

**Discuss and evaluate ways in which the work of C.G. Jung can be used in pastoral care today.**

## Introduction

I will begin this essay by giving an indication of how I understand 'today'. As 'pastoral care' is located within the Christian tradition, I will look at Jung's work in regards to his complex relationship with Christianity, as well as key elements in the Jungian-Christian dialogue. As there are undoubtedly areas of Jung's work that directly conflict with Christianity, the question arises: does a Christian reaction to Jung arise from a fear of the psyche or from a deeper sense of caution? I believe that this is a key issue in evaluating the ways in which his work can be used in pastoral care today. Christian psychologists, particularly among Jung's contemporaries, as well as modern interpreters, may turn out to be surprising helpers in the critical evaluation and fruitful synthesis of Jung's work in today's cultural epoch in the Christian context. The concept of the Shadow, as well as Jung's categories of opposites within the human person, particularly as they relate to his stages of life theory, are identified as significant for pastoral ministry. Although Jung's work on symbols and dreams is very useful pastorally, I will refer to it only in conclusion as I sum up how I see Jung's work can be used in pastoral care today.

## Our Cultural Context

A term used to describe the current era of Western culture is postmodernism. Although theories vary widely regarding postmodernism, I shall take it to be descriptive of a period of time, signifying, as Charles Jencks has expressed it, the continuation of Modernism and its transcendence. Jencks goes on to say that postmodernism is a kind of a double activity that acknowledges our complex relationship to the preceding world view (Jencks 1992:11). He objects to the polarising polemics that pit modernism against postmodernism, often expressed in lists of mutually exclusive elements of each world view, "hierarchy vs. anarchy" for example (Jencks 1992:12). As an alternative he proposes that the emergence of postmodernism in the second half of the twentieth century does not entail an abandonment of modernism, but rather that postmodernism is "a hybridization, a complexification of modern elements with other ones." Jencks refers to this as double-coding (Jencks 1992:12).

I would like to bear in mind this double-coding at the outset of an evaluation of the work of a Swiss psychologist who died 47 years ago, since his work is seen by some as very useful in our postmodernism era when a spiritual outlook is being recovered. Carl Gustav Jung is popularly seen as someone who countered the rationality that characterised much modern thinking, putting spirituality firmly at the centre of man's search for meaning and wholeness and clearly identifying man's problems as ultimately spiritual. Jung stated that when a man outgrows his inherited religion and is no longer

able to embrace his full life, his psyche becomes something in its own right which cannot be dealt with by the church alone. And it is for this reason that we have a psychology based on experience and not on articles of faith. He said that the very fact we have such a psychology is symptomatic of a profound convulsion of spiritual life (Jung 2006: 206).

Jung's view was that the rational world order of his day, ignoring the metaphysical dimension of life, caused a displacement of psychic life. This life had hitherto always found expression in a metaphysical stream, and modern man despite his great efforts to do so, can no longer refrain from acknowledging the might of these psychic forces (Jung 2006: 207). It is this that distinguishes the twentieth century from all other epochs of history. "We can no longer deny the dark stirrings of the unconscious are effective powers - that psychic forces exists which cannot, for the present at least, be fitted in with our rational world-order" (Jung 2006: 207).

This gives us a picture of how Jung viewed his work in his time - as stepping in where religion had stepped out - and fits in well with some modern commentators who see him as a prophet and pastor in an secular age who wrote a pastoral response to the decline of religiosity in his day, rescuing religion from modern skepticism at a time when modernity had reached the apex of its power in the first half of the twentieth century. In this view Jung is seen as someone who recovered the vitality of the healing power of Christianity in an age of science (Ulanov and Dueck 2008: 5).

Despite Ulanov and Dueck's important insights regarding why Christians should read Jung today, I do not find the popular inclination to take him up now that we are rediscovering religion very convincing. I would agree that Christianity lost a lot of it's cultural influence and institutional power in the modern period, but as an historic faith I do not believe that it lost the ground that those who no longer profess the faith would have us believe.<sup>1</sup> The Enlightenment may be characterised as a rejection of institutional Christianity, but this is not necessarily the negative development that it is often presented by Christians to be.

