



\* Archetypal Analyses \*

[www.mytho-logos.net](http://www.mytho-logos.net)

## **The Poly-Vocal Self of Monotheism**

### **A Singularly Complex God and Its Parabolic Incarnation in Christ and Depth Psychology**

By Leslie Emery

This paper explores two examples of a reductively unitary cultural model of selfhood diversifying into a more complexly varied, yet still contiguous field of identity. The implication drawn from these examples is that radically singular and exclusive self-models can somehow prompt a shift in cultural imagination about the complexity of selfhood that is inclusive of a seemingly disparate *loci* of intention, thus 'identity,' in 'a person.' This theme is explored here by associating the diversification of a singular self-model in monotheistic religion with the emergence of a pluralistic concept of psychic identity as articulated in depth psychological theory. The religious instance involves the shift from a singular to a triadic or Trinitarian divine model of selfhood. That development of Christian monotheism out of its Hebraic predecessor is approached here as an intuitive response to a sense of psychic compression imposed by the identity model of an absolute monotheism. Enough persons evidently responded to the resulting concept of a diversified yet somehow still monolithic godhead to generate a significantly different religious representation of selfhood (i.e., as Father/Son/Holy Ghost).

In the related case of depth psychological theory, the development of a rational psychological model of decentered yet contiguous psychic composition of selfhood is approached as a related response to reductive self-modeling. In this theoretical context, the diversification develops 'out of' yet also 'in reaction to' a radically reductive basis for identity asserted in self-consistent, positivistic rationalism. Thus, in contrast to the mythically intuitive response in the religious context, this psyche-logical one is necessarily an analytical development. It is a reasonable re-conception of complex identity posed in response to an 'unreasonably singular' concept.

These transits can be simplistically stated thusly: The mythic reduction of a divine/ideal self-image in God is viewed as prompting a mythic diversification in the incarnation of God the Son who is both divine and human. And, in related fashion, the rationalistic reduction of self-identity to mental mechanism and identity as self-consistent reasoning prompted a more complexly reasoned version of the logic of psychic identity in depth psychology. These shifts are regarded as unusual because both ‘locate’ the diversification of selfhood ‘internally.’ That is, a shift from radical monotheism to overt polytheism—from a singular godhead to various separate ones—would model diversity of self as different possible self-models. Similarly, a psychology that posits self-diversification only as ‘fragmentary dissociation’ is figuring it as a ‘splintered’ or ‘shattered’ status. The examples discussed here both assert a diversified model that is also unitary, even though it is not ‘self-consistent.’ This trait of multi-valenced unity is represented here in the uses of the terms poly-vocal and parabolic selfhood.

Depth psychological conceptions of the radical diversity or self-complexity of psychic identity provide the analytical references deployed here for understanding the intuitive shift in the religious imagination from utterly singular, disembodied, all-powerful monotheistic self-model to a more pluralized and relational one expressed in the form of the Holy Trinity. That historical precedent of figuring a ‘manyness in oneness’ is subsequently considered here as prefiguring and perhaps precipitating the second instance—that of rationalistic reduction of identity in Humanist philosophy and scientific materialism from which emerges a depth psychological model of self-complexity. Taken together, these instances of diversification of primary socio-cultural models for selfhood are lastly approached as suggesting that radical reduction of selfhood models activates a compassionate concern for the traumatic struggle of psychic diversity with/in singularity. Thusly viewed, the emphasis upon ethical egalitarianism in the social orders shaped by Christian and Humanist perspectives appears in some way to be a result of their relatively radical emphasis upon singularity of self and identity.

The first section below presents a summary paraphrasing of C. G. Jung’s depth psychological model for self-complexity. The second section relates this model to the differentiation of self-aspects ‘from within’ the singular identity of the monotheistic Hebrew God YHVH or Yahweh, as manifested in the Christian New Testament story of the incarnation of God as Jesus the Christ or messiah. This differentiation of the singular God into ‘Father and Son’ is interpreted as representing an individuation of psychic aspects of selfhood into characteristically contrasting complexes of concern that coexist in what remains somehow a single psychic field or identity. That development, occurring in a monotheistic religious tradition, is understood as generating an additional and different ‘voice’ within the divine model of

selfhood. The character of the self, as modeled by a divine imago or self-image, thusly becomes significantly more complicated in this shift. In becoming The Trinity, the monotheistic self-model becomes ‘poly-vocal,’ while retaining a hierarchical unity under its status as all-inclusive Father God.

The third section in this paper seeks to suggest a sense of how such Judeo-Christian cultural references for selfhood, and the social structures these precipitated, might have contributed to the development of depth psychological insights and theories about pluralistic intra-psychic composition of consciousness and its radically complex dynamics. Citations from Biblical texts and depth psychological theorists are relegated to two appendices in the interests of presenting these associations as succinctly as possible. The actual citations are engaged in a less abstract style in the appendices.

## **I. A Paraphrasing of Jung’s Theory of Complexity in Ego<>Self Relations**

Jungian style depth psychological theory conceives a plurality of psychic elements composing the totality of selfhood. Within that diversified field, egoic identity, or the habitually established ‘self-aware sense of self’ represented by the pronoun “I,” is considered to ‘act as’ the source of a unitary selfhood. However, the reflexive assertion of a singular sense of self, associated with the term ego, is not regarded as representing the full spectrum of psychic aspects in a person’s consciousness. Ego thusly figured is a partial representation of total selfhood, and thus but one source of intention and expression. The complexity of psychic elements and associations proposed in this theory are assumed to inherently manifest contrast and contradiction. Thus the sense of identity represented by the ego or “I” (‘who I think I am’) is but one loci of ‘self assertion.’

Accordingly, a concept arises that posits an intra-psychic interplay between egoic identity in consciousness and aspects of one’s mind which ego perspective on selfhood does not effectively represent in its configuration of identity. It is the existence of contrasting loci of self-assertion in mind or psyche that is understood as necessitating an egoic function, the purpose of which is to impose some unitary version of selfhood upon that diversity. Aspects of psychic activity and intention not represented by this ego-identity (the non-egoic psychic contents) are understood to constitute ‘the unconscious.’ This term is somewhat misleading, as ‘conscious intention’ is associated with the ‘activities’ of non-egoic aspects of the whole psychic field of a person—i.e., behavior can be generated from either so-called ‘conscious’ egoic intention or the impulses of ‘unconscious’ non-egoic elements. In addition to the concept of egoic function as a form of ‘self-ordering,’ Jung

posited that the activities of non-egoic aspects of the ‘unconscious’ field of psyche effectively generated not only contrasting loci of intentionality, but constituted as from of ‘alter ego function’ seeking to define selfhood.

Jung portrayed the intra-psychic dynamics of these aspects of consciousness as a ‘self to Self’ relationship, the lowercase self indicating the subfield of egoic identity and the upper case Self indicating the entirety of psychic consciousness—the latter configuring a totality that ultimately includes the egoic aspect. Within the diversified entirety of the capitalized Self, various aspects of psychic content (impulses, experiences, interpretations, anxieties, etc.) are regarded as becoming connected to form dynamic nexes of intention termed “psychic complexes.” These “complexes” are, in a sense, ‘alter egos’ or ‘splinter psyches’ in that they assert intentional influence on behavior—though much of this activity typically remains ‘unconscious’ from the perspective of habitual waking ego consciousness. Relatively elemental or basic impulses in human consciousness, such as desire for autonomy and relational dependence, assert conflicting motives for behavior. These are considered to become further ‘entangled’ with elements of life experience (rejection, affirmation, pleasure, pain, etc., in relation to particular people or circumstances).

Various combinations of such psychic contents constellate into the conglomerates of psychic complexes. These then tend to conflict and compete for influence over the ‘whole self,’ which ultimately they collectively constitute. Given this view of psychic ‘architecture,’ whenever the notion of complexity is applied to consciousness in this writing it necessarily implies the dynamical interplay of such psychic complexes. Given such a self-model, it is difficult to conceive there being any ultimate hierarchy of self-aspects. If psychic composition is as complex as this theory figures it, any rigidly singular sense of selfhood seems likely to be either illusory or result from a tyrannical imposition of one psychological complex over all others. Using a collective political model, the result of such an imposition seems likely to ‘instigate resistance and revolt’ among self-aspects ‘subjugated’ by any such ‘tyrant of self-identity.’

From the perspective of this theory of psychic complexity, any imagination of selfhood that assumes consciousness to be constituted in a singular ego status is psychologically inadequate. An assumption that identity is encompassed and defined by the conscious “I” collapses awareness of psychic plurality and its dynamism into a singular identity. A falsely unitary sense of continuity of selfhood results in which self-contradictions become obscured and are readily denied for the sake of preserving a self-consistent egoic identity. Such a ‘one and only’ egoic identity for psychic life is relatively incapable of noticing, validating, or engaging the contrasting nexes of awareness and intention in the total field of consciousness it does not overtly

represent. Consequently, what can be termed the ‘many voices of the larger Self’ are repressed by the ‘one and only’ sense of selfhood that reflexively ‘speaks for’ the whole Self. Such an exclusive attitude in egoic self-awareness about the ‘nature of psychic selfhood’ would appear to frustrate development of a dynamically articulated self < > Self relationship.

