Research Article **ISSN 2835-6276**

American Journal of Medical and Clinical Research & Reviews

The Bird's Nest Metaphor II: The Chicks Who Remained

Julian Ungar-Sargon MD, PhD

*Correspondence: Julian Ungar-Sargon

Received: 20 Aug 2026; Accepted: 30 Aug 2026; Published:05 Sep 2026

Citation: Julian Ungar-Sargon. The Bird's Nest Metaphor II: The Chicks Who Remained. AJMCRR. 2026; 5(9): 1-19.

Abstract

A previous study traced the commandment of shiluach ha-ken (Deuteronomy 22:6–7) from biblical law through rabbinic controversy into the mystical imagination of the Zohar, and proposed a clinical theology built upon the dialectic of divine presence and absence: the mother bird as Shekhinah, the emptied nest as exile, and therapeutic tzimtzum as the clinician's disciplined contraction that makes room for the patient to emerge [1]. That essay followed the mother. The present essay reverses the direction of attention and remains with the chicks.

The decisive textual opening is Tikkunei Zohar, and the sixth tikkun, which is largely given over to elaborations of the Shekhinah as bird: mother sheltering her offspring, mother driven from a ruined nest, mother wandering with and without her young. What distinguishes this stratum from both the biblical and the classical rabbinic material is that the suffering is doubled. The mother is chased away and the children cry out. The cry of the fledglings is not decorative. In the narrative logic of the sixth tikkun, it is the cry that ascends, that is carried upward through the graded worlds, and that finally compels a response within divinity itself.

This essay develops the theological and clinical consequences of that doubling. It proposes, as an explicitly constructive rather than philological move, that the patient occupies two positions in the nest simultaneously: chick and tzaddik. As chick, the patient is dependent, exposed, and vocal in registers that precede coherent speech. As tzaddik — understood in the sefirotic sense of Yesod, the channel, rather than in the colloquial sense of moral perfection — the patient becomes the conduit through which repair passes. The Shekhinah, correspondingly, appears as Mother-God: not an omnipotent maternal rescuer substituted for an authoritarian paternal deity, but a maternal presence who is herself exiled, bereaved, searching, and in some measure dependent upon the cry she receives.

Five bodies of scholarship discipline the argument. Erich Neumann supplies the ambivalence of the maternal archetype — containment and engulfment, womb and tomb — and, in his long-unpublished Jewish writings, an explicit attempt to read Kabbalah and Hasidism as a corrective to what he regarded as

the anti-feminine bias of normative Judaism. Elliot R. Wolfson prevents any naive celebration of a recovered "divine feminine" by demonstrating the androcentric architecture within which kabbalistic gender symbolism operates. Eitan P. Fishbane licenses attention to the verbs of the bird imagery — hovering, wandering, chirping, fledging — as themselves theological. Daniel C. Matt models the refusal to exhaust a symbol by explaining it. Moshe Idel authorizes the move from symbol to theurgy, in which human action participates in the configuration of the divine world rather than merely contemplating it.

The resulting model displaces the picture of a healer acting upon a passive sufferer. The Mother shelters the chick; the cry of the chick summons the mother. The patient needs the Shekhinah; the exiled Shekhinah, in the strange grammar of this literature, needs the patient. Healing is accordingly reconceived not as unilateral cure but as relational tikkun — a repair in which both parties are altered, and neither is required to disappear.

Keywords: Tikkunei Zohar, Shekhinah, shiluach ha-ken, kan tzippor, Mother-God, Great Mother, Erich Neumann, Elliot Wolfson, Eitan Fishbane, Daniel Matt, Moshe Idel, theurgy, tzaddik, Yesod, tzimtzum, therapeutic theology, hermeneutic medicine, trauma, divine feminine, anti-theodicy.

Where the First Essay Stopped

The earlier study ended on a line I chose deliberately and left unfinished: the mother bird flies away, but the interpretation continues [1]. That sentence is now the point of departure.

The first essay moved vertically. Presence gave way to absence; fullness contracted into emptiness; the Shekhinah went into exile; and the clinician was asked to imitate that contraction. The argument was that the practitioner becomes most useful not by filling every silence with explanation but by constructing a sufficiently protected emptiness in which another person can appear [1,8,9]. I remain persuaded by that argument. It has organized a good deal of my clinical writing and, more importantly, a good deal of my clinical practice.

But the argument has a blind spot, and the text itself supplies it.

Deuteronomy does not describe an empty nest. It describes a nest containing efrochim o beitzim — fledglings or eggs — with the mother settled over them [2]. The mother commands our theological attention because she is the one dramatically sent away. Yet she is not the only creature in the passage. The young remain. The verse's own syntax makes them the reason for everything: it is because she is al ha-banim, over the children, that she may not be taken. What happens to them when the body above them disappears?

The question sounds like developmental psychology. In Tikkunei Zohar it becomes theology.

The classical rabbinic tradition, it must be said, resisted sentimentalizing this commandment at all. The Mishnah silences the prayer leader who says, "Your mercy extends even to the bird's nest," and the Talmud offers several reasons — that such language implies a selectively merciful deity or reduces the commandments to divine sentiment [3]. Maimonides read the mitzvah as an instance of consideration for animal distress within a system of decrees whose deepest rationales are not ours to reconstruct [4]; Nachmanides read it as pedagogy directed at the human character rather than at the bird [5]. Eliezer Segal's study of the Talmudic sugya remains the best account of how early the tradition recognized that the verse was theologically dangerous [6]. Beth Berkowitz has since shown how unstable the human–animal boundary is in this passage, and how much interpretive work has gone into stabilizing it [7].

The Zohar breaks that restraint. It asks what the mother finds when she returns, identifies her with the Shekhinah and her young with Israel, and lets the maternal grief become divine grief [8,9]. That is where the first essay concluded.

Tikkunei Zohar goes further, and in a different direction. It does not merely intensify the mother's anguish. It gives the children a voice.

