

## A NEW LOOK AT THE PSYCHODYNAMICS OF JEWISH FAMILY LIVING \*

by ABRAHAM N. FRANZBLAU, Ph.D., M.D.

*Hebrew Union College of Jewish Institute of Religion  
New York, N. Y.*

IN a recent paper on "Family Diagnosis," the late Dr. Robert Gomberg traced how, beginning with the therapy of the individual, the realization steadily evolved that the family constellation was an inseparable part of the psyche of each of its members, and that the whole was, indeed, greater than the sum of its parts. We are all familiar with the profound implications of this realization, and the effect which it is exerting in certain quarters on the concepts, modalities, techniques and procedures of psycho-analytically oriented psychotherapy.

I speak of Dr. Gomberg not only because of my desire to pay tribute to his memory and to his multifaceted contribution to the various fields in which he worked, but because his life and work are so strongly relevant to the theme of this address. He says, in the same paper: "The whole concept of role theory, small group theory, culture value orientation and its influence on personality is a complex and not simply digested, understood and used theory. In addition, the need to develop an inter-relatedness between inner psychological factors and social role and cultural values with respect to etiology, motivation and char-

acter formation, is again a complex task to be worked out."

One of these culture values, which he was taking a fresh delight in exploring at the period of his untimely death, was religion, especially Judaism. He was following the rabbinic dictum, "Let thy house be open wide" and was perceiving a wider entity than either the individual or the family, in his people, its culture, its beliefs and its practices. He was reaching out for something great and deep, and greeting it, when he found it, with the joy of discovery or re-discovery.

We had many discussions on the essence of liberal Jewish thought in theological matters like the meaning of life, the problem of evil, sin and guilt, the motivation of behavior, reward and punishment, and many others, as well as on many ethical, sociological and even political Jewish themes. He was fascinated by comparison of the Jewish point of view with that of other religions, particularly Christianity, and would glow with pleasure at the recognition of a point of uniqueness or excellence, or the discovery of an area where the wisdom of the ancient sages adumbrated an insight of modern depth psychology. Not only the ideology of Judaism attracted him strongly in recent years, but its practices as well. Our families often celebrated Sabbath and festivals to-

\* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Chicago, Illinois, May 18, 1958.

gether. He spent a whole summer, along with his family, at our "Camp for Living Judaism," in California. From all this he seemed to be acquiring a *Neshomah Yesayrah*, an added soul.

In this, I like to feel that he was symbolizing the quest of many Jews in the fields of the medical and social sciences for roots, for rediscovery of the ancient truths, which have for millennia fructified Jewish life, and which may perhaps again be reinterpreted and applied for the enrichment of our own experience. Judaism came to be for Dr. Gomberg not a substitute for anything, but an interdigitating entity which strengthened, inspired and integrated his personal life.

I imagine that we all, at times, seek a unifying principle in our work and our world. We need not blush for it. Einstein sought such a principle. This genius who unlocked the unimaginable power of the atom, posited, in his Unified Field Theory, one formula, one law, for the microcosm, the world of atoms too small to comprehend, and for the macrocosm, the world of heavens too great to encompass. Is it wrong for us to strive to include also the anthropocosm, the world of man and his works?

It is in line with this thought that I have chosen to devote my remarks to a few of the larger issues related to Jewish family living. I would like to explore with you some of the inter-relationships of religion and psychoanalysis as they bear upon the Christian and Jewish family situations and to draw some inferences, if possible, about the etiology of the differences which are still so widely found between our own patterns and those of our neighbors. It would be important to note whether, and if so, to what extent they stem from religious or cultural differences and to trace, if possible, the psychodynamics of the process. In so doing, I am taking a liberty with my assigned theme. Per-

haps the title, "A New Look at the Comparative Theology and Psychodynamics of Christian and Jewish Family Life,"<sup>1</sup> would better suit what I intend to present here. I realize that this is a large subject, worthy of much greater talents than I possess and much more time and space than a single paper will allow, but shall risk dipping into it, nevertheless.

That differences in the findings as to quality of social behavior have always existed barely requires proof before a group like this. Yet, since so many of us deal daily with disturbed Jews or with Jewish families of marginal emotional adjustment and maturity, it may be appropriate to sound the note of caution, that our clients or patients are perhaps the exception rather than the rule among the Jewish group. The comparative studies of Jews and other groups roll up an impressive testimonial whether the factual material presented be on juvenile delinquency, adult criminality, prison populations, family desertion and non-support, separation and divorce rates, alcoholism and alcoholic psychoses, venereal disease rates, commitments to mental hospitals for the tertiary manifestations of syphilis, or whatever. As a most recent example, you will recall the report in *Time Magazine* of March 17, of this year, in which the Yale Center of Alcoholic Studies reports first admissions of alcoholic psychotics in New York State Hospitals. Such admissions are 50 times as numerous among the Irish as among the Jews (25.6% vs. 0.5%), fifteen times as many among the Scandinavians, ten times among the Italians, nine times among the English and eight times among

<sup>1</sup> Editor's Note: Dr. Franzblau's interpretations of the significance of the Christian and Jewish principles in this paper are his own and are not to be taken as necessarily those of the Conference or the *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*.

the Germans. I am sure we all were amused at the specious and possibly even slightly anti-Semitic tinge in reasoning of Dr. Snyder, the author of the report, as he squirmed to find an acceptable explanation of this simple finding, which to us seems to need no explanation.

