

THE VALIDITY OF JUNG'S METHOD

in

DREAM INTERPRETATION

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty
of the College Department of St. Meinrad
Seminary in partial fulfilment of the re-
quirements for a Bachelor of Arts Degree.

Richard James Joseph Ruppel

May, 1959

St. Meinrad Seminary
St. Meinrad, Indiana



TABLE of CONTENTS

Introduction - - - - -	p. 1
I. The History Of Dream Interpretation - - - -	p. 2
A. Primitive background	
B. Biblical background	
C. Background in the Catholic Church	
D. Modern Psychology	
II. The Origin of Jung's Method - - - - -	p. 7
A. Freud and dreams in psychoanalysis	
B. Adler's break with Freud	
C. Jung's break with Freud	
D. Jung's point of departure	
III. An Exposition of Jung's Method - - - - -	p. 12
A. The general rules	
B. The technique	
C. The criterion of validity	
IV. A Critical Analysis of Jung's Method - - -	p. 20
A. Various opinions	
1. Those contra	
2. Those pro	
B. Statements of Pius XII	
V. Conclusion: An Evaluation of Jung's Method - -	p. 26
Footnotes - - - - -	p. 31
Bibliography - - - - -	p. 34

Introduction

It is an accepted fact that people do dream, a fact which no one seriously doubts, yet it is a different question when it is asked, "Can dreams really be interpreted?" If dreams can be interpreted, is there any method today which is considered as valid in reaching reality? If, so, is this method established on sound principles and applicable to the case or circumstances? These are the questions which should be in a person's mind when examining a certain method of dream interpretation. In the history of dream interpretation it is seen that different methods from the earliest primitives to the present day have received much attention and equal curiosity, but since the beginning of modern psychological research dream interpretation has taken on a new and equally important value in the field of psychotherapy.

It is the purpose of this paper to present in general the development and history of dream interpretation and in particular to examine the validity of one of the more important theories now in use in psychotherapy, namely, the method of Carl G. Jung. First we shall give a brief history of dream interpretation leading up to the origin of Jung's method. Then a more extensive study of the principles underlying the method and the technique itself will be presented. This study of Jung's theory will be based on the material concerning our subject found in the following works of Jung. Modern Man in

Search of a Soul, especially ch. 1. Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, especially the first essay on the Psychology of the unconscious. The Integration of the Personality, particularly ch. four. Psychology & Religion, especially ch. one. Psychological Types, mainly ch. XI which contains Jung's definition of the various terms used. Among the studies of Jung which were referred to one stands out which is an excellent study on the part of Dr. Jolande Jacobi, The Psychology of C. G. Jung. Following the exposition of Jung's methodology we shall present various critical opinions, particularly among Catholics. Our purpose in this is not to affirm or refute them, rather it is to show the acceptance of Jung's method among Catholics.

The History of Dream Interpretation

The history of dream interpretation extends from the early primitive peoples to contemporary psychologists. The primitive considered dreams as sources of information coming from the deities. This explains the existence of witch doctors, as is apparent from the following:

Primitive people, unable to explain the psychology of dreaming or to discover the causes of sleep ... attributed dreams to outside and supernatural agencies. Hence the persuasion arose that persons favored by frequent dreams were sacred and chosen intermediaries between the deity and man. 1

As civilization advanced these ideas of the primitive peoples became systematized to some extent as is evident in the history of the ancient peoples of the East.

...primitive societies used dreams and visions

as important sources of information. Great and enduring civilizations like those of the Hindus and Chinese built upon this foundation and developed from it a discipline of self-knowledge which they brought to a high pitch of refinement both in philosophy and practice. 2.

More detailed accounts of the history of dream interpretation in these countries can be found in the Encyclopedia of Religion & Ethics. The task of interpreting dreams had developed into an art, which was practiced by soothsayers and diviners. Evidence of these is given in the Old Testament at the time of Nabuchodonosor, king of Babylonia.

Then the king commanded to call together the diviners and the wise men and the magicians and the Chaldeans: to declare to the king his dreams.... 3

This example of soothsayers and diviners also show that along with the religious view of dreams there developed the superstitious attitude. This led to considering every dream as an omen. In Greece and in Rome, as well as among the Eastern peoples, the religious and superstitious interpretations of dreams developed side by side. Homer uses the dream as a messenger of the gods. In the Illiad he depicts how Zeus plans to honour Arhilles and destroy many of those beside the Acheans' ships by means of the dream.

Come now, thou baneful Dream, go to the Achaian's fleet ships, enter into the hus of Agamemnon, son of Atreus, and tell him every word plainly as I charge thee. 4

Plato also attributes the use of dreams to the gods. In explaining the causes of dreams and their nature he says:

These are the works of the second and cooperative

causes which god uses as his ministers when executing the idea of the best as far as possible. 5

Aristotle urges speculative philosophers to pay diligent attention to dreams. He refutes Democritus' theory that images and emanations are the causes of foresight, and explains why soothsayers and those who foresee the future in dreams were commonplace persons and not the most intelligent.

... their normal mental movements do not impede (the alien movements of dreams), but are beaten off by the latter. Therefore it is that they have an especially keen perception of the alien movements. 6

And in regard to who is able to interpret dreams which are either causes, tokens, or coincidences he says,

The most skilful interpreter of dreams is he who has the faculty of observing resemblances. And one may interpret dreams which are vivid and plain. 7

The height of this superstitious interpreting of dreams was reached when text books were published. The more notable is the Oneirocritica written by Daldianus Artemidorus. In this book Artemidorus lays down rules whereby anyone could interpret his own dreams.