Tikkun 6 and the Multiplication of the Bird

The sixth tikkun of Tikkunei Zohar is largely devoted to the Shekhinah under the figure of a bird [10]. Biti Roi's monograph on the mysticism and poetics of this corpus — the fullest scholarly treatment available — devotes a chapter to the theme and shows how thoroughly the imagery saturates the work: the Shekhinah protecting her offspring in the nest, the Shekhinah in exile as a bird whose nest has been destroyed, the Shekhinah wandering with her young and wandering without them [11]. Pinchas Giller's earlier study of the later strata of the Zohar remains the essential English guide to the theurgic logic within which these images operate [12].

Two features of this material matter for what follows.

The first is proliferation. Tikkunei Zohar is structured as seventy interpretations of the first word of Genesis, and its literary practice is itself an enactment of tikkun: the word carries the senses of arranging, adorning, installing, restoring, and repairing, and the act of interpretation participates in all of them [10,11]. A tikkun is not a commentary standing outside the broken thing. Reading is already an intervention. This is precisely the claim I have argued for in the clinical register — that interpretation of a patient's history is not a neutral act of information retrieval but a constructive act with consequences for the person interpreted [13,14].

The consequence for our imagery is that the bird does not settle into a single referent. Within one symbolic field we find the higher Mother and the lower Mother, Binah and Malkhut; the nest as Temple, as sukkah, as dwelling; the tree; the eggs, the fledglings, and the children as differentiated grades of soul and of learning; and Tzaddik/Yesod as the channel running through the whole [10,11,15]. In Zohar Ḥadash the correspondences are laid out almost as a glossary: the "way" is Rachel, the tree is the Shekhinah, the chicks are the tribes above and the eggs Israel below, and the doubled verb shale'ach teshalach is read as the two Temples [15]. The point is not that any one of these decodings is correct. The point is that the symbol has become an

ecology rather than a cipher, and Daniel Matt's translation practice — which preserves ambiguity rather than resolving it — is the appropriate model for reading it [16]. Wolfson's account of kabbalistic hermeneutics as poetic rather than propositional makes the same demand from a different direction [17].

The second feature is the doubled cry. Unlike the biblical text and unlike the classical rabbinic discussions, Tikkunei Zohar describes the suffering of both parties: the mother goes, chased away, and the children cry out [10]. What follows in the sixth tikkun is a narrative of ascent. The angels carry the echo of that suffering upward, arguing it through the graded levels of soul and world, until it reaches the Holy One, who recognizes the likeness between the anguish of the birds and the anguish of the people — and cries out in turn [10,11].

I want to slow down at that recognition, because it is the hinge of this essay.

The text does not say that God observed the suffering and being omniscient, already knew. It says the cry had to travel. It says the recognition was painful. It says that the recognition, once it occurred, produced a commitment to act on behalf of the people and on behalf of the Shekhinah.

Roi reads Tikkunei Zohar as the work of a kabbalist for whom the Divine Presence is the focus of religious labor — a feminine, weakened, maternal deity set against a perfect and masculine one, whose stature the kabbalist is committed to building up and whose situation he is obligated to improve [11]. If that reading is right, and I think it is, then the cry of the fledglings is not a detail of pathos. It is the mechanism.

Elsewhere in the corpus, Tikkun 23 and Tikkun 70 tie the same material to Temple, exile, and cosmic reparation: the nest is the Temple, the mother is the Shekhinah, the young are Israel, and the sending away is at once the historical catastrophe and the act that arouses compassion [18,19]. The Zohar's commentary on Ki Teitzei had already made the sending away a theurgic operation that hastens redemption [20]. What Tikkunei Zohar adds is the vocalization of the ones left behind.

The Nest Is Not a Fortress

Before turning to the chicks themselves, one implication of the nest imagery deserves separate treatment, because it bears directly on how we describe the space in which clinical work occurs.

Tikkunei Zohar associates the nest with the Temple and, at points, with the sukkah [10,18]. The second association is the more interesting one, because a sukkah is a dwelling whose fragility is constitutive rather than accidental. It is built to be temporary. Its roof must be sparse enough to admit the sky. One sits inside walls that make no pretense of defeating weather, let alone mortality.

The therapeutic space is often described, in the literature and in our own advertising, in the language of safety. The word does necessary work; I am not proposing that we abandon it. But safety easily slides into a promise of fortification, and the promise is false. Medicine cannot guarantee that the disease will not return. Psychotherapy cannot guarantee that the past will be neutralized. Religion, honestly practiced, guarantees none of this either.

The nest protects life without abolishing exposure. That seems to me a more truthful and more ethically defensible image of clinical holding than meta-

phors of cure, mastery, or rescue [21]. Donald Winnicott's holding environment is the nearest analogue in the psychoanalytic literature, and his insistence that the environment must be good enough rather than perfect makes essentially the same point in another vocabulary [22]. What the clinician can offer is smaller and, I would argue, more sacred than a guarantee: that the patient will not meet the fragile condition of being alive entirely alone.

This refines rather than replaces the earlier account of therapeutic tzimtzum [1,9,23]. Contraction is not merely the creation of psychological elbow room. Clinician and patient together construct a provisional shelter inside conditions neither of them controls. The shelter resembles the Shekhinah herself: real, inhabitable, intimate, and not permanent.

There is a further resonance worth registering. The Zohar locates the soul of the Messiah, before his descent, in a chamber called Heikhal Kan Tzippor — the palace of the bird's nest [24]. The nest is thus not only the site of catastrophe. In the messianic register it is where the one who will repair the world is kept until he is needed. Idel's studies of messianic mysticism trace the range of ways such imagery was activated by later kabbalists, sometimes contemplatively, sometimes with dangerous historical consequence [25]. For our purposes the association is enough to establish the ambivalence: the same nest is the scene of bereavement and the incubator of repair.

The nest, then, is not the opposite of exile. It is what can be built inside exile.

The Cry as Theurgy

We can now return to the fledglings.

In the narrative of the sixth tikkun, the chicks are not passive material. They cry, and the cry does something [10,11]. This is theurgy in Idel's precise sense: religious activity that participates in the configuration of the divine world rather than merely representing it or responding to it [26]. Idel's insistence, against a purely historical or doctrinal reading of Kabbalah, that these texts describe techniques and effects is what permits the argument I want to make [26,25]. Giller's account of the later Zoharic strata as intensely theurgic points in the same direction [12].

