
FUNDAMENTALS OF CARL GUSTAV JUNG'S ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE

Krzysztof Leśniewski*

*The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Faculty of Theology, Department of Orthodox
Theology, Al. Racławickie 14, Lublin, 20-950, Poland*

(Received 20 November 2023, revised 20 February 2024)

Abstract

For several decades now, Carl Gustav Jung's analytical psychology has been favourably viewed by many psychologists and theologians worldwide. There are very few voices of scholars who, unlike the mainstream thinkers who admire the Swiss psychiatrist's analyses of the structures of human consciousness, find in his views several dangers for human spiritual life. From a Christian perspective, it is necessary to analyse Jung's major anthropological assumptions regarding his vision on human being as related to God (as a Trinity of Persons) and demons to make a sound assessment of his views. This article illustrates in a synthetic way that the key ideas of Jung's anthropology are difficult to reconcile with the basic tenets of Christian anthropology.

Keywords: identity, person, God, personal, evil

1. Introduction

Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961), a Swiss psychoanalyst and psychiatrist, was the founder of analytical psychology [1]. As a young man, Jung worked with Sigmund Freud for six years (1907-1913). Initially, he was strongly influenced by him but later he developed his own concept of analytical psychology. This concept was based largely on knowledge borrowed from the Far Eastern religious [2, 3] and philosophical thought [4], writings of the ancient Gnostics [5, 6], and medieval alchemical treatises [7]. Although Jung declared a positive attitude towards all religions [8], he preferred the gnostic view of God, humans and the world as part of his concept of analytical psychology [9]. Jung's works combine speculative metaphysical and psychological themes with knowledge of cultural history and psychological experience. This article will examine several issues that are relevant in the search for an answer to the question of how to evaluate the fundamentals of Jung's understanding of human being from the perspective of Christian anthropology. Beginning with a presentation of popular Christian theologians' views on Jung's theological and

*E-mail: lesni@kul.pl, tel.: +48 665990201

anthropological ideas, this article will analyse the sources from which he drew his ideas and convictions and the characteristics of Jung's anthropology. Next, in Jung's works we will look for the answer to the question of his image of God, in order to show the identity of the human person on this basis. Among the many concepts important in Jungian anthropology, we will refer to the concepts of the shadow, the personal ego, the collective unconscious and the subconscious. Finally, a comparison will be made between man's relationship to personal evil in Jung and in Christianity.

2. Attitudes of Christian theologians to Jung's ideas

When reviewing studies of Jung's body of work, it was found that very few authors *explicitly* expressed the view that his analytical psychology was incompatible with Christian anthropology. There are many attempts to justify Jung's criticism of the most important dogmas and to argue that through depth psychology it is possible to better understand not only the most important dogmatic concepts, the nature of spirituality but also the very essence of Christianity itself. For instance, although Charline P.E. Burns notes that "Jung's engagement with Christian thought is unfortunately one of the most controversial and misunderstood facets of his work", she immediately adds, "this is regrettable because his interpretation of major themes and doctrines through the lens of depth psychology can be invigorating for Christians who struggle with the place of concepts like transubstantiation, the reality of evil, or God as Trinity in modern life" [10]. Charline Burns' views on Jung are not uncommon. These views were shared and still are by many theologians who, while recognising certain dangers resulting from the concepts of Jung's analytical psychology, try to prove that they are reconcilable with Christianity. In 1957, the Jesuit theologian Raymond Hostie published a monograph *Religion and the Psychology of Jung*, in which he lambasted many of the criticisms by concluding that Jung "rediscovered the religious and the sacred and got rid of an overweening rationalism" [11]. Dominican Antonio Moreno, in his 1970 work *Jung, Gods, and Modern Man* sought to prove that Jung's greatest contribution to Theology lies in proving that symbols, dogmas and images in Christianity are archetypal [12]. Biblical scholar Wayne Rollins applied many Jungian terms to biblical exegesis in his 1983 book *Jung and the Bible* [13]. Some authors such as Morton T. Kelsey and John A. Sanford made an effort to show that Jungian psychology can be helpful in the Christian life [14, 15]. Jung was also admired by the famous Paul Tillich, who in his work *Theology of Culture* described Jung as a person "who knows so much about the depths of the human soul and religious symbols" [16]. According to Charles Hanna, the study of Jung's body work allows to "gain insight into the ways in which men become aware of God" [17]. Jung's list of contributions to Christianity seems endless. Jung is admired by successive generations of theologians and psychologists who select theses from his rich body of work, based on which they emphasise the genius of his intuition and his special contribution to the analysis of the psycho-spiritual

human sphere. Jung's impact does not end with merely demonstrating the brilliance of his diagnoses concerning the human consciousness structures. The fact that analytical psychology is entering the place that until recently was occupied by religion is far more dangerous to Christianity. It is no coincidence that the view expressed over seventy years ago (in 1951) by Hans Schaer is becoming increasingly common. Namely, Jung is a guardian and physician of the soul, far more helpful to the modern Christian than a clergyman or theologian [18].

What could be the reason for justifying Jung's controversial views and finding in his neognostic and occult system of analytical psychology claims that would be helpful in better understanding Christian dogmatics and spirituality? Although Jung declared that it was not his intention to focus on claims about God because they were metaphysical in nature and that his viewpoint was purely empirical and focused only on the psychology of such claims [19], it is clear from an analysis of his works that he consciously built his system of analytical psychology based on theological assumptions and in strong opposition to Orthodox Christian doctrine and negation of the ethics of Judeo-Christian tradition.

