# Christ and the Psyche

The archetypal psychology of C.G. Jung has aroused a great deal of interest among theologians. A recent and excellent bibliographical essay lists 442 books and articles which have concerned themselves at least in part with the relation of Jung's work to theology.[1] But the author concludes that 'scholarship on the borderlands between theology and archetypal psychology has grown tired. What it needs to avoid declining into an eremitic glass-bead-game is not so much the flair of revolutionizing ideas as the painstaking re-examination of fundamental assumptions.'[2]

With this judgment I concur, and I have argued elsewhere that the theological method of Bernard Lonergan provides a quite adequate horizon for the dialectical reinterpretation and personal employment of the Jungian maieutic on the part of the theologian.[3] The kind of critical engagement with Jung that Lonergan makes possible will help the theologian construct a portion of theology's foundations. In this paper I wish to move on from these initial methodological considerations to one particular problem of great importance: namely, the Jungian interpretation of the symbolic significance of the figure of Jesus Christ. In this examination, I will be considering some of the fundamental assumptions of both Jungian psychology and Christian theology.

My paper divides into three major sections. The first two set the problem by way of an exposition of Jung's notions of the self and individuation, and by way of an interpretation of his treatment of Christ as symbol of the self. The third section states all too briefly the methodological framework for the theologian's employment and correction of Jung, suggests all too cryptically a new formulation of the individuation process in the light of these methodological considerations,

---

[1] James W. Heisig, 'Jung and Theology: A Bibliographical Essay,' *Spring: An Annual of Archetypal Psychology and Jungian Thought* (1973) 204-55. A significant treatment that appeared after this essay is the chapter on Jung in David Burrell, *Exercises in Religious Understanding* (Notre Dame, in: University of Notre Dame Press, 1974).

[2] Heisig, 'Jung and Theology' 232.

[3] See Robert Doran, *Subject and Psyche: A Study in the Foundations of Theology* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1975).

and proclaims all too poorly the symbolic and psychic significance of Jesus Christ within the framework of this revised notion of individuation.[4]

## 1 The Self and the Individuation Process

### *1.1 Consciousness and the Unconscious*

Individuation is the process of becoming one' s own self.[5] Jung proposes it as an alternative to two different paths of alienation, one in which the self retires in favor of social recognition or the persona, and the other in which the self is identified with a primordial image or archetype. The process of individuation occurs by way of the ego's conscious negotiation with the complexes of the unconscious.

Jung arrived at the notion of unconscious complexes very early in his psychiatric career. The instrument for his discovery was the association experiment, which revealed certain indicators of powerful emotions lying beyond the realm of consciousness. These phenomena were postulated by Jung to be the

---

[4] What is needed is a quite thorough rewriting of the foundations of the science of depth psychology from the standpoint of Lonergan's generalized empirical method. This endeavor would proceed by way of furthering the portions of Jung's psychology which are in harmony with Lonergan's method and reversing those portions which are in dialectical conflict with the horizon provided by this method. In the present paper, I am severely limited by space and time to indicating one area, albeit a central and crucial one, in which Jung stands in need of the correction that can result from an adequate epistemological, metaphysical, and theological base for understanding our psychic depths and their strange and elusive imaginal manifestations.

[5] 'Individuation means becoming an "individual," and, in so far as ""individuality" embraces our innermost, last, and incomparable uniqueness, it also implies becoming one's own self. We could therefore translate individuation as "coming to selfhood" or "self-realization."' C.G. Jung, 'The Relations between the Ego and the Unconscious,' in *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, vol. 7 in Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966) 173.

effects of concealed, feeling-toned complexes in the unconscious psyche.[6] These complexes are the cause of dreams as well as of disturbances in the association experiment. Jung first defined the complex as 'the sum of ideas referring to a particular feeling-toned event.'[7] He later added the notion of a nuclear element within each complex[8] and distinguished between the emotional and the purposeful aspects of the complex.[9]

The feeling-toned complex is a common phenomenon, not limited to acute or pathological states or cases. Some, especially those connected with religious experience, even lead to long-lasting emotional stability.[10] This discovery led Jung very early to grant a greater significance to the inner content of an emotional experience than was accorded it by Freud.[11] Furthermore, complexes tend to exhibit a tenacious inner cohesiveness and stability, a unity of structure resulting

---

[6] Information on the association experiment and the complexes is provided in Henri F. Ellenberger, *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry* (London: Penguin, 1970) 691-94, and in Liliane Frey-Rohn, *From Freud to Jung: A Comparative Study in the Psychology of the Unconscious*, trans. Fred E. Engreen and Evelyn K. Engreen (New York: C.G. Jung Foundation, 1974) 13-40. It should be pointed out that consciousness for Jung is itself a complex, whose center is the ego. In general, consciousness for Jung is ego consciousness, whereas the unconscious is everything that lies beyond the ego's differentiated realm. We shall later be pointing to a different and, I believe, more accurate and far-reaching notion of both consciousness and the unconscious. For the moment, though, we are concerned only with Jung.

[7] C.G. Jung, 'The Associations of Normal Subjects,' in *Experimental Researches*, trans. Leopold Stein in collaboration with Diana Riviere, vol. 2 in Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972) 72.

[8] C.G. Jung, 'On Psychic Energy,' in *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, vol. 8 in Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968) 11.

[9] C.G. Jung, 'A Review of the Complex Theory,' in ibid. 92-104.

[10] C.G. Jung, 'Dementia Praecox,' in *The Psychogenesis of Mental Disease*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, vol. 3 in Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960) 43.

[11] See Frey-Rohn, *From Freud to Jung* 20-21.

from the association of feeling and idea. 'Every minute part of the complex reproduced the feeling-tone of the whole, and, in addition, each effect radiated throughout the entire mass of the associated idea.'[12]

Complexes, then, are the structural units of the psyche. Each complex has a specific focus of energy and meaning, called its nucleus. While the psyche is a whole, its parts are relatively independent of one another. The ego is its central complex, but the ego must remain in harmony with its unconscious background. This it does by negotiating the other complexes, and thus preventing them from splitting away and forming a second authority to thwart the aims of the ego. This second authority never goes away, but 'a living cooperation of all factors'[13] is possible through the process of individuation. Complexes are miniature, self-contained personalities in their own right, but this need not at all mean the disintegration of personality. In fact, there is dormant within the psyche an image of wholeness, which represents the goal of the development which is individuation. This image is progressively realized by the cumulative negotiation and integration of the complexes as they manifest themselves in dreams and other psychic phenomena.

### *1.2 The Personal and the Collective Unconscious*

Unconscious complexes can be either personal or impersonal. Personal complexes include material which I know but of which I am not at the moment thinking; material of which I was at one time conscious but which I have forgotten; everything which, without attending to it, I feel, think, remember, want, and do; and the repressed memories made so much of by Freud.[14] They are 'those ideas which either belonged to the ego-complex or were split off from the ego and ignored. All personal contents, thus, were reminiscences of events which had occurred during life.'[15] Impersonal complexes, on the other hand, are independent of the ego and of personal memory. They originate from a more primordial base, and they have a meaning common to all. The domain of personal complexes is called the personal unconscious, that of impersonal complexes the collective

---

[12] Ibid. 23.

[13] Jung, 'The Relations between the Ego and the Unconscious' 174.

[14] C.G. Jung, 'On the Nature of the Psyche,' in *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche* 185.

