

REVISIONING INCARNATION: JUNG ON THE RELATIVITY OF GOD.

John P. Dourley.

JUNG'S NATURALISM AND RADICAL CONTAINMENT

Jung understands the psyche, taken in its totality, to be the sole source of human experience. Even the apparently objective basis of the world of sensation is mediated through ‘...psychic images...’¹. Jung must be taken at face value when he makes the blatant metaphysical statement, ‘Not only does the psyche exist, it is existence itself’². In particular the student of religion or of psychology interested in the origins of religious experience must take these epistemological remarks with a deep-seated seriousness when Jung goes on to deny in these passages the reality of an ‘...Archimedean point...’ external to the psyche which could address the psyche from beyond itself³.

Jung’s rejection of the epistemic possibility of any agency addressing the psyche from beyond the psyche discredits the biblical imagination foundational to all forms of orthodox monotheism. The scriptural imagination of the diverse One and Only Gods of biblical repute jointly frame the relation of the divine to the human as that of a wholly other and self-sufficient God first creating and then

¹ Citations from the Collected Works, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton: Princeton University Press), will be cited by essay name or title of the Collected Work followed by CW number, paragraph and page. Jung, ‘Psychology and Religion’, CW 11, par. 16, p. 12.

² Ibid., par. 18, p. 12.

addressing and saving humanity from a position somehow transcendent to it. Though he waffles on the issue, the burden of Jung's extensive writing on religion effectively denies the ontological reality of the transcendent One and Only Gods of the variant monotheisms and the supernatural world from which they arbitrarily invade the human in creative and redemptive enterprise.⁴ Such moments of unbidden grace reduce grace to the gratuitous. They divest the divine of all compulsion, self-interest or completion in relation to the human as they divest the human and creation of any need by the divine and so of any ultimate meaning.

While Jung's psychology undermines the ontological reality of biblical monotheistic divinities and, indeed, of all divinity understood to exist beyond the psyche, Jung equally rejects the possibility of a religion-free humanity. On empirical grounds⁵ he claims to identify in humanity universal an '...authentic religious function in the unconscious'.⁶ This function produces the experience of the divinities and, through such experience, their oft conflicting communities with an insistence humanity can neither escape nor easily bring into its service. Putting Jung's paradox as succinctly as possible, religion has no referent beyond the psyche, can and does kill fluently and is humanly unavoidable.

Framing Jung's challenge to human religiosity in these terms, does not involve Jung in a contradiction. The logic of his psychology consistently affirms that the only legitimate and inevitable form of transcendence is intra-psyche, located in the transcendence of the archetypal psyche to its spokesperson, the ego, at once creature and redeemer of its archetypal origin. For Jung humanity is only now becoming aware that the divinities which the psyche has created and allowed to

³ Ibid.

⁴ Cf. Dourley, 'Recalling the Gods: A Millennial Process', 23-35 and 'In the Shadow of the Monotheisms: Jung's Conversations with Buber and White', 125-145.

⁵ On Jung's empiricism and denial of metaphysics cf., Dourley, "Jung and Metaphysics: A Dubious Disclaimer" 15-24.

escape its containment must now be identified as creations of the psyche and recalled to their psychic origin where humanity can consciously deal with them with ethical responsibility, in the case of the monotheisms, for the first time in their history. Jung makes the evolutionary necessity of such recall of the monotheistic Gods explicit when he writes, ‘It was only quite late that we realized (or rather, are beginning to realize) that God is reality itself and therefore – last but not least – man. This realization is a millennial process.’⁷ Indeed, in Jung’s view the recall of the Gods to the containment of their psychic origins was anticipated as early as the book of Job and once under way defied any ‘...saving formula which would rescue the monotheistic conception of God from disaster.’⁸

This recalling of the Gods to their psychogenetic origin and the responsibility of dealing with them there is the defining characteristic and psychological culmination of Jung’s psychology as it touches on religion. As the only resource for human consciousness, the psyche creates the experience even of the divine. Like Otto, and much of twentieth century religionist thought, Jung equates the experience of divinity with the experience of ‘...the numinosum...’⁹. Unlike Otto the origin and referent of the experience of the numinous is not, for Jung, a ‘wholly other God’. Rather archetypal energy and imagery creative of the religious experience itself works in the interests of the personal integration of the individual in whom it occurs. Through the transformation of the individual thus addressed the archetypal contributes to the enhancement of the consciousness of the collectivity.

Contained within the natural psyche, the substance of the commerce between humanity and divinity is that between consciousness and its intra-psychic creator

⁶ Jung, ‘Psychology and Religion’, CW 11, par. 3, p. 6.

⁷ Jung, ‘Answer to Job’, CW 11, par. 631, p. 402.

⁸ Ibid., par. 607, p. 385.

⁹ Jung, ‘Psychology and Religion’, CW 11, par. 6, p. 7. Jung cites Otto's The Idea of the Holy in fn. 1.

seeking redemption in its creature, the ego. Jung's sense of radical containment, then, confines the dialogue between the human and the divine to the immediate dialogue of consciousness with its source within the psyche. Jung explicitly extends this confinement to mystical experience as the primordial form of religious experience. "Mystics are people who have a particularly vivid experience of the processes of the collective unconscious. Mystical experience is experience of archetypes."¹⁰ Such experience is for Jung both natural and intra-psychic. Thus understood the experience defeats any distinction between the natural and supernatural in the interests of Jung's vastly extended psychic naturalism.

REVISIONING INCARNATION

Within the context of radical containment incarnation takes on a wholly new meaning. It no longer describes the invasion of the human by supernatural divinities at their pleasure addressing humanity through patriarch, prophet, judge, messiah or the communities established in their wake. Nor can the reality of incarnation be limited to rather exceptional, indeed, on occasion, unique human beings. Rather incarnation becomes the process of the unconscious becoming progressively conscious in humanity and so engages all. Incarnation becomes a never completed, yet culminating, moment in a dialectical process involving the birth of consciousness from the Great Goddess, the unconscious, and the recurring death of consciousness into her in the interest of her ever greater redemption in her child, human consciousness. The self presides over the process in cooperative reciprocity with and dependence on the ego, the sole source of discerning reason in the universe, now vested with the vocation of luring its matrix into ever greater incarnation through her progressive expression and self-realization in history.

¹⁰ Jung, 'The Tavistock Lectures', CW 18, par. 218, p. 98.

