

# 15. Jung's Analytic Psychology and the Self

Copyright © James S. Fleming, Ph.D.

---

*Life has always seemed to me like a plant that lives on its rhizome. Its true life is invisible, hidden in the rhizome. The part that appears above ground lasts only a single summer. Then it withers away – an ephemeral apparition. When we think of the unending growth and decay of life and civilizations, we cannot escape the impression of absolute nullity. Yet I have never lost a sense of something that lives and endures underneath the eternal flux. What we see is the blossom, which passes. The rhizome remains.*

–C. G. Jung<sup>1</sup>

*Man positively needs general ideas and convictions that will give a meaning to his life and enable him to find a place for himself in the universe.*

–C. G. Jung<sup>2</sup>

---

## On The Nature of the Self

Development of the self is one of the most interesting topics of psychology – but note that the term “self” is meant to imply a rather general psychological construct rather than peculiarly personal or egocentric one. This psychological self is an elusive construct with many definitions. Roy Baumeister (1999) claimed that “No topic is more interesting to people than the self. It is what you mean when you say ‘I’ . . . Providing a satisfactory definition of self has proven fiendishly difficult (p. 1).” But consider that much of the study of the psychological self concerns the self-concept (i.e., people’s ideas about “who they are”), including the roughly equivalent terms self-esteem, self-worth, or self-acceptance (i.e., the evaluative aspects of existence, as in “how am I doing, in the great scheme of things?”). Self would therefore seem a kind of catchall category for the perceptions of oneself and for the evaluation of one’s life and experiences.

But it is also more than that. William James was the first self-psychologist, and remains one of the greatest contributors to the understanding of self (James, 1890). Most social scientists are

mainly concerned with what James called the “Me-self,” or all of those self-evaluative attributes that one associates with oneself. These attributes facilitate an understanding of the “self-as-object” as opposed to James’s “I-self,” or “self-as-subject.” The latter is the subjectively experienced knower, the former the objectively known<sup>3</sup>. Though most social scientists have studied Me-self, some have taken the alternative route and attempted to study the self-as-knower, which can also be called the *phenomenal self* (or self as experienced). It is those theorists of the phenomenal self that are considered in this section of the text, including Jung, Maslow, Rogers, May, and others in this tradition, who taken together may be called *existential-phenomenologists*.

## **Jung as Self-Psychologist and Developmentalist: A Preview**

Carl Gustave Jung is usually treated as a post-Freudian in the psychoanalytic tradition, because Jung (like Freud) viewed the unconscious as a key element in his psychology. Placing Jung in this context is therefore not without its rationale; however, this placement may obscure the fact that Jung was both a self-psychologist and a developmental psychologist – concepts which are of critical concern for this text.

Jung’s entire oeuvre is built around the concept of the self, and on its development through the lifespan. In fact, Jung believed that the very goal of human existence was the development and fuller realization of the self (think of Socrates’ dictum, “know thyself”), and that uncovering the knowledge of the self was foremost in his psychology. For Jung, self-understanding implied an increasing awareness of unconscious feelings, desires, and motives. He believed in developing all aspects of one’s personality to the fullest possible extent, and in this he can be compared with those later psychologists in this section that emphasized self-actualization, or the process of becoming ever more whole and complete. The main difference is that the latter stressed conscious rather than unconscious processes.

To clearly grasp these two key aspects in Jung’s psychology –

self and psychological development – requires some reading between the lines of his writings, which were vast: The collected works of Carl Jung consist of nineteen volumes. While certain of his ideas were stated with crystalline clarity, others often seemed obscure; even arcane. At times one might suspect that Jung was writing more for himself rather than for the world at large!

To complicate matters, Jung wrote on subjects that seemed decidedly unscientific and even occult, such as flying saucers, alchemy, tarot, extra-sensory perception, the I-Ching, Kabala, and Eastern and Western religions. We may wonder, then, was Jung a psychologist, philosopher, or a mystic? But Jung himself was aware of the dangers of mixing these different approaches to knowledge: he claimed that he wrote about these exotic subjects to further understand their symbolic or archetypal (in the sense defined subsequently) significance. In other words, he did not claim to *literally* believe in flying saucers, in the sense that they were sent by aliens to observe us, and so forth; but rather, he wrote about how people sought in such objects a kind of wholeness that was lacking in their lives; and he attempted to explain what these visions symbolized psychologically to their purported observers (Jung, 1959).

Yet Jung may indeed have been mystic as well as psychologist. In his autobiography (1961/1973) he reports on his personal visions, premonitions, and on his thoughts on life after death. The opening quotations also give the sense of ideas almost metaphysical rather than scientific. But to his credit, he separated those works (such as the autobiography) that dealt with these exceptional phenomena from the collected works, which he believed to be based in science – at least as he understood this term. For all of that the reader’s “mileage may vary,” with those of an open nature more likely to be accepting of some of these “farther out” ideas, and those of a more skeptical nature less so. In any case, it should be noted that many if not most of Jung’s major concepts can in fact be subjected to scientific scrutiny; and many of these – such as his contributions to psychological types (Jung, 1921/1971) – are widely recognized as useful scientific constructs.

Jung’s concepts pertaining to development of self apply to the entire lifespan, but he was especially focused on adulthood and

especially on the later stages of life. As will be seen, these include his ideas about the midlife crisis, and his concepts of individuation, and the transcendent function – terms which are precisely defined later – which are decidedly relevant to personal development. Jung also believed that the challenges of the second half of life are essentially spiritual concerns. Here the reader may see some parallels with the Eriksons (Erik and Joan) per Chapter 9, though the Eriksons did not couch their terms in quite this manner.

To see how Jung's theory applies to development of the self it is first necessary to present an overview of his main ideas. But as a prelude, a brief bit of biography will help to make Jung's worldview more comprehensible.

## **Biographical Background<sup>4</sup>**

### **Jung's Relationship with Freud**

The relationship of Jung with Freud, but especially the eventual break in their professional association, played a crucial role in Jung's development. Following this break, Jung experienced a period of considerable angst and depression, and at times it seemed as though his mental state bordered on psychosis.

The relationship itself began in mutual admiration, but it also had to some extent a father-son dynamic: In the beginning Jung had almost a worshipful view of Freud, who appeared as a wiser, older influence. On Freud's part, he envisioned Jung as his protégé and successor. One of their chief disagreements was over the role of sex in repression. Like Freud, Jung believed that certain memories became repressed into the unconscious, but he believed that sexual anxieties were not the cause in most cases; and he could not understand what he viewed as Freud's obsession with sex.

