

Understanding Jung: recent biographies and scholarship

F. X. Charet, *Montreal, Canada*

Abstract: The tendency to associate Jung with Freud has undergone a change and both are increasingly perceived as founders of depth psychological schools whose exact relationship is unclear. The separation of the two was largely due to Jung's rejection by the psychoanalytic community because of his perceived spiritual inclinations. Recent scholarship has emphasized these spiritual inclinations in both a positive and negative way and brought to light Jung's non-Freudian sources, while other Jungian practitioners are seeking a closer association with psychoanalysis. This conflicting development is related to tendencies in Jung himself that are evident in his own life and in research conducted into the writing and publication of *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Though the status of the latter as Jung's autobiography has been called into question there remains the necessity to explain the myth of Jung's life enshrined there and the impact this has had on a public looking for meaning in a time of considerable change.

Key words: autobiography, biography, Freud, Freudians, Jung, Jungians, myth, psychoanalysis, spirituality.

During this visit to London [in 1935], Jung had occasion to look up some references, and he went to the Reading Room of the British Museum. He was asked if he had a reader's ticket. 'No', he replied, 'I'm afraid I haven't. I did not know that was required'. 'Who are you?' he was asked. 'What is your name?' 'I am a Swiss doctor on a visit to London. My name is Jung – Dr. Jung.' 'Not Freud, Jung, and Adler?' exclaimed the assistant. 'Oh no', he replied. 'Only Jung!'

(Bennet 1961, p. 6)

There has been much discussion and bitter argument in recent years about the status of the psychotherapeutic claims of psychoanalysis and, more particularly, the integrity and long term significance of its founder, Sigmund Freud. Though there is no consensus on these subjects there is little doubt that Freud's person and achievement have received some debilitating blows in the onslaught.¹ Because Jung is no longer so identified with Freud he has managed to escape much of the criticism and has even been perceived as having suffered abuse and neglect at the hands of Freud and his disciples (Gallant 1996). Some Jungians have taken comfort in this, feeling vindicated that their man is finally being appreciated instead of overshadowed by Freud. The fact of the matter is

that this uncoupling of Jung from Freud raises some interesting questions now that Jung is also coming under scrutiny, both inside and outside the Jungian community, with varying arguments as to the credibility of his views, the further development of his thought, the larger issues of his relation to the context within which he lived and worked and the sources he drew upon. In what follows I will address a number of these questions by canvassing some of the recent trends in scholarship on Jung and his spiritual preoccupations by commenting on specific publications, and offering a perspective that I hope will further an understanding of Jung.

Jung, Freud and the Freudians

Until recently the name of Carl Jung was always linked to that of Freud and even that of Alfred Adler, making up the triumvirate of early depth psychology. That Freud and Jung are not so identified today has much to do with the concerted effort on the part of the psychoanalytic community to render Jung *persona non grata*. The association of Freud and Jung was opposed as early as the first decade of this century, chiefly among Freud's Viennese disciples who took a strong dislike to Jung, even predicting his apostasy from the Freudian camp. Their main concerns were Jung's spiritualizing inclinations which they detected in his theological preoccupations, his forays into occultism, and that Freud looked far too favourably upon Jung as his potential successor (Charet 1993, pp. 171–213). As Freud's biographer, Ernest Jones remarked of their prophetic talents, quoting a German proverb, 'Hate has a keen eye' (Jones 1955, p. 44).

Freud, too, knew of Jung's spiritual preoccupations but he chose to exercise tolerance. A remark in a letter to Jung, in 1908, characterizes his earlier position: 'I knew that our views would soon be reconciled, that you had not, as I had feared, been alienated from me by some inner development deriving from the relationship with your father and the beliefs of the Church ...' (Jung/Freud 1974, p. 158). Nevertheless, Freud became increasingly concerned with Jung's ties to Christianity and his abiding interest in spiritualism which came to the fore in the famous 'poltergeist business', producing a cracking in the bookcase that Freud witnessed with Jung in his study later the same year (Charet 1993, pp. 187–9). A month after Freud wrote the above letter to Jung, Karl Abraham warned Freud about Jung reverting to his former spiritualistic inclinations and Herman Nunberg, who was studying with Jung at the Burghölzli at the time, reports an almost identical poltergeist experience (Charet 1993, pp. 184, 189ff.). Try as he might Freud could not wean Jung from such spiritual preoccupations and his worse fears were realized when Jung, his appointed heir, began to insinuate them into the theory and practice of psychoanalysis (Charet 1993, pp. 189ff.). Jung vividly recalls a conversation he had with Freud about the matter:

Freud said to me, 'My dear Jung, promise me never to abandon the sexual theory. That is the most essential thing of all. You see, we must make a dogma of it, an unshakeable bulwark'. He said that to me with great emotion, in the tone of a father

saying, 'And promise me this one thing, my dear son: that you will go to church every Sunday'. In some astonishment I asked him, 'A bulwark – against what?' To which he replied, 'Against the black tide of mud' – and here he hesitated for a moment, then added – 'of occultism'.

(Jung 1973, p. 150)

By way of comment, Jung added:

This was the thing that struck at the heart of our friendship. I knew that I would never be able to accept such an attitude. What Freud seemed to mean by 'occultism' was virtually everything that philosophy and religion, including the rising contemporary science of parapsychology, had learned about the psyche.

(Jung 1973, pp. 150–1)

It is clear from this report that Freud's concerns about Jung were related to his spiritual preoccupations. These preoccupations were increasingly leading him to press for changes to the fundamental ground of psychoanalytic theory, the psychosexual basis of all psychological disorders. Jung felt that there were experiences that were evident in both conventional and heterodox spirituality that required a 'second look'. Freud, for his part, was not prepared to seriously and publicly consider the data of religion and what he called 'occultism' as anything other than psychosexual, and certainly not as raw material upon which to modify the fundamentals of psychoanalytical theory. In the end Jung was prepared to reject Freud's authority and the terminal insights of his psychosexual theory in favour of a more profound understanding of human experience. This understanding would cause Jung to include in his psychology the reality of myth and spirituality without the obligation of having to reduce these to personal psychology. In the end he uncovered a transpersonal dimension of the psyche he termed the 'collective unconscious' with its contents the 'archetypes'.

It took Freud himself somewhat longer than his followers to take a public stand against Jung and when he did so, in 1914, in *On the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement*, he was uncharacteristically belligerent in tone (Freud 1957). After a number of personal attacks on Jung's character, Freud zeroed in on the crucial element that Jung and his followers were attempting to introduce into psychoanalysis, and here it is clear that Freud understood this to be a form of spirituality which he felt was regressive and potentially destructive to the insights he had introduced. He suspected this attempt at revising psychoanalysis was influenced by the 'theological prehistory of so many of the Swiss' (Freud 1957, p. 61). Freud characterized Jung's undermining of the psychosexual theory by subversively introducing a spiritual dimension into human psychology as follows:

If ethics and religion were not allowed to be sexualized but had to be something 'higher' from the start, and if nevertheless the ideas contained in them seemed undeniably to be descended from the Oedipus and family-complex, there can only be only one way out: it must be that from the very first these complexes themselves

do not mean what they seem to be expressing, but bear the higher ‘anagogic’ meaning ... which made it possible for them to be employed in the abstract trains of thought of ethics and religious mysticism.