This intra-psychoic dialectic, taken in all its moments, Jung terms “individuation”, the core dynamic in his understanding of the psyche. Jung provides one of his most vivid portrayals of the process through the prism of his alchemical work. Its ultimate deviation from orthodox monotheistic thought lies in his conception of God as the “filius philosophorum”,¹¹ God as the son or creature of the alchemical philosopher. In Jung’s usage the phrase describes a process in which God and humanity create each other in one organic movement contained within the psyche. From its precedence as creator of the ego the self is ‘...something which existed before the ego and is in fact its father or creator and also its totality’.¹² This side of the dialectic is compatible with monotheistic imagery of a God external to the psyche creating humanity and human consciousness from beyond, though, for Jung, even this movement simply describes the emergence of the ego from the unconscious.

The second moment in this dialectic offends monotheistic imagery and is incompatible with it. For this second moment describes the incarnation of the self in ego consciousness worked by the ego’s response to the need of the self to become conscious in it. The self is then a child of the ego’s efforts to usher it into consciousness. Writes Jung, ‘This is why the alchemists called their incorruptible substance – which means precisely the self – the filius philosophorum’¹³. In these words Jung is effectively saying that the ego’s role in its reciprocity with the self is to proffer to the self a needed cooperation without which the self could not become conscious in humanity and humanity could not become conscious of its native divinity.

¹¹ Jung, ‘Transformation Symbolism in the Mass’, CW 11, par. 400, p. 263.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

As stated the first movement in this cycle is quite in accord with traditional doctrines of creation. Just as an external God is commonly imagined as creating the human, Jung's internalization of this image would have the self giving birth to consciousness as the first moment of individuation. But the second moment in this process is far from traditional and is frankly heretical. For the self as the son of the philosopher, born into the alchemist's consciousness through the alchemist's efforts in the opus, implies, when translated into a religious idiom, that an unconscious God creates consciousness to become conscious in it. Clearly in this second moment divinity is dependent on the efforts of the ego to become conscious or incarnate in consciousness. Such incarnation is the life long opus or goal of alchemical and, for Jung, of all psychic transformation as well as being the psychic basis of the Catholic Mass.¹⁴

In these typical passages Jung not only identifies the major moments of divine/human reciprocity as the core of the natural individuation process, he also contends that humanity is natively aware of the divine urgency to become conscious in its creature. Such urgency becomes the ground meaning of each life at the individual level and of history at the collective level. In this perspective the reality of a self-sufficient and transcendent God redeeming humanity through the conferral of grace, salvation, or privileged status from beyond the human cedes to the myth of the human slowly enticing its both willing but unwilling creator¹⁵ into an ever fuller consciousness realized only in the human. From the perspective of alchemy, and Jung devotes three volumes to it, the process of individuation is in and of itself a religious process whose consequence is to make God progressively conscious or

¹⁴ Jung, Psychology and Alchemy, CW 12, pars. 480 – 489, p. 396 – 406, especially par. 485, p. 404 and par. 489, p. 406 where the opus is mentioned.

¹⁵ Cf. Jung's description of the unwillingness of divinity to become conscious in his 'Answer to Job', CW 11, pars. 595, p. 381; par. 574, p. 372; par. 575, p. 373.

incarnate in humanity through the process of the individual's fuller recovery in consciousness of his or her natural, native and universal divinity.

THE PSYCHODYNAMIC OF INCARNATION REVISIONED

In its most general sense, then, Jung understands incarnation as God's progressive achievement of consciousness in the creature. From this more general sense Jung can become much more specific on the psychodynamic involved in God's education in history.¹⁶ As previously described, in the first moment the self works the expulsion of the ego from its source in the unconscious. The ego, now successfully out of the Goddess or Great Mother, fully enters into the pain of what moderns call existential life. Free from the cosmic womb and an unconscious identification with the self, the ego must face the great threats to life which Tillich, for instance, identifies in his work, The Courage To Be, as death, guilt and meaninglessness.¹⁷ Worse, the negativities of existential consciousness have to be faced with an attenuated or severed relation to the self left behind in paradise. From Jung's perspective, even greater than the existential afflictions Tillich identifies, is the ego's torture between the legitimate but contradictory sides of deity unresolved in the eternity of divine life, the unconscious, and seeking resolution in the human created out of divine necessity for that purpose.

Throughout his writing Jung remained deeply impressed by the image of the Christ figure dying in despair abandoned by God between the yes and the no of two thieves.¹⁸ For Jung the thieves symbolized the divinely grounded opposites of good and evil, and, by extension, any side of the divine self-contradiction seeking

¹⁶ Cf. Dourley, 'Bringing Up Father: C.G. Jung on History as the Education of God', 54–68.

¹⁷ Tillich, The Courage To Be, 40-63.

¹⁸ Cf. for instance, 'Transformation Symbolism in the Mass', CW 11, par. 342, p. 225; par. 407, p.269; 'The Answer to Job', CW 11, par. 739, p. 455; 'Christ, A Symbol of the Self', CW 9ii, par. 79, p. 44; par. 123, p. 69; 'The Structure and Dynamics of the

reconciliation in the suffering of individuation well imaged as crucifixion. What Jung is doing here, in yet another religious paradigm for individuation, is universalizing the symbol of a specific crucifixion to depict that moment, human and divine, when the human ego holds the pain of the divine opposites to the point of its death, hopefully toward a resurrected consciousness encompassing in its embrace, the lethal opposites occasioning its preceding death. Jung is unequivocal in describing the human suffering of the divine opposites toward their resolution in the human as that point where humanity and divinity become one in patterns of mutual redemption. In further describing this moment as both “eschatological” and “psychological” Jung is equally explicit in affirming that the resolution of the divine self-contradiction in the human is the base meaning of individuation and the direction in which human history, if successful, moves. All of this is evident in Jung’s description of the Christ figure dying in despair between the opposites of affirmation and negation.

Here his human nature attains divinity; at that moment God experiences what it means to be a mortal man and drinks to the dregs what he made his faithful servant Job suffer. Here is given the answer to Job, and, clearly, this supreme moment is as divine as it is human, as “eschatological” as it is “psychological”.¹⁹

Thus understood the second moment of incarnation as individuation involves the painful death of the ego and its immersion in the Goddess from which it had been born. In a revealing passage Jung identifies the dissolution of the ego in its source as a wedding ‘...with the abyss...’ and as the goal of the mystic and hero alike. ‘This piece of mysticism is innate in all better men as the ‘longing for the

Self’, CW 9ii, par. 402, p. 255.

