

Jung and Kabbalah: imaginal and noetic aspects

Steven M. Joseph, Albany, CA, USA

Abstract: Jung made use of kabbalistic images and motifs in various parts of his opus, including in his alchemical studies, in *Aion*, and extensively in *Mysterium Coniunctionis*. He also recorded an important dream after his heart attack which made use of kabbalistic symbolism in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. In this paper I explore Jung's ideas in relation to Kabbalah, first, by differentiating between Jung's *imaginal* approach to kabbalistic symbolism and the *noetic* intention of the Kabbalah itself in its use of *imaginal* material. Second, I present a number of typical examples of how Jung understands (and sometimes misunderstands) kabbalistic material that he cites. Third, I briefly survey the development of the Kabbalah as an *imaginal noetic* system, and present a core self-understanding of kabbalists—as engaged in inner 'self-work' which intends to 'sweeten the harsh judgments of existence in their very roots'. Finally, I differentiate Jung's understanding of the psychological living symbol from the kabbalistic understanding of the mystical symbol. In this fourth section of the paper, I conclude by presenting a basic Hasidic/kabbalistic teaching on the nature and function of verbal contemplative prayer—as an illustration of the difference between the two understandings of symbolism. The four sections of the paper are framed by a 'Prelude' and a 'Coda'.

Key words: contemplative prayer, Hasidism, *imaginal noetic*, infinity and finitude, Kabbalah, symbolism, temporality and atemporality

Prelude

God said: 'If only they had abandoned Me, but had kept My Torah' (Talmud Yerushalmi, Hagigah, 1, 7). My master [the Ba'al Shem Tov] explained that the goal of all knowledge of God is to realize that one is truly ignorant. There are two categories of such ignorance. The first is that of a person who immediately submits to ignorance. Realizing that it is ultimately impossible to know, he does not make any attempt. The second is that of the individual who probes and searches until she herself realizes that it is impossible to know. The difference between the two can be explained by a parable.

Two people want to meet the king. One goes through all the king's rooms, delighting in the palace treasures, until he is finally barred from actually meeting

the king. The other one finds out about this and says, 'Since I know that it is impossible to get to meet the king, why even bother to visit the palace?' (She immediately gives up all hope of ever attaining knowledge).

This is the meaning of God's statement. God says, 'They abandon Me', since it is impossible to know God. But still, God says, 'If only they had abandoned Me'—realizing that they ultimately cannot probe or know—but only after 'they had kept My Torah' and had explored all its treasures.

(Ben Porat Yosef, 2a in Kaplan 1984, pp. 34-35)

I.

Near the beginning of his essay on 'Transformation symbolism in the mass', Jung states that

psychology is in the unfortunate position where the observer and the observed are ultimately identical. *Psychology has no Archimedean point outside since all perception is of a psychical nature.*

(Jung 1942/1954, para. 377; italics added)

Later in the essay, however, Jung adds that

you would not be able to understand what you suffer *unless there was that Archimedean point outside, the objective standpoint of the self, from which the ego can be seen as a phenomenon.*

(ibid., para. 428; italics added)

In other words, the self stands outside the ego as an Archimedean reference point, but there is no such reference point outside of the *totality* of the psyche for us to stand on. He continues:

without the objectivization of the self, the ego would remain caught in hopeless subjectivity and would only gyrate around itself. But if you can see and understand your suffering without being subjectively involved, then because of your altered standpoint you also understand 'how not to suffer'...

(ibid., para. 428)

Jung clarifies his view that all perception is psychical: 'the psychic reality underlying the statement of belief or rite' he calls 'its empirical basis', while 'its [metaphysical] object is beyond the reach of human perception and understanding except in its psychic mode of manifestation' (ibid., para. 376).

The object of a statement of belief or a ritual act is 'beyond the reach' of human knowing except psychically, says Jung, because we lack an 'Archimedean point' of reference outside of psyche. Yet *within* psyche, so to speak, there is an Archimedean point (the self) on which we can stand and from which we

can view and grasp the ego. We can schematize this situation in a diagram (see Figure 1 below).



Figure 1: Ego, Self, 'Outside'

The 'X' factor in Figure 1 represents Jung's view of a domain 'beyond the reach of human perception and understanding', a putative 'metaphysical' realm, about which we might speculate, but which we can never truly *know*—because 'psychology has no Archimedean point outside'.

But this schema does not yet portray the full extent of Jung's view of the subjective ego's situation *vis-à-vis* its non-subjective backgrounds. The outer empirical world, which we access and experience through our senses, provides another objective 'Archimedean point'—a non-psychical one—from which to understand our ego experience. The empirical world includes, of course, our physical, natural and cultural surroundings as well as our biological, somatic embodiment.

We can now extend our initial schema as follows:



Figure 2: Ego and Non-Ego Domains

Both 'world' and 'self' are names for non-ego ('not-I') influences and impingements on our personal ego (subjective 'I') experiences. They are not truly separate as the pictorial schema suggests, but are *deeply interpenetrating* through ongoing psychological processes of projection, introjection, projective identification, as well as continuous linguistic processes of metaphor and metonymy. Nevertheless, there *is* something different, that we all feel, between the inner and the outer non-ego dimensions of life. And just as there is for Jung a domain 'beyond the reach of human perception and understanding' in the inner dimension (the 'X' factor), so is there a mystery beyond our reach in the outer dimension. We can extend our schema of Figure 2 to include this view:



Figure 3: Inner and Outer 'Unknowns'

In general, in his professional scientific writing, Jung speaks only of the 'God-image' (in our schemata the 'Self'), leaving the question of God Itself

(our 'X' factor) unknowable, or at least ineffable. But in his essay on 'Transformation symbolism in the mass' he does point towards 'X'. While discussing the symbolism of the cross in the Apocryphal Acts of John, Jung writes:

The definition of the cross or centre as *diorismos*, the 'boundary of all things', is exceedingly original, for it suggests that the limits of the universe are not to be found in a nonexistent periphery but in its centre. There alone lies the possibility of transcending this world. All instability culminates in that which is unchanging and quiescent, and in the self all disharmonies are resolved in the 'harmony of wisdom'.

(Jung 1942/1954, para. 434)

I understand Jung to be telling us here that, while there may be no Archimedean point *outside* of the psyche from which to perceive and understand ourselves objectively, there *is* such a point *inside*, within the deep centre of the psyche, which the Acts of John portrays as the trans-personal, trans-temporal 'boundary of all things' and 'harmony of wisdom', at the dimensionless centre point—a singularity symbolized in Jung's text by the cross. But, Jung seems to say, we cannot *speak* of it without slipping into the kind of metaphysical, non-psychological language that he wishes to avoid, at any rate in his scientific essays.

In his personal letters, when he is apparently not feeling guarded, he does speak of 'X'. For one example, in a letter to Victor White, Jung writes:

The Divine Presence is more than anything else... This is the only thing that matters... I wanted proof of a living Spirit and I got it. Don't ask me at what a price... I know that my way has been prescribed to me by a hand far above my reach... I am only trying to be a decent tool.

(Jung 1975, 1, pp. 491-492).