(Freud 1957, p. 62)

In other words:

All the changes that Jung has proposed to make in psycho-analysis flow from his intention to eliminate what is objectionable in the family-complexes, so as to find it again in religion and ethics.

(Freud 1957, p. 62)

The real intention of this revision, according to Freud, is to create ‘a new religio-ethical system’ that is ‘bound to re-interpret, distort or jettison the factual findings of analysis’ (*ibid.*). Apart from the satisfaction of having vented his spleen, which this attack on Jung gave him, Freud placed firmly in the minds of his disciples that there was a no man’s land between him, the father of psychoanalysis, and Jung, the apostate son. This great divide was not crossed by either man in their lifetimes.

It is clear that the central antagonism between Freud and Jung to which all the minor ones became attached, was the conflict over the precise understanding of the concept of *libido*. It became evident to Freud that Jung could not accept the assumptions about the psychosexual nature of the *libido* that he deemed essential to psychoanalytic theory and practice. It is also clear that Jung had ambitions for psychoanalysis that involved what today is termed ‘the transpersonal’ which Freud found to be regressive and, therefore, unacceptable. The excommunicated Jung gradually disappeared from psychoanalytic literature existing only as an incomplete figure, a neurotic or a psychotic with a few good ideas mired by religious pretensions, whom Freud, at first, misjudged as a person of talent. These coals were raked over again and again and, for good measure, in Edward Glover’s *Freud or Jung* (1950), in Ernest Jones’s *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud* (1955), and, of late, in Peter Gay’s, *Freud: A Life for Our Time* (1988).

The smouldering embers of Jung’s ties to Freud were briefly fanned into flame with the publication of *The Freud/Jung Letters* (1974), a fascinating correspondence that rejuvenated an interest in their ill-fated association. The letters were scrutinized in detail in the book review sections of the psychoanalytic periodicals, in innumerable articles, and in full-length studies. They show, among other things, Jung’s preoccupation with mythology, religion and the occult. With few exceptions, the psychoanalytic community’s earlier assessment of Jung stood firm or, as one of their own, the late Kurt Eissler of New York, put it: ‘Rest in peace’ (Eissler 1993, p. 182). This certainty about Jung as ingrate and deceiver pursuing the illusion of spiritual realization has not always stood the psychoanalytic community in good stead. In the recent scholarship *contra* Freud there is even a tendency to

assume that Jung has not received a fair hearing from the Freudians (Gallant 1996).

Apart from doctrinal Freudians whose only interest in Jung is to cut a swath through his early psychoanalytic years to make way for the procession bearing the undefiled and protected image of Sigmund Freud, there are a few who have been more judicious in their comments on Jung. The British psychoanalyst D. W. Winnicott's review of Jung's *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* in the *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* (1964) is full of lucid insights and casts a critical eye on the doctrinaire Freudian view of Jung without, however, entirely distancing himself from interpreting Jung's psychology as an elaborate and moderately successful attempt to cure himself. More recently, a small number of psychoanalysts have begun to take another look at Jung (for example, as evidenced by the guest edited article by Samuels 1996). Peter Homans, in his *Jung in Context* (1995), has acknowledged this second look at Jung and the reasons for it and raised a further question that is becoming increasingly important:

We now know that ... most 'contemporary trends' in psychoanalytic scholarship were first articulated by Jung. And we now know that both Jung's life and thought have been pathologized and vilified repeatedly by Freudians of every stripe. But we also know – or we ought to know – that none of this is important anymore.

What is important is that Jung's life and work have had, and continue to have, a powerful and permanent impact upon contemporary culture – not as great as Freud's, to be sure, but greater than a great many others, including virtually all of Freud's followers ...

This, in turn makes important the reasons, still unknown, for this impact and for Jung's virtual erasure from the scholarly scene. But we will never understand either unless we study Jung's analytical psychology as a movement within the context of other movements. Jung's significance for the study of depth psychology lies in the power his ideas and personality have had to organize a highly influential movement ...

(Homans 1995, pp. l-li.)

Jung's biography as a spiritual paradigm

Jung has, indeed, fared fairly well outside the psychoanalytical camp and the circles of conventional psychiatry and psychology. His erasure from the scholarly scene may not be as entire as Homans states as there is an increasing interest in his ideas in other disciplines such as religious studies and literature. The fact remains, though, that Jung has done even better outside of academia itself where he has been absorbed, or half absorbed, by a host of spiritual maverick movements, purveyors of self-realization, or the lucrative self-help industry. To call Jung one of the darlings of that rather amorphous entity 'The New Age' is, if anything, an understatement. As far back as Marilyn Ferguson's *The Aquarian Conspiracy* (1980) Jung was credited with being a major influence. Finally, there are the Jung institutes, centres and societies across the Western world drawing interested individuals into training programmes, workshops

and lectures on everything from introductions to the elementary features of Jung's psychology (the ego, persona, shadow, anima/animus, self, collective unconscious) to all that could be conceived as archetypal or capable of a mythic interpretation, be they dreams, fantasies, or directed active imagination.

Much of what interests many Jungians and fills their widely read publications is attracting more and more of those who assume a legitimate status in what passes itself off as a school of psychology. If there is one important element in the increasing popularity of Jungian literature it has to do with the spiritual curiosity and concerns that are currently present in a large part of the population directly associated, it would seem, with the decline of traditional religion. Many look to Jungian psychology as a possible substitute for traditional religion that no longer addresses their spiritual yearnings. Its contemporary psychological language, insight into human behaviour and respect for spiritual aspirations are perceived to be its most attractive features. Moreover, Jung's own life and personality as paradigmatic of the contemporary search for meaning figures prominently in this literature.

It is quite clear from the various biographies that have been written about Jung that there is a spiritual dimension in his life and thought and, while this has proved an embarrassment to some, it is this that has attracted a large interest in his psychology. Most biographies of Jung build on *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (1973), recorded and edited by his secretary, Aniela Jaffé. In this work we find Jung reluctantly revealing publicly for the first time the remarkable experiences he had undergone in the course of his long life. The degree to which religious experiences and preoccupations are present in the book has surprised even some of Jung's close colleagues (Charet 1993, p. 2). Moreover, it becomes clear in this work that Jung's life and psychology are deeply connected, though the external details about his life are largely excluded from his account. He regarded these as irrelevant and gave voice to his experiences, or, in his own words:

In the end the only events in my life worth telling are those when the imperishable world irrupted into this transitory one. That is why I speak chiefly of inner experiences, amongst which I include my dreams and visions. These form the *prima materia* of my scientific work.

