



Georg Juckel, Knut Hoffmann, Harald Walach (Hrsg.)

# SPIRITUALITÄT

## in Psychiatrie & Psychotherapie

 Pabst

Georg Juckel, Knut Hoffmann, Harald Walach (Hrsg.)  
Spiritualität in Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie

---



Georg Juckel, Knut Hoffmann, Harald Walach (Hrsg.)

# Spiritualität in Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie



PABST SCIENCE PUBLISHERS  
Lengerich

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <<http://dnb.ddb.de>> abrufbar.

Geschützte Warennamen (Warenzeichen) werden nicht besonders kenntlich gemacht. Aus dem Fehlen eines solchen Hinweises kann also nicht geschlossen werden, dass es sich um einen freien Warennamen handelt.

Das Werk, einschließlich aller seiner Teile, ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

© 2018 Pabst Science Publishers, D-49525 Lengerich

Internet: [www.pabst-publishers.de](http://www.pabst-publishers.de)

[www.psychologie-aktuell.com](http://www.psychologie-aktuell.com)

E-Mail: [pabst@pabst-publishers.de](mailto:pabst@pabst-publishers.de)

Print: ISBN 978-3-95853-382-0

eBook: ISBN 978-3-95853-383-7 ([www.ciando.com](http://www.ciando.com))

Bildnachweis Titelseite: © [rolffimages-Fotolia.com](http://rolffimages-Fotolia.com)

Lektorat: Andrea Glomb

Formatierung: Susanne Kemmer

Druck: KM-Druck, D-64823 Groß-Umstadt

# Inhaltsverzeichnis

<b>Geleitwort</b>	
<i>Andreas Heinz</i> .....	7
<b>Vorwort</b>	
<i>Georg Juckel, Knut Hoffmann &amp; Harald Walach</i> .....	9
<b>„Geistigkeit“: A Problematic Concept – eine Einleitung</b>	
<i>Joel Whitebook</i> .....	13
<b>I Religiöse Aspekte von Spiritualität</b>	
1. Ausgewählte historische Beispiele des Verhältnisses von Spiritualität zu Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie	
<i>Michael Seidel</i> .....	29
2. Die Sehnsucht nach einem Vater: „Psychotherapie“ der Ostkirche	
<i>Anna Briskina-Müller</i> .....	43
3. Haben Augustinus und seine Suche nach dem „Seelenheil“ heute noch eine Bedeutung für uns? Ein Dialog zwischen einem Psychiatrie-Erfahrenen und einem Psychiater	
<i>Sebastian Schröer &amp; Georg Juckel</i> .....	63
4. Muslime in der Psychotherapie	
<i>Achmad Bransi</i> .....	99
5. Spirituelle Aspekte aus dem Judentum in Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie	
<i>Nicolai Stern</i> .....	119
6. Psychiatrie, Psychotherapie, Taoismus und Buddhismus	
<i>Walter Dmoch</i> .....	143
<b>II Spiritualität und Religion in der klinischen Praxis</b>	
7. Krankenhauseelsorge in der Psychiatrie	
<i>Gerald Dittscheidt &amp; Antje Streithoff-Menzler</i> .....	181

8. Achtsamkeit zwischen West und Ost. Annäherung an Spiritualität in der Psychotherapie mit der Dialektisch-Behavioralen Therapie (DBT) und Chan <i>Jan Glasenapp</i> .....	211
9. Zum Stand der Forschung zu „außergewöhnlichen Erfahrungen“ und ihren psychologischen Auswirkungen <i>Claude-Hélène Mayer &amp; Niko Kohls</i> .....	237
10. Operationalisierung von Spiritualität im Vergleich Deutschland – USA <i>Heinz Streib &amp; Constantin Klein</i> .....	251
11. Spiritualität, Religiosität und Atheismus in stationärer psychotherapeutischer Behandlung – Zusammenhänge mit Psychopathologie und Therapieerfolg <i>Robert Mestel &amp; Madlen Baier</i> .....	267
12. Spiritualität und Religiosität in der Psychotherapie <i>Harald Walach &amp; Liane Hofmann</i> .....	283
 <b>III Spiritualität ohne religiösen Bezug</b>	
13. Ein Weg, sich „seelisch zu berühren“ – Grundzüge einer pragmatischen Psychotherapie in der Psychiatrie (PPP): Annehmen, Zuwenden, Verstehen, Hilfreich-Sein <i>Georg Juckel</i> .....	307
14. Was macht Sinn? Gedanken aus der Logotherapie und Existenzanalyse als sinngebende Therapieverfahren <i>Walter Cremer</i> .....	333
15. Spiritualität in der Psychotherapie <i>Reinhard Zinke</i> .....	351
16. Spiritualität für Atheisten <i>Knut Hoffmann</i> .....	369
17. Intuition in der psychiatrischen Diagnostik <i>Christian Luckhaus</i> .....	379
18. Was ist denn in dich gefahren? Verhaltensbiologisch-anthro- pologische Überlegungen zur Spiritualität in der Psychiatrie <i>Martin Brüne &amp; Wulf Schiefenhövel</i> .....	397
 <b>Autorenverzeichnis</b> .....	 409

# Geleitwort

Andreas Heinz

Georg Juckel, Knut Hoffmann und Harald Walach haben mit dem Buch „Spiritualität in Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie“ ein wichtiges Thema aufgegriffen, denn die Suche nach dem Sinn der eigenen Erfahrungen, die gerade im Bereich psychischer Erkrankungen auch überraschend, verstörend oder vereinsamend sein können, ist eine wichtige Bedingung jeder Krankheitsbewältigung. Den Autoren gelingt es zu vermeiden, dass der Wunsch nach Sinngebung und Verständnis in einem kosmologischen Zusammenhang einseitig auf religiöse Aspekte verkürzt wird. Deshalb ist der inhaltliche Bereich „Spiritualität und Religion“ besonders wichtig, gerade auch in Zeiten, in denen viele Patienten keine religiöse Zugehörigkeit haben oder sich von den etablierten Glaubensgemeinschaften bewusst abwenden. Umgekehrt ist es für eine moderne Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie wichtig, auch außerhalb europäischer Traditionen spirituelle Ansätze und Haltungen zu kennen und ernst zu nehmen. Dem widmen sich die Kapitel zum Islam, Judentum und dem Taoismus und Buddhismus. Aber auch viele auf den ersten Blick rein psychotherapeutisch anmutende Interventionsverfahren basieren auf einem Welt- und Menschenbild, das auf spirituelle Traditionen verweist. So ist beispielsweise die Diskussion um Achtsamkeit sowie die Dialektisch-Behaviorale Therapie (DBT) nicht denkbar ohne den Bezug auf Aspekte des Zen-Buddhismus, auch wenn die komplexe Meditations- und Lebenspraxis asiatischer Traditionen sich in modernen Therapieverfahren oft eher verkürzt und allzu plakativ wiederfindet. Wichtig in diesem Zusammenhang ist auch der ehrliche Rückgriff auf Erfahrungen der eigenen, oft grausamen europäischen Geschichte, der auch die Logotherapie und Existenzanalyse nach Viktor Frankl geprägt hat.