[15] Frey-Rohn, *From Freud to Jung* 34.

unconscious. The latter is a superpersonal level of the psyche whose contents concern humanity as such. The discovery of this universal layer of psychic life opened for Jung and his followers prospects of psychotherapy which extend beyond the confines of personal psychopathology. The impersonal complexes are 'the fertile ground of creative processes,'[16] permitting the process of individuation to be a distinctly creative one, and giving rise to the judgment that Jung's psychology is essentially one of creativity.[17] Thus the 'second authority' of the unconscious background is not disruptive but creative of individuated life when complexes come from or can be related to the impersonal or collective layer, and when the contents of this deeper dimension can be harmoniously integrated into one's conscious development. This integration, however, is not to take place by way of identification with the impersonal complexes, for then one's conscious individuality is inundated by a primordial image which inflates the ego to the dimensions of some kind of *Übermensch*, or on the contrary destroys the ego completely on account of its power. In the first case, one becomes 'the fortunate possessor of the great truth which was only waiting to be discovered, of the eschatological knowledge which spells the healing of the nations.'[18] Regarding the second case, Jung tells us in his autobiographical reflections of a dream he had dealing with his intimation of a second authority at the base and source of the conscious mind.

> It was night in some unknown place, and I was making slow and painful headway against a mighty wind. Dense fog was flying along everywhere. I had my hands cupped around a tiny light which threatened to go out at any moment. Everything depended on my keeping this little light alive. Suddenly I had the feeling that something was coming up behind me. I looked back, and saw a gigantic black figure following me. But at the same moment I was conscious, in spite of my terror, that I must keep my little light going through night and wind, regardless of all dangers.[19]

---

[16] Ibid. 35.

[17] James Hillman, *The Myth of Analysis* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1972) 34.

[18] Jung, 'The Relations between the Ego and the Unconscious' 169.

[19] C.G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (recorded and edited by Aniela Jaffé, trans. Richard and Clara Winston, (New York: Vintage Books, 1963) 88.

The little light was consciousness, understanding, 'the only light I have.'[20] The darkness was the second authority, Personality No. 2, 'with whom ... I could no longer feel myself identical.'[21] The storm ``sought to thrust me back into the immeasurable darkness of a world where one is aware of nothing except the surfaces of things in the background.'[22] The darkness of this background had to be recognized and negotiated, but not identified with. Identification would seem to be the shortest route to continual contact with the renewing power of the primordial layer of the psyche, but when one identifies with this layer it becomes storm, wind, and darkness, not life, renewal, and transformation.

> If a man is a hero, he is a hero precisely because, in the final reckoning, he did not let the monster devour him, but subdued it, not once but many times. Victory over the collective psyche alone yields the true value – the capture of the hoard, the invincible weapon, the magic talisman ... Anyone who identifies with the collective psyche – or, in mythological terms, lets himself be devoured by the monster – and vanishes in it, attains the treasure that the dragon guards, but he does so in spite of himself and to his own greatest harm.[23]

Individuation, then, is dependent upon an attitude which finds in feeling-toned complexes, whether personal or impersonal, occasions for deepening one's self-understanding, for becoming more conscious, for expanding one's personality. Everything seems to depend on the delicacy of one's conscious attitude toward the unconscious complexes. There are places where Jung suggests that individuation is a matter of the detachment from inner states and outer objects that constitutes the mystical *via negativa*. Thus, 'the aim of individuation is nothing less than to divest the self of the false wrappings of the persona on the one hand, and of the suggestive power of primordial images on the other.'[24] Or:

> By understanding the unconscious we free ourselves from its domination ... The pupil is taught to concentrate on the light of the innermost region and, at the same time, to free himself from all outer and inner entanglements. His vital impulses are guided towards a consciousness void of content, which

---

[20] Ibid. The identification of consciousness with understanding is Jung's, not mine.

[21] Ibid. 89.

[22] Ibid. 88.

[23] Jung, 'The Relations between the Ego and the Unconscious' 170.

[24] Ibid. 174.

> nevertheless permits all contents to exist ... Consciousness is at the same time empty and not empty. It is no longer preoccupied with the images of things but merely contains them. The fullness of the world which hitherto pressed upon it has lost none of its richness and beauty, but it no longer dominates. The magical claim of things has ceased because the interweaving of consciousness with the world has come to an end. The unconscious is not projected any more, and so the primordial *participation mystique* with things is abolished. Consciousness is no longer preoccupied with compulsive plans but dissolves in contemplative vision.
>
> ... This effect ... is the therapeutic effect par excellence, for which I labour with my students and patients.[25]

### *1.3 The Self as Center and Totality*

The key to the attainment of this detached state is the shifting of the center of gravity of the total personality from the ego, which is merely the center of consciousness, to a hypothetical midpoint between consciousness and the unconscious which Jung calls the self. 'If the transposition is successful, it does away with the *participation mystique* and results in a personality that suffers only in the lower storeys, as it were, but in its upper storeys is singularly detached from painful as well as from joyful happenings.'[26] For Western people, such an attitude can only be reached by renouncing 'none of the Christian values won in the course of Christian development,' by trying 'with Christian charity and forbearance to accept even the humblest things in one's own nature.'[27] Such an attitude can be

---

[25] C.G. Jung, 'Commentary on "The Secret of the Golden Flower,"' in *Alchemical Studies*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, vol. 13 in Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970) 44-45. This essay of Jung's I find the finest statement of the existential meaning of individuation, one far more compatible with the framework provided by a generalized empirical method than Jung's later formulations. But it presents a vision which Jung did not seem to have the philosophical and theological horizon to sustain in any consistent fashion. Unfortunately, Jung's contact with alchemy was also launched by his encounter with 'The Secret of the Golden Flower,' and there was a romantic strain in Jung's disposition which he could not resist and which led to his eventual capitulation to what, I believe, is a fundamentally and dialectically different manner of thinking from what is reflected in this essay.

[26] Ibid. 45-46.

[27] Ibid. 48.

aped only so long before it produces ‘an unstable situation that can be overthrown by the unconscious at any time.’[28] The alternative to aping such an attitude is to give due consideration to the unconscious, and to integrate its contents, always keeping in mind as one does so that ‘without the most serious application of the Christian values we have acquired, the new integration can never take place.’[29]

The self is conceived by Jung, however, not only as a center, but also as the totality of consciousness and the unconscious. The notion of psychic totality gradually became the guiding principle in all of Jung’s investigations. This evolution is linked with the development of the notions of a creative transformation of energy and of a teleological orientation on the part of the psyche as a whole.[30] Jung came to understand psychic development as ``an entirely natural and automatic process of transformation,’[31] invested with an unconscious meaning which works itself out in the production, not so much of symptoms of an underlying disorder as of symbols progressively anticipating an already established goal. This goal is the self, understood as wholeness or psychic totality.

Normal development, then, inevitably entails onesidedness, if it is consciously directed at all,[32] but this onesidedness means that part of the psyche is repressed, and that an inferior part of the personality is formed, which Jung calls the shadow. ‘By shadow I mean the “negative” side of the personality, the sum of all those unpleasant qualities we like to hide, together with the insufficiently developed functions and the contents of the personal unconscious.’[33] But the shadow is negative only from the standpoint of the ego. Potentially it contains the seeds of future development, of transformation, and even of a higher and more authentic form of morality. This is because, as repressed and hidden from ego consciousness, the shadow is connected more intimately than the ego with the energic forces of the psychic depths from which all consciousness emerges in the

---

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.

[30] See Frey-Rohn, *From Freud to Jung* 43-71.

[31] C.G. Jung, *Symbols of Transformation*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, vol. 5 in Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967) 59.

[32] See C.G. Jung, ‘The Stages of Life,’ in *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche* 388.

[33] C.G. Jung, ‘On the Psychology of the Unconscious,’ in *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology* 66, note 5.

first place. Proper negotiation of the shadow is the beginning of the shift from the ego as center to the self as center, and from a state of rift between the ego and the totality to a condition of wholeness. What had previously been thought worthless contains enormous positive potentialities for psychic development, if only one knows how to tap it. The weak point of one's psychic life can be the source of potential victory, provided the latter is understood in the sense of an expanded consciousness and a deepened and more centered personality. The shadow is truly the gateway to the unconscious, the link between the ego and the depths, indeed the universal reaches, of psychic energy.

