

ONE OF THE MOST FAMOUS OF THE PLAYS OF ANCIENT GREECE IS THE PLAY BY SOPHOCLES CALLED, "OEDIPUS THE KING". THE PLAY IS BASED ON A GREEK MYTH THAT AN ORACLE HAD WARNED LAIUS, THE FATHER OF OEDIPUS, THAT A SON WOULD BE BORN TO HIM WHO WOULD SLAY HIM. THE SON WAS BORN, EXPOSED TO DANGER BY LAIUS, AND WAS RESCUED AND REARED BY THE KING AND QUEEN OF CORINTH, WHOM THE BOY REGARDED AS HIS PARENTS. LATER IN LIFE, OEDIPUS, IN IGNORANCE, SLAYS HIS FATHER AND MARRIES THE WIDOW OF THE MAN HE KILLED, NAMELY HIS OWN MOTHER. A MYTH IS NOT BASED ON ^{a specific historic event} HISTORIC REALITY, BUT IT CAN CONTAIN WITHIN ITS SYMBOLISM A PROFOUND PSYCHOLOGICAL TRUTH. THUS, WE DO NOT ASK CONCERNING A MYTH, "DID THE EVENTS ACTUALLY HAPPEN THAT WAY? INSTEAD WE ASK, IS THE SYMBOLISM OF THE MYTH TRUE TO LIFE?"

IT IS THE THESIS OF SIGMUND FREUD THAT THE OEDIPUS MYTH ~~IS~~ ENABLES US TO UNDERSTAND MANY OF THE DEEPEST AND DARKEST WORKINGS OF THE HUMAN MIND. DR. FREUD AND HIS SUCCESSORS IN THE FIELD OF PSYCHIATRY HAVE ~~BEEN ABLE TO PROVE~~ ^{learned} CLINICALLY THAT IT IS THE INFANTILE WISH OF THE HUMAN SON TO DISPLACE HIS FATHER, JUST AS IT IS THE INFANTILE WISH OF THE ~~HUMAN~~ DAUGHTER TO DISPLACE HER MOTHER. THIS PROCESS OF INSTINCT AND FEELING WHICH, ACCORDING TO DR. FREUD, ALL HUMAN BEINGS EXPERIENCE TO SOME DEGREE, HOWEVER CONTROLLED AND SUBLIMATED IT MAY BE, ^{Freud calls} ~~IS CALLED~~ THE OEDIPUS COMPLEX.

IN MY OPINION THE CONCLUSION THAT DR. FREUD ONCE PROMULGATED AS A THEORY HAS NOW BEEN SOUNDLY ESTABLISHED AS A ~~TRUTH~~ ^{theory} PRINCIPLE UPON WHICH WE HAVE TO BASE A GREAT DEAL OF OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE HUMAN MIND. IT HAS BEEN CLEARLY ESTABLISHED, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT CHILDREN IN CERTAIN AGE GROUPS ARE PARTICULARLY PRONE TO FEELINGS THAT ARE ANTAGONISTIC TO THE PARENT/ OF THE SAME SEX. THE AVERAGE CHILD WILL HAVE NIGHTMARES DURING THIS PERIOD, WHEN FILLED WITH GUILT ABOUT HIS HOSTILE INTENTIONS TOWARDS HIS PARENT, HE WILL PROJECT OVER TO THE PARENT A DESIRE TO HARM HIM, AND THE CHILD WILL DREAM OF HIS PARENT IN THE FORM OF AN ANIMAL WHICH IS SET ON EATING OR HARMING THE CHILD. THE INTENSITY OF THE CHILD'S HOSTILITY TOWARDS THE PARENT OF THE SAME SEX WILL VARY WITH THE PARTICULAR CONDITIONS IN THE FAMILY AT THAT TIME. NO TWO CHILDREN MAY REACT ALIKE, BUT THE PROCESS IS AT WORK. ^{in each case} THE DETAILED STUDY OF THE DREAMS OF CHILDREN TAKE ALL THE GUESS WORK OUT OF THIS CONCLUSION. IT IS NORMAL FOR THE CHILD TO LOVE AND HATE HIS PARENT, AND IT IS NORMAL FOR THE CHILD TO WANT TO DISPLACE HIS PARENT, SO THAT HE CAN BECOME THE FAVORITE OR EXCLUSIVE LOVE OBJECT OF THE PARENT OF THE OPPOSITE SEX. AS THE CHILD MATURES, IF HE IS NORMAL, HE WILL ~~WANT NOT MERELY TO DISPLACE HIS FATHER, BUT TO COMPLETE WITH HIM, AND ULTIMATELY, MERELY TO IMITATE HIM.~~ ^{male} IF THE CHILD IS NORMAL, HIS CHILDISH DESIRE TO REPLACE HIS FATHER WILL RECEDE, AND HE WILL NOT FEEL OVERLY GUILTY. ~~IF THE CHILD HAS A PROBLEM ADJUSTING TO LIFE, RE??Y???~~ MANY A SON, HOWEVER, CARRIES WITH HIM THROUGHOUT HIS ADULT LIFE, A SUB-CONSCIOUS GUILT FOR A STILL-TEEMING DESIRE TO DISPLACE HIS FATHER, A DESIRE OF WHICH HE MAY NOT BE CONSCIOUSLY AWARE. ACCORDING TO THE FOUNDER OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS, THIS PROBLEM WHICH ALL HUMANS BEINGS HAVE TO SOME DEGREE, IS A BASIC ONE IN UNDERSTANDING HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS. ^{in Development}

