Harold P. Blum

Tribute to Graziella Magherini. Freud's travels and the Stendhal Syndrome

Abstract

Freud's experience of de-realization at the Parthenon in Athens, and his anxiety and creeping out of the roman church with the Michelangelo masterpiece of Moses are virtually overlooked examples of the Stendhal Syndrome, pertinent to the history of psychoanalysis as well as to Freud psychobiography. The discussion of Freud's reactions will encompass the psychoanalytic, historical, social and artistic context. Derivatives of Freud's early travel phobia, childhood and adolescent fantasy, will be linked to the psychology of disturbed visitors to distant art centers and museums.

Keywords

Freud's travel disturbance; Freud and Fliess; Freud and Jung; Freud and Moses; Freud and Athens

DOI – 10.6092/issn.2038-6184/7297

Harold P. Blum

Tribute to Graziella Magherini. Freud's travels and the Stendhal Syndrome*

Graziella Magherini, in her original masterful contribution on the Stendhal Syndrome, described acute psychological disturbance persisting from several hours to a few days in tourists visiting Florence. The individual experienced a variety of symptoms from panic including fears of suffocation and death and/or depression Somatic symptoms included tachycardia, vertigo, and near or actual fainting. In some cases there was a reaction of alienation, depersonalization, and or de-realization (Magherini, 2007a).

Travelers who experienced the Stendhal Syndrome sometimes sought companions for comfort and security and often expressed a wish to return home. They were usually asymptomatic prior to their visit and the onset of symptoms could occur in any location in their travels when encountering a particularly evocative work of art. The surround could be regarded as foreign, confusing and/or hostile, but sometimes as benign and pleasant.

The syndrome is named for the famed French author Stendhal who visited Florence in 1817 and wrote:

"I was in a sort of ecstasy, from the idea of being in Florence, close to the great men whose tombs I had seen. Absorbed in the contemplation of sublime beauty. [...] I reached the point where one encounters celestial sensations. [...] Everything spoke so vividly to my soul. Ah, if I could only forget. I had palpitations of the heart, what in Berlin they call "nerves". Life was drained from me. I walked with the fear of falling" (Stendhal, 1973).

Though originally formulated in the city noted for its masterpieces of art, the syndrome has also been called the Jerusalem Syndrome and may occur in any setting with great art. The disturbed emotional reaction of each individual is determined by multiple factors in his/her immediate present, past life experience, neuro-biological endowment. The Stendhal Syndrome consists of a broad spectrum of psychological distress, simply stated a destabilizing effect elicited by experiencing a great work of art (or perhaps on viewing even a mediocre work of art, in one lacking aesthetic sensitivity). The relation of the art to the spectator's present and past life is highly individual, but usually entails an aesthetic appreciation of the masterpiece.

Every traveler consciously and unconsciously, beginning with the planning for the trip, reacts to experience of travel, to its comforts and excitement, its burdens and hardships. Travel involves separation from home, family and friends, and the familiar surround, and may be solitary or include one or more companions. Travel to a new strange place may also involve encounters with different cultures, customs, and language. The new experience may combine confusion with exhilaration, isolation with intimate discovery. The unfamiliar may challenge identity and require adaptation to new relationships between the self and surround. Travel may also permit and promote new freedom of curiosity and exploration and gratification of otherwise inhibited passions. Great works of arty may evoke powerful unconscious fantasies, long forgotten, or released and

returned from repression. Although the reactions of the traveler may superficially resemble the problem of adaptation of the immigrant, the traveler's foreign visit is time limited.

While viewing any work of art may elicit an emotional reaction of greater or lesser intensity, positive, negative, or mixed, viewing a great work of art in one's home city, or in a perhaps familiar nearby museum can be quite different from encountering art during distant travel. The Stendhal Syndrome occurs in a foreign landscape that fosters emotional responses to the art that may not have occurred in a familiar setting. Stendhal himself referred to his heightened emotional state due to being in Florence. Stendhal was a dragoon in Napoleon's army when he entered Italy in 1800, not an aristocrat on tour. Italy became his favorite country, and figures prominently in his autobiography. The European "Grand Tour" for cultural education, often following the completion of formal education and conferred and/or confirmed social status, as the wealthy contemplated timeless masterpieces. Stendhal was among the first to use the term "tourist", writing about travel as commonplace and ordinary, rather than reserved for the wealthy few (Bamforth, 2010).