If the cry is theurgic, then the sound the sufferer makes is not merely a symptom to be abolished. It is an address, and it is efficacious.

I want to be careful here, because the claim is easily misread as a romanticization of pathology. It is not. Illness does not carry an inherent mystical meaning; suffering does not automatically ennoble; a great deal of what patients say in distress is exactly what it appears to be and requires treatment rather than interpretation. The claim is narrower and, I think, defensible: before we set about eliminating a disturbing utterance, we might ask what relationship it is attempting to sustain.

The chick calls because somewhere in its symbolic world there remains an expectation of a mother.

This reframes a range of familiar clinical phenomena. The symptom that returns session after session may be less a failure of progress than a form of liturgical repetition. Prayer, after all, is largely repetition; the Psalter says the same things many times, and the tradition does not regard this as a defect [27]. Some prayers praise, some demand, some protest, and some contain almost no propositional

content beyond help. So do patients.

The chirp is a useful term precisely because it names an intermediate register — neither silence nor completed discourse. Much clinical suffering lives there. Anxiety announces a danger for which consciousness has not yet found a sentence. The body speaks before the biography catches up. Traumatic reenactment repeats what narrative memory cannot yet hold. Wilfred Bion's account of containment — the capacity of another mind to receive what is unprocessed and return it in metabolized form — describes the maternal function this literature dramatizes [28]. What the kabbalistic text adds is that the containment is not only downward. The cry goes up.

The clinical discipline that follows is demanding: to listen long enough for communication to become possible, without forcing it prematurely into the clinician's preferred language [29]. Neither to dismiss the chirp as noise nor to receive it as automatic revelation.

The Ambivalence of the Great Mother

Erich Neumann's analysis of the maternal archetype supplies the comparative vocabulary this argument needs, and it does so without requiring us to claim that Kabbalah secretly contains Jungian psychology. That claim would be false and would destroy the historical specificity that gives the symbols their force — a reduction I have criticized elsewhere in the context of contemporary archetypal challenges to biomedical orthodoxy [30,31].

Neumann's usefulness lies in his refusal to sentimentalize the maternal [32]. The archetypal Mother holds opposing possibilities: protection and engulfment, generation and destruction, nourishment and deprivation, womb and tomb. The matrix that makes development possible is also the field from which differentiation must eventually occur [32,33]. Neumann's later work on the nascent personality develops the same dialectic at the level of the individual child's emergence from the primary relationship [34].

This casts unusual light on shiluach ha-ken. From the standpoint of simple compassion, the command remains disturbing; that is why the Mishnah had to legislate against a certain kind of prayer about it [3]. From the standpoint of individuation, departure and development are inseparable. The chick cannot remain indefinitely beneath the maternal body.

The clinical corollary is uncomfortable and worth stating plainly. A therapy whose deepest fantasy is the reproduction of perfect maternal containment is regressive. The clinician who must always comfort, always answer, always be available, always reassure, may have ceased to function as a clinician and begun to serve, unconsciously, the fantasy of an omnipotent mother who guarantees that abandonment will never recur. Neumann lets us see why such benevolence becomes dangerous: the Good Mother turns terrible precisely when she permits no separation [32].

But the Zoharic transformation blocks any quick celebration of separation, and this is where the Jewish material departs from a straightforward developmental psychology. In the developmental account, the child's individuation is purchased by discovering that maternal omnipotence was an infantile construction. In Tikkunei Zohar, the mother is not merely relativized. She suffers. The relationship is severed at both ends. Separation penetrates divinity itself [10,11].

There is a further reason to bring Neumann into this argument rather than any of Jung's other students. Neumann spent the years between 1934 and 1945 in Tel Aviv writing a two-volume study of Jewish consciousness that he never published and never discarded, the second volume of which is devoted to Hasidism and draws heavily on the Zohar [35,36]. His explicit project there was to find, within Kabbalah and Hasidism, resources against what he regarded as the legalism and the anti-feminine bias of normative Judaism since the Second Temple [36]. Moshe Idel contributed the foreword to that volume — a convergence of exactly the two scholars this essay leans on most, and one that argues against treating them as belonging to incompatible worlds [36].

A biographical detail from that period is too apt to omit. In a 1934 letter to Jung, Neumann wrote: You will be my Zaddik [35]. He was using the word relationally — not to designate moral perfection, but to name a function performed by another person for him. That is very close to the sense in which I want to use the term below.

Mother-God After Omnipotence

To call the Shekhinah Mother-God is not to install an all-loving Mother in the place of an authoritarian Father. That would change the divine pronouns and leave divine omnipotence untouched.

The more radical possibility, and the one the Tikkunei Zohar material supports, is that the maternal symbolism unsettles omnipotence itself.

This Mother does not prevent separation; she undergoes it. She is not serenely untouched by her children's exile; she goes into it. She is not the physician standing over the wounded patient; she is implicated in the wound.

The theological stakes are considerable. Classical philosophical theology protects divine perfection by way of impassibility: creaturely suffering cannot alter God. Kabbalistic myth takes another road entirely. Exile, sin, prayer, commandment, and human intention have consequences within the symbolic life of divinity [26,25]. Abraham Joshua Heschel's account of the prophetic literature — divine pathos as the central category, God as affected by history rather than insulated from it — is the nearest thing in modern Jewish thought to a systematic defense of this instinct [37]. I have developed the same theme through the Shekhinah's own pain and through the hermeneutics of a suffering God elsewhere [38,39].

Within the present argument the clinical implication is startling. We are accustomed to hearing the patient say, in one idiom or another, help me. The bird metaphor permits a second sentence to appear beneath the first: your becoming whole matters to God. And beneath that, a third: something of God waits with you to be restored.

Healing then is neither autonomous self-actualization nor rescue from above. It becomes a site of theo-anthropological reciprocity — which is the direction in which the tzimtzum literature had already been pushing, once one takes seriously the possibility that the contraction was itself a wounding and that its repair requires us [40,41].

The patient needs the mother. The Mother, in the strange grammar of this text, needs the patient.