82/

DR. FREUD HAS WRITTEN MANY BOOKS DEMONSTRATING THIS AND OTHER PRINCIPLES CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF THE HUMAN MIND. HE MUST BE RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE OUTSTANDING ^{creative minds} GENIUSES OF ALL HUMAN HISTORY. IT CAN FAIRLY BE SAID, THAT EVERY EDUCATED PERSON TODAY OPERATES WITH AT LEAST SOME PART OF FREUD'S TEACHING AS PART OF HIS REGULAR THINKING PROCESS. IN HIS BOOK, "MOSES AND MONOTH ~~E~~ISM", DR. FREUD TRIES TO APPLY THE INSIGHTS OF THE OEDIPUS COMPLEX NOT

JUST TO ONE ~~COM~~ INDIVIDUAL BUT TO AN ENTIRE PEOPLE. SPECIFICALLY, HE ASKS US TO MEDITATE UPON THE POSSIBILITY THAT THE HEBREW PEOPLE MURDERED THEIR FOUNDER AND FATHER, MOSES, AND THAT SUBSEQUENT DEVELOPMENTS IN JUDAISM ARE DUE TO THE RELEASE OF THE REPRESSED GUILT FEELING OF THE PEOPLE THAT THEY HAD KILLED THEIR ~~founder~~ AT SOME TIME IN THE ANCIENT PAST. DR. FREUD ADMITS THAT HE IS TAKING A GREAT LEAP IN THIS BOOK. HE ADMITS THAT HE HAS NOT SOLVED ~~many~~ ^{all of the} PROBLEMS IN TRYING TO ESTABLISH THIS THEORY, NEVERTHELESS HE OBVIOUSLY THOUGHT WELL ENOUGH OF THE IDEA TO TRY TO ~~SOLIDIFY HIS~~ ^{PUBLISH} POINT. AS ONE READS THE BOOK, WHICH IS UTTERLY FASCINATING, ONE GATHERS THAT DR. FREUD FEELS THAT HE HAS SUBSTANTIALLY MADE HIS POINT. IN OTHER WORDS, HE IS SO CERTAIN OF THE OUTLINES OF THE POINT THAT HE FEELS THAT HE DOESN'T NEED MORE PROOF.

The Book

11
^{writes}
DR. FREUD IS SATISFIED THAT RELIGION PRIMARILY SPRINGS FROM THE SAME NEXUS AS THE OEDIPUS COMPLEX. HE BORROWS FROM CHARLES DARWIN THE SUGGESTION THAT IN PRIMEVAL TIMES MEN LIVED IN SMALL HORDES, EACH UNDER THE DOMINATION OF A STRONG MALE. "THE STRONG MALE," ^{and} WAS THE MASTER AND FATHER OF THE WHOLE HORDE, UNLIMITED IN HIS POWER, WHICH HE USED BRUTALLY. ALL FEMALES WERE HIS PROPERTY, ^{the} THE FATE OF THE SONS WAS A HARD ONE: IF THEY EXCITED THE FATHER'S JEALOUSY THEY WERE KILLED OR EMASCULATED OR DRIVEN OUT. ULTIMATELY ONE OF THE SONS MIGHT SUCCEED IN DEVELOPING HIS OWN PRIVATE HORDE, WHERE HE WOULD REIGN AS A MASTER, AFTER THE IMAGE OF HIS FATHER.

daughters as well as the wives.

