Abstract

Informing the Botanical Monograph dream (March 1898) is Freud’s intention to set himself free from the Law in order to get on with his secret ambition to establish an enlightened secular world where anti-Semitism is unknown--and, thereby, to make an atonement for having “killed” his infant brother Julius. The ‘fratricide’ in Freiburg is a concealed dream-element, as are the Torah, Michelangelo’s Moses and the Dreyfus Affair. Freud’s recollection of destroying with his sister Anna the illustrated “account of an journey through Persia” masks Freud’s intention to set himself free from the Law by taking his stand before his personal totem, Michelangelo’s Moses. References are made to Die Traumdeutung, “Der Moses des Michelangelo,” “Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse,” and Freud’s correspondence with Wilhelm Fliess and Carl Jung.

. . . Another presentiment tells me, as if I knew already--though I don't know anything at all--that I am about to discover the source of morality.

Letter of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess dated 31 May 1897.

The Origins of Psychoanalysis: Letters to Wilhelm Fliess.

. . . in every language concrete terms, in consequence of the history of their development, are richer in associations than conceptual ones.

Sigmund Freud, The Interpretation of Dreams.
In his 1958 essay, "Psychoanalysis--Science or Party Line?," Erich Fromm asserts:

unconsciously [Sigmund Freud] was--and wanted to be--one of the great cultural-ethical leaders of the twentieth century. He wanted to conquer the world . . . and to lead man to the only--and very limited--salvation he was capable of: the conquest of passion by intellect. To Freud, this--not any religion or any political solution like socialism--was the only valid answer to the problem of man. [In Fromm, E. (1963). The Dogma of Christ; New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston. 143].

To convey to you my reading of the father of psychoanalysis, I'll paraphrase Fromm:::

consciously [Sigmund Freud] . . ., wanted to conquer the world . . . and to lead man to the only--and very limited--salvation he was capable of: the conquest of passion by intellect. To Freud, this . . .was the only valid answer to the Jewish problem.

In other words, like Theodor Herzl, Sigmund Freud was bent on saving his people--only secretly so. I was cued me in to Freud's messianic ambition by his dream of the Botanical Monograph --more accurately by a scene from his childhood which came to Freud while he was analyzing this short dream. According to Freud, this recollected scene is "intimately related" to "the ultimate meaning of the dream, which I have not disclosed (191)." This memory, which is the key to unlocking the dream, is the focus of my talk.
But first, the dream itself. Here is James Strachey’s translation of the dream which Freud dreamt in the second week of March 1898, while working on his masterpiece, *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900):

I had written a monograph on a certain plant. The book lay before me and I was at the moment turning over a folded coloured plate. Bound up in each copy there was a dried specimen of the plant, as though it had been taken from a herbarium. (Freud, 1900, 169)

Now here is the all-important memory:

. . . It had once amused my father to hand over a book with coloured plates (an account of a journey through Persia) for me and my eldest sister [Anna] to destroy. Not easy to justify this from the educational point of view! I had been five at the time and my sister not yet three; and the picture of the two of us blissfully pulling the book to pieces (leaf by leaf, like an artichoke, I found myself saying) was almost the only plastic memory that I retained from that period of my life. (172; Freud's italics, for he was associating to "colored plate.")

In the original edition [*Die Traumdeutung* (1900).], the plates or illustrations in this “account of a journey through Persia” are denoted by” Tafeln,” which commonly signifies the Decalogue or the Ten Commandments [cf. “Die (mosaischen) Gesetztafeln, decalogue” (The New Cassell's German Dictionary, 1962, 193)]. In 458 B.C.E., after redacting the Torah in Babylon, Ezra journeyed with the Tafeln-filled Torah to another city in the Persian Empire, Jerusalem, where, in a public ceremony thirteen years later (445 B.C.E.), he read the Law to the people, establishing the Torah as the Book of Books. The “account of a journey through Persia” then can easily signify the
Persian travel book of every Jew's childhood, the Torah—in Freud's case, in the form of the illustrated German-Hebrew Philippson's Bible, a re-bound volume of which his father, Jakob, gave him on his thirty-fifth birthday, May 6, 1891. Mercifully, Jakob wasn’t able to foresee that, in 1897, the year following his death that his brilliant son will secretly resolve not to preserve, but to destroy the Law—see to it that there’d be no remnants of the Torah to rebind, not one leaf, not one law. (Cf”. the picture of the two of us blissfully pulling the book to pieces . . . leaf by leaf.”)

