

C. G. Jung's Answer To Job: A Half Century Later

J. Marvin Spiegelman

Abstract

A detailed summary of Jung's *Answer to Job* is presented, along with a commentary on it and on how Jung's insights have held up over a half century, particularly in the area of the rise of the feminine principle. Further sections discuss the role of eros, further Biblical material, and intuitions on how the various strands in the world image of the Self (particularly among the monotheisms) are developing.

Keywords

Job, the Feminine, evil, eros, Biblical progression, Judaeo-Christian psychology, strands in the Self.

The invasion of evil signifies that something previously good has turned into something harmful . . . the ruling moral principle, although excellent to begin with, in time loses its essential connection with life, since it no longer embraces life's variety and abundance. What is rationally correct is too narrow a concept to grasp life in its totality and give it permanent expression.

(C. G. Jung, *Answer to Job*)

I

It is now more than half a century since C. G. Jung wrote *Answer to Job* (Jung, 1952), to my mind one of the most important spiritual texts of the twentieth century. That book was nothing less than a psychological study of the history of God over the last twenty-five hundred years. Less spectacularly considered, Jung attempted to understand how the Self, the image of God in the Western psyche, had undergone change and development over that time. Of special interest to him was the problematic condition of that psychological image at the approaching end of the Christian aion, as Jung put it.

As might be expected, the book was greeted with alarm and misunderstanding, both in theological and scientific circles, but has enjoyed a continuing

J. Marvin Spiegelman has a Ph.D. in clinical and social psychology from UCLA (1952) and an analyst's diploma from the C. G. Jung Institute Zürich (1959). He has taught at Hebrew University, UCLA, USC, and Pacifica; published some 80 articles; authored, co-authored and edited twenty books, the most recent being *The Divine WABA* (within, among, between, around): A Jungian Exploration of Spiritual Paths.

interest among the educated public. The larger academic world has neglected this book, but a recent scholarly work has gathered together all the relevant literature (Bishop, 2002). Theologians, such as Victor White, from the Catholic side (White, 1959), and Martin Buber, from a Jewish perspective (Buber, 1952), found much to criticize in Jung's attempt at the "psychization," so to speak, of the God image. Comments even from some of Jung's followers suggest a lack of understanding of what he was about. In a 1993 volume of the *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, for example, two analysts, one from Britain and one from Israel, believed it necessary to interpret the text reductively, as reflecting Jung's childhood problems, so it is not surprising that this major work has proved difficult for many to grasp. On the other hand, another Jungian, Edward Edinger, has written an excellent introduction and commentary (Edinger, 1992). A former Jesuit, Jack Miles, has done something similar to Jung in writing a *Biography of God* (Miles, 1995), also basing himself on the Biblical text. In a personal communication, he told me that *Answer to Job* had impressed him, but that Jung did not sufficiently appreciate the role of Israel. I shall quote some of his work later on and add to it as well.

In this paper I propose to examine how Jung's predictions have held up and suggest how what he was trying to do can be extended, even if only a little. I will begin by presenting a summary of that book, together with some comments, to refresh those who may not have read it for some time and to provide necessary information for those who have not studied it. I begin by giving the flavor of Jung's (1952) writing, after the introduction:

The book of Job is a landmark in the long historical development of a divine drama. At the time the book was written, there were already many testimonies which had given a contradictory picture of Yahweh—the picture of a God who knew no moderation in his emotions and suffered precisely from this lack of moderation. He himself admitted that he was eaten up with rage and jealousy and that this knowledge was painful to him. Insight existed along with cruelty, creative power along with destructiveness. Everything was there, and none of these qualities was an obstacle to the other. Such a condition is only conceivable either when no reflecting consciousness is present at all, or when the capacity for reflection is very feeble and a more or less adventitious phenomenon. A condition of this sort can only be described as amoral. (para. 560)

So does Jung begin. He describes himself as a "modern man with a Christian education and background," but his astonishing insight also gives a Jew like me pause. One must note that the general Judaeo-Christian understanding is that it was this same god image that demanded the highest level of moral attainment that was possible in the ancient world. We are faced with the power of this divine antinomy and the experience of it in Job, whose greatest quality, says Jung, is that "he does not doubt the unity of God." He clearly sees that God is at odds with himself—so flatly at odds that Job is quite certain of finding in God a helper, an "advocate" against God. As certain as he is of the evil in Yahweh, he is equally certain of the good (para. 567). God is a personality and tremendously involved with

humankind, in contrast with the all-ruling Father Zeus, who “in a benevolent and somewhat detached manner” (para. 568) allows the universe to go along, and only punishes the disorderly. The Greek god did not moralize but ruled instinctively, demanding only the sacrifices due him, had neither plans for nor much involvement with human beings. The Jewish god needed human beings and swore to David, for example in the 89th Psalm, that he would not lie to him. Yet he “who watched so jealously over the fulfillment of laws and contracts, broke his own oath” (para. 570). This is an image of a being that lacks self-reflection. He is not imperfect or evil, like a Gnostic demiurge, but is everything in its totality.

Why, then, does God need man? He needs humankind, says Jung, in order to achieve a greater consciousness, a more precise rendering of himself to himself. Yet he is ambivalent about this, abandoning his faithful servant, Job, to evil. This poor victim of a divine plot is thereby secretly lifted up to a superior knowledge which God himself does not possess, namely his own antinomy. Yet we discover that Job is an outward occasion for an inward dialectic in God himself (para. 587). It is as if God projects his skepticism on Job and the latter is challenged as though he, himself, were a god!