DR. FREUD, THEN CONTINUES THE DARWINIAN SUGGESTION. (P. 103). ^{He writes} he says THAT THE NEXT DECISIVE STEP TOWARDS CHANGING THE PRIMEVAL SOCIAL ORGANIZATION CAME WHEN " THE BROTHERS WHO HAD BEEN DRIVEN OUT AND LIVED TOGETHER IN A COMMUNITY ^{grouped} ~~clustered~~ TOGETHER, OVERCAME THE FATHER, AND ACCORDING TO THE CUSTOM OF THOSE TIMES- ALL ^{ate} ~~partook~~ OF HIS BODY. THIS CANNIBALISM, noted Dr. Freud, NEED NOT SHOCK US, IT CONTINUED INTO FAR LATER TIMES.

FOR
THE ESSENTIAL POINT IS ~~HOWEVER~~ THAT WE ATTRIBUTE TO THOSE PRIMEVAL PEOPLE THE SAME FEELINGS AND EMOTIONS THAT WE HAVE ^{discovered} ~~elucidated~~ IN THE PRIMITIVES OF OUR OWN TIMES, OR CHILDREN, BY PSYCHOANALYTIC RESEARCH. THAT IS TO SAY, THEY ^{resent} NOT MERELY HATED AND FEARED THEIR FATHER, BUT ALSO HONOURED HIM AS AN EXAMPLE TO FOLLOW: IN FACT EACH SON WANTED TO PLACE HIMSELF IN HIS FATHER'S POSITION. THE CANNIBALISTIC ACT THUS BECOMES COMPREHENSIBLE AS AN ATTEMPT TO ASSURE ONE'S IDENTIFICATION WITH THE FATHER BY INCORPORATING A PART OF HIM.

THE MEMORY OF THE FATHER LIVED ON DURING THIS TIME OF THE "BROTHER HORDE". A STRONG ANIMAL, WHICH PERHAPS AT FIRST WAS ALSO DREADED, WAS FOUND AS A SUBSTITUTE. THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE TOTEM ANIMAL RETAINED THE ORIGINAL ABIVALENCY OF FEELING TOWARDS THE FATHER. THE TOTEM WAS, ON THE ONE HAND, THE ^{ancestral father} AND PROTECTING SPIRIT OF THE CLAN: HE WAS TO BE REVERED AND PROTECTED. ON THE OTHER HAND, A FESTIVAL WAS INSTITUTED ON WHICH DAY THE ~~SAME~~

3/

animal was killed just as my ancestral father had been killed.

~~THE RITE WAS SUBSTITUTED OUT TO THE ANIMAL AS WAS METED OUT TO THE PRIMEVAL FATHER ON THAT DATE. THAT IS, THE ANIMAL OR FATHER SUBSTITUTE WAS KILLED AND EATEN BY ALL THE BROTHERS TOGETHER IN THE TOTEM FEAST. THIS GREAT DAY WAS IN REALITY A FEAST OF TRIUMPH TO CELEBRATE THE VICTORY OF THE UNITED SONS OVER THE FATHER.~~

11 ACCORDING TO DR. FREUD ~~THE~~ TOTEMISM MAY BE REGARDED AS THE EARLIEST APPEARANCE OF REL. IN THE HISTORY OF MANKIND. THE NEXT STEP FROM TOTEMISM IS THE HUMANISING OF THE WORSHIPPED BEING. HUMAN GODS TAKE THE PLACE PREVIOUSLY FILLED BY ANIMALS. *Even so* THE GOD IS *may* STILL ^{be} REPRESENTED BY AN ANIMAL OR HE BEARS THE COUNTENANCE OF AN ANIMAL. *This fact is borne out by drawings of religious symbols + by the use of animal masks by primitive priests.*