Wolfson's Objection: Against an Easy Divine Feminine

At this point an objection must be met and met properly rather than acknowledged and set aside.

Why call the Shekhinah Mother-God? Does this recover a suppressed feminine divine presence, or does it project contemporary therapeutic and gender ideals onto medieval texts that will not bear them?

Elliot Wolfson's scholarship makes the naive answer unavailable. Across Circle in the Square, through a Speculum That Shines, and Language, Eros, Being, Wolfson has demonstrated the extraordinary complexity of gender in kabbalistic symbolism and its recurrent androcentric architecture [42,43,17]. The existence of a grammatically and symbolically feminine Shekhinah establishes nothing egalitarian by itself. Feminine symbolism can operate perfectly well inside conceptual structures that privilege the masculine, derive the female from the male, and imagine eschatological integration in terms that dissolve rather than affirm feminine autonomy. Arthur Green's account of the historical emergence of the feminized Shekhinah in thirteenth-century Kabbalah, and Peter Schäfer's study of feminine images of God from the Bible forward, complicate the picture further by locating the symbol within a specific polemical and devotional context rather than an eternal one [44,45].

Consequently, Mother-God cannot be announced as the forgotten female half of an otherwise male Jewish deity. That would domesticate the texts in the service of a contemporary agenda, however sympathetic.

My term is instead phenomenological and theopoetic. Mother-God names a mode in which the divine–human relationship is undergone through gestation, dwelling, nourishment, bodily proximity, separation, longing, and return. It makes no claim about divine sex. It makes no claim that a fourteenth-century kabbalist would have endorsed the constructive theology built here. I have argued this position at length in relation to the Shekhinah as a political and theological paradigm, and in relation to maternal instinct as a category with both theological and technological stakes [46,47].

Wolfson's warning, properly absorbed, strengthens the clinical application rather than weakening it.

A patient should never be pressed back into "Mother" as a predetermined role. The clinician need not be female. The patient need not have experienced motherhood, or maternal safety, as good. Some mothers abandon. Some engulf. Some injure. Some are dead. Some patients have no maternal experience worth the name to draw on. Precisely for this reason the symbol must remain a symbol. Mother-God names neither an idealized woman nor social motherhood projected onto heaven; it names a Presence capable of holding life while also permitting the distance that differentiation requires.

And Wolfson permits a further move, which is essential to the argument of this essay. Kabbalistic gender imagery characteristically crosses what it appears to stabilize: the masculine contains the feminine, the feminine becomes masculine, reception turns into generation, absence functions as a mode of presence [42,17]. The erotics of that crossing — the play, the delight, the mutual arousal that the texts describe without embarrassment — is not incidental to it [48,49].

If that is how the symbolism works, then the patient-as-chick can become tzaddik. The recipient becomes the conduit. The one who needed holding becomes capable of holding. The wounded becomes healer without first ceasing to be wounded.

Fishbane and the Verbs

Eitan Fishbane's work prevents this material from collapsing into a diagram.

His approach to the Zohar treats it as literary art: gesture, dramatic setting, movement, landscape, encounter, emotion, and narrative surprise are constitutive of mystical meaning rather than ornamental to it [50]. The Art of Mystical Narrative concentrates on the main body of the Zohar rather than on Tikkunei Zohar, which must be handled as its own stratum with its own literary temperament [11,12]. But the methodological insight transfers intact, and Roi's own treatment of Tikkunei Zohar under the double heading of mysticism and poetics confirms that the transfer is legitimate [11].

Consider what the verbs are doing.

A bird is not a code for the Shekhinah; it flies. A mother does not correspond to Malkhut; she hovers. The chick does not symbolize Israel; it chirps. The exiled Presence does not occupy a conceptual category called absence; she wanders. Michael Fishbane's account of how rabbinic literature generates myth out of biblical kernels supplies the deeper background for why such verbs carry doctrinal weight in this tradition at all [51].

A sefirotic chart cannot communicate the ache of circling above an emptied nest. It cannot reproduce the sound of offspring calling for a mother who is no longer visible. The theology is in the kinetics.

The clinical parallel is direct and, for me, the most practically useful consequence of Fishbane's method. A patient's meaning does not reside solely in propositions. It occurs in pauses, in repetitions, in tone, in posture, in the inability to finish a sentence, in the sudden slide from "I" to "you," in the story told for the fourth time, in the laugh where grief should have been, in the silence after a question.

This modifies the earlier claim that biography is a text to be interpreted [1,13]. I would now put it differently. A life is not merely a text. It is a performance occurring in the presence of another. The clinician is not simply a reader standing outside the page; the clinician has entered the story and is being read in turn [14].

Matt and the Discipline of Not Exhausting the Symbol

Daniel Matt's translation and commentary supply a second methodological safeguard. The Pritzker edition's governing decision was to preserve the Zohar's poetic intensity, ambiguity, and multivalence rather than flatten it into a single explanatory system [16]. Isaiah Tishby's earlier anthology and Gershom Scholem's foundational account established the field, but both were more willing to systematize than the texts themselves invite [52,53].

The bird must remain more than one thing.

The mother is the Shekhinah, and the phenomenology of protection. The nest is the Temple, and a home, and a sukkah, and a temporary shelter. The chicks are Israel, and prayer, and dependence, and learning, and becoming. The tree is Tzaddik, and Torah, and life, and mediation. A symbol lives because no paraphrase exhausts it.

This bears directly on diagnosis. Diagnosis is necessary; I spend most of my working life making them, and a wrong one causes real harm. But classification is not exhaustive understanding, and the temptation of contemporary medicine is to behave as though it were.

Major depressive disorder. Post-traumatic stress disorder. Parkinson disease. Metastatic carcinoma. Chronic pain.

Each of these statements may be medically indispensable and existentially inadequate at once. The symbolic imagination does not abolish diagnosis; it situates diagnosis inside a larger field. The chick has a diagnosis. It also has a nest, a mother, a cry, an absence, a memory of warmth, and wings that have not yet been tested. The discipline required is a form of sacred notknowing — the willingness to hold interpretation open past the point where a confident formulation becomes available [54].