This paper is a psycho-biographical discourse on Freud's Stendhal Syndrome on visits to Italy and Greece. The evocations of Freud's thoughts and feelings during his travels, particularly to Rome and Athens, as well, the significant antecedents of his reactions in his preadult life are emphasized. Of the multitude of papers on the subject, I have referred to those of particular personal interest. My discussion concentrates on Freud's complex relationship with Moses, a psychoanalytically monumental figure. Freud's reaction to Michelangelo's Moses exemplifies how an individual's personal history and conflicts, both conscious and unconscious, interpersonal and intra-psychic, may be manifest in the intense emotional responses

described as the Stendhal Syndrome.

Freud's travel disturbance was manifest not only in the Stendhal Syndrome but in travel inhibition and in two episodes of fainting in Jung's presence. Freud was planning his only trip outside of Europe to lecture and receive an honorary doctorate from Clark University, Worcester, MA, USA. On August 20, 1909, Freud fainted when Jung spoke of prehistoric remains the day before they were to sail to America. Freud interpreted Jung's comments as disguised death wishes towards him. Again fainting in Jung's presence in 1912, on a trip to Munich from Vienna, Freud recalled having previously fainted in the same hotel room in 1906 and 1908. He interpreted his fainting as a reaction to unconscious homosexual conflicts, but also connected to early childhood antecedents. He interpreted his fainting to deeply repressed death wishes towards his infant brother, Julius (Julius was born when Freud was about eighteen months old and died when Freud was about twenty-four months old (Blum, 1977; 2015). Freud's 1912 fainting episode was also associated with being weary from travelling with poor food and excess smoking. Jung, representing his estranged colleague Fliess and his deceased brother, Julius, had disagreed with Freud about the Pharaoh Amenhotep scratching out the name of his father on Egyptian monuments. Freud fainted as he recognized that he represented Jung's effaced father (Gay, 2006). This excursion into ancient history involved travel through time and space. An almost timeless past reappeared in a return of the repressed. A reactivated archaic superego may have evoked fantasies of punishment for Freud's death wishes toward Jung and other rivals, present and past. In his break with Jung and Adler, Freud turned to Moses, as he had in his estrangement from a hostile Fliess and at other times of crisis. A lifelong preoccupation of Freud, Moses was a double, an idealized self and object, a self-analyst in fantasy who replaced Fliess.

That Moses was an imposing figure dating from Freud's childhood could be readily reconstructed from Freud's life and work. Freud (1925, p. 8) write "My deep engrossment in the Bible story, (almost as soon as I learned the art of reading) had as I recognized much later, an enduring effect upon the direct of my interest". His father, Jacob Freud, had given him a Philippson Bible with its exposition of Moses, who bestowed the ten commandments written in stone and binding on all people without exception. Moses, the supreme prophet of the old Testament was the law giver, leader, and liberator. There was a Moses like statue which stood in the central square of the little town of Freud's birthplace, Pribor, Czech Republic. The statue is currently in the rear of St. Mary's Church, and has been identified as the He brew prophet Zacharius. One of Freud's nursemaids likely took him with her to that church. The statue may well again have represented Moses to the adolescent Freud when he visited Pribor (Blum, 1991). By the time Freud returned to Pribor he had already been acquainted with the Philippson Bible with its images of ancient Egypt. Moses holding the Commandments written on the tablet was on the frontispiece of the Bible. Regarding his childhood and adolescence, Freud proposed that the power of religion "lies in the truth which it contains. I showed that truth was not a material but a historical truth" (Freud, 1927, p. 72). Freud identified with the Biblical patriarchs, e.g. Jacob, Joseph, and especially with Moses, as an idealized father figure and an alter ego. Moses was the most important of Freud's doubles. Through projective identification he treated Michelangelo's awesome statue of Moses as though it were a double. Freud's identified with different aspects of Moses during different developmental phases, from protective, feared and/or punitive omnipotent object to awe inspiring abstract ideal.