improve

DR. FREUD THEN GOES ON TO WRITE, " MORE THAN ONE AUTHOR HAS BEEN STRUCK BY THE CLOSE RESEMBLANCE BETWEEN THE RITE OF CHRISTIAN COMMUNION WHERE THE BELIEVER SYMBOLICALLY INCORPORATES THE BLOOD AND THE FLESH OF HIS GOD, AND THE TOTEM FEAST, WHOSE INNER MEANING IT REPRODUCES." WE CAN PAUSE TO MAKE THE ANALOGY HERE THAT CHRISTIANITY DOES BEGIN WITH THE MURDER OF THE GOD, AND DR. FREUD IS ONLY ASKING US TO BELIEVE THAT JUDAISM BEGINS IN MUCH THE SAME WAY WITH THE MURDER OF ITS OWN LIBERATOR. A STUDY OF ANCIENT RELIGIONS, AS IN THE STANDARD WORK, " THE GOLDEN BOUGH", BY FRAZER, CLEARLY SHOWS THAT MANY OF THE ANCIENT GODS WERE IDENTIFIED WITH ANIMALS WHO WERE KILLED AND EATEN AT THE FESTIVAL MEAL BY THE WORSHIPPERS. THE FOLLOWERS OF THE GOD ADONIS OR TAMMUZ CONCEIVED OF HIM IN THE FORM OF A WILD BOAR OR PIG WHICH WAS THE SACRIFICIAL ANIMAL OF THEIR COMMUNION, WHENCE THE JEWISH DICTUM NOT TO EAT THE PIG. ADONIS, LIKE JESUS, WAS A GOD WHO WAS KILLED, ONLY TO BE RESURRECTED. THE SAME IS TRUE OF THE GOD ATTIS, WHOSE BODY IN EFFIGY WAS CARRIED AROUND ON A WOODEN TREE OR CROSS DURING THE FESTIVAL OF DEATH AND RESURRECTION. ATTIS, TOO, WAS IDENTIFIED WITH THE WILD BOAR AS A TOTEM ANIMAL REPRESENTING THE GOD. THIS WAS TRUE ALSO OF THE EGYPTIAN GOD OSIRIS WHO WAS CONCEIVED AS A *dying +* RISING AND ~~DYING~~ GOD.

11 FREUD MAKES THE POINT THAT ~~THE CHRISTIANS WERE RIGHT AND THE JEWS WERE WRONG? IS BELIEVING? IN ORIGINAL SIN? SIN? ONLY?~~

THERE IS TRULY SUCH A THING AS ORIGINAL SIN. THE SIN, ACCORDING TO FREUD, IS NOT THAT ADAM ATE THE APPLE, BUT THAT PRIMEVAL MAN KILLED THE FATHER OF THE HORDE, AND ALL MANKIND CARRIES THIS KNOWLEDGE AND GUILT SUB-CONSCIOUSLY WITHIN THEM. CHRISTIANS, CONTEND FREUD, RECOGNIZED THAT THEY KILLED GOD, I.E. THE FATHER, BUT JEWS ~~STUBBORNLY~~ STUBBORNLY DENY THAT THIS IS SO. BECAUSE THE CHRISTIANS CONFESS THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE MURDER OF GOD, AND INDEED, *in one sense* FREELY MURDER THE GOD AGAIN BY EATING HIM REGULARLY, THEY ~~ARE~~ *represent* ^{in one sense} ACCORDING TO FREUD, (p. 113) A PROGRESS IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGION. THIS PROGRESS IS MEASURED IN TERMS OF THE RETURN OF THE REPRESSED. JEWS, CONTEND FREUD, HAVE PRESENTED RELIGION ON A HIGHER SPIRITUAL AND ETHICAL LEVEL, AND IN A PURER FORM OF MONOTHEISM, BUT THEY CONTINUED TO REPRESS THE *memory* WHICH ALL HUMANS HAVE, I.E. THAT WE, IN OUR PRIMEVAL PAST, KILLED THE FATHER (GOD).

FREUD EMPHASIZES THE POINT THAT MEN NEED TO ADMIT THAT THEY KILLED THE PRIMEVAL FATHER IN ORDER TO RELEASE THEIR IMBEDDED GUILT FEELINGS. IN THIS SENSE, HE FEELS THAT ST. PAUL HAD RELIGIOUS INSIGHT. ON THE OTHER HAND, FREUD MAKES A STRONG CASE FOR THE SUPERIORITY OF JUDAISM IN TERMS OF A PURE MONOTHEISM.