From Chick to Tzaddik: A Constructive Proposal

I now state the central move of this essay, and I want to state its status clearly.

Tikkunei Zohar does not say that the chicks are the tzaddikim. Its symbolism is more differentiated than that: the fledglings can signify Israel, souls, students, and grades of sacred learning, while Tzaddik/Yesod appears within the same bird-tree-nest constellation as the channel or generative axis connecting the worlds [10,11,15]. The equation I am proposing is therefore explicitly constructive rather than philological. I am not reporting what the text says; I am building on what it makes available.

The proposal is that the therapeutic patient occupies both positions.

As chick, the patient is vulnerable, dependent, and vocal in a pre-articulate register. As tzaddik, the patient is a conduit.

This use of tzaddik must be detached from the colloquial sense of moral perfection. In the sefirotic vocabulary, Tzaddik/Yesod is a relational term. Yesod gathers, transmits, connects; it is the point at which what is above becomes available to what is below. Yehuda Liebes's studies of the Zoharic tzaddik trace how thoroughly the figure is defined by function rather than by moral achievement [55]. Idel's work on the erotic dimension of the same symbolism shows how much of that function is conceived as the joining of what has been separated [48].

The patient becomes tzaddik not by ceasing to suffer. The patient becomes tzaddik when suffering no longer abolishes relationship.

Consider what that looks like at the bedside.

The depressed patient who manages one truthful sentence rather than disappearing entirely into isolation has performed a small act of Yesod. The traumatized patient who discovers that another human being can witness an unbearable memory without fleeing has reopened a channel that was closed. The bereaved patient who learns that continued love does not require the denial of death has joined absence and presence without collapsing either. The patient with chronic illness who can accept care without permitting the illness to consume identity has differentiated the chick from the broken nest.

None of this constitutes sainthood. All of it constitutes relation. That is the whole of the claim: the wounded person who remains, or becomes again, capable of connection. I have argued in a different key that the patient occupies a sacred role in the therapeutic encounter rather than merely a receptive one [56]; the present formulation gives that intuition its textual and structural basis.

The proposal also corrects an asymmetry in my earlier work that I have come to regard as a defect. In the first essay, and in much of the surrounding literature, the patient appears as a divine spark requiring restoration [1,8]. The formulation is not wrong, but it carries a danger. A spark is an object. One finds it, raises it, returns it. The clinician remains the active kabbalist and the patient becomes holy material awaiting rescue.

A chick is not an object. It is alive. It calls, resists, hungers, responds to presence and absence, and may leave. Most importantly, it has a voice. The therapeutic subject is not a sacred fragment handled by an enlightened practitioner but another center of experience whose voice constitutes the field. Henri Nouwen's wounded healer named the same insight from the clinician's side of the relationship [57]; what is proposed here is its mirror image on the patient's side [58].

The Wounded Tzaddik

We may now define the essay's central figure with some precision, and with the necessary disclaimers.

The wounded tzaddik is not the spiritually superior patient. Suffering is not redemptive. Pain does not ennoble automatically. Trauma destroys at least as often as it transforms, and any theology that obscures this fact is not worth having [59].

The term names a possibility that sometimes emerges within suffering: that the wounded person becomes a channel for a form of truth unavailable to the illusion of invulnerability.

Tzaddik/Yesod is the connector. The wound is the site at which connection was broken. Healing occurs when connection becomes possible again without the wound being erased.

The scar, in other words, is not the opposite of healing. The scar is healed tissue that remembers rupture. I have made this argument elsewhere through the figure of the fractured vav — the broken letter that becomes a portal rather than a defect [60]. The wounded tzaddik is the human analogue of the Shekhinah as this literature depicts her: present and exiled at once.

The consequences for how we assess outcome are substantial. A patient may remain chronically ill and become more whole. A patient may continue grieving and become more alive. A patient may retain traumatic memory and cease living entirely inside the traumatic past [61]. Wholeness is not the restoration of a previous state. Tikkun is not rewind. It is a new configuration assembled from what remains after breaking.

Trauma and the Broken Nest

Trauma gives this metaphor its darkest resonance, and any account that cannot survive contact with it should be abandoned.

The traumatized person has frequently encountered not ordinary developmental absence but the catastrophic failure of protection. The expected mother did not return. The home was not safe. The body became the site of invasion. The protector became

the perpetrator. Or events overwhelmed every protector available [61].

In such circumstances an easy theology of maternal divine care becomes not merely useless but cruel. Where was Mother-God?

The bird metaphor does not solve this. Its value is that it declines to pretend the nest remained intact.

The Shekhinah in this literature is depicted as wandering. Divine presence is represented through dispossession. The theology does not ask the traumatized patient to reinterpret catastrophe as secretly benevolent — which is the standard move of theodicy and the reason theodicy so often fails at the bedside [62]. It says something else: the broken nest belongs inside the religious symbol.

There are religious frameworks in which suffering is evidence that faith has failed. Tikkunei Zohar offers another possibility. Exile is not outside the map of divinity. Absence does not place the sufferer beyond the sacred geography. The post-Holocaust literature turns on precisely this question — Rubenstein concluding that the God of history had died, Fackenheim insisting that the categories themselves had ruptured, Kalonymus Kalman Shapira preaching in the Warsaw Ghetto that the divine weeps in a hidden chamber [63,64,65]. My own position has been that anti-theodicy is more honest than theodicy and that the heretical strands of the tradition are more useful at the bedside than the harmonizing ones [62,66,67].

The abandoned chick remains related to the mother precisely through the cry of abandonment.

Even protest preserves address. One does not ask Where are You? of absolute nothingness.

From Tzimtzum to Hovering

The first essay proposed tzimtzum as the governing clinical posture: the practitioner contracts to make room [1,9,68]. I now want to add a second posture, and it comes from the verse itself.

Deuteronomy describes the mother rovetzet — settled, crouched — over the young [2]. The tradition hears in this an echo of the merachefet of Genesis 1:2, the hovering over the face of the deep, and of the eagle in Deuteronomy 32:11 who hovers over her fledglings, stirring the nest without abandoning it. Tikkunei Zohar exploits the resonance thoroughly [10,11].