Man is enormously elevated thereby, something that has never happened before: “Without knowing or wanting it, a mortal man is raised by his moral behavior above the stars in heaven, from which position of advantage he can behold the back of Yahweh, the abysmal world of ‘shards’” (para. 595). Jung is referring here to the idea in Kabbalah that the shards are counterpoles to the ten *sephiroth*, or stages in the revelation and manifestation of God’s creative power. The shards represent the forces of evil, which are a by-product of the process of the *sephiroth* manifesting and a consequence of previous, inadequate experiments in creation. Job has discovered that God is a phenomenon, “not a man”—even less than human at times (para. 600). Jung points out that to assume that the creator of the world is a conscious being is a disastrous prejudice which leads to such nonsensical doctrines as the *privatio boni*, that evil is just the absence of good. Job reacts in an adjusted way, but sees that Yahweh behaves as irrationally as a cataclysm and then “wants to be loved, honored, worshipped and praised as just. . . . One can submit to such a God only with fear and trembling . . . but a relationship of trust is out of the question to our modern way of thinking” (paras. 604–605). Yet Yahweh demands loyalty and gets it. By humiliating Job, however, he pronounces judgment on himself and gives man moral satisfaction that is not recognized. This could have resulted in the relativization that affected the Greek gods, but this did not happen for the next two thousand years. Yet God’s dual nature was perceived by the unconscious mind of man and this was bound to have far-reaching consequences.

Jung now makes a *discursus* back to the time when the Book of Job was written, between 600 and 300 B.C.E., which places it also about the time of the Book of Proverbs. He does so in order to assess what was happening in the psyche at this time. He thereby demonstrates the development of the idea of the “incarnation” and the subsequent emergence of the Christian story. The Book of Proverbs shows the effect of Greek influence in that the idea of Sophia, the *Sapientia Dei* or Wisdom of God, is presented as a feminine spirit that existed before Creation. This Sophia is a part of God with characteristics like the Johannine *Logos*, the *Chochma* of Kabbalah, and also Indian *Shakti*. This feminine wisdom is exalted as the Word of

God, who brooded over the waters at the beginning and has her throne in heaven. In the *Wisdom of Solomon*, she is wisdom as a loving spirit and "better than might." Again I quote more fully from Jung:

From the ancient records we know that the divine drama was enacted between God and his people, who were betrothed to him, the masculine dynamis, like a woman, and over whose faithfulness he watched jealously. A particular instance of this is Job, whose faithfulness is subjected to a savage test. As I have said, the really astonishing thing is how easily Yahweh gives in to the insinuations of Satan. If it were true that he trusted Job perfectly, it would be logical for Yahweh to defend him, unmask the malicious slanderer, and make him pay for his defamation of God's faithful servant. But Yahweh never thinks of it, not even after Job's innocence has been proved. We hear nothing of a rebuke or disapproval of Satan. Therefore we cannot doubt Yahweh's connivance. His readiness to deliver Job into Satan's murderous hands proves that he doubts Job precisely because he projects his own tendency to unfaithfulness upon a scapegoat. There is reason to suspect that he is about to loosen his matrimonial ties with Israel but hides this intention from himself. (para. 616)

Jung shows that God, with the help of Satan, infallibly picks on the most faithful of the lot, Job. At the same time, God remembers a feminine being who was a friend and playmate from the beginning of the world, a first-born "stainless reflection of his glory and a master workman," namely, Sophia (para. 617). There must be some dire necessity for this anamnesis of Sophia; things just could not go on as before. The "just" God could not go on committing injustices and the "Omniscient" could not behave any longer like a clueless and thoughtless human being. Self-reflection becomes imperative, and for this Wisdom is needed. We realize that the failure to corrupt Job has induced changes in Yahweh's nature.

Jung carefully traces the early archetypal stories involving the pure son and impure one. He also reminds us that God did not say "it is good" for the creation of Monday, the second day, in which separation of the upper and lower firmament took place. This dualism was not "good." In the *pleroma*, the background, there is a perfect interplay of cosmic forces, but with Creation—the division of the word into distinct processes in space and time—conflict occurs. Perfection and completion begin their opposition. We also now discover that Yahweh's marriage with Israel had perfectionist aims in it and lacked the kind of relatedness that we now know as "eros." Rather than values and the appreciated subjectivity of the partner, there is only a relationship to a purpose which man must help to fulfill. Faithfulness of his people becomes more important the more he forgets Wisdom.

Job is the climax of this development. Man sees the split in God, needs Wisdom as an advocate. God, having been met and seen, needs her too. Therefore, this realization of Sophia, Wisdom, betokens a coming act of creation, which uses the Egyptian model of incarnation, in Pharaoh, but this is not merely repeating the archetype mechanically. "The real reason for God's becoming man is to be sought in his encounter with Job" (para. 634). This time it is not the world that is to be

changed. Rather, it is God who intends to change his own nature. Only one human being is to be created, a God-man, born of a human woman, a second Eve. This incarnation was only partial, since it was necessary to protect against evil, and thus he was more divine than human. Therefore, the perfectionism continued. Yet, says Jung: "One should make clear to oneself what it means when God becomes man. It means nothing less than a world-shaking transformation of God. It means more or less what Creation meant in the beginning, namely an objectivation of God. At the time of the Creation, he revealed himself in nature; now he wants to be more specific and become man" (para. 631).

From this we can understand that God is reality itself. When God created the world from the "void," he breathed his own mystery into every part of it. From this comes the belief that it is possible to know God from his creation (para. 630). If God is in everything already, why the incarnation? One would like to say that Christ had to appear in order to deliver mankind from evil, but, in fact, Yahweh could have simply stopped Satan, if he had wished. Rather, what we see is that "*Yahweh [God] must become man precisely because he has done man a wrong. He, the guardian of justice, knows that every wrong must be expiated, and Wisdom knows that moral law is above even him. Because his creature has surpassed him he must regenerate himself*" (para. 640, italics added). Jung does not bring to our attention here the familiar medieval image of Mary cradling the unicorn in her lap, seen as the wrath of God contained by her in conceiving the new divine child, but the link with this particular symbol of regeneration is most apropos.