The egoic is understood then to be capable of greater or lesser awareness of and interaction with ‘the rest of the Self.’ In general, the “I” attitude about identity tends to reflexively avoid or remain oblivious to the ‘otherness’ of the ‘larger Self.’ Selfhood in such a condition is undifferentiated to the perspective of ego. Differentiation of the plural elements of intra-psychic dynamism into a more complex conscious self-identity is considered to require a process of “individuating” them into a self-conscious inter-activity. Thereby the “psychic complexes” that are typically ‘not conscious’ to the “I” of egoic identity, despite their influence upon it and personal behavior, can become more a part of overt self-awareness. This “process of individuation” is not understood to produce a ‘singular individual’ but rather a person who is consciously aware of and ‘in relationship with’ the contrasting particularities of his or her own psychic plurality and its intra-psychic dynamism. Much confusion arises from Jung’s use of the term individuation for this activity of diversification since in his sense, ‘to individuate’ is not to become a singular self but an ‘individualized self-complexity.’

However, the reflexively reductive efforts of egoic identity assertion tend to oppose this differentiation of inconsistent diversity in selfhood. The “I” sense of selfhood, which generates what is called personality, resists relationship with what it regards as ‘other’ in psyche. Long-term repression of psychic plurality is thus more typical in personality development than is effective individuation of non-egoic self-aspects. Aspects of consciousness thusly denied or repressed tend to ‘fester’ in the ‘unconscious,’ often producing some eruptive effect upon behavior or conscious sense of self. Such effects can include depression, loss of egoic confidence, or overtly dramatic “acting out” of repressed impulses—typically in ways inconsistent with the egoic sense of ‘who’ or ‘how’ one is. Depth psychological theory terms this phenomenon “the return of the repressed.” Much personal anxiety and collective social turmoil are associated with the psychological pressures generated by repression of psychic plurality. In the absence of effective individuation of self-complexity, the theory holds, violent, depressive, aggressive, and even creative ‘eruptions’ in feelings and behavior are inevitable consequences.

Emergence of a more pluralistic sense of selfhood ‘from out of’ a status of singular egoic identity is obviously frustrated by a ‘lack of self-knowing’ about what remains essentially ‘unconscious.’ It is assumed then that some external sources of reflection are needed to direct the attention of

egoic identity to its own self-complexity. Such reflection can come in three general ways. Firstly there is the internal context in which the 'rest of the Self' might 'give voice' to non-egoic perspectives on selfhood through dreams, visions, or intuitions. Secondly there are the ways in which other persons 'mirror' one's attitudes and behaviors back to one's egoic self-awareness. Thirdly, there are socially and culturally generated models for structuring selfhood. All these sources of 'self reflections' are important influences on personal sense of self. Simplistic versions of selfhood in these reflections by other persons and social modelings are not conducive to promoting a more complex self < > Self relationship. Social and cultural symbolism generates potent models of self-configuration and intra-psychic dynamism. Religious imaginations of 'the divine self' in the personifications of gods and goddesses are particularly potent references for such modeling of one's identity as they have an ideal quality. More modernist social models for selfhood, deriving from rationalistic philosophy and materialistic science, exert similarly idealized configurations of identity.

These models are in a sense 'projected' by the collective cultural imagination 'on to the world,' much as characters in movies are projected 'onto a screen' that all are watching. As 'projections' these models can then be 'taken back into' personal sense of self, or "introjected" into psyche as models of selfhood. Such figures presented in the collective imaginations of myth and religion offer original or archetypal models for selfhood and relationship. As such, they present humans with models of primary or elemental aspects of consciousness composed in particular postures or attitudes. Modeling pluralistic or polyvalent representations of intra-psychic dynamism would thus require non-unitary images of 'divine selfhood.' Polytheistic religions and mythologies do so by providing an array of contrasting models for selfhood—differing gods and goddesses manifesting different characters or identities. These models are, in a depth psychological view, associated with different types of "psychic complexes" configured around nexes of psychic concern such as War, Love, Marriage, or Kingship. In notable contrast, a monotheistic imagination of one, singular, all-powerful, and exclusively masculine god models a radically narrow reflection of psychic identity. It models, in effect, only one way to be a 'true' or 'holy' self. It provides little affirmation of any inherent and valid contradictory intra-psychic composition of selfhood. And for humans of the female gender, it does not even offer a reflection of a 'divinely valid' status for femininity as a primary element of psychic identity.

In so far as human egoic function 'looks outward' for examples of how to compose a conscious sense of self, it responds by taking cultural models 'back in,' or in psychological terminology, "introjecting" those external models. Confronted with a figuring of 'divine selfhood' or idealized status of

self-identity that is exclusively singular, masculine and patriarchal, identity that is formed in response to it is likely to impose drastic reductions of conscious awareness about self-complexity. A sense of self modeled upon such a cultural projection of the 'ideal self' can be understood as expressing the dominance in human consciousness of an 'undifferentiated mono-psychic Father Complex.' That is to say, it favors a nexus of concern in psyche with patriarchal authority and masculine primacy. Egoic identity reflexively formed in imitation of that model is 'under the primary influence of' a relatively unconscious "psychic complex" that seeks to impose the authority and dominance of an all-powerful father figure upon psychic identity. Jung used the term "imago," derived from the Greek word for an actor's mask, to indicate such a 'face' imposed upon the complexity of selfhood. Such singularity of identity, with its emphasis upon authoritarian power, tends to generate opposed self-identities. It tends to offer a stark choice of either a 'self-righteous sense of self' validated by 'identification with' the archetypal divine model, or its opposite in an inferior status utterly subordinated to the ideal model of patriarchal dominance. There is no 'different but equal' model offered in such a singular cultural mirroring of identity composition.

As an introjected model, an authoritative Father-God imago can promote a singularly identified sense of self in psyche that demands obedience from all self-aspects regardless of any contrasting characteristics. Again, the tendency of the egoic "I" function in psyche is assumed to be inherently reductive in its assertion of a unitary selfhood, thus such an 'outer' model seems likely to readily enforce that tendency. The "I" of identity is thus likely to remain unconscious of the intra-psychic complexity' of 'its own Self. The monotheistic divine self-model can thus be seen encouraging a 'mono-valent' or mono-logical sense of selfhood that is intrinsically resistant to acknowledging the diversity of the larger Self. Such a 'god of singular authority' is, in essence, 'the god of ego function.' The inherently authoritarian impulses of egoic effort to assert a unitary and consistent sense of self are reinforced by this mythical projection an ideal of singular self-control. However, if psyche is as complex as depth psychology asserts, and the principle that repression of its diversity leads to some form of "return of the repressed," then this self modeling seems likely to provoke differentiating reactions. Oddly then, according to the theory, one might expect extremely singular or narrowly configured self-identity to ultimately provoke some commensurately radical individuation of self-modeling for psychic identity.

Appreciating the difficulty of such a differentiation requires consideration of the potency of collective social standards for proper and valid identity. All societies impose standards for valid and proper expressions of identity. When those standards privilege a projection of divinely singular selfhood, difficulty of expressing self-complexity is clearly amplified. Two

levels of confrontation between reductive modeling of identity are evident here, the internal one between egoic and non-egoic assertions of selfhood, and the external one between persons and the social collective. Any effort to elaborate a pluralistic sense of selfhood is opposed by both the introjected model that becomes a form of 'identity complex' in psyche, and the external expectations of other people or society. This situation can be seen as providing a more obvious context in which to enact the struggle for more complex elaboration of self < > Self relations, or individuation. The more external conflict with the culturally projected model can be understood as 'making manifest' the internal psychic struggle between egoic identity and non-egoic psychic aspects or complexes in an 'out there' contexting.

Thusly oriented, a persons 'whole sense of self' can confront the reductive modeling as a social imposition. It can come to awareness of the repression of selfhood in the form of an external influence. Again, in a rather unexpected turn, self-psychology as represented in aspects of depth psychology presents a conundrum in which restrictive social models of self-identity actually provide an impetus for egoic function to resist reductive influences. A political example best illustrates this situation. Just as a person might revolt against a political tyrant, one can revolt against the reductions of a socially idealized singular self-model. In so doing one then has begun a process of individuating selfhood externally that can mirror the possibilities for an internal or intra-psychic individuation. Conflicts between personal sense of self and socio-cultural models can produce a neurotic psychological state of 'being beside oneself' with anxiety about how to 'be one's actual Self' and how to 'belong to society.' Confronted with the example of a singularly authoritarian Father God self model, a person can experience great anxiety about how to repress psychic diversity internally in order to imitate the model and social standards for behavior derived from it.

In summary, an absence of cultural images of archetypal diversity in psyche (such as offered in polytheistic myth and religion) frustrates intra-psychic impulses seeking to generate a pluralistic self-identity. This dilemma was interpreted by Jung (in his Answer to Job) as characterizing the context of ancient Hebrew culture, as expressed in the Old Testament Hebrew Bible. In the Book of Job Jung discerns the overt conflict of the human ego function attempting to honestly comply with the demands of a singularly All Powerful Father God imago. In Jung's analysis, the confrontation between Job and Yahweh illustrates the limits of this god-imago as a mirror of human identity. The distress inflicted upon human consciousness by such a singularly reductive model appears to have necessitated some "individuation" of the god-self imago in collective imagination in order to allow for modeling greater psychic complexity. Jung locates the eventual development of that differentiation in the cultural imagination of an incarnation of the god imago

as an actual human, thusly enabling its singularity to become ‘humanly complicated.’