3. The sources of Jung's understanding of man

Jung's concept of analytical psychology took many decades to develop. In individual years, Jung further refined his concept, drawing his inspiration mainly from gnostic sources and Far Eastern religious and philosophical thought. Using such sources, he created a whole system of terms through which he attempted to describe human identity in relation to clinical experience. His fascination with alchemy resulted in the monograph *Psychology and Alchemy* (1944) [20] and such studies as: *Commentary on 'The Secret of the Golden Flower'*, *The Visions of Zosimos*, *Paracelsus as a Spiritual Phenomenon*, *The Spirit Mercurius*, and *The Philosophical Tree* [21].

As part of his interests, Jung also explored occultism and spiritualism, which resulted in such works as *On the Psychology and Pathology of So-Called Occult Phenomena* (his doctoral thesis), *On Spiritualistic Phenomena*, *The Psychological Foundation of Belief in Spirits*, *The Soul and Death*, *Psychology and Spiritualism*, *Foreword to Moser: 'Spuk: Irrglaube Oder Wahrglaube?'*, *Foreword to Jaffe: Apparitions and Precognition*, *The Future of Parapsychology* [22]. There are many contradictions and inconsistencies in Jung's works, both with regard to philosophical and theological issues. Jung's mind-set is marked by reductionism. Although he took the element of mystery very seriously in his body of work, recognising reductionism in the theories of other authors (such as Freud or Adler), he fell into the same trap - he interpreted all phenomena only in psychological terms. Phenomenological research focusing on the analysis of the realm of symbolic experience was paramount in Jung's method [23]. Hence his focus on dreams, fantasies, visions, myths and fairy tales, which he interpreted symbolically, referring primarily to motifs and

images relevant to gnosticism, alchemy, Christianity, and Far Eastern religions. He formulated essential elements of analytical psychology in relation to ancient idealistic philosophy (Platonism and Neoplatonism) [24] and German idealism [25]. Some difficulty in a comprehensive assessment of Jung's views may result from the fact that in the process of creating his anthropological and therapeutic system he used two research paradigms such as the antimaterialist paradigm (theoretical and speculative), based on idealistic and phenomenological philosophy, and the positivist and materialist paradigm that is based on natural sciences, especially Medicine.

It is not possible to present a comprehensive concept of Jung's anthropology in a synthetic form. Its many elements may be compared to mosaic pebbles, which have been scattered in different places, very far from one another. Jung expressed many of his views in opposition to the Christian vision of God and human, based on Gnostic dualism and the demonstration that good and evil are of equal value and that their assimilation is essential to individuation [26]. In order to portray the mystery of a human being, Jung created a complex conceptual system that is hierarchically ordered. Jung invented some of the concepts that are part of the system of analytical psychology and gave them specific meanings. He borrowed some of the concepts from Philosophy, Theology or other fields of Humanities and Science, frequently changing their original designatum so that they acquired a specific aura of mystery. The study of Jung's works can be compared to an occult initiation, which results in a separation from the real world, i.e. familiar civilisation and culture.

4. The specifics of Jung's anthropological system

Jung viewed a human being in a dialectical manner. On the one hand, Jung pointed out the uniqueness and exceptionality of a human being. On the other hand, he focused on human enslavement by demons that reign in the unconscious. According to him the devil should be considered as kind of the 'shadow' archetype, and in this sense it is "the dangerous aspect of the unrecognized dark half of the personality" [27]. The assimilation of archetypes and symbols indicated by Jung seems to be both an ideal key to help in the diagnosis of problems related to one's own identity and an effective therapeutic method that allows to gain not only insight into oneself, but also a sense of belonging to a selected caste [28-30]. The path of spiritual maturation that Jung proposes is long and unpredictable. This is because new demons, which need to be recognised, accepted and assimilated, are constantly emerging from the unconscious. Human beings, following the path indicated by Jung, feel simultaneously weak and limited in their abilities and at the same time they have flashes of being an all-powerful 'god'. The more the human person describes their identity using concepts borrowed from analytical psychology, the more they discover that there is actually no difference between good and evil, truth and falsehood, beauty and ugliness, holiness and sinfulness. This is obvious because Jung argued that bringing opposites together is the only way to embody

the fullness of humanity. In Jung's anthropological system, the bivalent logic within which it is possible to establish a specific boundary between truth and falsehood or good and evil is replaced by cognitive relativism and negation of Christian ethics. This was based on the Jungian assumption that the Judeo-Christian ethics is a product of shadow repression. Jung attributes 'numinous ambivalence' to God in opposition to divine justice, love, or goodness. For Christians, Jung's failure to acknowledge any external standard or reference point for evaluating values should be a warning sign that this may be dangerous, as it carries the risk of subjectivism, relativism and egocentrism. According to Jung, humans are meant to strive for the fullness of their humanity without reference to God the Creator and Saviour, as they are actually 'god' themselves. If human beings are not a creation of God in the Trinity of Persons, then they do not need God to be saved. Interiorization of God and making Him into an idol by giving Him anthropomorphic characteristics contributes to distorting His image in the human mind. God is reduced to a construct of various types of imagery from the collective and individual unconscious. The blurring of the image of God, along with the simultaneous emphasis on His apophaticism and identification with the human ego, is combined with the presentation of Him in a bipolar manner: both good and evil. Is it possible for this type of dialectical image of God not to have a devastating effect on human consciousness? After all, the Jungian interpretation of God does not represent the Living and True God, but a caricatured idol, which is an illusion or a set of dynamically changing images that, regardless of whether they fascinate or frighten, are ontologically indistinguishable from human beings.

