

D0179

What are some of these changes?

1. In his later work,

Jung focuses more on the collective background of the psyche.

As he does so,

it becomes more evident to him that the archetype is unfathomable, that the conscious mind can only approximate what is and remains an ultimately superpersonal nucleus of meaning.

The ultimate meaning of the archetype, he says, will never be conscious. It can only be interpreted, and every interpretation necessarily remains hypothetical, and incomplete.

The ultimate core of meaning may be circumscribed, but not clearly and distinctly grasped.

The core of meaning remains unknown,

as though it belongs to another realm than that of nature of interiority.

It always expresses itself in metaphors.

For example,

the content of the dream ^{of the self} may speak of the sun and may identify the sun with the lion, or the king, of the hoard of gold guarded by the dragon, or the power that makes for life and health, yet it is neither the one nor the other, but some unknown third thing that finds more or less adequate expression in these metaphors, yet remains ultimately unknown and not to be fitted into a formula of reason.

2. Yet these metaphors are not unrelated to the conscious life of the individual, even if they cannot be clearly and distinctly intellectualized by the individual.

For they do play a regulating function in the psyche.

They arrange the elements of images;

they stimulate psychic happenings and order them toward the goal of wholeness.

They even seem to have a foreknowledge of the goal.

They are like the hand that guides a crayon or the foot that executes the dance-step. They have a dim foreknowledge of the meaning and pattern of the whole process. They even seem to possess the goal in an a priori fashion.

*

This distance of the organizing factors leads Jung to distinguish the archetype-as-such from the archetypal image.

The archetype-as-such is an essentially ~~f~~ irrepresentable basic form *or pattern*. The images give a ~~sh~~ somewhat definite shape to this form, but the ~~form~~ ^{archetype} as such is not representable, not imaginable.

It is, he says in his later work, a spirit factor in the depth of the psyche which is incapable of being represented in conscious form as it is in itself. Only the images can become conscious, but the images are only expressions of the dark background from which they ~~pp~~ emerge.

3. Jung no longer speaks of the archetype as organically acquired.

Rather its origin is simply unknown.

He says it "entered into the picture with life itself."

He says that he can say nothing about it except that it is given from the beginning. "*Science of the human soul.*"

4. There is in Jung's later work

a unity-in-tension between the organizing activity of the archetypes and the regulating activity of the instincts.

This does not mean, though,

that the images are reduced to biology.

For the archetype is numinous in its effects,

and this numinosity cannot be accounted for in any other terms than spirit.

Thus: ¹⁹¹⁶ "In spite of or perhaps because of its affinity with instinct, the archetype represents the authentic element of spirit."

In this sense,

archetype and instinct are opposites,

as we can see when one compares a man who is ruled by his instinctual drives with a man who is seized by the spirit.

And yet archetype and instinct belong together as complementary to one another, as compensatory to one another, as correspondences.

Neither one is to be derived from the other,

but they subsist side by side as reflections in our own minds of the opposition that underlies all psychic energy.

§.5. The ρ unity-in-tension of archetype and instinct let Jung to postulate that on either end of the psychic spectrum there are two transcendental principles that are quite separate from one another: spirit and instinct. It is their tension that sparks psychic energy, whose goal is to unite them. They are mediated by the archetypal image, ~~the~~ through which spirit becomes incarnate and instinct meaningful and creative.

Jung calls these two factors psychoid; they are quasi-psychic, but they are autonomous from the psyche. Their opposition has in itself no moral significance. Instinct is not in itself bad any more than spirit is good. Both can be both. (The most important two sentences in Jung's entire CW).

Archetypes-as-such are no longer psychic; only archetypal images are. Archetypes-as-such are transcendent principles of spirit determining the orientation of life toward wholeness.

Instinct is called the psychic infra-red, passing over into the physiology of the organism and merging with its chemical and physical conditions; spirit or archetype is called the psychic ultra-violet, a field which exhibits none of the peculiarities of the physiological yet can no longer be regarded as psychic, even though it manifests itself psychically.