The negotiation of the shadow only introduces one to the other capacities of the unconscious: its resources for heightened personal performance, its direction toward the emergence of a future personality, its provision of both commonsense and sophisticated intellectual insight, its rich store of personal and collective memories, its autonomy as a producer of symbols of transformation, its capacity to premeditate new ideas and their combinations, its independent powers of perception, association, and prediction. The history of Jung's association with Freud[34] reveals that Jung was aware very early in his professional career that the potentialities of the unconscious are far more extensive than Freud allowed. But it was necessary for him to explore the archaic images which he relates to the archetypes of the collective unconscious before he could exploit his suspicion of a farther-reaching and more creative psychic life. Then he discovered that certain fantasies and dreams could be explained only by appealing to superpersonal motives, to something greater in us than the ego and the personal unconscious, and that these images are released by an organizing center in the psyche, a central nucleus to the entire personality, a regulating principle intent on integration and individuation; by a center which is also a goal, the self.

### *1.4 The Psychic and the Psychoid*

The last twenty-five years of Jung's life saw his thought move far beyond medical psychology. His work became an empirical science of the human soul, and as such

---

[34] See chapter 5 in Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, and *The Freud/Jung Letters: The Correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C.G. Jung*, ed. William McGuire, trans. Ralph Manheim and R.F.C. Hull, Bollingen Series XCIV (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974).

it becomes directly pertinent to the theologian.[35] Among the notions of his thought which were affected by this development are the archetypes of the collective unconscious.

In Jung's early work, the archetypes are not distinguished from archetypal images; namely, experienced representations of typical forms of behavior which tend to repeat themselves in the course of the living of the human drama. From their center, creative forces emerge which shape and transform life and which are ultimately responsible for genuine intellectual and artistic achievements. The ego needs the archetypes for its own continued vitality, but the archetypes also need the ego if they are to be consciously realized.

In his later work, Jung distinguishes the archetype-in-itself from the archetypal images, and he focuses more on the background of the images. He realizes more and more the incomprehensibility of the archetype-in-itself, its permanently unknown meaning.[36] The core of meaning, what the images refer to, remains unknown, as though it belonged to a realm transcendent to the psyche. This core of meaning expresses itself in metaphors which, while issuing from the realm beyond subjectivity, nonetheless are related to the life of the individual, regulate that life, stimulate psychic happenings, order them to or away from the goal of individuation, and seem to possess a foreknowledge of the envisioned terminus.[37]

Jung is led by these data to posit the presence of spirit in the psyche and to relate archetypes to this spirit factor. The collective unconscious had always consisted for Jung of vestiges of biological evolution and heredity closely connected with instinct. The archetypes had been and remain correlative to instincts. But, says Jung, they 'are not just relics or vestiges of earlier modes of functioning; they are the ever-present and biologically necessary regulators of the instinctual sphere' and stimulate images which represent the meaning of the

---

[35] The import of this fact, recognized by many (including Jung), seems to be best understood by Evangelos Christou, *The Logos of the Soul* (Vienna-Zürich: Dunquin Press, 1963). Unfortunately Christou died before completing this penetrating study, one of the few serious efforts at Jungian metapsychology to appear to date.

[36] See C.G. Jung, 'The Psychology of the Child Archetype,' in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, vol. 9i in Collected Works of C.G. Jung, trans. R.F.C. Hull (Princeton: Bollingen Series XX, 1968) 156.

[37] See Jung, 'On the Nature of the Psyche' 204, 209.

instincts.[38] But these images are also numinous or spiritual or mystical in their character and effects. They can mobilize religious convictions and draw the subject under a spell from which one cannot and will not break free, so deep and full is the experience of meaningfulness one enjoys.[39] Thus, 'in spite of or perhaps because of its affinity with instinct, the archetype represents the authentic element of spirit, but a spirit which is not to be identified with the human intellect, since it is the latter's *spiritus rector*.'[40] Instinct and archetype, ``the most polar opposites imaginable,' yet 'belong together as correspondences, which is not to say that the one is derivable from the other, but that they subsist side by side as reflections in our own minds of the opposition that underlies all psychic energy.'[41]

Jung thus postulates two 'transcendental principles' quite separate from one another: spirit and instinct. Their tension is the source of psychic energy, which moves to unite them. They are mediated by the archetypal image, through which spirit becomes incarnate and instinct consciously meaningful. Spirit and instinct are not themselves psychic, but psychoid, that is, understood by relation to the psyche, but autonomous from the psyche and not subject to will as is the psyche's disposable energy. Archetypes in themselves are no longer psychic, but are transcendent principles of spirit determining the orientation of both consciousness and the unconscious psyche. Instinct is called the psychic infra-red, passing over into the physiology of the organism and merging with its chemical and physical conditions, while spirit is the psychic ultra-violet, neither physiological nor psychic. The psyche unites spirit and matter in the image.

On the basis of the hypothesis of the psychoid, Jung found himself in a position to understand somewhat better certain phenomena which had always interested him: parapsychology, extrasensory perception, and astrological correlations. He came to regard these phenomena as synchronistic, that is, as manifesting a meaningful but acausal concurrence of mind and matter. Their just-so orderedness is rooted in the psychoid parallelism of spirit and matter. The archetype-in-itself is thus an a priori ordering principle which cannot be distinguished from continuous creation understood either as a series of successive acts of creation or as the eternal presence of one creative act.[42] Synchronicity

---

[38] Ibid. 201.

[39] See ibid. 206.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Ibid.

[42] See C.G. Jung, 'Synchronicity: An Acausal Connecting Principle,' in *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche* 417-531.

points to an ultimate unity of all existence, the *unus mundus*. The collective unconscious becomes the timeless and spaceless unity underlying empirical multiplicity, a transcendental psychophysical background containing the determining conditions of empirical phenomena. As such, it is a darkness beyond the categories of the mind, incommensurable to consciousness, less and less accessible to conscious correction and reasoning – yet the darkness, not of meaninglessness, but of a superabundance of meaning beyond the powers of rational comprehension and influence, and yet involving ego consciousness and the unconscious psyche as participants in a world-creating drama to which the individual has no choice but to submit. In this surrender one finds the self, finds one's life, but no longer claims it. One lives the 'just-so' life, without ulterior motives, without desire and without fear. In the experience of the self the dark background of the empirical world approximates consciousness. This is the experience of bounded infinity, of finite boundlessness, where the incommensurable distance of the unknown draws very near.[43]

## 2 Christ in Archetypal Psychology

### *2.1 Christ and the Archetype of the Self*

Concomitant with Jung's movement to an empirical science of the soul is a development of his notion of the self. As we have seen, symbols of the self reflect a central point that does not coincide with the ego, 'something irrational, an indefinable existent, to which the ego is neither opposed nor subjected, but merely attached, and about which it revolves very much as the earth revolves around the sun.'[44] The goal of individuation is not knowing the self, but sensing it, and sensing the ego as the object of an unknown and supraordinate subject.[45] Jung calls the postulate of the self a step beyond science, yet one without which empirical psychic processes could not be understood.[46] The self is only potentially empirical, because it is the totality. Only certain symbols can convey its reality.[47]

---

[43] See Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* 325.

[44] Jung, 'The Relations between the Ego and the Unconscious' 240.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Ibid.

[47] C.G. Jung, *Psychological Types*, vol. 6 in Collected Works of C.G. Jung, trans R.F.C. Hull, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971) 460.

Jung's most provocative treatment of these symbols appears in his book *Aion*.[48] This investigation 'seeks, with the help of Christian, Gnostic, and alchemical symbols of the self, to throw light on the change of psychic situation within the "Christian aeon."'[49] Many of Jung''s reflections about the self in this book gravitate around the symbol of the Fishes, because Jung thinks it seriously synchronistic that astrologically Pisces is the concomitant of 2,000 years of Christian development; and around the symbol of the Anthropos, the emergent symbol of the Age of Aquarius. The Christian aeon coincides with the age of Pisces, whereas the emergent age is that of Anthropos.

