed in him,

he 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 often felt as though I 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. (72)

Let us now attempt to summarize this overview of the major themes of Freud's Judaism. Freud believed he retained the essence of Judaism though he rejected the outward trappings of ritual and observance. He was reticent to clearly articulate what constituted that essence but there is some evidence enabling us to flesh it out. Bakan and others speculate that Freud's aversion to Orthodox Judaism was manifested by his evident contempt for Jewish law.

Ernst Simon proposes that Freud suffered from the same type of neurosis which he believed gave rise to religious impulses. He advances the argument that Freud's acceptance of the ethical standards of Judaism without their theological foundation gave rise to his neurosis.

Bakan and others claim that Freud's Judaism was repressed so that he might assimilate into the secular world. His Judaism resurfaced however and served as an impetus for developing his psychological phenomenology.

Grollman and Cuddihy see Freud's essence of Judaism as his special feeling for and relationship with other Jews.

Berkhower and Vetter understand Freud's Judaism to be a consummate respect for the value of study and the search for truth. Klein and Fromm agree with this hypothesis and add that Judaism provided Freud with the courage and daring to pursue ideas with ruthless honesty.

## V FREUD ON CHRISTIANITY

We have seen that Freud's criticism of religion hinged on the theory that belief in an all-powerful father God infantilized the believer and led to a neurotic dependency on an illusion and compulsive ritualistic behavior. According to Freud the worship of a father-God restricted human development by compelling belief and suppressing doubt. Religion, then, discouraged resolution of the Oedipal complex and ultimately the attainment of intellectual freedom.

Freud's criticism of Judaism consisted of the observation that by enforcing an ever increasing number of rules it precluded intellectual advancement. "These rules, he insisted, 'were pitiful regulations which perpetuated the guilt connected with the parricide.'" (73)

Freud inveighed against Christianity for much the same reasons. Christianity, he believed, veiled the parricide with the concept of original sin. He further condemned Christianity for avoiding the necessity of dethroning the father-God and instead merely replacing him with the son, "Christianity having arisen out of a father-religion, became a son religion. It did not escape the fate of having to get rid of the father." (74) In short, Freud thought of Christianity as another permutation of a "universal obsessional neurosis," (75) and as such saw it as inhibiting human development.

These insights were true for Freud on the theoretical intellectual level. On the more personal, emotional level Freud experienced anti-Semitism throughout his entire life. Maybaum points out,

Freud wrote as a Jew. That does not mean that he wrote consciously about Judaism or Christianity. The difference between Judaism and Christianity did not concern him much. To him both were only religions, but there was an important difference between them. Christianity was the religion of the enemy. (76)

The incident concerning his father's hat being thrown into the mud and the anti-Semitic insult that went with it made a deep and lasting impression on Freud.

Jones also makes reference to Freud's experience of anti-Semitism.

Freud considered himself a Jew and was proud of the fact. But he had to suffer for it, although he was quite clearly first in his class at his secondary school and rarely had to face questions there...He had only a few non-Jewish friends; humiliations of all kinds at the hands of anti-Semitic 'Christians' were his daily lot...Such experiences unleashed in Freud feelings of hatred and revenge at an early date and made the Christian faith completely incredible to him. (77)

Freud himself said at the age of sixty-nine in his autobiography, "Above all, I found that I was expected to feel myself inferior and an alien because I was a Jew. I refused absolutely to do the first of these things." (78)

Simon claims that Freud ascribed the hatred of Christian for Jews as,

...the Christians are not genuine Christians, but 'badly christened', who have remained in the barbaric polytheistic state of their forefathers. They have not yet overcome their grudge against the new religion which was forced on them and they have projected it on the source from which Christianity came to them...The hatred for Judaism is at bottom hatred for Christianity, and it is not surprising that in the German National Socialist revolution this close connection of the two monotheistic religions finds such clear expression in the hostile treatment of both. (79)

Thus in understanding Freud's concept of Christianity, we need to take into account Freud's personal encounters with Christian anti-Semitism.

There is one other important aspect of Freud's view of sexuality and sublimation. As we have noted, while Freud rejected the legalistic and ritualistic formulations of Judaism, he accepted the worldliness of the Jewish ethic to attain happiness in this world. Freud regarded the attainment of happiness in a world beyond ours as a neurotic example of wish fulfillment. As Vetter points out this marks an important distinction for Freud between Christianity and Judaism.

The Christian view of sexuality as a curse was countered by Freud's theory of the libido and the universal physical need to avoid pain by enjoying pleasure. Henry Kagan, as quoted in Grollman, compares this principle "with that found in Christianity with Paulinian deregations of sex." (81) Grollman makes the connection between Freud's theory of sexuality and Judaism's view explicit by asserting, "Even the sexual aspect of Freud's doctrines which had so alarmed the Christian world

was in harmony with the Jewish viewpoint." (82) Freud objected to the Christian efforts to sublimate sexuality. Philip Rief, as quoted in Cuddihy, refers to this story of Freud's as, "a parody of the reticent manners and morals of the nineteenth century...Freud is that malicious person..." (84)

In summary then, Freud saw Christianity as an attempt to encourage submission and obedience to an all-powerful deity albeit a son-God rather than a father-God. He found in Christianity the same "obsessional neuroses" he observed in all religious doctrines.

His view of Christianity, however, was influenced by his experiences with anti-Semitism. He speculated that so called Christians had not fully internalized Christianity and projected their dissatisfaction with it onto Judaism and Jews.

He further observed Christianity's view of sexuality to be a sublimation of primal urges. Freud, wished to expose such sublimation for he found it detrimental to the enhancement of health in the here and now.

## CHAPTER TWO

In our introduction to this work we endeavored to outline Freud's religious school training in order to ascertain his early exposure to, and identification with, Jewish texts and worship observances. We also adumbrated Freud's major theories regarding the nature of religion in general, God, Judaism and Christianity. In this chapter we will attempt to locate Freud in the historical and cultural ambience of his fin-de-siècle Vienna.

A detailed exposition of the historical and sociological factors which combined to forge Freud's Vienna would take us well beyond the confines of this study. Instead we will briefly survey the history of anti-Semitism in Austria and then focus on those aspects of that history which directly impinged upon Freud.

The seminal work in this field is Earl A. Grollman's, Judaism in Sigmund Freud's World. Grollman contends that anti-Semitism was established in Vienna from the first reliable account of the presence of Jews in the country. (1) He asserts that during the reign of Louis the Child (899-911) Jews were denied legal protection and were used as agents to extract funds from a resistant Christian citizenry to fill the royal coffers. He claims, "The Jew was attracted into marginal banking for one reason. He was forbidden to engage in other occupations." (2)

In 1204, under Emperor Frederick II, the Jewish community built their first synagogue in Vienna. Conditions improved markedly for Jews during this time in that they were appointed to important financial positions and were protected against violence and forced conversions by royal decree. (3)

There were, however, growing threats to Jewish security. Christians began to enter, "The formerly marginal occupations associated with 'Jewish Trade.'" (4) As a result of this encroachment the privileged status of Jews was seriously undermined and the "economic motive for their suppression was clear." (5)

By 1215 as a result of an edict issued by Pope Innocent III, Jews were forced to wear a distinctive mark to indicate their ignominious status. In addition, legislation was enacted to prevent Jews from charging high interest rates for loans and were precluded from holding public office. (6)

Rudolph I, the First Habsburg, founder of the Imperial House of Austria and member of the Ecclesiastical Christian Synod, carried forth the wishes of the Holy See by ordaining that the Jew distinguish himself by wearing a differentiating and disfiguring pointed hat—pilem cornutum. As a consequence of the Vienna Church synod in 1267, masses of people were encouraged by the Emperor to incite bloodshed and massacres. The Jew was pelted and stoned, spat upon and cursed. Many of the synagogue laments which are preserved in the liturgy commemorate the elegy of this period. (7)

By the fourteenth century Christians had established themselves as serious competitors in the area of banking, financing and trade.

Unwilling to compete with their Jewish rivals, who were both more experienced and sometimes had the advantage of connections with their fellow-Jews in distant commercial cities, Christian businessmen urged the total exclusion of Jews from all trading. (8)

By the late fourteenth century Jews could only participate in those ventures which required the investment of personal funds in high risk enterprises. Grollman surmises that these ventures necessitated Jews living in urban and commercial centers and this linkage of Jews with metropolitan areas raised the acrimony of the Christian rural peasantry.

The Jew was hated primarily because he served as an emblem of city life. To the Austrian tiller of the soil, the Jew became the token of the monster, the all-dominant, much-feared city. (9)

The Hussite Wars (1419-1436) further exacerbated the precarious Jewish existence. Catholics accused the Jews of supporting John Huss who denounced many of the Dominican excesses regarding confessions and indulgences. (10) The long impending violence against the Jews finally commenced. The synagogue of Vienna was razed and Jews were burned at the stake and many more committed suicide rather than be forcibly converted to Catholicism. (11) The Jewish population either escaped Austria or was annihilated.

Still the inexorable need for working capital brought the Jews back into Austria, although they were forced to pay for higher taxes than were demanded of other citizens. (12) Even Martin Luther (1493-1546) who initially championed the Jewish cause later "urged the princes to destroy the synagogue and confiscate the wealth of the Jew." (13)

Grollman postulates that this unrelenting history of virulent anti-semitism forced the Austrian-Jewish community to develop a number of defensive reactions. These reactions included the need "to band closely together in an invincible national cultural solidarity." (14) Some of the manifestations of this solidarity were expressed in an intense concentration on religious symbols and rituals.

For many Jews, ritual became almost as concrete a representation of God as the graven image, Jesus. By utilizing a common object, one expressed kinship with the other. Religious symbols were his in-group community badge. These tokens created a sense of solidarity, of belongingness and of acceptance. The symbol was the same for all, definite and prescribed. In ritual one can love his co-religionist, because he does not strive against him and is not being striven against. A narcissistic identification was responsible for the ties that existed between members of the same group where they identified with one another because of one common characteristic: membership in the same minority ethnic group. (15)

Another expression of resistance to the majority group's disparagement of Jews and Judaism took the form of reacting in kind.

By translating the persecution of his people into evidence of the majority group's sense of their own inferiority, the Jew defended himself against his foes. Being the constant source of loathing, the Jew invented his own plausible excuses and alibis to explain his privations, deprivations and external frustrations. His defensive armor involved the stereotyping of the outside world as ignorant, obtuse, and subordinate. There must be a certain something about me that made the Christian so frightened, he thought. In order to preserve his inner self-respect, he expressed a sense of superiority and pre-eminence over the goyishe kup (the non-Jews's inadequacies). Jews would then resolve the protean world of common experience into two depicted as divine and everything Gentile derided as demonic. The synagogue became more than a Beth Tefillah (House of Prayer). It was also a Beth Hakenesseth (House of Meeting). This was the place to laugh and live more comfortably and make fun of oneself and feel superior by scorning the persecutors, who are not "Mine (God's) own treasure from among all peoples." (Exodus 19:5-6) (16)

Still another reaction took the form of sublimation.

This adaptation alludes to the deflection of energy into intellectual, cultural or artistic pursuits. Primitive, unacceptable impulses are sublimated into socially acceptable activities and permitted freedom to flow into consciousness without anxiety. (17)

The major implication of this adaptation in the Jewish community was in the area of study. Learning became the Jewish method for maintaining self-esteem. In addition to this function, education served to cultivate a compensating culture, and a way of looking inward to a contemplative life far removed from the oppressive outward world.

Erudition suggested a belief in the omnipotence of thought, similar to the primitive concept of the child who assumed that his wishes and thoughts might govern the courses of events in the outside world. Emphasis on learning as a means of control was especially strong during persecution. (18)

As was noted in the introduction the themes of Jewish solidarity and separateness, emphasis on religious symbols and rituals, the need for self-justification and sublimation in the form of intellectual development all played a significant role in the development of Freud's phenomenology.

Until the end of the eighteenth century Jews lived in ghettos separated physically as well as culturally from the predominant society. They continued to suffer from outrageous anti-Semitic calumnies, as well as from restrictive legislation.

Some Jews met those appalling situations by turning inward to intellectual activities and mysticism. Others found the baptismal font to be the touchstone of protection from the assaults of the anti-Semites. Some even rallied to the irresistible appeal of a man called Sabbatai Zevi with his messianic pretensions and to his successor, Jacob Frank (1750), the "incarnation" of David, Elijah, Jesus and Mohammed. (19)

At the end of the eighteenth century, an era deemed a time of enlightenment, Emperor Joseph II issued a series of radical edicts which served to virtually emancipate the beleaguered Austrian-Jewish community. The Emperor, a devotee of Voltaire, was influenced by the renaissance of intellectual activity characterized by the works of Voltaire, and Rousseau, of Goethe and Pope, of Spinoza and Mendelssohn. (20) The edicts he issued abolished the oppressive tax system as well as the Jewish badge and granted the Jew the freedom to choose an occupation, to attend the public schools and to live anywhere in Vienna. (24) The impact of these edicts upon the Jewish community was incalculable.

Jews were suddenly catapulted from the medievalism of the past toward a new, unexpected modernity. After the fall of the Bastille on July 14, 1789, Jews made contact with the outside world and learned of sciences that had shattered ancient theologies and of a contemporary revolutionary faith called "Reason." Joseph II introduced a new type of Jew into Austrian society—The Salon Jew. The Salon Jew was not only tolerated but welcomed into the drawing rooms of the Christian intelligentsia. Discussions were not about religion of Thalmus but literature and philosophy. So cataclysmic was this change for the Jew, that no prior preparation could be made. Of course, not all the Jews were affected. Many could not comprehend the Newtonian physics or the speculative thoughts of John Locke. For some, there were the lingering loyalties to the ghetto, the Torah, and to the God of Antiquity. For others who were now freely participating in the business of the new industrial revolution, there was a kind of "religious" devotion to the state that had allowed the Jew the mobility to move upward on the ladder of wealth. (22)

The nineteenth century, the century of Freud's birth, saw the rise of science and intellectualism and the decline of the traditional expressions of Jewish faith. Jews pursued the new preoccupation with reason, with a vengeance, for it seemed to toll the end of the narrow and harsh life the Jew had led previously. Still, such a fundamental and profound change could not help but portend a time of deep dissonance for the Jew.

The movement into rationalism became the attempt of some born of Jewish background to escape the Jewish world. Not only was the religious faith professionally embarrassing for many, but the spiritual elements were bereft of meaning. No longer could answers be accepted on faith. Many now questioned the ancient values and assumptions incorporated in their religious theologies and as a result became agitated and disturbed. (23)

This new age was not destined to last. By the end of Joseph's reign most of his reforms had been rescinded. The influence of Metternich reversed the spirit of emancipation begun by Joseph II and the danger of expulsion remained a real threat for the Jews. This reactionary trend was countered by vestiges of the regime of Joseph II. Conditions improved with the Congress of Vienna of 1815 and a new synagogue was built in Vienna in 1826. (24)

The result of 1848 drove the repressive Metternich from authority and once again brought fresh hope of emancipation for the Jews. Once again these hopes were dashed. (25)

After the revolution, the old discriminations were gradually restored again. An attack on liberal democracy was cloaked in anti-Jewish feeling. The new ruler, Emperor Ferdinand, sought to make the struggle for liberty appear detestable to the Austrians by representing it to be the work of the Jew. He, however, was too weak to remain at the helm of the state's ship and was replaced by his nephew, Francis Joseph I, who adopted autocratic policies. Total blame for the revolution and all objectionable phenomena was again thrust upon the Jews. (26)

The Jewish community had, however, tasted of freedom and could no longer accept its absence passively. It was into this world of struggle Freud was born. The Jew of Freud's world faced unremitting anti-Semitism from the outside culture and many of them chose assimilation and conversion in response to it. We now turn to a discussion of anti-Semitism in Freud's world and his response to it.

Klein asks the very important question, "If the anti-Semitic movement commanded considerable political and popular support, how deeply did it penetrate into the daily lives of the people?" (27) He answers the question by pointing out that primarily the assault on Jews took the form of insidious derision in the theater,

newspapers and the political arena. When anti-Semitism went beyond the bounds of insult it took the form of economic discrimination, Jewish businesses were boycotted, mostly unsuccessfully, and there were efforts to bar Jews from the higher levels of the civil service. (28)

The political and economic situation in Austria worsened due to concessions which had to be made in Italy in the war of 1859. Further losses to Prussia and Italy in 1866 led to dire financial straits and even greater anti-Jewish sentiment. (29) It was as a result of this economic and national collapse that precipitated the Freud family moving to Vienna.

The anti-Semitic movements in Austria were fully supported by the Catholic Church. The Catholic party in Austria vigorously opposed any legislation recognizing Jewish rights. (30)

Throughout the 1870's the Austrian government was dominated by German influence. It was at this time the The Talmud Jew appeared, "...a book filled with fabrications and forgeries, it exercised a very strong influence and achieved importance." (31) This anti-Semitic calumny "became a common subject of conversation in cafes, at club meetings and at popular gatherings." (32) Although discredited by Rabbi Josef Samuel Bloch of Vienna it marks the degree of anti-Semitism existing in Austria during Freud's youth.

Klein points out that anti-Semitism was mainly directed against immigrant Jews. Assimilated Jews already living in Vienna or who had come from the western parts of the empire resented the fact that they were associated with the unassimilated Ostjud. (33)

These assimilated Jews considered themselves German, they supported German nationalism and they felt discomforted and angered by the Jews from the East. During the 1870's these self-identified German Jews clung tenaciously to their belief in the possibilities of social integration. Still, toward the end of the decade virulent

and inexorable anti-Semitism "had pushed to the extreme the German Jews' efforts at justifying their identity and worth as Germans."

It was in this atmosphere that Freud completed medical school. Anti-Semitism was keen among students and Jews were ostracized from life inside and outside of the university. It seems that Freud experienced the tension between German and Jewish identification personally.

The years just before and during his internship at the General Hospital were years when Freud went through deep personal change. Upon his graduation from medical school, Freud's twofold pride as a German and a Jew had vanished. Radical anti-Semitism produced the feeling of dislocation. As he expressed in his Weiss letter (September 1883), Freud felt uncomfortable about being a Jew. He responded with 'horror and shame' to the way the Jews who attended Weiss' funeral conducted themselves in front of Christian observers. At the same time, Freud felt bitter about being German. In the mid-1920's, he recalled, 'I considered myself German intellectually until I noticed the growth of anti-Semitic prejudice in Germany and German Austria. Since that time, I considered myself no longer a German.' Indeed, when the subject of German nationalism came up in the 1880's and later in his life, Freud felt uneasy and wanted to 'supress' the 'frightening' feelings stirring inside him. Nor under the circumstances could Freud sustain any longer his cheerful hopes for social integration. These hopes for 'Love extended to all mankind' had become 'illusions' due to his 'sobering' experiences as a Jew in Vienna. (35)

The elections of 1895 brought the virulently anti-Semitic Karl Lueger to power in Vienna and signified the end of the Jewish hope for an enlightened culture.

Sigmund Freud, by family background, conviction, and ethnic affiliation, belonged to the group most threatened by the new forces: Viennese liberal Jewery. Though not—or, more accurately, no longer—a political man, Freud watched with anxious interest the rise to power of the New Right both in Austria and abroad, especially in the France of the Dreyfus affair. Karl Lueger was his bete noir; political hero. (36)

The re-emergence of anti-Semitism affected Freud in a most sensitive area, his professional life. Academic promotions of Jews in the medical faculty was a virtual impossibility.

In response to his professional and political frustrations Freud retreated into social and intellectual withdrawal. He actually stepped down the social ladder, from the upper medical and academic intelligentsia to which he had gained access in the eighties to a simpler stratum of ordinary Jewish doctors and businessmen who, if they could not assist or

further his scientific pursuits, did not threaten or discourage him. In 1807 Freud joined B'nai B'rith, the Jewish fraternal organization, as a comfortable refuge where he was accepted without question as a person and respected without challenge as a scientist. (37)

Schorske maintains that the difficult conditions of Freud's external world drove him to search inward and this shift gave rise to the daring ideas he began to develop at this time, including his theories regarding the sexual etiology of neuroses. "Freud's intellectual originality and professional isolation fed upon each other." (38)

Cuddihy speculates that Freud's personality, the product of an Eastern European Jewish home, felt ill at ease in the emerging modernity in Vienna. He understands Freud's struggle to be an unsuccessful attempt to break into the life of polite society denied to Freud because of his Jewish ancestry. Cuddihy further asserts that it was this inability to fit in, that provided Freud with the courage and the energy to renounce any pretensions at "civility", the hallmark of the new culture. Instead Freud sought to break the back of this new bourgeois culture by stripping it of its illusion of manners and to replace it with his theory of sublimated sexual drives.