(Jung 1973, p. 4)

In the prologue to *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* Jung makes clear that all his inner experiences and their depth psychological exploration taken together configure into what he called his 'myth'. The myth that emerges is one of increasing consciousness arising out of what amounts to a spiritual journey away from conventional religion, through the personal unconscious into the deeper recesses of the psyche, far past the Freudian id, into the collective unconscious. This is an area of the psyche, the landscape of which is populated by symbols that require specialized techniques to draw from them their power to transform. Dream analysis and active imagination are the techniques used

in this transformative journey called ‘individuation’ that characteristically involves encountering various complexes and archetypes and ends in a new spiritual orientation where the centre of psychological gravity has shifted from the ego to what Jung called the ‘self’. Moreover, this transformed self is linked to a larger, distinctly salvific sounding, claim that pronounces the extension of human consciousness to be adding to the consciousness of the God-image, as Jung would have it.

Until recently this myth stood firm, half-understood, sequestered behind the more formal Jungian preoccupation with psychological typology and more clinically identifiable problems. It is in Jung’s mature writings and letters that his myth comes to the fore to be finally enshrined in the story of his life as revealed in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Here Jung is revealed as a psychologist who is also a visionary, even a prophetic one, who anticipates the profound changes that will ripple across the spiritual landscape of the modern world years after his own death. What Jung experienced in himself and foresaw for the modern West was a shift in the God-image within the psyche itself that would have devastating effects for Judaism and Christianity. These institutionalized religions would go into decline to be replaced by a more experientially orientated spirituality wherein God would take birth in the human soul in the form of the self. This was Jung’s myth. As he himself put it:

[T]he myth of the necessary incarnation of God – the essence of the Christian message – can then be understood as man’s creative confrontation with the opposites and their synthesis in the self, the wholeness of his personality ... In the experience of the self it is no longer the opposites ‘God’ and ‘man’ that are reconciled, as it was before, but rather the opposites within the God-image itself. That is the meaning of divine service, of the service which man can render to God, that light may emerge from the darkness, that the Creator may become conscious of His creation, and man conscious of himself.

That is the goal, or one goal, which fits man meaningfully into the scheme of creation, and at the same time confers meaning upon it. It is an explanatory myth which has slowly taken shape within me in the course of the decades. It is a goal I can acknowledge and esteem, and which therefore satisfies me.

(Jung 1973, p. 338)

It also seems to have satisfied many of Jung’s followers and it is perhaps for this reason that biographies of Jung by Jungians do not abound, unable to vie with the power and authority of *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. As we shall see, the latter has recently come under closer scrutiny raising interesting questions about its integrity as an autobiography.

Two Jungian biographies of Jung, by way of example, are worth mentioning: Barbara Hannah’s *Jung: His Life and Work* (1976) is an insider’s account, chatty, gossipy in its details and, finally, hagiographical. The myth remains intact. The late Marie-Louise von Franz, another insider, has crafted a more sophisticated work that attempts to situate Jung in the contemporary cultural context. Intellectually closer to Jung she has amplified Jung’s own self

understanding, the main thrust of which is evident in her subtitle, *C. G. Jung: His Myth in Our Time* (1975). If this too is hagiography, it is of a higher order. In her account Jung emerges as a figure of major historical significance in whose life and thought intersect the most important currents of our time from spirituality to quantum physics. Laurens van der Post's *Jung and the Story of Our Time* (1975) and Anthony Stevens's *Jung* (1994) are two other biographies from the Jungian camp that conveniently fall into the genres exemplified by Hannah and von Franz. There are other biographies on the fringe of the Jungian movement or of a pedestrian type, interested in Jung and attracted to his ideas: E. A. Bennet, *Jung* (1961); Charles Baudouin, *L'Oeuvre de Jung* (1963); Vincent Brome, *Jung: Man and Myth* (1978); Anthony Storr, *Jung* (1973); and Gerhard Wehr, *Jung* (1987). Beyond these the most current biographical interest in Jung's life and thought has taken a critical turn in both senses of the word.

Jung and anti-Semitism

Before turning to a number of more critical biographies of Jung, it is worth noting an aspect of Jung's personality and behaviour that has been referred to again and again: his alleged anti-Semitism. The earliest source for such an allegation is to be found among Freud's Jewish disciples and even in Freud himself. Yet little was made of this until the emergence of Nationalism Socialism in Germany in 1933, after which Jung assumed the role as president of the largely German International Society for Psychotherapy. It is acting in this capacity and making some remarks about the differences between Jewish and Aryan psychology and the more than implicit allusion that Freud's psychology was, after all, Jewish, that Jung found himself the object of accusation. In addition, there are the interviews he gave in the 1930s in which he pontificated on the subject of Hitler, Stalin and Mussolini in not entirely negative terms (Jung 1977). A few letters have also come to light that have added fuel to the accusations.

Whether Jung was an opportunist, an anti-Semite, or merely in the wrong place at the wrong time has been hotly debated, and the subject, in 1989, of a New York conference and a Paris workshop. Out of this came the publication *Lingering Shadows* (Maidenbaum & Martin 1991) which seems to have said all there is to say about the subject. Its conclusions are as ambiguous and complex as the man himself, and therein might lie the final explanation, but there is no question that Jung does not appear at his best. Recently, it has come to light that the FBI, in 1944, put together two reports on Jung responding to accusations of alleged sympathy to Nazism (Schoenl 1998, pp. 34–6). And if there is any truth to Richard Wolin's recent allegation in *The New Republic* that the British Foreign office, in 1946, assembled documents under a file titled 'The Case of Dr. Carl Jung: Pseudo-Scientist and Nazi Auxiliary' with the never carried out intention of prosecuting Jung, we should expect the shadow

of Jung's alleged anti-Semitism to linger a while longer (Wolin 1997, p. 30). In the end, the closest that Jung came to an admission of guilt was to Rabbi Leo Baeck, a major figure in German Jewry and a holocaust survivor, when he stated of his behaviour during the Nazi period, 'Well, I slipped up' (Jaffé 1971, p. 98).

Less because of his alleged anti-Semitism and more because of his emerging prominence in the spheres outside of medical psychology and academia, Jung has recently become the focus of attention. Roughly, this has taken two forms, both of which are bolstered by a more thorough and careful reading of the sources of his life and thought. The first of these shares with the early Freudians a tendency to see Jung through the instability of his childhood as revealed in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* and to read his foibles and shortcomings, uncovered in his writings, unpublished material, and in the secondary literature, as evidence of a person of narcissistic cast with religious pretensions. The second has sought, using many of the same sources, to more fairly minded place Jung and his psychology in their social and cultural context, reading his religious and philosophical preoccupations in the light of the cultural changes occurring in Western society.