In 1901, Freud was elated upon his first entry into Rome having overcome a long inhibition of travel to Rome, after

six prior trips to Italy. He promptly went to the Church of San Pietro in Vincoli. He sought Michelangelo's famous statue of Moses, probably previously known from a copy in the Vienna academy of Art. Gazing at the monumental masterpiece, Freud wrote to Martha (his wife) that he expected the statue to move at any moment. He then reacted to the statue with awe, wonder, fascination, and inspiration. In Freud's imagination the statue came to life. Foreshadowing his later interpretation, he asserted, "I have come to understand the meaning of the statue by contemplating Michelangelo's intention" (Jones, 1955, p. 365). Freud wrote to Jones when Jones was visiting Rome, asking Jones to bring his deepest devotion to Moses. He wanted Jones to write to him about Moses, and Jones made a pilgrimage the day after his arrival to convey Freud's greetings to Moses. Jones knew how to please Freud, for whom the Moses statue was a totem, an icon, alive, yet a religious relic of Biblical antiquity. Moses was resurrected, brought to life, in Freud's daydreams as an ego ideal, ideal self and object, alter ego, and ambivalently loved and hated parental authority. So different from his devalued real father, Moses was exalted and worshipped as a hero, dissociated from a parricidal fantasy of murdering Moses and usurping his authority.

Freud visited "Moses" on all his trips to Rome, so that while Freud was separated from most of his family, Rome and Moses were inseparable. His 1913 visit to Rome and Moses was different, from his previous visits. It was a period of inner turmoil related to external conflict with Adler and Jung. Freud visited Moses every day during his 1913 travel to Rome. Freud analyzed The Moses of Michelangelo, while symbolically in analysis with Moses. The statue had been magically brought to life in Freud's imagination, dissociated from reality. He had an analytic session with Moses each day for three weeks in September, 1913 (Blum, 1991): "I stood daily in the church in front of the statue, studied it,

measured it drew it until that understanding came to me that I only dared to express openly in the paper" (Gay, 2006 p. 315). His emotional reaction was stated soon thereafter:

"No piece of statuary has ever made a stronger impression on me than this. How often I have mounted the steep steps from the unlovely Corso Cavour to the lonely piazza where the church stands, and have essayed to support the angry scorn of the hero's glance! Sometimes I have crept cautiously out of the half-gloom of the interior as though I myself belong to the mob upon whom his eye is turned – the mob which can hold fast to no conviction, which has neither faith nor patience, and which rejoices when it has regained its illusory ideals" (Freud, 1914b, p. 214).

The passage refers to the worship of the Golden Calf by renegade Hebrews. He apparently was experiencing the Stendhal Syndrome, a flood of feelings memory, and sensations with prominent anxiety and guilt. Why did Freud, so out of character, now cower and cringe in the presence of Michelangelo's Moses? Pope Julius II had commissioned the Moses sculpture for his own tomb in the city of Julius Caesar. Pope Julius and Julius Caesar were associated with Freud's brother Julius who died in infancy one month before the death of Freud's mother's brother Julius. Similar conflicts involved in a slip of memory concerning the name Julius Moses (Freud, August 26, 1898, in Masson 1995, p. 324), referring to both Julius and Moses suggested conflict concerning the death of Julius. His death compounded by his mother's grief, left a germ of guilt consequent to Freud's jealousy and fulfilled death wishes. Freud's description of the Moses of Michelangelo as frozen forever in his wrath unconsciously referred to his fear of retribution for the fulfillment of his death wishes towards his brother Julius. His commentary is reminiscent of the menacing "Commendatore" statue in *Don Giovanni*, one of Freud's favorite operas. Infuriated by the worship of the golden calf, Moses requested divine retribution towards the

renegades. Having formerly idealized Fliess, Adler, and Jung, Freud was now eager for their analytic demise, as he had unconsciously wished for the demise of his brother Julius, his infant rival. Why did Freud write (1914b) *The Moses of Michelangelo* anonymously? If he were concerned that his knowledge of art history and criticism was inadequate, why had he not omitted his name from his psychoanalytic essay on Leonardo da Vinci? Presumably Freud was reluctant to reveal the depth of his rage at Jung, Adler, and Fliess. Different from the Biblical Moses, he contained his rage, rather than smashing the commandments in a tantrum. Embarrassed at having fainted in Jung's presence, Freud could have preferred not to acknowledge his masochistic wish to appease his apostate former colleagues. He protested that Jung wrote analytic papers; without mentioning Freud's name. Unlike Freud, Jung gave a religious rather than an analytic interpretation of parricide. Their acrimonious exchange was probably in same hotel room where Freud had argued in his break with Fliess. In Freud's (1910) "non vixit" dream, Fliess and other rivals vanished. Freud was afraid his discoveries and name would be effaced, yet also later acknowledged a homosexual submission to Jung in his fainting and being carried by Jung to a couch. Freud also associated to his guilt over his death wishes towards his infant brother Julius who vanished. Freud attempted to analyze the Moses statue from every angle and perspective. He inferred a sequence of movements preceding the seated Moses holding the tablets upside down (Blum, Blum & Pazzagli, 2007). This depiction might also be related to feeling a loss of equilibrium and balance as reported by Freud's as well as other travelers upon confronting art that arouses intense ambivalent emotions (Magherini, 2007a).