Peter Gay agrees that modernity gave rise to anti-Semitism,

Whatever else it was, German anti-Semitism was a way of confronting—or, rather, not confronting—the pressures of contemporary life, which were remaking Germany as they were other industrial nations in the nineteenth century: specialization, mechanization, the crowding in of impulses and the speeding up of existence, the burgeoning threats posed by Godless morality, Socialist revolution, and cultural nihilism; anti-Semitism was, in short, an irrational protest against the modern world. (39)

Gay understands the anti-Semitism of Freud's world to be an irrational manifestation of cultural nostalgia. The stereotypical Jew, real Jews notwithstanding, was the pushy foreigner forcing his way up the social ladder, imitating the refined and genteel Germans who rightfully belonged in Vienna. The Jew seemed, "clever, rootless, physically and psychologically mobile—a provocative assailant, the unpalatable anti-thesis, of their cherished teutonic ideals." (40) "He stood, in short,

for all the forces the anti-Semite felt powerless to prevent from taking over his world." (41)

Naturally amidst all this external pressure the urge to assimilate was felt keenly by Jews. Peter Gay posits, however, that the appearance of Jewish assimilation was an illusion, that in fact, Jews had already been assimilated. He maintains that German Jews thought and acted exactly like the Germans and,

If professional anti-Semites had not called attention to the presence of Jews in the arts, in literature, in journalism, there would have been no way of deducting their religious affiliation from the quality or the character of their work. (42)

He claims that by 1888 "Jewish" professions had virtually disappeared and that "more and more, German Jews were rich, or prosperous, or poor, in the way of other Germans; more and more, they were cultivated or philistine in the same way." (43)

While Gay asserts that loyalty to Germany and her ideals did not necessarily dictate a German-Jew to repudiate Judaism, it often did. "One thing is certain: waves of anti-Semitism made wavelets of conversion; times of calm reduced the urge to join the safety of the dominant denominations." (44)

Regarding the issue of assimilation in Freud's time, Gay concludes, German Jews were wholly similar to Germans in general. Just as a German could be a "typical" Rhinelander, so too, could a German be a "typical" Jew. He claims that the notion of Jews being "rootless" or "clever" or thirsting for innovation in the arts is a myth largely perpetrated by the Jews themselves. (45)

German Jews moved toward the mainstream of German culture as much as they were permitted to do so. There was nothing in the Jewish cultural heritage, and little in their particular social situation that would make them into cultural rebels, into principled Modernists. (46)

Klein, rejects this assessment when he points out, that Jews identified with the liberal ideals of the constitutional government of the 1860s and 1870s. This liberal spirit was declining in the 1880s and the security of the Jews declined with it. Jewish attachment to policies scorned by the public-at-large left them in an extremely vulnerable position and made assimilation ever more tenuous. (47)

Adherence to German liberalism provided assimilated Jewry not only a political and ideological position in Austrian society, but a way of averting the fate of the East-European Jewry. Yet, rather than furthering the chances for assimilation, the German-Jewish insistence on German identity made assimilation even more difficult. In response to the initial stages of anti-Semitism, Jews reacted defensively. They defended a once-promising, but now-vulnerable, position, and they did so obstinately. In other words, by reaffirming their German-liberal loyalties, Jews insistently denied this mounting threat to assimilation. This rejection of anti-Semitic developments accelerated their solution as anti-Semitism became an integral part of Austrian life. (48)

Whether one accepts Gay's position that German Jews in the 1880s were wholly a product of their new time, not iconoclasts or "modernists", or Klein's proposition, that by stubborn identification with German liberalism Jews affirmed their attachment to noble cultural ideals despite their times, it seems clear that Jewish isolation had shifted to a sporadic and often arbitrary integration into the dominant culture. (49)

The impact of this haphazard integration had a powerful affect on Jewish religious approaches. As Grollman points out there were significant permutations resulting from the collision of Jewish traditional precepts with the ideals of German liberalism. Some of these permutations included, a complete repudiation of Judaism

by conversion to Christianity, the rise of Wissenschaft des Judentums, the establishment of Reform Judaism, and the notion of the "positive historic Judaism" which formed the basis of Conservative Judaism. (50) The Orthodox establishment did not take these permutations lightly and the resulting factionalism only served to intensify an already volatile situation.

Further Grollman contends,

Confusion was compounded when Jewish learning, that had so long existed in a vacuum of isolation, was now considered obsolete when compared with the music, art and philosophy of the newly-discovered civilization. (51)

The Jew was in the throes of disorientation from within and from without. Only marginally accepted in the prevailing culture, often abused and reviled, the Jew struggled to find a safe niche in his secular world and could no longer find refuge in his traditional harbors, the synagogue and study of sacred literature. (52) It was a time of terrible dissonance for the Jew.

Before we turn to a discussion of the implications of these events and situations and Freud, it would be helpful to summarize major themes established thus far. We have provided a broad outline of history of anti-Semitism in Austria pointing out that Jewish involvement in the marginal occupations of financing and banking made the Jew invaluable to rulers but an object of envy for others who wished to engage in the same trade. The Catholic Church for religious and economic reasons played a significant role in undermining Jewish security.

The Jew was also linked with the rise of cities and cosmopolitan values, for banking and finance, the "Jewish trades", relied on commercial centers. This further alienated Jews from the rural peasantry who feared the demise of their way of life.

The Hussite Wars and Martin Luther's anti-Semitism led to the virtual destruction of Jewish life in Austria in the late 15th and early 16th Centuries. Jews were subjected to torture and forced conversions, and these terrors left an indelible imprint on the Jewish psyche.

The Austrian-Jewish community developed a number of defensive postures to protect themselves from the outside world. Some of these defensive strategies included an intense concentration on religious symbols and rituals, denigration of Christians and the Christian world and sublimation in the form of fervent study of Jewish traditional texts.

The end of the eighteenth century catapulted the Jew into modernity. For the first time Jews had access to the great ideals emanated from "The Age of Reason". These ideals, while holding for the Jew the promise of emancipation, also broke the chain of Jewish tradition and left the Jew without a secure anchor.

The nineteenth century saw the rise of science and intellectualism and the decline of traditional expressions of Jewish faith. With it came the countervailing forces of renewed anti-Semitism. The struggle of the Jew to be accepted into the mainstream culture began in earnest, for the Jew had tasted the heady freedom of emancipation and would no longer passively accept its denial.

The battle intensified during the mid-nineteenth century with the Jew enjoying periodic parity with the dominant culture only to see that parity destroyed. Gay insists that the Austrian-Jews assimilated as much as they could and did not advance innovative notions of modernity, while Klein claims that by virtue of their adherence to German idealism Jews bucked the backlash against this idealism and in affect made themselves vulnerable by internalizing the values of the enlightenment.

In any event the Jew was caught betwixt and between and the tension produced many permutations of religious identification. We now need to examine how these deep currents of change impinged upon Freud.

Klein sees the substance of psychoanalysis to be the result of Freud's assertion of his Jewish identity. "Freud recalled that during the early stages of the development of psycho-analytic theory, he had a clear consciousness of an inner identity as a Jew." (53) He speculates that this consciousness was fueled by Freud's disappointment with the prospects of assimilation. (54)

Grollman describes Freud's reaction to the anti-Semitic tenor of his times as one marked by defiance and bold resistance.

For Freud, as with Brandeis and other Jewish children growing up in an atmosphere where they were persona non grata, life was an angry bully, making faces, shaking a menacing fist and shouting names. But Sigmund, like his hero Hannibal, would not be intimidated; he faced his tormenters and shook his fist right back. He was a three-homeless man: a revolutionary scientist among Austrians, and Austrian among Germans, and a Jew among people of the world. (55)

Grollman maintains that Sigmund Freud suffered from the tension generated by his biculturalism, feeling equally estranged from his father's easy identification with ceremonial aspects of traditional Judaism, as well as from his own secular culture, whose acceptance of him as a Jew, "vacillated not only from generation to generation but from moment to moment." (56) Grollman points out that for Freud, "Anxiety was heightened when he was perched uncomfortably between two cultures and often feeling a part of neither. (57)

Not the Freud didn't try to mitigate this anxiety by establishing himself in the general secular culture. Klein points to the serious attempt Freud made to assimilate. One of the manifestations of this attempt occurred in 1869 or 1870 when Freud formally assumed the name "Sigmund" a German variation of the name

"Sigismund" given to him at birth. (58)

The decision to change the name was in part a reaction to the increase in anti-Semitic sentiment at the end of the 1860s, for the name 'Sigismund' gained currency as a favorite term of abuse in anti-Semitic jokes. By replacing his given name with a Germanic-sounding name, Freud severed his important link with his Jewish background to identify more closely with the progressive German-liberal culture. (59)

Another example of Freud's efforts to identify with the "progressive German-liberal culture" was his association during medical school with the radical German student society, the Leseverein. This organization advocated an Austrian alliance with Germany for the express purpose of gaining guaranteed civil liberties. The society also "strived to recover the elemental, emotional, and passionate qualities of life, as well as the organic and collective impulses of social existence." (60) Klein reflects that Freud's five year association with this society (1873-1878) indicated his belief that "Jewish traditions were conspicuously anachronistic in an era of democratic reform," (61) and that Freud accepted Judaism only in its most modern, ethical form.

Humanistic Judaism complemented German liberalism, engendering the belief in the peaceful coexistence between Jews and other religious or national groups. Like his contemporary German Jews, Freud had 'cheerful hopes' for social integration. (62)

Klein claims these "cheerful hopes" were dashed when it became apparent that anti-Semitism would not allow for "social integration."

Though the (anti-Semitic) movement did not become systematic and widespread - indeed radical - until the 1880s, forms of economic and political discrimination against the most conspicuous pariah segment of Viennese Jewry had gained momentum at the end of 1860s. (63)

The "most conspicuous pariah of Viennese Jewry" refers to the Hungarian and Galician Jews against whom most of the anti-Semitic attacks were directed. Thus Freud, as quoted by Klein, was moved to observe when reflecting back on his gymnasium days,

In the higher classes I began to understand for the first time what it meant to belong to an alien race, and anti-Semitic feelings among the other boys warned me that I must take up a definite position. (64)

Initially Freud's "definite position" was his profound distaste for provincial Jewry. One of the most important motives he had for dropping the name "Sigismund" was to distance himself from these victims of cultural anti-Semitism. "While still a student at gymnasium, then, Freud broke away from his East-European heritage in part to avert any association with an 'alien race.'" (65)

When Freud enrolled at the medical school of the University of Vienna he found the same conditions, pronounced anti-Semitism directed against Jews from Hungary and Galacia as well as against Jewish students in general.

When, in 1873, I (Freud) first joined the University, I experienced some appreciable disappointments. Above all, I found that I was expected to feel myself inferior and an alien because I was a Jew. (66)

Klein offers a two-fold explanation for Freud's extreme sensitivity to the anti-Semitic movement. The first was that, "Freud was deeply self-conscious, and unsure of himself, and especially sensitive to social rejection," (67) the second was "his firm liberal commitment to social integration." (68)

Provincial customs and ritualistic behavior were, like political privilege, social stratification, and special economic interests, anathema to Freud's universalistic sensibility. Combined with the psychological longing to belong, his ideological attachment to liberal ideals built up in him a strong desire to assimilate, which broke down that much more painfully when he experienced anti-Semitic hostilities. (64)

In 1875, a crisis developed in the medical school as a result of an essay published by Theodore Billroth (1829-1894), an eminent Viennese medical professor and surgeon.

In this passage, Billroth - a member of the teaching faculty in Vienna since 1867 - openly challenged the legitimacy of accepting Jews from Hungary and Galacia at the Viennese Medical School. Arguing against the policy of open admission for citizens of the state, and thus arguing

from a position of reasonableness, Billroth explained that these impoverished Jews were for the most part lacking the talent for the natural sciences, and...absolutely unsuitable to become physicians. This was true because the immigrant Jew never had an exposure to a good preparatory education or to a stimulating culture. Nor, he argued, would the Jew be able to overcome his cultural and educational limitation. Once he came to Vienna, the struggle for substance would deprive him of the time to study and would make it difficult for him to become a part of the general culture. He claimed that this situation threatened the high standards of the Vienna Medical School, since backward, ignorant, starving students could only become backward, ignorant, starving physicians. (70)

The response that Victor Adler (1852-1918) issued in regard to the Billroth affair underscored the internal conflict of German Jews. Adler prepared a statement defending his German identity and probably delivered it to the Leseverein. (71)

Adler endeavored to reaffirm the difference between Jewish immigrants from the East, whose culture had been distinct from German culture for centuries, and Western Jews, who had lived at least under the influence of German culture for some two generations. Once he made the distinction, he went about proving his loyalty to German nationalism. The situation called for nothing less. His appeal reflected the general response of the Leseverein and of its many Jewish members to the demonstrations and counterdemonstrations incited by Billroth's book. The executive committee, on which Adler sat, published a resolution disapproving the Jewish agitation against Billroth. Moreover, the society's membership overwhelmingly decided to publish its support of Billroth - an unqualified statement of praise for his struggle on behalf of German nationalism. (72)

In all probability Freud, as a member of the society supported Adler's position.

Several years later it became clear that the anti-Semitic movement was so firmly rooted in Vienna that the ideals of German liberalism had been relegated to the realm of wishful thinking. This deterioration had a particularly deleterious affect on Freud for it undermined his confidence in the ability of liberal values to influence moral behavior as well as constituting a severe blow to his self-pride. (73) As Klein emphasizes, perhaps the most traumatic implication of the death of German liberalism for Freud "was the disappearance of an active forum for the exchange and dissemination of progressive views. (74) Klein proposes that Freud was "a man who needed support for the development of his views." (75) The lack of this network was extremely painful to him.

There was an unanticipated reaction to the anti-Semitic movement in Austria. Instead of debilitating Jewish self-esteem, the very opposite occurred.

The irony of the impact of incipient racial anti-Semitism on Freud, and on German Jews like him, was the influence it had on their discovery of a new basis of emotional and ideological support. Though the movement frustrated the aspirations Jews associated with German nationalism, it stimulated, at the same time a positive Jewish response - the feelings of self-defense, pride, and courage, as well as the mutual recognition among Jews of shared beliefs and of strength through unity. (76)

Perhaps the most telling example of the change in Freud's attitude toward his Jewish identity occurred in 1883. While on a train ride Freud unintentionally disturbed his fellow passengers by opening a window. They in turn abused him calling him "a dirty Jew" and suggesting that Jews, unlike Christians, were self-centered and selfish. (77) Freud, as quoted in Klein, recorded his reaction,

Even a year ago I would have been speechless with agitation; but now I am different, I was not in the least frightened of that mob, asked the one to keep to himself of his empty phrase which inspired no respect in me, and the other to step up and take what was coming to him...I was glad I refrained from joining in the abuse, something one must always leave to the others. (78)

This incident characterizes Freud's emerging sense of independence and self-confidence regarding his Jewish identity. As Klein points out,

he felt neither the pain of inferiority nor that of social alienation that he had associated a few years earlier with being an outsider, for the judgments of the passengers were nothing, anyway, but 'empty phrases which inspired no respect' in him. Indeed, as an outsider he felt superior to them: He would not diminish his dignity, which he was defending, by exchanging abuses with them. (79)

By 1926 Freud, as quoted in Gay, was able to reflect,

My language is German...my culture, my attainments are German. I considered myself German intellectually, until I noticed the growth of anti-Semitic prejudice in Germany and German Austria. Since that time I prefer to call myself a Jew. (80)

Let us now summarize the implications of anti-Semitism on Freud's Jewish identity. Freud endured a high degree of tension generated by his biculturality, perched precariously between two cultures but not feeling fully a part of either. Freud tried to assimilate into the general culture but the anti-Semitic movement frustrated his attempt and left him feeling alien and estranged. Freud initially felt less than charitably towards the East European Jewish immigrants and resented his being associated with them. He maintained his commitment to the values of German liberalism but was self-conscious and unsure of himself. Once convinced that his idealism was not founded in reality, Freud became more confident and much more willing to assert himself as a Jew.

### CHAPTER THREE

In Chapter One we briefly outlined the implications of the collision of the ideals of German liberalism with Jewish traditional values and with renewed anti-Semitism in Vienna. Grollamn describes a young Jew of Freud's world as,

...plagued by a vague self-image as to the meaning of being a Jew. His understanding of Jewish content was circumscribed. His confused parents often gave little direction. (1)

The young Jew of Freud's day was a marginal being, as we have said, perched uncomfortably between two cultures and had to live on two levels, "a member of the general community and as a son of the covenant. He was in this world but was never quite sure of it." (2) This bicultural existence caused tremendous strain within the Jewish family and often pitted child against parent. We turn now to a discussion of Freud's family dynamic to ascertain, one, if Freud's family endured the tension previously described and two, if this tension existed, how did it impact on the development of Freud's phenomenology.

Freud's father, Jacob, appears to have been a gentle man who apparently chose not to play an authoritarian role in the family. (3) He did not interfere in Freud's selection of a profession but what position he took regarding Freud's view of religion is more difficult to evaluate. Rainey quotes a remark Jacob is reported to have made, "My Sigmund's little toe is cleverer than my head, but he would never dare to contradict me." (4) Rainey concludes that Sigmund "probably would have kept rather quiet about his views of religion in his father's presence. (5)

Marthe Robert contends that Jacob Freud was,

a Jewish father, a 'vague' father who, from what we know of his times and birthplace, must also have left his son in a state of suspension between two histories, two cultures, two irreconcilable forms of thought. (6)

Robert asserts that Jacob played a pivotal role in Freud's development of psychoanalysis, his theories of religion and most especially his development of the Oedipal drama. (7)

Fromm describes Freud's relationship to his father as diametrically opposed to that of his mother. Apparently she indulged and pampered him while his father took a more impartial approach to him.

Characteristic of this difference is the fact that when at the age of two he was still wetting his bed, it was his father, and not his mother, who reproved him. And what did the little boy answer? 'Don't worry, Papa, I will buy you a beautiful new red bed in the Neutitschein.' We see here already the traits which would characterize Freud in his later life: a difficulty in accepting criticism, a supreme self-confidence, and rebelliousness against his father and, as we may also say, fatherly authority. He, at the age of two, is not impressed by his father's scolding, but puts himself into the shoes of the father, as one who can make him a gift of the bed later. (8)

Fromm also relates a more drastic and profoundly rebellious expression of Freud's ambivalency regarding his father. At the age of seven or eight he deliberately urinated in his parents' bedroom and Fromm explains,

This was a symbolic act of taking possession of his parents' bedroom, with an aggressive tendency, obviously directed against his father. His father reacted, quite understandably, with anger, and exclaimed: 'That boy will never amount to anything.' Freud, in commenting on this incident, wrote: 'This must have been a terrible affront to my ambition, for allusions to this scene occur again and again in my dreams and are constantly coupled with enumerations of my accomplishments and successes, as if I wanted to say: 'You see I have amounted to something after all. (9)

Freud's efforts to vindicate himself to his father were exceeded only by his wishes for his father to be of mythic proportions. As Dor-Shav points out,

But this was, alas, with regard to his father, not to be. Freud's father, we are told, suffered from a complete paralysis of the intestines during his last weeks. This led, for Freud, not only to 'disrespectful thoughts of all kinds', but also, ironically, reminded him of the scornful manner in which a schoolfriend had recounted how a relative having dropped dead in the street, was found to have passed a stool at the moment of death. This, it appears, had disturbed not only the daughter

of the dead man, but also Freud's friend—and Freud himself. Thus to have his own father, too, lose control of his functions was apparently, for Freud, an ironic and bitter note indeed. Freud wanted his father great and unsullied—and in control. In the Moses of Michelangelo essay, that is indeed how he presents him! (10)

We have already recounted the traumatic event which Jacob Freud told of his cap being knocked into the gutter by a Christian thug and his answer to his son's question, "And what did you do?" "I went into the roadway and picked up my cap" was the father's quiet reply. Freud reflecting on this incident is quoted in Cuddihy as saying,

This struck me as unheroic conduct on the part of the big, strong man who was holding the little boy by the hand. I contrasted this situation with another which fitted my feelings better: the scene in which Hannibal's father, Hamilcar Barca, made this boy swear before the household altar to take vengeance on the Romans. Ever since that time Hannibal had had a place in my phantasies. (11)

Ernest Jones says of this incident,

his father never regained the place he had held in his esteem after the painful occasion...The lack of heroism on the part of his model man shocked the youngster who at once contracted it in his mind with the behavior of Hamilcar. (12)

As Cuddihy says, the impact of this incident on Freud was terrible, "The young Freud was shocked, indignant and, far more important, ashamed—ashamed of his own father." (13)

The character of Hannibal had significant influence on Freud in his early years and Freud, as quoted in Fromm, knew why,

Hannibal had been the favorite hero of my later school days. Like so many boys of that age, I had sympathized in the Punic Wars, not with the Romans, but with the Carthaginians. And when in the higher classes, I began to understand for the first time what it meant to belong to an alien race, and anti-Semitic feelings among the other boys warned me that I must take up a definite position, the figure of the semitic general rose still higher in my esteem...And the wish to go to Rome had become in my dream life a cloak and symbol for a number of other passionate wishes. Their realization was to be pursued with all the perseverance and single-mindedness of the Carthaginian, though this fulfillment seemed

at the moment as little favored by the destiny as was Hannibal's lifelong wish to enter Rome. (14)

Clearly Freud identified with Hannibal for a number of reasons. First of all Hannibal was a hero who vigorously fought the Romans who most likely represented to Freud the authority of the Roman Catholic Church. Second, Hannibal was of the Semitic race whom Freud saw as an avenger of oppressed people. And, third, we come to see, Hannibal had a gallant and brave father.

If he had to have a Jewish father, little Sigmund would at least have wanted him to be a man proud of his race, a bold warrior, a heroic though vanquished Hamilcar, in whose footsteps he would be glad to follow...Instead of which he had a weak father who, not content with swallowing an insult and picking up his cap, made matters worse by bringing up the incident years later by way of proving that the times had changed for the better thanks to the new liberalism of the families. (15)

Freud could never forgive his father for what he believed to be his cowardice.