According to Freud, the Botanical Monograph dream was instigated by a conversation he had the previous evening with his friend, the ophthalmic surgeon Leopold Königstein. The subject matter of this important conversation, Freud, however, doesn’t disclose. Nor will he ever disclose . . . On February 14, 1911, eleven years after publication of _Die Traumdeutung_, Freud's disciple Carl Jung, who was then conducting seminars on dream interpretation, writes Freud, expressing his displeasure at Freud’s withholding “the crucial topic of the conversation with Dr. Königstein, "which is absolutely essential if the dream is to understood properly. “(McGuire, 1974, 392.)

Three days later, on the 17th, Freud, under perceived pressure, replies:

,. the crucial conversation . . . dealt with the very topic we touched on in Munich. . . the Egyptian statue allegedly costing 10,000 kronen . . . When I was a young man my father chided me for spending money on books, which at the time were my higher passion. As you see all this is not for the common people. (McGuire, _Ibid_. , 395.)

But a close reading reveals that Freud is again holding back-- the crucial topic of the conversation cannot have been the pricey “Egyptian statue” which he couldn’t afford to add to his collection of antiquities:

. . . my dream was connected with an event the previous evening. I had walked home with Dr. Königstein and had got into conversation with him
about a matter [angelegenheit] which never fails to excite my feelings
lebhaft erregt whenever it is raised. . . . (Freud, 1900, 171 [177].)

Since erregend (cf. erregt) means “irritability” and lebhaft means “strong” or “vigorous” (The New Cassell's German Dictionary, 1962), the “matter which never fails to excite [Freud's] feelings” is repugnant to him. Moreover, this is true for Dr. Königstein as well:

. . . in the course of it [the conversation] I had given [Dr. Königstein] some information [ihm Andeutungen gemacht] which was bound to affect both of us closely. . . [beiden nahe gehen mussen] . . . (174, [180])

Strachey's translation is misleading. Freud did not give Königstein “some information.” He gave Königstein an interpretation. [The New Cassel's German Dictionary (1962) defines deutung (cf. Andeutungen, above): “interpretation, meaning, signification.”]. Here, then is a more valid rendering:

. . . in the course of [the conversation] . . . I had given him an interpretation [about a matter] which was bound to affect both of us closely. . .

Moreover, the original wording suggests strongly that this aversive or repulsive subject matter is a bad omen presaging disaster or dark times ahead. [Die Vorbedeutung (cf. “ihm Andeutungen gemacht,” or “I had given him [an interpretation]”) means “foreboding, omen, augury” and vorbedeuten means “to forebode, presage” (The New Cassell's German Dictionary, 1962, 543)].

According to Strachey, Freud (1900, 172, ed. n.1) dreamt the Botanical Monograph on or about 10 March 1898. And in early March 1898 there was one “matter” (or "angelegenheit") that “was bound to affect,” that must move both ("beiden nahe gehen müssen . . .") Freud and his fellow Jew profoundly: the miserable Dreyfus Affair. (Incidentally, Angelegenheit, which Strachey translates as “matter,” also means “affair.”) The militant-anti-Jewish violence in the land of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, accounts of which Freud and Königstein read daily in the Neue Freie Presse, portends for Freud the resurfacing of virulent anti-Semitism throughout Christendom.
The month before, Freud had written Fliess, “Zola keeps us breathless. He is a fine fellow, a man with whom one can get on.” (Origins, 1954, 245) This letter was written on February 9th, the second day of Emile Zola's seventeen-day libel trial for “J' accuse,” his bold Open Letter in defense of Captain Dreyfus in which the fifty-seven year-old writer accused specific members of the French General Staff of covering up “one of the greatest crimes of the century,” their railroading of Dreyfus. On February 23rd, less than three weeks before the Botanical Monograph, Zola was sentenced to a year in prison for libel vis-a-vis “J'accuse” (later set aside). [in 1898, date unknown Freud recruited Konigstein for his "B'nai B'rith lodge (Klein, 1985, 87).]

Freud's book-destroying accomplice in the recollected scene, his sister Anna, was born on December 31 1858, which was eight months after his infant brother Julius died (April 15). Several months prior to dreaming the Botanical Monograph, Julius's death surfaced, returned to Freud, in his systematic self-analysis (Freud had begun the self-analysis in response to Jakob's death (23 October 1896), which left him feeling uprooted):

... I welcomed my one-year-younger brother (died within a few months) with ill wishes and real infantile jealousy, and... his death left the germ of guilt in me. (Letter to Wilhelm Fliess of 3 October 1897; Origins, 1954, 219.)

Oppressed by his fratricidal sense of guilt, Freud secretly vowed to make an atonement by delivering the children--other little Juliuses (and Saras)--from the scourge of anti-Semitism. And that very year, 1897, Freud discovered not only the Oedipus complex but also a dazzling derivative: the God-idea stems from the Father complex. That is, God the Father is a projection out on to the universe of the Oedipal boy's idealized perception of his father. With this godsend (or God-send) which he keeps close to his chest, Freud would redeem himself from having played Cain to Julius's
Abel: no God, no Judaism, no Christianity, no miserable anti-Semitism to distort or destroy the lives of the children. [Or, as the Root (Judaism) goes, so goes the miserable Branch (Christianity.) At the cost of Judaism, he would redeem the Kinder—and himself.

