

FREUD, JUNG, AND PASTORAL PSYCHOTHERAPY: UNEASY BEDFELLOWS
(OR: “WHAT’S A NICE FREUDIAN LIKE YOU
DOING IN A COUNSELING MODALITY LIKE THIS?”)

Pamela Cooper-White, Columbia Theological Seminary

Draft only: please do not cite without permission.

Abstract

The integration of psychology and religion/spirituality may seem obvious in pastoral counseling circles. As Jonte-Pace, Parsons, Jones, McDargh, and others have cautioned, the spiritual and the psychological cannot be conflated uncritically.

The year 2009 marks the 100th anniversary of the visit of Freud and Jung to Clark University, and the subsequent infusion of psychoanalytic ideas into pastoral care and psychology. On this anniversary, it seems appropriate to explore how, a century later, we “stand in the spaces” between theology and psychoanalytic thought.

The paper will deconstruct both an uncritical rejection of Freud’s writings, and a naïve appropriation of Jung’s apparently more spiritual psychology. Using further comparison with object relations and relational theory, I will argue that it is on methodological grounds we may find the most traction for pastoral psychotherapy. By standing in this tension, we discover a messier but fruitful realm of relationality and flux--congruent with our postmodern time.

I enter a doctor’s consulting room to arrange for my surgery. I am dismayed when he tells me that this will be a very long procedure. The anesthesiologist has said that I will have to be under for a very long time.

This was my “initial dream”¹ when I entered analysis in 1991 with a Jungian analyst who incorporated a rich blend of Jungian and British object relations theory and technique.² I had recently made the decision to re-enter ordained ministry after a period of disengagement (coinciding with exploration of other unfinished vocational avenues). I had engaged in a number of years of solid, ego-psychology oriented pastoral

Cooper-White: Freud, Jung, and Pastoral Psychotherapy

counseling. But the dream was clear: to get further on this journey of psychological and spiritual discernment, it was necessary to “go under” (at least, as I thought of it then—I have since critiqued the metaphor of “depth” in favor of a postmodern relational understanding of the unconscious as spatially dispersed, not simply an archaeological dig “downward.”³). Nothing less and nothing easier would do. So I came to the work of pastoral psychotherapy, both as patient and later as therapist, with the assumption that psychological growth and spiritual formation—the dimension that distinguishes pastoral psychology from all other secular psychologies—belong together.

Pastoral counseling and psychotherapy are identified with this assumption—in fact it is precisely this “integration” that historically distinguished pastoral counseling from the “secular” therapeutic professions, (although this distinction has recently been challenged by a new interest among social workers, psychologists, and even some psychoanalysts in spirituality as a social-scientific category).

Such integration of psychology and religion, or spirituality, may seem obvious in pastoral counseling circles. There is much denial, however, and some amount of fancy footwork, necessary in maintaining this belief, particularly among those of us who claim a psychoanalytic theoretical orientation. I have never found it so easy to reconcile psychology with theology or religious belief. Once one moves beyond the general practice of pastoral counseling and the often comfortable, supportive realm of parish pastoral care toward a psychoanalytic/psychodynamic approach, specific schools of psychoanalytic theory begin to compete and conflict both with a Christian identity and with each other. As Jonte-Pace, Parsons, Jones, McDargh, and others have cautioned for over a decade, the spiritual and the psychological cannot be conflated quite so easily or uncritically.⁴

The most obvious contradiction would seem to lie between Freud’s seemingly resolute atheism, still espoused by many classical analysts today, and any religious or spiritual perspective. Many pastoral counselors, wishing for a more spiritual approach, gravitate toward C.G. Jung because of his apparently more spiritual perspective. But the task of integrating a Christian identity with “depth” psychology is not really so simple as to trade in a more supposedly atheistic Freudian point of view for a Jungian one in the interests of incorporating the spiritual dimension into psychotherapy.

Freud

On one hand, Freud is not quite as pure an antagonist—or at least, a more ambivalent one toward religion or spirituality than is popularly thought.⁵ Regarding Freud only as an antagonist is a fundamentalist approach to Freud. It takes too literally certain statements in his writings, such as his scorn for any inherently human “oceanic religious feeling” apart from infantile wish fulfillment,⁶ or his analysis of Moses as a father-figure in an oedipal struggle writ large in Hebrew history.⁷ As Bettelheim and others have pointed out,⁸ Freud himself embodied a split between the scientific materialist, (the aspect evident in most of his writing, which was for a scientific audience⁹), vs. the nineteenth century romantic with a strong interest in culture¹⁰ and in the paranormal¹¹—the Freud more subtly revealed in his actual work as a therapist,¹² in

biographies,¹³ and in correspondence, for example, Freud's respectful, even admiring 30-year correspondence with the Swiss pastor Oskar Pfister.¹⁴

A strong ethic, albeit a rather somber, pessimistic one emphasizing the virtue of renunciation, and shorn of any religious origins, is discernible in Freud's writings, as well as a Jewish regard for reciprocity and respect for the dignity of others.¹⁵ As Phillip Rieff famously put it, the atheist Freud had the "mind of a moralist."¹⁶ Freud's Judaism could also be seen as a palimpsest in both his hermeneutical method—the seeking out of latent meanings in manifest material, revealed through linguistic techniques and open to alternative interpretations¹⁷—as well as many of the philosophical and religious assumptions particularly in his cultural writings.¹⁸ Edward Said points to the "irremediably diasporic, unhoused character" of the post-exilic Jewish community as a source for Freud's own resistance toward easy palliatives, whether political or religious.¹⁹ Freud's ethic derived, rather, from a sense of human solidarity founded in a tragic realism regarding human fallibility, desire, and identity complexity.

Freud's critiques of religion tended to caricature some of the worst of Judaeo-Christianity's authoritarianism, its denigration of the body—particularly sexuality, and its disregard for insights from psychology and science.²⁰ Freud objected to religion as an institutionalization of the oedipal conflict and a paternalistic demand on the part of religious authority for infantile, blind obedience to an irrationally moralistic superego rather than a means of rational moral decision-making²¹—an "ethical realism" which Reinhold Niebuhr later affirmed (although as a Christian theologian Niebuhr retained the religious language of sin and redemption which Freud had rejected).²²

Freud was interested in the feeling of the "uncanny" (das *Unheimlich*), identifying it linguistically as the opposite of the familiar, the "homelike" (*heimlich*).²³ The uncanny arouses dread, and in Freud's discussion seems especially to tread in a region in which the distinction between the living and the dead becomes blurred. Freud describes a paradox, that the uncanny, the unhomelike, is always dimly perceived as secretly familiar, because it represents a return of repressed infantile fears, and the magical thinking that accompanied them. Thus ghosts and spirits are re-projected onto current reality, as Freud wrote in his essay "The Uncanny," when infantile dread is re-evoked by "silence, solitude, and darkness...elements in the production of the infantile anxiety from which the majority of human beings have never become quite free."²⁴ "The distinction between imagination and reality is effaced, as when something that we have hitherto regarded as imaginary appears before us in reality, or when a symbol takes over the full functions of the thing it symbolizes."²⁵ Freud similarly rejected a tendency he found in religious believers to concretize religious symbols and metaphors as fixed realities, and further characterized religion as an immature delusion of consolation and gratification of infantile wishes, rather than a mature renunciation of the pleasure principle.²⁶

Many of the same critiques have been vigorously prosecuted (though not necessarily using Freud's theoretical language) by theologians and religious leaders within organized religion, and not only in the modern era. As Kirk Bingham recently suggested, persons of faith can persist in belief, "living in the tension" between religious faith and the psychoanalytic disposition to question:²⁷

Cooper-White: Freud, Jung, and Pastoral Psychotherapy

...[B]elievers, unlike the helpless child who must ultimately capitulate to the stronger oedipal father, have the capacity to imagine something better. We can either settle for an unreflective and insular religious faith of the first naïveté [citing Ricoeur], or we can choose to expose our faith to a hermeneutics of suspicion, which invariably opens the door to a postcritical religious faith of the 'second naïveté.' This...corresponds to...the supreme choice facing every person of faith, namely, whether or not to update and transform our psychical image of God.