The fact that Freud rejected his father's passivity is reflected in a number of important events, one of which we have already mentioned. In 1883, while on a train, Freud was confronted about an open window by a group of fellow travelers who called him "a dirty Jew" and questioned his "Jewish manners". The similarity to his father's cap-in-the-gutter experience was striking. As Cuddihy points out,

All the essential elements of the paternal encounter repeated themselves: the public place, the dispute about the propriety of certain behavior in a public place, the charge of incivility itself made incivily (like shouting at a child to be quiet), the physical challenge, and the 'ironic politeness' of the Gentile's renewed request—all with one important difference: Freud's calling their bluff by an open challenge to stand up and fight. (16)

Still another incident Freud had internalized his hero's fortitude at the expense of his father's passivity is described by Jones, as quoted in Grollman,

On returning from a walk they found their way home, which meant crossing the Thumsee to get to their hotel, barricaded by a noisy crowd who were shouting anti-Semitic slogans at them. Swinging his walking stick Freud unhesitatingly charged into them with an expression on his face that made them give way before him. It was by no means his only

experience of the kind. I recall a particularly unpleasant one where he also cowed a hostile group that happened on a train journey from Hamburg to Vienna during his engagement time. Freud could on occasion create a formidable impression with a stern and somewhat scowling glance. The last time when it was displayed, and with success, was when he faced the Nazis in his home in 1938. (17)

It would be helpful to summarize what has been stated thus far. It seems clear that from an early age Freud felt some ambivalency for his father. When scolded by his father for wetting his bed Freud responded in a patronizing fashion as if he were the father. Approximately five years later Freud deliberately urinated in his parent's bedroom and was told by his father that he would never amount to anything. This incident had enough force to cause Freud to reflect on his accomplishments years later as an effort to disprove his father's prediction.

At the age of ten his father recounted an incident of his being humiliated by a Christian who knocked his cap into the gutter and his subsequent timid response. Freud became ashamed of his father and identified instead with the great warrior Hannibal.

Freud, himself, confronted with aggressive and threatening anti-Semitic baiting, acted with great courage and was able to assertively retain his dignity. All the major authors on this subject acknowledge Freud's loss of esteem for his father to be a major motivating factor in the development of his psychoanalytic theories especially regarding his views of religion, Jewish identity and the development of the "Oedipus complex" a subject to which we now turn.

In 1885, while in Paris, Freud went to see a production of "Oedipus Rex" and it left a deep impression on him. (18) Twelve years later, in the midst of his self-analysis, Freud returned to the story of Oedipus and had some startling insights. In regular correspondence with his friend Fliess he says as quoted in Cuddihy, "I have found love of the mother and jealousy of the father in my own case too, and now

believe it to be a general phenomenon of childhood." (19)

Cuddihy proposes that Freud's passion for this play because understandable to him only when he confronted the repressed fury for his father's timidity.

The story his father had told him at ten or twelve, I shall argue, bears an uncanny resemblance to the event that precipitated the Oedipus story: the chance meeting on the street, the incivility of the threat to 'thrust (one) rudely from the path.' This time the son doesn't 'take it lying down' but, when 'jostled,' strikes back in anger at the driver. Then, just as with Freud's father years back, Oedipus is struck 'full in the head' but this time, instead of the 'unheroic conduct' of his father meekly fetching his cap of the muddy gutter, Oedipus in his fury strikes back again and kills...his father. (20)

Cuddihy speculates that Freud's shame for his father's behavior became a kind of "moral parricide." He repressed this shame, unwilling to be a disloyal son, but the play caused these feelings to resurface and Oedipus does what the young Freud wished his father had done. The shame Freud felt for his father was exacerbated by his "excelling" his father socially, and especially, culturally. As Cuddihy puts it, "to be ashamed of another or for another—such as a parent—is an even more shattering experience than to be ashamed of or for yourself." (21)

Cuddihy goes on to argue it is precisely because the parent is blameless that one feels guilt for feeling ashamed of the parent. It is the progeny who accepted the cultural norms and found the parent lacking. This assimilation means the acceptance of a new reference group by which one's parents seem hopelessly vulgar.

So paradoxically, it is we who are guilty for achieving those things—social mobility, refinement, assimilation—in virtue of which we experience our own parents as embarrassing and distasteful to us. (22)

Cuddihy claims that Freud sublimated the shame into guilt, since wishing to kill his father was easier than feeling shame for him.

It is more permissible and tolerable to own up, to blame yourself for being a parricide (in fantasy), than to be ashamed of your father (in reality) for his, and consequently your, misfortune in having been born a Jew. (23)

Robert agrees with Cuddihy's assessment of the origins of the "Oedipus complex." She sees the crux of Freud's self-analysis, the central and most disturbing element of it being, "his unconscious desire to disavow the Jewish father whom he held responsible for his taints, his poverty, and his social humiliation." (24)

Robert postulates that Freud's father was the focal point and "perhaps the only source of his psychic difficulties." (25) She asserts that the purpose of Freud's self-analysis was

to learn to distinguish the real Jakob Freud from the mythological father, upon whom all the son's most archaic impulses had formerly been fixated, and whose multiple faces now bewildered him. If he succeeded, the Jakob Freud, at last dissociated from his troublesome double..would be brought down to earth, once he recovered his human form, he would take on the distinct features and infinitely varied nuances which are everywhere the mark of the living creature. (26)

Here is where Robert parts company with Cuddihy. Rather than seeing the Oedipus struggle as the movement from shame to guilt, from reality to fantasy, as does Cuddihy, Robert asserts the movement is from fantasy to reality, a reality in which shame for another is tolerable for it is one of the "infinitely varied nuances which are everywhere the mark of the living creature."

Robert claims that Freud's self-analysis led to the discovery of the "Oedipus complex" and behind this complex was the face of Jacob Freud.

His occult presence was indeed remarkably tenacious not only did he exert a subterranean influence on the more or less novelistic part of his son's work - Totem and Taboo, Moses and Monotheism; he also continued to intervene not infrequently in his son's life by bringing the full weight of an inopportune past to bear on the present. Undoubtedly he was in some measure responsible for the alteration of infatuation and disaffection in so many of Freud's friendships...(27)

The discovery of the "Oedipus complex" was Freud's attempt to extricate himself from his father's "occult presence." Robert proposes Freud was not wholly successful in this endeavor. She claims, like Cuddihy, Freud felt remorse at "excelling" his

father and regret at not always being able to love him.

But he could justly say...that on one point at least he had not weakened: if he had not avenged his father...by following in the footsteps of Hannibal, neither had Rome vanquished him; he had not succumbed to the spells of the mythical city, which for him was the symbol of ambition and disavowal. (28)

Bakan understands Freud's theory of the "Oedipus complex" as the attempt

To remake and rework our conceptions of morality in a way which would make it possible for the individual to live a richer and less hampered existence, freed from the taboos which Judaism had imposed upon itself for its survival and which had been accepted by the Christian world as a way of life. (29)

Thus Bakan agrees with Cuddihy and Robert to the extent that Freud was trying to alleviate guilt but he maintains that it was not Jacob who had engendered this guilt but rather the figure of Moses. It is Moses who Freud must kill allegorically to destroy the firm and relentless hold of traditional Judaism on himself, as well as parallel institutions on Western civilization at large. What Bakan has done is substitute the figure of Moses for Jacob Freud, reasoning that Freud had followed the same process when he substituted the valiant Hamilcar for his timid father. These themes will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

Schorske sees Freud's struggle with the "Oedipus complex" much differently. The death of Jacob created an intense personal crisis for Freud. He described his father's death, as quoted in Schorske, as, "The most important event, the most poignant loss, of a man's life." (30) The death of Jacob in 1896 created for Freud a psychological crisis in which he had to choose either a political or psychological conclusion.

To lay his father's ghost Freud had either, like Hamlet, to affirm the primacy of politics by removing what was rotten in the state of Denmark (a civic task) or to neutralize politics by reducing it to psychological categories (an intellectual task). (31)

Schorske theorizes that Freud opted for the latter. Freud neutralized politics when

he developed the concept of the "Oedipus complex" for with it came the realization the "all politics is reducible to the primal conflict between father and son." (32) The significance of this insight for Freud was profound. No longer was he subject to the vagaries of his political situation as a Jew in anti-Semitic Vienna, no longer would he be subject to the oath of Hannibal, cast into the role of military and political liberator. Schorske suggests that this was "his victory over politics." (33) By advancing the theory of the "Oedipus complex" psychoanalysis had prevailed over history, "with that discovery, a new road to Rome lay open." (34)

#### CHAPTER FOUR

As we noted in the previous chapter, Freud identified to an almost neurotic degree with the great general Hannibal. Inextricably entwined with this identification was what Schorske calls Freud's "Rome neurosis." (1) A typical cultivated and educated Austrian, Freud was well versed in classical culture, and soon developed an analogy between his work as a depth psychologist and the work of an archeologist.(2) With this insight what started as a serious but casual interest in archeology became a passion. He struck up a friendship with a professor of archeology and in a letter to Fleiss, as quoted in Schorske, he wrote "He keeps me up till three o'clock in the morning....still He tells me about Rome." (3)

The Rome obsession gradually grew so strong that when Freud reached an impasse in writing The Interpretation of Dreams he observed as quoted in Grollman, "I am not in a state to do anything except the topography of Rome, my longing for which becomes more and more acute." (4)

Between the years 1895 and 1898 Freud traveled to Italy five times without ever entering Rome. TIn The Interpretation of Dreams Freud wrote of four Rome dreams, "all of which suggest, in one form or another, redemption or fulfillment that is never quite achieved." (5) Schorske theorizes that these dreams were a conflation of images of the Roman Catholic Church with Jewish ideals and realities. (6)

In one dream Rome appears as 'the promised land seen from afar,' implying Freud to be in the same relation to Rome as Moses to Isreal. The vision, though Frued does not say so, seems to express a forbidden wish; a longing for an assimilation to the gentile world that his strong waking conscience - and even his dream-censor-would deny him. (7)

Freud also indicated Rome represents "an earthly city of recreation (recreation), of resurrection." (8) In his analysis of this dream Freud identifies himself with a sad and gentle Jewish character on his way by train to a vacation resort,

who the conductor beat up at every station, but undaunted continued on, what Freud called, his via dolorosa. (9) "Thus the lofty vision of Moses-Freud seeing Israel-Rome 'from a far' had its lowly analogue in the picture of the little-Jew-Christ-Freud reaching Carlsbad-Rome on a via dolorosa." (10)

Still another Rome dream finds Freud looking out a train window and observing a structure now a papal castle but formerly a Roman imperial tomb. The train rushes past and Freud is unable to enter the castle, a symbol of both Roman paganism and Christian salvation. (11)

Though Freud did not analyze these dreams fully he did acknowledge, as quoted in Schorske, that the wish to go to Rome "had become in my dream a cloak and symbol for a number of passionate wishes." (12) The only one of these passionate wishes Freud chose to reveal was his identification with Hannibal, and Freud observed, as quoted in Schorske, "like him, I had been fated not to see Rome." (13) In the previous chapter we discussed the implications of Freud's Hannibal identification and here we only wish to remind the reader of Schorske's interpretation of it,

He defined his Oedipal stance in such a way as to overcome his father by realizing the liberal creed his father professed but had failed to defend. Freud-Hannibal as 'Semitic general' would avenge his feeble father against Rome, a Rome that symbolized 'the organization of the Catholic Church and the Habsburg regime that supported it. (14)

Schorske maintains that Freud's Rome dreams suggest that he held yet another vision of Rome, that of a 'love object.' Freud's passion for the ancient Rome conflicted with the image of Rome as the symbol of the Catholic church and the death of his father and the rise of anti-Semitism in the 1890s, bound Freud to the Hannibal vision of Rome. Schorske claims these fetters were broken during Freud's self-analysis accomplished in The Interpretation of Dreams. Nearly five years after his father's death, Freud entered Rome in 1901, not "to take vengeance on the

Roman" but "as intellectual pilgrim and psycho-archeologist." (15)

The brilliant, lonely, painful discovery of psychoanalysis, which made it possible for Freud to overcome his Rome neurosis, to kneel at Minerva's ruined temple, and to regularize his academic status was a counterpolitical triumph of the first magnitude. By reducing his own political past present to an epiphenomenal status in relation to the primal conflict between father and son, Freud gave his fellow liberals an a-historical theory of man and society that could make bearable a political world spun out of orbit and beyond control. (16)

Gordis takes a different view of Freud's obsession with Rome than does Schorske. He cites Jones' explanation that Freud's conflict lay "between the two Romes, one the Rome of classical times, which Freud loved and admired, the other Christian Rome, which destroyed and supplanted the older one." (17) Gordis moves beyond Jones' analysis, which was closely followed by Schorske, and offers the following explanation, had Hannibal prevailed over the Romans, the Western world would have been modeled after the Semitic civilization, but since Rome eventually triumphed this became an impossibility. This portended later tragedies for the Jews because "a victorious Rome was able to batter down the walls of Jerusalem, burn the Temple, and drive the Jewish people into exile." (18)

Thus Gordis contends that Freud's conflict was not between pagan Rome and Christian Rome but between two antithetical facets of classical Rome—"Rome, the center of ancient culture which he loved, and the Rome which he hated as the enemy and destroyer of his people." (19)

If, as Freud himself emphasized, the subconscious is far more powerful than the conscious and the rational part of our nature, his ties with Judaism and the Jewish people were rooted far more deeply than either he or his biographer recognized. (20)

Robert agrees that "what prevents Freud from going to Rome is his Jewishness, not a personal failing, but a hereditary and incurable disease." (21) Robert claims that the war within Freud was initially between the gentle Jew on the train,

periodically beaten by the conductor, and the valiant Hannibal who preferred taking his own life than submitting to his enemies. Robert suggests that one of Freud's "Rome dreams" might be a handy synthesis of both of these conflicting internal realities, "the little Jew, capable of adapting himself to anything, and the uncompromising Semite work in hand..." (22) The result would be a synthesis which would resolve Freud's psychological dilemma regarding Rome. She claims however that this resolution was unacceptable to Freud and against all logic he rejected the image of the persevering, though accomodating, Jew and chose to ally himself with Hannibal. (23)

She claims this choice disquieted Freud and only his Oedipal theories and self-analysis brought successful resolution.

This victory over his personal myth, which marks not only the end of the century but also a new era in the history of thought, gave him the certainty that he could now win a leading position 'on the other side' without fear of disavowing himself; and admire everything he loved there without feeling even in his dreams...the slightest temptation to bend his knee. (24)

Fromm proposes the reason for Freud's strange hesitancy to reach Rome had its origins in his unconscious.

Visiting Rome meant, apparently, for Freud's unconscious, the conquest of the enemy city, the conquest of the world. Rome was Hannibal's aim, it was Napoleon's aim, and it was the capital of the Catholic Church, which Freud deeply disliked. In his identification with Hannibal, he could not go further than his hero until, years later, he made the final step and entered Rome; quite evidently a symbolic victory and self-affirmation, after the appearance of his chef-d'oeuvre, The Interpretation of Dreams. (25)

In this interpretation Fromm is in the mainstream of opinion regarding Freud's obsession with Rome. He also mentions another important identification Freud made with Rome-his identification with Moses and Messianism and it is to this subject we now address ourselves.

Bakan quotes Freud regarding one of his "Rome dreams" in which he claims Messianism is clearly evident,

Another time someone led me to the top of a hill and showed me one half-shrouded in mist; it was so far away that I was surprised at my view of it being so clear. There was more in the content of this dream than I feel prepared to detail; but the scheme of 'the promised land from afar' was obvious in it. (26)

He suggests that Freud's attachment to Hannibal may well have indicated an identification with the military Messiah spoken of in Jewish traditional literature. He points out the association of Jerusalem with Rome when he quotes Freud as concluding a letter to Fliess by saying, "If I closed with 'next Easter in Rome;' I should feel like a pious Jew." (27) Bakan speculates that Freud conceived of himself as the military Messiah in the spirit of Jewish mysticism and quotes Freud again in defense of his position, "I have often felt as if I had inherited all the passion of our ancestors when they defended their Temple, as if I could joyfully cast away my life in a great cause." (28) Further Bakan asserts that Freud's identification with the military hero Hannibal supports his argument.

Bakan claims that the most telling evidence for his hypothesis of Freud's Messianic identification is his obsession with Rome, "The legendary dwelling place of the Messiah, and the place where the Messiah will reveal himself." (29) Bakan notes the proximity of Freud's development of the "Oedipal complex" with his long awaited trip to Rome and concludes,

Freud's emotional identification with the military Messiah of the Jews catches in metaphor several critical aspects of Freud's personality. The military Messiah, blessed by Moses, can violate one of the strongest taboos among the Jews, the commandment against killing, and the derivative taboo against thoughts of aggression which might involve bloodshed. Thus by participating in this image, Freud could feel free to indulge in thoughts of killing oppressors in a way which would have been otherwise traditionally closed. His ego could tolerate murderous thoughts. We need only remind ourselves of the great significance in Freud's writings of death wishes directed against others, particularly the father, and its formulation in the fundamental paradigm of the Oedipus complex.

Furthermore, the military ethos may well have been one of the primary sources of his enormous energy. (30)

Klein also finds evidence of Messianism in Freud's obsession with Rome. He cites "the promised land" dream as a deep expression of Freud's identification with the prophet Moses. He also asserts a commonality of purpose and vision,

For Jews seeking to articulate a deep sense of ethical purpose and a universal vision, Moses, the lawgiver and liberator of the Israelites, could serve as a supreme archetype. (31)

Klein finds significant import in Freud's reticence to discuss this identification in detail.

...Freud expressed his attraction to the Biblical figure in a reserved and unassuming way. He refused to discuss the obvious reference to Moses in his Rome dreams: 'There was more in the content of this dream than I feel prepared to detail...' That the Moses identity surfaced in his public writings is one indication of the vigor of his Jewish feeling. (32)

Grollman follows the line of reasoning already established in this chapter. He notes Freud's Hannibal identification and his reluctance to go to Rome. He also finds a connection between the development of the Oedipal theories and Freud's finally overcoming his reluctance and visiting Rome. Grollman mentions in his account of Freud's Rome obsession our next topic for discussion. "When Freud at last did reach Rome, it was Michelangelo's statue of Moses which fascinated and magnetized him." (33)

Before we begin the discussion of Michelangelo's Moses let us briefly summarize what we have established thus far regarding Freud's Rome obsession and Messianic identification. Freud's casual interest in archeology became a passion when he observed the metaphorical connection between the work of the archeologist and the depth psychologist. This passion led to an obsession with Rome. The confluence of Freud's Rome obsession with his self-analysis and work on The Interpretation of Dreams strongly suggests a link between them.

Freud made five trips to Italy in the late 1890s but could not bring himself to enter Rome. During this time he had four dreams regarding Rome which he recorded in The Interpretation. These dreams suggest that Rome had become for Freud a "symbol for a number of passionate wishes."

One of the major issues Freud was contending with at this time was the death of his father and his ambivalent feelings toward him. Freud had assumed a strong identification with Hannibal probably as a counter measure to what he believed to be his father's timidity. Schorske posits that as long as he held this identification, like Hannibal, he would never enter Rome. Rome symbolized for Freud the Roman Catholic Church and the bitter anti-Semitism he and his father had experienced. On a different level Freud greatly admired classical Rome. These two visions created a deep dissonance which Freud could only resolve by putting his father to rest with the development of Oedipal theories. Schorske concludes that Freud had to develop a psychological rather than political world view to break away from his father and his Hannibal identification and finally enter Rome. Gordis claims Freud's Rome dilemma was between two aspects of classical Rome, the first Rome which drove his people into exile and the second Rome which was the center of ancient culture. Freud could only enter Rome when he came to peace with the Western world, a world based on Roman culture.

Robert considers Freud's Rome obsession a sole product of his Jewishness. She contends that Freud's dilemma was his feeling that Rome represented a compromise of his integrity as a Jew and his father's son. Through his self-analysis Freud became strong enough not to feel seduced by Rome nor disloyal to his father by enjoying Rome's treasures.

Fromm offers an interpretation of the Rome dilemma based largely on Jones'

account and consequently very similar to Schorske's. He does, however, raise the subject of Freud's identification with Moses and Messianism.

Bakan understands Freud's identification with Hannibal as a manifestation of his identification with the military Messiah spoken of in Jewish traditional literature. He links this identification with Freud's Oedipal theories consistent with his identification with the military Messiah and Rome.

Klein places Freud's Messianic impulses with an identification with Moses. He claims Freud shared a "deep sense of ethical purpose and a universal vision" which Moses and Freud's Jewish identity made Moses a logical archetype for Freud's identification.

Once the spell of Hannibal was broken Freud was a frequent visitor to Rome. He would spend long solitary hours on a daily basis in the Church of San Piztio in Vincoli staring at Michelangelo's famous statue of Moses "in order to study it, measure it, and sketch it, until he could awaken in himself the fullest possible comprehension of that masterpiece." (34) Freud seemed to have "experienced a kind of ecstasy" from his contact with the statue and "all references and allusions to Moses disappear from his letters for a long period of years." (35) Vogel explains this absence as a time when the exceptionally vivid image of the statue became deeply buried in Freud's subconscious, only to emerge twenty years later..." (36) What was the nature of Freud's fascination with the Moses figure and how did it influence Freud's last great work, Moses and Monotheism?