But before setting others free from their religious chains, it is essential, he understands, that he set himself free from the Law, from Judaism’s hold. In this light, please consider the following:

[t]he thoughts corresponding to [Botanical Monograph] dream consisted of a passionately agitated plea on behalf of my liberty to act as I chose to act and to govern my life as seemed right to me and me alone. . . . (467)

Again, in order to get on with his messianic ambition it is essential that Freud free himself from the Law. Freud hints at how he would do this in his gloss on his free-associations to the dream-element “artichoke”:'

Behind 'artichokes’ ["leaf by leaf, like an artichoke"] lay, on the one hand, my thoughts about Italy [which Freud doesn't specify] and, on the other hand, a scene from my childhood . . . (283).

"[O]n the one hand . . . on the other hand" indicates an equivalency, doesn't it? Because the childhood scene ("on the other hand") is bound up with Freud's desire to "govern [his] life," Freud's “thoughts about Italy” ("on the one hand") should also pertain to his desire for personal freedom. It is safe to read my “thoughts about Italy” as “my thoughts about Rome”: Consider:

“on the one hand,” Rome  
I, Sigmund, take my stand before that terrible Symbol, the Tafeln-bearing Moses of Michelangelo (in the Church of St. Peter in Chains).

“on the other hand,” Vienna  
I, Sigismund, 5, destroy a token of Torah given me by father Jakob, the Tafeln-filled Persian travel Book.
In his 1914 essay, “The Moses of Michelangelo,” which initially was published anonymously, Freud will confess, “no other piece of statuary has ever made a stronger impression on me than this [Moses]” (213). And as we shall see, it is for good reason that the statue impresses him so.

Now, at the time Freud held to the cathartic method of cure for neuroses:

. . . [we] lead the patient's attention back from his symptom to the scene in which and through which that symptom arose; and having thus located the scene, we remove the symptom by bringing about, during the reproduction of the traumatic scene, a subsequent correction of the psychical course of events which took place at the time. (Freud, 1896, 193).

In other words, when a patient relives a traumatic event, there is a purging of the emotions which sustain the neurotic symptom which arose from that event; hence, the symptom collapses. Freud's neurotic symptom is submission to the Will of the Father, be the father Jakob Freud, Moses or Jehovah. And because the situation before Michelangelo's Moses would be reminiscent of his Oedipal days when he wanted to kill his father to possess his mother, Freud who is secretly bent on killing Moses (by destroying the Law) in order to possess Mother Earth understands that there would be uprushes of feelings and attitudes from his childhood concerning his father, Jakob. It is essential that he stay in control as these resurface, especially the parricidal rage and the terror while awaiting the anticipated retribution, castration. Indeed, in his 1914 essay "Der Moses des Michelangelo" (throughout which “die Tafeln” denotes the two Tablets or Tables of the Law) Freud unwittingly reveals his castration anxiety before Moses/Moses, who enraged, glowers at, the Israelites worshipping the Golden Calf:

. . . 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 [das keine Überzeugung festhalten kann] . . .(213 [175])

Freud uses “Überzeugung” to denote the word “conviction” in the phrase,” the mob which can hold fast no conviction. And since “zeugungslieb” “means penis” (Cassell's (1982), the following reading of Freud's recounted experience is reasonable: "[It's] as though I myself belonged to the mob unto whom [Moses] eye is turned… the mob which [can not hold on to their penis].”

Moment by moment he must stay alert, understand that what he is experiencing are but new editions of feelings and attitudes from his childhood vis-à-vis his father Jakob. Keeping his emotional balance is essential if he is to set himself free from the will of the father; again, whether that father be Jakob Freud, Moses or Jehovah.

Because he loved his father, Freud understands that guilt or filial piety could sabotage his intention to destroy the Law and replace Moses, both as Lawgiver (“Know Thyself!”) and as deliverer of the Jews. Moreover, not having surmounted his belief in what he will call “the Bible Story,” he fears Yahweh’s Justice, especially that his “children unto the third and fourth generation” will pay for their father’s rebellion. (Exodus 20:5) When he was a boy, Freud, dreading Jakob’s retribution, abandoned his impious ambition; would he, dreading Yahweh’s retribution, abandon his new more ambitious impious ambition?