Such a reconfiguration of the culturally projected divine model of selfhood demonstrates how the “repressed” can ‘return’ as unconscious complexity or plurality of psyche that ‘comes to know its self more complexly.’ In this instance, an abstract, disembodied, authoritarian god imago is subjected to an embodied experience or gnosis of psychic complexity in the context of mortal human consciousness—with all its conflicts and inconsistencies. A singular god imago ‘divides’ into Father and Son with the incarnation of Jesus, thus acquiring plural identity and ‘more than one voice’ with which to model psychic dynamism. In this manner the self < > Self relationship becomes more overtly expressed as the self model ‘comes to know its self parabolically’—through ‘being/standing beside’ It Self, or ‘inside its own diversity.’

Thereby, the individuation of the monotheistic model of selfhood is shifted toward a more intricate status that requires expression in some more irreducible or paradoxical telling, one tending to emerge from a relatively decentered, non-controlling perspective with/in psyche. In this way multiple aspects of personal self and archetypal or ‘all-inclusive Self’ are given poly-valent ‘voicing.’ A question remains, however, about to what degree this diversification of a cultural self-model might be ‘heard’ or acknowledged by the egoic identity function in individual persons. Psychologically, the original mono-valent psychic Father-complex has not disappeared. Indeed, in this religious imagination it retains hierarchical priority. Since it so readily reinforces an intrinsically reductive egoic sense of self, it is likely to persist in unconsciously influencing sense of self by continually attempting to control and collapse the new poly-valent manifestation of self-complexity. Jung’s theory thus acknowledges that by force of habit, that authoritarian sense of identity is likely to subordinate the emergence of any more individuated representation of selfhood to a more simplistic, hierarchically ordered status. It is inclined to impose a return to the fundamental and less conscious fantasy of unitary singularity of psychic identity.

## **II. A Paraphrasing of the Biblical Incarnation as Singular Self-Model Individuation**

From this psychological perspective that posits an intrinsic struggle between singularly assertive egoic identity and an inherent diversity or plurality of intention in psyche, the authoritarian YHVH of the Old Testament appears to model an entity struggling with the compression of ‘polytheistic

consciousness' into a singular, mono-gendered divine version of idealized Selfhood. The psychic diversity modeled by the divinities of polytheistic cultures is here 'imploded' into a singular figure. Being 'The One and Only God,' the Hebraic monotheistic imagination of selfhood is alone, without divine others as relative equals to 'play off of.' It cannot converse or contend with separate archetypal aspects of divinely represented consciousness 'as-other-gods' since these are necessarily denied or subordinated to Its intra-psychic unitary sense of Self. It is an entirely un-individuated image of pluralistic psychic elements—a sense of self entirely unaware of having any inconsistency, incapable of acknowledging any unconscious or non-egoic status of self. It is a self alone, without otherness to engage. There is thus virtually no interactive eros available to It on an archetypal level.

Psychologically, this status can be considered one of great alienation and dissociation. A psyche so isolated would likely seek relation and reflection from even remotely similar forms of consciousness. It does not seem surprising that this particular god-image, having no divine equals, is depicted as unusually concerned with the affairs and ethical conduct of humans (relative to the god-images of polytheistic cultures). The very singularity of its status appears to force It closer to humans to engage in reflective relationship and thus come to know and individuate Its own 'inter-psychic complexity.' In Its reductive confusion of that complexity, the Old Testament Yahweh can be seen to act-out repressed or un-individuated psychic 'complexes' in unpredictable, violent and jealous behaviors—all without self-aware reflection upon its own self-contradictory nature. Faced with what at times seems a 'rogue' divinity, (considering the ethical stipulations for human behavior associated with It), the human egos of the Hebrew tradition who see themselves as living under Its aegis appear to alternate between begging for mercy and struggling to understand Its desires through a series of prophetic revelations and elaborately rationalistic interpretations of Its rules for ideal behavior.

In the portrayals of the Old Testament, this god-imago's identification with Its human creations/creators and obsession and preoccupation with their adherence to its rules, presumably manifests in function as a projection of socially 'compressed' conditions of their own psychic identities. Along the historical way, the representations of Yahweh shift from its being a merely tribal divinity to one that is superior to all other divinities, and finally to the one and only valid divine model of selfhood. In addition, It becomes The God of Social Justice. It not only becomes more concerned with human affairs than divine ones, it becomes an explicitly ethical figure of idealized selfhood, a moralistic divinity of 'goodness' in contrast to evil, of fairness in opposition to inequity. Yet It continues to be represented as vengeful toward those who disobey it, and thus seemingly unconscious of its own moral ambiguity,

unaware of the capricious inconsistencies of its own actions toward others. There is a contrast here with such divinities as those of Greek polytheism that do not deny their aggression and jealousy or attempt to justify it by righteous purity and power.

Jung notes that it is only in confrontation with a consciousness much weaker (the human Job), yet more aware of the inconsistency and injustice of the All Powerful God and willing to expressly reflect those qualities back to It that causes YHVH to be 'faced' with His contradictory nature. Job's refusal to grovel and ask forgiveness for sins he has not committed presents The All Powerful Divine Patriarch with an honest reflection of Its 'unjust' manipulation and domination of others. The collective social 'projection' of compressed human psychic plurality in the form of a singularly composed God Self is thusly challenged to become conscious of Its self-contradiction, of its different self-aspects, of the poly-valent nature of psyche. In refusing to admit to sins he has not committed, Job reflects back to God that God is not 'all good' but rather simply 'all powerful.' In Jung's view, the God Self has thusly been provided with a reflection that might instigate a differentiation or individuation of Its own diversity.

Jung reads the subsequent developments of the Hebrew and Christian religious mythology as expressing a shift in divine modeling of selfhood from an unreflectively authoritarian image toward a 'new' sense of selfhood more genuinely concerned with ethically moral consistency in behavior and social justice. This is necessarily a move away from petulant outbursts, the desire for sacrifices, and a need to impose control over otherness by force. Curiously, such a move toward greater ethical emphasis and consistency places a greater burden of self-awareness upon humans who seek to obey It. Where as rituals of sacrifice once seemed adequate to appease anger of the God Self about disobedience and thus atone for one's sins, humans were increasingly required to reflect upon their own contradictions and admit these as evidence of their 'fallen status' relative to that of the divine. God becomes not just all-powerful, but in essence 'too good' for human's to 'live up to.' However, the image of psyche posited in this God of Righteous Morality remains exclusively singular and thus unindividuated.

Thus, in order for the interplay of singular identity and human complexity to develop further, the divinely reductive model seems to be drawn even closer to the human actuality. In order for the God/Self to be able to know Itself in a more positively paradoxical, less blindly single-minded way, It appears to be compelled toward greater intimacy with otherness as humanness. (Remember here that, according to the psychological perspective, the god imago is a 'projection' of the role of the inherently reductive egoic "I" in human psyches.) If any individuating re-differentiation of such collapsed archetypal selfhood is to be made manifest, some more polytheistic context

that 'divides' the conscious identity (ego) of God is required. Thus this figuring of singularly divine selfhood divides, gives birth to Itself, Its otherness as Its Son—an archetypally original or divine 'offspring' that is not just 'another god' but a god born of humanness, generated via a human mothering in matter. By way of this autogenic mitosis, the singular divine imago of psyche divides in such a way as to give Itself another 'voice'—one inflected by human experience and its complexities' inherent contradictions. In so far as It remains unitary as God, this self-model becomes 'poly-vocal.'

This incarnation of a 'split off aspect' of the singular monotheistic God-Self not only moves the divine image of selfhood toward human frailty and complexity, but also brings It into relation with femininity. This birth of God-as-man, sometimes identified as The Son of Man, involves the mediation of human femininity. In the subsequent articulation of this religious tradition, the humanly embodied Son of God expresses a more empathic relationship toward others than Its disembodied Father seemed to have previously presented. Though ostensibly masculine, this Son of the Divine Self promotes empathic love for others as much, perhaps more so than obedience to The Father. There is here a suggestion of a more female or maternal sensibility. Furthermore, this more humanized form of God Self is depicted in the New Testament as struggling with the conflict between His humanity and his authoritative, miraculous power. Rather than acting in an overtly heroic masculine manner, commanding obedience by displays of super human actions, he tends to teach affinity and reciprocity as the modes of a 'divinely approved selfhood.' 'Be wary that you judge, lest you be judged,' He suggests. He claims divine authority and performs miracles but the Son expresses his teaching about 'proper behavior for the self' in a more sympathetic tone and compassionately persuasive language than has the patriarchal Father God. He seems to understand that demonstrations of power intended to enforce obedience to moral or ethical rules fail to induce humans to act out of compassionate relation to others voluntarily.

The God Self as humanized Son of The Father appears to have learned as a human that ethical concerns as encountered in complex human consciousness cannot be expressed simplistically or simply rationally—by mere laws and rules. Psychologically, the inflexible moralizing of the disembodied Father cannot be the message of the embodied Son if the latter is to manifest a genuine individuation of singularly divine Selfhood. Thus the formerly singular and rather notoriously punitive God Self individuates as the non-violent 'God Who Loves Me', who is the compassionate savior of conflicted human individuals that suffers with them, as one of them—rather than commands them to obey from 'afar.' It needs be noted that He is represented as continuing to convey the Father God's threat of damnation to the faithless. This 'deferral' to the ultimate authority of the Yahweh/The Father God asserts

a continuity between them, inferring an overarching hierarchy of selfhood. This acknowledgement of some primary authority over the diversification of divinely represented selfhood indicates the diversification is intra-psychic rather than a splitting of the god imago into competitive forms. Given this continuity, the different reasonings for why humans should obey the ethical injunctions of the God Self presented by the Father God and the more humanly relational, incarnated Son God suggest an ‘internal’ individuation. The patriarchal Father God perspective appears to rely on the rational of influencing human behavior by threat and punishment: obey or suffer. The incarnated Son of God’s version demonstrates a rationale that appeals to reciprocity among persons rather than hierarchy: love and you will be more likely to be loved, ‘do unto others as you would have them do unto you.’ Thereby the logic of divine selfhood seems to shift from a relatively singular or mono-valent emphasis to a more complex or polyvalent one.

