The Philemon Foundation was founded at the end of 2003, and since this time, has made critical contributions to a number of ongoing projects preparing for publication the still unpublished works of C. G. Jung. The Foundation is grateful to its donors who have made this work possible. *Jung History*, which will appear semi-annually, will provide accounts of some of the ongoing research supported by the Philemon Foundation and other news. In addition to scholars funded by the Philemon Foundation, *Jung History* will present reports of significant historical research and publications in the field. In recent years, an increasing amount of new historical research on C. G. Jung has been undertaken, based on the study of hitherto unknown primary materials. However, the publication of such research has been widely dispersed, which has led to the desirability of a publication to gather together such work and make it better known. *Jung History* sets out to fill this need. *Jung History* will be freely distributed to donors, collaborating institutions, and interested readers. To receive each issue in print form, please send an e-mail to editorial@philemonfoundation.org. *Jung History* will also be available for download at www.philemonfoundation.org. For further information concerning the Philemon Foundation, please send an e-mail to info@philemonfoundation.org.

The Editors —
Sonu Shamdasani, Editor
Wendy Swan, Editor
Stephen A. Martin, Consulting Editor
Eugene Taylor, Consulting Editor

**CONTENTS**

**FROM THE UNCOLLECTED JUNG:**
JUNG IN OXFORD, 1938: PAGE THREE
Sonu Shamdasani

SYSTEMA MUNDITOTIUS AND SEVEN SERMONS: SYMBOLIC COLLABORATORS IN JUNG’S CONFRONTATION WITH THE DEAD: PAGE SIX
Barry Jeromson

TINA KELLER’S ANALYSES WITH C. G. JUNG AND TONI WOLFF: PAGE ELEVEN
Wendy Swan

AN INTRODUCTION TO CAROL SAWYER BAUMANN (1897–1958): PAGE SIXTEEN
Amy Colwell Bluhm

SOME CRITICAL ISSUES ABOUT JUNGIAN ANALYSIS: PAGE TWENTY
Vicente de Moura

IN MEMORIAM: PAGE TWENTY-FOUR

PATRONS AND COLLABORATING INSTITUTIONS: PAGE TWENTY-FIVE

Copyright for the articles in Jung History remains with the authors.
LIKE HIGH ALPINE MISTS, the scope of genius can often shroud the true historical landscape that lies behind it. Such is the case for C. G. Jung. The immensity of his intellectual and psychological achievement has engendered, since portions of it have been published, lively discussion, astute interpretation and not a little bit of controversy. This shroud is what undoubtedly prompted Sonu Shamdasani in *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology: The Dream of a Science* to write on the first page of this remarkable volume: “...the very proliferation of ‘Jungs’ leads one to question whether everyone (who speaks of Jung) could possibly be talking about the same figure?” The discernment of the towering reality that stands behind these clouds of projection is at the heart of the mission of the Philemon Foundation. In service to this mission, and in addition to preparing for publication the accurate, scholarly editions of Jung’s unpublished work free from a multiplicity of Jungs, *Jung History* was created. As the semi-annual organ of the Philemon Foundation its attendant aim is to contribute to the evolution of the New Jung Scholarship founded upon accurate historical research as opposed to theoretical debate. To this end the current issue is an evolution of our first. In it and in all succeeding issues smaller pieces of unpublished Jung will be included so that in addition to the volumes of the *Philemon Series* that require a far greater amount of time to reach the reading public, a steady flow of new Jung material will be insured. Shamdasani’s piece on Jung’s participation at the Tenth International Medical Congress for Psychotherapy, held at Oxford, England in the fateful year of 1938, just before the outbreak of the Second World War, inaugurates this commitment. Our other articles continue our focus of presenting material about critical, often overlooked aspects of Jung History. In his article, Barry Jeromson raises to awareness the seminal relationship between Jung’s *Seven Sermons to the Dead* and his very first mandala, illustrated on the front cover, entitled *Systema Munditotius* (*The System of All Worlds*). For as much attention as the *Seven Sermons* has received, the inverse is true about this remarkable painted image. Jeromson demonstrates that both of these creations are inextricably related, equally vital components of Jung’s own psychocosmology and the development of Analytical Psychology. Wendy Swan fills another important historical gap with her paper about Tina Keller, an early analysand and subsequent colleague of Jung, whose use of techniques of active imagination in her personal and professional work illuminates the critical importance played by this methodology in the practice of analysis. Amy Bluhm explores the life of another of Jung’s less well known but highly gifted analysands and colleagues, Carol Sawyer Baumann. Baumann chose courageously to “follow her own nature” by eschewing conventional married life to pursue her own individuation in Zurich, analyzing with Jung and becoming an integral part of the Jungian community. Finally, Vicente de Moura, curator of the Picture Archive at the Jung Institute in Zurich, poses, among other questions a singularly compelling one: “How did Jung himself work with patients.” Against the backdrop of Jung’s encouragement of his analysands to paint, the products of which form the basis of the Picture Archive, de Moura makes an insightful attempt at an answer. With the publication of this second issue of *Jung History*, the Philemon Foundation adds to its significant progress since the Spring of 2005 when the first issue appeared. Since then we are pleased to report major advances on a number of fronts. In November 2005 formal notification came from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation that the Philemon Foundation had been awarded a $40,000 matching grant to fund the transcription of over 100 unpublished manuscripts and seminars by C. G. Jung housed in the Jung Archives at the ETH in Zurich. This award is of the greatest importance as it is not only a significant vote of confidence in our mission but also revives the meaningful relationship between the publication of Jung and the Mellon family that originally funded the Bollingen Foundation and the publication of Jung’s *Collected Works*. The transcription process has already begun and is expected to last for at least three years. In addition to coordinating this important task that will significantly aid the broader editorial process, the Philemon Foundation must also meet the challenge of raising the $40,000 in matching funds required by this grant. Another import-

tant event occurred almost at the same time. After two years of negotiation the Philemon Foundation and the Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at University College London have concluded an agreement whereby the Philemon Readership in Jung History has been established, initially for ten years. Dr. Sonu Shamdasani, General Editor of the Philemon Foundation, will occupy this endowed chair. It will be the vehicle by which, with the backing of the world’s foremost institution for the study of the history of medicine and psychiatry, Dr. Shamdasani will pursue his editorial and scholarly work, train a new generation of historians of Jung and collaborate with a diverse group of scholars to develop the field of Jung History. Over the long term, the institutional support of the Centre will greatly assist the Philemon Foundation to complete its mission. Our scholar editors have also been very busy this year. Ann Lammers, Adrian Cunningham and Murray Stein have completed their editorial work on the correspondence between Jung and Victor White, and its expected publication date is 2006. It will be the first volume in the on-going Philemon Series. Ernst Falzeder has completed his work on the Children’s Dream Seminar and that fascinating seminar is ready for publication. Angela Graf-Nold continues to make steady progress on Jung’s ETH Lectures and we are looking forward to the manuscript of the first volume of that long series to be ready sometime in 2006. In the last year alone she has recovered twenty-eight hitherto unknown transcripts of these lectures by Jung. Finally, and most importantly, the Red Book, edited by Sonu Shamdasani, is moving closer to formal publication. If all goes well, we are expecting a 2007 publication date. On the docket for the not so distant future, we are lining up additional seminars and manuscripts for the editorial process including some of Jung’s English and German seminars and a completed unpublished text on alchemy. Our donor base is broadening. With the Mellon Grant, we have now received significant support from four public and private foundations as well as hundreds of individual donors for which we are immensely grateful. We, at the Philemon Foundation, look forward to the continuation of this encouraging trend. Finally, as Jung History was about to go to print, we were informed that the Executive Committee of the International Association for Analytical Psychology (IAAP), the credentialing organization representing Jungian analysts worldwide, had awarded the Philemon Foundation a grant to support our ongoing ETH Lecture project. Their collegial support is deeply appreciated and welcomed.