In the Israelite religion, however, it was a different story. For the most part the interpretation of dreams was kept pure from superstition and the like. This was due mainly to laws prohibiting such skills and art. In Leviticus, 19, 26, it states: "You shall not divine nor observe dreams." In Deuteronomy 18, 10 there is the law, "Neither let there be found among you any one that consulteth soothsayers, or observeth

dreams and omens." In Jeremias the Lord warns against false prophets and diviners (29,3), "Let not your prophets that are in the midst of you and your diviners deceive you, and give no heed to your dreams which you dream...." And in Zacharias 10, 2 diviners are called liars and vain, "... and the diviners have spoken a lie and the dreamers have spoken vanity; they comforted in vain."

Yet the spiritual value of dreams is clearly manifest in the Bible. When the Lord speaks to Moses in Numbers 12, 6, He says, "... If there be among you a prophet of the Lord, I will appear to him in a vision, or I will speak to him in a dream." In Job 33, 15-16, Eliu tells Job how God instructs men,

By a dream in a vision by night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, and they are sleeping in their beds: Then he openeth the ears of men, and teaching instructeth them in what they are to learn.

Those who followed the superstitious interpretation of dreams were punished. This was the case with Manasses who was led captive to Babylon. In II Paralipomenon 33, 6 it states, "He observed dreams, followed divinations, gave himself up to magic arts ... to provoke the Lord to anger."

This prohibition of superstitious interpretation and the acknowledgement of supernatural dreams was carried over into the Catholic Church. This is evident from the writings of the early Fathers of the Church.

It may suffice in this connexion to recall the names of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Gregory the Great, whose teaching on the question at issue is clear and emphatic. 8

Gregory of Nyssa, in his On Fate, defended human liberty against fatalism. There were a few, however, who did not accept this traditional position. The most notable is a certain Synesius, the bishop of Cyrene around 400 AD. In his De In-somniis he extols dreaming as the amplest and surest mode of prophesying.

Medieval theologians continued to uphold the traditional view. St. Thomas gives the causes of dreams and whether they can be interpreted. He states it thus,

Sic ergo dicendum quod si quis utatur somniis ad praecognoscenda futura secundum quod somnia procedunt ex revelatione divina; vel ex causa naturali, intrinseca sive extrinseca, quantum se potest virtus talis causae extendere: non erit illicita divinatio. Si autem huiusmodi divinatio causetur ex revelatione daemonum cum quibus pacta habentur expressa, quia ad hoc invocantur; vel tacita, quia huiusmodi divinatio extenditur ad quod se non potest extendere: erit divinatio illicita et superstitiosa. 9

Interpreting was not always encouraged and the Church reserved the right to decide whether revelations were authentic or not. A Jesuit, Benedictus Pererius, wrote that nobody should or could interpret dreams "nisi divinit afflatus et eruditus. ... Nemo enim novit quae Dei sunt, nisi spiritus." 10 This right of the Church to decide on revelations through dreams lost some of its influence as a result of the Reformation. Carl Jung refers to this and writes,

... Protestantism, having pulled down many a wall which had been carefully erected by the Church, began immediately to experience the disintegrating and schismatic effect of individual revelation. 11

With the progress of psychological research modern theolo-

gians continue to hold the traditional view while adding that data deduced from dreams can in some cases of nerves produce cures. Also they state that it is morally licit to reasonably conclude something about the future if one knows the natural causes and if treated as having a natural origin.

... quindi non ogni interpretazione dei s. e condannabile, essendo la scienza umana nella possibilita di dedurre dai s. dati utili da usarsi, p. es., per la cura di alcune nevrosi; occorre pero che si sia certi a persona seria anche dal punto di vista morale.

Conoscendo le cause naturali del s., si puo ragionevolmente concludere qualche cosa circa il futuro; il che e anche moralmente lecito, se si tratta di s. che hanno origine naturale. 12

This opinion will be important later for evaluating the validity of Carl Jung's method.

The Origin of C. Jung's Method

Here we shall treat only those aspects which pertain to dream interpretation in Jung's method. Until the latter part of the nineteenth century psychology was primarily concerned with the conscious mind. At this time, the search for the causes of neurosis and their cure gradually led to clinical investigation of the unconscious. It was thought that here lay the causes of the neurosis. Since the middle of the last century this search was headed by such men as Liebault, Janet, Bernheim, Glournery, Breuer, Freud, and Adler. Jung himself was mainly influenced by Freud and Adler of the German school. The efforts of these men led to several different methods of arriving at a knowledge of what is happening in the unconscious

which would be used in curing neuroses. Jung list three of the more known methods.

The original method was hypnotism: either interrogation in a state of hypnotic concentration or else the spontaneous production of fantasies by the patient while in this state. ... but compared with the present technique it is too primitive and therefore unsatisfactory. A second method was evolved by the Psychiatric Clinic, in Zurich which is primarily theoretical and experimental. Its results give one a comprehensive though superficial grasp of the unconscious conflict or "complex". The more penetrating is that of dream analysis, discovered by Freud. 13

It was in 1900 when Freud wrote his Die Traumdeutung. In this work he laid the foundations of the third method of psychotherapy mentioned above, a psychology of dreams - psychoanalysis. This work opened a new and vast field for dream interpretation. For Freudian psychoanalysis and the analytical method in general consists mostly of numerous dream-analyses. These dreams express the contents of the unconscious which are then used as a valuable means in the treatment of neurosis. Freud's hypothesis is that all dreams are attempts at wish fulfillment, which refer to experiences of the remote past, wishes that concern biological drives, particularly sex. 14

One of Freud's first associates, Alfred Adler, was one of the first to break and form a separate school - known as individual psychology. Adler traces the origin of neurotic disturbances in the individual back to an exaggerated, but frustrated, drive to dominate. 15 Thus his dream interpretation was teleologically oriented, which was in direct opposition

with Freud's causal procedure. With these two opposing theories of Freud and Adler the stage was now set for the appearance of Jung's method.

