

Moses and Monotheism (German: *Der Mann Moses und die monotheistische Religion*) is a book about monotheism by Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis. It shocked many of its readers because of Freud's suggestion that Moses was actually born an Egyptian, [vague] rather than merely raised as an Egyptian.

If anything, he proclaims it with even less reservation: That conviction I acquired a quarter of a century ago, when I wrote my book on Totem and Taboo in , and it has only become stronger since. From then on I have never doubted that religious phenomena are to be understood only on the model of the neurotic symptoms of the individual, which are so familiar to us, as a return to of long-forgotten important happenings in the primeval history of the human family, that they owe their obsessive character to that very origin and therefore derive their effect on mankind from the historical truth they contain. He gives a narrated form of summary of the primordial event of the father murder, more precisely and to the point than in his earlier book, and begins it with the following reservation, which was more vaguely implied in Totem and Taboo: The story is told in a very condensed way, as if what in reality took centuries to achieve, and during that long time was repeated innumerable, had happened only once. Certainly, it has the flavor and characteristics of a story, or a myth. The strong male was the master and father of the whole horde, unlimited in his power, which he used brutally. All females were his property, the wives and daughters in his own horde as well as perhaps also those stolen from other hordes. They were forced to live in small communities and to provide themselves with wives by stealing them from others. The one or the other son might succeed in attaining a situation similar to that of the father in the original horde. One favored position came about in a natural way: An echo of the expulsion of the eldest son, as well as of the favored position of the youngest, seems to linger in many myths and fairy-tales. The next decisive step towards changing this first kind of "social" organization lies in the following suggestion: In *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud expands and clarifies his theory somewhat. He specifies the stages gone through by mankind as a whole, in comparison to the individual neurotic stages of "early trauma - defense - latency - outbreak of the neurosis - partial return of the repressed material. He describes the process: Mankind as a whole also passed through conflicts of a sexual aggressive nature, which left permanent traces, but which were for the most part warded off and forgotten, later after a long period of latency, they came to life again and created phenomena similar in structure and tendency to neurotic symptoms. The latency mentioned, which exists both in the individual and the collective, is a sort of mental period of incubation, where the traumatic event is forgotten to the conscious mind, but remains subconsciously and gains strength, so that when it erupts, it is much more potent than it was at the time of the traumatic event: It is specially worthy of note that every memory returning from the forgotten past does so with great force, produces an incomparably strong influence on the mass of mankind, and puts forward an irresistible claim to be believed, against which all logical objections remain powerless - very much like the *credo quia absurdum*. He compares this phenomenon to the delusion in a psychotic, having a long forgotten core of truth that upon reemerging becomes both distorted and compulsive. As a consequence of this latency, Freud needs to explain how something forgotten can remain through generations, to emerge in people as a very vivid and powerful memory of sorts. In Totem and Taboo he supposed no forgetting of the father murder, on the other hand he did not specify that the memory was kept through the generations. What was implied was an established totemism, containing the trauma of the father murder and continuing to be obeyed, long after the actual event had been forgotten. In *Moses and Monotheism* he introduces latency, the suppressed memory able to reemerge, and therefore needs to explain this process. Freud states very clearly that people did forget about the initial event: In the course of thousands of centuries it certainly became forgotten that there was a primeval father possessing the qualities I mentioned, and what fate he met. He uses the analogy with the individual, whose traumatic memory is repressed, buried deep in the unconscious, but has not disappeared, wherefore it can emerge, and when doing so has the intensity described above. Both the individual and the collective has this ability: I hold that the concordance between the individual and the mass is in this point almost complete. The masses, too, retain an impression of the past in unconscious memory traces. Such repressed memories may emerge in certain circumstances. With collective