I said the simple finding in the alcohol study seems to need no explanation. And yet it does. We cannot simply take for granted what suits our purposes. If it is true, as it seems to be, that Jewish home and family life are even today endowed with some mysterious extra safeguards against the disintegrative forces of the environment, how can we account for this fact? As scientists, we must seek causes as well as describe phenomena.

While it has not been fashionable for people in such professions as psychiatry, psychology and the social services to concern themselves too greatly with religion as a force in the psychodynamics of family life, the Jewish religious profession has been insisting with ardor and conviction that the kind of findings we are discussing here are due to the Jewish concept of *Kiddush Hachayim*, the sanctification of life, which, they claim, introduces emotional integrity into the family, strengthens what we call "reciprocal role adaptation," "complementarity," etc., and underlies all of Jewish family dynamics. The sanctification of life in the family is the only gateway, they claim, to *Kiddush Hashem*, the sanctification of God. It is this, "secret weapon" also, they say, operating through both favorable and unfavorable periods of Jewish history, through golden eras of culture and enlightenment and dark centuries of persecution and pogrom, which has safeguarded the individual, and assured the moral integrity, survival and growth of Jewry and Judaism.

The lines of alienation are growing less hard and fast, and we now are not entirely surprised to find some psycho-

analysts who concern themselves, to some degree, with what goes on in churches, synagogues and temples.

One of my rabbinical students, who has a week-end pulpit, came to me one day recently greatly troubled. The night before, a prominent psychoanalyst had come in and said he would like to join the congregation and send his child to religious school, but wanted first to put his cards on the table. "I am an atheist," he said, "and do not intend to change my views, but I believe my child should have free choice, from the same starting point as I had. Meanwhile, could you find some committee for me to serve on, where my being an atheist won't interfere? When I join something, I like to carry my share of the load." My student wrung his hands, "How can I have an atheist on my committee?" I advised, "Believe his actions, not his words!" It proved to be sound advice.

There was a time in the beginning, when psychoanalysis itself did not concern itself particularly with values, morals and religion, *per se*. However, Freud soon began to play the spotlight of his brilliant perceptions in this direction. In 1919 he published "Totem and Taboo"; then came, "The Future of an Illusion"; and after that, "Moses and Monotheism," all of which deal with various aspects of religion.

If I may be permitted to paraphrase freely his line of argument, Freud has suggested that there are three basic reasons why religion evolves. First, Nature is cruel and capricious, showing man no favor. He feels weak and fearful and alone, like a child. He must battle for his existence or perish. If the benevolent or malevolent forces in his environment become personified as deities, he can attribute the praise or blame for successes and windfalls, failures and disasters to them alone, and he can propitiate the malevolent deities and flatter those that are benevolent, with the

conviction that he is thereby averting evil and attracting good. (In addition, I might add, parenthetically, by peopling the universe with gods, even though some of them are conceived as hostile, man does not feel so alone.)

Second, Freud says, as far as man can possibly know, death is the inescapable end of life. There is no shred of evidence to the contrary. But this, man cannot bring himself to accept. He cannot conceive of his own non-existence, nor of leaving or being left by his loved ones. So he invents immortality and the hereafter as a means of thwarting the inexorable and equalizing the inexplicable inequities of life. The gods whom he has invented, he appoints as keepers of the accounts which will consign him to some kind of Heaven or Hell.

Third, man cannot face the hazards of living, all by himself. He needs the help of his fellow men for his own survival and that of his loved ones. But to gain it he must yield some of his own pleasures when they conflict with theirs. This is the price he must pay for the benefits of civilization, however much he may resent the paying. Since the strong might take advantage of their strength and oppress the weak, the basic commandments of communal living are given divine origin and sanction. The likelihood of obedience is thus enhanced, with the result that the strong are controlled and the weak protected. (Besides, again I might add, parenthetically, obedience to his deity and the divine commands gives primitive man the feeling of "being good" and therefore of earning divine favor, as he earned parental favor in childhood.)

Thus, to Freud, religion is a neurotic substitute for a mature resolution of the problems and conflicts of living. He feels it is the "universal obsessional neurosis of humanity" (*The Future of an Illusion*, page 76). This neurosis, "like the child's, originated in the Oedipus Complex, the relation to the father."

Ernest Jones, in his "Essays," puts this point of view succinctly: "The religious life represents a dramatization on a cosmic plane of the emotions, fears and longings which arose in the child's relations to his parents." (Vol. II, chap. VIII, page 195—"The Psychology of Religion.")

Freud was a keen, though critical student of religion, hence his contributions cannot be dismissed lightly, even by religionists. If, as he maintains, religion has no sound basis, then, from our point of view, the word Jewish is superfluous in our theme, and the dynamics and logistics of Jewish family living must become essentially a study in pathology.

The truth is that among the primitive religions, we find almost complete confirmation of his formulations. The primitive deities are the personification of the benevolent and malevolent forces of their environment, and primitive religion consists mainly of the propitiation or flattery of these deities. The after-life, as they conceive it, is largely a continuation of their existence, with the pain subtracted and the pleasure multiplied. Family and communal behavior, motivated and controlled by divine injunction, is interpreted for the masses by highly privileged, consecrated religious functionaries, who are accepted as representatives of the gods. To proceed with even the simplest functions, without consulting the will of the gods, is to risk disaster. Since disaster was the constant companion of man before civilization multiplied his defenses, the sway of the religious functionary was great.