Stephen A. Martin, Psy.D., President
n addition to the mountain of unpublished manuscripts, correspon- 
dences and seminars of Jung, there are contemporary accounts and 
reports that fill gaps in the existing record, like small mosaic pieces. The 
following accounts from *The Lancet*, *The British Medical Journal* and *The Times* provide information concerning Jung’s participation at the Tenth International Medical Congress for Psychotherapy held at Oxford between 30 July and 6 August 1938.

The congress commenced with Jung’s presidential address, (reproduced in CW 11, §§ 1069–1074). In this, Jung spoke of the need to unify the profession of psychotherapy, and spoke of how the committee for psychotherapy of the Swiss Society for Psychotherapy had attempted to formulate fourteen points upon which all psychotherapists using psychological analysis (except from those using hypnosis) could agree. The BMJ reported “the motive behind this enterprise was, he said, to lay a basis for practical work and to abandon futile discussion of theory.”

In the version published in the *Collected Works*, Jung stated that he was presently going to discuss these fourteen points, but the discussion was not reproduced. However, a fuller account of what he said was reported in *The Lancet*, where the points were indicated as follows:

*Psychotherapy, having been developed by physicians, makes use of medical techniques. Its first objective is a diagnosis, and to this end it has recourse to an anamnesis. The patient recounts his difficulties and on the basis of what he says together with the symptoms an attempt is made to find out the specific nature of the illness.*

The results show that there are forms of illness which have nothing to do with bodily disturbances, but which are only intelligible in terms of the psyche or mind.

Therefore this method of diagnosis does not focus on the seat of the illness but on the general psychic disposition of the sick person. The method of investigation is adapted to the study of the psyche and is put on a broader basis than that obtained in pathology.

It takes into consideration all possible ways in which a person may express himself: his premeditated speech, his free associations, his fantasies, his dreams, his symptoms and symptomatic actions, and his demeanour.

This investigation reveals an aetiology reaching down into the depths of the personality and thereby transcending the limits of the conscious mind.

Psychotherapy calls the dark portion of the psyche the unconscious. The investigation leads first to the discovery of unconscious fixations on crucial situations and persons significant in the patient’s childhood. These fixations have both a causal and a purposive aspect and set tasks for future fulfilment.

The illumination of the factors out of which the illness developed and continued is one of the tasks of psychotherapy.

Its method is the analysis and interpretation of all forms of expression.

The therapeutic development of the patient depends on the relationship between him and the physician. This relationship also forms the basis of the patient’s relationship to society.

In treatment this relationship takes on the specific forms of a transference, which is the projection of unconscious contents and appears as a transferne neurosis.

The reduction of the transference neurosis shows it to have been laid down in the unconscious fixations of childhood.

Back of these individual fixations collective unconscious factors are assumed.

The new contents must be realised as parts of the personality because it is only in this way that the patient can feel his responsibility towards them.”

Jung did not present a paper at the congress, but answered some written questions. Michael Fordham, who was present at that occasion, recalled that “the idea was that he would present himself well in this way and so ward off some of his detractors. I do not think that it was a success.” Jung’s comments were reproduced in *The Lancet*:

Prof. Jung at the close of the congress, answered a number of written questions. He emphasised that psychology was such a large and difficult subject that the medical psychotherapist could not rest on his own training alone, but must borrow from philosophy, anthropology, history and literature. Many difficulties would vanish with a better knowledge of primitive psychology. Primitives had few traces of the phenomenon we called “will” or “volition”; they had to work themselves up ceremonially into a state of doing anything unusual. During the ages man had detached a controllable amount of energy from the universe, and could call it his will power, but when the task was too difficult the amount was inadequate. We all acted largely on instinct, and that had no moral value. A man could sublimate on will but not on instinct. Asked about the difference between the two
halves of life, he said that up to about 36 the personality expanded into life like an exploding celestial body. After 40, depression was very frequent among those who had not reached fulfillment of their ambition. In the second half of life something within asked: What next? Where are you going now? The disagreeable answer was: Death. Since time immemorial man had rejoined that death was a goal. The great religions were preparations of the second half of life. Those who in the first half of life shirked the risk of their love adventure or their career, and those who in the second half of life shirked that mental development, became neurotic. It was the same thing. Those who in the first half refused to live, in the second half refused to die. Where were the schools for adults to teach them about the second half of life? The subject was taboo, and so they became neurotic and psychotic. Religious experience was as valid as any other experience. There was no criterion of validity of experience. Conclusions drawn from experience might be criticised as valid or not, but the experience itself was absolute. One might as well say: “Is it a valid fact there are elephants?” If a man had a religious experience, nothing could be said but that he had a religious experience. It was a world-wide and universal phenomenon. If anyone did not know what religious experience was, he was not normal; it meant that he did not recognise his own religious experience and that some other part of his life was exaggerated by that amount of energy which should go into religious experience. It was an insanity of the white man that he had lost the religious order of life. With these words he wished to close the congress.

During the congress, Jung was awarded an honorary degree (D. Sc.), Barbara Hannah recalled that “A great many universities awarded honorary degrees on him, but the only time I remember Jung being at all excited by such an honour was at Oxford. This was not because of his own recognition, but because the whole traditional ceremony, the many treasures belonging to the colleges, the buildings themselves, and the medieval atmosphere which still hung over Oxford at that time delighted and fascinated him.” An account of the ceremony was reported in The Times:

In Convocation to-day, the Vice Chancellor presiding, the honorary degree of Doctor of Science was conferred on Professor Charles Gustave Jung, Professor of Psychology in the University of Zurich. Dr. Jung is at present presiding over the Tenth International Medical Congress for Psychotherapy which is meeting in Oxford, this being the first time that the congress has met in an English-speaking country.

In presenting Professor Jung, the PUBLIC ORATOR said that while Plato had divided the human soul into three parts, rationem, spiritum, libidem, [reason, spirit, desire] sometimes in conflict and sometimes in harmony, modern philosophers had to these three added others, quas inscius “sub limine,” ut aiunt “reprimit” unus quisque nostrum [which are unknown to us ‘below the threshold,’ as one says, ‘repressed’ in our interior].

“In time immemorial man had rejoined that death was a goal. The great religions were preparations of the second half of life.”
Outstanding among these philosophers was Professor Jung. He had made a study of general psychology, and also shown how to bring to light and cure the flaws of individual patients, menda et vitia in lucem proferre docuit et sanare [he has taught how to bring to light faults and defects, and to cure them]. One of his methods was that of “free association,” “Heus tu, quid tibi in mentem revocat hoc verbum? responde statim.” respondes: “quid illud? quid tertium?” [“pay attention, what comes to mind with this word? Respond immediately.” You reply: “What is the second? What is the third?”]

By this and other methods of investigation he would discover your type, cui “typo” sis adscribendus, utrum ratio te an sensus gubernet, utrum mens tua ad te ipsum “introversa” sit an ad res externas “extraversa.” [Which “type” you belonged to, whether thinking or feeling directed you, whether your mind was ‘introverted’ towards yourself or ‘extraverted’ towards external things.]

But determination of type, and even cure, were in Professor Jung only preliminaries to the patient’s fuller life, neque animo aegrontati satis mederi quemquam credit nisi simul ad vitiam meliorem et ampliorem rerum adspectum instituere conetur: nam dubio procul his rebus sua cuique voluntas principium dat. [He did not believe that one could heal a sick soul without at the same time attempting to teach a better life and a wider view of things: since without doubt in these things one’s own will gives the beginning.] The VICE-CHANCELLOR admitted Dr. Jung with the words: — Vir egregie, animi humani scrutator simul et medicator, qui res penitus latentes in medium protulisti.” [Honoured man, you have researched and healed the human soul at the same time, you have brought to light deeply hidden things.]