Yet what Jung means here by 'the Divine Presence' is experience-near, not distant, abstract and metaphysical. Responding to a correspondent about his famous answer in a 1959 interview to the question of whether he believed in God ('I don't need to believe... I know'), Jung writes:

When I say that I don't need to believe in God because I 'know', I mean I know of the existence of God-images in general and in particular. I know that it is a matter of a universal experience and, in so far as I am no exception, I know that I have such experience also, which I call God. It is the experience of my will over against another and very often stronger will, crossing my path... outside my knowledge and intention. The strange force against or for my conscious tendencies is well known to me... It has always been called 'God'.

(Jung 1975, 2, p. 522)

Note how even here Jung remains true to his view that *all* knowing—all *gnosis*—is via images. Jung knows 'of the existence of God-images' and not of what may lie within and/or beyond any and all images of divine presence. Jung lets 'X'

remain unspeakable (and apparently unknowable), except as it manifests within and through psyche. In this he remains true to his particular project—a vital part of the twentieth century move beyond reductive positivism and spiritually-flattened modernity—of recovering and restoring a living connection to the numinosity of the divine (both the gods and God), within the parameters of scientific practice and knowledge. When he writes to Victor White that ‘my way has been prescribed to me by a hand far above my reach’ and that ‘I am only trying to be a decent tool’, Jung is referring at least in part to his particular scientific project—uncovering the psychical roots of the religious attitude.

An important corollary of the analysis I have just presented is that, whatever symbolic material came to Jung’s hands—whether from the clinical presentation of patients’ dreams or narratives or associations, or from cultural and religious myth, ritual or thought—he consistently filtered it through the lens of his particular psychical attitude and perspective. On the one hand, this was an extremely rich and generative approach, which has given us the abundant legacy of analytical psychology. But on the other hand, this has meant that Jung handled some of the symbolic material that he studied in a limiting way—much like the man wearing *rose-coloured* glasses, who may well know of the existence of the colour *blue* (since the colour *rose* includes a *bluish* hue) yet remains unaware of *the many subtle nuances of blue and azure and violet and cornelian*—and who consequently assumes that people who speak of these higher energy and higher frequency colours are merely abstract, experience-distant metaphysicians.

Kabbalah is the now predominant manifestation of the long Jewish mystical tradition, and the form most widely disseminated in pre-modern European Christian culture and consciousness. Jung made use of symbolic images and motifs from the Kabbalah in a number of his writings. These included ‘Paracelsus as a spiritual phenomenon’ (Jung 1941), ‘The philosophical tree’ (Jung 1945/1954), *Aion* (Jung 1951), and *Mysterium Coniunctionis* (Jung 1955), as well as his post-heart attack vision reported in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (Jung 1961, 1965 edn., pp. 293f.).

Unlike the symbolic motifs of alchemy, which fit Jung’s project in their implicit finding of ‘Archimedean points’ *only within* their symbolic images—everything else being ‘X’—the symbolic motifs of the Kabbalah operate—as I will argue—in a fundamentally different way. As a consequence, although Jung’s use of kabbalistic material is always interesting and often illuminating, he typically misses the unique perspective on the religious function of psyche—on the *telos* inherent within the *imaginal*—that Kabbalah provides. The *imaginal* is Henry Corbin’s term, derived from his study of the mysticism of Sufism and particularly of the teachings of the great Sufi mystic Ibn Arabi, for the experiential world of archetypal images—the objective psyche, in all its symbolic and energetic wholeness and fullness (Corbin 1958/1969, 1954/1980. See also Ibn al’ Arabi, *The Meccan Revelations*, Volume 1, ed. Chodkiewicz, tr. Chittick 2002).

Kabbalah is a rich and wide-ranging symbolic system that, like some other mystical teaching traditions, uses the materials of the *imaginal* for a specifically

noetic intent. The Book *Zohar*, the root text of the Kabbalah (the Hebrew word *zohar* means ‘illumination, enlightenment’) uses a play on words in Aramaic/Hebrew to make just this point. The Hebrew root Y-D-‘A (*yod-dalet-‘ayin*) means ‘to know, knowledge’, in the sense of immediate experiential knowing, embodied *gnosis*. The Hebrew root SH-‘A-R (*shin-‘ayin-resh*) is the basis of the noun ‘gate’ (*sha-‘ar*) as well as the verb ‘to imagine, to take the measure of’ (*le-sha-‘er*). As an aside, note the archetypal *imaginal* motif implicitly within this three letter Hebrew root, which associatively links the liminality of gateways to the transformational nature of feeling-toned images—compare my discussion of Hebrew roots as archetypal motifs in ‘Lilith and the integration of chthonic life’ (Joseph 1994).

The *Zohar* (1,103a-b) begins by citing a verse from the scriptural *Book of Proverbs* (31, 23): ‘Her husband is known in the gates’. The referent of ‘Her’, according to the *Zohar*, is *Shekhinah*, the divine feminine, the immanent, all-pervading *indwelling divinity within* every human heartsoulmind. The referent of ‘Husband’ is the Holy Blessed One, *Kudsha B’rich Hu*, the divine masculine, the transcendent, all-encompassing, *generative divine surround* of all and everything, including human consciousness. The *Zohar* elaborates on the verse from the Proverbs as follows:

Her husband is known (*no-d‘a*) in the gates (in the *she-‘a-rim*), known in the measure of what one imagines (*me-sha-‘er*) in one’s heartsoulmind, each one according to his/her own measure (*le-fum shi-‘ur-a di-lei*).

In other words, the *Zohar* teaches, the *imaginal* experience is the gateway through which one enters to attain true knowledge/*gnosis* of God, the *noetic* reality.

The crucial idea here, for our purposes, is that a *noetic* insight into divinity, while ultimately finite and thus always inadequate to the endless mystery of the creative source of all and everything (called *Ein Sof*, Endlessness, in the Kabbalah), nevertheless has some meaningful content. We can, in however limited a way, speak of and imagine something about ‘x’. And in truth, asserts the *Zohar*, we use our imagination and feeling—our *imaginal* heartsoulminds, our faculties of psyche—as the gateway *par excellence* to our *noetic* intuitions of the divine ‘X’. This is the whole intent of the kabbalistic teachings on the symbolic array of the *sefirot*, both as (i) a complex imago of the generative flow and manifestation of divinity into the finite world, imaged as a ‘descent’, and also as (ii) an *imaginal* map of contemplative entry into the *noetic* mysteries of the godhead, our ‘X’, imaged as an ‘ascent’. This view of the role of the psyche in attaining religious insight and knowledge/*gnosis* of God is fundamentally different from Jung’s viewpoint. In the next section of this paper I will look at some specific instances of Jung’s use of kabbalistic material, which will hopefully illuminate the distinction that I am asserting here.

There exist important non-dual teachings in the Jewish mystical tradition, for example the highly developed teachings on *acosmism* (the idea that there is no

intrinsic reality to cosmos) and *panentheism* (the idea that everything—all of the cosmos—is subsumed and nullified *within* God) in Hasidic thought in general and in Habad Hasidism in particular, which are reminiscent of some Eastern approaches (cf. Elijor 1993; Foxbrunner 1993). The *Zohar*'s teaching, however, is not non-dual. The only aspect of Hasidism that Jung seems to acknowledge, however, is the idea of *kadmut ha-sekbel* (literally the 'primordially of consciousness'), in the teachings of the Maggid of Mezerich, the primary disciple of the Ba'al Shem Tov, as a precursor to Jung's own idea of the collective unconscious. Jung's source for this is Sigmund Hurwitz's excellent translation of and psychological commentary on the Maggid's teachings, 'Psychological aspects in early Hasidic literature', published in *Timeless Documents of the Soul* (1952/1968). Otherwise, most of his material comes from the Zoharic traditions of *coniunctio*, and to a lesser degree from the earlier traditions of Merkavah (divine chariot) mysticism and its probable pre-rabbinic, pre-Christian, pre-Gnostic precursors.