Freud had assumed that the statue represented Moses preserving the tablets rather than destroying them in his rage against the heretical worshippers of the golden calf.

Freud's Moses had changed from the murderous avenger of the Hebrews who had killed an Egyptian overlord; he did not break the tablets. Freud's Moses was identified also with his own father, Jacob. In his inscribed Hebrew dedication of his gift of the rebound Bible to his son Sigmund on the latter's 35th birthday Freud's father compared the rebound Philippson Bible to the preservation of the sacred tablets. Freud (1914b, pp. 299-230) in scribed in his own essay "the Moses we have reconstructed will neither leap up nor cast the Tablets from him [...]. In his first transport of fury, Moses desired to act, to spring up and take vengeance and forget the Tablets; but he has overcome the temptation, and he will now remain seated and still [...]. Nor will he throw away the Tables so that they will break on the stones...he has controlled his anger [... he remembers his mission and for its sake renounced an indulgence of his feelings".

Freud recreated Moses in his interpretation of and identification with Michelangelo. Freud regarded Moses as the founder of the Jewish religion, proposing that a prior Moses had been murdered by a crazed mob, similar to the Freud's proposition of murder of the primal father by the hordes of brothers (Freud, 1913). The internalization of the primal father and the laws of Moses may be regarded as anticipating the formulation of the superego, and its relation to the development of culture and religion. Freud's (1914a) anonymous essay was written just after his polemical *History of the Psychoanalytic Movement*. He had written to Ferenczi that the present situation in Vienna makes him feel more like the wrathful Biblical Moses than Michelangelo's Moses. Freud was the oedipal and sibling rival, victorious over Adler and Jung. Both left the Freud group and Jung resigned as president of the growing International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA). In 1909, Freud wrote to Jung that he himself was the Moses forbidden to enter the promised land, Jung as Joshua would take its possession, i.e. would become the leader of the

psychoanalytic movement. He had been concerned that the fledgling IPA might be considered a Jewish society.

Was not the promised land also the city of Rome? That the promised land referred to Rome as well as Jerusalem can be gleaned from earlier noted in Freud's (1900) dreams about Rome. Identified with Moses, he could only glimpse the forbidden city from afar. Freud as Moses, the liberator, led to freedom from the tyranny of unconscious fantasy and trauma and externally freedom from anti-Semitic intimidation (Freud, 1900, p.196-197) declared: "to my youthful mind, [...] the increasing importance [...] of the anti-Semitic movement upon our emotional life helped to fix the thought and feeling [...]. Thus the wish to go to Rome had become in my dream life a cloak and symbol for a number of other passionate wishes".

By 1914 Freud was less concerned about having Jung as a non-Jewish, Christian leader of the psychoanalytic movement. He was more secure as the Moses like figure and founder of psychoanalysis and would.

Freud's (1937) *A Disturbance of memory on the Acropolis* exemplifies Freud's travel conflicts, manifest in Greece, where he experienced the Stendhal Syndrome, contemplating the timeless architecture and art of ancient Athens. This paper was composed long after Freud's visit to Athens in 1904, accompanied by his brother, Alexander. The paper is perplexing in its timing, as well as in its presentation as a written gift to the writer, Rolland, on his 70th birthday. In his open letter to Rolland Freud stated that the composition was barely worth the latter's attention. He described a strange, surprising, sudden thought which crossed his mind as he stood and surveyed the Acropolis. "So all this really does exist, just as we learned it at school" (Freud 1937, p. 240), He further stated "the whole psychical situation, which seems so confused and is so difficult to describe [...] such a feeling is known as a 'feeling of de-realization'."