Hovering is neither intrusion nor withdrawal.

To hover is to remain near without occupying the other's space. This may be the most precise available image of therapeutic presence: close enough to respond, distant enough not to engulf, present enough to be found, absent enough to permit movement.

Therapeutic tzimtzum, on this account, does not require disappearance. Its mature form is hovering. The clinician contracts the demand to be central while preserving the availability of relationship [23,68].

The patient's discovery unfolds in stages, and I have watched it unfold in this order more times than I can count.

First: I can exist beneath a caring presence without being consumed by it.

Then: I can exist when that presence is not immediately visible.

Finally: I can carry the capacity for presence into relationships beyond this room. Winnicott's account of the capacity to be alone in the presence of another, and of the transitional space in which that capacity develops, describes the same sequence from within a different tradition [69].

This is not abandonment. It is fledging.

Which brings us to the hardest clinical form of shiluach ha-ken.

Sometimes the mother cannot remain. No therapeutic relationship should promise otherwise. Treatments end. Clinicians retire. Patients move. Illness progresses. Death intervenes. And even successful therapy contains the seed of separation, because a therapy from which the patient can never depart has failed in a different way.

The sending away of the mother therefore also names one of the hardest tasks in treatment: transforming attachment without destroying it. Early on, the patient may need the actual clinician intensely. Later the patient carries something of the relationship internally. The nest becomes portable. The mother does not cease to exist because she is no longer physically hovering.

This is not a facile doctrine of letting go, and the Zoharic material refuses to make it one, because in this literature the mother suffers too. Separation has a cost on both sides. Graduation from treatment contains grief. Recovery can threaten a relationship that was organized around illness. The patient may fear that needing less means loving less. The clinician may unconsciously prefer to remain necessary — and this last is worth examining honestly in supervision, because it is common and rarely admitted [70].

Tikkun requires separation at both ends. The chick must discover wings. The mother must tolerate flight.

Mutual Tikkun Without Therapeutic Narcissism

The claim that patients transform clinicians requires careful handling, because it is easily corrupted.

There is a real therapeutic narcissism in the sentence "my patients heal me." The patient did not enter treatment to repair the clinician. The patient's suffering cannot ethically be appropriated as material for the practitioner's spiritual development. Anyone who has watched this happen in a clinical setting knows how quickly the encounter reorganizes itself around the clinician's needs.

Yet the opposite fantasy — that the clinician is unaffected — is equally false and rather more common in medical culture, where it is often mistaken for professionalism [70,71].

Clinical encounter leaves traces. One remembers voices. Certain deaths stay. Some patients expose blind spots. Some evoke an irritation that turns out to be information about oneself. Some alter one's understanding of courage. Some demonstrate that cure and healing are not synonyms.

Mutuality must therefore be distinguished from symmetry. The relationship is radically asymmetrical in responsibility, expertise, and power; noth-

ing in this essay should be read as diluting that. But it may still be reciprocal in transformation. Idel's theurgy names exactly this structure at the theological level: something changes on both sides of the relation, without the two sides becoming equivalent [26].

This is the theological paradox of mother and chick, transposed. The chick depends on the mother. The cry of the chick moves the mother. The patient depends on the clinician's competence. The clinician who genuinely encounters the patient does not remain exactly who he was.

And the patient may disclose aspects of existence unavailable to the healer. A dying person teaches the physician about mortality. A traumatized person exposes the limits of ordinary assumptions about safety. A disabled patient reveals how thoroughly medicine has confused normality with value. A grieving patient demonstrates that attachment continues after the disappearance of its object.

The patient does not merely receive knowledge. The patient alters the knower.

The Final Reversal: Mother-God as Patient

One inversion remains, and it is the point toward which the whole essay has been moving.

We have spoken of the Shekhinah as Mother-God and of the human sufferer as patient. But the exile imagery makes a further identification difficult to avoid.

She is displaced. She grieves. She longs for reunion. She wanders. She requires tikkun [10,11,38].

The human being, in other words, is not the only wounded subject in the room.

This does not mean that God suffers a psychiatric disorder, and I want no part of the theological sentimentality that would run in that direction. It means that the symbolic structure of Kabbalah refuses to reserve vulnerability for creatures. Roi's reading of Tikkunei Zohar — a weakened, maternal deity whose stature the kabbalist is obligated to build up — states this as the plain sense of the corpus rather than as a modern imposition [11].

The therapeutic encounter can accordingly be imagined as a site where two wounds intersect: the wound of the human person and the wound named Shekhinah.

When the abandoned person is accompanied, exile is locally contradicted. When an unspeakable experience becomes speakable, something scattered is gathered. When a person previously reduced to a diagnosis is encountered as a subject, the divine image is restored in that person. When the clinician renounces omnipotence but refuses indifference, Mother-God hovers again.

Tikkun occurs not because the world has been repaired in totality but because a fragment of relation has been restored.

This extends the model of Shekhinah consciousness proposed earlier [8,46]. Previously I argued that the clinician creates sacred space through presence and contraction. I would now say more and say it differently.

The sacred space is not created by the clinician alone. The chick builds the nest too. Its cry summons relation. Its trust converts clinical space into

dwelling. Its capacity to survive absence is what makes the mother's withdrawal something other than abandonment. Its eventual flight reveals that successful maternal presence was never intended to produce permanent dependence.

Conclusion: A Nest for the One Who Was Sent Away

The first bird essay followed the mother into exile. This one has remained with the chicks. The shift changes a great deal.

Seen from the mother's position, shiluach ha-ken is a theology of absence. Seen from the chick's position, it becomes a theology of development after the collapse of guaranteed presence. Seen through Tikkunei Zohar, the metaphor becomes more radical still: mother, offspring, nest, tree, prayer, Torah, Shekhinah, tzaddik, and redemption circulate through one another, and no symbol stays fixed [10,11].

The patient begins as the chick beneath the mother. But the chick grows. The one who was held becomes capable of holding. The one who cried becomes capable of hearing another cry. The one who required a nest may build one for someone else. The recipient becomes the channel. The chick becomes tzaddik.