2.

When Jung cites kabbalistic materials in his works, he draws on 20th century academic scholars such as Gershom Scholem and Tsvi Verblosky, as well as Sigmund Hurwitz, who had an extensive knowledge of Hasidism and who wrote a valuable translation and psychological commentary of a major early Hasidic work (Hurwitz 1952/1968). In addition, Jung drew on much Zoharic material, as well as some materials of the 16th century Lurianic Kabbalah. His main source was the translation of core kabbalistic texts into Latin by Knorr von Rosenroth, published around 1680 as *Kabbalah Denudata*. It is noteworthy and significant that Jung drew very little from the traditions of Christian cabalists such as Pico della Mirandola and Johannes Reuchlin. I would speculate that Jung's apparent disinterest in materials from the Christian Cabala may have reflected an awareness of the polemical nature of this tradition—much of it an attempt to persuade Jews, after their expulsion from Spain at the end of the fifteenth century, of the truth of Christianity.

In 'Paracelsus as a spiritual phenomenon' (Jung 1941), during an exposition of the alchemical *filius philosophorum* (the son of the philosophers), Jung compares the *filius* to the Gnostic Man of Light imprisoned in Adam to the pre-Christian Primordial Man, to Paracelsus' Astral Man, and to both the kabbalistic *Adam Kadmon* (Jung 1941, para. 168) and then (*ibid.*, para. 168) to the kabbalistic *Metatron*, the Prince of the Faces, the supreme angelic intermediary between the divine and the created worlds. All these diverse *anthropos* imagos are presented by Jung as *symbolic equivalents* of the Self, of the archetypal wholeness of the human psyche.

From a psychical *imaginal* perspective, Jung is of course right. Imagos of supraordinate human wholeness, for all their diversity across and within different cultural, historical and psychical horizons, have an inherent similarity

at the level of the *imaginal*, as image, as psyche. But, specifically with regard to the two kabbalistic imagos Jung cites, attending solely to the *imaginal* similitude of *Adam Kadmon* and *Metatron* misses completely their meaning within the *noetic imaginal* traditions of Kabbalah.

Adam Kadmon is the Primordial (Divine) Adam, the initial gesture and manifestation of the godhead, of Endlessness (*Ein Sof*), towards the created being. It is envisioned as primordial potential creativity in-formed by infinite creative light in an utterly non-dual manner, perhaps somewhat like the Dharmakaya of Tibetan Dzog Chen teachings but without the Eastern elusion of the *personal relational* dimension (cf. Norbu 1986). *Adam Kadmon* is the unimaginable and ineffable merest potentiality of formative energetic process and structure, which unfolds and manifests as spacetime and as cosmos within spacetime. The 'X' that the kabbalists point to in their imago of the Primordial Adam—as thin (*dak* in Hebrew) and non-existent (*ayin*, literally is-not, no-thingness, in Hebrew) as it is—yet has the primordial potential of the individuated human form. In the Kabbalah, this means that the arrangement of the *sefirot*, which defines and delimits the archetypal structure of the human and of the cosmic, is continuously unfolding from *Adam Kadmon*, the primordial *anthropos* imago, as the reality of all created worlds.

Metatron is the chief of the angels, called *Sar HaPanim*, the Prince of the Faces, who (by numerical correspondence of the letters of his name) carries one of the names of God within his own very name—the divine name *Shaddai* (Breasts/Nurturance/Mighty Fertile Mountains). The name *Shaddai*, according to the early kabbalist Nachmanides, expresses the hidden (that is, unconscious) reality of the miraculous nature of all natural phenomena that ego consciousness typically takes for granted as only, merely natural. *Metatron* in the Kabbalah is an angelic messenger, an *imaginal* intermediary, who transmits the enlivening fructifying divine energies within the divine name *Shaddai*—the miraculous reality of existence *per se*—to ordinary created realities of all diverse kinds.

Metatron is *not* divinity (as is *Adam Kadmon*), but is a created being with an all-encompassing task. The all-encompassing structure of *Metatron*, like that of *Adam Kadmon*, is envisioned in terms of the array of the *sefirot* (though with *Adam Kadmon* it is only potential). Yet *Metatron* is a creation, while *Adam Kadmon* is primordial divinity. This distinction remains crucial for all the kabbalists, even the later Hasidic non-dual teachers. Jung in his discussion of the Primordial Man in his 'Paracelsus' essay has collapsed one imago into the other, both becoming for him merely psychical equivalents of a Self-imago.

In his 1945/1954 essay on 'The philosophical tree' (CW 13), Jung makes some useful comments about the alchemical philosophical tree and the kabbalistic Tree of Life (which is the ten-fold array of the *sefirot*). He correctly notes that the Tree of Life is 'actually a mystical world tree'. He also notes that tree is envisioned as inverted, growing from above down, and that it represents Man. He states: 'The idea that man is an inverted tree seems to have been current in the Middle Ages' (Jung 1945/1954, para. 411, fn 4).

These are valuable observations about the tree's archetypal status within psyche. They do not, however, illuminate the Tree imago as a portrayal of a dynamic process flowing in all directions, but mainly from above down (divine to human) and from below up (human to divine). The essence of the Tree of Life imago in *the Kabbalah* is that it illuminates and portrays the continuous, ever-renewed energetic flows between the divine 'X' and the inner Self and outer World. Jung cites Knorr von Rosenroth, saying that von Rosenroth 'is of the opinion that the "great tree" [of life] refers to [the *sefirah*] Tiferet, the bridegroom of Malchut. The upper Sefira Binah is named the "root of the tree", and in Binah is rooted the tree of life' (ibid.). It is noteworthy that Jung intuitively grasps the importance of von Rosenroth's 'opinion' while apparently being unaware that this so-called opinion is an authentic kabbalistic teaching. He is also apparently unaware that Malchut is represented as the Tree of Knowing Good and Evil, equivalent to the Tree of Death in kabbalistic doctrine. I believe this provides us with an insight into the accuracy of Jung's *imaginal* intuition while also showing his relatively superficial knowledge of Kabbalah in 1945 when this essay was written. Jung's focus, in 'The philosophical tree', consistent with his *imaginal* psychical orientation, is of course on the formal similarities between tree imagos in kabbalistic, Gnostic and alchemical traditions. He exhibits no particular interest in *noetic* dimensions of the images and teachings.

Jung (1951) brings in some kabbalistic material in *Aion*, but his main use of Jewish source material in this work is midrashic and Talmudic. His main interest here is in the midrashic images of the right and left hands of God, dispensing light and life according to the principles of mercy (*hesed*) and justice (*din*). I will not elaborate on all of Jung's examples here, but see Jung's discussion in CW 9ii, 1951, paras. 104-14 & paras. 166-74.