Freud also advocated that the best preparation for becoming a psychoanalyst was a broad, interdisciplinary background not only in science and psychology, but in the humanities, literature, history, and the arts.²⁸ Freud repudiated the trappings and language of religion and spirituality, perhaps as some have suggested due to his own early object relations and unconscious associations to religion, the oceanic, and a fear of the maternal,²⁹ but he did, in fact, value much of what contemporary pastoral theologians and therapists would consider to be pertinent to the spiritual domain.

Jung

On the other hand, Jung offers no easy panacea for a pastoral psychotherapist.³⁰ Jung has sometimes been appropriated by theologians, pastoral counselors, and spiritual directors as a bridge figure between psychoanalysis and religion.³¹ "Transpersonal psychology," an outgrowth of Jungian analytic psychology and the human potential movement (e.g., Abraham Maslow's "self-actualization"³²), is particularly appealing to some because of its focus on Jung's idea that the edges of consciousness open out toward universal human consciousness and the transcendent. Quoting from the web site of the Institute for Transpersonal Psychology in Palo Alto, California:³³

Transpersonal Psychology is a psychology of health and human potential. While recognising and addressing human psychopathology, transpersonal psychology does not derive its model of the human psyche from the ill or diseased. Transpersonal psychology looks to saints, prophets, great artists, heroes, and heroines for models of full human development and of the growth-oriented nature of the normal human psyche... Another way of putting this is that the personality is, by design, the vessel or vehicle which enables the soul and spirit to navigate through the world. Thus, the proper role of the personality is to be a translucent window, a servant to divinity within.

However, Jung's attitude toward organized religion *per se*, particularly the constricted moralistic Christianity of his own Protestant upbringing as a Swiss minister's son, was conflicted at best.³⁴ This bias reflects both Jung's longing for personal authenticity over against blind obedience to external authorities, and his frustration in particular with western Christian institutions. It has, however, filtered

into some contemporary Jungian practice as a (sometimes quite unconscious) privileging, and often romanticization, of Eastern spiritual practices and symbols, and a reverence for ancient pre-Christian mythology, while de-valuing, ignoring or even denigrating western Judeo-Christian images and stories. This may be overcome as an individual practitioner, by choosing elements of Jung's writings that are compatible, re-mythologizing Judeo-Christian symbols,³⁵ as in the earlier writings of Victor Turner (a Dominican priest who initially corresponded collaboratively with Jung much as Oscar Pfister corresponded admiringly with Freud)³⁶, and the work of Episcopal priest and Jungian analyst John Sanford.³⁷

However, there remains a significant conflict between Jung's thought and mainstream Christian doctrine, originating in Jung's own critique of Christianity. For example, there is a profound dissonance between Jung's concept of the archetype of Wholeness vs. Christianity's moral emphasis on *purity and goodness*. Jung conceived of the process of maturation, which he called "individuation,"³⁸ as a journey toward wholeness. It requires the bringing to consciousness and embracing of the "Shadow"³⁹—aspects of the Self (often imaged in Jungian psychology as the dark, the primitive, the ugly) that are disavowed, disowned, displaced. Even God, Jung posited in *Answer to Job*, must have a Shadow if God is to be whole.⁴⁰ This is perhaps nowhere better exemplified in Jung's writings than in the famous fantasy image he recorded from his own childhood:

I gathered all my courage, as though I were about to leap forthwith into hell-fire, and let the thought come. I saw before me the cathedral, the blue sky. God sits on His golden throne, high above the world - and from under the throne an enormous turd falls upon the sparkling new roof, shatters it, and breaks the walls of the cathedral asunder.⁴¹

In his struggle to free himself from the constraints of his father's rigid Protestantism, Jung faced a terrifying possibility: even God shits. God for the boy Jung was a maddening paradox: "God alone was real—an annihilating fire and an indescribable grace."⁴² This ambiguous view of God's nature flew in the face of his father's rigid Christian convictions that God was omnipotent, pure goodness, and that the goal of Christian living was purity and obedience.

This Christian drive toward purity and perfection is peculiar when one considers the gore and anguish of human existence actually depicted in both the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament, and is not very compatible with the gospel narratives of Jesus' own life and grisly death. But a Platonic mind-body split emerges in the Bible in Paul's Greek writings, and it pervaded patristic and medieval Christianity.⁴³ It comes down to us again in the pietistic fervor of some of the reformers, not only in the 16th century, but later in the passionate evangelical desire for "perfection," expounded, for example, by Wesley and Edwards.⁴⁴ Can one remain a Christian, with all that Christianity has come to mean historically, and still embrace the terrifying ambiguities of the God of Scripture? This was at the heart of Jung's personal quest in childhood: what kind of

God could be vast enough to contain even the worst imperfections of creation, and still bring forth good?

Jung's attitude toward the question of God's existence represented a departure from Freud's defensive atheism. Jung was agnostic about the question of God's objective existence, but remained open to the traces of the divine in the subjective experience of psychic life.⁴⁵ For Jung, the image of God was an archetypal symbol,⁴⁶ stemming from the collective unconscious (for Jung, the "deepest" layer or deposit of shared human images throughout history, accessible to every individual via the outer edges of the personal unconscious). The God archetype was closely related to the archetype of Wholeness and its related form, the archetype of the Self.⁴⁷ He defined the Self as much larger than the conscious ego⁴⁸ (derived from Freud), which is really only a small part of the total person. In this schema, the ego performs an important executive function, but tends to regard itself as more central than it actually is. The outer boundaries of the Self are transpersonal, contiguous with all other persons, and across generations, even centuries. The Self contains aspects of the 'collective unconscious,'⁴⁹ the accumulated deposit of knowledge, wisdom, and patterning of experience shared among all humanity. At its outer edges, Jung believed, the Self flows into the divine.

Jung viewed Christ as an archetypal symbol for the Self⁵⁰ (as was the Buddha,⁵¹ and other non-personal religious symbols such as the Mandala⁵²), bridging the individual and the divine. This was related for Jung to the call of the Self for "individuation," which Jung further perceived to be represented by the symbols of transformation in the Christian Eucharist.⁵³ Individuation thus incorporated a relational, moral quality. Jung believed that by bringing the unconscious to awareness, and owning the Shadow dimension of oneself, one could withdraw the projections of evil that one had assigned unconsciously to the external world, thereby refraining from demonizing others.⁵⁴ (This process psychologically is not unlike the movement described in Kleinian theory from the infantile splitting of the "paranoid schizoid position"⁵⁵ (in which negative psychic contents are projected onto or even into other persons), to the "depressive position" (in which one is able to psychically hold good and bad together, acknowledging one's own hunger and aggression and mourning one's omnipotent fantasies of perfect goodness and omnivorous control).