¹⁹ Jung, ‘Answer to Job’, CW 11, par. 647, p. 408.

mother,’ the nostalgia for the source from which we came.’²⁰ Yet marriage with or death into this abyss is fraught with peril, for the hero or mystic must return from the possibly devouring mother with the prize of a consciousness renewed in its energy and extended in its empathy through the moment of immersion, death into the cosmic womb. For Jung the return completes the cycle of individuation, of birth, death and resurrection to be undergone, ‘...not once but many times’.²¹

This cycle is the same rhythm he elsewhere describes in more formal psychological language as that of the “progression” and “regression” of libido from and to its source in the collective unconscious.²² In some passages, inspired by Goethe, he relates progression and regression to the diastolic and systolic movement of blood out of and back to the heart²³ and extends this analogy to the mystics’ journey to identity with and return from the furthest realms of divinity.²⁴ Here the themes of suffering are less explicit. Rather there comes to the fore the recurrent pattern of the ego’s movement from and return to its source as modeling the ongoing flow of psychic energies. When entered deeply and consciously by the mystics, this cycle describes the basic movement toward a human consciousness progressively more capable of uniting in itself the opposites latent in divinity awaiting their conscious mutual embrace in humanity. Jung would argue that immersion in the source of libido in itself enables those who return from it a greater unification of opposites in their subsequent psychic life. The reason for this may well be that a moment of unity with the source of consciousness within the psyche is also a moment of unity with the source of the opposites that can fragment human consciousness. That one could better unite these opposites on return from this

²⁰ Jung, ‘On the Psychology of the Unconscious’, CW 7, par. 260, p. 169.

²¹ *Ibid.*, par. 261, p. 170.

²² Jung, ‘On Psychic Energy’, CW 8, pars. 60-76, p. 32 – 40.

²³ *Ibid.*, par. 70, p. 37.

²⁴ Jung, Psychological Types, CW 6, par. 428, p. 253.

moment of unity would follow from the reality of having gotten “behind” whatever form the opposites take in the individual’s concrete life. From the experience of this deeper position a more empathic consciousness would naturally follow one back to surface consciousness.

This possibility and goal of perceiving reality from the position of its ground informs Jung’s interpretation of the alchemical symbol of the unus mundus. The symbol speaks to a consciousness uniting in itself all strata of the psyche; body, soul and spirit, consequent to a rigorous purification so intense as best to be imaged as death.²⁵ Jung equates this consciousness with the corpus glorificationis,²⁶ the glorified body reserved by Christian orthodoxy to the resurrected body in its post-temporal heavenly state. Jung does not conceive of the glorified body as describing a post-temporal state. Rather he is contending that the alchemist worked to the experience, however ephemeral, of the glorified body in the present body as the culmination of the alchemical process in the here and now. Describing the unities worked by the alchemist he writes, ‘By sublimating matter he concretized spirit’.²⁷ The intent of this brief passage is to argue that the soul united with spirit in the purified body through the alchemical cycle enables a perception of the surrounding world as transparent to its underlying divine unity. Switching images but not intention Jung will also describe the culmination of alchemical transformation as the “one day” usually understood as the day of original creation recaptured in the end of time in paradise regained. For Jung the “one day” like the “corpus glorificationis” is not delayed till death but attaches, in however a passing manner, to the culmination of the alchemical process in the here and now.²⁸

²⁵ Cf. the alchemical depiction of the soul leaving the body in Jung, ‘The Psychology of the Transference’, CW 16, p. 269.

²⁶ Jung, Mysterium Coniunctionis, CW 14, par. 763, p. 535; par. 774, p. 542.

²⁷ Ibid., par. 764, p. 536.

²⁸ Ibid., par. 718, p. 505.

Jung can give a more precise psychological content to the aforementioned experience of the unus mundus. It would be one in which the individual ego entered into a living resonance with what Jung calls ‘...the eternal Ground of all empirical being...’²⁹. This eternal ground is at once the ground of both the individual psyche and of the empirical multiple. Union with it would enable consciousness to perceive all of reality as an expression or manifestation of its divine ground. This experience describes a culminating theophany, the appearance of the divine, not only in the mind of the beholder but in all that is beheld as transparent to its source. In a more primitive religious idiom the human would perceive reality through the eyes of God. The obviously religious and yet wholly natural implications of such consciousness led Jung effectively to equate alchemical and mystical experience evident in his statement, ‘...the mystical experiences of the saints are no different from other effects of the unconscious’³⁰.

In his fuller elaboration of the psychology of alchemical epiphany, Jung unites two psychological traits that would seem to be incompatible. He contends that the process leads to the personal integration of the individual through the stabilization of the many complexes that make up the individual as the ego comes into ever greater fidelity to the self. At the same time this experience relates the individual, with ever broadening embrace, to the world beyond the ego through the ego’s increasing consciousness of their common ground. Jung sums up the dual effect of personal integration and a more universal relatedness in these lines:

By “composing the unstable,” by bringing order into chaos,
by resolving disharmonies and centring upon the mid-point,
thus setting a “boundary” to the multitude and focusing
attention upon the cross, consciousness is reunited with
the unconscious, the unconscious man is made one
with his centre, which is also the centre of the universe,

²⁹ Ibid., par. 760, p. 534.

³⁰ Ibid., par. 778, p. 546.

and in this wise the goal of man's salvation and exaltation is reached.³¹

This experience would work an impressive harmony of personal integration and universal sympathy. Again it implies that the passing moment of unity with the common ground of individual consciousness and the whole of nature works a mysterious unity of opposites - the personal integration of the individual and an enhanced relation to all that is out of immersion in their common source.

THE MYSTICAL BACKGROUND

As is now evident many aspects of Jung's understanding of the psyche are not compatible with the theological imagination of a transcendent self-sufficient divinity approaching the psyche from beyond it. Yet Jung was greatly drawn to significant individuals in the Western Christian mystical tradition both for personal sustenance and as spiritual ancestors who had gone before him in their experience of the intimacy of the divine in its native intersection with their humanity. The two mystics who appear most frequently in Jung's corpus are Meister Eckhart (d. ca. 1328) and Jacob Boehme (1575-1624). An examination of their influence on Jung and their appropriation by Jung raises the evolutionary and historical possibility that substantial currents in the Christian mystical tradition, at least since the thirteenth century, bear a progressively explicit experience of divinity which works an appreciative undermining and transcendence of the Christian myth itself. One would then be faced with the paradox that Christian mysticism itself urges Christianity's current self-transcendence toward a mythical consciousness beyond its current configuration. Such a surpassing of Christianity inspired by its own mystics would render intelligible the current turn to gnostic, hermetic, eastern and mystical

³¹ Jung, 'Transformation Symbolism in the Mass', CW 11, par. 445, p. 292.

spiritualities which have in common the recovery and enhancement of humanity's experience of its native divinity. It would also locate Jungian psychology and Jung's self-understanding as a psychologist in this tradition. In his correspondence with Fr. Victor White O.P., with whom he carried on a sustained theological/psychological conversation for fifteen years, Jung acknowledges that the same Spirit, the Paraclete, which created Christianity, may now prompt Christianity beyond itself.³² In this letter Jung does depict himself as a modern Joachim di Fiore (d. ca 1202). The original Joachim predicted in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century the onset of a new age of the Spirit as Jung would seem, in this letter, to see himself doing for the twentieth. This letter would confirm that Jung himself saw his psychology as a force contributing to the birth of a new societal myth appreciative of its Christian precedent but surpassing it through the assimilation of elements foreign to orthodoxy yet possibly endemic to the experience of its own mystics. Its contribution to the dawning of a new mythic consciousness can thus be seen as a major factor in Jung's appreciation of Western mysticism.