Jewish imagos of the divine holding of the opposites continue to interest Jung throughout *Aion*. While discussing the 'Monad' and the 'Son of Man' of the Gnostic Monoïmos, Jung quotes Hippolytus, who states: 'The emblem of the perfect Man, says Monoïmos, is the jot or tittle'. Jung then notes that the 'jot' is: 'The iota . . . the smallest Greek character, corresponding to our "dot" (which did not exist in Greek)' (Jung 1951, para. 340, fn. 135). And: 'The relationship of the *i* [iota] to the self is the same as that of the Hebrew letter Yod to the *lapis* in the Cabala. The Original Man, Adam, signifies the small hook at the top of the letter Yod' (ibid., fn. 136, citing a kabbalistic source, *Sha'arei Kedushah*, which Jung undoubtedly knew only from von Rosenroth).

Here, I believe, we can see Jung's deep *imaginal* intuition carrying him to the very edge of the kabbalistic verge, of the leap into Endlessness (*Ein Sof*)—as symbolized by 'the small hook at the top of the Yod'. That 'small hook' represents the no-thing-ness above and beyond the archetypal array of the *sefirot*, where the Primordial Adam (*Adam Kadmon*) contains the potential manifestations and diversity of all and everything in a singularity of nothingness—like an unfathomable and ineffable 'moment before' a cosmic big bang, so to speak. But, true to his method and project and personal predilections,

Jung does not step over that verge into a *noetic* consciousness that transcends images.

At the conclusion of *Aion*, Jung notes that

The natural archetypal symbolism, describing a totality that includes light and dark, contradicts in some sort the Christian but not the Jewish or Yahwistic viewpoint, or only to a relative degree. The latter seems closer to Nature and therefore to be a better reflection of immediate experience.

(1951, para. 427)

Here in his conclusion Jung makes clear that his interest and intention in *Aion* is to elucidate the attempts (by Jews, early Christians, Gnostics, alchemists, etc.) ‘to find suitable symbolic expressions for the self’ (ibid., para. 428) His use of kabbalistic and other Jewish material is finally in the service of this *imaginal* aim. Jung is not interested in the *noetic* dimensions of the material he utilizes, content to let ‘X’ remain in the (unconscious) background.

The same may be said about Jung’s use of kabbalistic material in *Mysterium Coniunctionis* (Jung 1955). He uses material provided to him by Sigmund Hurwitz, Rivkah Scharf (mainly biblical and midrashic), and Gershom Scholem. His textual citations are from source material translated in von Rosenroth’s *Kabbalah Denudata*. He quotes from Naftali Bacharach’s important Lurianic kabbalistic work, *Emek Ha-Melekh*, but without citation (presumably he read portions which were translated by von Rosenroth). But Jung uses this kabbalistic material for his own purposes, which were not those of the kabbalists themselves.

Jung cites kabbalistic sources primarily in his chapter on ‘Adam and Eve’. He uses kabbalistic images of the conjunction of the *sefirot* of Tiferet and Malkhut to illustrate the *coniunctio* of masculine and feminine—in the Kabbalah, the conjunction of the Holy Blessed One (masculine) and *Shekhinah* (feminine Presence). This is a conjunction that sometimes happens, sometimes not. The flow of divine life energy into the world depends on whether this sacred marriage of the Holy One and the Shekhinah is consummated or disrupted. That in turn depends, in kabbalistic teaching, on the actions and consciousness of human beings (an ‘awakening from below’), which aim to elicit a divine will to bestow (an ‘awakening from above’).

Jung is interested in the particulars of the *imaginal* portrayal of the sacred marriage of Tiferet and Malkhut, a symbol for Jung of the marriage of psychical opposites. Despite his clinical concerns, though, he is evidently *not* interested in the *coniunctio* of Tiferet and Malkhut as a symbolic portrayal of the vicissitudes of the divine flow—the numinous, in psychical/experiential terms—into our world, and how it is sustained or disrupted by human consciousness and activity.

Even more striking is Jung’s inattention to a second, primordial *coniunctio* in kabbalistic teaching, between the divine Father (*Abba*) and Mother (*Imma*), ‘the two divine lovers who [unlike the Holy One and Shekhinah, also known as Son and Daughter] are never separated’ (*trei re’in d’lo mitpardin*). Jung makes

no mention of this 'higher' *coniunctio* of Mother and Father despite his access to von Rosenroth's translation of the *Idrah Zuta* ('the Smaller Holy Assembly') from the *Zohar*, which is the main Zoharic source for material on the perpetual generative union of Mother and Father (cf. Giller 2001, Chapter 6, 'The *Idrot*: the emanation of divinity').

The *noetic* use of images of *coniunctio* by the kabbalists aims at making intelligible, in however inadequate a manner, *the trans-temporal trans-spatial emanation* of light, life energy, and abundant flow ('*or*, *chiyyut*, *shefa*) from (a) Endless Unitary Divinity, via (b) the ceaseless, unconditional, gnostic *coniunctio* between Father and Mother (Wisdom and Understanding) as 'horizontal' (non-hierarchical) divine lovers, through (c) the conditional 'vertical' *coniunctio* of Son and Daughter—which is for good or for ill depending mainly on the consciousness and deeds of humans—ending at (d) the world of our manifest ordinary conscious experience. Jung makes use, out all the vast Zoharic material at hand, only of those images which relate to *coniunctio* as *psychical transformative process within time*. He also, of course, cites images from the Kabbalah that present a primordial *anthropos* imago. But Jung does not, as far as I can see, even notice what is the core *noetic* concern and intent of kabbalistic use of the *imaginal*; namely, *the elaboration of a nested hierarchy of analogous archetypal arrays (of the worlds of the sefirot) as a dynamic model of the transitions from Infinite to finite, and from finite to Infinite—especially as they are affected by and affect the human realm*.

In the next section of this paper I will look a bit more closely at how the Kabbalah, as a whole, makes use of the *imaginal* psyche for the *noetic* intentions of the human heartsoulmind.

3.

The roots of Kabbalah, which emerged as a developed teaching only in the late 12th and early 13th centuries in Provence and Catalonia, can be traced back to antiquity, to a pre-Christian, pre-Rabbinic, pre-Gnostic doctrine of an *anthropos* who is at the same time unitary and ten-fold in nature (Idel 1988, Chapter 6, 'Kabbalistic theosophy'). We can perceive archaic roots of this *anthropos* tradition in the visions of the prophet Ezekiel in the Hebrew Bible (particularly Chapters 1 & 10). Ezekiel has a visionary revelation of the 'likeness of the appearance' of a Man—a primordial *anthropos*—sitting on a Throne, which rests on a firmament of a divine Chariot, which is in turn carried by angels known as *Chayot HaKodesh* (Holy Living Beings) and *Ofanim* (Wheels), who rest on and move about the earth. The holy *Chayot* have faces in the four directions, the face of a man forward, of a lion on the right, of an ox on the left, and of an eagle behind.

A second root of the kabbalistic traditions is the letter mysticism of the *Sefer Yetsirah* (the *Book of Formation*), composed sometime between the third and sixth centuries of our era. The 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet constitute the

letters of divine speech, which according to Hebrew scripture God used to create the world ('God *said*, Let there be light, and there was light', and so on). Each letter of Hebrew has a numerical value, and words with the same numerical value share an archetypal and occult affinity. The letters and words of Hebrew thus have a mystical resonance and contain deep mysteries.