Jung now shows us how the hero myth is invoked in order to bring about the desired experience of the divine, who now needs to know what it is like to be a human being. The dove and the love-goddess are implied, but the change in the ordinary myth of the hero-god dying young is shown by the precise experience of Christ. He is certainly identified with his love of humankind, but the scriptures also reveal a "certain irascibility" in his temperament, as is often the case with people who do not reflect about themselves. The great exception to this lack of questioning himself is found only at the very end, when he cries despairingly on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Jung now reveals what this means: "Here his human nature attains divinity; at that moment God experiences what it means to be a mortal man and drinks to the dregs what he made his faithful servant suffer. Here is given the answer to Job and, clearly, this supreme moment is as divine as it is human, as 'eschatological' as it is 'psychological'" (para. 647).

Jung tells us that Yahweh has now become the "good" God, but asks what we are to make of the cautious petition inserted into the prayer, "Lead us not into temptation?" That carry-over from the Psalms is hardly the mark of a divine who is the *summum bonum*. At this point, however, Jung contrasts the Catholic and Protestant views, which essentially results in freedom being seen as greater in the latter, but there is more rigidity, too, in that only the Scriptures are regarded as the word of God. Catholicism, with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, can allow further revelations, such as the important one of the *Assumptio Mariae*. Jesus, we are made to see, is not fully human, and it is clear that "*just as man suffers from God, so God must suffer from man*" (para. 657, italics added). It is in this way, one might add, that the statement "Ye are Gods" can be realized. The result of this is that man

himself is filled with divine conflict; he himself carries the symbol of the cross, which is spirit and flesh, divine and human, in his own being. "*It does not seem to fit God's purpose to exempt man from conflict and hence from evil*" (para. 659, italics added). Furthermore, Jung asks what kind of father could it be who demands the killing of his first born as a sacrifice? He is surely not the *summum bonum*! As in the Jewish experience, it is healthier to know the opposites, to fear God as well as to love Him.

Now Jung brings in the vision of Ezekiel of the "Higher Man," as well as the experience of the Buddha, in which there is a movement of the divine toward the mortal (the Son of Man) and the reverse. Both God and man want to escape from blind injustice. The central idea in this, Jung states, is: "The inner instability of Yahweh is the prime cause not only of the creation of the world, but also of the pleromatic drama for which mankind serves as a tragic chorus. . . . the two main climaxes are formed first by the Job tragedy and secondly by Ezekiel's revelation" (para. 686).

Job suffers, one might say, but Ezekiel becomes a witness. Enoch becomes a Son of Man in his ecstasy and comes closer also. All these moments culminate, says Jung, in Jesus, who, as a Jewish reformer and prophet of an exclusively good God, becomes a sacrifice to reconcile God with himself and with man. This incarnation is not confined to the one man, but is presaged as continual.

All this cultivation of good, Jung shows us, is brought to an enantiodromia in the Apocalypse of John (para. 698). He conjectures that the John of the Epistles is the same author as the former, since the continual preaching of goodness brings about the change into darkness shown in the Apocalypse. Jung also suggests that the more Christian the consciousness, the more heathen the unconscious. The very attractive heathen qualities, such as the image of the divine youth and beauties of spring, are particularly missing in Christianity, which even developed a denial of sexuality. The chief feature of the visions, however, was not just a personal shadow of John, but to compensate the too-light presentation of the divine. Thus John's vision extended far beyond the first half of the Christian aion of one thousand years. He anticipated the alchemists, Jacob Boehme, and perhaps even sensed God's birth in ordinary man, which the alchemists, Meister Eckhart, and Angelus Silesius also intuited (para. 733). The whole outline of the dark ending of the Piscean era is suggested, whose possibilities make mankind shudder. Jung speaks of the four horsemen of the apocalypse, such as the atom bomb, chemical warfare, and the unspeakable destruction of the Holocaust. There is presented the paradoxical idea of God in the apocalypse as both a savior and author in the total universal destruction. God is forcing man to become conscious and unite the forces that assault him. The tendency is to both divide and unite; the need is to assimilate the dark God. Everything depends on man, says Jung: "The only thing that really matters now is whether man can climb up to a higher moral level, to a higher plane of consciousness, in order to be equal to the superhuman powers which the fallen angels have played into his hands" (para. 746). In short, man must know the Self, not the little self or ego, but the larger totality of which he is a part. The doctrine of the assumption of Mary into heaven points to a *hieros gamos*, a new divine marriage, which will bring about the birth of a divine child in man, which is synonymous with individuation.

Jung points out (in 1952!) that the evolution of consciousness has already indicated a change in that the feminine can no longer be second-class, but requires equality. This means that a man's religion (such as Protestantism) is not enough, and that the feminine needs to be represented in the *pleroma*, which is now taking place. The resulting divine birth means a process in which humanity becomes conscious of its own polarity—divinity and humanity, light and dark, good and evil—in a total and precise way. The danger in such consciousness is a terrible inflation, which already exists on the world level among states. The antidote to this inflation is this realization: "Even the enlightened person remains what he is, and is never more than his own limited ego before the One who dwells within him, whose form has no knowable boundaries, who encompasses him on all sides, fathomless as the abysses of the earth and vast as the sky" (para. 758).

II

We may now inquire whether, after half a century, Jung's evaluation of the evolution of the Self-image is supported or not by subsequent developments. Let us first consider his suggestion that the elevation of the feminine into the Godhead is truly a millennial event. On the outer level, it is surely true, as we all can see. Since 1950, women have advanced in power and recognition in every aspect of life everywhere in the West and, to some degree, in the East as well. But that has been largely secular. Does this also obtain in religious recognition?

Several years ago, I did a study of the changes and development of the image of Mary during the last two thousand years (Spiegelman, 1998). I noted in that paper that since the first appearance of the Virgin to James in the year 39 of our Common Era, until 1990, there had been a total of 244 different events. Half of these occurred after 1940 and fully one-third of them had taken place since the *Assumptio* in 1950. Clearly these visions increase in frequency as the last era ends and the new one begins.