Carl Gustav Jung was also a pupil of Freud and founded the Zurich school, commonly known as analytical psychology, which he tried to change to "complex" psychology in 1935. He broke with Freud in 1913 after the publication of his Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido, in which he broadened the concept of libido to include all psychic energy and not just the sexual drive. With this break Jung found himself between Freud and Adler for he still considered his method only as a further development of Freud's method.¹⁶ Yet, knowing that the two theories contradicted each other, Jung sought for something with which he could bridge this chasm.

Now, since both theories are in a large measure correct, that is to say, since they both appear to explain their material, it follows that a neurosis must have two opposite aspects, one of which is grasped by the Freudian and the other by the Adlerian theory. ...The incompatibility of the two theories ... requires a standpoint superordinate to both, in which they could come together in unison.¹⁷

Jung finds this bridge between the two opposing theories in the actual existence of type-difference, mainly introversion and extraversion.

This discovery brought with it the need to rise above the opposition and to create a theory which should do justice not merely to one side or the other side, but to both equally.¹⁸

He does this with the supposition that there is no psychic energy unless there is a tension of opposites. By this Jung

means that psychic energy or activity arises from the contrary opposition of different forms of compensation. (This notion of compensation will be further explained in the section on the exposition of Jung's method.) Jung then concludes that a psychological theory must be based on the principle of opposition.

Therefore, since this principle is fundamental,

... the Freudian and Adlerian viewpoints contradict each other only when they claim to be generally applicable theories. But so long as they are content to be technical, auxiliary concepts, they do not contradict or exclude one another. 19

In view of this Jung conceives the unconscious as a manifestation of energy that springs from the tension of opposites, and which consists in a sequence of fantasy-occurrences which appear spontaneously in dreams and visions. By observing and analyzing these dreams Jung arrived at the concept of the collective unconscious because from his observations he concluded that the dream is a primitive form of thinking and that the individual mind inherits remnants of the past, supraindividual residues. Thus he held that in addition to the personal unconscious there also existed the collective unconscious which does not consist in personal acquisitions, as does the personal unconscious, but that it consists in the inherited possibility of psychic functioning in general, from which originate contents of mythological associations - those motives and images which can spring anew in every age and clime, without historical tradition or migration. 20

With his second supposition of the collective unconscious

Jung finds it necessary to differ from the exclusively causal and reductive procedure in both Freud and Adler's method of dream interpretation. From experience Jung claims that they are inadequate, and gives his reasons:

It breaks down at the point where the dream symbols can no longer be reduced to personal reminiscences or aspirations, that is, when the collective unconscious begin to appear. It would be quite senseless to try to reduce these collective ideas to anything personal - not only senseless but positively harmful, as painful experience has taught me. 21

Since the analytical method alone was inadequate Jung found the solution to the problem by adopting together with the analytical method a synthetic mode of treatment. For only then do the symbols of the collective unconscious yield their distinctive value.

I had first come to the fundamental realization that analysis, insofar as it is reduction and nothing more, must necessarily be followed by synthesis, and that certain kinds of psychic material mean next to nothing if simply broken down, but display a wealth of meaning if, instead of being broken down, that meaning is reinforced and extended... by amplification. 22

(More will be said concerning Jung's notion of amplification in the following section on the exposition of his method.) With this point of departure Jung begins to develop his own theory in dream interpretation. Having included the contrary theories of his two predecessors on the basis of the necessary principle of opposition he leaves himself open to all other possible means by reason of his synthetic procedure on the basis of the actuality of the collective unconscious.

An Exposition of Jung's Method

Concerning a theory in dream interpretation Jung repeatedly claims that he has no theory. He does not mean by this, however, that dreams cannot be interpreted.

To say that dreams are unintelligible is a mere reflection of the doctor's subjective opinion. Nothing is unclear to the understanding; it is only when we fail to understand that things appear unintelligible and confused. In themselves, dreams are clear. 23

Rather, Jung gives the impression that his theory consists in the fact that it is not a set, general theory, but a method which simply helps one in a particular instance. He compares his method in interpreting dreams to a method or theory in predicting the conscious activity of a person.

We are not yet in possession of a general theory of dreams that would allow us, unchastised, to adopt a deductive procedure, any more than we enjoy a general theory of consciousness that would permit deductive conclusions. 24

His method can be summed up in this phrase: every interpretation is a hypothesis. In other words, Jung considers every dream as a fragmentary text which is written in an unknown language. In which case, the method demanded and to be used is that of carefully examining the context.

I know that if we meditate on a dream sufficiently long and thoroughly - if we take it about with us and turn it over and over - something almost always comes of it. 25

Certainly, if left by itself such an interpretation would be mere conjecture. This fact leads Jung to his second general rule, namely, that an interpretation first reaches a relative

certainty only in a "series" of dreams. Jung gives his reasons for interpreting the whole series of dreams in the following:

Certainly, the interpretation of each single dream is essentially "conjecture"; but the course of the entire series gives us all the necessary supports by which immediately to correct possible errors in preceding parts. 26

An important consequence which followed his investigating the series of dreams was that of their arrangement. This concerns the third general rule. Are dreams successive or radial (being grouped around a centre of significance) in a series? Since Jung describes the arrangement of dream images as standing outside the categories of time and space, and subject to no causality, their real arrangement is a radial one. 27 Thus, for the sake of recognizing these basic themes, Jung urges his patients "to make a careful record of their dreams and the interpretation given them." 28

We have already seen that Jung differs from the purely causal interpretation of dreams, namely because he deems such an approach inadequate for giving a true interpretation.