For example, the word for 'light' in Hebrew is '*or* (*aleph-vav-resh*)', which has the numerical value of $1 + 6 + 200 = 207$. The word for mystery, *raz* (*resh-zayin*), has the same numerical value, $200 + 7 = 207$. Thus light, and particularly the light created on the first day of creation (sun, moon and stars were created only on day four!), is an all-pervasive light which is occulted, mysterious, and dark—the dark-light energy of the primordial unconscious. The aggadic traditions teach that this light is alluded to in the verse from the Psalms, which states: 'Light is sown for the righteous' (Ps. 97, 11), and they call it the 'light hidden away for the righteous' (Talmud Bavli Hagiga 12a). The *Zohar* (1, 15a) calls this light 'the lamp of darkness' (*botsina de-kardinuta*), and elaborates on it as the primordial measure of creative activity by the infinite Divinity. It is also, in Hasidic teaching, the light within each of the letters of the words of contemplative prayer (Weintreb 1983, p. 298). In Part 4 of this paper I will elaborate on this idea.

A third root of kabbalistic teaching lies in the centrality for Judaism of the mythic motif of Exile and Redemption. This motif goes back to the very origins of the Israelites, according to scriptural tradition, in the wanderings of Abraham and Sarah, and in the enslavement of the children of Israel in Egypt and their subsequent redemption from slavery. It goes back even further, to the original exile of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden at the beginning of the book of Genesis. As the kabbalists develop their approach, they trace the motif of exile back to the very creation of the cosmos at the beginning of space-time. By a play on words (creation is a *gilui*, a revelation of divine power and light, but it is also a *galut*, an exile from the oneness of divinity), they express the idea that the world as a whole *is*, in its essence, a fundamental state of exile—awaiting redemption by the unifying work of sentient human beings. Thus the motif of exile and redemption becomes the foundation for deep meditations on unity and multiplicity, wholeness and fragmentation, harmony and disharmony, freedom and slavery, and so on.

According to Moshe Idel (1983, 1990), the Kabbalah became a public teaching, especially in 13th century Spain, in part as a response to and a repudiation of the assertion by the great 12th century philosopher and legalist, Moses Maimonides, that the 'esoteric' side of Judaism was none other than the Neo-Platonized Aristotelian science of his day. Maimonides' philosophical mysticism, as expressed especially in the later chapters of his classic *Guide of the Perplexed* (Maimonides 1963), was incompatible with, and denied the validity of, actual *imaginal* esoteric teachings that had been kept alive as oral tradition among small groups of Jewish mystics since antiquity. The publication of kabbalistic texts, and the increasingly public dissemination

of kabbalistic ideas and practices, was thus an assertion of the centrality of this *imaginal* approach for the *noetic* intent that the mystics sought to realize.

In a discussion of the ‘mystical functions’ of kabbalistic ritual and practice Gershom Scholem (1974, p. 174) suggests four main intentions of the mystical activities of kabbalists: (1) to establish (re-establish) harmony between *din* (restrictive judgment) and *rachamim* (expansive compassion); (2) to effect the intra-divine sacred marriage (the *zivvuga kadisha*, the *heiros gamos*) between the (masculine) Holy Blessed One and the (feminine) *Shekhinah*; (3) to redeem *Shekhinah* from Her exile in the ‘Other Side’ (the *Sitra Achara*, the ‘other side’ of holiness, the domain of the archetypal shadow); and (4) to protect the individual soul from the disintegrative forces of the ‘Other Side’—as well as assisting him or her in overcoming it. To these four kabbalistic intentions we might add another, which comes to full expression in Hasidism in the 18th century: (5) to do self-work within the material physicality of the world (*avodah begashmiyut*), through the lifelong effort of containing, transforming and integrating (*hakhna’ah*, *havdalah*, *hamtakah*—literally: subduing, discriminating, sweetening) the Other Side of holiness, in order to make a ‘dwelling place’ in our lower, finite and constricted world for the manifest unitary presence of the all-encompassing infinite blessed One.

All of these intentions are summed up in a Zoharic teaching, from the *Idrah Rabba* (Great Holy Assembly) section, as elaborated by the early 18th century founder of Hasidism, Israel Ba’al Shem Tov. According to the Ba’al Shem Tov, all the self-work (*sich arbeiten*) that a person does, in both the inner and outer worlds, is intended fundamentally ‘to sweeten all judgments at their very root’ (*le-hantik ha-dinim be-shorasham*). For the Ba’al Shem Tov and his followers, beyond their passionate engagement with affectively alive myth, symbol and image (the *imaginal*), and beyond even their intent of using the *imaginal* to approach the *noetic* (the gnosis of divinity, of ‘X’, as far as humanly possible)—beyond all this lies a *profound yearning to heal* the world and the human soul by *sweetening all the harsh judgments of existence at their very roots, within the unfathomable, all-encompassing, endless, unitary godhead*. This is accomplished by *growth in consciousness and in engaged human activity that redeems all and everything from exile*, by unconcealing the ‘hidden light’ of unity within the dark, fragmented, and seemingly implacible multiplicity and fragmentation of ordinary existence.

This core kabbalistic intention is actually close to the therapeutic intention of Jung’s project—namely to accomplish the ‘real therapy’ of freeing an individual, not so much from his or her pathology *per se*, but from what Jung has called ‘the curse of the pathology’ through encountering its numinous roots. Yet the *noetic* Kabbalah follows a very different path and practice from the depth-oriented *imaginal* approach of Jung’s analytical psychology. In the final section of this paper I will develop this idea through differentiating the symbolic attitude in Jung’s thought from the symbolic approach

of the Kabbalah—and through presenting a kabbalistic/Hasidic teaching of the Ba'al Shem Tov on the practice of contemplative prayer using spoken language.

4.

In his 'Definitions' section at the end of his book on *Psychological Types*, Jung (1921/1971) states that a symbol

always presupposes that the chosen expression is the best possible description or formulation of a relatively unknown fact, which is none the less known to exist or is postulated as existing.

(para. 815)

The Christian cross, for example, taken symbolically, expresses an 'as yet unknown and incomprehensible fact of a mystical or transcendent, i.e., psychological, nature, which simply finds itself most appropriately represented in the cross' (*ibid.*, para. 815). Jung continues:

The symbol is alive only so long as it is pregnant with meaning. But once its meaning has been born out of it, once that expression is found which formulates the thing sought, expected, or divined even better than the hitherto accepted symbol, then the symbol is *dead*, i.e., it possesses only an historical significance.