Freud's attitude toward Jung, on the other hand, seemed paternalistic; in a letter to Jung (dated April 16, 1909; reproduced in Jung, 1961/1973) he stated that he “. . . formally adopted you as an eldest son, anointing you as my successor and crown prince . . .” (p. 361). In 1909 both men accepted an invitation from G. Stanley Hall to visit and lecture at Clark University in Massachusetts. Their relationship was already strained by this time

over disagreements regarding the prominent place of sex in Freud's psychology and Jung's interest in matters that were more spiritual. They spent a great deal of time together, and also attempted to interpret one another's dreams. It was in this endeavor that Freud disappointed Jung in his inability to make sense of the latter's imagery. But by this time Jung was beginning to see fragments of ancient and impersonal images in his dreams. One dream was of a two-story house, in which Jung believed the top story represented the conscious mind, the lower one the unconscious. But even below this story he found passageways to deeper and deeper depths. The primordial images he encountered in his dreams he would later term *archetypes*, and come to regard as kinds of universal symbols which he thought were embedded in the unconscious of all people.

Jung was an independent thinker so it is understandable that, though he grasped Freud's brilliance, he did not wish to be merely a mouthpiece for another man's views. Freud, on the other hand, did not wish to let go – and he could not seem to acknowledge other points of view, especially with regard to his views on sex as the dominant force in human motivation. Hence followed the rebellion, not only of Jung, but also of Adler and other early adherents – who could not bring themselves to accept Freud's views on this subject (his Achilles heel), which they perceived as dogmatism. Jung in particular stated that “My whole being was seeking for something still unknown which might confer meaning upon the banality of life” (1961/1973, p. 165). It was obvious that Freud's views were too materialistic for him, but to Freud, Jung's were too close to the occult to be scientific.

Ironically, Freud himself believed that a young man must learn to separate himself from his father as part of the oedipal struggle (ironic because of Freud's own oedipal tendencies, which were discussed in Chapter 8). In Jung's case, he believed that his father – a country parson – failed him as an adequate role model. Jung viewed his father, Johann Paul Achilles Jung, as an unhappy, non-communicative man. Jung believed his father suffered from religious doubts and faulted him for not questioning his beliefs or pursuing a more spiritual and less literal path to religion. Here it is necessary to explain Jung's own Gnostic spiritual orientation. The

Gnostics were an early Christian sect who believed that “. . . to know oneself, at the deepest level, is simultaneously to know God; this is the secret of gnosis” (Pagels, 1979, p. xix). Jung saw his father’s unhappiness as a failure to explore the deeper realms of existence: he was conventionally religious, but completely lacking in spirituality.

In the author’s view, Jung transferred his need for a strong father figure onto Freud, whose intellectual credentials were much richer and also more deserving of his admiration than those of his own father. Yet despite Freud’s great intellect and his keen analytic mind, Freud, too, was basically a materialist. Although Freud, like Jung, was interested in the study of other cultures and in mythology, he refused to grant any credence to the spiritual side of life. Freud said to Jung on one occasion “My dear Jung, promise me never to abandon the sexual theory. That is the most essential thing of all. You see, we must make a dogma of it, an unshakable bulwark . . . Against the black tide of mud” (Quoted in Jung, 1961/1973, p. 150). The “mud” Freud referred to was any idea that smacked of religion, spirituality, or occultism.

Hearing these remarks, Jung began to lose respect for Freud. To make a dogma of his ideas on sexuality – that very notion was an aberration to anyone who was interested in an open-minded search for truth. Jung, incidentally, did not think sex irrelevant to psychology; “On the contrary [sex] plays a large part in my psychology as an essential – though not the sole – expression of psychic wholeness” (Jung, 1961/1973, p. 168). But he believed that Freud became obsessed with the topic to an unnatural degree. Jung thought that Freud overlooked the human need for meaning, including spiritual needs.

### **Jung’s Dark Period**

Alas, a falling out of son and father is inevitable if the son is ever to achieve a state of independence. The more the father figure attempts to reign in the son’s ambitions the more difficult is the process of separation. Thus Jung’s period of pain and internal strife were a result of this rift: He had to let go of the reins and assume his own place in psychiatry, but for this he paid a great price.

After his break with Freud, following the American visit, Jung stated that “. . . a period of inner uncertainty began for me. It would be no exaggeration to call it a state of disorientation. I felt totally suspended in mid-air, for I had not yet found my own footing” (1961/1973, p. 170).

For the next several years Jung continued with his psychiatric practice, but he adopted a very non-Freudian stance. Rather than attempting to interpret his patient’s dreams, for instance, he allowed them to make their own interpretations, which he deemed a more appropriate practice. But having abandoned a Freudian framework, he still felt a need for a new, more cohesive system for working with people. To enable this goal, and because of his own mental state of depression, he went very deeply inside himself. It was during this period that he opened himself to his own unconscious, which revealed itself in dreams that were often vivid, and in imaginative fantasy. He also experienced visions, which made him wonder if he had gone too far inside his own head: he at times even questioned his sanity. However, his devotion to his family and his continuing professional practice provided a leveling balance to these inward ventures.

Archetypal figures began to appear to Jung in dreams. One such figure, a “wise old man,” he came to call Philemon. Philemon became for Jung an inner voice of guidance, not unlike an Eastern guru. Philemon represented, in Jung’s words, “superior insight” (1961/1973, p. 183). Another, a small blind child called herself Salome. He came to regard her as his “anima” or the feminine component within his psyche. Still another figure, a “leathery, brown dwarf” represented his shadow, or dark side. Jung did elaborate journal writing describing these images, and he even painted them<sup>5</sup>.

Jung believed that these archetypal figures from his own unconscious were also present in buried layers of everyone’s unconscious minds. His research into mythology and cultural anthropology led him to discover these and other archetypes in the art and myths of cultures around the globe. They became important for his new psychology of the collective unconscious (described more fully shortly). And all of Jung’s subsequent works stemmed

from these initial encounters with his own unconscious mind, begun in 1912.

The most difficult of these times for Jung came in 1913 when he experienced a vision of a flood encompassing all the land from the North Sea to the Alps, spreading from there to Switzerland (his home land). He saw “the mighty yellow waves, the floating rubble of civilization, and the drowned bodies of uncounted thousands. Then the whole sea turned to blood” (1961/1973, p. 175). This is the time when he truly thought he might be undergoing a psychotic episode. But when the Great War (World War I) broke in Europe, he came to believe instead that this vision and related dreams had been psychic premonitions of that horror that eventually came.

Toward the end of this intense period of Jung’s life, and as it happens, toward the end of the war, he began painting *mandalas*, which are archetypal symbols of wholeness based on circular configurations – the Buddhist “wheel of life” and Navajo sand paintings are examples of mandalas that are embedded in those particular cultures. Jung did not seem to know why he was compelled to paint these at first, but eventually he came to understand that they stood for the archetype of the self, and that constructing these paintings represented a search for selfhood, or personal healing.

## **Elements of the Jungian Theory of Personality**

### **The Components of the Mind**

Like Freud, Jung believed in an unconscious mind which contains repressed memories and internal conflicts of which people are unaware, together with forgotten memories and subliminal impressions. His *personal unconscious* was thus equivalent to Freud’s unconscious plus his preconscious mind. And like Freud, Jung also recognized the conscious mind as consisting of those thoughts and feelings that are recognized by the individual. For Jung the *ego* was at the center of consciousness. Conversely, the ego can block threatening thoughts and feelings and keep them from conscious awareness where they would otherwise create



anxieties. As with the later ego psychologists, Jung did not dwell on the significance of Freud's id.