5. In the image of what God, human being is created?

In the 1948 work *A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity* (*Versuch einer psychologischen Deutung des Trinitätsdogmas*), Jung attacked the most important Christian dogma - the Trinitarian dogma. Jung began his critique of the Trinitarian dogma with the disclaimer that he had no theological knowledge and no interest in exploring the complex metaphysical speculations that had been accumulated in past centuries [31]. Did he actually not have any theological knowledge? If we examine in detail such works by Jung as *A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity* (1942, 1948), *Transformation Symbolism in the Mass* (1942, 1954), *Über die Beziehung der Psychotherapie zur Seelsorge* (*The Relationship of Psychotherapy to Pastoral Care*) (1932, 1948), *Psychoanalysis and Pastoral Care* (1928), and *Answer to Job* (1952) [32, 33], it becomes clear that his proclaimed lack of theological knowledge must be considered provocative. In both these and many other works, Jung referred to Christian doctrine and criticised it from different points of view. He drew his arguments in particular from the secret teachings of ancient gnostics and medieval alchemists. A hallmark of Jung's theological views was the symbolic treatment of Divine Persons. An example of this type of depersonalisation can be found, for example, in the book *Aion: Researches Into*

the Phenomenology of the Self (1951), in one chapter of which Christ is reduced to a symbol of the Self.

Jung declared that the primary purpose of his study on conceptions of God in religions was to clarify “those psychological views which” seemed to him “necessary if we are to understand the dogma as a symbol in the psychological sense” [31, p. 111]. Given that there is no doubt that the doctrine of the Trinity originally corresponded to the patriarchal social order [31, p. 151], he insisted that “the history of the Trinity presents itself as the gradual crystallization of an archetype that molds the anthropomorphic conceptions of father and son, of life, and of different persons into an archetypal and numinous figure, the ‘Most Holy Three-in-One’” [31, p. 151]. According to Jung, “the Trinity and its inner life process appear as a closed circle, a self-contained divine drama in which man plays, at most, a passive part” [31, p. 152]. In Jung’s opinion, it is difficult to see how God in the Trinity could practically, morally or symbolically mean something to humans [31, 153]. Before Jung explicitly attacked the dogma of the Trinity by referring to prehistoric Greek thought, he sought to demonstrate that “the quaternity is an archetype of almost universal occurrence. It forms the logical basis for any whole judgement.” [31, p. 167; 34]. Jung stressed that the Trinity should be understood as a process [31, p. 196]. If we add a “fourth element” to it, then “this process would culminate in a condition of absolute totality” [31, p. 196]. Reflection on the Trinitarian dogma is essential to understand Jungian anthropology. The analysis of the intra-Trinitarian relationship and God’s reference to Lucifer makes it possible to determine the relationship between human and their shadow. Just as Lucifer is in opposition to the Trinity of the Divine Persons, so every human being is in relation to their own shadow, or layers of the unconscious. A human being becomes aware of their own shadow only during individuation, i.e. the pursuit of a separate yet unique wholeness in their development [31, p. 197-199].

God, as analysed within analytical psychology, is primarily an archetype that cannot be apprehended by reason [31, p. 74, 148-151]. More likely, God can be felt intuitively deep within oneself as a psychic reality [31, p. 151-152]. Hence, it is not important whether God actually exists [31, p. 158-159]. Reflecting on the existence of God is a concern for philosophers or theologians [31, p. 306-307]. For Jung, it was important to recognise God as the beginning of all of human’s psychic life, given that He is present within [31, p. 84-85]. And if God is present in humans, He is the same as the human ego. Therefore, it is impossible to distinguish the human ego from God [31, p. 157].

From an anthropological perspective, it is highly relevant that Jung presents God as simultaneously good and evil. Evil is present in God in the likeness of a shadow that is an integral part of human identity [35]. While being aware that human may be tempted to treat God as the supreme good (Latin *summum bonum*) [36] and consider Him as someone else entirely, Jung proposes that we recognise the existence of divinity within ourselves. For this purpose, he uses the concept of archetype. In his view, the archetype is a constitutive element of the entire human psychic structure. As the basis of the layers of the

collective unconscious, such archetype is not actualized. Archetypes are divided into archetypes-as-such, i.e. archetypes that are not actualized, and archetypes actualized in image form (archetypal images). Through archetypes, humans can react psychologically and experience in their imagination different kinds of motifs, especially those that are present in religions, myths, fairy tales or dreams. Archetypes that are not actualized are unconscious, potential and autonomous in nature. Jung combined the God archetype with the ego archetype in such an imprecise way that he actually blends these archetypes. Humans should seek God within themselves, namely in the centre, called the *self*. Jung explains that: "Intellectually the self is no more than a psychological concept, a construct that serves to express an unknowable essence which cannot grasp as such, since by definition it transcends our powers of comprehension. It might be equally well be called the 'God within us'" [27, p. 325]. Jung's concept in this regard is illogical. On the one hand, he recommended not to identify God with one's own ideas or projections in consciousness. On the other hand, he argued that God actually exists as an ego archetype. It should be noted that both in Judaism and in Christianity it is unacceptable to identify God with a human soul. A human being, at most, may enter into covenant with God and abide in relationship with Him. The question is what led Jung to identify the ego archetype with the God archetype. Why did he think that the God of the Judeo-Christian tradition should be regarded as evidence of shadow repression rather than evidence of the collective unconscious? Why did he claim that God must contain evil within Himself? Why was he convinced that if a person does not acknowledge that evil is part of God, they are afraid to accept it as a shadow of God in the same way that they are afraid of their own shadow? On the one hand, he justified the lack of precise explanation of many of his views by stating "Here faith or Philosophy alone can decide, neither of which has anything to do with the empiricism of the scientist" [31, p. 190]. On the other hand, he sought to prove that everything within his psychology. Methodologically, Jung's arguments can be considered a typical example of wishful thinking, regardless of his intentions.