A person is biassed who turns to dreams for the sole purpose of discovering the hidden cause of the neurosis, for he leaves aside the larger part of the dream's actual contribution ... they also offer a prognosis or anticipation of the future.... 29

Hence Jung applies the concept of causality in a different and limited sense. For beside examining the causal connexions, one must also consider the situational value within the total dream context. For this reason he introduced the fourth general rule, that of "conditionalism", wherein the situation with its con-

temporary, momentary conditions is a decisive factor. ³⁰ By conditionalism Jung expands the idea of causality and understands it as a manifold interpretation of causal relations. Thus, through conditionalism causality is conceived by means of an interplay of conditions and so is used

to enlarge the simple significance of the relation between cause and effect by means of the manifold significance of the relations between effects. Causality in the general sense is not thereby destroyed but only accommodated to the many-sided living material, ... ³¹

In view of conditionalism and his theory that every dream is a hypothesis Jung lays down the fifth important rule to be followed in interpreting symbols. He repeatedly states that the interpreter must not be prejudiced and must renounce all preconceived opinions. Hence, he holds that there are no standard symbols in dreams. Rather, they should be regarded as individual and true but not as signs or symptoms of a fixed character. They must be examined in relation to the dreamer's immediate state of consciousness, that is, his philosophical, cultural, social, religious, and moral convictions. And only through comparative studies in mythology, folk-lore, religion, and language can these symbols be determined and given a relatively fixed meaning. Jung emphasizes their indefinite content

because theoretically there do exist relatively fixed symbols whose meaning must on no account be referred to anything whose content is known, or to anything that can be formulated in concepts. ... It is the indefinite content that marks the symbol as against the mere sign or symptom. ³²

In addition to these five general rules for interpretation Jung makes the appropriate distinction between subjective and objective interpretation. Subjective interpretation treats dream figures and events symbolically. It refers to the internal facts, to the dreamer's attitude in reference to himself and to the given psychic reality. In other words, synthetic. On the other hand objective interpretation is analytical. It treats dream figures and events concretely, not symbolically, referring to external facts and the dreamer's to these facts.

The reason Jung makes this distinction is as follows:

Interpretation on the objective level is analytic, because it breaks down the dream content into complexes of memory that refer to external situations. Interpretation on the subjective level is synthetic because it detaches the underlying complexes of memory from their external causes, regards them as tendencies or components of the subject, and reunites them with that subject. 33

Having considered Jung's general rules we now come to his technique in interpreting dreams. Although Jung does not give a fixed number of steps in his technique we shall do so here for the sake of clarity.

(1.) Obtain full knowledge of the life situation. This means a description of the present conscious situation and all the preceding events. This is the step with which analytic and objective examination pertains.

(2.) Obtain full knowledge and determine the subjective context of the dream. This refers to the personal and suprapersonal or collective unconscious contents in the dream. These are deter-

mined by synthetic and subjective interpretations. Thus personal unconscious contents such as regressions, conflicts, infantile tendencies are brought into the light, made conscious and solved. Then contents from the collective unconscious such as archaic motives and symbols can be compared with mythological parallels.

This "personal unconscious" must always first be disposed of - that is to say, made conscious; otherwise, the entrance to the collective unconscious cannot be opened. 34

(3.) Do an exact reconstruction of the dream context. This step is performed by means of 'amplification'. It is the means of making the psychological context of dream contents or the relations in which the dream content is naturally embedded intelligible.

... we resort to amplification in the interpretation of dreams, for a dream is too shadowy an adumbration to be understood until it is enriched through the stuff of association and analogy, and is thus amplified to the level of intelligibility. 35

But by association Jung does not mean the notion of "free associations" or a causally connected chain of associations to be followed backward, rather, it has the notion of a directed association that returns ever and again to the centre of significance given in the dream, revolving as it were about this very centre. 36 In this sense, amplification means a broadening and enriching of the dream content with all possible similar, analogous images. These analogous images are most important in determining the direction given the associations in the

amplification procedure. Their use depends upon the individual dream and the special knowledge of the interpreter in certain fields. Jung gives special importance to these fields of knowledge and says,

It is of especial importance for me to know as much as possible about primitive psychology, mythology, archaeology, and comparative religion for the reason that these fields afford me priceless analogies with which I can enrich the associations of my patients. 37

Amplification is used in dealing with both the personal and the collective unconscious contents. The meaning of the personal unconscious content is obtained by means of subjective amplification, that is, by questioning the dreamer as to what each dream element signifies to him personally. The meaning of the collective unconscious content is obtained by means of objective amplification, that is, by illuminating the universal human aspect of the problem with the general symbolic material of legends, mythologies, etc. 38

(4.) In complicated situations, correlate the interpretation with objective information from third persons. When an interpretation does not seem to make much sense, information from other sources such as third persons often greatly help in giving the dream a meaningful interpretation.