MEISTER ECKHART AND THE GOD BEYOND GOD

Jung confesses that he found personal inspiration in Meister Eckhart's sense of resignation and 'letting be'.³³ Jung also pays him great tribute for his sensitivity to what moderns would call the "unconscious" six centuries before it was subjected to more formal identification and investigation.³⁴ Of greater importance, beyond the personal level, Jung uses Eckhart to illustrate his own understanding of the intimacy of the divine to the human in their intra-psychic reciprocity. In these passages Jung makes it explicit that he contains the relation of the human to the divine in the

³² Jung, Letter to Father Victor White, November 24, 1953, *C.G. Jung, Letters, Vol. 2*, p. 138.

³³ Jung, 'Commentary on 'The Secret of the Golden Flower'', CW 13, par. 20, p. 16.

relation of consciousness to archetypal powers. Here and elsewhere Jung elaborates this relation through his conception of the ‘relativity of God’.

Thus Eckhart serves to illuminate Jung’s psychologically radical thought on the ‘relativity of God’³⁵. Claiming Eckhart’s experience as a precedent, Jung grounds his understanding of God’s relativity on the perception of the divine and the human as ‘functions’ of each other within the containment of the psyche. In this framework, writes Jung, God no longer exists ‘...outside and beyond all human conditions but as in a certain sense dependent on him [man]’ in so intimate a manner that ‘...man can be understood as a function of God and God as a psychological function of man’³⁶. To remain ignorant of God as a function of the human and so of the approach of the divine to the human from within the psyche constitutes, ‘...a complete unawareness of the fact that God’s action springs from one’s own inner being’³⁷. Jung’s position here is simply a variation of his denial of an Archimedean point beyond the psyche from which the psyche can be addressed. Here he is more forceful. Those who understand religious experience as originating in an agency or agencies beyond the human psyche are ignorant of the nature of religion itself.

Jung read Eckhart accurately on these points. An independent reading of Eckhart furthers a specifically theological appreciation of the inner dialectic between the human and the divine, a dialectic to which Jung gives psychological substantiation in his appropriation of Eckhart. Drawing on his own immediate experience Eckhart distinguished two dimensions of deity, the Godhead (Gottheit) and its derivative, God as Trinity and creator (Gottes). For Eckhart the division is

³⁴ Jung, ‘Gnostic Symbols of the Self’, CW 9ii, par. 302, p. 194.

³⁵ Jung, Psychological Types, CW 6, par. 412, p. 243.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid., par. 413, p. 243.

clear. He writes, ‘God and Godhead are as different as doing and non-doing’³⁸. In his deepest return to God, in the moment of breakthrough to the Godhead, Eckhart achieves a total identity with God beyond all differentiation. ‘...for in this breakthrough I receive what God and I have in common. I am what I was, I neither increase nor decrease nor diminish, for I am the unmoved mover who moves all things’³⁹. The recovery of this unqualified unity with the divine is the basis of Eckhart’s doctrine of resignation for here he rests in identity with the Godhead beyond need or compulsion to any activity or external expression whatsoever.

This moment in the cycle describes the furthest ingression into divinity. It is followed by a return to conscious life as a creature once more distinct from its creator. As a creature Eckhart stands before the Trinity as his creator in a position of otherness and separation. He describes this consciousness in his famous passage that when he came out from God all creatures spoke of God but none were happy or blessed.⁴⁰ In these words Eckhart anticipates the nineteenth and twentieth century existential sense of alienation which has at its core the conviction that to be other is to be alien and the greatest form of alienation is that of the creature from its source.

This pain of alienation from his source as creature over against creator lies behind Eckhart’s strange prayer, ‘...I pray God to rid me of God...’⁴¹. This is a prayer that the alienating otherness of God as creator be removed so that Eckhart may return to his native identity with the Godhead beyond all otherness including that which prevails between creator and creature. Obviously Eckhart is describing a cyclical process of moving from the consciousness of the surrounding world of the

³⁸ Meister Eckhart, Sermon LVI, "The Emanation and Return", Meister Eckhart, p. 143. Cited by Jung, Psychological Types, CW 6, par. 428, p. 254.

³⁹ Meister Eckhart, Sermon LXXVII, "The Poor in Spirit", Meister Eckhart, p. 221. Cited by Jung, "Foreword to 'Introduction to Zen Buddhism'" CW 11, par. 887, p. 543. The Evans' translation reads, "...motionless cause that is moving all things."

⁴⁰ Jung, CW 11, par. 887, p. 543.

⁴¹ Meister Eckhart, Sermon, "Blessed Are the Poor", in Meister Eckhart Mystic

multiple, of others, and of God as other, to an identity with the source of both individual consciousness and of the multiple which consciousness perceives beyond itself.

What Jung, in effect, is doing is using Eckhart's experience of a cyclical and recurring identity with and distancing from the Godhead to describe individuation as immersion in and egression from the unconscious. Jung's conception of the relativity of God, as developed in his pages on Eckhart, effectively describes the ego's return to a moment of identity with its source preceding a revitalized engagement with the surrounding world. Effectively ego and God dissolve into each other. As Jung puts it explicitly, '...God disappears as an object and dwindles into a subject which is no longer distinguishable from the ego'⁴². In the ego's recurring entrance into and return from this moment of identity with divinity, divinity becomes progressively incarnate by becoming self-conscious in human consciousness.

In other significant passages on Eckhart Jung links him with the gnostics on the basis of their common experience of the divine as the ground of their interiority. Again in these passages Jung refers to a state of consciousness or unconsciousness in which divine and human subjectivity become one. In a paradoxical phrase worthy of Eckhart himself Jung writes, 'As the Godhead is essentially unconscious, so too is the man who lives in God'⁴³. Elsewhere he links Eckhart to Zen Buddhism with its emphasis on the power of the 'non-ego-like self' pervading the ego as the self takes the ego into its service⁴⁴. In the context of his discussion of Zen and Eckhart, Jung deplores the fact that a Zen-like consciousness of the self as the basis of a personal experience of divinity remains foreign to the Church whose function it

and Philosopher, trans. Reiner Schurmann, p. 216, 219.