It was noted in the BMJ that after the ceremony, “On his return in his robes to the congress hall delegates stood and applauded. Dr. H. Crichton Miller said that their applause expressed their appreciation, and that of Oxford and the world, of his great services to psychotherapy.”

2 The Lancet, 6 August 1938, p. 332.
4 The Lancet, 6 August 1938, p. 336.
6 The Times, 1 August 1938, p. 12. Cf. Fordham, The Making of an Analyst, p. 80. I would like to thank Alfons Reiter and Barbara Zipser for assistance with the Latin.

I would like to thank Alfons Reiter and Barbara Zipser for assistance with the Latin.
I had painted the first mandala in 1916 after writing Septem Sermones: naturally I had not, then, understood it.\textsuperscript{1} Jung’s first mandala sits in isolation as the frontispiece of CW9\textsuperscript{2}, where it is labelled ‘a mandala of a modern man’. The title inscribed on the drawing itself is \textit{Systema munditotius}, the system of all the worlds. \textit{Systema} also appears in Jaffe’s illustrated biography of Jung.\textsuperscript{3}

There it is accompanied by a commentary written by Jung nearly forty years after he drew the original. Largely, though, \textit{Systema} has been ignored by writers on Jung’s symbolism, marginalised as little more than a Jungian relic. Nowhere, is there any discussion of the place of \textit{Systema} in the wider domain of Jung’s ideas. Without any apparent warning, it just appeared, fully formed. Why did Jung draw this symbol? What prompted it?

The above quotation gives us a clue. It links \textit{Systema} chronologically with Jung’s obscure gnostic tract, \textit{Septem sermones ad mortuos} (Seven sermons to the dead).\textsuperscript{4} Unlike \textit{Systema}, \textit{Sermons} has attracted interest over the years as various commentators struggled to interpret its meanings. However, any comprehensive link between it and \textit{Systema} has remained unexplored.

The purpose of this article is to establish this link. \textit{Systema} is hand-inscribed with a medieval Gothic script favoured by Jung in recording his waking fantasies. The inscriptions are in Latin, with a smattering of Greek. \textit{Systema} consists of fourteen rings centred on a sixteen-point star. It appears to be a cross-section through a series of concentric spheres. It is a \textit{complexio oppositorum}. The oppositional symbols that become evident in translating the inscriptions are oriented in three ways: vertically, horizontally and inner/outer. The opposites paired vertically and horizontally combine to create a symmetric cross, concentric with the circles.

The outer set of four rings corresponds to the macrocosm. Inside this is a ring of fire, that Jung called the ‘inner sun’. Moving inwards, the outer set of rings is repeated, although inverted vertically. Another ring of fire then repeats, followed by a further iteration of the four outer rings. Although scale did not permit the detail, Jung describes this sequence as repeating endlessly towards the centre wherein lies the microcosm. Representing his inner and outer worlds, then, \textit{Systema} is best described as Jung’s psychocosmology.

\textbf{SEVEN SERMONS TO THE DEAD} \textit{Sermons} was supposedly prompted by parapsychological happenings — a poltergeist visitation — in Jung’s household in 1916.\textsuperscript{5} The spirits of the dead overwhelmed Jung’s home, prompting him to sit for three days and write \textit{Sermons}. On completion, the chronology of these two works raise intriguing possibilities about the nature of the parapsychological events in Jung’s home that reputedly triggered the writing of \textit{Sermons}. This study is topical. Jung’s \textit{Red book} is now in publication under the editorship of the Jung historian Sonu Shamdasani. Contemporaneous with \textit{Sermons} and \textit{Systema}, the \textit{Red book} is the notebook in which Jung recorded and illustrated his waking fantasies during this period. It constitutes primary data on Jung’s theories. What other treasures akin to \textit{Sermons} and \textit{Systema} lie within it?

\textbf{SYSTEMA UNDER THE MICROSCOPE} \textit{Systema} is hand-inscribed with a medieval Gothic script favoured by Jung in recording his waking fantasies. The inscriptions are in Latin, with a smattering of Greek.

\textit{Systema} consists of fourteen rings centred on a sixteen-point star. It appears to be a cross-section through a series of concentric spheres. It is a \textit{complexio oppositorum}. The oppositional symbols that become evident in translating the inscriptions are oriented in three ways: vertically, horizontally and inner/outer. The opposites paired vertically and horizontally combine to create a symmetric cross, concentric with the circles.

The purpose of this article is to establish this link.

\textbf{SYSTEMA MUNDITOTIUS AND SEVEN SERMONS: SYMBOLIC COLLABORATORS WITH THE DEAD} BARRY JEROMSON...
dead disappeared. Jung writes through the voice of Basilides, a semi-legendary Alexandrian gnostic of the second century AD. Consequently, *Sermons* is replete with gnostic themes reputed to have originated with Basilides.8

In sermon I, Jung/Basilides preaches that the essential for created beings is the principle of individualization. The emptiness of material creation is compared with the fullness of the pleroma which is both nothing and everything. It is the fullness of God’s powers and, in it, all opposites balance each other. In *sermons* II and III, we meet Abraxas, the supreme god of Jung/Basilides’ pleroma. Abraxas is superior to all other gods. In sermon IV, Jung/Basilides talks about various lesser gods. In *sermons* V and VI, Jung/Basilides addresses the libido problem and the connection between sexuality and spirituality, a major theoretical concern for Jung at the time. Finally, in sermon VII, Jung reveals that there is a single star within, a fragment of the pleroma, which is humanity’s goal.

**SYSTEMA AND SEVEN SERMONS COMPARED**

Jung describes *Systema* as portraying ‘the antinomies of the microcosm within the macrocosmic world and its antinomies’. It is thus the inner and outer world of human experience, beset on all sides by dualities and contradictions. Likewise, *Sermons* is replete from start to finish with lists of the oppositons and paradoxes that overwhelm ‘the dead’.

*Systema* lies within the pleroma, the divine realm of the gnostics, within which all dualities are dissolved. So too does *Sermons*, where Jung’s discussion of the pleroma constitutes sermon I.

**THE AMBIVALENT ABRAXAS**

At the bottom of the vertical axis of *Systema* appears the god Abraxas, with the body of a serpent and the head of a lion surmounted by a ten-pointed halo. Jung labels Abraxas *dominus mundi*, the lord of the world. He is the dominant figure of both *Sermons* and *Systema*. In his commentary on *Systema*, Jung refers to Abraxas as ambivalent.9

In *Sermons*, Abraxas is introduced in sermon II as a ‘god above God’, as standing ‘above the sun [god] and the devil’. ‘Had the pleroma a being’,

---

7 Jaffé, A., op. cit., p. 75.
as the lowest sphere of degenerate creation. Unaware of the transcendent god, the demiurge believed himself to be the supreme god. Prior to 1842, Abraxas was regarded as the supreme or transcendent god of the Basilideans. However, in a manuscript discovered in that year and tentatively attributed to Hippolytus of Rome, a Christian heresiologist, the status of Abraxas was much lower, approximating that of a demiurge or less. Jung’s reference to Abraxas as ambivalent is further reinforced by all sources cited here who agree that the Abraxas/Basilides connection is at best tenuous. Holroyd suggests that Abraxas, which figured on many popular talismanic gemstones, was elevated to divine status as an attempt by detractors to associate the Basilideans with vulgar superstition.

