

Monograph
**RECOVERING THE EXPERIENCE OF THE LOST
NUMINOUS IN CURRENT JUNGIAN PSYCHOLOGY:
A POETIC AND MUSICAL LAMENTATION**

Suzan Rood Wilson,
Jungian Analyst
Member of C. G. Jung Institute of Seattle
Seattle, Washington

© Suzan Rood Wilson, all rights reserved. 2008.
Permissions through the law offices of Mark J. Wilson, Seattle, Washington

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Translation</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>	
I. <u>Abstract</u>			5	
II. <u>Foreword</u>		<i>The phenomena of personal experiences, past and present</i>	7	
	אימא	Mother	<i>Following inklings, “Mother Path”</i>	7
	דמעות	Tears	<i>Telling about the Numinous</i>	8
	היים	Life	<i>First experiences of the Numinous, “Ruby Crystal” dream, Guadalupe, Music.....</i>	9
	חג ההתגלות	Epiphany	<i>The Numinous Etching on the wall.....</i>	16
	מנורה	Menorah	<i>“Numinous Wall” dream.....</i>	18
III. <u>A Case for the Experience of the Numinous</u>			21	
	נסתר	Mystery	<i>The Idea of the Holy, Varieties of Religious Experience.....</i>	21
	לשון	Language	<i>Etymology of “Numen”, Hymn to the Sun....</i>	24
	להנהן	Nod	<i>Ann Marie.....</i>	27
	שמיימית	Numinous	<i>The Idea of the Numinous, Participation Mystique, Corbett.....</i>	29
	לילית	Lilith	<i>Kris, Lilith, lion, red wig.....</i>	32
	יונג	Jung	<i>Jung and Schlamm on consciousness.....</i>	38
	מקרין אור	Luminous	<i>Æ and The Candle of Vision.....</i>	41
	לעשות	Enact	<i>Mitzvot, Schlamm, To Do.....</i>	43
	בלתי ידוע	Unknown	<i>Tacey, The Unknown, rapprochement.....</i>	47
IV <u>Theory, the Second Pillar</u>			53	
	תיאוריה	Theory	<i>Bill, the couple at the door, etymology of “Theory,” explanations.....</i>	53
	סימן	Augury	<i>Pontifices & Augures, Levites & Kohanim, stadium & punctum, kairos & chronos.....</i>	58

<u>Section</u>	<u>Translation</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
פער	Gap	<i>Ulanov on Jung</i>	66
כלי	Instrument	<i>Lillian and the pottery monster.....</i>	69
משל	Parable	<i>Stories and Theory misused</i>	70
מות	Death	<i>My father, Writing on the Wall, Tenebrae service, Lamentations of Jeremiah, The Lessons of Darkness.....</i>	72
להפריד	Divide	<i>Holy Week and the Lamentations of Jeremiah.....</i>	74
חושך	Darkness	<i>St. James, Extinguishing candles, death</i>	75
ערפול	Negative Capability	<i>Keats, Hillman, Rodríguez, Penetratum of Mysteries.....</i>	76
דם	Blood	<i>Lorca and the Duende.....</i>	79
שושנה	Roses	<i>Castilian Roses.....</i>	81
רוח	Spirit—Duende	<i>Duende and Death.....</i>	81
אבידות	Loss	<i>Tea and Jungian Psychology before the lost experience of the numinous, Jung's experiences as basis for Analytical Psychology.....</i>	83
ירמיהו	Jeremiah	<i>Loss of heritage language, Jeremiah's four stages of prophetic calling.....</i>	87
לפתות	Lure	<i>A changing world: World Wars I and II, Nazism, Uncertainty.....</i>	91
פרויד	Freud	<i>Freud's fear of death, Jewish heritage, certainty of theory.....</i>	94
פסיכואנליזה	Psychoanalysis	<i>Rise of psychoanalysis in England, Fordham, Stein on Post-War atmosphere, Eros and Thanatos, Lockhart.....</i>	96
V	<u>The Manifestation of Loss</u>		102
הבהרה	Manifestation	<i>Collective influences away from numinous, regulations, power to control fear.....</i>	102
לנבא	Prophecy	<i>Jeremiah and prophecy.....</i>	104
VI	<u>Creativity and the Numinous</u>		105
יצירתיות	Creativity	<i>Einstein on Creativity.....</i>	105
מוח	Brain	<i>Neurobiology, mind/body connection, Effect of music and spoken poetry on the brain.....</i>	105

<u>Section</u>	<u>Translation</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
שירה	Poetry	<i>Poetry, Rilke's Sonnets to Orpheus</i>	110
VII <u>Retrieving the Lost Experience of the Numinous</u>			115
ניגוד	Opposition	<i>Collectives vs. Individuation, the Personae of Jung and Hedy Lamarr.....</i>	115
לאחזר	Retrieving	<i>Doing and then understanding, Colman and the Round Table, Johnston and extraverted/sensation, common language, equal relationship to tasks.....</i>	120
ארוס	Eros	<i>The missing piece, Metropolis: "The mediator between the head and hands must be the heart"</i>	126
גשר	Bridge	<i>Eros: the God which bringeth twain together in service of life.....</i>	128
<u>REFERENCES</u>			130
<u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</u>			134

I. Abstract

Current trends in Jung's analytical psychology embrace a variety of orientations. These may be seen as flowing from different "streams" of Jung's original thinking. I am most interested in Jung's reflections on the experience of the "numinous" by which he meant the sudden appearance of a potentially transformative experience that punctures everyday reality and arrives with a clear intention to create something from the event.

In order to understand Jungian analysis as a whole, it is necessary to reference Jung's psychological development, his *Zeitgeist* and the historical context that shaped his thinking.

As Jungian psychology has developed in subsequent decades, the experience of the numinous has been counterbalanced by theories that have explained the numinous *as a theory*, and not as much as an experience, as it had been viewed in Jung's time. This has been a necessary and valuable development, since it has brought balance, compensation, and structure to the praxis of Jungian analysis.

However, the balance has, in my opinion, tipped too far. I propose that the experience of the numinous has gone missing or untended in current Jungian identity and development.

In a theoretical approach the experience of a successful analysis would be the unfolding of the analytic work in conformity to a particular theory and expectation. The numinous approach is led by something other than conscious theoretical expectations, and is grounded in the *experience* of the numinosity of the archetypes. The experience of the numinous then becomes the guiding force in the analytic space.

The numinous approach developed with Jung and the first generations of Jungians that followed. The "theoretical" approach emerged in response to an overly romantic allegiance to the "numinous" approach. An overly romanticized approach to a numinous experience can lead to

inflation. Theory, in and of itself, is most successfully applied when it poses questions that open to other questions. However, when theory is misused, it can lead to reductionism and rigidity.

In recent times, Jungian literature has reflected the misuse of theory, and this has led to exclusion and diminution of numinous experience. The current generation of Jungians needs to find a way to harmonize these two approaches. Without this harmony and a common language, Jungians are in the position to continue an endless system of splitting within Jungian analytic groups.

Through poetry and music I will attempt to demonstrate the fundamental nature of numinous experience. Further, both poetry and music can deeply affect the brain and emotions through the phenomena of direct experience.

My understanding of how Jungian analysis occurs involves first working with complexes; secondly, working with the collective unconscious and then, working to discover the voice of the Self, through the various manifestations of the unconscious, including numinous experience. It is this last position that is my template for this monograph.

My intent is to illustrate the importance of the numinous in Jungian literature and in clinic and that the loss of the experience of the numinous in current Jungian psychology is lamentable.

Key Words: Numinous, Theory, Lament, C. G. Jung, Analytical Psychology

II. Foreword

And as little as aught can exist in man without the divine numen, so little can aught exist in man without the natural lumen. A man is made perfect by numen and lumen and these two alone. Everything springs from these two, and these two are in man, but without them man is nothing. – Paracelsus: *Sämtliche Werke*.

I am no stranger to numinous experiences. From my earliest memories, things have occurred to me and around me that have punctured my everyday reality. I have been forced by these occurrences to shift my awareness away from my conscious intentions and to give full regard to these “other” experiences. Sometimes these experiences come in the form of dreams or synchronicities. Sometimes they simply appear.

אִמָּא

(Mother)

I have written this paper heuristically and phenomenologically. Plainly stated, this means I had no outline from which to operate, but only an idea of or a trajectory towards what I wanted to write. The writing emerged as ideas came to me, through the writing itself and through my daily experiences during this concentrated period of time. The process has been like following an inkling. I had an inkling to look up the word “inkling,” and discovered that it derives from the Middle English words “to mutter” or “to murmur.” Both these words, in turn, are connected etymologically to the word “lament.” So, one might say I began my lament by muttering and following inklings.

One day during the time I was engaged in the process of writing this paper – in fact, I was one day from completing it – I went to pick up some lighting fixtures in Port Townsend for my never-ending house remodel. I went for a walk in the woods. Whenever I go to Port Townsend, I walk in the woods at Fort Warden. There is a path there, which has always “called” to me. Anyone I have ever invited to that spot has said that the place is “numinous” or “magical,”

or words to that effect. I call it the “Mother Path,” because I find it to be a place of the Great Mother. Numinous things have occurred for me over the quarter century I have been walking on that path. There is an energy force that has seized me, since the very first time I found the place.

When in those woods, I relaxed for the first time in weeks. I could feel the life force entering me, calming and soothing, like a good mother. I wondered if anything numinous would occur. I waited. Nothing particularly struck me. After about an hour, I decided to get some dinner. I always leave that place bowing my head in reverence and feeling as if I have just taken Communion. I walked down the “Father Path,” where my son, Henry and I had buried a piece of obsidian and a salt crystal in the roots of a tree soon after I learned that my father was terminal with cancer a few years prior. These two stones were symbolic talismans, which embodied an important aspect of the relationship with my father.

As I turned onto the main path that led to the car, I felt the steady cadence of my steps, breathed in the sweet smell of the wet earth and tree pitch from the Douglas firs. I was suddenly overcome by a rush of emotion. Tears began to stream down my face. I took out a scrap of paper from my pocket along with my trusty fountain pen, and jotted down my thoughts about the paper I had just written. I believe it needs to be included as the front piece to this body of work:

The words flowed from me like blood. I came to the woods to learn that. No animal appeared, no augury emerged from the flights of birds. Just a knowledge that my words flowed like blood, like tears.

דמעות (Tears)

The experience of *telling* about my numinous experiences has not always been positive. Some people are disturbed by my reports, or they do not believe me. They think I am in an ego-inflation or they ignore me for one reason or another. Some attempt to explain these experiences

as mere coincidence. Many who have experienced numinous events themselves choose to pay little attention to them; most do not do anything about them.

I do not know why these experiences occur for me or why they occur for others. I *do* know they come from “somewhere else,” or from something “other,” and they come with an intention. The intention is an imperative to manifest and create something from the experience, not simply to interpret or understand it.

חיים (Life)

I grew up in Studio City, California, during the 1950’s. I remember the distinct sound of the milk delivery early each morning. The milk bottles, filled with creamy homogenized whole milk, would shift in their metal delivery basket with the brisk cadence of the milkman’s industrious pace. I would hear the bottles rattling against each other, as the milkman set the basket on the front porch with a final percussive flourish. That was my alarm clock.

My house was not safe. Early morning was a mixture of the anticipated delight of the world outside, coupled with the dread of the dark, unknowable and unexpressed psychic disturbance that pervaded my home. Breakfast was accompanied by the white Bakelite radio that sat on a shelf above the washing machine. My brother and I would listen to the same radio program every day before school: *Turn Back the Clock with Andy and Virginia*. The radio was a bright counterpoint to the heavy atmosphere in the house. Something was wrong there.

I experienced the early morning Los Angeles sun, streaming in the den window and warming the house. Light, and the way it reached the earth at the 34th parallel north, was extremely important to me. In my earliest memories, light played a very significant role. And still does. Through my experiences of light, I could track the time of year by the angle of light

that penetrated my house and environs. Los Angelinos do not have a distinct sense of seasons, but I was highly attuned to the subtleties of light emanating from the natural world.

The natural world delighted me. I remember one morning – maybe it was a conglomeration of many such mornings – I rode my bike down the block toward the Catholic school at the end of the street. In the early part of the day our side of the street was in shadow. The interplay of sunlight and shadow are still imprinted on my mind. In the 50's the San Fernando Valley was filled with the smell of orange and lemon blossoms, especially as the earth warmed up in the mornings. The smells of my childhood are also deep body and brain impressions. The view across the Valley to the San Gabriel Mountains was crystal clear. I reached the corner and turned right toward the east. The sun was piercing into my eyes. I noticed some magenta and purple fuchsias in baskets, that hung from the rafters of the corner house. I smelled sweet orange blossom, sage, the pepper tree behind me and the eucalyptus across the street. There was a swirl of warmth, light, and smells. A sudden feeling overtook me. It was as if everything was surrounding me, protecting me.

In Junior High, I was accepted into the Chamber Choir, a small group of singers that was fortunate to perform some of the most beautiful choral literature. We sang Bach, Mozart, Brahms, early madrigals and liturgical pieces. I had always loved to sing. For the first time, I was given an opportunity to sing *great* things. I found my love and my home in music at the age of eleven. And I had designs on a career as a professional opera, oratorio and Lieder singer.

It was a pivotal time. I not only loved the music, but was also struck by the way the music and lyrics were intricately married. My entire being could be penetrated by the impact of certain pieces. This is still my experience. I guess I am some weird sort of Jew. I was raised on

high church music, yet am deeply rooted in the traditions of my own orthodox Jewish inculcation.

It was during high school when my older brother, Steve, and I would go to the corner record shop. Unlike many teenagers, we listened to, played and sang classical music. Steve is a classical guitarist. He would accompany me on his guitar while I sang. We spent our money on classical music records and sheet music. Music became part of our childhood psychic bank account. We would come home after school, put a record on and sing to it. One of these was *Les Leçons de Ténèbres*, (*The Lessons of Darkness*): *The Lamentations of Jeremiah*, by the baroque French composer, François Couperin. I have kept that record in my hall closet for years, along with a million other vinyl records, unplayed and untouched with the advent of new technology, but also not forgotten.

Through the amplification of a dream I had some years ago, I was reminded about the *Lamentations of Jeremiah*, *The Lessons of Darkness*. The dream brought back to me that each section in the Lamentations begins with a Hebrew letter that is sung as a “melisma.” Then the actual verses of the Lamentations of Jeremiah, which have been translated into Latin, are sung after each melisma. The piece is a meaningful representation of the mixing of the Hebrew/Jew and the Latin/chorister and is a way for me to envision the individuation process: through music and poetry. I knew this paper would have something to do with the Jew/Christian connection.

Not only did I sing in the Hollywood High School Chamber Singers, in which we were exposed to the liturgical music of the great composers. I also sang in the choirs of all my friend’s churches, including Catholic, Methodist, Presbyterian and Episcopal. I was the Jewish kid who knew everyone else’s liturgy. And, of course, when the choir went up for Communion, so did I. It became a regular part of my weekend religious experience: Synagogue on Friday night and

Saturday all day, with Kiddush, and Communion on Sunday morning in whatever church I happened to be singing. I was, and still am, no stranger to the *Coniunctio*, in whatever form it is offered – and to the numinous experience of singing.

In my fourth year of analytic training, on the night before we began the study of the *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, Jung's last great master work, I had the following dream:

There is a huge ruby crystal. It is about 5 inches in diameter, and has irregular but highly polished natural facets. The ruby is absolutely transparent, except for its gorgeous red color. In the center, visible from any of the facets of the crystal is a double helix shape of tiny faceted yellow diamonds, strung together. A man's voice booms out and says to me, "THIS is how you read the Mysterium!!!"

I understood the dream to mean that the *Mysterium* cannot be read in any logical or theoretical way, but it can and *must* be approached as if entering into the dark, into a church, into the experience itself. Any facet of any angle will reveal the absolute truth, the DNA of all matter and the Self.

For me, to sing is to be near God. When I sing, I am transported to another place, out of my body, out of this world, to what I would call the numinous. When I sing certain notes, it is as if I am taken off the earth. The poetry is intricately interwoven, so that music and poetry form a union of sound and image. The act of singing impacts me as if I am looking into the ruby crystal, into the eye of God. It connects me to my DNA, my true Self and God. The psyche does not care what language is spoken or which god or prophet is honored. I only know that through music, I gain access to the Self. Through music, I enter the double helix of all human experience.

During the twelve years that my husband, Mark and I tried to have a child, I began going to the Catholic Cathedral in Seattle, St. James. It was there that I began to talk to the Virgin Mary, since she was a Jew and also had undergone a form of *in vitro fertilization* – of a sort. I go to the Cathedral now and to a local Catholic parish church, Holy Family.

Before writing my control cases for my Jungian analytic certification, I took a day to center myself. I went to the woods.

Afterwards, I went to St. James Cathedral to light a candle in the Lady Chapel. When I arrived, the place was crowded. I needed *quiet*. I was not going to get it there. Besides, there were no candles to light, as the Sacristan had not yet replaced them after the noon Mass. The Virgin in the Lady Chapel had been replaced some months prior with a different icon. The original substantial Virgin was gone, and in her place was an icon of a young teenage girl with her baby. Somehow, this icon did not strike me as a motherly contemporary, one with whom I might have a good conversation about spiritual matters and initiatory preparedness. I visited the small chapel where a more maternal icon stood, one of Mary standing on the world, with her foot on a snake which had an apple in its mouth. I have a small statue like this in my garden.

I then went to Holy Family Church. It was about 3:00 pm, just at the turning of the season towards autumn. I parked my car, remembering the last time I had been here: the day of my analysand's father's funeral (the woman about whom I was about to write my control case, This was her family's parish church). Some years before the beginning of her analysis, this woman had a dream which heralded her breast cancer. In the dream she is bitten by a rat in her left cheek (the breast cancer was in her left breast). Her attention turns to a vase of red roses. She eats the red roses in the dream, as if by eating the roses, she was taking in the red life energy. I told her that if I had heard this dream at the time she was diagnosed ten years prior, I would have felt encouraged by the image of the red roses in the dream and would have felt that she might well survive the cancer. She did survive.

All the doors of the church were locked. When I tried the center double doors, something

gave way, so I tried it again. The doors had a deadbolt which was not seated properly in the flange. I pulled slightly and the door opened! I went in, closing the door behind me.

I was completely alone in the church, and there were no lights on inside, but the autumn sun streamed in through magnificent “vitreaux,” the stained glass windows. I sat in a pew near a vestibule and said to myself silently, “Wait. When you wait, things happen.”

The light from the west was coming through the stained glass windows, diffusing the light inside the church. The vestibule had an altar, but the icon on the wall was in silhouette from the strong low-lying sunlight streaming in from two stained glass windows on either side of it. The icon was actually a painting, framed behind glass, and I could not see it well, because the church behind me was dark and the light through the windows was obscuring my clear view of the image in the painting. There were also many vases of tall red roses concealing the bottom of the painting. I tried to move closer to see the painting and could barely make out the words “Our Lady of Guadalupe.” I knew only that she was the patron saint of Mexico, but knew nothing of her story. From my vantage point, I suddenly noticed that she seemed to be standing on some horns! This reminded me of the icon of the Virgin I had just left at the small chapel at St. James, who was standing on the Christian symbol of evil, the snake. This was a very powerful image. The Patron Saint of Mexico, standing on what I believed to be the horns of the Devil. What *was* this?

I left the church awestruck, closed the door tightly behind me and went home. I pulled up Guadalupe on the Internet, and at the same time I clicked into my email. There was an email from the “red rose” woman about whose case I was just going to write, which was synchronicity enough. I read her email first. It included a dream she had the night prior about being on a beach

in *Mexico* with two young animus figures. Naturally, I was struck by the fact that she had dreamed about Mexico and I had just seen the Patron Saint of Mexico back at the church.

I then pulled up the Internet screen and read about Our Lady of Guadalupe. According to Catholic accounts of the Guadalupan apparition, during a walk from his village to the city on December 9, 1531, which, coincidentally or synchronistically or numinously, is *my birthday*, only 421 years prior, Juan Diego Cuauhtlatatzin, a poor but devout Catholic, saw a vision of a Virgin at the Hill of Tepeyac. Our Lady of Guadalupe told Juan Diego that an abbey must be built on this site, but when Juan Diego went into town and spoke to the Bishop to deliver this message, the Prelate asked for a miraculous sign. So for the next few days, Juan Diego kept encountering the Virgin. On December 12, Juan Diego again encountered the Virgin on his way into town. Juan Diego told the Virgin that he was not believed by the Prelate. So, She told Juan Diego to gather flowers from the hill, even though it was winter, when normally nothing bloomed. He found Spanish Castilian *red roses*. He gathered them in his *tilma*, a garment made of rough agave fibers, which generally only last a few years, and presented these to the Bishop. According to tradition, when the red roses fell to the ground from his garment, the icon of the Virgin of Guadalupe was miraculously imprinted on the cloth. Part of the miracle is that the *tilma* still exists, beautifully preserved, and the colorful image of the Virgin is as bold and bright as it was when it first appeared. She actually stands on a crescent moon, not on devil's horns.

It took me some time to completely grasp what had just occurred. Often, I find that numinous experiences most often cannot be consciously understood at the moment they occur. This situation was no exception. In honor of the dream I ordered two Castilian red rose bushes to be delivered in the spring.

חג ההתגלות (Epiphany)

Recently, an analysand asked me about an etching I have on the wall in my waiting room. I had purchased this etching when I was nineteen years old from a little gallery across from the Academy of Fine Arts in Florence, where Michelangelo's statue of David resides. The etching was cheap. The subject matter had something to do with a woman writing music and being inspired from above by a divine light. The real reasons I bought it were because it was inexpensive and it had to do with music. It has remained on my waiting room wall for many years, and I was connected to it more by the fact that I had traveled in Europe as a young adult, and this was a European treasure that I could show off. I had no deeper relationship to it, except that it had a connection to music.

As I was commenting on the etching to my analysand, I suddenly realized that the etching was in fact, about the *puncturing* of music from the divine light of inspiration – the appearance of the numinous. I finally saw the significance of the etching that hung on my wall for many years.



Francesco Bartolomeo del.

Annali dell'Arte della Stampa Roma per l'anno 1717

מנורה (Menorah)

Many people express that they are drawn to Jungian psychology, because through Jung's words and experiences, they feel that they have been able to make *sense* of and to *understand* their lives through his theories and concepts. I have come to Jung in part for this very same reason. However, the larger part for me is that I have been able to find in Jung a *confirmation* for my own numinous experiences. Jung's encounter with the unconscious and his way of engaging the numinous has been a template for me.

In my family of origin I was the oddball. My parents and my brother were all born in July, all Cancers, born during the light time of year. I was born in December, a wild Sagittarian, the dark one, who carried the Shadow for my family. I was the medial one, who was designated, not by any design, to hold the light of consciousness in a family which could not see the darkness and destruction left in their wake. My birthday often falls during Hanukkah, the Jewish holiday that celebrates the miracle of light. My Hebrew name, given to me just after my birth, is Menorah, "the holder of the light." Neither the Rabbi nor my parents had a clue that in fact, I would have to hold the light for my family. It has often been a difficult task.

During my Jungian training program, my attention was constantly drawn to new literature in the field of Jungian psychology. These readings have been generally about new ways of approaching the unconscious, about archetypes, dreams, images, synchronicity, transference and countertransference, object relations, ego, Self and soul. I have found that many current Jungian writers and writers from other psychoanalytic disciplines, take Jung as a jumping-off point, and travel far to the "running stream and the watermill beating the darkness." (Eliot, 1930, p. 69)

I have been drawn to Jung as a source, even more so than for his theories. Nearly all of

Jung's theoretical postulations came out of his own numinous encounter with his unconscious, during the writing of the *Red Book*, which he wrote in the wee hours of many nights from about 1913 to 1918 . Jung does not talk *about* experience. He tells experience. He re-creates it, manifests it and makes art of it. Throughout his work, he reveals his individual archetypal blueprint through the images of the unconscious, the enactment of them and his subsequent understanding of what he had experienced, onwards through the development of his theories.

For me, then, the value in my study of Jung has always had to do with the primacy of *numinous experience*, in some way or another. Jung knew, as a *gnosis*, about the numinosity of immediate experience in images and creative acts. He learned that when the numinous is given its proper attention, it acts as an orientation toward the archetypal revelation of the story of a person's entire life.

Because numinous experiences carry intentionality, I have often pondered what the intention of numinous experiences might be. My answer is that the numinous is always pointing the way to a creative and imaginal manifestation. Although I cannot say with any certainty what the origins of numinous experiences may be, I *can* say that numinous experiences seem to “want” something to be born into the world.

Not long ago, before going to sleep for the night, I had been reading an article about a postmodern theory of dreams, and I had a dream that night myself:

I am in the farmlands of the Scottish Highlands. Before me is a wall, about six feet high, and only about 20 feet across. The wall could hold nothing back or in, since it was rising out of the ground, like a monolith, with open space on both sides of it. Unlike typical stones found in Scottish soil, which are traditionally dark, the stones that make up this wall before me are a sandstone color. Some of the stones are formed, like cobblestones. Some are naturally formed, but all are this sandstone color. The wall is constructed with some straight rows and some curved rows, but all the stones fit together perfectly, without any chinks. I view the wall from what would be the Northeast, and I am looking

to the Southwest at the wall. I notice that some of the stones have a luminous and numinous quality to them, and they seem to be glowing.

