

Fromm, Freud, and Midrash

ELLIOT B. GERTEL

THE WRITINGS OF ERICH FROMM (1908–1980) REPRESENT a significant chapter not only in the annals of psychoanalysis but in the history of Jewish hermeneutics. Indeed, one cannot help being struck by the fact that almost all of Fromm's work, whether a discussion of psychoanalysis, Marxism, or contemporary society, draws heavily upon the Bible, and even at times refers to the Talmud, Hasidic works, and other Jewish religious sources. Where Freud saw psychoanalysis as a "metamorphosed extension of Judaism," as Yosef Haim Yerushalim notes,¹ Fromm followed in the footsteps of his master and created a body of work that is midrashic.

One encounters in Fromm's works various exegetical genres of a Jewish mode. The most basic of these devices is, of course, the quoting of Scripture, especially to begin and conclude. On the frontispiece of *The Revolution of Hope* (1968), for example, one is welcomed by the words of Koheleth: "For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope" (Ecclesiastes 9:4). In *Beyond the Chains of Illusion: My Encounter with Marx and Freud* (1962), Fromm cites Psalm 135 to illustrate his concept of idolatry and further draws upon Hosea 14:3, which describes idolatrous man as bowing to the work of his own hands.² This volume ends with a verse from Isaiah, chosen to summarize Fromm's argument. So, too, in *The Sane Society* (1955), one of the earlier works, Fromm draws upon biblical verses dealing with idolatry to help the reader understand his pioneering discussion of modern alienation. The book closes with the famous verse from Deuteronomy: "I put before thee life and death, the blessing and the curse . . . therefore choose life" (Deuteronomy 30:19).

This Scripture quoting persists throughout Fromm's work. It began with his first book, *Escape From Freedom* (1941) which is, in its largest sense, a modern commentary on—or perhaps response to—the Book of Exodus. To illustrate the unhealthy phenomenon of the excessive dependence of certain social classes, Fromm cites the biblical expression, "clay in the potter's hand" (Jeremiah 18:6), transforming it from a description of man's dependence on God to an indictment of excessive dependence on fellow men.³

In fact, one finds throughout Fromm's writings the old homiletical device of using biblical texts and stories to illustrate more contemporary convictions. Thus, in *Escape From Freedom, You Shall Be As Gods* (1966), and other works, Fromm utilizes the Garden of Eden narrative in Genesis as a paradigm for

ELLIOT B. GERTEL is Rabbi of Congregation Rodfei Zedek in Chicago and a contributing editor to Conservative Judaism and The Jewish Spectator. He is film and TV critic for the National Jewish Post and Opinion.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in: Judaism: A Quarterly Journal of Jewish Life and Thought, Fall, 1999 (Issue No. 192, Vol 48, Number 4)

Gertel, E. B., 1999: Fromm, Freud, and Midrasch, In: Judaism. A Quarterly Journal of Jewish Life and Thought, Vol. 48, Issue 192 (No. 4, Fall 1999), pp. 429-439.



man's "process of individualization," wherein he "cuts his ties with nature" so that history—and alienation—can emerge.⁴ To Fromm, the messianic visions in the Bible represent a complete victory of man over incestuous ties⁵—a quintessential psychoanalytic interpretation! In *The Forgotten Language* (1955), the Book of Jonah is interpreted as describing the state of being protracted and isolated;⁶ and in *Man For Himself* (1947), Fromm adds that the Book of Jonah teaches that the essence of love is to labor.⁷ In the same place, he compares Jonah to Cain, so engaging in the homiletical device frequently utilized by the Rabbis of drawing parallels between biblical characters. And in *The Heart of Man: Its Genius For Good and Evil* (1964), Fromm interprets the biblical story of King Solomon, the baby, and the two women as a depiction of the "necrophilous person" (the villain in Fromm's works), who is more willing to kill or to be killed than to achieve justice through life-affirming means.⁸

Needless to say, one as concerned with the concept of freedom as Erich Fromm is quite intrigued with the narrative in the early Book of Exodus which describes Moses's encounter with Pharaoh. Beginning in *Escape From Freedom* and expanding his thought in *You Shall Be As Gods*, Fromm offers an extensive excursus on that narrative as a model of human liberation. Pharaoh's confusion of worship with laziness becomes a condemnation of all who do not recognize that productiveness is intrinsic.⁹

Like Jewish preachers throughout the ages, Fromm is attentive to the nuances of Hebrew words. His favorite Hebrew word is *emunah* (generally translated, "faith"), which Fromm interprets as denoting the "certainty of the uncertain."¹⁰ Fromm further notes that the word *emunah*, in the Hebrew Bible, can mean "firmness," and can describe a character trait rather than belief in something.¹¹ Here he uses Hebrew etymology for the secularization of religious terminology.