The content of what Mary has had to say over the centuries has also undergone significant change. Initially, and until the early twentieth century, the message was one of love, compassion, and healing. Since Mary appeared to the three shepherd children in Fátima in 1917, there have been frequently expressed requests by her that Rosaries be said by the faithful, implying that human action and prayer are necessary to change conditions on earth, to bring peace, for example. And while Mary is still usually loving and kind, a note of urgency and demand is now present as well. Later messages include the statement that the Lord was very wroth with the sins of the world, that a second world war would occur, that atheist Russia would spread error throughout the world (and at a time when that country had not yet become the Soviet Union!), and that several nations would be annihilated. In later appearances, she continued to ask for intercessory prayer, but also told people not to worry about communist Russia, that she would take care of that matter. Apparently, she did! It is an insufficiently noted historical event that an imperial, communist Soviet Union allowed itself to be overthrown without necessity, and that this was the essential result of one or a few powerful men so inclined to let it happen. Perhaps it was Mary herself who spoke into Gorbachev's ear!

In the most recent messages, Mary grows even more urgent: if people do not repent, “the Father will inflict terrible punishment on all humanity. It will be greater than the deluge, such as one has never seen before. Fire will fall from the sky and will wipe out a greater part of humanity,” says the Madonna to Sister Agnes Sasagawa in Japan in 1973 (see Spiegelman, 1998). She goes on to say that the devil will penetrate everywhere, even among bishops of the church. Along with this dire message, however, Mary calls upon people to cooperate with her in saving the world. She calls for a “unity of heart” to console both her and Jesus. She says that God wishes to establish devotion to her immaculate heart in the whole world.

These messages suggest that Mary not only reveals her continuing love and care, but that she has become—as Jung predicted—coequal with Jesus, in that there is a “unity of heart” between them. She also asks for cooperation with all of humankind, not just Catholics or Christians. She even asks that Catholics respect other religions (although some Church officials dispute this). All this is necessary, she states, in order to soften the wrath of God at the terrible behavior of people in the world using their freedom in devilish ways. We must thus conclude that the image of Mary, seen psychologically, has indeed been elevated into heaven, now equal with God the Father and the Son and Holy Spirit. The Trinity has now evolved into a quaternity, a greater wholeness. We also now realize that the masculine divinity is in agreement that the world should be devoted to her immaculate heart. In the ruling images of the collective, therefore, this predicted Assumption of importance and power of the feminine principle has been and is being fulfilled—“on earth as it is in heaven,” one might say, psychologically.

Finally, and most importantly, we are told that as many as possible of humankind should participate in acts of prayer and to do so in union with both masculine and feminine images of the divine, indicating that human beings have great potential influence in softening divine wrath. The power and significance of the individual in the psychic cosmos, both male and female, is affirmed in an extraordinary way. Is this not exactly what Jung suggested in 1952?

This vindication may have another, unfinished side to it. Jung's emphasis throughout his life was upon the need, for God and human beings, to grow in consciousness—this seemed to be the reason for man's existence altogether. This focus was also present in his seeing the aspect of the divine feminine that was being revealed, namely Sophia or Wisdom. Logos was his emphasis. In the closing chapter of his *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (Jung, 1961), on the other hand, as an old man, he deeply and powerfully acknowledged the centrality of Eros and its mystery. In *Answer to Job*, however, the place and importance of love in the divine development and transformation is sparse. He does speak of Yahweh gradually “loosening” his marital ties to the Israelites, but it seems that love is not the issue. Yet love is—or became—a central issue in the development of Judaism and is of course of primary concern in the Christianity that arose out the dynamics that Jung was writing about. One wonders why he made no mention of the *Book of Ruth*, a text in the Hebrew Bible bursting with the value and wonder of several kinds of love. Furthermore, it is this book that literally connects the messianic tradition in both Judaism and Christianity. The Messiah, it affirms, is to be born out of the generations of a convert, Ruth, and will arise out of the seed of David.

Jack Miles (1995), in his *God, A Biography*, shows how love develops in the unfolding image of the deity. He says that love is not indicated as such in the Bible until Isaiah 40, when

The Lord begins suddenly to show an intense, intimate and prior awareness of Israel's fears and sorrows, doubts and assumptions, the novelty is . . . that the Lord has become mysterious.

He has been wrathful, vengeful and remorseful. But he has not been loving. It was not for love that he made man. It was not for love that he made the covenant with Abraham. It was not for love that he brought the Israelites out of Egypt or drove out the Canaanites before them. The 'steadfast love' of the Mosaic covenant was . . . rather a fierce mutual loyalty binding liege and vassal than any gentler emotion. (pp. 236–237)

He has been purposeful and faithful to the covenant, but not moved by the long-term suffering of the Israelites. But then the face changes in Second Isaiah:

Your maker is your husband. . . .the Holy One of Israel is your Redeemer. . . .The Lord has called you like a wife forsaken and grieved in spirit, like a wife of youth when she is cast off, says your God.

For a brief moment I forsook you, but with great compassion I will gather you. In overflowing wrath for a moment, I hid my face from you; but with everlasting love I will have compassion for you, says the Lord, your Redeemer. (Isaiah 54:4–8)

Miles continues: "What has happened to God that he is speaking this way? His life has surprised him. When he punished Israel, he did not anticipate that her sorrow would lead him toward love" (p. 249, referring to Isaiah 52:13–53:12).

This realization of the increasing capacity for love and the expectation of this in both God and man is, I think, central to the developing image of the Self and something that one is confronted with endlessly in analytic work. We discover in that work that not only is consciousness essential but that the capacity for love, as Freud also understood, is also central and is developed in that process. I might add here a contribution from that other strand in the western development of consciousness, the Greek, when I remind us of the story of Psyche and Eros, emerging in the later years of the Greco-Roman and early years of the Christian era. There, Aphrodite becomes a teacher of love to the psyche—unlike her earlier, mostly dangerous involvement with humans—and helps the ultimate union of psyche with her son Eros. I see this parallel development of eros, along with logos, as carried specifically, but not exclusively of course, by analytic work (Spiegelman, 1996).