Advised against their plan to travel to Corfu, Sigmund and Alexander accepted the suggestion to visit Athens. Freud wrote to Rolland that his de-realization was a defense against his unconscious wish for superiority over his father. "It must be that a sense of guilt was attached to the satisfaction". They had gone far beyond their father... "The very theme of Athens and the Acropolis in itself contained evidence of the son's superiority. Our father [...] had no secondary education, and Athens could not have meant much to him" (Freud, 1937, pp. 247-48). In Athens he bought some antiquities for his collection, beyond the means and comprehension of his parents. He had travelled to places of his youthful imagination. Freud then referred to the separation aspect of travel as pleasurable rather than activating phobic anxiety. "The pleasure of travel [...] is rooted... in dissatisfaction with home and family". On this trip Freud was both "big" (older) brother and father figure to Alexander. His parents had given him a paternal role in choosing his brother's name, Alexander, after Alexander the Great for their new son and last child after the birth of five sisters. During visits to the household of Sigmund Freud, his five grown sisters would join Martha and Minna (Freud's wife and her sister) while Sigmund and Alexander conversed and smoked in Sigmund Freud's office.

Freud corresponded with Romain Rolland from 1923 to 1939. At Freud's urging Stefan Zweig arranged Rolland's visit to Freud (1924) and a complex relationship had developed (Fisher, 1976). Rolland's "oceanic feeling" reflecting a state of merger or an undifferentiated phase, the pre-verbal infant's lack of ego boundaries, was noted by Freud (1930). Rolland had written *Voyage Within*, amplifying a psychoanalytic journey shortly after visiting Freud in 1924. What were the deeper meanings of Freud's de-realization thirty-two years prior to his open letter to Rolland? (Lippman, 2008) Rolland was an intellectual, a creative, prolific, writer and a Nobel Prize winner in

literature in 1915. Pertinent to the Moses statue, Rolland had written a biography of Michelangelo. He was a staunch pacifist and a member of a World committee against War and Fascism. Rolland also wrote an "open letter" not to an individual, but to the people of Germany. He protested the brutality of the criminal madmen who controlled and terrorized the country. Jews and political foes of the Nazis were forced to flee, but faced travel restrictions. Freud was doubtless aware of Rolland's humanitarian protest amidst the Nazi celebration of the 1936 Olympic games. The references to Ancient Greece in the context of Nazi Germany might also have activated the memory of de-realization. Freud's deep interest in Greek mythology was evident in his utilization of the Greek myths of Oedipus and Narcissus. Freud was identified with and admired by Rolland, gratified by their friendly relationship. Though ambivalent, Freud was and willing to acknowledge and consider Rolland's ideas. Freud clearly then preferred his oedipal paradigm to the early infant mother experience suggested by the oceanic feeling. Narcissism and envy may also have been issues in their relationship as Freud had aspired to a Nobel Prize. Though Freud considered the pre-verbal undifferentiated phase, he maintained an over simplified, oedipal conflict, rather than an over determined interpretation of his de-realization on the Acropolis.

The open letter to Rolland enigmatically excavated Freud's memory of de-realization on the Acropolis in 1904. Proposed as an analytic session (Kanzer, 1969) in fantasy, Freud's open letter referring to his experience at the Acropolis, thirty-two years prior, tends to obscure interpretations of the meaning of the open letter. Nor did Freud's open letter address over determination of analysis via letter, and of the transference-counter-transference to Rolland. Freud's Stendhal Syndrome of de-realization on the Acropolis has been the subject of much analytic inquiry (Fisher, 1976). At that time Fliess had accused Freud of

plagiarizing the theory of human bisexuality. Though related to Fliess's accusation of plagiarism and the Acropolis Stendhal Syndrome (Schur, 1969), bisexuality is not apparent in Freud's Moses papers. Terminating their correspondence and personal relationship, Freud's final break with Fliess occurred in 1904, amidst recrimination by Fliess. Freud's self-analysis by mail with a proxy analyst was embedded in the Freud-Fliess correspondence (Masson, 1985) which contained as well the germination of psychoanalysis. The open letter to Rolland may be regarded as a sequel to the Fliess letters. That his relationship to Fliess continued to loom in Freud's mind is apparent in his paper on Michelangelo. In the Fliess letters, where Freud first formulated the Oedipus complex in writing, Freud simultaneously introduced his pre-oedipal reconstruction of his reactions to the birth and death of his infant brother Julius. His sibling rivalry and death wishes toward Julius coalesce with his oedipal rivalry and parricidal wishes toward his father. The paired death wishes both relate to the possession of his mother in successive developmental phases. By Freud's adolescence he had not only had the prerogative of being his mother's confidant, but also her advisor and an authority to his siblings. The reality of his achieving superiority to his father with his mother's collusion was denied and reaffirmed on the Acropolis. He had achieved superiority over Fliess, his oedipal and sibling rival, whose memory he preferred to forget. The father figure of the Acropolis disturbance was, in the deep unconscious, also the empowered mother, a phallic woman condensing mother and father. The Acropolis, Athena, like Rome, was the desired yet prohibited mother figure (McGuire, 1974, p. 197)?