Fromm delights in contrasting *tikvah*, the Hebrew word for "hope" with *esperar*, the Spanish term for the same idea: the former, he declares, has the more dynamic connotation of "tension," while the latter describes a state of waiting.¹² The Hebrew words *rahamim* and *ahabah* are also frequently contrasted by Fromm in his discussions of various kinds of love. The former, we are told, describes "motherly love" and derives from the root *rehem*, "womb." The latter, employed to describe erotic love, denotes "fusion and union."¹³ These terms are explored in greater detail by Fromm in *The Art of Loving* (1956), where he employs Hebrew etymologies to illustrate his concepts of motherly and other kinds of love.¹⁴

Fromm turns to rabbinic as well as to biblical sources. *Escape From Freedom* begins with Hillel's famous dictum in *Ethics of the Fathers*: "If I am not for myself, who will be for me? And if I am only for myself, what am I? And if not now, when?" And at the end of *Man For Himself* (whose title certainly echoes Hillel's dictum), Fromm rephrases another famous dictum of Hillel's, "Do not do to others what is hateful to you": "Whatever you do to others you also do to yourself." Fromm elaborates: "The respect for life, that of others as



one's own, is the concomitant of the process of life itself and a condition of psychic health."¹⁵

Like Jewish homiletics of all ages, Fromm's interpretations of Scripture range from brilliant insights into the plain meaning of the Bible to shameless forcing of the biblical text, in Fromm's case, to fit psychoanalytic dogmas. Among the ulterior uses of the Bible in Fromm's work is his insistence, at the end of *You Shall Be As Gods*, that we find in biblical literature a clear-cut evolution of the God-concept from authoritarian ruler to constitutional monarch, from anthropomorphically-described God to nameless God. The Jewish religion, Fromm editorializes, could "not take the last logical step, to give up 'God' and to establish a concept of man as a being who is alone in the world, but who can feel at home in it if he achieves union with his fellow man and with nature."¹⁶ But Fromm did not prove that there are "logical steps" in the development of biblical religion. An objective, critical scholar would suspect such pat stacking of biblical epochs, since idolatry reasserted itself in some of the most sophisticated periods, and powerful trends in religious progress could be felt in some of the most degrading circumstances.

In *The Sane Society*, Fromm actually readjusts the classical Jewish concept of *galut* (exile imposed as divine punishment) to his own thinking. Instead of the Dispersion regarded as a setback to Jewish life in the Jewish land, Fromm offers a diaspora viewed as a healthy separation from the land until such time as the Jewish people "has overcome the incestuous tie to the soil and to nature."¹⁷

There are many other forced characterizations of biblical thinking that Fromm presents in an authoritative manner, as though he were describing the true meaning of the Bible (whether psychological or otherwise) and not just presenting his own views. One more sample of such homiletic license that may be cited is Fromm's characterization of the biblical view of love, especially in *The Art of Loving*, which does violence to the ancient texts by ignoring the element of God, and the role that the Divine plays in the commandments to love.¹⁸

But Fromm's best insights into the bible more than compensate for any forced characterizations we might encounter. *You Shall Be As Gods* contains many important interpretations of biblical texts; and there is not a knowledgeable Jewish preacher who at one time or another has not cited Fromm's brilliant defense of the Sabbath in *The Forgotten Language*. What is most remarkable is that it is not merely the *idea* of the Jewish Sabbath that Fromm defends, but the *rabbinic* observance of it. In the Sabbath rituals, he argued, "we are dealing not with obsessive over-strictness, but with a concept of work and rest that is different from our modern concept."¹⁹ Fromm's concept of the Sabbath comes remarkably close to that of Abraham Heschel, who was writing at around the same time. To Fromm, the Jewish *Shabbat* is "man's victory over time," for "by stopping interference with nature for one day you eliminate time."²⁰

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.