Bei aller Notwendigkeit einer Sinnsuche bleibt das medizinische Fach Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie aber der weltanschaulichen Neutralität verpflichtet. Dies nicht nur, weil das Fach für Menschen jeglicher Sinndeutung und -gebung offen sein muss, sondern auch, weil gerade am Beginn jeder Psychotherapie der Zweifel und die Offenheit für andersartige, ungewöhnliche oder nicht benennbare Erfahrungen stehen muss. „Der Sinn, den wir ersinnen können, ist nicht der ewige Sinn“, sagt Laotse in der Übersetzung von Richard Wilhelm. „Der Name, den wir nennen können, ist nicht der ewige Name“. Laotse gesteht zu, dass unsere Welt eine immer schon benannte und durch die Verbalisierung verstandene und geformte ist, betont aber den chaotischen Urgrund allen Seins. Spiritualität läuft immer Gefahr, zur Ideologie zu (de-)naturieren.

Es ist das Verdienst des vorliegenden Buches, hier vorsichtig zu bleiben und mit der Vielzahl der vorgestellten Perspektiven für jene Offenheit einzutreten, die unser Fach und die Auseinandersetzung mit den Erfahrungen der Patientinnen und Patienten so dringend braucht.

Berlin, im Oktober 2017

# Vorwort

Georg Juckel, Knut Hoffmann & Harald Walach

## *In Gedenken an Hans-Wolfgang Hoefert*

Das nun vorliegende Buch entstammt einer Samstagsveranstaltung an der Klinik für Psychiatrie, Psychotherapie und Präventivmedizin des LWL-Universitätsklinikums der Ruhr-Universität Bochum am 09. Mai 2015 zum Thema „Psychiatrie und Spiritualität“, bei der neben den beiden Veranstaltern Georg Juckel und Knut Hoffmann, Anna Briskina-Müller, Walter Cremer und Lothar Katz aus ihren jeweiligen Blickwinkeln sprachen. Diese Tagung hatte eine ausgesprochen hohe Nachfrage und Teilnehmerzahl und sie war nicht nur ein intellektueller Genuss, sondern für viele von uns quasi ein „Erweckungserlebnis“, über „spirituelle Momente“ in Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie vertieft nachzudenken, verschiedenste Perspektiven und Aspekte dieses Themas und ihre Relevanz für unser Fachgebiet darzustellen. Vor diesem Hintergrund und Erkenntnisinteresse ist das jetzige Buch mit den vielen verschiedenen Perspektiven und Autoren zu verstehen. Ziel ist es, einen breiten Überblick quer durch unterschiedliche Religionen und Kulturen für alle im Bereich von Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie Arbeitenden und Interessierten, insbesondere für den Nachwuchs zu schaffen. Selbstverständlich fühlen sich bitte alle Kolleginnen und Kollegen aus angrenzenden Disziplinen wie der Psychosomatischen Medizin oder der Klinischen Psychologie und darüber hinaus allgemein Interessierte gerne mit angesprochen.

Dieses Buch ist dem Bedürfnis geschuldet, dass man wegen des rationalen und empirischen Vorgehens in Diagnostik und Behandlung bei psychischen Störungen auch den emotionalen und spirituellen Bedarf von Patienten und Therapeuten berücksichtigen sollte. Wir alle spüren, dass in diesen zwischenmenschlichen diagnostischen und therapeutischen Kontakten und ihrem Wechselspiel viele schwer fassbare Momente mitschwingender Gedanken, Gefühle und Impulse nicht nur bloß vorhanden, sondern ganz eklatante Wirkfaktoren bei gelingenden Beziehungen sind, aber eben auch den diagnostischen und therapeutischen Erfolg darstellen. Erst hierdurch, so unsere Auffassung, ergibt sich eine wirkliche mit- und zwischenmenschliche Medizin im Bereich der psychischen Störungen und es ist nach all den Jahrzehnten der nüchternen Klassifikation und Therapieschemata aus unserer Sicht an der Zeit, in aller Breite diese mitschwingenden Momente zum Thema zu machen und hier Diskussion und Selbstreflexion in unserem Fachgebiet mit an-

zuregen. Hieraus könnte eine durchaus kritische und selbstkritische Auseinandersetzung beginnen, und neue Zugangswege zu psychischen Erkrankungen könnten erkennbar werden. Und natürlich ist es ein Trend der Zeit – vielleicht auch angesichts der Orientierungs- und Haltlosigkeit der modernen Gesellschaften – nach „übersinnlichen“, inneren oder äußeren Erfahrungsmomenten zu schauen. Wir betrachten dies als eine positive Entwicklung, die wir selbstverständlich nicht „obskuren Geistesheilern“ und Co. überlassen wollen. Bei mittlerweile sicherlich über 3000 oder 4000 Arten von Psychotherapie, bei unzähligen spirituellen Ansätzen bis hin zum Sektierertum mit allen Schäden für die uns anvertrauten Patienten ist es wichtig, dass unsere seriösen Fachgebiete in aller kritischen natur- und geisteswissenschaftlichen Grundhaltung positiv und offensiv an diese Thematik herangehen und die Ansätze, Gedanken, aber auch Bedarfe in ihrer Essenz und Gültigkeit für eine angemessene, aber auch dann hoffentlich auch weiter verbesserte Diagnostik und Behandlung sichern.

Insofern wünschen wir unseren Lesern viele Anregungen, viele neue Erkenntnisse und eine möglichst gelungene und breite Aufnahme der hier dargestellten Aspekte und Einsichten in die eigene klinische Praxis. Darüber hinaus wäre es wünschenswert, wenn viele dieser Aspekte, die zunächst „nur“ theoretische Einsichten sind, in quantitativen und qualitativen Studien untersucht werden.

Das Buch ist unterteilt in verschiedene Sektionen. Hierbei wurden vor allem diagnostische und therapeutische Aspekte gewichtet. Ebenfalls waren religiöse und nichtreligiöse Ansätze ein Ordnungsaspekt. Alle Beiträge können getrennt für sich gelesen werden, aber auch ein Querlesen durch verschiedene Beiträge zum Erfassen wesentlicher übergeordneter Themen ist gut möglich. Bewusst haben wir in heutiger „Abstract-Kultur“ darauf verzichtet, die Autoren um eine Zusammenfassung o. ä. zu bitten. Jeder Beitrag hat eine dem Autor und dem Thema spezifische Struktur und sollte vom Leser auf diese Weise gewürdigt werden. Das „Aufspüren“ der entscheidenden Aussagen im Beitrag soll natürlich auch ein Stück weit Vergnügen bereiten.