(*ibid.*, para. 816)

Note carefully that Jung views the symbol as expressing something 'as yet' unknown, and that its 'mystical or transcendent' nature is in truth 'psychological'—in the language of this paper, *imaginal*. The symbol, says Jung, is alive only while it is still 'pregnant with meaning'. Once that meaning 'has been born out of it' the living symbol dies, for then the reality once symbolized has become 'a *known* thing' and the 'symbolic expression as an analogue or abbreviated designation for a *known* thing is *semiotic*'—i.e., merely a conventional sign (paras. 815-16). Something is 'as yet' unknown, something 'psychological', that is carried in the womb of the living symbol, still 'pregnant with meaning', that will eventually be 'born out of' the pregnant symbol, deadening it in the process of childbirth (This is Jung's metaphor!). Note that for Jung the symbolic is a *process* that unfolds and develops *in time*, and not a trans-temporal reality. Note also that for Jung the 'as yet' incomprehensible mystical or transcendent 'fact' expressed by the symbol is actually psychological/*imaginal* (apparently it merely *appears* mystical or transcendent due to its current incomprehensibility), but this realization has not yet been born into consciousness out of the unconscious. Jung implicitly reminds us that the *temporal* and the *imaginal* belong together, are two aspects of one kind of reality, a truth that is often obscured by our thinking of imagination as mainly visual pictures.

We can see how Jung's real interest is in the *psychology* of the symbol—its place in the unfolding of human experience in the process of living. Thus he goes on to state that the 'attitude that takes a given phenomenon as symbolic may be called, for short, the *symbolic attitude* . . . [I]t is the outcome of a definite view of the world which *assigns meaning* to events . . .' (ibid., para. 819). Later in his definition he elaborates that a 'symbol really lives only when it is the best and highest expression for something divined but not yet known to the observer. It then compels his unconscious participation and has a life-giving and life-enhancing effect' (ibid.). Moreover: 'Purely unconscious products [of the psyche] are no more convincingly symbolic *per se* than purely conscious ones; it is the symbolic attitude of the observing consciousness that endows them both with the character of a symbol' (ibid., para. 821).

We can fruitfully compare Jung's discussion with that of Gershom Scholem in his classic study, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (1941/1954), in which he differentiates between the use of the 'allegorical sign' and the 'mystical symbol' in the Kabbalah. According to Scholem, the symbol is

a form of expression which radically transcends the sphere of allegory. In the mystical symbol a reality which in itself has, for us, no form or shape becomes transparent and, as it were, visible, through the medium of another reality which clothes its content with visible and expressible meaning, as for example the cross for Christians. The thing which becomes a symbol retains its original form and its original content. It does not become, so to speak, an empty shell into which another content is poured; in itself, through its own existence, it makes another reality transparent which cannot appear in any other form . . . the mystical symbol is an expressible representation of something which lies beyond the sphere of expression and communication, something which comes from a sphere whose face is, as it were, turned inward and away from us. A hidden and inexpressible reality finds its expression in the symbol . . .

For the Kabbalist, too, every existing thing is endlessly correlated with the whole of creation; for him, too, everything mirrors everything else. But beyond that he discovers something else which is not covered by the allegorical network: a reflection of true transcendence. *The symbol 'signifies' nothing and communicates nothing, but makes something transparent which is beyond all expression [italics added] . . . [it] is intuitively understood all at once – or not at all . . . It is a 'momentary totality' which is perceived intuitively in a mystical now – the dimension of time proper to the symbol.*

(p. 27)

Note the subtle but fundamental difference between Jung's view of (1) the symbol *as* psyche, as an *imaginal* expression which is part of a psychological process, and Scholem's view of (2) the symbol as an *imaginal* presence which 'makes another [*noetic*] reality transparent . . . something which lies beyond the sphere of expression and communication'.

For the first, Jung's viewpoint, the living symbol expresses a *psychical process* in which a content that is *not yet* conscious—but is *pregnant with emergent potential for consciousness*—becomes conscious, given the appropriate *symbolic attitude* of consciousness (Jung calls this process the *transcendent function*).

For the second, the viewpoint of the kabbalists, the symbol renders transparent a *transcendent reality* that is fundamentally hidden and ineffable, yet available to the appropriate *intuitive perception*. Note the different usages of the word ‘transcendent’. For Jung, the living symbol is part of an unfolding process over time. For the kabbalists, the mystical symbol is available within time to enable an intuitive grasp of a ‘mystical *now*’ that transcends temporality.

Let us now look at the teaching of the Ba’al Shem Tov, the 18th century founder of the Hasidic movement, on contemplative prayer using spoken words. The Ba’al Shem Tov’s teaching takes the form of a commentary on a verse from Genesis describing God’s command to Noah to make an ark: ‘Make a window for light in the ark, and finish it to a cubit [a measure of length] from above . . . make bottom, second and third decks for it’ (Genesis 6:16). The Hebrew for ‘a window for light’, or better, ‘a luminous opening’ is *Tsohar*. The word can also mean ‘a luminous crystal’. The Hebrew for ‘ark’ is *Teivah*, an ‘ark’—it also means ‘a word’.

Here is the teaching:

Rabbi Israel, Master of the Name, peace be upon him, taught:

‘Make a luminous opening [a Tsohar] in the ark [in the Teivah]’. This means that each word [each Teivah] that an individual says in Torah study or in prayer should be luminous and enlightening. For in every letter [of a spoken word] there are angelic worlds, souls and Divinity [three ascending realms from our finite reality towards the Infinite], and the letters ascend and become attached and unite one with the other and with God. And then the letters unite and become attached together to make a word [a Teivah] – then they unite in a true unity with Divinity.

And each individual must unite and include his or her own soul with every aspect of this process, for then all the worlds are unified as one, and they ascend and make vast rejoicing and delight beyond measure. This is [what is written in the verse from Genesis], ‘make bottom, second and third decks for the Teivah’ – namely, angelic worlds, souls and Divinity.

A person must listen to every Teivah [to every spoken word], listen to what it is saying, because Shekhinah [the divine indwelling Feminine] – the world of divine Speech – is speaking through the person, and that person is merely Her attendant, Her luminosity [Tsohar], so that She may emerge in enlightenment. Thus an individual brings pleasure to the Creator. And one needs great faith [for the artistry of this practice] – for Shekhinah is called (in the Zohar 2:16b) Faith of an artisan [‘emunat ‘aman], and without this artistic faith one is called, God forbid, a mischief-maker who divides the Ruler [who splits the divine Masculine, the Holy Blessed One, from the divine Feminine, the Shekhinah].

‘Finish it to a cubit from above.’ [The measure ‘cubit’ in Hebrew is ‘Ammah, like ‘Immah, the divine Higher Mother]. We can thus say that after the word, the Teivah, has left one’s mouth, one need not remember it any more, because one cannot know how it goes to a High Place [to the Higher Mother], just as one cannot look directly at the sun. And this is what the verse means, ‘Finish it from Above’ [let go and let the Higher Mother complete it].

To the degree that you can do this artistry, this artistic practice, do it in a manner of 'Come, you and your entire household, into the ark' (Genesis 7:1) – namely, with all your body and energy come into the word – into the Teivah [enter into the Teivah, the word that you speak, with all your body, heart and thought].