memories, this is most likely to happen because of recent events, which are similar to those repressed. Now, Freud speculates that the individual does not have only personal memories stored in the unconscious, but also: When they react to early traumata, when an Oedipus or castration complex is examined, other than purely personal experiences seem to emerge. These make more sense if regarded as somehow inherited from earlier generations. Freud believes that they are part of what he calls the archaic heritage. Cronus castrates Uranus, by Giorgio Vasari, 16th Century. He also uses the argument of "the universality of speech symbolism," the ability to have one object symbolically substituted by another, especially strong in children. This symbolism is also at work in dreams, and Freud regards it as an ability inherited from the time that speech was developing. He is rather diffuse here, since he gives no examples of what kinds of objects and symbols he refers to. He does admit that the science of biology allows no acquired abilities to be transmitted to descendants, but boldly states: Regarding the primeval father murder, he is quite certain: Men have always known - in this particular way - that once upon a time they had a primeval father and killed him. They even use similar ways to argue for their theories. Still, Freud makes no mention of Jung, and no comparison with his models. It is also quite unlikely that Freud would not recognize and ponder the similarities. Moses Freud gives two examples from biblical events, on which to apply his theory: About Moses, Freud claims that he was not Jewish but an Egyptian, befriending a Jewish tribe, taking it out of Egypt and converting it to his monotheistic religion, that of pharaoh Ikhnoton, the Aton religion of a single sun god. The reason for a monotheistic god at all appearing in otherwise abundantly polytheistic Egypt, Freud finds in the imperialistic success of Egypt, immediately preceding the cult of Aton: The Jews, who even according to the Bible were stubborn and unruly towards their law-giver and leader, rebelled at last, killed him, and threw off the imposed Aton religion as the Egyptians had done before them. The idea of Moses being killed by the Jewish tribe, Freud readily admits to have picked up from a text by German theologian and biblical archaeologist Ernst Sellin. Later on, Freud has this Jewish tribe meet and join with another, and as part of the compromise between them, they adapted the worship of a volcano-god Jahve, influenced by the Arabian Midianites. In an effort to release themselves of the guilt for having killed Moses, that tribe insisted on proclaiming him the father of this new monotheistic religion. In that way, they were almost accomplishing the father worship, which Freud makes the basis of his theory on the origin of religion. In the course of time Jahve lost his own character and became more and more like the old God of Moses, Aton. Jesus Freud moves on to compare the story of Moses with that of Jesus, who was also sacrificed - but willingly, as a symbolic amends for a primordial father murder: A Son of God, innocent himself, had sacrificed himself, and had thereby taken over the guilt of the world. The adoration of the shepherds, by Rembrandt. Jesus, proclaimed the son of god, i. Thus the other sons, the rest of mankind, can in their minds feel forgiven by the father. This is a process reminding of the Greek concept of catharsis, a cleansing bringing relief. Freud sees it approaching and unavoidable, because "a growing feeling of guiltiness had seized the Jewish people - and perhaps the whole of civilization at that time - as a precursor of the return of the repressed material. And of course he sees the Holy Communion as an example of the totem feast, where the totem animal was ritually consumed. Freud finds a significant difference in the fates of Moses and Jesus - the former being a father figure, the latter that of a son. Therefore, he sees the Mosaic religion as essentially focused on the father, whereas Christianity is focused on the son: The old God, the Father, took second place; Christ, the Son, stood in his stead, just as in those dark times every son had longed to do. The killing and dividing of a primal being is a common motif among creation myths - oddly not used as an example by Freud, although he must have come across such examples, for example in the Norse mythology. On the other hand, it is also easy to find myths and religions with little or no trace of such a beginning. In religions swarming of gods of both genders - such as the Indian and Japanese ones - the conclusion makes far less sense. In this evolution I am at a loss to indicate the place of the great maternal deities who perhaps everywhere preceded the paternal deities. He seems to think that maternal gods dominated prior to the father murder, but were substituted with a high father god as a result of it. Society as a whole evolved to a patriarchy, for the same reason: With the institution of paternal deities the fatherless society gradually changed into a patriarchal one. The family was a reconstruction of the former primal horde and also restored a great part of their former rights to the fathers. Now there were patriarchs again but the social achievements of the brother clan had not been