Rainey suggests that Freud's Jewish identity was so strong that it was common for him to identify himself and even colleagues with great figures and events of Jewish history. (37)

In the early days of the psychoanalytical movement, when Jung was Freud's heir apparent, Freud spoke of Jung as the 'Joshua' who was to

enter the promised land of 'psychiatry,' which he, like 'Moses,' could only view from afar. (38)

Rainey suggests that Freud's interpretation of the statue, which departs from the Biblical narrative, "depicts the great leader restraining his anger at the defection of the masses in order to preserve the precious tablets of the law." (39) Freud, himself, experienced the defection of important colleagues especially Jung, and felt he had to restrain his wrath in order to preserve the psychoanalytic movement. Rainey contends this similarity in situation linked Freud with Moses,

Agnostic as he was, he nevertheless reached back into the history of his people to find the paradigms to describe his life's work. (40)

David Bakan believes that "primary key to the understanding of Freud is contained in his concern with Moses." (41) He quotes Freud's reaction to Michelangelo's Moses:

For no piece of statuary has ever made a stronger impression on me than this. How often have I mounted the steep steps of the unlovely Corso Cavour to the lonely place where the deserted church stands, and have essayed to support the angry scorn of the hero's glance! Sometimes I have crept cautiously out of the half-gloom of the interior as though I myself belonged to the mob upon whom his eye is turned—the mob which can hold fast no conviction, which has neither faith nor patience and which reboices when it has regained its illusory idols.

But why do I call this statue inscrutable? There is not the slightest doubt that it represents Moses the Law-giver of the Jews, holding the Tables of the Ten Commandments. That much is certain, but that is all...(42)

Freud's initial attempt to analyze the impact of this statue was expressed in his essay "The Moses of Michelangelo," published anonymously in *Imago* in 1914. (43) Freud was reluctant to publish the essay at all saying, as quoted in Bakan, "Why disgrace Moses by putting my name to it? It is a joke, but perhaps not a bad one." (44)

Bakan points that the essay was conceived and written at the time of Freud's deep despair over Jung's defection from the psychoanalytical movement. Freud saw

Jung as the bridge to the Gentile world who could save psychoanalysis from being conceived of as only "a Jewish science."

In 'On the History of Psychoanalytic Movement', which he wrote at about the same time as 'The Moses of Michelangelo,' he writes bitterly of Jung that he 'seemed ready to enter into a friendly relationship with me and for my sake to give up certain prejudices in regard to race which he had previously permitted himself.' It is clear the 'The Moses of Michelangelo' was written at a time when Freud was in the throes of considerations regarding the lot of the Jews. (45)

Clearly central to Freud's considerations concerning the lot of the Jews was his deep feeling regarding Moses. Jones, as quoted in Bakan, says,

There is every reason to suppose that the grand figure of Moses himself, from Freud's early Biblical studies to the last book he ever wrote, was one of tremendous significance to him. Did he represent the formidable Father-Image or did Freud identify himself with him? Apparently both, at different periods. (46)

The essay itself does not attempt to analyze Michelangelo's motives or psychological insights expressed in the statue but "Rather, he (Freud) simply uses the statue as an occasion for the clarification of his own problem with respect to Moses." (47)

Bakan concludes that "The statue does not represent Moses about to rise in anger." (48) Instead the statue represents controlled and restrained anger, anger which will not result in a violent, hostile act. Bakan quotes Freud as saying,

But Michelangelo has placed a different Moses on the tomb of the Pope, one superior to the historical or traditional Moses. He has modified the theme of the broken Tables; he does not let Moses break them in his wrath, but makes him be influenced by the danger that they will be broken and calm that wrath, or at any rate prevent it from becoming an act. In this way he has added something new and more than human to the figure of Moses; so that the giant frame with its tremendous physical power becomes only a concrete expression of the highest mental achievement that is possible in a man, that of struggling successfully against an inward passion for the sake of a cause to which he has devoted himself. (49)

Bakan points out that Freud quoted the relevant passage of the Bible concerning

the people's defection and Moses' wrath (Exodus 32:7-35) but leaves out verses 21-29 which chronicle the punishment for the defection. "That Freud deletes these passages is indeed another way of making his point: the punishment for defection will not ensue." (50)

Though Jung had defected from the ranks, Freud would not turn in anger but rise above his wrath "for a cause to which he has devoted himself," Bakan asserts this "cause," the psychoanalytic movement, cast Freud in the role of the "new Lawgiver" and this is the sum and substance of his identification with the Moses of Michelangelo. (51)

Fromm also finds in Freud's essay "The Moses of Michelangelo" an attempt to reinterpret the traditional story of Moses' breaking of the tablets. Fromm posits that Freud's efforts were motivated by forces "not clearly recognized consciously, and against the recognition of which must have existed a considerable resistance." (52)

He identifies these forces as Freud's effort to control his fury with Jung but perhaps more importantly "because he saw himself as Moses, not understood by the people and yet able to control his wrath and to continue his work." (53) Fromm suggests that according to Freud the theme of the broken tablets had been modified by Michelangelo from one of anger to concern and compassion for the people. Freud's flippant remark concerning this essay, regarding it as a "joke", is understood by Fromm as Freud's "embarrassed reaction to the unconscious identification with Moses, which was the power motive behind the article." (54)

Dor-Shav takes exception to Fromm. He argues that Freud primarily identified his father, not himself, with the figure of Moses, and this theme is detailed in Moses and Monotheism. Dor-Shav speculates that "the Moses of Michelangelo" essay was Freud's attempt to idealize his father, "an attempt to express and come to

terms with the ambivalent feelings toward his father." (55) Dor-Shav asserts that,

Freud was not yet ready, apparently, at the time, to express the other side of his ambivalent feelings toward his father — that expression was to wait until much later, until the end of his life and Moses and Monotheism. (56)

Dor-Shav makes the case that Freud regarded Moses as a symbol of his father, an idol set up in "The Moses of Michelangelo" and broken in Moses and Monotheism. It in no way suggests an attempt on Freud's part to deny his Jewish identity, in fact,

...it is with the Jewish people, that Freud identifies himself—with the people whom he sees as a child in their relationship to Moses, the father who 'created' them...instead, he is deeply identified with the Jewish people, and sees himself, with them, as the carrier of a great ethical tradition. (57)

Robert agrees with Dor-Shav's assessment of Freud's father identification with the statue of Moses.

While waiting to vie with the giant whose Law he endeavors to re-write, Freud contemplates him with admiration and fear, no longer as an analyst clothed with authority, but with all the curiosity, love, and secret envy of a son. (58)

She sees in Freud's essay on Michelangelo's Moses an attempt to transcend the violence he felt toward defectors from his psychoanalytical movement and a movement away from the passionate, albeit ambivalent feelings, for his father. The intensity of these feelings projected onto the figure of Moses is reflected in Robert's observation that "it was another quarter of a century before he had done with Moses." (59)

Grollman points out, from the years 1933-1936, the figure of Moses was of vital concern to Freud. Grollman quotes Jones on the motives for this vital concern.

I do not find this question hard to answer. The reason that just narrowed Freud's interest in mankind in general and its religions to the more specific question of the Jews and their religion, could only have been the unparalleled persecution of his people that was getting under way in Nazi Germany, with the likelihood of this spreading to his native country. Like so many other Jews of that time who simply wished to live at peace

with their fellow men without parading any of their particular differences from them, Freud was once more forced to wonder what it was in his people that evoked such horrible reactions, and how they had become what they were. (60)

Thirty eight years after Freud's first visit to Rome, and his initial encounter with Michelangelo's Moses, Freud published his reflections in Moses and Monotheism, 1939. This work created a maelstrom of controversy which exists to this day. Before we begin an analysis of this controversy it would be helpful to provide a broad outline of the contents of the work.

Freud began by advancing the astounding theory that Moses was not a Jew but, an Egyptian. He derived this theory by pointing to the etymological roots of the name Moses which he believed to be Egyptian as well as theorizing that Moses was slow of speech not because he suffered from a speech impediment but because he did not know the language of the Hebrews.

Freud continued by asserting that Moses was of regal origin who received the tenets of monotheism from Ikhnaton who reigned from 1375 to 1358 before the common era. This monotheism was characterized as "a universal monotheistic God-faith that permitted no image worship and stressed ethical attributes." (61) When Ikhnaton died there was a violent reversion back to polytheism and only Moses adhered to the precepts of monotheism.

Moses taught the faith to the Habiri tribes of Arameans living in Goshen who decided to live their own lives with the God of Moses. Thus Moses the Egyptian acquired a belief in monotheism and converted the Jews to it. (62)

Bakan, who is treated in greater detail later in this chapter, attributes Freud's great attention to Moses to his lowly social status.

By creating a Gentile Moses of high position and royal lineage, he overcomes his sense of the Jew as a person of low social status. Freud, as we know from various biographical items, felt very sensitive about the low social position to which his Jewishness held him. Freud's myth

that the Jews were adopted by a Gentile of high nobility overcomes the sense of degradation. (63)

Another important point Freud made in Moses and Monotheism was the circumcision was an Egyptian rite Moses introduced to the Hebrews. Grollman speculates that Freud's motives for offering this explanation was his hope "to lessen the prevalent anti-Semitism." (64) He quotes Freud as saying,

The deeper the motives of anti-Semitism have their roots in times long past; they come from the unconscious, and I am quite prepared to hear what I am going to say will at first appear incredible. I venture to assert that the jealousy which the Jews evoked in other peoples by maintaining that they were the first born, favorite child of God the Father, has not yet been overcome by these others, just as if the latter had given credence to the assumption. (65)

For Freud, circumcision was the mark by which Jews laid claim to their "chosen people" status. Freud, as quoted in Grollman, said,

Among the customs through which the Jews marked off their aloof position, that of circumcision made a disagreeable, uncanny impression on others. (66)

Thus Freud attempted to convey the concept the the "chosen people" status of Jews caused too much anguish for them and it was an illusion, they had been chosen by Moses, a non-Jew, rather than God.

Further, Freud reiterated the theme of Totem and Taboo, namely that Moses, as the primal father, was killed by the Jews, who in an effort to repent for the murder became ardent monotheists and gave Moses an exalted position. Grollman notes Ernst Simon's important insight that the murder of the father by his son is but a suitable and dialectical form of identification with him."

Jews and Christians alike condemned the book. Jews felt the work demoralized them in their darkest hour, Christians felt it was a rejection of "a son religion" embodied by Christ and were offended by Freud's atheism. Academicians questioned his historical methodology and data. Grollman argues that Freud anticipated these

reactions and quotes him to explain why he had to deny the Jewish people their greatest personality by making him an Egyptian. "Such a deed is not to be undertaken lightheartedly—especially by one belonging to that people. But truth is truth." (68)

How then are we to understand Moses and Monotheism? Vogel says,

The true source of the book was Freud's long and profound obsession with the figure of Moses, which would not leave his imagination in peace. Ever since that distant trip to Rome, the invasive image of Moses, though repressed in his subconscious for many years, had never ceased to haunt him, until it finally erupted, bursting all bonds of restraint, in the composition of the book. (69)

Vogel contends that Freud had to destroy Biblical tradition and the figure of Moses and lawgiver, to clear the way for the insights he had developed in psychoanalysis.

Vogel claims that Freud blamed personal difficulties on the fact that he was Jewish. He contends that Freud needed to prove, at any cost, that he was a descendant of Egyptian nobility, from a glorious lineage rather than of the plain and despised Israelites.

He concludes that Freud was a

...victim of his own inferiority complex, did not resolve his conflicts by self-analysis, and was ultimately unable to quite accept his own identity as a Jew. He proved unable to overcome his rejection by the world of German culture, whose spiritual son he was, which gave rise to immense feelings of frustration. It was to resolve that dilemma that Freud wrote his book on Moses and monotheism. (70)

Vogel criticizes Moses and Monotheism on both the historical and psychological premises Freud advanced. He sums up his critique thusly,

Speaking of psychoses, Freud once remarked that in every hallucinatory idea there is a base of forgotten or deformed truth. This enables the sick person to take his hallucination as truth, though the hallucination has expanded well beyond the kernel of truth from which it started, and smothers that truth in its errors. In the matter of Freud's interpretation of the history of Moses, perhaps we might say that the kernel of truth is the existence of Moses, and all the rest is the hallucinatory product of Freud's personal psychosis. (71)

Fromm, in commenting upon Moses and Monotheism, was prompted to ask the question,

What could provoke Freud to write a book, far away from his field, and try to prove something on the evidence of analogies and their reasoning? (72)

Fromm surmised that Freud was motivated by the same fascination and sense of identification with Moses "which had given rise to his temper on Michelangelo over twenty years earlier." (73) Fromm claims that despite his intentions Freud had not transfigured Moses, but the Jewish people.

But he did something, not against Moses, but against the Jews. He deprived them not only of their hero, but also of the claim to the originality of the monotheistic idea. If this had been Freud's field, or if his proof had been overwhelming, no psychological questions need be asked as to the motive of Freud's publication of Moses and Monotheism. But since this is not so, one must assume that Freud's preoccupation with Moses was rooted in the deep unconscious identification with him. Freud, like the great leader of the Jews, had led the people to the promised land, without reaching it himself; he had experienced their ingratitude and scorn, without giving up his mission. (74)

Bakan traces the import of Moses and Monotheism to Freud's interpretation of Michelangelo's Moses. As we have discussed the statue of Moses suggested to Freud restrained wrath, Bakan theorizes that Moses is the image which embodies the whole brunt of Jewish orthodoxy. From Mosaic dicta come the laws and commandments which guide the Orthodox Jew's every act. Bakan says,

Moses is representative of the superego, the force generated within the individual to keep his form 'instinctual gratification.' The force which maintains renunciation of instinctual gratification is the fear of punishment. In the allegory of the discussion of a statue Freud is saying that the feared punishment will never eventuate. The superego is restrained. The superego will withhold its wrath, and will not strike. In this new view of Moses, Freud has turned him into a stone image, one which will not kill those who dance around the golden calf, those who do not accept, but violate the commandments upheld by the rabbinic tradition. Freud's essay on Moses is a symbolic Sabbatian assertion of freedom against the severe restrictions of thought and action which had been the life strategy of the Eastern European Jews. (75)

Bakan suggests that Freud was never able to fully break from the Mosaic dicta. That guilt was an acquired trait transmitted from generation to generation forms an integral part of Freud's thinking about religion.

We may summarize our addition to Jones's interpretation of the significance of Freud's essay as follows; Moses is the symbol of orthodoxy, the author of the Law, the figure responsible for imposing its heavy yoke. In the Sabbatian tradition Freud opposed himself to the Law. In his interpretation the excess of the Mosaic-type Law mode of neurosis and was generally inappropriate for modern living. (76)

Bakan conjectures that Freud was siezed by guilt for his defection from the Law and could only progress by observing that Moses was now cast in stone and unable to exact punishment on the transgressors of his Law.

He paralyzes the Mosaic image, asserting that Moses, 'will remain seated and still in his frozen wrath,' 'that this Moses would remain sitting like this in his wrath forever.' (77)

Bakan says that Moses and Monotheism expresses Freud's deepest impulses and is the only book written by Freud "which directs itself avowedly to the problems of Judaism and the meaning of being Jewish." (78)

Bakan points out the many inconsistencies found in the book, he notes the hesitancy and tenuousness of some of Freud's propositions and observes, "The option we have is either to dismiss the book or find a way of understanding it which will do justice to Freud's genius." (79) He opts for the latter and suggests that it is deliberately obscure for it is located in the Kabbalistic tradition and was written in a time of intense persecution.

He treats the theme of Moses-as Gentile as an oblique example of the Freudian theory of opposites.

If, following Freud, the context trends to bear out the interpretation by opposites, as it seems to in this instance, then Freud's assertion the 'Moses...was an Egyptian whom a people needed to make into a Jew' can more meaningfully be formulated as Moses was a Jew whom Freud needed to make into a Gentile. (81)

Bakan attributes Freud's motives for turning Moses into a Gentile to Sabbatian impulses. He speculates that Freud needed to overturn Moses' law, in essence to transfigure it so thoroughly as to commit an act of heresy.

For Freud, a modern product of the enlightenment, an avowed and ritualistic act of conversion was essentially too trivial to have any deep emotional significance. By converting Moses into a Gentile, Freud committed his psychological act of apostasy. If, as we have seen, Freud strongly identified himself with Moses, then his preoccupation with the Moses of Michelangelo, who sits petrified in a church in Rome and graces the tomb of a Pope, and his turning Moses into a Gentile, can be understood as Freud's own realization of the Sabbatian act of apostasy. Through the image of Moses, as he develops it in his *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud becomes a Gentile psychologically as he makes a Gentile of Moses. (82)

We have already alluded to Bakan's theory of Freud's raising his social status by creating a Moses of noble Egyptian origins. We have also discussed how the Moses-as Gentile theme was used as a device for deflecting anti-Semitism. Bakan offers two other implications engendered by Moses and Monotheism.

The first is, if Moses was not really a Jew, the Jewish people

have been made ridiculous and have persisted in being ridiculous; all of the pain they have suffered over the centuries because they have embraced the Torah was due to an historical imposition by a Gentile-Egyptian. That he was Egyptian, the classical oppressor, makes this situation so ironic, the Freud's message, if taken seriously, should produce a most anguished burst of tears and laughter. And most important, Freud's assertions makes the Jews the butt of the greatest joke in history; and thereby achieve for them also the greatest gain in history, freedom from persecution. It converts them from threatening to comical and stupid characters. (83)

Still another implication was Freud's symbolic identification of Moses as superego. The "yoke of the law" was too restrictive and those Christians who were "badly christened" chafed under the burden. Bakan suggests that Freud wanted to lighten the load, to remove the yoke and thereby remove the burden of the Jews who personified the Law.

If the Jews represent the authority of the Law, only a Jew can declare the Law is dead. Psychoanalysis, in this larger sense, may be viewed as a fundamental effort to modify the classical image of the Jew. The Jew no longer stands in the shadow of Moses insisting upon rigid adherence to the letter of the Law, for example, Shakespeare's Shylock, but rather as a father figure, patient and forgiving, tolerant and understanding of violations of the Mosaic code. Such a role can be accomplished by Freud only through his full identification of himself as a Jew who is, moreover, dissociated from the figure of Moses. In his presumptive position of authority he can rescind the Law, declare the Law invalid. Thus Freud plays the role of a new Moses who comes down with a new Law dedicated to personal psychological liberty. (84)

Thus Bakan makes the case that Moses had to be killed to remove the restrictions on himself, Jews and the world-at-large. The Mosaic Law, so Freud thought, created neurosis and guilt and had to be overturned to

make it possible for the individual to live a richer and less hampered existence, freed from the taboos which Judaism had imposed upon itself for its survival and which had been accepted by the Christian world as a way of life. (85)

Bakan concludes that the murder of Moses was Freud's own doing.

What he is doing is projecting a current fantasy onto a past situation, which is what is done in all mythmaking. It is Freud who wishes that Moses were murdered; and by this, of course, we must mean he wishes that the current repressive and oppressive forces associated with the Mosaic image would be killed. What Jacob Frank did literally when he cut up the Torah to make shoes of the parchment for his friends, Freud does in his own way through myth.

Dor-Shav takes a somewhat different approach to Moses and Monotheism. As has been pointed out he believes that Moses was a father image for Freud and that Moses and Monotheism was motivated by the need to outdo and destroy the father. Dor-Shav contends that it was Freud's identification of his father with Moses which was the powerful motive for his obsession with the Moses figure.

Once this hypothesis is posited, further speculation follows logically. First, it becomes clear that 'Moses and Monotheism' does not express an unconscious hatred for, or rejection, of Judaism and Jewish identity. Rather, our analysis leads us to suggest that, in this work, Freud, if anything, identifies himself with the Jewish people as a whole, to whom he attributes the self-same traits which he considers his own. (87)

Dor-Shav quotes Freud to buttress his argument that Freud is describing himself when he describes the "children" of Israel.

...they have a very good opinion of themselves, think themselves nobler, on a higher level, superior to others, from whom they are also separated by many of their customs. With this they are animated by a special trust in life, such as is bestowed by the secret possession of a precious gift. (88)

This "precious gift" is the gift of "chosenness," and it was a mixed blessing for "it brought with it the enmity of the siblings-of the nations." (90) For this enmity Freud blamed his father or symbolically Moses,

It was Moses-the-father who was directly responsible for bringing hatred upon the Jew; the all-powerful father-image responsible for the sufferings of the child. It is upon his father that Freud here projects the blame and resentment he feels for the jealousy from which he suffered. This becomes even clearer when Freud goes on to say, 'It was one man, Moses, who created the Jews. To him this people owes its tenacity in supporting life; to him, however, also much of the hostility which it has met with and is meeting still.' (90)

This then, Dor-Shav maintains, was the meaning and motive of Moses and Monotheism.

Robert follows the argument the Freud viewed the statue of Michelangelo in terror, half expecting it to reach out and punish him for his transgressions, specifically his Oedipal theories. Soon he realized that the statue would not move and "Freud learned once again that he was doomed to bear all the weight of his guilt alone." (91) So for the moment Freud was spared his punishment but was left with guilt and remorse for his symbolic murder of his father.

Robert argues that the series of catastrophic events which besieged Freud and the Jewish people late in his life rekindled his repressed guilt and forced him to ask, "how the Jew came to be what he is and why he has drawn upon himself this undying hatred." (92) This, she contends, was Freud's ostensible reason for writing this work. Robert chronicles a familiar litany of the book's shortcomings and points out that Freud was "dissatisfied with it to the very end." (93) What, then, prompted

Freud to painfully deprive the Jewish people of its most exalted prophet? Robert answers, "he did not want to die without writing the true novel of his life, and like every inspired novelist he was so utterly possessed by his fictitious world that he remained deaf to reality." (94) Robert amplifies this theme by pointing out that reality was for Freud, in his last years, most unpleasant.

Buffeted from one extreme to the other by news reports that could not always be verified; horrified by events which for all his pessimism he had never thought possible; rendered more emotionally vulnerable than ever before by old age and illness—Freud made a few questionable statements in these days. But whatever one may think of the fluctuations in his thinking, the fact remains that this Moses did not spring primarily from the contradictory emotions aroused by him by the tragic events of the day, but was rooted in his remote past, in his need to reconsider the facts of his birth, to change them at least in his imagination and so become the master of his fate. (95)

Robert maintains that Freud's Moses was a device, however rift with difficulties, to disavow his father, to liberate himself from the chains of the generations and to maintain his own individuality and uniqueness.