In Sermons, Jung followed the earlier tradition in according Abraxas the higher status, as the transcendent god. In exploring his personal mythos, Jung seemed drawn to Abraxas as his personal god, within which all opposites were reconciled: good and evil, light and dark, life and death and, as we shall see below, sexuality and spirituality. However, in the commentary on Systema written nearly forty years later, Abraxas is distinctly demiurgic. Perhaps, by then, Jung was trying to counteract the poetic licence he exercised in 1916.

PHANES AND THE PRIMAL LIBIDO
In Systema, Jung provides Abraxas with an alter ego not obvious in Sermons. At the top of the vertical axis, in a winged egg, is the figure of a child named Erikapio or Phanes. In his commentary to Systema, Jung describes Phanes as ‘reminiscent of a spiritual figure of the Orphic gods’. Elsewhere, Jung discusses Phanes in the context of transformations of the libido. Phanes is identified variously as the first created, the god of love, bisexual and the cosmogonic principle. He thus appears to represent the primal libido or psychic energy enclosed in a cosmic egg. This in turn gives birth to the opposites of logos and Eros, of rationality and relatedness, symbolised in Systema by a winged mouse (representing science) and a winged serpent (representing the arts) just beneath the figure of Phanes. In sermon III, Phanes is heard fleetingly in a list of the many attributes of Abraxas as ‘the hermaphrodite of the earliest beginning’. In Sermons, Abraxas is without opposition. This is rectified in Systema, where Phanes becomes the source of psychic energy ultimately resolved in and transcended by Abraxas. Here is evidence of a theoretical role of Systema. It is Jung’s first attempt to model geometrically the complex nature of the libido or psychic energy.

In Systema, Phanes is lit from below by Eros in the form of a seven-branched candelabra, or burning bush. Both Eros and its opposite, the tree of life, are elaborated in sermon IV. There, also, Jung identifies the four points of the cross of Systema as the principal gods: the sun god, Eros, the Tree of Life and the devil. The sun god illuminates the left side of Systema, while the right side, Satanas, is in darkness. Here are the light of consciousness and the dark unconscious. There is more than a hint here also of sun god as ego and devil as shadow.

SEXUALITY AND SPIRITUALITY
A further pair of opposites on the horizontal axis of Systema contains the heavenly mother as double beaker and earthly father as double phallus. These feature in sermons V and VI, at the centre of Jung’s reflections on the opposites of sexuality and spirituality. Jung talks of masculine sexuality as earthly, while that of the feminine as spiritual and of the heavens. At the same time, he sees masculine spirituality as heavenly, while that of the feminine as earthly. The interplay of masculine/feminine and sexuality/spirituality is represented on the horizontal axis of Systema by the partly feminine serpent entwined in the double masculine phallus, and the partly masculine Holy Spirit as dove flying in the realm of the celestial mother as double beaker (womb). These symbols are the subject of sermon VI.
The relationship between sexuality, spirituality and the libido lay at the heart of Jung’s theoretical differences with Freud. In *Psychology of the unconscious*, Jung sought a broader definition of libido as psychic rather than just sexual energy. In *Systema*, he moves towards a geometric resolution of this problem by structuring it two-dimensionally, along masculine/feminine and sexuality/spirituality axes. Within this framework, each of the symbols on the horizontal axis of *Systema* is dualistic. The serpent, for example, is both feminine and masculine, and both phallic and spiritual. In each case, while one pole of each duality is overt at any instant, the other is hidden or repressed.

**THE DIVINE SPARK**

At the centre of *Systema* is a star/sun. In typical gnostic theology, man’s nature is dual, consisting of a perishable physical body and a soul that is a fragment of the pleroma, a ‘divine spark’. By attaining gnosis of this divinity within, man enables it to be released on death to rejoin the pleroma. If gnosis is not attained, then, on death, the ‘divine spark’ is hurled back to reincarnate in the physical world. The core of *Systema* then corresponds to the ‘divine spark’.

At the foot of the vertical axis, within the physical world or macrocosm are symbols of death and rebirth (labelled *mors et vita futura*). In one sense, these symbolise the failure of the ‘divine spark’ to reunite with the pleroma.

The fragment of the pleroma which is the divine spark is heard in sermon I, where Jung refers to the pleroma as ‘the smallest point ... in us’. It is heard again in sermon VII when Jung talks of an innermost infinity, wherein, ‘at immeasurable distance standeth one single star in the zenith ... This star is the god and goal of man’. To attain oneness with this star, the message of *Sermons* is that man must first experience and then transcend the opposites through the principium individuationis, fighting against primeval sameness, towards distinctiveness. Here in embryonic form is Jung’s core process of individuation leading towards a unity with the Self, the inner star.

**PROJECTION**

The remaining symbols of *Systema* include a multiplicity of unnamed daemones and gods represented by stars. These are also seen in sermon IV where Jung discourses on the ‘multiplicity and diversity of the gods’. Moreover, each god has a light and dark side: ‘Each star is a god, and each space that a star filleth is a devil’. According to the gnostic writer, Stephan Hoeller, continual references to gods as stars, suns, moons, fire, trees, mythical monsters and so forth in *Sermons* represent projections from the microcosm of the psyche into the macrocosm of the external world.

In sermon VII, Jung talks of man as lying between these two domains. ‘Man is a gateway, through which from the outer world of gods, daemons and souls ye pass into the inner world’. In *Systema*, Jung mediates microcosm and macrocosm by the physical human body. Between the outer spheres of the world and the innermost infinity of the microcosm is the corpus humanum et deus interiores minoresque (the human body and one god and the inner and lesser world). There it is symbolised by a red sphere of blood and an inner sun. The projection of the gods outwards is achieved in *Systema* by the vertical inversion of the inner world, as though light were passing through a single lens. The spheres representing the human body are thus metaphors for the human eye.
SYSTEMA AS DYNAMIC SYSTEM

From the foregoing analysis, *Systema* can be seen as an attempt by Jung to represent geometrically psychological problems, both personal and theoretical, of major concern to him at the time. On the horizontal axis of *Systema* appear the tensions between the opposites: the spiritual and the sexual poles of the libido, the light and dark sides of nature, good and evil, and masculine and feminine.

The vertical axis represents movement. The primal libido represented by the androgynous Phanes in the cosmic egg moves downwards, dividing into the opposites on the horizontal axis. In *Sermons*, the opposites are inherent in the pleroma, but the vehicle for their emergence into the world is obscure. Of Phanes there is but the merest glimpse. This missing piece in the jigsaw is present in *Systema*.

The opposites are then resolved and transformed in the symbolic Abraxas. Upward movement is represented symbolically by the tree of life, sprouting from the head of Abraxas and pointing towards the inner star with resonances to the Jungian Self. Inner/outer movement is also evident. The elements of the macrocosm carry the projections of the psychic contents of the microcosm. Jung’s dynamic of projection thus provides a psychologising of the gnostic aphorism ‘as above so below’.

*Systema* resonates with much of Jung’s later psychodynamics. The anima, the shadow and the archetypes/gods are evident. The voice of typology, still five years away, is muted. Its 3 + 1 structure is implicit in the cross with one arm in the darkness of Satanas.

The ambivalent Abraxas appears to contain elements of both the Self (as transcendent god) and the ego (as flawed, world-creating demiurge). But it is unwise to draw too close a theoretical comparison here, because where does it leave the star/sun at the centre of the mandala? In fact, in 1916, Jung’s concept of the Self and its relationship to the ego was yet to coalesce.