given up and the actual difference between the new family patriarchs and the unrestricted primal father was great enough to insure the continuation of the religious need, the preservation of the unsatisfied longing for the father. Again, this chain of events seems more likely in a society with a clearly monotheistic religion, like the Judeo-Christian sphere. In *Moses and Monotheism* he slightly altered his views on a mother goddess and a matriarchate, as mentioned above. The fall, by Michelangelo Guilt, too, is much more present in Judeo-Christian religion than in many others. This part of his theory is far weaker than that about an actual battle between father and sons. Instead, history tells us that people have not had that much trouble ridding themselves of any guilt, even when performing worse acts than that of killing a tyrant father. Certainly, there are emotions that torment all members of our species, and rule over many of our actions - but Freud fails to prove that guilt is one of them, outside of his own closest frame of reference. Certainly, sexuality, death, and the complications of blood relations appear as themes in countless myths - as they do just about constantly in our own minds. Man is a flock animal, subject to a lot of struggle in the process of reproduction. There is a competition about the females in several species, including our own, and a strong male might not be satisfied by a first choice only, but strive to exclude the other males from approaching any of the females. If any species would have found the solution of the suppressed males joining and thereby overpowering the leader, this would be most likely with mankind. It seems to be sort of a dead-end. Whether the worship of a god stems from some kind of savage making amends or not, the theory gives few tools for further understanding. In literature on the subject, it is treated as little more than a parenthesis, mentioned in passing as an oddity that would have been forgotten if it were the work of a lesser known figure than the father of psychoanalysis. In *Moses and Monotheism* he makes the clear distinction between the individual and the collective perspective, that the psychopathology of human neurosis belongs to individual psychology, "whereas religious phenomena must of course be regarded as a part of mass psychology. In this way, religions are social laws, claiming a higher justification. They are also, with their rituals and myths, instruments by which the individual gains some aid in adapting to them. This function of religion, which Freud is no stranger to, can be approached by his method, and a continued development of it.

2: Moses and Monotheism () by Sigmund Freud

A few weeks ago I came across a book by Sigmund Freud called Moses and Monotheism, his last completed book. The subject of this book is an attempt to delve into the origins of Judaism and make sense of the story of Exodus.

The subject of this book is an attempt to delve into the origins of Judaism and make sense of the story of Exodus. The story of the Exodus is one of the most important in the Judaic religions: Moses, through the ten plagues, defies the will of Pharaoh and frees the Israelites from slavery, leading them to the promised land of Canaan. DeMille film *The Ten Commandments*. Freud, however, argues for the exodus happening slightly earlier; towards the end of the 18th dynasty Rameses II was the 3rd Pharaoh of the 19th dynasty and the period after the reign of the Heretic King Akhenaton. Akhenaton effectively overthrew the social and religious order of Egypt by proclaiming there to be only one god, the Aton, manifested in the sun, but omnipresent and omnipotent. In doing so Akhenaton was not only attempting to overthrow the old religion, but also to destroy the power of the priests of Amon who, over the previous centuries, had accrued so much power that they were able to rival that of Pharaoh. To this end Akhenaton moved the capital from Thebes modern Luxor and founded a new city, Akhetaton now called Tell Armana, here he built a temple to the Aton and forbade the worship of any other gods. However, Akhenaton became obsessed with his new god to the extent that his empire began to crumble. On his death he was succeeded by his son Tutankhaton. The priesthood of Amon seized their chance to reclaim power and forced the new king to re-establish the old religion, whereupon he was renamed Tutankhamen replacing replacing Aton with Amun. Horemheb made it a personal mission to destroy any evidence of the Heretic King. In this task Horemheb was relatively successful so that all memory of Akhenaton had been completely forgotten until the discovery of his capital city in the late 19th century. Freud starts his hypothesis by claiming that Moses was an Egyptian and not a Hebrew. To start with he points to the name itself. We know from archaeological evidence that circumcision was a tradition practised by the ancient Egyptians. It would seem strange therefore that the Hebrews would adopt, as a symbol of their specialness, a practice in common with the most powerful nation on Earth at the time. Freud claims that the most convenient time for the Exodus to have taken place would be in the time immediately after the death of Akhenaton, at time when the followers of the Aton were persecuted by the old religion. Freud therefore deduces that Moses was possibly a priest of the Aton who gathered his followers to flee into exile. Freud goes on to theorize that Moses was a very wilful and forceful man as evidenced by his actions in the Book of Exodus and points to several rebellions that he faces in Exodus; he deduces that in one of these rebellions Moses is killed by his followers. Freud postulates that it is their guilt over the killing of Moses that led to his followers incorporating him as the great prophet of the Book of Exodus. Freud suggest that, coming from the more cultured society of Egypt, the followers of Moses became the priestly tribe of Levi, creating a line of continuity from the priesthood of the Aton to the modern era. Close to his own death, Freud had started to recognize the poetry and promise in religion. Despite being deeply irreligious, Freud was able to take inspiration from the great prophets of the past. Much in the same way as Nietzsche hated Christianity yet aspired to emulate Jesus. The book is about far more than trying to make sense of the Exodus story. It is Freud showing his fascination with Moses, a man he sought to emulate in the sense of making conceptual innovations which could stand the test of time.