In the open letter to Rolland Freud further associated to Napoleon who crowned himself an Emperor in Notre-Dame rather than permitting the Pope to place the crown on his head. Napoleon turned to a brother and wondered what

their father would say if he were there. His mother's "golden Sigi", Freud crowned himself with her tacit approval in a condensation of narcissistic, pre-oedipal and oedipal triumph with guilt and transient symptomatic remorse.

Why did the memory of the Acropolis incident recur in 1936? Did Freud not question himself or did he withhold his knowledge of the connections between the 1904 experience and the 1936 open letter? Freud may have consciously decided on selective omission of many other associations and explorations. Describing his de-realization, the reality of and brutality of Naziism and the painful threat of his own cancer are denied or avoided in Freud's open letter. The manifest content of the Acropolis memory concerns creative art, screening and reversing the highly distressing contemporary reality.

Conspicuous by its absence in the 1936 open letter to Rolland was the rising anti-Semitic violence and the premonition of associated anti-analytic, anti-intellectual coercion and assault (Lippman, 2008). Attacked externally by Naziism, internally by cancer and old age, fearful for his family and for psychoanalysis Freud became preoccupied with Moses. Freud initiated writing Moses and Monotheism within months after his books were burned by the Nazis. Moses was again reincarnated in a psycho-social crisis, also a personal and psycho-analytic group crisis. Conflicted, Freud irregularly revised the text and delayed publication.

Freud published the first two chapters of Moses and Monotheism independently in Imago. The publication of *Moses and monotheism* was not completed until Freud was safely in England, six years after its inception. Freud had been concerned that it would exacerbate antagonism to psychoanalysis and alienate many Jews. He claimed that Moses was originally Egyptian rather than Jewish, removing Moses and himself from Jewish descent.

Moses was once a murderer, then murdered, and then immortalized in his accomplishments. Morality was

consolidated after murder, as in *Totem and Taboo* (Freud, 1913). Freud's family romance is apparent in his writings about Moses. The popular embrace of Naziism, glorification of Hitler, and burning of his books in Germany stimulated Freud's analytic inquiry. He proposed that the unified invisible superego, (an invisible abstract god) not dependent on idols or representations of divinity in the church, fostered the intellect and helped to inhibit tendencies to belligerence and brutality. For Freud the Christian trinity was regarded as a regression to polytheism.

It was one man, Freud who created psychoanalysis just as Freud claimed Moses created the Jewish people. Freud's ambivalence and identification with the aggressor surfaced in his assigning blame to the Jews for their refusal to admit a primal parricide, as if in agreement with the stereotypical accusation that they were Christ/God killers. At the same time, Freud interpreted anti-Semitism as a disguised form of Christian self-hatred. "The Christians have not got over a grudge against the new religion…but they have displaced the grudge onto the source from which Christianity reached them. The fact that the Gospels…is set among Jews and in fact deals only with Jews, has made the displacement easy for them. Their hatred of Jews is at bottom a hatred of Christians…" (Freud, 1939, p.191). The commandments of Moses remain sacrosanct for the dyadic parent child religion. Freud/Moses was a founding father "who was averse to all ceremonial and magic and set before men as their highest aim a life in truth and justice" (Freud, 1914a, p. 50). Freud's Stendhal Syndromes were inextricably interwoven with creativity in art and in the art and science of psychoanalysis. However, his memory of de-realization was more deeply related to tyranny and injustice, to worry that the magnificent cultural achievement of the Acropolis and Pantheon, and the commandments of civilized regulation of instinct and affect could be lost to posterity. That the Acropolis had endured across the centuries

actually provided some measure of comfort and reassurance that psychoanalytic principles and great art would survive and be preserved.