Critical biographies of Jung

Biographies that take a more critical view of Jung were, until recently, rare items. Paul Stern's *Jung: The Haunted Prophet* (1976) is the most significant exception, the subtitle of which aptly conveys the author's view. Recently, a rather shrill whistle has been blown on Jung and his school and its growing influence, calling attention once again to the spiritual features of Jung's life and thought and questioning his status as the founder and creator of a legitimate psychology.

The most thorough recent biography of Jung, and a leading example of the more critical approach, is Frank McLynn's *Jung* (1996). What emerges in McLynn's reading of Jung's life is a penchant for the previously unacknowledged facts, the hidden, the avoided, distorted realities of his weaknesses, foibles, and failures. The polished hero is shown to be tarnished, the great one made small, and the accepted scale is human size, all too human. McLynn paints a man who is largely self preoccupied and somewhat of an ambitious opportunist who is not above using other people for his own ends. His insensitivity towards his wife by having repeated affairs and a longstanding relationship with his associate, Antonia Wolff, is emphasized. His other personal shortcomings, obvious in his outbursts of anger, his stubborn reluctance to face certain facts and, finally, his exaggerated notions about the significance of his explorations of the unconscious are all here.

McLynn's literary style and mastery of the sources of Jung's life make his biography stand out as the most readable and thorough that has been published to date. His judgements are often astute and perceptive but the

lingering impression is that he does not like or respect Jung and wishes his readers to feel the same. He most certainly does not think that the status and significance of Jung's achievement are anything of the order of historical importance that his followers claim and, by implication, he dismisses the value of much of Jungian psychology in the modern world in spite of its growing popularity which McLynn sees as rooted in a dubious set of ideas that are identified as 'New Age'. The future of Jung and his psychology, like the claims about his greatness, are, according to McLynn, in grave doubt.

Richard Noll in two works, *The Jung Cult* (1994) and *The Aryan Christ* (1997), has offered the most stinging indictment of Jung to date. These two works have attracted a considerable amount of attention not unrelated to the media savvy of its author who, if truth be told, was once an aspiring Jungian himself. These works overlap considerably, prompting one reviewer to remark on what might have motivated the author to write the same book twice! Noll's books display a style and method of argument that is difficult to disentangle but essential to an appreciation in them of what is of value and what is not. There is a considerable amount of learning and effort that is obvious in the published and unpublished material that is covered, but the persuasiveness of the argument has been widely perceived as too often mired by an insistence on a particular negative interpretation.

When boiled down, Noll's thesis is that Jung embarked on a journey under the influence of a Germanic tradition of nature and folk philosophy that had tendentious racial and religious features opposed to both Judaism and Christianity. Furthermore, Jung reconfigured these influences with the intention of creating a religious movement, the centrepiece of which was his own experience of self-deification parleyed into, and disguised as, a school of psychology. The attention Noll has generated, and especially his allegation of having uncovered the foundational document of the Jungian school drafted by Jung himself to support his claims, has called forth a flurry of book reviews and a detailed rebuttal in Sonu Shamdasani's *Cult Fictions* (1998b). In the end, there is no question that Noll has dug up interesting material from many sources and fingered the spiritual ambitions that Jung entertained for his psychology, but in the ensuing discussion the volume is too high, the sound too incoherent, the pitch too shrill to properly evaluate the significance of Noll's claims. What is clear is that he has touched a raw nerve in the Jungian community and this has to do, once again, with the spiritual factors and ambitions that are present in Jung's life and psychology.

The shortcomings of McLynn's and Noll's books on Jung's life and thought have also had to do with, among other things, premature judgements. The reality is that not all the facts are in and this makes the promise of explaining Jung, his psychology and its future prospects, a difficult one to keep. The arguments that many Jungians offer to counter these 'misunderstandings' of Jung run the gamut from sheer publicity seeking to a fear of the unconscious and inner resistance to the truth of Jung's discoveries. Apart from the fact that such

explanations cannot bear the full weight of the criticism of Jung that has been levelled of late, it is quite clear that the Jungian community have been reluctant participants in the pursuit of information about Jung and the contextualization of his psychology. Extreme positions such as Noll's may prod them to take up their obligations with more seriousness and require of them to take responsibility for harbouring spiritual concerns in their psychology.

Jung's biography and scholarship

In fact there are a number of individuals, Jungians and otherwise, who have worked quietly, out of the glare of the lights of publicity, to further the understanding of Jung that Peter Homans has called for. The pioneer work in this field is Henri Ellenberger's *The Discovery of the Unconscious* (1970) that argued for Jung's independent status as a major figure in depth psychology by uncovering many of his sources. Ellenberger investigated the period before Jung came under the influence of Freud and, in particular, his early life, his *Zofingia Lectures* (1896–99) given as a student, and his medical dissertation (1902) *On the Psychology and Pathology of So-Called Occult Phenomena* (Jung 1970, 1983). Together these demonstrate that he came to his later psychological theories from a different *point de départ* than was the case with Freud. Here Jung's early religious and philosophical interests are of crucial importance as are the influences of a number of now largely forgotten mentors and colleagues of Jung.

There are a number of recent full-scale studies that have focused more specifically on these sources or brought new ones to light. The Jungian analyst Marilyn Nagy's *Philosophical Issues in the Psychology of Jung* (1991) and Paul Bishop, *The Dionysian Self: C. G. Jung's Reception of Frederick Nietzsche* (1995) as well as Jung's own extended seminar *Nietzsche's Zarathustra* (1988) with an introduction by James Jarrett, have made more intelligible Jung's philosophical pedigree and countered the Jungian tendency to understand analytical psychology to have been born miraculously from Jung's mind. These works make it clear that Jung stands in a modern philosophical tradition in direct tension with the traditional beliefs of Judaism and Christianity leading back into Nietzsche, von Hartmann, Schopenhauer and to Kant. And recently Sean Kelly in his *Individuation and the Absolute. Hegel, Jung, and the Path Toward Wholeness* (1993) has compared Jung's views with Hegel's raising some intriguing questions in the face of Jung's denial of any influence from that quarter (Jung 1975, p. 501).

On another front my own *Spiritualism and the Foundations of C. G. Jung's Psychology* (1993) has uncovered the heterodox religious influence of spiritualism on Jung and traced this from the broader culture into his early family life, through his university years, up to his encounter with Freud, and beyond into his theory of the archetype. Anne Lammers has also focused on the religious dimension of Jung's thought and its tension with Christianity in her *In God's*

Shadow (1994), reconstructing the late relationship between Jung and the Dominican theologian Victor White, using their unpublished correspondence. In all of these works Jung's myth has been anchored to history and linked to the philosophical and broader religious culture of the modern West. What these works demonstrate is that Jung was less of a reactionary than is often assumed. His work stands within a particular tradition of interpretation in which elements of a more formal European philosophical and religious influence intersect with the admixture of experiential spirituality. These studies and a few others have all added to what will become a more clear and dependable understanding of Jung's significance and his place in Western culture.