Ein Teil des Buches entstammt einem früheren Versuch unseres Kollegen, des Gesundheitswissenschaftlers Hans-Wolfgang Hoefert, eine aktuelle Zusammenstellung von Beiträgen zum Thema „Spiritualität und Gesundheit“ herauszubringen. Er hatte einen von uns (Harald Walach) zur Mitwirkung animiert. Kurz nach der Zusammenstellung der potenziellen Autorenliste verstarb Hans-Wolfgang Hoefert plötzlich. Aus verschiedenen Gründen war es sinnvoll, diese Beiträge in diesen Band zu integrieren. Wir verstehen diesen Band daher auch als Gedenken an Hans-Wolfgang Hoefert, der weder die Entstehung noch das Reifen der von ihm gepflanzten Idee miterleben konnte. Hans-Wolfgang Hoefert war Professor für Gesundheitswissenschaften an der Alice-Salomon-Hochschule in Berlin und wandte sich mit großer Begeisterung vor allem neuen, noch wenig diskutierten oder vernachlässigten Themen zu. Weil ihm die Bestrahlungstherapie einer früheren Krebserkrankung das arti-

kulierte Sprechvermögen weitgehend genommen hatte, konnte er sich auf Tagungen nicht gut äußern. Umso wichtiger war ihm die Teilhabe am wissenschaftlichen Diskurs über das geschriebene Wort. Dieses Buch war ihm ein spezielles Anliegen. Noch kurz vor seinem Tod hatte er Harald Walach gebeten, es auch ohne ihn fertigzustellen. Daher ist es eine wunderbare Koinzidenz, dass zwei völlig unterschiedliche, aber dem gleichen Thema gewidmete Unternehmungen zu einer Sammlung zusammenwachsen konnten. Dies zeigt auch, dass das Thema nun „an der Zeit“ ist und die Herausgabe eines solchen Werkes womöglich auf größeres Interesse stößt, als man zunächst glauben würde.

Wir danken all unseren AutorInnen und insbesondere Professor Andreas Heinz für ihre wertvollen Beiträge. Unseren LeserInnen wünschen wir nicht nur eine interessante Lektüre, sondern auch eine Erweiterung und Vertiefung ihres diagnostisch-therapeutischen Repertoires.



# “Geistigkeit”: A Problematic Concept – eine Einleitung

Joel Whitebook

The date was the second of August 1938. The lights were about to go out over Europe for the second time in less than thirty years, and the International Psychoanalytic Association was holding its fifteenth Congress in Paris. It was the last meeting that the organization would convene before continental Europe was almost completely emptied of its analysts, and before the creator of their field died the following year. It was therefore the last opportunity that Freud had to address his assembled followers before taking leave of them. But he was dying of cancer in London and too weak to attend, so – as he had when he was awarded the Goethe Prize in 1930 and when his mother was buried that same year – he dispatched Anna to represent him. The text that he chose to have his daughter read on that occasion was a section from his final major work *Moses and Monotheism* entitled “*Der Fortschritt in der Geistigkeit*.” (we will discuss the translation below.) Just as Moses sought to put his affairs in order and provide the Israelites with his last testament before ascending Mount Nebo to die at the age of one hundred and twenty, so, it has often been suggested, that Freud, another “important Jew who died in exile,” drafted his final testament in *Moses and Monotheism* before he returned “to the earth in London” at eighty-three.<sup>1</sup>

The text as a whole, however, is not suitable to play that role. Freud himself repeatedly apologizes for its severe deficiencies, likening it to “a bronze statue resting on clay feet.”<sup>2</sup> It is confused, repetitious, tortured, lacunary, and, at points, even bizarre. One might say that it is “mutilated.” To this day, many, if not the majority of analysts are exasperated and embarrassed by the work – which, Edward Said suggests is, like Beethoven’s last compositions, is a defiantly emancipated specimen of *Spätstil* – and wonder how this “jagged quarry,” as Ilse Grubrich-Simitis describes it, could exist “in the midst of such a classical landscape of manuscripts.”<sup>3</sup> The section of *Geistigkeit*, on the other hand, is a far more appropriate text to serve as Freud’s last testament. Its relatively lucid

<sup>1</sup> W. H. Auden, “In Memory of Sigmund Freud,”

<sup>2</sup> S. Freud, *Moses and monotheism*, p. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Edward Said, *Freud and the Non-European*, (New York: Verso, 2003), pp. 28-29 and Ilse Grubrich-Simitis, *Early Freud and late Freud: reading anew studies in hysteria and Moses and monotheism*, *The new library of psychoanalysis* vol. 29, trans. Philip Slotkin, (New York: Routledge, 1997), p. 53. At the same time, the extraordinarily lucid and rigorous “An Outline of Psychoanalysis,” written at same time, presents a condensed dogmatic presentation of Freud’s fundamental ideas, which eliminates any suspicion that his mental capacities had declined. See S. Freud, “An Outline of Psycho-Analysis,” 1940, SE 23, pp. 141-209.

composition and straightforward if not one-sided exhortation make it well suited for rallying the troops. Whatever the more esoteric and obscure truths contained in *Moses and Monotheism*, the passage that Anna delivered in Paris contained the exoteric message that Freud wanted his followers to carry with them after his death.

Freud had identified with Moses in various ways throughout his life, and when it came time to draft his last testament, he saw specific parallel between his situation and the prophet's. Moses had devised an elitist, severe, and uncompromising monotheistic doctrine, which he attempted to impose on the common people from above – Freud refers to them as the “mob” – and which they ultimately found intolerable. Indeed, according to Freud's version of the legend, Moses's demands were so unbearable that Israelites rose up and murdered him.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, Freud believed he had subjected a ragtag “gang” of marginal Viennese *Luftmenschen* to his equally “harsh” doctrine, and they also had difficulty maintaining its rigorist demands. There had already been the defections of Adler, Rank, and Jung – not to mention the heterodoxy of Mrs. Klein and her group in London – and he suspected that his discontented followers, who remained “murmurers” as long as he was alive, would become overt “blasphemers,” once he died.<sup>5</sup> And his concerns about the resistances within his own ranks that applied a *fortiori* to the public at large.

There are those Jewish commentators who to deny that, throughout his life, Freud retained “a completely negative attitude toward religion in any form” and want to claim him as a favorite son, who, after an extended period of wandering as an apostate, returned to the fold and made peace with the tribe at the end of his life.<sup>6</sup> They often argue that, by taking up the Bible in the 1930's, Freud was complying with “the paternal mandate” that Jacob had inscribed on the *Gedenkblatt* of the family's Philippson Bible on the occasion of his son's thirtieth birthday, and fulfilling his father's entreaty to return to the “Book of Books.” Although the

<sup>4</sup> Just as Freud ignores the fact that an attempted infanticide preceded patricide in his treatment of the Oedipus legend – that Laius tried to kill Oedipus as an infant before his grown son actually murdered him – so, he fails to mention a similar fact in his presentation of the Biblical story: in the course of one day, Moses executed – “purged” – thousands of his “counter-revolutionary” followers who had danced before the Golden Calf, before the survivors rose up and supposedly murdered him. It is also striking that Freud praises the Levites, the elite members of Moses “vanguard party” who carried out the bloody purge and kept the memory of Moses' vision of monotheism alive during the long period “latency,” until it finally returned from repression and was rekindled in Kadesh. The role of the Levites in the politics of the Bible and Freud's affirmative view of them invites comparison with the function that Freud envisioned for the “Committee,” the trustworthy “central committee” of his own “vanguard party” that was constituted after the arch-apostate, Jung, had been “purged.” See Michael Walzer, *Exodus and Revolution*, (New York: Basic Books, 1985), pp. 55–66

<sup>5</sup> Bela Grunberger observes that almost all the so-called dissidents, in one way or another, asserted the importance of the early mother against Freud's patricentrism. However, rather than backsliding, as the Freudian orthodoxy sees it, they can be viewed as attempting to add, with varying degrees of success, an essential corrective to Freud's official position. See Léon Chertok and Isabelle Strenger, *A critique of psychoanalytic reason: hypnosis as a scientific problem from lavoisier to Lacan*, trans. Martha Noel Evans, (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992), p. 102.