The psychoanalytic study of religion has also shown us the large role played by the awesome mystery of sex in primitive religious belief and ritual, epitomized in the primitive puberty rites, which, in whatever time or clime we may examine them, are almost identical everywhere in form and content. They have one common pattern: the privilege of

sex is granted by the elders, provided the taboos of the community (especially those relating to incest) are accepted by the initiates. The solemn and mettletesting rituals attending initiation of the young adults into the community of their elders were usually climaxed by wildly orgiastic rites.

The mixture of the sacred and the sexual, which we find so crudely expressed here, is also characteristic of many of the later religions. Sacred prostitution, as one example, played a large role in some of the ancient religions, and various actual or symbolic castration ceremonies were practiced in others. The priests of Cybele, often self-castrated, would hold a recurrent festival in which on the third day, Attis, the son of the Goddess, who had died, is brought to life again through the ministrations and intercession of his mother. In the Egyptian religion, similarly, Isis periodically restores Serapis-Osiris to life. In Mithraism, the young Son-God opposes and finally slays the father and becomes the master of his own fate. Similarly, in the Greek and Roman religions we find the human sexual conflict intertwined with the relations which the gods reflect in their behavior, relations which are often abhorrent to our sense of morality. Their family morality, in turn, reflected the patterns of the gods.

From the dynamic point of view Christianity represents, in many ways, a compromise between primitive and more advanced religious and psychosexual concepts, which is reflected in many ways in attitudes and behavior in the family. The contrast between Christianity and Judaism in this respect is so striking, as I shall point out in detail, that the more one studies this subject, the more one wonders what meaning the term "Judeo-Christian," which is so commonly used today, can actually have.

The creed of Christianity, and in this we must include Protestantism as well as Catholicism, for only a few deny the Divinity of Jesus, is that Jesus is God's only-begotten Son, who came to earth in the flesh to take upon Himself man's sins and atone for them by His death upon the Cross, and who then was resurrected and returned to Heaven. This dogma, which represents, in some ways, a pathway for escape from personal responsibility for untoward behavior, contains primitive elements present in earlier religions hundreds of years before Christianity. The myth of a son born of a divine being and a human, who dies and is reborn, occurs again and again in early literature. In the Vedic literature, almost five thousand years old, there is an almost exact parallel to the Jesus story.

Ubiquitous, too, in primitive ritual, was the custom of eating the God. It was related to fertility rites and stems from cannibalistic fantasies (perhaps even practices) about the father, later substituting the totem animal and finally the ritual meal. The Mass, or Holy Communion, is a symbolic residual of this same primitive rite of eating the God. Dogmas like the Virgin Birth and practices like chastity vows of the religious orders testify to the depth of the sexual conflict, of which these are attempted, though unsuccessful, resolutions. The father authority principle is at once accepted, by the inclusion of God in the Trinity, and rejected, by the central role which Jesus, the Son, comes to play. The virile masculine principle, or procreative male, is not permitted to function in the conception of Jesus, but instead an abstract, asexual principle, the Holy Ghost, is the fecundating agency. Similarly, the female, in contradistinction to all her other earthly sisters, does not accept the full boon of her femininity as wife, by accepting a male sexually, but is impregnated asexu-

ally. Yet her loving mother-function, once The Child Jesus is born, is acceptable in this religious system, and receives full adoration in the majority of the churches, and some adoration in all.

An analysis of the psychodynamic roots of this aspect of Christianity is given by the late Dr. Henry Allen Bunker, in his paper on "Psychoanalysis and Religion" (Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences, Vol. III, p. 30.) He says in part: ". . . the Christian religion asks, What shall a man do to be saved? . . . The answer to this crucial question we see acted out in every initiation ceremony, while at the same time we find it verbalized in the Christian canon as: 'Except ye be circumcised . . . ye cannot be saved.' (Acts, 15:1.) . . . only if one first suffers the talion punishment (of symbolic castration) for incestuous wishes for the mother and death wishes against the father, only then is it permitted to see the Kingdom of God, to be 'saved,' to be received into the father-generation as an equal, to achieve adult sexuality; 'castration' is the price of immortality." Thus concludes Dr. Bunker.

The contrasts with Jewish doctrine are striking. Circumcision is placed at the eighth day of life when all of its Oedipal struggle connotations are sublimated in the highest degree and tied, not to a competitive struggle with the father, but to the tender and protective parental impulses. The Bar Mitzvah rites in Judaism, the counterpart of the primitive initiation rites, channelize sexual and aggressive energies into study and the acquisition of power through knowledge, as Arlow points out. "This is a particularly favorable way out, consistent with the demands of a society in which there is a considerable time lag between sexual maturity and sanctioned heterosexuality." ("A Psychoanalytical Study of a Religious Initiation Rite — Bar Mitzvah," Psychoanalytic

Study of the Child, Vol. VI, p. 372.) This love of Torah which, incidentally, is usually put in the feminine gender (*Etz Chayim Hee*—"She is a tree of life"), continues all through the life of the Jew, and affords a sublimated ideal, while the tenacious clinging to the concepts of love of Jesus or of Mary, the mother of God, which is characteristic of Christianity, may delay or interfere with such sublimation. Arlow says of the Bar Mitzvah boy (*ibid*, 373): "The initiate renounces remnants of his Oedipal wishes for the demands of the developing superego, namely, group loyalty and studiousness." The ordeal through which he passes is standing up before the multitudes and making an oral communication, reading the blessings or the Torah and Haftarah, and making a speech. His gift, as the many-level quip, "Today I am a fountain pen," highlights, is symbolic, but sublimated.