A **complex** is a constellation of emotions in the personal unconscious that is blocked from consciousness and that is centered on a personal problem area and is persistent and long lasting. For example, a man who is attached to his mother to an unhealthy degree has a "mother complex," and likewise a woman may have a "father complex." Jung created a technique called the **word association test** to uncover complexes in his patients. This projective test consists of a standardized set of words that the analyst repeats to the patient. In response, the patient says the first word that comes into her or his mind (e.g., "pencil – stick," "child – boy," "feeling – sad," and so on). When the patient has a lengthy pause in responding to related words, anxiety over the word indicating an underlying complex is suspected. Jung also measured skin conductance as an indicator of anxiety associated with certain words as one of the first physiological tests of anxiety. Time of response, galvanic skin response, and more indirectly, signs of stress such as coughing, blushing, or facial expression, were used by Jung as aids in diagnosing a complex.

The **collective unconscious**, briefly mentioned above, goes deeper than the personal unconscious. This is the repository, as it were, of archetypes that Jung believed to be shared by all humanity. In **Jungian dream analysis**, elements of the personal unconscious are often bound up with archetypes of the collective unconscious as well. Archetypes, like complexes, have emotional associations connected with them. These archetypes were presumably formed through the experiences of our ancestors when faced with certain characteristically human situations – in other words, they evolved over the eons. An archetype is not to be confused with a symbol such as a Freudian phallic symbol. Rather than being associated with a single kind of image or object, an archetype goes deeper and evidence for it is more indirect; but it may be manifested in dreams, in the form of a symbol.

**Archetypes and Jungian Dream Analysis.** In Jungian dream analysis, archetypes may appear in "big" dreams or those which seem to touch on something deep inside a person. Jung claimed

that such archetypical dreams have a *numinous* quality, or in other words, a kind of intensive energy that is otherworldly, or have a “possessive or obsessive force” (Jung, 1961/1973, p. 347).

Also, Jung emphasized that the characters in a dream can represent different aspects of one’s self; thus, conflicts between persons in a dream can often be interpreted as inner conflicts between competing desires or between different “sides” of one’s personality. For example, if a man dreams of having a physical fight with another man, this might signify a conflict with a shadow, or part of the self that is not consciously acknowledged.

Jung believed that symbols in dreams have personal meaning, so symbols do not by themselves have a universal meaning (e.g., a “phallic shaped” object might or might *not* have something to do with sex.) In fact, dream symbols may have many meanings, and it is crucial to tie the contexts of dreams to what is known of the dreamer’s background. The Jungian analyst is more likely to learn something of value about a person by analyzing a series of associated dreams than by considering a single dream by itself. *Dream amplification* is the process by which the patient presents many different associations (free associations) to the dream or dream series; from such associations it may be possible to identify recurring themes, or complexes.

## **Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious**

There are a great many cultural archetypes according to Jung (1934/1959); for example, there is the archetype of the Hero (as in Joseph Campbell’s, 1968, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*), the Earth Mother, the Wise Old Man, the Jokester, the Fool, the Maiden, and so forth. Those familiar with tarot cards will note that each of these is represented in the tarot deck. But of particular importance to Jungian theory are those archetypes that symbolize aspects of one’s personality, discussed next.

*The Persona.* Persona is Greek for mask, and in Greek dramas the actors wore masks that portrayed emotions like pain, sorrow, or joy. For Jung the *persona* is the outward appearance or public image that one creates; it is ordinarily a façade that hides one’s true feelings. To a certain degree, all of us put on a “social face” for

others. But there is a problem when a person dons a persona too much of the time, and the ego identifies with this outward expression of one's personality. The danger is in forgetting who one really is underneath that public face, while adopting instead an archetypal personality (e.g., the Hero, Wise Old Man; even the Shadow). Jung referred to this kind of extreme identification as *inflation* (as in "that person has an inflated ego"). The result is loss of contact with one's real self; the person becomes one-sided – actually a caricature of him/herself.

*The Shadow.* Yes, the Jungian shadow does represent the "dark side" of one's personality, but shadows do not always represent negative or evil parts of ourselves; they can be, but often they are more simply parts of ourselves that we do not consciously wish to own. The shadow also represents the primitive but artistic creativity within each of us; it speaks to our vitality. Note that Jung's "dark period" was also his most creative time of life!

## **Archetypes in Modern Mythology: The Movies and Television**

### **May the Force Be With You!**

Archetypes abound in Hollywood! The traditional western movie contains all the elements of cultural mythology: The hero, fair maiden, and the evil, shadowy villain. In case viewers weren't sure, in the old days of western film making the hero was the one with the white horse and hat and the villain always wore black. Variations on the plot setting abounded, of course, but the script always amounted to basically the same themes of good versus evil, and the need to save the helpless damsel in distress.

In the days of yore the heroes were the knights of King Arthur's Round Table, and the villain was sometimes even more fearsome as the fire-breathing dragon (who sometimes sported two heads as well) or the wicked wizard who could cast evil spells on the hapless hero or heroine.

Think of the original George Lukas film *Star Wars* and its sequels. Lukas and Jung both knew their mythology and something about Eastern religions as well. Equate the “way of the Force” with the way of the eternal Tao and you get the picture, with its light and dark sides representing the yang and yin, or eternal opposites (Porter, 2003). If you are familiar with these films, try to identify each of these characters with one of these archetypes: Shadow, Hero, Wise Old Man, and Maiden.

*Starwars characters:*

- Luke Skywalker
- Han Solo
- Lando Calrissian
- Princess Leia
- Darth Vader
- Obi-Wan Kenobi
- Yoda

(For a more in depth analysis of these characters in relation to Jung’s psychology visit George Boeree’s, web site.)

\*\*\*\*

### **Who Was that Masked Man?**

Some film actors probably become strongly identified with their screen personas. The masked character the Lone Ranger was played by Clayton Moore in the early days of television. Moore loved to wear his Lone Ranger mask in public when he signed autographs. As he aged, however, the corporation that owned the rights to the character refused to let him wear the mask, so he switched to wearing very dark sunglasses instead. They didn’t want Moore confused with a younger actor who played the Ranger in a newer film. But the film flopped, and eventually Moore prevailed: The public simply demanded that he be allowed to resume this role and wear his mask, continuing to uphold that “persona.” Whether Moore over-identified with the hero character

of the Lone Ranger, or whether he was just having fun, might be difficult to decide without a greater knowledge of the man and his life off the stage. *Hi Yo, Silver!*

A good example of encountering the shadow is one given by Jung himself. In a dream the “leathery brown dwarf” slays what appears to be an archetypal hero figure – a blond Germanic man Jung referred to as Siegfried. Jung (1961/1973) identified this “hero” with the German people at the time of the First World War. The shadow stood for his misguided tendency toward nationalism, or seeing heroism in the German cause. Symbolically, Jung admits that “Siegfried” also stood for his former hero, “Sigmund” (i.e., Freud). The lesson in both cases is in the dangers of hero worship.