<sup>6</sup> Heinrich Meng and Ernst Freud (eds.), *Psychoanalysis and Faith: The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Oskar Pfister*, trans. Eric Moser, (New York: Basic Books, 1963), p. 110. See for example Emanuel Rice, *Freud and Moses: the long journey home*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1900).

claim is not false *per se*, stated in this general way, it is, as Armstrong argues, sorely inadequate:

Some see in Freud's late-life interest in Jewish history a clear pattern of departure and return, and while I agree with this characterization generally, I would like to qualify just how one is to understand 'return.' For it seems brutally clear that Freud's 'return' to the Jewish tradition in *Moses and Monotheism* is no facile reconciliation, nor a death-bed lapse into some suitably modified form of piety.<sup>7</sup>

The first point to be made is that Freud did not only identify with Judaism at the end of his career, but throughout it – although in its earlier phases it tended to appear in his private correspondence, where he referred to *Yiddishisms* from the likes of Itzig, rather than in his official publications, where he chose to quote more hallowed figures like Sophocles, Shakespeare, and Goethe. The difference was that, in the thirties, he embraced his identification with Judaism more thoroughly and went public with it.<sup>8</sup> Despite his skepticism about every variety of national pride and his uncompromising atheism in *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud manifests enormous pride, as Rieff points out, in his identification with Moses – albeit, while interpreting him as an ancient precursor of the *Aufklärung*.<sup>9</sup>

Armstrong's claim that Freud's "return" to Judaism was no simple act of filial piety is correct. Indeed, to say that the "homecoming" was "ambivalent" is too tepid; it was *thoroughly conflicted*. Yerushalmi's asserts that "at the same time" as Freud fulfilled the paternal "mandate by returning to the intensive study of the Bible," he also maintained "his independence from his father through his interpretation." But the idea of maintaining "his independence" is too tepid and soft peddles the sheer amount of aggression that was involved in that fulfillment.<sup>10</sup> In addition to an identification with the tradition for which he undoubtedly had deep affection, Freud's "return" to Judaism also included an act of patricidal destruction directed at "the religion of the fathers." He took what was his father's and "made it his own" by devouring and cannibalizing that patrimony and spitting it out in a radically altered form. The conjunction of identification and parricide should not be surprising to an analyst, for, according to Freud's own theory, most creative acts of any magnitude necessarily include both elements.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Richard H. Armstrong, *A compulsion to antiquity: Freud and the ancient world*, (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2005), p. 248.

<sup>8</sup> See Robert, *From Oedipus to Moses*, tk.

<sup>9</sup> Rieff, *Freud: the mind of a moralist*, tk.

<sup>10</sup> Yerushalmi, *Freud's moses*, p. 78.

<sup>11</sup> See Joel Whitebook, "Hans Loewald: a radical conservative," p. 98. When Freud's anti-secular critics claim that he became more sympathetic to religion in *Moses and Monotheism*, they tend to obscure the issue to their own advantage. What is new in the book – in contrast to the more rationalist *Future of An Illusion* – is a greater appreciation of the enormity of the *power* that religion exerts human beings. "There is," Freud observes, "an

Freud, like Schoenberg, turned to Moses as a response to the rise of Hitler. The more obvious and less troubling question to ask at the time would have been this: What was it about the German (and Austrian) character and culture that gave rise to Nazism? However, because of his consistent commitment to self-reflection, Freud raised a different question – one that he knew would not go down well with his persecuted co-religionists: What was it about “the particular character of the Jew[s]” that had “earned [them] the hearty dislike of every other people” throughout much of history?<sup>12</sup> This question presupposes a specific psychological theorem. Contrary to a popular conception, paranoia does not consist in pure projection “into the blue,” but attaches itself onto some anchor, however minimal, that exists in extra-psychic reality. Likewise, prejudice is not a purely projective phenomenon either. As with paranoia, it also “leans on” some feature in the person who is persecuted.<sup>13</sup> If they are honest with themselves, individuals who have been the object of hatred often recognize that something in them provided a hook for their persecutor’s projections. Having made this psychological point, however, we must immediately register a warning to forestall a particularly pernicious and not uncommon interpretation of it. To say that there is something about the Jews that provokes anti-Semitism – or that there is something about any persecuted group that provokes their persecution – *in no way implies that they got what they deserved.*

Freud answers the question in the following way. What he considers the highest achievement of the Jewish people, namely, their comprehensive articulation of a monotheistic worldview that is fully “dematerialized” or transcendent, is also the source of the remarkable hatred that has regularly been directed at them. (We should note that, while the revolutionary Egyptian Pharaoh Akhenaten first enunciated the monotheistic vision, according to Freud, it fell to Moses and the Israelites, whose “peculiar psychic aptitude” was well suited for the task, to complete his project.<sup>14</sup>) Freud takes one of “the precepts of the Moses religion” to be of central importance: “the prohibition against making an image of God,” or, to put it differently, “the compulsion to worship a God whom one cannot see.”<sup>15</sup> By analyzing the *Bilderverbot*, as it is often referred to, he believes he can elucidate the civilizational significance of Jewish

element of grandeur about everything to do with the origin of religion,” and, he admits, “that this is not matched by the explanations we have hitherto given.” *Grandeur, however, is not truth.* In fact, its source is purely emotional: the awe invoked by the powerful father. Freud had come to realize that the force of religion is far greater than he had formerly recognized, but he continued to believe that its content was *false*. No less than, *Moses and Monotheism* consists in an Enlightenment-style critique of religion, which repeats the argument of Totem and Taboo almost verbatim, and continues to liken it to psychopathology and traces its origins as the murder of the primal father. Indeed, he deploys the argument of the earlier book, and states that he remains as convinced of his theory of the primal hoard as he had been in 1912. Freud, *Moses and Monotheism*, p. 128 & p. 58.

<sup>12</sup> Ernst Pfeiffer (ed.), *Sigmund Freud and Lou Andreas-Salomé Letters*, trans. William and Elaine Robson-Scott, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc., 1966), p. 204 & *Ibid.*, p. 105.

<sup>13</sup> S. Freud, “Some neurotic mechanisms in jealousy, paranoia and homosexuality, 1922 SE 18, p. 226.