3: Moses And Monotheism : Freud,Sigmund. : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive

Moses and Monotheism is Sigmund Freud's last book and was only published after his death. It contains a concise summary and revision of his major theories but even more importantly he expresses his true beliefs about the history of the Judeo/Christian religions.

Assmann is no amateur. He is an eminent German Egyptologist, and no one writes with more authority about relations between ancient Egypt and ancient Israel. Equally important, Assmann aspires to something at once more tenable and more valuable than Freud. Freud tried to describe Moses as he really wasâ€¦ Assmann instead chose to write an account of how Moses has been remembered in different times and placesâ€¦ Assmann gives a dazzling account of several centuries of [the Moses-as-Egyptian] traditionâ€¦ Moses the Egyptian, for all its brilliant erudition, is not simply dispassionate history. It is equally a homily. At the same time, his plea that modern theologians adopt similar views has great moral force. Assmann has done nothing less than suggest that Judaism, Christianity, and Islam be set upon different, more inclusive foundations. By demonstrating that these alternate foundations have long been part of the Judeo-Christian tradition, Assmann makes such sweeping reform almost plausible. Plausible or not, Assmann has written a book that is scholarly and passionate, a book that inspires as well as informs. This is a feature that is no less apparent today than it was two hundred years ago. Assmann tells several interlocking stories. His primary narrative line is the memory of Egypt in the European scholarly imagination. Here he attemptsâ€”with considerable successâ€”to move beyond a conventional history of scholarshipâ€¦ Assmann moves beyond cultural history to something more subtle: That question has to do with the religious distinction between truth and falsehood. It seems natural to a Jew, a Christian or a Muslim to consider his or her own religion true and other religions false. This tendency is especially strong in Christianity. But according to Egyptologist Jan Assman, people who practised the ancient religions we call pagan did not see the world in this way. People of different nations might worship different sets of goddesses and gods, but there were alternative expressions of the same underlying reality. The book is highly recommended, andâ€”quite a good read. Later, in the period treated hereâ€”they credited Moses with having instructed the Hebrews in a version of Egyptian religionâ€¦ This is certainly a fascinating workâ€¦ This account of the theme of Moses the Egyptian should appeal to students of the time period mostly treated here. Moreoverâ€”the volume will serve to introduce any number of students of the Near East to several thinkers who were prominent in their own time but not widely known today. One hopes that this strategy, which leaves other books to be written, has reopened an inexhaustible well of inquiry. It is tantalizing and inviting. No one can fault him on his scholarship or erudition. He is one of the most talented historians of the Ancient world.

4: Moses the Egyptian – Jan Assmann | Harvard University Press

This one-page guide includes a plot summary and brief analysis of Moses and Monotheism by Sigmund Freud. Moses and Monotheism is a religious philosophy book by Austrian psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud, consisting of three essays and expanding Freud's work on psychoanalytic theory to generate hypotheses about historical events.