*The Anima/Animus.* Like Freud and others in the psychoanalytic tradition, Jung believed that people were, in a sense, bisexual. But in the present context this term does not refer to sexual preference or activity, but rather to the fact that all of us have within us characteristics of the opposite sex. For example, the male sex hormone testosterone and the female sex hormone estrogen are present in both sexes, but to differing degrees.

The *anima* represents the feminine within the male psyche. Jung identified this part of the personality with the “soul” of the male, and as the gatekeeper to his unconscious mind. The *animus* serves a similar function for females.

Jung believed that men tended to be more rational in the intellectual sense than women; hence a man’s growth process requires him to learn to accept his feeling or feminine side. The reverse, of course, is true for women. A man who is excessively moody, or a woman who intellectualizes too much, would be seen by Jung as having failed to adequately come to terms with the anima or animus, respectively.

A woman may *project* the animus or male archetype onto men; perhaps seeking in them a quality of personality that she lacks; and again, a similar process occurs in men with projection of the anima onto women. Seeing the other person in terms of an archetype,

rather than as the real, flesh-and-blood person that he/she is, can be the cause of relational stress and failure. The characters of Henry Higgins and Eliza Doolittle in Shaw's *Pygmalion*, or the musical *My Fair Lady* based on this play, exhibit such tendencies toward projection. If people can develop the opposite sex sides of their personalities they would no doubt be much more satisfied in their intimate relationships, not having to depend on their partners for satisfying unrealistic or impossible needs! The raging battles between the sexes that one sees or participates in, Jungians would agree, are really between two archetypes. This is also the reason that "love at first sight" seldom lasts<sup>6</sup>.

***The Self.*** The *self* is Jung's most important archetype of personality. The self represents the unity of the personality; it is all that a person can attain through personal growth and striving in one's life. Though the self is largely unconscious, people nonetheless strive for wholeness. People who are more psychologically healthy are those who have achieved a greater realization of the self, and have become more conscious of the self. But self-realization is always necessarily incomplete because psychological growth is never fully achieved<sup>7</sup>.

In dreams the mandala often represents the self. Recall that Jung painted mandalas almost obsessively toward the end of his "dark period." In dreams, other symbols of the self often appear, such as a fish, gemstones, or animals (when they connect to the basic, primitive parts of ourselves); indeed, in the right context, many kinds of animals or objects are potential "self" symbols.

### **Searching for the Self: A Jungian Dream from the Author's Youth**

In my mid-thirties when I was still a single man I returned to graduate school with a strong sense of self-direction in pursuit of my doctorate. But I was unhappy in other areas of my life, including some failed relationships. Generally, though, I can say that I was striving and searching, both internally (through thoughts

and dreams) and externally (via my studies) for a better life and career.

I began to have a series of dreams about bodies of water and of fishing. On many nights over a period of several months I had such dreams. Sometimes I was fishing from a dock or a boat, but usually with little luck (no bites). Once I did catch a Japanese glass fishing float in a net (mandala symbol). Another time a very big fish struck my line with great ferocity and nearly pulled me into the water with it, but alas, the line broke and it escaped.

This dream series was capped by the following dream, in which I was finally successful in catching a “big fish.” This was a very dark night (dark as in unconsciousness); I was on a dock or pier that spread over a vast body of water (sea or ocean) as far as one could see in all directions. Below me but at a crisscross angle was another pier, and below that was sea itself.

On the lower pier were people who spoke with angry voices. They shouted at me and showed their fists, although I can’t recall hearing any specific words from them. But I ignored them and dropped my line into the water below, at the juncture of the two piers.

Then I felt a huge tug and I began to reel in an enormous fish. It must have been about 8 feet in length. When I hauled it in, it sparkled and shimmered in the moonlight, radiating colors of pink, silver, and gold.

The meanings one may find in dreams are subjective, and subjectively dreams usually seem to have more than one meaning, with symbols that can do “double duty.” Or as Freud noted, dream symbols can be very efficient. I will give my interpretation, but others may see different things here as well.

The sea, it seemed to me, represented the unconscious with its surface being the dividing line between these two states of mind: the conscious and the unconscious. The fact that the sea was vast and dark meant to me that it has an archetypal element to it. In fact the three levels – top deck, lower deck, and sea itself – could easily represent consciousness, the personal unconscious, and the collective unconscious, respectfully.

At the level of the second deck the angry voices, I thought, could only represent the self-doubts and self-criticisms that I was

undergoing at the time. (Had I been younger I might have seen these as voices of other people – family or others – with whom I had experienced conflicts; but at this level of maturity, I think I understood that they were best seen as conflicted parts of my self.) This was the level of the personal unconscious to me.

The vastness and darkness of the sea evoked a kind of numinous feeling, so I had not doubt that this represented something very primitive and archetypical: The collective unconscious.

I suspect that a Jungian might also see the crisscrossed piers as representing opposing forces within myself. But note that the fish was caught at the juncture of these forces. I believed that the fish represented my greater self – it symbolized that for which I strove so intently in both my conscious state and at a deeper level. This “catch” also silenced and awed (at least temporarily) the angrier inner voices of conflict and doubt. I think the enormity of the dream and its symbols overwhelmed me, and for a time inflated my ego. But I also felt that it marked a significant milestone in my process of personal growth.

Perhaps the dream helped me to solve some of my external problems as well as internal conflicts. I had been dating many women at this point in my life, and was not really sure of what it was that I wanted or needed from a relationship. But about a year later I made a choice and married – a decision that I have never regretted.

It seems with me that at every point in my adult life when I am experiencing a certain degree of tension, a feeling of being blocked, I begin to have such archetypical dreams of fishing expeditions; it becomes my own way of “working things out” at an unconscious level – corresponding as well with work on personal conflicts at an outer level.

## Psychological Types

In Jung’s (1921/1971) book *Psychological Types* he described two basic *attitudes* (or characteristic ways of acting) called



*introversion* and *extraversion*, and four *functions* (or typical ways of taking in or processing information): *Thinking, feeling, sensing* and *intuiting*. The attitudes represent opposing styles – introversion versus extraversion – as do the two opposing pairings of the functions: Thinking versus feeling, and sensing versus intuiting.

Many people have taken psychological tests that measure these attitudes and functions, the best known of these being the *Myers-Briggs Typological Indicator*, or MBTI (Myers, 1980). The *Keirsey Temperament Sorter* (Keirsey, 1998) is another well-used instrument for measuring Jungian types; also see Wheelwright and Buehler (1964).

### **The Attitudes: Introversion versus Extraversion**

Introverts are people with an inward and subjective orientation (or attitude, in Jung’s terminology) to the world; they tend to like ideas. Extraverts, on the other hand, are oriented to the external and the objective; to people and to action. Jung’s two basic personality types based on these classifications have been upheld in countless psychological research studies of personality traits (recalling Chapter 14). But notice that Jung viewed these types somewhat differently from most theorists. Hans Eysenck and others saw extraverts as very sociable, outgoing, physical, and prone to taking risks; and introverts as shy and retiring. The truth is that, because introverts often are so “inward,” they are much less attuned to what is going on around them, and they are indeed less sociable. But Jung’s views on the difference between these types differ from later theorists, who stress relationships to a much greater degree. (But note that both points of view can be considered valid without contradiction.)