What is evident, though, in the dual complexio oppositorum that is *Systema* and *Sermons* is a symbolic reconciliation of opposites: light and dark, inner and outer, and conscious and unconscious. As such these works resonate with Jung’s transcendent function in action. Indeed, it was in 1916, after these two works were completed, that Jung wrote his essay, the *Transcendent function*.

CONCLUSION: A REVISED CHRONOLOGY

This analysis casts a new light on the relationship between *Sermons* and *Systema*. They can now be seen as joint symbolic products of Jung’s exploration of the unconscious. Moreover, the chronology in the quotation at the start of this article and the evidence presented above points to *Systema* as some sort of geometric embellishment of *Sermons*.

However, information now emerges that preliminary sketches for *Systema* predate *Sermons* by several weeks (Shamdasani, pers. comm., 8 April 2004). The chronology is no longer as clear cut as it seemed. It now appears that Jung’s initial focus may have been the mandala. *Systema*, in other words, may have acted like a meditative device. Here, perhaps, was Jung constructing his personal mythos in the form of a psychocosmology with sources in gnostic imagery. Did *Systema* lead Jung so deeply into the collective unconscious that it triggered the visitations by ‘the dead’? Who were ‘the dead’? Was *Systema* the doorway into a spiritual realm of archetypal ancestral vestiges in the collective psyche? Where does that leave *Sermons*? Is it conceivable that *Systema* unleashed the spirits of the dead, who were then banished from Jung’s presence by the writing of *Sermons*?

While these speculations may yet be resolved with the appearance of the *Red Book*, one thing is already clear from this analysis. Rather than lie separately in remote corners of Jungiana as they do now, *Systema munditotius* and *Seven sermons* should hold a central place, together. They were collaborative symbols, not only in Jung’s reconstruction of his personal mythology, but also in his seminal theorising about the psyche.
TINA KELLER’S ANALYSES WITH C. G. JUNG AND TONI WOLFF

WENDY SWAN

ina Keller (1887–1986), a Swiss physician and psychotherapist, was one of C. G. Jung’s first patients in psychotherapy. She was in analysis with him from 1915–1924, and with his primary associate, Toni Wolff, from 1924–1928. During her 13 years of combined analysis, Keller learned various forms of the technique of active imagination to assist in her analyses. Active imagination was described by Jung as “a technical term referring to a method I have proposed for raising unconscious contents to consciousness.” Keller used three primary modalities in her active imagination experiments: writing, painting, and bodily movement.

She became acquainted with the study of psychology and the name of Carl Jung through her husband Adolph Keller. Adolph had completed theological and philosophical studies in Basel and Berlin, and in 1909 had moved to Zurich to assume the prestigious position of pastor of St. Peter’s Church. Adolph Keller met Carl Jung during a study group at the Burghölzli Hospital; at that time, Jung was second in command when the psychiatric clinic was under the directorship of Eugen Bleuler, a pioneer in research on schizophrenia. Adolph Keller attended the study group to enhance his knowledge of current developments in psychoanalytic theory and practice; he wished to stay informed of these developments because he engaged in pastoral counseling as part of his professional duties.

Tina Keller met Carl Jung shortly after she and Adolph Keller were married in 1912; in fact, during the Kellers’ honeymoon, Adolph was reading Jung’s recently published book, *Transformations and Symbols of the Libido* (1912). Jung invited Adolph and Tina Keller to attend weekly meetings at his home in Küsnacht. According to Tina Keller,

Jung was then trying to formulate his own ideas, sorting out where he agreed and where he differed from Freud. He invited a group of friends to his house for regular open evenings, where he would speak to us and use that audience as a sounding-board. My husband’s contributions to the discussions were specially appreciated, because of his academic training and his theological and philosophical background.

Initially, Tina Keller attended the gatherings to learn about the ideas that were of interest to her husband, but she quickly became interested in them herself. In 1915, Tina Keller began analysis with Jung at the recommendation of her husband; she was experiencing severe anxiety and he thought Jung might be able to help. Keller worked analytically with Jung on and off from 1915–1924; her treatment was interrupted periodically due to external events, such as Jung’s mandatory military service and the demands of Keller’s growing family.

When Jung started seeing Keller for psychotherapy in 1915, he was 41 years old, a psychiatrist in private practice, and a writer and thinker exploring fundamental principles of the newly emerging field of analytical psychology. Keller was 28; she had been married three years, was the mother of two young children and pregnant with a third, and was active with the duties as a pastor’s wife, all the while her personal life was “inundated with intuitions and fears.” Keller explained that:

Dr. Jung did not consider me “sick.” He said my fears were a symptom, showing that I was in a growth-process he called “individuation.” He believed the symptoms were necessary to keep me from escaping the process; the fears, he believed, would only disappear, as I became more mature. This might take a very long time. In fact, “individuation” is a life-long process....

Keller’s early analysis coincided with the years of Jung own self-experimentation. She reported going to sessions and seeing Jung’s personal active imagination paintings and writings in plain view; in fact, Jung was instructing Keller on the method he was using to explore his own unconscious. “Dr. Jung wrote in his ‘black and his red book’ during emotional upheavals and during the period of discovery described his ‘visions’ and then wrote dialogues and commentaries...sometimes these paintings would be visible in Jung’s consulting room.”

During Keller’s analysis with Jung, he focused primarily on her symptoms of anxiety and confusion concerning religious matters, and in that regard, Jung’s primary goal was to strengthen Keller’s ego. Outside the sessions, he encouraged her to continue the analytic process by working with the unconscious material on her own. While giving her support on improving the quality of her external life, he also taught her various methods and techniques for communicating with the unconscious. To help relieve Keller’s anxiety outside sessions, Jung encouraged her to express her feelings by techniques that necessitated active participation and communication between conscious and unconscious materials. In this regard, Keller experimented with various forms of writing and painting from the unconscious. The primary writing techniques with which Keller experimented were spontaneous writing (a form of automatic writing), and letters written to Jung not intended to be mailed.

The practice of spontaneous writing became a life-long technique for Keller. She highlighted its importance when she stated that “probably the most valuable result of my work with Dr. Jung is that I have today a technique that allows me to connect unconscious elements with my thinking and my actions in a continuous way.” Keller also painted a number of pictures depicting internal states during her analysis with Jung.

In 1924, after an absence from analysis, Keller wished to resume her sessions with Jung. He was not available, however, because he was departing shortly to study the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico. Therefore, Jung transferred Keller to Toni Wolff, a former patient of his who had become a lay analyst....
and his primary associate, with whom Tina worked analytically until 1928. When Keller was transferred to Wolff in 1924, she was 37 years old; Wolff was 36. At the time, Keller had intended to wait for Jung to continue her analysis; she saw the time with Toni Wolff as an opportunity to learn more about Jungian psychology. “I planned to ask her to teach me some theory while I was waiting for Dr. Jung’s return.” However, it became apparent in her first session that Toni Wolff would become her primary analyst.

While in analysis with Wolff, Keller became “closer to Dr. Jung. I now belonged to the intimate circle of pupils around him that participated in his thought.” During the analysis with Wolff, Keller continued occasionally to have an individual session with Jung; she also attended his seminars, including “that special seminar where Dr. Jung told us of his own development [active imaginations].” Keller was referring to the 1925 seminar on analytical psychology, delivered in 16 weekly lectures from March 23 to July 6, in which Jung “briefly discussed the experiences and methods he used to work with the unconscious materials and waking fantasies he experienced during his years of self-experimentation (1912–1918).”

Keller was in analysis with Wolff from late 1924 until the family moved to Geneva in 1928 when Adolph accepted the directorship of an international relief organization. During the four year analysis, Keller had a number of waking fantasies related to a dark figure in her unconscious, “the dark doctor,” which were very distressing. Keller was able to achieve a rapprochement with this figure with Wolff’s assistance and with the use of active imagination experiences in the form of writing, painting, and bodily movement.