⁴² Jung, Psychological Types, CW 6, par. 430, p. 255.

⁴³ Jung, 'Gnostic Symbols of the Self', CW 9ii, par. 301, p. 193.

remains, ‘...to oppose all original experience, because this can only be unorthodox’⁴⁵. In a remark predicting the currently increasing cultural search for a viable spirituality no longer in religious institutions but in therapy, Jung states that only emerging forms of psychotherapy, and here he would certainly include his own, carry this Zen sense of interiority in contemporary civilization.⁴⁶

The substance of Jung’s appropriation of Eckhart, then, lies in Jung’s identifying the human relation to the divine as wholly intra-psychic in the interplay between ego and self. This makes divinity as dependent on humanity for its incarnation in consciousness as the human on the divine for the initial creation of its consciousness. In appropriating Eckhart’s experience of the breakthrough Jung broadens orthodox theology and psychology by pointing to a moment of total identification of the human and the divine, the conscious and unconscious. He clearly points to the fourth dimension within deity and the psyche, both to the God beyond the God of Trinity and differentiation and to a dimension of the psyche, muted but present in his writing, beyond even the archetypal with its compulsion toward conscious expression. Could Jung have been referring to this dimension of the psyche beyond even archetypal energies when he writes of archetypal, statements ‘There is nothing to stop their ultimate ramifications from penetrating to the very ground of the universe. We alone are the dumb ones if we fail to notice it’⁴⁷.

JACOB BOEHME AND HISTORY AS GOD’S COMPLETION

Jung’s identification of an intimate mutual dependency between the divine and the human in Eckhart becomes much more pronounced in the mystical

⁴⁴ Jung, ‘Foreword to ‘Introduction to Zen Buddhism’, CW 11, par. 887, p. 543.

⁴⁵ Ibid., par. 903, p. 553.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

experience of Jacob Boehme. It is not surprising, then, that foundational motifs in Boehme are even more present in Jung's understanding of the psyche than those of Eckhart. Boehme, like Eckhart, is very aware of a moment of total identity with the divine or with what he terms the 'ungrund' preceding a return to the '...very grossest and meanest matter of the earth...'⁴⁸. Indeed, it is in the return from this unity to the squalor of existence that Boehme's mystical experience is most unique and justifies Jung's claim to see in Boehme a spiritual predecessor whose experience describes the dynamic of the psyche as achieving full self-realization only in historical consciousness, personal and collective.

For Boehme's experience led him to the conviction that the opposites as grounded in the divine life are not reconciled in eternity as orthodoxy would have it. The central symbol of Christianity, the Trinity, can be read to mean that the opposites within God are united in eternity as the precondition for their unity in time.⁴⁹ Such eternal resolution is contradicted by Boehme's experience. Rather an unconscious divinity which can neither perceive nor reconcile the opposites inherent in its own life is forced to create human consciousness as the sole agency which can perceive the divine self-contradiction and respond to divinity's plea to resolve its conflicted life in humanity.

This essential aspect of Boehme's experience is picked up and amplified by Jung both in his autobiography⁵⁰ and Collected Works. In his autobiography he recounts a series of dreams he had in later life in which his minister father figured prominently. In one dream Jung reflects that his refusal to follow his father in

⁴⁷ Jung, 'A Psychological Approach to the Trinity', CW 11, par. 295, p. 200.

⁴⁸ Boehme, The Forty Questions of the Soul and The Clavis, sec. 8, v.

⁴⁹ Tillich is the best recent theological exponent of this position. Cf. his Systematic Theology, III, 283 - 286.

⁵⁰ Cf. the current dispute on the status of this work in Shamdasani, 'Misunderstanding Jung: the afterlife of legends', Journal of Analytical Psychology, 45:3, 459-472 and Charet, 'I beg to differ', ibid., 473-476. The dispute continued in ibid., 45:4, 615-622.

touching his head to the ground in deference to Uriah, in the dream context a symbol of the betrayal of human autonomy to a wholly transcendent God, reflects what humanity long has known, namely, that, ‘...by a small but decisive factor...’ humanity ‘...surpasses its creator...’⁵¹. Jung does not document this remark and leaves unidentified instances of a human wisdom surpassing the divine. In his amplification of this dream he does, however refer to Job.⁵² Earlier in his autobiography he confesses to ‘...the greatest inner resistances before I could write Answer to Job’⁵³. In this work Jung makes it very clear that divinity is a living antinomy or self-contradiction seeking resolution in a superior human consciousness it is forced to create for that purpose.⁵⁴ This truth is first perceived by Job and enacted by the Christ figure whose human suffering is of the divine self-contradiction toward its resolution in the human in a process at once redemptive of the divine and the human.

Jung could equally well have appealed to Boehme to make all of the foregoing points. In the subsequent history of the West, Boehme was identified by Hegel as no doubt a mystic but also as the father of German philosophy because of his experience of divinity driven to become conscious of itself in humanity.⁵⁵ Hegel worked Boehme’s mystical insight into the substance of his grand essentialist view of God’s self-realization in history culminating in the death of Christ, symbolic of God as other, toward the Spirit immanent in history now understood as working the unity and mutual redemption of humanity and divinity as history’s base meaning. Only late in life did Jung acknowledge affinities between his psychology and

⁵¹ Jung, Memories, Dreams, Reflections, 220.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid., p. 216.

⁵⁴ Jung, ‘Answer to Job’, CW 11, par. 567, p. 369; par. 584, p. 377; par. 642, p. 406.

⁵⁵ Hegel, Lectures on the History of Philosophy; The Lectures of 1825-1826, vol. III, 119, 120.

Hegel's philosophy.⁵⁶ The common ancestor is Boehme, perhaps making of Jung Hegel's psychologist and of Hegel Jung's philosopher.

Before leaving this point it should be noted that some current Boehme scholarship identifies in Boehme the remote but real source of modern utopian movements.⁵⁷ The idea of acting on behalf of the realization of divine consciousness in history has proven genocidal in the twentieth century. Jung's response to this fact might well be that humanity must face the power of the archetypal world as it seeks incarnation in history and that inflation, especially in the form of archetypally possessed communities, is a real but unavoidable danger. In this position Jung contributes to the understanding of the systemic basis of genocide in all forms of monotheism, religious or political. The ultimate defense against such possession, for Jung, remained the individual's conscious fidelity to the self. *'Resistance to the organized mass can be effected only by the man who is as well organized in his individuality as the mass itself'*⁵⁸. Whether or not such challenging and individual fidelity to the self can finally offset political and/or religious fundamentalism remains to be seen. In any event his appropriation of Boehme should make it evident that Jung's psychology is hardly apolitical. One might well indeed argue that becoming conscious in a Jungian sense is a political activity and not infrequently a subversive one.