Jung's reflections on God were inextricably related to his reflections on demons, especially Lucifer. While convinced of the validity of the gnostic systems justifying the existence and significance of personal evil, he believed that the biblical tradition obscures this truth. The gnostic view that the devil, as Satanaël, is the first son of God, and Christ the second [37] - was for Jung the basis for his insistence on abandoning the Trinitarian formula and replacing it with the formula of the "quaternity" [31, p. 169-170], for "God is quaternity" (Latin *quarternarium*), called Barbelo by the Gnostics [31, p. 190]. Such views are in stark contrast to the Christian definition of God as "the ultimate good" (Latin *summum bonum*) within which there is no place for the presence of Evil in the Trinity. The devil, according to Christian doctrine, remains outside the Trinity as the 'ape of God'. Satan, in turn, is the "shadow of the Trinity" (Latin *umbra trinitatis*), analogically to the role of the Antichrist [31, p. 171-172]. According to Jung, the three Divine Persons need a fourth one for, without it,

they lose their meaning. The inclusion of a fourth person in the Trinity would have a redemptive and healing effect on man [31, p. 187-189].

Jung, fascinated by the Gnostic explanation of reality, made use of the principle of the coincidence of opposites (Latin *coincidentia oppositorum*), which according to Mircea Eliade is “the ultimate aim of the whole psychic activity” of human being [38]. Petteri Pietkainen states that Jung could be ‘called as a psychologist of *coincidentia oppositorum*’ [39]. The essence of this principle was precisely presented by Nicholas of Cusa, a medieval thinker who sought scientific inspiration in the Platonic, mystical, scholastic and humanist traditions [40-43]. Jung seventeen times cites Nicholas of Cusa as his source for the above mentioned Latin term. While Nicolaus of Cusa, as part of his “learned ignorance” (Latin *docta ignorantia*) argued that God is a “coincidence of opposites”, for there is nothing greater or lesser outside God and as such He is completely transcendent and inaccessible to any intellectual cognition, Jung regarded this “coincidence of opposites” from a gnostic perspective, arguing that both good and evil are present in God [44]. He pointed out the “coincidence of opposites” also as a fundamental hermeneutical principle through which not only the mystery of God but also the mystery of man can be explained. It should therefore come as no surprise that Jung sought to prove that there is no omnipotent God who is the Creator and Saviour of man. By undermining the Christian Trinitarian dogma and divinising Satan by making him equal to God, the father of analytical psychology contributed to changing not only the image of God in people’s minds but also to popularising the illusion that God does not ontologically differ from him.

6. The identity of human person according to Jung

How did Jung describe the identity of the human person? A human being is a soul combined with a material body. In his view, since soul and matter are contained in one and the same world, and are also in constant contact with each other, it is quite likely that they are two aspects of the same reality [45]. If the soul (psyche) was completely distinct from matter then how could it be able to move matter? And if matter was alien to the soul, could it give rise to it [46]? What, therefore, is the body? Jung explained that “The body is merely the visibility of the soul”. And what is the soul? “The soul is the psychological experience of the body”. Because ultimately they are “really one and the same thing” [47]. If Jung equated the spiritual element (the soul) with the material element (the body), it can be inferred that this was based on a monistic vision of the human person, which is definitely different from the concept of man as a ‘spiritualised body’ or ‘embodied soul’ derived from the Old Testament. If the soul and the body are two aspects of the same reality, then in relation to Christian soteriology, a question that might be asked of Jung is whether with the death of a person both the soul and the body are annihilated.

Of the concepts by which Jung represented various aspects of being human, those most important in his system, such as: 'ego', self, soul, psyche, anima, animus, persona or shadow have specifically defined referents, and the relationships between them are arranged in a complex system. The relation of the unconscious to consciousness was presented by Jung as a relation that cannot be clearly explained using the laws of bivalent logic. Truth and falsehood merge into one. Jung saw the ego as a composite reality to which all that is contained in consciousness is related. The ego forms the centre of the field of consciousness. It is the subject of all personal acts of consciousness [46, p. 3]. The ego consists of general awareness of one's own body and data stored in memory. It is a collection of psychic facts that has the ability to attract various kinds of content from the unconscious, which is generally a dark and mysterious realm [48]. 'Self-knowledge' is usually mistaken for the knowledge of one's ego-consciousness. It is wrongly assumed that having consciousness of one's ego is equivalent to knowing oneself. However, this is not the case, because the ego only knows what is in the field of consciousness and has no access to what is hidden in the unconscious [49]. This personal unconscious is personified by the shadow [50]. The self was defined by Jung as the totality of the conscious and unconscious psyche [20, p. 182]. The self, as a symbol of wholeness, is a coincidence of opposites (Latin *coincidentia oppositorum*) and is therefore composed of both light and darkness at the same time [51]. The relation of the ego to the self is the same as that of the moved to the mover. The self surrounds the ego on all sides and is therefore superior to it. The self, like the unconscious, exists a priori and it is from it that the ego emerges. The self is the unconscious prefiguration of the ego. From this it follows that man does not create himself. Rather, "It is not I who create myself, rather I happen to myself" [31, p. 259]. The self, in making an effort at self-realisation, goes beyond the ego-personality. Jung emphasised that "the experience of the self is always a defeat for the ego" [50, p. 545-546].