At his time, persecution and hatred for the Jewish people was quite common. Being a pioneer in the field of psychoanalysis, he set out to investigate the origins of the Jewish people. Among his most astonishing claims was that Moses was not of Jewish. For one, the name Moses is not of Jewish origin and can be traced back to ancient Egyptians. The book is an attempt to apply psychoanalysis to the field of history. An extension on his earlier works such as Totem and Taboo. In keeping with his suggestion about the primal father, Freud argues that a small band of individuals, which Moses led out of Egypt during a time of great civil war, conspired against him and eventually killed him. In his book, Freud argues that the tribe of Israel from this original sin of the murder of the tribes founding father. However, when his followers murdered Moses, they were overcome by a deep sense of remorse and guilt. Later on, as this small band of individuals were wandering through the deserts, they came upon monotheistic tribe. They combined with this tribe but their collective memory of Moses never died. Consequently, the Jewish people invented the coming of a Messiah. According to Freud, the concept of a Messiah was nothing more than a desire for reconnecting with their ancient father figure "Moses". To explain the Jewish story of the adoption of Moses, Freud draws on the concept of family romance. Freud argues that individuals have a primal desire to trace their bloodline back to royalty. This is because it makes them feel good about themselves. The band of individuals who Moses escaped with from Egypt created the story of the adoption of Moses. In the second section of the book, Freud set out to explain how the Jewish religion was developed. In his book, Freud explains that the Egyptian god Aton was in fact the original god of Moses. However, the god Aton was not wholly accepted by the polytheistic priests of ancient Egypt who had a deep connection to the people. The god Aton was created during the reign of the pharaoh named Akhenaton. His dream of creating a monotheistic god however crushed to the ground when he died. The polytheistic priests of the Aton order immediately reestablished themselves and the god Aton was lost to history. However, some in the royal family, which Moses came from were not pleased with this. They attempted a rebellion but were ultimately defeated and hence they fled to the desert. Freud points to the practice of circumcising young children in Jewish culture, very little mention of life after death and the strict adherence to a single god as similarities between Jewish religion and that of Aton worshippers. After his attempts at power were thwarted by the priests, Moses became frustrated and led his band of loyal followers out in the desert where they could practice their religion in peace. However, it is important to note that this was a conjecture created by Freud and has no basis in real evidence. Freud further analyzes Jewish folklore to find truth for his conjecture. He had the advantage of having first-hand experience seeing as he was born Jewish. However, at some time their beliefs from their polytheistic past came into conflict with the religion of Moses. Consequently, when Moses died, most of his religion was abandoned. They returned to their polytheistic and almost completely forgot about Moses and Aton. However, in their nomadic lifestyle, they came upon a people who had also escaped the civil unrest that had gripped ancient Egypt. However, this people practiced the worship of a mountain god who they called Yahweh. The newfound god was very demanding of the people of Israel in terms of ritual sacrifice. The people began to follow this god and even built places of worship, which they named temples in honor of Him. For instance, the practice of circumcising young children was retained. Over time, the suppressed memory of Moses due to shame began to reemerge. In order to avoid dealing with the fact of the murder of their primal father, the Jewish people invented stories about Moses mysterious disappearance. Over time, the people integrated the stories of Moses to the newfound god Yahweh. As time progressed, combined with the psychology of family romance, Jews magnified the volcano into an all-powerful god and of course, they placed themselves at the center of his adoration. Later in his work, Freud claims that the story of Jesus was another fanciful invention of the Jews. In his work, he claims that the nailing of Jesus to the cross was a way for humanity and Jews to try to deal with this sense of

guilt. This guilt rose from the murder of Moses. Freud claims the original sin was actually the murder of the primal father. Freud seems to have based most of his work on the premise of Judeo-Christian religion. His work, especially concerning human sexuality, revenge and deep-seated guilt does tend to resonate with human beings, even if just at a basic level.

5: Religious Experience Resources - Reviews

Not because Freud's hypothesis is correct necessarily, but because he was, to the best of my knowledge, the first person to bring up the Akhenaten Aten worship (which was the first known monotheism) and try to connect it to the monotheistic worship of YHWH by the Israelites.