In Boehme's experience of God two conflicting opposites are foundational. What tradition has termed the "Father" becomes a dark burning fire, an angry, masculine figure of immense power based on the primacy of unrelated self-affirmation. In fact Boehme identifies this principle as the hell into which the fallen angels were plunged when they refused the outward movement of God into full

⁵⁶ Letter to Joseph F. Rychlak, April 27, 1959, *C.G. Jung, Letters*, Vol. 2, 502.

⁵⁷ Walsh, *The Mysticism of Innerworldly Fulfillment*, 67-104.

⁵⁸ Jung, 'The Undiscovered Self', CW 10, par. 540, p. 278. Italics are Jung's.

manifestation in the human.⁵⁹ Over against this dark side of God the second principle is an androgynous Christ figure⁶⁰ whom Boehme will, on occasion, relate to the feminine in the person of ‘...Sophia, as the Bride of Christ’⁶¹. In contrast with the Father, the Christ figure is imbued with the warming light of consciousness and communicability. With Sophia, functioning here as an outgoing Spirit, the divine life manifests in all that is, stamping or signing nature and consciousness with the darkness of the Father and the light of the Son. In alchemical terms, and Boehme was familiar with alchemy, the Spirit or Self as the unifier of opposites is thus challenged to work a tincture of dark fire and warming light in uniting Father and Son in human consciousness.⁶²

At this point what distinguishes Boehme and aligns him with Jung comes strongly into play. For only in the theatre of human consciousness can the divine opposites be perceived and reconciled. Thus the resolution of the divine self-contradiction occurs, to the extent it does occur, in both divinity and humanity in a single organic process. Boehme depicts the suffering undergone as the Spirit works the unity of divine opposites concurrently in human and divine consciousness as a ‘crack’, or ‘shriek’ like a ‘flash of lightning’ splitting open ‘...the dry hardness of death’⁶³. This bringing of God to conscious birth by uniting its opposites in human consciousness describes a point in which divinity and humanity jointly undergo the agony of redemption in each other. Boehme lends substance to Jung’s remark that the entire world is God’s suffering undergone in the human as the price of wholeness. Writes Jung of this universal suffering, ‘The whole world is God’s

⁵⁹ Boehme, Six Theosophic Points, secs. 12 - 14; The Forty Questions of the Soul and the Clavis, 47, 48; The Three Principles of the Divine Essence, Chp. 1, secs., 68, 69, 49.

⁶⁰ Stoudt, Sunrise to Eternity, 284.

⁶¹ Jacob Boehme, The Way to Christ, trans. Peter Erb (New York: Paulist, 1978), sec. 14, p. 154.

⁶² Boehme, The Forty Questions of the Soul and The Clavis, sec. 195, 47.

⁶³ Weeks, Boehme, An Intellectual Biography of the Seventeenth Century Mystic and

suffering, and every individual man who wants to get anywhere near his own wholeness knows that this is the way of the cross'⁶⁴.

On the theme of suffering Jung introduces Boehme's mandala in his works.⁶⁵ For Jung not only Boehme's but all mandala imagery depicts the redemption of the divine in the human through its cruciform nature focused on the pain of the centre holding together the hosts of opposites on the periphery.⁶⁶ The closer the individual draws to the centre the more does that individual feel the human and divine tension of holding centeredness. To unite the opposites of the divine ground of life in personal life is the deepest meaning of the suffering that attaches to individuation and for Jung is the substance of incarnation revisited. Describing the pain of individuation he writes, '...self-realization – to put it in religious or metaphysical terms – amounts to God's incarnation.'⁶⁷

In giving new life to Boehme in the twentieth century Jung has contributed to humanity's dignity and importance at both the individual and collective level. Individually he has shown that the deepest suffering in each life is some side of divinity's suffering its own unresolved conflict toward resolution in that life. The individual's bearing of this suffering culminates in a consciousness in which the opposites which preceded it embrace in a sympathy more inclusive of the human totality. This extended empathy is the heart and goal of what Jung describes as the "transcendent function". The dynamics of the psyche itself are such that the consciousness born of the suffering of opposites transcends and includes the opposites that gave it birth.⁶⁸ Thus the individual's response to the suffering in one's

Philosopher, 124, 125.

⁶⁴ Jung, 'A Psychological Approach to the Trinity', CW 11, par. 265, p. 179.

⁶⁵ Jung, 'A Study in the Process of Individuation', CW 9i, 296.

⁶⁶ 'Transformation Symbolism in the Mass', CW 11, par. 433, p. 284; 'A Psychological Approach to the Trinity', par. 229, p. 155.

⁶⁷ 'A Psychological Approach to the Trinity', CW 11, par. 233, p. 157.

⁶⁸ Cf. Jung's fullest treatment of the transcendent function in 'The Transcendent Function',

life, especially where it is done in conscious dialogue with the self most intensely in the form of the dream, confers a higher consciousness on divinity made real through that unique individual myth which emerges through the dialogue itself.

This dynamic is also at the heart of Jung's shift to a quaternitarian cosmology. The suffering involved in Christianity's current supersession by a new myth is toward a Spirit working a richer synthesis of opposites than does or can the Spirit of Christianity. For this more encompassing Spirit would unite the spiritual with the bodily, the male with the female and the dark and light sons of the same father, Christ and Satan, with each other.⁶⁹ Boehme, like Jung, was explicit in locating evil in the divine and implies strongly that God became aware of evil in the divine being only as experienced in the human.⁷⁰ And yet the unifying Spirit at work in the thought of both Boehme and Jung would demand the unity even of the opposites of good and evil as a characteristic of the myth now appreciatively supplanting its Christian precedent.

In the end then Boehme extends Eckhart and completes Jung's understanding of the psyche's foundational cycle, not by denying the moment of unity with the divine at the core of Eckhart's experience, but by extending this moment to its culmination in time and history in the resolution of God's unresolved tensions in human historical consciousness. Where Eckhart sees the fourth in the Godhead beyond God, Boehme adds that the God beyond God becomes real only in human consciousness and Jung incorporates the truth of both mystics in his understanding of the psyche. Humanity is the fourth dimension of divinity where alone the eternal conflict of Father and Son, and of all divine opposites, is resolved in the psyche.

CW 8, 67f.

⁶⁹ Cf., diagram of this process in Dourley, Jung and the Religious Alternative: The Rerooting, 239.

⁷⁰ On this point cf. Nicholas Berdyaev, 'Unground and Freedom', Six Theosophic Points, xxv, - xxvii, and A. Weeks, Boehme, an Intellectual Biography, 88, 105.