The reality of God was, for Jung, a psychic reality, founded in collective human experience, and therefore beyond any sort of empirically grounded debate.⁵⁶ The divine was psychological phenomenon, as manifested in the personal experience of individuals over centuries and across cultures. Jung claimed his own personal acquaintance with "the numinous or divine,"⁵⁷ while demurring both from the abstract philosophical question of God's "physical existence," and from the question of personal faith or personal belief. For Jung, God was a matter of subjective knowledge through personal, psychological experience. It was in this sense that Jung said in a radio interview in 1955, "All that I have learned has led me step by step to an unshakeable conviction of the existence of God. I only believe what I know. And that eliminates believing. Therefore I do not take his existence on belief—I know that He exists."⁵⁸ It is likely that the long-awaited publication next month of *The Red Book*,⁵⁹ Jung's personal record of his experiments in "active imagination," which appear to have tested the boundaries

Cooper-White: Freud, Jung, and Pastoral Psychotherapy

between brilliance and madness, will reveal more of Jung's most personal reflections and experiences of both the divine and the demonic.

The subjective nature of Jung's construction of the divine has prompted a further critique, particularly from theologians. In Jung's own time, Martin Buber stated that Jung's "new psychology protest that is 'no world-view but a science,' [and yet] it no longer contents itself with the role of an interpreter of religion. It proclaims the new religion, the only one which can still be true, the religion of pure psychic immanence."⁶⁰ Buber objected to a psychological reductionism he found in Jung's writing, a kind of Gnosticism in which transcendence and faith was sacrificed to "knowledge."⁶¹

Our colleagues Don Browning and Terry Cooper, among others, are also critical of a close parallel between analytical psychology and the human potential movement—the optimism inherent in both, that the human being is naturally being drawn toward growth, including moral development. Browning and Cooper have written:⁶²

Jung failed to understand the deeper levels of anxiety and inordinate self-concern and how these facts of human nature invalidate all uncomplicated harmonistic metaphysics and the philosophical ethical egoisms that follow from them... [I]n the thought of Jung, both the moral selectivity of the individuation process and the redemption of the transcendent function give rise to an image of self-fulfillment that does not go beyond the ethical-egoist actualization of one's own unique potentials.

This critique has a particularly American, Protestant ring to it, as it focuses on the 20th century problem of individuation as rampant individualism, and targets the human potential movement as tending toward a "culture of narcissism." In my view, Jung was not so much hampered by what to our 20th century American eyes looks like subjectivism (although this caution is warranted), as by his own 19th century cultural and philosophical context—the pre-World War European confidence in progress (including the individual). Both Freud and Jung viewed psychoanalysis/analytic psychology as liberative tools freeing human beings from the grip of unconscious motivations.

Just as Freud was embedded in a modernist paradigm, continually striving to prove his credibility as a scientific rationalist, Jung was embedded in a *premodern* Platonic paradigm of ideal dichotomous forms (Anima/Animus, Self/Shadow, etc.) eternally being manifested in partial, dichotomous, earthly representations. Like Freud, Jung was also striving along heroic lines to promote enlightenment and a form of rationalism that, while departing from Freud's own orthodoxy, nevertheless was grounded in a desire to confront unthinking obedience to authorities, whether religious, philosophical, or scientific. Jung shared Freud's confidence in the freedom, including moral freedom, that could be bestowed by recognizing, plumbing, and exploring the depths of the unconscious.

It would be an injustice to accuse either Freud or Jung of simplistic thinking—reading their original works reveals tremendous breadth, complexity, and also social concern.

Cooper-White: Freud, Jung, and Pastoral Psychotherapy

Freud, his daughter Anna, and others of their circle viewed psychoanalysis as a means toward promoting social justice,⁶³ and Jung saw the raising of the unconscious to consciousness, and the withdrawing of projections onto the other as evil, as a way toward world peace.⁶⁴ Yet, it is useful from a postmodern vantage point to deconstruct a certain historically bound and culture-constrained naïveté—or at least, perhaps, unfounded optimism—wedded to the heroic, self-confident colonialism that inheres in both men's theories. And there is something naively troubling about Jung's departure from Freud's insistence on attention to life lived in the body, with all its struggles and inherent moral conflicts, and the basic motivational drives of sex and aggression. Jung, therefore, cannot be uncritically adapted or appropriated by pastoral psychotherapists as an easy antidote to Freud.

I would argue, regarding Freud and Jung taken together, that it is on *methodological* grounds we may find the most traction for pastoral psychotherapy. As I have argued elsewhere,⁶⁵ I am proposing that we maintain—and maintain the tension between—both Freud's hermeneutic of suspicion, and Jung's sensing of the numinous. Freud's skepticism, and Jung's openness to unexplained phenomena and the spiritual realm, are most helpful to a 21st century pastoral theologian and psychotherapist if taken together. Their theories of religion, its origins, meaning, and function, and their reflections on human constructions of the divine, deserve continued attention. Both theoretical traditions are entwined in our psychological inheritance, including the sub-discipline of the psychology of religion. Both offer useful deconstructive (analytic) methods (even when we do not agree with their conclusions) that search beyond the surfaces of things, and stand in opposition to the easy answers, superficial consolations, and demonizing of the "other" that may arise from uncritical religious belief. Both also engage in exploration of human experiences of the uncanny, the mysterious, and (at least for Jung) the divine.

The tension between Freud and Jung, and their very personal oedipal conflict, is a *relational* tension. It is in such a relational space, even as an arena of conflict, I would argue, and not in coming down firmly on one side of their debate or the other, that our own wrestling with the tension between religion and psychology, theology and psychology, can be most fruitfully played out. This is not to argue for the 19th century solution of resolving a dialectic by somehow discovering a transcendent or over-arching solution that encompasses both sides. It is, rather, a shift from the need for "a" solution to the embrace of the tension itself, a shift from content to process, from knowledge (in the form of certainty) to relationship.

Ever the preacher's son, Jung struggled inconclusively throughout his life to reconcile the competing healing claims of psychology and religion. Jungian analyst Murray Stein has even argued that Jung was not interested in demolishing Christianity, but rather, healing it from its historic complexes and transforming it "along lines compatible with the Jungian therapeutic,"⁶⁶ encouraging "the development within Christianity of a kind of Hinduistic spirit of ecumenical tolerance for every conceivable image of God and for every possible expression of the self."⁶⁷ In Jung's essay "Psychotherapists or the Clergy?" he offered the following concluding paragraph:⁶⁸

The *living spirit* grows and even outgrows its earlier forms of *expression* [a reference to both religion and psychotherapy]; it freely chooses the men [sic] who proclaim it and in whom it lives. This living spirit is eternally renewed and pursues its goal in manifold and inconceivable ways throughout the history of mankind. Measured against it, the names and forms which men have given it mean very little; they are only the changing leaves and blossoms on the stem of the eternal tree. (emphasis added)

Although Jung's emphasis here was on a singular spirit, the numinous or the divine as it manifested itself in ever-changing images and symbols of the human imagination across cultures and centuries, it is the relationality of the word *expression* I want to highlight here. I would propose that by "standing in the (perhaps multiple) spaces"⁶⁹ *between* Freud's atheism and Jung's archetypal theories, in the realm of expression itself, we may discover a more messy but fruitful realm—a realm of relationality, a livingness of Spirit rather than a rejected totem or a carefully defined archetype. Here we may find, congruent with the more postmodern context of our own time, a "third" domain, always in flux, of relationality, tension, and mutual expression—a "transitional" domain of imagination.