7. Why the concept of shadow is so important in Jungian anthropology and therapy?

The concept of the shadow in Jung's anthropology is of great importance both for understanding who a human person is and conducting therapy within analytical psychology. The shadow is "a living part of the personality and therefore wants to live with it in some form" [52]. If one is not aware of having a shadow, part of the existence of one's personality is thus denied [53]. By assimilating the shadow, a human being gains a body. Then the animal sphere of instinct emerges and, suppressed by fictions and illusions, the primitive psyche reaches the realm of consciousness [54]. Acceptance of the shadow can be compared to passing through a narrow door to go down to a deep well [52, p. 21]. The more one turns to the light of consciousness, the greater is the shadow behind one's back [53, p. 49]. The shadow is "the other side of the Creator" [55]. In order to explore the shadow, one must recognize the dark aspects of one's

own personality and acknowledge that they are present and real [46, p. 8]. What is light without shadow? What is God without evil present in Him? Jung argued that “to ascribe infinite evil to man and all good to God would make man much too important: he would be as big as God, because light and absence of light are equal, they belong together in order to make the whole” [47, vol. II, p. 929].

Jung not only combined the spiritual element with the material one but also argued that every man carries within himself a primeval unconscious image of the feminine (anima) and every woman has an innate unconscious image of the masculine (animus). Animus corresponds to the paternal Logos and anima corresponds to the maternal Eros [46, p. 14-15]. The task is to distinguish the shadow from both the anima (the source of creativity) and the animus (the source of contact with the unconscious) in order to better understand everything that is negative in oneself [56]. The integration of the shadow is a first step in the analytic process to identify what anima and animus are. Jung's classification of the human spiritual sphere into animus and anima has its origin in the thesis that every human being is torn apart and thus his or her ‘unbalanced psyche’ not only suffers internally, but also becomes the cause of division in terms of relations with others and society as a whole. According to Jung's concept, the human psyche is not a monolith. It consists of three parts: the collective unconscious, the ego, and the personal unconscious. According to Jung, the psyche is not the same as the soul. The soul, in fact, is just some isolated set of functions that can be described as a ‘personality.’ The soul is in opposition to the persona, which is a mental ‘mask’ that is formed in conflict with the expectations of the external social world as a necessary adaptive attitude that enables the achievement of human comfort. The quality of the soul is unapproachability. In Jung's system, the soul should be understood as a functional part of the psyche. There are several subsystems in the psyche. According to Jung's need to specify the function of the psyche, he either pointed to two subsystems, namely the sphere of the conscious and the sphere of the subconscious, or he pointed to the relationship of the psyche to the subsystems that are hierarchically ordered. In the latter classification, he identified the ego/‘I’ (whose basic task is adaptation to the external world), the persona (adaptation of the individual to social reality), the soul (adaptation to the subject's internal reality), the personal unconscious (proper to the individual), and the collective unconscious (common to the entire human race).

8. The personal ego of human being vs. the collective unconscious and the subconscious

The personal ego emerges from the collective unconscious, suppressing the assimilated content in the personal unconscious. In order to reveal the collective unconscious, it is necessary to refer to archetypes and symbols that preserve the continuity of the entire experience of all past ages. The personal ego is marked by autonomy. It can only be accessed through intuition, imagination, projections, conceptual associations, art, folklore and dreams. The conscious ego

emerges from the collective unconscious in the form of a mask or persona. Jung treats the concept of persona as collective unconscious data felt and regarded as personal. Persona is a set of ways of being arbitrarily selected from the collective unconscious. In his definition of persona, Jung refers to the original meaning of the term persona, namely the mask put on by Etruscan warriors (*phersu*) when going on plundering expeditions across Europe or actors in ancient Greek theatre (*prosopon*) [57]. He fails to consider that Christianity introduced to European civilisation a new and revolutionary understanding of the term persona/prosopon to describe the human person [58]. It should be stressed that a person in Jung's anthropology is a being who is very much dependent on what is going on in the subconscious and, therefore, can control own life to a very small extent. This results in pessimism about the possibility of transformation and maturity of the human person. Human beings have great difficulty relating to other people because of the projection of those parts of themselves that they have repressed. Hence, Jung encourages to see the shadow within oneself, for only by doing so will it be possible to understand others better and love them as they are [27, p. 50]. The ability to deal with the dark sides of oneself, directly and indirectly, affects the building of healthy relationships with other people.

For Jung, the human being is first and foremost an individuality or individual, not a personal being in the Christian sense. Jung refers to the process of inner growth towards the fullness of humanity as individuation. Individuation is separating one's conscious ego from unconscious images, as they pose a threat by inducing one to succumb to deceptive illusions. This endless task for every human being is essential for the fulfilment of the individual and the betterment of the world. As part of the individuation process, a human being is supposed to consciously extract data from the subconscious. It is helpful in this process to analyse dreams or other manifestations of the unconscious to consistently move towards a more integrated fullness of self. Jungian individuation cannot be equated with the spiritual development of the human person in Christianity. A kind of elitism is noticeable in Jung's anthropological system, expressed in the fact that only certain people are able to reach a higher level of development, which is due to the specificity of nature itself. He stresses that "nature is aristocratic" and explains that "only those individuals can attain to a higher degree of consciousness who are destined to it and called to it from the beginning, i.e. who have a capacity and an urge for higher differentiation" [27, p. 165]. Achieving a higher degree of consciousness is equivalent to attaining the fullness of one's humanity. It involves combining the unconscious with the conscious. Jungian elitism cannot be reconciled with the saving will of God that marks the Christian tradition.