Analogous to the archetype as such there is instinct as such. Analogous to spirit as such there is matter as such. The image unites them in the psyche. Through the image spirit becomes incarnate and matter becomes meaningful and conscious. One aspect of the image points upward, the other downward. The image is the concrete synthesis, the unity-in-tension of spirit and matter, of future and past, of teleology and archeology.

(Nov. 29)

A more precise way of understanding instinct and archetype in Jung's later work is to view instinct as the threshold between psyche and matter, and archetype as the threshold between psyche and spirit. Matter and spirit constitute what lies beyond the realm of psyche. Psychic energy is to be geared now toward the unification of matter and spirit. It is to mediate incarnate spirit. The Self now becomes a matter of incarnate spirit, spiritualized matter, through psyche or soul.

Doran: Strictly speaking, it must be admitted that this latter is an interpretation, admittedly Teilhardian and Lonerganian, of the later work of Jung. Jung does not go this far, even in "On the Nature of the Psyche," and the reason is that he does not possess an adequate notion of spirit. Spirit is self-transcendent. It is the originator of questions for meaning, questions for truth, and questions for value. It is what works on matter through psychic energy to produce symbols that enable feeling to be self-transcendent. The notion of self-transcendence is missing in Jung. The Self is not conceived of by Jung as self-transcendent. It is because of his lack of discrimination^{of} spirit that Jung falls into difficulties over the problem of evil. Even in "On the Nature of the Psyche," he makes it clear that instinct and spirit are not respectively equivalent to evil and good. Rather, he says, "both can be both." What remains to be done in Jungian psychology is to articulate what constitutes the manners in which instinct and spirit can be either good or evil. The key to this articulation will be the notion of self-transcendence.

F. Synchronicity

1. Syn- chronistic phenomena

From the hypothesis of the psychoid, Jung could move on to an investigation of phenomena which most other scientific psychology considers at best borderline: the phenomena of parapsychology, extra-sensory perception, astrological correlations, and the I Ching. These phenomena Jung calls synchronistic.

In fact, from 1929 on Jung observed a class of events that appear to point to a direct relation between psyche and matter and began to suspect that physical energy and psychic energy may be two aspects of one and the same underlying reality. He noted, for example, that dream motifs frequently also appear as outer events in a person's life. (eg. of my Boston dream). The connection between inner events and outer events is not causal in the sense of modern physics, but is a connection of a relative simultaneity and a connection of meaning.

He observed also that synchronistic phenomena occurred primarily in situations where psychic energy ψ tended to be intensely activated. He postulated that what occurs in these instances is that an archetype has been constellated, and appears both inside and outside the psyche. The archetype thus becomes conceived as an a priori form of orderedness between spirit and matter. It seems to have the quality of an act of creation. Jung thus speaks of the a priori orderedness of spirit and matter as continuous creation. (debatable)

Synchronistic phenomena thus reveal what Jung regards as the aspect of the archetype which extends into the world of matter. These phenomena are difficult to formulate scientifically in that they are irregular and unpredictable. They elude statistical probabilities. All Jung could say is that nature seems to have a principle of acausal orderedness along with its principle of causality. There are in nature ordered relations for which ^{no} causal explanation exists, in the sense of causality as it is used in modern physics. Synchronicity phenomena are just-so correspondences of something material and something spiritual,, something outer and something inner. [He ^{skip} even goes on to say (as a result of his work with W. Pauli) that there are other examples of acausal orderedness in nature than those he has noticed in psychology: the radioactive period in micro physics, manifesting a certain order but giving no way of determining the time of disintegration of the single particle. But these phenomena may be regular, whereas synchronicity is not;] synchronistic events are unpredictable connections of meaning. In Chinese philosophy they are unmistakable signs of Tao or universal meaning.

In synchronistic events the duality of spirit and matter is overcome in the most complete manner. These events point to an ultimate unity of all existence, which Jung called the unus mundus, the one world. There is an ultimate harmony of opposites that is pointed to by these phenomena.

(Again, I think the matter is more complicated, and will try to indicate my own emerging position on the matter in our last couple of classes).

2. Three further changes in Jung's thought.

Three changes are now introduced in Jung's notion of the nature of the psyche and its process of uniting the opposites. These changes are probably experienced for the most part only in the second half of life.