Again, this is not a dialectic in the Hegelian sense. What I am attempting to describe is not a reconciliation or sublation of ideas/doctrines/theories. Ideas won't save us in this conundrum between theology and psychology. Rather, I am proposing that it is in fully embracing the paradoxical relationship between the two realms, and continuing to imagine their interplay—even in the midst of its seeming impossibility—that new chances for dialogue may spark and ignite. By "standing in the spaces" tolerating the conceptual clashes and the not-knowing, tolerating the uncertainty about whether or how these domains may co-exist, we may be driven again to the dimension of preverbal experience, symbolization, and what Christopher Bollas refers to as "the unthought known."⁷⁰ It is likely, then, that we will find a dance of mutual concern and interrogation between theology and psychology more in our *practices* rather than in our intellectual elaborations of theory and dogma.⁷¹ The meeting ground of psychology and religion may best be discovered in the place of *ethics*, as our practices as theologians and as clinicians come together in response to real, suffering persons with whom we engage in relationship.

Potential Space: Object Relations and Standing in the Contradictions

This concept of "standing in the spaces" between subject and object, subject and subject, known, and unknown, and tolerating ambiguity and unknowing as a field for creativity, including religious thought and theological imagination, find support in earlier psychoanalytic writings of the British object-relations school, especially the work of D.W. Winnicott (as has been noted by now by several scholars in our field of psychology and religion). Winnicott identified religion, together with art and philosophy, as belonging to the realm of "transitional phenomena."⁷² Winnicott defined transitional phenomena as "the third part of the life of a human-being, a part that we

cannot ignore, ...an intermediate area of experiencing, to which inner reality and external life both contribute...a resting-place for the individual engaged in the perpetual human task of keeping inner and outer reality separate yet interrelated.”⁷³ Winnicott (following Melanie Klein) proposed that an infant initially makes no distinction between the mother’s actual breast and the internal fantasy of the breast that is needed and desired. To the extent that the mother is able to anticipate the baby’s needs and provides breast (and by extension, the provision of food and nurture) “at the right moment,” the baby is confirmed in the illusion that s/he has created the breast. The object of desire is simultaneously created (from the inside) and discovered (from the outside). There is thus an intermediate psychic area or “potential space” between “me” and “not-me” that is initially blurred and undefined.

In order to navigate the maturational process by which the mother comes to be recognized as a separate entity outside the infant’s control, a child will often adopt a teddy bear, blanket, or other soft object that can stand in for the mother’s breast and at the same time can remain totally under the child’s control. This is the origin of Winnicott’s term “transitional object.” The object helps the child make the transition from believing that everything is a part of him- or herself, to tolerating the loneliness engendered by a realization of his or her separateness. In health—that is, in Winnicott’s terms when provided with “good enough” parenting⁷⁴ and a “facilitating environment”⁷⁵—the child eventually lets go of the object as the capacity to relate to actual other persons increases.

In Winnicott’s concept, maturation brings about a shift from “object relating” (by which he means relating to one’s own internal objects and relating to others through projection) to “object usage” (a somewhat utilitarian sounding term for what we might commonly understand as relating to an actual other person, perceived with his or her own separate subjectivity.)⁷⁶ This process is actually initiated by the child’s innate aggression, in which s/he attacks and destroys the object (as s/he perceives the other internally), and is then confronted by the actual object, beyond his or her projections, which survives. During infancy, this is the parent who survives the child’s biting and pummeling and continues to care for the child, neither retaliating nor abandoning.⁷⁷ As the child grows, fantasy is gradually modulated by the ongoing interaction between internal objects that are loved, hated, tightly held, devoured, attacked and controlled, and external others who have their own uncontrollable reactions and jar against the child’s internal fantasies and projections.

Yet the “reality principle” does not quash internal fantasy altogether. This interplay between inner and outer remains as a third dimension, in the realm of imagination and play, and it continues over the lifespan, encompassing both personal reverie and creative outward expression. It is also the realm of cultural experience, in which both the capacity for trust and the potential for “creative living” are engendered in the space between baby and mother, child and family, individual and society.⁷⁸ As Ana-Maria Rizzuto has pointed out, religious symbols and God-representations do not fade away as blankets and teddy bears do, but continue to mature alongside one’s representations of self and other, as an individual continues to engage ultimate questions of mortality, meaning, and the purpose of existence.⁷⁹

Winnicott did not expand upon his brief statements locating religion within transitional phenomena. More recently, however, psychologists of religion have extended Winnicott's ideas to explore human experiences of faith and images of the transcendent. James Jones has highlighted the primary relationality of all human knowing—including the human project to construct images of God—existing in an interactive space analogous to transitional phenomena.⁸⁰ William Meissner similarly located religious faith, including God-representations and the use of religious symbols, and the experience of prayer, in Winnicott's "potential space,"⁸¹ in which "the experience of faith...is neither exclusively subjective nor wholly objective by reason of its own intentionality; rather, it is a realm in which both the subjective and objective poles of experience contribute to the substance of belief."⁸² The child simultaneously finds and experiences him- or herself to be creating the provisions of faith as it is provided by family and community.

Meissner's observation that religious objects are "the vehicles for the expression of meanings and values that transcend their physical characteristics"⁸³ is important in countering Freud's critiques of religion's tendency to collapse symbols into concrete objects. What Freud viewed as a totem or fetish, we might, with Meissner, more accurately identify from within religious tradition as an idol. Just as in Eastern Orthodox tradition an icon is intended as a "window" into the divine, and not as something to be worshipped in itself, religious symbols participate in the transitional space between the inner world of fantasy, dreams, and images, and the external world of separate reality.

Winnicott and object relations theorists have not attempted to solve the question of God's existence. But they make room for the dialogue between psychology and religion by relocating the mystery of human experiences of transcendence from the realm of searching for empirical answers to the realm of relationality. They invite us to "stand in the spaces"⁸⁴ *between* inner certainty (which actually belongs to internal fantasy and splitting), and external "truth." Just as Jung found in Christ an archetypal symbol for the Self, object relations theorists have also perceived Christ as a symbol of the object that is destroyed by human aggression, yet paradoxically survives as a genuine object of love.⁸⁵ God-in-Christ neither retaliates nor abandons humankind—but on the contrary, by being destroyed, lives to become the very means of forgiveness and redemption. Dodi Goldman also finds in the contemplative religious tradition an analogy with the child's sense of safety with the "good-enough" mother: "The capacity to be alone in the felt presence of the mother parallels the traditional idea of the Presence of God as being both intimate and ultimate."⁸⁶

Good-evil, all-or-nothing fights about absolute truth belong to Klein's "paranoid-schizoid position," in which one identifies with the good and projects the bad onto external objects. Holding a "depressive position" toward religion itself, relinquishing the twin illusions of perfection and certainty, frees us to recognize the ambiguities and unresolvable questions that faith poses.

Regarding God from the transitional space of our own simultaneous knowing/not-knowing, we are thus able to enter into a space of holy imagination—a sacred space in which we experience God through relating with other human beings.