One could isolate many more instances of Fromm as Jewish homiletician and Bible-commentator, but we have certainly found enough of a pattern to pose a significant question: Why the preoccupation with the Bible? Is it simply that the biblical tradition was the one that Fromm knew best, the tradition that he absorbed since childhood? And why was Fromm so intent on using Hebrew words to illustrate his points? After all, why play philological word games when one does not accept a particular text as authoritative?

The temptation is, of course, to psychoanalyze Fromm, to hypothesize, with one Protestant critic, that Fromm cited the Hebrew Bible so frequently because it still wielded a certain authority over him.²¹ Yet one could respond that Fromm also cited New Testament verses, and became fascinated with Zen literature in his later years.²² Perhaps he quoted the Bible so frequently because everyone knows many of its stories, and perhaps he turned to Zen out of a conscious or unconscious desire for new disciplines,²³ or even out of dissatisfaction with psychoanalysis.

Yet, in all fairness to Fromm, it would seem that he *chose* to cite the Hebrew Bible because he put it in a special category "The Old Testament," Fromm panegyricizes, "is a *revolutionary* book; its theme is the liberation of man from the incestuous ties to blood and soil, from the submission to idols, from slavery, from powerful masters, to freedom for the individual, for the nation and for all of mankind."²⁴ The prophetic tradition in particular is glorified by Fromm as a "humanist religion" which required that man "understand his situation, see the alternatives, and then decide."²⁵ Rabbinic tradition, too, offers worthy guides to human self-betterment. Rabbi Akiba, for example, is described as "one of the greatest humanists among the sages."²⁶

Fromm is far more deeply rooted in the Bible than in Rabbinics or in the general Jewish hermeneutics in which Fromm certainly has a place. To understand Fromm's more immediate motives or models for Bible interpretation, we must study not so much Fromm's Jewish education as his psychoanalytic training in the Freudian tradition. One place to begin that is with his *Sigmund Freud's Mission* (1959).

Whereas Freud is not at all ambivalent in his pronouncements that God is but a projection of the father-image upon the cosmos, and that the therapeutic science of psychoanalysis is all that the human soul really needs, Fromm's writings on religion are a network of contradictions and ambivalences. On the one hand, Fromm can observe that the worship of God is an attempt to get in touch with a part of ourselves we have lost through projection.²⁷ On the other hand, Fromm can assert that God has become an idol of words, phrases, and doctrines,²⁸ so suggesting that there *may be* an objective divine reality outside of man. And yet, Fromm ends *You Shall Be As Gods* by describing an "x-reality," a kind of godless God-feeling, a non-theistic "religious attitude" that can save even the non-theist from the materialistic idolatries of modern man.

In *Escape From Authority: The Perspectives of Erich Fromm* (1961), John Schaar, Fromm's most effective critic, points to the weaknesses in Fromm's views of



religion and ethics. Schaar notes that Fromm's psychoanalytic philosophy shuns authority with an almost obsessive aversion, and tells people with an equally obsessive temerity that they can achieve perfection. This is not the place to cite the many difficulties that emerge from Fromm's interpretation of Marxism or of social and economic conditions; Schaar is very helpful on these issues. Suffice it to say that the same ratio of insights and distortions that Fromm brings to the Bible may be found in his explanation of other texts and of other social and historical traditions. Like every intellectual, Fromm was guilty of all kinds of projections and verbal games. And like every genius whose life is directed toward service to humanity, he bequeathed both break-throughs and *culs-de-sac*.

In this respect Fromm was no different from Freud. Yet his approach to the Bible and to rabbinic tradition was part of the critical dialectic with Freudian doctrine in which he openly engaged in many of his works, especially *The Forgotten Language*, where he modified Freud's view of dreams, and in *The Crisis of Psychoanalysis* (1970), where he argues against Freud's understanding of the so-called "Oedipal Complex." Despite his protests against authority, Fromm's bible, like that of all neo-Freudian analysts, was the complete works of Freud. Fromm's work must therefore be regarded as a hermeneutic in the Freudian tradition that is colored and even distinguished by immersion in Jewish homiletics.

In *Sigmund Freud's Mission*, Freud's "Oedipus Complex" is questioned, re-interpreted, and re-named the "Joseph Complex."²⁹ (Fromm differs from Freud in that he regards competitiveness, and not incest-wishes, as the basic cause of normal sibling rivalry.) In this re-interpretation, we see that Fromm actually employs Freud's original text as a pious preacher would utilize the Bible: He cites the original, giving it all due deference. Only *then* does he recast the original Freudian mythos into what he regards as more appropriate biblical images.