The direct impact of Eastern philosophical and religious influences upon Jung is later and complicates the reconstruction of the streams flowing into the reservoir that he drew from to create his psychology. These influences, ranging from yoga to the Chinese book of divination and philosophy, the *I Ching*, so much more obvious in our world today, were drawn on by Jung earlier in the twentieth century and are canvassed in Harold Coward's *Jung and Eastern Thought* (1985) and J. J. Clarke's *Jung and Eastern Thought* (1994). Jung's own psychological reading of yoga is now available in his *Kundalini Seminars* (1996) with an informative introduction by Sonu Shamdasani. Though these recent works have brought to light the significance of Eastern thought for Jung it is premature and an increasingly unlikely conclusion to pronounce his psychology to be a smorgasbord of all these Western and Eastern influences as is sometimes done. Apart from the missing ingredient of how the precise lines of these influences converge in Jung's psychology there is the even more complicated subject of Jung's own personality and peculiar genius of which we know all too little in spite of the various claims of unmasking.

In addition to these full length studies of the background and context of Jung's psychology, a few narrowly focused attempts have been made to argue that Jung is part of an alternative tradition to psychoanalysis with the emphasis of the non-Freudian psychological sources tending to predominate. A few earlier small-scale studies by Haule and Witzig highlighted the independent influence on Jung of Pierre Janet and the Geneva philosopher and psychologist, Théodore Flournoy (Haule 1983, 1984; Witzig 1982). Sonu Shamdasani has added to the status of Flournoy as an important influence on Jung in his introduction to the recent reprint of Flournoy's famous psychological study of a medium, *From India to the Planet Mars*, and elsewhere (Shamdasani 1994, 1998a). Eugene Taylor has underscored the influence of Janet and Flournoy and claimed them as part of a so-called French-Swiss-English-American axis with Frederick Myers and William James representing England and America respectively (Taylor 1996, 1980, 1998). All were deeply interested in spiritualism and psychical research, and are called upon to account for Jung's more favourable reading of the spiritual and parapsychological. In other words, these latter students of Jung's psychology would favour a pedigree that locates Jung's sources in a non-Freudian set of psychological influences that give a

positive reading of things transpersonal and are ideally independent of his encounter with Freud. The subsequent emergence of transpersonal psychology and the crucial role Jung has played in its development lends a certain weight to this argument (Cortright 1997).

Valuable as this line of enquiry might be, and while there are indications of the direct and significant influence of Janet and Flournoy on Jung, it has not yet been adequately demonstrated that a direct line exists from Myers to Jung, nor has the exact nature and extent of James's influence upon Jung been the subject of detailed study. Though this argument is promising it is also ambitious in claiming the right to be called 'the new Jung scholarship' whose chief assumption is that Freud had little or no influence upon Jung and that the future prospects of Jungian psychology lie in asserting its independence while aligning itself with transpersonal psychology and distancing itself from psychoanalysis.² This is up against a large consensus that the influence of Freud, though it is later, is far too obvious to justify such a claim. It is also up against a movement on the part of some Jungians to form an alliance with psychoanalysis.

Freud, Jung and their followers

In addition to the ongoing research into Jung's non-Freudian sources there are also Jungians who are more favourably disposed toward Freud and the neo-Freudians and who seek a *rapprochement* between psychoanalysis and analytical psychology. This group is more likely to stress Jung's Freudian connections and his anticipation of some of the recent moves in the psychoanalytical community in the direction of self psychology. It need not be said that Jung's spiritual interests are not overly emphasized by this group in spite of the fact that some contemporary psychoanalysts regard Freud's views on religion as too rigid (Meissner 1984). The concerns that these Jungians have are to strengthen an understanding of the psychology of childhood, one of the weakest areas of Jung's psychology. The clinical insights of the psychoanalytical community have proved to be of great value in this regard but the result has also been to play down or abandon parts of Jung's more far reaching metapsychology, by which I mean the spiritual or transpersonal dimension of his thought. There is also a decided reserve about the more usual Jungian tendency to mythologize Jung's life and achievement.

Little of this has found its way into a formal examination of Jung's life and the sources he drew upon, other than the occasional short article and interview, and must be seen instead in the revisions and adaptation of some of Jung's theory to the realities of the consulting room (Fordham 1975, 1978, 1995). Another clear indication of this orientation is the collaboration between these analytical psychologists and members of the psychoanalytic community in the form of meetings and jointly sponsored conferences. It is quite clear that the direction of this group of Jungians is to seek a reconciliation of Jung with post Freudian theory and practice and that, in their view, the future prospects

of analytical psychology lie in accomplishing this. To some degree they are aided by the realization on the part of some psychoanalysts that the salvation of psychoanalysis requires considerably less dogma and resistance to the demands of a more sophisticated clientèle and a coming to terms with the all too devastating recent criticism of Freud that underscores the limitations of his vision. In some respects this reinterpretation of both Jung and Freud marks a distancing from the founding fathers and may explain the lack of a formal interest in their lives and sources other than to sketch them as a background to more recent developments in theory and practice.

It is premature to anticipate the outcome of all these conflicting tendencies to read one set of influences as crucial to the formation of Jung's psychology. The reality seems more likely to be that Jung came under a number of influences and drew on a number of sources that were reworked by his own particular genius into a psychological interpretation that took the form of analytical psychology whose future prospects are unclear.³ Even though recent evidence has weighed in the direction of the influence of non-Freudian sources this should not be allowed to undermine the reality of Freud's influence on Jung. And if these are in tension with one another, or outrightly antagonistic, this should not persuade us that Jung was not at times drawn to one influence or the other. Nor should we overlook the fact that this suggests that Jung had a certain ambiguity about his own spiritual experiences and inclinations during his psychoanalytic period. In the end it was the intensity of Jung's relationship with Freud and subsequent breakdown that precipitated a crisis Jung only overcame with the creation of a new psychological perspective, albeit drawing on sources and experiences from his earlier life. It was only after this that Jung broke out on his own.

That Jung's new perspective was shorn of a proper psychology of childhood, a more realistic view of sexuality, and a few other shortcomings, should not surprise us. It seems clear that when Jung parted with Freud he retreated into his deeper interests that were transpersonal in nature and out of which came his theory of the collective unconscious, archetypes, and psychology of religion. Nor should it be overlooked that when the psychoanalytic community lost Jung they were in danger of severing their ties with a larger and common experience of things that transcend the immediate physical realities of life. This too has produced results, in particular the more than doubtful psychoanalytic reading of spirituality which seems to be rooted in Freud's own psychological development (Rizzuto 1998). In the end, it may be that the two tendencies in the Jungian community, to distance from Freud or to seek a reconciliation, reflect a certain division in Jung himself and this becomes clearer with a more careful and more sophisticated understanding of his personality.

Memories, Dreams, Reflections: autobiography or biography?