For Jung the Christ image, as an Anthropos figure uniting in itself the whole of humanity, has, at least up to now, been inadequate to the task of liberating the 'true man,' just as, in the East, the Buddha image was unable to protect against the invasion of Communist ideology. This is because the Christ image, as we have known it, is too one-sided to be able to represent our wholeness. It is 'lacking in darkness and in bodily and material reality.'[50] The medieval alchemists perceived this and attempted to free from matter a divine Anthropos, 'an image of man in which good and evil, spirit and matter, were genuinely united and through which not only man but also all of nature would be made whole.'[51]

*Aion* discusses the relations between the traditional Christ figure and the symbols of wholeness or of the self taken from nature. Wholeness, Jung says, is not an abstract idea. It is empirical, in that it is anticipated by the psyche in the form of spontaneous or autonomous images. These include the quaternity or

---

[48] C.G. Jung, *Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, vol. 9ii in Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968).

[49] Ibid. ix.

[50] Marie-Louise von Franz, *C.G. Jung: His Myth in Our Time*, trans. William H. Kennedy (New York: C. G. Jung Foundation, 1975) 135.

[51] Ibid. 136. Dr von Franz continues: 'At bottom it is the image of man in the Aquarian Age which is being formed in the collective unconscious. The astrological image of the Aquarian period is an image of man which, according to Jung, represents the Anthropos as an image of the Self, or of the greater inner personality which lives in every human being and in the collective psyche ... The task of man in the Aquarian Age will be to become conscious of his larger inner presence, the Anthropos, and to give the utmost care to the unconscious and to nature.' Note the equivalence of 'good and evil' with 'spirit and matter.'

mandala symbols, whose significance as symbols of unity and totality is amply confirmed by history and empirical psychology. Wholeness confronts the subject in an a priori fashion through these images. In fact, unity and totality stand at the highest point on the scale of objective values in that their symbols cannot be distinguished from the *imago Dei*.

Why do these symbols have this value? 'Experience shows that individual mandalas are symbols of order, and that they occur in patients principally during times of psychic disorientation or reorientation. As magic circles they bind and subdue the lawless powers belonging to the world of darkness, and depict or create an order that transforms the chaos into a cosmos.'[52] The integration of the meaning of these symbols is painstaking work, for the disorientation of the psyche usually means that many projections must be withdrawn before the symbol can be realized. Feeling as a function of value is attached to these symbols, and only when it enters into the judgment passed on their meaning is the subject affected by the process of experiencing them.

In discussing the self in the context of the Christian aeon, Jung is preoccupied by the saturation of Christian tradition with premonitions of the conflict of Christ and Antichrist. He finds parallels to this conflict in 'the dechristianization of our world, the Luciferian development of science and technology, and the frightful material and moral destruction left behind by the Second World War.'[53] Christ is still, says Jung, the living myth of our culture, 'our culture hero, who, regardless of his historical existence, embodies the myth of the divine Primordial Man.'[54] It is Christ who occupies the center of the Christian mandala, Christ whose 'kingdom is the pearl of great price, the treasure buried in the field, the grain of mustard seed which will become a great tree, and the heavenly city.'[55] Christ, then, represents the archetype of the self, a totality of a divine kind, a glorified man, a son of God unspotted by sin, the true image of God after whose likeness our inner man is made.[56] Theologians such as Tertullian, Origen, and Augustine are quoted to substantiate this archetypal interpretation of the symbol of Christ for the Christian psyche. But for these authorities and others, the image of God in us does not reside in the corporeal human being, but in the invisible, incorporeal, incorrupt, and immortal *anima rationalis*. This God image

---

[52] Jung, *Aion* 31-32.

[53] Ibid. 36.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid. 36-37.

[56] Ibid. 37.

was not destroyed by the Fall but only damaged and corrupted, and it can be restored through God's grace. Thus Christian tradition used the language of restoration in its symbols of the self or of the *imago Dei*. The renewal or transformation of the mind (see Romans 12.2) called for in Christian preaching 'is not meant as an actual alteration of consciousness, but rather as the restoration of an original condition, an apocatastasis.'[57] The recognition of the person of Christ is really the recognition of the ever-present archetype of wholeness which had been lost from view or never attended to. This recognition restores an original state of oneness with the God image in the human soul.

For Jung there is no doubt that 'the original Christian conception of the *imago Dei* embodied in Christ meant an all-embracing totality that even includes the animal side of man.'[58] But this image of Christ soon came to lack wholeness, since the dark side of things was excluded from it and made into a Luciferian opponent. The figure of the Redeemer became bright and one-sided. The dark side of the self, the dark half of the human totality, became ascribed to the Antichrist, the devil, evil. The dogmatic figure of Christ was made so sublime and spotless that everything else turned dark beside it, so one-sidedly perfect that it demanded a psychic complement to restore the balance. This complement was provided in Christian doctrine by the figure of Satan as Antichrist.[59]

Jung highlights what he considers a fatality inherent in the perfectionism of the Christian disposition. It leads inevitably, by a necessary psychological law, to a reversal of its spirit.

> The psychological concept of the self, in part derived from our knowledge of the whole man, but for the rest depicting itself spontaneously in the products of the unconscious as an archetypal quaternity bound together by inner antinomies, cannot omit the shadow that belongs to the light figure, for without it this figure lacks body and humanity. In the empirical self, light and shadow form a paradoxical unity. In the Christian concept, on the other hand, the archetype is hopelessly split into two irreconcilable halves, leading ultimately to a metaphysical dualism – the final separation of the kingdom of heaven from the fiery world of the damned.
>
> ... Every intensified differentiation of the Christ-image brings about a corresponding accentuation of its unconscious complement, thereby increasing the tension between above and below.

---

[57] Ibid. 40.

[58] Ibid. 41.

[59] Ibid. 41-43.

> ... The ideal of spirituality striving for the heights was doomed to clash with the materialistic earth-bound passion to conquer matter and master the world. This change became visible at the time of the 'Renaissance.' The word means 'rebirth,' and it referred to the renewal of the antique spirit. We know today that this spirit was chiefly a mask; it was not the spirit of antiquity that was reborn, but the spirit of medieval Christianity that underwent strange pagan transformation, exchanging the heavenly goal for an earthly one, and the vertical of the Gothic for a horizontal perspective (voyages of discovery, exploration of the world and of nature). The subsequent developments that led to the Enlightenment and the French Revolution have produced a worldwide situation today which can only be called 'antichristian' in a sense that confirms the early Christian anticipation of the 'end of time.'[60]

The meaning of the astrological symbol of Pisces, the two opposing fishes, is related to this conflict of Christ and Antichrist in the psychic situation which prevails at the end of this aeon.

> It is as if, with the coming of Christ, opposites that were latent till then had become manifest, or as if a pendulum had swung violently to one side and were now carrying out the complementary movement in the opposite direction. No tree, it is said, can grow to heaven unless its roots reached down to hell. The double meaning of this movement lies in the nature of the pendulum. Christ is without spot, but right at the beginning of his career there occurs the encounter with Satan, the Adversary, who represents the counterpole of that tremendous tension in the world psyche which Christ's advent signified. He is the 'mysterium iniquitatis' that accompanies the 'sol iustitiae' as inseparably as the shadow belongs to the light, in exactly the same way, so the Ebionites and Euchites thought, that one brother cleaves to the other. Both strive for a kingdom: one for the kingdom of heaven, the other for the 'principatus huius mundi.' We hear of a reign of a 'thousand years' and of a 'coming of the Antichrist,' just as if a partition of worlds and epochs had taken place between two royal brothers. The meeting with Satan was therefore more than mere change; it was a link in the chain.[61]

Christian tradition, then, has made Christ into only one-half of the archetype of the self. The other half it has labelled as Antichrist, Satan, evil. 'The Christian

---

[60] Ibid. 42-43.