If Eckhart and Boehme are combined in the full amplification of Jung's reception of them, the psyche is extended in two directions. Eckhart describes a moment of identity of ego and unconscious through the total dissolution of the ego in the unconscious, possibly beyond even the archetypes and their compulsion to become conscious in history. Boehme appreciates and has undergone Eckhart's moment of unity but insists that it must serve the unification of divine opposites in existential consciousness. In the end, unity with the Godhead beyond God becomes real and incarnate only in the human as the manifestation and completion of such unity. The deepest ingression into the archetypal world culminates in an enriched, balanced and empathic human consciousness in everyday life. Because one moment in this cycle is of the infinite, the ego's immersion in the divine fullness, the cycle can never end. Because the divine fullness demands realization in the human, the cycle can never be evaded. The suffering and glory of humanity lies in its never ending task to cooperate with the divine pleroma in its always to be surpassed incarnation in the human.

CONCLUSION: JUNG AND POST-MODERN MYSTICISM

Jung lived before the advent of post-modernism but his appreciation of mystical experience would find a significant resonance in work focusing on the recovery of a viable mysticism in a post-modern context. Don Cupitt, a Cambridge theologian, is a leading figure in this area of scholarship. As his thought progressed he came to an appreciation of the immediate and experiential nature of mysticism which, he claims, the mystics entered largely through their writing.⁷¹ For the later Cupitt this understanding of mystical writing has a political and subversive role to play within Christianity.⁷² Effectively it dissolved the reality of God as an absolute

⁷¹ Don Cupitt, *Mysticism After Modernity*, 11.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 56.

metaphysical other. Here Cuppitt shares an obvious affinity with Jung's conception of the relativity of God. In dissolving the objective metaphysical God the mystic was free and freed others from the power structure of the Church based on such ontological objectivity. Cuppitt describes the Church as "a sacramental machine" and "orthodox machine", hierarchically structured to produce a salvation or happiness which it cannot produce in this world or the next because of its insistence on a never-ending dualism between the divine and the human.⁷³ The mystic sought a more immediate happiness in the here and now, a happiness the ecclesial machinery promised but could never deliver.⁷⁴

Such subversion is a dangerous enterprise because it works to corrupt the absolute power of the Church and of the God of happiness the church allegedly mediates but never delivers as the basis of its power and of the clerical industry devoted to the maintenance of such power. In contrast to ecclesial spirituality, the mystic wants and attains the indefinitely postponed happiness of the Church in the present. Thus the mystic is writing in such a way as to destabilize the institution but must protect himself or herself with 'a plausible deniability'⁷⁵ in the face of possible brushes with the inquisitor who may glimpse what is truly going on. This ploy enables them to point to their orthodoxy which surrounds the more corrosive elements in their writing. Cuppitt mentions Eckhart's extensive defense during his various trials as an example of such plausible deniability.⁷⁶ What Cuppitt is actually arguing is that only the seditious elements of mystical writing are to be valued. The more traditional piety expressed therein is a disguise.

What Cuppitt shares with Jung in his appreciation of mysticism extends beyond their common admiration of profound and immediate religious experience

⁷³ Ibid., 50, 51.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 56.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 120.

bought to fruition in and through archetypally inspired language and writing. They both are affirming that the mystical experience corrodes the notion of God as objective other and that this corrosion demands a moment when all dualism cedes to unqualified identity between God and soul. Cupitt calls this a “double meltdown” of God and the soul into each other.⁷⁷ He describes the double meltdown in these lines, ‘When the writing does succeed in melting God and the soul down into each other, the effect of happiness is astonishing’⁷⁸.

Cupitt’s double meltdown, read through Jung’s appreciation of Eckhart and Boehme, would describe that moment when ego and unconscious are one. The soul returns to its maternal origin and, reborn from it, becomes the vehicle of an ongoing incarnation of its sacred source in its subsequent consciousness. Read through a mystical paradigm the process describes that of individuation itself. At this point not only God and the human coincide. So do theology and psychology. All involved in that process Jung terms, “individuation” are participating, in an admittedly endless degree of variation, in the dramatic journey so vividly described in the writing and experience of the mystics.

Nor is Cupitt alone in his views on how a viable contemporary mysticism might be revisioned. Lionel Corbett seeks to make Jung’s understanding of the “religious function” the basis of a contemporary religiosity based on the individual’s experience of the psyche as the source of the numinous.⁷⁹ He is sensitive to the question of whether the psyche is ‘cause’ or ‘transmitter’ of the experience of the divine. The issue he raises is central to this paper. It is whether there is an objective God beyond the psyche. In this case the psyche would mediate

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 118f.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p.121.

⁷⁹ Corbett, The Religious Function of the Psyche, 2, 11f.

the divine. The counter position is that the psyche is the origin of all including religious experience.⁸⁰

The position taken in this paper is that Jung, in the end, contains the experience of God within the psyche. The numinous latency of the archetypal as it impacts on consciousness accounts fully for the human experience of the divine. Humanity is currently becoming aware of this and turning the dialogue with the divine into the dialogue with the archetypal. Corbett's position is slightly different. He looks upon the question of the reality of God beyond the psyche as beyond human resolution, as Jung occasionally will. As such the question is moot as long as it is realized that the psyche is, at least, the sole mediator of numinous experience and that the experience is the basis of humanity's sense of God. Nevertheless suggesting that the issue is philosophically irresolvable and so, psychologically and therapeutically irrelevant, does not prevent Corbett from accurately pointing out that many Jungian analysts still cling to the idea of a God beyond the psyche. Corbett is correct in pointing to the unresolved dualism between psyche and the divine that this position entails and to the unconscious Jewish/Christian bias which informs it.⁸¹ Corbett, too, moves beyond general references to mysticism and identifies Eckhart and Boehme as among Jung's predecessors in establishing that divine/human intimacy Jung locates in the psyche itself.⁸² Corbett argues that the fostering of such intimacy is and will be foundational in contemporary and future religion and the spiritual practice which will inform it.

It has become a sociological fact that in Western culture and perhaps beyond, ecclesial religion, what Cupitt calls the "orthodox machine", is becoming

⁸⁰ Ibid., 6, 7, 8.

⁸¹ Ibid., 42.

⁸² Ibid., 35, 36, 200

increasingly religiously insipid. It continues to lose its spiritually and intellectually sensitive membership even as its total numbers can swell through its appeal to a growing fundamentalism, ranking such institutions among the most serious current threats to humanity's survival. In this societal context Jung's revisioning of mysticism and incarnation would address a number of constituencies and align his thought with the growing influence of a variety of esoteric traditions, east and west. For those who once could, but no longer can, access their divine depths through the institution, Jung's perspective offers the radical option of unmediated conversation with divinity in and through the psyche. For those for whom the symbolic and ritual sense has died even as they remain in a religious community, the experience of the self incarnating in consciousness could restore a living meaning to their accustomed symbols and rituals. For those without any history of membership in a religious community Jung's understanding of incarnation could reconnect the individual with their native divinity. Should this happen in significant number, the so called secular world could recover a humanity at once more sensitive to its own creative and life-giving depths and more encompassing in its sympathy for the totality of humanity.