As I have discussed elsewhere (Spiegelman, 2002), the archetypal image of Aphrodite can be seen as the ancestress of depth psychology, having entered the offices of Freud and Breuer at the end of the nineteenth century along with those

women suffering from hysterical symptoms that dumbfounded positivistic science's understanding of the mind-body connection. The development of the archetypal feminine has been central in the depth psychological movement, impaired only by the effort, in recent decades, to subject psyche to rules and regulations. Themis, instead of serving Aphrodite, as in the original myth, becomes her regulator. Aphrodite, along with the differentiation of her son Eros, may leave analytic institutions and societies, but seems to be still present in the work of the individual analysts.

We may also note that the Assumption of Mary into heaven was essentially that of the mother image, although Sophia, as Logos, was also implied, as Jung said. The increasing power of the feminine is revealed as essentially reflecting the maternal aspect rather than, say, the sexuality of Mary Magdalene or Aphrodite. Even in analytic circles, it is apparent that the initial patriarchal Freudian myth of the Oedipal conflict has been superseded by the mother-infant emphasis inaugurated by Melanie Klein. Even among many Jungians, this myth takes precedence over the seemingly equally relevant story of Eros and Psyche or the highly significant alchemical studies of Jung. His discussion of the transference (Jung, 1946) certainly carries analytic understanding to a larger perspective. Perhaps the further development of consciousness will bring a shift from the prevailing Themis orientation (rules and regulations) to an appreciation of Artemis (the feminine as individual and for itself) and the return of Aphrodite in a new, more differentiated way. The development of mutuality and intersubjectivity in analytic work surely mirrors the archetypal opposites (e.g., King and Queen, Brother and Sister), including the alchemical perspective, in a more complete way (Spiegelman, 1996).

III

But what about Jung's emphasis on the need for the integration of the dark and light sides of God, the reconsideration of the problem of evil? Has the severe separation of good and evil in the consciousness of western civilization and its leading religion been changed? Certainly not politically, since the mutual labeling of "evil empire" has been readily hurled back and forth over the last half-century. I believe, however, that the overpowering fact of the Holocaust—for me the central spiritual event of the twentieth century—was in the background for Jung's reflections in *Answer to Job*, but not addressed directly in his understanding of the development of the God image. I would like to backtrack a bit in order to include a further integration of the Hebrew Bible and the modern Jewish experience to round out Jung's view and bring it closer to the present. (See also Spiegelman, 2004).

Western religious consciousness, in its patriarchal character, begins with the Hebrew Bible and with Abraham in particular. He is the "chosen one" to bring the monotheistic experience and belief to this consciousness, which grew out of the matriarchal religions of Assyria, Babylonia, and Egypt. While monotheism had a modest beginning in Egypt and there is significant psychological development evidenced in the Gilgamesh myth of Babylonia, this is truly a freshet in the development of consciousness. The differentiated polytheism of the Greek psyche also begins here, but only rather later. Judaism develops with the prophet, Moses, and it is with him that "choseness" by God becomes tribal. The fact of the "dictation"

of the Bible to Moses shows its general human character and origin, in the book of Genesis, but it becomes particular with the appearance of God to Moses personally. It is fulfilled, however, only through the commandments given to him and to the Israelites, as a tribe, on Mt. Sinai about 1313 B.C.E.

Abraham is, psychologically, a remarkable figure. He says, *hineni*—"Here I am"—to God's call, and apparently is even ready to sacrifice his son when God so commands. This theme of sacrifice will be evident once again when it is Jesus who is to be sacrificed, as discussed below. But this readiness to obey, without question or complaint, changes drastically when we get to the Book of Job. Prior to this, Abraham also obeys his wife, Sarah, when she grows wroth with her maidservant, Hagar, who has bragged about having a son when her mistress had not. Hagar and her son, Ishmael, are driven out, but she is assured that her seed, out of Ishmael, will be a great nation also. Traditionally, it is understood that the Arab peoples and, subsequently, Islam, are born out of this branch of the original "founder," so that Abraham is indeed the "father" of the three monotheisms in the West. It is noteworthy that when Sarah hears of the near-death of her beloved son, Isaac, she becomes very ill and soon dies. This shock, too much for a loving mother, is repeated a millennium and a half later, in the experience by Mary of the crucifixion of her son, Jesus. Isaac, one of the "fathers of Judaism," remains rather in the background, henceforth, in contrast to his father, Abraham, and to his sons, Jacob and Esau. This no doubt is because of that great shock to him, too, which occurred not when he was a child but when he was a man near 40. Yet it is he who is required to pass on the birthright to the eldest of his twin sons, Esau, and is deceived, both by his younger son, Jacob, and by his wife, Rebecca. She, remarkably, is told by God that Jacob should and would be the heir of the "chosenness" (as priests of God), although Esau would be also be the father of a mighty nation, continuing the path of Ishmael in some stories and of other nations also. So, the woman—the mother and the feminine—continues to hear and pass on the voice of the divine among the Hebrews, just as did Sarah and Eve before her.

While Abraham is totally loyal and true, without questioning his God, Isaac is nearly wiped out by his experience of the divine and with his father. Jacob, although devious, may be said to more fully carry on both an individuating experience and be a spokesperson for his people. He is the one who has the vision of the Ladder of Ascension into Heaven, with angels circulating upon it, and it is he who struggles with the angel of God all night. He thereby achieves the proper blessing on his own, making up for his theft from Esau of such specialness by God. Jacob, then, may be the succeeding conscious carrier of this path of "chosenness" and, by extension of his new name, Israel ("he who struggles with God"), to all of the Israelites.