I awoke from this dream with a start. I knew instantly that the dream was clearly compensatory to the reading from the night prior. I had been reading about a theory of dreams. My viewpoint in the dream is from the Northeast and Scotland. My experiences in Scotland when I was in college, left me rapt in wonder. So, I associate the psychic geography, Scotland, to the numinous and the directional stance, the Northeast, to the light of dawn and to the beginning of wisdom. The Southwest is obviously the part of the country where I was born, but also represents to me the “opposite.” On “my” side of the wall, which is not really a wall at all, but something else, are the numinous stones. As I played with the images in the dream, I sensed that the other side of the wall would be the “non-numinous.” The view from that side would be of the darker indigenous Highland stones. If my side of the wall had numinous stones embedded in the structure of the wall, what would be “embedded” in the other side? Of what would the “non-numinous” side consist? I then thought about the reading from the night prior. The other side of the wall would be embedded with theory. Both sides of the wall are part of the structure of the wall itself. The wall could not stand without both sides.

Throughout my analytic training, I saw that the current direction of Jungian analysis has veered away from experience and toward the use of theory to provide explanations. Experience, which is always *uncertain*, is often treated as a theoretical construct, as if experience might be explained by theory. However, I realize that theory is not an explanation for the way experience is integrated. Unless a theory “conforms” experience, it is only a theory, and cannot begin to approach and integrate experience itself. Theory used to explain experience is a misuse of

theory. Taking hints from the dream, both sides of the wall create the structure, and both sides, theory *and* experience, must stand as the two balanced pillars of current Jungian psychology.

III. A Case for the Experience of the Numinous

נסתר (Mystery)

Intuitively it is possible to glean a sense of what the words “numen” and “numinous” mean in the Foreword above. The words, their derivatives and roots have historical usage that will illuminate the path that leads to the center of my paper.

Rudolf Otto and William James were at the forefront of early 20th century theologians and academicians who attempted to understand and examine the nature of numinous experiences.

Rudolf Otto was an eminent German Lutheran theologian and scholar of comparative religion. In 1917, he published *The Idea of the Holy* or as it was originally called in German, *Das Heilige*. It is one of the most successful German theological books of the 20th Century and has never been out of print.

Otto discusses the common usage of the word “holy.” According to Otto, holy has come to mean “completely good” in contemporary religious applications, as in the absolute attribute of moral goodness. It is Otto’s view that this common usage of the term is inaccurate. Originally, “holy” did not include any ethical or moral element. Otto states, “It was not original and never constituted the whole meaning of the word.” He says the original idea of the holy contained a quite specific *element* or *moment*, which sets it apart from anything rational, ethical or theoretical. It is something inexpressible...in the sense that it completely eludes apprehension in terms of concepts.” Concepts, he furthers states, are a “schematization” of what was “a unique

original feeling-response, which can be in itself ethically neutral and claims consideration in its own right.” Otto felt it was worthwhile to find a word to stand for this ineffable “moment,” or the “extra” in the meaning of “holy... beyond the meaning of goodness.” For this purpose, he adopted a word coined from the Latin, *numen*, which means “a divine nod in assent.” From *numen*, he created the word, “numinous.” Otto uses the word both as an adjective, as in “a numinous experience,” and as a noun, as in “the numinous.” Both uses of the word describe a state of mind that punctures psychic space and also stands for a state of mind in which the “numen” or “numinous” in a person begins “to stir, to start into life and into consciousness.” He states further that this experience cannot be taught, but rather can only be evoked and awakened in the mind “as everything that comes ‘of the spirit’ must be awakened.”

Otto explained the numinous as a "non-rational, non-sensory experience or feeling whose primary and immediate object is outside the self," which underlies all things. The numinous is a mystery (*mysterium*) that is both terrifying (*tremendum*) and fascinating (*fascinans*) at the same time. Of this, Otto states

A characteristic common to all types of mysticism is the “Identification,” in different degrees of completeness, of the personal self with the transcendent Reality. This identification has a source of its own... and springs from “moments” of religious experience... Identification alone, however, is not enough for mysticism; it must be Identification with the Something that is at once absolutely supreme in power and reality and wholly non-rational. And it is among the mystics that we most encounter this element of religious consciousness.” (Otto, 1958, p. 22)

William James, in *Varieties of Religious Experience* (1961) alludes to the representations of the Greek gods:

As regards the origin of the Greek gods, we need not at present seek an opinion. But the whole array of our instances leads to a conclusion something like this: It is as if there were in the human consciousness a sense of reality, a feeling of objective presence, a perception of what we may call “something there,” more deep and more general than any

of the special and particular “senses” by which the current psychology supposes existent realities to be originally revealed. (James, 1961, p. 62)

James termed one aspect of his philosophical constructs “Pragmatism.” He defined true beliefs as those that prove useful to the believer. How very pragmatic of James. Truth, he said, is that which works to further the way of belief. He considered that “religious *genius*” – which derives from the root word, “gene” or “a procreative divinity” – was another way of describing *religious experience*. He thought this should be the primary focus in the study of religion, rather than religious institutions and their accompanying dogma. He felt that institutions were merely the social descendent of genius or experience. Further, he believed that intense, and even pathological varieties of experience, religious or not, should be pursued by psychologists, because they demonstrate, in their grand scale, the normal processes of human life. In the chapter, “The Reality of the Unseen,” James provides several examples of “numinous” experiences:

Probably every religious person has the recollection of particular crisis in which a direct vision of the truth, a direct perception, perhaps, of a living God’s existence, swept in and overwhelmed the languor of the more ordinary belief. (James, 1961, p. 68)

Later he states:

[I]f we look on man’s whole mental life as it exists, on the life of men that lies in them apart from their learning and science, and that they inwardly and privately follow, we have to confess that the part of it of which realism can give an account is relatively superficial. It is the part that has the prestige undoubtedly, for it has the loquacity, it can challenge you for proofs, and chop logic, and put you down with words. But it will fail to convince or convert you all the same, if your dumb intuitions are opposed to its conclusions. If you have intuitions at all, they come from a deeper level of your nature than the loquacious level which rationalism inhabits. Your whole subconscious life, your impulses, your faiths, your needs, your divinations, have prepared the premises, of which your consciousness now feels the weight of the result; and *something in you absolutely knows* that that result must be truer than any logic-chopping rationalistic talk, however clever, that may contradict it.” (James, 1961, p. 74) [Italics added]

James realizes that there is no theory or a name for the experience in which “something in

you absolutely knows.”

לשון
(Language)

It is instructive to explore the origins of the word “numinous,” how it has come into modern usage and what is contained in the DNA of the word.

Etymology is the study of origins of words that have been lost through the development of language. Multilingualism, in which a people use more than one language, has likely been common throughout much of human history. In tribal hunter-gatherer societies, as an example, multilingualism was common, as tribes needed to communicate with neighboring peoples. In present-day cultures, where there is much variation in language over short distances, it is usual for people who have dealings outside their own town or village to know the language and words of the neighboring community. When speakers of different languages interact closely, it is typical for their languages to influence one other’s. Words from one language are often abandoned for words in another, especially when the population is greater in the language that is adopted and if the speakers of the new language wield more power or prestige.

The loss of the origins of words is lamentable, because *living* in the origins of words is the archetypal DNA of the language. The most common process leading to the loss of an original language occurs when a community of speakers of one language becomes bilingual in another language, and gradually shifts allegiance to the second language until the community ceases to use the original or *heritage* language. This occurs through a process of assimilation. The watering-down of a language is, in part due to a lack of regard for the inherent value of the heritage words themselves and the experiences out of which words grew. (Thompson, 2001)

What lives in the DNA of the word *numen*? By learning its origins, what can be

recovered of the original meaning and the value inherent in the heritage of the word?

The Oxford English Dictionary defines “numen” as “Deity, divinity; divine or presiding power or spirit.” Numinous and numinosity derive from “numen,” which is the basis for all words connected with it. These include numinal, numinosity, numinosum, numinism, numina and numinously. It is from the Latin *nūmen* (n), meaning “a nod in assent,” and *nuere* (v), “to nod or beckon.” Numinous, as stated above, is both an adjectival and a nominal form. Numinal is another adjectival form of *numen*, and numina is the Latin plural form. Numinosum is another Latin noun form of *numen*. The term is generic and does not indicate a particular religious or spiritual philosophy.

Swaddled in the etymology of *numen* are *nutant*, *nutate*, *nutation*, and *innuendo*. The first derivative is *nūtāre*, “to nod one’s head frequently.” The Latin adjectival form is *nūtant*, and past participle *nūtātus*, whence “to nutate.” Also there is the derivative *nūtātiō*, and the oblique stem *nūtātiōn-*, which gives birth to the English word, “nutation.” Nutation is the frequentative form of *nuere*, “to nod the head,” which has the prefix-compound *innuere*, “to nod the head,” with the prefix *in-* or *to*, especially as a *sign*, with gerund *innuendum*, and ablative form, *innuendo*. I found it particularly curious that “numinosity” and “innuendo” are related. I found myself musing about the “innuendo of the divine.”

Innuendo implies a condition “by nodding, hence by *hinting*.” From this we find *insinuation*, which derives from “to snake one’s way into a place,” such as into someone’s confidence, for example. Thus, the numinous snakes into our reality, hardly noticed, until it bites or punctures, and our attention is no longer where it was.

Related to *nuere*, or “to nod” is the Sanscrit *nāuti*, from which the stem and root are *nau-*,

návate, the stem of which means “he budes or stirs.” This is compared to *Ru nakati*, which means “to waken.” What is awakened by the divine nod?

Finally, *nuere* has the derivative *nūmen*, which can be compared to the Greek *neuma* related to *pneuma* from which we arrive at the lungs and “a group of notes sung while one’s breath lasts.” Here in this word are the overtones of singing. Song connects with spirit, and so, the numinous is also the *breath* of the divine spirit, which can be expressed through song. Following “spirit” a little ways down the road, its root is the Latin *spirāre*, which means, “to breathe.” My mind is awirl with images of spirituality. Spirituality is the way to *breathe* in the divine. In the act of breathing, the holy spirit is “inhaled.” The necessity of breathing is how the cells of the body become oxygenated. It is the breath of life. Implied here is that human beings cannot live without spirituality, which incorporates the need for song. (Partridge, 1983, p. 444)

In c. 1300 BCA., Pharaoh Akhenaten wrote “Hymn to the Sun,” probably as an ode to the Egyptian Sun god, Ra:

Thou alone hast created the world according to Thy wishes,
with men and their herds and flocks,
together with all wild creatures that are on the earth,
and that go upon the rivers,
and that soar through the air above us on their wings.
How splendid are all the works of Thy mind,
Thou Lord of Eternity.
*On earth all things are accomplished at a nod of Thy head,
for Thou are the Creator.*
Thou alone are life, for man lives but through Thee. (Italics added) (Pritchard, 1958, pp. 227-230)

So, the nod of God’s head sets in motion not only all of human existence, but also all acts of human creation. A numinous event, the nod of God’s head, is the harbinger of an imperative to creation, and to manifest the content embodied in the numinous event. Imagine what the nod of God’s head might look like. The nodding of God’s head, unlike a human nod, is not a subtle

gesture or nuance. I imagine it to be *really big*. For me, this is what the experience of the numinous is like. It comes as something really big, something from God that punctures into everyday reality and battens upon the recipient of this experience, the necessity to bring something of its intention to fruition.

להנהן
(Nod)

When my son, Henry was four weeks old, I needed to go back to work, after nearly a three-month hiatus from my practice. I was dreading the day, even though I worked in my home office. I did not wish to entrust my baby to just anyone. My husband, Mark, and I put an ad in the paper, and received about a hundred responses. The ad ran for a week, just prior to Christmas of 1994. During the first week that the ad was running, we hired a young woman. I felt that she was not perfect, but she seemed to be “fine,” her references checked out, and I could not think of a reason *not* to hire her – except she was not exactly “right.” Mark and I felt that she was the best of the respondents, and I needed someone, but I had a nagging feeling that I could not quite identify. I think I would have been more capable of identifying my feelings, if I were not just postpartum. She was set to begin work the first week in January.

On Christmas day, now over twenty years ago, after I had hired this other woman, I received a call. There was just something in the woman’s voice, and even though it was the least likely day to interview a nanny, I felt excited and asked if she would mind coming to my house for an interview. She said she would be happy to have an interview, even on Christmas day. When she knocked, I stood in the threshold of my front door and saw she was wearing a large crystal point, dangling on a chain around her neck. Our eyes met, and I “knew” her. I said to her, quite spontaneously, “I’m hiring you.” She replied just as spontaneously, “I’m taking the job.”

Obviously, she saw something in me, too. She later told me that the night before, Christmas Eve, she said a prayer in which she asked for change to come into her life. It was not until Christmas morning that she actually saw our ad. She realized immediately that this was the response to her prayer.

The way we hired one another was such an incredible numinous moment for both of us, which we discuss often, even now. After a formal interview (!), one in which Mark's logic dictated that we should actually *call* her references, Ann Marie was ours. She has been my son's "aunt" and my sister. And even to this day, she is my right hand. I rely on her tremendous intuitive and medial powers. She is able to anticipate my thoughts, my actions, and my laments. I am so grateful that she has been part of my life all these years and she has had a significant hand in the spiritual and emotional growth of our son.

Ann Marie is the eldest daughter of a Lutheran minister. She told me that when she was little, she used to say she would be a minister, like her father. Ann Marie is connected in some way to the same spiritual message that was carried by the ministers who surrounded her as a child, particularly her father. I have often said to her that she ought to pursue becoming a minister herself, coupled with being a therapist or a medium.

When I was in the midst of writing the paper, Ann Marie came in, having picked up Henry from school. As we ate a late lunch, she asked me about the progress on the paper and she asked to hear some of it. However, before I read any of it to her, we started to discuss *her* experience of God. I do not recall how the discussion began. She said that for her, it is as if God is a "partner." In her view, God says, "*You* don't know where everything is, but *I* do." She said further, "Usually you get a *nod*. You'll see one thing, and then you'll get a nod from somewhere else from your 'partner' that is in agreement with the last thing behind it. You see one thing and

then another that underlines the first thing. You're always in communication with your partner, but you have to be open and aware. Sometimes I say to God, 'I'm *here*. I'm listening.' I'm never disappointed. I feel synchronicity to be the outward manifestation of the inner dialogue and relationship with God."

I was absolutely sure that I did not read anything to her prior to that event about Otto's use of the term *numen*, or the "divine nod," but then, why would she have chosen to use the word "nod" before I read it to her? When I asked her why she had used the word, she simply said, "It just feels like a nod saying yes." This sort of event is particularly characteristic of my relationship with Ann Marie. The space between us was punctured by the "moment," the "event," the "numinous."

שמיים

(Numinous)

It is well-known that Jung used Otto's word, "numinous" in his clinical and theoretical investigations of the non-rational phenomenon of the puncturing by "something other" into conscious reality. Jung's basis for analytical psychology largely emerged from his encounters with his unconscious, which occurred from approximately 1912-13 to 1917-18. The images and inner dialogues that manifested from these encounters were described in the *Red Book*, the private journal Jung wrote during that disturbing, yet extraordinarily rich period of his life. The numinous images and experiences described in the *Red Book* were a primary source for the ideas and theories Jung developed in the *Collected Works*.

In the work of other scientists, theologians and analysts, including Otto, James and Lévy-Bruhl, Jung found links to his own experiences of the non-rational and to the concepts that he developed from his training as a physician and analyst.

Jung borrowed Lucien Lévy-Bruhl's term *participation mystique* to denote "an unconscious identity in which two individual psychic spheres interpenetrate to such a degree that it is impossible to say what belongs to whom." (Lévy-Bruhl, 1966). Certainly, my experience with Ann Marie was such an event.

In a recent publication, *The Idea of the Numinous*, the numinous is discussed by writers from different analytic traditions. It is one of the first large compilations on the subject of the numinous. What is noteworthy about the book is that each of the articles discusses some aspect *about* the numinous. In other words, the numinous *as an experience* is not granted sovereignty. I thought Lionel Corbett's article, "Varieties of numinous experience: the experience of the sacred in the therapeutic process," might be an exception, judging from the title. I learned through the process of researching for the paper that titles can be deceiving. More examples will follow.

In the article Corbett presents the dreams and visions of analysands. This was encouraging. However, Corbett attempts to "make a case for my own belief that such numinous experience is an authentic experience of the sacred." (Casement & Tacey, 2006, p. 54). Because Corbett presents case material, I was excited at first. I have had a direct and excellent experience in seminar with Corbett, so my hope was to read Corbett's own reactions in being a participant with the unconscious material of the analysand. It is evident that Corbett knew that he needed to be careful with the patient's numinous dreams and visions, for fear of hurting the analytic relationship. I think this is an appropriate stance. The analyst must be careful with any patient's production from the unconscious. Nonetheless, there is a sense in Corbett's article of his own disconnection from the *reality* of the patient's *actual* experience. What is missing is the *participation mystique*, the state in which the analyst can move into that interpenetrative psychic sphere, where the analyst's unconscious and the analysand's unconscious are indiscernible from

one another. At first, I thought perhaps it is Corbett's writing style. In actuality, however, the article shines a light on the trend in current analytical literature generally, which tends to omit the analyst's actual experience in favor of describing the events. Why must there be an ego in the room at that point? Why is the psyche not the authority at that moment? And most important, why must the analyst believe that something must be *done* about it, as if it were a germ in the room, to which one does not wish to get too close for fear of infection? Nevertheless, I feel a necessity to stand for greater engagement with numinous experience in a clinical setting.

I do not perceive in Corbett's article that he fully enters the numinous experience with his patient. He attempts to "help" the patient "understand and integrate" the experience. Corbett does not demonstrate in his article that the analyst can be a witness to the experience, not simply attempt to understand it or integrate it, but allow the experience itself to lead the patient *and* the analyst towards whatever it "wants." How can one witness, or enter the presence of the divine without feeling the sheer terror of such an event? It is a "just so" experience, very like a "just so" dream. It seems easier to some to sit with a dream, even a numinous dream, than experience the numinous directly, because the impact of the vision or dream is "one step removed." The dream happened last night or the night before. The vision occurred the morning after the last session. The analyst can distance him/herself from the actual impact of the *participation mystique* and the numinous that propels it.¹

What is so challenging about being in the room with the *numen*? How can one witness or more, enter the presence of the divine without feeling the sheer terror of such an event?

¹ It is true, however, that Jung himself understood the possibility of "infection" by the unconscious contents of another, which is the shadow side of entering another's psychic space. (Jung, MDR, p.50f)

לילית (Lilith)

The appearance of the numinous in my clinical work has been astonishing and also, at times, frightening. A few years ago I was referred a patient by a Jungian practitioner who was moving out of the area. The therapist told me that the woman was “not an analytic case.” I asked what she meant by this. The therapist said that she was probably “Borderline.” She told me the patient was very compliant and tracked all her dreams. They had done work primarily around her “father complex,” as the therapist told me, but the therapist just did not think that the patient could be in an analytic process, because her ego was not strong enough.

My first session with Kris was the typical gathering of bits and pieces of information. I usually ask on the phone, during the initial call, if the person dreams. I often find that the information I need to enter the analytic process is living in the patient’s dreams. In our first sessions, we discussed her previous therapy, and how it had been helpful for her. She told me that the therapist enabled her to see how her father complex was impeding her work life.

Kris was a medical care provider. The most important information I gleaned about her work was that she would often feel invaded by the negative energy of certain of her patients. Over time, I have come to understand that Kris was not Borderline, as in a pathological diagnosis. She was borderline, as in being medial. She passed between the world of the unconscious and her conscious life. The problem, as I diagnosed it, was that the invasion into her inner world was often hurtful and she did not have good protective mechanisms to allow her to be with these invading patients and still protect her own core.

Kris’ father died when she was eleven years old. He was alcoholic and was mostly

unsuccessful in and uninspired by his work. Her mother was also alcoholic. Kris described her as withholding and cold. The referring therapist felt one of the primary reasons that Kris was vulnerable in the world was because her father did not initiate her into her adolescence. His early death short-circuited his ability to teach her how to protect herself in the world.

Her brother, Tom, was beaten by the father. After the father's death, Tom's anger strongly emerged towards Kris. He beat her and berated her through most of her adolescence, as Tom had been beaten and berated by his father. Kris had had an intuitive relationship to her father, who probably protected her against the mother's lack of connection to Kris, at least to some degree. After the father died, the mother turned her back on the abuse from the brother. Many of Kris' dreams reflect how the mother may have colluded in allowing Tom to beat Kris.

Kris' animus had been likely identified with the failed father. Her practice as a health care provider has also not been very successful. She had not dealt to any great extent with her mother complex. She *did* understand that her mother was seductive and sexual. Kris could express her femininity through her sexuality, but her real feminine power was diminished into seductive sexuality.

Kris had three miscarriages in her late thirties and, as a result, she and her husband, Alan, adopted two Asian girls. She felt inadequate that she could not have a child from her body. Her marriage suffered during the time she was going through the failed pregnancies, and, for a while, she did not know if her marriage could survive. She almost had an affair at that time.

Kris presented dreams and worked with them imaginally and creatively, so this *was* analysis. About two years into our analytic work she had a dream. In the dream a male lion mauls a man and had his skin ripped from his chest. Another man was determined to save him. The man was helping him. One of the ways in which we discussed the image of the lion was that

it was an inner figure. We explored what part of her was a lion. She said that the lion in her was a highly instinctual and also incredibly powerful aspect of her masculine side. Kris had learned many Jungian terms in her previous therapy, so she attempted to understand the dream through the concepts she had learned. She talked about the animus being mauled, but that another masculine aspect was “determined to save him.” She thought this was positive. The lion energy could destroy, but it also was passionate, strong, helpful and determined.

She came to the next session having done quite a lot of research into lions. She had found and read the story of Lilith, Adam’s original wife, created out of the same soil as Adam. She was deeply affected by the power of this dark *feminine*, one who could destroy babies, seduce men, and yet contained the power of the lion. Lilith, she told me, was often depicted with long red hair.

The following week, Kris came into the session wearing a long red wig! I realized that I was sitting before Lilith. She presented a dream:

I killed the woman with the red hair. I tried to hide it, but some private police were on to me. Alan [her husband] knew about my murdering and he hoped I wouldn’t be caught, but he realized it would happen. I hid the remains of the blood, but on the blue chair there were small red hairs and the detective found them with a microscope. Now, here I was, a young person with young children, facing many years of prison. My mom was very shaming, but she thought that I could do the time in prison. That by the time Mary [her 10 year old daughter] was older, I would be out and it wouldn’t hurt her. I felt that all she cared about was that no one would know, and we would keep up appearances for Mary’s sake.

I might have interpreted this dream, but what was more imperative for me was to be with Kris in the *reality* of Lilith. She wanted to talk *about* the wig and Lilith. I asked her just to be Lilith with me. I asked her what she was feeling. I watched her enter the Lilith space. It took a minute or two while she made the transition. She said that she felt incredibly powerful. She told me, at one point, that she felt sexually aroused. She could feel that she was as red as the blood in

the dream with the lion. The power coming through her was so great. I felt afraid to be with her in this way, because, obviously, she was possessed of the archetype of Lilith. I also did not know if it would be right to have her stay in this brutal, yet passionate energy.

I had the referring therapist's words in my mind as we sat there. Maybe she *was* Borderline, and maybe I was watching a psychic split taking place right in front of me. In the end, something told me that I would be fine and she would be fine. I just kept going. It was strange to be in that outrageous energy with her. I experienced her animal power, her sexuality, her blood-letting and knew that she could devour. I hardly remember how long this part of the session went on.

Something shifted in the room. She became silent. We sat in this silence for several minutes. Her eyes began to tear up. She said she suddenly felt sad. She said she could not be passionate in her life with Alan, sexually, creatively or in any other vital way. She knew that she had to kill the red-haired woman because there was no room in her marriage or in her childhood for her passionate nature. I, too, was in tears. The only thing I offered to her was that some red hairs remained on the blue chair for the detective to find, which were the remnants of the wild, creative, yet devouring, raging and passionate Kris. I knew, but did not say, that this was the redemptive offering in the dream.

I had an almost unbearably difficult time being with her in that raw numinous place.² It

² "Raw numinous experience" should not be confused with "raw archetypal experience. Generally, experiencing an archetype is numinous; being identified or possessed by an archetype is not numinous. Interpreting observations as being the result of an archetype are not numinous, nor are explanations of phenomena archetypal. There are ways the concepts of the archetype gets used. Then there are ways the archetypes actually operate. For experience to be numinous the archetype must be experienced; identification with the archetype is not numinous, because one is merged with it, so to speak. But in no case can an archetype be experienced directly; only the manifestations of the archetype can be experienced. So in this sense, there is no such thing as a "raw archetypal experience." However, as I have stated, there certainly is "raw numinous experience."

was only by my being with her in the numinous affect that she could make any conscious sense of what had just occurred. It took several minutes of reflection for her to become conscious of what she had just experienced. She said, through her tears, that she knew for her to remain married to Alan, she had to sacrifice the Lilith part of her. The mother figure in the dream was also diminishing this part of her, in favor of keeping up appearances. She began to sob. I held fast. I knew something was coming. After she had cried as much as she needed, there was more silence. Here, now, was this vulnerable human being in a red wig. She spoke with a different voice. She said, “Your real self is reaching for you as hard as you are reaching for it. You think you are alone, but you’re not. You have this other side reaching just as hard for *you*.”