[61] Ibid. 43-44.

image of the self – Christ – lacks the shadow that properly belongs to it.'[62] Tradition did not allow God or Christ to be a paradox. Christians have thus fallen prey to a false spiritualism which bifurcates the self. They have preferred an ethic of perfection to one of wholeness.[63] They have in fact mistaken one-sidedness for wholeness, for Christ represents the self and Christ is one-sided. By representing Christ as simply good and spiritual, they have placed something evil and material in opposition to him. They have, in fact, equated instinct, the dark side, with evil, while at the same time discountenancing evil as a *privatio boni*, 'a mere diminution of good and thus deprived of substance,' as simply 'the accidental lack of perfection.'[64] But if the self is not exclusively spiritual or light, its shadow turns out to be much less evil or threatening than the Christian tradition has made it out to be. The self includes the light and the dark, and individuation becomes a *mysterium coniunctionis*, a nuptial union of opposite halves.[65] The body acquires a special and, to the traditional Christian, an unexpected and alarming significance. Matter has considerable numinosity in itself, since it is part of the composite which is the totality, the self. Not to recognize this is to split oneself into two halves. The conscious half is identified with Christ, who then becomes an ego ideal rather than an archetypal image of the self. The dark half, regarded as evil, is suppressed or repressed, and, to the extent it remains conscious, is projected outside, so that the world must act out the conflict that is ultimately the moral problem of the individual.

### *2.2 Evil as Substantive*

Jung attributes the spiritualistic perversion that he finds in the Christian tradition to the metaphysical doctrine of evil as a *privatio boni*, which, he claims, was motivated by a desire to avoid both a metaphysical dualism and an attribution of the causality of evil to God, and which for Jung succeeded in doing neither. God for Christian tradition is the *Summum Bonum*, a doctrine which for Jung is a

---

[62] Ibid. 45.

[63] See Erich Neumann, *Depth Psychology and a New Ethic*, trans. Eugene Rolfe (New York: C. G. Jung Foundation, 1969).

[64] Jung, *Aion* 41.

[65] Jung's final study of the individuation process as a *mysterium coniunctionis* appears in a book by that title, vol. 14 in Collected Works of C.G. Jung, trans. R.F.C. Hull, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

product of the 'hybris of the speculative intellect,'[66] and the origin of the later axiom, *Omne bonum a Deo, omne malum ab homine*.[67] Jung has at least three arguments against such notions. The first is a logical argument, namely, that good and evil are a logically equivalent pair of opposites which constitute the premise for any moral judgment. They are 'coexistent halves of a moral judgment' and belong therefore to the realm of human values. We are the authors of human value judgments, but not of the facts submitted to our moral judgment, except in a very limited sense.[68]

The second argument is theological (in the loose sense). Evil is said by Basil to have no substance but to arise from a 'mutilation of the soul,' and yet really to exist. Its relative reality, then, has a ground in a real mutilation which itself must have an equally real cause, even if this be nothing more than carelessness, indifference, and frivolity. To posit such psychic causes does not reduce evil to nothing but shifts it to the plane of psychic reality. The latter is 'very much easier to establish empirically than, say, the reality of the devil in dogma, who according to the authentic sources was not invented by man at all but existed long before he did. If the devil fell away from God of his own free will, this proves firstly that evil was in the world before man, and therefore that man cannot be the sole author of it, and secondly that the devil already had a "mutilated" soul for which we must hold a real cause responsible.'[69]

The third argument is existential, and it concerns our experience of conflicts of duty. Real moral problems result from those situations where we seem to be required to satisfy irreconcilable obligations, where a choice cannot be arrived at by rational discrimination, let alone in dependence on precedent, precepts, and commandments. Such dilemmas are terminated, Jung says, not by a decision, but

---

[66] Jung, *Aion* 46.

[67] Ibid.

[68] 'These facts are called by one person good and by another evil. Only in capital cases is there anything like a *consensus generalis*. If we hold with Basil that man is the author of evil, we are saying in the same breath that he is also the author of good. But man is first and foremost the author merely of judgments; in relation to the facts judged, his responsibility is not so easy to determine. In order to do this, we would have to give a clear definition of the extent of his free will. The psychiatrist knows what a desperately difficult task this is.' Ibid. 47-48.

69 Ibid. 48.

by uncontrollable natural forces. Jung finds psychological benefit and accuracy in attributing such forces to the will of God, in that they ‘ought not to be regarded as an arbitrary wishing and willing, but as absolutes which one must learn how to handle correctly.’[70] ‘God’ is here to be understood in the sense of daimon, that is, of ‘determining power which comes upon man from outside, like providence or fate.’[71] While we can obey or reject the daimon, obedience is more than following one's own opinion, and rejection destroys more than one's own invention.[72] There are evils necessarily concomitant upon the resolution of all conflicts of duty, and if it is true that the resolution of such conflicts is due to the will of God, then these evils must be ascribed to God as to their cause.

Jung prefers to the Christian doctrine of God as *Summum Bonum*, then, the Gnostic conceptions of good and evil as, respectively, the right and left hands of God, with the right hand pertaining to rationality and the masculine, and the left hand to emotionality and the feminine. While the Christian notion of *privatio boni* took hold in the struggle against Manichean dualism, the Gnostic conception of the reality of evil does not endanger the unity of God. Jung is also sympathetic with the Ebionite notion of the two sons of God, the elder being Satan, and the younger Christ. ‘Only with Christ did a devil enter the world as the real counterpart of God.’[73]

## 3 Toward a Metascience of Depth Psychology: The Orders of Elemental Symbolism

Christ and Satan are treated by Jung as archetypal symbols, on the same plane as, for example, the royal king and queen of alchemical lore who symbolize the androgynous nature of the psyche, or the golden flower of Taoist literature which Jung interprets as symbolizing the wholeness of individuated life.[74] Archetypal symbols are taken from nature and imitate nature, albeit in a generic and highly

---

[70] Ibid. 27.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Ibid.

73 Ibid. 61.

74 For the royal pair, see inter alia Jung, *Mysterium Coniunctionis*. For the Taoist symbolism of the golden flower, see Jung, ‘Commentary on “The Secret of the Golden Flower,”’ esp. 22-25.

associative manner. They reflect a wholeness in nature, and can effect a wholeness in us insofar as we are nature. When Christ and Satan are understood as archetypal symbols, both are necessarily incomplete, for one is light and the other darkness. Neither reflects a wholeness in nature such as is symbolized in the nuptial *coniunctio* or in the golden flower rooted in the earth but displaying its singular perfection to the world of light and sun and air. On the archetypal level, only a conjunction of Christ and Satan would seem to reflect the wholeness of nature that comes to expression in the associative clusters of archetypal symbols. They need one another if they are adequately to represent the self, the wholeness, that is the goal of the individuation process. Christ for Jung is necessarily inadequate as a symbol of the self or Anthropos, for he is without sin and darkness. Only the reconciliation of God's two sons, of the hostile divine brothers, of the warring fishes who constitute the sign of Pisces which has prevailed over the Christian aeon, will provide the symbolization of individuated totality that will satisfy Jung's postulate of a progressive reconciliation of opposites cumulatively heading toward the realization of the self.

Jung's speculation is more developed in an earlier work, 'A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity,'[75] where the Trinity is presented as an incomplete symbol, lacking the fourth element which could make it whole. The fourth element is the devil, the dark or evil side of God. The fuller implications of such a position are revealed in Jung's perhaps most controversial work, 'Answer to Job.'[76] While Jung begs his reader to pay attention to a preface in which he assures us that he is writing not theology but psychology, the work cannot be ignored by the theological community. Statements such as the following reflect Jung's passionate convictions concerning what constitutes adequate symbolizations of the deity.

