

The Silberstein & Fluss Correspondence: Early Letters

© Eric Miller, March, 2012

I have destroyed all my notes and letters accumulated for 14 years, all scientific abstracts and manuscripts of my work; only some family letters have been spared. All my old friendships and relations presented themselves again and silently took the deadly blow. . . I cannot mature and cannot die, worrying about who will lay their hands on my old papers. The biographers should work it out somehow, we don't want to make it too easy for them. S. Freud letter

As with virtually every aspect of Freud's life, when we turn to examine the details of Freud's early correspondence we encounter contradictions, misquoted text, and conflicting chronologies. These cannot be accidental occurrences, but are strictly regulated in conformance to a plan — a plan requiring the collaboration of "unknown hands" whose emendations and distortions betray a knowledge of Freud's nature and crimes.

Freud's early letters, especially those to Silberstein (and to a lesser extent to Fluss) are especially important to the thesis presented in this work as they encompass the period of time when it is claimed Freud murdered his half-brother John. This being the case, it is imperative that every effort be made to clearly penetrate into Freud's early background — especially that time immediately preceding and succeeding the hypothesized murder of John Freud.

The murder of John would almost assuredly have occurred sometime between 1873 and 1875. Therefore, given Freud's inveterate habit of letter writing, his compulsion to express himself and his garrulous nature, it is highly unlikely that, if he did indeed murdered his brother John, in the indicated period, evidence of the event could not be totally hidden from view. A close examination of Freud's early letters should, then, provide substantive evidence of the dark event in the form of direct statements, concealed or censored passages, distortions of chronology, and veiled allusions to the crime. And, we should not only find these elements in Freud's early letters, but we can also anticipate finding further indications that Freud was homicidal even before the murder of John. The Silberstein correspondence, in particular, then, affords a unique opportunity to affirm or negate the thesis presented in my work: that Freud was a homicidal maniac and

that he murdered his half-brother,
John Freud sometime between the age of 17 and 19.

Background To The Silberstein Correspondence:

Eduard Silberstein (1856 —1925) was probably Freud's closest boyhood friend. Evidence indicates that they had become friends at least as early as 1870. According to the translator of the correspondence, Eduard attended the same high school as Freud, Leopoldstadter Real — und Oergymnasium, and matriculated in 1874, one year after Freud. Silberstein's father owned a business in Brailia, Romania and Eduard lived in Vienna in order to attend school there. Most of the early letters, then, were written in the summers when Eduard returned home to Bralia. Concerning his family little is known but they appeared to be close family friends. In a letter of 1883 Freud referred to Eduard's father as "half mad."

Freud's first letters and notes to Silberstein begin in 1871. A few brief notes were written in the non-summer months on the occasion of Freud being sick and requesting Silberstein to visit, or other such matters. Otherwise the letters were written during the summer months of their separation. In a letter allegedly written immediately after his return from England (i.e., 1875), Freud mention "John whom you know already" — indicating, perhaps, that he had met him in 1870 when John was supposed to have visited in Vienna. Despite the fact that Sigmund and Eduard were writing to each other in Spanish as early as we know (i.e., 1871) Freud informed Silberstein in a post card allegedly from England that John could read and write some Spanish. Other than these references there are no other known references to John in any of the extant correspondence.

Eduard, upon graduation, enrolled in the law curriculum and studied for a year in Leipzig before returning to Vienna in the winter of 1875. He graduated with a degree in law in 1879. From their earliest years they shared an interest in politics, languages, and literature. They wrote to each other frequently in Spanish with occasional smattering (phrases or single words) of other languages such as Latin and Greek. Together they formed a secret society, of which they were the only members. The secret organization was called the Academia Castellana (Castilian Academy) which was originally referred to as the SSS. Freud's own letters to Silberstein reflect his intense, if not passionate, attachment to his friend; he often speaks of his "longing" for him and asserts that Silberstein is "wedded" to him

through their common interests.

The translator of Freud's letters in keeping with the conventional barrage of propaganda observes: "both friends were accomplished linguists." Yet he himself repudiates an a literal translation of Freud's letters as such an approach would reduce, Freud letters to that of a "stammerer." This is due we are told to Freud's ungrammatical use of the Spanish language, to the degree it is often impossible to even know what he means. Talking out of both sides of his mouth, Boehlich says that to translate Freud directly would reveal him as a stammerer, because, he stated, "Freud never wrote anything like correct Spanish." The inability to write correct Spanish — to the extent great liberties had to be taken in construing Freud's meaning would hardly qualify him as an accomplished linguist. The issue is not a slight or insignificant one when we must scrutinize and interpret various of Freud's specific uses of language bearing upon our thesis. In any case, highly questionable translations of Freud's letters are often freely and even perhaps necessarily used, precisely because he was not an accomplished linguist.

In any case, Freud and Silberstein gave each other secret names, developed journals and a correspondence, and shared their infatuations with each other and created a shared "mythology" of the A.C. (Castillian Academy) in which Freud invariably referred to himself as the "dog of Seville." Though very close in their early years, they drifted apart as time when on. By 1879 communications dropped off radically and only intermittent messages exchanged. In one letter of 1876, Silberstein, it can be inferred, had noticed a great change that had come over Freud. It is not improbable that this change, which Freud himself refers to as a "complete transformation of mood" accounted for the distance coming between the two close childhood friends.

Silberstein's First Wife Is Killed At Freud's Home/Office at the House of Atonement

Strangely, as with a great many of those whom Freud greatly loved and greatly hated, tragedy came into their lives through the auspices or direct hand of Freud. On May 4th, 1891 Silberstein's first wife apparently committed suicide at Freud's house while she was in therapy with him. Suffering from "melancholia," she went to Vienna to receive treatment from Freud. The editor of the Silberstein correspondence tells it this way. "When she arrived she told her maid to wait

downstairs, and instead of going to the consulting rooms, threw herself to her death from the third floor [American fourth floor] without having seen Freud."

Boehlich presents the tragic event as though the woman had just arrived, and *before seeing Freud*, killed herself. According to Silberstein's granddaughter, however, this was not the case. In a brief essay included in the Harvard edition, "Biographical Notes On Dr. Eduard Silberstein," Silberstein's granddaughter, Rosita B. Vieyra, specifically states that Freud had "unsuccessfully treated" Silberstein's wife, whose name, interestingly, was Pauline — the same name as Freud's half-sister in England:

He [Silberstein] fell deeply in love with Paula (or Pauline) Theiler, a young girl from Jassy. Sadly, their marriage was a short one. She soon became mentally ill, was treated unsuccessfully by his friend Sigmund Freud, and threw herself from a window in Freud's apartment building. This tragedy was corroborated by Anna Freud, who invited me to visit her in 1982, a few months before her death.

Pauline died May 14, 1891, Fleischl's death was admittedly "hastened" by Freud in 1891 and six months previous to the death of Pauline Freud had killed Mathilde with "inappropriate" injections of a sexual hypnotic, as an experimental cure for Graves's disease — a pet theory of his at the time. During this period (i.e., 1890 - 1891) Freud was advertising his mistaken, if not insane, conviction that neurosis was the result of sexual secretions and that hysteria, ironically, was not curable by therapy (p.282).

In view of all this we may understand Boehlich's wanting Freud not to have even seen Pauline before she jumped or was thrown out the window. The question then remains, for how long did Freud treat her before she allegedly committed suicide? And of further interest is the question, why has no other biographer of Freud's ever mentioned this highly pertinent point — why was it suppressed?

Silberstein: A German Nationalist

During World War I, Silberstein worked for the enemy occupying German forces and was tried by his countrymen for "treason," but was "completely exonerated," according to his granddaughter. The Silberstein correspondence

nonetheless clearly documents that Silberstein was an adherent of the German national socialist movement, even in his early school days, and frequently contributed to the social democrats — Freud refers to Silberstein contributing to their "secret war chest." In one letter, Freud even warns Silberstein not to mention the German *reich* lest others be offended. Indeed, in one letter (Jan. 30, 1875) Freud wrote: "If that should be followed by one or two semesters spent together in the capital of the New German Reich — which, it would seem, need not be considered a complete impossibility — then we should have achieved the ideal, idyllic state of the A.E. we envisaged two years before our Styrian tour."

In any case, a brother of Silberstein's committed suicide — at what age we do not know — and it was later feared by Silberstein's second wife that he would do the same: "There was a time when my grandmother Anna feared that he would follow his brother's example." Eduard died in Braila in 1925. Silberstein's granddaughter relates that he was a kindly and gentle man, contributed to the welfare of his people, without sharing in their religious beliefs, and was a socialist in that he was for "workers' rights and the common man." From this accounting of him we can easier accept his taking a different path from his childhood friend Sigmund Freud.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the Editor of this collection of letters stated that for the transcription he "relied mainly on photographs." Whether these were photographs of the original letters is uncertain.

Note On The Fluss Letters

Emil Fluss, the other childhood friend with whom Freud corresponded was a family and personal friend from earliest years. The Fluss's and Freud's were apparently friends from the days when the Freud's resided in Freiberg. Emil's father was the prosperous owner of a weaving mill and had some five children, three brothers and two sisters.

The letters were offered for sale in the 1930's, purchased by Dorothy Burlingham in Vienna and given to her friend, Anna Freud. Marie Bonaparte took them to Paris upon the Nazi entrance into Vienna and then later took them to London. They were found in the possessions of Ernest Jones when he died.

Ernest Jones quotes from one of the letters in his authorized biography on Freud and asserted it was the only surviving letter from Freud's early years. He either was unaware of the other letters or chose to suppress knowledge of their existence. To make publication of the 100 year old letters, they were X-rayed and enlarged which "incontestably" established the text. Despite this claim, as we shall see, there are internal inconsistencies and chronological displacements.

Credibility of the Translators

It is most curious that the translators of Freud's early letters are either unprofessionally sloppy or intentionally devious in their presentation of materials particularly bearing upon Freud's early years. For some reason it is almost invariably insisted on that Freud, in conformance with his own official statement, first returned to his place of birth at the age of 16. Ernest Freud, for example, in his presentation of "Some Early Unpublished Letters of Freud," remarks:

and it was not until 16 that he returned, for the first time, to his home-town, in the company of two friends, to spend his holidays there as a guest of the Fluss family.