Figure 2
Lilith
("Thank you" note from Kris)

יונג
(Jung)

“Numinosity... is wholly outside conscious volition, for it transports the subject into the state of rapture, which is a state of will-less surrender.” – (Jung, 1981, Para. 383)

I made some mistakes as I did the research for this paper. Some are worth discussing. While investigating the Internet for articles on the topic of the numinous, I found a book, the title of which appeared to be exactly on point: *Jung, Numinous Experience and the Study of Mysticism* by Leon Schlamm. The book was scheduled for publication early this year. I contacted the publisher, only to discover that the book was not even set for publication. So, my timing was off. I then attempted to find the author, hoping I could get a glance at the manuscript or purchase an advance copy of the book. Maybe, I thought, he would allow me to pick his brain. I found his website and emailed him in England. A dear friend of mine who lives in Essex offered to go to the University of Kent (which my friend said was only a “spit away” from his house), and offered to copy anything Schlamm might allow me to see. I was delighted when Dr. Schlamm wrote back and included the titles of one of his articles and a book that contained a chapter he wrote on the numinous. In my return email, I asked if he might be willing to discuss his upcoming book with me. I offered some of the bones of my topic, before I had an opportunity to read an actual word from one of his articles or texts.

I found the article he recommended on the Internet and downloaded it. In my boundless enthusiasm, I also ordered up the book that contained the chapter he had written. I sat down to read the article I had downloaded. Again, I found titles can be deceiving. The downloaded article had a great title: “C.G.Jung and numinous experience: between the known and the unknown” (2007). The article was not what I hoped it would be. I realized only after I had “said too much” in my email that Schlamm would probably be utterly offended by the ideas in my paper. I do

make use of the book, but not in the way I thought I would. In my opinion, the article and book make what I believe are specious comparisons between Jung's and Otto's views about numinous experience.

The book, *Jung and the Monotheisms: Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (1994), contains Schlamm's chapter called "The Holy: a meeting-point between analytical psychology and religion." The book and the article compare Otto to Jung and find disparities in the way each approaches the "concept of the numinous." Schlamm says in the article, "C.G. Jung and Numinous Experience: between the known and the unknown:"

Nevertheless, in spite of these similarities, Jung had many reasons for modifying Otto's concept of the numinous. What most clearly separates Jung's interpretation of numinous experience from Otto's is *the clinical need at all costs to preserve the fragile autonomy of consciousness*, threatened by the fascinating, yet dangerous, numinous forces of the unconscious which are so powerful, they may cause the disintegration of the personality (Schlamm, 2007, p. 407). [Italics added].

Schlamm has cited Jung in *Collected Works Volume 12*, Paragraph 439 as his authority for his statements. This is what Jung *actually* wrote:

The dread and resistance which every natural human being experiences when it comes to delving too deeply into himself, is, at bottom, the fear of the journey to Hades. If it were only resistance that he felt, it would not be so bad. In actual fact, however, the psychic substratum, that dark realm of the unknown, exercises a fascinating attraction that threatens to become the more overpowering the further he penetrates into it. The psychological danger that arises here is the disintegration of personality into its functional components, i.e., the separate functions of consciousness, the complexes, hereditary units, etc.

Jung is writing about the Hero Myth. In the paragraph 438, just above, Jung writes about the purpose of the descent into the unknown regions of the unconscious:

The purpose of the descent as universally exemplified in the myth of the hero is to show that only in the region of danger (watery abyss, cavern, forest, island, castle, etc) can one find the "treasure hard to attain (jewel, virgin, life-potion, victory over death).

Schlamm's interpretation leaves out the most important aspect of the Hero Myth, which

is the inevitability of the hero's descent to find the inner treasure and the terrifying possibility that psychic splitting might occur when this initiation is undertaken. Jung does *not* say there is a "clinical need *at all costs*" to preserve the fragile autonomy of consciousness. This would indicate a complete misunderstanding of analytical psychology, which strives to bring into consciousness those elements of the unconscious that are often activated by numinous experience – in other words, the potential violent and reckless meeting of two opposing forces, which pave the way for a transcendent and creative third position, *hopefully* leading to the possibility of individuation. It is fundamentally impossible for an unconscious event to be conscious at the instant that it occurs.

The "Visions Seminars" were based on Jung's analysis of Christiana Morgan. Morgan drew the numinous images that emerged from the psyche during her analytic work. These productions from the unconscious became the basis for the seminars. Jung states, "My point is really the insistence upon the fact that no matter what your conscious attitude is, the unconscious has an absolutely free hand and can do what it pleases." (Jung, 1976, p.15) Later, he states, "We overvalue the conscious tremendously. . . But in a certain sphere of psychology, we see that consciousness means nothing" (Jung, 1976, p. 38). Both these thoughts support my contention about Schlamm's view that consciousness cannot intervene at the moment of numinous experience. Jung is saying that a numinous experience can interrupt consciousness, not that consciousness interrupts a numinous experience.

Toward the end of his life, Jung spoke to a group of candidates at the Institute in Zürich. He said:

If you follow the unconscious closely, your intelligence will not sink below a certain level, and you will add a good deal of intelligence to what you already possess. If you

take the unconscious intellectually, you are lost. It is not a conviction, not an assumption. It is a *Presence*. It is a *fact*. It is *there*. It *happens*.... (Jung , 1977, p. 320)

My fantasy about his remarks is that he may have been worried about the way in which his experiences and ideas were becoming theorized and made into certainties. Jung is asking for the candidates to leap into the chasm of the unknown. He is asking for trust, and trust is never certain. He knew that there was no way to understand the unconscious intellectually. There is no way to hedge one's bet: One can either go into the unknown or must stay on the sidelines. Jung knew that there was no way to make sense of what emerged from the unconscious until there was an *encounter* with the unconscious. Schlamm, in the above excerpt from his work, could not understand that Jung was advocating for nothing less than a heroic leap into the abyss of uncertainty.

מקרין אור (Luminous)

It should be recognized that Jung and his contemporaries, which included artists, scientists, and philosophers, were born and raised during the Romantic and occult movements of nineteenth century Europe. The late nineteenth and early twentieth century recapitulated and amplified the empirical scientific methodologies that were developed strongly during the Age of Enlightenment. In Jung's *Zeitgeist*, however, the psychological foundation for scientific developments was based in a deep relationship to the psyche, nature and art.

Jung's doctoral dissertation, "On the Psychology and Pathology of So-Called Occult Phenomena," demonstrates the influence of his early Swiss-German upbringing. Jung was steeped in the traditions of Romanticism and Occultism. The phrase, "So-Called" in his dissertation title is telling. It illustrates Jung's anticipation of negative criticism in light of the new science of psychology, which was evolving.

One of these contemporaries of Jung's, Irish author, poet, painter and mystic George William Russell, wrote a set of transcendent essays on Celtic mysticism. Known by his pen name Æ (derived from the word "Aeon," which was a pseudonym derived from a proofreader's query regarding the author's illegible rendering of the word, "Aeon," hence "Æ."), Russell was a seer, mystic, poet, painter, co-operator, political thinker, journalist, editor, public speaker, and the conscience of the Irish nation. He was friends with many other figures of the Celtic renaissance of the early 20th century, including Y.B. Yeats and James Stephens. He lived up to the "word of power." Russell once said to a novelist, "Seek on earth what you have found in heaven."

The Candle of Vision (1918) describes Russell's numinous and luminous excursions into the "otherworld," including clairvoyant and prophetic visions, precognition of Gnostic concepts, past-life and astral journeys, and, always, heightened awareness of the beauty that pervades mundane reality. Russell describes encounters with what today we would call UFOs, and attempts to construct a private Kabalistic text based on an intuitive reconstruction of a primal language and alphabet. He attempts to put a mystical gloss on the primeval Celtic pagan deities. In the preface *The Candle of Vision* Æ writes:

When I am in my room looking upon the walls I have painted I see there reflections of the personal life, but when I look through the windows I see a living nature and landscapes not painted by hands. So, too, when I meditate I feel in the images and thoughts which throng about me the reflections of personality, but there are also windows in the soul through which can be seen images created not by human but by the divine imagination. I have tried according to my capacity to report about the divine order and to discriminate between that which was self-begotten fantasy and that which came from a higher sphere. These retrospects and meditations are the efforts of an artist and poet to relate his own vision to the vision of the seers and writers of the sacred books, and to discover what element of truth lay in those imaginations. (Russell, 1918, p xii and xiv)

Æ understood the imperative of setting a foot strongly in both worlds, not one world more so than the other. Russell had success in the world of the everyday, but understood the necessity for a balance with the spiritual world.

Is it possible to bring the world of numinous experience together with the everyday world of consciousness? How might it be possible to understand and integrate numinous experiences? Corbett certainly hopes for consciousness, as does Schlamm. So does Jung. Æ lived both sides as well. How might this understanding and integration occur? Obviously, it cannot occur *in medias res* of a numinous experience.

לעשות (Enact)

A curious phrase in the Book of Exodus (24:7) gives a clue to the integration of the numinous and consciousness. God offers the Torah through Moses to the children of Israel. This “offering” is a Mitzvot or a Commandment. The appearance of God is always a commandment, in the same fashion that the divine nod or *numen* is a commandment. In the mysterious, tremendous and fascinating appearance of God, one does not stand about and muse, “Maybe I ought to think about this. Maybe I should be *conscious* of what I need to do with the fact that God just talked to me.” The scripture reads: “And he [Moses] took the book of the covenant and read it in the hearing of the people; and they said, ‘All that the Lord hath spoken will we do, and obey.’” (Davidow, 1957, p.62)

The Israelites do not hedge their bets. They do not question the numinous experience. They do not say, “Well, Moses, let’s just see what God is offering here, and then maybe we’ll do it.” This passage is also translated as “We will do and we will hear.” A midrash, which is a Torah exegesis, (Neuser, 2003) tries to explain this strange answer to the Israelites. God knocked

on the door of other nations and sought consent to the gift of Torah, but God was refused. Only Israel took the risk to accept the Torah, and to do so in a way that involved obeying/doing before hearing/understanding. In other words, the Israelites say, “We will do and we will hear.” Rabbi Menachem Mendl of Kotzk explained that some actions cannot be understood (or heard) until they are performed (done). It is only by doing that understanding may come. The Israelites were courageous enough to heed the divine nod. Not everyone is so open to the numinous.

Schlamm offers his idea that one fundamental principle of analytical psychology is to “preserve the fragile autonomy of consciousness.” He discusses the possessive or obsessive effect of numinous experience on consciousness.

Here lies the road to inflation or even psychosis... Moreover, Jung understood one of the most significant aims of the quest for individuation to be the strengthening, or even the extension, of consciousness in the face of these powerful, numinous, psychic forces. Even while he was emphasizing the value of the conjunction of consciousness with the unconscious for the individuation process, he was at the same time constantly warning his readers of the need for consciousness to maintain some distance between itself and the numinous contents of the unconscious, if there was to be an authentic *coniunctio oppositorum*. Consciousness must maintain its independence, *although not be completely disconnected, from the numinous, psychic contents of the unconscious*, if there is to be real individuation. (Schlamm, 1994, p. 26) (emphasis added)

Schlamm fails to comprehend that Jung himself fell deeply into the unconscious. Jung knew that he had to *do* first and then to *understand*, never knowing for certain that he would emerge whole from the experience of his encounters with the numinous images that emerged from his unconscious mind, recorded in the *Red Book*. How is it possible to maintain consciousness, while at the very same moment, “not be completely disconnected from the numinous psychic contents of the unconscious?”

Schlamm discusses the difference between the features of Otto’s theory of numinous experience and Jung’s. Schlamm proposes that Otto emphasized unqualified submission as a

distinguishing difference between the two. Schlamm states that mystics experience the *numinosum* more intensely than non-mystics, and contends, “Ultimately, the mystic must surrender his whole being, even his consciousness, to God.” The Israelites were not less mystical in their relationship to God than Schlamm’s mystic or the one he subscribes to Otto. In the same way, Jung’s encounter with his unconscious was not less powerful, simply because he held consciousness as a goal, *after the fact*. In each instance, submission to the images of the unconscious are required for a numinous experience to take place. Otherwise, God does not come. There is no nod. Schlamm further states:

Individuation [for Jung] requires the holding together of the numinous contents of the unconscious – even stupefying experiences of the *mysterium* – with consciousness; in other words, it requires the acknowledgement that there cannot be any experience of the *numinosum* without the presence of consciousness. (Schlamm, 1994, p.27)

I do not believe it is within human capability to be in an experience of the divine and at the same time, not be completely overtaken and in submission to that experience. Schlamm is attempting to make a direct comparison between Otto and Jung. However, Otto was a theologian, who was attempting to study religious experience, and Jung, in his capacity as a doctor of the psyche, developed his understanding of Otto’s idea of numinous experience and affect.

Jung understood that a numinous experience was nothing that could be mediated in the moment by the conscious mind. A numinous experience could only be understood by submitting to the demands of the experience itself, and the images within that experience that demanded to be manifested. Understanding and integration of the experience might or might not come after.

Jung approached this passion psychologically, not, as with Otto, only as a question of worship and religion. Jung’s concerns were similar to and different from Otto’s. Jung approached the numinous psychologically (as in the study of psyche or soul), *and* as a matter of

worship, religion and myth, healing and individuation, and of the essence of being and life itself. Otto's primary focus was on worship and the religious aspects of life. Jung's reflections lay in the direction of engaging the "inner God." Both men related to the passion that comes from the encounter with the image of God, the *imago dei*. For Jung, the question of a numinous experience was to make meaning of an aspect of the unconscious that needed to be made conscious and given form.

For Jung, his encounter with numinous experiences was of critical importance to the entire body of his work that came after. During these important years, during the writing of the *Red Book*, Jung was often emotionally distraught, and in order to maintain a relationship with the assaulting images that were rising up from his unconscious, he had to turn to some techniques to calm himself, enough so that he could work with the images:

I was frequently so wrought up that I had to do certain yoga exercises in order to hold my emotions in check. But since it was my purpose to know what was going on within myself, I would do these exercises only until I had calmed myself enough to resume my work with the unconscious. As soon as I had the feeling that I was myself again, I abandoned this restraint on the emotions and allowed the images and inner voices to speak afresh... To the extent that I managed to translate the emotions into images – that is to say, to find the images which were concealed in the emotions – I was inwardly calmed and reassured. Had I left those images hidden in the emotions, I might have been torn to pieces by them.... As a result of my experiment, I learned how helpful it can be, from the therapeutic point of view, to find the particular images which lie behind emotions. (Jung, 1989, *MDR*, p. 177).

Jung later wrote:

I took great care to try to understand every single image, every item of my psychic inventory, and to classify them scientifically – so far as this was possible – and, above all, to realize them in *actual life*. That is what we usually neglect to do. We allow the images to rise up, and maybe we wonder about them, but that is all. We do not take the trouble to understand them, let alone draw ethical conclusions from them...*It is equally a grave mistake to think that it is enough to gain some understanding of the images and that knowledge can here make a halt. Insight into them must be converted into an ethical obligation...* (Jung, 1989, *MDR*, p. 192f) (emphasis added).

Jung makes it abundantly clear that it is not only important to understand the images and to make sense of them, but more importantly, to *enact* them, create them and manifest them in everyday life. He strongly believed the psyche has a role in creating the future.

בלתי ידוע (Unknown)

Current trends in analytic literature show a movement towards blending Jungian theory with post-Jungian, Freudian, post-Freudian and other psychoanalytic traditions. On the one hand, Jung, who has really never been successfully restated in other analytic traditions, believed in the Collective Unconscious or Objective Psyche as well as the Personal Unconscious. Freud, and the post-Freudian theorists who reinvented the Freudian wheel, believed that one could plumb the depths of the unconscious and make all its contents known. Freud had a mortal dread of the “black tide of the mud of occultism,” which saturated all of Jung’s best thinking. This has remained as an unbridgeable gap for nearly a hundred years – until recently. Now there are those who believe that it is possible to utter Jung and Freud in the same breath, honoring their differences and still calling it “good.”

It is clear that Jung emphasized numinous *experience* in his personal life and in his work, both with his patients and in his writing. Over time, the literature of Jungian psychology has become more theoretically focused, and, in particular, subsuming the phenomena of the analytic process to transference theory and explanations. What is not as clear in current analytical psychology is how analysts relate to their own personal experience of the numinous or to the numinous in their clients. If the literature is reflecting a trend in analytic practice and the personal life of analysts, then the numinous and its directive is being lost and replaced by theoretical interpretation and explanations of the numinous.

David Tacey, the co-editor of and contributor to *The Idea of the Numinous*, the compendium of articles about the numinous cited above, has written another article that offers a solution to the unbridgeable gap: “The gift of the unknown: Jung(ians) and Freud(ians) at the end of modernity.” (Tacey, December 2007) This article has to do with the Unknown, and what to do *with* it. Tacey states,

What interests me... about trends in psychoanalytic thought generally is that we are witnessing a return of the Unknown in clinical theory and practice. This reflects broader changes beyond these disciplines, and indeed the Unknown, as ‘mystery’, ‘infinity’ or ‘unknowability’, is returning.... The Unknown... has made an unexpected comeback... What all this shows is that we live in a time of enormous change and instability, where many of the ideas and values of the past have dissolved, and scholars with open minds have to go back to first principles and renegotiate the ground upon which knowledge is based.

Tacey is saying that the Unknown is making a “comeback.” It is as if he is saying that the Unknown went away and now can return as something less frightening and somewhat more acceptable than it was “before,” ready in its rejuvenated form to be managed within a more inclusive therapeutic construct.

Tacey quotes Michael Eigen, who argues that “knowing is an essential, implicit part” of psychotherapy. And yet therapy is a “knowing in which the unknown remains unknown.” Tacey says that this is very different from the old ideals of psychoanalysis, in which the goal was to make what was in the unconscious *conscious*. Freud proclaimed, “Where *id* was, there *ego* shall be,” as if it were possible for the entire unconscious to be drained away, leaving only consciousness. Tacey further states that post-Freudians have given up on the idea that a complete knowledge of the unconscious is possible. He states,

Today they find more interest in maintaining the otherness of the unconscious and respecting it as such. This is essentially a religious attitude, an attitude of attending to mystery and living in the presence of Other.

Tacey further quotes Eigen's notion of therapy: "The unknown gives birth to a fuller unknown, is part of the ever growing unknown, an unknown that is the background, horizon, support of experience." Tacey says that what Eigen advocates is "pure Jung."

But it is a Jungian stance without Jung, or it arrives at the spirit of Jung without needing Jung as guide. Again, it confirms my hunch that the "problem" with Jung is that he got to his position too early and the world was not ready for it. Now, therapists from all schools of thought – regardless of lineage or affiliation – are seeking to cultivate and deepen the Unknown, to preserve its integrity, discern its purpose, sanctify it to some extent and protect it from the ravages of the ego. The post-Freudians don't seem to need the weight of Jungian terms and structures; they can do without the collective unconscious and the archetypes, the Self and the transcendent function. They are moving in the same territory, but travelling lighter, without the burden of neologisms and scientific-appearing apparatus.

Tacey attempts to make Jung *acceptable* to his audience by relegating his experiences of the numinous and the theories that he developed from them, by finding correlative theories in the work of post-Jungians and post-Freudians, particularly Bion and Winnecott. He ends up saying that Jung's basis of consciousness is no longer science, but is now "art and religion" and "poetic and mythic." But now, "the post-Freudians are being urged into the same direction, thus suggesting that the deeper reaches of mental functioning resist the methods of science and invite the methods of myth...It would seem that reality rests upon a vast oceanic substrate that resists rational knowing and is best apprehended as mysterious and numinous. There is a point at which logos gives way to mythos."

Tacey states that this is an "historic moment," in which Freudian and Jungian positions merge and regain the unity of purpose and commitment that was lost a hundred years ago. He apologizes for the indelible stain on Jung, which involves charges of "mysticism" and "anti-Semitism," but that seems to be a minor issue in the phenomenon of the uniting of the opposites.

He ends with the following:

The *rapprochement* between analytical psychology and psychoanalysis that I envisage is “theoretical only,” and not a practical arrangement where scholars reach across the divide and accept each other as fellows and friends. But what has brought these rival traditions together is mutual regard for the Unknown.

Tacey believes that it is possible to merge Jungian and psychoanalytic theories. But in order to accomplish this, numinous experience must be *diminished* to “mysticism,” “art and religion,” and “poetry and myth.” None of these descriptions, in and of themselves, are inaccurate and I would actually agree with Tacey’s assessments of Jung – Jung embodied all of it. My disagreement with Tacey’s article lies in the fact that he compares Jung to Freud and the post-Freudians, when there can be no real meeting of the minds between them. Freud and those who came after stood for the primacy of the ego as the function of the psyche that balances between primitive drives and reality. Jung conceived of the ego as the central complex within the field of consciousness. Although the concepts are related, Jung came no closer to accepting Freud’s position of the function of ego than Freud came to accepting Jung’s knowledge of the primacy of numinous experience and the collective unconscious. Again, as with Schlamm’s comparison between Otto and Jung, the ground upon which these comparisons are being made is uneven.

Although I disagree with Schlamm’s idea that consciousness mediates in a numinous experience, it does beg a colossal question: If *consciousness* does not experience numinosity, then what is it that *does* the experiencing of the numinous? Schlamm uses the idea of consciousness in the sense of certainty or objectivity, as if consciousness is always there to weigh experience, as one might assess something objectively. The problem with this perspective is that numinous experiences override or more precisely, *overwhelm* objectivity. Schlamm fails to acknowledge or accept that in the throes of a numinous experience, one becomes the *subject*

of the numinous experience, and the ego cannot objectively digest the experience at the very moment it is occurring.

Still the question remains: What is it that does the experiencing of the numinous? If it is found in Schlamm's idea, that some form of consciousness seems to do the experiencing, then my application of the word *conscious* has to be distinguished from Schlamm's use of the word, in the way he uses it as a "vigilant appraiser." I believe the numinous can be experienced by an *aspect* of consciousness, but not the part of consciousness that is familiar to us as the part of the mind that does the "thinking." I imagine conscious awareness of the numinous as a kind of *kinesthetic* awareness. Jeffrey Raff, in *Jung and the Alchemical Imagination* (2000) has referred to this sort of awareness as the "psychoid." That term is lacking in this instance. One could call it "pre-mind," but both *psychoid* and *pre-mind* are too "mental." In a numinous experience, there is a level of awareness that one is inside something that is unusual or amazing, but which cannot be grappled with logically. It is quite different from both subconscious and preconscious awareness. It is different from the way ordinary consciousness thinks through things, and it uses a different logic than focused thinking. In numinous experience, something "other" impinges from outside. Often, the experience does not last very long, because the conscious thinking mind *does* tend to intrude. One cannot stay too long in the presence of God's nod. Numinous experience has an external intention that occurs usually when one is not expecting it or prepared for it. It enters into the field and calls attention to something particular. Inevitably, one is punctured by such an experience, but many who experience a numinous event do not want to engage it, and push the experience away, diminish it, attempt to understand it, explain it or try to integrate it.

In a way then, consciousness of being in an unusual experience, in the way I have tossed it to and fro here, is necessary for the event to come in to the field. You must consciously say “yes.” You must acknowledge the “nod.” There can be no conscious intent for how the material should be dealt with or thought about. Because it can occur so quickly, the numinous can be overwhelming. The role of the conscious mind is to choose to accept the *numen* or to push it away, once the moment has come. The fact of the experience itself cannot be pushed away. It happens and happens with a force. Over the lintel of Jung’s house in Küsnacht, written in stone, is a reminder that whether or not we acknowledge the nod, it is there: *Vocatus atque non vocatus, dues aderit*, (“Called and not called, God is present”) the answer the Delphic Oracle gave the Lacedemonians when they were planning a war against Athens.

There is a correlative experience in the way that sounds affect the body. As I said above, consciousness of numinous experience is kinesthetic. Spoken poetry and music are mental, psychic *and* sensory experiences. Poetry and music involve a different kind of consciousness, that is at once sensory experience as well as something that focuses mental attention. It is now known, through recent developments in neurobiology, that music and poetry enter the entire body and brain, through receptors in the brain as well as receptors over the entire body. The skin is covered with sound receptors. These receptors bring music and poetry into consciousness, but they enter through the body, too. In a sense, then, *numen* receptors may be present all over the body.

In William Blake’s book, *Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, he writes,

Man has no Body distinct from his Soul for that call’d Body is a portion of Soul discern’d by the five Senses, the chief inlets of Soul in this age. (Blake, 1975)

What is consciously experiencing the numinous is *all* the senses, all of the human being, not simply the thing Schlamm calls consciousness, by which he implies only a mental function.

I have discussed one of the pillars of analytical psychology, the Numinous. Now I will explore the other pillar, Theory.

IV. Theory, the Second Pillar

תיאוריה (Theory)

Numinous experience and theoretical observation are different ways of approaching an event. In my dream of the numinous Scottish wall, both approaches have a place.

In the middle of writing the paper, which was under a deadline, I still continued my clinical practice. I had not been working with patients during the weekdays, because when my son was in school, I tended to get more work done and had fewer distractions.