In expressing understanding of the complexity of moral human consciousness experienced through incarnation, the newly individuated version of Divine Self manifests some qualities of language that differ significantly from the Father God’s (as represented in the Old Testament Bible). The expressions of the incarnated Son of God tends to eschew direct commandments in favor of persuasive examples and telling tales that seem to ‘speak around’ their meanings, in overt analogies and metaphors. These stories are aptly termed parables in that they present a parabolic expression rather than directive injunctions. This ‘divine voicing’ seeks to promote affinity among humans through emotional appeals for empathy. The Word of God has become flesh and appears to have been significantly influenced by the complexities of mortal incarnation. Since The Word of God is eternal but also now possessed of the experiential gnosis of the mortal embodiment of the human psyche, It appears compelled to alter the manner of its ‘speech’ in extolling ethical morality to human persons. This ‘parabolic’ expression is not simplistically direct and literal in the manner of egoic demands. It is more poetic than declarative. Such language is resistant to literalistic or singular interpretation. It seems to indicate there is a great complexity of elements to be considered in the effort to ‘comprehend the Will of God’ in human terms. Given these characteristics, the voicing of the incarnate God Self seems to be less that of a reductively singular egoic sense of self and more one concerned with embracing difference and contradiction between persons—and thus within them as well.

That this humanized formulation of Divine Selfhood is shown to be repudiated and crucified by humans suggests a great resistance on the part of human egoic identity to embrace its Divine Message about ethical acceptance of the conflicted character of human motives. This ‘death of God’ might also be viewed as essential for the God Image of selfhood to fully experience

humanness by suffering its physical pains and ultimate death. The subsequent disappearance of God as Human also serves psychologically to ‘reunite’ the differentiated aspects of The One True God with Itself, as Father/Son. The death of Divinity in human form is also understood as leaving The Word of His teachings as the manifestation of His ‘essence’ or presence. The religious tradition goes on thereafter to assert that the death of the one God Man Jesus effectively ‘liberates’ His spirit, termed The Holy Ghost or Paraclete, so that It can become available to all persons every where at all times. This figuring further individuates the God Imago as the Trinity of Father/Son/and Holy Ghost.

However, it is the Son not the Father who experienced the ‘consciousness raising’ mystery of embodiment in the mortality of the human psyche. The Father continues to remain primarily associated with the undifferentiated identity of the Old Testament authoritarian figure. The Son’s individuating differentiation is thus situated ‘in the shadow of’ the Almighty Undying (and never human-ized) Father. The human disciples of the Son of God, and thus of The Embodied Word of Divine Selfhood, appear rather lost and confused by His death. How could God have died? Why did he not defy human authority with his superhuman powers? In the re-absorption of the Son back into the egoic identity of The Father, the proponents of the ‘new teachings’ (the compassionate “good news” of empathic salvation for self-conflicted ‘sinners’) appear to be left in a rather confused state about what ‘words’ are actually the Divine Instructions—the uncompromising dictates of The Father, or the compassionate, parabolic references of The Son? Confusion over this conflict can be seen as characterizing much of the subsequent history of Christ-ianized monotheistic religion. The ‘shadow’ of the authoritarian patriarchal God Image of selfhood remains relatively dominant as the model of archetypally egoic self-identity despite the relational ethics emphasized by The Word of the humanized God Son.

This manifestation of an individuation within the singularly configured God Image of selfhood presents new possibilities an intimate and some ways ‘equal’ eros between the human and the divine models of selfhood. Humans are now presented with an aspect of God Self that invites seek empathic relationship. However, though a divine psychic trinity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is suggested, the subsequent authority of an orthodox Church emphasizes these elements as a hierarchical unity dominated by and included in the field of the Father God. The institutional form of that Church, in identifying its authority over humans with that of the patriarchal Father God, presents a regressive assertion of the singularly self-defining egoic function as the ultimate arbiter of identity. Furthermore, the Trinitarian formulation omits the potential for conceiving a divine quaternity that might include some femininity in the imagoes of idealized selfhood. There is not divine affirmation

of the Mother of the Son: She Who Gives Birth to God as Human.

This paradoxical drama of God Self becoming differentiated through human incarnation, yet in a sense ‘collapsing back’ into a unitary status, aptly demonstrates the human difficulty of developing self-conscious ego < > self or ‘self < > Self’ relations. Just as the disembodied, singularly authoritarian God Ego is somehow confronted with a very different self-aspect through the incarnation of the Divine Son as “The Son of Man,” the merely human ego identity is seen as confronting a complexity of selfhood when by its own confrontation with mortality and the embodied conflicts of consciousness or psyche diversity. Neither the monotheistic God Ego nor the typically reductive and singular human ego identities appear to actually represent the complexities of selfhood. By ‘suffering embodiment’ in human complexity, the often abstract and reflexively singular egoic sense of self experiences an experiential ‘gnosis’ of selfhood. This can be thought of as an inter-coursing of singularity and plurality, of egoic reduction in/with psychic diversity, that enhances relationship between the seemingly disparate states of the singular “I” and the complex Self. This contrast is also represented in the differentiation and relationship between spirit and matter.

There is staggering psychological significance to be found in this mythical imaging of the struggle between singular and plural, conscious and unconscious or non-egoic psychic aspects. Figured intuitively as an emerging differentiation *within* an originally monolithic divine self-*imago*, it is articulated in relation to a primary emphasis upon equitable treatment and compassion for ‘the other.’ It is assumed here that this association is actually the primary ‘motive’ for this cultural re-imagination of self-modeling. Somehow the emphasis upon an authoritarian, even vengeful God *Imago* for selfhood becomes involved in producing cultural emphasis upon charity, compassion, respect for individuality and difference in overtly pluralistic social orders. Somehow the resolutely singular, autocratic, distant, disembodied, divine self-model generates the embodied, empathic, parabolically expressive, mortal one. The removed, totalitarian egoic God Self suddenly ‘falls’ into the radically complicated awareness of incarnated consciousness where spirit is compromised by matter and, as a result it would seem, takes a much more empathic view on otherness, difference, privilege, charity, suffering, and social hierarchy.

Much interpretation of these ‘psycho-mythic events’ promotes the view that ‘Christ died to save sinners.’ This view could be understood psychologically to assert in essence, ‘God individuated as Christ and thereby I am saved. Thus this “I” need not suffer the incarnation of my Christ-aspect and its crucifixion by a world of singularly identified egos.’ A contrasting view refers to the incarnated God Self’s expression, ‘I am the way,’ suggesting that to become more ‘god like,’ or ‘divinely individuated,’ one needs live in the

manner of Jesus. This view suggests that the only means for furthering complex self-knowing, to manifesting a more complete individuation, involves suffering a yet more complex incarnation. Each psyche would thus have to 'suffer incarnation of the egoic authority over selfhood' into the terrible complexity of polycentric psychic plurality. That submission of egoic identity to self-complexity is mirrored in the example of the Christ Self living in and for empathic relation to other persons as the 'others of the human self.' Individuational differentiation of selfhood requires a paradoxical, parabolic simultaneity of being both 'my' self and some otherness of self, living as/for 'one's own self/selves and that/those of other persons. As the singular God The Father differentiates into God The Son/Son of Man and then God The Father/Son/Holy Ghost, so mere persons become transformatively embody aspects of both parent and child, male and female, singularity and multiplicity, mortality and archetypally eternal divinity—or disembodied spirit and incarnated matter. To interpret this 'tale of divinely modeled self-individuation' as a miracle which 'saves' persons from having to suffer the torments of self-complexity in relation to ethical morality seems to favor the more ancient view that sacrifice (in this case of the incarnate God Self) can appease the Father God and gain His forgiveness for the transgressions of un-individuated (unconscious) human psychic complexities.

### **III. The Monotheistic/Monological Origins of Depth Psychology's Individuation of Reductively Rationalistic Identity**

Considering the various cultural imaginations of divine selfhood one can readily wonder how the symbolism presented in the Judeo-Christian religious traditions came play such a dominant role as a global model for selfhood. Why did the cultures oriented to a self-image of a One-and-Only God obsessed with ethically moral human behavior, that undergoes a tripartite differentiation yet remains 'one entity,' come to dominate world history? And how might that imagination of an ethically righteous, divinely singular self-*imago* that paradoxically become partly human by embodying in 'impure' mortal flesh, have contributed to the evolution of depth psychology's conception of a pluralized, only nominally hierarchical, yet somehow unitary status of psychic identity? The response offered here to such questions is, simplistically put, that the monotheistic orientation of Christian cultures contributed to a secularized intellectual rationalism that was similarly reductive or singular in its assertions of ultimate unity and truth. Thus the self-models posited by such mono-valent or mono-logical rationalistic definitions emphasized an ultimate 'self-consistency' for identity. This rationalistic self-model resembles that of the authoritarian Yahweh or Father God *imago*. Thus the premise ventured

here is that the restrictive modeling for selfhood posed by philosophical rationalism and mechanistic science somehow stimulated an individuating response ‘from out of itself.’ That development of a more complex ‘logic of selfhood’ appears as both related to and derived from the more intuitive reaction to the singular god-self model in the individuating incarnation of God the Son of Man. Thus the mechanistically analytical self-modeling of post Enlightenment European thought is seen as generating a contrasting psychology of radically diversified psyche or identity consciousness.