So when we come to the experience of Moses, several generations later (leaving out for the moment the role of Jacob's brother, sons, and, in particular, Joseph), the defining moment is not the crossing of the Sea of Reeds (where all are chosen to be saved), but when he delivers the commandments given by God to all the Israelites at Mt. Sinai. The Hebrew Bible has it (Numbers 1:46) that there were 600,000 people present at that time and that the souls of all the Jewish people born since then were also present in some form to receive this transmission of divine direction on how to live life in relation to God and what this means. It is also tra-

ditional to understand that all 600,000 received the Torah and that there are thus 600,000 possible interpretations. This means that a collective or tribal consciousness was involved, but an individual one as well. With the birth of Christianity, we go from the 600,000 who received the "calling" at Sinai to the One who hears the voice of God from Nazareth onwards. The message is an individual one, and Jesus could readily be seen as someone who encourages individual salvation and, therefore, is closer to conscious individuation as Jung describes it. In the Christian story, the Jews were responsible for the Son of God's death. They killed God, or at least did not stand up for their own Messiah; thus they merited the subsequent rejection and persecution. Christians understood this as a proper retribution, while Christians themselves became the Chosen people. As this myth begins to change with the Enlightenment and the broader perspective of science and philosophy by the later 19th and 20th centuries, the power of the story diminishes for many people. Instead, with the appearance of Nazism—making itself present in a nominally Christian people with its paganism and Wotanism underneath—it would appear that God, too, permits the killing of the Jews (6,000,000 of them), since they "killed" his son. But this Holocaust also shows the dark side of God—he either killed them or let them be killed, unjustly.

One might consider that whereas the original condition was that of the Many (Israelites) giving way to the One (Jesus), the movement now goes from the One (Jesus) who has experienced the divine most deeply, to the Many (the six million) who also did so, but in a shockingly dark and unjust fashion. Thus the stories of Job and Jesus are repeated: the innocents are put into the hands of the dark side. Now, perhaps, the presence of the Many is not just the continuing "chosenness" of Israel and the Jews, as God promised, nor only the continuation of Christian specialness and uniqueness, thanks to Jesus, but that once more the Group is emphasized. It is the Group that is visited darkly and now, perhaps, the Group is to be subsequently visited from the light side. Redemption is to be for the collective as well as the individual. The Book of Revelation, after all, also suggested that the End Days would see the saving and elevation into heaven of 144,000 souls. Jung brought consciousness of individuation as the path of finding the divine within, which was also the message of Jesus, and now, perhaps, the Group experience of both the divine "within" and "among" can take place. Or as I have described it (Spiegelman, 2003), there is God Within, God Between (mutual process in analysis, love), God Among (ritual observance), and God Around (Nature, Art, Music, Synchronicity).

Consider a further aspect of the symbolism of "six": the many ideas in Jewish thought about cycles and messianic expectation also revolve about the calendar itself. We are now in the year 5766–5767 (2005–2006 C.E.), anticipating the great change expected to occur in the year 6000. The universe is said to have been created at the outset of this 6000-year cycle, which can also be seen (as in the six days of creation of the world) as symbolic of larger time-scales or events. Is it not possible to consider that the foregoing ideas about the six might also find their culmination, not only in the 2000-year cycle of Christianity and of astrology, but also in the 6000-year cycle of Judaism? That the "new age" for the whole of creation could take place some 230 years from now is not such a bad prediction, should we listen to Jung's reflections on these processes.

It may also be noteworthy that the symbolism of six involves both duality and the triad, continuing the dynamic nature of recent history. It may be that the wholeness suggested by the quaternity and the sphere are still projected into that future time, perhaps preceded by the continuing development of wholeness in individuals and, perhaps, small groups.

IV

What remains now is to consider the most recent international experience of the problem of evil as evidenced in the quarrel among the monotheisms. After broiling for some time, the battle among the myths of Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and Scientific Rationalist Materialism has come fully into focus since the horrific image on 9/11/01 of the suicide/homicide Muslim bombers crashing into the "Twin Towers" of New York, and the Pentagon. Jung had mentioned, in passing, that he felt the spirit of Islam in the military passion of the Nazis, without casting any aspersion on the religion of Islam itself. Rather, he sensed that passion, armed with divine mission, something missing from the West for some time, was a primitive invasion of soulless Europe.

That, in itself, was prescient, but when we consider that the Muslim terrorists aimed their venom at a symbol of western might, we can see that the power they attacked was the mercantile, rationalist, scientific, non-religious myth that they despised. They do not bomb Christian churches (in contrast to synagogues) and mostly want all western materialism out of the Muslim world. Our response, however, is more complex. We embrace the values of the Goddess of Reason, namely democracy, tolerance, and the separation of church and state, but underneath that more modern commitment is the continuation of the Crusades. A western general proclaims that his Christian god is stronger than that of the enemy and our president prides himself on being a born-again Christian. In that sense, then, the old battle of Christian versus Muslim, as well as Muslim versus Jew, continues. It is true that the ancient war of the Christian against the Jew has been vastly alleviated, thanks to the experience of the Holocaust, I would imagine, with the Catholic Church in the forefront of this reparation. Protestant churches are a bit slower in such reconciliation (e.g., Presbyterian animosity toward Israel), but they are in no sense more hostile than the left and right of the European rationalist intellectuals. Fewer than 10% of Europeans ever attend church (aside from Italy and Ireland), in contrast to 40% in the United States, while over 90% of Americans profess faith in God. We proclaim the values of the Founding Fathers, a kind of benevolent deism, but 60 million copies of books proclaiming and describing the End Days and Armageddon have been sold in the United States over the last ten years. On the other hand, the hatred among Muslims toward the Jew equals that of the Nazis, with Israel becoming the contemporary focus for traditional anti-Semitism. Judaism, meanwhile, tries to realize the ancient dream of homeland as promised by God, whether secular or religious.