Twitter The shocking story that Freud tells—or appears to tell—in *Moses and Monotheism* is well known. Judaism Terminable and Interminable. Monotheism is not of Jewish origin but an Egyptian discovery. The pharaoh Amenhotep IV established it as his state religion in the form of an exclusive worship of the sun-power, or Aton, thereafter calling himself Ikhnoton. The Aton religion, according to Freud, was characterized by the exclusive belief in one God, the rejection of anthropomorphism, magic, and sorcery, and the absolute denial of an afterlife. Moses was not a Hebrew but an Egyptian priest or noble, and a fervent monotheist. In order to save the Aton religion from extinction he placed himself at the head of an oppressed Semitic tribe then living in Egypt, brought them forth from bondage, and created a new nation. He gave them an even more spiritualized, imageless form of monotheistic religion and, in order to set them apart, introduced the Egyptian custom of circumcision. But the crude mass of former slaves could not bear the severe demands of the new faith. In a mob revolt Moses was killed and the memory of the murder repressed. The Israelites went on to forge an alliance of compromise with kindred Semitic tribes in Midian whose fierce volcanic deity. As a result, the god of Moses was fused with [this god] and the deeds of Moses ascribed to a Midianite priest also called Moses. However, over a period of centuries the submerged tradition of the true faith and its founder gathered sufficient force to reassert itself and emerge victorious. In the beginning the primeval father was slain by his sons. Ultimately, in polytheism, he was completely forgotten, his memory repressed. In its very essence, therefore, monotheism represented the return of that long latent memory in the form of the one omnipotent God beside whom there is no other. The tremendous impact of what Moses revealed to the Israelites lay, one might say, in a shock of recognition, in their profound sense of reunion and reconciliation with the long lost Father for whom mankind had always unconsciously yearned. This, indeed, was the origin of their feeling of being the Chosen People. Only after another period of latency that lasted some five to eight centuries did the Mosaic religion return to group consciousness and grip the Jewish people for all ages to come. From the very moment of its appearance until today *Moses and Monotheism* has been controversial. But is this story as stable as is generally believed? And yet, although Freud never explicitly repudiates any of these claims, a close reading of his text shows that he silently drops all of them. Moses was an Egyptian: The Israelites murdered Moses: There were two Moseses: And any analysis of his famous claims must both subject them to historical criticism and put them in the context of postbiblical discussions of Moses that go back to late antiquity. Jan Assmann, Richard Bernstein, and others have done so, and yet they, and innumerable others, have presumed that we know the story that Freud settled on. First the two Moseses: Freud proposes that there was first an Egyptian Moses and later a Midianite Moses, in the second essay of *Moses and Monotheism*. The mediator between God and the people [that is, the Jewish tribes] in the founding of this religion was named Moses. He was the son-in-law of the Midianite priest Jethro, and was keeping his flocks when he received the summons from God. How are we to account for this? As we just saw, it suffices for him to assert that after the Jews had murdered the Egyptian Moses and rejected his religion, they at some later point, under the influence of Arab Midianites, adopted a new, lower, more primitive form of religion, consisting of the worship of the volcano god. So why did Freud introduce this second Moses to begin with? To understand this, we must realize that the first two essays of *Moses and Monotheism* take the form of a detective story or quest. Freud keeps trying to develop his story, but at key points he seems to arrive at a dead end, an insuperable problem. But then he somehow manages to overcome the difficulty and proceed with his account. Indeed, the very insuperable difficulty turns out to be the vehicle for further progress. So it is with the two Moseses: In the second essay, Freud develops his view that Moses was an Egyptian. But now he faces a problem. So, who was the real Moses? So, both Freud is right and Meyer is right, because there were two distinct Moseses. Funerary figure of Ikhnoton, ca. Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Why was it