Like Janus, the two-headed Roman guardian of the threshold, Freud must be ever vigilant or he’d never resolve his father problem, never be his own person. One momentary lapse, and he could kiss his messianic ambition goodbye.
The world's greatest representation of Moses, however, is more than a mere prop for Freud to set himself free from bondage to the Law--much more: . . . My own superstition has its roots in suppressed ambition (immortality) and in my case takes the place of that anxiety about death which springs from the normal uncertainty of life. . . .

[Freud's jottings in the interleaved copy of the 1904 edition of The Psychopathology of Everyday Life (Freud, 1901,[1904], 260, ed. n.]

Because 'murdering' the biblical Moses (by destroying the Law) and supplanting him, both as the new moral educator and deliverer of his defenseless people, guarantees Freud immortality, Michelangelo's 8-ft, 4-inch bull-horned representation of that great man of his people so excites Freud's superstitious tendencies that the statue is his personal totem, that is, Moses himself (or the shade of Moses). In this regard, consider the following from Freud's 1914 anonymously published essay, "The Moses of Michelangelo;"

I can recollect my own disillusionment when, during my first visits to San Pietro in Vincoli [St. Peter in Chains], I used to sit down in front of the statue in the expectation that I should now see how it would start up on its raised foot, dash the Tables of the Law to the ground and let fly its wrath. . . (Freud, 1914, 220.)

Feeding Freud's "totem" superstition is, I suspect, his Roman Catholic sensibility thanks to his devout Czech nanny who took him to mass regularly at Freiburg's Church of the Nativity of Our Lady: if bread, a Communion Wafer, is Jesus, what's to keep stone, Michelangelo's marble Moses, from being the biblical Moses? [When Freud was growing up in the small Catholic Moravian town of Freiburg, where he learned that symbols (Wine and Wafer) can be what they represent (the Blood and Body of Jesus), a statue inspired by Michelangelo's Moses was in its town square: this imposing
Israelite writes on a stone tablet and wears a helmet with horn-like projections
(Lippman, 2003, 34, n.9)]

For a sense of Freud's uncanny experience before the statue we turn to the famous passage from “The Moses of Michelangelo”:

. . . How often have I mounted the steep steps from the unlovely Corso Cavour to the lonely piazza where the deserted church stands, and have essayed to support [standzuhalten] the angry scorn of the hero's [Moses'] glance [Blick des Heros]! . . . (Freud, 1914, 213 ['Der Moses des Michelangelo,"175])

According to The New Cassell's German Dictionary (1962), blick (“glance”) means “touches of light,” and blicken, in addition to meaning “to glance,” means “to shine” (cf. Exodus 30:35: “. . . the skin of Moses' face shone”). And in the Cassell's edition of 1914 (Bruehl, 1906 [rev. 1914]), the year that “Der Moses Des Michelangelo” was published, we find that anblitzen, which stems from the same root, in addition to meaning “to cast a furious look upon,” means “to throw a ray upon.” (In the frontispiece of the Freud family Bible, the illustrated German-Hebrew Philippson Bible, rays emanate upward in ‘bundled’ fashion from both sides of the forehead of the Tablet-bearing biblical Moses.)

The year before, 1913, in Totem and Taboo, Freud quoted the anthropologist, Northcote W. Thomas’s pertinent observation:

. . . 'Persons or things which are regarded as taboo may be compared to objects charged with electricity; they are the seat of a tremendous power which is transmissible by contact and may be liberated with destructive effect . . .' (20; italics mine)

This mysterious force or mana is comparable, then, to lightning or blitz.

Let's now turn to the word standhalten (“to support,” above). The 1914 edition of Cassell's defines standhalten as follows: “To withstand; to resist; to hold one's own;
to stand firm.” Freud’s “choosing” *standhalten* suggests strongly that whenever he entered the Church of San Pietro in Vincoli that Freud attempted to resist the *blick* or mana of Moses/Moses (cf. “How often have I . . . essayed to support . . .”). Applying this decoding of *blick* and *standhalten* back to the time of the Botanical Monograph dream (March 1898), we get the following rendering:

> Vis-a-vis the mana [*blick*] of Moses/Moses, I intend to [*standhalten*] withstand, resist, hold my own, stand firm.

On the other hand, when Freud writes about the Israelites vis-a-vis Jehovah, instead of using *standhalten*, which implies active resistance or opposition, Freud uses *ertragen* which implies passive submission. (“To bear; to suffer; to tolerate; to put up with”):

> . . . Even Moses had to act as an intermediary between his people and Jehovah, since the people could not support [*ertruge*] the sight of God; and when he returned from the presence of God his face shone-some of the mana had been transferred on to him . . . (Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego, 1921, 125 [Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse, 140])

Whereas *ertragen* suggests resignation (the Israelites or the fathers), *standhalten* suggests resistance or defiance (Freud). Unlike the desert fathers who passively suffered the will of Yahweh, this Israelite would hold his ground, stand up to Moses/Moses, ultimately to Yahweh.