Distinguishing between the two analyses, Keller stated that:

while before [with Jung] I was learning to deal with irruptions from the unconscious spontaneously, now [with Wolff] I was going to confront the unconscious process, consciously meeting it. Therefore Dr. Jung had tried to strengthen my ego through discussion. He knew it needs a strong ego for such confrontation with unconscious dynamic images.”

Keller was ambivalent about Jung. She was fascinated by him, attributing her interest to the fact that Jung was “a pioneer in a passionate search, trying to look behind the visible into the dark world of the psyche.” However, she was also repelled by him, stating that “Dr. Jung could be so sarcastic. He made fun of people in an unfeeling way.” She went on to say that “[Jung] was not the kind of man [she] was attracted to,” concluding that “perhaps only a man who did not wish to be labeled ‘good’ could explore the dark unknown? A ‘good’ man, like [my] husband, would keep to the light side of life.”

In addition to having an ambivalent response to Jung the person, she also had a mixed response to her analysis with him. He did teach her useful techniques to help navigate her anxieties, but she stated that in general “it is difficult to remember what Dr. Jung said in the many sessions I had with him...I wondered whether much of our conversation was not a waste of time?” She also had doubts about his judgment in recommending psychoanalysis as the treatment of choice for her anxieties considering her personal circumstances; she talked about the “advantages and disadvantages of involving a woman with small children in a long depth-analysis. Dr. Jung, however, felt sure that when I met him I was already in the growth-process and could not have avoided it. So I found myself involved in a long depth-analysis without knowing what I was undertaking.”

At the age of 94, Keller summarized her view of Jung in the following passage:

Even something that is long past, if it still stirs the emotions, is like an undigested meal, a portion of life that one has been unable to assimilate, but also unable to reject fully. My meeting
with Dr. Jung, his ideas and personality, was such an undigested portion of my life. His image stood before my mind’s eye as a great rock, blocking my way and outlook. My whole experience involving Dr. Jung’s thought and person seemed like a sphinx to whose question an answer must be found. I had to face the painful fact that I was blind in my admiration and later in my hostility. While blind anger blocked my way I was forced to think and to wait and think again till my emotions gradually calmed down and I could see more realistically.

Keller began to write autobiographical accounts in the late 1960s. In 1968 she was interviewed by Gene Nameche for the Jung biographical archive housed at the Countway Medical School of Harvard University in Boston. Keller wrote an unpublished account of her analyses with Jung and Wolff which she submitted for the project. In the 1970s she wrote a four part manuscript in German entitled ‘Wege inneren Wachttums (Ways of Inner Growth),’ published in 1972, 1973, 1975, and 1977, respectively. In the 1970s she began writing her autobiography in several English drafts which are housed in the private collection of the Keller family. In 1971 she was asked to give a lecture at the Jung Institute in Küsnacht upon the occasion of the 10th anniversary of Jung’s death because she was one of the few people yet living who knew Jung in the early days. This presentation was published subsequently in a journal called Inward Light (1972), and describes the clinical practices of Jung and Wolff during the formative years of analytical psychology. Finally, in the summer of 1981 (at the age of 94), she completed a final unpublished edition of her life story entitled Autobiography (Keller Family Papers).  

“MY WHOLE EXPERIENCE INVOLVING DR. JUNG’S THOUGHT AND PERSON SEEMED LIKE A SPHINX TO Whose QUESTION An ANSWER MUST BE FOUND.”
AN INTRODUCTION TO CAROL
SAWYER BAUMANN (1897–1958)\textsuperscript{1}

AMY COLWELL BLUHM

For a long time I hoped
I would be able to
lead two lives, that of
a married woman, as
well as following my
work. Some women can
do that. . . . I have been
through a lot of suffer-
ing and conflict, trying to find the
right path to follow, but now that it
is at last clear to me I feel happy in
looking ahead to the peace and
joy of being free to follow my research. I have tried
too long, to go against my own nature. (Personal
communication, Carol Baumann to Irving Fisher,
Baumann Papers, December 18, 1939)\textsuperscript{2}

Carol Sawyer’s pivotal transformation, about
which she reflects in the opening quote, was nascent
in 1927. During that year, she left her family and
traveled to London for a three month analysis with
Jungian analyst H.G. Baynes. In 1929, Carol Sawyer
(later Baumann) moved herself and her children to
Zürich and continued as C.G. Jung’s analysand until
her death in 1958. Here, I will be presenting an
introduction to Carol Sawyer Baumann’s previously unpublished
correspondence with C.G. Jung.

There is a deep philosophical
pulse that runs through it: the
recognition that the transfor-
mation that occurred in
Carol Sawyer’s life is both
common and abstruse, and
deeply human. The character of her
struggle was continually that of the call
of her family and the call to her work.

The literature produced to date on the history
of analytical psychology and the life of Jung and the
Jungians, as Shamdasani points out, approaches Jung
in disparate fashion, ranging from idolatry to hostil-
ity, too often laced with factual errors and a lack of
historical rigor.\textsuperscript{3} Additionally, the literature pro-
duced by individuals who were directly involved
with Jung or the early Jungians prove to be invalu-
able memoirs. Work such as that of Shamdasani,
and, earlier, Henri Ellenberger emphasizes the
philosophical, intellectual, social, and political con-
texts for Jung’s work.\textsuperscript{4} The current project aims to
add to the contextual history of analytical psycholo-


Connecticut. As a child, she enjoyed several family vacations to Europe and was active in different outdoor groups, including the Campfire Girls, and attended a pseudo-Native American camp called Camp Sobego Wohelo. In 1919, Sawyer lost her older sister, Margie, who suffered from a nervous breakdown, hospitalization, and, finally, pleurisy.

In 1921, Carol Fisher married Charles Baldwin Sawyer at her parents’ home and subsequently moved to Cleveland, Ohio. According to family reports, Carol Sawyer nearly died during the birth of her first child, Baldwin Sawyer, in 1922. As she later described to her son, she exited her body from the back of the head and hovered above the ceiling. She then floated and saw, over a large wall, a beautiful garden. She wanted to go on but looked back to see the new baby and knew that she must return.

Carol Sawyer took her first significant steps toward Zürich between 1927 and 1931. Sawyer moved from a traditional, family-centered life to living as a student and budding researcher in the Zürich circle of Jungians. Following an initial analysis in Cleveland, Sawyer had analysis with the Jungian H. G. Baynes in London in the summer and early autumn of 1927. The analysis involved work with psychological opposites as well as the conflict between her personal work and her draw to her family at home. As evidenced by the initial quote, she struggled throughout her life with this dichotomy.

Upon returning to Cleveland, Sawyer began a heavy correspondence with her cousin, Leonard Bacon and his wife — processing her work with Baynes and attempting to reconcile her own growth with her marriage, her role as a mother, and her life. That summer, she traveled to San Francisco to work with the Bayneses, who were vacationing there, and made a decision to separate from her husband.

In 1929, she moved to Zurich with her children. She had analysis with Jung, launching immediately into work with her father complex, as Jung reflected:

"The truth is, that you had a most formidable attack of your father complex, which is characterized by a considerable amount of incestuous libido. The latter shows itself always in a sexual form, because it wants to return to the father, whom it never has been able to reach before. ...Yours leapt out alright at me, because I am the father, yet I am not the father. This is the most ideal chance for a female father complex. Well I guess you have to accept me for a while as a father substitute and I have to accept a loving “daughter.”" (C. G. Jung to Carol Sawyer, BP, December 21, 1929)

Carol Sawyer Baumann went through several name changes throughout her life. She was born Caroline Fisher. Her first married name, which she held from 1921 until 1933, was Carol Sawyer. Her second marriage, to Hans Baumann, occurred in 1933. She kept the name Baumann for the remainder of her life. From 1933 onward, she was referred to as Carol Baumann, although there were occasions upon which she was referred to as Carol Fisher Baumann.