Fromm notes in *Sigmund Freud's Mission* that Freud saw himself as a Moses figure. As evidence, he cites Freud's famous letter to Jung to the effect that the latter was to be his Joshua. Whether or not Freud saw himself as Moses is not the issue. (Indeed, in an incisive study, Marthe Robert argues that Freud did *not* think of himself as Moses, but rather felt *intimidated* by Michelangelo's statue of Moses, which represented to him the father and the people with whom he had acted in a petty manner. Mme. Robert posits that, if anything, Freud regarded himself as a Joseph-figure, as an "interpreter of dreams."³⁰ What matters is that Fromm believed that Freud regarded himself as a Moses.

In order to draw conclusions about the significance of Fromm's orientation, we must pause and consider what traditions Freud actually inspired and, more important still, how Freud, whether consciously or subconsciously, prompted others to see him.

If Freud was a Moses, he was a Moses visited by revelations about human beings, and not by the Divine Word. He claimed as his source of authority that psychoanalysis was a "science." Indeed, some critics observed that Freud shunned mysticism and spiritualism precisely because he did not want psychoanalysis to endanger its respectability as a science.³¹

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.



Yet Freud would not or could not shun religious sources. He decided, however, to approach the Bible as though it were a patient on his couch. Thus, his infamous work, *Moses and Monotheism: Three Essays* (1939), is an almost chatty excursus on a neurotic Bible. He attempts philological studies of words,³² he posits obscure Egyptian origins in pentateuchal beliefs and practices,³³ he editorializes on how religion is a neurosis of humanity.³⁴ He even provides a good, old fashioned attack on the talmudists in the style of the New Testament scholars of his day.³⁵ It is only at a few junctures in the book that he actually settles down to posing the fantastic theories that Moses was an Egyptian, that his god was the sun-disc deity of short-lived Egyptian "monotheism," and that the Israelites, out of fear of biological or cultural castration, murdered Moses and worked out their sense of revulsion and guilt over this crime by writing the Bible.

The attempts to explain Freud's perverse infatuation with Moses are many. Philip Rieff declares that "Freud was his own ideal Jew . . . a fantasy Moses, lonely and estranged as he leads the large remainder of himself . . . from one small oasis of rational insight to another, with no promises of a promised land this time around."³⁶ Rieff also suggests that Freud saw himself as a latter-day Joseph.³⁷ Paul Ricoeur sees through this romanticized view of the Freudian self-image, however. He observes, like Marthe Robert, that:

Moses stood as a father image for Freud himself, the same image he had already encountered at the time of "The Moses of Michelangelo"; this Moses had to be glorified as an esthetic fantasy and liquidated as a religious fantasy. One can guess how much it cost Freud to run counter to Jewish pride at the very moment when the storm of Nazi persecution was breaking out by publishing *Moses and Monotheism*, when his books were being burned and his publishing house ruined, and when he himself had to flee Vienna and take refuge in London: all this must have been a terrible "work of mourning" for Freud the man.³⁸

In *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition*, David Bakan posits that Freud viewed Moses as the symbol of the yoke of the Law. Freud therefore, he argues, killed Moses out of Sabbatean sentiments.³⁹ Yet Bakan's theory is immediately suspect, since one does not require Sabbateanism as a motive to kill off a symbol of authority. Furthermore, Bakan observes in the same book that Freud created a Gentile Moses of high position (royal Egyptian lineage) so that he could overcome his own feelings of lower status because he was a Jew.⁴⁰ I dare say that even Freud was not so torn a personality that he required Moses to be *both* an authoritarian target *and* a pattern for assimilation! Nor does what we know about Freud's moral conservatism fit with Bakan's theory that Freud saw himself as a new Moses whose mission it was to rescind the Law.⁴¹ Freud was not as concerned with abolishing accepted moralities of religious traditions as he was with eradicating neuroses.