Having been born in a caul (Jones, 1953, 4), which is a sign of greatness, and which his mother, Amelia, never let her “goldener Sigi” forget, it is probable that Freud superstitiously believes that he, himself, possesses mana from birth, and, so, may be able to withstand the terrible mana or supernatural power of Moses/Moses:

> . . . kings and chiefs are possessed of great power, and it is death for their subjects to address them directly; but a
minister or other person of greater mana than common can approach them unharmed . . . .

. . . This power is attached to all special individuals, such as kings, priests or newborn babies, to all exceptional states, such as the physical states of menstruation, puberty or birth, and to all uncanny things . . . (Sigmund Freud, Totem and Taboo, 1913, 20; 22, Freud's italics.)

Moreover, if Freud were to withstand Moses/Moses' terrible charge or mana, then not only would he deliver himself from the Law. He would possess the mana of Moses: the terrible radiance would be transferred on to him, the new Moses.

. . . The strangest fact seems to be than anyone who has transgressed one of these prohibitions himself acquires the characteristic of being prohibited-as though the whole of the dangerous charge had been transferred over to him. (Ibid., 22)

Here it is worthwhile to back track and quote from Freud's letter to his best and confidant Wilhelm Fliess of December 3rd, 1897, three months prior to the Botanical Monograph dream:

. . . I dreamt I was in Rome . . . . Incidentally my longing for Rome is deeply neurotic. It is connected with my schoolboy hero-worship of the Semitic Hannibal, and this year in fact I did not reach Rome any more than he did Lake Trasimeno.

Since I have been studying the unconscious, I have been so interesting to myself. It is a pity that one always keeps one's mouth shut about the most intimate things.

["The best that you know you must not tell to the boys."]
(Origins, 1954; 236; Bracketed quote from Goethe’s Faust, as translated by James Strachey; italics mine.)

Note that Freud in this guarded letter writes, “Since I have been studying the unconscious . . .” What he is alluding to is universal, pertaining not just to himself but to humankind in general. And armed with “the best” that he knows, his secret theoretical knowledge regarding the humble or Oedipal beginnings of God the Father, Freud would annihilate religion and, thereby, eliminate anti-Semitism. Unlike Hannibal, not only would this Semitic avenger enter Rome; he would crush the Romans, the new Romans, the Roman Catholic Church, the breeding ground for anti-Semites like the Christian who knocked his father Jakob’s’ new Shabbat fur cap into the mud and ordered him off the pavement, with Jakob meekly complying, not defending himself.

In the dream book, just before mentioning the fateful Sunday stroll when Jakob related his Shabbat encounter with the good Christian in Freud’s birthplace, Freiburg in Moravia, Freud refers to his boyhood identification with Hannibal:

To my youthful mind Hannibal and Rome symbolized the conflict between the tenacity of Jewry and the organization of the Catholic church. And the increasing importance of the effects of the antisemitic movement upon our emotional life helped to fix the thoughts of those early days. Thus the wish to go to Rome had become in my dream-life a cloak and symbol [Deckmantel und Symbol (G. W. II/III, 202)] for a number of other passionate wishes . ..(1900, 196-7)

This is a veiled confession: in order to ultimately eliminate Christendom, especially the Catholic church, Freud would journey to Rome, enter the Church of St. Peter in Chains, and, there, set himself free from the Law by confronting or coming face-to-face with that terrible Symbol, the Moses of Michelangelo. In Luther’s Bible, which Freud references in his works, “Decke” [as in Symbol und Deckmantel] denotes the veil which cloaks the dangerous supernatural radiance or mana of Moses: _... “till Moses
had done speaking with [the terrified Israelites at the foot of Mt. Sinai], he put a veil on his face" [Exodus 34:33-"legte er eine Decke auf sein . . "]. And if the dangerous charge of that terrible Symbol. Michelangelo’s Moses, were ‘transferred over to Freud, he would assume the mantle or mantel of Moses.

On September 2, 1901, Freud summoned courage and at long last entered the Eternal City. Three days later, on Thursday, September 5, he crossed the threshold of the gloomy Church of St. Peter in Chains, and took his stand before Moses/Moses. Remarkably, like Jakob who had seen “God face to face” and prevailed, Freud came through this dreaded but essential ordeal. At age 45, Freud—who enjoyed quoting the German poet Ruckert’s line, “the Book tells us it's no sin to limp”—came away from that dreaded encounter in the gloomy church not only a man but an exceptional being possessing the divine and terrible Biblical radiance of Moses (at least his superstitious side believed he did).

In the fall of the following year, Freud gathered disciples (Gay, 1988, 136, ) and was on his way to preparing the ground for his Promised Land, an enlightened brotherly world where the seed of Abraham can at last move freely over frontiers. And was on his way to becoming FREUD.