This is why the therapeutic metaphor cannot terminate in cure. The final question is not only whether the symptoms have diminished. It is whether a person once exiled from body, relationship, meaning, or hope can again become a place in which presence dwells.

Each of our five interlocutors has done specific work here, and it is worth naming what each contributed. Neumann showed why maternal imagery grips the psyche and why the Good Mother turns terrible when she permits no separation — and, in the Tel Aviv manuscripts, that a Jungian could look for the corrective inside Kabbalah rather than outside it [32,35,36]. Wolfson prevented that mother from becoming a sentimentalized divine feminine, and kept her linguistically unstable, erotic, paradoxical, and irreducible to biological gender [42,17]. Fishbane taught us to watch her move [50]. Matt taught us not to exhaust the image by explaining it [16]. Idel reminded us that interpretation and ritual do not merely describe the divine drama but participate in it [26,25].

And Tikkunei Zohar supplied the decisive image: the mother goes, chased away, and the children cry out [10].

Perhaps this is what patients have always done. They arrive after some version of the nest has failed. They speak in symptoms, stories, gestures, silences, repetitions, dreams, anger, dependence, and hope. Medicine is trained to translate these sounds immediately into diagnostic language, and much of the time it must.

But the maternal clinician listens first — not because every cry contains a mystical secret, but because a cry addressed to another human being is already the beginning of relation.

The Shekhinah is Mother-God because she represents the possibility that reality can receive that cry.

Yet she is more than the mother who hears. She is also the mother who has been driven out, and whose own dwelling depends on the restoration of

relationship. Which discloses the deepest reversal of the bird metaphor: we do not merely await the return of the Shekhinah to be healed. In becoming capable of relationship again, we prepare a nest in which the Shekhinah herself may return.

The patient is therefore never merely the object of tikkun. The patient may become its agent.

The chick, still carrying the memory of abandonment, grows wings. The wounded one becomes tzaddik. The nest becomes Shekhinah. And healing becomes the place where mother and child, God and human being, presence and absence, wound and relation encounter one another without either side being required to disappear.

Note on Citation of Primary Sources

References to Tikkunei Zohar follow the standard Vilna pagination. The bird imagery is concentrated in the sixth tikkun, with the passage central to this essay — the mother chased away and the children crying out, and the ascent of that cry through the worlds — at 23a; parallel treatments appear in Tikkun 23 and Tikkun 70. Readers working from a different edition, or from Sefaria's digital text, should verify folio references against their own copy, as the numbering of the tikkunim and the pagination do not always align across printings. Translations of Zoharic passages, where quoted, follow Matt's Pritzker edition for the main body of the Zohar; Tikkunei Zohar is not included in the Pritzker project and renderings from it are my own.

References

1. Ungar-Sargon J. The bird's nest metaphor: from biblical text to mystical vision. KOS J Public Health Integr Med. 2025;1(2):1–11.
2. Deuteronomy 22:6–7.
3. Mishnah Berakhot 5:3; Babylonian Talmud, Berakhot 33b.
4. Maimonides M. The Guide of the Perplexed III:48. Pines S, translator. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1963.
5. Nachmanides M. Commentary on the Torah, Deuteronomy 22:6–7.
6. Segal E. Justice, mercy and a bird's nest. J Jew Stud. 1990;41(2):176–95.
7. Berkowitz BA. Birds as dads, babysitters, and hats: an "indistinction" approach to the mother bird mitzvah in Deuteronomy 22:6–7. Worldviews Glob Relig Cult Ecol. 2021;26(1–2):79–105.
8. Ungar-Sargon J. Shekhinah consciousness in the therapeutic space: from incarnation to redemption in the sacred space of healing. HSOA J Psychiatry Depress Anxiety. 2025;11(1):059.
9. Ungar-Sargon J. Epistemology versus ontology in therapeutic practice: the tzimtzum model and doctor-patient relationships. Adv Med Clin Res. 2025;6(1):94–101.
10. Tikkunei Zohar, Tikkun 6 (21a–24a), especially 23a.
11. Roi B. Ahavat ha-Shekhinah: Mistikah u-Po'etikah be-Sifrut Tikkunei ha-Zohar [Love of the Shekhinah: Mysticism and Poetics in Tiqqunei ha-Zohar]. Hebrew. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press; 2017.
12. Giller P. The Enlightened Will Shine: Symbolization and Theurgy in the Later Strata of the Zohar. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press; 1993.
13. Ungar-Sargon J. Hermeneutic approaches to medicine: from objective evidence to patient as sacred text. EC Neurol. 2025;17(6):1–10.
14. Ungar-Sargon J. The patient as parable: highlighting the interpretive framework: applying mystic hermeneutics to patient narratives. Int