1 This is a synopsis of my dissertation work: Bluhm, A. C. (2005). Turning toward individuation: Carol Sawyer Baumann’s interpretation of Jung, 1927-1931. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center, San Francisco, CA. Caroline Fisher Sawyer Baumann went through several name changes throughout her life. She was born Caroline Fisher. Her first married name, which she held from 1921 until 1933, was Carol Sawyer. Her second marriage, to Hans Baumann, occurred in 1933. She kept the name Baumann for the remainder of her life. From 1933 onward, she was referred to as Carol Baumann, although there were occasions upon which she was referred to as Carol Fisher Baumann.

2 Baumann Papers, Carol Fisher Sawyer, located in the home of Peter and Ann Sawyer Williams, Cleveland Heights, OH. Indexed by Amy Colwell Bluhm, 2002–2003, hereafter referred to as BP.


6 Hazard Family Papers, Rhode Island Historical Society, Providence, RI.


The interaction of Jung’s theory and Carol Sawyer Baumann’s interpretation of individuation reveals to what degree and in what way each influenced the other. The extent to which she was successful in her quest can be gauged by Carol Sawyer Baumann’s intellectual grasp of the principles of analytical psychology, her extensive researches into non-western cultures, and her ability to communicate her findings on the process of individuation through her lectures and published writings.

According to Katy Rush Cabor, Jung said “Mrs. Baumann understands analysis better than anyone in an intellectual way.” This can be determined by the cogency of her varied research, writing, and lecturing following her arrival in Zürich and until her death. The highlights of her work are as follows.

Soon after she arrived in Zurich, Sawyer (later Baumann) began translation work on the Tao Te Ching, from the Chinese with the assistance of Dr. E.H. von Tscharner. Sawyer Baumann continued an interest in Taoism throughout her life, including composing an article using Laotse as an exemplar for the path of individuation. In 1937, she spent time in the caves of southern France and explored the connection between the caves, symbology, and the collective unconscious. In 1942, she began a correspondence with the great Sioux medicine man Black Elk and also commenced her long work composing a manuscript that formulated a psychological consideration of his big vision. Additionally, Sawyer Baumann traveled to the U.S on at least four separate occasions in the 1940s and 1950s to do field work with the Zuni and the Sioux.

Jung entrusted Sawyer Baumann to translate “On the psychology of eastern meditation” by the Sri Lankan philosopher of aesthetics, Dr. A. K.
Coomaraswamy. In 1947, Sawyer Baumann was able to secure military access to post-World War II Munich, the first Jungian to lecture there following the war. Jung was enthusiastic about Sawyer Baumann’s impending experience, as he was confident that she had a firm understanding of analytical psychology (C. G. Jung to Carol Baumann, February 14, 1947, BP).

Finally, beginning in 1945 and continuing until her death in 1958, Sawyer Baumann collected dozens of women’s reports on their childbirth experiences in order to compose a schema for understanding how women experience childbirth psychologically. The preliminary results were published in 1955 and she intended to expand them to book length. She was still collecting women’s reflections at the time of her death.

Returning to the question of Jung’s effect on Sawyer Baumann, it is difficult, though possible, to speculate. Importantly, Sawyer Baumann left behind no analytical diaries, making it impossible to assess her inner response to Jung. As Jung had commented, and as a reading of her lectures and writing shows, Sawyer Baumann’s intellectual response to Jung’s work was quite strong. She was also heavily involved in the Psychological Club and the larger community around Jung, both of which influenced her life and thought. To divorce her from this social milieu would be in error.

Regarding Carol Sawyer Baumann’s influence on Jung, the documents do provide some information. Carol Sawyer Baumann was arguably Jung’s staunchest defender against charges of anti-Semitism following World War II, representing Jung’s work during the war to the community in New York, interviewing him for a published response to the accusations, and, as mentioned above, being the first Jungian to bring analytical theory to Munich following the war. Furthermore, she was a strong liaison between the Zurich community and the Analytical Psychology Club of New York and lectured in London and Geneva as well. 16

HE PICTURES ARCHIVE AT THE JUNG INSTITUTE, ZURICH

Jung had a complex and very dynamic relationship to the visual arts. To this day, he remains the only major psychologist to have painted, made drawings and sculptures as part of his own inner development. From 1917 on he actively encouraged many of his patients to create pictures of their dreams and fantasies. Jung realized that this method helped his patients to confront the unconscious and to grasp the symbolic material.

The Pictures Archive was created during Jung’s last years and chronicles the inner journeys in a collection of almost 4,000 pictures from Jung’s patients and almost 10,000 pictures from Jolande Jacobi’s patients. The first dated pictures in the archive are from 1917 and extend over a period of about 40 years. The clients who created these pictures, around one hundred men and women from different countries, were in analyses with Jung himself or with one of his collaborators. Jung did not like the idea of leaving the client without his or her picture and therefore asked his analysands to paint the same picture twice, so that Jung could keep one copy with him.

Later, Jolande Jacobi systematized the pictures and catalogued them in topics that are helpful to recognize the archetypal symbolism behind the figures. She also enriched the collection by adding the pictures made by her own patients.

The goal of the collection was, and still is, to support the students of Jungian psychology in their learning about archetypal symbolism and picture interpretation. The archive is open to students, analysts, and all those interested in Jungian psychology. The collection is available at the C. G. Jung Institute in Zürich to all those who would like to study it or be moved by it.

While looking at these pictures you can see what Jung saw, picture by picture, and thus better understand how many of his ideas and concepts were developed. The pictures have been used for research, lectures, articles and even simply to find inspiration and connection to the unconscious.

However, what I want to explore in this article are some open questions which I have confronted in my work. I have been working as a Jungian analyst since 1996 and as curator of the Pictures Archive at the C. G. Jung Institute in Zürich since 1997. For the last eight years I have been studying Jung’s approach towards his patients. We have access to some case histories, patients’ notes, and pictures. This provides us with a partial look inside the way Jung worked with these patients. The critical issues for me are the following: How did Jung himself work with his patients? What kind of patients were they? And, is it possible to apply the same method in contemporary Jungian analysis?

From his books, it is not possible to gain a clear picture of how Jung worked with his patients. Jung did not write a “case report” as we know it today. How he actually worked therapeutically with his patients is not easy to glean from his writings. We know that Jung delved deeply into the archetypal background of his patients’ material, showing the mythological associations and observing the development of the clients (the individuation process), but his interventions during the therapy hour or his attitudes towards his clients are not well known.

My intention in this article is to present some of my conclusions, without claiming any absolute truth about them.

THE PRACTICE OF C. G. JUNG

Jung’s clinical work started at the beginning of the 20th century at the Burghölzli Mental Hospital in Zürich. The young C. G. Jung confronted patients from all social levels. Jung’s work with the word association experiment gave him the basis for developing the complex theory, and the work with Freud between 1906 and 1913 helped him to develop his analytical skills. However, after the break with Freud in 1913, Jung sought his own way. In his personal quest, he discovered that the creative
expression of his inner world through drawings, sculpting, and other artistic means allowed him to discover information from his own personal psychological labyrinth. This inner work later became the guide to his methodology.