important to Freud to claim that Moses was an Egyptian and that he was murdered by the Israelites? As we get further into *Moses and Monotheism*, it turns out that its real goal is to suggest a historical scenario that would explain the Jewish psyche. And the fact that this savior, the Egyptian Moses, had chosen the Israelites helped Freud to account for the emergence of Jewish self-confidence. The murder and, perhaps even more so, the repression of its memory are the key elements of both the second essay in *Moses and Monotheism* and the first part of the third essay. The Jewish people under Moses were just as little able to tolerate [his] highly spiritualized religion. There came a time when people began to regret the murder of Moses and to seek to forget it. It is simply dropped. What is going on here? Originally, as I briefly stated earlier, Freud needed his thesis of the murder of Moses to account for Jewish guilt. The Jews repressed both memories, but, as all good Freudians know, repressed memories are the most potent ones. But, as Freud retells his story, it turns out that it was not the repressed memory of the murder of Moses that triggered Jewish guilt, but something else entirely. But if it was not the repressed memory of the murder of Moses that triggered Jewish guilt, what did? All scholars agree that the evidence that Freud advances in favor of Moses being an Egyptian is extraordinarily weak. Both Philo and Josephus knew that the name Moses is etymologically Egyptian, but they did not conclude from this that he was of Egyptian stock. For him, just as God is the great other, so Moses has to be other than the people he chose. And here we come to the significance of Moses being an Egyptian. Moses, the Egyptian, chooses the Israelites, who as a group of Semitic tribes are foreigners, are ethnically other than him, to be his new people. Governor of the frontier province Goshen in which certain Semitic tribes had settled. These he chose to be his new people. Note that he does not choose them to be his people—they already are his people. Therefore, while Freud in this section states that Moses took his monotheism from Ikhnoton, he never refers to Moses as an Egyptian. For it is no longer necessary for Moses to be ethnically other than the Jew in order to elect the Jews. I can now answer my earlier question. If it was not the repressed memory of the murder of Moses that triggered Jewish guilt, what was it, according to Freud? For the appearance of Father Moses, alongside the appearance of God the Father that constituted the substance of his teaching, and behind both the submerged memory of the primal father, elicits both love and hostility. The love toward the father—Moses, God, the primal father, or all three blended together—and the sense of being chosen by him give rise to the sense of self-confidence, while the unacknowledged and repressed hostility toward him gives rise to guilt. In the last section of *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud writes: The first effect of meeting the being who had so long been missed and longed for was overwhelming and was like the traditional description of the law-giving from Mount Sinai. Admiration, awe and thankfulness for having found grace in his eyes—the religion of Moses knew none but these positive feelings towards the father-god. A rapture of devotion to God was thus the first reaction to the return of the great father. There was no place in the framework of the religion of Moses for a direct expression of the murderous hatred of the father. All that could come to light was a mighty reaction against it—a sense of guilt on account of that hostility, a bad conscience for having sinned against God and for not ceasing to sin. And indeed, no repressed memory of an actual murder is necessary in order to instill any sense of guilt in the Israelites; the unexpressed hostility and murderous rage are more than sufficient. For, as Freud has taught us, in the depths of the unconscious, the wish is as potent as the deed. To cite the full passage that I excerpted earlier: There is no doubt that it was a mighty prototype of a father, which, in the person of Moses, stooped to the poor Jewish bondsmen to assure them that they were his dear children. And no less overwhelming must have been the effect upon them of the idea of an only, eternal, almighty God, to whom they were not too mean for him to make a covenant with them and who promised to care for them if they remained loyal to his worship. It was probably not easy for them to distinguish the image of the man Moses from that of his God, and their feeling was right in this, for Moses may have introduced traits of his own personality into the character of his God—such as his wrathful temper and his relentlessness. But in the second account it is the appearance of Moses, the father, together with his teaching about God the Father and the ambivalent feelings they trigger that, at one and the same time, elicit both Jewish self-confidence and Jewish guilt. A deep and striking narrative irony, then, lies at the very heart of *Moses and Monotheism*. It changes in ways of which the teller may be unaware. This was, of course, a lesson taught by the master, Freud himself, but that does not mean that he himself was exempt from it. Strikingly,

when Jews sit down to retell the story of the exodus on Passover night, the account, as found in the Haggadah, differs radically from that in the Bible. But this change in the retelling, far from being inadvertent or unconscious, was deliberate.

6: Moses and Monotheism by Sigmund Freud

Freud was quite interested in Jewish history. At his time, persecution and hatred for the Jewish people was quite common. Being a pioneer in the field of psychoanalysis, he set out to investigate the origins of the Jewish people. Among his most astonishing claims was that Moses was not of Jewish.