One of the letters in this E. Freud's article, however, is dated February 7, 1873. In this letter Freud specifically states that he first visited Freiberg "two years ago," — when Freud would have been 14, or 15 at the most. Freud Biographers such as Jones, Clark, and virtually every Freudian scholar who comments on Freud's trip to Freiberg "for the first time" reports the event to have at the age of 16. Again, in conformance with Freud's own assertions ("I first returned to the place of my birth at the age of 16). Though the issue may at first seem trifling, when the correct chronology of Freud's "first visit" to Freiberg is sorted out a deeper and more ominous significance emerges — as we shall discuss.

Walter Boehlich, in his Introduction to *The Letter of Sigmund Freud to Eduard Silberstein 1871-1881* makes mention of the fact of a "shared journey [between Freud and Silberstein] from Roznau to Freiberg in the summer of 1871." Of course, Freud would have been 14 at the time, and Silberstein would have been 13. One of the reasons this is an issue of worthwhile consideration is the fact that the scholars have isolated Freud's first "calf love" as occurring during this time period — and the story of this calf love provides the substance of a great deal of

commentary concerning the most important biographic events in Freud's life, bearing upon his creation of the theory of psychoanalysis. The "calf love" was Gisela Fluss, sister of his other great friend, Emil. Gisela was only 11 years old ("then not yet twelve years old") when Freud first developed his first love. The romance became full blown on Freud's next summer, in 1872, when Gisela had just turned 13.

All this is important for, as we shall see, the story of Freud's romance turns up again and again in discussions of Freud's early years in the context of his great sufferings and the theme of rape. In a letter allegedly written only a couple weeks after his supposed return from his trip to England the story of Gisela assume major and alarming importance as the letter is full of suicidal, tormented, utterances, supposedly commemorating the marriage of Gisela — a girl with whom Freud declares he never even engaged in a conversation! I shall shortly return to this issue.

The Sins of Stanescu

H. Stanescu, who was responsible for "smuggling" the Silberstein correspondence out of Rumania and selling it to the Freud estate (\$100,000 and later elected to the Board of Directors of the Freud Archives) states in his article "Young Freud's Letters to his Rumanian Friend, Silberstein" that there was "only" one letter "preserved in an un-authentic form, probably a copy forwarded to the family." The letter which he identifies as "un-authentic" is a letter from Freud to a group of Rumanian Jews dated April 28, 1929. This letter was supposedly written in commemoration of a "mourning ceremony" which took place almost four years after his death! It is difficult to know if this letter is a forgery, with the purpose of establishing Freud's continuing good relations with Silberstein after the death of his wife, or not. Since there are presumably two letters on nearly the same theme, one of April 28, 1929 and another of April 22, 1928 sufficient confusion exists to warrant a suspicion of the matter.

Though Silberstein asserts there was only one un-authentic letter, the Harvard edition identifies other letters as un-authentic. The letters identified as "unreliable" and by an "unknown hand" by the Harvard edition are as follows:

The letters dated July 10, July 11, 16, 1873, together with the

letter dated April 22, 1928, exist only in unreliable copies by an unknown hand.

So, Stanesco either identifies another letter as un-authentic (April 28, 1929) or he or the Harvard edition is in error. Stanesco, then, identifies as authentic three letters that are declared not to be so in the Harvard edition (i.e., July 10, July 11, July 16 — all in the year 1873!) One begins to wonder who decided what letters and which were not. What was the criterion employed for the determination and what were the qualifications of the person or persons for arriving at these conclusions.

We must add to this problem, the problem of the corruption by Stanesco himself of at least one letter, and if we could examine the originals probably more would be found. Freud's letter of March 27, 1875 was presented by Stanesco as follows:

The essence is a revolutionary asperity full of bitter criticism. Hebbel feels best when somebody is ruined by the results of passion; all the heroes of his plays are defiant, fiercely fighting each other and the prevailing passion is always invested with grandeur. Very beautiful is his Judith, an eternal problem, the strong woman who defies the overwhelming man and avenges the inferiority imparted her by her sex. 'Ring des Cyges' is again a sexual problem at time very lovely. The author prefers women, the poetic, warm-blooded animals who, besides the obstinacy which they share with the male, are also apt to harbor glowing sentiments.

The translator of the Harvard Edition renders the same text as follows (in italic the omitted portions):

His is a harsh and revolutionary nature, full of bitter criticism. There is little trace of the kind of plot in which, although the hero who has fought for a good cause may be basted, his cause is triumphant, or the writer can at least promise it victory. *When it comes to murder, he is a veritable Shakespeare — he is most keen on ruination paved by passion, all his heroes are stubborn and given to cracking open each other's skulls, and he invariably*

paints passions so large that it is worth the writer's trouble to examine them and perhaps, if I understand Hebbel rightly, to excuse them. I particularly like his Judith, which poses a sexual problem; an excessively strong woman stands up to an excessively powerful man and revenges herself upon him for the inferiority her sex has imposed on her

In addition to the missing italicized words in Stanesco's presentation, (*sans editorial indications of the excision*) after the ellipsis at the bottom of the quote and the pickup beginning with "Ring des Cyges" another 150 words and more intervene! One wonders if the same letter was being presented. No doubt it is just coincidental that the omitted italicized portion deals with the subject of murder. Also, that Freud assumed the author thought such activities were excusable — an unwarranted conclusion on Freud's part. Was the passage too revealing about Freud's own thoughts, rather than the authors, and so was excised without the appropriate indications befitting an honest translator?

Another corruption of Stanesco's presentation, if not translation, occurs in reference to Freud's letter of April 15, 1876:

Even later on, Freud still remains shy, locked in his "Hamlet-hood," as can be understood from his letter dated the 15th of April, 1876, written from Trieste, in which he states that he is only able to appreciate from afar the beauty of Italian women. There is a characteristic attempt to react to these facts ironically: "Physiologically, I only know they like walking," and, as to anatomical investigations — "it is unfortunately forbidden to dissect humans."

Actually in the referenced letter the text reads, according to the Harvard Edition:

So much for the anatomical features. Physiologically, all that I know about them is that they like to go for walks. They speak the language, which sounds exceedingly ugly in the mouths of men, so prettily that their a's and o's, clearly and openly enunciated ring out over and over again.

The mention of dissection on humans occurs, after many intervening sentences and in the next paragraph, and it relates to *children, live children*.

Few small children appear on the streets. Those I have seen look very precocious, and already temper their beauty with face powder. Since it is not allowed ["unfortunately forbidden"] to dissect human beings, I really have nothing to do with them.

What the Harvard edition presents as "not allowed" is given by Stanesco as "unfortunately forbidden." Was Freud's desire to "dissect" the children, and it being "unfortunately forbidden" he stays away from them?! He is **not** attempting to react to Italian women in an ironic way with this statement, nor is he discussing the subject of dissections, *in abstracto*.

In Stanesco's accounting of the letters he states that there were some longish letters written in 1872, nine letters of 1874 and twenty of the year 1875" — skipping entirely mention of the year of 1873 — which, whether coincidence or not, is certainly interesting from the point of view of our thesis.

Despite this omission of the critical year of 1873, in Stanesco's accounting of the correspondence, nonetheless, he immediately next quotes from a letter of July 11, 1873 — one of those identified as the Harvard Edition editor as being from an "unknown hand," but which Stanesco claimed was authentic.

Further complicating matters, the text of the letter which Stanesco identifies as of July 11, 1873 is actually found in a letter of July 17, 1873, which appears to be a continuation of the letter of July 16, 1873. All this, of course, disposes any sincere investigator to the conclusion that what is required is the services of a handwriting forgery expert.

A last comment on Stanesco's presentation of materials and his translations English rendition. As compared to the Harvard Edition the same translated letters by Stanesco are hardly recognizable. I think it can be fairly stated that the Harvard edition seems a "watered down" version in most every respect.

In any case, I count, in the Harvard Edition twenty-seven letters given the date the year 1875, rather than twenty; and twenty four that are demarcated as separate

letters sent (some letters are included or biggy-backed with others, i., e., the letter of January 1, included with letter dated December 31, 1874). There are 12 letters for 1874 as opposed to Stanesco's claim of 9. He does not mention any of the other years of letters relative to an accounting. As it was Stanesco who was responsible for "smuggling" the letters out of Romania one would presume he would have known how many letters he had, after all he bartered for their sale. Perhaps there is another explanation which is not apparent.

Interestingly there is a 10 month absence of letters between the years 1872 and 1873 and an 8 month absence of letters from 1873 and 1874, but a continuous flow of letter from 1874 to 1875 and lastly, there is a 6 month absence of letters from 1875 to 1876 - with a rapidly diminishing exchange of letters thereafter.

As to the Harvard Edition translation, to assure oneself that we have a proper translation would require scrutinizing the entire text. The Editor comments that the letters had to be virtually "reconstructed."

The passages in languages other than German [and whole letters are written in Spanish], for understandable reasons. Nor have they been translated literally; in other words, there has been no attempt to replace Freud's clumsy Spanish with comparable clumsy translation. Instead, I have tried to capture Freud's style as closely as possible. . . The alternative, easier approach would have reduced Freud to a stammerer and at the same time shifted the burden of interpretation onto the reader, who, when the going became hard, would not even have had the opportunity of deducing from the "false" premise to the "correct."

So much for the value of the Harvard Edition for scholars! But, before turning to the text of some of these early Freud letters for indications of his state of mind, one other matter ought to be particularly mentioned, the letter of July 11, 1873.

A Cat Out Of A Bag

In 1980, much to the chagrin of the then Director of the Freud Archives, Dr. Eissler, it was learned that a "Freud sleuth," Peter Swales, was "mistakenly" sent

copies of 2/3rds of the Silberstein correspondence from the Library of Congress. For some unknown reason, 1/3 of the collection of the correspondence was put on the "restricted" list — meaning no one was to see these letters. Why this would be so is an enigma by itself, as Freud had no patient identities to protect — the automatic reason given for the blockading of Freud's letters. By some error, though *all* of the letters were supposed to have been restricted (according to Eissler), some of them got out. Swales met with Dr. Eissler to discuss the matter. Eissler wanted all the letters back, but Swales would not capitulate to Dr. Eissler's demands. Eventually Swales was give a \$7,000 grant to "complete" his research, and somehow or other, the subject of the Silberstein letters — for which every Freud scholar was hankering — evaporated. Swales, does not disclose the nature of his agreement with Dr. Eissler, or whether he was required to promise not to reveal the letters.