If the postmodern 'pro-spiritual' now gives rise to a form of anti-rationalism, then we move into another reactionary phase and are therefore limited by the inevitable swing back into its opposite in the future. One is reminded again of the usefulness of Jenck's double-coding for where we find ourselves today, and the truth, well expressed by Robert Weber, that the road to the future runs through the past (Weber 2003: 7). Lesslie Newbigin developed this thought in his writing about Christian mission, believing that it was vital for professing Christians to understand rightly how secularism, and so the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Enlightenment can be seen as a reaction against an outward, and often oppressive form of Christianity. Rather than going on to reject the religion out of hand a reading of 'radical church history' is instructive. E.M. Broadbent's *The Pilgrim Church* (1935) draws a sharp distinction between the 'visible' and 'invisible' church, charting the history of the church that sought to practise the principles taught in the NT. B.F.C. Atkinson is another author who traced the Church's two histories with his book *Valiant in Fight - a Review of the Christian Conflict* (1937). The conflict experienced by the church has been against itself, at least until relatively recently, as between the institutional and non-institutional forms.

modern mindset, had arisen - as a direct result of the Gospel itself.<sup>2</sup>

If it is correct that secularism has arisen from the presence of the Gospel in society, it must be the case that modernism, and so Western civilisation, rests on Christian foundations. And this also is true for postmodernism, defined at the beginning of this essay as the continuation of modernism and its transcendence. Whilst still a Cardinal, the now Pope Joseph Ratzinger made the point, that the power of Christianity, which made it into a world religion, consisted in its synthesis of reason, faith and life. He asks, “Why is this synthesis no longer convincing today? Why, on the contrary, are enlightenment and Christianity regarded today as contradicting each other and even mutually exclusive? What has changed in the enlightenment, or in Christianity, that it should be so?” (Ratzinger and Pera. 2006: 23)

However the Enlightenment enthroned rationality, it did not succeed in doing away with religion. I agree with Jencks that the either/or dichotomy of rational/spiritual may be seen as an insufficient, or at least an incomplete framework for understanding our times. The emphasis on reason may have led some to deny the supernatural elements of Christianity, but for others it led to a proof-orientated, 'evidence that demands a verdict', expression of the faith (Weber 2003: 15). The Christian faith has always been filtered through its host culture, in which it is communicated through one or more dominating principles. Weber tracks the story of Christianity as moving from a focus on mystery in the classical period, to institution in the medieval era, to individualism in the Reformation era, to reason in the modern era, and now in the postmodern era back to mystery (Weber 2003: 16).

If it is given to man to have two ways of knowing - the rational and the intuitive - it would follow that spirituality can be experienced and expressed through both modes. Double-coding in this context is the adding of man's intuitive function to the rational one, with the belief that God created both and is equally in the subject(ive) as well as the object(ive) and is well able to communicate through either, or indeed both. To deny this is to deny part of oneself, indeed the nature of God Himself, who holds both capacities within Himself. From the Enlightenment onwards it could be seen that Christianity was rejected, not because of rationality but in spite of it, but it did undoubtedly contribute to diminishing the supernatural aspects of the faith in the Church, particularly as it existed in its institutional form.

I do not think that we are in a period of recovering a religious or spiritual outlook, and so need to look back to Jung's ideas to meet people's rising spirituality, but rather we need to rise to the challenge of how to represent Christianity through inner, rather than outer means, something we have not had to do for over 200 years. This is where Jung's work, and indeed the very language of psychology, might be of great help to us, both on a cultural as well as an individual pastoral level. Jung's work as a psychologist should be

---

<sup>2</sup> Newbigin explores this at length in, 'The Relevance of Trinitarian Doctrine for Today's Mission' (1963). He said, “But if we have to be on our guard against the typical religious illusion that the forms of Christian sacral society can be indefinitely preserved, we have also to keep ourselves free from the typically secularist illusion that liberation from the given means that human freedom is secured.” (p54)

judged on its own merits whatever the period of history.

Ulanov and Dueck suggest that Christians are afraid of the psyche, but it could be said that, sensing the treasure and depths it contains, they choose to avoid a Jungian approach rather than run the risk of tainting it in some way with Jung's perceived gnostic/occult-influenced ideas. If this is so, then the question to ask is: can a separation between Jung's psychology and spirituality be made by Christian practitioners?