(5.) Correlate the meaning found by establishing the context with the text of the dream itself. This is the final result of an interpretation. Only after a careful survey of the context is an interpretation attempted by inserting in the text of the dream the previously determined meaning. The resulting inter-

pretation or explanation is usually one whose meaning is unexpectedly different from the attitude of consciousness. Jung does not deny the possibility, however, that its meaning is parallel to or reinforces the attitude of consciousness, but he asserts that they are fairly rare. And in regard to this he points out that the explanation should not be influenced by subjectivism,

... under no circumstance may we anticipate that this meaning will correspond to any subjective expectation, for often the dream says something astonishingly different from what we should have expected. If the discovered meaning of the dreams answers to expectation, this is actually a reason to be wary, for the standpoint of the unconscious is as a rule complementary or compensatory to consciousness.... 39

As is referred to in the above quotation, the basis of this last step in Jung's technique is the principle of compensation. By compensation he means a balancing or supplementing. It is a general functional adjustment, an inherent self-regulation of the psychic apparatus.⁴⁰ This principle must also be applied as a general rule in dream interpretation, because dreams as coming from the unconscious have a compensatory relation to the conscious situation. Too little on the conscious side results in too much on the unconscious side. Hence, in dream interpretation it must be asked, "What conscious attitude does the dream compensate?"

Because of its compensatory function the dream gives certain "indicia" about either the objective causality or the objective tendencies. In other words, its compensation is

either reductive or prospective. By reductive compensation the dream integrates into the conscious situation all the elements that are repressed or disregarded. By prospective compensation the dream anticipates future conscious performances that manifests itself in the unconscious. It must be noted, however, that by this latter function Jung does not mean a future performance preexists in the dream.

This is not to say the final meaning, in the sense of an end given a priori, pre-existed in the preparatory stages of the phenomenon we are discussing. According to the theory of knowledge it is evidently not possible, from the indubitably final meaning of biological mechanisms, to deduce the pre-existent fixation of a final end. 41

Rather, Jung means that the interpretation can be a discovery of why there is a combination of just these certain elements. It might be compared to weather predictions, for when there is a certain combination of clouds, winds, temperature, etc. they predict rain.

Having completed the various steps and now possessing the final result of a dream interpretation the most important factor still remains - is it valid in reaching reality. Jung considers dreams on a plane with physiological fact. It is not a deliberate manoeuvre calculated to deceive but a natural event. And according to Jung an interpretation reaching reality depends upon the person himself experiencing it. Without experiencing the interpretation it cannot be said to reach reality. The validity of dream interpretations is the direct outcome of their being experienced.

On paper the interpretation of a dream may look arbitrary, muddled, and spurious; but the same thing in reality can be a little drama of unsurpassed realism. To experience a dream and its interpretation is very different from having a tepid rehash set before you on paper. 42

Jung's sole criterion for the validity of an interpretation reaching reality is "that it works". He realizes that it is not an absolute criterion for validity, but justifies its use by reason of its reliability. He claims that it is reliable and gives his reasons as follows:

If we have made a wrong interpretation, or if it is somehow incomplete we may be able to see it from the next dream. Thus for example, the earlier motif will be repeated in clearer form, or our interpretation may be deflated by some ironic paraphrase, or it may meet with straightforward violent opposition. ... Just as the reward of a correct interpretation is an uprush of life, so an incorrect one dooms itself in deadlock, resistance, doubt, and mutual desiccation. 43

Therefore, an interpretation in Jung's method is valid and reaches reality when the dreamer experienced its interpretation and has an uprush of life with no violence done to his personality.

A Critical Analysis of Jung's Method

Before entering upon a critical analysis of Jung's methodology in dream interpretation it would be well to recall that this is not a discussion of Jung's concept of religion and other highly controversial points in his analytical psychology. Rather it will be limited to the main source of controversy in dream interpretation - its validity in reaching reality. Only

the more important commentators, esp. among Catholics, both pro and contra, will be presented. Those contra can be said to be headed by Fr. Gemelli, whereas Fr. White heads those pro.

The main criticisms of the contra group is that of subjectivism, finalism, and illogicalness. Fr. Gemelli maintains that Jung's method would lead to subjectivism, but since Jung postulated the psyche as a reality it now leads to psychologism.

Analytic psychology thus is primarily characterized by this wavering sense of vagueness and imprecision. ... On the one hand he affirms, without offering proofs, that the objective world is distinguishable from the subjective or psychic world. But on the other hand he affirms that the objective world cannot be known by the subjective world. This would lead to a radical subjectivism if Jung did not advance a new postulate, namely that psychic reality is the reality par excellence. Jung says that this reality is experienced directly, although previously he had declared that it was unknowable. 44

But this psychic reality says nothing for or against the ontological reality of the phenomenon concerned. Therefore it is psychologism. Because of this psychologistic approach Gemelli holds that Jung is unacceptable from the Catholic standpoint. 45

Edward Glover likewise criticizes Jung for his illogicalness in regard to the reality of the psyche which is known through dream interpretations.

Glover writes that Jung enunciated contradictions and illogical conclusions, the fact that he attributes a value to psychic reality, i.e., to something which at first he had presented as a possibility, pure and simple, demonstrate his incapacity to call a cat that which is a cat and to keep it so named. 46

Fr. Raymond Hostie, who is a sympathetic critic of Jung also claims and acknowledges that incongruity and incoherence

lie at the base of Jung's system. Hostie's main criticism is that according to Jung's method it is up to the therapist to decide whether to use subjective or objective interpretation.

It seems to me that this theoretic distinction between analysis on the objective plane and subjective plane shows, precisely because it leaves us unprovided for in practice, some sort of failure of method.... I shall leave all criticism of this for the next chapter. 47

Hostie's criticism in the following chapter is based on Jung's illogical 'pendulum movement' from absolute subjectivity to pure objectivity. He states that Jung derived this from philosophical assumptions combining a realistic "common-sense" philosophy, with a theoretical agnosticism borrowed from Kant.

This illogicality sunders subject and object irremediably. But Jung had emphasized their interdependence. In his interpretation of dreams he - not unsuccessfully - drew attention to analysis on the subjective plane. But he could not succeed in unifying it with analysis on the objective plane. 48

Although Fr. James VanderVeldt and Dr. Robert Odenwald cannot exactly be called critics of Jung, nevertheless, they do point out what they think is lacking in his method. They object to his use of finalism and hence tend to follow Fr. Gemelli's position.