The conflicting views of Freud's self-image only point to the complexity of that self-image and of its effect upon others, whether personally or through Freud's writings. Though the truth about Freud's self-image will probably

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.



always be veiled by the hidden inner dynamics that elude any psychoanalytical study, the question remains important for our understanding of Fromm. For whatever the contradictions involved in determining the Freudian self-image, it is clear that Freud regarded himself as possessing authority to reassess Scripture, that he was obsessed with the character of Moses (whether out of guilt or identification), and that he did, in fact, employ biblical literature, among other literatures, especially Greek and German, to illustrate his psychoanalytic discoveries or reevaluations. It is also clear that Freud had good experiences in Jewish education, as is indicated by his warm tribute to his teacher, Professor Hammerschlag: "Religious instruction served him as a way of educating towards love of the humanities and from the material of Jewish history he was able to find means of tapping the sources of enthusiasm hidden in the hearts of young people and making it flow out far beyond the limits of nationalism or dogma."⁴²

I believe that it is safe to say, in view of the evidence, that Freud internalizes biblical characters—or at least identified greatly with some of them (Joseph, perhaps Moses)—while purporting to be a Bible critic. He was also *viewed* as a biblical figure; he projected that image, whether because he articulated his identifications (which, as we have seen, he sometimes did), or because something in his bearing suggested it. As Rieff testifies:

Freud's orientation was . . . close to the prophetic. The function of a crisis psychology, as of the prophets, is to heighten the sense of threat and fear in the face of losses of self-identity, and to offer a control: hope, as the psychic state supplied by adhering to tradition, with the prophet as instructor. Freud, in this sense, was on the side of tradition. For him the past constituted the most dynamic part of the present. Tradition was never remote, but continually in the process of reasserting itself. He sought to remind people of it, and of its importance.⁴³

Fromm, by contrast, functioned as a kind of exegete of the biblical tradition. He seems to have seen Freud and Freudianism as marking the most significant, contemporary juncture in the tradition of hermeneutics. It was not the Bible as such that Fromm interpreted, or even the Bible according to Freud, but rather the Bible *because* of Freud, the Bible as the heritage of psychoanalysis *by virtue of* Freud. (In *this* sense, Freud saw himself as a kind of Moses-figure.) Yet both Fromm and Freud no longer perceived the Bible as the Word of God. To them, it became an important vehicle of understanding and interpreting the human psyche.

In a letter to Arnold Zweig about *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud confessed that "the essay doesn't seem to me to be too well substantiated, nor do I like it entirely. . . . This historical novel won't stand up to my own criticism."⁴⁴ Marthe Robert observes ironically, but convincingly that if Freud "had stuck to his original idea of a 'historical novel,' he might have avoided a good deal of regretful or acrimonious criticism. . . . He would have written a kind of historical fiction claiming only to communicate a certain amount of *psychic*



truth as any novel is entitled to do. But once he abandoned his projected novel for a scientific work, he staked his good name as a scientist in a dubious undertaking, which instead of serving science and history, exploited them unscrupulously."⁴⁵

The irony of *Moses and Monotheism* is that the "scientific," "critical" Bible-study that Freud set out to write became just another *midrash*.⁴⁶ At the very best, the book is today regarded as an unorthodox, whimsical *midrash*. Paul Ricoeur is more than kind when he refers to it as containing "an impressive number of hazardous hypotheses."⁴⁷ The tragedy is that Freud had a genuine aptitude for critical understanding of the Bible against its historical environment. He even approximated the observation of the great Bible scholar, Professor Yehezkel Kaufmann, that pagan religion, as opposed to biblical religion, emphasized a fate that controlled deity.⁴⁸ But Freud's own conflicting feelings about Jews, Judaism, and Moses probably prevented him from achieving objectivity and success as a Bible scholar. Instead, he created a *midrash* known as psychoanalysis.

Psychoanalysis is a hermeneutical tradition; and David Bakan asserts that in psychoanalysis, "each person is a Torah." He goes so far as to observe—and not without at least a little truth—that the name of one of Freud's early patients, Dora, about whom he wrote extensively in evolving his views, is strikingly similar in sounds to the word *Torah*.⁴⁹ Unfortunately, Bakan strains to show that it is the *kabbalistic* tradition that influenced Freud, even though he admitted that "we are unable to hypothesize that Freud actually read any kabbalistic literature."⁵⁰ Bakan does not seem to realize that the hermeneutic devices he attributes to Freud are actually reminiscent of rabbinic *midrash*, which influenced kabbalistic thinking as well.