The most commonly referenced ‘founders’ of psychological theories about this pluralistic ‘depth’ in human consciousness, Freud and Jung, are themselves ‘cultural creatures’ of monotheistic spiritual traditions. Their personal religious backgrounds were Jewish and Protestant Christian, respectively. But they lived many centuries after the rise of Trinitarian monotheism to socio-cultural dominance in Europe. The entire milieu of social and intellectual life in which they existed was pervasively configured by the contrasting assertions of a threateningly patriarchal Father God figure for selfhood and the contrastingly empathic, emotionally sensitive one of the Son of God/Man model. Thus their thought, like that of others in such a culture, was conditioned by the contrast between the idealistically mono-valent logic of the Father God imago as well as that of the more complex, poly-valent logic of Its parabolically relational individuated Son aspect. This contrast can be stated as one between a more exclusively mechanical mode of ordering and understanding causation on the authoritarian side, and a more egalitarian concern for including all evidence of phenomenal occurrence in one’s analytical interpretations, even if these cannot be conformed to a singularly self-consistent model of causation. In so far as Freud and Jung were identified with the patriarchal mode of asserting singular, self-consistent explanations, they sought to ‘explain the structure and function’ of mind or psyche. In so far as they were compelled to conduct their analytical studies with an egalitarian regard for the differences and complexities of human consciousness, they developed interactive models for selfhood that were neither ultimately unitary, hierarchical, or rationally self-consistent. In so doing their theories effectively individuate the ‘depths’ of psychic complexity repressed by more mechanistic and unitary models.

In contrast, much of modernist psychology has tended to reassert the reductive bias against plurality of selfhood by regarding ‘mental health’ as depending upon a ‘strong,’ singular, ‘self-consistent’ egoic sense of self. That emphasis is termed by some as “ego psychology” or the ‘psycho-logic of egoic determination of selfhood.’ One might readily associate such a psychological perspective more with the self-model of the autocratic Father God than the empathically incarnated Son God that emphasizes compassionate love and relationship over conformity and obedience. The

“depth” psychological theories of selfhood associated with Freud and Jung thus express a form of ‘psychical ethics’ by promoting acceptance and relationship with the conflicted ‘otherness’ of one’s self. Indeed, both Freud and Jung tended to identify psychic or mental distress as consequences of autocratic egoic repression of psychic diversity, rather than as evidence of failure to attain appropriately singular, egoically determined self-identity. Psychic distress thus comes to be seen as a ‘reasonable response’ to painful self-denial or incompatibility with reductive social models for selfhood. Compulsively neurotic or seemingly psychopathic aspects of thought and behavior can thereby be regarded as symptoms of suffering under reductively oppressive social models for selfhood, rather than ‘abnormal and thus unhealthy deformities of selfhood.’ This acceptance and affirmation of ‘self-inconsistency’ posits a compassionately egalitarian perspective on the complexity of psyche. It validates the ‘presence of otherness’ in the seeming singularity of selfhood.

In somewhat differing ways, Freud and Jung posed models of irreducibly complex or pluralistic selfhood as intrinsic and valid. Freud’s is known in association with a tripartite configuration of psyche designated super ego, ego, and id. The first term indicates a socialized god-like judgmental aspect of self that demands absolute obedience to the socialized rules for proper selfhood (this associates with the patriarchal Father God imago). The second one, ego, established the concept of a primary self-identity associated with the pronoun “I” in psychological theory. The third, id, he used to indicate an aspect of psyche that manifested biological urges or drives that were inherently un-socialized. In this version of selfhood, the ego aspect is ‘caught between’ the ‘raw impulses’ of the id and the socialized demands of the super ego aspects of psyche. Consequently, the “I” or ego aspect is understood as repressing much of the conflict into a status Freud termed the subconscious. Human behavior is greatly complicated by the effects such repressed impulses, desires, and concerns exert upon selfhood—meaning that much of thought and behavior are motivated by psychic impulses of which one is not consciously aware. In essence, Freud did not, however, offer any hope that the ego could ultimately triumph over this conflicted dividedness of the self. In his view, ‘mental health’ constituted relative success in mediating the conflicts between self-aspects and with social demands for conformity—while minimizing neurotic distress.

Jung’s modeling also provides a tripartite version of psychic composition. He proposes statuses of a personal consciousness, a personal unconsciousness, and a collective unconscious. The personal consciousness correlates roughly with Freud’s ego aspect as the habitually familiar, self-ordering sense of selfhood. Jung’s personal unconscious aspect resembles Freud’s subconscious one in so far as it ‘contains’ repressed emotions,

experiences, and impulses such that the conscious ego attitude is not overtly aware of these. However, it also overlaps the field of a collective unconsciousness that ‘contains’ elemental or archetypal forms of human psyche. These latter are best understood in reference to patterns of mythical, spiritual, and religious expressions occurring across diverse cultures.

Both these psychological perspectives of ‘the depths of psyche’ eschew any primary hierarchical reduction of its diverse elements to a singular order or authority. These views are egalitarian in the sense that they respect the inherent difference or otherness of psyche and thus the conflict and distress that arise in individual minds. That distress can then be approached empathically, with respect and compassion, as phenomena that are somehow ‘be lived with.’ The often painful otherness and conflict of selfhood can thereby be approached as a ‘fact of being a self’ to which sense of self needs be accommodated. Authoritarian impulses to repress self-diversity or to mechanistically excise it by some surgical or pharmaceutical method are thusly avoided.

### **The Psychological Ethics of an Egalitarian Attitude toward Psychic Diversity**

The concept of inherent and irreducible diversity in psyche or mind suggests not only a decentered selfhood but also one that can assert some ‘reasonably accurate’ identity by way of compromise. That is, no one single self aspect could consistently dominate sense of self if the diversity of psychic composition were to be given some ‘just’ representation. Thus the depth psychological attitude that honors psychic diversity in a sense transposes the inter-personal contexting of the “Golden Rule” in Christian ethics into the intra-psychic context of individual selfhood. Self-aspects, including those that are in some respect socially improper, are acknowledged as valid, if problematic, elements of selfhood. It can be most difficult for the conscious egoic “I” to ‘uncover’ and accept the presence of repressed or anti-social self-aspects, much less develop an ethically egalitarian regard for these. Often the neurotic symptoms and dissociative behaviors associated with their repression can seem preferable to egoic attitudes than ‘coming to terms’ with ‘the repressed.’

Disturbances of conscious sense of self or unitary identity caused by such repressions and resulting in socially debilitating depression, neurotic anxiety, and compulsive behaviors came to be viewed by depth psychological theorists as ‘appropriate’ expressions of psychic trauma. Thus the therapeutic responses conceived by these theorists tended to seek the source of the distress by ‘uncovering’ conflicts between egoically asserted identity and subsequently repressed aspects of the ‘rest of the Self.’ In this approach, bringing conscious awareness ‘into relation with’ negated or

unacknowledged aspects of “id” of the larger Self was considered to relieve some of the debilitating effects of self-denial and repression. These theories about and therapies for the inevitable conflicts between socially inflected egoic versions of selfhood and the ‘psychic complexes’ of the ‘depths of the Self’ manifested somewhat differently in Freudian psychoanalysis and Jungian analytical psychology. A core aspect of these therapies involves a ‘re-telling’ of one’s life, an imagining and re-imagining of psychic complexity of self, others, and the world, a reconsideration of what is ‘actual’ history and what ‘compensatory’ fantasy.

This reconsideration of selfhood and assumptions about reality requires acceptance of a non-literal, complicated, often morally ambiguous realm of psychic being. It reveals psychic life as an infinitely variable set of aspects/voices/images with conflicting and vague meaning to ego consciousness that can only be ‘told’ in images and metaphoric stories. This is not the world of selfhood defined by standardized social values and roles, nor by materialistic science. Depth psychological attention to the ‘reality of the psyche’ reveals a highly individualized composition of diverse self-aspects that defy broad generalizations. This internal ‘world’ of unedited psychic ‘characters’ and ‘voices’ is often shockingly contradictory and socially improper. Such a Self manifests a contradictory set of impulses upon which socially ethical behavior must either be imposed ‘from outside’ by autocratic compulsion, or else develop through a process of continual ‘internal negotiation’ between the conflicting intentions of self-aspects that allows them to defer to social norms.

Freud conceived this struggle to involve egoic negotiation between the impulses of an elemental id aspect of psyche and the conformist demands of a socialized super ego aspect. Jung posed it in terms of contrast and conflict between psychological complexes that vie to influence egoic sense of self and its control upon behavior. In these theories and related ones there is a consistent theme of some self-aspect that can examine, analyze, differentiate, and select among conflicting psychic components. This view assumes the presence of a rationally cognitive function in egoic articulation of selfhood. But there is also consistent expression of the role of feeling and emotion in this process. Repressed aspects of psyche/Self ‘make them selves known’ to egoic identity primarily through emotional affects such as agitation, depression, affection, excitement, or despair that disrupt habitual sense of self. The differentiatial manifestation of the psychic complex of compassionate empathy configured by the Jesus Self-Image represents just such an affect-toned response to the rigid abstraction of the YHVH Patriarchal God-Self imago.