<sup>14</sup> S. Freud, *Moses and monotheism*, p. 111.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 112–113.

monotheism. His thesis is that this prohibition introduced “an advance in *Geistigkeit*” into world history:

[It] meant that a sensory perception was given second place to what may be called an abstract idea – a triumph of *Geistigkeit* over sensuality or, strictly speaking, an instinctual renunciation, with all its necessary psychological consequences.<sup>16</sup>

The question of how to translate *Geistigkeit* into English is not only controversial, but also raises important substantive issues concerning Freud’s theory. The German term *Geist* is richly polysemic in a way that the candidates for its English translation are not. It is therefore difficult to convey its multiple meanings and full resonance with any one of them.<sup>17</sup> For example, although Katherine Jones’s choice to translate *Geistigkeit* as “spirituality” in the first English translation of *Moses and Monotheism* has the advantage of capturing the extra-cognitive and emotional reverberations contained in the German, it fails to adequately capture the term’s reference to reason and the intellect. We can therefore understand James Strachey’s decision to translate *Geistigkeit* as “intellectuality” in *The Standard Edition*. By not mentioning “spirituality,” he not only avoids any hint of Jungian vaporousness, but he also highlights the supreme value that Freud attaches to the intellect. Predictably, however, Strachey’s choice errs in the opposite direction: it can strike one as overly cognitivist and lacking in emotional resonance. Because of its polysemic nature, *Geistigkeit* can be interpreted as a “tertiary” concept, and, like all of Freud’s best concepts, it prescribes as task: to sublimate/sublimate the binomial opposition between intellectuality and *Sinnlichkeit* [sensuality] at a higher level of integration.

Although Akhenaten and Moses’s creation of monotheism occurred before the Axial Age, as it is usually conceptualized, they can be seen, as Assmann suggests, as axial phenomenon. The feature unifying the diverse achievements that are generally subsumed under the idea of the Axial Age – the contributions of Confucius, Socrates, Buddha, and Jeremiah – is, Assmann argues, “a breakthrough to a kind of transcendence.”<sup>18</sup> In one way or another, axial figures posited a sphere of second order being and thinking – for example, a notion of a “de-materialized” God with the Jews and the idea of Reason with the Greeks – that made it possible to not only understand first-order thinking and the world as it is given, but also to criticize them. To use Hegel’s language, this breakthrough to transcendence raised the human species out of its immediate natural existence and elevated it to the level of self-reflective *Geist*. The point that needs to be stressed is that the positing the existence of a tran-

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 113.

<sup>17</sup> See Richard J. Bernstein, *Freud and the legacy of Moses, Cambridge studies in religion and critical thought*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 31.

<sup>18</sup> Jan Assmann, *Of god and gods: Egypt, israel, and the rise of monotheism, George I. mosse series in modern European cultural and intellectual history*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2008), p. 79.

scendent sphere creates a standpoint from which “actually existing reality” can be criticized. Moses’s introduction of monotheism made a new form of critique possible, and, for Freud, this is perhaps its most significant accomplishment, and one that he appropriated. The Mosaic attack on idolatry, in other words, was the precursor of Freud’s own destruction of the idols through the psychoanalytic critique of illusion.

The fact that by asserting the demands of *Geistigkeit* over those of sensuality [*Sinnlichkeit*] required the “renunciation” of instinctual life and the devaluation of the body constitutes the linchpin for Freud’s explanation of anti-Semitism. To accomplish “higher” *geistig* achievements, one must renounce and repress the distracting perceptions and seductive temptations offered by the material world as well as the immediate demands of the drives. Like most obsessional attempts to control the instincts, with the Jews, the *geistig* demands for renunciation steadily proliferated over “the course of the centuries” until, according to Freud, they assumed a central position in Judaism. “The religion” that began with the *Bilderverbot*, he observes, developed “more and more... into a religion of instinctual renunciations.” As the Prophets never tire of telling us, “God requires nothing other from his people than a just and virtuous conduct of life – that is, abstention from every instinctual satisfaction.”<sup>19</sup>

Freud’s celebration of *Geistigkeit* is unabashedly androcentric and patriarchal. He offers a particularly concrete and somewhat strained explanation of why “this turning from the mother to the father points to a victory of *Geistigkeit* over sensuality – that is, an advance in civilization.” Because birth, the physical emergence of the infant from the mother’s body, is an observable fact, he argues, “maternity is proved by the evidence of the senses.” By contrast, insofar as no comparable empirical evidence existed for establishing the identity of the father prior to the discovery of DNA, “paternity” is a “conceptual” matter, that is, “a hypothesis, based on an inference and a premise.”<sup>20</sup> We might note that this is an argument legions of deadbeat dads have deployed in less *geistig* situations. The triumph of patriarchy over the chthonic deities – of the Father of the primal horde over the Great Mother – represents an advance in *Geistigkeit* because to determine paternal lineage, one must rely on “conceptual” considerations, inferences, rather than “sensual” evidence.

<sup>19</sup> S. Freud, *Moses and monotheism*, pp. 118–119. Though it may partly represent the envy of an unathletic *Shiva Boucher* who had recently witnessed the Olympic games in Berlin, Freud, his *Hellenophilia* notwithstanding, praises the Jews’ decision to pursue “intellectual labours” at the expense of “physical activity,” as opposed to the Greeks’ attempt to integrate mind and body, as “the worthier alternative.” His rationale that their almost exclusive concentration on the intellect has “helped to check the brutality and tendency to violence” in the Jewish people rings especially hollow in today’s world. There is, however, another way in which Freud remains a Greek. Insofar as he sharply extols *Geistigkeit* over *Sinnlichkeit*, and lionizes the mind at the expense of the body, Freud, as Assmann points out, is a Platonist, and his position suffers from many of the same difficulties as Plato’s dualistic philosophy that constructs an opposition between “highest” to the “lowest.” Assman, tk.

<sup>20</sup> S. Freud, *Moses and monotheism*, p. 114. Perhaps for this reason, the discovery of DNA should be considered a *Fortschritt in der Geistigkeit*.

There is another more important point to be made about Freud's account of "the advance in *Geistigkeit*." Not only does it represent a "triumph" of patriarchy; it is an expression Freud's "matrophobic" devaluation of the pre-Oedipal realm in that it also represents the debasement of the maternal dimension, which is. The early breast-mother, with the warmth, comfort, smells, closeness, and pleasure that she offers her child is, after all, the apotheosis *Sinnlichkeit*. From the heights of the *geistig* Mosaic perspective, that sensuality is, as Grubrich-Simitis argues, demonized as "the fleshpots of Egypt," which can be understood as a "metaphor" for the temptation to return to a state of symbiotic merger with the archaic mother.<sup>21</sup>

Freud had a particular template in mind for explaining anti-Semitism: it is the hatred of Akhenaten and Moses, resulting from the demand for renunciation they imposed on their people, writ large. After Akhenaten's death, in reaction to his anti-sensual and aniconic revolution-from-above – which sought to eradicate the abundant visuality of Egyptian culture and religion – the priests he had purged allied the common people, angrily rose up in a counter-revolution, and eradicated every trace of the Pharaoh's monotheistic worldview. By the same token, when the Israelites in the desert found they could no longer tolerate the renunciations that Moses's ascetic and dematerialized monotheism was imposing on them, they not only yearned to return to "the fleshpots of Egypt" and danced naked around the Golden Calf, but, if Freud is to be believed, they also revolted against their leader and murdered him.