A very promising line of enquiry into Jung's personality has been a more detailed examination of the sources of Jung's life and thought, especially

Memories, Dreams, Reflections. Jung's secretary, Aniela Jaffé, is credited with recording and editing this work. Jaffé tells us in her introduction that Jung was a reluctant autobiographer and only warmed up to the project by and by. When he did he was moved to pen the first three chapters and two later ones. The rest of the book was assembled from interviews, unpublished writings, and a now published seminar that Jung gave, in 1925, entitled *Analytical Psychology* (1989). Furthermore, Ms Jaffé tells us, Jung went through the entire manuscript adding and making alterations here and there (Jung 1973, pp. v–xiv). Apart from the fact that the German edition and the English edition are not exactly the same, this is where the matter stood until recently (Muramoto 1987).

As the result of research conducted independently by Alan Elms and Sonu Shamdasani at the Countway Library of Harvard Medical School, which houses the original transcript used in the translation and an oral archive of interviews with Jungian insiders and in the archives on Jung at ETH-Bibliothek in Zürich and the Library of Congress, we now know there was further editing of the manuscript (Elms 1994; Shamdasani 1995). This editing consisted of expurgating undesirable references to certain persons and, in particular, Jung's mistress, Antonia Wolff, as well as an assortment of other changes. As Shamdasani states of what he discovered when he compared the editorial transcript with the published version of *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*:

not only whole chapters that were not published – such as an account of Jung's travels in London and Paris, and a chapter on William James – but also significant editing on almost every page.

(Shamdasani 1995, p. 123)

In editing her interviews with Jung, Jaffé selected only those items she deemed worthy of retention. It now seems that Jung made specific references in the original draft to his mother's neurotic hysteria and her dominance of his father. Clear allusions to the poverty of his childhood were more direct and painful. Letters between Jung and his wife were also removed as were references to her. Idiosyncratic references to Hitler, Billy Graham and others were also left out. The most notable exclusion is of Jung's associate and mistress Antonia Wolff. We find out that she was deeply involved with Jung during those fateful years (1913–16) when he experienced his free fall into the unconscious. In fact not only did they become intimate during this time but there are indications that she so merged her own fantasy life with Jung's as to make the final products inseparable. In spite of these tantalizing details much of what may have been intended for publication has all but disappeared. Apparently Jaffé intended to reconstruct and publish the account of Jung's relationship with Wolff but she died before this occurred.

The chapter on Freud in the transcript survived into the published edition of *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* and his presence to the exclusion of almost

anyone else ‘strengthens the Freudocentric reading of Jung’, according to Shamdasani (Shamdasani 1995, p. 125). The excluded chapter that was to follow on the Swiss psychologist, Théodore Flournoy, and William James softens the dramatic nature of the break between Freud and Jung and invites an alternative interpretation. It would seem that Jung leaned on Flournoy and James during this period, coming under their influence. This, in part, may account for the direction in which he took his psychology and the emphasis he placed on spiritual factors, similar to those present in his earlier preoccupations.

All the complex factors that influenced the assembling of *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* have not yet been disentangled, nor has the significance of the editorial changes made been precisely measured. And though it is difficult to explain some of the exclusions, toning down, softening and rendering more conventionally acceptable seem to have been the guiding intentions. This has resulted in ‘the auntification of Jung’ to borrow Elms’s felicitous phrase which had its origins in a comment by Jung when he realized the work was being tampered with (Elms 1994; Shamdasani 1995, p. 130). In terms of allocating blame, it now appears that it was Jung’s own immediate family and through the pressure that they exerted on Jaffé, often countered by Jung’s English translator R. F. C. Hull, that the majority of changes were made. Jaffé, who was to receive royalties from the work in lieu of a pension, may have been willing to comply with Jung’s family’s requests as Jung himself was becoming more feeble as he approached his own death, which occurred on June 6, 1961, sometime before the work was released.

There is also the additional factor of Jung’s own attitude to *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Though he made reference to it as ‘Aniela Jaffé’s work’, it is obvious that he wrote a number of the chapters himself, dictated others, and went over the rest, making changes here and there (Jung 1973, pp. vi–vii; Jung 1975, pp. 414, 550). He was also concerned enough about the work to elicit the aid of his English translator, R. F. C. Hull, to insure that the integrity of the text be preserved against a tendency to ‘auntify’ him. The changes that were made and Hull’s correspondence demonstrate that he was not always successful in acceding to Jung’s request. The complexities of its assembly and Jung’s denial in writing that *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* was his autobiography, has led Shamdasani to conclude that what ‘was indeed a remarkable biography has been mistakenly read as an autobiography’ (Shamdasani 1995, p. 133).

In the light of Jung’s own direct involvement in the creation of *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, it is difficult to sustain Shamdasani’s final judgement. Alan Elms’s own reading of Jung’s behaviour published in his *Uncovering Lives* (1994) is more psychologically suggestive. He argues persuasively that Jung was ambiguous about his ‘autobiography’ as he was ambiguous about his own life, unable to reconcile two tendencies in himself that had a long history going back to what he called his personality No. 1 and No. 2. As Jung remarked, ‘I am what I am – a thankless autobiographer’ (Jung 1975, p. 453). In other

words it is not inconceivable that Jung's desire to disclose the personal details about himself in his honest and sometimes coarse portrayal was only possible when an equally reticent tendency could be secure in the attitude he must have known his more bourgeois family would take when time came for publication. One assurance that Jung required was that it not be published while he was alive (Jung 1973, p. viii). Jaffé cites Jung's explanation:

I have guarded this material all my life, and have never wanted it exposed to the world; for if it is assailed, I shall be affected even more than in the case of my other books. I do not know whether I shall be so far removed from this world that the arrows of criticism will no longer reach me and that I shall be able to bear the adverse reactions ... The 'autobiography' is my life, viewed in the light of the knowledge I have gained from my scientific endeavours. Both are one, and therefore this book makes great demands on people who do not know or cannot understand my scientific ideas. My life has been in a sense the quintessence of what I have written, not the other way around ... Thus the 'autobiography' is merely the dot on the i.

(Jung 1973, p. xii)

In fact, the editing process continued through a number of printings coming to a final end in 1973. That the integrity of this document should now be called into question is a matter of some importance for any understanding of Jung and his psychology and it is to be hoped that the full story will be reconstructed by some diligent scholar detective.

As significant as this line of investigation is, it is also necessary to account for the spiritual preoccupations at the heart of Jung's life and thought and enshrined in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, as it seems that this is what has moved many of Jung's students and readers, creating for him an increasingly wider audience for his ideas. The impact *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* has achieved, as much as it is a bowdlerized account, also has to do with its importance as a spiritual document of our time. It is the capstone of the emerging myth of the founder of Jungian psychology, the first to be crafted in the Jungian style. Myth dominates. Whether this myth as presented in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* is seen as a unifying force in a complex life or as a fiction tyrannizing the facts of that same life into submission, is a matter of some debate.