The passionate and reactive nature of these complexes can thus create effects that either dominate egoic identity or eruptively threaten to destroy

its dominant role in asserting selfhood. From this perspective, the volatile behavior of YHWH's authoritative reactions to human disobedience of His commandments suggests His sense of self is 'in the grip' of a neurotically restricted self-identification. His behavior, as expressed in His unprovoked persecution of Job, expresses the intentions of a psychic complex constellated around authoritarian control and obedience. Yet Its/His conduct in the Job story appears to be seeking just the sort of challenging reflection Job's protestations provide for the patriarchal father-complex or identity. If to know oneself honestly is to experience the complexity of poly-valent psyche, then the egoic "I" must submit to 'hearing many voices' in the Self. To know oneself 'complex-ly' is to become aware of the structures of psychic complexes established in one's conscious<>unconscious psychodynamics. However, doing so also requires evading the powerful ability of some complexes to dominate egoic attitudes and so preserve its monological control over the self-complexity. That control is naturally seductive to egoic function in a plural psyche, as it is to social groups, who are confronted, should they 'look within,' by their own contradictions and seeming chaos. Such self-awareness appears to most often require 'external reflection,' much as Yahweh received from Job, or the analysand seeks from the psychotherapist.

### **From Religious Self-Modeling to Psych-Logical Practice of Parabolic Presence**

To analyze one's selves thusly, to re-view the complexities of one's incarnation as diversified spirit in a singular body, requires a 'standing beside oneself.' The ego aspect of consciousness must begin to relinquish its identification with a narrow portion or simplistic notion of the larger psyche. This enlarged and de-centered perspective on human, if not worldly, consciousness can be described as parabolic. A parable is currently defined as "a simple story illustrating a moral or religious lesson." But the term derives from the Greek *parabole* for juxtaposition or comparison and from *paraballein* for 'to set beside': *para* = beside and *ballein* to throw. In the therapeutic context we attempt to sit down beside ourselves to better see/know ourselves. Mathematically, a parabola is an arc (trajectory of a life?) defined in relation to the adjacent point of two intersecting axes. There is some resemblance between the way the Jesus Self-Image 'parabolically' differentiates from the compacted unilateral imago of the patriarchal Father God to 'sit compassionately beside' the dividedness of human psyches struggling to be in ethically egalitarian relationships, and how depth psychology differentiates from the reductive Humanistic Rationalist Self-model and begins attending empathically to the ego's struggle with complex self-consciousness.

Depth psychological imagination can be regarded as furthering the differentiation of unitary self-modeling by providing a rational yet complex psychological perspective on how cultural projections of both singular and plural self-models effect identity. It enables us to view the cultural projections of multiple divinities and mythical figures as archetypal psychic aspects and to interpret the actions or stories of those figures as demonstrations of intra- and inter-personal psychodynamics. The divinities and their actions thusly model characteristics types of psychic complexes that ‘take shape’ in individual personal psyches. As such they are psychic forms that exist within or as well as ‘outside’ human consciousness since they have a phenomenal reality as ‘projections’ that prompt psychic phenomenon in persons when they are ‘introjected’ into personal psyches. However, this extra ordinary analytical insight into the complexity of psyche did not come into being in a polytheistic cultural milieu. Rather, the cultural background of its emergence is a monotheist-cum-rationalist-humanist cultural mentality. Pondering this association, one might suppose seems that only through prolonged socio-cultural experience of a mono-valent imagination of selfhood, along with the impetus of compounded psychic energies generated by the associated repression of psychic diversity, could the parabolic approach of depth psychology become manifest.

That is to state: only by struggling with identities trapped in singularly compressed concepts of self/Self relations (both religiously and philosophically) could there evolve such a ‘revelatory’ re-imagining that compassionately re-positions self-reflection both with/in and outside/of or ‘beside’ the multiplicity of psychic life. It appears further that the overtly articulated concerns of Christian culture for ethically egalitarian interpersonal relations, (considered here to have some origin in the self-assessment demanded by an ethically obsessed divine self model in God) contributed somehow to depth psychology’s posture of ethical respect for the ‘otherness of psyche’—the non-egoic, un-socialized, radically autonomous aspects and expressions of ‘unconscious’ consciousness. Jung’s notions of how creative intensity can be generated by ‘holding the tension of opposites in consciousness’ appears to apply to both instances of individuation of the self-model: that of the incarnation of the repressively monological Father/God into the complexly conscious parabolic teacher/Son of Man God self-model, and that of the emergence of the parabolic selfhood of depth psychology from out of the reductively rationalistic Humanist philosophy of identity.

This proposed reiteration of concerns exemplified by the intuitive individuation of a collective cultural projection of divine self-models in depth psychological theory and practice also can be seen in relation to femininity and embodiment. Depth psychology gained much of its initial articulation in Freud’s work with female patients and their experience of conflict over the

socialized role of physical eros or sexuality for egoic identity. Neurotic anxiety about the sexualized or erotic body in/as selfhood is a primary concern of Freud's investigation of psyche. There is a sense in which depth psychological perspective is 'sitting down beside' or 'parabolically walking around' the alienated *body* of human consciousness. In the analyst's consulting room the disembodied linear logos of monotheism and idealistic rationalism are brought into relationship with the plural psyche as a radically complex *embodied* continuity. The role of emotional affect or feeling is emphasized by Jung as a crucial indicator of the activity of unconscious psychic complexes. Such affectual feeling depends upon the emotional capacities of embodiment. And as indicated in Freud's concerns with sexuality and death, there is great importance of 'the body' to knowing psyche as the incarnate place where matter and spirit coexist to co-generate consciousness, rather than simply compete. After all, the body is exactly the place where the singularly divine, disembodied Father God is imagined to have 'entered in' to become Its/His more compassionate/carnal manifestation—*by way of feminine humanness*.

The notable absence of reference to femininity or the female body in the individuation of the Father God imago through incarnation of The Son of Man suggests some incompleteness to the differentiation of the self-model. Though that individuation was made possible in and through the feminine body, the collective religious imagination did not grant equally divine status to feminine selfhood. Subsequently, some further individuating differentiation appears when Christian religious doctrine granted the mother of God The Son a sort of semi-divine status as Mother Mary the Holy Virgin. But this image resists affirmation of the fully sexualized erotic body. Both femininity and the erotic body are thus not granted 'divine status' as models of selfhood and so are 'denied a voice' in 'speaking for the self.' Furthermore, the compassionate incarnation of God the Father as God the Son of Man is typically characterized as an asexual entity. Much is made, however, of his suffering the agonies of mortal embodiment as he undergoes sacrificial execution. Thus embodiment plays no small part in the 'psycho--drama' of this projected individuation of the mono-logical self-model into greater self-complexity, both as expressed physical suffering and repressed erotic pleasure. These themes are again echoed in Freud's work with so-called hysterical women patients suffering psychological distress over their feminine sexuality.

Thusly considered, depth psychological thought and practices individuate the reductively singular 'voice of self' presented by self-consistent rationalism (here viewed as modeled upon the idealized patriarchal authority of the unitary Father God) into a poly-vocal engagement with the embodied plurality of a radically complex/complexed selfhood. Thereby, the inherently con/fused status of psychic composition, with its egoic and non-egoic aspects all entangled in various nexes of psychic intentionality, is offered a

parabolically de-centered self-model by the present reflections of a psycho-analytic ‘attendant.’ This role of the compassionate analyst becomes that of witness to and confidant of the psyche that struggles with its multiplicity. By avowedly foregoing any personal interest in or position of judgment upon the personal psyche the analyst is seeking to assist in its self-knowing, the analyst in essence attempts to ‘stand aside from’ the reductive self-models of rationalism and religion in order to ‘stand with’ the egoic aspect of a psyche confronting the threatening plurality and disorder of the larger Self. Again, this reflective attendance of the analyst who ‘enters into’ the intra-psychic self < > Self relational dynamics of personal psyches resembles that of the Son of God/Man figure promoting respectful ethical inter-personal relations among persons.

In the religious contexting, once the human aspect of the Son of God is deceased, He is figured as manifesting something termed the Holy Spirit—the eventual third portion of The Holy Trinity that is The One God. This entity or presence is referred to as the Paraclete. Somehow God’s experience as, incarnation in, death of, and resurrection from human complexity generates this third self-model of the Paraclete. This word derives from the Greek word *kaliēn*, for ‘to invoke or call,’ and *para*, for ‘to the side of.’ Thus there is some sense that the God Self that has suffered and died ‘as humanness’ can now be ‘called to the side of’ human’s in need of assistance in struggling to accommodate their contradictory multiplicity to the singularity of identity demanded by society and figured by the all-inclusive God the Father self-model.