- a. the collective unconscious is no longer thought of as a body of contents which can become conscious through dreams and can be clarified by the ego, through negotiation. Rather it is now thought of as a form of existence without space and time, as the principle

that renders possible the ultimate unity of the world. It is irrepresentable and does not become conscious except through images, which are only phenomena, effects. It is ultimately independent of human judgment and decision. It is a darkness beyond the categories of the mind, incommensurable to human consciousness, inaccessible to conscious correction and reasoning. Responsible for a certain fatalism that is found in Jung's later work.

- B. Its darkness, ^{however,} is not the darkness of ultimate meaninglessness but of a significance that extends beyond the paltry capacity of ego-consciousness to understand. Ego-consciousness thus becomes even more radically relativized than earlier. This relativization is carried to extremes by some latter-day Jungians, who neglect the still important role of understanding and decision when one is confronted by the archetypes. Jung himself never went this far.

Nonetheless, it may be affirmed that for Jung ego-consciousness now becomes a participant in an ultimately incomprehensible drama, a cosmic drama beyond its powers of rational comprehension and influence. (Fails to see that the Self is also a participant).

- c. The individuation process now demands surrender to this incomprehensible mystery as a pre-condition for entrance into and experience of the unus mundus. This experience is an opening of a window upon eternity. It is the experience of the Self. It extricates a person from the narrow prison of ego-consciousness and opens him to the beyond. But it is only achieved by a surrender that is experienced as a dark night, a surrender of the individual to the mediating role of psyche between instinct and spirit. The ~~sp~~ problem, left unresolved by Jung in his later work, is whether this surrender completely eradicates human freedom. As we shall see, there are many possibilities of union between spirit and matter, for both spirit and instinct can be either good or evil. ^{DOERAN:} Only human freedom and, I believe, faith in an all-good God can tip the balance. With this freedom, trusting in God, one sacrifices the desire of ego-consciousness to control one's destiny. One lets God determine one's destiny. One freely agrees to the vocation God has given one. One finds the meaning of Jesus' saying: He who would save his life will lose it, but he who loses his life for My sake and the sake of the Gospel will find it. One finds his life, yes, but one no longer claims it. Rather, after the sacrifice, one spends the remainder of his days living the "Just so" life, the simple life of gifting and receiving, without claims and demands, without ulterior motives, without desire and fear. In the ideal case, one is brought to what the Buddhists call satori or enlightenment, the Taoists the awakening to the

Sec. 1
160,
Sec. 2,
begins here →

Tao, the Hindu relinquishing the fruits of one's actions, and the Christians mystical union with God in Jesus Christ. One then no longer need fear anything, for one has nothing to gain and nothing to lose. One has lost everything, but one has also gained everything. All one need then do is gratuitously spend one's energy in the simple life of the sharing of insight, while relinquishing all ulterior concerns into the hands of the inaccessible light which is also the dark background of one's individual destiny. *John Donne, The Way of all the Earth.*

This is the potential of Jungian psychology, if only it can deal with the problem of evil. But, unfortunately, it does not deal with this problem, and so the surrender in all too many cases is a pact with evil, even an unsuspecting pact, rather than abandonment into the hands of an all-loving God.

G. The Self and the Critique of Christianity

1. *Under-
standing
the Self.* Today we come to Jung's later attitude toward Christianity. It is an attitude that I will disagree with, mainly because I disagree with his notion of Jesus Christ. I regard Jung's position as a direct consequence of his inadequate position regarding evil, with his failure to emphasize the important of ^{faith and} the disengagement of spirits in the latter stages of the individuation process, and thus with the indiscriminate nature of the surrender of ego-consciousness to the cosmic drama of spirit and matter that transcends the limits of the human psyche and yet in which the human psyche is a participant. Perhaps there is no better way to bring out the Christian position on the meaning of Jesus Christ than to contrast it with Jung's. At least I have found no better way to clarify it for myself.

The approach we will take is through a discussion of Jung's position on the archetype of the Self.