The evidences of deep unresolved sexual conflicts in the roots of original New Testament Christian theological dogma, the implications of which for family life are obvious, crop up continuously also in the writings of many of the church fathers and church leaders through the centuries. St. Paul's famous statement in I Corinthians VII, 7-9, is significant: ". . . I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn."

Marriage is placed in the third and lowest scale of Christian purity, the next higher being celibacy voluntarily adopted after marriage or after the death of a spouse, and the highest being absolute virginity. We may recall, if we have read church history, that as zealous as St. Augustine was for virgins before he became a monk, so ardent was he for virginity afterward. His ex-

ample is instructive: one either yields to sin, or renounces it—there is no middle course—as there is no such thing as slightly pregnant. The celibacy of the Church's highest functionaries, the religious orders of priests and nuns, speaks for itself. Contrast this view with that of Judaism that teachers and religious functionaries are unfit to serve unless they are married. The High Priest could not perform the service in the Holy of Holies, unless he had a wife. The Rabbis said (*Yebamoth*, 62b): "He who is without a wife is without joy, blessing or good." It is interesting to note, as Rabbi Maybaum has pointed out in his article entitled "Tradition that is Living," that while some of the great men who have influenced European culture spent their lives without wife or child (including Descartes, Kant, Leibnitz, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche), of over 2,000 rabbis of the Talmud whose teachings have come down to us, only one, Ben Azzai, is reported to have been unmarried.

On the position of women, St. Paul is clear: they are inferior. "They are commanded to be under obedience." "Let them be silent, and at home consult their own husbands." (I Corinthians, XIV, 34.) Tertullian actually rails against them: "You are the Devil's gateway . . . On account of your desert—that is, death—even the Son of God had to die." (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. XI, p. 305, "On Female Dress".) What a tender contrast is the statement (*in Ketuboth*; 62a), "A man must not cause his wife to weep, for God counts her tears," or another (*in Baba Metziah*, 59a) "If your wife is small, bend down and listen to her."

Who of us can doubt that the guilt feelings about sex which Christianity inculcates both directly by its teachings and indirectly by the unconscious perception of the sexual conflict symbolized

in the Godhead, are not conducive to the achievement of the best possible sexual adjustment in marriage for the couple or in family life for the children. The conflict is, in turn, projected onto the Godhead, and is readmitted as a force to distort and disturb personal behavior and attitudes in home and family life, in which it is rooted. Hence, there is created a vicious circle, a reflexive, self-perpetuating, endless pattern, like when we stand between two facing mirrors in a hallway. Can this possibly be without effect?

Also to be a spiritual shuttlecock, thrown back and forth endlessly in the grip of the desires of the flesh which are styled by the church and felt by the individual to be both infinitely tempting and infinitely sinful, is a fate under which only the most stoical can stand up for long. There can be no middle ground between the two, not even in holy matrimony, for guilt forms a canopy over every Christian bed. As Nietzsche has so well put it: "Christianity poured a drop of poison into the cup of Eros."

The robust attitude toward sex, on the other hand, which is found in the Bible,—"Rejoice in the wife of thy youth,"—"Be thou ravished with her love," and countless other examples in Proverbs, Song of Songs and other books, is continued in rabbinic literature, and exemplified in Jewish family life down through the ages. In "Marriage and the Jewish Tradition," (*Philosophical Library*, 1951) edited by Rabbi Stanley R. Brav, the rabbinic references are quoted abundantly. A succinct summary is also available in Rabbi Eugene Mihaly's article, "The Jewish View of Marriage," *CCAR Journal*, October, 1954, pp. 32-38. For example, the great Rabbi Meir (*Niddah*, 31b), says the ideal is that the sex act be not perfunctory and dutiful, but that the experience be as exciting and fresh as the

first union on the wedding night. In Moed Katan, 9b, the wife is urged to use cosmetics and wear ornaments so that she may be attractive to her husband, not only in her youth, but also in her old age. Even early, in the Pentateuch we find it stated boldly that a man, on the other hand, may not diminish his wife's "food, raiment, or conjugal rights." (Exodus, 21:10)

It is interesting to note, when we look into the personal history of some of the leaders of the pessimistic neo-Calvanist movement in modern Christian theology, how often it has been their lot to have unhappy family relations in childhood, particularly with their earthly fathers. This seems to color their marital experience and their concepts of man and of the relations between God and man. It is as though their unhappy relationships and their gloomy theology spring like twin geysers out of the depths of the seething miseries of their childhood and youth.