4

Individual

Public

I AM SURE THAT MY LISTENERS WILL WANT TO KNOW, "HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT ALL OF THESE THINGS RABBI". I BEGAN MY REMARKS BY SAYING THAT I GENERALLY ACCEPT THE TEACHINGS OF FREUD CONCERNING THE WORKINGS OF THE HUMAN MIND. I BELIEVE THAT THE WORLD IS ONLY BEGINNING TO RECOGNIZE THE ~~IMPORTANCE~~ ^{importance} OF THIS MAN'S CONTRIBUTION. WE ARE DEALING IN THIS BOOK HOWEVER, NOT WITH FREUD'S THEORY ABOUT THE INDIVIDUAL MIND, BUT ^{with} ~~ABOUT~~ HIS THEORY ABOUT THE COLLECTIVE MIND OF MANKIND. HE ATTEMPTS TO DEMONSTRATE IN THIS BOOK THAT THE ADVANCE OF MANKIND FROM PRIMITIVE TIMES IS ROUGHLY COMPARABLE TO THE ADVANCE OF A ^{single} MAN FROM HIS CHILDHOOD, AND THAT MEN, AS A WHOLE, HAVE REPRESSED ^{memories of} ~~feelings and primitive~~ ^{primitive} ~~instincts~~ WHICH ~~HE~~ ^{had}. ~~IT~~ I THINK IN THIS REGARD THAT WE MUST LISTEN VERY CLOSELY TO WHAT DR. FREUD IS TRYING TO SAY. ON THE OTHER HAND, WHEN HE COMES TO APPLYING HIS THEORY TO A SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT IN HUMAN HISTORY, I THINK HE RUNS INTO TROUBLE. HIS THEORY MAY BE APPLICABLE TO HUMAN HISTORY IN GENERAL. IT MAY BE IMPOSSIBLE TO APPLY THE THEORY TO A PARTICULAR PEOPLE OR TO A PARTICULAR MOVEMENT IN HISTORY ^{which covers out a thousand years}

FOR EXAMPLE, DR. FREUD HAS ENABLED US TO UNDERSTAND THAT ALL HUMAN BEINGS HAVE TRACES OF THE OEDIPUS COMPLEX, BUT THE NORMAL HUMAN BEING WILL DEVELOP TO THE POINT WHERE HE WILL IMITATE HIS FATHER, INSTEAD OF TRYING TO DISPLACE HIM. HE LAUDS XTY FOR REMINDING MEN THAT THEY KILLED THEIR GOD, YET WHAT HAS PAULINE XTY DONE FOR THE MINDS AND DEEDS OF MEN. ^{Except for the more modern & liberalized Xtian sects, Xty has} IT GENERALLY ~~HAS~~ TAUGHT MEN THAT IF THEY WILL ONLY ACCEPT THE MYTH OF THE GOD WHO DIED FOR THEIR SINS, THEY ARE THEREBY MIRACULOUSLY SAVED. JUDAISM, DR. FREUD COMPLAINS, HAS NOT BEEN ABLE TO RELEASE THE REPRESSED KNOWLEDGE THAT MEN KILLED THEIR GOD OR FATHER. ON THE OTHER HAND, FREUD ADMITS THAT JUDAISM IS A PURER MONOTHEISM AND HAS ENCORAGED ^{encouraged} ITS FOLLOWERS TO RISE TO GREATER SPIRITUAL HEIGHTS. IT MAY BE THAT DR. FREUD ~~has~~ ^{has} NEGLECTED ONE OF HIS OWN POINTS IN ORDER TO ESTABLISH ANOTHER MORE FAVORED POINT. IT IS ALSO PART OF HIS PRINCIPLE, THAT WHILE A NORMAL SON WILL WANT TO DISPLACE HIS FATHER, WHEN THE SON IS YOUNG, AS THE SON GROWS OLDER, HE WANTS TO BE LIKE THE FATHER, AND HE IS QUITE CONTENT WITH IMITATING HIM, RATHER THAN KILLING HIM. ^{I believe that Freud has overlooked this dev. within Judaism.}

IN THE 23rd CHAPTER OF LEVITICUS JEWS ARE TOLD IN THE NAME OF GOD, "YE SHALL BE HOLY BECAUSE I THE LORD YOUR GOD AM HOLY." OVER AND OVER AGAIN, JUDAISM INVITES THE JEW TO IMITATE GOD, TO PATTERN HIS LIFE AFTER GOD-LIKE ACTIONS. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT XTY, AS PRESENTED BY PAUL, MAKES THE WORSHIPPER DEPENDENT ON THE GOD, BUT JUDAISM STRIVES TO MAKE THE WORSHIPPER A PARTNER WITH GOD. IN THIS SENSE, ^{it has} XTY TENDS TO KEEP THE WORSHIPPER IN AN INFANTILE STATE, SO THAT THE MURDER OF THE GOD MUST BE REPEATED EVERY EASTER, IN ORDER FOR THE WORSHIPPER TO FEEL SECURE. IN JUDAISM, THE IMAGE OF GOD AS A VENGEFUL, PUNITIVE FATHER HAS BEEN REPLACED BY THAT OF A ^{should be} GOD WHO IS LOVE - GIVING AND FORGIVING. THERE IS NO NEED TO KILL THIS GOD.