Some resonance again is evident between this aspect of the mythical representation of individuating self-models and the role of the depth psychological analyst. The analyst is prepared to be ‘called to the side’ of a psyche in conflict over its human complexity in ways not unlike that of the compassionate incarnated God Self. Training for becoming a depth psychological version of the Paraclete involves foregoing any social or religious position for passing judgment of the validity of a psyche’s status of selfhood—be it radically singular or chaotically multiple. The relative maxim is, essentially, that one cannot be empathically present with the ‘depths’ of psyche if one is acting out of either ‘personal interest’ or socialized values of propriety. The egoic person of the analyst, by undergoing his or her own ‘analysis’ with an established analyst, is subjected to a form of enforced confrontation between his or her own singular egoic identity and the complex-inflected complexity of the non-egoic aspects of the ‘unconscious’ Self. This training resembles a sort of psychological crucifixion of egoic identity as its attention is continually directed toward the conflicted psycho-dynamics of the selfhood it seeks to represent as unitary. One cannot become an analyst without ‘suffering’ this ‘incarnation’ of sense of self in the emotionally

embodied complexity of one's own psyche/Self.

There is a sense then that to be depth psychological analyst is to be one who has been egoically 'reborn' into a radically complex self-awareness and thus become capable of attending compassionately to that struggle in other humanly entangled psyches. This concept of psyche-logical practitioner is not one of an ideally 'whole' or healthy person attending to a 'broken' or unhealthy one. Rather, it is more that of a person experienced in suffering psychic complexity in their own self < > Self relations, as well as with analysis of its varied formulations in others. It is by 'virtue' of that experience that one might 'practice depth psychological analysis by being able to stand with,' 'in,' and 'beside' the struggle for complex identity in others, rather than feeling compelled to pass judgment on it from some patriarchal Father God or idealistic, self-consistently rational perspective—or feel compelled to 'fix' it in some rationalist or mechanistic manner.

The foregoing association between a proposed individuation process 'acted out' in the historical developments of a cultural projection of divine self-models and a similar shift toward greater complexity in rational models of selfhood is not intended to imply some equivalence between religion and psychology. What is intended is to illustrate an intrinsic archetypal impulse in human consciousness and culture to articulate the struggle between a need for unitary identity and the reality of psychic diversity or pluralism. The issue is not whether one mythical or religious imagination of self-models is superior to another, or that psychology is superior to religion. Rather, the concern of this paper has been to indicate that the monotheistic emphasis of Judeo-Christian religious imagination of individuation in singularly divine selfhood does appear to have provided the background for a non-reductive rational approach to the logic of psyche. None of this discussion is offered as justification for assuming that emergence of depth psychological theory and practice constitutes a transcendent triumph over the tormenting dividedness of human consciousness and its struggle for a unitary identity. The salvational aspect of Christian religious expectations is not reiterated in depth psychological theory. The only 'accomplishment' suggested here in respect to the emergence of depth psychological perspective and practice is that of a reasonable basis for a psychically ethical practice of at compassionately attending to the inevitable difficulties of being a parabolic selfhood. The proposed reiterated individuations of religiously mythical and philosophically psychological self-models are offered to prompt more self-consciously complex practice of 'parabolic presence' with/in the diversified 'voices' of selfhood.

The following appendices are offered as meditations upon the themes of this paper.

## *Appendix 1 De-complexing Biblical Voicings: Tracking Contradictory Expressions of Unconscious Psychic Complexes in Divine Speech*

In the beginning, speaking was creational -- even though no one else heard.

In the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth, the earth was formless and void and darkness covered the face of the deep, while a wind from God swept over the face of the waters. Then God said, "Let there be light"; and there was light. (Genesis 1:1-3)

Then God said, "Let us make humankindness in our image, according to our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea . . . (Genesis 1:26)

So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them . . . . (Genesis 1:27)

God saw everything that he had made, and indeed, it was very good. (Genesis 1:31)

Could He have seen all? Is He as omniscient as he thinks? For soon he is displeased with his creations in their disobedience. For a mere seeking of knowledge, a mere touch of divine intelligence they are banished. What does He not know about himself, or deny, that causes Him to fear the knowing of mere mortals, what sensitivity makes for such enmity in this god YHVH?

Then the Lord God said, "See, the man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil; and now, he might reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever: -- therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from which he was taken. (Genesis 2:22-23)

Rejected though his creations are, they prosper, gain some complexity of culture, and yet again the Almighty Creator is disappointed in His own work.

And the Lord was sorry that he had made humankind on the earth, and it grieved him to his heart. So the Lord said, "I will blot out from the earth the human beings I have created -- people together with animals, and creeping things and birds of the air, for I am sorry that I have made them. (Genesis 6:6-7)

Even so he saves one pair of each, evidently unable to part with his reflection in them. But still, he torments them for their weakness in his eyes. Even his chosen he sadistically puts to impossible choices.

God tested Abraham. He said to him “Abraham!” And he said, “Here I am.” He said, “Take your son, your only son Isaac, whom you love, and go to the land of Moriah, and offer him there as a burnt offering on one of the mountains I shall show you.” (Genesis 22:1-2)

Who is the conscience, who the vindictive, unreflective entity when the created must plead to the Creator for empathic discretion? Abraham pleads with the vengeful Lord for the righteous of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Far be it from you to do such a thing, to slay the righteous with the wicked, so that the righteous fare as the wicked! Far be it from you! Shall not the Judge of all the earth do what is just? (Genesis 18:25)

Evidently not, if the judging is to be done by this blustering, temperamental terror of a divinity. And there are no alternatives, no other godheads to plead the ‘merely human case’ to in this religious cosmology of psyche. This pattern of rebuke and pleading between judgmental Father God and His ever inadequate creations goes on, and on, for hundreds of years and pages. Until one man dares to defend his integrity before the fickle fury of this divinity. Job, neither prophet nor divinely chosen tribal leader, mere honorable everyman, is tested by the Lord God and his satanic shadow. Stung by the power of God, Job curses his birth but not the Lord. Yet neither does he admit fault that is not his, despite his friends urging. To their assumptions of his guilt he replies:

Will you show partiality toward him, will you plead the case for God? Will it be well with you when he searches you out? Or can you deceive him, as one person deceives another? He will surely rebuke you if in secret you show partiality. (Job:13:8-10)

Let me have silence, and I will speak, and let come what may.  
I will take my flesh in my teeth, put my life in my hand.  
See, he will kill me: I have no hope, but I will defend my ways to his face. This will be my salvation, that the godless shall not come before him. (Job 13:13-16)

Knowing God’s omniscience he trusts it and begs only to face his tormenter and know he is heard.

Only grant two things to me, then I will not hide myself from your face: withdraw your hand far from me, and do not let dread of you terrify me. Then call, and I will answer; or let me speak, and you reply to me. How many are my iniquities and my sins? Make me know my transgressions and my sin. Why do you hid your face from me and count me as your enemy? Will you frighten a windblown leaf and pursue dry chaff? (Job 13:20-26)

so you destroy the hope of mortals. You prevail forever against them, and they pass away . . . They feel only the pain of their own bodies, and mourn only for themselves. (Job 14:19-20, 22)

Job implies the cowardice of the bully to this power that torments him unjustly and without fair trial. He acknowledges the miserable alienation of humans whose image of divine self is so set against them. All property and family destroyed by God, Job is nothing but a humiliated ego. But his friends' fear of that vengeful God bars them from taking the side of their own. Eliphaz speaks: Job Undermines Religion.

What are mortals, that they can be clean? Or those born of woman, that they can be righteous? God puts no trust even in his holy ones, and the heavens are not clean in his sight . . . (Job 15:14)

All the more reason for the afflicted to protest such ungodly animosity.

God gives me up to the ungodly, and casts me into the hands of the wicked. I was at ease and he broke me in two; he seized me by the neck and dashed me to pieces; he set me up as his target; his archers surround me. (Job 16:11-13)

My eye pours out tears to God, that he would maintain the right of a mortal with God, as one does for a neighbor. (Job 16:20)

So conscious is this man's ego of himself he admits of possible unconscious errors, and claims them as his own, refusing to project blame on Satans.

And even if it is true that I have erred, my error remains with me. (Job 19:4)

So the mere person, tormented and abandoned by archetypal powers, sets this challenge to the divine:

For I know that my Redeemer lives, and that at last he will stand upon the earth, and after my skin has thus been destroyed, then in my flesh I shall see God, whom I shall see on my side, and my eyes shall behold and not another. (Job 19:25-27)

He notes God's unjust inconsistency:

Why do the wicked live on, reach old age, grow mighty in power? (Job 21:7)

Elihu counters:

Surely God is great, and we do not know him. (Job 36:26)  
If you are righteous, what do you give to him; or what does he receive from your hand? Your wickedness affects others like you, and your righteousness, other human beings. (Job 35:7)

The faults of persons seem only relevant to persons. The divine is unaffected by them. Finally the absent Lord can take no more provoking and arrives in his whirlwind, despite Job's pleas for an unthreatening audience. Denied an incarnation of the archetypal force of psyche in the flesh, terrified, the human ego collapses.

I had heard of you by the hearing of the ear, but now my eye sees you; therefore I despise myself, and repent in dust and ashes. (Job 42:5)

Miraculous then -- God turns upon Job's judgmental neighbors!

My wrath is kindled against you and against your two friends; for you have not spoken of me what is right, as my servant Job has. (Job 42:7)

There is no new intimacy here between human and divine -- but the divine seems to acknowledge It has acted unjustly, out of keeping with its sense of itself, compensating the object of Its persecution.