The central conflict at the heart of the notion of "an advance in *Geistigkeit*" is this. On the one hand, the introduction into history of a thoroughly "de-materialized" monotheistic religion constituted an undeniable epochal advance and represents one of the Jews' greatest contributions to civilization. On the other hand, the demand for renunciation that is integral to it has provoked formidable resentment among the other peoples of the world. It is here that we arrive at Freud's central thesis concerning anti-Semitism: *the anger that the Gentile world harbors towards the Jews for having imposed that demand for renunciation on them is the central cause of the Jew hatred that has regularly flared up over thousands of years*. Writing during the Nazi period, Horkheimer and Adorno make the point aphoristically: "Because [the Jews] invented the concept of the kosher," which exemplifies their renunciatory ethic, they "are persecuted like swine."<sup>22</sup> We might add that, owing to the fact that persecutory structures of thought typically obey primary processes, the Jews are often simultaneously condemned as hypersexual and lascivious.

In 1918, in a letter to Oskar Pfister, Freud had asserted that only "a completely godless Jew" could have discovered psychoanalysis.<sup>23</sup> Then in his in his 1930 "Preface to the Hebrew Translation of *Totem and*

<sup>21</sup> Grubrich-Simitis, *Early Freud and late Freud*, p. 72.

<sup>22</sup> Horkheimer and Adorno, *Dialectic of enlightenment*, p. 153.

<sup>23</sup> Meng and Freud, *Psychoanalysis and Faith*, p. 63.

*Taboo*,” he ups the ante and asserts that it was he, a non-believing psychoanalyst, who in fact instantiated the “very essence” of Judaism – although “he could not [at that time] express that essence in words.”<sup>24</sup> In response to Freud’s description of himself as “a godless Jew,” Pfister had made the completely *meshuga* assertion that no “better Christian” than Freud ever existed. Now, Freud is in effect making the equally *chuzpadik* claim that no better Jew than he had ever walked the earth. Far from having abandoned the tribe, he is irreverently asserting that, precisely as an “apostate Jew” – as an iconoclastic Jew – he is the essential Jew. Though Yerushalmi clearly bristles at the idea, he is forced to conclude that Freud’s “secret” is not only that he is “a godless Jew,” but also that psychoanalysis “is godless Judaism.”<sup>25</sup> How can Freud make the seemingly outrageous claim that he embodies the essence of Judaism? By identifying Judaism with one particular strand in it: the Mosaic. He then assimilates Moses the prophet to Moses Mendelssohn and construes the Mosaic critique of idolatry as the ancient prefiguration of the *Aufklärung’s* critique of illusion. This in turn allows him to maintain that the psychoanalytic critique of religion has carried the Mosaic critique of idolatry to its ultimate conclusion by demonstrating that not this or that particular religion, *but religion as such* is idolatrous. One might say that *The Standard Edition* becomes the new Torah.

Bernstein maintains that, although he does not explicitly flag it as such in *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud in fact articulates the essence of Judaism he had gestured at in the “Preface” to *Totem and Taboo*. And, according to Bernstein, it is epitomized in the phrase “*Der Fortschritt in der Geistigkeit*.” There is no doubt Bernstein is in some sense correct when he argues that “this is a legacy with which Freud proudly [identified]” and wanted to honor at the end of his life.<sup>26</sup> The thesis, however, is also problematic, in no small part because the concept of *Geistigkeit* is itself problematic, and Bernstein does not sufficiently pursue its problematic aspects. Whatever its positive content, there is one thing that the essence of Judaism, as Freud saw it, was not: flabby. As we have seen, the feature of the Judaic tradition – more precisely of the Mosaic tradition – that he cherished and identified with was its critical rigor, manifested in its hostility to icons and idols. It was the internalization of that iconoclasm that, Freud believed, allowed him to stand outside the “compact majority” – including the compact Jewish majority – and adhere to a transcultural standard of scientific objectivity. The flattering self-images that a group creates to boost its collective narcissism – “the idols of the tribe” – should not, he believed, be exempted from that skeptical rigor. Indeed, he may have been bending over backwards to demonstrate his commitment to cosmopolitan and universalist values when he maintained that Moses was an Egyptian, and told his critics that he refused

<sup>24</sup> S. Freud, *Totem and Taboo*, SE 13, p. xv.

<sup>25</sup> Yerushalmi, *Freud’s Moses*, p. 99.

<sup>26</sup> Bernstein, p. 84.

to “put the truth aside in favour (sic.) of what are supposed to be [the] national interests” of his own people, regardless of the profound historical crisis that was threatening them.<sup>27</sup>

Freud’s somewhat hortatory celebration of *Geistigkeit* in *Moses* is flabby in that does not adequately capture the critical iconoclasm that he saw as an essential feature of the monotheistic revolution. To be sure, given the multiple traumas that confronted him at the time – his cancer, the uprooting of the professional infrastructure he had created, Hitler’s massive attack on the Jews, and his immigration to London – we can understand why Freud may have relaxed his critical standards and painted an idealized and inspirational portrait of his people.<sup>28</sup> Nevertheless, in so doing, he retreated from the skeptical iconoclastic rigor that were central to his Jewish ego ideal. The concept of *Geistigkeit* is too uncritical and affirmative – indeed, too un-analytic – and contains more than a whiff of sanctimony and self-satisfaction. One can imagine a Reform rabbi in pre-war Berlin, presenting a variation of Freud’s encomium to *Geistigkeit* as a sermon to the respectable members of the Jewish *Bildungsbürgertum* – the people whom, Franz Kafka, Gershom Scholem and Walter Benjamin revolted against.

There is also a more insidious side to Freud’s affirmation of paternal *Geistigkeit* and denigration of maternal *Sinnlichkeit*: It can be seen as identification with the aggressor – namely, with Pauline Christianity. The adoration of the Madonna may be one aspect of Christianity, but Paul’s teachings, which criticize *Israel carnalis* and Jewish legalism in the name of Christian spirituality, are more central to its history.<sup>29</sup> As Robert Paul observes, the opposition between “spirituality” and “carnality” is at the heart of Paul’s denunciation of the Jews.<sup>30</sup> And Assmann notes that “it could be said that Christianity is primarily and fundamentally distinguished by a principle that could no better be characterized than with Freud’s phrase, “progress in [spirituality].” Assmann is content to conclude that although “it is not without a certain irony,” Freud’s “use of a Christian topos” to articulate what he believed to be the greatest accomplishment of the Jewish people “was quite unintentional.”<sup>31</sup> Yet the whole thing is too peculiar to be left there and invites analytic scrutiny. It would seem that Freud’s eagerness to valorize the Jews led him to a certain identification with the aggressor.

The “third ear” of every self-respecting analyst should have perked up at the mention of *Fortschritt*, for, as Freud taught us, there is no unambiguous progress in psychic life or cultural history. Every advance exacts its price. In this respect, enlightened psychoanalytic thinking is similar to mythical thought, which holds, as Horkheimer and Adorno

<sup>27</sup> S. Freud, *Moses and monotheism*, p. 7.

<sup>28</sup> See Grubrich-Simitis, *Early Freud and late Freud*, pp. tk.

<sup>29</sup> See Daniel Boyarin, *Carnal Israel: reading sex in talmudic culture*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

<sup>30</sup> Paul, *Moses and civilization*, 36.