Psychiatrist Karl Stern (1906-1975), a Roman Catholic convert from Judaism, speaks about how the overextension of the psychological method is a modern fallacy. "If someone decides, merely on the basis of psychological observation what God is, what Holy Communion is, what Mystical Union is, then there is no boundary to psychology. This would mean that psychology can answer all problems, and that things have no true essence" (Stern 1961: 86). This fallacy he calls psychologism.<sup>3</sup> Although Stern is referring to overtly reductionist thinkers, such as Freud, who reduce religion to their own categories in the material world, Jung may be seen to have done the same in reverse with his overextension from the psychological into the spiritual. It is this point that is a central one in any dialogue between Jungians and Christians.

### The Jungian Christian Dialogue

Although Jung's ideas may contain Christian elements and he is sympathetic to this religion, he is seen by many Christians as ultimately rejecting it, like many modern thinkers eschewing the authority of the church and replacing inherited beliefs with the ideas inherent in their chosen field. Considering Jung's own view that his psychological theories were a kind of religion substitute or alternative outlet for man's psychic life, he may be seen as reductionist, and the rejection of Christianity, which his own search for meaning entailed, as ultimately giving his theories a materialist strand. This would be why, as Ulanov and Dueck point out, for some Christians, Jung's work signals not a return to faith but a manifestation of agnostic liberalism (Ulanov and Dueck 2008: 4).

Some expressions of Christianity have had an uneasy relationship with both psychology and philosophy, perhaps because it is these disciplines that purport to uncover significant truths about man (apart from the obvious saving work of Christ). Francis Schaeffer, the Evangelical philosopher and founder of the L'Abri community, expressed a kind of 'middle way' between wholesale acceptance and outright rejection of the field when he said that modern psychology has valuable insights, but these "good bits and pieces" are not enough without what he called a sufficient base (Schaeffer. 1972: 173). Schaeffer thought that if people acted on the teaching of the word of God, in practice they would gain a sufficient psychological base and that if a man lives in the light of the Christian revelation he will have a psychological foundation (Schaeffer. 1972: 173). He thought it better that man have a proper base and framework as to who he is and what his purpose is

---

<sup>3</sup> A position in philosophy where psychology plays a central role in grounding or explaining some other, non-psychological type of fact or law.

without the “bits and pieces”, than the “bits and pieces” in a total vacuum. In the last analysis, Schaeffer says that there is no real answer to man's psychological need apart from the Creator-creature framework, an understanding of the Fall, and the atoning work of Jesus Christ in history (Schaeffer. 1972: 174).

Leanne Payne, originally an Episcopalian and founder and president of Pastoral Care Ministries, has written extensively against the dangers of what she terms Christian Jungianism. She identified, as does Ulanov, the issue of evil as being the main one over which Jung most fully departs from a Christian framework. If good and evil are reconciled, says Payne, then Jungian psychology can never be divorced from gnosticism (Payne 1994: 213).

Payne also cites another, more subtle, reason, as to why Christian Jungianism is to be avoided - namely, that it does not share the same symbolic system as Christianity and so will eventually re-mythologise/re-symbolise the heart of the Christian, giving rise to symbolic confusion within that person (Payne 1994: 215). For example, the Jungian God-image is the Self, and in Christianity it is Father. No matter what dogma is believed about God in the head, it is the image symbolised in the heart that will inevitably rise up and cause a disturbance within the person if it does not converge with their belief, leading to a wrong view of both the human person and God and ultimately leaving Jungian Christians in a position where Jungian categories powerfully overshadow their Christianity (Payne. 1994: 216).<sup>4</sup>

Ulanov puts this point well, both about Jung's ambivalence to the father-image/God and the development of his views about good and evil. For Jung we serve God by becoming conscious of the polarities of existence in ourselves and in being itself. The question in this paradigm is where to put the bad, and Jung clearly chooses to put it in God (Ulanov and Dueck 2008: 60). This is what the world's monist, as opposed to theistic, religions lead to, and so it is not surprising that Jung finds a natural home within Eastern religions, where the God-image and the Self-image often merge, and good and evil are reconciled. Self-images, says Ulanov, are not God but rather bridges to the reality that transcends the whole psyche, with the Self archetype linking to what is beyond the archetypal layer, to the reality which authors us (Ulanov and Dueck 2008: 61).