The People of Israel We may start from one character trait of the Jews which governs their relationship to other people. There is no doubt that they have a very good opinion of themselves, think themselves nobler, on a higher level, superior to the others, from whom they are also separated by many of their customs. With this they are animated by a special trust in life, such as is bestowed by the secret possession of a precious gift; it is a kind of optimism. Religious people would call it trust in God. We know the reason for this attitude of theirs and what their precious treasure is. According to trustworthy accounts, they behaved in Hellenistic times as they do today. The Jewish character, therefore, even then was what it is now, and the Greeks, among whom and alongside whom they lived, reacted to the Jewish qualities in the same way as their "hosts" do today. They reacted, one might think, as if they too believed in the preference which the Israelites claimed for themselves. When one is the declared favorite of the dreaded father one need not be surprised that the other brothers and sisters are jealous. What this jealousy can lead to is exquisitely shown in the Jewish legend of Joseph and his brethren. The subsequent course of world history seemed to justify this Jewish arrogance, for when, later on, God consented to send mankind a Messiah and Redeemer, he again chose him from among the Jewish people. The other people would then have had reason to say: On the strength of my previous remarks we may say that it was the man Moses who stamped the Jewish people with this trait, one which became so significant to them for all time. He enhanced their self-confidence by assuring them that they were the chosen people of God; he declared them to be holy and laid on them the duty to keep apart from others. Not that the other peoples on their part lacked self-confidence. Then, just as now, each nation thought itself superior to all the others. The self-confidence of the Jews, however, became through Moses anchored in religion; it became a part of their religious belief. By the particularly close relationship to their God they acquired a part of his grandeur. To him this people owes its tenacity in supporting life; to him, however, also much of the hostility which it has met with and is meeting still. Translation by Katherine Jones.

7: Moses and Monotheism - Wikipedia

In that context, the pivotal role of Freud's masterpiece, Moses and Monotheism, is widely recognized. Freud and Monotheism brings together fundamental new contributions to discourses on Freud and Moses, as well as new research at the intersections of theology, political theory, and history in Freud's psychoanalytic work.

8: The Question of God . Moses and Monotheism | PBS

Freud's Moses and Monotheism In Moses and Monotheism, which was published in , the same year Freud died, he boldly repeats his theory from Totem and Taboo, although having received substantial criticism for it, during the quarter-century since he presented it.

9: Freud and Monotheism

"Moses and Monotheism" indicates that Freud, irreligious as he was, could still find inspiration in a religious figure. Something similar was true about Freud's predecessor, Nietzsche.

Postcolonial borderlands Jim harrison brown dog Collaborative product design and manufacturing methodologies and applications Ronald Reagans contradictionary of the American language Palaeolithic archaeology in Iran The national and religious song reader Women and Justice Process Chemistry of Petroleum Macromolecules Four letters from Sir Isaac Newton to Doctor Bentley, containing some arguments in proof of a deity. No right : phenomenality and self-denial in Nietzsche Indian Trust Counsel Authority Shifts in economic geography and their causes Anthony J. Venables. Commentary Douglas A. Irwin. General d The cotton patch version of Luke and Acts Out of silence and darkness Death of the battleship. The violoncello of Juffrouw Rosenboom The journey toward sustainability: where do we stand today? V. 4. Soviet nuclear weapons by Thomas B. Cochran . [et al.] V. 2. The United States Army in a global era, 1917-2003 Books about making money The Story of Glass (Large Print Edition) KATHARIN GOES NUR SCH (Great Big Board Books) Stones of the new consciousness Readings on Heart of darkness Excerpts from State and revolution Vladimir Lenin. Undrstdg Human Behav Eff Managing for business effectiveness The conditional view Clark H. Pinnock. Pastoral counseling, a reflective mode Pictorial practical fruit growing Obras Poeticas. THREE VOLUMES V. 1. Memoir and poems. The political danger of the day. A letter to the Press. By Lord Balfour of Burleigh. World war ii soviet armed forces 3 Demi lovato book stay strong Frommers Washington, D.C. 2004 Sparse matrices and their applications Haynes Jeep Wrangler 1987 thru 1999 lelts writing task 1 simon Halachos for the traveler