FURTHER WITH ITS EMPHASIS ON CONDUCT, JUDAISM TEACHES THAT A MAN BECOMES WHAT HE DOES. WE DON'T BECOME LIKE GOD BY EATING HIS BODY AND BLOOD, AS IN THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNION, WE BECOME LIKE GOD BY ACTING LIKE GOD, BY IMITATING HIS DEEDS OF JUSTICE AND LOVE. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT FREUD IS RELUCTANT TO ADMIT THAT BIBLICAL JUDAISM CONTAINS THE SEEDS OF A MOST ADULT AND PROGRESSIVE, AND HEALTHY MINDED RELIGION.

Exemplification

made for a certain congruence in Judaism

FURTHER, THE REQUIRED READING OR READING OF AN ANCIENT PART AS RECORDED IN THE BIBLE HELPS US ^{to} ~~relieve~~ ^{relieve} THE PASSIONS OF THE ANCIENT PAST & THUS TO EXPRESS THEM. IT MAY BE THAT THE ^{revelation} ~~revelation~~ ^{tradition} ~~tradition~~ ^{causally} ~~causally~~ ^{presented} ~~presented~~ IN WRITING HAS

4

FREUD IS NOT CONTENT WITH MAKING A GENERAL THEORY ABOUT THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION. HE ACTUALLY ATTEMPTS IN THIS AUDACIOUS AND FASCINATING BOOK TO SHOW THAT THE STORY OF MOSES AS IT IS TOLD IN THE BIBLE SUPPORTS HIS THEORY. HE REMINDS US OF THE OUTLINE OF THE OEDIPUS SITUATION IN REAL LIFE, WHERE THE SON ACTUALLY HOPES IN HIS SUBCONSCIOUS TO DISPLACE THE FATHER. THEN, FREUD REFERS TO THE STANDARD STORIES ABOUT THE LIFE OF GREAT MEN, AND ATTEMPTS TO SHOW THAT ALL OF THEM CONTAIN ELEMENTS OF THE OEDIPUS STORY. THE ELEMENTS ARE THESE: p. 7

1. THE HERO IN THE MYTH OR STORY IS THE SON OF PARENTS OF HIGH STATUS USUALLY THE SON OF A KING.
2. HIS BIRTH IS IMPEDED BY DIFFICULTIES. DURING THE ~~CHILD'S~~ PREGNANCY, ~~THE~~ FATHER IS WARNED BY AN ORACLE OR DREAM THAT THE BIRTH OF THE CHILD WILL BE A DANGER TO HIM.
3. IN CONSEQUENCE THE FATHER GIVES ORDERS FOR THE NEW-BORN BABE TO BE KILLED OR EXPOSED TO DANGER.
4. THE CHILD IS THEN SAVED BY ANIMALS OR BY POOR PEOPLE.
5. WHEN FULL GROWN HE REDISCOVERS HIS NOBLE PARENTS AND WREAKS VENGEANCE ON HIS FATHER, AND RECOGNIZED BY HIS PEOPLE, ATTAINS FAME.

FREUD POINTS OUT THAT THE ELEMENTS OF THE STANDARD STORY FIT SUCH ANCIENT HEROES AS SARGON OF AKKAD, CYRUS, ROMULUS, OEDIPUS, PARIS, HERACLES, GILGAMESH, AND MOSES.

HE CONCLUDES THAT ALL OF THESE STORIES SAY ONE THING, A HERO IS A MAN WHO STANDS UP MANFULLY AGAINST HIS FATHER AND IN THE END VICTORIOUSLY OVERCOMES HIM.