Jung calls the archetype of the Self "the archetype which it is most important for modern man to understand." (Aion, p. 266). The Self is no abstract idea. It is initially empirical in that it is what is anticipated by the psyche in the form of spontaneous or autonomous symbols of unity, totality, and centredness. But it is empirical also in the sense of the unus mundus as experienced reality, in the sense of the experience of the progressive reconciliation of the opposites of matter and spirit in the psyche by the transforming power of archetypal images or elemental symbols. The intellect can understand the symbols of the Self without the individual being changed by them; but this is not the sense in which Jung is speaking of understanding the Self. He is speaking of an understanding permeated by feeling, an understanding that is empirically rooted not just in an anticipation but in an ongoing realization. For such an understanding of the Self, one must accept one's unconscious, one's shadow, one's anima or animus--for all of these are aspects of the totality that is the Self. And these are aspects modern man is least willing to accept.

2. *The
Scientific
Status of
the Notion
of the Self.*

It was only toward the middle of the 1920's that Jung made the notion of the Self the focus of his psychology. In a description of 1928, he spoke of the Self as "strange to us and yet so near, wholly ourselves and yet unknowable, a virtual centre of so mysterious a constitution that it can ~~not~~ claim anything--kinship with beasts and gods, with crystals and with stars--without moving us to wonder, without even exciting our disapprobation."

At this time, too, he clarifies the scientific status of the notion of the Self by referring to it as "a construct that serves to express an unknowable essence which we cannot grasp as such, since by definition it transcends our powers of comprehension."

The Self is both the beginning of psychic life and the goal toward which it is oriented. All symbols of the self are experienced as a central point, a point that does not coincide with the ego. In fact, Jung says, "the self has as much to do with the ego as the sun with the earth." As the Copernican revolution in astronomy involved a cosmological decentering of man's self-understanding regarding his place in the universe, so the psychological revolution begun by Freud and continued by Jung involves a decentering of the home and origin of meaning, away from ego-consciousness to the dark reaches of the unconscious, and, with Jung, ultimately to the mid-point which is also a totality, the Self.

The Self, then, is "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." Sensing (not knowing) the self is in this way the goal of individuation.

In 1928, Jung said that his psychological inquiry must come to a step with the idea of the Self, for such an idea is "a transcendental postulate which, although justifiable psychologically does not allow of scientific proof." The idea of the Self is thus "a step beyond science," but one which is "an unconditional requirement of the psychological development I have sought to depict, because without this postulate I could give no adequate formulation of the psychic processes that occur empirically. At the very least, therefore, the self can claim the value of an hypothesis analogous to that of the structure of the atom."

Symbols of the self have another quality besides that of center, and that is the aspect of totality. The Self is the wholeness of consciousness and unconscious, the point of reference for the fragments of the psyche, for complexes, for archetypal images.

In his later work, however, Jung refers to the notion of the Self, not as a step beyond science, but as a scientific postulate. But it is a transcendental scientific postulate: i.e., "it presupposes the existence of unconscious factors on empirical grounds," and is postulated as the condition of the possibility of these factors. In itself it remains ultimately unknowable. It is a working hypothesis.

3. The Archetype of the Self in the Contemporary Age.

Why is the Self the archetype which it is most important for modern man to understand? Jung maintains that there is a change occurring in the psychic situation of the "Christian aeon," and that the notion of the Self crystallizes this change and contains a potential contribution to the birth of a new aeon in human history. Jung puts synchronistic stock in the fact that astrologically Pisces is the concomitant of 2000 years of Christian development, and that the emergent symbol of the Age of Aquarius is Anthropos. Symbolically, this change will mean an alteration in the Christ-image, which up to now, and through the age of Pisces has been inadequate, Jung says, to the task of liberating the "true man." So too, in the East, the Buddha-image has proven unable to protect against the invasion of materialistic and totalitarian ideology.

Why is this the case? For Jung it is because these images of Christ and the Buddha are both too spiritualistically one-sided to be able to represent wholeness adequately. They are lacking in darkness and in bodily and material reality. Von Franz says that 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."

4. Christ as Archetype of the Self, according to Jung.

Jung's book, Aion, discusses the relations between the traditional Christ-figure and the natural symbols of wholeness or of the Self. First, symbols of unity and totality are the highest in value, because they cannot be distinguished from the image of God in the human soul. They are invested with such value because they are symbols of order and occur principally in times of psychic disorientation and reorientation, bringing order out of chaos.