Med J. 2025;25(2):41–50.
15. Zohar Ḥadash, Midrash Ruth, Ma'amar Kan Tzippor (94a).
16. Matt DC, translator and commentator. The Zohar: Pritzker Edition. 12 vols. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press; 2004–2017.
17. Wolfson ER. Language, Eros, Being: Kabbalistic Hermeneutics and Poetic Imagination. New York, NY: Fordham University Press; 2005.
18. Tikkunei Zohar, Tikkun 23 (69a–70a).
19. Tikkunei Zohar, Tikkun 70 (121b–122a).
20. Zohar III:281a (Ki Teitzei).
21. Ungar-Sargon J. The wound as altar: divine absence and the therapeutic space of healing. Neurol Res Surg. 2025;8(3):1–16.
22. Winnicott DW. The Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment. London: Hogarth Press; 1965.
23. Ungar-Sargon J. Self-kenosis and the hermeneutic clinician. Am J Med Clin Res Rev. 2026;5(7):1–19.
24. Zohar II:7b–8a (Heikhal Kan Tzippor).
25. Idel M. Messianic Mystics. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press; 1998.
26. Idel M. Kabbalah: New Perspectives. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press; 1988.
27. Ungar-Sargon J. Psalms: prayer, praise, and tikkun: toward a theology of repair through sacred language. Case Rep Rev. 2026;6(1):85.
28. Bion WR. Learning from Experience. London: Heinemann; 1962.
29. Ungar-Sargon J. Presence within and beyond words: sacred listening as experiential encounter. Am J Med Clin Sci. 2025;10(2):1–7.
30. Ungar-Sargon J. Archetypal and embodied approaches to medical practice: a critical analysis of challenges to biomedical orthodoxy. J Psychol Neurosci. 2025;7(3):1–16.
31. Ungar-Sargon J. The sacred paradox of healing: integrating shadow and light in medicine, politics, and spirituality through Jungian and Kabbalistic wisdom. J Psychol Neurosci. 2025;7(3):1–16.
32. Neumann E. The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype. Manheim R, translator. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 1955.
33. Neumann E. The Origins and History of Consciousness. Hull RFC, translator. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 1954.
34. Neumann E. The Child: Structure and Dynamics of the Nascent Personality. Manheim R, translator. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons; 1973.
35. Neumann E. The Roots of Jewish Consciousness, Volume One: Revelation and Apocalypse.
36. Lammers AC, editor; Kyburz M, Lammers AC, translators. London: Routledge; 2019.
37. Neumann E. The Roots of Jewish Consciousness, Volume Two: Hasidism. Lammers AC, editor; Kyburz M, Lammers AC, translators; foreword by Idel M. London: Routledge; 2019.
38. Heschel AJ. The Prophets. New York, NY: Harper & Row; 1962.
39. Ungar-Sargon J. The pain of the Shekhinah: from midrashic exile through to embodied theology. J Relig Theol. 2026;8(1):58–77.
40. Ungar-Sargon JY. Divine suffering, the hermeneutics of reading and the clinical encounter. Biomed J Sci Tech Res. 2026;65(1).
41. Ungar-Sargon J. The wound that gives: the pain of self-contraction in creation, revelation, and the therapeutic encounter. Am J Med Clin Res Rev. 2026;5(6):1–15.
42. Ungar-Sargon J. Divine error and human rectification: tzimtzum as theological rupture and therapeutic possibility. Adv Educ Res Rev. 2025;2(1):76–86.
43. Wolfson ER. Circle in the Square: Studies in

the Use of Gender in Kabbalistic Symbolism. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press; 1995.
44. Wolfson ER. Through a Speculum That Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 1994.
45. Green A. Shekhinah, the Virgin Mary, and the Song of Songs: reflections on a kabbalistic symbol in its historical context. AJS Rev. 2002;26(1):1–52.
46. Schäfer P. Mirror of His Beauty: Feminine Images of God from the Bible to the Early Kabbalah. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 2002.
47. Ungar-Sargon J. Shekhinah consciousness: divine feminine as theological and political paradigm for human suffering. EC Neurol. 2025;17 (5):1–15.
48. Ungar-Sargon J. The Shekhinah, maternal instincts, and transcendence: from Kabbalah to AI ethics and the therapeutic space. EC Neurol. 2025;25(RW-201):1–35.
49. Idel M. Kabbalah and Eros. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press; 2005.
50. Ungar-Sargon JY. An economy of delight: sha'ashu'im, jouissance, and the erotics of healing. Am J Neurol Res. 2026;5(2):1–13.
51. Fishbane EP. The Art of Mystical Narrative: A Poetics of the Zohar. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 2018.
52. Fishbane M. Biblical Myth and Rabbinic Mythmaking. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2003.
53. Tishby I. The Wisdom of the Zohar: An Anthology of Texts. Goldstein D, translator. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1989.
54. Scholem G. Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism. New York, NY: Schocken Books; 1941.
55. Ungar-Sargon JY. The sacred epistemology of not-knowing: uncertainty and doubt as foundations for humility in medicine and religion. Clin Rev Cases. 2026;8(1):1–8.
56. Liebes Y. Studies in the Zohar. Schwartz A, Nakache S, Peli P, translators. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press; 1993.
57. Ungar-Sargon J. Chosen to suffer: a theological reflection on the sacred role of the patient. Am J Neurol Res. 2025;4(3):1–7.
58. Nouwen HJM. The Wounded Healer: Ministry in Contemporary Society. New York, NY: Doubleday; 1972.
59. Ungar-Sargon J. When the body breaks: a four-dimensional case study in embodied theology and the wounded healer. Am J Neurol Res. 2025;4(4):1–6.
60. Ungar-Sargon J. The fluid presence of evil: moral ambiguity in the therapeutic space. Neurol Neurosci. 2025;6(7):033.
61. Ungar-Sargon J. The fractured vav: a theology of sacred brokenness as portal between healing and holiness. J Behav Health. 2025;14(4):1–9.
62. Herman JL. Trauma and Recovery: The Aftermath of Violence — From Domestic Abuse to Political Terror. New York, NY: Basic Books; 1992.
63. Ungar-Sargon J. The wound as altar: an antitheodicy of the Shoah. J Relig Theol. 2026;8 (2):6–28.
64. Rubenstein RL. After Auschwitz: Radical Theology and Contemporary Judaism. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill; 1966.
65. Fackenheim EL. God's Presence in History: Jewish Affirmations and Philosophical Reflections. New York, NY: Harper & Row; 1970.
66. Shapira KK. Sacred Fire: Torah from the Years of Fury 1939–1942 (Esh Kodesh). Worch JH, translator. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson; 2000.

67. Ungar-Sargon J. The duality of divine presence: exploring the dark Schechina in Jewish mystical thought and post-Holocaust theology. J Behav Health. 2025;14(2):1–10.
68. Ungar-Sargon J. The holiness of the heretical: heretical Kabbalah as a response to catastrophe and the limits of theodicy. J Clin Oncol Adv Ther. 2026;2(3):1–5.
69. Ungar-Sargon J. Makom, tzimtzum, and the collapse of the horse-and-rider parable/mashal. Am J Med Clin Res Rev. 2026;5(6):1–23.
70. Winnicott DW. Playing and Reality. London: Tavistock; 1971.
71. Ungar-Sargon J. Moral injury, and the liminal theology of peace in Jewish thought, Jungian psychology, and the therapeutic imagination. J Psychiatry Res Rep. 2026;3(2):1–12.
72. Ungar-Sargon J. When the healer mourns: physician grief after a patient's death. Trends Gen Med. 2025;3(4):1–10.