Swales was a controversial character during this period. In an interview with a journalist he supposedly declared his knowledge of Freud was "enormous" and only he truly understood Freud — whom he regarded as highly devious and quite unlike his official portrait. Surely Swales could have made a great deal of "scholarly hay" with the letters which he had in his possession - had he chose to release their contents. But, to my knowledge, he never wrote about or discussed the Silberstein letters with anyone. When, some years ago, I came upon a reference in one of Swales essays on Freud derived from a letter of July 11, 1873, I became especially interested in what the letter contained. Swales had referenced a remark of his concerning Freud's mythic heroes and implied that Freud had mentioned Romulus and Remus in that letter — indicating to Swales that the twin theme was psychologically important to Freud relative to the subject of murder. Indeed, as Swales made the same point more than once in his writings ("Freud, Minna Bernays, And The Conquest of Rome," "Freud, Fratricide,& Fliess"), the inference can reasonably be drawn that Swales was using the letter of July 11, 1873 as support for his thesis that Freud was mythically identifying with the murder twins of Roman mythology.

Almost from childhood to death, Freud sought to fashion his life to the pattern of the heroes of myth, legend, history and literature. Those quixotic and grandiose realms constituted for Freud the supreme reality — and the deed of murder, like that of incest, is *permitted* to those heroes.

In the spirit of myth, then, notwithstanding the supposed father-identification, it is tempting to regard Freud and Fliess as Romulus and Remus — a myth well appreciated by Freud.

And the footnote reference Swales appends to this last sentence is:

Jones 11, 441, 451: SEXX111, 11-13; cf. Letter of Freud to Eduard Silberstein of July 11, 1873 in the Sigmund Freud Archives, Library of Congress — 'Unrestricted' till 1980; 'Restricted' since 1980

Now we are faced with two rather strange situations. In 1983 I made a check with the Library of Congress concerning this letter of July 11, 1873. I was then told that letter was not available to be seen as it was "restricted." Another check made in the latter part of 1990 provided the information that the letter of July 11, 1873 *was not part of the collection* of letters to Silberstein — and, furthermore, that according to the Library of Congress's records, *never had been*. Nonetheless, I was informed that another researcher had, in 1989, also made an enquiry about the same letter and a note in the file indicated that there was a reference to the letter in an Israeli publication. Now, with publication of the Harvard Edition of the Silberstein correspondence there is such a letter — but it does contain a reference to Romulus or Remus. There is however a note at the end of the letter stating that the "remainder of the letter is missing." Curiously, in this letter of July 11, 1873 (from an "unknown hand") there is mention of Freud's trip to England:

Regarding my English visit, I repeat my request that you tell no one about it.

The letter ends with the statement, "I hope the allegory is clear." The editor's bracketed statement [Remainder missing] is added to the end of the letter.

So, there was more to the letter. And, I assume, that "more" would have included a reference to Romulus and Remus, the twin gods or ancient Rome, where the mightier murdered the weaker.

Despite the tenuous and sometimes frail basis of Swales theories, and despite his

rather tortured attempts to paint Freud in a light which proves only he understands him, has ever understood him, he is generally credited by the Freudians as being careful in his "scholarship." And, whatever else may or may not be said about him, he has contributed to unearthing and publicizing additional examples of Freud's fraudulent case histories — regardless whether he continues in the pay of the Freudian organizations or not.

Unfortunately, however, though Swales, more than once, has chastised the Freudian elite with censorship of Freud's writings, he himself has participated in the "veil of secrecy" hiding the real Freud from public view. When inquiry was made of him concerning the Silberstein correspondence, he was stonily uncooperative and *refused to share any of the Silberstein materials*. Swales could certainly advance the cause of "open enquiry" by making public his knowledge about the Romulus and Remus quotation and other facts about the correspondence to which he had privileged, albeit "mistaken" access.

Textual & Chronological Inconsistencies

When we examine Freud's early letters relative to their chronology, in order to deduce when it was that Freud really went to England, we are confronted with a number of problems and issues. There are, it seems, a number of issues which cast doubt on the dating of at least some of the letters, as well as their authenticity as previously discussed (the number of "unknown hands" and unreliable text). When various documentary evidence is correlated these discrepancies, which are not otherwise apparent, become visible — and when examined in the light of the murder thesis become especially interesting.

For example, in two sources of early letters from Freud, the Fluss correspondence and the Silberstein correspondence, it is indicated that Freud had "two courses" in philosophy. This fact, or alleged fact, is stated in the letters themselves. According to the official university accounting of the classes taken by Freud, however, there was only one year in which he had two courses in philosophy, the summer of 1875. However, mention of having two courses in philosophy is contained in letters dated in November 8, 1874.

I should be sorry, for instance, if you, the lawyer, were to neglect

philosophy altogether, while I, the godless medical man and empiricist, am attending two courses in philosophy. One of the courses - listen and marvel! deals with the existence of God, and Prof. Bretano, whose gives the lectures is a splendid man. . .

Indeed, Freud's list of classes for the summer of 1875 is published in the Harvard Edition of the Silberstein correspondence. On Freud's 18th birthday, he wrote:

you will say I incited you to attend his lectures. But I could after all, judge the man only by what he had said and not by what he was going to say. Last year I hear him utter many a brave word and many a bright thought. This year, I definitely feel that we were wrong to let him expound his favorite subject. . .you ask me why I had spoken so highly of Professor Bruhl. . For instance he no longer acknowledges D. Strauss of whom twelve months ago he said that he was 'a thousand time wiser than I.' Of Darwinism, which last year he supported in several of his lectures. . .

The date of this letter is March 6, 1874. "Last year" or "twelve months ago" Freud was still in high school and not at the University — he did not graduate until July of 1873. The letter is misdated.

Also, the Post Script to this March 6th letter states that he was going to the opera and that *Die Rauber* was at the Burg theater. He further mentioned that Rossi was also playing at the *Theater an der Wien*.

P.S. In intend to go the theater on Sunday. We have the choice between the Magic Flute at the Opera, *Die Rauber* at the Burg Theater, or Rossi at the *Theater an der Wien* [Municipal Theater of Vienna]. If you go to see *Die Rauber* you will find a companion in Silberstein. I shall probably go to the Magic Flute.

This event then, must have occurred on March 6, 1875, since in the same letter, as discussed above, Freud was attending university classes "twelve months ago."

But this event supposedly occurred in the summer of 1873, when Freud reported on August 2 that he had already seen two plays in the two previous weeks.

For the rest, I have little cause for jubilation or for complaint either. I am not going to the Exhibition, but in a short two weeks I have seen Rossi as Othello in the Wiedner Theater [Municipal Theater of Vienna], *Die Rauber* in the Burg, and in the Laubetheatre, and Caius Gracchus as well.

Was *Die Rauber* playing at the Burg Theater, and Rossi at the *Wien* in both March of 1874 (sic. March, 1975) and August of 1873? A footnote in the Harvard Edition of the Silberstein correspondence indicates that "Rossi came to Vienna during the World Exhibition [1873] to perform his most famous role." A famous Italian actor who performed on the international stage, Rossi, is not likely to have appeared at the same theater in 1873 and 1875 coincidentally with the simultaneous performance of *Die Rauber* at the same theater in both years. A check of the historical records of performances will affirm or negate this suspected fraud. If historical records prove that Rossi was not in Vienna in 1874, then there is a double corruption in this letter, and handwriting analysis should prove the letter is a forgery.

Other inconsistencies could be pointed out but it seems there is already enough grounds to require professional examination of the letters to judge of their authenticity. We have, in summation, internal discrepancies, letters written in an "unknown hand" or "hands" and we have corrupted text from Stanescu who himself provided the purported letters written by Freud. Furthermore, we have an apparent duplicate "ghost period" between March 6, 1875 and August 2, 1973. If historical records verify that Rossi did not perform in both years, and that *Die Rauber* was not also performing at the same time, then we must conclude either that both letters refer to the same year. I suspect that year will be 1873, not 1875. I deduce this from the assumption it is the year of 1875, the phony year of Freud's trip to England which needs to be accounted for. Or, in other words, events occurring in 1873 needed to be shifted to 1875. This opens up the possibility that many of the letters allegedly written in the summer of 1873, were in fact, not written in 1873 at all but rather in 1874 and 1875. Also, as we shall later discover, the fact that Freud saw the play *Die Rauber* twice *before* he went to England would explain why Freud insisted on the relationship between himself and John in reference to playing in that play together, where Freud was assigned the role of the murderer Brutus. It was all compressed in the same time period and hence

especially memorable.

A TRIP TO ENGLAND & A CONFUSION OF DATES & TIME

There are about 20 letters in the year 1875 before there is a letter mentioning anything about a trip to England. Then it comes in a post card, without warning or preparation.

Vienna, July 15, 1875

Dear Eduard,

I am leaving on Friday at 7:30, will be arriving in Leipzig at 5:30 p.m. on Saturday, and hope to see you at the station and to spend 1—2 days at your place. My final destination is Manchester.

Your Cipion

The next mention of the trip is on July 20. In a two sentence letter Freud merely states:

I am sailing at midnight on the Hudersfield for Grimsby, from where, without delay, I shall proceed to Manchester.

The next letter of August 3, 1875, informs Silberstein that he is now in England. In this first letter from England, Freud appends a note that "My nephew John speaks and understands a little Spanish." Interestingly, a footnote attached to John's name gives the following information:

John Freud (b.1855); untraceable.

The letter is written in Spanish and John's name is given its Spanish form of "Juan."

Freud's next letter is written from Vienna, September 9, 1875, and begins with

these words: "Two mornings ago I returned to dear old Vienna after my seven-and-a-half weeks travels. . ." Interestingly, he goes on to say, within a few sentences:

The reason why I am not writing in Spanish is because of a resolution I have made. Since I am heartily ashamed of not owning a *diccionario*, I have decided to purchase one. Once I have one, things will be much easier and I shall write frequently in Spanish — therefore, why write in Spanish today when I have not yet acquired a dictionary? As you can see this is sound idler's logic. . .

This is interesting, as Freud had been writing in Spanish right along; indeed the whole first letter written from England was in Spanish. One might assume Freud didn't have a Spanish dictionary with them then either, if he still didn't have one when he returned. Did John not have a Spanish dictionary? That he would suddenly make a "resolution" about it, sounds a bit fishy. Could this merely be a ploy to account for the reason it wasn't written in Spanish because the letter was, in fact, the work of an "unknown hand" — an unknown hand wanting to explain its inability to use Spanish in Freud's inimitably "illiterate" manner? Interestingly, as well, is the fact that Freud suddenly injects into his letter a plaintiff note — seemingly out of context:

I really believe that we shall never be rid of each other; though we became friends from free choice, we are as attached to one another as if nature had put [us] on this earth blood relations; I believe that we have come so far that the one loves the very person of the other and not, as before, merely his good qualities, and I am afraid that were you, by an unworthy act, to prove quite different tomorrow from the image I keep of you, I could still not cease to wish you well. That is a weakness, and I have taken myself to task for it several times.