~~THE~~ HOW NOW DOES FREUD APPLY THE PSYCHOANALYTIC ELEMENTS OF THIS STORY TO MOSES? THE BIBLE TELLS US THAT THERE WERE DANGERS CONFRONTING MOSES AT HIS BIRTH BECAUSE OF AN ORDER BY PHAROH THAT ALL THE MALE CHILDREN OF THE HEBREWS BE PUT TO DEATH. IN THE BIBLE, PHAROH IS CLEARLY NOT THE FATHER OF MOSES. THE BIBLICAL STORY, HOWEVER, DOES SAY THAT MOSES WAS RAISED BY THE EGYPTIAN PRINCESS. FREUD SUGGESTS THAT MOSES WAS REALLY THE SON OF THE EGYPTIAN PRINCESS, AND THAT PHAROH FEARED THAT HIS GRANDSON WAS A DANGER TO HIM. ACCORDINGLY HE ORDERED THE CHILD KILLED. MOSES WAS SAVED, BEING SUCKLED BY A WOMAN OF RELATIVELY HUMBLE ORIGIN, A HEBREW WOMAN, AND WHEN HE GREW UP, HE ATTACKED PHAROH STRAIGHT ON. IN BRIEF, FREUD SUGGESTS THAT THE BIBLICAL STORY HAS REVERSED THE REAL SITUATION. MOSES WAS NOT A HEBREW BY BIRTH BUT AN EGYPTIAN WHO IN REVOLTING AGAINST HIS FATHER OR GRANDFATHER SOUGHT TO THROW IN HIS LOT WITH A PEOPLE OF HUMBLE ORIGIN.

FREUD CALLS THIS MYTH WHEREBY AN INFANT IS EXPOSED TO DANGER AND IS REARED BY A STRANGE FAMILY, THE EXPOSURE MYTH. HE BELIEVES IT TO BE THE FIRST STEP IN HIS PROOF THAT MOSES WAS NOT A JEW. WE WILL SEE TWO WEEKS FROM TONIGHT WHY FREUD THOUGHT IT IMPORTANT TO ESTABLISH THE POINT THAT MOSES WAS NOT A JEW.

9/ WE MUST NOT FORGET, HOWEVER, THAT FREUD WHO WAS A VIENNESE, KNEW JUDAISM MOSTLY AS ORTHODOXY. HE DID NOT LIVE IN A TIME WHEN REFORM JUDAISM HAD PEELED OFF THE REPETITIOUS RITUALS OF ORTHODOXY AND HAD HELD UP THE TEACHING OF THE PROPHETS IN THEIR ORIGINAL BRILLIANCE. IN CONDEMNING JUDAISM SO COMPLETELY, FREUD WHO LIKED JEWS, MAY HIMSELF HAVE BEEN ACTING OUT THE OEDIPUS MYTH, TAKING A FEW HEALTHY WHACKS AT HIS OWN ^{maternal} FATHER AND GRANDFATHER. ON p. 53 OF HIS BOOK MOSES AND MONOTHEISM, FREUD STATES, "THE DISTORTION OF A TEXT IS NOT UNLIKE MURDER". THE MAN IS OBVIOUSLY BRILLIANT, BUT IT IS FAIR TO SAY THAT IN HIS TREATMENT OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT, HE USES MORE THAN A LITTLE LICENSE. HE IS CLEARLY GUILTY OF A DISTORTION THAT BORDERS ON MURDER. WE ARE SECURE ENOUGH IN OUR UNDERSTANDING OF JUDAISM TO TAKE FREUD'S TREATMENT IN GOOD ~~Humor~~ ^{Humor}. THE MAN HAS MANY INSIGHTS WHICH CAN TEACH US MUCH CONCERNING THE GENERAL NATURE OF RELIGION. WE CAN PROFIT FROM THE READING OF HIS ^{exciting} BOOK. WE WONDER, HOWEVER, WHY HE WAS SO CONCERNED ABOUT ~~TEARING~~ HIS OWN RELIGION TO SHREDS. SURE, WE ALL HATE OUR FATHERS, BUT WE CAN STILL TRY TO IMITATE WHAT WAS GOOD ABOUT THEM.

Diffines - Jew. rel. didn't worship SUN

Customs - Circumcising (Breed acknowledge that Phoenicians + Syrians approached along Egypt-Custom)

HS circumcising in phoenician tribes
Australia
New Guinea

Bible - Moses not circumcised (Breed - cover up). Moses' wife performed circumcise. She - a Semite (midianite) - HS -

many laws from midianite - nomadic Bible - Moses spent a period in midian a shepherd (Canaan). Timey Moses - in 1k history period -

1375 - but Rameses - built when? (century earlier than accepted date)

Why adopt Hebrews? no other accept. why would they accept? certain parallels = 476

Pig - ? Herodotus - Eg. hated swine -

set - in sun's hog - wounded Horus

but also revere cows (Isis) - do revere cows. further traces, "Golden Bough". Horus clearly identified w/ OSIRIS + cult of dead attributes

Prayer - p 475 - Sage
Pis became embodied
set = deity + enemy of OSIRIS
not Horus
Pis worship identified as OSIRIS
annual sacrifice of pig or OSIRIS + it derived as enemy because OSIRIS

Speech impediment - ancient Greek Hebrew.