"According to one pole," Paul Ricoeur observes, "hermeneutics is understood as the manifestation and restoration of a meaning addressed to me in the manner of a message, a proclamation, or as is sometimes said, a kerygma: according to the other pole, it is understood as a demystification, as a reduction of illusion."⁵¹ Philip Rieff expresses the same idea in a more Freud-oriented vein:

In traditional hermeneutics, the discrepancies which inspire the interpretative effort are attributed either to accidental mutilation or to secret intention of texts. In psychic texts, discrepancies—breaks in continuity, distortions of content—are always presumed to disclose intention. Mutilations to the psychic life do not occur by chance. More than once in Freud the dreamer's situation is likened to that of a journalist who, in order to evade political censorship, supplies ingenious hints to put the reader on the track of the message which he cannot declare straightforwardly.⁵²

Psychoanalysis did not end traditional hermeneutics, however. Freud and Fromm kept the Bible in their sights. It was before them at all times.

In regarding patients as texts, the psychoanalysts also opened the possibility of regarding texts as patients. And it is precisely this turn of events



which enables us to understand Fromm. Freud regards Scripture as a neurotic outgrowth of a primal crime of Moses-murder. Bakan views it as an hysterical codex of laws devised out of incest-fears and their accompanying guilt. And Fromm? He certainly belongs to this tradition. Hence, Jakob J. Petuchowski could refer to *The Art of Loving* as "Erich Fromm's Midrash on Love."⁵³ Fromm is capable of distorting the Bible in some of his *midrashim*. But, then again, all the generations of Jewish (and Christian) exegetes have been guilty of this to some extent. Where Fromm differs from them is in his view of the focus of *midrash*. Always it is the *person* who is the text—his loving, his hoarding, his living. Fromm's hermeneutics are as rooted in Freud as in the Bible. Fromm employs Freud *and* the Bible when they are helpful, and looks to other sources, such as Zen Buddhism, when he fails to find an obliging image in either. Yet Fromm always creates *midrash* which, as Petuchowski describes it, "is not only concerned with blending new insights and ancient wisdom . . . but must also contain *musar* (ethical teaching) and *tochachot* (criticism and reproof)."⁵⁴ Whatever his prejudices as biblical exegete, Fromm, it must be said, made his writings rich in both *musar* and *tochachot*.

NOTES

1. Yoşef Haım Yerushalmi, *Freud's Moses: Judaism Terminable and Interminable* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1991), p. 99.
2. Erich Fromm, *Beyond the Chains of Illusion: My Encounter with Marx and Freud* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1962), p. 58.
3. Erich Fromm, *Escape From Freedom* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1941), p. 144. In a rather unclear line of thought, Fromm declares that the prophet's words, "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow" (Isaiah 1:18), illustrate the antithesis of "authoritarian philosophy" (*Escape From Freedom*, p. 171). Just how this is true he does not really say.
4. Erich Fromm, *You Shall Be As Gods* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), p. 70.
5. *You Shall Be As Gods*, p. 53.
6. Erich Fromm, *The Forgotten Language: An Introduction to the Understanding of Dreams, Fairy Tales, and Myths* (New York: Rinehart and Co., 1951), p. 22.
7. Erich Fromm, *Man For Himself* (New York: Rinehart and Co., 1947), p. 99.
8. Erich Fromm, *The Heart of Man: Its Genius For Good and Evil* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 41.
9. *Man For Himself*, p. 106.
10. Erich Fromm, *The Revolution of Hope* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 13.
11. *Man For Himself*, p. 109.
12. *You Shall Be As Gods*, p. p. 154n.
13. See Erich Fromm, *The Sane Society* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955), pp. 33-34; *Man For Himself*, p. 100. Actually, *ahabah* denotes covenantal love. Other philological observations made by Fromm can be found in *The Dogma of Christ and Other Essays on Religion, Psychology and Culture* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), p. 195; *Beyond the Chains of Illusion*, p. 116; and *You Shall Be As Gods*, p. 192.
14. Erich Fromm, *The Art of Loving* (New York: Harper and Row, 1956), pp. 49ff.
15. *Man For Himself*, p. 225.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.