— Sept 9, 1975

Freud then, in the same letter, goes onto give information concerning his relatives. Interestingly, the information is wrong, and it is strange to see how this

could be the case when he has just returned from England and surely the ages of his relatives, etc. much have come up. He says that Silberstein will want to know about his relatives and starts out by saying that he has two "brothers" from his father's side "twenty and twenty-two years older than I." Actually Emmanuel is 24 years older than Sigmund and Philipp is twenty years older. Their birth data bears this fact out and Freud himself gives their correct age differences in his published writings. Interesting, also, is the fact that it is only John's age that is not directly mentioned or alluded to. John was (or would have been) 20 years old at the time — recall all Freud family genealogies in England give John "mysterious disappearance" at the age of 18!

Of those persons in our family whose uncle I may call myself, you are already acquainted with John, he is an Englishman in every respect, with a knowledge of languages and technical matters well beyond the usual business education. Unknown to you, and until recently, to me, are two charming nieces, Pauline, who is nineteen, and Bertha, who is seventeen, and a fifteen year old boy by the name of Samuel— which I believe has been fashionable in England ever since Pickwick — and who is generally considered to be a "sharp and deep" young fellow. In the case of all my relatives I would find less to criticize than to praise, and much to praise warmly, if I were not disqualified by my biased position of brother and uncle, and by the cordial reception I was accorded, from occupying the judge's and critic's bench. . . I have the sea, the sacred *thalatta*, following the waves of the high tide as they retreated thunderously from the shore, and have caught starfish on the beach. . . I am more suspicious than ever of philosophy. . .

Before passing to the next letter, however, another point ought be made. Freud states in the same letter (Sept. 9th) that he is delighted that Silberstein has found the occasion to use the noble Spanish language again and, he continues:

and I am longing for the hours and walks next year during which, after a twelve months separation interrupted by a three day meeting, we shall be able to exchange words for words. .

Now this is most interesting. According to the chronology, it is in a couple of months that Silberstein will be moving to Vienna to attend the university in the Winter Semester of 1875, with registration beginning in Oct. '75. Why would Freud be longing for walks "next year," i.e., 1876, when Silberstein will be living in Vienna for the winter semester of '75? In September 9th he asks to know the time of his arrival, so it is presumably immanent. Besides this Freud is in the process of arranging housing for him in October. And, in any case, the phrase "after twelve months separation" is itself a reference for chronological reckoning. Silberstein, who graduated in 1874, and spent a year in Leipzig (winter semester '74 to summer semester '75, would be the twelve month period — putting Silberstein back in Vienna in the winter of '75. In other words, it seems this letter was actually written in 1874! Was the three day meeting, then, the three days spent when Freud met with him on his way to Manchester? It would seem so. The summer of 1874.

Another correlation which would appear to fix the date of this letter in the year 1874 is another passage from the text. Freud states:

Had I been asked last year what was my dearest wish, I would have replied: a laboratory and free time, or a ship on the ocean with all the instruments a scientist needs. . . now I waver about whether I should not rather say: a large hospital and plenty of money. . . I have been flattered with the hope that I might see England again next year or the year after.

Two points arise. It was in 1873 that Freud first announced in a letter to Emil Fluss that he intended to become a natural scientists. Prior to this his intention was to go into the study of law. Indeed, Freud makes quite a to-do about his intention to become a natural scientist in his letter to Emil of May 1st, 1873:

When I lift the veil of secrecy will you not be disappointed? I have decided to become a Natural Scientist and herewith release you from the promise to let me conduct all your lawsuits.

Besides the fact (unless these letters, too, are forgeries and/or misdated) that Freud's mention of "last year" places the letter supposedly written in 1873 as actually written in 1874, there is also the further mention of another planned trip to

England, "next year" or "the year after." Did Freud actually go to England more than once, once in 1874 and then again later in 1875? Curious.

Silberstein went home after graduating, as was his custom. Freud's trip to England went through, he stopped and saw his friend for 2-3 days as he stated in his post card on his way to Manchester, and then, Silberstein was to be in Leipzig for 12 months, after which he would return to Vienna, at which time they would walk and talk together as in the old times. Perhaps this is the reason why Freud wrote the seemingly odd words about never being rid of each other despite the commission of unworthy deeds. This construction, then, would accord with Freud's statement in a letter to the famous historian, H.G. Well, that "I first went to England at the age of 18," as well as Freud's sister, Anna, who stated that her brother "first went to England at 18." And there is yet another correlation. In April 5, 1876, Freud wrote from Trieste that:

I am a person with the unfortunate tendency of finding everything ordinary and becoming used to everything quickly; when I a landlubber for eighteen years, am transplanted suddenly to the shores of one of the most beautiful seas, I feel as nonchalant by the second day as if I had been born on a fishing smack.

Freud here must be referring to England. He was a "landlubber" until his first trip across the sea to England at "eighteen years." Of course, we have evidence from his own letter that he spent time at the Irish Sea Shore, and he certainly was not eighteen, according to the official chronology of his trip, but rather 19. At the time of the writing of this letter he is actually 20 — calculated by his fraudulent birth date he will be twenty in almost exactly one month. Is this a mistake in translation? Or did the translator inadvertently give Freud's correct age when he went to England for the first time?

In any case, in the very next letter, after his return from England, allegedly September 19, 1875 Freud makes mention of a word he used in his a previous letter and observes:

but if by the exclamation mark you placed in your note before the word *Erinnerungsschwelgerei[e]n* (I beg your forgiveness for using so common and popular an expression) you meant to imply

that these memories are mixed up with matters of love, I believe you are mistaken and far off target [far from the white - *tiras lejos del blanco*].

This is interesting because no such word appears in the previous letter. The word *Erinnerungsschwelgereien* means, according to the editor "wallowing in nostalgia." But Freud specifically disavows this word in reference to "matters of love" and emphasizes that interpretation would be "far from the white." How far? Matters of hate?

Interestingly, in Stanesco's article, "Young Freud's Letters To His Rumanian Friend, " published in 1971 in *The Israel Annals of Psychiatry and Related Disciplines, Vol. 9., Nos. 3, December 1971*, Silberstein says that "all" letters written from Freud to Silberstein were preserved. "Luckily, Silberstein had faithfully preserved all letter of 'Cipion' and among these there were also some remnants of the literary juvenilia. . ." A statement clearly at odds with the position of the Harvard edition which states that:

As we can tell from the context and from knowledge of the relationship between the two friends, not all of Freud's letters have come down to us, either because Silberstein failed to keep some of them or because they were lost after his death.

Of course, another possibility exists, and that is that some of the letters were destroyed by Stanesco's or people in the Freud group before and/or after they were secreted in the Library of Congress. As previously discussed one such letter, the letter of July 11, appears to have been lost while in possession of the Library of Congress. How many others many have been destroyed for some reason or other we do not know. Did Silberstein not really know if there were letters missing or not? It does not take much of a scholar to see that, given the text that remain. It is difficult he could have been so careless or so stupid, especially since "money was on the line" for him and the value of the collection would have been partially determined by its completeness — as is the case with all other correspondences of the famous. But to continue.

In the next letter, Oct. 2, '75, Freud mentions his trip to England again and that he is expecting a photograph of his nieces in Manchester. Included with this letter

is Freud's poem *Epithalamium*, to which I will return. In an enclosure, Freud also observes that he now buries the magic wand and calls for a new age.

and may a new age begin without forces working in secret, that has no need of poetry and fantasy! Let no one seek a principle save in the present, not in the alluvium or diluvium, nowhere save among the children of man, not in the gruesome primeval past when wild creatures could consume the oxygen of the atmosphere unpunished by man —

And he ends the letter with "a mixture of sadness and jest." After this letter and another written on the same day, there are no letters for six months.

When Freud writes again, six months later, he is a different man. His first letter of March 28, 1876 speaks of the city of Trieste, that it is beautiful and contains "beasts that are beautiful beasts." This letter is followed by another where he identifies himself as serving "a beast-killing science." He refers to himself also as "a landlubber for eighteen years." He is, in fact twenty years old at this time, or dating from his fraudulent birth date, nineteen about to be twenty. Why he would say 18 is uncertain. In this letter he regrets not being able to "dissect human beings" (as previously quoted).

Silberstein has noticed a "sudden" "change in attitude" and Freud himself, in this letter of April 23, '76, refers to a "complete transformation" of his mood and describes himself as being "eaten up with impatience." The letter ends with him saying:

I gave the boy a few shells I had picked up on the seashore, and parted from him with a kiss as befits a *zio* [uncle], an office which has been bestowed on me again in the last few days in Manchester [i.e., his "brother" Philipp had a baby].

On August 13, John Freud's birthday — he would have been 21 — Freud wrote:

So you've become a martyr? Perhaps you would like to be canonized after this life, which would not be all that difficult, considering that the great Christopher Columbus is going to be

canonized one of these days, and all he did was to discover another more beautiful and happier land, which the Pope and the Church finished off. And you, who have sacrificed your health on the altar of canon law the better to discover and proclaim in public how bishops used to dress and the reasons they gave to discard their unwanted "nieces," would you not have greater expectations than Columbus. But I am hopeful that it will be a long time yet before the proverb *de mortuis nil nisi bene* [*let nothing but good be said of the dead*] applies to you — and hence repeat what I have said many times before to you, namely that you have studied without rhyme or reason and that you deserve some kind of punishment, severe enough to be felt and remembered.

Freud then says he has had enough of speaking of his "punishments" and "must speak of other things." These other things are continuing matters on death and punishments, but then he seems to lose what he is talking about and refers to a "grand design" that is "ruling" the letter.

In the first place of the death of Fernan Caballero, or Cecilia Bohl de Faber, who was a woman, our author, and the daughter of a German businessman, and who spent the first twelve years of her childhood in Germany. (interrupted)

A grand design rules this letter, which I have been writing for three days without being able [to finish].

My mother and my sisters have recently arrived, speaking marvels of you. . .