Frightened by his increasingly marked resemblance to Jakob Freud, he fought with all his strength against this 'return of the repressed' which beginning in middle life, foreshadows the slow extinction of a man's individuality. (96)

Robert concludes that Freud's Moses "was the son's last protest and bulwark against the inevitable return of the fathers." (97)

Eisler advances the idea that Freud applied the methodology of his clinical investigations to the history of the people of Israel. He claims that the Jews are the unique recipients of records, data, and descriptions of the past which lend them an insight into their own history, "insight sufficient to make for mastery over the country's historical destiny" (98) Eisler argues that Freud read this history as he would a case study,

reconstructing from the evidence at hand the events that actually had taken place, and which had escaped preservation in tradition because of the all-inclusive mechanism of repression. Just as in a therapeutic analysis, he thus reconstructed an early childhood trauma...(99)

We have attempted, in this chapter, to outline Freud's movement from identification with Hannibal to Moses. We have surveyed some of the motives, both conscious and unconscious, for this shift. Because of the many and diverse theories we have discussed it would be helpful to summarize some of our major findings.

The shift from Hannibal to Moses can be dated to Freud's overcoming his aversion to Rome and finally visiting the city in 1901. Symboically this visit can be understood to have resulted fro Freud's self-analysis and development of his Oedipal theories. Freud developed an obsessional attachment to Moses initially expressed in his reaction to Michelangelo's statue of Moses. Some of the motives for this passionate attachment include, his anger with defectors for his psychoanalytical movement, his considerations concerning the nature and fate of the Jewish people, clarification of his own deep involvement with Judaism and the Jewish people, an attempt to find resolution to the ambivalent feelings he had for his father. These issues were brought to the fore in his essay "The Moses of Michelangelo" written in 1914.

Freud was not, however, finished with Moses. In 1939 he published Moses and Monotheism, and the implications of this work were staggering. Many theories have been offered to explain Freud's last great creative effort. Some of these include an attempt to mitigate the lowly status of the Jew, to reinterpret the Jewish concept of "choseness," to explain the nature of guilt and the tenacity of the Jewish people, to overturn the law of Moses and create a less repressive, more psychologically healthy world view, and an attempt to dispell the perception of Jews as the embodiment of the law. Still other theories attribute a more personal motive for

Freud's Moses. Some of these theories include an effort on Freud's part to disassociate himself from Jewish legalistic formulations, to identify himself with a more noble heritage than the Hebrews, to analyze his relationship to his father through Moses, to assuage his guilt at rejecting the premises of Orthodox Judaism, to strengthen his identification with the Jewish people if not Jewish law and an effort not to regress but to remain an autonomous individual. One thing we can say with certainty, and perhaps it is the only thing, Freud's Jewish connection was passionate and deeply felt, heroic, thoughtful and honest.

## CHAPTER FIVE

In the previous chapter we discussed Freud's relationship with the figure of Moses and his analysis of Judaism. In this chapter we will examine how Freud related to significant Christians in his life and work. We hope to divine from this study how Freud viewed Christianity vis-a-vis Judaism.

Rainey quotes a significant conversation Freud had with Joseph Wortis in 1935 in which he expressed a belief in the "superiority of Jews to Gentiles." (1)

Wortis recounts that he raised the question, 'What does Judaism stand for, and in what ways are its ideals different from other group ideals?' Freud replied, 'Ruthless egotism is much more common among Gentiles than among Jews. . .and Jewish family life and intellectual life are on a higher plane.' Wortis' response was that Freud seemed to think that Jews were 'superior people.' Freud answered: 'I think nowadays they are . . . when one thinks that ten or twelve percent of the Nobel Prize winners are Jews and when one thinks of their other great achievements in sciences and the arts, one has every reason to think them superior.' (2)

Later in the conversation Wortis expressed the opinion that he hoped "the Jews would become assimilated and disappear," and while Freud did not object he did note that,

a Jew ought not to get himself baptised and attempt to turn Christian because it is essentially dishonest, and the Christian religion is every bit as bad as the Jewish. Jew and Christian ought to meet on the common ground of irreligion and humanity. (3)

It has been pointed out throughout this study that Freud viewed Christianity in a less than sympathetic light. Robert says,

Freud detested Christianity long before he invented psychoanalysis; he detested it as a Jew who had suffered from its power to oppress, and later on as a believer in reason, because he regarded it as an irrational survival, an archeological vestige and a barrier to the progress of thought. (4)

Henry E. Kagan in his essay "Sigmund Freud, the Jew" quotes Freud on the difference between Jews and Christians as saying,

It has seldom been so clear to me as now what a psychological advantage signifies to be born a Jew and to have been spared in one's childhood all the atavistic nonsense. (5)

Clearly Freud had little use for the Christian religion, being as thoroughgoing an atheist as one could imagine. But what did he think of Christians?

Cuddihy proposes that Freud actively opposed what he believed to be the bourgeois sublimating impulses of liberal Christians. He saw these impulses especially operative in the treatment of sexuality.

All the Christian deferences to women, all the obliquities and courtesies and cunning delays in gratification converted the sex drive into Christian-bourgeois love. (6)

Cuddihy asserts that Freud believed this sublimation to be illusionary, a product of modernity which needed to be exposed and dispensed with.

For Freud, courtoisie is a decoration of sexual intercourse in the same way that courtesy decorates social intercourse. His deepest urge was to strip both of their courtliness. He experienced both as a hypocritical disguise. . . that must be stripped away, like any 'appearance', exposing the 'reality' underneath. (7)

Cuddihy argues that Freud's attempt to reveal the true origins of sexuality was frustrated by a number of overriding concerns. First, Freud feared his theories of sexuality might be rejected out of hand because he was Jewish. Second, Cuddihy speculates that Freud feared his theories were already known but bourgeois Christians were "too polite" to discuss it publicly. As a result of both these concerns Freud felt it was imperative to find Christian "proselytes" to his psychoanalytic movement.

Gentile proselytes were extremely important to Freud for another reason: only they could shore up his self-doubts that psychoanalysis might not be, as its adherents claimed, a 'science' at all (having discovered no new truth) but a social-cultural movement of Diaspora Jews who, as social pariahs, only dared say what Gentiles had known all along but, due to their gentility, had been unwilling or unable to mention. If the latter should be the case, psychoanalysis reduces in the end to what Freud half-feared it might be: a counterculture adversary to the bourgeois-Christian ethos of civility and respectability. The Abraham letters are valuable even in censored form, for with Abraham, unlike with Ernest Jones, as Sontag notes, 'Freud is able, without embarrassment, to refer to his sense

of his Jewishness and the special vantage-point he felt it gave, and also to confide his fears that, without adherents among the goyim ('the people'), psychoanalysis would be just 'a Jewish science' and a casualty of anti-Semitism.' (8)

In short, Freud's relationship with Christians might be characterized as one of approach-avoidance. On one hand he felt he needed them to further his psychoanalytic cause and to be assured his theories were original and universal while on the other hand not wanting to feel compromised by them or assimilated with them. No where are these conflicts clearer than regarding his theories of sexuality and his arguments with Alfred Adler.

Adler died in 1936 while lecturing in Scotland. Arnold Zweig wrote to Freud expressing his remorse at Adler's sudden death. Freud responded promptly with a letter omitted from The Letters of Sigmund Freud (9) as quoted in Cuddihy,

I don't understand your sympathy for Adler. For a Jew boy out of a Viennese suburb a death in Aberdeen is an unheard of career in itself and a proof of how far he had got on. the world really rewarded him richly for his service in having contradicted psychoanalysis. (10)

One wonders at the acrimonious tone of Freud's letter. Its bitterness suggests a deep hatred that transcended the relationship, or former relationship, these men had had. There were other issues afoot and I contend these issues include Jewish assimilation and Freud's disdain and fear of being compromised or perhaps seduced by the Christian world.

Brome describes the difference between Adler and Freud,

Unlike Freud he had the marks of a typical Viennese intellectual whose day seemed impossibly barren if it had not taken him deeply into the cafe life of Vienna and involved him in one or more arguments for which a display of wit was obligatory. (11)

Certainly Adler engaged Freud in many arguments and their relationship was always strained. At first the tension was generated by the disputes between two factions of the Society, "one dominated by the figure of Jung in Zurich and the

other by Adler in Vienna." (12) At the second International Psycho-Analytical Congress held in Nuremberg in 1910, Ferenczi, a close associate of Freud's, introduced a proposition that the administration of the Society, as well as the right to select papers to be published, should be granted to the Zurich contingent. As if this were not enough the proposition also suggested that Jung be elected lifetime President of the International Analytical Society. (13) Adler and his colleague Stekel protested violently against the proposition and the unspoken question was, did Freud instigate the proposition. Brome says,

Jones in his biography of Freud lays the blame for what followed on Ferenczi, but Ferenczi merely carried out instructions from Freud, and there were some present at the Congress who believed that Freud had deliberately chosen a 'stooge' to present his revolutionary proposition knowing how inflammatory it would be. He remained the power behind the scenes. (14)

Stekel and Adler called the Viennese contingent into a "secret meeting" to denounce the proposition when according to Stekel as, quoted in Brome,

Suddenly the door of the room opened and there was Freud. He was greatly excited and tried to persuade us to accept Ferenczi's motion; he predicted hard times and a strong opposition by official science. He grasped his coat and cried: 'They begrudge me the coat I am wearing, I don't know whether in the future I will earn my daily bread.' Tears were streaming down his cheeks. 'An official psychiatrist and a gentile must be the leader of the movement,' he said. (15)

Brome attributes this extreme reaction to Freud's suffering from "early anti-Semitic bitterness and suspicion." (16)

In any case this rift with Adler was healed only to be allowed by a more serious and finally fatal breach in their relationship. Adler substituted the theory of the aggressive drive in lieu of the libido. (17) With this theory Adler's Individual Psychology "swept away the concepts of repression, infantile sexuality and the unconscious with the result that very little of Freud's psycho-analytical theories were left intact." (18) Brome quotes Freud after Adler's break from him as saying,

Adler "wasn't a normal man" and added, "His jealousy and ambition are morbid."

(19) Brome notes Klemperer's vivid account of Adler's break from Freud "as a tyrannical attack, and said that Freud finally asked everyone present to express his opinion of Adler and his work." (20) It seemed as if Freud had arranged a trial of Adler and, "Any chance of compromise vanished because of Freud's intolerance." (21)

What were Freud's motives for his bitter disputes with Adler? He certainly seemed to have acted with excess and Brome observes that though Freud could exercise, "Considerable wisdom and tolerance. . .this side of Freud's character was heavily qualified by another." (22) This other side of Freud's character, Brome claims, came to the fore,

When someone put forward a proposition which seriously disturbed his own views, he first found it hard to accept and then became uneasy at this threat to the scientific temple he had so painfully built with his own hands. Thus his tolerance was qualified by insecurity, his breadth of vision by a special form of Jewish patriarchy and, in the event, his own words proved partly true—he was not fitted for the role of leader. (23)

Fromm says of this quality of Freud's character,

To people who idolized him and never disagreed, he was kind and tolerant; just because, as I have emphasized before, Freud was so dependent on unconditional affirmation and agreement by others, he was a loving father to submissive sons, and a stern, authoritarian one to those who dared to disagree. (24)

Fromm claims that Freud's acerbic attitude toward Adler was caused by Adler's not being "a submissive son."

Robert claims that Freud found Adler's system based entirely on the impulse for aggression and feared that this stark vision would repel the public.

That such a bleak and depressing conception of the world should find supporters is a further proof that humanity, weighed down by its own sexual needs, will agree to any system which allows it to subdue them. (25)

Cuddihy advances this proposition in more radical fashion. In Freud's view, Adler had traded fidelity to truth and to his own true identity for social acceptance among the goyim.

He made the truth polite. . . 'and the world rewarded him richly.' (For the 'world' we must read 'the goyim,' just as in Freud's 1914 letter to Abraham. . . where he hesitates to contradict Abraham's suspicions of the Swiss Gentile Pfister inasmuch as Abraham had been so right before on Jung: 'I have been warned against contradicting you in the judgment of the people.' (26)

Several important points regarding Freud's views on the Christian world and its impact on his phenomenology may be gleaned from his arguments with Adler. He feared for the survival of psychoanalysis for several reasons. He thought that it might fall prey to the contention that it was a "Jewish science" and felt he needed a Christian to bring psychoanalysis to the "people." He further feared that his theories of sexuality would be rejected for being untoward and upsetting. He struggled to maintain the integrity of his precepts and not compromise their power and yet not alienate those to whom his theories might be most helpful and healing. He found in Adler a "man of the world", who at once compromised his theories by introducing aggression in place of the libido, a more acceptable instinct, and who insisted upon recognition in the movement and yet was a Jew when Freud felt the pressing need for Christian leadership. The conflict was exacerbated by Freud's unyielding character and one need only remember Freud's disgust with his father's passivity to imagine how unyielding he might be.

In summary, then I contend Freud found in Adler elements of the anti-Semitic calumnies being advanced against Jews. An urban, intellectual man who frequented the cafes, willing to adapt to society's preferences, an ambitious and jealous man

seeking only to advance himself at the expense of anything or anyone. Certainly at the more conscious level Freud saw Adler as a threat to the furtherance of the psychoanalytic movement and unlike Michelangelo's Moses, frozen in passivity, Freud responded like the traditional Moses and rose up in wrath to crush his rebellion.

Freud feared the compromise of his theories for good reason. In 1910 Freud met with Eugene Bleuler, Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Zurich who had become very interested in Freud's work through his assistant, Jung. Brome records, "From the outset Bleuler had revealed an uncertain attitude towards psychoanalysis, writing papers in support of it one month and criticizing it the next." (27) Freud felt it was important to have Bleuler's support especially because a rift had developed between Jung and Bleuler. It was to heal this rift that Freud met with Bleuler. (28)

Apparently the meeting was cordial and friendly but Bleuler made a point of Freud's emphasis on sexuality. Cuddihy quotes Freud in a letter to Abraham as reflecting,

They both (Bleuler and his wife) tried to take me by storm and persuade me that I should not talk of 'sexuality,' but should find another name for what does not coincide with sexuality in the popular sense. All resistance and misunderstandings would then cease. I replied that I had no use for such household remedies. (29)

Recalling Freud's own early change of his first name from Sigismund to Sigmund and his later views regarding conversion it was quite natural for him to refuse what Cuddihy sees as an invitation "to sell out." (30) Cuddihy finds in Freud's refusal a connection regarding his views of sublimation, assimilation, and religion.

Freud's proud and moving refusal was, literally a refusal to apostatize from Yiddishkeit (and from the functional equivalents, in Galut, of Yiddishkeit). It is precisely here that we find the 'inner link' between the earlier Freud and the later Freud of the 'metapsychological' works

of 1928 and 1930—The Future of an Illusion and Civilization and Its Discontents. Freud's sexual 'fundamentalism' is legitimated by a religious for that matter, Reform Judaism's—sublimation of Jehovah into a God without thunder. Freud writes,

'Where questions of religion are concerned, people are guilty of every possible kind of insincerity and intellectual misdemeanor. Philosophers stretch the meaning of words until they retain scarcely anything of their original sense; by calling "God" some vague abstraction which they have created for themselves, they pose as deists, as believers, before the world; they may even pride themselves on having attained a higher and purer idea of God, although their God is nothing but an insubstantial shadow and no longer the mighty personality of religious doctrine.

The id may not make itself acceptable by refining itself, nor must the Old Testamentary God by reforming Himself, nor should psychoanalysts by assimilating themselves.' (31)

Robert points out that Bleuler came from a culture so radically different from Freud's that a conflict was inevitable.

Most of them (the Swiss psychiatric establishment) were vegetarians and abstainers, which raised something of a barrier between them and their foreign colleagues. This sectarian attitude, quite obviously alien to the habits of Freud and his Viennese followers, was not exactly compatible with their enthusiasm for the new psychology. . . certain doctors who worked under Bleuler and Jung had an uneasy feeling that the Burgholzi mysticism would make a real rapprochement between Zurich and Vienna rather problematic. (32)

Once again Freud's conflict between needing the acceptance of psychoanalysis by the Christian world was frustrated by its need to make Freud acceptable at the expense of his ideas. This he was unwilling to do. Robert says of the Swiss contingent,

They (the Swiss) had to rid themselves of beliefs, habits of thought, and prejudices of all kinds inherent in their background, to which they were very much attached even when they thought themselves fully emancipated. Since such imponderables exert a determining influence and are almost impossible to get rid of, the new adepts were under constant temptation to adapt Freudian psychoanalyses to the traditions of a more or less secularized Christianity. (33)

One of the most brutal efforts to make Freudian psychoanalysis "acceptable" is recorded by Grollman quoting an anecdote told by Jones.

. . . when the Nazis entered Vienna, they decreed that only an "Aryan" could be allowed to conduct the Psychoanalytical Clinic. Unfortunately, the only member of the Vienna Society answering to this description had just fled over the mountains to Italy. On hearing this I (Jones) cried out 'O my God—the only Sabbath-Goy is already gone.' (34)

Jones' statement embodies the conflict Freud had with the Christian world. Freud thought the world wanted psychoanalysis unsullied by sexuality and instincts deemed unworthy of "good Christians." The Nazis wanted psychoanalysis unsullied by Jews. Freud was unwilling to accommodate either. Robert, writing of Freud's relationships with Christian associates says,

they were repelled by the thought of explaining the high by the low, of reducing the sublime to instinct, in short, by analysis in the strict sense of the word, and here Freud could make no concessions without destroying his most precious creation with his own hands. (35)

It was in his relationship with Jung that these issues were the most volatile.

Jung developed a passionate interest in psychiatry while at the University of Basle between the years 1900 and 1909. In 1903 Jung found striking similarities between his own work and those recorded in Freud's, The Interpretation of Dreams. (36) This discovery unnerved Jung for he planned an academic career and Freud was considered unmentionable in his University circles. Brome quotes Jung as saying,

Important people. . . mentioned him surreptitiously, and at congresses he was discussed only in the corridors, never on the floor. Therefore the discovery that my association experiments were in agreement with Freud's theories was far from pleasant to me. (37)

Brome contends that the events that followed yield important information concerning the relationship that developed between Jung and Freud.