All of these situations, or combinations of them, share this in common with Jung and his esoteric sympathies. Those in them live directly out of the unconscious in institutional or non-institutional contexts. They are participants in the incarnation of the source of consciousness universal in their personal consciousness and through their consciousness in society. In a strange passage, reminiscent of Cupitt's remarks on the need of the mystic to cloak their intention in a "plausible deniability", Jung claims that in his time the repression of the gnostic experience of the divine is being lifted creating the conditions for its flowering in contemporary culture. 'It would not seem to me illogical if a psychological condition, previously suppressed, should

reassert itself when the main ideas of the suppressive condition begin to lose their influence'⁸³.

The current revived interest in mysticism and esotericism at the academic, religious, psychological and personal levels confirms Jung's suspicion that religious communities which could not inform their thought and practice with a gnostic/mystical element, or equivalent esoteric sensitivity, have lost their spiritual credibility and so, paradoxically, the power to suppress the very energies needed for their own renewal. The Spirit of the Self, freed from institutional constraint, would become more universally available in immediate experience. Jung may have anticipated this development in contemporary religious consciousness when he wrote of the growth of a more direct and personalized experience of the self, "No one can know what the ultimate things are. And, if such experience helps to make life healthier, more beautiful, more complete and more satisfactory to yourself and to those you love, you may safely say: 'This was the grace of God'"⁸⁴.

⁸³ Jung, 'Psychology and Religion', CW 11, par. 160, p. 97.

⁸⁴ Ibid., par. 167, 105.

Bibliography.

- Berdyaev, Nicolas, 'Unground and Freedom', Six Theosophic Points, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958.
- Boehme, Jacob, The Three Principles of the Divine Essence, Chicago: Yogi Publications Society, 1901.
- _____, The Forty Questions of the Soul and The Clavis, trans. John Sparrow, London: John M. Watkins, 1911.
- _____, Six Theosophic Points, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958.
- _____, The Way to Christ, Peter Erb, (trans.), New York: Paulist Press, 1978.
- Charet, Francis X., 'I beg to differ', Journal of Analytical Psychology, 45:3 (2000), 473-476.
- _____, 'A final reply', Journal of Analytical Psychology, 45:4 (2000), 620-622.
- Corbett, Lionel, The Religious Function of the Self, London: Routledge, 1996.
- Cupitt, Don, Mysticism after Modernity, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.
- Dourley, John P., 'Jung and Metaphysics: A Dubious Disclaimer', Pastoral Sciences, 12:1 (1993), 155-24.
- _____, "In the Shadow of the Monotheisms: Jung's Conversations with Buber and White", ed. Joel Ryce-Menuhin, Jung and The Monotheisms, London: Routledge, 1994, 125-145.
- _____, Jung and the Religious Alternative: The Rerooting, Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1995.
- _____, "Recalling the Gods: A Millennial Process", in Spiegelman, J.M. (ed.), Psychology and Religion at the Millennium and Beyond, Tempe: New Falcon Publications, 1998.
- _____, 'Bringing up Father: C.G. Jung on History as the Education of God', The European Legacy, 4:2 (1999), 54-68.
- Eckhart, Meister, Meister Eckhart, collection by F. Pfeiffer, 1857, trans. C. de B. Evans, 2 vols., London: John M. Watkins, 1947.
- Hegel, G.W.F. Lectures on the History of Philosophy, vol. III, Medieval and Modern Philosophy, Robert F. Brown (ed.), Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Jung, C.G., 'The Undiscovered Self', Collected Works, vol. 10, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.

_____, Memories, Dreams, Reflections, A. Jaffe, (ed.), New York: Vintage, 1965.

_____, 'On the Psychology of the Unconscious', Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, Collected Works, vol. 7, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

_____, 'On the Psychology of the Transference', The Practice of Psychotherapy, Collected Works, vol. 16, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

_____, 'Commentary on 'The Secret of the Golden Flower'', Alchemical Studies, Collected Works, vol. 13, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

_____, Psychology and Alchemy, Collected Works, vol. 12, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

_____, 'Christ a Symbol of the Self', Aion, Collected Works, vol. 9ii, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

_____, 'Gnostic Symbols of the Self', Aion, Collected Works, vol. 9ii, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

_____, 'The Structure and Dynamics of the Self', Aion, Collected Works, vol. 9ii, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

_____, 'A Study in the Process of Individuation', Collected Works, vol. 9i, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

_____, 'Psychology of Religion', Psychology and Religion: West and East, Collected Works, vol. 11, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

_____, 'A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity', Psychology and Religion: East and West, Collected Works, vol. 11, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

_____, 'Answer to Job', Psychology and Religion: West and East, Collected Works, vol. 11, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

_____, 'Transformation Symbolism in the Mass', Psychology and Religion: East and West, Collected Works, vol. 11, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

_____, 'Foreword to Suzuki's 'Introduction to Zen Buddhism'', Psychology and Religion: East and West, Collected Works, vol. 11, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

_____, 'On Psychic Energy' The Structure and Dynamics of the Self, Collected Works,

vol. 8, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

_____, 'The Transcendent Function', The Structure and Dynamics of the Self, Collected Works, vol. 8, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

_____, Mysterium Coniunctionis, vol. 14, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

_____, Psychological Types, Collected Works, vol. 6, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.

_____, C. G. Jung, Letters, Vol. 2, 1951-1961, eds. G. Adler, A. Jaffe, trans. R.F.C. Hull, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.

_____, 'The Tavistock Lectures', The Symbolic Life: Miscellaneous Writings, Collected Works, vol. 18, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Schurmann, Reiner, trans., Meister Eckhart, Mystic and Philosopher, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978.

Shamdasani, Sonu, 'Misunderstanding Jung: the afterlife of legends', Journal of Analytical Psychology, 45:3 (2000), 459-472.

_____, 'Reply', Journal of Analytical Psychology, 45:4, 615-620.

Stoudt, John, Sunrise to Eternity, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1957.

Tillich, Paul, The Courage To Be, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952.

_____, Systematic Theology, vol. III, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1963.

Walsh, David, The Mysticism of Innerworldly Fulfillment: A Study of Jacob Boehme, Gainesville: University of Florida Presses, 1983.

Weeks, Andrew, Boehme: An Intellectual Biography of the Seventeenth Century Philosopher and Mystic, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.