The weak point in Jung's finalism is that it is exclusively of a subjective nature; man is supposed to find his destiny in his own archetypes, hence in himself. The Jungian system ignores the objective purpose of human life. 49

On the other hand, the pros assert that Jung's critics misunderstand his method when they attempt to judge it by intellectual rigor alone. They point out, as Jung himself does again

and again, that he is not a philosopher but a psychologist and empiricist. Fr. White maintains that Jung's method is a step forward in the field of psychotherapy.

... we venture to submit that Jungian theory and practice at least offer possibilities of a way out from the dilemma with which we have been occupied. 50

Fr. White further states that Jung's method must not be fitted into philosophical terms alone, but must also be understood from the psychological viewpoint.

... but Jung's writings are hardly intelligible unless it be understood that they are the product of sensation, intuition, and feeling at least as much as of intellect.... Fr. Hostie's criticism is often conducted by trying to fit Jung's data and ideas into philosophical categories of doubtful appropriateness. 51

A close associate of Fr. White, Gebhard Frei, says we must constantly keep Jung's empirical method in mind when reading his works. He claims that Jung should not be denied the right to base his work methodologically on empirical observation alone, without departing from that to make metaphysical pronouncements by way of inference. For Jung doesn't deny such a thing as faith, but he is convinced that it would be an offence against scientific method to proclaim his personal beliefs in purely scientific works. Moreover, Jung is distrustful of rational inference which overstep the limits of empirical observation. Therefore Jung acknowledges two ways of methodology only, experience and belief, whereas we acknowledge three ways, experience, inference, and belief. In view of this, Frei sides with Fr. White and holds that we should acknowledge Jung as an

empirical psychologist.

We should confront and accept the wealth of empirical data which Jung offers us and recognize its profound significance. At the same time we shall pursue our own traditional procedure in the paths of "rational psychology"! This clashes not at all with the findings of empirical psychology, and has its own weighty themes of the soul's spirituality, substantiality, and immortality. Neither empirical nor rational psychology clashes with our faith. 52

While commenting on Jung's method of dream interpretation Josef Goldbrunner upholds what Jung's critics have called its illogicalness. For de facto dreams are alogical and if we are to understand them we must allow for this alogicality.

Every dream has a meaning.... The mentality accustomed to abstract modes of thinking has first to familiarize itself with the alogical imagery of the dream world. Dreams resist the stranglehold of cause and effect. They are based not on the logical proximity but on an interweaving of events. The Western mode of thought has much to learn from the Oriental in this respect. 53

On the basis of this Goldbrunner goes on to state why Jung's theory of no theory, or that every dream is a hypothesis, is not out of the question.

Dreams have something essential to add to conscious knowledge. This means that every dream is relative to the particular situation in which the conscious mind finds itself. And this makes any universally valid interpretation of dreams quite out of the question. 53

MacLhiot, O.P., praises Jung (and also Freud) for restoring to psychology its specific object, namely, the psyche in all its complexity and the wealth of its vital impetus. According to MacLhiot we ought to take a more positive and less critical attitude toward their work.

We owe them this minimum of scientific probity: to adhere to what appears to us to be substantiated in their hypotheses, while remaining receptive to new findings, and not to fall into stupid dogmatism....54

It is interesting to note that the point which VanderVedlt and Odenwald pointed out as Jung's weak point, the subjective nature of his "finalism", is taken from a different point of view by R. Maloney. Maloney accepts Jung's finalism as something to counteract Freud's method.

The interpretation of the dream is not so stereotyped as in Freud's doctrine, nor are symbols so fixed in their meaning; a more finalistic and less mechanical view of psychic life in general is possible. 55

Having seen the various positions held by those both pro and contra it is now a fitting time to observe the principles laid down by Pius XII in this regard. Pius XII first states in an Address to the Fifth International Congress of Psychotherapy and Clinical Psychology (April 13, 1953) that questions the the use of new psychic methods pertaining to scientific psychology belong to the competence of those in the said field. Later he numerates several conditions which must be met.

But theoretic and practical psychology... should bear in mind that they cannot lose sight of truths established by reason and by faith, nor of the obligatory precepts of ethics.

Psychotherapy and clinical psychology must always consider man 1) as a psychic unit and totality 2) as a structural unit in himself 3) as a social unit 4) as a transcendental unit, that is to say, a unit tending towards God. 56

And in regard to analyzing the contents of the psyche with which the recent dream interpretations deal, Pius XII has this

comment to make:

We should certainly not find fault with depth psychology if it deals with the psychic aspect of religious phenomena and endeavors to analyze and reduce it to a scientific system even if this research is new and if its terminology is found in the past. 56

In connection with these statements of Pius XII it would be well also to recall the teaching of modern theologians as expressed by Bozanelli, which was treated at the end of the section on the History of Dream Interpretation. (p. 7)

An Evaluation of Jung's Method

Before drawing any conclusions let us review the basic principles which underlie Jung's methodology in dream interpretation. The dream is the expression of the unconscious and can be interpreted by observing the following general rules. 1.) Every dream is a hypothesis. 2.) Relative certainty is had only in a series of dreams. 3.) Dreams have a radial arrangement. 4.) Causal relations depend upon conditionalism. 5.) There are no fixed standard symbols. 6.) There is a distinction between subjective and objective interpretation. 7.) Associations are directed by amplification. 8.) Dreams have a compensatory or supplementary relation to consciousness, either reductive or prospective. With these general rules Jung then develops his technique which need not be recalled here since his methodology must be judged according to the principles upon which it is based.