16. *You Shall Be As Gods*, pp. 225ff.
17. *The Sane Society*, p. 53.
18. John H. Schaar, *Escape From Authority: The Perspectives of Erich Fromm* (New York: Basic Books, 1961), p. 47.
19. *The Forgotten Language*, p. 196.
20. *The Forgotten Language*, p. 249.
21. See J. Stanley Glenn, *Erich Fromm: A Protestant Critique* (New York: Westminster Press, 1966), p. 23.
22. See *Beyond the Chains*, p. 156, and "Psychoanalysis and Zen Buddhism," in *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis*, edited by D. Suzuki, Erich Fromm, and Richard De Martino (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), p. 129.
23. Schaar, p. 262.
24. *You Shall Be As Gods*, p. 7.
25. *The Revolution of Hope*, p. 49.
26. *You Shall Be As Gods*, p. 153.
27. Erich Fromm, *Psychoanalysis and Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), p. 50; and Fromm, *Marx's Concept of Man* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1969), p. 44.
28. *Beyond the Chains*, p. 155.
29. Erich Fromm, *Sigmund Freud's Mission* (New York: Grove Press, 1959), p. 63.
30. Marthe Robert, *From Oedipus to Moses: Freud's Jewish Identity*, translated by Ralph Mannheim (New York: Anchor, 1976), pp. 97-98, 107, 154.
31. Anthony J. DeLuca, *Freud and Future Religious Experience* (Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams, 1977), p. 230.
32. Sigmund Freud, "Moses and Monotheism: Three Essays," in *The Complete Psychological Works of Freud*, edited by J. Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1964), vol. 23, pp. 8, 114.
33. *Moses and Monotheism*, pp. 26-27, 69, 110.
34. *Moses and Monotheism*, p. 55.
35. *Moses and Monotheism*, p. 17.
36. Philip Rieff, *Freud: The Mind of the Moralizer* (Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1961), p. xv. For the suggestion that Freud saw psychoanalysis as a "metamorphosed extension of Judaism," see Yerushalmi, p. 99.
37. Rieff, p. 8.
38. Paul Ricoeur, *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*, translated by Dennis Savage (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), p. 244. On Freud's concerns about publishing his work on Moses, see Jerry Victor Diller, *Freud's Jewish Identity: A Case Study in the Impact of Ethnicity* (London/Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1991), pp. 135ff.
39. David Bakan, *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition* (Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand, 1958), pp. 129, 164.
40. Bakan, p. 150. For the contrary suggestion that Freud posited an Egyptian Moses because he wanted a repressed Moses, see Elizabeth J. Bellamy, *Affective Genealogies: Psychoanalysis, Postmodernism and the "Jewish Question" After Auschwitz* (Lincoln/London: University of Nebraska Press, 1987), pp. 130ff.
41. Bakan, p. 160.
42. *Obituary of Prof. S. Hammerschlag*, in *The Complete Psychological Works of Freud*, edited by J. Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1959), vol. 9, p. 255. For insights into Freud's acquaintance with and use of biblical texts, see Yerushalmi, pp. 66ff.
43. Rieff, p. 240. On tradition, see Yerushalmi, pp. 29-31.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.



44. Cited by Robert, p. 148. Yerushalmi suggests that Freud had originally intended to do a psychoanalytic study of Moses (p. 18). On Freud and Michelangelo as "biblical exegetes who radically violate the plain sense of the text," see Yerushalmi, p. 22. For brilliant research into the literary background of Freud's Moses theories, see Yerushalmi's comments on Ernst Sellin, pp. 25-26. On Moses and Freud's anger, see Yerushalmi, p. 25. On Moses and Freud's father, Jakob, see Diller, pp. 144ff.
45. Robert, p. 161.
46. See Robert, pp. 213-214, note 50.
47. Ricoeur, p. 245.
48. Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, edited by J. Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1961), vol. 21, p. 18.
49. Bakan, pp. 246-247.
50. Bakan, p. 241. See also Robert, pp. 171-172, note 1.
51. Ricoeur, p. 27.
52. Rieff, p. 120.
53. *Commentary*, December 1956.
54. *Commentary*, p. 545.

Propriety of the Erich Fromm Document Center. For personal use only. Citation or publication of material prohibited without express written permission of the copyright holder.

Eigentum des Erich Fromm Dokumentationszentrums. Nutzung nur für persönliche Zwecke. Veröffentlichungen - auch von Teilen - bedürfen der schriftlichen Erlaubnis des Rechteinhabers.



Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.