I planned two back-to-back thirteen hour weekend days. I knew it was going to be exhausting, I thought little of the actual *relationships* I have with my patients, how much I enjoy them, learn from them and love the clinical work I do. All I could see in front of me was a lot of time away from the paper, not enough time with my family, too much psychic input, not enough time to recuperate between patients, and worry about the huge weekend I had set up for myself. I was approaching my work from a distance, not by way of Eros. I was completely split off from the fact that the way I practice was the way I was writing this paper.

My second patient on the first day was Bill, a single man, in his early 50's. Bill is a very kind man whose mother was alcoholic and whose father, the silent drinking partner, was minimally involved in mediating the overt alcoholism with the mother. Bill has had few romantic relationships, all of which ended unsatisfactorily. He says that he wants love in his life, but has

not pursued his stated goal, despite a good deal of work on his negative mother complex. I had not seen him in a few weeks, due mostly to my crazy writing schedule. Bill came in very contrite; he had not done any of the work he had set for himself to do since the last time I saw him. The work he had planned to do involved various ways of pursuing a romantic relationship.

I said very little about his lack of follow-through and just waited for something else. Pretty soon, he said, “Oh, something interesting *did* happen!” He described a common quotidian scene. He was having dinner by himself in a restaurant he frequents and as he was leaving, an elderly couple was entering. He held the door for them. They told him “thank you.” He said that as he held the door, their eyes met his and in one instant, Bill knew that he and this couple were “hit” by the knowledge that they were connected to something far greater than the banal scene at the door. He said he could not describe the feeling, but it was a tremendous “moment.” The fact that he knew the couple felt the same thing made the experience even stranger. My mind immediately went to Rudolf Otto, and his description of the numinous as a “tremendous moment.” Bill said that this “moment” occurred as he was literally opening the door to the outside. I thought of the situation at the threshold of my front door, the day I hired Ann Marie. He said that the feeling was so “momentous” that he almost forgot about it until our meeting. I asked him why he thought he might not have remembered such a momentous event. His reply was that it seemed like such a small thing, but as he was talking with me about this, his eyes filled with tears. He said that these events occur all the time to people, and he seemed confused about this emotional reaction. We sat in silence while he tried to make sense of his tears.

I said I was curious about why he might have been emotional right then. He did not answer the question directly, but said, “Literally, when this happened, I felt like I was going through the door into someplace else.” I said, “Yes, to open the door is the task. When you open

up to these moments, you get a nod, a whisper that *this* is what intimacy is. This is what Eros is. You have been asking for relationship. And guess what? *This* is what it means to be in the experience of a relationship, not merely being in a theoretical one.” I said that the impact of the experience might have been why he had forgotten about it. I said it is like a sudden glimpse at the eternal, and it can be overwhelming. I then asked, “Do you think that a theoretical relationship will sustain you for the rest of your life?” He asked me what I meant by a “theoretical relationship.” I replied that it was one where he sat on the sidelines and stood apart from experiences, such as the one that had occurred in the threshold of the restaurant, opening the door to it. He said he knew that as we were talking, he realized that he had been playing at pursuing a relationship. He said he didn’t realize how scary it was to open the door to the reality of intimacy. He never would have seen the experience at the restaurant as an example of intimacy, unless I made the connection. What I did not say is that if I had not been writing the paper, I too might have missed his experience as a numinous experience. Finally, I told Bill that Jung had said that all of life was in preparation for our death. I asked him what he thought of that idea. He said he was not happy, if his life were to end right now, because he had avoided the types of experiences that simply hit him like the one at the door of the restaurant. I said that there are always opportunities to take up the task. The couple at the door was one such opportunity, but I said I thought there were probably many more in his life and there will be many others to come. I told him when you pay attention, they come more frequently, but they require something of you. So many people ignore them or explain them away. This session also reminded me that I was not “in Eros” with my patients, not truly in relationship with them, and was glad for Bill’s experience to remind me what my work is really about. I was reminded again of how much I love my patients and the attitude of love I needed to carry throughout that busy weekend.

In the “Visions Seminars” Jung discussed the autonomy of the unconscious. He stated, “We train the patient to let things happen so that he can see what his psyche is; otherwise he labors under the impression that his psyche is exactly what he wants it to be, that he makes it.” (Jung, 1976, p.72) Bill thought he could control his unconscious reactions and what he discovered was that his conscious intentions were not in control.

I finished work at 8:30 pm. I was pretty drained, but felt like taking a look at the paper. I thought I would start with the etymology of the word, “theory.”

I would have guessed that the Indo-European root word for “theory” might have had something to do with the Greek word for God or “theo.” That would have been extremely interesting, and would have put “theory” and “numinous” in the same etymological basket. However, it is rarely possible to know where words diverged from their original meanings and why. My search into the etymology of “theory” has taken me elsewhere.

It is not God, but “theatre” that is at the root of the word *theory*. In my etymological research, I found all derivatives of the word “theory” have to do with seeing and observing. The Latin *theātrum*, is akin to the Greek *thea*, a sight, and to *theasthai*, to view. These are related to the Greek, *thauma*, a thing compelling the gaze, a wonder (as in “thaumaturge”), and then to the Greek *theōrin*, which is starting to sound more like “theory,” and means “to look at.” Its derivative is *theōrēma*, a seeing, a sight, an object of study, hence a speculation. This leads to the idea of a *theorem*. Another derivative is the noun, *theōria*, a looking, a seeing, an observing or a contemplation or a speculation. Via the *theatre*, the word then connects to the idea of watching and observing as a way of learning. (OED, 1971; Partridge, 1983; Shipley, 1945)

The etymological exploration gave a new meaning to the inkling I had about Bill, too. My use of the word “theoretical” with him, with no conscious intention on my part, was

impregnated with roots in “observing” and “viewing,” as one would view a theatrical performance. I had no idea when he and I talked about the “theory” of relationship that I was actually using the word in its root form, as in a theatrical viewing. What “hit” him in the session with me, numinously, was the deeper life in the word “theoretical.” He realized that he was approaching the potential for an Eros relationship with a woman as an observation, not an experience.

Despite all of this wonderful *understanding* that came from Bill’s experience, I had approached his telling of the story as if it had taken place *out of the room*. In fact, I did not see that there was something occurring *in* the room that was as numinous as the moment he experienced in the threshold of the door with the elderly couple. I missed an opportunity to cross the threshold with him in the emotional charge of my consultation room. I chose to explain what had occurred with the couple, rather than allow the moment to unfold in the room. So, I realized how difficult it is to be with the Divine Nod when it is occurring. I was able to be with Kris in her Lilith mode, because it was so clear that this was unusual. However, I diminished the importance of Bill’s experience in its apparent lack of drama. I felt some shame and inflation when I thought about how critical I had been of Corbett’s treatment of his patient’s numinous experience in clinic. I also thought about Schlamm’s explanations and realized that I had done the same thing.

I missed an opportunity by making theory of his experience. I failed to allow the discomfort of his experience. In hindsight, I feared “he couldn’t take it.” Delving a bit deeper into my own counter-transference, I now realize that something in me was fearful that *I* couldn’t take it. I wanted to take away his pain, explain it away, and in so doing, I was not trusting that he *could* take it, and could take it and use it in a way that would be transforming for him. Why was I

afraid? I know now that I was afraid of losing control. I wanted to be certain that I understood his experience and could make him feel comfortable by my explanation. I was unable to stay with his emotions. What I *know* through my own experiences of the numinous is that something *is* always scary, because nothing is certain in that place of openness. Yet, also, I know that experience always leads forward. I also know that learning occurs out of mistakes, not out of parables, which are the fruit of human mistakes. This is a lesson both for my patient *and* for me.

סימן (Augury)

“Improvement makes strait roads, but the crooked roads without Improvement, are roads of Genius.” –
from William Blake, *Marriage of Heaven and Hell*.(1975)

My analytic voice with Bill was the voice of a theorist. In essence, I was *observing* him at a distance, as though he were a theatrical event. Properly applied, theory can allow us to ask questions that can lead to other questions. However, theory can also be misused, to reduce experience to rigid observation. This latter stance is one I see as a trend in current Jungian psychology, which is beginning to lean more and more toward post-Freudian interpretation and explanation. I believe that explanations make it easier for the analyst. I admit I have misused theory. It is so difficult to know when theoretical explanations are appropriate and when they are not. If I take the Torah Midrash as a guide, the idea would be to *do* or to allow the emotional experience and then to *hear* or to explain, if an explanation is required at all.

In the situation with Bill I was responding to a need to get the man through the hour. I had someone on the other side of him. I did not want him to leave in an emotional dither. I realize now that he was not *in* an emotional dither. He was emotional. Is this a prejudice on my part? Are men not allowed to be emotional? This calls my own psychology and complexes into question, which certainly have a bearing on the session. I can say with some certainty that I

believe that his emotions played into the unconscious decision on my part to interpret his experience.

In clinic, rarely is there an either/or stance. A clinician does not always approach clinical material strictly as theory or as experience. Usually there is a combination or maybe there is a style. I will speak in generalities for a bit about current trends, both in clinic and in the analytic literature, realizing that nothing is absolute.

Examples of the theoretical and numinous approaches are exemplified by the Pontifices and Augures, the two orders of priests in ancient Rome. Roman law divided the ministers of religion into two orders: First, the *Pontifices*, who were appointed by Emperor Numa (I cannot find authority that the name Numa is derived from *Numen*). These were members of the order of the *Collegium Pontificum*, which administered ecclesiastical laws, prescribed the ceremony of any public or private worship, made pronouncements, prepared proclamations, interpreted prodigies, explained ceremonies and laws, and punished persons guilty of offenses against religion. In short, these priests “pontificated.” Theory, authority, dogma and orthodoxy are associated with this order. The insignias of the Pontifices were a badge, the *toga praetexta*, a conical-shaped woolen cap, a *pileus*, and a straight staff called a *virgula*, wrapped in a tuft of wool with a tassel at the top.

The second order was the *Collegium Augurium*. These priests were called *Augures* or *Auspices* and their order was established by Romulus. The word Augur or Auspex at first meant “diviner by birds (*aves*), but over time the name was applied in a larger sense. The art of divining was called *Augurium* or *Auspicium*. In ancient times no transaction, either public or private, took place without consulting the augures or auspices. The auspices were divided into five divisions in the ways they were derived:

- 1 From the sky (*ex cælo*), particularly from lightning and thunder;
- 2 From birds (*ex avibus*), which were either *oscines*, which gave auguries by singing or *alites*, by flying;
- 3 From the feeding of chickens (*ex tripudiis*), chiefly war auguries;
- 4 From four-footed animals (*ex quadrupedibus*). It was told that when a fox, a wolf, a horse, a dog, or any of the kind of quadruped ran across a person's path or appeared in an unusual place, it formed an augury; and
- 5 From every other kind of augury (*ex diris signis*), such as sneezing, stumbling, and other accidental things. (Beard & North, 1998)

The Augures were, therefore, responsible for divining the future by observing the heavens, the singing and flying patterns of birds, the stamping or dancing of chickens, signifying the “dance of war,” sudden appearances of animals and anything else that might constitute a synchronous or numinous event. The Augures stationed themselves on a piece of open ground, and after offering sacrifices, proceeded, with veiled heads, to mark out a particular division in the heavens in which they intended to make their observations. For the division of the heavens, they used the *lituus*, the crooked wand particular to their priestly order (as opposed to the Pontificate’s straight wand), and they wore the traditional *trabea*, a white robe with scarlet stripes and a purple seam. The *trabea* and the *lituus* were the insignias of the Augures. Naturally, the Augures carried a crooked wand. The straight wand belongs to the Pontifices! (Beard & North, 1998)

In early Rome, both orders of the priesthood held equal importance. The division of the priesthood is similar to the division of the rabbinical order in early Judaic tradition. There were

two tribes of the original twelve tribes of Israel, which were responsible for the religious ministry of the Temple.

First, there was the Levite tribe. Like the Pontifices, they were responsible for the physical order of the Temple. The Levite's principal roles in the Temple included singing Psalms during Temple services, performing construction and maintenance for the Temple, and serving as guards. The Levites also served as teachers and judges. The Book of Ezra reports that the Levites were responsible for the construction of the Second Temple and they also translated and explained the Torah when it was publicly read. (Klein, 1979, p.387-388.)

Second, the Kohanim, like the Augures, were chosen to fill a role of spiritual leadership. Traditionally, they have been teachers of Torah and Halachic decision makers (the Halacha is the collective body of Jewish religious law, including biblical law – the 613 mitzvot or commandments – and later Talmudic and rabbinic law, as well as customs and traditions.) The Kohanim were responsible for performing the sacred service in the Holy Temple. Mitzvah 381 says that one must show honor to a Kohein, and to give him precedence in all things that are holy (Lev. 21:8) (HaCohen, 1990).

There is a pattern here. There are two “types” in the early Roman priesthood. Universally and historically, priests, clinicians and other caregivers of the soul, have been divided into these two types. Now, this is a constricted way of approaching the situation. Of course there are more than two types. I am not necessarily discussing typology, but perhaps this *is* another lens through which to look. Applying Jungian typology, the Pontifices may be categorically typed as extraverted/sensation types. The Augures may be introverted/intuition types. Jung, however, did not consider typology to be categorical, but considered it to be a dynamic analysis of individual response. Therefore, it would be incorrect to attempt to apply strict formation to these two

“types.” In the way I have them circumscribed here, they appear as paired opposites. However, I treated Bill through a categorical theoretical approach, not through a dynamic one, even though I consider myself to be on the dynamic side of the equation. Most clinicians do not operate in the extremes. Most clinicians tend to operate in conformity to a particular approach. Contemporary analytic practitioners tend to gravitate toward one of these two general approaches.

Taking a theoretical approach to analysis then, theory can never be applied purely to a clinical situation. Those who tend to operate from a particular theoretical approach view the experience of a successful analysis as the unfolding of the analytic work in conformity to that particular theory and expectation. The numinous approach is led by something other than conscious theoretical expectations, and is grounded in the *experience* of the numinosity of the archetypes. The experience of the numinous then becomes the guiding force in the analytic space.

I recall a philosophy class I took in college at Berkeley. I do not remember the course title, but maybe it was a course in modern philosophy and literature. After all, those subjects were along the lines of one of my majors, the other being pre-med. One of the classes I particularly recall was held in Dwinelle Hall. In this memory, I can see the morning sun coming in from the east, so I assume I was dumb enough to have taken an early morning class. The teacher reminds me, in hindsight, of Peter Boyle, the actor who portrayed the monster in Mel Brook’s “Young Frankenstein.” He was discussing religion. He said that people who follow organized religions where God is an external force, as in fundamentalist religions, tend to see their “locus of control” as being exterior. What he meant was that God is an external entity to whom they pray, and prayer is answered from the outside. God, he said, is an idea or a concept, located outside the person. He contrasted this to a Gnostic view of God, where God is within,

and he termed this perspective an “internal locus of control.” Those who tend to an internal locus of control are less likely to follow religious beliefs where they cannot follow internal cues. Prayer tends to be addressed to the Self, not to an external source. The contents of this lecture have stayed with me to this day.

Another view into the ruby crystal, this time from the realm of art, is offered by Roland Barthes. Barthes was a French literary critic, a social theorist, philosopher and semiotician. His work extended over many fields and he influenced and was influenced by structuralism, semiotics, existentialism, postmodernism, and post-structuralism. His work, *Camera Lucida* (1980), had a profound and unexpected impact on my thinking. His ideas dovetail completely with the idea of the two pillars. *Camera Lucida* is both an inquiry into the nature and essence of photography, which is a passion of my mine, as well as a commemoration of Barthes’ mother. The book explores the impact of photography on the Spectator. He distinguishes the photographer from the object that is photographed. Further he engages in a deeply personal discussion of the lasting emotional effect of certain photographs. Barthes considers photography as impossible to reduce to the rules of language or culture, and says that photographs act on the body as much as on the mind. Of course, this mirrors my own thinking that art impacts the body and mind. He states:

The photograph itself is in no way animated... but animates me: this is what creates every adventure.

Barthes discusses two elements by which photographs make an impact. He describes the kind of photographs that he perceives as:

...a consequence of my knowledge, my culture; this field can be more or less stylized, more or less successful, depending on the photographer’s skill or luck, but it always refers to a classical body of information.... Thousands of photographs consist of this field, and in these photographs I can, of course, take a kind of general interest, one that is

even stirred sometimes, but in regard to them, my emotion requires the rational intermediary of an ethical and political culture. What I feel about these photographs derives from an *average* affect, almost from a certain training.

Barthes designates this effect *Studium*. By this he does not mean a “study,” but rather,

application to a thing, taste for someone, a kind of general, enthusiastic commitment, of course, but without special acuity. It is by *studium* that I am interested in so many photographs, whether I receive them as political testimony or enjoy them as good historical scenes: for it is culturally (this connotation is present in *studium*) that I participate in the figures, the faces, the gestures, the settings, the actions. (Barthes, 1980, p.26)

The second element he describes is the *Punctum*. This element in photographs will break or punctuate the *studium*. In this case, it is not the observer who seeks out through “my sovereign consciousness,” this element “which rises from the scene, shoots out of it like an arrow, and pierces me.” *Punctum* photographs designate this wound, this prick, the mark made by a pointed instrument. The *Punctum* photograph will disturb the *Studium*.

The *Studium* photograph demonstrates the photographer’s intentions,

to enter into harmony with them, to approve or disapprove of them, but always to understand them, to argue them within myself, for culture (from which the *studium* derives) is a contract arrived at between creators and consumers. The *Studium* is a kind of education which allows me to discover the *Operator*, to experience the intentions which establish and animate his practices, but to experience them “in reverse,” according to my will as a *Spectator*. *Studium* photographs are endowed with *functions*, which are, for the Photographer, to inform, to represent, to surprise, to cause to signify, to provoke desire. As the *Spectator*, Barthes says, “I recognize them with more or less pleasure: I invest them with my *studium* (which is never my delight or my pain.).” (p. 27)

I have alluded several times to the way a numinous experience can puncture. It is through Barthes that I gravitated to the realization that numinous events puncture everyday reality.

Theory or *studium* experiences are always “coded.” Numinous experiences or *punctum* are not.

As Barthes says, “What I can name cannot really prick me. The incapacity to name is a good symptom of disturbance.” In this statement lies the difference between a theoretical and a

numinous approach. The theoretical approach can name, designate, define the boundaries of, and code experience. In the numinous experience, the boundary of consensus reality is punctured by something “other” that cannot be codified or explained.

Barthes further anticipates the Torah Midrash about *doing* first and *understanding* later when he says,

Nothing surprising, then, if sometimes, despite its clarity, the *punctum* should be revealed *only after the fact*, when the photograph is no longer in front of me and I think on it. [Italics added] (p. 53)

Barthes’s describes how a *punctum* photograph enters consciousness:

Absolute subjectivity is achieved only in a state, an effort of silence (shutting your eyes is to make the image speak in silence). The photograph touches me if I withdraw it from its usual blah-blah: “Technique,” “Reality,” “Reportage,” “Art,” etc: to say nothing, to shut my eyes, to allow the detail to rise of its own accord into affective consciousness. (p.55)

The *punctum*, he states, is a “kind of subtle *beyond*.” It is what occurs after the fact, in reveries about something that is not any longer there. This is why Schlamm’s idea that consciousness must be present at the moment of a numinous experience, does not fit.

The *punctum* enters at the “right or opportune moment,” or at the *kairos*. The *studium* would enter at the *chronos*, or in a timely, orderly manner. I have made allusion to the way time can be thrown off in the presence of a numinous experience. With Kris/Lilith I had a sense of being *out* of time in the presence of the numinous. Bill, at the restaurant threshold, educed a different feeling for me in relation to time. In the session with Bill, I was aware of time constraints, another patient coming after, wanting to place his experience into a framework for the convenience of ending “on time.” Barthes identifies this strange experience of time and timelessness through photography. One can look at a photograph from a hundred years ago, and know that the people in it were alive, handsome or beautiful, in this location, etc. That is the

studium of the photograph. But the *punctum* is that this person is going to die. At the same time, we can know that *this has been* and *this will be*. The photograph *pricks* because of this awful juxtaposition. He says, “Whether or not the subject is already dead, every photograph is this catastrophe.”

Barthes ends the book with the following fine description of the two pillars, theory and numinous experience:

Such are the two ways of the Photograph. The choice is mine: to subject its spectacle to the civilized code of perfect illusions or to confront in it the wakening of intractable reality.

פער
(Gap)

The straight and crooked paths belong together, yet cover different ground. The straight path accords with the straight staff of the Pontifices and their capacity to administer the laws of Roman religion, the *studium* approach of Barthes, the interpretation of Torah and the keeping of ritual by the Levites, and the certainty of theory and consciousness. The crooked path accords with the crooked staff of the Augures and their silent divination of signs, the *punctum* of Barthes, the mystery of Jewish ritual and spirituality of the Kohanim and the uncertainty of numinous experience and the unconscious.

Ann Ulanov, in her book, *Religion and the Spiritual in Carl Jung* (1999), captures the essence of these two opposites, and Jung’s positions on each:

For Jung, theory is a part of what we put in the space between ego and Self, part of any approach to the numinous but not the numinous itself. He finds in theory a net in which to catch the contents of the far-flung spaces, to gather them with his own fervent participation. He owns and disowns theory simultaneously, as his much-quoted remark about clinical work illustrates: that we learn all we can, but when we are before the living person of the patient, we must throw it all out, set it aside, taking first what the other says to us.(p.150)

She adds:

When Jung pushes us toward the space between the ego and the Self, he is pushing us toward a conscious naming of the illusions...So although we cannot identify our theories and images with the numinous, we can allow them to remain arrows that point and fly through the space between ourselves and the numinous. Jung, utterly different from other analysts in this, directs us consciously toward those gaps: “The main interest of my work is with the approach to the numinous.” Thus, he says, “The decisive questions for us is, ‘Are we related to something infinite or not?’” That, I would suggest, is the explicit foundation of the work we do.(p. 159)

Ulanov has identified Jung’s notion of the complex relationship between theory and numinous experience. For Jung, she states, theory is a net that can gather numinous experiences and attempt to make sense of them. However, as Ulanov points out, Jung also preferred experience over theory. She further states that theory has the ability to be a link between consciousness and numinous experience, but Jung preferred to remain *in* the gap, not to fill it with explanatory theories. Theories that fill the gap, Ulanov suggests, remove the possibility for the real psychological and spiritual inquiry. Jung, she writes, directs us to a conscious encounter with whatever resides in that gap, because only there is the possibility of finding the infinite. Ulanov, however, clearly shows Jung’s respect for theory. She understands that theory and numinous experience really do stand as the two pillars of analytical psychology. However, she is definite in stating that Jung’s central focus was not on making theories to explain the numinous, but to draw near to the numinous itself.

In various places throughout the Collected Works, Jung addresses the numinous and its relationship to theory. In Volume 15, in “On the Relation of Analytical Psychology to Poetry” (1996), Jung discusses theory and numinous experience and their relationship to art.

Jung identifies two particular modes in the origination of artistic endeavor and the unique psychology of the artist. In the first, Jung states:

There are literary works, prose as well as poetry, that spring wholly from the author’s intention to produce a particular result. He submits his material to a definite treatment

with a definite aim in view; he adds to it and subtracts from it, emphasizing one effect, toning down another, laying on a touch of colour here, another there, all the time carefully considering the over-all result and paying strict attention to the laws of form and style. He exercises the keenest judgment and chooses his words with complete freedom. His material is entirely subordinated to his artistic purpose; he wants to express this and nothing else. He is wholly at one with the creative process, no matter whether it has made him its instrument so completely that he has lost all consciousness of this fact. In either case, the artist is so identified with his work that his intentions and his faculties are indistinguishable from the act of creation itself. (par. 109)

Jung classifies this mode of artistic approach as *introverted*, because the intent of the artist bears upon the creation. Jung cites Schiller who classified the two artistic approaches. Jung conceptualized Schiller's approach as the *sentimental*. The work of art comes from the inner sentiment of the artist. Jung states, "The introverted attitude is characterized by the subject's assertion of his conscious intentions and aims against the demands of the object." Jung considers Schiller's plays and most of his poems to be representative of the introverted attitude, in which the material is mastered by the conscious intentions of the poet.

Of the other classification, which Jung called *extraverted*, he states, "...the special significance of a true work of art resides in the fact that it has escaped from the limitations of the personal and has soared beyond the personal concerns of its creator." He also writes, "Personal causes have as much or as little to do with a work of art as the soil with the plant that springs from it." Further, Jung states, "One might almost describe it [a work of art] as a living being that uses man only as a nutrient medium, employing his capacities according to its own laws and shaping itself to the fulfillment of its own creative purpose."

Jung writes that *extraverted* or as Schiller terms it, "*naive*" works of art

...flow more or less complete and perfect from the author's pen... These works positively force themselves upon the author: his hand is seized, his pen writes things that his mind contemplates with amazement. The work brings with it its own form; anything he wants to add is rejected, and what he himself would like to reject is thrust back at him. While his conscious mind stands amazed and empty before this phenomenon, he is

overwhelmed by a flood of thoughts and image which he never intended to create and which his own will could never have brought into being. Yet in spite of himself he is forced to admit that it is his own self speaking, his own inner nature revealing itself... Here the artist is not identical with the process of creation; he is aware that he is subordinate to his work or stands outside it, as though he were a second person; or as though a person other than himself had fallen within the magic circle of an alien will. (par. 110)

Jung knew very well about being seized by an imperious creative impulse that battered on his life. During his encounter with the unconscious and his active imaginations, as well as the writing of the *Red Book* and *Seven Sermons of the Dead*, Jung's hand was taken from him by something quite beyond his own conscious control.