---

[75] C.G. Jung, 'A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity,' in *Psychology and Religion: West and East*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, vol. 11 in Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969) 107-200.

[76] C.G. Jung, 'Answer to Job,' in ibid. 355-470. Marie-Louise von Franz tells us that this was the work of Jung's which satisfied him the most; that he would rewrite all the others if he could, but would leave this one as it is. If this is true, it provides us with a significant hermeneutical key to the interpretation of Jung's entire corpus. See von Franz, *C.G. Jung: His Myth in Our Time* 161. On the supposition that 'Answer to Job' so successfully expresses what Jung wanted to say, von Franz's book may well be as accurate a reflection of the final meaning of Jung's work as we have available to us at present.

> Job ... was an ordinary human being, and therefore the wrong done to him, and through him to mankind, can, according to divine justice, only be repaired by an incarnation of God in an empirical human being. This act of expiation is performed by the Paraclete; for, just as man must suffer from God, so God must suffer from man. Otherwise there can be no reconciliation between the two.[77]

Again:

> Redemption or deliverance has several important aspects, the most important of which is the expiation wrought by Christ's sacrificial death for the misdemeanours of mankind. His blood cleanses us from the evil consequences of sin. He reconciles God with man and delivers him from the divine wrath, which hangs over him like doom, and from eternal damnation. It is obvious that such ideas still picture God the father as the dangerous Yahweh who has to be propitiated. The agonizing death of his own son is supposed to give him satisfaction for an affront he has suffered, and for this 'moral injury' he would be inclined to take a terrible vengeance. Once more we are appalled by the incongruous attitude of the world creator towards his creatures, who to his chagrin never behave according to his expectations. It is as if someone started a bacterial culture which turned out to be a failure. He might curse his luck, but he would never seek the reason for the failure in the bacilli and want to punish them morally for it. Rather, he would select a more favorable culture medium. Yahweh's behaviour towards his creatures contradicts all the requirements of so-called 'divine' reason whose possession is supposed to distinguish men from animals. Moreover, a bacteriologist might make a mistake in his choice of a culture medium, for he is only human. But God in his omniscience would never make mistakes if only he consulted with it. He has equipped his human creatures with a modicum of consciousness and a corresponding degree of free will, but he must also know that by so doing he leads them into the temptation of falling into a dangerous independence. But Yahweh is forgetting his son Satan, to whose wiles even he occasionally succumbs. How then could he expect man with his limited consciousness and imperfect knowledge to do any better? He also overlooks the fact that the more consciousness a man possesses the more he is separated from his instincts (which at least give him an inkling of the hidden wisdom of God) and the more prone he is to error. He is certainly

---

[77] Jung, 'Answer to Job' 414.

> not up to Satan's wiles if even his creator is unable, or unwilling, to restrain this powerful spirit.[78]

Again:

> To believe that God is the Summum Bonum is impossible for a reflecting consciousness.[79]

Again:

> The inner instability of Yahweh is the prime cause not only of the creation of the world, but also of the pleromatic drama for which mankind serves as a tragic chorus. The encounter with the creature changes the creator.[80]

Again:

> Yahweh's decision to become man is a symbol of the development that had to supervene when man becomes conscious of the sort of God-image he is confronted with. God acts out of the unconscious of man and forces him to harmonize and unite the opposing influences to which his mind is exposed from the unconscious. The unconscious wants both: to divide and to unite. In his striving for unity, therefore, man may always count on the help of a metaphysical advocate, as Job clearly recognized. The unconscious wants to flow into consciousness in order to reach the light, but at the same time it continually thwarts itself, because it would rather remain unconscious. That is to say, God wants to become man, but not quite. The conflict in his nature is so great that the incarnation can only be bought by an expiatory self-sacrifice offered up to the wrath of God's dark side.
>
> At first, God incarnated his good side in order, as we may suppose, to create the most durable basis for a later assimilation of the other side. From the promise of the Paraclete we may conclude that God wants to become wholly man; in other words, to reproduce himself in his own dark creature (man not redeemed from original sin) ... The incarnation in Christ is the prototype which is continually being transferred to the creature by the Holy Ghost.[81]

---

[78] Ibid. 414-15.

[79] Ibid. 419.

[80] Ibid. 428.

[81] Ibid. 456-57.

Here too Jung expresses his enthusiasm for the dogma of the bodily assumption of the Virgin Mary into heaven, since it reveals, he believes, the integration of matter and femininity, and thus of the dark side, into the Godhead.

What we have said, then, of Jung's treatment of the symbolic significance of Christ may also be said of that of the Trinity. If the symbol of a triune God is treated on the archetypal plane, and thus as a symbol taken from nature and imitating nature, it is necessarily a symbol of incompleteness. It seeks its fourth, for quaternity does indeed seem to be the numeric symbolism of natural wholeness, which finds its expression in rotary and cyclical movements which are usually divided into four phases.[82]

David Burrell has accepted the archetypal incompleteness of Trinitarian symbolism, but has proposed a different 'rounding off' from that postulated by Jung, one which would also affect the evaluation of the symbolic significance of Christ as archetype of the self.

> So far as the Christian symbol of the Trinity is concerned, it does in fact seem to invite a fourth member. Christian tradition holds out the missing place to be filled by each one who is adopted into sonship ... Without denying that trinity is symbolically inferior to quaternity, one can see in the deficient symbol of the Trinity a way of displaying the fact that the Christian revelation is not a mere announcement but an invitation. God presents himself as lacking what only the faithful respondent can fill. Or more explicitly yet, what only the community of the faithful can make up for, as it fills out 'the fullness of him who fills the whole creation' (Eph 1.23).[83]

The question faced by neither Burrell nor Jung is whether archetypal symbols, that is, symbols of wholeness taken from and imitating nature, are to be treated as criteria for judging the symbolic adequacy of statements about the divine. It is clear, I believe, that for Jung the divine is to be found within nature, and exclusively there, and is to be liberated from the darkness of matter in the form of the divine Anthropos, the image of man which unites good and evil, spirit and matter, masculine and feminine. The drama of redemption is reversed: we redeem God from unconsciousness more radically than God redeems us from sin. Jung's own personal belief is revealed in posthumously published lecture notes compiled by disciples and entitled 'Is Analytical Psychology a Religion? Notes on a Talk

---

[82] See Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957) 160.

[83] David Burrell, *Exercises in Religious Understanding* 231.

given by C.G. Jung.'[84] In these notes dating from 1937 Jung reveals affinities with the later radical theology of Thomas J.J. Altizer, who, it is significant, wrote his doctoral dissertation on Jung. One quotation will suffice:

> Life has gone out of the churches, and it will never go back. The gods will not reinvest dwellings that once they have left. The same thing happened before, in the time of the Roman Caesars, whose paganism was dying. According to legend, the captain of a ship passing between two Greek islands heard a great sound of lamentation and a loud voice crying: *Pan megistos ethneken*, Great Pan is dead. When this man reached Rome he demanded an audience with the emperor, so important was his news. Originally Pan was an unimportant nature spirit, chiefly occupied with teasing shepherds; but later, as the Romans became more involved with Greek culture, Pan was confused with *to pan*, meaning the All. He became the demiurgos, the *anima mundi*. Thus the many gods of paganism were concentrated into one God. Then came this message. 'Pan is dead.' Great Pan, who is God, is dead. Only man remains alive. After that the one God became one man, and this was Christ; one man for all. But now that too is gone, now every man has to carry God. The descent of spirit into matter is complete.[85]

On such an assumption, of course, only symbols taken from nature and imitating nature can reflect the wholeness of the All that is God. There is no further dimension of symbolism beyond the archetypal, for there is nothing further to be symbolized. What is to be done is to win through to the wholeness that can make one a carrier of God, of a quadripartite God in whom evil is as real and as effective as good. At this point Jung brings us into theological difficulties of the greatest import for the life of religion, difficulties not unlike those experienced in the earliest centuries of the Christian church. How is the Christian theologian to meet these difficulties?