9. Human relationship to personal evil in Jung and Christianity

Jung's predestinarianism is in stark opposition to God, "who wants all people to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth" (1 Timothy 2.4).

Furthermore, the essence of individuation is man's striving for an undefined fullness, which is achieved by combining opposites (e.g. good and evil). In Christianity, the essence of spiritual development is becoming more like God by fighting against personal evil. The problem of evil is fundamental in the evaluation of Jung's system of analytical psychology. For it is central to the critique of Christian ethics. To undermine its meaning, Jung appealed to concept present in the works of Origen, Athanasius the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and Augustine, elaborated later on by the scholastics that evil is the absence of good (Latin *privatio boni*) [59-63]. According to the father of analytical psychology, this "robs evil of absolute existence and makes it a shadow that has only a relative existence dependent on light. Good, on the other hand, is credited with a positive substantiality" [31, p. 168]. Referring to psychological experience, Jung proclaimed that 'good' and 'evil' are the polar opposites of the moral judgement that a human being makes. And moral judgement can only be made about opposites that are equally real and possible. Hence, the logical conclusion is that the opposite of a seeming evil can only be a seeming good, and evil devoid of substance can be contrasted with equally non-substantial good. And Jung's reasoning intends to show that although "the opposite of 'existence' is 'non-existence', the opposite of an existing good can never be a non-existing evil, for the latter is a contradiction in terms and opposes to an existing good something incommensurable with it" [31, p. 168]. In this way, Jung tried to prove that it follows from the opposition of good and evil that evil cannot be considered the absence of good. Evil is the other side of good, in the same way, that light is unthinkable without darkness [31, p. 168]. It should be strongly emphasised that what happens in a human being, Jung derives from what he believes takes place in God himself. Within this kind of logic, evil in relation to the Trinity is the same as the shadow in relation to the human soul. Human maturity is about accepting good and evil [64]. One has to come to terms with them and deal with them. In such a view, there is no room for the recognition of the moral imperative present in the Judeo-Christian tradition. There is also no room for sin. And if there is no reference to objective moral standards, the distinction between good and evil becomes blurred. Jung's argument that morality automatically leads to the denial of evil appears to be completely unconvincing. Fundamental from a soteriological perspective in Christian doctrine is the importance of man's freedom of choice between good and evil, i.e. to embody the image of God or commit sins and become like demons [65]. Within his anthropology, Jung rejected the Christian ethical tradition and proposed instead identifying good with evil, which must consequently lead to relativism and subjectivism. The failure to define the boundaries between good and evil blurs the distinctions between non-creation and creation, objectivity and subjectivity, which are crucial for Christianity.

10. Conclusions

According to Thomas B. Kirsch: “Jung’s influence has reached across the globe [...]. His books have been translated into many languages, and many of his theories have become part of everyday language such as complex, archetype, introvert, extravert, synchronicity, and individuation.” [66] His analytical psychology has captivated many psychologists and psychotherapists for over a century. One might even venture to say that it would be unthinkable for contemporary psychology to abandon its essential anthropological, diagnostic or therapeutic assumptions. The vision of the human person that Jung proposed became normative for the Social sciences. Its widespread acceptance is so great that it has effectively supplanted the Christian view of human beings. In this context, the question arises as to what is so attractive about Jung’s anthropological system that it has effectively become the only valid explanation of the mystery that is human in the scientific world. Interestingly, for at least several decades now, we have been witnessing a process of abandoning the Christian conceptual categories, which in past centuries were used to show precisely who the human being is as a person created in the image and likeness of God, what is the essence of human dignity and what human freedom entails [67]. The process of Christianising Jung’s neo-Gnostic views is also worrying. This is particularly noticeable if one examines the content of lectures on psychology given in seminaries or Catholic universities. Therefore, many questions can be asked about whether there really is no other way to explain the mystery of God and humans today than within the framework of Jung’s system of analytical psychology...

Why do Christian theologians and psychologists draw so little (or not at all...) on the diagnostic and therapeutic wisdom preserved in the spiritual traditions of Catholicism or Eastern Orthodoxy? Why has the hesychastic therapeutic method, based on biblical and patristic anthropology, whose fundamental premise is recognising the human being as a creation of God [68] and a spiritual, psychological and corporeal being, been forgotten? There is a big difference between hesychasm and analytical psychology. As a diagnostic and therapeutic method, hesychasm is based on anthropology that is entirely different from Jung’s and appeals to a completely different image of God. In hesychasm, the transformation of the human person, although requiring the undertaking of various spiritual struggles, is primarily the work of God in the Most Holy Trinity [69] and not the result of work on oneself within the process of individuation postulated by Jung. It is also imperative to note that there is no room for the synergy of the human being with God to fight demons within analytical psychology. It is also worth noting the different treatment of philocalic texts in hesychasm and the Jungian system. In hesychasm, the Word of God is the Word of the Holy Scriptures that saves man in the community of the Church. At the same time, in analytical psychology, the Bible is treated the same way as books considered sacred in other religions, namely as a myth through which humans can know themselves better.