If we apply these principles as they are laid down by Jung, "in themselves", to the traditional teaching of theologians and to the statements of Pius XII (confer respectively to the latter part of the History of Dream Interpretation and of the Critical Analysis of Jung's Method) it can be said that there is no conflict. However, as we have seen from the various opinions, some of Jung's critics claim that the use of such principles will lead to "subjectivism", "finalism", and that they are "illogical". If this is so, then Jung's methodology cannot be acceptable. But let us examine more closely these three major criticisms.

Having observed the opinions concerning the charge of subjectivism, finalism, and alogicality as expressed by those both pro and contra it is apparent that these charges are based upon how the critic's notion of what the "psyche" or the unconscious is conforms with Jung's notion. For if the critic does not think that the psyche is such as Jung conceives it, then certainly Jung's methodology will lead to either subjectivism, finalism, or alogicality. On the other hand, if the critic accepts Jung's notion of the psyche, then definitely if understood his methodology will not lead to subjectivism, finalism, or alogicality. Since there is this difference in opinion, the question rises, "How are we to judge its validity in reaching reality?" Moreover, who is able to determine whether Jung is wrong (it must be remembered that we are considering only Jung's methodology in dream interpretation and not other highly contro-

versial issues in his analytical psychology) especially since the study of the psyche or the unconscious is yet in its earliest stages, to which Jung himself draws attention, and since as of yet no one has given a precise and scientific definition of the nature of the unconscious.

In view of this, in judging the validity of Jung's methodology in reaching reality we would like to present the position taken by R. Demos. According to Demos the validity of Jung's notion of the psyche is determined by the satisfactory way in which it explains psychic phenomena.

The validity of the assumption is determined by the satisfactory way in which it explains these phenomena. ... There is the realistic and there is the positivistic construction of hypothetical entities, and Jung's position is realistic. In sum, the conception of the unconscious has the validity which belongs to any postulated entity by virtue of the fact that it explains phenomena in satisfactory fashion. 57

Demos realizes that Jung is not primarily a philosopher but an empiricist and scientist, thus granting him the right to restrict the ability to understand psychic phenomena with the intellect alone.

I think we may safely conclude that for Jung the psyche - or at least part of it - is an independent and irreducible reality, providing material for an autonomous science of psychology. 57

With this in mind Demos then points out that Jung's interpretation of dreams, as indicating what the unconscious is saying, is a matter of hypothesis. And in regard to how we are able to judge whether an interpretation is valid, he feels that Jung

himself has given the means whereby they may be tested. In the following Demos gives two tests which in his opinion give a satisfactory certitude to an interpretation.

In the first place there is the test of what I will call coherence. Thus the interpretation of dreams is analogous to the process of decoding. Coherence is not limited to a comparison of dreams of one and the same person. Light is thrown also by a comparison of the total sequence of dreams with myths and archetypes.

Secondly and inseparable from the first a test is found in the dreamer's own response to the interpretation offered to him. If the interpretation clicks with him, ... there is evidence in favor of the correctness of the interpretation. Obviously, we are not here provided with scientific criteria of evidence. The sense of conviction is too personal and subjective, moreover it may happen that when the dreamer rejects the interpretation, such a rejection is explained as due to resistance. If so, obviously the interpreter can never be wrong. But this is putting the matter extremely. Granted that the interpretation can never be more than probable, it is possible to test the factor of resistance, and there is always the reference to the context of the series of dreams. 57

Hence, we can conclude that Jung's methodology in dream interpretation is valid in reaching reality insofar as it gives a satisfactory explanation of his notion of the nature of the psyche. This in turn is acceptable insofar as it does not conflict with ethics, truths established by reason, or faith and considers man as a psychic unit, a structural unit in himself, a social unit, and a transcendental unit. And as long as we limit our consideration to the results and their necessary presuppositions in Jung's methodology in dream interpretation, but go no further, it cannot be said to conflict with those points mentioned above. Therefore, Jung's methodology in reaching reality is valid secun-

dum quid. That is, it can be considered as valid in the sense that it is one explanation (we are not excluding other explanations) that does give a fairly satisfactory interpretation of what little is actually known concerning the psyche in experimental psychology, and in the sense that up to date there has been no research to show that it is false. In answer to the three charges of subjectivism, finalism, and alogicality it can be said that these are a misunderstanding of Jung's notion of the psyche or the unconscious. Certainly no one would deny that Jung believes in subjective interpretation, that the psyche has a teleological structure, and that its movement is dialectical - from opposite to opposite, but in conclusion we can say with Demos,

In general Jung's language is 'holistic' not analytic, not employing sharp and exclusive concepts; the use of such a language is justified in terms of his doctrine of the psyche. 57