It will not do, I believe, in this day and age for the theologian simply to declare that symbolic thinking must give way to the analogical thinking of metaphysics when one intends to speak in a scientific manner about the divinity and Christian revelation. Nor is it even sufficient, though certainly it is appropriate, to point to the implicit realism of scriptural imagery, a realism which in the course

---

[84] 'Is Analytical Psychology a Religion? Notes on a Talk given by C.G. Jung,' in *Spring: An Annual of Archetypal Psychology and Jungian Thought* (1972) 144-48.

[85] Ibid. 146-47.

of theological development eventually, indeed within three centuries, achieved expression in propositions which transcended imaginative representation and, because of this transcendence, were able to clarify doctrinal questions in a way that symbolic thinking could never do.[86] I do not wish to deny the place of metaphysics in theology[87] nor to play down the significance of the emergence of an explicit though noncritical realism concomitant with the development of the Trinitarian and Christological doctrines. Such systematic and historical emphases could well show that, on many issues, Jung has begged the question or entirely missed the point, and more radically could demonstrate the need of a rigorous maieutic to control the vagaries of symbolic thought. But I wish to suggest that this maieutic must be more in keeping with the realm of interiority upon whose symbolic manifestations Jung has done so much to open us by his painstaking and courageous explorations of the labyrinthine paths of psyche. There is an emerging control of meaning in terms not of theory or system or metaphysics but of interiority,[88] and Jung has made no small contribution to its elaboration. His contribution, however, does not adequately account for the fact that human interiority is not only psyche but also and primarily intentionality; namely, a capacity for self-transcendence in knowing, doing, and religion, a capacity whose fulfilment alone constitutes authentic selfhood. Intentionality and psyche are distinct dimensions of interiority, and this twofold constitution must inform any adequate symbols of the self. Moreover, it is intentionality analysis that provides the basic framework for the integration of psyche into the new maieutic. The theologian's principal problem in confronting Jung is one of method.

I am suggesting, then, that archetypal psychology is transformed when it is sublated by intentionality analysis, but that the sublation and transformation do not remove from psychology its own intrinsic explanatory power. By this power

---

[86] See Bernard Lonergan, 'The Origins of Christian Realism,' in *A Second Collection*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971) 239-61; more fully his *De Deo trino*, I. *Pars Dogmatica* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1964) 15-112 [*The Triune God: Doctrines*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, vol. 11 in Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011) 24-255].

[87] See Bernard Lonergan, *Philosophy of God, and Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973).

[88] On the notion of the control of meaning, see Bernard Lonergan, 'Dimensions of Meaning' (*Collection: Papers by Bernard Lonergan*, ed. F.E. Crowe (New.York: Herder and Herder, 1967) 252-267.

symbolic terms and relations are fixed by one another at the symbolic level itself, without the need for moving into a nonsymbolic realm of discourse to achieve explanatory existential or theological significance, even though the possibility of this metaphysical transposition remains intact.[89] Intentionality analysis will result in a transformed science of depth psychology, and the changes it will introduce on Jung's notion of the self and hence of the symbolic significance of the person of Christ for the human psyche are enormous.

This reconstruction of depth psychology will reveal among other things that there are three and not two orders of elemental psychic symbols: personal, archetypal, and anagogic. The difference and relations among these three orders of symbols are best understood from a clarification of the notion of the unconscious.

Bernard Lonergan has indicated that 'the unconscious' frequently is used to refer to what is or has been conscious but not objectified.[90] This aspect of subjectivity, I believe, would better be called 'the undifferentiated.' But what is truly unconscious is all energy in the universe that is not present to itself, the energy that emerges into new forms in accord with emergent probability, but not in accord with the potentially intelligent emergent probability that is human consciousness.[91] Proximately to consciousness, this energy takes the form of neural-physiological process in the body. More remotely, it is universal energy, the entire nonconscious cosmos.

Energy begins to become conscious when it becomes psychic energy, and the latter emerges in the dream. With Jung, we may distinguish between the ego or differentiated consciousness of the subject and the totality of subjectivity, the self. The latter is a triple compound, however, of differentiated consciousness, the twilight of what is conscious but not objectified, and the strictly unconscious energy of neural-physiological process. These constitute the limits of the self at any time. When neural-physiological energy enters into consciousness in the dream, a portion of the strictly unconscious dimension of the self has become conscious. Its symbolic language may be personal. The personal unconscious includes repressed elements as well as elements that have never been conscious in either a differentiated or undifferentiated fashion. As the personal unconscious of an

---

[89] My argument is given in some detail in my *Subject and Psyche*.

[90] Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1972) 34.

[91] On emergent probability, see Bernard Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1957) 123-128; Collected Works edition, vol. 3 in Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992) 144-51; on intelligent emergent probability, ibid. 209-11/234-37.

intelligent subject, it is permeated by intelligence. Its revelations will frequently appear as insightful commentaries on the waking life of the subject.

Other dreams, properly referred to as archetypal, will reflect more universal and generalizable motifs of personal development and decline. The symbols of these dreams are taken from and imitate nature, and are thus archetypal. The energy from which these dreams emerge is what constitutes 'nature' and is also what alone should be called the collective or, better, impersonal or objective or cosmic unconscious. It is the potency also for some of the dreams that are synchronistic with or prophetic of outer events.

Finally, there are certain dreams, recorded I trust in the annals of all the higher religions, that can be said to originate with an experienced directness from the absolute limit of the process of going beyond that is God. Such dreams are hermeneutic of the divine call to an ever more converted mode of living or to the execution of specific tasks. In them, the energy that is the cosmic and then the personal unconscious is the transparent medium of creative and redemptively healing power. The symbols of such dreams are anagogic. They are not so much mimetically emergent from within nature or energy or history, as the whole meaning of nature, energy, and history is contained within them[92] and is offered in a revelatory fashion to the consciousness of the dreaming subject as his or her ultimate dramatic context of existence. These dreams are no longer a mere commentary on life or imitation of nature; they are rather the context or system of relationships that constitutes the ineffable mystery that is the final meaning of existence, the context within which all of life is contained and which now offers itself to the subject in the form of a concrete call. Intentionality analysis will reveal that there is a totality of meaning about such symbols that reflects the final limit of the dialectic of human desire, the dialectic between unconditional love or universal willingness and cosmic hate, the dialectic that is at once the final and the basic option of every human subject. Joseph Flanagan, to whom I am indebted for introducing me to Northrop Frye's distinction between archetypal and anagogic symbolic meaning, remarks that 'in the anagogic phase of meaning, a single symbol can become so concentrated in meaning as to contain within itself an unlimited feeling of desire or dread. The classical examples of this in the Western literary universe are the symbols of Christ and Satan.'[93] If we may still speak of anagogic symbols as the emergence of the unconscious into consciousness, we do so only indirectly, that is, with reference to the psychoid medium of anagogic

---

[92] On anagogic symbolic meaning, see Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* 115-28.