Another interruption: just now I spilled half a glass of water over this wretched letter. Perhaps to crown it all, it won't even reach you and you would think I have forgotten your existence and the obligations of friendship. Perhaps that is what you already believe, because I have not sent you the bow for the small fiddle, as you asked in your letter. But know that this cursed instrument of torture [Freud hated music] is at this very moment staring at

me. . . every time you pay the violin my left ear starts ringing.

Behold new fortune right now in the form of an oval and pointed inkblot, which has so upset me that I must conclude. . .

The editor informs us that in 1873 the Archbishop of Bordeaux proposed the canonization of Columbus, which was turned down in October of 1877. Further, that the daughter of von Faber, a well known Hispanicist had his daughter move with him to Cadiz in 1813. *But she did not die until April 1, 1877.* But Freud is making the point that she had died, she didn't die until 8 months later! Is the letter misdated?

All in all it is certainly a strange letter. The punctuation in the passage quoted above is as given, except for the caesura in the fourth paragraph. Freud sounds drunk, but is apparently drinking water. He doesn't sound well and the letter is incoherent. A couple more letters follow, then in August 14, 1877 (the following year) — the day after John's birthday (when he would have been 22), the change in Freud has become very pronounced, and indeed pathological. The devilish aspects of his personality now assume a monstrous dominance:

Here it is so inhumanly hot that all the juices of pious thought had curdled (!) in me and all the bilious and poisonous constituents of my Self have begun to seethe. This very letter is a kind of crisis intended to rid me of morbid matter. I wish for all the rabble found on this earth to be struck down by heavenly thunder and the world to become so depopulated that one would encounter just one human being every three miles. If this wish remains unfulfilled, posterity will rue the day. A certain number of scoundrels is quite acceptable, for it helps people to grow hot under the color, but aye many are unhealthy.

The Editor Becomes A Writer Of Fiction

Walter Boehlich in his Introduction to *The Letters of Sigmund Freud to Eduard Silberstein 1871-1881* was aware of this terrible change that had come over Freud.

He wrote:

However, when he returned to Vienna [from England] something happened for which we have been unable to find a satisfactory explanation, in a strange way, Freud put a stop to his youth, to his youthful dreams and to everything connected with the Academy.

He buried the magic wand and moved forward into a new age "that has no need of poetry and fantasy." [editorial reference added]

Boehlich actually overstates the case. Freud did not put a stop to everything connected with the Academy. He is still writing in Spanish, is still signing his name "Cipion, the dog of Seville," etc. Still, it is certainly correct that there seems to have been a profound change. Boehlich then goes on to assert that the "trigger" of this change was the marriage of Gisela, Freud's first calf love. Yet, incredibly Boehlich then proceeds to theorize that there was no marriage at all and that *Freud made up the whole story of the marriage in order to get rid of Gisela, because she was too unbearable to his memory*. He even suggests that Freud wanted to murder her in his imagination.

In short, Gisela was neither to be married nor did she get married at that time, Freud invented the whole thing to rid himself of Gisela, to render her unattainable. He could not kill her off, not even poetically, and if someone had to be done away with then it had best be himself, but not even that in earnest. And so he married her off in order finally to forget her — but in vain, since "Screen Memories" indicates that he continued to feel deeply perturbed even after thirteen years of marriage. Because she seemed dangerous, Gisela was consigned to the dungeon of mythology from the very outset, yet the pattern of Freud's behavior did not alter even when the threat must have seemed less. . .

This is really incredible, and, at first it would seem entirely untenable — mere mad ruminations on the part of the editor. But there are two elements that are missing from this assessment of the madness of the Editor. One, there was an original draft of the poem as well as notes contained on a sheet. The rough draft of the

poem is presented in the Harvard edition, the notes, which form the basis for the editors surmise, however, is entirely missing from the book — leaving us dependent for the validity of the conjecture on the author of it himself. First let us turn to the draft of the poem. Boehlich says:

Here everything is wild despair. Thoughts of suicide abound, and the idea of beholding "the faithful bride in another's arms" enrages him.

Freud in these notes betrays that he is in a "wretched abominable despair." But really, Boehlich's reasoning is quite feeble in his presentation. And he seems to be consciously trying to construct a "mystery" which supersedes the one which identifies Freud as clearly despairing and suicidal. At least, one has the right to this suspicion, in the absence of any justification for his view. For instance, Boehlich, after stating that the great change that came over Freud was due to the marriage of Gisela, then concludes that Freud probably made the whole thing up and then adds a mystery to that!

Instead of the riddle now being solved, fresh and even more intractable, problems arise. From the letter he sent it is plain that Freud was conveying a piece of news — the marriage of a principle — to Silberstein (or from somebody else?) had cast "wretched abominable despair" into Freud's heart. *Only one of the two can be correct.* But which? Matters become even more complicated, because the sheet of draft paper contains further notes that refer to a planned journey to Lemberg. These lead to the supposition that Silberstein (*whose relationship with the Fluss family was more straightforward*) had also been invited to the wedding in Lemberg, and that Freud wanted to meet up with him at the station early in the morning. Silberstein would have been traveling there from Braila. In any event, nothing came of Freud's journey, either because of the death of Wahle's father or else because he did not have enough money for his ticket. The multiplication which is also to be found on the sheet of draft paper could have been an attempt to work out how much the rest of his English currency was worth. [italic added]

First of all, what does Boehlich mean "only one of them can be correct"? There are *three possibilities, not two* — Freud wrote the letter, Silberstein wrote the letter, or someone else wrote the letter. Boehlich tries to get us to believe that Freud was conveying the "news" of the marriage of the "principle" [assumed to be Gisela] with the assumption being that Silberstein did not know about it. Just because Freud wrote that "and what the occasion is [for the poem] you will learn when you read it" does not mean Silberstein did not know about the marriage, if there indeed was one, only that he will find out the occasion was *for his poem*. Unless there is some critical information which Boehlich has but is not disclosing to his readers Boehlich comments are pure, if not impermissible conjecture. assumption on his part.

Secondly, how does he know Silberstein's relationship with the Fluss' was "more straight forward." There's no evidence that I know of for this. Indeed, in a letter to Fluss, Freud reminds Fluss that he had a friend Silberstein, the one who accompanied him to Freiberg — suggesting that Silberstein was not very close at all. Boehlich presents no commentary to indicate they had a closer relationship. Did not Gisela spend New Year's Eve at Freud's house? Were they not reputedly very close family friends since the early days in Freiberg? Did Freud not stay in the Fluss household and fall in love with the Mother as well as the daughter? What is the meaning of Boehlich's remark — where does he get it?

Boehlich tries to create the impression that Freud was or was not invited to the wedding — how does he know one way or the other? And how does all this theorizing square with Boehlich's idea that, indeed, there never was a wedding in the first place! Or that Freud merely wanted to "meet up with" Silberstein at the station. He also states that "nothing became of Freud's journey" — how does he know this — "either because of the death of Wahle's father or else because he did not have any money" — how does Boehlich know this? Whale's father's funeral was the next day — one day after he sent the letter! There's not another letter until April *of the next year*, and there is no further mention about this "fictions" marriage that didn't happen, so how does Boehlich know Freud didn't go to the non-event because he didn't have any money? And isn't it a little extreme for Boehlich to suggest that Freud wanted to kill Gisela! Good Heavens, its my thesis that Freud is a murderer, not Boehlich's. Or does Boehlich know something he is not telling his readers?

The fact is that Gisela married in 1881, she was born in 1859 and was about 22 at the time of the marriage. The marriage certificates indicate she was a "spinstress" not a divorcee or a widow, so in the absence of significant facts there is no reason to assume anything different. Was there an engagement that was called off? Who knows. This would be the most reasonable assumption. Perhaps Freud wrote the Epithalamion in expectation of the marriage on the announcement of engagement to be married — and the marriage just didn't come off. It is true, nonetheless that Freud does refer to the "groom" but that could be a mere convention. No wild suppositions are required for this simple scenario — unless Boehlich knows something he is not telling us. Could he be trying to detract us from the real issue, namely, that Freud was in an insane state of mind, in any case. That the real or imagined event stimulated in him murderous thoughts, and as Stanesco states it, "dire envy dripping with venom." And, also, perhaps we are being thrown off the track of realizing that Gisela just turned 16 at the time of Freud's composition. Boehlich seems to be at such pains to explain Freud's poem with such an extreme theory because of the pathological extremes to which Freud goes, mostly in the draft, but also in the "finished" poem. In the draft he speaks of "rage" "pain sears" his breast, he asks for potassium cyanide, arsenic, a sharp razor blade, a revolver, lead bullets, his "wretched fate" he can bear "no more" and something that was "so cruelly destroyed."

Boehlich, like most Freudians, waxes forth on things of which he knows not and spins out embellishment after embellishment, like Freud himself, based on tissues of information, and pontificates upon with all the seriousness of a "diagnosis." Writing about when Freud first met Gisela when she was only 11, and when Freud developed his "love" for her, Boehlich continues:

Some six months later we meet her in the correspondence as "Ichthyosaura," a most misleading name for a clearly attractive young creature. . .

How does he know she was "clearly attractive." Has he ever seen a photo of her, or read one word written by her, or heard the testimony of anyone other than Freud? He's only making it up. He goes on to describe Freud falling in love with this child who is not yet 12 years old. Boehlich continues:

We cannot tell if Gisela noticed what was happening to Freud,

She went away, disappearing from his sight for many years, although not from his memory. He was able to impose abstinence on himself but not to erase his memory of her.

How does Boehlich know that Freud "imposed abstinence" on himself? Well, the fact is Freud say Gisela in the summer of 1871 and in the summer of 1873 and then January 1, 1875, approximately one year and three months after Freud fell "in love" with the barely 13 year old child (born June 26, 1859) she is a guest at Freud's house. So, this is hardly "disappearing from his sight for many years." This pretty picture of Freud imposing abstinence on himself out of love for his first love who has disappeared from sight for many years, but whose memory burned bright — all this does not preclude Boehlich from suggesting, rather shockingly that Freud wanted to get rid of her, to "kill her off." Think about it. Freud is himself 16, the young girl is just 13 and Freud wants to a year and a half later to kill her in his imagination because he can't stand the memory of her, so painful has it become. What are we really dealing with here? And why does Boehlich paint this strange picture. There is more to the story, that's why.

Incest With An Ichtyosaurian

In a letter of August 17, Freud makes a curious remark. Writing to Silberstein, Freud relates that:

a youth by the name of Emil, head of the dyeworks, who tried to render relations with Ich. palatable to me even then. The young man is a favorite of mine; I find him honest, very discreet, capable of noble sentiments. . . I made him privy to the saurian myth of Roznau, asking him if he still hankered after Ichth. He denied it in good faith and in exchange told me the story of his declaration of love to a certain Ottilie."