Cooper-White: Freud, Jung, and Pastoral Psychotherapy

God is both like us and not like us as we simultaneously create and discover God through our interactions, ethical dilemmas, and inevitable conflicts with other people—perhaps especially those who are least “like us.” God is thus encountered as the “uncanny,” the strange, and the unhomelike—as in Rudolf Otto’s description of numinous experience, the Holy as “mysterium tremendens.”⁸⁷ It is not surprising, then, that in our Judaeo-Christian tradition God is allied with the stranger, the sojourner, the one(s) we ourselves oppress, this discovery becomes transformed into an ethical call for justice, to meet and love the stranger as/who is ourselves.⁸⁸

Pastoral Psychotherapy: Faith Seeking Understanding

What are the implications of this practice of holy imagination for pastoral psychotherapy? Wilfred Bion, in his summary of psychoanalytic practice theory, located psychoanalysis at the intersection of “the medical and the religious.”⁸⁹ By “religious” Bion was not referring to organized religion or theology, but was noting the dimension of the ineffable and the poetic in psychoanalysis, and its engagement with the deep human questions of existence.⁹⁰ From Freud’s correspondent, the Swiss Pastor Oskar Pfister onward, religious therapists and ordained clergy have not only embraced psychodynamic theory, but have made major contributions as psychoanalysts.⁹¹ Anton Boisen’s *Exploration of the Inner World* was a foundational work for pastoral theology, in which Boisen’s own experience as a mental patient in mid-20th century America prompted him to advocate for the integration of a humanistic, religious perspective into the treatment of mental illness, and regarding the patient as the primary textbook for psychotherapy: “the living human document.”⁹²

More recent analytic writers have also explored the concept of “faith” as it relates to therapeutic practice and a philosophy or psychoanalytic attitude toward human growth and meaning. Psychoanalyst Michael Eigen, whose published musings on the edges of psychosis, union and differentiation, ecstasy, and rage are some of the most thoughtful and adventurous in psychoanalytic writing,⁹³ brought attention to “the area of faith in Winnicott, Lacan and Bion” in a much-discussed article in 1981,⁹⁴ and more recently Marie Hoffman explored the connection between Fairbairn’s and Winnicott’s religious upbringing and milieu, and the relational turn in psychoanalytic theory.⁹⁵ The broader category of spirituality has recently become a hot topic in psychoanalytic writing,⁹⁶ as contemporary theorists have recognized psychoanalysis as a way of touching the ineffable, and moreover, describing the particular form of hope that underlies all psychotherapy even when formulated in the most secular terms—the faith that human beings can grow and change, and that the therapeutic relationship has something to do with the deepest questions of human meaning, purpose, and existence.

New voices have entered the dialogue between religion and psychology from multicultural and interfaith perspectives as well.⁹⁷ Even the category of sin, from which psychological theorists tend to shy away, is readmitted in somewhat different language, like the “return of the repressed.” For example, Heinz Kohut wrote a little known essay validating altruism and moral courage as something more than simply a neurotic reaction formation,⁹⁸ and in an interview toward the end of his life, Kohut quoted

Cooper-White: Freud, Jung, and Pastoral Psychotherapy

Eugene O'Neill's statement, "Man is broken. He lives his life by mending. The grace of God is the glue."⁹⁹

In a recent textbook on psychoanalytic psychotherapy, Nancy McWilliams describes this psychoanalytic sensibility as a form of "theology,"¹⁰⁰ whose articles of faith include a commitment to authenticity and a belief in the positive power of self-knowledge. In her summary of the "psychoanalytic sensibility," McWilliams also draws further implications for social transformation and political justice:¹⁰¹

It is my deep conviction that the attitudes I have discussed—curiosity and awe, a respect for complexity, the disposition to identify empathically, the valuing of subjectivity and affect, an appreciation of attachment, and a capacity for faith—are worth cherishing not only as components of a therapeutic sensibility but also correctives to some of the more estranging and deadening aspects of contemporary [American] life. Their opposites—intellectual passivity, opinionated reductionism, emotional distancing, objectification and apathy, personal isolation and social anomie, and existential dread—have often been lamented by scholars and social critics as the price we pay for our industrialized, consumer-oriented, and technologically sophisticated cultures. The cultivation of the more vital attitudes that undergird the psychoanalytic sensibility just might be good for the postmodern soul whatever one's orientation to psychotherapy.

Freud called psychoanalysis the "impossible profession"¹⁰² If psychoanalysis was already impossible in Freud's day, then is it plainly unthinkable to integrate it with the even more "impossible" interdisciplinary profession of pastoral psychotherapy? Yet, if *psycho-therapy* is at heart the healing (*therapeúo*) of both mind and soul (*psyche*), can the two vocations of pastoral helper and psychotherapist not somehow find a way to meet in in a distinctively pastoral practice? Is it not possible to develop, borrowing a term from John McDargh, a "psychotheological perspective?"¹⁰³ Our colleague Jim Jones wrote this invitation to a dialogue between psychoanalysis and theology:¹⁰⁴

In this dialogue, theology's role would be to take this psychoanalytic image of inherent relationality and carry it to its furthest reaches, thus connecting psychoanalysis and theology in a common exploration of human relationality and shedding light on the larger implications of a category that psychoanalysts may use unreflectively. The theologian might help see the larger implications of the analyst's implicit image of relationality. The analyst might help the theologian see the unconscious themes at work in the theologian's image of the ultimate reality. Together, they shed light on both the depths and heights of human experience of existing as relational beings.

With this paper, I hope to generate discussion in which we can continue that dialogue, drawing from contemporary and postmodern psychoanalytic models that have been considerably elaborated in the decade since Jones made this invitation,

Cooper-White: Freud, Jung, and Pastoral Psychotherapy

¹ C.G. Jung, "The Practical Use of Dream-Analysis" (1934) in R.F.C. Hull, trans., *The Complete Works of C.G. Jung*, Bollingen Series XX, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958) (hereafter: *CW*), Vol. 16.

² This blending is not unusual. The separation of Jungian and classical psychoanalysis is less pronounced in Britain, for example, in the work of Michael Fordham, e.g., *Freud, Jung, Klein—The Fenceless Field: Essays on Psychoanalysis and Analytical Psychology*, ed. Roger Hobdell (London: Routledge, 1998), and this integration was a strong aspect of Jungian training in the C.G. Jung Institute of San Francisco. More recently, an entire issue of *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* was devoted to reflections by Jungian analysts on contemporary questions in psychoanalysis: James Fosshage, Jody M. Davies, Beverley Zabriskis, Andrew Samuels, Polly Young-Eisendrath, JoAnn Culbert-Koehn, David Sedgwick, Donald Kalsched, Mario Jacoby, and Stephen Mitchell, "Analytical Psychology after Jung..." *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 10/3 (2000), 377-512.

³ Pamela Cooper-White, "Higher Powers and Infernal Regions: Models of Mind in Freud's Interpretation of Dreams and Contemporary Psychoanalysis, and their Implications for Pastoral Care," *Pastoral Psychology* 50/5 (2002) 319-43; earlier version first presented to the Person, Culture, and Religion Group, AAR, November, 2000, Boston, MA.