[93] Joseph Flanagan, 'Transcendental Dialectic of Desire and Fear' (paper presented at the 1974 Lonergan Workshop) 78.

dreams and to our own absolutely spiritual unconscious, and not with reference to the first and quite personal agent of such dreams.[94]

Such an account of the unconscious is not sufficient to explain our dreams, however. Coupled with and interlocking in scissors-fashion with energy-become-psychic is a symbolic function that belongs to human intentionality. This symbolic function joins with and constitutes the human psyche as the psyche of a potentially intelligent, reasonable, responsible, agapic, but also incarnate subject, a subject who is within nature but destined for a goal which transcends the whole order of nature or proportionate being. Anagogic symbols witness to the transcendent origin and destiny of such a subject. They express 'a mystery that is at once symbol of the uncomprehended and sign of what is grasped and psychic force that sweeps living human bodies, linked in charity, to the joyful, courageous, wholehearted, yet intelligently controlled performance of the tasks set by a world order in which the problem of evil is not suppressed but transcended.'[95] As symbolizing our 'orientation into the known unknown,' they unlock the transforming dynamism of human sensitivity and `bring it into harmony with the vast but impalpable pressures of the pure desire, of hope, and of self-sacrificing charity.'[96] Intentionality analysis will reveal that the dialectic of good and evil cannot be overcome by an apocatastatic reconciliation of opposites but only by the divine transformation of evil into good that is redemption. Good and evil will not be among the opposites of spirit and matter, or transcendence and limitation,[97] reconciled by psyche, for evil in its roots is basic sin, and basic sin is a non-event that can be understood only by an inverse insight: the only point to the non-self-

---

[94] On the notion of the spiritual unconscious and its relation to the work of Freud and Jung, see Roger Woolger, 'Against Imagination: The Via Negativa of Simone Weil,' *Spring* (1973) 256-72.

[95] Lonergan, *Insight* 723-24/745.

[96] Ibid. 723/744.

[97] See ibid. 469-79/494-504.

transcendence of the potentially self-transcending subject or self is that there is no point to it.[98]

One final point must be added to round off what is nonetheless a very incomplete sketch of a metascience of archetypal psychology. Jung knew, and psychotherapy can bear out, that the joining of spirit and matter in psychic imagery can be destructive as well as constructive, even morally evil as well as good.[99] I find no way in which the vistas opened for us by the work of Jung can be understood in terms of scientific psychology alone. The themes treated by Jung do not find in his work the universal context within which alone they can be understood. We seem to be led by the process of discovery to which Jung introduces us to adopt an explanatory standpoint that is beyond the scientific disengagement of a purely immanent process of subjective psychological development and breakdown. The only adequate horizon for understanding psychic data seems to demand not only the sublation of depth psychology by intentionality analysis but also the sublation of both psychology and method by the process of the discernment of spirits. The triply compounded subject or self (spirit or intentionality, psyche, and matter or limitation) is a participant through intentionality in dimensions of reality that transcend the subject's individuality but that affect the subject's emergence or failure of emergence into authentic selfhood.

Archetypal images, then, are the recurrent and often cyclical symbols taken from nature that enable the transcultural communication of the human drama to take place, the associative clusters that refer to and evoke human action as a whole and especially as it displays the story of a conflict between desire and reality.[100] Anagogic symbols are no longer parts of a whole, however associative and generic, but the containers of the whole of human action, the symbolic correlatives of a religiously transformed universal viewpoint, symbols that seem to be and say (rather than show) or to negate the Logos, the shaping word of the universe and of

---

[98] Several notions are to be distinguished sharply when dealing with the problem of evil. Lonergan, for example, accurately distinguishes moral impotence, basic sin, moral evil, and physical evil. Only basic sin is a *privatio boni* in the sense in which this expression is metaphysically intended to indicate a lack and only a lack. More strictly, it is a non-event where intelligence would expect an event. Jung fails to distinguish the various components that constitute the problem of evil.

[99] See Jung, 'On the Nature of the Psyche' 205-206.

[100] See Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* 104-15.

history.[101] Christ and Satan function, not in an archetypal fashion, so that they need one another, but in a supremely anagogic, and so dialectical, manner for the Christian psyche, and even for the secular psyche of Western people. It is not their coincidence that will symbolize the wholeness that is the destiny of the self, but only the glorious body that had once been overcome by the power of darkness, sin, and death, and that is now raised to life by the transcendent power of the Father.[102] The goal of individuated totality is transcendent, not immanent, and is understood only by a theology that reflects on the living religion that alone enables human subjectivity to emerge from the endless treadmill of self-analysis to which it is diabolically condemned by a psychology that refuses to transcend the realm of rotary, cyclical, quadripartite symbols of the eternal return.[103] This psychology, in insisting on the hegemony of these symbols rather than on that of symbols of liberation from the eternal return, witnesses in its own unique way to the fact that, once God is admitted on intelligent and reasonable grounds, even the intellectual tangles resulting from fundamental counterpositions on the human subject's intentionality are 'not merely a cul-de-sac for human progress,' but a 'reign of sin, a despotism of darkness; and men are its slaves.'[104]

The psyche of the human subject is to be articulated with an intentionality whose natural desire is for the vision of God,[105] but whose potentiality for the actualization of this finality is radically and, within the order of nature, irretrievably disempowered by the surd of basic sin. Individuation is to be reinterpreted as the conversion of the human psyche to participation in the universal willingness that alone expresses the natural finality of subjectivity.

---

[101] See ibid. 115-28.

[102] It may be not insignificant for this discussion that Jungian psychology lacks a developed study of the symbol of Father, a symbol intrinsically related to intentionality as opposed to, but capable of sublating, psyche. The absence of an appreciation for the symbolic significance of Father has also been noted by Laurens van der Post, *Jung and the Story of Our Time* (New York: Random House, 1975) 78-79.

[103] 'There are two fundamental movements of narrative: a cyclical movement within the order of nature, and a dialectical movement from that order into the apocalyptic world above. (The movement to the demonic world below is very rare, because a constant rotation within the order of nature is demonic in itself).' Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* 161-62.

[104] Lonergan, *Insight* 692/714.

[105] See Bernard Lonergan, 'The Natural Desire to See God,' in *Collection* 81-91.

Symbols of the self are, most properly, symbols that reflect the existential status of the total subject at any point in its pilgrimage. But Christ may function indirectly as a symbol of the self in several ways. The Crucified, for example, may be the symbol of the life and truth and love that are victimized by my refusals to be a pure and naked desire for God,[106] and also the symbol of the universal willingness that alone matches the unrestricted character of intentionality's thrust toward total agapic self-transcendence.[107] The Risen One may be the symbol of the self I will be when I know even as I am known. The figure of Satan, on the other hand, may function as the symbol of the radical refusal to be a pure and naked desire for God, and of the self I will be if I continue to deny the truth of who I am. The meeting between Christ and Satan is not a link in the chain of nature's cyclical and rotary movements, but the expression of the final irreconcilability of universal willingness with the non-event of basic sin's refusal to answer the divine call.

Jung's later speculations on alchemical symbolism and his pathological outbursts in 'Answer to Job' reflect the decadence to which the romantic imagination is subject in its last phase, when it refuses to submit in truth and in tautly stretched love to the death-dealing powers of the autumn of life. Frye tells us that a central image of the last or *penseroso* phase of romance is that of 'the old man in the tower, the lonely hermit absorbed in occult or magical studies.'[108] It is as though Jung embodied in his person the entire mythos of romance, but no other mythos, and principally not the apocalyptic mythos whose symbols are anagogic and whose relation to the demonic is not that of potential complementarity but that of dialectic,[109] of the presence or absence of the converted subjectivity that makes its way, in fear and trembling, in the darkness of a repentant faith, but also with the resilience of a hope that has broken through the great mandala, toward the ulterior finality of the self in the direct vision of God.

---

[106] See Sebastian Moore, *The Crucified Jesus is No Stranger* (New York: Seabury, 1977).

[107] On universal willingness, see Lonergan, *Insight* 623-24/646-47.

[108] Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* 202.

[109] The dialectical character of the meaning of Christ and of Satan is studied carefully by Frederick E. Crowe, 'Dialectic and the Ignatian Spiritual Exercises,' *Lonergan Workshop* 1, ed. Frederick Lawrence (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978) 1-26.