<sup>31</sup> Assmann, *The price of monotheism*, 101

put it, that “everything that happens must atone for the fact of having happened.”<sup>32</sup> The cost of creating monotheism was not only the repression and debasement of sensuality and the body, but the maternal dimension *überhaupt*. One of the most problematic features of Freud’s celebration of *Geistigkeit* is his uncritical affirmation of its thoroughly androcentric and patriarchal orientation, which is particularly obvious after the rise of feminism and its critique of psychoanalysis. Indeed, the reader is taken aback when Freud criticizes Christianity’s reintroduction of the figure of the mother as “a cultural regression” from transcendent heights of Jewish monotheism to a more primitive stage of religious development based on “the great mother goddess.”<sup>33</sup> It could in fact be argued that the rehabilitation of the maternal dimension was a crucial factor in Christianity’s triumph over Judaism in popularity.

The monolithic androcentrism of *Moses and Monotheism* has a psychological as well a political source. Psychologically, Grubrich-Simitis argues that because in himself Freud had never successfully confronted “the catastrophic events of [his] own early childhood” largely connected with his relation to his mother, when memories of those early traumatic experience were reactivated by the traumas of the thirties, he could only deal with them through a displacement, namely, from the maternal world onto world history.<sup>34</sup> Instead of excavating his own pre-history and his relation to the archaic mother, Freud turned to an excavation the “primeval” history of civilization through what Shorske calls his second “Egyptian dig.”<sup>35</sup>

In addition to the psychological factors that were undoubtedly at work, the masculinist bias of *Moses*, Shorske argues, also results from Freud’s attempt to present an idealized picture of Akhenaten’s Enlightenment and Moses’s continuation of it in order to enhance the Jew’s conception of themselves and stiffen their mettle in their struggle against Nazi barbarism. Shorske points out that Egypt had replaced Greece as the ancient culture that Freud idealized. Though the Jews had never achieved “an honored place in the gentile history” of Athens, Rome or Vienna, “in Egypt,” he argues, according to Freud’s narrative, they “became the Kulturvolk that rescued the highest gentile civilization from the unholy alliance of priests and ignorant people.” The implicit message in *Moses and Monotheism* is, Shorske suggests is this: “in modern times, the Jews, and cultured gentiles were, through exodus and exile, [likewise] saving Europe’s enlightened civilization from Hitler.”<sup>36</sup>

To accomplish his goal Freud – writing at the time of the Berlin Olympics – apparently believed it was necessary to portray the Jews not

<sup>32</sup> Horkheimer and Adorno, *Dialectic of enlightenment*, p. 8.

<sup>33</sup> S. Freud, *Moses and monotheism*, p. 88.

<sup>34</sup> Grubrich-Simitis, p. 68.

<sup>35</sup> Carl Shorske, “To the Egyptian Dig: Freud’s Psycho-Archeology of Cultures,” *Thinking with history*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), pp. 191–215.

<sup>36</sup> Shorske, “To the Egyptian dig,” p. 209.

simply as a Kulturvolk, but specifically as a “masculine Kulturvolk,” and therefore emphasized “Moses imperial manliness.”<sup>37</sup> By demanding instinctual renunciation, the prophet, Shorske maintains, “liberated the Jews not so much from Egyptian bondage as from their instinctual drives.” Moses was “a father to the childish people who “transformed them into a father-people,” that is, a mature, manly, and tenacious *Kulturvolk*, whose commitment to *Geistigkeit* allowed them to survive, although eliciting the intense hatred of the Gentile world.<sup>38</sup> The demands of this “monumental” history of the ancient Near East were, in short, gave rise to the androcentric and patriarchal biases of *Moses and Monotheism* and caused Freud to extol the “masculine” virtues of *Geistigkeit*, while debasing the “feminine” and “maternal” values of *Sinnlichkeit*.

Shorske argues, however, that an alternative route was available to Freud, which, had he taken it, might have resulted in more accurate picture of the ancient Near East and avoided the one-sidedness of his patriarchal theory of religion and civilization. What’s more, it might have prevented mainstream psychoanalysis from cleaving to a narrowly androcentric and downright misogynist orientation that was detrimental to the field’s development and required four decades to overcome. Shorske calls our attention to the fact that Freud had exhibited a distinctly different mindset at the time of his earlier forays into the uncanny land of Sphinx and was thoroughly familiar with two texts that presented a radically different picture of Egyptian culture but chose to ignore them.

In addition to his identification with Moses, it is likely that Freud’s curiosity about Egypt was also first aroused when, sitting by his father’s side, he had read *The Philippon Bible*, which contained numerous woodcuts depicting various aspects of the Ancient Near East. Shorske tell us that after 1900 – that is, after his “conquest of Rome” – Freud’s curiosity about Egypt asserted itself and “nurtured interests [in him] that were in drastic contradiction to the faith of his fathers and even to the male orientation of psychoanalysis.” Indeed, according to Shorske, Freud’s “first Egyptian digs” raised “ultimate and even dangerous questions of the psyche” to which Freud had previously “devoted scant attention.”<sup>39</sup> Jewish law, as Chasseguet-Smirgel observes, is suspicious of “mixture” and many “Biblical prohibitions are based on a principle of division and separation” – of what can touch and not touch, what should be kept distinct and apart.<sup>40</sup> Exactly the opposite is the case with the Egyptian world that Freud was exploring in the first years of the twen-

<sup>37</sup> Richard Armstrong drew my attention to the fact that the Olympics constituted, with its celebration of physicality, constituted part of the backdrop for *Moses*.

<sup>38</sup> Shorske, “To the Egyptian dig,” p. 209.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.* p. 205.

<sup>40</sup> Janine Chasseguet-Smirgel, “Perversion and the Universal Law,” *Creativity and Perversion*, (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1984), p. 8.

tieth century. It was characterized by mixture, ambiguity, and bi-polarity, especially with regard to bisexuality, a topic Freud was keenly interested in in the aftermath of his relation with Fliess.

In *Leonardo*, for example, Freud turns to Egyptian mythology to interpret the artist's early memory where what Freud believed was a vulture struck the boy on the mouth with its tail while he was resting in his cradle. The memory, Freud argues, comprises a homosexual fantasy, in which the vulture represents the phallic mother inserting her penis into the boy's mouth. With this interpretation, Shorske points out, "a new [bisexual] figure" appears "on the psychoanalytic scene: the phallic mother."<sup>41</sup> Because we are not primarily interested in Leonardo's psychic life but Freud's, the fact that the interpretation was infamously based on a mistranslation (the Italian word Freud took for "vulture" actually meant "Kite") is beside the point. For us, what is important is that Freud arrives at his interpretation of the memory through associations to the Egyptian goddess Mut, an early hermaphroditic Egyptian mother deity, who the head of a vulture and is generally depicted possessing a phallus.

Contrary to the heterosexual bias that tends to characterize Freud's "official position," in this text he praises the bisexuality of the Egyptian gods. In a remarkable statement, he notes: "expressions of the idea that only a combination of male and female elements can give a worthy representation of divine perfection."<sup>42</sup> Shorske argues that just as the Egyptian world, with its indeterminate sexuality, can be viewed as the archaic history of the humanity, so the pre-Oedipal world, with its unintegrated drives, can be seen as the archaic history of the individual. Unfortunately, Freud's excursion into bisexuality and pre-Oedipal development in *Leonardo* that occurred on his "first Egyptian dig" remained a relatively isolated event that he did not systematically pursue in his later work. To do so, might have result destabilizing and fruitful insights that would have been productive for his creativity and avoided many serious errors in the development of psychoanalysis.