Are these warring strands all part of the mind of God, we might ask, following Jung? I think that we can see it this way, now. Jung also saw the interplay of archetypal forces played out at a political level. We witness the shadow and light of each of our western religious traditions, including the rational/scientific,

informing the nations and regions. As Jung saw, nations now carry the inflation of certainty of their rightness, as the faiths always have. But the clash of opposites is visibly and horribly demonstrated in the crash into the Twin Towers and in the suicide bombers in the Middle East. Islam, never having had the Enlightenment (which brought democracy, civil rights, and individuality to the West, as well as the less attractive mercantilism and secularism), attacked the overarching, even hubristic, symbol of those towers, along with their human occupants. This can be seen as a negative *coniunctio*, with a possible more positive union in the future, perhaps bringing these valuable qualities to the Muslim states, as the United States proclaims it wishes to do. Perhaps Islamic passion and the capacity for submission to the divine (which the word Islam connotes) will also affect us, particularly our rationalist hubris.

The shadow side of the United States, however, including our greed, excess, aggressiveness, and righteousness, finds its foe in the Islamic shadow of violence and intolerance, as well as even more inflated righteousness. This battle of the opposites, each of which feels itself—as monotheisms do—to be “the truth,” can be seen as different aspects of the divine Oneness who has “chosen” all of them at various times. Their increasing interaction may indeed be due to the End Time in which the New Age—or no age!—takes place. Christians expect a Second Coming, Jews the Messiah, and the Muslim Savior is the twelfth Imam, named Mehdi, all of whom appear when corruption and chaos are at their worst. Hence evil is central to all three monotheisms. Secular, scientific rationalism has had many utopian schemes over the last two centuries, but the myth relies on the advancement of knowledge and technology to the degree that humanity can recreate itself and, without acknowledging God, science becomes the Creator itself. Considering the advances in genetics, biological sciences, and technology, that aim is no longer only a distant dream.

How, then, will these strands in the western and mid-eastern psyche, aspects of the Self, reconcile or annihilate each other? And what does God intend? I would offer that this new kind of “world war” is part of that larger struggle in which Jung’s and others’ vision of the One World is gradually coming into being, however slowly and painfully. And that means that the Asian religions, the polytheism of Hinduism and the non-theistic religion of Buddhism, as well as the animism of Africa, are ultimately to be included in our One World. Marie-Louise von Franz, perhaps Jung’s most gifted pupil, believed that unless Christianity was able to integrate the divine mercurial stratum of the psyche discovered by depth psychology as revealed in alchemy, it was likely to be totally relativized.

All this is of great challenge to the traditional monotheistic orientation and asks for integration. The One Divine in Multiple Aspects has been experienced by many individuals in dreams, such as the famous one of Max Zeller, in which people all over the world were building the new Temple (Zeller, 1975). Jung acknowledged to Zeller that he had seen many such dreams and avowed that this would occur in about 600 years. So, we have another numerical time frame of a coming unification. And then, perhaps, if we have not destroyed each other, the Monotheistic God, along with its divisions and oppositions, will find its fulfillment in a new world myth.

That anticipated wholeness can also be imagined in our increasing use of the term “planet,” beginning with the vision of the earth as seen from the moon not

so long ago and by the earlier vision of Jung in a near-death experience when he glimpsed both this sphere and the wonderful “blue” around it. It may also receive symbolic support from science, in that a new fusion-type nuclear reactor—in contrast to the fission (atom splitting) reactors we have been struggling with for half a century—is being built in France, under the aegis of a many-nation consortium. This anticipated wholeness, one hopes, will include the achievements of individuation and enlightened group membership in its totality. But before the mystery of the divine, we can, like Jung, remain aware that we are only our limited egos before the One who encompasses us on all sides.

V

Several anonymous critics have responded to this paper (in an earlier draft) and the editor has been kind enough to send these to me for comment.

One person believed me to be too contained in Jewish psychology, thus “writing out of metaphysical or ideological or political containment.” I suppose this was because I mentioned that a “Jew like me” took pause at Jung’s astonishing insight, but perhaps the use of Jewish material, as well as the number symbolism (which others also questioned), contributed. This judgment would astonish members of my Psychoecumenical Group, meeting for over twenty years and comprising a Buddhist priest, a Catholic priest, two nuns, an Orthodox rabbi, an Episcopal priest, a Protestant minister, and occasional visitors of other faiths, all of whom are therapists, with me as the only clerically lay person. It might also surprise those who have read my many books, authored or co-authored or edited, on the relationship of Jungian psychology to Buddhism, Judaism, Catholicism, Protestantism, and to Sufism-Islam, which, I have prided myself as thinking, I wrote from the experience of these faiths from “inside” (psychologically) and not merely as an outsider to them. I can only also suggest that I was simply telling something about my personal origins, just as Jung did when acknowledging his background was Christian. I presume that we are all analyzed and psychologically oriented and to that extent not “contained” in any myth other than our own, individual one. Hence, when speaking about God or the God-image, I am referring, like Jung, to the psychological images emerging from the unconscious and I am not positing the objective “truth” of any of these. Are we not, we Jungians, engaged in the work with psychic reality? But perhaps this critic was put off by the emphasis on the Jewish experience and number symbolism. I brought this aspect forward since I think that Jung was less inclusive in this way (and this was also the opinion of the Jesuit Jack Miles) and because the Holocaust seemed to me to be of overwhelming significance. But I trust that I did not overdo this focus, and I believe that I was still quite connected to Jung’s work and attitude.

This critic, and two others, also thought that I was too speculative with my intuitions about number, etc., and that I was not sufficiently grounded. “Where’s the beef?” asked one, and another thought I was being theological or theosophical. I admit to the speculative intuition, but reject the other judgment since I place myself firmly in the psychological, imaginal camp, just as Jung did. As to the “beef,” I prefer a statement that what I presented was not this person’s “cup of tea,” which I can surely understand.