Seven years later, on April 15, 1908, the fiftieth anniversary of Julius Freud's death, the six-year-old Psychological Wednesday was renamed-- as per his carried motion- the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society (Nunberg and Federn, 1906-08, 373); in this manner, Freud secretly dedicated to the memory of Julius the psychoanalytic movement.

In 1935, the Polish-Jewish writer Bruno Schulz (1990) averred, "certain images in childhood . . . amount to an agenda" (111). Though Freud's image of him and his sister Anna destroying "an account of a journey through Persia" seems to fall into this category, this childhood scene is not a veridical recollection. For as Freud (1899) asserts in "Screen Memories":
Whenever in a memory the subject himself appears . . . as an object among other objects this contrast between the acting and the recollecting ego may be taken as evidence that the original impression has been worked over. It looks as though a memory-trace from childhood had been here translated back into a plastic and visual form at a later date--the date of the memory's arousal. But no original impression has entered the subject's consciousness. (321; italics mine)

The evoked childhood scene, like the Botanical Monograph dream, is itself a wish fulfillment. By the "date of the memory's arousal," Freud is bent on destroying religion; accordingly, in addition to depicting Freud (and his sister) destroying a fitting Torah symbol ("an account of a journey through Persia"), the critical scene contains a mix pointing to his mighty weapon, the Oedipal beginnings of the God the Father: (1) infantile sexuality ("pulling . . . artichoke"; see Anzieu, 1986, 285-6), and (2) the age at which the Oedipal boy not only abandons his ambition. He also unwittingly transforms his father into God the Father ("I had been five").

Freud's messianic ambition can easily account for his abandoning the seduction hypothesis (adult psychopathology, namely hysteria, stems from father-child incest) for the Oedipus complex and its dazzling derivative, Freud's mighty weapon (and shield), the origin of the idea of God the Father.
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AUTHOR’S NOTE ON THE DECODING PROCEDURE USED

The author, a clinical psychologist, is not a psychoanalyst. One day about twenty-five years ago, a high school biology teacher brought in an analysis of one of his dreams that he had arrived at by using of a comprehensive dictionary—that is, he looked up the several meanings of individual words of the dream narrative. Fascinated, I
decided to use this approach with the shortest dream of Freud's that the father of
psychoanalysis analyzes publicly—the dream of the Botanical Monograph. (At the time I
knew little about Freud's private life, including his obsession with the biblical Moses or
Michelangelo's Moses.) Would my 'blind' analysis of the dream (initially I did not read
Freud's interpretation, nor did I read his associations) approximate Freud's own
reading? That was the question. (At the time I did not know that Freud was holding
back, not revealing his full reading of the dream.)

Using Webster's New Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary (1969), I referred to
James Strachey's Standard Edition translation. (Later-after reading Freud's discussion
of the Botanical Monograph and considerable research on his private and public life,
including and especially his correspondence with Wilhelm Fliess--I referred to the
original publication, Die Traumdeutung.)

The decoding rationale was as follows. At the time of the narration, the dreamer
has a limited word pool available to draw from; determining this word pool are the
dreamer's overall vocabulary level and the dream meaning(s), meaning(s) which can
below the threshold of consciousness; the dreamer is cognizant preconsciously of
definitions other than the ostensible meaning(s) of individual words in the dream
narrative; by listing and then sorting into inferred themes the varied definitions of each
'independent' dream narrative word (e.g., "book"), a clearer understanding of the
(latent) dream emerges. In other words, ostensibly independent dream words will be
found to be semantically related, yielding themes as selected dream words are each
variously defined and these definitions, in turn, are compared with one another.
Here is an actual example of the procedure, for which eventually small Rolodex cards
were used:

a. the author looked up the Botanical Monograph dream word “book.”
b. using the dictionary, he found three definitions;
c. for each of the three “Book” definitions he prepared Rolodex
card #s 106, 107 and 108:

106. Book= Something felt to be a source of enlightenment or instruction.

107. Book= The total available knowledge and experience that can brought to bear on a task or problem.

108. Book= The standard or authority relevant in a situation.

d. This procedure the author repeated for other Botanical Monograph selected stimulus words.

Once this was done, the author, beginning with definition #1, compared each definition with every other definition irrespective of the Botanical Monograph stimulus word. The author carried out this procedure for only the first 39 definitions; that is, each of these 39 definitions were compared with the remaining 155 definitions. He discontinued his systematic comparison because he believed the returns would not be worth the additional effort, for by then he believed that he had arrived at themes of significance sufficient in number to make an interpretation. It should be noted that the author took liberties: stimulus words were split in to their components (morphemes); nouns were changed to verbs or adjectives; contiguous words were combined and the combinations themselves were looked up; and if a word in a dictionary definition intrigued the author, it, itself, was defined and numbered. Remember, dreams make use of word play, including puns. For four items, the author referred to The Encyclopaedia Britannica.