Now, Emil is the brother of Ichth. What was Freud's meaning when he asked him if he still hankered after Ichth, his sister? Emil was the same age as Freud, and Freud wants to know if he is "still" hankering after his sister? Freud wrote this portion of the letter in Spanish. The Spanish is, after Freud say he asked him "si todavia tuviese inclinacion por Ichth." Or was Ichth really Gisela?

In a letter of August 16, 1873 and responds to something Silberstein wrote to

him about concerning a comment Freud had made about "English glances." Apparently Silberstein interpreted what Freud had written as having an incestuous connotation, for he wrote in response:

In philosophy we are on a par, but the angelic (not the English) glances I confessed to yearning for I cannot obtain at home, as you suppose [presume]— one does not long for what one possesses, but rather I yearn for them because I do not possess them. In worldly matters you have gained an advantage over me. Your aunt seems to be a woman of great understanding. Now you can rightly say: "I, too, have been a shepherd in Arcadia," as Schiller put it. Or, if you prefer to read it in another language, "*anch io sono pastore.*" But I am no shepherd and have not been one all through the holiday, which is curiously noteworthy, yet it is worthy of your confidence.

In the very next letter (August 20, 1873) Freud returns to the issue again and wants to take back what he clearly wrote. Apparently Freud is responding again to another letter of Silberstein's, but the previous letter was dated the 16ths of August and it seems unlikely that he would have already received a reply. In any case, Freud wrote:

Know, therefore, that when I wrote the expression "*englische*" glances the first time in German, it was ambiguous. The second time, when I translated it into Spanish, I was forced to say "*miradas inglesas o angelicas*" to make my meaning clear. You assumed that there were angels or little angels in my hose of whose glances I was speaking, but I replied to you in the greatest haste that your assumption was wrong and that I was simply longing for angelic glances: at home I have none.

One wonders is this really from Freud's hand, or by one of those "unknown hands." First, of all, Freud did not write "miradas inglesas or angelicas," he wrote, "Cuanto a la filosofia somos iguales, pero las miradas angelicas (no inglesas), las cuales yo confesaba desear, no se pueden coger en casa mia, como tu presumes, porque no se anhela, lo que se tiene, antes bien yo las deseo, por no tenerlas. En las cosas del mundo tu me has ganado la delantera.— In other words essentially

what was recorded above in English, replete with the incestuous innuendo and the innuendo that Silberstein was "making" it with his Aunt.

There is reason to believe that Gisela is not Ichth, or that Freud is nearly if not actually psychotic in his relationship to Gisela. In a letter to Emil Fluss of September 28, 1872 he wrote:

But if you want me to entertain you with reports about Ichthyosaura, let me tell you that there was more irony, yes, mockery, than seriousness in this whole flirtation. You were never present at a meeting of the "Spanish Academy" (the name of our two-member society). But had you heard how the poor creature was torn to shreds, you wouldn't have had a different picture of 'our' relationship to her. Any detailed description would have to be prefaced by Goethe's line: "A fairy tale. . .it was once upon a time.

Do, please make known to Freiberg's *haute volée* (I raise my hat) our little masquerade when the occasion presents itself. Lift the veil of secrecy which surrounds the 8-16 Russians, Turks, and Tartars and show the *crème* of Freiberg's society our familiar faces. If it amuses you, invent something to add to it, present as fact incidents we should never have dreamt of — as long as you give them food for conversation to talk about *us*.

Now, is it likely Freud would write this to the brother of Gisela — close family friends — that they "tore her to shreds," that there was only "irony" and "mockery" in his feelings for his sister. Remember here that Freud is referring to Ichthyosaura. He does not say Gisela. It is the scholars who say that Ichth is Gisela. It is true that there is a letter of February 7, 1873 where, discussing "Ichthyos," Freud stated that "When we visited the weaving-mill, my friend absently minded touched one of the machines with his hand. What did Ichthyos do?" etc. The Fluss's owned the weaving-mill but that doesn't prove Gisela was Ichthyos. Ichthyos was probably a friend of Gisela and there would be nothing strange with her being at the weaving-mill.

Discussing his feeling for Gisela, Freud speaks of how sad he was that he had

not the courage to engage his "calf love" in conversation.

One day I shall explain to you the difference between my affection and another passion at some length; for the moment let me just add that I did not suffer any conflict between ideal and reality, and that I am incapable of making fun of Gisela. So please avoid all allusions to her in the presence of Rosanes or others.

Is Freud speaking of two girls here, one for whom he has "affection" and another for whom he has "passion," one of whom is an "ideal" and another who is "real." Perhaps, perhaps not. Still, it ought to be noted that Freud states that in consecrating their Academia Castilian building with sacrificial bodies, "as in ancient times," they should bury "two princesses." He suggests:

we sacrifice two victims, two princesses or *reinas*. . .queens who previously reigned over our realm.

So, there were two "princes" who reigned over their realm, not just Gisela. I have just provided a brief example of how the Freudians carry on with ridiculous exaggerations about things they know nothing about as though their own fictions had the standing of a "scholarly" hypothesis, just because it entered their minds, so it is entirely possible all the scholars have been wrong, again, in their belief that Icthy was Gisela Fluss. Indeed, Boehlich, for example, goes so far as to suggest that Freud once uses the name of Icthy as another name for Gisela's brother, Emil.

Still, it is entirely possible that Freud was truly psychotic — and spoke evil of only "one" of them but revered the "other." Also, his above remark that one day he will explain the difference between his "passion" and "affection" with a passage from the Fliess correspondence where he refers specifically to his homicidal mania. The passage where Freud says the riddle of Count Oudenieur explains — that is to say where one minute he loves and the next minute he wants to see his love disappear in blood. Indeed, the interpretation has to be considered in light of Boehlich's own thesis, that Freud wanted to do away with Gisela.

Serious doubts, however, exist concerning this assumption, though I do not doubt Freud was crazy. That Freud would speak to Emil about his sister in such a cruel and deprecating language is, however, dubious, at least to me. Of course, this is merely a guess, but a guess based on the normal reaction of a brother to

hearing his sister rudely and hatefully referred to — was Emil different in this regard? Perhaps.

Nonetheless, Freud does refer to Gisela in terms of his "turbulent thoughts," and turbulent thoughts and a "loved" one is a dangerous mixture in the mind of Sigmund Freud, as we shall have ample opportunity to discuss.

Also arguing, perhaps, for the identification of Gisela and Ichthy being the same person, is another reference to her in a letter to Martha Bernays on October 28, 1883, over 10 years later:

Did I ever tell you that Gisela was my first love when I was but 16 years old? No? Well, then you can have a good laugh at me, firstly on account of my taste and also because I never spoke a meaningful, much less amiable word to the child. Looking back, I would that seeing my old home-town again made me feel sentimental.

The Mystery Continues: A Second Gisela?

One might have hoped we had enough of the complications of Gisela and Ichthy, but thoroughness forbids our leaving off. For another distinct and real possibility asserts itself. That is that Freud's poem, celebrating the marriage of Gisela, was written in 1873 and that it was not addressed to Gisela Fluss, but the Archduchess Gisela, daughter of Kaiser Franz Joseph, who married her cousin Prince Leopold of Bavaria. Here then was a "Gisela" whose name could well have been turned to Ichthy as she was the namesake of Gisela Fluss — and given the fact that Freud and Silberstein often did things like that, that is to say, interchanged names, not only for others, but for themselves — and it was to the Duchess that the poem was written. This would perhaps properly place the poem in the context of a psychotic venomously "humorous" poem ranting and raving about how "desperate" the disappointed lover of the Duchess had become upon hearing of the news of the marriage of the Kaiser's daughter.

In a post script to the letter of May 1st, 1873 Freud writes:

Was Freiberg illuminated or a Foundation for Indigent Brides set up when 'our Princess' got married (for, as Goethe says, she was ours)? No? Oh, how perfidious a town I was born in.

On the same day when 'Austria's Imperial Daughter [Gisela] entered Munich, Justus Liebig was married to his grave there. A truly ingenious arrangement contrived by fate. Munich should receive compensation for the grievous loss suffered through Liebig's death.

A footnote to this passage indicates that the "Princess" and "Imperial Daughter" referred to is Gisela, "daughter of Kaiser Franz." What a convenient target for Freud, to transfer his political hatreds and venomous personal disappointments onto the subject of this marriage. Does he not mockingly call her his own "she was ours," does he not personalize Freiberg with the event, though Freiberg is not in Austria, and does he not mockingly call his town "perfidious" for not "illuminating" the town or setting up a Foundation to commemorate the event?

This could explain a lot written in the poem, both the first draft and the finished poem. Does not Freud refer to the "princesses" of the Academia Castilian who should be buried under their building's foundation? Freud's mocking of her physical features, her "rounded" face and girth, her "spherical" shape, her "pumpkin-like head" that the shape of her chin or nose or "ears conformation" can't be determined — all this does not sound like the girl Freud fell in love with! In the finished poem he refers to her "crown" her "crowning glory" her compassion with the queens and princesses of rulers, etc. He makes it clear she is not Jewish. She is "not like the Cedar of Lebanon, the classical tree of the Jews, But rather like the noblest of forms, the ideal of shapes —" And then he goes on to describe her "spherical" shape and indeterminable nose and chin.

Such an interpretation would also explain why in the finished poem Freud wrote, in reference to the marriage, "The latest of news received from a friend with delight." But in the rough draft he wrote exactly the opposite, "To put into German words, the wretched, abominable despair, your letter so suddenly cast into the depths of the heart —" If understood as an exaggerated mocking, the two opposite reactions to the same event are perhaps understood in the context of a mere change of genre. Certainly, if there is anything of Freud's own real personal

emotions in this, then the only other conclusion is that he is extremely psychotic — going from being "delighted" by the news to being in "abominable despair," over the same event! Only a psychotic can be simultaneously delighted and suffering terribly.

That Freud and Silberstein indulged in writing these kinds of pieces is not to be doubted. In a letter of February 21, 1874 Freud accepts the records of the Academy and gives an inventory of their literary works. Included among them are various literary pieces, parts of novels, poems, tongue in cheek essays, etc. Freud reminds Silberstein of,

the letters between D. Berganza, and D. Cipion, of K. Kurschner's willfulness, of D. Moller's grief in love, of his lover's plaint, composed by you, of the scenes in the house of Ichthyosaura, of her bitter monologue, of her biblical lamentation for Roznau, of her relationship to Achilles, Hector and Breiseis and similar foolishness. . .