⁴ For a recent survey of some of the intellectual debates in the field of religion and psychology, see Diane Jonte-Pace and William Parsons, Eds., *Religion and Psychology: Mapping the Terrain—Contemporary Dialogues, Future Prospects* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001). See also James Jones, *Religion and Psychology in Transition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996); *Contemporary Psychoanalysis and Religion: Transference and Transcendence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993); and *Terror and Transformation: The Ambiguity of Religion in Psychoanalytic Perspective* (New York: Brunner-Routledge, 2002); and Mary Lou Randour, Ed., *Exploring Sacred Landscapes: Religious and Spiritual Experiences in Psychotherapy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

⁵ E.g., see Ivan Ward, Ed., *Is Psychoanalysis Another Religion?: Contemporary Essays on Spirit, Faith and Morality in Psychoanalysis* (London: Freud Museum Publications, 1993); Diane Jonte-Pace, "In Defense of an Unfriendly Freud: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and Theology," *Pastoral Psychology* 47/3 (1999), 175-81; Kirk Bingaman, *Freud and Faith: Living in Tension* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003); Don Browning and Terry Cooper, "Metaphors, Models, and Morality in Freud," Ch. 3 in *Religious Thought and the Modern Psychologies* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 33-56. See also Diane Jonte-Pace, *Teaching Freud*, AAR Teaching Religious Studies Series (London and New York: Oxford University Press/American Academy of Religion, 2003). For a more critical evaluation of Freud, see Don Browning and Terry D. Cooper, "Metaphors, Models, and Morality in Freud," in *Religious Thought and the Modern Psychologies*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 33-56.

⁶ Freud, *Civilization and its Discontents* (1930), *SE* 21:64.

⁷ Freud, *Moses and Monotheism* (1939) *SE* 23:3-140.

⁸ Bruno Bettelheim, *Freud and Man's Soul* (New York: Knopf, 1982).

⁹ Freud, *Project for a Scientific Psychology* (1985), *SE* 1: 283-398.

¹⁰ Peter Homans explores the implications of Freud's cultural theories for theology in *Theology after Freud: An Interpretive Inquiry* (New York: 1970).

¹¹ Peter Gay, *Freud; A Life for Our Time* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1998), 354-55, 394, et passim; Felicity Kelcourse, "Intersubjectivity, Infantile Helplessness and Occultism: Non-Ordinary Experience in the Dialogue between Freud and Jung," paper presented to the American Academy of Religion, Philadelphia, November, 2005; paper available online at <http://home.att.net/%7Epcr-aar/2005/sessions05.htm> (November, 2005).

¹² There are five published first-hand accounts of Freud's analyses: Smiley Blanton, *Diary of My Analysis with Sigmund Freud* (Hawthorn Books, 1971); Hilda Doolittle (the poet "H.D."), *Tribute to Freud* (New York: New Directions, 1956); J.M. Dorsey, *An American Psychiatrist in Vienna, 1935-1937*,

Cooper-White: Freud, Jung, and Pastoral Psychotherapy

and *His Sigmund Freud* (Detroit: Center for Health Education, 1980); Abraham Kardiner, *My Analysis with Freud: Reminiscences* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1977); Joseph Wortis, *My Analysis with Freud* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1994). For interesting contemporary analyses of these accounts, see also Johann Cremerius, "Freud bei der Arbeit über die Schulter Geschaut: Seine Technik im Spiegel vom Schülern und Patienten," *Jahrbuch der Psychoanalyse* 6 (1981); L Momigliano, "A Spell in Vienna: But Was Freud a Freudian? An Investigation into Freud's Technique between 1920 and 1938, Based on the Published Testimony of Former Analysts," *International Review of Psycho-Analysis* 14 (1987), 373-89; and especially Beate Lohser and Peter Newton, *Unorthodox Freud: The View from the Couch* (New York: Guilford, 1996).

¹³ Ernest Jones, *Sigmund Freud: Life and Work*, 3 vols. (London: Hogarth, 1957); R.G. Clark, *Freud: The Man and the Cause* (New York: Random House, 1980); Richard Wollheim, *Sigmund Freud* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Paul Roazen, *Freud and His Followers* (New York: Random House, 1975); Louis Breger, *Freud: Darkness in the Midst of Vision: An Analytical Biography* (New York: John Wiley, 2000); and Madelon Sprengnether, "Reading Freud's Life," in Anthony Elliott, Ed., *Freud 2000* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 139-68. See also Lilli Freud-Marle, *In My Uncle's House: Memoirs of Lilli-Freud-Marle* (New York: Basic Books, 1980); Stephen Applebaum, "Is the 'Impossible Profession' Possible?" *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 4/1 (1987), 81-88; Hans Küng, *Freud and the Problem of God*, trans. E. Quinn (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979); Ana-Maria Rizzuto, *Why Did Freud Reject God?: A Psychodynamic Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

¹⁴ *Psychoanalysis and Faith: The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Oskar Pfister*, Ed. Heinrich Meng and Ernst L. Freud (New York: Vintage, 1975; orig. publ. 1963). See also other correspondence of Freud, e.g., *The Letters of Sigmund Freud*, ed. Ernst Freud, trans. Tania and James Stern, with introduction by Steven Marcus (New York: Basic Books, 1960; also available in Dover reprint edition, 1992); *The Freud/Jung Letters* Ed. William McGuire, Trans. Ralph Manheim and R.F.C. Hull, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974). A new and more complete translation is currently in progress, ed. Isabelle Carol Noth and Christoph Morgenthaler. For more on recent research into this correspondence, see Noth and Morgenthaler, eds., *Seelsorge und Psychoanalyse* (Practical Theology Today 89), 2007.

¹⁵ Ernest Wallwork, "Thou Shalt Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself: The Freudian Critique," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 10 (1982), 266, also discussed in Browning and Cooper, 47-50.

¹⁶ Phillip Rieff, *Freud: The Mind of a Moralizer* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979).

¹⁷ On Freud's hermeneutics in particular see Susan Handelman, "Interpretation as Devotion: Freud's Relation to Rabbinical Hermeneutics," *Psychoanalytic Review* 68 (1981), 2ff; on Freud and midrash, see Jerry Jennings and Jane Peterson Jennings, "'I Knew the Method': The Unseen Midrashic Origins of Freud's Psychoanalysis," *Journal of Psychology and Judaism* 17/1 (1993), 53-75.

¹⁸ E.g., David Bakan, *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition* (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1958); Marthe Robert, *From Oedipus to Moses: Freud's Jewish Identity* (Garden City: Anchor/Doubleday, 1976); and Moshe Gresser, *Dual Allegiance: Freud as Modern Jew* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1994). Note that Freud biographer Peter Gay has taken a somewhat contrasting view, emphasizing Freud's departure from religious Judaism, in *A Godless Jew: Freud, Atheism and the Making of Psychoanalysis* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987).

¹⁹ Edward Said, *Freud and the Non-European* (London: Verso/Freud Museum London, 2004), 53, also citing Isaac Deutscher, *The Non-Jewish Jew and Other Essays* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1968), 35, 40.

²⁰ Freud, *The Future of an Illusion* (1927), *SE* 21:3-58. See also Joachim Scharfenberg, *Sigmund Freud and His Critique of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988); Gregory Zilboorg, *Freud and Religion: A Restatement of an Old Controversy* (Westminster: Newman Press, 1958).

²¹ E.g., Freud, *Totem and Taboo* (1913), *SE* 13:1-164; *New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis* (1932-33), *SE* 22:67; *Moses and Monotheism: Three Essays* (1939), *SE* 23:1-140.

Cooper-White: Freud, Jung, and Pastoral Psychotherapy

²² Reinhold Niebuhr, "Human Creativity and Self-Concern in Freud's Thought," in Benjamin Nelson, Ed., *Freud and the Twentieth Century* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1974), 260ff; also discussed in Browning and Cooper, 50-56.

²³ Freud, *The "Uncanny"* (1919), *SE*17:219-256.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 252.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 243.

²⁶ Freud, "Beyond the Pleasure Principle" (1920), *SE*18, especially 7-17.

²⁷ Kirk Bingham, *Freud and Faith: Living in the Tension* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2003), 60, also citing Paul Ricoeur, *The Conflict of Interpretations* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1974), 339.