In Christianity, there is no place for self-salvation (Greek *autosoteria*), self-purification or self-improvement through accepting opposites, which are present in the Jungian method. In opposition to the analysis of the mental states of the soul (present in consciousness and emerging from the unconscious - collective or personal) proposed by Jung, hesychasm examines thoughts (Greek *logismoî*) and imaginings (Greek *phantasiai*), appearing in consciousness/imagination (Greek *phantasia*), concerning their spiritual sources (especially the personal God and personal demons). The excessive concentration on what goes on inside a person to the detriment of the importance of external conditions, typical of analytical psychology, is not the same as the discernment (Greek *diakrisis*) between thoughts and imaginings in relation to real existing personal evil and the sense of responsibility for the salvation of others in the hesychastic method [70-72].

Why, then, do Christian theologians of spirituality or Christian psychologists fail to see that Jung's excessive focus on the inner states of the soul leads to the glorification of cognitive subjectivism and social alienation and the escalation of egotism? One can endlessly ask questions relating to analytical psychology and be surprised that Jung's anthropological concepts form the basis of most, if not all, contemporary psychotherapy schools. There also remains one open question about what spiritual power makes Jung's anti-Christian vision of the human being the essential basis for diagnosis and therapy of the human person.

References

- [1] S. Shamdasani, *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003, 3-28.
- [2] J.J. Clarke, *Jung and Eastern Thought. A dialogue with the Orient*, Routledge, London, 1994, 57-140.
- [3] H. Coward, *Jung and Eastern Thought*, State University of New York Press, New York, 1985, 3-169.
- [4] M. Nagy, *Philosophical Issues in the Psychology of C.G. Jung*, State University of New York Press, New York, 1991, 37-264.
- [5] R.A. Segal, *Religion*, **17(4)** (1987) 301-336.
- [6] S.A. Hoeller, *The Gnostic Jung and the Seven Sermons to the Dead*, Quest Books - Theosophical Publishing House, Wheaton (IL), 1982, 1-43.
- [7] S. Marlan, *C.G. Jung and the Alchemical Imagination. Passages into the Mysteries of Psyche and Soul*, Routledge, London, 2021, 8-115.
- [8] J.W. Heisig, *Imago Dei: A Study of C.G. Jung's Psychology of Religion*, Associated University Press, Cranbury (NJ), 1979, 3-144.
- [9] M. Palmer, *Freud and Jung on Religion*, Routledge, London, 1997, 85-196.
- [10] C.P.E. Burns, *Jung's Engagement with Christian Theology*, in *Teaching Jung*, K. Bulkeley & C. Weldon (eds.), Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011, 96.
- [11] R. Hostie, *Religion and the Psychology of Jung*, Sheed and Ward, London, 1957, 222.
- [12] A. Moreno, *Jung, Gods, and Modern Man*, Sheldon Press, London, 1970, 252.
- [13] W. Rollins, *Jung and the Bible*, John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1986.

- [14] M.T. Kelsey, *God, Dreams, and Revelations*, Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, 1974, 81-213.
- [15] J.A. Sanford, *Dreams: God's Forgotten Language*, J.B. Lippincott, Philadelphia, 1968, 13-216.
- [16] P. Tillich, *Theology of Culture*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1964, 122.
- [17] C. Hanna, *The Face of the Deep: The Religious Ideas of C.G. Jung*, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1967, 20.
- [18] H. Schaer, *Religion and the Cure of Souls in Jung's Psychology*, Routledge, London, 1999, 206.
- [19] C.G. Jung, *Letters*, G. Adler & A. Jaffé (eds.), vol. 2, Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ), 1973-1974, 518-519.
- [20] C.G. Jung, *Psychology and Alchemy*, R.F.C. Hull (ed.), *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, vol. 12, Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ), 1968.
- [21] C.G. Jung, *Alchemical Studies*, in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, G. Adler & R.F.C. Hull (eds.), vol. 13, Princeton University Press/Bollingen Paperback, Princeton, 1983.
- [22] C.G. Jung, *Psychology and the Occult*, Routledge, London, 2008.
- [23] R. Brooke, *Jung and Phenomenology*, Routledge, London, 2015, 29-52, 140-165, 179-181.
- [24] R. Robertson, Psychological Perspectives A Semiannual Journal of Jungian Thought, **44(1)** (2002) 80-95.
- [25] P. Bishop, J. Anal. Psychol., **57(3)** (2012) 335-363.
- [26] A. Ribí, *The Search for Roots: C. G. Jung and the Tradition of Gnosis*, Gnosis Archive Books, Los Angeles, 2013, 59-153.
- [27] C.G. Jung, *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, vol. 7, H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler & W. McGuire (eds.), Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1972, 139.
- [28] A. Samuels, *Jung and the Post-Jungians*, Routledge, London, 2005, 19-37.
- [29] J.-L. Le Quellec, *Jung and les archetypes. Un mythe contemporain*, Sciences Humaines Éditions, Auxerre Cedex, 2013, 75-81.
- [30] D. Lindenfeld, Rethink. Hist., **13(2)** (2009) 217-234.
- [31] C.G. Jung, *A Psychological Approach to the Trinity*, in *Psychology and Religion: West and East, The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, G. Adler & R.F.C. Hull (eds.), vol. 11, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1969, 110.
- [32] J. Ryce-Menuhin, *Jung's Answer to Job in the Light of the Monotheisms*, in *Jung and the Monotheisms. Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, Routledge, London, 1994, 111-124.
- [33] J.P. Dourley, *Jung and His Mystics. In the end it all comes to nothing*, Routledge, London, 2014, 170-186.
- [34] J.P. Dourley, *Paul Tillich, Carl Jung and the Recovery of Religion*, Routledge, New York, 2008, 102-109.
- [35] H.L. Philp, *Jung and the problem of Evil*, Rockliff, London, 1958, 5-261.
- [36] K.E. Kirk, *The Vision of God: The Christian Doctrine of the Summum Bonum*, James Clarke & Co., Cambridge, 1998.
- [37] Z. Pleše, *Evil and Its Sources in Gnostic Tradition*, in *Die Wurzel allen Übels*, F. Jourdan & R. Hirsch-Luipold (eds.), Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2014, 101-132.
- [38] M. Eliade, *Mephistopheles and the Androgyne. Studies in Religious Myth and Symbol*, New Sheed and Ward, New York, 1965, 81.
- [39] P. Pietkainen, *C.G. Jung and the psychology of symbolic forms*, Academia Scientiarum Fennica, Helsinki, 1999, 239.