It is historically interesting to note that Jung thought that part of his conflict with Freud arose because the two psychiatrists were opposing types, at least in writing styles: Freud’s writings expressed an extroverted psychology whereas Jung’s (and Alfred Adler’s for that matter) were both strongly introverted in their contexts.

## **The Functions: Thinking Versus Feeling, Intuiting Versus Sensing**

*Two Kinds of Perceiving.* Jung believed that people differ in the way that they perceive the world. Some people focus on the reality of the objects they see before them whereas other folk see possibilities. Consider a plain white vase. When such an object is placed before a sensing person, she “sees” a plain white vase, but an intuiting person sees (perhaps) a container for liquid, an object of beauty (when filled with red roses), or more artfully imagines what the vase might look like if adorned with paste-on sequins and rhinestones. Jung believed that intuiting people use more of the unconscious mind in perceiving, sensing people more the conscious mind, or WYSIWYG (“what you see is what you get”).

*Two Kinds of Judging.* When making decisions or coming to conclusions, thinking people use logic more than emotion and the process tends to be impersonal. Feeling people are the opposite; they view things more subjectively, and are concerned with the personal consequences of decisions that they may make whenever people are concerned. It is not necessarily true that feeling people are illogical; more to the point they are “tender-minded” to use William James’ term (a trait also identified by Raymond Cattell as one of his personality dimensions; Chapter 14) when deciding issues that affect people’s feelings. Research on gender roles has shown positive correlation between thinking and traditional masculine or instrumental role, and there is also a positive correlation between feeling and traditional feminine or communal gender role (e.g., Lentz, 1983<sup>8</sup>). There are also gender differences as one might expect, with women scoring higher on feeling, men on thinking; but bear in mind that these differences are only based on averages: there are also lots of men who are feeling types and there are many women are thinking types. It is of course, possible for some people to be quite well-developed on both sides; a goal advocated long ago by C. P. Snow (1959; also see Hustvedt, 2016).

*A Functional Hierarchy.* Jung believed that just *one* of the functions (thinking-feeling or sensing-intuiting) was a person’s *superior or dominant function*, or the one he/she uses most often

in dealing with the outer world. Another is the *secondary or auxiliary function*, one that is also relied on, but not as much. The third in the hierarchy is called the *tertiary function*; it is used much less, hence it is almost unconscious in many people. Finally, the *inferior function* is the one used less, of which most people are unaware. For example, consider a man who is very much a thinking person (his superior function) who also uses sensing as his “backup” or secondary function. As he is not without compassion, he also recognizes that he has feelings for people (feeling is tertiary). But this man is not very intuitive, so that is his least developed or inferior function.

***Judging-Perceiving: The Myers-Briggs Addition.*** In order to determine one’s superior function, the Myers-Briggs instrument includes a measure of the way in which people confront the outer world. (This typological measure was not part of Jung’s original scheme.) ***Judging*** people are more decisive whereas ***perceiving*** people have a greater tolerance for lack of closure (and perhaps toward procrastination). Similarly, Judging people tend to like schedules, perceiving people are more open to spontaneous activity.

Here is how these additional measures work toward determining one’s dominant function (this may seem somewhat complex!). If a person is an extravert and judging, then the dominant process is, indeed, a judging one of thinking or feeling (whichever the person has scored highest on). If a perceiving type, then the dominant process is sensing or intuiting.

But this is *reversed* for introverts because introverts approach the outer world differently; introverts, by definition, do not use the dominant process to deal with the outer world (they use the dominant process to deal with the inner world). Therefore, if an introvert is judging then the dominant function is perceiving – either sensing or intuition. And if the introvert is perceiving, then the dominant process is thinking or feeling. Isabel Myers Briggs (1980) argues that the judging-perceiving typology and its ability to identify one’s dominant function follow indirectly from Jung’s (1921/1971) extended theorizing.

## Usefulness of the Types

Tests of Jungian typology like the Myers-Briggs use letters to abbreviate types as follows, with an illustrative item (not from any given test) shown in parentheses:

- I: Introversion (“I love best a day spent with my studies.”)
- E: Extraversion (“I am most energized when in a group of people.”)
- S: Sensing (“I am good with details.”)
- N: Intuiting (“I place trust in my hunches.”)
- T: Thinking (“I base my opinions about people on facts, not emotions.”)
- F: Feeling (“I value harmonious relationships.”)
- P: Perceiving (“I enjoy spontaneity in interactions with others.”)
- J: Judging. (“I carefully plan my daily activities in advance.”)

These comprise four pairs of opposites (e.g., I vs. E). From these it is possible to construct 16 possible types (e.g., INFP, ESTJ). Descriptions of each type are beyond the scope of the present text, but see, for example, Boeree (1997), Kiersey (2004), or Myers (1980). These classifications are widely used in business management seminars (primarily to help people to understand and get along with people who are of different types than themselves), and in personal and occupational counseling (certain types seem to gravitate to certain fields).

Here are some of interesting findings on types reported by Myers (1980):

- In a study of 375 couples, most were matched (77%) on at least two of the MBTI scales, and only 4% were totally dissimilar. But most typically the couples were matched on S or N, or in other words, they “saw things the same way” (p. 128).
- Some occupations are also more clearly “typed” than others. Myers reported that 87% of accountants were of type S, and of these, the majority were STs.
- But 77% of research scientists were NTs.

- In a sample of college students who selected counseling as a major, 77% were NFs.
- And 78% of nursing students were of type F (split between SF and NF).
- In Western cultures such as the U.S., about 75% of the population are extraverts, 25% introverts. These statistics are reversed in Asian countries such as Japan.

Some people are quite taken with Jungian typology. As a result of having taken the test they often feel that they have a greater understanding of themselves and especially of their relationships to others, why others are different, and so forth. Some even claim that this knowledge has changed their outlook and their very lives! But others are skeptical and seem to find this test of no more use than a typical supermarket magazine article with a self-improvement quiz (see, for example, Emre, 2018). (Perhaps the value one finds in the tests is related to one's type itself!) But as noted, research does show statistically and practically significant results indicating that certain types do gravitate to certain occupations and that type matches and mismatches in intimate relationships can be predictive of success or failure. The constructs thus have some demonstrated utility.

A different criticism has been made by some personality researchers who claim that types represent only extremes and that most of us are somewhere in the middle on these typology scales. In fairness, tests like the MBTI and Keirsey also give continuous variable scores on each bipolar dimension as well as type classification. But on the other hand, Jung's theory posits that individuals are essentially of one type or another, and that these preferences determine the *characteristic* ways in which they interact with the world. The notion of discrete types is also important in his ideas about psychological development, as will be seen subsequently.