One work that Freud drew on extensively in writing *Moses and Monotheism* was James Henry Breasted's *The History of Egypt* (1905). Breasted had roots "in the progressivist spirit of America's New History" and, according to Shorske, sought to chart "Egyptian culture as it struggled out of chthonic darkness to the achievements of rational enlightenment in the reign of his hero, Akhenaten." Indeed, Freud's "portrait of Akhenaten" as a rational enlightener, expounding a demanding, rational, androcentric and puritanical doctrine, "is firmly grounded in Breasted's account."<sup>43</sup> At the same time, however, Breasted also presents another

<sup>41</sup> Shorske, "To the egyptian dig," p. 206.

<sup>42</sup> Freud, *Leonardo*, p. 94. In this context, Freud raises the bogging question of why humans endow "a figure which is intended to embody the essence of the mother with a mark of male potency which is the opposite of everything male." Had he been able to face the frightening power of his on mother, he might have been able to provide a better answer to this question than the dubious one he formulated with the castration complex.

<sup>43</sup> Shorske, "To the Egyptian Dig," pp. 109-110.

deeply sensual side to Akhenaten's personality and his dynasty that Freud completely ignores. For example, in contrast to the rigid and geometric Egyptian art that preceded it, the works of Akhenaten's reign display "a sensuous, naturalistic plasticity worthy of art nouveau." Indeed, "frescoes depicting Akhenaten and his beautiful queen Nefertiti in tender communion," according to Shorske, "radiate the joy of Sinnlichkeit." None of this sensuality, however, can be found in Freud. He "selected from Breasted" only what served his purposes in connecting "the Egyptian Enlightenment" with the *geistig* portrait he wished to create of the Jews. "In his copy of Breasted's history," Shorske tells us, "Freud marked on those passages" that helped him further those aims.<sup>44</sup>

There is something particularly striking about the second text Freud chose to ignore, namely, Karl Abraham's "Amenhotep IV."<sup>45</sup> Not only had proposed the topic of Akhenaten to his colleague from Berlin, but he had also praised the article, which emphasized the feminine side of the Pharaoh's personality and cultural innovations, when it was published in 1912. It has often been observed that there is a double Abrahamic repression in *Moses and Monotheism*: of Abraham the patriarch as the founder of the Jews, and of Abraham the analyst as the author of this important article. According to Abraham's paper, Akhenaten's character is distinctly androgynous. Moreover, the young Pharaoh was not only deeply attached to two powerful women, his mother Queen Tiy, but was also deeply influenced by them. Indeed, it may be the case that Queen Tiy was the source and inspiration for his monotheistic revolution was, which would mean that the origins of monotheism were matriarchal. While there was undoubtedly a *geistig* side to Akhenaten, according to Abraham, he was no ascetic: there were deeply sensual aspects to his personality and the culture that surrounded him. The exclusion of Abraham's article from *Moses and Monotheism* is, as Roith argues, another symptom of Freud's need to suppress the maternal dimension from his thinking in general and his account of religion in particular.<sup>46</sup>

As we mentioned, the idea that everything has its price is not foreign to psychoanalysis. And the price that Freud paid for creating an image of the Jews that would strengthen them during perhaps the most profound crisis they had faced, was the exclusion of the feminine and maternal dimension from his thinking. As Shorske puts it, "For the sake of the Jews in Hitler's *Götterdämmerung*, Freud banished from his mind the promising insights into sexuality and culture he had found in Egypt, and abandoned them in *Moses and Monotheism*."<sup>47</sup> It is not our place to judge Freud's decision, but only to understand the price that was paid

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. 110.

<sup>45</sup> Karl Abraham, "Amenhotep IV: a psycho-analytical contribution towards the understanding of his personality and of the monotheistic cult of aton, *Clinical papers and essays on psycho-analysis*, ed. Hilda C. Abraham, trans. Hilda C. Abraham et al. (New York: Bruner/Mazel Publishers, 1955), pp. 262-290.

<sup>46</sup> Estelle Roith, *The riddle of Freud: Jewish influences on his theory of female sexuality*, *The new library of psychoanalysis* 4, (New York: Tavistock Publications, 1987), pp. 172-173.

<sup>47</sup> Shorske, "To the Egyptian Dig," p. 213.

for his “repudiation of femininity,” namely, the exclusion of an entire dimension of psychic life and cultural life from his thinking. Those of us who arrived on the scene after the feminist critique of psychoanalysis, which, in many important respects, dovetailed with the field’s pre-Oedipal turn: to recoup that dimension and to use the resources that Freud, the ambivalent patriarch, provided us to criticize patriarchy.

---

# I Religiöse Aspekte von Spiritualität

---



# 1.

## Ausgewählte historische Beispiele des Verhältnisses von Spiritualität zu Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie

Michael Seidel

Ein Sammelband über spirituelle Aspekte von Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie kann historische Aspekte nicht gänzlich unerwähnt lassen. Religiöse Gemeinschaften und religiös motivierte Persönlichkeiten haben sich im Laufe der Geschichte mit dem Phänomen *psychische Krankheit*, namentlich mit der Versorgung von Menschen mit psychischen Störungen befasst und natürlich dazu auch grundsätzliche Aussagen und Vorstellungen formuliert.

An dieser Stelle kann auch nur einigermassen erschöpfender Überblick über die Entwicklung des Verhältnisses religiös bestimmter Positionen zu Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie, erst recht nicht über die Vielfalt religiöser und theologischer Positionen zu psychischer Krankheit gegeben werden. Selbst wenn man sich allein nur einigermassen repräsentativ auf christliche Positionen beziehen wollte, überstiege auch das schon angesichts der Vielfalt von Frömmigkeitsformen und Glaubenspraxis im Laufe überschaubarer Entwicklungszeiträume und der Gegenwart einerseits, von theologischer Ausrichtung und konfessioneller Prägung andererseits den Rahmen eines Einführungskapitels bei weitem. Darum sollen nur einige ausgewählte Aspekte streiflichtartig beleuchtet werden. Versteht man die ausgewählten historischen Aspekte aus dem christlich geprägten Kontext als Beispiele sowohl positiv wechselbezüglicher als auch kritischer wechselseitiger Verhältnisbestimmung, haben sie ihren Zweck erfüllt, das vielgestaltige Wechselverhältnis im Laufe der Zeit ins Bewusstsein zu heben.

### Zur Geschichte der Versorgung von Menschen mit psychischen Krankheiten

Anders als es die weithin bekannte kurze Geschichte der Psychiatrie von Ackerknecht (1957) vielleicht nahelegt, hat die Versorgung von Menschen mit psychischen Krankheiten in der christlich-abendländischen Welt eine lange, wenngleich nur wenig durch verlässliche Quellen belegte Vorgeschichte. Darauf haben unter anderem Schott und Tölle (2006) hingewiesen. Vor allem erwähnten sie unter Bezug auf Schipper-