- [40] J. Hopkins, *Nicholas of Cusa's metaphysic of contraction*, Banning, Minneapolis, 1983.
- [41] J. Hopkins, *Nicholas of Cusa's dialectical mysticism*, Banning, Minneapolis, 1985.
- [42] C.L. Miller, *Reading Cusanus: Metaphor and dialectic in a conjectural universe*, Catholic University of America Press, Washington DC, 2003.
- [43] P.J. Casarella (ed.), *Cusanus: The legacy of learned ignorance*, Catholic University of America Press, Washington DC, 2006.
- [44] D. Henderson, *Studies in Spirituality*, 20 (2010) 101-113.
- [45] C.G. Jung, *On the Nature of the Psyche*, in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, vol. 8, ed. H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler & W. McGuire, Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ), 1972, 279.
- [46] C.G. Jung, *Aion. Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self*, in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, vol. 9, Bollingen Foundation/Pantheon Books, New York, 1959, 261.
- [47] C.G. Jung, *Nietzsche's Zarathustra. Notes of the Seminar Given in 1934-1939*, J.L. Jarret (ed.), vol. I (30 January 1935), Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ), 1988, 355.
- [48] C.G. Jung, *The Tavistock Lectures. On the Theory and Practice of Analytical Psychology*, in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, vol. 18, H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler & W. McGuire (eds.), Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ), 1977, 11.
- [49] C.G. Jung, *The Undiscovered Self (Present and Future)*, in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, vol. 10, H. Read, M. Fordham & G. Adler (eds.), Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ), 1970, 249.
- [50] C.G. Jung, *Mysterium Coniunctionis. An Inquiry into the Separation and Synthesis of Psychic Opposites in Alchemy*, in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, ed. H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler & W. McGuire, vol. 14, Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ), 1970, 106.
- [51] C.G. Jung, *Symbols of Transformation. An Analysis of the Prelude to a Case of Schizophrenia*, in *Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, R.F.C. Hull (ed.), vol. 5, Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ), 1968, 594.
- [52] C.G. Jung, *The Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*, in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, G. Adler & R.F.C. Hull (eds.), vol. 9, Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ), 1968, 20.
- [53] C.G. Jung, *Dream Analysis. Notes of the Seminar Given in 1928-1930*, W. McGuire (ed.), Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ), 1984, 53.
- [54] C.G. Jung, *The Psychology of the Transference*, Ark Paperbacks, London, 1983, 77.
- [55] C.G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, Vintage Books, New York, 1989, 328.
- [56] C.G. Jung, *Visions. Notes of the Seminar Given in 1930-1934*, C. Douglas (ed.), vol. II (25 January 1933), Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ), 1997, 890.
- [57] M. Nédoncelle, *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 22(3-4) (1948) 279-299.
- [58] J.D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion. Studies in Personhood and the Church*, Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1997, 27-49.
- [59] J. Hick, *Evil and the God of Love*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2010, 38-68.
- [60] G.R. Evans, *Augustine on Evil*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982, 1-6.
- [61] D.A. Cress, *Augustinian Studies*, 20 (1989) 109-128.
- [62] B. Anglin and S. Goetz, *Int. J. Philos. Relig.*, 13(1) (1982) 3-12.
- [63] T.C. Calder, *Am. Philos. Quart.*, 44(4) (2007) 317-381.

- [64] E. Farley, *Good and Evil. Interpreting a Human Condition*, Augsburg Fortress, Minneapolis, 1990, 115-138.
- [65] L. Vicens, *Christianity and the Problem of Free Will*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2023, 5-62.
- [66] T.B. Kirsch, *The legacy of C.G. Jung*, in *Who Owns Jung?*, A. Casement (ed.), Karnac Books Ltd., London, 2007, 155.
- [67] Kallistos of Diokleia (Ware), *'In the Image and Likeness': The Uniqueness of the Human Person*, in *Personhood: Orthodox Christianity and the Connection Between Body, Mind and Soul*, J.T. Chirban (ed.), Praeger, Westport (CN), 1996, 1-13.
- [68] D. Staniloae, *The Experience of God. Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, vol. 2. *The World: Creation and Deification*, I. Ionita & R. Barringer (eds.), Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Brookline (MA), 2005, 67-118.
- [69] Kallistos of Diokleia (Ware), *The Understanding of Salvation in the Orthodox Tradition*, in *For Us and For Our Salvation*, R. Lannoy (ed.), Brill, Utrecht, 1994, 107-131.
- [70] J.T. Lienhard, *Theol. Stud.*, **41(3)** (1980) 505-529.
- [71] S. Ramfos, *Like a Pelikan in the Wilderness. Reflections on the Sayings of the Desert Fathers*, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Brookline (MA), 2000, 218-227.
- [72] A.D. Rich, *Discernment in the Desert Fathers: Diakrisis in the Life and Thought of Early Egyptian Monasticism*, Paternoster Press, London, 2007, 39-237.