How are these symbols of the Self related to the image of Christ? Christ is still, says Jung, the living myth of our culture, "our culture here and now, regardless of his historical existence, embodies the myth of the divine Primordial Man." Christ occupies the centre of the Christian mandala; it is 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, the heavenly city. Christ, then, has represented for Christians the

archetype of the Self, the true image of God, after whose likeness our inner image is made. But Jung finds that the image of God in Christianity has always or almost always been identified with the invisible, incorporeal, incorrupt, immortal rational soul. And this he finds distasteful. He is convinced that it was not originally the case, that the original Christian conception of the image of God embodied in Christ meant an all-embracing totality that even includes the animal side of man, so that originally the recognition of Christ as an archetype of the Self was valid. But the Christ-image, very early in Christian tradition and even in some of the NT writings, came to lack wholeness, says Jung, since there was excluded from it the dark side of things. Everything dark was turned into the devil, an opponent of the God-image. Christ became a symbol of the ego rather than of the Self. He became too bright and one-sided. The dark side of the human totality became ascribed to the Antichrist, the devil, evil. Christ came to be conceived as without shadow, and thus without body and humanity. But in the notion of the self, light and shadow must form a paradoxical unity. For Jung the Christian concept splits the archetype of the Self into a hopeless dualism. The complement to the perfection of Christ became, not another element in Christ himself, but the figure of Satan as Antichrist, who now came to be the archetype of matter and instinct, just as Christ became the archetype of spirit.

What does this mean for the Christian psyche? It means that the portion of the totality that was excluded from the image of the Self as identified with Christ has not been integrated into the psyche. Christianity has become an enemy of matter and thus of individuation, which seeks to integrate matter with spirit. It has bifurcated the Self. But matter is itself invested with a numinous significance that Christianity has in general overlooked. ^(Teilhard) By neglecting it, Christianity has projected into the world a conflict between spirit and matter than can only be resolved in the psyche of the individual. Christianity is almost held responsible ~~for~~ the dechristianization of our world, for the overweening development of science and technology, for the frightful material and moral destruction of Europe in the wake of the Second World War.

For Jung, then, Christian tradition has made Christ into only one-half of the archetype of the Self. The other half it has labelled as Antichrist, Satan, evil. ^(over) ~~But what does Jung do with this? (Up to now, some of what he says is quite valid, though I would deny that the main stream~~

Christianity has never identified Satan with matter).

*Christ Archetype
Psychology*

*- fill this out in lecture Both
Case for both*

What Jung wants is that we revise our notions, that we see Christ & Satan as two halves of a total symbol of wholeness, which is also an image of God. He prefers the symbolic expression of the Ebionites, acc. to wh.

Satan & Christ are both sons of God. He wants us to establish a reconciliation betw. them by integrating good & evil in ourselves. He hints that, as we do this, we will be redeeming God from his own inner division. He suggests that we introduce Satan into the Godhead, so that God becomes whole (four) and not incomplete (three).

5. Questions posed to Jung:

The following are some questions I would like to pose to Jung on the basis of my interpretation of his thought on this point.

Is he accurately reflecting Christian doctrine?

Has Christian doctrine ever identified matter and the body with evil?

Is it accurate to say that Satan is for Christians a representative of matter, and Christ of spirit?

Is it not more accurate to say that Christ is the symbol par excellence, the incarnate symbol, of the unification of spirit and matter?

Is it not more true of Christian doctrine that it has recognized that neither spirit nor matter is in itself evil? That both can be both?

Is it not true that Satan for Christians is not matter but spirit?

Isn't it Jung who is falling into the trap of identifying matter with evil, and so of identifying the unity of spirit and matter with the unity of good and evil?

Isn't it more accurate to say that any integration of spirit and matter can be either good or evil?

Isn't it then true that good-evil ~~but~~ must be sharply distinguished from spirit-matter?

Aren't Spirit + matter contraries, while good and evil are contradictories, the presence and absence of an orientation to self-transcendence.

6. Archetypal and Anagogic Symbols.