Søren Kierkegaard is a classic example. He was engaged to Regina Olsen, a lovely girl, but broke the engagement after four years, unable to face marriage. Emil Bruenner, one of the outstanding spokesmen of Christendom, says (in *Man in Revolt*, p. 348) "We cannot think of our Lord as married, although we are not in the least jarred by the fact that he ate and drank." Sex seems to be the "original sin." To turn one's back on it is alone deemed worthy. To be what Kierkegaard calls a "single one," a solitary man whose contact with the world is broken, is, to him, the only way to salvation. He says, "In order to come to love, I had to remove the object." Martin Buber, commenting on this, says: "God wants us to come to him by means of the Reginas he has created, and not by renunciation of them." This is what the rabbis meant when they said in (Mishna Berachot, IX, 5): "You shall love God

with all your inclinations"—even with the *Yezer Ha-rah*, the sexual urge. Note that while it is commonly termed the "evil inclination," its use in the loving service of God belies the designation. The rabbis so cherished the institution of marriage that they pictured God as occupying himself in Heaven, since the completion of the creation of the world, mainly with matching couples.

The doctrine of salvation by withdrawal from life reaches its absurd extreme in Heidigger, the German theologian—man can discover his true being and become himself, he says, only through death.

What is the origin of such ideas, dynamically? We must remember that the Son of God, who is, for man, the sole gateway to salvation and to whom prayers are addressed "In the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, Amen!", came to outrank the Father, God, only at the cost of death, the greatest of all possible punishments. Only after suffering death on the cross could he be redeemed, rise again and rule. Such dogmas have their roots, as we all know, in the time-old unconscious Oedipal struggle of the rising son and the declining father. Must not the ever-present crucifix, symbolizing the rebellion, the punishment and the triumph, have its unconscious influence upon this same struggle as it takes place even today, in all Christian homes where adolescents are moving toward adulthood?

Compulsory submission to parental authority is required of children, while the adult voluntarily subjects himself to authority on many fronts; he obeys the law, honors his contracts, conforms to custom and convention, complies with moral codes, and the like. He can achieve this new status healthily during adolescence and after, not by rebelling against the authority of his father and triumphing over him, but by a growth process which the emotionally healthy

father aids in every way possible, and in which he takes pride. Thus in healthy Oedipal resolution, each succeeding generation may stand on the shoulders, not on the neck, of its predecessors.

If ethical sanctions cannot be rooted effectively in rebelliousness, neither can they be formed in fear, whether it be fear of divine, or of temporal or parental authority, whether of pain or deprivation in this world, or of Hell-fire in the next. In Jewish thought the "fear of God" was not defined in terms of a reaction to a threat of punishment. Its proper definition has always been recognized to be "awe of God." Fear cannot accomplish the miracle of the creation of a mature and noble human. Only love can.

This does not, of course, imply that a child must be reared fearless. There are fears rooted in reality which are the benevolent tutors of the ego and help conform the child's id-impulses to reality. Artificially engendered fears, however, become tyrannical martinets over the superego. The pressure of such fears is resented and evokes hostility against those who create or impose them, often followed by feelings of guilt. Through fear a person may be controlled, but he can never learn through this means to control himself. On the other hand, when the suppression of impulses by parentally or artificially engendered theological or sexual guilt and fear fails, it may foster rebellion against all authority, even that which operates for one's own advancement or which is necessary for one's own survival. We can then become rebels against ourselves, divided souls with no resting place, neither in Heaven nor in Hell.

In the dynamics and logistics of the conversion experience within Christianity, we may explore another manifestation of the influence of its all-pervading guilt load and may perhaps gain further

insights. Not only non-Christians become converts to Christianity, but also many good Christians undergo a religious "conversion," a unique experience, unlike any other in their prior religious life. They are suffused with a feeling of at-oneness with their Savior and freedom from sin, and they move in a mood of exultation, sublimely confident that they have been "saved." They become, in the metaphor of William James, "twice-born souls."

Dynamically, the background for the Christian conversion experience is found in the harnessing of both the normal self-deprecatory inferiority feelings and the compensating omnipotence fantasy of infancy to a two-pronged religious hypothesis—first, that sinfulness is the natural unredeemed state of man and dooms him to eternal damnation, and second, that redemption can come only through Christ.

It is evident that acceptance of the first hypothesis prolongs and builds up the infantile guilt tensions *ecclesiogenically*, that is, wholly and solely through church teachings. It is well known that an individual may carry a great burden of such guilt regardless of exemplary ethical and moral behavior in reality. Starbuck, in his "Psychology of Religion" (page 64), points out how this may be a retarding factor in character formation. He says: "Conversion is a process of struggling away from sin, rather than of striving toward righteousness."

I believe further, that the exultant feeling of being "saved," like the guilt feelings which preceded it, is also *ecclesiogenic*, that is, it grows wholly and solely out of church teachings. It derives its power from unresolved residuals of the infantile omnipotence fantasy. It is somewhat akin to the phenomenal exultation accompanying the feeling of being "in love," which I have traced to the

same source in my book, "The Road to Sexual Maturity" (ch. IV, "Why Cupid Is an Infant").

It is, incidentally, very different from the closest parallel to it which exists in Judaism, the exultation of the Hasidim in their worship. The reason is that they have no antecedent depression to provide the trigger-tension for the release, but believe that, through joy and fervor, man reaches the highest religious insights. Arthur Cohen puts it succinctly in his beautiful little book on Martin Buber (Hillary House, N.Y., 1957, p. 84): "The holiness of God, according to Hasidism, was wherever man chose to find it and open himself to its greeting."