One day, Jung recorded 'the devil whispered to me that I would be justified in publishing the results of my experiments and my conclusions without mentioning Freud.' At the very outset, it is clear that a sense of rivalry existed on Jung's part and a conflict arose over the ethics of priorities. Simultaneously the voice of what Jung refers to as his 'second personality' spoke to him again saying: If you do a thing like that, as if you had no knowledge of Freud it would be a piece of trickery. You cannot build your life on a lie.' Whereupon, it seems, the devil stopped whispering in his ear, the prowling person who wanted to exploit the very repression with which Jung's discoveries were so concerned, capitulated, and Jung became an open partisan, fighting for Freud. (38)

Jung defended Freud at a convention in Baden-Baden in May, 1906 as well as at the First International Congress of Psychiatry and Neurology held in Amsterdam in 1907. (39) Freud, although invited to attend the Congress decided to go on vacation but later apparently felt the need for someone to defend his cause and wrote to Jung as quoted in Brome,

I don't know whether you will be lucky or unlucky but I should like to be with you just now, enjoying the feeling that I am no longer alone. (40)

If Jung needed any encouragement, he "could tell (him) about (his) long years of honourable but painful loneliness." (41) Brome observes,

These years began, Freud said, as soon as he glimpsed the new world of sexual pathology, when even his closest friends failed to understand what he was trying to do and he reached a point where he himself wondered whether he was 'in error'. In later storms and difficulties he clung to The Interpretation of Dreams as to a rock in the breakers, until he reached the calm certainty that this was his chosen path and waited for a voice from the outside world which would respond. When it came, he now wrote to Jung, 'It was yours.' (42)

From the outset however, Jung did not entirely agree with the sexual basis of Freud's theories. This is revealed in correspondence which began between them in 1906 and continued until 1913 when the final break occurred. (43)

Jung first visited Freud in 1907 and from all accounts it was a momentous meeting. Brome reports that Jones told him that

Freud regarded the first meeting with Jung as very important because he had seldom encountered a man with such wide-ranging knowledge, and such a lively sympathy for the mechanism of neuroses. (44)

Jung, as quoted in Brome, said of the meeting, Freud, "was the first man of importance I had encountered: in my experience up to that time no one else could compare with him." (45)

An important implication of this initial meeting was Jung's attempt to introduce qualifications into sexual motivation but Freud held to his convictions. In retrospect Jung reflected that Freud seemed to have an emotional investment in his sexual theories and as quoted in Brome said, "When he spoke of it, his tone became urgent, almost anxious, and all signs of his normally critical and skeptical manner vanished. . . ." (46) Brome points out that Jung may have neglected to take into account Freud's passionate nature and the importance of his theories "heightened by the twin forces of anti-Semitism and the scorn, if not open abuse, of Viennese medical circles." (47) In any case, Brome contends, "From the outset Jung attempted to convert Freud's preoccupation with sex into religious channels which made him explicable in his own terms." (48)

By 1908 Freud had at last been recognized and acclaimed for his contributions, especially at The First International Psychoanalytical Congress held in Salzberg. (49) But all did not go smoothly at the Congress for Abraham and Jung got into a sharp row over the origin of dementia praecox. Freud wrote to Abraham urging him to reconcile with Jung, he said, as quoted in Robert,

Be tolerant and don't forget that really it is easier for you to follow my thoughts than for Jung, since to begin with you are completely independent, and then racial relationship brings you closer to my

intellectual constitution, whereas he, being a Christian and the son of a pastor, can only find his way to me against great inner resistances. His adherence is therefore all the more valuable. I was almost going to say it was only his emergence on the scene that has removed from psychoanalysis the danger of becoming a Jewish national affair. . . (50)

Abraham did as Freud wished and wrote a conciliatory letter to Jung but informed Freud that it seemed to no avail but Freud wrote back, as quoted in Robert, "We Jews have an easier time, having no mystical strain." (51)

In his next letter to Abraham, quoted in Robert, Freud said,

I surmise that the repressed anti-Semitism of the Swiss, from which I am to be spared, has been directed against you in increased force. But my opinion is that we Jews, if we want to co-operate with other people, have to develop a little masochism and be prepared to endure a certain amount of injustice. There is no other way of working together. You may be sure that if my name were Oberhuber my new ideas would, despite all the other factors, have met with far less resistance. (52)

Despite reservations from the Viennese contingent the relationship between Freud and Jung deepened. They exchanged revealing letters in which "Each man admitted to having marked neurotic characteristics." (53) Perhaps they played a little rough though, for on a voyage on their way to deliver a series of lectures in America in 1908 they spent a considerable amount of time analyzing each other's dreams. Jung, in interpreting one of Freud's dreams asked for more details of a personal nature to which Freud gave him a suspicious look and responded as quoted in Brome, "But I cannot risk my authority!" Jung reflected, "At that moment he lost it (Jung's respect) altogether. The sentence burned itself into my memory." (54) Apparently Jung felt that Freud's reticence had destroyed their relationship for as quoted in Brome, "Freud was placing personal authority above truth." (55)

Despite these periodic and dramatic jousting matches Freud and Jung kept up their correspondence including many involved discussions of the occult. Freud thought of Jung as his "successor and crown prince" and in a letter to him said, as quoted in Vogel, "If I am Moses, then you are Josuha and will take possession of the promised land of psychiatry, which I shall be able to glimpse only from afar." (56)

The year 1910 marked a turning point in Freud's relationship with Jung. As has been mentioned, Jung had serious reservations concerning Freud's sexual theories. Freud was aware of Jung's doubts and during one of Jung's visits to Vienna, Freud, as quoted in Brome, said to him, "My dear Jung, promise me never to abandon the sexual theory. That is the most essential thing of all. You see, we must make a dogma of it, an unshakable bulwark." When Jung incredulously queried a bulwark against what, Freud replied, "Against the black tide of mud. . ." and after a moment of hesitation added "of occultism." (37)

Jung was aghast at the use of the words "bulwark" and "dogma". Brome says,

The conversation with Freud struck a chill to Jung's heart. He suddenly felt that all their differences and reconciliations were meaningless beside the arbitrary nature of Freud's demands. 'What Freud seemed to mean by 'occultism' was virtually everything that philosophy religion, including the rising contemporary science of parapsychology had learned about the psyche.' As Jung saw it, a scientific truth was a hypothesis which might be superseded by another hypothesis and was certainly not 'an article of faith for all time.' (58)

Jung felt that Freud had substituted the dogma of sexuality for the dogma of religion and he concluded, as quoted in Brome, "At bottom, however, the numinosity, that is the psychological qualities of the two rationally incommensurable opposites-Yahweh and sexuality-remained the same." (59) Jung amplified this theme, in his Memories, Dreams, Reflections, in which he asserted that Freud was working at cross purposes,

trying to divest himself of religious impulses only to assume them in the guise of sexual impulses. He further contended that this process was beyond Freud's conscious awareness. (60)

It was during this same year that the cataclysmic International Psycho-Analytical Congress was held in which Freud advocated that Jung be made lifetime president and editor of the yearbook. We have already discussed the catastrophic events of this convention. Grollman notes,

The extravagant way that Freud pinned his hopes on Jung, as though he were deliberately raising another person and dismissing himself from the field was fraught with many overtones. . .Freud was caught in the fantasy of having someone carry his message to the world—a gallant protagonist speaking in the name of science beyond the reach of anti-Semitic prejudice. (61)

Alas, this wish was not to be. In 1911 Jung published Symbols of the Libido, a refutation of Freud's sexual theories. Jung, as quoted in Brome, openly informed Freud of his fundamental disagreement with him,

To me incest signified a personal complication only in the rarest cases, usually incest has a highly religious aspect for which reason the incest theme plays a decisive part in almost all cosmogonies and in numerous myths. But Freud clung to the literal interpretation of it and could not grasp the spiritual significance of incest as a symbol. (62)

In June of 1913 Freud wrote to Abraham saying, as quoted in Brome, "Jung is crazy but I have no desire for a separation and should like to let him wreck himself first." (63)

Still Freud and Jung endeavored not to allow their personal disagreements to undermine their professional relations. Freud thought it possible to cooperate with Jung on a formal basis although their informal relationship had completely deteriorated. "Both men approached the last Congress of International Psycho-

Analytical Association at Munich, on 7 September 1913, 'in the expectation that there would be no open break.'" (64) There were, however, many schisms between the Vienna and Zurich contingents which finally came to a head over the election of the president. The Viennese contingent who did not approve of Jung's re-election abstained from voting. Naturally Jones abstained and afterwards Jung approached him and said, as quoted in Brome, "I thought you were a Christian." (65) Brome says that Jones understood Jung to mean by this that he was not a Jew, "but colloquial English allows the more common interpretation that he was not a generous, tolerant person." (66) In any case, Jones, quite naturally, "wondered how far Jung's anti-Semitism conditioned this remark and his whole attitude to Freud. . ." (67)

We must now briefly consider the possibility of Jung's anti-Semitism. One year after the fateful Congress Jung resigned the presidency and served notice that no Zurich analyst would again be identified with it. Freud upon hearing the news wrote to Abraham, as quoted in Brome, "So we are at last rid of them, the brutal, sanctimonious Jung and his disciples." (68) Charge and counter-charge were exchanged between the Jungian and Freudian schools and both sustained malicious damage. Perhaps this set the stage for what followed.

In 1934, Jung, as quoted in Brome, wrote the following polemic,

The Aryan unconscious has a higher potential than the Jewish; that is the advantage and the disadvantage of a youthfulness not yet fully escaped from barbarism. In my opinion it has been a great mistake of all previous medical psychology to apply Jewish categories which are not even binding for all Jews, indiscriminately to Christians, Germans, or Slavs. In so doing, medical psychology has declared the most precious secret of the Germanic peoples—the creatively prophetic depths of soul—to be a childishly banal morass, while for decades my warning voice has been suspected of anti-semitism. The source of this suspicion is Freud. He did not know the Germanic soul any more than did all his Germanic imitators. . .Has the mighty apparition of National Socialism which the whole world watches with astonished eyes taught them something better? (69)

Brome quotes Wilhelm Ropke as saying that when Professor Kretschmer

found himself unable to continue his function as President of the German Association for Psycho-Therapy and as editor of the leading periodical, Professor Jung obligingly filled the vacancy left by his honest German colleague and accepted the Nazi invitation to take over his function. (70)

Grollman points out that "Jung's primary function was to differentiate between Aryan and Jewish psychology and to emphasize the value of the former." (71) The argument regarding Jung's affiliation with the Nazis is still a very emotional and volatile subject. Brome concludes,

What emerges from it all? Was there enough evidence to show that Jung's defection from Freud had elements of anti-Semitism openly avowed or unconsciously engendered? When Freud first selected him as Crown Prince, Freud said that 'he seemed ready for my sake to give up certain racial prejudices which he had previously permitted himself.' Their long-drawn-out quarrel may have revived such prejudices but it looks very much as though Jung was maneuvered into leaving the International Society by a powerful group of Freudians. On the other hand, was he guilty of association with the Nazis under doubtful conditions for a period of three years? The answer must be yes. (72)

Several important themes regarding Freud's relationship with Christians emerge from his relationship with Jung. Freud was evidently susceptible to developing intense dependencies on charismatic personalities. We have spoken of Freud's tendency to credulity and he himself employed this word when referring to his relationship with Jung. Freud felt that psycho-analysis was in danger of becoming associated only with Jews and this fear exacerbated Freud's feeling of dependency on Jung. Jung's initial doubts regarding the sexual basis of Freud's theories should have alerted Freud to impending dissention, in addition to the fact that he had been warned by a number of his colleagues, but his need to bring psychoanalysis to the "world" blinded him to these concerns.

An analysis of Freud's motives in cultivating his relationship with Jung was characterized by Freud as similar to Moses' passing on the law and the reigns of leadership to Joshua. Jung was, however, a reluctant Joshua. Jung was preoccupied with translating Freud's sexual theories into more acceptable religious channels. Despite his avowed need for Jung, Freud refused to allow this "sublimation", and held forth against it.

Freud was aware of what he termed Jung's "repressed anti-Semitism" and counselled his Jewish associates to exercise tolerance with him. Freud reasoned that Jung would have to overcome strong internal resistance to accept Freud's Godless phenomenology. He drew from his experience with Jung the insight that Jews would have to develop a certain degree of masochism in order to work with Christians.

Freud thought that Jews were in a more advantageous position to understand and accept the principles of psychoanalysis for Jews were culturally adept to resolute independence and were not "tainted" by "mystical strains." Freud took a rather stoic view of what he thought to be anti-Semitic resistance to his theories. Still, he thought that Jews were much closer, by virtue of their intellectual heritage, to accept and embrace his psychological theories.

Despite Freud's intent to transcend Christian resistance and anti-Semitic responses, he was not willing to compromise the integrity of his ideas. In this steadfastness he sometimes appeared to be authoritarian and inflexible. Apparently Freud, himself, was aware of this tendency and once referred to himself as similar to the traditional Moses, willing to break the tablets of the law in anger at the defection of the faithful. Whether this trait was a personal manifestation of a

psychological dilemma or was simply Freud's attempt to preserve the purity of his theories is impossible to determine. Clearly Jung thought that Freud had substituted psychological dogmas for religious ones. For Jung, Freud's insistence on his "authority" constituted the end of their relationship. For Freud the end was marked by Jung's insistence on ascribing religious motives for sexuality.

Jung's subsequent development of a difference between "Aryan" and "Jewish" psychology confirmed Freud's worst fears. The differences between Christians and Jews had intruded on the advancement of psychoanalysis and caused an irrevocable break between them. Jung's identification with the Nazis sealed the rift.

## CHAPTER SIX

Primarily Freud's associates were Jewish. To the extent that he was involved in social or professional organizations they were Jewishly oriented. As Rainey points out,

Most of Freud's friends were Jewish. His children married Jews. Throughout his life he remained a member of the Israelitische Kultusgemeinde and paid the required taxes. He also belonged to B'nai B'rith. He presented many of his early theories of psychoanalysis in the lectures to Jewish groups. Most of the members of the Vienna psychoanalytic group were Jews. (1)

Bakan says,

Freud spent his whole life in virtual ghetto, a world made up almost exclusively of Jews. Not, however, that there were no noteworthy exceptions as, for example, Brucke and Jung; and not that his non-Jewish associations were not important to him. Still, the essential part of his cultural experience was with the community of Jews. (2)

Bakan claims that Freud felt an affinity to an early exposure to Jewish mysticism, a tenuous supposition, it does seem clear that Freud felt a certain easiness with Jews from his own cultural milieu. In this chapter we intend to explore Freud's relationships with Jews and Jewish organizations to determine the quality to which his Jewish identity influenced them.

Grollman suggests that most of the criticism directed against Freud emanated from Christian rather than Jewish sources. (3) As a result of this hostility from without, psychoanalysis became by necessity a Jewish "in-house" movement. Grollman quotes Klausner in support of this point.

Freud himself was a Jew, and most of the members of his immediate Vienna circle were Jews. Admittance to the psychoanalytical movement required analysis by a previous initiate, a sort of 'apostolic succession.' The original Jewish group tended to analyze Jews. Unwittingly, psychoanalytical ideology may be couched in a Jewish ethic strange to individuals socialized in the Protestant ethic. (4)

Grollman also offers another explanation for the Jewish embracing, albeit qualified,

of psychoanalysis, as opposed to the Christian generally negative approach to it.

Some have attributed the Jews's relative acceptance of psychiatry to the fact that theology and doctrine play a lesser role in Judaism than in Christianity. Emphasis in Judaism is not placed upon creed but deed. Reason is of primacy. Medieval Jewish philosophers stressed the idea that knowledge—all knowledge—it vital; it is the pillar of our very being. Faith without reason is mute. (5)

In any case, it seems clear that Freud felt more comfortable with other Jews. This was manifested by Freud's close association with Jewish organizations throughout his life. We now turn to a discussion of Freud's involvement with these organizations to ascertain the extent to which his associations were determined by his Jewish identity.

The Jewish organization to which Freud evidenced the most commitment was the B'nai B'rith. As Simon points out, "Freud's only public contacts in Vienna were with Jews." (6)

He also delivered a lecture on "The Interpretation of Dreams", to the Fraternity of Jewish Students, a full five years before his book was published. (7) It was around this time, probably in 1897, that Freud joined the Viennese lodge of the International Order of B'nai B'rith. Freud, as quoted in Grollman, wrote a letter in 1926 to the B'nai B'rith in which he outlined some of his motives for joining the organization.

It happened that in 1895, I was subjected simultaneously to two powerful convergent influences. On the one hand I had obtained my first glimpses into the depths of the instinctual life of man, and had seen things calculated to sober or even to frighten me. On the other hand, the publication of my disagreeable discoveries led to the severance of the greater part of my human contacts: I felt as though I were despised and shunned by everyone. In this loneliness I was seized with a longing for a circle of chosen men of high character who would receive me in a friendly spirit in spite of temerity. Your society was pointed out to me as the place where such men were to be found. What bound me to Judaism was, I must confess, not belief and not national pride, for I have always been an unbeliever and have been reared without religion, but not without respect for those requirements of human culture called 'ethical.'

Whatever national pride I have, I endeavored to suppress, considering it disastrous and unjust, frightened and warned as I am by the example of what national pride has brought to the nations among whom we Jews live. But there were other considerations which made the attractiveness of Judaism and Jews irresistible—many obscure forces and emotions, all the more powerful the less they were to be defined in words; and also the clear consciousness of an inner identity in common with yours, or a common construction of the soul. And soon there was added to this the knowledge that only to my Jewish nature did I owe the two qualities which had been indispensable to me on my hard road. Because I was a Jew I found myself free from many prejudices which limited others in the use of their intellect, and, being a Jew, I was prepared to enter opposition and to renounce agreement with the 'compact majority.' (8)

We find this revealing letter, written when Freud was 70 and suffering from his debilitating illness, many of the themes which characterized his Jewish identity. Some of these themes included Freud's sense of isolation owing to his "disagreeable discoveries," and his need for "a circle of chosen men of high character who would receive me in a friendly way in spite of my temerity." As we discussed in the previous chapter this kind of relationship could not be established with Jung and Bleuler, owing in large measure to their resistance to Freud's theories and less consciously to their reactions to Freud as a Jew. This kind of relationship could not even be established with the Jewish Adler for his need to establish a separate methodology necessitated a movement away from Freud's authority.

We also find in this letter Freud's clear rejection of a ritualistic or chauvinistic formulation of Judaism but a sympathetic view of Judaism's respect for "those requirements of human culture called 'ethical.'" Yet there were other aspects of Judaism that for Freud "made the attractiveness of Judaism and Jews irresistible. These attributes were apparently difficult for Freud to define, he terms them "obscure forces and emotions, all the more powerful the less they were to be defined in words..." To these undefinable forces, Freud adds the awareness of an inner identity common to Jews, "a common construction of the soul." Finally Freud attributes to

his Jewish identity a freedom from intellectual prejudice and the courage to oppose societal values. We will attempt to address these themes as they impacted on Freud's association with the B'nai B'rith.

Regarding Freud's feelings of isolation Klein observes,

Freud longed not just for friends, but, by joining the B'nai B'rith, for Jewish friends...He had sought refuge specifically from anti-Semitic ostracism. (9)

We have discussed Freud's early bitter experiences with anti-Semitism and his stoic efforts to rise above them. It was assuredly an effort on Freud's part to find an area of protection and support which prompted his membership in the B'nai B'rith.

Still Klein suggests that consolation was not the only reason for Freud's association. At the occasion of the first lecture to the organization on dream interpretation one observer recalled,

From beginning to end, everyone listened with rapt attention to Freud's words. He made the results of his recent studies clear to us not only in the cogency of his ideas but in his overall lucidity. (10)

Freud was overjoyed at the reception of his ideas. He continued to address the attentive membership of his B'nai B'rith lodge many times as Klein observes,

Here was an audience that had greeted, debated, and discussed Freud's theoretical construction of psychoanalytical psychology, often before he published the results. Having abandoned the academic circles for the time being, Freud filled through the B'nai B'rith, the professional as well as the social vacuum in his life. The Jewish society became an active intellectual forum for his metapsychological views during the productive five year period 1897-1902, and, in this respect, was a precursor of the movement of psychoanalysis..As Freud later said of the brotherhood, 'At a time when no one in Europe would listen to me and I had no pupils in Vienna, you offered me your sympathetic attention. You were my first audience.' (11)

Klein points out that Freud made significant contributions to the development of the B'nai B'rith itself. He attended nearly all of the meetings and actively recruited at least three members. In addition to these activities Freud was

instrumental in the founding of a second Vienna lodge, and served on various committees. (12) Klein sees in Freud's prodigious efforts at promoting the organization, "The signification of the society as a force for articulating his Jewish identity." (13)

Ludwig Brown (1867-1936) who served as vice president of the Viennese Lodge had known Freud since the late 1880's and had grown closer to him as his private physician in the 1920s, delivered an address ("Freud's Personality and his Importance as Brother") attempting to define Freud's Jewish identity. (14) He felt that Freud's refusal to accept ritual expressions of piety, or all of the political platforms of Zionism indicated a reluctance to embrace any partial expression of Judaism. Rather, Brown saw Freud as "genuinely Jewish" for not simply being a part of the whole. Brown contended that Freud's respect for humanitarian ideals led him to join the B'nai B'rith and claimed that Freud developed a science which affirmed "a perfectly Jewish conception of life." (15) Klein says of Brown's address, "That Freud was, despite his lack of religion, 'genuinely Jewish' was beyond Brown's doubt, 'Can anyone even imagine Freud as not Jewish.'" (16)

Freud, as quoted in Klein, pointed to the significance of the B'nai B'rith's emphasis on ethical ideals and sense of moral commitment. He characterized his association with the brotherhood as based on "The total agreement of our cultural and humanitarian ideals, as well as the same joyful acknowledgement of Jewish descent and Jewish existence, have vividly sustained this feeling." (17)

His concentration on the furtherance of psychoanalysis notwithstanding, Freud's involvement with the B'nai B'rith constituted his firmest commitment. Klein says,

the degree of this identification with the notion of Jewish ethical responsibility provides an important insight for it shows the extent of Freud's Jewish consciousness during his development of the theory and the movement of psychoanalysis. (18)

Knoepfmacher concurs with Klein's assessment of Freud's tie with the B'nai B'rith. He sees Freud's association with the brotherhood as the epitome of "what tied him to Judaism and Jewry," a sense of belonging to a group of high minded Jewish individuals dedicated to humanitarian ideals, receptive to his theories and with whom he shared a common psychic structure. (19)

Apparently, Freud was aware of the exalted position accorded to him by the B'nai B'rith. He wrote to a friend some weeks after the birthday celebration held in his honor by the brotherhood, "From all sides and places, the Jews have enthusiastically seized me for themselves..." (20) He remarked that they treated him as if he were a "God fearing Chief Rabbi," or "a national hero." (21) Still, he viewed what he expresses in his letter as the qualities which marked him as a Jew, namely, freedom from intellectual prejudices and the courage to oppose majority conventions, were the ingredients of the "common construction of the soul" which is evidenced by Jews.

In summary then we may understand Freud's association with the B'nai B'rith as an effort to find a circle of educated and receptive men with whom Freud could share his theories without fear of censorship or rejection. Further, Freud needed a Jewish circle, for he felt a sense of psychic kinship with them and they served as a safe haven from anti-Semite hostilities. The nature of this kinship might be characterized as a high regard for ethical and humanitarian concerns and a commitment to advance these concerns in society. Freud's self-professed Jewish identity was characterized by intellectual freedom and courage to oppose societal biases and these qualities were enhanced by his active involvement with the B'nai B'rith.