The author arrived at nine clusters or themes—that is, a group of definitions that somehow are similar or related, even loosely.: Adherence, Authoritative Source; Vivid Impression; Conceal; Overturn: Revelation; Many Colors; Confinement; and Conformity. Studying these themes, the author concluded that “Freud aspired to be a modern Moses who would enlighten mankind through his then current project, his dream book, which would describe the relationship between civilization and man . . .”
The author then looked up what Freud had written about Moses in his letters and in his works. And after learning about Freud's obsession with Michelangelo's Moses, the author intuited that the statue was a concealed Botanical Monograph dream-element. “Why,” he wondered, “did Freud conceal the statue from his readers?” Since Freud acknowledges that Botanical Monograph was driven by his wish to be his own person—“the dream consisted of a passionately agitated plea on behalf of my liberty to act as I chose to act and to govern my life as seemed right to me and me alone”—it was not a great leap to surmise that Freud intended to set himself free from the Law by taking his stand before Moses. (Initially I believed that the statue was a mere prop for him to set himself free from the Law. Only later did I infer that Moses was his personal totem.) As far as I know, I had no preconceived notions.

Were this decoding procedure to be repeated, it should be done using Freud's own words, not a translation. Perhaps there can be two groups of college students, one who knows that Freud is the dreamer; the other who doesn't.

Professor Martin Potschka suggested, rightly I now believe, that I present this decoding procedure to the reader.

This essay itself, however, should be judged as one would any other--Is the case made?

ADDENDUM

"the 'Julius' had not slipped my memory."

Because it would have lengthened the essay unduly, I omitted relevant material, such as Freud's failure in the summer of 1898 to recollect the surname of the
German-Jewish poet, Julius Mosen (1803-67), a guarded account of which Freud wrote to Fliess on August 26, 1898 (this is Freud’s only mention of the lapse):

You know how you can forget a name and substitute part of another for it, to which you could swear, though it inevitably turns out to be wrong. That happened to me not long ago over the name of the poet who wrote Andreas Hofer (“Zu Mantua in Banden...” [“To Mantua in Chains...”]). I felt it must be something ending in au-Lindau, Feldau, or the like. Actually, of course, the poet’s name was Julius Mosen; the “Julius” had not slipped my memory. I was able to prove (i) that I had repressed the name Mosen because of certain associations; (ii) that material from my infancy played a part in the repression; and (iii) that the substitute names that occurred to me arose, just like a symptom, from both groups of material.

The analysis resolved the thing completely; unfortunately, I can not make it public any more than my big dream... (Freud, 1985, 324)

Freud states that he “can not make [his Mosen name-failure] public any more than my big dream” which suggests strongly that the Mosen slip and Freud “big dream” are intimately related. Two months earlier Fliess had written Freud expressing his reservations about Freud’s toying with including the dream in his on-going work, The Interpretation of Dreams. Here is Freud’s reply of June 9 suggests strongly that anti-Semitism informs his “big dream” which is lost:.

... Let me know at least which topic [in the dream] it was to which you took exception and where you feared an attack by a malicious critic. Whether it is my anxiety, or Martha, or the Dalles [poverty or misery in Yiddish], or my being without a fatherland? (ibid, 315 italics mine).
In *The Jewish State*, Theodor Herzl (1896) called anti-Semitism *Judennot*, “the misery of the Jews,” [Emile Zola in “J’accuse!” (January 1898) denounced “the miserable anti-Semitism”]. Clearly anti-Semitism is implicated in the lost dream; so it easy to assume with confidence that the same holds for the Mosen slip.

By instituting with his envisioned movement an enlightened atheistic world free of the miserable anti-Semitism or *Judennot* Freud would atone for his having “killed” Julius (“the Julius' had not slipped my memory ....material from my infancy ...”)

But first this Cain must free himself from the Law by summoning courage and successfully take his stand before Moses/Moses in the Church of St. Peter in Chains (cf. “... in Banden [in Chains]”). [It had been the titular church of Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere (1443-1513, who, later, as Pope *Julius* II, commissioned Michelangelo to create Moses for his tomb (cf. *Julius Mosen*).]

Virgil, the singer of Aeneas (cf. “Andreas Hofer”), was born at Andes near Mantua (cf. “*Zu Mantua in Banden. . “*), which is often referred to as the poet’s birthplace. (In the *Divine Comedy*, Dante addresses the shade of Virgil, “Courteous Mantuan spirit.”). Freud would follow the path of Aeneas-up to a point. To save his homeless and wandering people, Aeneas, in Italy, descended to the underworld to receive instructions from his father, Anchises; on the other hand, to save his scattered and oppressed people, Freud, in Italy, would descend to the underworld to destroy (ultimately) the Instructions of his spiritual father, Moses, the Law.