The first Christian hypothesis, about the innate sinfulness of man, leads to depression and despair. The second hypothesis, about the exclusive saving power of Jesus, leads to exultation and release. Clearly, if the dynamics of the process are not accepted, the logistics will be destined to fail. Non-believers will remain unmoved. In Franz Werfel's "Song of Bernadette," Lafite says: "There are no conversions to belief. There is only a return to it." I think it is safe to conclude that Heaven cannot really be harvested at a baptismal font, nor ripe fruit of the spirit from the Golden Bough.

Needless to say these dogmas are a sidelong factor and do not alone determine, even though they may greatly influence behavior. There are millions of excellent marriages, made by good Christians, who rear fine children in happy homes. The question I am raising is whether this is because of or in spite of dogmas which denigrate man, which afford him easy escape from the responsibility for his behavior, which surround sex with guilt, and which control him by threat of Hellfire or promise of Heaven. Where ethics has little relationship to behavior, and grows out of doctrine rather than experience, where the differ-

ence between guilt rooted in reality and that which is ecclesiogenic becomes fuzzy, and where absolution may be granted, rather than earned in relation to the injured party or the offense, we must remain cautious as to the strength of the character traits which result.

How can limits be set? On what basis does reality testing take place and how firm are its results? What kind of ego-boundaries result from this pattern of child rearing? If character is not firmly rooted, may it not be a swaying structure, built on quicksand, which can overturn under the stress of temptation or adversity? The live branch withstands the storm; the rotted bough may break and fall.

What about Judaism in these respects? There are within it, undoubtedly, relics of the primitive. Are these characteristic or marginal? Has Judaism developed to maturity over the ages? Can we find any relation between the theological concepts of Judaism and the home and family life of Jews? Is there an explanation for the unique and excellent family situation to which we have alluded?

Analyzing the primitive elements in Judaism in a penetrating psychoanalytic study entitled "The Pan-Headed Moses—A Parallel," (the International Journal of Psychoanalysis, Vol. 32, page 83) Dr. Eva M. Rosenfeld admits the fact that: ". . . in the horns of Moses are haunting memories of the wild god Pan, as well as of the immovable Yahveh." She maintains that monotheism brings organization into the chaos and enables science and intellect, rather than primitive emotions, to attain a commanding position . . . She says: "The development of monotheism was, like the formation of the superego, a gradual process in which each phase retained traces of the epoch which preceded it." It would seem that only in a dynamic faith could such growth occur. The resistance of the

rabbis to the completion of the canon of the Bible, or even to commit the Talmud to writing shows a stubborn refusal to undergo fossilization, such as that of which Toynbee accuses us. In the life of the individual this keeps the mind open for new insights, new revelations, and it gives democratic responsibility to each generation, as Maimonides urged, to advance our understandings. It makes for "continuity through change," as the late Dr. Leo L. Honor called it, or as the theologians call it, "progressive revelation."

Dr. Arthur B. Brenner, in "The Covenant With Abraham," (Psychoanalytic Review, Vol. 39, p. 34) states: ". . . a voluntary mutual covenant would be entered into by God . . . only with a people who possess a sense of responsibility, i.e., a super-ego . . . Hebraism therefore arrives at a mature means of identification with the father God—by internalization, not of His symbolized flesh, but His authority, His law, His moral standards." Clearly, what can be accomplished by a whole people can be accomplished by individuals in the Jewish family.

The unique agency in Jewish history, in fact, in the total history of all mankind, which accomplished this internalization of God's "authority, His law, His moral standards," rather than "of His symbolized flesh," is unquestionably the institution of prophecy. What was it that made and moved the prophets?

Dr. Jacob A. Arlow, one of our leading psychoanalysts well versed in Hebrew lore, whose study on Bar Mitzvah I have already quoted, has given us a brilliant answer to this question in a paper entitled "The Consecration of the Prophet" (the Psychoanalytic Quarterly, Vol. XX, 374). He says: "The prophet . . . regarded himself as a mere instrumentality in the service of a greater cause . . . he transcended the barrier of reason and played on the unconscious emotions of

his listeners, exhorting them to participate in his exultation and to share with him his vision of glory . . . Toward his master, the prophet is the passive 'rod of his wrath' but in so doing he is permitted to share in God's omnipotence. He exhorts the multitudes, berates Kings and High Priests, and proclaims God's will . . . It was Freud who demonstrated the feeling for God is derived from the feeling for the father. Upon this emotional basis is founded the relationship between the prophet and God . . . This is what distinguishes the true prophet from the false prophet . . . the true prophet is one who correctly divines and expresses the emergent, but still inarticulate dreams and aspirations of his people. In this respect prophecy is like great art and both survive for the same reason. . . . At the threshold of the ages," concludes Arlow, "stands the prophet, midwife of humanity's dreams."

If the prophet was the midwife of humanity's dreams, the rabbis and teachers of later generations were the wet-nurses, nourishing and sustaining them after the prophets had helped them to birth. They led them by the hand and guided their faltering footsteps. They embodied the ethical ideal in a way of life for the home and family, the market place and the wider outer world, which stood the test of time. It survived the hammer-blows of adversity and the temptations of favored eras, because while it remained dynamic and flexible, changing its dogmas and its rituals, changing even the face of God as its insights grew, it afforded a solid base for the intimate sphere of family relations, which did not fluctuate or vacillate.