Should this preclude Christians using Jung in a pastoral care context? Leanne Payne does talk about what is right with Jung in the midst of her critique by citing Karl Stern as an example of someone who showed how the psychoanalytical, as founded by Freud and carried on by Jung, can be made philosophically neutral, that is, freed from the materialistic and Gnostic superimpositions of its founders (Payne 1994: 216). Through Freud and Jung's work the psychiatric world moved away from mechanistic models, empathy found a place in psychiatry and this, combined with an understanding of the

---

<sup>4</sup> See *The Unconscious Confusions of Christian Jungianism* by Leanne Payne and Kevin Perrotta for a further exploration of this line of thinking. First published in April/May 1988 edition of the Pastoral Renewal, and also available at [www.leannepayne.org](http://www.leannepayne.org)

symbolic language of the unconscious, meant that what had hitherto been meaningless was now a key to unlocking hidden truths about the human person. Jung's contribution cannot be underestimated, as he was someone who Stern believed consolidated the foundations of the psychoanalytical theory (Stern 1961: 61).

What Payne says about Stern may apply equally to the German psychologist Fritz Kunkel (1889-1956) as both men put Jung's ideas to good use, keeping their thoroughly Christian intellectual and symbolic system intact. Payne believes that secular psychology yield valid discoveries and insights, but is opposed to those who adopt a Jungian hermeneutic and place it as a grid over the Scriptures and so over the whole Judeo-Christian symbolic understanding of reality (Payne 1994:217).

Jungian analyst John Sanford (1929-2005) in an interview he gave about the Jungian-Christian dialogue, makes the point that, just as not all Christians are the same, likewise Jungians differ in their views.<sup>5</sup> There is the kind of Christianity where the mind is open, as well as the more fundamentalist expressions where it is often seen as more expedient to keep the door shut on the shadowy realities residing in one's unconscious. However, this may be seen as equally true for many people of no religious faith, but Sanford underlines the importance of truth in this regard (which Christians should be particularly committed to) and the need to be confident in the ability of the truth to bring the mind back to its proper centre. He goes on to articulate the points, already mentioned, regarding where Jung and Christians part company, and where he disagrees with Jung, namely about the nature of evil and the Self. He also brings in the ideas of Kunkel at these points, with whom he was more aligned, and which, if embraced, open up a world of possibilities for Christians who may otherwise fear or avoid Jung in their pastoral practice.<sup>6</sup> Sanford remarks that up to now the Jungian-Christian dialogue has been decidedly one way, as flowing from the Christian side to the Jungian. The challenge for the future is for Jungians to understand how there could be great benefit from their being more open to Christianity.

### Evil, The Self and the Shadow

Undoubtedly, where Jung and the Christian tradition part company is Jung's rejection of the traditional notion of evil as *privatio boni*, as the deprivation of good. (Ulanov and Dueck 2008: 66). Sanford takes up this point in the above-mentioned interview and draws out how he differs from Jung on this point - he does not see evil as an integral part of God, but rather something allowed for by the higher purposes of God. Sanford wants us to understand that there is no Jungian doctrine about this and that Jungians, in fact, do

---

<sup>5</sup> For details of the video of this interview and a full transcript see [www.innerexplorations.com/catjc/5.htm](http://www.innerexplorations.com/catjc/5.htm). Subsequent quotes without references are taken from this transcript.

<sup>6</sup> Another leading Jungian analyst, Robert Johnson, who studied under Kunkel, was also greatly influenced by Kunkel. Sanford underwent analysis with Kunkel.

not have doctrines. He goes on to call Jung's epistemology an “encapsulated” one, in that the knowledge of God is mediated to consciousness through the Self, and the Self as the archetype of God (being both good and evil) is the only way one knows anything about the nature of God. It is at this point that Kunkel enters and may greatly assist Christians who would otherwise reject Jung on grounds of theology. Sanford explains in the interview, that Kunkel believed that genuine evil did not come from the Self, but from the ego, and to the extent that the ego is in an egocentric state, it partakes of the nature of evil.