In and out of the Jungian community *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* is viewed as Jung's testament to his inner life and to the myth of consciousness that emerged from that life and took the incarnate form of Jungian psychology. Here are some of Jung's dreams and visions, his confrontation with the unconscious and his victory of self-realization, written in a manner and style that has enticed so many readers to sense in Jung's journey something of momentous importance. People and places are few and far between and when they do surface they too must yield to the will of Jung's accumulating vision which finally unfolds into myth, the myth that human life is to add to the

consciousness of God. If Jaffé was the scribe, a glance at Jung's later published works and letters indicates he was the inspired source.

Moreover, as an autobiographical document purporting to come from Jung it has served as the skeleton upon which all biographies have fleshed out their particular understanding of Jung's life and thought. If all the details are not there or in their intended order we are still left with having to account for its impact, for its attraction to biographers, for the power of the myth that it offers. Here we are faced with questions that escape biography proper and ramify into issues of religious change and the spiritual impoverishment, if not bankruptcy, of our times alongside which Jung juxtaposes the myth of consciousness at the heart of his psychology. In addition to all the contextualization and bourgeois concerns about Jung's candidness and their implications, it is also this spiritual dimension, so negatively judged by Freud and his followers and so central to Jung's psychology, that must be addressed if we are to understand Jung.

In the end Jung has not yet found his biographer nor has the issue raised by Homans as to why Jung and his psychology have found such a receptive audience been properly addressed in spite of the various attempts. New biographies of Jung will, no doubt, be written.⁴ In addition to marshalling the accumulating details about Jung's life and thought, whether and how these biographies will address the question of Jung's spiritual life and his myth we do not know. It might be in one of these Jung will have found his biographer and we will be able not only to see him more clearly within the context of his times but also to understand how it is that his myth has spoken to so many today.

TRANSLATIONS OF ABSTRACT

Un changement s'est opéré dans la tendance à associer Jung et Freud; ils sont de plus en plus considérés comme les fondateurs de deux écoles de psychologie des profondeurs dont la relation exacte n'est pas claire. La séparation entre les deux a été largement due au rejet de Jung par la communauté psychanalytique du fait des inclinations de celui-ci perçues comme spirituelles. Des études récentes se sont penchées sur ces inclinations spirituelles d'une manière positive et négative, et ont mis en lumière des sources non freudiennes de Jung; en même temps d'autres praticiens jungiens cherchent un rapprochement avec la psychanalyse. Ce développement conflictuel est lié à des tendances qui se trouvent chez Jung lui-même, évidentes dans sa propre vie et dans la recherche qui sous-tend l'écriture et la publication de *Ma vie, mémoires, rêves, et pensées*. Bien que le statut d'autobiographie de Jung concernant l'ouvrage cité ci-dessus soit mis en question, il reste la nécessité d'expliquer le mythe de la vie de Jung incrusté dans ce texte et l'impact que ceci a eu sur un public cherchant un sens dans un temps de changements considérables.

Die Neigung, Jung mit Freud zu assoziieren, hat einen Wandel durchlaufen; beide werden zunehmend als Gründer tiefenpsychologischer Schulen gesehen, deren genaue

Beziehung zueinander unklar bleibt. Die Trennung der beiden geschah wesentlich durch Jungs Ablehnung von seiten der psychoanalytischen Gemeinschaft aufgrund seiner angenommenen spiritualistischen Neigungen. Die neuere Forschung hat diese spiritualistischen Neigungen in sowohl positiver als auch negativer Weise unterstrichen und hat Jung's nicht-Freudianische Ursprünge ans Licht gebracht, während andere Jungianische Praktiker eine dichtere Assoziation mit der Psychoanalyse suchen. Diese konflikthaftes Entwicklung steht in Verbindung mit Tendenzen in Jung selber, die offensichtlich werden aus seinem Leben und durch Forschung hinsichtlich des Verfassens und Publizierens von Erinnerungen, Träume, Gedanken. Obgleich der Status des letzteren als Jungs Autobiographie infrage gestellt wurde, bleibt doch die Notwendigkeit der Erklärung des Mythus von Jungs Leben, der dort vergraben ist und der Wirkung, welche dies hatte für eine Öffentlichkeit auf der Suche nach Sinn in einer Zeit beträchtlichen Wandels.

C'è stato un mutamento nella tendenza ad associare Jung e Freud, ed entrambi sono sempre più considerati come fondatori di scuole di psicologia del profondo la cui relazione non è del tutto chiara. La separazione fra i due fu in gran parte dovuta al rifiuto che Jung subì da parte della comunità psicoanalitica per via delle sue inclinazioni spirituali. Studi recenti hanno enfatizzato tali inclinazioni spirituali sia in senso negativo che positivo e hanno messo in luce le basi non-freudiane di Jung, mentre altri studiosi junghiani sono alla ricerca di una maggiore comunanza con la psicoanalisi. Tale sviluppo del conflitto è dovuto alle tendenze dello stesso Jung che sono evidenti nella sua vita e alle ricerche condotte sul suo libro. "Sogni, ricordi, riflessioni". Sebbene quest'ultimo sia stato chiamato in questione proprio in quanto autobiografia, resta la necessità di spiegare il mito della vita di Jung celato lì dentro e l'impatto che esso ha avuto su un pubblico alla ricerca di un significato in un tempo di notevole cambiamenti.

La tendencia a asociar a Jung con Freud ha realizado un cambio, y ambos son percibidos como fundadores de escuelas de psicología profunda cuya exacta relación no está muy clara. La separación de ellos dos fue largamente ocasionada por el rechazo de la comunidad psicoanalítica debido a sus conocidas inclinaciones espirituales. Recientes estudios han enfatizado estas inclinaciones espirituales en ambas formas negativas y positivas y han traído a la luz fuentes no-Freudianas de Jung, mientras que otros analistas Junguianos buscan una asociación mas cercana con el psicoanálisis. Este desarrollo conflictivo se encuentra en relación con tendencias dentro del mismo Jung que son evidentes en su propia vida y en investigaciones escondidas en la escritura y publicación 'Recuerdos, Sueños y Pensamientos'. Aún cuando el status de este último como autobiografía ha sido cuestionado, perdura la necesidad de explicar el mito de la vida de Jung ensalzada allí y el impacto que ella ha tenido en la visión del público que busca significado en una época de cambios considerables.

Notes

1. Frederick Crews et al., 1995. Crews' articles, now published in book form, first appeared in the *New York Review of Books* in 1993–94 creating quite a stir. He cites most of the relevant material up to the date of the book and is responded to by many

of his critics. His *Unauthorized Freud* (1998) takes the argument a step further by gathering between the covers a collection of some of the most trenchant criticisms of Freud.