Freud's assertion that religious impulses originate in the Oedipus Complex is undoubtedly true. But this does not necessarily stigmatize religion as neurotic. We speak of "the infantile neurosis," yet we recognize that the Oedipus Complex is not a sickness, but supplies

the crucial building materials out of which adult sexuality is constructed. Out of the child's infantile desire for exclusive possession of his mother, grows the mature desire for exclusive possession of his mate, the foundation of fidelity in family life, and out of his infantile hostile impulses toward his father, grow the healthily aggressive traits which enable a man to win a place for himself in the world and provide for and protect his family. So it is with the primitive impulses of religion. In Judaism they do not remain primitive, but can serve as building materials for adult morality and as a springboard from which man's spirit can leap to great heights. Their origin in the Oedipus is not necessarily fatal.

If the Godhead in Christianity projects unresolved sexual conflicts, and may, in turn, adversely affect the sexual adjustment of couples in marriage, the God concept in Judaism should have the opposite effect. In Jewish theology, God is the undivided unity ruling the universe. He is the *El Shaddai*, the epitome of masculine strength and power, yet the *El Rachum*, who tempers justice with mercy, as must any human father who wishes to rear his children healthily. He rules by law, not by whim, and His law is immutable—it has no exceptions. There is thus a fundamental discipline in the universe, as there must be in the world of man.

The acceptance of law as a principle thus places the individual, in his own private life, in harmony with the universe. The child's security as he learns about life, lies in this very fact, that there is a vast preponderance of certainty and justice which he can trust, pitted against the occasional capriciousness of the world and the people around him. The certainties need not always be pleasant. The child can face and accept hunger, physical suffering, pain, sorrow, privation, even persecution, if they are

merely unpleasant realities, instead of barbed accusations of personal worthlessness and inferiority.

In this same fact lies, perhaps, one of the secrets of Jewish survival. The acceptance of the dynamic concept of God as a just and loving ruler in a moral universe, with whom the Jew could identify, lent the same strength to the entire Jewish group as the individual child's acceptance of his mother as his partner in his world. Having "swallowed" the loving God, in the same sense as the child introjects the loving mother, and being filled, as the prophets were in their theophanies, with a sense of being saturated with divine love and elevated by a feeling of original worth, rather than of original sin, the Jews can withstand persecution and move forward to ever greater maturity. We saw this during the London blitz, when children held in their mothers' arms through the seemingly unending terrors of the air raids, in bleak underground shelters, were safe and unharmed emotionally, while children separated from their mothers' loving and protecting arms languished despite luxurious surroundings and the finest personnel. (*War and Children*, Anna Freud and Dorothy T. Burlingham, Medical War Books, New York, 1943.)

I believe it is in *this* kind of psychodynamic explanation, rather than in that of moral masochism, that the phenomenon of the absence of hate against our detractors and persecutors lies. The emotionally mature Jew accepts anti-Semitism and prejudice realistically. He does not conclude, because the outside world may be prejudiced and may manifest discrimination against him, that the fault lies within him. Rather, he sees prejudice as the problem of the prejudiced. He tries to teach this point of view to his children in his home. It would be unrealistic, however, to ignore the undertow of resentment or even

rebellion which is engendered in some by this behavior on the part of the outside world, against the fate of being a Jew and which leads to lesser or greater forms of escapism or even apostasy. The problem is somewhat similar to that which preventive medicine encounters in combatting an epidemic disease; one can either combat the causing organism or immunize the individual. Our Jewish defense organizations attempt the first; the second can best be done in a home with Jewish self-appreciation in a setting of emotional maturity.

In Jewish theology the mother figure does not rule in heaven as part of the God-company, but reigns on earth as the high-priestess of the home, loved, revered, and respected by her family, and accorded rights far beyond those which any other civilization accorded its women for thousands of years afterward, in fact, not until the emancipation of women in the modern era. In addition to her rights to property, protection, divorce, etc., think of a statement like the one in *Leviticus Rabba* (IX, 9): "A groom must not enter the bride's chamber without first asking her consent," in the light of the life-and-death power which husbands had over their wives and children in other cultures for millennia afterward.

A Jewish mother in the pattern of her faith cherishes and never rejects her femininity both as a wife and as a mother. Jewish literature is full of examples of all of the excellent qualities which have characterized her and made her home a secure fortress for her loved ones. Proverbs 32, the *Ashet Chayil*, A Woman of Valor, was written over 2000 years ago. She has always cried out with her matriarch mother Rachel to her own Jacob, "Give me children, or else I die." (Genesis, 30:1) She has felt, as the rabbis said in *Kiddushin* (30b), "God, father and mother are partners in man's creation," and as for

her children, she has treated them as though in truth the dictum "You cannot see God's face and live" were abrogated for them. . . . "Little ones look upon the face of the Shechinah." (*Masseket Kallah Rabbati*, 11,8.) She gives her husband the respect and veneration which are due him for the support and protection, as well as for loving guidance which he gives his family. And he reciprocates.