"Was a fresh confirmation of the thesis" - p. 38

(HS - it never his brother - also in Egypt -)

Phrygia - killed by

Pis - tied to ATTIS + Adonis (Worshippers ATTIS abstained from eating the flesh of swine) ... indicates that the pig was regarded as an embodiment of ATTIS. legend ATTIS killed by Boar similar

annual that kill's a God - or God or chief (HS - interrelation of Egyptian) Pis = sacred animal among Syrians - neither sacred nor eaten Adonis = Pis = Demeter... annual feast Egyptian

Problems - P. 17 ff.

Possibility - Ikhnaton P. 22 ff.

? = in 17th yr could the ritual have taken place?

Relies on Arthur Weigall, "The Life & Times of Akhnaton", 1923

a) one God only -

b) all magic →

c) no cult of dead - Burettid only
say Osiris no longer heard of - Dawning of Conscience

④ HB - and ethics - i.e. the nature of the God

Conclusion - more committed rel. of

Ikhnaton -

ATON (ATUM) = Adonai = Adoni

HB - Hyksos - could he have gotten it from Hyksos or Hebrews?

never mentions - def. view

that Israf = Hyksos influence

Moses - 13-14 cent BCE - His nationality impt - why

a) name is Egyptian - mose = child - abridgement
of full name Mes - Amen-mose; Ptah-mose

[HB - So is Aaron + Pharaoh + other
priest]

Freud - chastity Breasted, "The Dawn of
Conscience" for passing over Thut-mose and
Ra-mose (Ramess) - p. 5

b) Rank - average myth - p. 7 = hero

Son of King - his birth = danger to King;
father orders new born babe to be killed;
he is saved; grows + takes vengeance
on his father - (P. 7-8)

[HB - kernel of Oedipus myth]

c) Sargon of Akkad (AKkad p. 5)

brought up by the drainer of water
as his own son - (B) - drainer of water
from verb - (?) cf. p. 9 -

Cyrus, Romulus, Oedipus, Paris, Hercules.

→ A Hero = man who stands up manfully
against his father + in the end
overcomes him.

D) Cf. myth - p. 10 - ① royal + humble family

more ~~reverse~~ procedure -

1st family (royal) = center

2nd " (h. Eg) = royal have ~~some~~

Edward Meyer says orig. myth diff.

(p. 11) - who = he or chaf 15?

Freud → i.e. - more must be born into Royal

family 1st + raised by humble one

If not so, how can he be a hero?

i.e. - stand up to father (or grandfather)

p. 12.

[H.B. - but here in Bible there are 2
contrary civilizations - whole point.
can't put his story into context of other

e) In all cases of the myth, the 2nd family
which adopt the hero is his real
family - p. 12. - quote

H.B. - check this in myth.

0.3 Midianites - Edward Meyer
(or when he wrote) says basic formulation
rel. at Mesbat-Gad, ^{over} in
Sinai peninsula - adopted Sahel
(Moses - prophet of $\gamma\gamma\gamma'$, a mt. ^{volcano} but
no volcano in Egypt.)
Kuent - $\gamma\gamma\gamma'$ = in "an uneasy, bloodthirsty
demer" p. 39

III) More with a violent end -

Ernst Sellin (1922) ^{see} found in Horeb
found evidence [nobody else acknowledges]
^{Sellin} sees one of Mesbat. Moses would be
reunited & lead back into Egypt.
[HB - False!]

conclude - more involved & his rel. abandoned
- $\gamma\gamma\gamma'$ rel.

IV) Levites - Egyptian retention of Moses - are heavier with known tradition. [HB - but there is more in O.T. & from Levites]

V Source - J + E -

2171

and Elohim - not Aton (Adonai)

HB - Elohim = Semitic (Eulil = fic) who is
Mesopotamian God + it is 2171 mat i pronounced
Adonai (Aton). Diff. Gods - Hugo Gressmann -

- o -

Conclusion
Pfund - "The detection of a text is not unlike
a murder" p. 52 found murdering his people ->
his father

- o -

Adonai (= ^{man}razzuz) - Bab. + Syria. [not Egyptian -
but Semitic] Eg Aton = Aton.

HB - was (Akhnaton - God) - an other Pharaoh -
more - not.