# Jung on Personality Development

## The Developmental Process

Jung likened human development to the development of any organism. A person begins as an embryo or “seed” that represents life undifferentiated at the beginning, but throughout the course of development unfolds or becomes more differentiated (in both biological and psychological senses of the word). Jung’s approach, like that of Maslow and Rogers (considered later in this section) was *ogranismic*<sup>9</sup> in that he saw the process of development as going from an undifferentiated state into one that was increasingly integrated or consistent and unified, thus his emphasis was holistic. The ultimate goal of personality development was the achievement of selfhood, self-realization, or a state of completeness or wholeness – though Jung realized that full attainment of the self is never complete: the quest for selfhood is always necessarily imperfect. But some people come closer to this goal (or are more integrated) than others.

A life well-lived was for Jung (as for Socrates) a well-examined one. Development of the self he considered a life-long process. It is not surprising that with Jung’s inward orientation he saw integration of the personality in terms of increasingly bringing more unconscious parts of ourselves into conscious awareness. The competent therapist could facilitate this process by helping a person understand their dreams or by any other means that brings the patient in contact with his/her unconscious thoughts and feelings. The more difficult road, of course, is to undergo this process alone (as Jung did), rather than with the aid of a therapist or with the help of some other “wise counselor.”

*Individuation and Differentiation.* The process of *individuation* for Jung was the development of all the different potential aspects of one’s personality in the journey to selfhood. Jung’s emphasis was on development of wholeness or completeness rather than development of “goodness” (don’t overlook that “shadow side”!). *Neurosis* occurs as a stifling of

individuation, in which a part of the personality remains undifferentiated from the rest (e.g., the archetypes of the anima, animus, persona, or shadow; or one of the attitudes or functions).

Individuation implies the separate development of a number of different personality aspects, some of which may appear to be in opposition (e.g., introversion and extraversion or thinking and feeling). Such development Jung referred to as *differentiation* (a complementary process to individuation; individuation refers to the growth of various aspects of one's self, differentiation refers to their distinctiveness). But ultimately the self is perceived as a psychological whole.

Jung saw individuation as an inner process that occurs in everyone, universally, which does not require any external impetus – though external forces may inhibit it. For example, Hall and Nordby (1973) suggest that “the modern world provides inadequate opportunities for the shadow archetype to become individuated” (p. 83; also see Jung, 1957.)

***The Transcendent Function and Integration.*** How did Jung reconcile this development of many parts with the idea of the self as a whole? By introducing the concept of the *transcendent function* in which psychological opposites are united. For Jung this meant uniting conscious perceptions with unconscious ones. This transcendence takes place when the conscious mind confronts the unconscious (e.g., with the help of a Jungian analyst), resulting in a new level of understanding that unites concepts that were previously at odds.

Consider the example of a man who learns to develop his anima (feminine side). Such a man “. . . is *not* one whose behavior is sometimes masculine and sometimes in the feminine mode. He is *not* part man and part woman. Rather, a true synthesis between opposites has been achieved so that it may be said transcendence has abolished gender except in a biological sense” (Hall & Nordby, 1973, p. 85). *This is a powerful statement!* While it is unlikely that any male completely transcends gender, it is possible that he can transcend gender stereotyped roles by embracing his feeling side, and can thus become more fully human (or *integrated*). Needless

to say, a similar potential exists for a woman. But how many of us really reach such a level of integration?

Jung believed that the transcendent function is often realized symbolically in dreams in which opposites are co-joined. Dream symbols of transcendence include the hermaphrodite (person of balanced gender) or perhaps a dream of a wedding (as in the “marriage or joining of opposites”). Indeed, Jung thought that there was an archetype of the “royal marriage” (which he also termed the *hieros gamos*, a Greek phrase). Perhaps the public’s fascination with royalty (as in the frequent tabloid references of the real lives of the British royal family) is unconsciously reflected by such concerns! Certainly the *hieros gamos* is the stuff of many a fairy tale.

### **Jungian Stages of Development**

Jung (1931/1960) divided the lifespan into four major stages: Childhood, youth, middle age, and old age. But basically Jung saw a dichotomy between the tasks of youth and those of the later years, beginning with middle age (about 35-40 years).

***The First Half of Life.*** In early *childhood* the infant has little notion of the self, but as the ego develops and the infant’s conscious awareness of its environment increases, children first seem to see themselves in the third person, as though they were objects (not unlike Piaget’s ideas per Chapter 3). Later their sense of themselves as separate beings increases as the beginnings of selfhood start to show themselves. From a Jungian viewpoint, the rest of one’s life can be seen as a process of increasing this self-awareness and self-knowledge – a process that is obviously more complete in some than in others.

***Youth.*** Youth is the period from puberty until middle age. As with Freud and Erikson, Jung saw puberty as a time in which the adolescent’s conflicts concern the need to cling to the childish needs and dependencies of the past which clash with the simultaneous need for adult independence. Jung would probably not have quibbled with Erikson’s characterization of this stage as one of identity versus role confusion. And as with Erikson, Jung



saw young adulthood as a time of establishing a family and career. Jung believed that during this time behavior was largely guided by societal demands. Men typically learn to assume masculine careers and male parenting roles, and women feminine family and career roles. In coming to grips with these external demands, Jung saw extraversion as the required attitude (and therefore extraverts make a better adjustment during this phase). People thus tend to be somewhat one-sided in their psychological development during the first phase of life. They also rely very much on their dominant attitude and dominant function.

*The Second Half of Life.* At middle age the individual has, presumably, accomplished many of her/his major life goals pertaining to career and family. This is the time when people begin to search for something more as they look inward and take stock of themselves and where they will be going for the rest of their lives. Now introversion takes precedence as the needed function for accomplishing this task (and introverts, at last, have the advantage). The individual often becomes more involved in community affairs, and artistic endeavors (compare to Erikson's generativity). But this is also a time for increased self-discovery, which for Jung meant expanding the self, in part by getting in touch with one's unconscious thoughts and desires. Ideally, one would learn to discover and exercise one's previously ignored functions – the sensing woman develops her intuition; the thinking man develops his feeling side; women relate to their animus and develop their masculine attribute; and men to their feminine (anima) side.

Jung especially enjoyed counseling patients at this age because he could help them discover and explore these different sides of themselves. He used dream analysis as one technique for doing this, because he felt (as did Freud) that dreams were the key to the unconscious mind; but whereas Freudian interpretation involved themes of sex and aggression, Jung strove more to help people find personal meaning. This personal search did include identifying complexes or personal conflicts, but also helping people to discover (or uncover) more of the totality of the self that was

within their reach – so partly this involved identification of archetypal elements in dreams.

At the time of middle age, many (if not most) people encounter what Jung termed a *midlife crisis*. A person realizes that the goals of the first half of life are completed (or are at least under control), but then begins to ask “now what?” The accomplishments that a person has achieved have usually come at some cost; for in bowing to social convention, something of the individual may have been lost. It is at this point that the woman may turn toward her animus, the man to his anima. Jung’s advice is to listen to one’s dreams, to the unconscious, and to try to learn from this listening.

How one actually handles the midlife crises varies considerably from person to person. Some people handle this period with more grace than others. But it can be a conflict and a struggle, sometimes resulting in a person’s complete remaking of their life. For example, a man who is anxious about his lost youth may leave his wife and family for another, younger woman. Women have also been known to leave their families for another life, though perhaps less commonly. But for many people this is more a time of inner change than of outer restructuring.