The absence from the Jewish home of venereal disease, syphilitic psychoses, alcoholism and a host of similar weaknesses which have their roots in the moral realm are not accidental, for the standards of sexual morality are high, for good reason. In a "good" marriage—where the needs of the couple meet and match on both the conscious and unconscious levels—we also have a lasting marriage and a satisfying one.<sup>2</sup>

The attitude of Judaism toward sex is a robust one as well as a moral one. The pleasures of the marital bed are to be enjoyed to the full, without shame or guilt. In fact, the Talmud gives full recognition to the need and desire for foreplay and the normal variations of sexual activity and the right of both partners for gratification. It also approves contraception in certain situations. The pull of infidelity is, under these circumstances, bound to be lessened even if it were not as abhorrent as it is to the Jewish ideal.

In this, the Jewish home, in my estimation, stands at the very pinnacle of the ladder of evolution. For the latest achievement of the human race biologically, which marks us off from all of the rest of creation, is the capacity of the human female to enjoy pleasure in sexual intercourse.<sup>3</sup> In the rest of the animal

<sup>2</sup> See the chapter "The Lasting Marriage" (page 193) in my book, "The Road to Sexual Maturity."

<sup>3</sup> See the chapter "The Rocky Road to Femininity" (p. 122) in my book "The Road to Sexual Maturity."

kingdom, the female is driven by "heat," which is seasonal, cyclic and based on biochemical secretions. The human female is driven, instead, by what is in many ways the most powerful force in the universe—love. This places her in a state of continuous latent capacity, which can become intense on stimulation, and she seeks something higher than mere erotic excitement (which is the easy way, open to anyone and everyone), namely, a setting in which meaning and purpose can enrich both her pleasure and her soul. It is in a loving home, with a loving husband, rearing well-loved children that she finds it, as all other daughters of Eve could, too. The absence of guilt feelings and shame enables her to strive for, and often actually reach the heights to which this new-found evolutionary skill entitle her. The Jewish home by its very nature must achieve this goal more frequently than that of its neighbors. And the fruit of it is a high order of character, by all comparative standards, in both the parents and the children.

The son of Jewish creed and deed does not identify himself consciously or unconsciously with a rebellious divine Son upon whom he may cast the guilt of his own desires and rebelliousness and thus achieve a vicarious redemption. But he accepts his divine Father in reverence and love, as he accepts his human father. In Judaism the son is regarded and treated as a worthy individual and as he matures, he acquires his entitlement of worth and dignity, and also of responsibility, in his own right. Thus he becomes capable of standing side by side with his father, and of assuming parental authority himself, later, in his own familial relationships. Reared by loving parents who accept themselves as personalities, he can accept himself, his gender and his potency. He can, in a realistic fashion, accept the fact that he has both excellencies and shortcomings,

utilizing the one and striving to remedy the other in building a good life. He can resolve his authority-conflict healthily under the guidance of loving parents, who see him through the turbulence of his adolescence with patience and understanding, and respected outsiders, who can serve as "authority bridges" over the chasm between the infantile and the adult concepts. With siblings and rivals of his own generation, he is able to handle both cooperation and competition healthily. And toward his subordinates and inferiors, he is able to show respect and consideration, appreciation and fairness, sufficient to earn him loyalty and devotion from them.

This is the probable source of the manifold excellence of the findings about Jewish family life. For myself, I cannot separate the faith of the Jew from the patterns of his home life, for the evidence would seem to indicate that where there is a diminution in the strength of the one, the strength of the other also declines.

From a dynamic point of view, too, there seems to me to be correlation between this faith and the principles and criteria which we have set up for emotional maturity. Judaism is man-fostering, not man-flagellating. It attributes to man original worth, not original sin. It approves a robust rather than a puritanical sexual life, but insists that it be characterized by fidelity and integrity. Its ethics are deed-centered, rather than creed-centered. It is healthily aggressive, in the face of evil, rather than passive or permissive and does not turn the other cheek to sadism. It insists that guilt feelings must be related to untoward behavior, rather than to violations of ecclesiastic principles. It eschews the use of fear as a deterrent or the promise of rewards in the hereafter as a motivation, in compensation for good deeds. (Ben Azzai said "The reward of a *mitzvo* (good deed) is a *mitzvo*; and the reward

of an *averah* (transgression) is an *averah*"). It favors sublimation and gratification of id-impulses, rather than blanket renunciation or repression. It is this-worldly, rather than other-worldly, progressivistic, rather than perfectionistic, centrifugal, moving constantly outward from the individual to society, from the "I" to the "Thou," rather than centripetal, concerning itself with the salvation of the individual and his soul alone. It is reality centered, rather than myth and mystery centered. It is melioristic as to the future of man rather than messianic or pessimistic. It is God-seeking, rather than God-fawning. It leans on reason rather than revelation in its questing for truth. It is universal, rather than parochial. It is democratic,

rather than sacerdotal, and it is dynamic, rather than static.

In a recent article in *Social Forces* on "Faith, Ritualism, Charismatic Leadership and Religious Behavior" (March '56; 34:241), W. Seward Salisbury sums it up, as though for this paper. He says: "Judaism is characterized by the noticeable extent to which the highest religious feeling is identified with family relationship and experience. The stability and solidarity of both institutions are thereby enhanced by this fusion of religious and familial functions."

The Jewish home is, perhaps, as the rabbis said, a *Mikdash M'at*, a small sanctuary. If we are an excellent people, and we are, by all the evidence, perhaps this is an important reason why.