²⁸ Freud, "The Question of Lay Analysis" (1926), *SE* 20, 183-250.

²⁹ Judith Van Herik, *Freud on Femininity and Faith* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982); Ana-Maria Rizzuto, *Why Did Freud Reject God? A Psychodynamic Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); Diane Jonte-Pace, *Speaking the Unspeakable: Religion, Misogyny, and the Uncanny Mother in Freud's Cultural Texts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

³⁰ Critiques of Jung's attitudes toward God and religion have been advanced beginning with writers in his own lifetime, such as Martin Buber, *Eclipse of God: Studies in the Relation Between Religion and Philosophy* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1953) and Victor White, who broke with Jung over Jung's *Answer to Job in Soul and Psyche: An Enquiry into the Relationship of Psychology and Religion* (London: Collins, 1960). For more recent critique, see Don Browning and Terry Cooper, "Creation and Self-Realization in Jung," Ch. 7 in *Religious Thought and the Modern Psychologies*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2004), 144-81. For a review of critiques, see Michael Palmer, *Freud and Jung on Religion* (London: Routledge, 1997), 166-96.

³¹ E.g., Morton Kelsey, *Christo-Psychology* (New York: Crossroad, 1983); Ann Belford Ulanov and Barry Ulanov, *The Healing Imagination: The Meeting of Psyche and Soul* (New York: Paulist Press, 1991); Urban T. Holmes, *The Priest in Community: Exploring the Roots of Ministry* (New York: Seabury, 1978); Thomas Hart, *Hidden Spring: The Spiritual Dimension of Therapy* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 23-24.

³² Abraham Maslow, *Toward a Psychology of Being* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1968).

³³ Robert Hutchins, "Transpersonal Psychology," <http://www.itp.edu/about/tp.cfm> (accessed 7/05).

³⁴ Jung, *Memories, Dreams and Reflections*, rev. ed., Ed. A. Jaffe, Trans. R. and C. Winston (New York: Vintage, 1989; orig. publ. 1961).

³⁵ E.g., Jung, "Christ, a Symbol of the Self" in *Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self* (1934) *CW*9/2: 36-71; and "A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity," *CW*11:152-57.

³⁶ Victor White, "The Frontiers of Theology and Psychology," The Guild of Pastoral Psychology, Guild Lecture No. 19, and *God and the Unconscious* (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1952). For a discussion of White's relationship with Jung, see Murray Stein, *Jung's Treatment of Christianity: The Psychology of a Religious Tradition* (Wilmette, IL: Chiron, 1985), 5-8.

³⁷ E.g., John A. Sanford, *The Kingdom Within: The Inner Meaning of Jesus' Sayings* (San Francisco: HarperSan Francisco, 1987) and *Mystical Christianity: A psychological Commentary on the Gospel of John* (New York: Crossroad Classic, 1994).

³⁸ Jung, and H.G. Baynes, (1921). *Psychological Types, or, The Psychology of Individuation* (1921) *CW*6.

³⁹ Jung, *Aion CW* 9/2:8-10; and *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*(1934, 1954), *CW* 9/1:20ff.

Cooper-White: Freud, Jung, and Pastoral Psychotherapy

⁴⁰ Jung, *Answer to Job* (1952), CW11:369, 372 et passim.

⁴¹ Jung, *Memories, Memories, Dreams and Reflections*, 39.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 56.

⁴³ For a concise history of body-soul dualism in Christian theology, see F. LeRon Shults, *Reforming Theological Anthropology: After the Philosophical Turn to Relationality* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

⁴⁴ E.g., John Wesley, "A Plain Account of Christian Perfection," *The Works of John Wesley* (1872 ed. by Thomas Jackson), vol. 11, pp. 366-446; Jonathan Edwards, "The Importance and Advantage of a Thorough Knowledge of Divine Truth," (1739), in *The Sermons of Jonathan Edwards: A Reader*, Ed. Wilson Kimmach, Kenneth Minkema and Douglas Sweeney (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 26-48.

⁴⁵ Jung, Prefatory Note, *Answer to Job*, CW11:358. For a discussion of the tension in Jung's writings between "suspicion and affirmation" of religion, see Peter Homans, C.G. Jung: Christian or Post-Christian Psychologist? And "Psychology and Hermeneutics: Jung's Contribution," in Robert Moore and Daniel Meckel, Eds., *Jung and Christianity in Dialogue: Faith, Feminism, and Hermeneutics* (New York: Paulist Press, 1990), 21-37 and 170-95. Homans views hermeneutics as the bridge between Jungian psychology and theology, using religious imagery to create interplay between "the archetypal dimensions of theological doctrine, religious myth, and the individuation process" (p. 177).

⁴⁶ Jung, *Psychology and Religion* (1937, 1940), CW11:59.

⁴⁷ Jung, *Answer to Job*, CW11:469.

⁴⁸ Jung, *On the Psychology of the Unconscious* (1943), CW7:9-122; "The Relations between the Ego and the Unconscious in *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology* (1928, 1935), CW 7:123-244.

⁴⁹ First defined in *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, CW 7:64-79, 127-38; see also *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* (1954), CW 9/1:3-53.

⁵⁰ Jung, "Christ, a Symbol of the Self," CW9/2: 36-71; "A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity," CW11:152-57.

⁵¹ Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, CW 9/1:142.

⁵² Jung, "Concerning Mandala Symbolism" (1950), CW9/1:357.

⁵³ Jung, *Transformation Symbolism in the Mass* (1954), CW11:201-98.

⁵⁴ Jung, *Psychology and Religion*, CW11, esp. pp. 64-105.

⁵⁵ Melanie Klein, "A Contribution to the Psychogenesis of Manic-Depressive States, in *Contributions to Psycho-analysis 1921-1945* (London: Hogarth, 1935), 282-311, and "Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms" (1946) in *'Envy and Gratitude' and Other Works* (New York: Delacorte, 1975), 1-24.

⁵⁶ For further discussion of this point, see Palmer, 123-28.

⁵⁷ Jung, *The Symbolic Life* (1976), CW18:707.

⁵⁸ W. McGuire and R.F. Hull, *C.G. Jung Speaking* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 251.

⁵⁹ C.G. Jung, *The Red Book*, trans. Sonu Shamdasani (New York: W.W. Norton, 2009).

⁶⁰ Martin Buber, *Eclipse of God* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), 83-84, cited in Stein, *Jung's Treatment of Christianity*, 9.

⁶¹ Stein, 9.

⁶² Browning and Cooper, 180.

Cooper-White: Freud, Jung, and Pastoral Psychotherapy

⁶³ Elizabeth Ann Danto, *Freud's Free Clinics: Psychoanalysis and Social Justice, 1918-1938* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005); Robert Coles, *Anna Freud and the Dream of Psychoanalysis* (Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1993).

⁶⁴ Jung, *Memories, Dreams and Reflections*.

⁶⁵ Cooper-White, *Many Voices: Pastoral Psychotherapy in Relational and Theological Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), Introduction.

⁶⁶ Stein, *Jung's Treatment of Christianity*, 193.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Jung, "Psychotherapists or the Clergy?" (1932), *CW*11:347.

⁶⁹ Borrowed term "standing in the spaces" from Philip Bromberg, "Standing in the Spaces," *Contemporary Psychoanalysis* 32 (1996), 509-535, and his book by the same title.

⁷⁰ Christopher Bollas, *The Shadow of the Object: Psychoanalysis of the Unthought Known*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987).