Sanford has written an in-depth comparison of the theories of Jung and Kunkel. In comparing Jung, Marie-Louise von Franz and Kunkel, Sanford says that the language of von Franz and Kunkel is not far apart, but Kunkel's language is stronger because he sees the egocentricity of the ego as something demonic, while von Franz regarded it as error. Jung and von Franz are more like Gnostics, who saw the great human failing in terms of error and ignorance, but Kunkel stands more in the biblical tradition because he sees the great human failings in terms of egocentricity, which he viewed as the psychological equivalent of sin (Sanford 1984: 371).

Sanford also has a broad view of individuation, the coming together of different parts of the psyche, by believing that increasing psychological consciousness is not the only way to become whole. It is rather how one lives and meets the challenges of life that leads to individuation. This is not dissimilar to Schaeffer's earlier point: that the Christian who has the spirit of truth working within them will very likely have a psychological basis for their lives whether they know it or not. Kunkel said that the “we” comes in when egocentricity is overcome and true relationship becomes possible. Sanford identifies this as something that Jung's psychology lacks, arguing that his point of view, though important, was too narrowly psychological.

Sanford has made a significant contribution to the Jungian-Christian dialogue in his assessment of Kunkel. He did not see Kunkel in any way replacing Jung but as filling in a “lacuna”. This lacuna, may be viewed as a kind of missing link that has the potential to connect Jung to the contemporary Christian world.<sup>7</sup> Sanford saw it as a failure of Jung that he did not study the Ego and explore the way in which egocentric patterns defeat individuation. The tendency to see the Ego in too innocent a light will inevitably result in a projection of the evil side of the Ego into the Self. He believed that, if it is not recognised that evil resides in the egocentric deviation of the Ego, there is no option but to project it into the Self instead (Sanford 1984: 371).

Sanford's mentor after Kunkel was Morton T. Kelsey, another contemporary Jungian Christian interpreter. He makes the point that Christianity offers no intellectual solution

---

<sup>7</sup> Leanne Payne seems to ignore, or is unaware, of this aspect of Sanford's writings, as he does not give it much space in the main body of his work. Morton Kelsey is seen by her as someone who has influenced Christians the most, and although not a blind follower of Jung, uses Jungian thought extensively to develop his view of the spiritual world. See ‘The Unconscious Confusions of Christian Jungianism’ by Payne and Perrotta.

to the reality of evil, but clearly gives a way of handling the problem by way of the Cross, with victory over it assured by the Resurrection. Just as in the outer world evil is encountered, we also experience it as we turn inward. Kelsey believes that we need God's power to deal with the negative forces within us, otherwise we will not be able to bear our own inner destructiveness.

This is where Jung's concept of the Shadow comes in. If our inner darkness (sinfulness) is not owned up to (confessed), then it will inevitably take over and run our life. The Shadow are the elements that are often the opposite of what we try to be consciously, but if recognised and accepted, would benefit the whole personality (Kelsey 1977: 115). It is when they are left to operate on their own that we can become negatively possessed by them, and in turn the destruction works both within us and in the outside world.

Ulanov echoes this line of thinking when she says that the Christian tradition includes the necessity of confession, which means facing our Shadow, and further, the transforming of generalised evil into specific acts of sin, which she defines as a breaking of relationship to the source that is God (Ulanov and Dueck. 2008: 64). Ulanov echoes Kelsey when she says that the Christian faith proclaims that light has already conquered ... "God has come and entered our long's day dying ... taken responsibility for creating us free creatures who can refuse God, taking the consequences onto the cross, where the innocent Holy One suffers as if guilty. The logic of evil stops here" (Ulanov and Dueck 2008: 62).

In another interview, *Facing Evil Within*,<sup>8</sup> Sanford speaks to D. Patrick Miller about what resulted when the church lost contact with the shadow side of reality. Although the goal of Christianity has always been to be a good person, the early church recognised the truth that even believers carried the opposite within themselves. It was this realisation that made Paul say, "I find then the principle that evil is present in me, the one who wants to do good."<sup>9</sup> However, he knew it was only God who could save him from such a condition, but it was knowing what his condition was, says Sanford, that enabled him to hold things together.