The extraverted attitude is characterized by the subject's subordination to the demands, which the object makes upon the artist. Jung cites Nietzsche's *Zarathustra* as a striking example. Yet, it cannot be denied that Jung was a magnificent theoretician in his own right.

כלי

(Instrument)

I have had my own imperious creative experiences, in which a work of art battered on me to become its manufacturer. Many years ago now, when I was regularly making pottery, I had a dream. The dream consisted of only one image: the head of a huge monstrous creature with leathery shiny black skin and sharp projectiles all over its head, and twisted razor sharp teeth. It also had hooded eyes with sharp projectiles where the eyelashes would be. This was quite an image, to be sure! I also awoke from this dream with a nasty muscle spasm under my left shoulder blade.

My friend, Lillian, who is a psychotherapist and massage therapist, tried to work out the knot in my muscle. I relayed the dream to her, and as she was pressing on the knot, the image of

the monster's head returned! I told her that I did not want this "monster" in my body and so I set out to make the head in clay.

The next evening I arrived at the pottery studio, just as the other artists were all leaving for the night. I locked myself in and turned off the front bank of lights. Only the back of the room was lit. As I sat at the table, in the dim light, I must have "left" my body. My hands were working with the clay, almost as if they were not my hands. I had never been so adept with clay. I never got up to get a drink or go to the restroom or even to stand back and look at what I was doing. Four hours simply evaporated away, in my intense state. Captive to the monster's head, I was shaken out of my reverie by the night watchman, and I had no awareness of how long I had been sitting there. When I saw the creation before me, I can honestly say that I had no idea how it got there and could not believe what had come from my hands. I was not the one who made the head. The head used my hands to make *it*. It now resides in my office.

משל (Parable)

What occurs in human experience has a bit to do with the modern concept of *denial*. Who has not had near escapes from danger? Who has not been prey to a potentially life-threatening situation, whether it came in the form of a car accident, a serious illness, or any number of "near misses?"

I have cried in relief when I have been spared. I have returned from the precipice of death and destruction, back to the ground of certainty and have praised the force that brought me back. For some time, I am able to remain in the numinosity of the experience. It punctures my consciousness afresh, each and every time I recount my near-miss. After some point, the story

ceases to carry the *numen*, and I simply fall into story-telling and parable. I recount the story through *chronos*, and no longer through *kairos*.

I have repeatedly used the words “puncture,” “prick,” “hit,” “tremendous,” and other words that imply penetration, almost as if they do not carry an *image*. They most certainly do. What is the image that arrives with being *punctured*? Is it a pleasing image? If I think about being punctured, this does not stimulate the image of a little prick of the finger, a little “owee” or a tiny surprise. This is a *puncture*. Images of puncture wounds arise from my childhood in the hot Los Angeles summers: rusty nails, too close encounters with black widow spiders, while looking through lavender alyssum-covered wood piles for lost balls or seeking cool and secret hiding spots under the house; trips to Riverside Hospital in the Valley to get tetanus shots. These are *deep* wounds that require bandaging, penicillin, stitches, disinfectants, mercurochrome in cobalt blue glass bottles with tinkling glass droppers. These “events” are not typical of an ordinary lazy day and they create the necessity to face the uncertainty of mortality.

Why then, it is difficult to remain in the “moment” with the numinous? Why is there such a deep denial that the threshold of the door is there *all the time*?

I have told the stories of my life sometimes as if I were a playwright. “I was a cab driver in London in 1973, got in an accident and was almost deported.” Yes, that happened to me. But, like the etching on my wall, it is a story about my European adventures that makes me look good. “What a courageous young girl! *You* drove a cab in *London*?” Meantime, I was miserable. I was being harassed constantly by my father to make more money, so I could even *stay* in London. I was depressed and scared. I hated the garage where my cab was based, hated being a sexual object to the male hacks, and actually *lost* money on the deal. I was terrified of being arrested for impersonation after the accident (I used my landlady’s drivers license, though

I looked nothing like her picture on it), spending time in jail and ultimately being deported. All that has faded now, and I am left with charming stories to tell. None of the puncturing remains. It is all theory and theatre.

I believe this has to do with the comfort of certainty. In that moment I deny my mortality and the reality of pain. Yet without that denial, there would be no human race: Women would never go through the agony of childbirth twice! I can tell you that! Most people do not like to stand too close to the edge, and they only stand there long enough to tell the stories of their near misses. Then, it becomes theatre. I am now the observer of my terrifying experience, when I was once so close to the eternal and close to demise.

Theory that is used to reduce experience to explanation is a misuse of theory. I am equating this misuse of theory with certainty. I realize the enormity of this statement. Inherent in what I say here is that a reductionist theoretical position is married to certainty, just as a numinous experience is married to *uncertainty*. Theory can be counted twice, weighed and divided. Theory is as certain as taxes and death? What? Death?

מָוֶת

(Death)

Because of my deep connection to the Catholic Church, I am usually aware of the occasion of Holy Week. When I was writing this paper, I did not realize that this was the week prior to Easter. It was a Wednesday and I realized that the ritual of the Order of the Tenebrae is always on the Wednesday night prior to Easter. St. James does quite the ritual. It is a dim candle-lit ceremony, with each of the candles being extinguished one at a time throughout the service until at the last, every candle and every light is out. This is, of course, symbolic of the gradual extinction of all human hopes, embodied in the crucifixion of Christ, the light of the world. It is a

somber observance. Also, a musical colleague, with whom I had sung this piece at St. James before, was doing the soprano part. I had always sung the Soprano II part of the duet with her, but I was just too busy with the monograph to sing with her that year.

I looked at the program and saw the date. It struck me suddenly that, on this date, the year my father died, I went down to Los Angeles to see him. Although he was weak as a baby, in a wheelchair by then, and hardly able to get out of bed, my family was not told that he was terminal. So, I still held the hope that I could help make him strong enough to go through more chemo.

I sat by his bedside, and we spoke very little. I refused to admit that he was at the last of his life. I asked him if there was anything we still needed to say. He told me, "I love you. I have always loved you." Yet, I would still not admit that he was dying. Not quite. I remained in that half-light of truth, and also in the half-shadow of denial. Why else would I have asked if we still had things to say to one another? He lay watching old movies on American Movie Classics. I just sat with him, laughing at the movies I saw with him as a kid, on Channel 5 on Saturdays. It felt as if I were in the *this has been* and *this will be* of Barthes' photographs. At one point, after my mother had interrupted for the billionth time, finally leaving the room, he asked me quietly, "Suzi, do you see anything on the wall behind the TV? Some writing?" I got up and looked. I saw no writing on the wall. He said, "There are little scribbles, in pencil. Do you see it there?" "No Leibl, I don't. But if I help you up, can you show me where it is?" At that moment, I recall feeling like such a good Jungian, in my willingness to enact my father's obvious delusions. I got up and walked over to where he was pointing. I said, 'Here?' "No. That's OK. You don't see it, huh? Some writing on the wall?" "No, Dad, I don't, but I am sure that you do, and if you want to show me, I'll help." He declined my help.

I knew that I had heard the expression, “Writing on the wall,” but only had a vague idea what it meant and no idea where it came from.

The week before I decided to fly down, I had a dream that my dad was with me at Lincoln Park in West Seattle, at the south end of the park, near the play area. He was in a wheelchair. In the dream there was a concrete pathway that snaked its way down to the water (there isn’t one in real life). I knew that if I could wheel my father to the water that he could be healed. My dad loved the ocean.

When I arrived in LA that day, I told my father that I wanted to take him to lunch at the beach. This was an excuse, of course. I really just wanted to get him to the ocean. My father could hardly get into the car, and his caregiver had to come with us. We drove to Topanga Canyon. Half way through the mountains, there was a reader board that said that the road had been washed out during the heavy winter’s storms and the road ahead was closed. I was devastated. My father was exhausted, but did not complain, simply from the car ride, and I knew that there was no way we could now get to a canyon that was open. He simply did not have the strength. I realized, as we stopped at the sign in the road, that there was no way my father could survive. I started to cry, and knew right then that he was going to die.

As I sat in St. James in the darkness, I wept. I listened to the stunning performance of Couperin’s Lamentations of Jeremiah, the Lessons of Tenebrae.

להפריד

(Divide)

Why is Jeremiah associated with Holy Week? As I stated earlier, Couperin set the text of the book of the Prophet Jeremiah in Latin, using the first fourteen letters of the Hebrew alphabet as the at the forefront to each of the sections of text that follows, which are sung in Latin.

Couperin combined the idea that Jeremiah was a Hebrew prophet, with the fact that the music was written for the High Church. The section breaks in this paper honor Couperin's creative use of Hebrew letters to divide the liturgy he uses from the Lamentations of Jeremiah. I, too, am using a Hebrew introduction to each section of my own text that follows.

The Church liturgy impresses upon the faithful the desolation of Christ shortly before the Crucifixion. This sacrifice was made necessary by the sins of humankind. For a text, the Church turned to the great Lamentations of Jeremiah. In these beautiful poems of the Old Testament, the prophet reflects the grief of Palestine when Jerusalem was conquered by the Chaldeans in 587 BCE. Jeremiah also laments the capture and razing of the Temple of Solomon, as well as the decimation of the population by terrible slaughter. The parallel is made between the unfaithful Hebrews of Jeremiah's time and the unrepentant and sinful Christians at the time of Jesus. The destruction of the Temple and the city in Jeremiah's time are equated to the abandonment and Crucifixion of Christ. I am making a parallel here to the abandonment of the numinous.

חושך

(Darkness)

As I sat in the dark church, it felt like theatre to me at first. Then, I felt a wave of sadness, and I suddenly wished to feel my father's touch on my head. I wanted him to stroke my hair, as he did when he braided it every day for me before school. I felt no touch. Slowly, the candles were being extinguished. The last of the lit candles were on a candelabrum, which held fifteen candles. The acolytes took turns extinguishing each one. I suddenly remembered my Hebrew name, Menorah, the "holder of the light." I was crying for my father. I knew I had held the light for him throughout my life, a light he could not hold for himself. In fact, I have held the light and the

darkness for all my family. It has been an enormous job, not always appreciated. At that moment, I did feel the touch of my father's life.

When I flew home after we got back from our foiled beach trip, I got on the computer to look up "Writing on the wall." Daniel 5. The hand of God comes down and writes on the wall the four words, "Count Count Weigh Divide." Nebuchadnezzar, who had pillaged the Temple, was being told that his days were numbered, and he was going to die. He had probably thrown out the Levites.

My father passed away a month later, during Passover. No one missed the significance of his passing at the Passover, the first born male. The blood of the Lamb was not on the door that day, and The Angel of Death did not pass him by. I chose the inscription for his headstone, which I had found on a headstone at St. Mary's at Paddington Green in London, just up the road from where I lived in the early 70's: "Death is but putting out the lamp, because the morning has come." All this came back to me in the shadows of the darkened church, as I wept.

ערפול

(Negative Capability)

The secret war between theory and the imaginal has been raging for millennia. In Plato's *Republic* he wrote of the dangers of imagination, especially through poetic consciousness, or what he called, the "divine madness" of inspiration.

In 1817, John Keats took up this same war in his now famous description of "Negative Capability," in a letter dated December 21, 1817, which was written to his two brothers. Keats writes:

...several things dove-tailed in my mind, and at once it struck me what quality went to form a Man of Achievement, especially in Literature, and which Shakespeare possessed so enormously – I mean Negative Capability, that is when a man is capable of being in

uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason.
(Keats, 1974)

Keats is saying that only where there are uncertainties and a capacity to be in the unknown that the numinous may enter. Theory cannot enter this place.

Keats was associated with Romantic poetry, the subject matter of which included Beauty, Death, Truth, Eternity of the Soul, and Nature. The association to Romantic poetry was no doubt propelled even further by his untimely death at twenty-five years old. Death surrounded Keats. Most of the important people in his life died in untimely fashions, from accidents to death in childbirth, and especially tuberculosis, to which Keats himself succumbed. He had deeply passionate feelings for a woman, which were never realized. However, Keats' letters are filled with the real meaning of his life and the greatness of his achievement in poetics: how one makes sense out of *experience*. This is an aspect of Keats' work that has been, for the most part, ignored.

Keats said that great people, especially poets (and I will apply this to musicians and artists in general) have the ability to accept that not everything can be resolved. Keats, as a Romantic, believed that the truths found in the imagination access holy authority. (Dare I say the *numen*? Might this "consciousness" actually puncture the "imagination?" Is this where numinous experiences reside?) Such authority cannot otherwise be understood, and thus he writes of "uncertainties." This "being in uncertain[ty]" is a place between the earthly reality and potentials of a more fully understood existence.

James Hillman in *Blue Fire* (1989) discusses the capacity to live in Negative Capability in the tension between Eros and chaos. He states on Page 272:

The idealizations which Eros tends always to constellate can be counterbalanced: creativity expresses itself also as destruction. Love's torture may not always lead to the

happy ending of our tale. The idealizations may be further weighted by recalling the connections in Hesiod, the Orphics, and the Renaissance Neoplatonism between eros and chaos.

Eros is born of chaos, implying that out of every chaotic moment the creativity of which we have been speaking can be born. Furthermore, Eros will always hearken back to its origins in chaos and will seek it for its revivification... Eros will attempt again and again to create those dark nights and confusions which are its next. It renews itself in affective attacks, jealousies, fulminations, and turmoils. It thrives close to the dragon.

Andrés Rodríguez' *Book of the Heart*, (1993, p. 39-40, complete text of the of letter of Dec. 21, 1817), takes up the entirety of Keats' letters. He says that Keats stands as a "prophetic precursor" of cultural and self-transformation. This aspect of his profound work has been overshadowed by the sensuousness of his poems. Rodríguez attempts to address the *Letters* as a missing piece in Keats' work, which grants to them their huge intellectual and spiritual labor:

In these *Letters*, one of the most inspiring spiritual documents of the West, we see the poet forming and transforming a passionate life of great joys and sorrows into a self of imagination and power. Keats is a hero of the heart, whose deep life experience oriented him in a unique way to the world of love, suffering, death and creativity. (endnotes)

Further on in the December 21st letter, Keats criticizes Samuel Taylor Coleridge, another Romantic poet, for his inability to be "caught from the Penetralium of mystery, from being incapable of remaining content with half-knowledge." In other words, Coleridge sought after explanation, completion and whole-knowledge, which Keats felt was far from the essence of "imagination."

What is the "Penetralium of mystery?" It sounds a bit like the "penetration" by a numinous experience. It is the place wherein one is capable of being in uncertainties.

The word Penetralium means "the innermost part," and the "sanctum sanctorum." It was used first in a religious context in the 1600's: "From the Penetralia – the secret chambers of the soul." It derives from the Latin root *pen*, or "inside," and is both that which is penetrated and the thing that penetrates. We are now back at *punctum*, the thing that punctures and enters.

Rodríguez states:

The term “Penetralium” has the strong suggestion of an innermost room with the prominent position of center. The Latin plural, *penetralia* means “innermost parts,” especially of a building, such as the sanctuary of a temple. Other forms, such as *penetrare*, *penitus* and *penes* all contain related meanings of “to enter within,” “deeply, into the inmost recesses,” and “within, in the power of.”(Rodríguez, 1993, p.66)

Keats saw this Temple with the eyes of imagination, the eyes of inner vision.

This temple is no place for whole-knowledge and theoretical explanations. It is a place of pure and soulful experience.

Rodríguez further states:

The Penetralium is a “person,” because it possesses a soul – but a soul unlike that of man who succumbs to the delirium of the senses. It should be thought of as a Person in the same sense as any one of García Lorca’s trio, *Duende, Angel, Muse*. (1993, Footnote 30, p. 67)

□7

(Blood)

Federico García Lorca was possibly the most important Spanish poet and dramatist of the twentieth century. Lorca's literary style was deeply influenced by the traditions of folk and gypsy music, “Deep Song.” García Lorca became *the* poet of Andalusia and its gypsy subculture. In his poetry he drew on old ballads and Spanish mythology to express his tragic vision of life. Death is at the heart of all his poetry, which is filled with the spirit of the Duende, to which Rodríguez refers above. Lorca describes the Duende in his essay, *Theory and Function of the Duende*. (1960)

Lorca’s Duende embodies the idea that life cannot be experienced to any greater capacity than in the presence of death. The Duende “is found in everything that springs out of energetic instinct.... [it is] a power and not a construct, is a struggle and not a concept.” Duende is not

theory or explanation. It is pure experience, and the experience that comes when one is close to the spirit of death.

Rodríguez' description of the Penetralium as a person is in accord with the spirit of Lorca's *Duende*. Lorca's descriptions are both delicious and horrifying:

The Duende is not in the throat, the Duende comes up from inside, up from the very soles of the feet... That is to say, it is not a question of aptitude, but of a true and viable style – of blood, in other words; of what is oldest in culture: of creation made act....

Lorca refers to the Duende as “A mysterious power that all may feel and no philosophy can explain.” As with Keats, there is a swirl of uncertainties in trying to catch the Duende by the tail.

Lorca states:

Any man – any artist, as Nietzsche would say – climbs the stairway in the tower of her perfection at the cost of a struggle with a Duende – not with an angel, as some have maintained, or with his muse. This fundamental distinction must be kept in mind if the root of a work of art is to be grasped.

Lorca anticipates my later discussion of Rilke's “deities hidden in our heart,” the three sisters, Joy, Longing and Lament, in the *Sonnets to Orpheus*, when he describes the differences among the Angel, the Muse and the Duende:

The Angel dazzles; but he flies over men's heads and remains in mid air, shedding his grace; and the man, without any effort whatever, realizes his work, or his fellow-feeling, or his dance... there was no resisting his radiance...

The Muse dictates and, in certain cases, prompts. There is relatively little she can do, for she keeps aloof and is so full of lassitude... the Muse arouses the intellect... but intellect is oftentimes the foe of poetry because it imitates too much, it elevates the poet to a throne of acute angles and makes him forget that in time, the ants can devour him, too, or that a great arsenical locust can fall on his head, against which the Muses who live inside monocles or the lukewarm lacquer roses of insignificant salons, are helpless.

Angel and Muse approach from without; the Angel sheds light and the Muse gives form... But the duende, on the other hand, must come to life in the nethermost recesses of the blood... The true struggle is with the duende.

שושנה

(Roses)

Just at the exact time as I had been writing about the Spanish poet, Lorca, I heard some scuffling at my front door. I went to check what was going on, and saw that a box had been left on my front porch. I opened the box, and saw that it contained the two blood-red Castilian roses that I ordered that last fall, which were to have been delivered in the spring. It *was* spring. I had ordered the roses in honor of the numinous experience I had at the church with Our Lady of Guadalupe, when I began to write about the patient who ate the red roses in her dream.

רוח

(Spirit – Duende)

To seek out the Duende, however, neither map nor discipline is required. Enough to know that he [the Duende] kindles the blood like an irritant, that he exhausts, that he repulses, all the bland, geometrical assurances, that he smashes the styles...

Duende is not about form, but the “marrow of form.” To beckon the arrival of the Duende, one has to turn out the Muse and keep vulnerable, so that the Duende might come. Lorca describes a singer who “contrived to annihilate all that was nonessential in song and make way for an angry and incandescent Duende... And then how she sang! Her voice... jetted up like blood, ennobled by sorrow and sincerity.” The Duende is like a heart-wrenching lamentation.

The arrival of the Duende always presupposes a radical change in all the forms as they existed on the old plane. It gives a sense of refreshment unknown until then, together with that quality of the just-opening rose, of the miraculous, which comes and instills an almost religious transport. All the arts are capable of Duende, but it naturally achieves its widest play in the fields of music, dance and the spoken poem, since those require a *living presence* to interpret them, because they are forms which grow and decline perpetually and raise their contours on the precise present.

Lorca states, “In every country, death comes as a finality. It comes, and the curtain comes down. But not in Spain! In Spain the curtain goes up... In Spain, the dead are more alive than the dead of any other country of the world.” He adds:

There is a balustrade of flowering nitre where hordes peer out, contemplating death, with verses from Jeremiah for the grimmer side or sweet – smelling Cyprus for the more lyrical – but in any case, a country where all that is most important has its final metallic valuation in death.

Again, prophesying the coming of the three deities in Rilke’s *Sonnets to Orpheus*, Lorca writes,

When the Muse sees death on the way, she closes the door, or raises a plinth, or promenades an urn and inscribes an epitaph with a waxen hand... to frighten off an unforeseen darkness.

When the Angel sees death on the way, he flies in slow circles... But imagine the terror of the Angel, should it feel a spider – even the tiniest – on its tender and roseate flesh!

The Duende, on the other hand, will not approach at all if he does not see the *possibility of death*, if he is not convinced he will circle death’s house, if there is not every assurance he can rustle the branches borne aloft by us all, that neither have, nor may ever have, the power to console. ...Angel and Muse escape in the violin or in musical measure, but the Duende draws blood, and in the healing of the wound that never quite closes, all that is unprecedented and invented in a man’s work has its origin.

Lorca writes at the last that he has raised three arches: the Muse, the Angel and the Duende.

But the Duende – where is the Duende? Through the empty arch enters a mental air blowing insistently over the heads of the dead, seeking new landscapes and unfamiliar accents; an air bearing the odor of child’s spittle, crushed grass, and the veil of Medusa announcing the unending baptism of all newly-created things.

אבירה (Loss)

My theme is the lost experience of the numinous in current Jungian psychology. Many questions emerge from this idea, and lately, these questions seem to swirl around my mind. For days now, I have been unable to find a way to formulate these questions. In frustration, a few minutes ago, I got up to make a cup of tea.

Tea has been a mainstay for me during this project, and I have been drinking many different varieties throughout the time I have been writing. I have several Victorian chintz teacups from which I drink my tea. One cup I particularly enjoy is a rare Paragon Pottery Company fortune teller's tea cup, and I drink loose-leaved oolong from it. There are fortune teller's symbols in the bottom of the cup, and I try to interpret what the leaves are saying as they land on the symbols at the bottom of the cup when the liquid is gone. So far, nothing surprising! Each type of tea I drink lends a character to the work I am doing. Today, I chose to drink some hand-rolled Jasmine Pearl Green tea from a Paragon black and pink floral cup. As I tossed six little "pearls" or beads into my cup, I noticed how the boiling water swirls and plumps the leaves, and by the time the tea is steeped, the pearls have unfurled into whole tea leaves that gather at the bottom of the cup. The transformation by boiling water is what acts upon the pearls to give forth their wholeness. The little pearls are like the *lysis* of my questions, the tied up, balled up *massa confusa*. The process of adding the boiling water "unties" the tea, much in the same way that heating up the images in the unconscious "analyses" or "unties" the tightly knotted unconscious material. I know I am mixing metaphors here, but this is an image that seemed to make sense about the questions that have plagued me.

I am discussing what has been lost in Jungian psychology, so I must ask what Jungian psychology was like before something was lost. So that is the first analysis.

Jung was formulating his psychological theories all his life. I can open to any page in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* and this is obvious. Jung, the man, and how he formulated theories were not different. Joseph Chilton Pearce, in his book, *The Magical Child* (Pearce, 1977) which I read years ago for my Master's degree in Psychology, says that children are born into a world of undifferentiated experience. The world is all "one," not unlike my tea pearl. Life is a process of differentiation, discrimination and educing the parts from the whole in order to understand the whole. The whole is always there, inherent in the parts and the parts *are* the whole. Henri Bortoft's book, *The Wholeness of Nature* (1996) does a beautiful job of discussing how the parts are pieces of a "hologram." Each slice of a hologram contains the whole.

Therefore, in my way of thinking, education is not about *giving* knowledge; rather, it is about educing or drawing out the innate wholeness of knowledge in the world and giving it form. This is the Socratic Method, viewed a bit differently.

Jung obviously had a powerful mind, but what arrived first was his "No. 2 personality." Nothing that Jung formulated in his thinking could be separated from his original Self. Everything emerged from his first experiences and first dreams. Jung's formal education as a physician, his subsequent experiences at the Burghölzli, his relationship with Freud, his clinical practice, the encounter with his unconscious, his marriage, children, friendships, affairs, in short, everything, helped to create analytical psychology. But what is analytical psychology?

The formation of Jungian psychology, as it was when it was "new," was the meeting of Jung's numinous experiences as they interfaced with his conscious mind. Every element in Jung's life, throughout his life, both internal and external, influenced the development of

analytical psychology. Jung cannot be removed from his Zeitgeist, and so it was not just Jung who formulated analytical psychology, but all the elements surrounding Jung, inner and outer, that helped to form it. Analytical psychology was not simply a theory, but it was a living experience, a way of life. But if analytical psychology emerged from Jung's psyche, mind and experiences, then what would analytical psychology have been like, how would it have evolved, if Jung were still alive and making sense of his experiences? Is there any other way to view the body of work that Jung developed? Is not analytical psychology *Jung*?