(From *Tsva'at Ha-Ribash*, Testament of the Ba'al Shem Tov, p. 8b, quoted in *Sefer Ba'al Shem Tov al Ha-Torah*, version of the Komarner Rebbe, Jerusalem, 5757 (1997), pp. 160-64)

The practice that the Ba'al Shem Tov recommends to his listeners invites them to become spiritual artisans, for whom every letter of every word that they utter while studying the Torah or praying becomes a source of illumination, a way of enlightening their awareness with the light of *Ein Sof* (Endlessness). Each spoken word is a *Teivah*, a Noah's ark with a luminous opening, an enlightening crystal that, so to speak, refracts the light of Endlessness towards the consciousness of finite human beings. It is worth noting, although the Ba'al Shem Tov does not explicitly mention this in his teaching, that the only other place in the Torah in which the word *Teivah* occurs is in reference to the ark in which the baby Moses was placed when he was set adrift on the Nile. In both instances, Noah's ark and Moses' ark, the vessels were rudderless and drifted as the spirit moved them. We may presume that the Ba'al Shem Tov intended his listeners to understand the words of prayer or study that they uttered to be similar—'after the word, the *Teivah*, has left one's mouth, one need not remember it any more', we then have no further responsibility for its fate. Our work, as faithful artisans of the holy spoken word, is simply 'to make a *Tsohar* in the *Teivah*'—to enter into each word as we utter it with all of our being and consciousness, so that it shines and enlightens with the unfathomable luminosity of Infinite Presence.

The Ba'al Shem Tov's teaching uses *imaginal* symbols—the letters and words of study and prayer—as mystical symbols, not for something psychical/*imaginal* that is 'not yet' conscious, but for a *noetic* reality which, in itself, is intrinsically and eternally ineffable and unknowable. Yet, the *Teivah* as mystical symbol, as Scholem reminds us, 'signifies nothing and communicates nothing'. Nevertheless it 'makes something transparent which is beyond all expression'—namely the luminosity refracted through the *Tsohar* that we make through our practice, through our self-work.

Jung put his knowledge of some kabbalistic symbolism to very good use. But he did not seem to realize the true *noetic* intentions of the kabbalistic involvement with living symbols in the domain of the *imaginal*. I hope I have adequately demonstrated this fact in this paper. Mystics of many traditions have, at times, made use of the *imaginal* for *noetic* purposes. Kabbalists are among these *imaginal* mystics. Jung's *opus* was, in my view, more purely *imaginal*—in this regard he was much closer to the inner alchemists than to the kabbalists. If my view is correct, then it sets a boundary to the usefulness of Jung's ideas for understanding the phenomenology of religious consciousness

and experience. This in no way detracts from Jung's genius, but it does limit the general applicability of his theories about the religious function of the psyche.

Coda

The sages of the midrash taught (Shemot Rabbah 3) on the verse, 'The God of your ancestors sent me to you' (Exodus 3:13), that in that very hour Moses requested that the Holy Blessed One make known His great Name to him. The Holy Blessed One said to Moses: My Name you seek to know? I am named according to My deeds! . . . When I judge the creatures I am called 'Elokim; when I war against the evil-doers I am called Tseva'kot; when I suspend the errors of human beings I am called 'Kel Shaddai; when I am compassionate to my world I am called Y-H-V-H. Thus, Eh'yeh Asher Eh'yeh ['I-will-be whatever I-will-be' (I am that I am)] (Exodus 3:14) – I am named according to My actions!

And in the Zohar (Ra'aya Mehemna Parshat Bo, p. 42b): Two contradictory verses, 'For you have seen no image [of God]' (Deut. 4:15) and 'The image of God you see' (Numbers 12:8). Even this image is not envisioned in its place, but only when it descends to rule over all and when it spreads out over all the creatures. This is because before the One created the imago of the world and formed its form, It was utterly singular [Yahid] without any form or likeness. And anyone who grasps It 'before' the level of createdness, when It is still 'outside' of any form or structure, is forbidden to make a worldly form or likeness – not even a holy Name nor any letter or point at all. This is what the text means when it says, 'For you have seen no image'.

But after It made the formal imago of the Chariot of the Supernal Adam [the archetypal divine anthropos], It descended to that level and was called by that form [the name] Y-H-V-H, so that sentient human beings could grasp It according to Its likeness: Kel, 'Elokim, Shaddai, Tseva'kot, Eh'yeh. So that conscious humans should know It in every aspect, how It guides the world with lovingkindness and with judgment etc.

Woe to anyone who equates It [the Infinite One] to any of these aspects – merely the likeness that we apprehend accords with the particular aspect It is invested in, and this includes Its investment in creation as a whole. And when It withdraws from the aspects of creation, It has no qualities or likenesses.

(cited in *Nefesh HaHayyim*, Part 2, Chapter 3, pp. 120-21)

The commentary on the *Nefesh HaHayyim*, called *Uvaharta BaHayyim*, elaborates on this passage as follows: The prophetic grade of 'the image of God you see' is the grade attained by Moses, characterized by the Name Y-H-V-H, which manifests the ongoing creativity within the cosmos. And at the time of the giving of the Torah, all the people of Israel attained a level at which they were witnesses to this prophetic grade. And from their conscious experience of this grade—'the image of God you see'—they understood —'for you have seen no image'. In other words, they understood that there is a still higher aspect of which they had no picture or image—and that aspect is the essential blessed

singularity and unity [*behinah shel atsmut Yahid baruch hu*] of which we can have no picture or image [no *imaginal* access!] but only a bare *gnosis* [*yedi'ah*] that there is such being (ibid.).

TRANSLATIONS OF ABSTRACT

Jung fit appel dans différentes parties de son oeuvre, à des images et à des motifs kabbalistiques, y compris dans ses études alchimiques, à savoir dans *Aïon* et abondamment dans *Mysterium Coniunctionis*. Dans *Ma Vie, Souvenirs, Rêves, Pensées*, il rapporte également un rêve important, survenu à la suite de son attaque cardiaque et porteur de symboles kabbalistiques. Dans cet article, j'analyse le rapport de Jung à la Kabbale: dans un premier temps en distinguant l'approche *imaginale* qu'a Jung du symbolisme kabbalistique de l'intention *noétique* de la Kabbale elle-même, dans l'usage qui y est fait du matériel *imaginal*. Puis je présente une série d'exemples de la manière dont Jung comprend le matériel kabbalistique qu'il évoque (et dont il se méprend aussi parfois). Ensuite, j'étudie les grandes lignes du développement de la Kabbale comme système imaginal noétique et je propose une conception des kabbalistes comme étant essentiellement engagés dans un «travail personnel intérieur» qui consiste à «adoucir les rudes jugements de l'existence à leur racine même». Enfin, je distingue l'approche de Jung du symbole psychique vivant de la compréhension kabbalistique du symbole mystique.

Dans cette dernière partie, je conclus en proposant les rudiments d'un enseignement hassidique/kabbalistique sur la nature et la fonction de la prière orale contemplative, afin d'illustrer la différence entre les deux approches du symbolisme. Les quatre parties de l'article sont bordées par un «Prélude» et une «Coda».