In Sanford's view, the church of the Middle Ages made a serious error in classifying fantasies as evil, leaving many Christians with little option but to repress them and so drive the Shadow further underground. People who believed they were good, he reminds us, were the leaders of the darkest time of institutional Christianity, the Inquisition, whilst also unleashing a fierce persecution of non-institutional forms of their own faith, as well as against those of other faiths. This principle, of course, is not confined to the Christian faith, being a danger in all religions that demand an outward standard. To know what Jesus thought of such people, one only has to look at the anger he vented upon the Pharisees of his day.<sup>10</sup> Matthew 23, which contains Jesus' denunciation of the Pharisees, Kunkel called a very masterpiece of Depth Psychology. He goes on to paraphrase the biblical

---

<sup>8</sup> For the full transcript of 'Facing Evil Within' see [www.fearlessbooks.com/SenseReports.htm#evil](http://www.fearlessbooks.com/SenseReports.htm#evil)

<sup>9</sup> Romans 7:21 (NASB translation).

<sup>10</sup> Jesus addresses the Pharisees as 'the sons of those who murdered the prophets'. Their guilt is a collective one.



text in psychological language. “Your egocentric mask is beyond reproach. But inside yourself your unconscious tendencies, the unconscious part of your egocentricity, as well as the unconscious passions of your un-lived life, are degenerating and decaying like corpses.” He continues, “We have to find and to redeem the Shadow side of our own case history. But how can we do it? For centuries religious people have searched their consciences, but they did not get rid of the 'dead men's bones',” (Kunkel 1947: 265) I would agree with Sanford and Kunkel, that the splitting of the Ego and the Shadow is a very real and present danger to religious people.

The interview goes on to make a very insightful point, namely, that the split from the Shadow in institutional Christianity links with the loss of the feminine. In the feminine reality contrasts are not drawn so starkly, and because the whole matter of the Shadow is very subtle and complex, the feminine element would have mitigated the complete split of the Shadow and the Ego. A great deal of energy is needed to maintain this split, and the results are not that we become good people, but merely (and tragically) those who develop an ever-stronger persona (Sanford defines the persona as a face of goodness put over the Ego).

It was Kunkel who said that the secret is that the Ego is the Devil, not the Shadow and so would have agreed with Jung that the Shadow contained 90% pure gold. This may be a hard truth for Christians to recognise, and also the fact that our desire for goodness may be more a product of egoism than any genuine godliness. Even though the Shadow presents us with problems, it is the Ego, says Sanford, in its refusal to accept the entire personality that contributes much more to evil than the Shadow. Unlike the Ego, the Shadow never lies and it is for this very important reason why it is the Shadow that contains, as Marie-Louise von Franz has said, the real biography of the human being, who is always inclined to assume he is only what he thinks he is.

All this is not to deny the reality of an archetypal evil existing beyond the human person, for beyond the Shadow there is always a line we can cross to the demonic. A big question in this context is, how can we discern what looks sinister from what actually is? Sanford believes it is the feeling function, the inner means we have of ascertaining true value, that will help us. This feeling function, he says, is always free of egocentric contamination.

### Jung's Categories

As well as an understanding, however interpreted, of Jung's concepts of Evil, the Self and the Shadow, I would identify Jung's categories of opposites that make up a human person as extremely helpful for those in Christian ministry, particularly as they relate to his theory about the stages of life. Jung identified three sets of opposites within a person's make up, one being the preferred function and the other the least preferred, or dormant one. For Jung there are four functions - thinking/feeling and sensing/intuitive, and these are expressed through introversion or extroversion. Jung believed that it was by developing the least dominant function in the latter stage of life that will help us through the inevitable crisis we will have to face.

Robert Repicky makes a very interesting observation about the inferior function when he says, "It is precisely in the realm of the inferior function, where the depths of one's commitment to his relationship with God, in humble acceptance of himself and desire for transformation meets the real test. The religious experience of conversion will always be accompanied in some manner by an eruption of the inferior function as it reveals the individual's state of disintegration, rendering him helpless and in need of the healing of God's love and acceptance in grace"<sup>11</sup> (Goldsmith and Wharton 1999: 166).

Jung stressed the importance of two stages of life, the second of which, from about 35 years onwards, we are all too often woefully unprepared for. It is true that youth brings with it power to achieve and establish oneself in the external world, but as we approach mid-life, particularly if we have been successful personally and socially, it would seem right to carry on in the way that has served us so well; but in doing so we overlook that social goals have been attained at the price of shrinking our personality (Campbell 1976: 12).