What implications does this have? I have studied Jung's life and work and attempted to make sense of what he experienced. The body of his work is called "the theory of analytical psychology." But, is this so? Jung did and would still abhor this notion. Jung did not write about his theories from an "introverted stance," as a work of art that the artist intends to create, but from an "extraverted stance," where experience dictates understanding.

Can Jungian psychology be distinguished from "Jung's psychology?" It is my belief that it cannot. Jung said, "I am glad to be Jung and not a Jungian." He warned, time and time again, that anything that did not originate in the experience of the individual was not individuation, but mimesis.

The people who surrounded Jung had the same task as the current generation of "Jungians" now has. Emboldened by Jung's presence and his experiences, they listened, like the youths of a hunter-gatherer tribe, to the fresh stories of the blood-letting of the neighboring enemy or the tale of the fierce lion, newly vanquished. They educed from Jung's experiences, and in Jung's Zeitgeist, in that time of history, they took courage from Jung to venture into the uncharted territory of their own unconscious demands.

This generation that has sprung from Jung's psychic lineage can only read about his experiences and wonder what it must have been like to be one of the trailblazers in the exploration of the unconscious. I have diligently studied Jung in training for seven years, yet no matter how much I study or read or work with my own dreams and unconscious process, I was not in Jung's presence. All I have are biographies and parables.

Often, when something amazing and new comes along, there is a tendency to "try it out, and see what this baby can do." There are no set boundaries on new experience, because the experience is unknown. Even common sense can sometimes be challenged. I think of the people who surrounded Jung during the time when working with numinous experience was new and untested. Imagine the excitement of that time, the energy that must have surrounded the core group of people who were deeply stirred by Jung's work with the core of analytical psychology – the numinous. Those who were working with Jung at the inception of analytical psychology were forging new territory in the western world. In Zürich they worked together, lived together and socialized together at a time and place in history which could never be duplicated. Those who worked analytically with Jung also ate dinner with him and drank with him. And more.

Simply because Jung took a first step, every dream is new, every experience is a first. If analytical psychology is nothing else, it is *new*. I think of Ezra Pound who wrote, "Make it New." No one can rely on anyone else's experience, not even Jung's, to attempt the complex task of individuation. So, I can read Jung's words, I can try to understand *his* numinous experiences, and the numinous experiences of those who worked directly with him, but those experiences are not *mine*. Jung's analysands brought forth art, music, poetry, which emerged unformed and "new" from their own psyches, not in imitation of Jung.

I can take courage from what Jung learned and taught, but I am innocent, not born, until I go through my own birthing. Each dream contains the potential for individual transformation. Jung said, “Behind a man’s actions there stands neither public opinion nor the moral code. Just as a man still is what he always was, so he already is what he will become.” (Jung, 1989a, Par. 390) This is the process of individuation.

יִרְמְיָהוּ

(Jeremiah)

In my discussion of etymology above, I said that the loss of word origins was lamentable. I discussed that languages become watered down through time and contact with other neighboring people. Original language can become diluted if one of the languages inherently wields more power or prestige than the other. The further away from the source, the more likely that other influences, circumstances, time, and social factors erode the original language, or change the meaning of the words to align with the new culture.

I believe that word origins are another way of accessing archetypes in language, and it is not a far leap from the loss of word origins to the dilution of numinous experience as the archetypal underpinning of analytical psychology.

Since the subject is lament, I turn once again to the Lamentations of Jeremiah. Who was this “Mega-Kvetch,” Jeremiah? He is the Hebrew prophet, one of the greatest figures of the Old Testament, of which the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah is the 24th book, second of the Major Prophets, after Isaiah. He lived to see the destruction of Jerusalem. His point of view was unusual and unpopular; the only religion he regarded as real was the religion of the heart; hence he deprecated sacrifices when they were considered all important.

The Book of Jeremiah is primarily a message of judgment on Judah for rampant idolatry. God had promised that He would judge idolatry most severely, and Jeremiah warned Judah that God's judgment was at hand. God had delivered Judah from destruction on countless occasions, but His mercy was at its end. Yet even in this most severe judgment, God promised restoration of Judah back into the land God has given them.

Jeremiah taught that religion was personal, not national. His main troubles with his people resulted from this set of ideas. After the fall of Jerusalem, Jeremiah was taken into Egypt, where he vanished from history. His hired scribe and companion, Baruch, helped Jeremiah write his book. It is full of remarkable and beautiful poems, some of them unsurpassed in Hebrew literature. The austere gloom of the book has given rise to the word *jeremiad*.

In the Lamentations, Jeremiah's "Call" from Yahweh to become a prophet and an unpopular complainer, proceeds through four steps. These four steps can offer a framework for what has happened to the experience of the numinous in current analytical psychology.

The four steps follow one upon the other, and they are analogous to the stages of the individuation process itself. Although these Biblical verses between Yahweh and Jeremiah seem to be a "conversation" held between two people, this conversation is parallel to the internal struggle someone might encounter during the process of individuation.

The first step in Jeremiah's calling is the "Commissioning." Yahweh tells Jeremiah that he is to become God's voice on earth. The "Call" is an acoustic process, often "heard" as an inner voice. Yahweh says to Jeremiah, "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee/And before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee; I have appointed thee a prophet unto the nations."

A person's "Calling" is often an internal voice heard during the inchoate or initiatory phase of the process of individuation, bringing to bear the seeds of one's true nature. Often, as in Jung's case, the inner demand is so great that it cannot be denied or explained away.

The "Commissioning" stage parallels Jung's "Calling" to his confrontation with his unconscious during the writing of the *Red Book*. This calling was the foundation of Jung's numinous experiences and his life-long work that ensued. The basis for analytical psychology came from his understanding of that profound work.

It is not uncommon that someone who is charismatic and a trailblazer can gather "disciples." Jung gathered to him many disciples who carried on the work with the numinous that Jung experienced and identified as such. Only a portion of these disciples had and *have* their own unique "commissioning" experiences, so the "basis" has become more diffuse over time and no longer carries the weight of Jung's own commissioning. These "imitators" can reproduce the words and similar experiences without going through a calling of their own.

The second step is the Objection. Jeremiah denies that he is worthy to live the truth of his own nature. This step is a denial that everything is going to be shaken up. The old rules will no longer apply, and this is a stage of bargaining against the flow of nature. Often there is an ego inflation and then a refutation of that inflation, which occurs when the reality of the situation really becomes clear. I went through this step when I was accepted into Jungian training, with its commensurate ego inflation. Some time into the actuality of the situation, I realized that this was not going to be easy, and thought about my "calling." Was the program going to help me to individuate as the person I was meant to become? Could I refuse the "call," if the program did not address my individual needs? I understood well that the role of a jeremiad is not pleasant.

Since Jung's time there have seen many splits and "Objections" in Jungian psychology. The splits and "breakaways" are nearly always an attempt to find something "more authentic," or different, more *certain*, more solid, etc. These are still imitation, because they are an objection to the original, not an original experience itself. The "new" groups find their basis in "contrast" and then more and more, they attempt to establish a "different ground." Thomas Kirsch, in *The Jungians* (2000) makes a thorough study of the various splits and breakaways in analytical psychology since Jung's time. If the numinous through Jung is one side of the "wall," then the other side, the contrasting side, would be a movement towards theory. Since Jung's "call", there has been a movement back to psychoanalysis and the post-Freudian movements. One hint might be that Jung's analytical psychology is full of uncertainties. So the "objection" or the "breakaway" has gone towards the certainties of psychoanalysis.

The third step is the Reassurance, where Yahweh tells Jeremiah that he knows him and his worth. This is the wrestling that must be undergone when one is confronted with the dark side of the unconscious, when the going "gets tough" and one wishes to give up the whole business. The reassurance is internal and must come from holding the tension of opposing forces.

Translated into a Jungian framework, the current generation of Jungians carries the tension of the numinous/theory split. Part of carrying the tension is the fact or the "illumination" that the numinous has gone missing or is lost. In contrast to the current preponderance of the theoretical approach, there is an opening to the numinous through non-analytical sources. The movement to a more balanced approach might come through art, music, poetry and other creative processes to a more balanced approach. I will also discuss this in more detail.

David Tacey's article discussed earlier, has all the earmarks of an attempt to bring together the numinous or as he calls it "the Unknown," with the reductionism of psychoanalysis.

However, Tacey's idea fails in light of the *fact* of numinous experience. For there to be a bridge between numinous experience and theory, each must stand on its own. There can be no watering-down of either side. The primacy and the origins of the one cannot absorb or be absorbed into the other. In the current literature the numinous or the Unknown has been theorized, not experienced. Unfortunately, certainty has become psychoanalytic theory. There is too much about numinous experience *sui generis* that has to be softened or diluted for it to fit neatly into this current psychoanalytic construct.

The fourth step in Jeremiah's calling is the Sign. In psychological terms, one might experience a confirming dream or perhaps a synchronicity or numinous experience which confirms and signifies that the correct, albeit unknown and often difficult choice has been made and now must be pursued. (Brewer, 1922, Chapter 9).

Currently, Jungians on both sides of the wall are not anywhere near the possibility of a Sign. More time may be required for anything to come of the tension of the opposites.

לפתות (Lure)

Why has numinous experience become lost in analytical psychology? What has pushed Jungians further and further away from numinous experience since Jung's time? What was the lure away from numinous experience? The answers to these questions form the second analytic task.

Answers cannot be found merely from a theoretical framework. They are mired in the experience of Jung's time, from which they cannot be separated. Therefore, a discussion of world events during Jung's time must be included in any comprehensive analysis of the influences that shaped the approach to the numinous.

The impact of World War I cannot be underestimated in any degree in relation to the psychological condition of the world. World War I changed the way wars had been previously fought, which hitherto had been fought in an orderly, predictable fashion, on one small turf or other. One of the outcomes of the War was a complete social and political reformation, moving from a governing system by monarchies and empires into political systems, in which family lineage as a qualification for leadership, was no longer viable. This marked the advent of socialist and “people’s” governments. Imperialism no longer sufficed in a modern and geographically mobile culture. Death was no longer an individual affair only. There was certainly hand-to-hand combat, but a new element was introduced in this war. Death was brought about without having to look directly into the eyes of the enemy. Now, there was mass killing by the random use of gases, which were released over wide areas. The airplane was used to drop bombs at indiscriminate targets and over huge geographical regions. The condition of “shell shock” was identified for the first time in this war, due to the horrors never before seen in any war until this time. The inventions of the automobile, flamethrowers, tanks and airplanes offered tremendous technological capabilities and also brought incredible sorrows.

The world economy suffered as well, which set up the next several years of conditions that led to the Depression and World War II. The years before the Depression were frightening and unpredictable economically, socially, politically and psychologically.

Women changed during World War I. They took active roles as ground support, which was a completely new idea. They worked in factories, which manufactured parts and necessities for the war machine, and actively participated in the business of war, no longer working as tenders of the injured and dying or staying home to tend to their broods of children. This war marked a freedom and independence for women. They were now able to become part of the

world work force. The invention of the cervical cap gave them sexual freedom, and freedom to choose if they in fact wanted children, and if so, just how many. The Roaring 20's, a time of sexual and social revolution, would likely not have occurred without the changes for women that developed from the war. The Temperance Movement developed in reaction to social freedoms, including drinking and other moral concerns.

There would be no return to a pre-War society. The uncertain, jarring changes and the psychological impact of such huge change in such a short period of time, created a collective sense of fear of death and the unknown.

The Nazi movement gained a stronger foothold in the 20's and early 30's than it did even before World War I. Nazism offered a response to mass cultural uncertainty. The failing world economy, particularly in post-War Europe, provided more fertile ground for a definitive "answer." The Great Depression made National Socialism very attractive, especially to the Germans, who had suffered so greatly in the First World War. The Nazis identified the Jews as convenient scapegoats, and rallied the people around vilifying the Jews as something they could count on. The Nazis promoted the idea that if only they could only get rid of the Jews, who were taking all the money and security, they could enjoy the bliss that they experienced in times gone by. All the horrors of the First World War would then melt into a dew. All the poverty from economic instability would then be solved. There would be none of the hopelessness that the war and Depression created. The need for certainty was answered by the Nazis.

World War II brought tremendous uncertainty to the rest of the world. In response to the uncertainty, the Allies got "busy." Everyone contributed to the war effort as a way to manage the need for self-sacrifice. There was a "cause," which was to destroy the enemy, and there was a clear and certain enemy in Hitler and later the Japanese. Then came the Bomb and the advent of

the nuclear age. In the 50's and 60's, Communism sent the world into a complete panic with the hopelessness, uncertainty and anxiety of a coming apocalypse (Ellenberger, 1970 & Shamdasani, 2003).

פרויד

(Freud)

I need to be very careful in the way I bring psychoanalysis into this next discussion. If I were less careful, I could simply write that psychoanalysis offered certainty. But on the heels of the previous discussion about the Nazis, I do not want to equate Psychoanalysis with Nazism, both of which offered a kind of psychological certainty. The common ground here is the need for certainty. There are no other parallels intended or implied.

It is my belief that Freud had a basic fear of death. He certainly wrote a good deal about it. Later in his life, Freud began to believe that the life instincts were not a complete picture: *Libido* is a lively thing. The pleasure principle keeps us in constant motion. And yet the goal of all this motion is to be still, to be satisfied, to be at peace, and to have no more needs. The goal of life, Freud might say, is death.

Freud began to believe that underlying the life instincts, there was a *death instinct*. He began to believe that every person has an unconscious wish to die. The death principle – *thanatos* – is one of the main tenets of Freud's drive concepts. Psychoanalysis is replete with the certainty of death. Inherent in the idea of the death drive is *apocalypse*, total devastation and doom. Freud's "Death" is nothing like Lorca's. For Freud, life is regressive and harkens backwards. Death is a finality. For Lorca, death carries the Duende, the spirit of earthy life energy and creativity. The Duende carries what might be considered the darker qualities of Eros.

Freud's notion of the death instinct may seem strange, and in fact, it was rejected by many of Freud's students. However, if life is looked upon as a struggle, death promises release from that struggle.

Freud was a Jew by heritage, but a self-defined atheist. In the Jewish religion of Freud's time and through the later 20th century, especially among the privileged class, there tended to be more of a *cultural* connection to a Jewish heritage, rather than an actual adherence to a belief in God. For the most part the practice of Judaism in Freud's time contained little belief in the afterlife, "Olam Ha-Ba" or "world to come." Most of modern Jewish religious practice concentrates on Mitzvot, which, as discussed above, are the commandments and deeds done on earth during one's lifetime. In my own orthodox Jewish education, nothing specifically was discussed about an afterlife, and so most modern or cultural Jews believe that life ends at physical death. Even though Freud was raised as a Jew, likely had a Bar Mitzvah, and identified as a Jew throughout his life, he openly dismissed religion in any form.

Yet Freud's theory of psychoanalysis is a banquet of exact "Mitzvot" spread before us to consume. I believe I am not the first to think that Freudian psychoanalysis is as formulaic as the prescriptions of Torah and Talmud. As my Uncle Jack used to say about my Auntie Ede, "You can take the girl out of Brooklyn, but you can't take Brooklyn out of the girl." Freud may have rejected Judaism, but psychoanalytic theory is as certain of its correctness as the most dogmatic of religions.

With the ever-present fear of death, uncertainty and apocalypse, psychoanalysis provided a theory of certainty to counteract fear of immediate and uncontrollable experience. In a state of fear, the easiest path is not towards the expansiveness of experience; the easiest path is toward power and control. Psychoanalysis was the theoretical antidote to powerlessness.

פסיכואנליזה (Psychoanalysis)

The rise of a Jungian psychoanalysis in England, under the ægis of Michael Fordham in London, was another factor which further diminished the value of the numinous. Fordham had been introduced to Jung's work as early as 1933 through H. G. Baynes. He was analyzed by Baynes in England and then again in Switzerland (he could not originally afford analysis with Jung). During the period of his analysis with Baynes, Fordham was in child psychiatric training, and was influenced principally by Melanie Klein's work. Fordham introduced infant-observation to Klein's techniques, and included theories from analytical psychology as well as psychoanalytic and object relations theories. Fordham's theory of child development "has permeated analytical psychology." (Kirsch, 2000, p. 46). It was Fordham who was the paladin for the "developmental" point of view in analytical psychology in contrast to a "classical" point of view.

After his analysis with Baynes came to an end, Fordham, on Jung's referral, began analytic work with Hilde Kirsch. Kirsch had to leave the country before Fordham's analysis could be completed, because, as a Jew during World War II, her family was not safe in Europe. Fordham then asked again to work analytically with Jung, now that he could afford Jung's fees. Jung would not work with him. Baynes had used Fordham's case in a public presentation in which his identity was not hidden well enough. Baynes said Fordham was schizophrenic, though his diagnosis was later challenged, but not soon enough to prevent the doubt cast upon Fordham's psychological state. In my opinion, Fordham's early diagnosis of schizophrenia would not have been a deciding factor in whether or not Jung would have seen Fordham for analysis. Jung was no stranger to schizophrenia. In Thomas Kirsch's book *The Jungians* there is

a giant missing parenthetical phrase about Jung's refusal to work with Fordham. Kirsch does not report the reasons why Jung made this decision, and says only, "It is my opinion that the combination of not seeing Jung, having a public analysis with Baynes, and having Hilde Kirsch terminate the analysis abruptly, left [Fordham] with wounds which never healed." (Kirsch, p.45)

The question of why Jung would not see Fordham has always been a nagging question for me, and it really never has been answered to my satisfaction. Moreover, what bearing did this fact have on the development of analytical psychology and the rise of psychoanalysis in Jungian psychology?

I have wondered about Fordham. None of the biographies I have read of Jung adequately explain the reason Jung was so dismissive of him. I would have expected Jung to have been intrigued by Fordham's case, since Baynes wrote to Jung that he considered him to be one of his most interesting cases. Further, I have always wondered why Jung made Hilde Kirsch an analyst *for* Fordham, thereby legitimizing her as an analyst in her own right. Perhaps a part of the answer lies in Mrs. Kirsch's personality.

In a personal interview with Dr. Russell Lockhart in the Spring of 2000, I asked Dr. Lockhart what it was like to have had analysis with Mrs. Kirsch. I was not yet in training to become an analyst, but was curious about *his* experiences in training, as training had always been my fervent goal.

Dr. Lockhart told me that Hilde Kirsch was one of the most medial people he had ever encountered. He further stated that she had many experiences of the numinous. In working with her, Dr. Lockhart's own numinous experiences, which always came to him in abundance, were honored by her and given the attention that well served his process of individuation.

I tucked away Dr. Lockhart's account of his work with Kirsch for a later time. Now, as I think about the development of analytical psychology, I have dusted off the story and brought it back onto the table, because it lends a direct account of the way in which Mrs. Kirsch worked with numinous experience. And it explains to me, inferentially, why Mrs. Kirsch would have been an excellent choice as an analyst for Fordham, who may well have been lacking in numinous experiences. I am also making some inferences here about Fordham, from the way in which he formulated his theories of developmental analytical psychology, psychoanalysis and object relations theory.

From all accounts, and there are several, Fordham kept trying to knock figuratively, on Jung's door to enter the Penetralium of numinous experience. Perhaps Jung felt that Mrs. Kirsch was the best person to give him access to numinous experience. Jung continually held him away. In several of the biographical accounts I have read of Jung's life, Fordham's commentaries of his encounters with Jung are always a little jabbing. There are probably grains of truth in Fordham's descriptions of their conversations, but almost without exception, Fordham is critical of Jung, focusing on potentially explosive subject matter, but in a very off-handed manner. I may well be reading into his "tone." In Ronald Hayman's biography of Jung, *A Life of Jung* (1999, p. 449), he describes the scene when Fordham visited Jung toward the end of Jung's life. He quotes Fordham: "He [Jung] looked at me as though I were a poor fool and did not know a thing. Then he started to talk about L.S.D. and the *abaissement du niveau mental* that it produced, so that archetypes could come into the field of consciousness. I had heard this dissertation more than once and it had always been a bad sign." Why did Fordham consider this a bad sign? It is not explained in Hayman's account or in any other source I have consulted. Perhaps the explanation is obvious, but I am not able to make sense of Fordham's assessment. In both Hayman's

biography and in Sonu Shamdasani's, *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology* (2003, p. 351), both authors write that Fordham reported that Jung was confused and distressed during that last meeting. After several minutes of silence, Jung dismissed Fordham – again.

In any event, Fordham's version of analytical psychology included aspects of psychoanalysis, child development, and object relations. When analytical psychology returned to England with Fordham, the British school of analytical psychology began changing to include the theories of the psychoanalytic schools, particularly when Freud moved to London in 1938. These theories were compelling lures away from the numinous.

The British school and Developmental theory had a huge bearing on the trajectory of analytical psychology in England. But these theories could not have gotten a foothold, were it not for the culture in post-War Europe that supported it.

It is important to understand the atmosphere in Europe after the war in order to understand its impact on psychoanalysis. Hitler's Germany had been steeped in Teutonic mythology, and there had been too much of the numinous that had run rampant in the collective psyche. The numinous had contributed to the devastation. Numinosity was no longer viable in the culture, and rationality took its place. Even though this was a reactive position, it represented a balance towards a more "sane" culture.

The negative result was the rejection of the deep human need for meaning, which requires something that can puncture everyday reality and bring experiences of the numinous. However, in the post-War atmosphere, with the rise of Communism and the level of fear and pain so much a part of the collective consciousness, it was nearly impossible to regard the numinous without equal fear.

Murray Stein, in his article “Importance of numinous experience in the alchemy of individuation,” in *The Idea of the Numinous* says that

...human life has a link to transcendence and that the individual is a “soul” with potential to come into relation with the spiritual in a wholly natural way that does not tip over into madness. (p. 49)

One of the lures away from the numinous was a desire to move away from uncertainty and fear of madness. Psychoanalysis, which could provide a structure to reduce all unconscious drives to the instincts, provided a sense of power and control.

What happened to the numinous at this point in history? There have always been the mystics, the *augures*, and others who operate in uncertainty. There were those who came to Zürich, despite the troubled atmosphere in Europe. Jolande Jacobi, Erich Neumann, the Kirsches and the Zellers among other Jews in Jung’s circle, were able to live with inner and outer uncertainty, yet still remain in rapport with their inner lives. Switzerland, which was an island of neutrality in both wars, was definitely impacted by the uncertainty of war, but was not as *directly* affected by it. On the other hand, Freud was in the fray of war and anti-Semitism in Vienna. Death surrounded him in a way that it did not directly surround Jung.

Jung believed that “life goes not backward nor tarries with yesterday” (Gibran, 1997). The direction of analytical psychology is toward life and Eros. The movement of Eros is forward, towards uncertainty and the possibilities of growth and numinosity that can come from such a state of existence. Eros moves away from the power principle, because power implies a hierarchical structure, where there is no parallel relatedness. Eros, as the god of relationship, is always looking for open hearts to puncture. Power and Eros cannot exist together. They are fundamentally opposite principles. Jung wrote,

Where love reigns, there is no will to power; and where the will to power is paramount, love is lacking. The one is but the shadow of the other: the man who adopts the standpoint of Eros finds his compensatory opposite in the will to power, and that of the man who puts the accent on power, is Eros. (Jung, 1972, par. 78)

As early as 1930, Freud understood that the other side of Thanatos was Eros, and he understood that the coming battle, literally and figuratively, would be between Eros on the one hand and Thanatos on the other.

The fateful question of the human species seems to me to be whether and to what extent the cultural process developed in it will succeed in mastering the derangements of communal life by the human instinct of aggression and self destruction. In this connection, perhaps the phase through which we are at this moment passing deserves special interest. Men have brought their powers of subduing the forces of nature to such a pitch that by using them they could now very easily exterminate one another to the last man. They know this – hence arises a great part of their current unrest, their dejection, their mood of apprehension. And now it may be expected that the other of the two *heavenly forces*, eternal Eros, will put forth its strength so as to maintain himself alongside of his equally immortal adversary. (Freud, 1961)

What did Freud mean by Eros’ “equally immortal adversary?” Russell Lockhart, in *Psyche Speaks* says:

Freud’s call for the advent of Eros is an insight... of enormous proportions. I’m not sure anyone heard him... It may follow from the same condition that allowed him to say two years later [1932] that “our best hope for the future is that the intellect – the scientific spirit, reason – should in time establish a dictatorship over the human mind. Whatever... opposes such a development is a danger for the future of mankind.” Here Freud seems to forget his call to Eros and falls into the typical stance of siding with reason against the soul. (p. 34)

Lockhart says that Freud later shifted his thinking to the primacy of Logos over Eros, and believed that anything that opposed theory was a “danger for the future of mankind.” Lockhart then states,

I feel Freud’s earlier sense was more correct, that the battle is not between Eros and Logos but between Eros and Thanatos. Thanatos seems ever-present in today’s world.... It is a certainty that with the advent of the means of extermination of all life as we know

it, an unholy alliance has grown up between the rational intellect and this final power, this incarnation of Thanatos.

Lockhart points out that it is theory (Logos) and the power to incarnate death (Thanatos) which poses the actual “danger for the future of mankind.” This is a very disturbing thought, and prophetic of a “wrong direction” for analytical psychology.

V. The Manifestation of Loss

הבהרה (Manifestation)

What is it in the current atmosphere of analytical psychology that indicates that the experience of the numinous is lost? I believe that it is in the collective as well as in analytic work. In fact, it would be naïve to believe that analysis can remain totally separate from the collective influences upon it.