Obviously it would be "in character" for Freud to have written the piece as a mocking "lover's plaint, composed by" himself. And, while I do not doubt that Freud was psychotic, this assumption seems the more reasonable one at this juncture in time. In a letter of February 21, 1875, Freud wrote that "Only in summer does the delight in the principles come into bloom." He was experiencing, he says, "all the painful and shaming sensations of a tomcat." He can't sleep, his legs feel glued together but, "truly no principle was to blame, rather a certain lack of principle — the old ones are no good any longer and no new ones have been found — it is just a time of transition." These do not sound the words of a young man who 8 months later is in terrible despair over one of the old principles getting married — an event, I would remind the reader for which there is no evidence for in the first place. And which all extant records argue against, viz. Gisela's marriage certificate when she does get married asserting she was a "spinstress," — neither widow nor divorcee, the other two categories of attestation. Incidentally, the Duchess Gisela was 16 at the time of her marriage — nearly the same age as Gisela Fluss.

But, with one interpretation or the other, we are left with additional evidences of the strangeness of Dr. Strange. And perhaps even of the strangeness of the editor

who came to odd conclusions based on frail evidence.

Zeplichal: The Stenographic Method & The Creation of the *Epithalamion*

There are three points I wish to make. If, for the sake of arguments, we temporarily assume that letters of July 17 and July 17 are frauds and proceed to the next letter, the letter of July 24 we are treated to an interesting clue. In the second sentence of that letter it is stated that Freud posted the Zeplichal to Silberstein. The Zeplichal is a stenographic notebook. It is in a stenographic form that Freud makes his notes for his poem *Epithalamion* for Ichtyos, in allegedly 1875. There is no mention in any of the letters that, previous to this, any of the letters or correspondence was in stenographic form. And so far as I can tell there is nothing in those "alibi" letters of the summer of 1873 that could not have been written in the Summer of 1875. All that needs be done is to change the dates.

Indeed, the Zeplichal is mentioned in letters of July 24, 1873, July 30, 1873, August 2, 1873, August 6, 1873, and August 28, 1873. In the last mention of the stenographic book Freud states that he must "ask you to let me borrow it for two hours a day, as I have acquired a taste for it." The next there is any comment on the subject of stenography is when we learn that the *Epithalamium* draft was written with its method. Did Freud really write his draft of the poem two years later or a couple months later at the time he was practicing this method?

Now, on the other hand, it is strange, as I have observed there is no discussion at all of any trip to England prior to the sudden announcement, allegedly on July 15, 1875, when Freud announces he is on his way. However, if we take the genesis of events in July 10 and July 11, when Freud announces the immanence of the trip, omit the non-entity letters, of the 15th and 16th of July, (which give no chronological fixes or references for historical deduction), and re-date the letter of July 26 which mentions the stenographic book, in which form Freud wrote the poem a couple of months later, and proceed with the next letter, we have the post card announcing Freud's departure.

In short, the letter of July 10ths says the trip is now possible, the next letter of

July 11th, "don't say anything to anyone until its certain," and then July 15, "I'm on my way. Destination, Manchester, meet me at the train station."

I realize all this is supposition, proof for which requires hand writing analysis and historical confirmation that Rossi, for example, was or was not in Vienna in 1873 and 1875. If it proves he was there both years, played at the same theater as coincidentally as *Die Rauber* was also put on twice at the same time and in the same theaters, then we must chalk this up to coincidence. So, too, the issue of the stenographic book. But there is no way around the fact that Freud could have been attending classes a year previously as he was in high school. This being an incontrovertible error, the date of the plays becomes established in the year 1875. Only a reexamination of the original text can resolve these perplexing problems.

Mountains & Molehills

That Freud was, all his life, an inventor of fiction, and passed off as fact his own wild imaginings, is beyond dispute. He himself frequently alluded to the close relationship of psychoanalysis to fiction and his early desire to be a writer of novels. This penchant was indeed prominent from the earliest phases of his life that we know anything about. Freud's latching onto a stray detail and constructing absurd theories based upon it is also well known — and should be especially embarrassing to the Freudians as, in fact, Freud's foundation theories were created from the same cloth, the very cloth as Freud wrote to Fluss in a letter of September 18, 1872

which fate makes swindlers when the time is ripe: cunning, mendacious, kept by his adoring relative [and disciples] in the belief that he is a great talent, but unprincipled and without character.

These words, themselves, incidentally was written about a young fellow traveler whom Freud had just met and could not have known anything about him except as in the capacity of an eavesdropper — and then only for the distance of a brief trip. Indeed, as an example of Freud's own "mendacious" character, in the letter just quoted, Freud wrote:

I'll have a hard time finding my way about in my memories of

yesterday [i.e., he just returned from Freiberg]. I shall confess the unvarnished truth to you — but to you alone, and I trust that no one will be allowed to see what was not meant for him to see.

Only two weeks before this letter, Freud is writing to Silberstein."

I have spared no means to keep you informed of my life in Freiberg. You will find me an informative oral source and my notebook and diary a written source, and these will relate the events of this month more than amply. . .I should prefer to spend it with you alone,

And he then pledges his friend Silberstein to secrecy. This is a feature of Freud's strategy with everyone since earliest childhood, to tell each one individually that they are the only cherished one, pledge each to secrecy and then tell everything to everybody. One of the most prominent words to be found in all of Freud's vocabulary is the word "secrecy." He tries to create a secret out of everything, the most trifling things. Quote after quote after quote could be provided where Freud alludes to a secret, pledges that the "secret" not be revealed, teases his correspondent with a secret, etc. etc. There is a reason for all this. Probably the fact that he grew up in a family that had to "keep secrets."

In any case, Freud took unusual interest in other peoples affairs from the beginning and he delights in trying to dominate over others, mix in their lives, tell them what's going on and seeks to demoralize them and deprive them of any pleasures that do not originate from himself or of which he partakes. So, in the letter of February 7, 1873, Freud begins with saying that Fluss's letter "delighted" him "immensely" — principally because it contained news of Emil's own calf-love. "This also gives you an idea of the great interest I take in you and Otlie [Emil's latest crush]."

More than a little jealousy is apparent in Freud's letter. He is in obvious competition with the young girl Otlie for Emil's affection. He then proceeds as is his custom to denigrate and demoralize to prove his "superiority."

There is a sentence in your letter, so unpretentious, plain and simple — but I think it is the profoundest you have ever written:

"The other day I went ice-skating, and so did she." Can an historian express himself more objectively? But what a story it tells! Allow me to sketch the sequence of events for you. You feel suddenly restless, you can't bear staying at home any longer, a strange presentiment comes over you, almost automatically pick up your skates; as if driven by the force of destiny, you hurry to the fateful place. And there, oh wonderful of concatenation of circumstances! You find Otilie. Truly, any more such strokes of Providence could convince even me of the inscrutable workings of a divine power.

And for sentence after sentence after sentence he goes on to play upon the theme — the theme, that is, that Otilie really didn't care for him as much as he thought: "I am convinced that hypothesis is not as improbable as you think." Freud knows he is envious: "Incidentally (and now, filled with envy, I am trying to dim you bliss) the conclusion you draw from Otilie's concern is not necessarily correct."

In the next letter Emil had obviously noted Freud's envy himself and said so. Freud wrote in response: I shall no longer try to dispute your happiness. If, as you say so triumphantly, I was envious there is now no longer any cause for it." The reason there would be no cause is because Otilie is gone. "Or has Otilie turned up again in Freiberg in the mean time. . . in the hope you will kindly keep me informed." In the next paragraph Freud refers to his life as "miserable" and that if his life is ever to be of any value it will be thanks to "this event." And then characteristically he creates a mystery out of the "event."

But the matter is as yet undecided; I should not like to present something half-baked as fact and then have to take it back later. I will give you more detailed news some other time. Do not make too much of what I am alluding to, but equally, do not think of it as mere toying with an idea. That way you will come closest to the truth.

But in the very next letter (May 1, 1873) Freud confesses that he created a mystery because of the "suspense, which would have greatly flattered me." This same letter, however, contains another sentence, and one much more important to our theme, — the murder of John and when Freud went to England. Freud remarks

to Fluss that he made no mention of a trip and asks:

Has nothing come of it? In that case, it would exactly resemble my planned trip to England and we could meet again in Roznau. For that's where I am likely to be. Should our plot turn out to be as delightful as you hope, there is not much to be said for an excursion to Freiberg.

This is most interesting. For at the beginning of that paragraph Freud commenting on something Fluss has told him remarks that Otlie was staying in Freiberg and Fluss was as happy about the event "as though you were staying there yourself, yet make no mention of a journey." But, Freud says that if his "plot" turns out there's "not much to be said about an excursion to Freiberg." Again, apparently indicating Fluss's time will be taken up with Otlie so there's not reason for him to go there. Apparently, Freud's obsessive interest in Gisela has been forgotten, despite his self-imposed "abstinence" alluded to by the scholars — a fact further supported by the letter, quoted above of February 21, 1875.

The Trip To England: Now You See It, Now You Don't

Examining the issue of when Freud went to England, as evidenced by the various letters mentioning the event, there is little doubt in my mind that there has been a corruption of many of these letters. The letter of May 1, 1873, to Fluss, for example, which discusses travels during the summer and Emil's canceled plans, it is allegedly stated that Emil's trip " would exactly resemble my planned trip to England and we could meet in Rosnau." It doesn't sound right, and has the "smell" of another one of those many passages of Freud's that, for various reasons, are corrupted and passed off as authentic.

Boehlich indicates that Freud's planned trip to England was "often planned and often postponed" — but where does he get this? It is in the letter just quoted of May 1, 1873, the first mention of a trip to England occurs. Then, on July 10 (by an "unknown hand") it is said the trip is "no longer an impossibility," but still uncertain. The *next day*, July 11 (also by an "unknown hand") Freud announces the trip is still uncertain. On August 2, 1873 the trip is still not off, but uncertain

("I regret it, however, not because it puts fetters on my possible journey"). Then, four days later, "the trip is off." It happens that a photocopy of this August 6 letter has fallen into my hand, the letter states: "*Die Hautpsache freilich die englische Reise ist dahin, ich bin mit contractmassigen unaufloslichen Banden an die Wiener Schwimmschule gebunden.*" He says here that the essential thing, the certainty of the trip is off and that he has an unbreakable ("indissoluble") contract for "swimming lessons" — and "even if I were not, I doubt whether a favorable wind would waft me across the Channel. "I dare not go on least I write a chapter of Job, mutatis mutandis."