2. These ambitions are obvious in the tone of Taylor's articles on the so-called New Jung Scholarship (see Taylor 1996, 1998).
3. We should not overlook the part 'the institution' played in the development of Jung's thought however original it might appear to be as Loewenberg (1995) has recently pointed out in his study of the Burghölzli during the period 1902–1904, bringing a number of previous unpublished remarks of Jung's to light.
4. Deirdre Bair, the well known literary biographer, is due to release a much anticipated biography of Jung, and Sonu Shamdasani has promised delivery in the near future of a major intellectual biography of Jung he has been working on for the past decade.

References

- Baudouin, C. (1963). *L'Oeuvre de Jung*. Paris: Payot.
- Bennet, E. A. (1961). *C. G. Jung*. New York: E. P. Dutton.
- Bishop, P. (1995). *The Dionysian Self: C. G. Jung's Reception of Nietzsche*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Brome, V. (1978). *Jung: Man and Myth*. London: Macmillan.
- Charet, F. X. (1993). *Spiritualism and the Foundations of C.G. Jung's Psychology*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Clarke, J. J. (1994). *Jung and Eastern Thought*. London: Routledge.
- Cortright, B. (1997). *Psychotherapy and Spirit: Theory and Practice in Transpersonal Psychotherapy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Coward, H. (1985). *Jung and Eastern Thought*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Crews, F. et al. (1995). *The Memory Wars: Freud's Legacy in Dispute*. New York: The New York Review of Books.
- (ed.) (1998). *Unauthorized Freud*. New York: Viking.
- Eissler, Kurt. (1993). *Three Instances of Injustice*. Madison: International Universities Press.
- Ellenberger, H. (1970). *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books.
- Elms, A. (1994). *Uncovering Lives: The Uneasy Alliance of Biography and Psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ferguson, M. (1980). *The Aquarian Conspiracy: Personal and Social Transformation in the 1980s*. Los Angeles: J. P. Tarcher.
- Fordham, M. (1975). 'Memories and thoughts about C. G. Jung'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 20, 102–13.
- (1978). *Jungian Psychotherapy*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- (1995). *Freud, Jung, Klein: the Fenceless Field*. London: Routledge.
- Freud, S. (1957). 'On the History of the Psycho-analytic Movement (1914)'. In *A History of the Psycho-analytic Movement, Papers on Metapsychology and Other Works (1914–1916)*. SE XIV.
- Gallant, C. (1996). *Tabooed Jung*. New York: New York University Press.
- Gay, P. (1988). *Freud: A Life for Our Time*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Glover, E. (1950). *Freud or Jung*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Hannah, B. (1976). *Jung: His Life and Work*. New York: Putnam.
- Haule, J. R. (1983). 'Archetype and Integration: Exploring the Janetian Roots of Analytical Psychology'. *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 28, 253–67.

- (1984). 'From Somnambulism to the Archetypes: The French Roots of Jung's Split with Freud'. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 71, 635–59.
- Homans, P. (1995). *Jung in Context*. 2nd ed. University of Chicago: Chicago.
- Jaffé, A. (1972). *From the Life and Work of C. G. Jung*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Jones, E. (1955). *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*. Vol 2. New York: Basic Books.
- Jung, C. G. (1970). 'On the Psychology and Pathology of So-Called Occult Phenomena (1902)'. CW 3.
- (1973). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, ed. Aniela Jaffé. New York: Vintage Books.
- (1975). *Letters*. Vol 2, eds. Gerhard Adler & Aniela Jaffé. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1977). *C. G. Jung Speaking*, ed. William McGuire & R. F. C. Hull. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1983). *The Zofingia Lectures (1896–99)*. CW. Supplementary Volume A.
- (1988). *Nietzsche's Zarathustra (1934–39)*, ed. J. L. Jarrett. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1989). *Analytical Psychology (1925)*, ed. William McGuire. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1996). *The Psychology of Kundalini Yoga (1932)*, ed. S. Shamdasani. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- & Freud, S. (1974). *The Freud/Jung Letters*, ed. William McGuire. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kelly, S. (1993). *Individuation and the Absolute. Hegel, Jung, and the Path Toward Wholeness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Lammers, A. C. (1994). *In God's Shadow: The Collaboration of Victor White and C. G. Jung*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Loewenberg, P. (1995). *Fantasy and Reality in History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Maidenbaum, A. & Martin, S. A. (eds.) (1991). *Lingering Shadows: Jungians, Freudians, and Anti-Semitism*. Boston: Shambala.
- Meissner, W. W. (1984). *Psychoanalysis and Religious Experience*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- McLynn, F. (1996). *Jung*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Muramoto, S. (1987). 'Completing the Memoirs: The Passages Omitted or Transposed in the English and Japanese Versions of Jung's Autobiography'. *Spring*. 47, 163–72.
- Nagy, M. (1991). *Philosophical Issues in the Psychology of C. G. Jung*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Noll, R. (1994). *The Jung Cult*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1997). *The Aryan Christ: The Secret Life of Carl Jung*. New York: Random House.
- Rizzuto, A.-M. (1998). *Why Did Freud Reject God?* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Samuels, A. (1985). *Jung and the Post-Jungians*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- (1996). 'Jung's return from banishment'. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 83, 469–89.
- Schoenl, W. (1998). *C. G. Jung: His Friendships with Mary Mellon and J. B. Priestley*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron.
- Shamdasani, S. (1994). 'Introduction' to Théodore Flournoy, *From India to the Planet Mars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1995). 'Memories, Dreams, Omissions'. *Spring*, 57, 115–37.
- (1998a). 'From Geneva to Zürich: Jung and French Switzerland'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 43, 115–26.

- (1998b). *Cult Fictions: C. G. Jung and the Founding of Analytical Psychology*. London: Routledge.
- Stern, P. (1976). *C. G. Jung: The Haunted Prophet*. New York: George Braziller.
- Stevens, A. (1994). *Jung*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Storr, A. (1973). *Jung*. London: Fontana.
- Taylor, E. I. (1980). 'William James and C. G. Jung'. *Spring*, 39, 157–68.
- (1996). 'The New Jung Scholarship'. *The Psychoanalytic Review*, 83, 546–68.
- (1998). 'Jung before Freud, not Freud before Jung: the reception of Jung's work in American psychoanalytic circles between 1904 and 1909'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 43, 97–114.
- Van der Post, L. (1975). *Jung and the Story of our Time*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Von Franz, M.-L. (1975). *C. G. Jung: His Myth in Our Time*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Wehr, G. (1987). *Jung: A Biography*. Boston: Shambala.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1964). 'Review of *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*'. *The International Journal of Psycho-analysis*, 45, 450–5.
- Witzig, J. S. (1982). 'Théodore Flournoy – A Friend Indeed'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 27, 131–48.
- Wolin, R. (1997). 'Prometheus Unhinged: Review of *The Aryan Christ: The Secret Life of Carl Jung* by Richard Noll'. *The New Republic*, October 1997, 27–34.

[MS first received April 1999, final version October 1999]