In my previous example with Bill, my restaurant/threshold patient, I experienced some of the collective pressures in my analytic work with him. For one, his numinous experience had to take a back seat to the demands on my time. What this caused in me was a disregard for the demands of the unconscious, which should have been a primary concern for me. Instead, rightly or wrongly, I felt that my whole day would have been challenged if I had stayed with this man in his numinous experience. I might have run over the time boundary. If I had put more time between him and my next patient, I might not have been able to squeeze in as many people into my work day, thus causing me to lose income. The demands of my busy practice caused me to make a decision to stay out of Negative Capability. I realized, only after the fact, that I was not serving my patient’s soul or even my own. I was dealing with the very real constraints of power

and money. The fine balance between working with the soul and having to run my life is not always easy to navigate, as if these two positions are even different. This was, lamentably, a loss for the soul of my patient, who was on the threshold of a numinous experience during his session with me.

Generally, not only do I experience the degrading of the numinous in my own work, but I experience in current Jungian realms, particularly in the literature, a pervasive sense that staying with numinous experience is somehow dangerous. I am aware that there is an underlying message or implicit requirement to control and interpret dreams and numinous experience, when, instead, what is wanted by the dream or the experience itself is to be *experienced* and to be *enacted* – to be distinguished from “acting out.” When these experiences cannot be lived out to their fullest capacity, there is no possibility for the dream to act as a bridge from the symbolic world into concrete reality. As guilty as I can be of interpreting or explaining at wrong moments, I know that interpretation always goes toward certainty, explanation, and going “back” to causes. This is in the direction of Thanatos. On the other hand, acting on a dream or *enacting* a dream always is in service of Eros, life, going “forward” into the unknown and uncertainty, where the transcendent can operate. When the psyche has the control, it has a role in creating the future. If explanations are sought, everything else tends to start dying.

Perhaps as a backlash to the fear and powerlessness of the post-war years, the 60’s saw a time of boundless “feel-good” psychotherapy. Licensing was not a necessary requisite to being a counselor. During the mid 70’s, the Tarasoff Decision changed legal and ethical standards in the counseling field. Due to a high court decision, therapists were suddenly held accountable for reporting potential violence, and the child abuse reporting laws came into effect. California got serious about training and licensing Master’s level therapists and began to require that Marriage

and Family Therapists carry malpractice insurance and instituted continuing education credits. Generally, these changes were for the better. Nonetheless, as with most regulations, there often comes a time when the regulations become galling. Some regulations actually can begin to impinge on the work between patient and therapist, and often these regulations may be created out of the fear that those in the position of enacting regulations will lose control. What may suffer is the creative flow between therapist and patient. I am reminded of the situation with my patient, Kris/Lilith. What if she *had* been Borderline, and what if she *had* acted out in an outwardly destructive or inwardly self-destructive way? These fears are always in the “field” when a patient does something that is “unusual.” I can hear my own tiny inner voice saying, “Will this come back on me legally?” My own fear level rises and I worry about what is “proper.” Over-regulation, such as the HIPAA standards, cause me to fear that I am not following rules, and I think too much about what the regulations want me to do, not what the psyche is asking of me to do. That is a huge loss.

לנבא (Prophesy)

Returning to Jeremiah, Judah had turned its back on Yahweh. The Judeans had begun to worship false idols and had succumbed to the lure of power and money. The society, according to Jeremiah, was teetering on apocalypse. Jeremiah lamented the loss of a relationship to Yahweh, and called for reform that would bring the Judeans back to the one true God. The problem with the most valuable thing, the “true path,” is that it is not always easy. The way is never sure and the rewards are usually not immediate or comfortable. Lures generally lead toward ease, power, popularity, explanations, beauty, money and status.

Prophets nearly always come *after* a loss to lament what was originally valued. Generally, they fight the popular tide, and “regularly expose[d] the failures of a society in savage rhetoric. The mark of the true prophet is that they bring God’s judgment on their own nation and their own people. They tell us things about ourselves that we don’t want to hear... [they] know about God’s passion for truth-telling in risky places.” (Brueggemann, 1978). In Mark 6:4, Jesus says, “A prophet is not without honor, except in his own country, and among his own relatives, and in his own house.” (American Standard Bible, 1929). Their message is never fashionable and their opinions are almost always, without exception, unappreciated. Prophecies generally do not foretell winning lottery numbers or first-place horses at the track. Prophecies almost always are concerned with a return to a valuation of a core virtue. In Jeremiah’s case the prophecies valued spiritual recovery instead of easy and glitzy answers. The prophetic stance is always related to Eros, future, growth and life. The apocalyptic stance is always looking back, toward Thanatos, stagnation and death.

Apocalypse, and its retrograde motion towards the past, resides in the realm of theory and certainty. The numinous with its *uncertainty* and its movement toward the future resides in the realm of *prophecy*.

VI. Creativity and the Numinous

יצירתיות

(Creativity)

“The most beautiful thing we can experience is the mysterious. It is the source of all true art and all science. He to whom this emotion is a stranger, who can no longer pause to wonder and stand rapt in awe, is as good as dead: his eyes are closed.” – Albert Einstein (1954)

מוח (Brain)

Neurobiology has a bearing on how the numinous is experienced. Those who live in western culture have become “lay experts” in the area of neurobiology. For example, Madison Avenue has brought awareness, almost to the point of absurdity, about over-the-counter medications, advertised in the media, which can deal with the pain of something as banal as a tension headache. What is remarkable about this is that people simply *accept* that there *are* such things as tension headaches. The idea is thrown around as if it were nothing. Yet, in exploring what exactly causes tension headaches, it is amazing to discover the astonishing nexus of electrochemical reactions that cause pain in the brain. Most people do not care about what the psychogenesis of physical conditions *is*, just that the pain goes away. The fact that something emotional can cause a physiological response escapes our interest.

There is ample evidence to support the impact of meditation, yoga, acupuncture, psychotherapy, analysis, and guided imagery on the body and mind. A deep tissue massage, Rolfing, chiropractic, Reiki, to name but a few, can have an impact on emotions, just as they have on the release of pain in the body.

During the holiday season just after my son’s birth, my husband and I went shopping. I was nursing my son then. If any doubt remained that there is a mind/body connection, I soon had no further lingering questions. As we walked through the crowded streets, I heard an infant crying from hunger. Every mother knows that “hunger” cry. It is different from any other type of crying a baby does. Even though my own baby was not crying, snoozing right in front of me in his stroller, the sound of a crying hungry baby caused me to lactate, right then and there. I used to hear this “urban legend” all the time. I discovered for myself that it is, in fact, quite true.

Increasingly, the field of neurobiology has recognized that music has an entirely unique impact on the brain. It is now believed that music preceded spoken language as a means of communication and sexual courtship among early hominids. (Levitin, 2006, Chapter 9, “The Music Instinct”). The mysterious quality of music is also addressed in the I Ching, Hexagram 16, Enthusiasm, which states,

The enthusiasm of the heart expresses itself involuntarily in a burst of song, in dance and rhythmic movement of the body. From immemorial times the inspiring effect of the invisible sound that moves all hearts, and draws them together, has mystified mankind... Music was looked upon as something serious and holy, designed to purify the feelings of men. It fell to music to glorify the virtues of heroes and thus to construct a bridge to the world of the unseen. (Wilhelm, 1950, p. 68-9)

What is known from the work of neuroscientists and developmental psychologists, such as Allan Schore, Joseph Chilton Pearce and David Levitin, is that sound, spoken poetry and music have a tremendous and undeniable ability to affect and manipulate emotions and the brain, and that includes all parts of the brain. Yet, the effect is largely inexplicable.

Allan Schore’s work, *Affect Regulation and the Origin of the Self: The Neurobiology of Emotional Development* (1994) discusses that the cortex of the right hemisphere (orbital cortex) is responsive not only to the positive aspects of facial expressions, visual stimuli, touch, smell, but also to auditory function and particularly *music*. The right brain is particularly responsible for processing music and sound; however, the left brain contributes also, by identifying tunes and lyrics.

Joseph Chilton Pearce, in *Evolution’s End* (1993) says that the brain is composed of three systems: the R-system, or reptilian brain; the limbic system, the part of the brain primarily responsible for emotion; and the neocortex, or the “thinking brain.” He says that all parts of the brain are penetrated by sound. Alfred Tomatis has found that the entire skin area of the body is

involved in hearing; every cell registers sound waves, sending its reports on to higher centers for processing. (Tomatis, 1991, p. 35ff). Within the last decade, studies have shown that certain kinds of music, such as the music of Mozart, impact child development and intelligence (Campbell, 2001). Yet, we do not marvel at how amazing this really is.

David Levitin, in *This is Your Brain on Music: The Science of a Human Obsession* (2006) discusses that the entire brain is involved in hearing music and spoken poetry. Both right and left hemispheres, cerebral cortex, the orbitofrontal region of the brain, cerebellum, in brief, all parts of the brain can be pierced or *punctured* by music and spoken poetry. It can be said, then, that music and poetry are full body, mind and psychic experiences. This harkens back to William Blake's "five Senses, the chief inlets of Soul."

My own experience is that the numinous often emerges in the area of the arts, especially music and spoken poetry. Music has always been the sphere in which I am most able to feel the freshness and newness of a performance, whether it has been for my own private pleasure or in a public solo concert. When I am singing, sometimes I feel as if I am simply singing a beautiful song or a harmonic part in a chorus. I always derive pleasure from making music. However, when the numinous enters, if it does, it feels as if time stands still, as if I am holding my breath so that the moment will not disappear, and each chord or note or moving passage is connected to the one just behind it and the one to come. There is a disbelief that it is occurring, and a vague fear that it will stop. Yet often, the moment continues, carried by something "other." It is exciting and exhilarating in a way that I cannot begin to express, and my inadequate description here echoes a similar charge of intensity and wholeness from which the experience originated. Numinous musical experiences puncture the time-bound reality, and enter me each time in a new

way. Even if I am performing the same piece three days in a row, it is impossible to perform the same music twice. It is not possible to *hear* the same music twice.

Poetry uses metaphor, which is the pairing together of two disparate things. Metaphor punctures the everyday brain, in the same way that music can. There is a power in poetry that is released by placing together two seemingly unconnected things. The theoretical mind, the logical mind, is thrown into disequilibrium in the presence of metaphor. It cannot reconcile the two strangely related ideas. There is a kind of electrical charge that is released by bringing together ideas that have not been brought together before. As with music, poetry can penetrate the cortex and rote thinking. Both poetry and music can go beyond and puncture the deepest mind. As with a musical performance, no spoken poem is the same poem twice; it is always bounded by the immediate circumstances which surround the moment.

Music and poetry endow us with the possibility to transcend our daily existence. I think now of the music in the Cathedral the night of the Tenebrae service, with the prophet Jeremiah's words set to pure ethereal music. Unexpectedly, I was back in the morning-house in Studio City, longing to feel the touch of my father's hand on my hair. This is what music can do. It can convey the qualitative nature of *kairos*. Theory takes a holiday in a numinous moment, but always, there is just a bit of an over-the-shoulder awareness or consciousness that the moment may end. Schlamm's idea of consciousness during a numinous experience is too heavy-handed. The full-body, mind and psychic awareness is not so edgy. The perimeters of consciousness are softer, mitigated by something divine.

If there is an awareness that God has nodded in our direction – though as I have mentioned, there may be no immediate awareness of this experience – the “afterglow” of the

numinous experience can continue to puncture reality. This occurs especially when one carries forward the numinous experience or “dreams the dream onward.”

שירה

(Poetry)

In the middle of the journey of our life, I came to find myself in a dark wood where the straight way was lost. Ah, how hard a thing it is to tell what a wild, and rough, and stubborn wood this was, which in my thought renews the fear. (Dante, *The Inferno*, 2003)

Some time ago, I met with an analyst from another institute to discuss my ideas on the lost experience of the numinous. I felt that he could help me to gather my thoughts about the topic, but instead, he told me that my topic was folly. He attempted to steer me in another direction, toward the theory of archetypes, which I found compelling and interesting. Yet I knew that this was not *my* direction. After meeting with him, I felt despondent, and lamented the fact that I had traveled so far from home, only to hit this dead end. I drove in the gloaming, through pretty neighborhoods, and my mind wandered to a poem from Rilke's *Sonnets to Orpheus*. I remembered only the first line of the poem, but I kept driving and saying it over and over in my mind. Finally, I drove into a parking lot and called my brother, Steve, the guitarist, lawyer, and most particularly, an accomplished poet. He had the Stephen Mitchell translation of *Sonnets to Orpheus*, in his law office, which was the translation I had in mind. While I sat in a parking lot, he and I went over it together. I think of my brother when I think of Orpheus, the lyre player and poet.

Sonnet VIII from the First Part:

Only in the realm of Praising should Lament
walk, the naiad of the wept-for fountain,
watching over the stream of our complaint,

to keep it clear upon the very stone

that bears the arch of triumph and the altar. –
Look: around her shoulders dawns the bright
sense that she may be the youngest sister
among the deities hidden in our heart.

Joy *knows*, and Longing has accepted –
only Lament still learns; upon her beads,
night after night, she counts the ancient curse.

Yet awkward as she is, she suddenly
lifts a constellation of our voice,
glittering, into the pure nocturnal sky.
(Mitchell, 1985)

To this day I do not know why Rainer Maria Rilke's sonnet pushed insistently into my mind. I have loved Rilke's poetry since high school, when I sang three Paul Hindemith songs based on Rilke's poems. One of them, "The Doe," is stuck in my head right now, with its "scherzo" rhythm, mimicking the gallop of a doe in the woods. Rilke's poetry lends itself to musical rendering, with beautiful metric patterns and noun-rich ontological structures.

Rilke is often described as sensitive and introspective. His style varies from elaborate and profound to delicately simple. Rilke's poems are characterized by striking visual imagery and musicality. A constant theme is the erotic and spiritual love between men and women. The tone of his verse is often mystical and prophetic, bearing a resemblance to medieval texts. This resemblance may well reflect Rilke's religious outlook. Much of the symbolism in his poems probes deeply into emotional and spiritual issues, involved in the search for transcendence in the absence of a relationship with a personal God. Death is a frequent theme.

The *Sonnets to Orpheus* is dedicated to Orpheus, the mythic singer and lyre player, forced to descend into the underworld, where he sought his love Eurydice, lost her to Hades and

lamented her in sorrowful songs. Orpheus becomes a symbol for Rilke of the acceptance of the transience of life and the transformative capacity of art.

It is an amazing thing the brain does. It is a very common experience for someone to have a song stuck in one's head. Why music can do this is beyond my comprehension, but has received tremendous attention, especially recently. Oliver Sacks' book *Musicophilia: Tales of Music and the Brain* (2007) investigates this strange phenomenon, and concludes, much as I have discussed above, that music, and in the same vein, poetry, impact the brain differently than other stimuli.

So, Steve and I tried to make sense of the poem. Now, in hindsight, the poem came as a numinous intrusion to corroborate my deep knowledge of the correct path for my paper: "Only Lament still learns."

The poem seems to begin with a strange paradox. Rilke writes that only in the realm of praising is where lament can exist. Rilke's idea of art is that it praises the world, even in death or lament. He demonstrates that the function of art *is* praise, and praise is not only given to something we consider *good* or typically praiseworthy, but to anything that can transform us. Rilke does not put a valuation on lament. He is saying that lament, along with positive and negative emotions, has the capacity to transform. One must be open and available to everything that the world offers, pain included. In Jungian terms, when one is open, the numinous can enter. Of course, the numinous is not only a positive thing. It can be negative, but its intent is always toward growth and transformation. So, lament can be numinous as well.

I think of Jung's statement about his belief in God:

To this day "God" is the name by which I designate all things which cross my willful path violently and recklessly, all things which upset my subjective views, plans and

intentions, and change the course of my life for better or for worse. (Jung, 1959, BBC interview)

Like Otto, Rilke sees “holiness” in Lament. There is holiness in the way of praising and lamenting. The prophet not only praises, but also laments. Both acts are sacred.

The numinous can defeat and harm. Lament is never fun. It is always about something urgent. Lament thwarts conscious intentions, but that which thwarts is where learning can occur most. Nietzsche said it a bit differently, “That which does not kill us makes us stronger.” Even the most negative things have the capacity to teach. Only by being open can one learn from grief.

In the place of receptivity, praise and appreciation, the “arch of triumph and the altar,” is where Lament, this little deity also resides. It is her proper place. She looks over our complaints, but lamenting is not the same as complaining. Complaining is the lesser form of lamenting. Complaining must be transformed into lamentation, and that is another way of praising the world.

Lamentation is complaining with meaning. If our complaints are not elevated to something meaningful, there is a separation from the fountain of life, the life-giving, sustaining and quenching inner source.

Rilke identifies the three deities “hidden in our heart,” which are like Lorca’s Angel, Muse and the Duende. Rilke’s deity, Joy, is similar to Lorca’s Angel. Joy and the Angel *know* what they seek. Their mantra is “I want.” The second deity, Longing, along with Lorca’s Muse, have figured out what they want, and have an object or a goal clearly in mind. That goal is accepted and all movement is toward the goal. When fate presents a roadblock, these inner figures cannot stand the disappointment. Only Lament, like the Duende, can ultimately cope with

the sorrow of not receiving the joy and the desire of longing for good news. It can make it into something clear and pure. It can make art of it.

Only Lament still learns, because only lament is still open to whatever is coming. This is the connection to numinous experience.

Like counting the rounds of the rosary, Lament sees the complaints. She notes the laments, knows each terrible sadness, and each daunting event. She counts them, weighs them and divides them. She suffers with her task. She is the one who must hold everyone's pain and holds their light and darkness for them. The other two cannot be bothered.

Lament is closest to God. Lament is never able to forget the sadness that she well knows. Her completion always is inclusive of all the sorrows through which she has gone, so her "fix" is never perfect. The language of suffering is not elegant. When truth is spoken, it too can be awkward. Truth comes often from pain and suffering.

As she waits, in the unknown of the dark night, the clarity comes. What exactly is a constellation of our voice? I realize that this is Mitchell's translation of Rilke's words, but it is an intriguing idea. Two things come to mind: One is that Lament can transcend her sorrow only if she is collectively recognized and praised. That is the prophet's dilemma. Will the prophet be heard and praised by the collective "constellated" mass? The second notion, which feels like the tighter fit, is that a constellation once was only a mass of patternless dots in the sky. A "constellation" makes pictures and patterns out of stars, hence the word within the word, "stella" which means "star" in Greek. This idea brings back the task of the Augures, the priests of Rome, who lined out an area of the sky and the stars with their crooked wands, to observe and make sense of signs. In this same way, Lament must make sense out of the complaints and violent and reckless accidents of suffering.

I find it intriguing that Rilke identifies that Lament is the youngest of the deities that are hidden in our heart. Why the youngest? I think about the many fairy tales in which it is always the youngest child on whom the fairy tale focuses. The youngest child often has the position of the transcendent, the potential between the two opposing forces. This child is always the Zero card in the Tarot deck, the Fool. The youngest child, Lament, is foolish enough to take on the task of the unknown. Neither of the other two, Joy or Longing, is equipped to deal with the numinous, when it knocks at the door.

So, it is from this position, holding the tension of the two opposite and certain forces that Lament transcends, awkward and imperfect in her ascent, but nevertheless, pure.

The poem is a template for what an analyst must do with the painful and sometimes numinous unconscious material of an analysand. The job of an analyst is to be able to sit with deep lament. The analyst must know that everything cannot be fixed and must hold the pain of not knowing. This is the very thing I wish I would have done with “Bill’s” numinous experience that day in clinic.

In 1977, a memorial publication was prepared in honor of Hilde Kirsch by the C.G. Jung Institute of Los Angeles. Michael Fordham was asked to write a tribute to her. The publication, *A Well of Living Waters*, included contributions by many analysts, and Fordham’s is particularly on point here. He writes,

The way she worked helped me to discover basic features of therapy on which I have built ever since. First, she showed me that passivity was not dangerous, later that it could be positively containing, next that not understanding could be helpful. She was a good listener though I often thought, and I may very well be in error here, that she did not know what was going on. She did not seem to mind and, as I did not either, it was valuable. I felt here was a woman who accepted chaos and gave me space.

VII. Retrieving the Lost Experience of the Numinous

ניגוד (Opposition)

As I look back upon what I have written thus far, I note that I have begun to “soften” as I near the completion of my work. I read my words above and see some of the vitriol I felt at the beginning, and I realize that I have come to a different place through the phenomenon of the process through which I have come.

I felt polarized in my thinking when I began. I felt strongly that the current attitudes towards theory and the lost experience of the numinous were on opposite sides of the wall, and I could not imagine a way to reconcile these opposites.

In the section of the paper above, where I discuss Jung’s relationship with Michael Fordham, I was thumbing through the index of Dierdre Bair’s book *Jung: A Biography* (2003) for other bits of research to support my thoughts. I saw that there was an end note. It was another reference to Fordham. Someone reading this paper might think I bear rancor against Fordham, but my point has little to do with Fordham himself.

Bair reports that in an interview with Fordham, Fordham stated that Jo Wheelwright told Fordham that when Wheelwright supposedly told Jung that he wanted to found an institute in San Francisco, Jung replied that he had no interest in founding an institute in San Francisco, and did not know why Wheelwright had done it. Fordham reported that Jung said he was against societies because “it goes against individuation. If you get a group, you immediately lower the status of the individual.” Wheelwright later said that the conversation with Fordham “never happened.” In accord with my earlier contention that Fordham “dropped” little off-handed

criticisms of Jung, I realized that Fordham, intentionally or not, fomented a tale that Jung stood assiduously against groups, in and of themselves, for the reasons Fordham ascribed to Jung via Fordham's non-existent conversation with Wheelwright. What has this powerful ascription to Jung done to furnish the impression that Jung was unequivocally against "societies?"

Fordham was right about Jung's doubts against collectives, because Jung was never ambiguous about the fact that collectives had the potential to do exactly as Fordham suggested. There were problems in the Zürich institute, as Bair's text presents. There were power struggles, arguments, and philosophical differences. However, Jung participated in the institute, despite his *warnings* against the inevitable problems in collectives. Many of those problems and power struggles did in fact occur, and some of the problems were caused by Jung himself. He got involved in the politics of the institute, and he did not unequivocally denounce the founding of the institute in Zürich, or the institutes in San Francisco, New York and Los Angeles. However, Fordham's "anecdote" has served to carry on the mandate against groups, as being anathema to individuation. Fordham really did have a point; I disagree with the way in which he made his point.

But I am here to discuss the two *balanced* pillars of Jungian psychology. My "wall" dream places me on the numinous side of the wall. I cannot and will not deny that it is where I am most comfortable. The numinous perspective steers away from collective experience, and is self-instructive and unpredictable. As I have said above, the numinous belongs in the realm of immediate experience and art, which naturally encourages differences and is the essence of *expressive* art. The other side of the wall, which I have identified as the theoretical perspective, tends to be didactic, collective in its approach and finds value in the exploration of potential

outcomes. What comes from theory, as it has been employed in current Jungian psychology, does not focus on the exploration of the unknown and uncertain matters of the soul.

Although these two positions seem to be and, in fact, are directly opposite, one cannot exist without the other. I think that is why Jung struggled so much with being part of a collective *and* being outside it. The fact is that we are *all* part of a collective. There is no denying the fact that we have to live in the world and co-exist with others. So, as individuated as a person may be, there is the reality that no one lives without interfacing with others. This is obvious, and I will not spend more time on this. More to the point are questions that arise from this fact of life: Can analytical psychology exist in a collective way?

Analytical psychology is composed of people who walk not only on both sides of the wall, numinous and theoretical, but all around it. There are as many streams of Jungian thought as there are Jungians. Any psychology that hems a person into a particular position leaves no room for individuation, in whatever way it manifests.

Jung well understood the dilemma when he stated,

Individuation cuts one off from personal conformity and hence from collectivity. This is the guilt which the individuant leaves behind him for the world, that is, the guilt he must endeavor to redeem. He must offer a ransom in place of himself, that is, he must bring forth values which are an equivalent substitute for his absence in the collective personal sphere. Without this production of values, final individuation is immoral. (Jung, 1977, Par. 1095f.)

He also writes,

A real conflict with the collective norm arises only when an individual way is raised to a norm, which is the actual aim of extreme individualism. Naturally, this aim is pathological and inimical to life. It has, accordingly, nothing to do with individuation, which, though it may strike out on an individual bypath, precisely on that account needs the norm for its orientation to society and for the vitally necessary relationship of the individual to society. Individuation, therefore, leads to a natural esteem for the collective norm. (Jung, 1971, Par. 761)

Jung was aware that the individuation process tends to remove the individuant from the collective. It is curious that Jung suggests that in order to become an individual, one must offer a “guilt ransom” to the collective from which one individuates. In the second quote, Jung says that the individual is always in *relationship* to the society from which the individual “strikes out.” He says that the individuant has a “natural esteem” for the collective norm. This does not sound like the thoughts of a man who shuns the collective. Instead, Jung advocates a relationship with the collective, even as the individuant moves away from collective norms.

I have always wondered if Jung’s Swiss heritage might have had something to do with his respect for the collective, since Swiss culture tends to take care of the collective in a different manner than other European nations did during Jung’s time. For example, as a Swiss citizen, Jung was obligated to serve in the federal army reserve on a periodic basis, which one can surmise may have impacted his view of the obligation towards the collective.