Because Mantua was known for its silk cloaks or mantles, “mantua” became a corruption of the French word for mantle, *manteau*; over time the word mantua came to mean mantle. And in order to assume or rather, usurp, the mantle of Moses, Freud would take his stand before Moses/Moses whose radiance or mana (*Mantua*) so terrified the Israelites at the foot of Mount Sinai that “till Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his face” (Exodus 34:33). And to support the sight of the mana-charged Moses/Moses, Freud can not rely solely on the fact that he was born in a caul;
additionally like his classical double, Aeneas, he would come armed with a mighty weapon.

Accordingly, we now turn to the substitute name, Lindau (. . . something ending in au-Lindau . . . "). Aeneas, to arm himself for his descent into the perilous underworld, plucked a magical, protective Golden Bough:

A tree's deep shade conceals a bough whose leaves
And pliant twigs are all of gold . . .
The tree's fruit, with its foliage of gold . . (Virgil, 1983, Bk VI, 12)

A lind or linden tree is graced with small yellow flowers, and "Au" is the chemical symbol of the element gold. So, even though Aeneas plucked his Golden Bough from an oak tree, the substitute name "Lindau" can easily be seen as a token of Aeneas' hell's charm. And, Freud, a modern but impious Aeneas who would save his homeless people, has already secretly plucked his golden hell's charm or "Lindau": his brilliant illumination: God the Father is a mere projection on the universe as perceived by the Oedipal boy-or as Freud will assert, "a personal God is, psychologically, nothing other than an exalted father." (Freud, 1910, 123)

And what's the point in plucking a "Lindau" or Golden Bough if not to descend into the "Feldau" or Golden Fields of Elysium?:

Where souls take ease among the Blessed Groves
Wider expanses of high air endow
each vista with a wealth of light. (Ibid):

Accordingly, "Feldau," Freud's other substitute name for Mosen (I first wrote "Moses"-an apt slip), can easily be seen as a token of those Golden Fields, the resting place for the blessed shades of the righteous dead or Manes (cf. Mantua).

In The Divine Comedy, with which Freud is thoroughly familiar, Virgil's shade, acting as Dante's guide to the underworld, informs Dante that because Moses "did not have baptism" the shade of Moses had been suspended in the Golden Fields (or
“Feldau”). And even though the shade of Virgil states that it had witnessed Jesus lift the shade of Moses to Paradise (Hell, Canto IV), it's easy for Freud to envision himself encountering in the same blessed region Moses' shade; more so, since it was in the Golden Fields that the shade of Aeneas's father pointed out to Aeneas the Romans, the future line of Aeneas's son, Julius (Iulus Ascanius), a line that's “just ... by choice” (Ibid. 202) For Freud, too, would have his own “Julius” or Julian line—an enlightened self-aware line which would establish his Promised Land, a harmonious brotherly world.

[Freud penned his guarded account of the Mosen slip to Fliess three days before the convening, on 29 August 1898, of the first major Zionist convention, the Second Zionist Congress in Basle, Switzerland. By this time his Jewish detractors were already denouncing Theodor Herzl (1860-1904) as a false messiah—a characterization which, Freud understands, may apply to him.]

That to the very end, Freud identified with Aeneas is shown by his last conscious act. In exile in London, on Thursday, September 21, 1939, Freud, wasting away—with at most a few days to live—told Dr. Max Schur, “without a trace of emotionality or self-pity, and with full consciousness of reality” that the time had come: ‘... Now, it's nothing but torture and makes no sense any more.” Whereupon, Dr. Schur kept his promise by injecting his cancer-ravaged friend and mentor with the fatal morphine. (Dr. Schur gave Freud two injections, twelve hours apart.) That date was the anniversary of the death of Virgil. But instead of dying on the death day of the singer of Aeneas as he had intended, Freud died two days later, Saturday, September 23, at 3 A.M. (Schur, 1972, 529.) To die on the Sabbath, indeed, to die on any Jewish holy day, is a good sign; it means that one has lead a righteous life. In the Jewish calendar, that fateful Saturday was the tenth of Tishri or Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, which, according to tradition, is the anniversary of Moses' descent from Mount Sinai with the second set of tablets of the Law, the ones which Moses had hewn and which he did not break. (See Lippman 2001). From Virgil's death day to the Day of Atonement is a time
span that bridges the two worlds of Sigmund Freud. Jakob Freud was right when he cautioned his brilliant son, “There are more things on heaven and earth than are dreamed of in your philosophy.” (Jones, 1957, 381)
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