We now turn to a discussion of Freud's connection with Zionism. As was noted

in Chapter Two Freud had belonged, in his student days, to a student fraternity which advocated a more democratic political system in Austria and encouraged the promotion of German culture. In that chapter we outlined Freud's movement away from these sentiments, due in large measure to the increase of anti-Semitic activities. Between the years 1880 and 1914, nearly two million Jews emigrated to the United States from Eastern Europe to escape programs, and around this time the Zionist movement began gaining strength. (22)

In the year 1902 Freud sent Theodor Herzl a copy of The Interpretation of Dreams along with a request that he review it. In the course of the letter, as quoted in Rainey, he says,

But at all events, may I ask you to keep the book as a token of the high esteem in which I-like so many others—have held since many years the poet and the fighter for the human rights of our People. (23)

Either in 1905 or 1907 Freud made reference to Herzl in one of his lectures at the University of Vienna. On this occasion Freud told of a dream in which Herzl had appeared to him as,

An appearance filled with glory, with a dark yet pale countenance, adorned with an attractive black beard, and with eyes that expressed infinite grief. The apparition attempted to persuade (Freud) of the need of immediate action, if the Jewish people was to be saved. These words astonished him by their logic and their pent up emotion. (24)

Two of Freud's sons were members of Zionist organizations, Martin was a member of Kadimah and Ernst a member of the large Student's Zionist Federation. Freud approved of their membership and it is significant that this approval came as a surprise to Martin. (25) In fact, Martin was stabbed in a fight between German-Austrian and Jewish student in 1913. He recounts, as quoted in Groliman,

I had no opportunity to fight these incipient Nazis under equal conditions man to man. I had to content myself with joining in brawls when Jews were out numbered by five to one, or even more. As I said earlier, I was wounded in such a brawl by a knife-thrust, and as I was the son of

a university professor, the newspapers reported the incident with a wealth of detail. I remember when I got home that night, neatly and expertly bandaged, the family were at dinner with a guest, the Reverend Oskar Pfister from Zurich. I apologized for my appearance and father threw me a sympathetic glance. (26)

In 1936 Freud, himself, was made an honorary member of Kadimah and was also appointed one of the board of governors of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem an institution Freud sometimes referred to as "our university." (27)

In 1926 Freud expressed the following sentiments regarding Zionism in a letter to Professor Friedrich Thieberger, as quoted in Simon, "Towards Zionism I have only sympathy, but I make no judgement on it, on its chances of success and on the possible dangers facing it." (28) This was the same year that Freud in his letter to the B'nai B'rith disavowed any Jewish national sentiment. Wortis, as quoted in Rainey, reported that in 1935 Freud said he was "not much of a Zionist" compared with Einstein, but went on to say,

I recognize the great emotional force, though, of a Jewish center in the world, and thought it would be a rallying point for Jewish ideals, If it had been in Uganda, it would not have been anything near so good. The sentimental value of Palestine was very great. Jews pictured their old compatriots wailing and praying as in the olden days at the old wall—which by the way was built by Herod, not by Solomon—and felt a revival of the old spirit. I was afraid for a while though that Zionism would become the occasion for a revival of the old religion, but I have been assured by people who have been there that all the young Jews are irreligious, which is a good thing. (24)

Thus, assessing the place of Zionism in Freud's Jewish identity is not an easy matter. Simon speculates that Freud saw in Zionism "not merely a national movement but a struggle for human emancipation, not on a private but a public scale." (30) As for the particularistic implications of Zionism, Simon suggests that Freud was inconsistent and evidenced an equivocal attitude towards it. Despite these inconsistencies Simon describes Freud as "a primitively nationalistic Jew, and perhaps even an effectively nationalistic Jew, as he described himself in a letter to the

poet Arthur Schnitzler." (31)

Rainey, like Simon, posits a certain ambivalence on Freud's part regarding Zionism. He attributes this ambivalence to Freud's deep attachment to the Enlightenment's ideals of universalism and brotherhood. Freud seemed to evidence concern that Zionism was another form of nationalism which he despised, but toward the end of his life thought as a necessary evil. (32) Rainey says,

Clearly, Freud himself was not a Zionist in the sense that Herzl and his followers were. Yet in the face of growing anti-Semitism and especially the Nazi threat he encouraged and sympathized with the various responses of his people to save themselves from the impending holocaust. On occasion he even referred to himself as a 'national Jew.' (33)

Klein understands Freud's ambivalence toward Zionism as a reaction against Jewish nationalism but a positive reaction to the implications of Zionism, namely pride and freedom. To the extent that Zionism represented a struggle for humanitarian ideals waged by Jews for the sake of mankind, Freud supported it, to the extent that it represented a positive national pride in the face of rampant anti-Semitism, Freud sympathized with it, but to the extent that it represented narrow particular interests, Freud could not fully embrace it.

We now turn to a discussion of significant relationships Freud had with Jews in order to ascertain how Freud's Jewish identity impacted on these relationships, and was influenced by them.

Freud had great respect for the nineteenth-century journalist Ludwig Borne. At the age of fourteen Freud was given the collected works of Borne and these were the only books from his adolescence he kept as an adult. (35) The admiration Freud had for Borne was evidenced by Freud's visit to his grave when he was in Paris studying with Charcot. (36)

Borne, who proved to be one of the most important German political journalists

of the nineteenth century, was born in the Frankfort ghetto in 1786. His family were wealthy Orthodox Jews. Through his tutor Borne was exposed to the ideas of the German Enlightenment and gradually became estranged from his family's Orthodoxy and evidenced disdain toward ritual observances.

As a young man Borne converted to Protestantism, not out of any deep conviction, but because he thought it would help to remove the obstacle in the way of his becoming a significant journalist. Apparently he felt that as a Protestant he would be more effective in the struggle for the liberation of all oppressed people, including the Jews. (38)

Borne championed the cause of political liberalism and vociferously defended the Jews against political discrimination. But he did not see the Jewish conflict as basically a Jewish-Christian problem, but as symptomatic of a larger issue, namely the denigration of human rights, the inevitable result of an aristocracy. The liberation of the Jews, Borne felt, would be the first step in emancipating all oppressed peoples from the talons of the aristocracy. (39)

Borne retained a deep connection with his Jewish ancestry, despite his Protestantism. He equated his advocacy of human rights with that of the Hebrew prophets. While Borne was sharply critical of Orthodox Jewry he was moved by the prophetic spirit of Judaism and found in it elements sympathetic to the ideals of the German Enlightenment. (40) Borne was particularly enamored of German culture and in this as well as other qualities we find striking similarities between Borne and the young Freud. We have already commented on Freud's disdain for Orthodox Jewry and his fervent liberalism and commitment to the ideals of enlightenment. We have noticed that in his student years Freud was associated with a fraternity dedicated to the furtherance of German culture and the democratization

of the German political structure. Freud had, however superficially, considered conversion as a way of escaping the rituals of a Jewish wedding ceremony. Although Freud quickly gave up the idea of conversion he was quite aware of the negative impact his Judaism had had on his career. (41) In time, as we have noted, Freud came to see conversion as essentially dishonest. Rainey describes Borne's influence on Freud as presenting the

...image of the Jew freed from the confines of Orthodoxy and deeply immersed in the mainstream of German culture—a man who was sharply critical of that culture but at the same time seeking to improve it. (42)

Grollman suggests that Borne's essays on journalistic technique "were to stimulate Freud in formulating the therapeutic method of free association." (43)

Another important Jewish relationship Freud had was with Josef Breuer. Breuer, born in Vienna in the same social milieu as Freud, was the son of Leopold Breuer, one of the most significant Chassidic religious leaders of his time. The father had considerable influence on the son, Josef. (44)

By the age of 26, Breuer had already established a solid scientific reputation and this in no small measure made him attractive to Freud.

Between the years 1883 and 1886 Freud relied heavily on his intense relationship with the older Breuer. Freud not only consulted Breuer on personal and professional matters but on Jewish considerations as well. The impact Breuer had on Freud is evident in a letter Freud wrote to him in 1884 in which he admitted to being, as quoted in Klein, "jealous of your opinion, even a nuance of your opinion." (46) Several authors have observed, including Klein and Robert, that Freud depended on Breuer, 40 years his senior, like a son.

Breuer, probably owing to the influence of his father, had a strong and developed sense of Jewish identity. He strongly opposed Jewish self-shame and thought it a

shameful desire to assimilate. (47) It was he who advised against Freud's conversion to escape a Jewish marriage ceremony.

Klein contends that Breuer functioned for Freud as a father figure and a spiritual advisor of sorts. It was during the time their friendship was most intense that Freud was making the transition for the belief that social integration was possible for the Jew and to the belief that Jewish pride was a victory over the insults of anti-Semitism. (48)

In three years (the time of Freud's most intimate contact with Breuer) Freud's Jewish consciousness developed from an anxious and erratic self-defense to an all-embracing sensibility inspiring deep passions. (49)

When Freud's friendship with Breuer began to wane, the "Fliess period" began (1887-1902). (50) Wilhelm Fliess was an ear, nose, throat specialist who began his medical practice in Berlin. Like Freud, he was Jewish and the son of a middle class merchant. (51) At the outset the two developed an intense and passionate relationship. Ernst Jones, as quoted in Brome, alludes to the strange quality of the friendship. 2

For a man of nearly middle age, happily married and having six children, to develop a passionate friendship for someone intellectually his inferior and for him to subordinate for several years his judgment and opinions to those of that other man...is unusual. (52)

Unusual indeed. The impact of Fliess on Freud was so powerful that it would not be an overstatement to say that virtually his whole existence depended on Fliess' judgment of him. (53) Jones in struggling to explain Freud's obsession with Fliess was moved to say, as quoted in Brome, "the extreme dependence he displayed Fliess...up to the age of 45, has almost the appearance of a delayed adolescence." (54)

Because Fliess lived in Berlin and Freud in Vienna their friendship was expressed mostly in correspondence. Through Freud's letters to Fliess we see that he thought Fliess to be capable of formulating vast and encompassing medical, biological, and

scientific theories. In fact, Fliess did develop some extravagant theories regarding sexuality, specifically his "nasal reflex neurosis" and his "periods theory." (55) Without delineating the intricacies of these theories, suffice it to say that the only important insight to be gleaned from them was his theory of the bisexuality of human beings. It seems likely that Fliess' daring approach to sexuality endeared him to Freud who was struggling with the significance of sexuality himself.

Freud was just beginning to develop his concept of sexuality toward the end of the 1880s and turned to Breuer for support and encouragement which was not forthcoming. Freud filled this need with Fliess. Fliess had one supreme advantage over Breuer for Freud. "He did not recoil from sexuality as a basis for human behavior. Indeed he made it the key to his work." (56) Many authors, including Simon, Brome, Bakan and Klein speculate that this important link between Freud and Fliess caused Freud to transfer the combined forces of mentor, father-figure and passionate friend, from Breuer to Fliess and led to Freud's exaggerated view of Fliess' scientific originality and importance.

In Freud's letters to Fliess we learn of Freud's difficult dilemmas. He discussed anti-Semitism, his successes and failures, and latest scientific speculations. Freud grappled with his emerging theory of psychoanalysis. As Peter Gay points out,

He had no one in Vienna to talk to, to test his ideas with, and to gather courage from; he was, in that great center of cultivation and learning, wholly alone. He could count on only one friend and confidant, Wilhelm Fliess, whom he met on a few appointed occasions for scientific talk. (57)

During these years Fliess functioned, in some respects, as Freud's psychoanalyst but was not up to the task. In 1896, Freud's father died and this event had such a profoundly disturbing effect on him that he decided to seek its origin. During the summer of 1897, Freud began his painful self-analysis and it was this courageous endeavor which finally liberated him from his obsessive dependence on Fliess. (58)

What followed was a tempestuous breakdown in their relationship. Charges of plagiarism and theft of ideas were levelled against Freud by Fliess. Specifically Fliess charged Freud with stealing his concept of the bisexual nature of human beings. The sordid charges may have had some basis in reality but remained sufficiently ambiguous to avoid any legal action by Fliess. Robert writes of the affair,

Morally it was for Freud one of these painful experiences which he kept coming up against all of his life and from which he gained a new insight into human beings as well as an increased knowledge of himself. (59)

What, then, may we conclude was the significance of Freud's relationship with Fliess? For one, Freud emerges as terribly ambitious and frustrated because of the lack of recognition he received. Certainly Freud attributed some of his lack of success to his being Jewish. (60) In his letters to Fliess we learn of his indignation and personal despair over the Dreyfus affair and the anti-Semitic agitation in Vienna. That Fliess was Jewish was necessary for Freud to open himself enough to admit the personal injury he felt at every example of hatred for the Jew. (61) Further, Freud's idealization of Fliess provided him with a Jewish figure after whom to model himself. Freud needed such a model until his own Jewish identity had become strong enough to stand on its own. (62) Fliess also exhibited the kind of daring and self-confidence that Freud needed to embark on his bold exploration of the psyche. With Fliess he could go on fantastic flights of the speculation and find a receptive and supportive colleague (63) Finally, Freud's relationship with Fliess, whom he unconsciously regarded as a transference figure, created such profound disturbances in Freud that it prompted his efforts at self-analysis. (64)

The next important relationship Freud had with a Jewish associate was with Karl Abraham. Abraham born in 1877 in Bremen was the younger of two sons of

a Jewish teacher. (65) Trained as a doctor, he developed a passionate interest in psychiatry and he joined the staff at Burgholzli, under the direction of the aforementioned Professor Bleuler. (66) Abraham only lasted a year there until a profound sense of frustration drove him to resign and at that time he met Freud and moved to Berlin. (67)

We have already outlined the vituperative dispute between Abraham and Jung at the Congress of 1908 and Freud's efforts to prevail upon Abraham to mend the rift with Jung. Freud tried to appeal to Abraham on the strength of their relationship saying that Abraham would be doing him a "great personal favor" with Abraham as evidenced by his remarks, as quoted in Rainey, that he and Abraham had a common "racial kinship" and a similarity of "intellectual constitution." (69) In reflecting on Abraham's publications, Freud observed,

I value so highly the resolute tone and clarity of your writing that I must ask you not to think that I overlook their eloquence. May I say that it is consanguineous Jewish traits that attract me to you? We understand each other. (70)

So it was with Freud. He believed that Jews were forced together by pressure from the outside but more importantly Jews were psychologically linked by freedom from the obfuscating forces of mysticism. Further, he thought the Jew to be "more sensitive, more critical of himself and more dependent on the judgement of others." (71) It is likely that this is what Freud meant by Jews having a common psychological structure.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

The ongoing discussion of Judaism and Freud is a fascinating one, for Freud himself, I believe, was never quite able to bring to consciousness the impact his Judaism had on his phenomenology. For this reason many authors have struggled to state a definitive thesis regarding the relationship of Judaism to Freud and then to prove it, only to find not much data forthcoming. Rather than to take this approach, I have endeavored to survey the major studies on the subject, outlining their theses and tracing their arguments. Of course I cannot resist stating my own point of view on the matter. Thus this conclusion consists of two parts, one, a summary and critique of the works I have surveyed and two, my own reflections.

The work most closely resembling my own is Rainey's Freud as Student of Religion. The focus of this work is to trace the development of Freud's religious thinking, especially in his early works. It consists of a series of essays written around this theme and does not attempt to serve as an authoritative biography nor a primer for Freud's psychoanalytic theories. Instead it seeks to provide the pertinent data from Freud's life and works pertaining to his thoughts on religion. It is by its own admission a broad portrait of Freud as student of religion and as such is a valuable tool for gaining entry into his religious thinking. It is a marvelous resource to start an investigation of the discussion of Judaism and Freud.

As distinguished from Rainey's work there are many resources offering a particular thesis intended to delineate the nature of the relationship between Freud and Judaism. One genre of this type is the attempt to locate Freud's religious thinking within the Jewish mystical tradition. The most important work in this genre is David Bakan's, Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition. Bakan's thesis is that Freud's contributions should be understood as a modern version of,

and contribution to, the history of Jewish mysticism. Bakan contends that Freud, either consciously or unconsciously, secularized Jewish mysticism and that psychoanalysis was the result of the process and thus serves as a contemporary continuation of the tradition of Jewish mysticism. Bakan's methodology can be described as quasi-psychoanalytic in that he analyzes and interprets various aspects of Freud's life and scientific works as representative of basic trends in Jewish mystical thought.

Other attempts in this genre include Yoram Bilu's, "Sigmund Freud and Rabbi Yehudah," and Vivian Rohel's, "A Trace on Freud's 'Mystic Writing Pad?'" All of these works presuppose that Freud's innovative ideas must have been derived from an already existing tradition, this being the Jewish mystical tradition. As interesting as these speculations might be, I do not place much credence to them for several reasons. First and foremost, Freud himself vociferously denied any influence from any Jewish traditional sources and indeed went to great lengths to disassociate himself from them. Secondly, Freud was, I believe, aware of a certain internal tendency in himself to fantastic speculations and flights of imagination which might have lent themselves to a mystical world view. He did, however, "ruthlessly check" these inclinations and I do not think they are reflected in his thinking on religion in general and Judaism in particular. Thirdly, the biographical information we do possess concerning Freud and Judaism does not reveal any particular exposure to mystical Jewish training nor any indication of preoccupation with cabbalistic theory or Jewish Messianic movements. For these reasons I do not think these works contribute much to the discussion of Judaism and Freud.

Other attempts have been made to establish that Freud was influenced by Jewish tradition, namely an intensive devotion to study and intellectual honesty.

Erich Fromm in Sigmund Freud's Mission maintained that Jewish tradition instilled within Freud a respect for reason and intellectual discipline. Both Fromm and Berkower postulate that Freud's self-professed agnosticism indicated a rejection of the trappings of Orthodox Judaism but not the spirit of humanism which served as its foundation.

Still other authors have asserted that Judaism's influence on Freud is found mainly in the sociological and cultural realms. Earl A. Grollman in Judaism in Sigmund Freud's World suggested that the essence of Freud's Judaism was his conviviality with other Jews. John Murray Cuddihy in The Ordeal of Civility took a similar approach. He understood Freud's Judaism as the company he kept, mainly other Jews. Harold Vetter and Arnold Meadow agreed that Freud evidenced in his work, concerns generally highly valued in Jewish culture, the alleviation of suffering, the preservation of human life and the enhancement of the human condition.

I find these approaches, the sociological and cultural foci of Judaism's impact on Freud, to be the most compelling. Freud's close association with Jewish organizations throughout his life and the easiness he felt with Jews from his own cultural milieu, point to his concept of Jewish identity. A significant theme emphasized in these works was the role of anti-Semitism in Freud's Jewish identity.

Dennis B. Klein's, Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement chronicled the impact of the Enlightenment on Viennese Jewry and the subsequent backlash of anti-Semitism. Both of these themes are fully explored in Klein's work and it is a valuable resource for tracing Freud's movement from a strictly universalistic conception of Judaism to his later notion of a common structure to the Jewish psyche.

There are several valuable works which provide the historical setting and a sense of the ambience of Freud's world. Carl E. Schorske's Fin-De-Siecle Vienna

traces the historical development of literature, politics, art history and philosophy of Freud's Vienna and provides a cultural setting for the genesis of Freud's phenomenology. Another important work of this kind is Peter Gray's, Freud, Jews and Other Germans. Gay adumbrated the collision of German liberalism with traditional Jewish values and delineated the impact of the identity crisis which helped to forge Freud's perception of his own Jewishness.

For an overview of the theory and history of psychoanalysis I recommend, Marthe Robert's, The Psychoanalytic Revolution. This comprehensive work weaves Freud's own writings with Robert's lucid commentary and provides the uninitiated with a clear understanding of the principles of psychoanalysis. A more technical work dealing with the psychoanalytic approach to religion is Volney P. Gay's, Freud on Ritual. This work, while an important contribution to the subject, presupposes a clinical background for the reader.

The seminal work for understanding Freud's Jewish identity is Ernst Simon's, "Sigmund Freud, The Jew." In this highly literate work Simon suggests that Freud had lost the theological underpinnings to Jewish traditional beliefs but maintained its ethical and moral impluses. Simon's theme is the basis for many author's insights regarding Freud's Jewish identity, including Grollman, Klein and Robert. Robert's, From Oedipus to Moses, takes many of Simon's premises but presents a hitherto unexplored explanations for Freud's rejection of the trappings of traditional Judaism, namely his ultimate characterization of Jacob Freud as the primordial murdered father which found expression in the universalistic concept known to us as the "Oedipus Complex." Robert's work is a marvelous guide to understanding the personal and familial forces which forged the "Oedipus Complex," as well as providing a lucid portrait of Freud's attempt to reconcile the Jewish legacy of his father with his

scientific bent and exposure to the Christian culture of late nineteenth century Vienna.

The Christian theological response to Freud is eloquently chronicled in Hans Kung's, Freud and the Problems of God. Kung, while acknowledging Freud's conception the existence of God as wishful thinking does not find in this a condemnation of God. Rather he postulates that a real God may certainly correspond to the wish for God. This insight lifts the belief in God from the realm of the neurotic, which Freud believed, and leaves as a possibility the actual existence of God.

It should be clear by now that this work does not attempt to be an exhaustive study of Freud's ideas on religion. Our focus has been on the historiography of the ongoing discussion on Judaism's impact on Freud. We have included a summary at the end of each major point established in this study as well as at the end of each chapter. Therefore we have only a few concluding remarks. First of all, Freud's early religious training influenced his abiding concern with the implications of religion in general and Judaism in particular. This interest was manifested in Freud's writings about rituals, the Moses figure and the nature of the belief in God. We also attribute Freud's early religious studies with providing one of his most difficult dilemmas, the reconciliation of the ethical demands of Judaism as Freud knew them, with their theological foundations. We conclude that Freud internalized the former while rejecting the latter.

Secondly, we content that Freud found comfort and solace from particularly vituperative anti-Semitism by his close association with Jews and Jewish organizations. Yet there remained a certain uneasiness in these associations. Freud did not wish to be "claimed" by Jews as their own. Nor did he wish psychoanalysis to be perceived as a "Jewish science." He was neither a Jewish nationalist nor a

"religious" Jew in the traditional sense. Yet he remained most comfortable with Jews and his primary associations were always with Jews. This identification apparently eluded his conscious awareness and he could only attribute it to a common construction of the psyche.

Thirdly, Freud attempted to construct a system of thought consistent with scientific methodology and the ideals of the Enlightenment. His impulses were humanistic and universalistic. His search for the truth was relentless and almost ruthless. His disciplined and reasoned approach was consistent with values he thought to be inherently Jewish, i.e. independence, rejection of mysticism and a love of learning. In his devotion to these values Freud was quintessentially Jewish.