It is important to note that Jung's books and ideas were already known in the scientific world and his books were studied in many different countries. Both Symbols of Transformation (1913) (Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido, 1912) and Psychological Types (1921) were known to psychologists as well as lay people after their publication. The patients that came to see Jung after the publication of his books have some common aspects. His clients at that time were mostly women, from wealthy families, with some knowledge of Jung's books. They were over 30 years old, usually older. Most of them were in the second half of life. These clients produced a large amount of drawings and paintings. Like Jung himself, they worked out their inner conflict and development in drawings and other creative arts.

In the Pictures Archive, we have few notes from Jung's patients that give us information about their interaction with Jung. The first drawings are from 1917, but the biggest part of the material presents an overview of patients' work from the 1920s until the 1950s. From the notes, we can see that in this period Jung was working with a different kind of patient from that which he had worked with at the psychiatric clinic.

Jung often encouraged the patient to paint. He expected the patient to express his or her inner world in pictures. Sometimes, Jung even directed the client to produce a duplicate picture and the patient usually followed Jung's advice. This aspect points to an important question: Did the client want to please Jung?

One potential answer is: it could be. Jung expected clients to produce pictures. Jung was already famous and had great influence on the patient, who usually had traveled long distances to see him and to work with him. We must bear in mind that such an influence is to be expected as a result of the counter-transference phenomena. It also must be noted that many of his clients already had some knowledge of his theories and wanted to experience the full extent of Jung's method. Nevertheless, it would be too simple to say that the patients were making drawings just to please Jung. This was simply the method he used to help his clients. Jung had experienced in his own development the benefits of dealing with the contents of the unconscious in a creative way and, at the same time, was developing his theories.

We may say that Jung himself was not a "Jungian analyst" who worked with "normal patients" as we work today. His clients were especially motivated and knowledgeable. They usually had the time and the disposition to confront their unconscious and to produce pictures or other artistic expressions. They were under the influence of the process of transference that was to be expected, and we must admit that talking with a Jungian analyst is different from talking with Jung himself.

THE RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE
The paramount question is: was Jung's way of treatment only valid and applicable for Jung himself? Recent studies done by the Swiss Society for Analytical Psychology (SGAP) in Zürich indicate that this is not the case. Nevertheless, I believe we as analysts must approach this question with a large measure of critical thinking. We need to study in more detail the conditions under which Jung was working with his clients in his own time.

What Jung was doing shows his intention: he
wanted to check if what he had discovered for himself in his personal experience was also valid for his clients. Training the client to deal with the material coming from the unconscious in that same way was a necessary step to observing the effects of his method. The clients were, at the same time, expecting what Jung wrote about in his books. These were the conditions and the attitude towards the work with the unconscious that were necessary for this work. Jung expected his patients to have a religious attitude toward the unconscious.

It is important to understand what Jung meant by "religious attitude." Jung interprets the term religion as coming from the Latin religere or "to consider carefully" (CW 8, para. 427), but there is also the possibility that this term came from religare "to link back, reconnect" (CW 5, para. 669). In both cases, the meaning of religion would be referring to something that has to do with careful observation and with reconnection to the images and contents of the unconscious. The term individuation can also be understood in this attitude: individuum, that means not-divided. The psyche should not be split and the analytical work should strive for totality. Jung’s methods basically are careful observation of and reconnection with what lives inside the individual, as the unknown part inside the psyche. As long as this attitude is present in analysis, Jung’s method, as he himself applied it, is valid and currently applicable.

THE TWO KINDS OF PATIENTS
The kind of patient that Jung had during the second half of his life was not the same kind of patient that he had treated earlier during his time at the Burghölzli Psychiatric Clinic. We can see how Jung connected his clinical observations in the development of his theory, but the kind of patients with whom he worked was totally different. It is possible to say that as he went deeper in his researches towards archetypal material, his method changed just as much as the kind of patient that he treated. The different response of the client to the treatment seems to relate to and depend upon the kind of client that Jung had.

In the practice of analysis and psychotherapy today, it is possible to see how differently patients react to the Jungian method. Many patients come with a request such as “please, help me to function again.” My opinion is that this is what the patient has a right to expect, in so far as the analyst is able to help him or her. The patient has a right to achieve the level to which he or she aspires. It seems to me that it is a mistake to push someone to delve deeply into an archetypal level if the client has no interest in doing so or if the required attitude towards the psyche is missing. To this kind of client the work will be basically psychotherapeutic. Here it is possible to achieve good results by applying Jung’s complex theory and the principles of the in-dividuation process. It can be combined with techniques from other psychological schools and usually the patient can gain relief from his or her psychological suffering.

However, there are other patients, who are not the majority, who require something more. Here the kind of questioning and the attitude that they have towards the work with the psyche are differentiated. It is possible to work more analytically with this kind of client and to apply the methods and techniques of Jung in full.

It is not my intention here to postulate that the first kind of patient is less important than the second. Each and every aspect of human suffering must be respected. The main point here is for the analyst. The client’s needs should be respected and the analyst should not propel him or her into a quest which he or she has not asked for.

Much of the research carried out today seems to me to be more influenced by the psychotherapy patient. The analyst’s observation of symptoms, the diagnostics and the goals of analysis fit in with what the scientific world would require today. However, it is not possible to include the analysis client within the guidelines for scientific study. It is also not necessary. Here we are dealing with questions that go far beyond the criteria used to evaluate psychotherapy. The most important criterion for me is the one which deals with the question of the mean-
Aniela Jaffé writes in her book, *The Myth of Meaning* (1984), about meaning and Jungian psychology. She describes how Jung tried to work with the question: What is the meaning of life? For her, Jung found an answer that satisfied his personal question, taking his scientific knowledge into consideration, but without claiming scientific validity for it. Jaffé writes: “There is no objectively valid answer to the question of meaning for, besides objective thinking, subjective valuation also plays its part. Each and every formulation is a myth in order to answer the unanswerable” (1984, p. 12).
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Philip Tyler Zabriskie, b. March 6, 1928 in Alexandria, Virginia, died peacefully on Dec. 25 2005 in his New York City home. Graduate of Groton School, Princeton University (Salutarian), Virginia Theological Seminary; Jung Institute, Zurich. Rhodes Scholar at Baliol College, Oxford. Held offices in the National Episcopal Church and World Student Christian Federation. He received a D.D., honoris causa, from Kenyon College. Practiced as Jungian Analyst in New York. He served as Chairman and President of the Board of the C.G. Jung Foundation, and later as President of the Board of the C. G. Jung Institute of New York and as a member of its faculty. He served on the Executive Committee of the International Association of Analytical Psychology, and as a Board Member of the Archive for Research in Archetypal Symbolism (ARAS). Founding member of Jungian Psychoanalytic Association. Philip transmitted the integrity of a considered and dedicated life.
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nulla mirum recti; et communi plecti, ab uno puncto, sex separantibus.

\[2+3+4=10\]

Cruix Rectilinae \((X)\) ex 4. fieri recti

\[\text{significant, ab Antiquissimis Latinis Pro-}\]

\[\text{ta (al solis acque) por 4. elementorum magia-}\]

\[\text{nas linces fuerit fata separata; Deindeque,}\]

\[\text{lineum Peripheroros Circulares, un Complemen-}\]

\[\text{ta consumtio,}\]

\[\text{statigas exordium (\text{in Anice})}\]

\[\text{en huma et fol sua separari voluit Elementi-}\]

\[\text{aria viget proportio, unde} \text{igis fieri minimis}\]

\[\text{huis semicirculis, un communi puncto connex-}\]

\[\text{quae vetera Nyphemerse Cosm.}\]

\[\text{211 [prefacio ad ege Maximilianum]}\]

\[\text{Terrestris quotidiae corp. Monas}\]

\[\text{hieroglyphica, in cetero ceteri latissi}]

\[\text{mi.}\]