The second half of life for Jung was a time of confronting the fact that life is finite – we all must come to grips with the fact that we will eventually die – and coping with this reality became the primary task, especially in old age. At this time of life Jung believed that people search for a greater degree of spiritual connectedness. For Jung this meant not only examining one’s life but also trying to see one’s place in the world. Is there an archetype of the eternal? Jung thought so, and thus he believed that people at this age necessarily attempt to form an image of an afterlife. Although Jung wavered on whether or not there might be an actual afterlife he nonetheless thought that this kind of striving and imaging was not only necessary but a healthy part of living a full life.

# Evaluating Jung

## Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious

Jung's biggest idea, which was that of the collective unconscious and its archetypes, is also his most controversial. It is difficult to verify that such a thing exists, although indirect evidence of archetypes abounds in cultural myths and symbols, and in dream symbols. Other indirect support comes from the observation that certain phobias are much more common than others: fear of the dark, of heights, and of snakes. All of these have potential evolutionary adaptive functions – the nighttime is when peoples of old were most vulnerable to predators, and heights and snakes can both be quite dangerous to the incautious. Are our fears of these dangers based on some kind of innate patterns or forms similar to archetypes? Seligman (1971) suggested this possibility.

Whether or not one believes that the persona, anima/animus, shadow, and self are truly archetypes these concepts are still quite useful. While the author knows of no research into the potentially negative effects of identifying too strongly with one's public image (persona) this appears to be a legitimate if under-exploited area for further study. The same might be said of the shadow side of one's personality. But psychologists readily concur with Jung that men and women are to some degree androgynous (i.e., have qualities of both sexes). Some theories of mental health posit that well-adjusted, psychologically balanced people are those who have integrated characteristics of the opposite sex into their personalities (e.g., Bem, 1974; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974).

## Other Jungian Concepts

Jung believed that the reality of paranormal phenomena (extrasensory perception) could be confirmed scientifically, citing the pioneering laboratory studies of J. B. Rhine. But Jung's beliefs in paranormal phenomena have never been verified by careful scientific scrutiny under controlled laboratory conditions. Jung has also been criticized for his tendencies toward obscurity and to mysticism.

On the other hand, many of his ideas have been more fruitful from a scientific standpoint. These include the formulation of his psychological types, but especially his delineation of introversion and extraversion; his projective techniques of word association and physiological measures of skin conductance as indicators of anxiety or more deep seated problems<sup>10</sup>; his notion of the midlife crisis; and his concept of realization of the self. The latter, it seems, is reflected in ideas of self-actualization in the humanistic psychologies of Maslow and Rogers. Yet Jung is never cited by these writers as a direct influence on their thinking; nor is he generally credited with being the first major “self” psychologist. But perhaps his influence on these writers was indirect.

### **The Darker Sides of Jung**

*Jung Against Freud.* In the earlier days of the Third Reich Jung supported some of the National Socialist Ideology. At least for a brief time he played into the hands of these ideologists as when he wrote anti-Freudian polemics, which described Freud’s psychoanalysis as “subversive,” and referring to its “smutty-mindedness” (quoted in Stern, p. 218). Stern (p. 217) states that “The reigning politics [National Socialism] having evidently put wind in the sails against his former mentor, Jung sets the ‘Aryan’ unconscious against the Jewish counterpart.”

Did Jung sincerely believe that there was such a thing as a Jewish *racial* psychology that could be contrasted with a German one, or was Jung mainly making a personal statement reflecting his rather strong anti-Freudian sentiments? Jung later distanced himself from the Nazi thinking and he also had many close Jewish associates who adhered to his own school of analytic psychology. Jung strongly denied any ties with anti-Semitism but still railed at “Freud’s brand of soulless materialism” (Stern, p. 219). In any case many of Jung’s Jewish followers stuck by him and accepted his explanations, and today there are many Jewish practitioners of analytic psychology that seem to be reconciled with Jung in spite of these earlier remarks. Clearly he supported Jews who had been victimized by the Germans, and treated many Jewish refugees without charge (including his protégé Aniela Jaffé; Bair, 2003). But there are also those who reject Jung for his alleged Nazi

associations. Stern was not the only writer to suggest that Jung never got beyond the trauma of his split with Freud, “the spiritual father that he loved and hated” (Stern, p. 220). Kaufmann (1980/1992) was of the same opinion, noting that Jung’s painting of Philemon, his “wise old man,” bore a remarkable resemblance to Freud. He also believed that one of Jung’s last major works, *Answer to Job* (Jung, 1952), still reflected this inner struggle. Briefly, in this work Jung claimed that Christ in the New Testament of the Christian Bible fulfilled the need for a God-figure that lacked the vindictiveness of the self-obsessed Old Testament God, Jehovah –who persecuted poor Job on a whim (a wager with Satan). But Kaufmann believes that “In *Answer to Job* the Jewish Father [“Freud”], in the Old Testament, can do no right while the Christian Son [“Jung”], in the New Testament, can do no wrong. [Therefore] *Jung is still fighting Freud*” (p. 419, emphasis added).

A thoroughly researched treatment by Deidre Bair (2003) places Jung in a more sympathetic light, especially regarding newly uncovered details of Jung’s life before and during the war years. Bair finds him less culpable than have others in terms of both his alleged Nazi sympathies and his attitudes toward Jews. Of related interest, it has now come to light that Jung secretly advised Allen Dulles, of the U. S. Office of Strategic Services, on German activities through his Swiss contacts. (Dulles would later head the C.I.A.) Jung was thus an “amateur spy” for the U. S. during the war!

***Did Jung Experience Psychotic Episodes?*** Jung may have experienced psychotic episodes following the break with Freud which included full-blown hallucinations very much as are seen in some types of schizophrenia, or by ordinary people after taking psychotropic drugs like LSD. What is remarkable is that he seemed to be able to step in and out of these unusual states of consciousness; he had one foot in reality by anchoring his sanity to his connections with his family and in his practice; but he feared going too far and virtually losing his mind. This fear was well-grounded: Anyone familiar with schizophrenia will understand that Jung was walking a dangerous path in these experiences. Yet Jung believed that mental illness was not qualitatively different from

ordinary experience. To understand psychosis Jung believed that the psychiatrist must be able to project him or herself into a similar (or at least a sympathetic) frame of mind. He also believed that the hallucinations experienced by a schizophrenic were not random mental events but rather like dreams in that they reflected a person's inner world – their needs and anxieties. Thus interpreting these hallucinations was a step toward helping, if not curing, the patient. A similar viewpoint was advocated later by the psychiatrist R. D. Laing (e.g., Laing, 1960) who also believed that the inner world of the psychotic could be meaningful and must be dealt with by the psychotherapist.