Jung benutzte kabbalistische Images und Motive in unterschiedlichen Bereichen seiner Arbeit, darunter in seinen alchemistischen Studien, in *Aion*, und insbesondere im *Mysterium Coniunctionis*. Jung beschreibt auch einen wichtigen Traum, den er nach seiner schweren Herzerkrankung hatte und der kabbalistische Symbole benutzt (*Erinnerungen, Träume, Gedanken*). In der vorliegenden Arbeit untersuche ich Jungs Vorstellungen in Bezug auf die Kabbala, indem ich zunächst zwischen Jungs *imaginaler* Herangehensweise an den kabbalistischen Symbolismus und der *noetischen* Absicht der Kabbala selbst in ihrem eigenen Gebrauch *imaginalen* Materials unterscheide. Zweitens zeige ich eine Anzahl typischer Beispiele dafür, wie Jung kabbalistisches Material zitiert und versteht (und manchmal missversteht). Drittens stelle ich kurz die Entwicklung der Kabbala als *imaginales noetisches* System vor und stelle ein zentrales Selbstverständnis der Kabbalisten dar—wie sie sich in die innere 'Selbstarbeit' begeben, die dahin führen soll, 'die schonungslosen Urteile über das Dasein in ihren Ursprüngen abzumildern'. Schließlich unterscheide ich Jungs Verständnis des psychischen lebendigen Symbols vom kabbalistischen Verständnis des mystischen Symbols. In diesem vierten Abschnitt der Arbeit schließe ich mit der Darstellung einer grundlegenden chassidischen kabbalistischen Belehrung über die Natur und Funktion des gesprochenen kontemplativen Gebets—als Illustration des Unterschiedes zwischen den beiden Verstehensweisen des

Symbolismus. Die vier Abschnitte der Arbeit werden durch ein Präludium und eine Koda eingerahmt.

Jung fece uso di immagini e motivi cabalistici in varie parti del suo lavoro, in parte nei suoi studi sull'alchimia, in *Aion*, e più estesamente in *Mysterium Coniunctionis*. Egli inoltre riporta in *Ricordi, Sogni, Riflessioni* un sogno importante avuto dopo il suo attacco di cuore per il quale fa uso dei simboli cabalistici. In questo lavoro esamino le idee di Jung in relazione alla cabala, in primo luogo differenziando l'approccio immaginale di Jung nei confronti del simbolismo cabalistico dall'intenzione poetica della cabala stessa nell'uso che essa fa del materiale immaginale. In secondo luogo presento un numero di tipici esempi del modo in cui Jung comprende (e a volte fraintende) il materiale cabalistico che cita. In terzo luogo esamino brevemente lo sviluppo della cabala come un sistema *immaginale poetico* e presento un punto centrale nella comprensione di sé dei cabalisti—come impegnati in un lavoro interno che intende 'addolcire le dure fatiche della vita alle loro stesse radici'. Infine distingo la comprensione junghiana del simbolo psichico vivente dalla comprensione cabalistica del simbolo mistico. Nella quarta sezione del lavoro —per illustrare le differenze fra le due comprensioni del simbolo— concludo presentando un insegnamento di base Hasidic/cabalistico sulla natura e la funzione della preghiera contemplativa verbale. Le quattro sezioni del lavoro sono strutturate con un 'Preludio' e una 'Coda'.

Jung hizo uso de las imágenes y motivos kabbalísticos en diferentes partes de su obra, incluyendo sus estudios alquímicos, en *Aion*, y en mayor extensión en *Mysterium Coniunctionis*. Incluso reportó un sueño importante después de su ataque cardíaco en el cual hizo uso del simbolismo alquímico en *Recuerdos, Sueños y Pensamientos*. En este trabajo exploro las ideas de Jung en relación a la kabbalah, primero, diferenciando entre la aproximación imaginal de Jung al simbolismo kabbalístico y las intenciones noéticas de la kabbalah en sí misma en relación al uso del material imaginal. Segundo, presento un número de ejemplos típicos de cómo Jung entiende (y con frecuencia malinterpreta) el material kabbalístico que cita. Tercero, brevemente analizo el desarrollo de la kabbalah como sistema *imaginal noético*, y presento un centro del auto-conocimiento de los cabalistas—como involucrados en el 'auto-trabajo' interior con el que intentan "suavizar la dureza de los juicios sobre la existencia hasta sus propias raíces". Por último, diferencio la comprensión junguiana del símbolo vivo de la comprensión kabbalística del símbolo místico. En esta cuarta parte del trabajo, concluyo por presentar una enseñanza básica hasídica/kabbalística sobre la naturaleza y la función de la oración verbal de la oración contemplativa—como una ilustración de la diferencia de las dos comprensiones del simbolismo. Las cuatro secciones del trabajo están enmarcadas por un 'Preludio' y un 'Código'.

References

- Ba'al Shem Tov, I. (1997). *Sefer Ba'al Shem Tov al Ha-Torah*. (In Hebrew). Jerusalem: Version of the Komarner Rebbe.
- Corbin, H. (1954/1980). *Avicenna and the Visionary Recital*. Dallas TX: Spring Publications.

- (1958/1969). *Creative Imagination in the Sufism of Ibn 'Arabi*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Elior, R. (1993). *The Paradoxical Ascent to God: The Kabbalistic Theosophy of Habad Hasidism*. Albany NY: SUNY Press.
- Foxbrunner, R. A. (1993). *Habad: The Hasidism of R. Schneur Zalman of Lyady*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.
- Giller, P. (2001). *Reading the Zohar: The Sacred Text of the Kabbalah*. Oxford NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hayyim of Volozin (1997). *Nefesh HaHayyim*. (In Hebrew). Wickliffe OH: Ohel Desktop Publishing.
- Hurwitz, S. (1952/1968). 'Psychological aspects in early Hasidic literature'. In *Timeless Documents of the Soul*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Idel, M. (1983). 'We have no kabbalistic tradition on this'. In *Rabbi Moses Nachmanides (RAMBAN): Explorations in His Religious and Literary Virtuosity*, ed. I. Twersky. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press.
- (1988). *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- (1990). 'Maimonides and Kabbalah'. In *Studies in Maimonides*, ed. I. Twersky. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press, 31–81.
- Ibn al 'Arabi (2002). *The Meccan Revelations*, Volume 1, ed. Michel Chodkiewicz; trans. William C. Chittick & James W. Morris. New York: Pir Press.
- Joseph, S. M. (1994). 'Lilith and the integration of chthonic life'. *The San Francisco Jung Institute Library Journal*, 13, 1, 5–46.
- Jung, C. G. (1921/1971). *Psychological Types*. CW 6.
- (1941). 'Paracelsus as a spiritual phenomenon'. CW 13.
- (1942/1954). 'Transformation symbolism in the mass'. CW 11.
- (1945/1954). 'The philosophical tree'. CW 13.
- (1951). *Aion*. CW 9ii.
- (1955). *Mysterium Coniunctionis*. CW 14.
- (1961). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.
- (1975). *Letters*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kaplan, A. (1984). *The Chassidic Masters*. New York/Jerusalem: Moznaim Publishing.
- Maimonides, M. (1963). *The Guide of the Perplexed*. Translation, introduction and notes by S. Pines. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- Norbu, N. (1986). *The Crystal and the Way of Light: Sutra, Tantra and Dzogchen*. Compiled and edited by John Shane. New York, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Scholem, G. (1941/1954). *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. New York: Schocken Books.
- (1974). *Kabbalah*. New York: Quadrangle/New York Times Books.
- Weinreb, A. (1983). *Book of the Way of Hasidim: The Torah of the Ba'al Shem Tov*, Vol. 2. (In Hebrew). Monsey NY: Sifrei Breslov.

Copyright of *Journal of Analytical Psychology* is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.

Copyright of *Journal of Analytical Psychology* is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.