⁷¹ A similar proposal is found in John Milbank, "Postmodern Critical Augustinianism: A Short *Summa* in Forty-two Responses to Unasked Questions," in *The Postmodern God*, ed. Graham Ward (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), p. 274.

⁷² D.W. Winnicott, "Transitional Objects and Transitional Phenomena" (1951) in *Collected Papers: Through Paediatrics to Psycho-Analysis* (London: Tavistock, 1958), 229-42; "Morals and Education" in *The Maturation Processes and the Facilitating Environment* (London: Hogarth, 1965, 94); see also *Playing and Reality* (New York: Basic Books, 1971).

⁷³ Ibid., 230.

⁷⁴ Winnicott, "Ego Distortion in Terms of True and False Self" (1960) in *The Maturation Processes*, 145.

⁷⁵ Winnicott, *The Maturation Processes and the Facilitating Environment*.

⁷⁶ Winnicott, "The Use of an Object and Relating through Identifications" (1969), in *Playing and Reality*, 86-94.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 91-92.

⁷⁸ Paraphrasing from Winnicott, "The Location of Cultural Experience" (1967), *Playing and Reality*, 103.

⁷⁹ Ana-Maria Rizzuto, *The Birth of the Living God: A Psychoanalytic Study* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

⁸⁰ James Jones, *Religion and Psychology in Transition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 144, citing Winnicott, "Transitional Objects and Transitional Phenomena," and *Playing and Reality*. See also Jones, *Contemporary Psychoanalysis and Religion: Transference and Transcendence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), and *Terror and Transformation: The Ambiguity of Religion in Psychoanalytic Perspective* (New York: Brunner-Routledge, 2002), esp. 82-105; Ann Belford Ulanov, *Finding Space: Winnicott, God, and Psychic Reality* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2001); Marie Hoffman, "From Enemy Combatant to Strange Bedfellow: The Role of Religious Narratives in the Work of W.R.D. Fairbairn and D.W. Winnicott," *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 14/6 (2004), 769-804.

⁸¹ Winnicott, "The Location of Cultural Experience," 100.

⁸² W[illiam]W. Meissner, "Transitional Phenomena in Religion" in *Psychoanalysis and Religious Experience* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), 177-83, reprinted in Donald Capps, Ed., *Freud and Freudians on Religion: A Reader* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 220-25.

Cooper-White: Freud, Jung, and Pastoral Psychotherapy

⁸³ Ibid., 223.

⁸⁴ Term borrowed from Philip Bromberg, *Standing in the Spaces: Clinical Process, Trauma, and Dissociation* (Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press, 2001).

⁸⁵ E.g., Brooke Hopkins, "Jesus and Object Use: A Winnicottian Account of the Resurrection Myth," *International Review of Psychoanalysis* 16 (1989), 93-100, reprinted in Capps, ed., *Freud and Freudians on Religion*, 231-39; and Marie Hoffman, "From Enemy Combatant to Strange Bedfellow."

⁸⁶ Dodi Goldman, *In Search of the Real: The Origins and Originality of D.W. Winnicott* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1993), 123, also cited in Hoffman, 787.

⁸⁷ Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and Its Relation to the Rational*, 2nd ed., trans. John Harvey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958; orig. publ. 1923).

⁸⁸ For a reflection on Freud's "uncanny" and the uncanny as the "foreigner" in ourselves, see Julia Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, trans. Leon Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991, esp. 181-92, also reprinted in Capps, ed., 327-34.

⁸⁹ Wilfred Bion, *Attention and Interpretation* (London: Karnac, 1984; orig. publ. 1970). See also Carlo Strenger, *Between Hermeneutics and Science: An Essay on the Epistemology of Psychoanalysis* (New York: International Universities Press, 1992).

⁹⁰ Bion identified this ineffable dimension of reality as a region of thought which he labeled "O," resonating with eastern meditative vowels and intimations of eternity – see Wilfred Bion, *Attention and Reality* (London: Tavistock, 1970).

⁹¹ E.g., William Meissner, *Psychoanalysis and Religious Experience* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984). For an excellent bibliography on religion and psychoanalysis, see Ward, Ed., *Is Psychoanalysis Another Religion?*, 79-93.

⁹² Anton Boisen, *The Exploration of the Inner World: A Study of Mental Disorder and Religious Experience* (New York: Harper, 1952).

⁹³ Michael Eigen, *The Psychotic Core* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1986); *The Electrified Tightrope*, Ed. Adam Phillips (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1993); *Ecstasy* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2001); and *Rage* (Wesleyan University Press, 2002)

⁹⁴ Eigen, "The Area of Faith in Winnicott, Lacan and Bion," *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 62 (1981), 413-33; reprinted in *The Electrified Tightrope*, 109-38..

⁹⁵ Marie Hoffman, "From Enemy Combatant to Strange Bedfellow: The Role of Religious Narratives in the Works of W.R.D. Fairbairn and D.W. Winnicott," *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 14 (2004), 769-804.

⁹⁶ Mary Lou Randour, Ed., *Exploring Sacred Landscapes: Religious and Spiritual Experiences in Psychotherapy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993); Kerry Gordon, "The Tiger's Stripe: Some Thoughts on psychoanalysis, Gnosis, and the Experience of Wonderment," *Contemporary Psychoanalysis* 40 (2004), 5-45; Peter Lawner, "Spiritual Implications of Psychodynamic Therapy: Immaterial Psyche, Ideality, and the 'Area of Faith,'" *Psychoanalytic Review* 99 (2001), 525-48; and Alan Roland, "The Spiritual Self and Psychopathology: Theoretical Reflections and Clinical Observations," *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 16 (1999), 211-33.

⁹⁷ E.g., Salman Akhtar and Henri Parens, *Does God Help? Developmental and Clinical Aspects of Religious Belief* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 2001). See also Benoni Reyes Silva-Netto, "Cultural Symbols and Images in the Counseling Process," *Pastoral Psychology* 42/4 (1994), 277-84.

⁹⁸ Kohut, "On Courage" (1985) in *Self Psychology and the Humanities; Reflections on a New Psychoanalytic Approach*, ed. Charles Strozier (New York: W.W. Norton, 1985), 5-50. Kohut also explicitly drew a connection between the idealized parent-image and images of God in *Analysis of the*

Self: A Systematic Approach to the Psychoanalytic Treatment of Narcissistic Personality Disorders (New York: International Universities Press, 1971), 27.

⁹⁹ Joachim Scharfenberg, "The Psychology of the Self and Religion, in *Advances in Self Psychology*, ed. Arnold Goldberg (New York: International Universities Press, 1980), 434, citing D.M. Moss, "Narcissism, Empathy, and the Fragmentation of the Self: An Interview with Heinz Kohut," *Pilgrimage* 4/1 (1976).

¹⁰⁰ Nancy McWilliams, *Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy: A Practitioner's Guide* (New York: Guilford, 2004), 4.

¹⁰¹ McWilliams, 45, also citing Louis A. Sass, *Madness and Modernism: Insanity in the Light of Modern Art, Literature, and Thought* (New York: Basic Books, 1992).

¹⁰² Sigmund Freud, *Analysis Terminable and Interminable* (1937), *SE* 23:211-253.

¹⁰³ John McDargh, "Concluding Clinical Postscript: On Developing a Psychotheological Perspective," in Randour, Ed., *Exploring Sacred Landscapes*, 172-93.

¹⁰⁴ James Jones, 1996.