### **Putting Jung into Perspective**

In terms of the development of the person through the life cycle, Jung like Erikson stressed the entire lifespan, even though Jung's focus was more centered on later life development – from middle age onward. Also like Erikson his writings on psychological development often seemed more like poetic description than rigorous science. The contributions of both of these two men are similar in that their conceptualizations of development provide a comforting framework for viewing growth processes: Jung's individuation and self-realization and Erikson's generativity and wisdom of old age are both positive outcomes of aging that most people can relate to. Jung's belief that people have in their nature a spiritual side – an aspect of personality he believed was either neglected in modern times or mistreated in fundamentalistic and literal ways – resonates with many people as well. There are a great many practicing Jungian therapists today as this form of therapy seems to appeal to a wide following. Perhaps one reason is that Jung placed so much emphasis on self-realization, including the search for a sense of meaning and for spiritual connectedness. Indeed, Jung's influence on religious thought and practice has probably been as great as that of his influence on the field of psychology (e.g., Stein, 1985).

\*\*\*\*\*

## For Thought and Discussion

1. Try to think of a dream you had that seemed numinous in the sense described by Jung; a dream that seemed to leave a lasting impression. Consider the characters in the dream and whether they might represent archetypes, and/or different aspects of your own personality.
2. Think of some recent popular movie titles. In each of these films, try to identify archetypical characters (hero, shadow, etc.).
3. Political analysis: Think of some prominent politicians (e.g., Bill Clinton; George W. Bush; Donald Trump). Do you think that a Jungian analyst would see in their personalities the archetypes such as the hero, shadow, or persona? How so?
4. Do you know your psychological type, using the MBTI framework for identifying the 16 possible typologies? Do you find that you clash with people of very different types? Can you give examples?
5. Have you had a midlife crisis yourself, or has someone who is close to you, such as a family member, undergone such a crisis?
6. Compare and contrast Jung and Erikson on the stages young adulthood through old age – how are they similar and how are they different?
7. Who appeals more to you as a theorist, Freud or Jung? Why?

\*\*\*\*\*

## Notes

1. Jung (1961/1973, p. 4).
2. Jung (1958/1964, p. 88; cited in Hall, Lindzey, & Campbell, 1998, p. 105).
3. "Objectively known": Not in a scientific sense, but as generally believed by the person.
4. Taken largely from Jung (1961/1973).
5. These paintings as well as a number of mandala symbols are excellently reproduced in Jaffé, 1979.
6. For an interesting account of the legend of Tristan and Iseult and their fateful romance as a paradigm for romantic love (or Jungian struggle between anima and animus), see Johnson's *We* (1983). Also see Sanford's (1980) *The Invisible Partners*.
7. The figures of Christ or Buddha are sometimes viewed as having attained the kind of perfection of self that most mortals cannot achieve; indeed, Jung used these as models of self-hood. For an account of Christ as a well-integrated, balanced individual in the Jungian sense, see Sanford, 1987.
8. Sharon Lentz (1983) found the following correlations of the continuous, bipolar dimension of the MBTI Thinking-Feeling scale with (a) biological sex (females higher on feeling) of  $r = .39$ ,  $p < .001$ ; (b) with masculine instrumentality (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974),  $r = -.48$ ,  $p < .001$ , and (c) with feminine expressiveness,  $r = .35$ ,  $p < .01$ .
9. Organismic theory in psychology stresses the unity and wholeness of the person and the personality; organismic theorists believe, for example, that one cannot meaningfully study perception, thinking, learning, etc., as totally separate systems. This approach characterized the Gestalt school as well as psychologists such as Adolf Myer and Kurt Goldstein. Goldstein was the first psychologist to popularize the concept of self-actualization.
10. Jung was not the first psychologist to use word association and skin conductance methods but he appears to have discovered these independently, and he did the most to popularize the former technique.



## References

- Bair, D. (2003). *Jung: A biography*. New York: Little, Brown & Company.
- Baumeister, R. F. (Ed.) (1999). *Self in social psychology: Essential readings*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *42*, 196-205.
- Boeree, C. G. (1997). *Carl Jung* [Online.] [www.ship.edu/%7Ecgboree/jung.html](http://www.ship.edu/%7Ecgboree/jung.html) [Accessed July 12, 2006.]
- Campbell, J. (1968). *The hero with a thousand faces* (2nd Ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Emre, M. (2018). *The personality brokers*. New York: Doubleday.
- Hall, C. S., & Nordby, V. J. (1973) *A primer of Jungian psychology*. New York: Mentor.
- Hall, C. S., Lindzey, G., & Campbell, J. B. (1998). *Theories of personality* (4th Ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Hustvedt, S. (2016). *A woman looking at men looking at women: Essays on art, sex, and the mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Jaffé, A. (1979). *C. G. Jung: Word and Image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- James, W. (1890). *Principles of Psychology* (Vol. 1). New York: Holt.
- Johnson, R. A. (1983). *We: Understanding the psychology of romantic love*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Jung, C. G. (1952). Answer to Job. In *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung: Vol. 11*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1957). *The undiscovered self*. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.
- Jung, C. G. (1959). The archetypes and the collective unconscious. In *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung: Vol. 9, Part 1*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Originally published in 1934.)
- Jung, C. G. (1960). The stages of life (R.F.C. Hull, Trans.). In *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung: Vol. 8. The development of*

- personality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Originally published in 1931.)
- Jung, C. G. (1964). Flying saucers: A modern myth of things seen in the sky. In *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung: Vol. 10*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Originally published in 1958.)
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types* (R.F.C. Hull, Trans.). *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung: Vol. 6*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Originally published in 1921.)
- Jung, C. G. (1973). *Memories, dreams, reflections* (Revised Ed., A. Jaffé, Ed., Trans. Richard & Clara Winston). New York: Pantheon Books. (Originally published in 1961.)
- Kaufmann, W. (1992). *Freud, Adler, and Jung*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers. (Originally published in 1980.)
- Keirsey, D. (1998). *Understand me II: Temperament, character, intelligence*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.
- Laing, R. D. (1960). *The divided self*. London: Tavistock.
- Lentz, S. L. (1983). *Jungian concepts as correlates of masculinity and femininity in a study of heterosexual attraction*. Unpublished masters thesis. Northridge, CA: California State University, Northridge.
- Myers, I. B. (1980). *Gifts differing*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Pagels, E. (1979). *The Gnostic gospels*. New York: Random House.
- Porter, J. M. (2003). *The Tao of Star Wars*. Lake Worth, FL: Humanics Publishing Group.
- Sanford, J. A. (1980). *The invisible partners: How the male and female in each of us affects our relationships*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Sanford, J. A. (1987). *The kingdom within* (Revised Ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1971). *Phobias and preparedness*. *Behavior Therapy*, 2, 307-320.
- Snow, C. P. (1959). *The two cultures and the scientific revolution*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1974). Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem

and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 29-39.

Stein, M. (1985). *Jung's treatment of Christianity: The psychotherapy of a religious tradition*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron Publications.

Stern, P. J. (1976). *C. G. Jung: The haunted prophet*. New York: George Braziller.

Wheelwright, J. B., & Buehler, J. A. (1964). *The Grey-Wheelwright Test* [Manual]. San Francisco: Society of Jungian Analysts of Northern California.