The End.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 T. Campbell, "Dream, Interpretation of", Catholic Encyclopedia Vol. V, p. 154. Hereafter cited as Campbell.
- 2 C.G. Jung, Modern Man in Search of a Soul (London, 1933), p. 213. Hereafter cited as Jung, Modern Man.
- 3 Daniel, ii, 2.
- 4 Illiad, Bk II, 10.
- 5 Timaeus, p. Stefh., xlvi.
- 6 De Divinatione Per Somnum, 464a, 26-29.
- 7 Ibid., 464b, 7-9.
- 8 Campbell, p. 155.
- 9 Summa Theologiae, II-II, Q. 95, a. 6.
- 10 B. Pererius, De Magia, Observatione Somniorum, et Divinatione Astrologica (Coloniae Agripp., 1598), p. 114.
- 11 C.G. Jung, Psychology & Religion (New Haven, 1938), p. 21. Hereafter cited as Jung, Psych. & Relig.
- 12 E. Bozanelli, "Sogno", Enciclopedia Cattolica, XI, p. 918.
- 13 C.G. Jung, Two Essays on Analytical Psychology (London, 1953), p. 289. Hereafter cited as Jung, Two Essays.
- 14 J. VanderVeldt & R. Odenwald, Psychiatry & Catholicism (New York, 1957), p. 112. Hereafter cited as Vander-Veldt & Odenwald.
- 15 Ibid., p. 158.
- 16 Jung, Modern Man. p. 164.
- 17 _____, Two Essays. p. 40.
- 18 Ibid., p. 43.
- 19 Ibid., p. 60/
- 20 C.G. Jung, Psychological Types (London, 1923), p. 616. Hereafter cited as Jung, Psych. Types.
- 21 _____, Two Essays. p. 79.

- 22 Ibid., p. 80.
- 23 Jung, Modern Man. p. 9.
- 24 _____, The Integration of the Personality (London, 1940), p. 98. Hereafter cited as Jung, Integration.
- 25 _____, Modern Man. p. 72.
- 26 _____, Integration. p. 101.
- 27 Jolande Jacobi, The Psychology of C.G. Jung (London, 1951), p. 92. Hereafter cited as Jacobi.
- 28 Jung, Modern Man. p. 16.
- 29 Ibid., p. 7.
- 30 Jacobi, p. 100.
- 31 Jung, Seminar on Children's Dreams, 1938-39. Privately printed.
- 32 _____, Modern Man. p. 25.
- 33 _____, Two Essays. p. 83.
- 34 _____, Integration. p. 111.
- 35 Ibid., p. 207.
- 36 Jacobi, p. 101.
- 37 Jung, Modern Man. p. 75.
- 38 Jacobi, p. 106.
- 39 Jung, Integration. p. 99.
- 40 _____, Psych. Types. p. 532.
- 41 _____, Two Essays. p. 289.
- 42 Ibid., p. 115.
- 43 Ibid., p. 110.
- 44 A. Gemelli, O.F.M., Psychoanalysis Today (New York, 1955), p. 85.
- 45 J. VanderVeldt, Review of "Psychoanalysis Today", American Ecclesiastical Review, CXXXI (1956), p. 141.

- 46 A. Gemelli, O.F.M., Psychoanalysis Today (New York, 1955), p. 86.
- 47 R. Hostie, Religion & the Psychology of Jung (New York, 1957), p. 39.
- 48 Ibid., p. 107.
- 49 VanderVeldt & Odenwald, p. 169
- 50 V. White, O.P., God & the Unconscious (Chicago, 1953), p. 156.
- 51 _____, "Two Theologians on Jung's Psychology", Blackfriars, XXXVI (1955), p. 383.
- 52 Gebhard Frei, "The Appendix" to Fr. White's book: God & the Unconscious (Chicago, 1953), p. 235.
- 53 Josef Goldbrunner, Individuation (New York, 1956), p. 38.
- 54 B. MacLhiot, O.P., "The Achievement of Jung", The Tablet, CCVI (1955), p. 103/
- 55 R. Maloney, "Depth Psychology", The Month, XV (1956), p. 360.
- 56 Pius XII, "Psychotherapy & Religion", The Catholic Mind, LI (1953), p. 428-435.
- 57 R. Demos, "Jung's Thought & Influence", Review of Metaphysics, IX (1955), p. 71-89.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Bozanelli, E., "Sogno", Enciclopedia Cattolica, XI, p. 917-918.
- Campbell, T., "Dreams, Interpretation of", The Catholic Encyclopedia, V, p. 154-155.
- Gemelli, A., O.F.M., Psychoanalysis Today. P.J. Kenedy & Sons, New York, 1955.
- Goldbrunner, J., Individuation. Pantheon Books Inc., New York, 1956.
- Hostie, R., S.J., Religion & The Psychology of Jung. Sheed & Ward, New York, 1957.
- Jacobi, J., The Psychology of Jung. Routledge & Kegan, London, 1951.
- Jung, C. G., Modern Man in Search of a Soul. Translated by Dell & Baynes. Routledge & Kegan, London. 1933.
- _____, Two Essays on Analytical Psychology. Translated by Hull. Routledge & Kegan, London. 1953.
- _____, Psychological Types. Translated by Baynes. Routledge & Kegan, London. 1923.
- _____, The Integration of the Personality. Translated by Routledge & Kegan, London. 1940.
- _____, Psychology & Religion. Yale University Press, New Haven, 1938.
- VanderVeldt, J. & Odenwald, R., Psychiatry & Catholicism. McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., New York. 1957.
- White, V., O.P., God & The Unconscious. With a foreword by C.G. Jung and an appendix by Gebhard Frei. Henry Regnery Co., Chicago. 1953.

BIBLIOGRAPHYPeriodicals

- Demos, R., "Jung's Thought & Influence", Review of Metaphysics, IX (1955), p. 71-89.
- MacLhiot, B., O.P., "The Achievement of Jung", The Tablet, CCVI (1955), p. 103.
- Maloney, R., "Depth Psychology", The Month, XV (1956), p. 360.
- Pius XII, Pope, "Psychotherapy & Religion", The Catholic Mind, LI (1953), p. 428-435.
- VanderVeldt, J., Review of "Psychoanalysis Today", American Ecclesiastical Review, CXXXI (1956), p. 139-142.
- White, V., O.P., "Two Theologians on Jung's Psychology", Blackfriars, XXXVI (1955), p. 382-388.

ARCHABEY LIBRARY



3 0764 1003 1222 7