Whenever I read a biography of a famous person, I realize that I fall into the “Hollywood Biography Syndrome.” I just made up that term. I always have a desire to see the famous person as having only one set of indisputable beliefs, no contradictions within his or her personality and an immutably consistent persona. Very few biographies I have ever read address this idea, but most biographies set up the expectations. I remember that Hedy Lamarr, the Hollywood actress, was arrested for shoplifting in the 60’s and again in the early 90’s, and I recall thinking how beautiful and brilliant she was (she co-invented and patented an early form of spread spectrum encoding, a key to modern wireless communication that is still used today) and how disappointed I felt, silly as that seems, that her persona was not the entire story. I wanted her to be congruent in all areas of her life, as if as a stunning, intelligent woman and a film star, she had no shadow and no contradictions.

Jung engendered so much veiled and blatant criticism for the many contradictions of his life. Paradoxically, Jung did not generally hide his contradictions, which made him a more visible target. There was no guess-work about his extra-marital relationships. When Emma died, he deeply regretted how his philandering had hurt her. In matters about individuation and the collective, he certainly held the opinion that individuation was one of the most important goals of life. Yet he also attempted to live in a collective. He belonged to clubs, maintained a large circle of friends and colleagues with whom he socialized and worked, and he established an association and involvement with the institute. David Tacey mentions the “stains” on Jung, as if everyone else reading Tacey’s article, including Tacey had no stains of their own. We Jungians feel as if we have to apologize for Jung’s humanness.

I have come to a point in this paper where I now must ask how and *if* it may be possible to retrieve the lost experience of the numinous in this current atmosphere of analytical psychology.

לאחזר (Retrieving)

In my earlier discussion about the four stages of a prophetic “calling,” I said that the fourth stage is usually some sort of transcendent “Sign,” and I said that Jungians on both sides of the wall were not anywhere near the possibility of a Sign. As I wrote it, I felt discouraged about the split in Jungian psychology, as if Jungian psychology itself was like Hedy Lamarr, composed only of a two-dimensional persona. I felt that theory and numinous experience were miles apart and felt no hope for a transcendent. By this I do not mean the same sort of compromise that David Tacey discussed, where, to accomplish a meeting of the minds, one side or the other has to concede something original or apologize for something foundational or human in order to “get

along” with the other side. That was an untenable solution and one I would not advocate. I could not think of a position that could be inclusive of both sides, and had no idea how I could possibly complete this paper.

I kept thinking about what I had written about the Torah Midrash about *doing* first and then *understanding*, but had no idea what that meant for *me* as I was writing the paper. Yes, I was doing the writing, but felt no closer to understanding. I was feeling hypocritical and incompetent.

I had the privilege of working analytically with Dr. Russell Lockhart. I met Dr. Lockhart in the early 80’s. When my husband and I moved to Seattle, it was a move towards nature and a more meaningful life for us. However, my first few months here were difficult. I was stuck. I really wanted to be in nature, but felt that I had to be someone else or thought that something had to happen before I could give myself permission. Early in my analysis, about four months after we moved here, I told Dr. Lockhart that I loved the woods, but I had not walked in woods since my 20’s, when I lived in London. Perhaps he had asked me about my relationship to nature, but I cannot now recall how the conversation began. I soliloquized about my many numinous experiences, walking at gloaming on Hampstead Heath, becoming in my mind like a wild animal that lived close to the earth. He let me go on, in my personal drama, for quite some time. He asked me why I had not sought out the woods here yet and gone for a walk, because clearly, this was a significant connection I had with nature. I told him I did not even know where there *were* any woods. He told me that Fort Warden was up the road from his office and even gave me exact directions and told me where to park my car. I explained all my difficulties and gave him all my excuses about why I could not possibly do this. From under his hat, and over his glasses, Dr.

Lockhart gave me that “look.” He said, quite matter-of-factly, “Just do it.” His words hit me square in the psyche! I knew he was right, and that day, I did take my first walk at Fort Warden.

After my “just do it” session with Dr. Lockhart, with his words reverberating around my head, I wrote him a long letter. In those days, I wrote him many letters between my weekly analytic sessions in Port Townsend, and the letters sometimes exceeded twenty pages. He told me years later that he had read every one. In that letter, which I still have, I told him that I was a child of the 60’s. In my family of origin particularly, but also supported by the collective, the overarching message was, “If it *feels* good, do it.” I was never forced to do anything. No one told me that I had to do anything that was hard or challenging. I never studied in school, because I was one of those students who could take a test and get an “A” without studying. I learned to get by on my natural intelligence and my ability to slide between the cracks. That is what I learned to do in my family. So Dr. Lockhart’s prescription felt alien to me, and the concept of doing something because you *had* to was completely out of my universe.

Part of it I realize now is that, typologically, my inferior function is Sensation. Go poll a room full of Jungians and by and large, there will be a joke about Jungians being Sensation-function deprived. “How many Jungians does it take to change a light bulb?” The only punch line I can think of at the moment is “They can’t!” or “Hire an electrician!” I had no idea that I needed to walk in the woods as a way of connecting to my inferior function.

I was fast approaching the part of this paper in which I had to think of something intelligent to say about what I had identified as the two pillars of Jungian psychology, theory and numinous experience, and how they must stand side by side. I was worried.

Out of the blue, perhaps by a divine nod, one of my colleagues sent me a review of a book that has actually been in print for many years. The review was by Alice Johnston, in a

newsletter from the C.G. Jung Institute in Montreal. My colleague knew I was trying to find something on collective experiences in the Jungian community. The review was on the book, *Up from Scapegoating*, (1995) by Arthur Colman. For me finding this book was the uncovering of a lost treasure. I felt as if I had found the Sign, the fourth step of Jeremiah's calling. In Colman's ideas, I found the bridge I had been seeking. It was the chink in the wall between the numinous side and the theoretical that allowed both to be recognized simultaneously.

Colman identifies three myths, and says,

The way groups learn and grow is mirrored in the myths they embody. Three central group myths – the Scapegoat, the Island and the Round Table—taken together, describe a widespread developmental sequence of group and societal maturation. (Colman, p. 80)

The Scapegoat with “its Janus twin, the myth of the messiah,” is the basis of most of our social institutions – religious, educational and family. It is also the cause of many contemporary societal ills. Where the scapegoat myth exists in a group, the group is never faulted for its problems, but the problems are blamed on an individual or subgroup that must be excluded or sacrificed.

The group myth of the Island embodies the dynamic of isolation and self-sufficiency. It takes an exclusionary stance and deals with problems as if it can handle anything on its own. The Island myth underlies many authoritarian political structures and different kinds of cults, such as fundamentalist communities and nations. Its main flaw is isolationism, which means isolation from any new ideas and resources, and leaves no room for the transcendent to enter.

Colman finds King Arthur's Round Table to be the most compelling of group myths

...for its combination of interactively authorized leadership and deeply felt group responsibility and connectedness, as well as its commitment to serve not only Table members, but the collective as a whole, a commitment to both task and process which serves both individual and collective psyche. (p.84)

Arthur is the valued and authorized leader with a powerful mission, but he is not the wisest or the strongest of the group. He is not even the greatest hero among them. In the legends, Merlin, the “prophet” and seer, who gifts the table to Arthur and Guinevere, says the table is to be “in the likeness of the world.” The table, says Colman, symbolizes “the induction of a new societal Self, a new world order, brought about by emphasizing the conjunction of difference – youth and age, various nationalities and talents – through a physical form that symbolized social and spiritual equality.” Arthur the king was not the authoritarian ruler but first among equals. Merlin institutionalized this principle by insisting on a collective task, which would emphasize service for the good of the whole rather than heroics for the good of the one.

Although the Round Table is a mirror of the society from which it has emerged and is not free from prejudice or human foibles, the vision is nevertheless a profound one – a commitment to the task of serving both individual and collective.

Colman also talks about the need for a special language. “This is the language of the feeling-laden image, the powerful teaching story, the myth that provides a connection and meaning to the group as a whole by transcending the seemingly separate contributions of individual members.” This parallels my discussion of the loss of original language, when a more powerful group influences the language of a less powerful group and the language of the less powerful group becomes diluted. Here, Colman identifies the need for a *transcendent* or a common language, one that is not one or the other, but encompasses the needs of both groups.

I have yearned for a more “human” language in Jungian writing and in clinic. I realize that I have been using Jungian “jargon” in this paper, such as father complex, negative mother complex, animus, and other Jungian terminology. In training, these terms were used liberally. In seminars, exams and papers, as well as in clinic and in supervisory settings, there has been an

expectation imposed to understand and use the common language of Jung. My hope is to find a common language, which does not use words to distance or to invent supercilious competition. I want to begin to use language that bridges this gap, across or through the wall. I believe that terminology is required to understand concepts. In communicating with one another, however, jargon can be distancing and objectifying. I advocate for more descriptive language instead of employing psychological “macros” or shortcuts to description.

Alice Johnston, the reviewer of Colman’s the book, added another dimension to Colman’s thinking, which was revelatory once again of the Sign. She says that Colman cites instances within the Jungian community where individual analysts have been failed by the collective body, owing to a bias “beginning with Jung himself against group life.” There is that argument again! Johnston further says,

There is another bias, in my view, which also mitigates against the successful evolution of group life and the individual. *It is the inferior, in both senses, fourth function of Jungian psychology, extraverted sensation.* Working from the sensation function, differentiated or not, is never less than hard. ... Yet if we are to achieve the kind of “interactively authorized leadership and deeply felt group responsibility and connectedness” that Colman writes of in his vision of a group modeled on the Round Table of Arthurian legend, with its “commitment to both task and process which serves both individual and collective psyche,” each of us must exercise our sensation function.(1996) (Italics added)

What does this imply? Johnston is advocating for both *task* as well as process. Task? Aren’t tasks something that people *do*? And what does she mean by “extraverted sensation” in this context? I am reminded of my earlier discussion about the Pontifices and Augures. I said that the Pontifices’ typology might have been “extraverted-sensation.” At the time I wrote that, I had not yet encountered Johnston’s review of Colman’s book. Yet, her ideas make good sense in context to creating a Round Table for Jungians.

My mind immediately travels to King Arthur's England. The knights were sent out on errands, hence the term "knight errant," meaning to "wander." They were given tasks and also took on tasks. They did the courageous "busy work" of the Realm, and then came in to sit at the Round Table to speak in a common language and work as individuals, each with his individual skill, for the good of the collective.

Johnston is saying that each Jungian, in institutes and in other collective functions, must work together to *do* the unpleasant work that groups must do. This is an extraverted stance, because it involves being in a problem-solving, task-oriented mode. As my highly introverted/intuitive friend, Lillian on Lummi Island used to say when we had to teach the schizophrenic residents at our treatment program to do everyday tasks, "Somebody's got to stir the oatmeal."

Johnston is saying that no one is more privileged than anyone else in a group. Each person must do the work that makes the collective thrive, while still honoring and respecting individual differences. The "hard work" of the sensation function is to do the tasks that allow the process to succeed. Jungians often want to skip that step or feel "above" it or as Johnston says, diminish its importance. She makes a big point. The Round Table was a *physical* representation of the symbolic and spiritual equality of the group and was an arrangement for numinous experience. Jungians cannot even change light bulbs, so how do they expect to sit as Arthur did, not as an authoritarian ruler, but first among equals? In plain terms, this means that everyone stirs the oatmeal. Everyone lends a hand to try to change the light bulb. No one, despite his or her "station" is any more privileged to take a pass on the tasks of the collective. One language is no more prestigious than any other, and the autonomy of each language must be preserved in its entirety.

As the experience of the numinous has been diminished since Jung's time, the task now is to find a way for the numinous to take a place at the Round Table, equal to theory. But there is something missing.

ארוס (Eros)

A few weeks after I began writing the paper, my son, Henry, the musician and rock music fanatic, told me that he wanted to rent a copy of Fritz Lang's classic 1927 film, "Metropolis." He told me that the famous rock band, "Queen" ("We will, we will rock you!" and "Bohemian Rhapsody") had used clips from the movie in one of their music videos. So, we rented it. I had seen the film in my freshman year at Cal, in an experimental French literature/film program, which I attended that year. The "immersion" program in French literature and foreign film was a little island of belonging, a parenthesis within the teeming campus of 40,000 students. Finally, in the world of Comparative Studies, I had found a way to explain the way I thought, felt and experienced the world. I have carried that experience with me ever since.

I recalled "Metropolis" as being a giant film, in the huge vertical style of Art Deco. I could not recall the plot line, except that it was about a big machine that ran everything. I did not remember that the machine was called "The Heart Machine."

In the film the great leader of the city, the rich mogul who owns and runs Metropolis lives in the Tower of Babel. He is symbolic of an earthly king and also Yahweh. He has a son, an innocent, a Christ figure who lives in a world of his father's riches and knows nothing of the reality of the misery of the people who run the Machine that maintain his earthly paradise. The force that makes his world beautiful is the "hands" of the workers, who work day and night in the underground city to keep the "Heart Machine" operating. This horrible labor breaks the spirit

of the people every day. The young man becomes inspired by an anima figure, “Maria,” to bring together the two disparate parts of the Machine – the hands and the head. Maria tells him throughout the film, “The mediator between the head and hands must be the heart.” She knows that he is to be the mediator. As the anima, she can whisper the message of compassion in the deep recesses of the unconscious, but only the Christ figure can actually *do* the uniting. It is the feminine that inspires him to do what she knows very well must be done. As Christ was sent by the Father to bring the message of love on earth, so the son in the film becomes the mediator between his father and the people. And it is only through the Heart, or Eros, that there can be a transcendent position between the opposing forces. This is what was missing: Eros.

In the film there is reluctance, even at the prompting of the Christ figure, to join together for the greater good. The hands, the *doers* and the head, the *understander*, do not like one another, let alone trust each other. Both sides do not want to give up their righteous position and their sense of superiority over the other. The Christ figure brings their hands together, as they look each other in the eyes for the first time. They meet in relationship. No longer is the Yahweh figure in his Tower of Babel. No longer are the workers beneath him, downtrodden in their misery. They meet as equals. In *Up From Scapegoating*, Colman quotes the Arthurian legend:

...It was ordained of Arthur that when his fair fellowship sat to meat their chairs should be high alike, their service equal, and none before or after his comrade. Thus no man could boast that he was exalted above his fellow, for all alike were gathered round the bard, and none was alien at the breaking of Arthur’s bread. (Matthews. 1989)

גשר

(Bridge)

I have realized now that my greatest lament has been that there has been no *bridge* between theory and numinous experience. Theory, of course, may be used in ways that are rigid and fixed, while emphasis on numinous experience may be seen as reactionary, even

fundamentalist, in the worst sense of that description. I now realize that Eros is the bridge or the chink in the wall or the transcendent. Without Eros, a *desire* to connect with “other,” there is no possibility for the numinous to stand side by side with theory. How hard it is to be open to that desire, which requires a willingness to be open to another’s perspective.

The experience of the numinous must have a place. It must not be exalted above theory, but must be regarded as a different and equivalent *pillar*. The image of a pillar now seems incorrect. It brings to my mind a vertical and hierarchical structure. The idea of a pillar did not originally impact me this way when I introduced the ideas of the two pillars of Jungian psychology. I now realize that pillars, like parallel lines, never meet on earth or consistent with the theories of plane geometry, probably not even in space. What is needed now is a horizontal image, hand-to hand, heart-to-heart, and equal on the same plane with theory at the Round Table. I think of Barthes’ discussion of the power of a *punctum* photograph, which “rises from the scene, shoots out of it like an arrow and pierces me.” I think of Ann Ulanov’s idea that, “...although we cannot identify our theories and images with the numinous, we can allow them to remain arrows that point and fly through space between ourselves and the numinous.” And finally, I recall what H.G. Baynes, who translated many of Jung’s works, wrote:

The essential character of Eros is the divine (i.e., creative) shaft which leaps across the guarded frontier of the subject in order to reach the object. The creative shaft is the impregnating phallus, the impressive, fertilizing image, the creative word, the idea which gets home, the divine leap by which the individual subject is able to transcend his own subjectivity and take effective part in the work of creation. This is Eros, the god which bringeth twain together in the service of life.” (Baynes, p. 132)

References

- American Standard Bible (1929) Brooklyn: Watchtower, Brooklyn.
- Bair, Dierdre. (2003) *Jung: A Biography*. Chapter 34 (Note 36) Boston: Little and Brown.
- Barthes, Roland, (1980) *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. New York: Farrar Straus.
- Baynes, H.G., (1949) *Mythology of the Soul, A Research into the Unconscious from Schizophrenic Dreams and Drawing*. London: Methuen & Co, Ltd.
- Beard, Mary & North, John, (1998) *Religions of Rome*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Blake, William, (1975) *Marriage of Heaven and Hell*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bortoft, Henri (1996) *The Wholeness of Nature: Goethe's Way toward a Science of Conscious Participation in Nature*. New York: Lindisfarne.
- Brewer, Julius, (1922) *The Literature of the Old Testament*. Chapter XI, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Brueggemann, Walter (1978) *The Prophetic Imagination*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Campbell, Don (2001) *The Mozart Effect: Tapping the Power of Music to Heal the Body*, New York: Harper.
- Casement, Ann & Tacey, David, (Eds.) (2006) *The Idea of the Numinous: Contemporary Jungian and Psychoanalytic Perspectives*. Corbett, Lionel, "Varieties of numinous experience: the experience of the sacred in the therapeutic process." p.53, London: Routledge.
- Casement, Ann & Tacey, David, (Eds.) (2006) *The Idea of the Numinous: Contemporary Jungian and Psychoanalytic Perspectives*. Stein, Murray, "On the importance of numinous experience in the alchemy of individuation." p. 34, London: Routledge.
- C.G. Jung Institute of Los Angeles (1977) *A Well of Living Waters: Memorial to Hilde Kirsch*.
- Colman, Arthur D. (1995) *Up from Scapegoating: Awakening Consciousness in Groups*, Wilmette, IL: Chiron.
- Dante, Alighieri (2003) *The Inferno*. Canto I, lines 1-4, New York: Random House.
- Davidow, Leonard S. (1957) *The Holy Scriptures: A Jewish Family Bible*. Chicago: Menorah Press.
- Einstein, Albert (1954) *Ideas and Opinions, based on Mein Weltbild*. pp. 8-11, Carl Seelig, ed., New York: Bonanza Books.
- Eliot, T.S., (1930) *The Wasteland and Other Poems*, "The Journey of the Magi." New York: Harcourt-Brace.
- Ellenberger, Henri (1970) *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic*

Psychiatry. P. 822ff, New York: Basic Books.

Ferrari, Domenico, delin., Arnolfo Van Westerhout, Sculp. Roma Sup. Perm., *Numen*, (Figure 1), etching.

Freud, Sigmund (1961) *Civilization and Its Discontents*. p. 144, J. Strachey, transl. New York: W. W. Norton.

Gibran, Kahlil (1997) *The Prophet*, "On Children." London: Wordsworth Editions.

HaCohen, Yisrael Meir (1990) *The Concise Book of Mitzvot: The Commandments which can be Observed Today*. Trans., Charles Wengrov, Jerusalem: Feldheim.

Hayman, Ronald (1999) *A Life of Jung*. New York: Norton.

Hillman, James (1989) *Blue Fire*. New York: Harper & Row.

James, William (1961) *The Varieties of Religious Experience: a Study in Human Nature*. London: Collier.

Johnston, Alice (1996) Review: *Up From Scapegoating: Awakening Consciousness in Groups*. Montreal: C.G. Jung Institute, Vol. 21, No 6.

Jung, C. G., *The Red Book*, Ed. Sonu Shamdasani (2009)

Jung, C.G, (1959) BBC interview with John Freeman.

Jung, C.G. (1968) Collected Works Volume 12, *Psychology and Alchemy*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Jung, C.G. (1971) Collected Works Volume 6, *Psychological Types*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Jung, C.G. (1972) Collected Works Volume 7, *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, "The Problem of the Attitude-Type." New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Jung, C.G. (1976) *The Visions Seminars [Books One and Two]*. p. 15, Zürich: Spring Publications.

Jung, C.G. (1977) Collected Works Volume 18, *The Symbolic Life*, "Adaptation, Individuation, Collectivity." Par. 1095f, London: Routledge.

Jung, C.G. (1977a) *C.G. Jung Speaking*. p.320, New Jersey: Princeton University Press

Jung, C.G. (1981) Collected Works, Volume 8, *Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Jung, C.G. (1989) Collected Works Volume 11, *Psychology and Religion: West and East*, par. 390, New Jersey, Princeton University Press.

- Jung, C.G. (1989a) *Memories, Dreams, Reflections (MDR)*. New York: Vintage.
- Jung, C.G. (1996) Collected Works Volume 15, *The Spirit in Man, Art and Literature*, “On the Relation of Analytical Psychology to Poetry.” New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Keats, John (1974) *The Selected Letters of John Keats*. New York: Signet.
- Kirsch, Thomas (2000) *The Jungians*. London: Routledge.
- Klein, Isaac, (1979) *A Guide to Jewish Religious Practice*. New Jersey: KTAV Publishing.
- Levitin, David (2006) *This is Your Brain on Music: The Science of a Human Obsession*, New York: Dutton.
- Lévy-Bruhl, Lucien (1966) *How Natives Think*. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Lockhart, Russell Arthur, (1982) *Psyche Speaks: A Jungian Approach to Self and World*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron.
- Lorca, Federico García (1960), Selected Poems, *Theory and Function of the Duende*. London: Penguin.
- Matthews, John, (1995) *The Elements of the Arthurian Tradition*. Boston: Element.
- Mucha, Alphonse (1898) *Thank-you note from Kris, Lilith, (Figure 2), The Arts: Dance*. London: Flame Tree Publishing.
- Neuser, Jacob (2003) *Pesikta Rabbati 21, Sifre Deut. 343 Blackwell companion to Judaism*. London: Blackwell.
- Otto, Rudolf (1958) *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the non-rational factor in the idea of the divine and its relation to the rational*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oxford English Dictionary (OED) (1971) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paracelsus (1996) *Sämtliche Werke*. ed. Karl Sudhoff and Wilhelm Matthiessen, Munich: Oldenbourg.
- Partridge, Eric (1983) *Origins: A Short Etymology Dictionary of Modern English*. New York: Crown.
- Pearce, Joseph Chilton (1977) *The Magical Child*. New York: Dutton.
- Pearce, Joseph Chilton (1993) *Evolution's End: Claiming the Potential for our Intelligence*. New York: Harper.
- Pritchard, James B. (Ed.) (1958) *The Ancient Near East - Volume 1: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures*. pp. 227-230. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Raff, Jeffrey (2000) *Jung And The Alchemical Imagination*. Maine: Hays (Nicolas) Ltd.
- Rilke, Rainer Maria (1985) *Sonnets to Orpheus*, trans. Stephen Mitchell, New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Rodríguez, Andrés (1993) *Book of the Heart*. New York: Hudson.
- Russell, George William (Æ) (1918) *The Candle of Vision*. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd.
- Sacks, Oliver (2007) *Musicophilia: Tales of Music and the Brain*. New York: Knopf.
- Schlamm, Leon, Joel Ryce-Menuhin (Ed.) (1994) *Jung and the Monotheisms: Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. "The Holy: a meeting-point between analytical psychology and religion." London: Routledge.
- Schlamm, Leon (2007) *European Journal of Psychotherapy & Counselling*, Volume 9, Issue 4 December 2007, pages 403-414, "C. G. Jung and numinous experience: Between the known and the unknown."
- Schlamm, Leon (Pub. Date June 2008) *Jung, Numinous Experience and the Study of Mysticism*. London: Routledge.
- Schore, Allan (1994) *Affect Regulation and the Origin of the Self: The Neurobiology of Emotional Development*. P. 237f, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Shamdasani, Sonu, (2003) *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology: The Dream of a Science*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Shipley, Joseph T. (1945) *Dictionary of Word Origins*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Tacey, David, *European Journal of Psychotherapy and Counselling*, Volume 9, Issue 4 December 2007, pages 423-434, "The Gift of the unknown: Jung(ians) and Freud(ians) at the end of modernity."
- Thomason, Sarah (2001) *Language Contact – An Introduction*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Tomatis, Alfred, Don Campbell (Ed.) (1991) *Music, Physician for Times to Come*, "Chant, the Healing Power of Voice and Ear" p.35ff, Wheaton, IL: Quest.
- Ulanov, Ann (1999) *Religion and the Spiritual in Carl Jung*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Wilhelm, Richard, (Trans.) (1950) *I Ching*, pp. 68-69, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Mark and Henry, my dear husband and son for their constant love, support and sacrifices. And for the mess in the dining room, where I wrote this paper for a solid six weeks, while the house was being torn apart and completely renovated.

To Russell Arthur Lockhart, Ph.D., Jungian Analyst, for his brilliance, perspicacity and ever-present support, love and belief in this project and in me, specifically.

To Terrill Gibson, Ph.D., Leland Roloff, Ph.D., and Eberhard Riedel, Ph.D., Jungian Analysts, C. G. Jung Institute of Seattle, for reading, correcting, and lovingly holding my feet to the fire.

To Ann Marie for her love, support, intelligence, mediality and quietly keeping me sane every day, behind the scenes.