As so often occurred in Freud's psychoanalytic voyage of discovery, he was able to turn inhibition into innovation, adversity into advantage. His "Stendhal Syndrome" confronting masterpieces stimulated his own creativity. His travel phobia may have paradoxically facilitated remarkable progress in the creation of psychoanalysis and the psychoanalytic consideration of art, artist, and spectator.

The study of Freud's emotional responses to art during his travels in Italy and Greece exemplifies the significance of one's thoughts, feelings, and conflicts underlying the varied manifestations of the Stendhal Syndrome. Insights into the influence of the unconscious in creating art and in responses to viewing art may mirror the role of insight in clinical psychoanalysis (Magherini, 2004).

HAROLD P. BLUM – Training and supervising psychoanalyst at the Institute for Psychoanalytic Education, affiliated with New York University School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, and Executive Director, Emeritus of Sigmund Freud Archives, which he had directed from 1987 to 2014. He is author of more than one hundred seventy five psychoanalytic papers and several books. Among his numerous assignments was Chair of five Triennial Symposia on "Psychoanalysis and the Arts" in Florence, Italy.

* This text was published in C. F. Catagni, S. Ferrari, A. Pazzagli (eds), *Pensare l'arte. Scritti in onore di Graziella Magherini*, Nicomp L.E., Firenze 2017, pp. 13-27.

Unlike the editorial conventions of our magazine, we have here maintained the APA referencing system.

REFERENCES

Bamforth I. (2010), *Stendhal's Syndrome*, Brit. J. Gen Practice, 60(581), 945-946.

Blum E., Blum H. & Pazzagli A. (2007), *The Body Image in Psychoanalysis and Art,* Florence, Italy, Nicomp L.E.

Blum H. (1977), *The prototype of pre-oedipal reconstruction*, Journal American Psychoanalytic Association, 25:757-785.

Blum H. (1991), *Freud and the figure of Moses: the Moses of Freud*, Journal American Psychoanalytic Association, 39, 513-535.

Blum H. (2015), *Reconstructing Freud's Prototype reconstruction*, International Forum of Psychoanalysis 24, 47-56.

Fisher D. (1976), *Sigmund Freud and Romain Rolland: The Terrestrial Animal and His Great Oceanic Friend*, American Imago, 33, 1-59.

Freud S. (1900), *The Interpretation of dreams*, S.E., 4-5.

Freud S. (1913), *Totem and Taboo*, S.E., 13, 1-102.

Freud S. (1914a), *On the history of the psychoanalytic movement*, S.E., 14:3-102.

Freud S. (1914b), *Moses and Michelangelo*, S.E., 13.

Freud S. (1925), *An autobiographical study*, S.E., 20.

Freud S. (1927), *The Future of an illusion*, S.E., 21:3-55.

Freud S. (1930), *Civilization and its discontents*, S.E., 21: 59-145.

Freud S. (1937), *A disturbance of memory on the Acropolis. An open letter to Romain Rolland on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, S.E., 22, 239-248.

Freud S. (1939), *Moses and monotheism*, S.E., 23.

Gay P. (1998), *Freud, a Life For Our Time*, NY: Norton.

Jones E. (1955), *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. II, NY: Basic Books.

Kanzer M. (1969), *Sigmund and Alexander Freud on the Acropolis*, American Imago, Vol. 26, 324-354.

Lippman R. (2008), *Freud's "Disturbance of Memory on the Acropolis" Revisited*, Psychoanalytic Review, 95, 489-499.

Magherini G. (2004), *The unconscious and art. The aesthetic uncanny and the function of the selected last*, EPF Bulletin 58, Psychoanalysis in Europe.

Magherini G. (2007a), *"I've Fallen Love with a Statue". Beyond the Stendhal Syndrome*, Florence, Italy, Nicomp L.E.

Magherini G. (2007b), *The Body Image in the Art of the Italian Renaissance*, in *The Body Image in Psychoanalysis and Art*, eds. Blum E., Blum H. & Pazzagli A., Florence, Italy, Nicomp L.E., pp. 43-55.

Masson J. (1985), *The Complete letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess 1887- 1904*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

McGuire W. ed. (1974), *The Freud/Jung Letters*, (Bollingen Series 94), Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.

Schur M. (1969), *The background of Freud's disturbance on the Acropolis*, American Imago, 26, 303-323.

Stendhal (1973), *Rome, Naples et Florence en 1817. Voyage en Italie*, Paris, La Pléiade.