The symbolism of the six has leapt out at me for many years, in the ways I mentioned (e.g., Holocaust numbers, Sinai, etc.), and I approach this number symbolism just as Jung did in *Aion* and elsewhere, as an archetypal expression of how the unconscious structures experience and events. I might have added other items, such as the Six-Day War, experienced by many as numinous or even miraculous, the six-sided Star of David, six days of Creation, etc. If the intuitions I put forward are not convincing, then so be it. I do not assert "truth" in this way. I offered my own since they were striking for me and nobody has put forward other intuitions or analyses about *Answer to Job* or the subsequent events of our time relating to Jung's intuitions. Sensate types will be unconvinced, of course, as well as other intuitives who have yet to express their own views. What I assert again, however, since this seems to be overlooked, is that all of us are speaking about the imaginal, psychic reality, which is crucial for Jungian thought (as it also is in the various mysticisms). It was from this perspective that I also presented the quip about Mary speaking into Gorbachev's ear. It was not funny for one critic and apparently was not seen in its psychological intention either.

The most extensive—and valuable—criticism came from one person who also found the number symbolism too literal. I need to remind all of us that the interplay between psychic reality and physical reality is interpenetrating and variable. I call attention to the intuition Jung had in his last years that the world would undergo terrific devastation. From his experience of his first deep immersion in the unconscious, seeing blood overcome Europe, except for Switzerland, and later seeing the effect of World War I, Jung often brought the two kinds of reality together. It is true that we never know to what extent the symbol becomes concrete or literal, but we try to hold these opposites together creatively, do we not?

This same critic took issue with my mention of Aphrodite in the consulting room, which was seen as "bad Hillman." This person also did not like my statement that "the development of the archetypal feminine has been central in the depth psychological movement, impaired only by the effort, in recent decades, to subject everything to rules and regulations." To this critic this sounded like "a rationalization for sexual acting out on the part of analysts individuated enough to resist collective moral sanctions." This person sees Aphrodite, I believe, from a perspective different from my own. That Aphrodite is the one who sanctions a dark Eros, just waiting for the opportunity for lust to triumph. The aspect I had in mind, however, belongs to the Psyche/Eros myth of our current aion, in which psyche has to undergo tests and transformation under the hands of Aphrodite in order to ultimately unite with her son, Eros, and achieve wholeness. The other view, of course, is the very one that many in our society seem to embrace and, it seems to me, illustrative of the very triumph of Themis over Aphrodite, rather than serving her, in the way that I have suggested. But I understand the fear and concern, for this involves the very darkness in the divine principle (now on the feminine side) that Jung was writing about.

This person also took issue with my focusing on the western monotheisms. I fully understand this, in light of the slowly emerging "world myth" I was writing about, but I was writing about *Answer to Job* and that book was certainly dealing with the Judaeo-Christian tradition. (Incidentally, Jung's is one of the very few books that can truly combine these, in my opinion). It looks as if there is still so

much to accomplish in the union of just the western monotheisms (including the rational/scientific one), that the larger perspective will surely take more time. That was surely Jung's intent, with his vision. He is supposed to have said, when reading Kabbalah and when reading Chan Buddhism (on is death bed), that he averred that each of these paths was "it!"

This leads to this same critic questioning how my work can "really add to Jung's vision of how human consciousness can change God, and what the new relation between the human being and God might look like, rather than what we end up with now, a series of scattered (and tired) insights into the evolution of religions." I agree wholeheartedly (about the first part, anyway!). It seems to me, as I have said, that we are gradually seeing not only the opposites in the divine, as Jung has shown so creatively, but also the multiplicity of images that are at war with each other. It is in this sense that I put forward the idea that the basic quarrel is between the One and the Many. We are gradually being required to face, within ourselves and within the world, that we need to endure this kind of conflict in the divine image, so that a new world myth can emerge. The conflicting myths, I fear, may need to get played out (I pray that the Armageddon aspect will not need to be literal), but the extent to which we are able to tolerate this multiplicity, along with unity, will determine whether humankind can truly survive and flourish, rather than simply destroy itself. It is here that the fantasies of a new technological age or new species, etc., begin to flourish. I, for one, prefer to stay with the task at hand, hinting at the future possibility, but siding with those who continue to work on such conflicts "within," "between," and "among."

References

- Bishop, Paul. (2002). *Jung's Answer to Job: A commentary*. Hove and New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Buber, Martin. (1952). Religion and modern thinking. In Buber, *Eclipse of God*. New York: Harper Torchbook.
- Edinger, Edward. (1992). *Transformation of the God-Image: An elucidation of Jung's Answer to Job*. Toronto: Inner City Books.
- Jung, C. G. (1946). Psychology of the transference. CW 16.
- _____. (1952). Answer to Job. CW 11.
- _____. (1961). *Memories, dreams, reflections*. New York: Random House.
- Miles, Jack. (1995). *God: A biography*. London: Simon and Schuster.
- Spiegelman, J. Marvin. (1996). *Psychotherapy as a mutual process*. Arizona: New Falcon Publications.
- _____. (1998). Jung, Mary and the millennium. In J. Spiegelman (Ed.), *Psychology and religion at the millennium and beyond*. Arizona: New Falcon Publications.
- _____. (2002). Twentieth-century depth psychology seen as the development of the archetypal feminine. *Psychological Perspectives*, 43, 66–79.
- _____. (2003). *The divine WABA (within, among, between, around): A Jungian exploration of spiritual paths*. Maine: Nicolas-Hays.
- _____. (2004). The need for meaning. *Psychological Perspectives*, 47(1), 37–46.
- White, Victor. (1959). Book review of *Answer to Job*, by C. G. Jung. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 4(1), 77ff.
- Zeller, Max. (1975). *The dream, the vision of the night*. Los Angeles: Analytical Psychology Club of Los Angeles.