Certainly after 40 our life contracts, and though it may be considered a sin for a young person to be preoccupied with self, for the ageing person, says Jung, it is a duty and a necessity to devote serious attention to ones self (Campbell 1976: 17). Jung is very clear that the second half of life must not be governed by the principles of the first, and indeed, "whoever carries over into the afternoon the laws of the morning ... must pay for it with damage to his soul, just as surely as the growing youth who tries to carry over his childish egoism into adult life must pay for this mistake with social failure" (Campbell 1976: 18).

## Conclusion

For those working in a pastoral care setting today, I would suggest an understanding of how the Shadow operates is extremely useful. This will go some way towards guarding against a mismatch between the inner and outer aspects that can so easily cause dissonance in the life of the 'good' Christian. Jung's work on dreams is one tool we can use to help a person uncover what may be repressed. If a person's Shadow is not owned up to in a Christian context, it is very easily projected onto the leadership or the structure of the Church itself, and leaving the community may be an easier option than facing the pain that individuation involves.

Jung's work on symbols is also instructive. We can only benefit from an awareness of how our hearts symbolise faith - does it correspond to the truth upheld in our tradition or is it in line with our earthly experience? There is also the matter of how our hearts symbolise ourselves. Significant work can be done with people to replace a negative self-image with a positive one through the use of symbol or metaphor. There are a myriad of Scriptures containing positive images we can apply to ourselves, and lead others to do the

---

<sup>11</sup> The original context for the quote is 'Jungian Typology and Christian Spirituality', published in *The Way*, vol 42 (1983).

same.

Developing our inferior function, particularly in the second half of life, as well as shifting our focus to the inward rather than the outward, Christians may need help in understanding the necessity of. Jung's stage of life may greatly assist in interpreting our experience as we enter into maturity, lift a burden that there is nothing wrong with us and show us that to be inwardly focused is not the same as being selfish. In adjusting to the demands of the second half of life, it may be that as well as help with specific issues, accompaniment is needed, so broadening out pastoral care into spiritual direction. And lastly, it may go without saying, but in order to maintain integrity and accountability the counsellor should be seeking to apply the same advice that they are giving others to themselves.

Jung says that we have no schools for forty year olds to prepare them for old age, death and eternity. (Campbell 1976: 17). Religion may once have been that school, but how many people, he asks, regard it as such today? This must surely be the greatest task of the pastoral ministry, to accompany people on this journey as they physically move closer to an eternal God.

## References

- Atkinson, B.F.C. (1937). *Valiant in Fight \_ a Review of the Christian Conflict*. (London: IVF)
- Broadbent, E.M. (1935). *The Pilgrim Church*. (London: Pickering and Ingels)
- Campbell, Joseph (ed). (1976). *The Portable Jung*. (New York: Penguin Books)
- Jencks, Charles. ed. (1992). *The Post-Modern Reader*. (New York: St Martin's Press).
- Goldsmith and Wharton. (1999). *Knowing Me - Knowing You*. (London: SPCK)
- Jung, C. G. (2006). *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*. (London and New York: Routledge)
- Kelsey, Morton T. (1977). *The Christian and the Supernatural*. (London: Search Press)
- Kunkel, Fritz (1947). *Creation Continues - a Psychological Interpretation of the First Gospel*. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons)
- Newbigin, Lesslie. (1963) *The Relevance of Trinitarian Doctrine for Today's Mission*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh House Press)
- Payne, Leanne (1994). *The Healing Presence*. (Eastborne: Kingsway Publications Ltd)
- Ratzinger, Joseph and Pera. Marcello. (2006). *Without Roots \_ the West, Relativism, Christianity, Isalm*. (New York: Basic Books)
- Sanford, John (ed) (1984). *Fritz Kunkel: Selected Writings*. (New York: Paulist Press)
- Schaeffer, Francis. (1973). *True Spirituality*. (London: Hodder and Stoughton)
- Stern, Karl (1961). *The Third Revolution*. (New York: Image Books)
- Ulanov, Ann Bedford and Dueck, Alvin (2008). *The Living God and our Living Psyche*. (Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge UK: William B. Eerdmans)
- Weber, Robert. (2003). *Ancient Future Faith*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Books)