Interestingly, in the letter just proceeding this, August 2, 1873, Freud wrote:

In order to tie myself down here and to burn my bridges, I have enrolled in swimming classes. I regret it, not because it puts fetters on my possible journey, but because the low water level has turned the classes into a mud bath.

As mentioned, it appears the trip is still possible as Freud refers to it as his "possible journey." In the same letter he says he will not be going to Roznau because his father will not permit it, and quotes from *Die Rauber* in this regard. Apparently Freud is standing by, and his father opposes him from leaving town "for good reason."

So far as I know, and as is revealed in the public records, there was only one tentative plan in 1873 (mentioned in the letter to Fluss, which is suspect) which did not firm up — thought impossible, then became possible, then canceled. And, if we accept the English language of the translator, a trip that was tentative, that was canceled in May and remained impossible throughout the summer and for the next two years. Then, suddenly, with no previous mention at all, in any of the letters, suddenly in July of 1875 Freud is on his way!

Conclusion

From the existing published record, riddled as it is by corruptions, inconsistencies and errors, it is very difficult to deduce anything for certain. Nonetheless, there is a high probability that we can deduce how the fraud was

accomplish regarding the manipulations of dates and the placement of text in the record so as to give the illusion that Freud went to England at the age of 19 — though I have already provided evidence, from the letters themselves, that Freud was 18 when he went to England. It seems virtually certain that entire portions of some letters were "incorporated" into other letters. In some cases, it seems just a date was changed.

Another instance of the anomalies to be found in the letters, to further emphasize the point, is a letter dated September, 18, 1874 — the year Freud *probably* went to England. Freud discusses in this letter (which if he went to England at 18 would have probably been shortly after his return from England) a list of universities for Silberstein to consider for his first semester in college. He tells Silberstein he did not send the list of courses available because he did not want him to be influenced in his decision and he might not go abroad, as Freud was hoping for his friend. "Since this reason still holds, I am not sending the list even now." Silberstein has evidently not settled on a school and must still be in Braila or, more probably, Rosenau. Freud states at the opening of the letter that he is sending a trifle to a friend, "a few miles away." But in the paragraph after mentioning that he was not going to send the schedule of classes he states:

Your news that you are diverting yourself in Leipzig by giving private lessons I can only take as confirmation of the paradox that if he cannot keep them within bounds, man can suffer from his virtues as much from his vices.

This statement does not make sense at all. Silberstein is not in Leipzig! What's going on here? Is this another fault of the translator?

Truth is of such a nature that it cannot be altered without pervasive consequences. A small distortion, seemingly unimportant, displaces reality and puts the entire scenario into the realm of fiction and illusion. Lacking the integrity of truth, the fictional construction becomes more and more apparent the closer it is analyzed. In natural rock, "seams" appear, and between the seams man-made concrete, not occurring naturally in nature — not in the structure of truth.

Ironically, yet perhaps predictably, the fatal error for the Freudians as well as Freud himself comes in the "displacement" of a play by Schiller, *Die Rauber* — the

very play that features, as its only female a woman with Freud's mother's name, Amalia — a play which also features compulsive murder mania and family incest — the very family realities which are being "covered over" in the record of the life of Sigmund Freud.

I have already mentioned that there are two references in Freud's letters to him having seen Schiller's play *Die Rauber*. In my comment on this above, I posed the question: did Rossi (an Italian actor) really play at the Burg Theater in March of 1874, and again in July and August of 1875? I pointed out that in the letter of March 6, 1874 it was declared that Freud made references to classes he attended "12 months ago" and "last year." I pointed out that 12 months ago he was still in high school, so the date must have been in error. Now I will correctly identify the date of this letter, it was written, if it was written by Freud at all, sometime in the winter of 1875. A critical overlooked problem for the crafters of the fraud, lies in the fact that in the post script to the letter there is also the statement that "If you go to see *Die Rauber*, you will find a companion in Silberstein." Now it is a matter of record that Silberstein came to Vienna, to live and go to school, in the Winter of 1875.

In a letter of Oct. 2, 1875 Freud makes reference to helping make arrangements for Silberstein's housing and he wants Silberstein to know that the Wahle family was offering their place to him. A footnote by the editor observes that "Silberstein did move in with the Whale family soon thereafter and lived with them for sometime at 19 Weintraubengasse." The winter of 1875 is the only date that satisfies the condition that classes that Freud had were "12 months" ago and Silberstein's availability for an evening at the theater. Silberstein it will be remembered lived in Leipzig prior to moving to Vienna.

Now with this correlation in mind, if we take the information concerning the theater (supposedly occurring in 1873 in Vienna during the summer) which provides the "alibi" that Freud was not in England, an interesting picture emerges. [Incidentally, there's a 6 month jump from the letter referring to housing for Silberstein and the next letter to him from Freud — which would account for the missing correspondence, i.e., they are in the same town. Also, the next letter comes from Freud when he is in Trieste, March 28, 1876.]

In any case, when we go to the text of July 1873 and examine the letters

carefully, we find that the first letter occurs after a 10 month absence of letters. Then there is the letter of July 10, saying the England trip is no longer impossible, followed by the letter of July 11, saying not to mention the fact (of the trip to England) to anyone till it is certain, and then there is another letter, dated July 16. The letter of July 16 is a non-entity, it could easily have been written any time. It is only a short paragraph long and possesses no information by which one could deduce time, place, circumstance, etc. The following letter likewise indicates very little, other than the fact (if the letter itself is not a fraud) that "Cholera is raging in some outlying districts" and that Freud is musing on his university studies for next year. I shall return to the issue of cholera presently.

A Young Freud Sampler

The following quotations are excerpted from the Silberstein correspondence. They indicate, among other things, Freud's state of mind. Since we cannot be sure of the dates of any of these passages, their themes should be particularly noted and what they indicate as to Freud's emerging character.

1.

I earnestly pondered the possibility of creating a system of numbers, having observed that everything in the real world has its equal, or equivalent, in the world of numbers. *Numbers are born or die, marry, and destroy one another like men.* Their estates comprise nobles, soldiers, *genealogical tables*, just as happens with the estates of mortal men. Numbers even have a mythology and gods! — Aug. 6, 1873

2.

Mind you, I do not hold as some aesthetes do, that everything immoral according to the letter of the Civil or Mosaic Code must also be unpoetic. . . Rather, poetry, supported by the power of our passions, can go quite some way toward transfiguring what is immoral, or better, what society does not allow. . . *An old superstition has it that no building is sound whose foundations have not cost a human sacrifice.* To the countenance of our A.E.

renovada y comfirmada [renewed and consolidated] we sacrifice two victims, two princesses or reinas, que antes en nuestro han imperado [queens who previously reigned over our realm]. — Aug. 22, 1874

Two months after his return from England (i.e., Sept'75) Freud wrote:

3. A kind of tremor is passing through the world; *the mortally ill hasten to die*, the sickly redouble their coughing and those still in good health surround themselves with bad conductors of heat and exhale clouds of fog from their lungs. Fortunately both of us are among those who have grounds to hope they will see another spring, and I for one have firmly resolved to make better use of Nature's favors and take better care of my physical well-being by going for walks and on brief outings. The soul, as everyone knows, is immortal and has no need of this; *the body, however, is mortal, and would like to be looked after before it dies*. — dated Nov. 8, 1874

It was I who delivered the death blow; it had been ailing for a long time and I took pity on its suffering. *I gave it [the publication] life and I have taken its life away, so blessed be my name, forever and every, Amen* — Jan. 30. 1875

I paged through and read the A.E. papers, which I obtained yesterday from your brother (who has grown into a strapping fellow), and reveled in the memory of days gone by. *I wanted to propose an auto-da-fe*, but now lack the courage, and instead confirm that I shall take over the secretariat of the A.E. from you, and afford the archives due care and protection. — Feb. 21, 1875

5. A thinking man *is his own legislator, confessor, and absolver*. — Feb. 27, '75
6. It is well known that our universe is approaching the enviable state of an evenly distributed and pleasant temperature, from

which there is no redemption; no more winters, but, also, no more blossoming or greening in the summer. *How glad would one be on doomsday to have one's face slapped by a neighbor. . . nothing will be capable of disturbing our sweet peace, neither war nor murder, no new discovery more cravings. . . You may work, study to become a German sage, deliver speeches, whip up the masses or look after your physical well-being and live it up — you will still remain a killer of yourself and the whole universe. . . you are swallowing up the world by the spoonful and guaranteeing an early demise for you and yours. . .*— April 28, 1875

7. Here it is so inhumanly hot that *all the juices of pious thought have curdled (!) in me and all the bilious and poisonous constituents of my Self have begun to seethe. This very letter is a kind of crisis intended to rid me of morbid matter. I wish for all the rabble found on this earth to be struck down by heavenly thunder and the world to become so depopulated that one would encounter just one human being every three miles. If this wish remains unfulfilled, posterity will rue the day. . . I have not enough hate to express my feelings and only console myself with the knowledge that they [Emperors of Russia and Germany] are digging their own graves. In times like these one is tempted to turn into a petroleur [fire bomber].* Aug. 15, 1877
8. But I am hopeful that it will be a long time yet before the proverb *de mortuis nil nisi bene* [let nothing but good be said of the dead] — and hence repeat what I have said many times before to you, namely that you have studied without rhyme or reason and that *you deserve some kind of punishment, severe enough to be felt and remembered.* Aug. 13, 1876 [John's birthday]
9. The people [of Trieste], finally, are very ugly, with few exceptions. . . Few small children appear on the streets. Those I have seen look very precocious, and already temper their beauty with face powder. *Since it is not allowed [i.e., "unfortunately forbidden"] to dissect human beings, I really have nothing to do*

with them. April 5, 1876

10. *When it comes to murder*, he [Hebbel] is a veritable Shakespeare — he is not keen on ruination paved by passion, all his heroes are stubborn and given to cracking open each other's skulls. . . it is worth the writers trouble to *examine them and* perhaps, if I understand Hebbel rights, to *excuse them*.

Note: p.4, "a plain, plump, and cheerful girl. In short, she does not compare with Ichth." - not like the description in the Wedding Poem.