## FOOTNOTES

### CHAPTER ONE

<sup>1</sup>D.M. Thomas, The White Hotel (New York: The Viking Press, 1981), p. 251

<sup>2</sup>David Bakan, Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition (Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1958), p. 46.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Reuben M. Rainey, Freud as Student of Religion: Perspectives on the Background and Development of His Thought (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975), p. 10.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Dennis B. Klein, Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Moment (New York, N.Y.: Praeger, 1981), p. 42.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 12.

<sup>11</sup>Klein, Jewish Origins, p. 42.

<sup>12</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 12.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid. p. 36.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 35.

<sup>15</sup>Willy Aron, "Notes on Sigmund Freud's Ancestry and Jewish Contacts," YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science, XI (1956-1957), p. 288.

<sup>16</sup>Bakan, Freud and Mystical Tradition, p. 50.

<sup>17</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 53.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 36

<sup>19</sup>Klein, Jewish Origins, p. 43.

<sup>20</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, pp. 38-39.

<sup>21</sup>Klein, Jewish Origins, pp. 43-44.

<sup>22</sup>Earl A. Grollman, Judaism in Sigmund Freud's World (New York, N.Y.: Bloch Publishing Company, 1966), p. 53.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

- <sup>24</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 102.
- <sup>25</sup>Lary Berkower, "The Enduring Effect of the Jewish Tradition upon Freud." American Journal of Psychiatry, (February, 1969), p. 1069.
- <sup>26</sup>Bakan, Freud and Mystical Tradition, p. 35.
- <sup>27</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 25.
- <sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 35.
- <sup>29</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 54.
- <sup>30</sup>Hans Kung, Freud and the Problems of God, Translated by Edward Quinn. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), p. 85.
- <sup>31</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 89.
- <sup>32</sup>Ernst Simon, "Sigmund Freud, the Jew," Leo Baeck Institute, Year Book II, 1957, (London: East and West Library, 1957), p. 295.
- <sup>33</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 130.
- <sup>34</sup>Kung, Freud and God, p. 95.
- <sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 20.
- <sup>36</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 150.
- <sup>37</sup>Volney Patrick Gay, Freud on Ritual: Reconstruction and Critique, (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979), p. 5.
- <sup>38</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 96.
- <sup>39</sup>Marthe Robert, The Psychoanalytic Revolution; Sigmund Freud's Life and Achievement, Translated by Kenneth Morgan. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966), p. 296.
- <sup>40</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 3.
- <sup>41</sup>Kung, Freud and God, pp. 38-39.
- <sup>42</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 109.
- <sup>43</sup>Simon, "Freud, the Jew," p. 285.
- <sup>44</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 92.
- <sup>45</sup>Kung, Freud and God, p. 42.
- <sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 44.
- <sup>47</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 127.
- <sup>48</sup>Kung, Freud and God, p. 50.

<sup>49</sup>Erich Fromm, Sigmund Freud's Mission; An Analysis of His Personality and Influence (New York: Harper, 1959), p. 95.

<sup>50</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 116.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 117.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 132.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., p. 66.

<sup>54</sup>Bakan, Freud and Mystical Tradition, p. 133.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid.

<sup>56</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 78

<sup>57</sup>Aron, "Notes on Freud's Ancestry," p. 290.

<sup>58</sup>Susan Handelman, "Interpretation as Devotion: Freud's Relation to Rabbinic Hermeneutics," Psychoanalytic Review, 68:2, (1981), p. 215.

<sup>59</sup>Bakan, Freud and Mystical Tradition, pp. 312-313.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., p. 311.

<sup>61</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 41.

<sup>62</sup>John Murray Cuddihy, The Ordeal of Civility: Freud, Marx, Levi-Strauss and the Jewish Struggle with Modernity (New York: Basic Books, 1974), p. 88.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., p. 87.

<sup>64</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 41.

<sup>65</sup>Harold J. Vetter and Arnold Meadow, "Freudian Theory and the Judaic Value System," International Journal of Social Psychiatry, (May, 1959), p. 204.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., p. 200.

<sup>67</sup>Berkower, "The Enduring Effect," p. 1073.

<sup>68</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 67.

<sup>69</sup>Fromm, Freud's Mission, p. 3.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid.

<sup>71</sup>Klein, Jewish Origins, p. 57.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid.

<sup>73</sup>Naomi Goldenberg, "Freud, Fathers and the Judeo-Christian Tradition," Psychocultural Review, 2:1 (1978), p. 48.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 46.

<sup>75</sup>Kung, Freud and God, p. 11.

<sup>76</sup>Ignaz Maybaum, Creation and Guilt: A Theological Assessment of Freud's Father-Son Conflict (London: Valentine, Mitchell, 1969), p. 133.

<sup>77</sup>Kung, Freud and God, p. 11.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>79</sup>Simon, "Freud, the Jew," p. 288.

<sup>80</sup>Vetter, "Freudian Theory," p. 199.

<sup>81</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 43.

<sup>82</sup>Ibid.

<sup>83</sup>Cuddihy, Ordeal, pp. 31-32.

<sup>84</sup>Ibid.

## CHAPTER TWO

<sup>1</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 4-5.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.,

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 6-7.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., pp. 7-8.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., pp. 8-9.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., pp. 10-11.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., pp. 12-13.

- 17 Ibid., p. 15.
- 18 Ibid., p. 19
- 19 Ibid., p. 22
- 20 Ibid., pp. 22-23.
- 21 Ibid., pp. 23-24.
- 22 Ibid., p. 24.
- 23 Ibid., p. 25.
- 24 Ibid., p. 28.
- 25 Ibid., pp. 28-29.
- 26 Ibid., p. 30.
- 27 Klein, Jewish Origins, p. 11.
- 28 Ibid.
- 29 Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, pp. 54-57.
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 Ibid., p. 61.
- 32 Ibid., p. 62.
- 33 Klein, Jewish Origins, p. 12.
- 34 Ibid., p. 53.
- 35 Ibid., p. 55.
- 36 Carl E. Schorske, Fin-De-Siecle Vienna
- 37 Ibid., pp. 185-186.
- 38 Ibid., p. 186.
- 39 Peter Gay, Freud, Jews and Other Germans (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), pp. 20-21.
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 Ibid., p. 95.
- 43 Ibid., pp. 96-97.
- 44 Ibid., p. 97.
- 45 Ibid., pp. 99-100.

- 46 Ibid., p. 101.
- 47 Klein, Jewish Origins, pp. 7-8.
- 48 Ibid., p. 13.
- 49 Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 33.
- 50 Ibid.,
- 51 Ibid., p. 34.
- 52 Ibid.,
- 53 Klein, Jewish Origins, p. 32.
- 54 Ibid.
- 55 Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, pp. 37-38.
- 56 Ibid., p. 35.
- 57 Ibid.
- 58 Klein, Jewish Origins, p. 46.
- 59 Ibid.
- 60 Ibid., p. 47.
- 61 Ibid.
- 62 Ibid., p. 48.
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 Ibid., pp. 48-49.
- 65 Ibid., p. 49
- 66 Ibid.
- 67 Ibid.
- 68 Ibid., p. 50.
- 69 Ibid.
- 70 Ibid.
- 71 Ibid., p. 52.
- 72 Ibid.
- 73 Klein, Jewish Origins, p. 55.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid. pp. 55-56.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., p. 56.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid.

<sup>80</sup>Peter Gay, Freud and Other Germans, p. 90.

### CHAPTER THREE

<sup>1</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 35.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>3</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 19.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Marthe Robert, From Oedipus to Moses: Freud's Jewish Identity  
New York: Anchor Books, 1976) pp. 11-12.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 12

<sup>8</sup>Fromm, Freud's Mission, p. 55.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 56.

<sup>10</sup>N. K. Dor-Shav, "To Be or Not To Be a Jew? A Dilemma of  
Sigmund Freud?" Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 56:5, (1977),  
p. 417.

<sup>11</sup>Cuddihy, Ordeal, p. 48.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 49.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Fromm, Freud's Mission, pp. 73-74.

<sup>15</sup>Robert, Oedipus, p. 112.

<sup>16</sup>Cuddihy, Ordeal, pp. 54-55.

<sup>17</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, pp. 91-92.

<sup>18</sup>Cuddihy, Ordeal, p. 50.

- <sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 51.  
<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 52.  
<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 59.  
<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 60.  
<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 62.  
<sup>24</sup>Robert, Oedipus, p. 98.  
<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 122.  
<sup>26</sup>Ibid., pp. 122-123.  
<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 129.  
<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 130.  
<sup>29</sup>Bakan, Freud and Mystical Tradition, p. 167.  
<sup>30</sup>Schorske, Vienna, p. 186.  
<sup>31</sup>Ibid.  
<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 197.  
<sup>33</sup>Ibid.  
<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 198.

#### CHAPTER FOUR

- <sup>1</sup>Schorske, Vienna, p. 189.  
<sup>2</sup>Ibid.  
<sup>3</sup>Ibid.  
<sup>4</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, pp. 78-79.  
<sup>5</sup>Schorske, Vienna, p. 190.  
<sup>6</sup>Ibid.  
<sup>7</sup>Ibid.  
<sup>8</sup>Ibid.  
<sup>9</sup>Ibid.  
<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

- <sup>11</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>12</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>13</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 191.
- <sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 202.
- <sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 203.
- <sup>17</sup>Robert Gordis, "The Two Faces of Freud," Judaism: A Quarterly Journal, Issue 94, Volume 24, Number 2, (Spring, 1975), p. 199.
- <sup>18</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>19</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>20</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>21</sup>Robert, Oedipus, p. 109.
- <sup>22</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 111.
- <sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 130.
- <sup>25</sup>Fromm, Fromm, Freud's Mission, p. 75.
- <sup>26</sup>Bakan, Freud and Mystical Tradition, p. 175.
- <sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 178.
- <sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 172.
- <sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 173.
- <sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 180.
- <sup>31</sup>Klein, Jewish Origins, p. 94.
- <sup>32</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>33</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, pp. 90-91.
- <sup>34</sup>Leon Vogel, "Freud and Judaism: An Analysis in the Light of His Correspondence," Judaism: A Quarterly Journal, Issue 94, Volume 24, Number 2, (Spring, 1975), pp. 181-182.
- <sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 182.
- <sup>36</sup>Ibid.

- 37Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 75.
- 38Ibid.
- 39Ibid.
- 40Ibid.
- 41Bakan, Freud and Mystical Tradition, p. 121.
- 42Ibid., p. 123.
- 43Ibid., p. 122.
- 44Ibid.
- 45Ibid., pp. 122-123.
- 46Ibid., pp. 123-124.
- 47Ibid., p. 125.
- 48Ibid.
- 49Ibid., pp. 126-127.
- 50Ibid., p. 126.
- 51Ibid., p. 127.
- 52Fromm, Freud's Mission, p. 77.
- 53Ibid., p. 78.
- 54Ibid.
- 55Dor-Shav, To Be, p. 414.
- 56Ibid., p. 418.
- 57Ibid., p. 414.
- 58Robert, Revolution, p. 291.
- 59Ibid., p. 294.
- 60Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 134.
- 61Ibid., p. 153.
- 62Ibid., pp. 153-154.
- 63Bakan, Freud and Mystical Tradition, pp. 150-151.
- 64Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 155.

- 65 Ibid.
- 66 Ibid.
- 67 Ibid., p. 158.
- 68 Ibid., p. 159.
- 69 Vogel, "Freud and Judaism," p. 191.
- 70 Ibid.
- 71 Ibid., p. 193.
- 72 Fromm, Freud's Mission, p. 79.
- 73 Ibid.
- 74 Ibid., pp. 79-80.
- 75 Bakan, Freud and Mystical Tradition, p. 128.
- 76 Ibid., p. 129.
- 77 Ibid., p. 130.
- 78 Ibid., p. 137.
- 79 Ibid., p. 143.
- 80 Ibid.
- 81 Ibid., p. 147.
- 82 Ibid., p. 148.
- 83 Ibid., pp. 155-156.
- 84 Ibid., pp. 159-160.
- 85 Ibid., p. 167.
- 86 Ibid., p. 164.
- 87 Dor-Shav, To be, p. 411.
- 88 Ibid.
- 89 Ibid., p. 412.
- 90 Ibid.
- 91 Robert, Oedipus, p. 144.
- 92 Ibid., pp. 145-146.

<sup>93</sup>Ibid., p. 152.

<sup>94</sup>Ibid., pp. 153-154.

<sup>95</sup>Ibid., p. 160.

<sup>96</sup>Ibid., p. 166.

<sup>97</sup>Ibid., p. 167.

<sup>98</sup>Kurt Eisler, "Freud and the Psychoanalysis of History," Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, (November, 1963), p. 680.

<sup>99</sup>Ibid., pp. 681-682.

#### CHAPTER FIVE

<sup>1</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 68.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>4</sup>Robert, Oedipus, p. 202.

<sup>5</sup>Henry E. Kagan, "Sigmund Freud, The Jew," unpublished address, unpagged, (1957).

<sup>6</sup>Cuddihy, Ordeal, p. 69.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 72.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 77-78.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 81.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup>Vincent Brome, Freud and His Early Circle, (London: Heinemann, 1967), p. 16.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 40.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 41.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 42.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

- 18 Ibid., p. 58.
- 19 Ibid., p. 59.
- 20 Ibid., p. 61
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 Ibid., p. 40.
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 Fromm, Freud's Mission, p. 66.
- 25 Robert, Revolution, p. 251.
- 26 Cuddihy, Ordeal, pp. 81-82.
- 27 Brome, Freud and His Circle, p. 46.
- 28 Ibid., p. 47.
- 29 Cuddihy, Ordeal, p. 79.
- 30 Ibid., p. 80.
- 31 Ibid., pp. 80-81.
- 32 Robert, Revolution, p. 217.
- 33 Robert, Oedipus, p. 136.
- 34 Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 149.
- 35 Robert, Oedipus, p. 139.
- 36 Brome, Freud and His Circle, pp. 22-23.
- 37 Ibid., p. 23.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 Ibid., p. 24.
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 Ibid., p. 25
- 44 Ibid., pp. 25-26.
- 45 Ibid., pp. 25-26.

- 46 Ibid.
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 Ibid., p. 27.
- 49 Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 98.
- 50 Robert, Revolution, p. 225.
- 51 Ibid.
- 52 Ibid., p. 226.
- 53 Brome, Freud and His Circle, p. 81.
- 54 Ibid., p. 100.
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Vogel, "Freud and Judaism," p. 190.
- 57 Brome, Freud and His Circle, p. 111.
- 58 Ibid., p. 112.
- 59 Ibid.
- 60 Ibid., p. 113.
- 61 Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 101.
- 62 Brome, Freud and His Circle, p. 122.
- 63 Ibid., p. 132.
- 64 Ibid., p. 133.
- 65 Ibid., p. 134.
- 66 Ibid.
- 67 Ibid., p. 135.
- 68 Ibid., p. 140.
- 69 Ibid., p. 143.
- 70 Ibid., p. 142.
- 71 Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 137.
- 72 Brome, Freud and His Circle, p. 151.

## CHAPTER SIX

- <sup>1</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 73.
- <sup>2</sup>Bakan, Freud and Mystical Tradition, p. 55.
- <sup>3</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 42.
- <sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 43.
- <sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 42.
- <sup>6</sup>Simon, "Freud, the Jew," p. 276.
- <sup>7</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>8</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, pp. 123-124.
- <sup>9</sup>Klein, Jewish Origins, p. 72.
- <sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 73.
- <sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 74.
- <sup>12</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>13</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>14</sup>Ibid., pp. 84-85.
- <sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 85.
- <sup>16</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 86.
- <sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 87.
- <sup>19</sup>Huge Knoepfmacher, "Sigmund Freud and the B'nai B'rith," Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 27:2, (1979), p. 446.
- <sup>20</sup>Klein, Jewish Origins, p. 86.
- <sup>21</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>22</sup>Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 69.
- <sup>23</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 71.
- <sup>24</sup>Simon, "Freud, The Jews," p. 274.
- <sup>25</sup>Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 72.
- <sup>26</sup>Ibid.

- 27 Ibid.
- 28 Simon, "Freud, The Jew," p. 275.
- 29 Rainey, Freud as Student, pp. 72-73.
- 30 Simon, "Freud, The Jew," p. 274.
- 31 Ibid., p. 275.
- 32 Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 73.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 Klein, Jewish Origins, pp. 23-24.
- 35 Rainey, Freud as Student, p. 61.
- 36 Ibid.
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 Ibid., pp. 61-62.
- 40 Ibid., p. 62.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 Ibid., p. 63.
- 43 Grollman, Judaism in Freud's World, p. 61.
- 44 Ibid., p. 71.
- 45 Ibid.
- 46 Klein, Jewish Origins, p. 58.
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 Ibid., p. 59.
- 49 Ibid.
- 50 Grollman, Judaism in Freud s World, p. 78.
- 51 Ibid.
- 52 Brome, Freud and His Circle, p. 1.
- 53 Robert, Revolution, p. 91.
- 54 Brome, Freud and His Circle, p. 2.

- 55Robert, Revolution, p. 92.
- 56Brome, Freud and His Circle, p. 3.
- 57Gay, Freud, Jews and Germans, p. 82.
- 58Robert, Revolution, p. 99.
- 59Ibid., p. 160
- 60Robert, Oedipus, p. 71.
- 61Ibid., p. 40.
- 62Ibid., p. 34.
- 63Bakan, Freud and Mystical Tradition, pp. 61-62.
- 64Klein, Jewish Origins, p. 72.
- 65Brome, Freud and His Circle, p. 85.
- 66Ibid.
- 67Ibid.
- 68Ibid., p. 86.
- 69Rainey, Freud as Student, pp. 67-68
- 70Ibid., p. 68.
- 71Ibid.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aron, Willy. "Notes on Sigmund Freud's Ancestry and Jewish Contacts." YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science, XI, 1956-1957.
- Bakan, David. Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1958.
- Berkower, Lary. "The Enduring Effect of the Jewish Tradition upon Freud." American Journal of Psychiatry, February, 1969, pp. 1067-1075.
- Bilu, Yoram. "Sigmund Freud and Rabbi Yehudah: On a Jewish Mystical Tradition of 'Psychoanalytic' Dream Interpretation." Journal of Psychological Anthropology, 2:4, 1979, 443-464.
- Cuddihy, John Murray. The Ordeal of Civility: Freud, Marx, Levi-Strauss and the Jewish Struggle with Modernity. New York: Basic Books, 1974.
- Dor-Shav N.K. "To Be or Not To Be a Jew? A Dilemma of Sigmund Freud?" Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 56:5, 1977, 407-420.
- Eisler, Kurt. "Freud and the Psychoanalysis of History." Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, (November, 1963).
- Freud Sigmund. The Interpretation of Dreams. Standard Edition, Volumes 4-5. Edited by James Strachey. London and New York, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Totem and Taboo. Standard Edition, Volume 13. Edited by James Strachey. London, 1950; New York, 1952.
- Fromm, Erich. Sigmund Freud's Mission; An Analysis of His Personality and Influence. New York: Harper, 1959.
- Gay, Peter. "Freud, Jews, and other Germans." New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Gay, Volney Patrick. Freud on Ritual; Reconstruction and Critique. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Goldenberg, Naomi, R. "Freud, Fathers, and the Judeo-Christian Tradition." Psychocultural Review, 2:1, 1978, 45-52.
- Gordis, Robert. "The Two Faces of Freud." Judaism: A Quarterly Journal, Issue 94, Volume 24 Number 2, Spring, 1975.
- Grollman, Earl A. Judaism in Sigmund Freud's World. Foreward by Nathan W. Ackerman. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1966.
- Handelman, Susan. "Interpretation as Devotion: Freud's Relation to Rabbinic Hermeneutics." Psychoanalytic Review, 68:2, 1981, 201-218, 1981.
- Jones, Ernest. Sigmund Freud: Life and Work, Volume I, London and New York, 1953.

- Jones, Ernest. Sigmund Freud: Life and Work, Volume II, London and New York, 1955.
- Jones, Ernest. Sigmund Freud: Life and Work, Volume III, London and New York, 1957.
- Klein, Dennis B. Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement. New York, N.Y.: Praeger, 1981.
- Knoepfmacher, Hugu. "Sigmund Freud and the B'nai B'rith." Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 27:2, 1979, 441-450.
- Kung, Hans. Freud and the Problems of God. Translated by Edward Quinn. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Maybaum, Ignaz. Creation and Guilt: A Theological Assessment of Freud's Father-Son Conflict. London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1969.
- Rainey, Reuben M. Freud as Student of Religion: Perspectives on the Background and Development of his Thought. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Robert, Marthe. From Oedipus to Moses: Freud's Jewish Identity. New York: Anchor Books, 1976.
- Robert, Marthe, The Psychoanalytic Revolution; Sigmund Freud's Life and Achievement. Translated by Kenneth Morgan. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1966.
- Rohrl, Vivian. "A Trace on Freud's 'Mystic Writing Pad?'" Journal of Psychological Anthropology, 2:4, 1979, 465-478.
- Rosenberg, Ann Elizabeth. Freudian Theory and American Religious Journals, 1900-1965. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1980.
- Ernst Simon. "Sigmund Freud, The Jew." Leo Baeck Institute, Year Book II, 1957.
- Thomas, D.M. The White Hotel. New York: The Viking Press, 1981.
- Vetter, Harold J. and Meadow, Arnold. "Freudian Theory and the Judaic Value System." International Journal of Social Psychiatry, (May, 1959), 197-207.
- Vogel, Leon. "Freud and Judaism: An Analysis in the Light of His Correspondence." Judaism: A Quarterly Journal, Issue 94, Volume 24, Number 2, Spring, 1975.