The Lord blessed the latter days of Job more than his beginning. . . .  
(Job 42:12)

Hundreds more years and pages later, Job's request seems to be answered through the incarnation of the divine as Jesus: Son of Man/Son of God. At last

the Lord has been moved to meet the human in its own dimension, to learn its personal sufferings and teach divine wisdom relevant to them. After centuries of harsh judgment, the Creator seeks the humbling feel of the flesh. And how differently He speaks now:

Jesus told the crowds all these things in parables; without a parable he told them nothing. This was to fulfill what had been spoken through the prophet: "I will open my mouth to speak in parables: I will proclaim what has been hidden from the foundation of the world." (Matthew 13:34)

But the wisdom of the divine spoken through the incarnate mouth is no simple set of rules cut on stone tablets.

Those who find their life will lose it, and those who lose their life for my sake will find it. (Matthew 10:37)

Telling odd stories in such double-speak to the crowds, his followers are confounded.

Then the disciples came and asked him, "Why do you speak to them in parables?" He answered, "To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven but to them it has not been given. . . . The reason I speak to them in parables is that 'seeing they do not perceive, and hearing they do not listen, nor do they understand.'" (Matthew 13:10)

Those who have not ears to understand such language are barred from it says the Lord. Yet, in recalling His words later, the disciples write that they were privileged, that though baffled they were given the real meanings of the parables in private! Since few if any can comprehend the parabolic telling of "what has been hidden since the foundation of the world," the incarnate divine must work miracles as proof of his authority from the Father. For that-- the magical transformation of matter-- is the divine power in which human egos can see and hear the meaning. Yet it is the Living Word of God that will bring salvation, he insists -- not belief in magic! Half human that he is, able to speak from both sides of the personal and archetypal divide, he has empathy for human weakness, the difficulty of meeting the ethical demands of the Father God. Faced with death, even he balks at the price of mortal complexity and obedience to the disembodied God.

"My Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me, yet not what I

want but what you want.” (Matthew 26:36)

Yet while he lives humanly, he urges humans to celebrate his incarnation humanly. For his divine requirements are not those of the disembodied Father.

Jesus said to them, “The wedding guests cannot fast while the bridegroom is with them, can they? As long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast.” (Mark 2:18)

And his actions and teachings suggest the rebellion of any son, suggesting that one’s true family, His family, are those who do the will of God -- and He is God.

“Whoever does the will of God is my brother and sister and mother.”  
(Mark 3:31)

Yet in the home of his human life, Nazareth, Jesus is rejected as divine embodied. Not even miracles garner faith in those who know his as a man.

And he could do no deed of power there, except that he laid his hands on a few sick people and cured them. He was amazed at their unbelief.  
(Mark 6:5)

Facing the end of his reign on the earthly plain, the loss of his personal being, he bows to the ultimate power of the disembodied divine in bidding his human comrades farewell.

You herd me say to you, ‘I am going away, and I am coming to you.’ If you loved me, you would rejoice that I am going to the Father, because the Father is greater than I. (John 14:28)

Yet He indicates He could do otherwise.

I will no longer talk much with you, for the ruler of this world is coming. He has no power over me, but I do as the Father has commanded me, so that the world may know that I love the Father. (John 14:30)

Before his death, he warns them of coming persecutions for teaching his word.

“ I did not say these things to you from the beginning, because I was with you. But now I am going to him who sent me; yet none of you asks

me, 'Where are you going?' But because I have said these things to you, sorrow fills your hearts. Nevertheless, I tell you the truth: it is to your advantage that I go away, for if I do not go away, the Advocate will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you. (John 16:5-6)

But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you everything, and remind you of all that I have said to you. (John 14:26)

You do well if you really fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." But if you show partiality, you commit sin and are convicted by the law as transgressors. (James 2:8)

He cannot help but pronounce ethical rules -- evidently faithless that humans will ever have 'ears to hear and eyes to see' such that they can understand "what was hidden since the foundation of the world" and told in his parables. As he prepares to return to the Father, he speaks again of the unbending rules to which humans will be held accountable. God is not bound by laws, to live up to His own law, for He is be All Powerful and All Good and has the right to demand obedience from humans. To demand ethics is to manifest them unless His power is above what he demands. To face, to 'gnow' this paradox, such complexity in facing ethical decisions requires more than obedience and faith -- a parabolic knowing which the disembodied Father seems not to understand Himself. What is the demand of this Father God -- obedience or empathic understanding? He seems paradoxical and confused in and of Himself, perhaps even more so now that he has experienced humanness via his Son-ness incarnation.

And after the embodied God has departed, the teaching falls to the charge of human egos. Well do they know their faults, if not their strengths:

Not many of you should become teachers, my brothers and sisters, for you know that we who teach will be judged with greater strictness. For all of us make many mistakes. Anyone who makes no mistakes in speaking is perfect, able to keep the whole body in check with a bridle. If we put bits into the mouths of horses to make them obey us, we guide their whole bodies. (James 3:1-3)

How great a forest is set ablaze by a small fire! And the tongue is a fire. (James 3: 5-6)

but no one can tame the tongue-- a restless evil, full of deadly poison.  
(James 3: 8)

From the same mouth come blessings and cursing. My brothers and sisters, this ought not to be so. Does a spring pour forth from the same opening both fresh and brackish water? (James 3:10-11)

It appears beyond the teachers to contain life's paradoxical qualities, the complexities of ethical judgments for a divinely inspired human ego. They fall back on the literalistic, reductive, mono-logical interpretations and judgments of the Father. They falter in the language of the parables.

Let mutual love continue. Do not neglect to show hospitality to strangers, for by doing that some have entertained angels without knowing it. (Hebrews 13:1-2)

Yet they know there is more to this life than meets eyes blind and ears deaf to incarnate divinity.

As you therefore have received Christ Jesus the Lord, continue to live your lives in him, rooted and build in him and established in faith . . .  
(Colossians 2:6-7)

For in him the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily, and you have come to fullness in him . . . (Colossians 2: 9)

They cannot quite get the message that The Word has become the incarnation of the Living God. They fall back on idolatry of his resurrected and thus eternal body as the place of it. They cannot accept that their own bodies become divine if they could but hear and see the paradoxical truth of the parables.

If with Christ you died to the elemental spirits of the universe, when do you live as if you still belonged to the world? Why do you submit to regulations? (Colosians 2:20-21)

So if you have been raised with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated at the right hand of God. Set your minds on things that are above, not on things that are on earth . . . (Colosians 3:1-2)

Put to death, therefore, whatever is earthly: fornication, impurity,

passion, evil desire, and greed, (which is idolatry). On account of these the wrath of God is coming on those who are disobedient. (Colosians 5-6)

The message of the Incarnation and the metaphor of the resurrection are forsaken. The body sacralized by Christ's speaking the godly word is debased. The abstraction of spirit exemplified by the still supreme disembodied Father triumphs over the example of the son. Obedience, not empathic love of neighbors, fair and unfair alike, remains the ultimate test of faith in the goodness of godliness. And yet, not quite so. For from here on there will always be a push and pull, a contrast, an additional voicing and example that complicates the old image of a distant, wrathful divine Self. Some part of God now knows personal humanness empathically. And some humans will have eyes and ears that can bring them faith by perceiving the complex teachings of the parables, not faith from blind obedience to rules. There are few, but more voices than before the incarnation, in this mono-theistic imagination.

## Appendix 2: Depth Psychology's Voicing of Psychic Complexity

At one moment Yahweh behaves as irrationally as a cataclysm; the next moment he wants to be loved . . . . He reacts irritably to every word that has the faintest suggestion of criticism, while he himself does not care a straw for his own moral code . . . (Jung, 549)

The drama has been consummated for all eternity: Yahweh's dual nature has been revealed, and somebody or something has seen and registered this fact. Such a revelation, whether it reached man's consciousness or not, could not fail to have far-reaching consequences. (Jung, 550)

Whoever knows God has an effect on him. The failure of the attempt to corrupt Job has changed Yahweh's nature. (Jung, 556)

. . . fear of God is regarded by man in general as the principle and even as the beginning of all wisdom. . . mankind tried, under this hard discipline, to broaden their consciousness by acquiring a modicum of wisdom, that is, a little foresight and reflection . . . (Jung, 561)

Wisdom is There, but it is compressed, complexed, un-articulated.

The lack of Eros, of relation to values, is painfully apparent in the Book of Job: the paragon of all creation is not a man but a monster! Yahweh has no Eros, no relationship to man, but only to a purpose man must help him fulfill. . . .

The real reason for God's becoming man is to be sought in his encounter with Job. (Jung, 562)

The new son, Christ, shall on the one hand be a chthonic man like Adam, mortal and capable of suffering, but on the other hand he shall not be, like Adam, a mere copy, but God himself, begotten by himself as the Father, and rejuvenating the Father as the Son. (Jung, 567)

The monolithic divine struggles to get out of Itself to know Its Selves while still trying to keep control of Itself.

All the world is God's, and God is in all the world from the very beginning. Why, then, this *tour de force* of the Incarnation? one asks oneself. God is in everything already, and yet there must be something

missing if a sort of second entrance into Creation has got to be staged with so much care and circumspection. . . . One would like to say that Christ had to appear in order to deliver mankind from evil. But . . . (Jung, 568)

But evil is the work of God The Omnipotent. However potent, the Almighty is remarkable 'unconscious.' His 'complexes' require attending in the therapy of human suffering and its Living Words. But it would not be archetypally divine if It could 'admit' such a need. Yet, divine as He is also, Christ is not reflective on 'his psychology,' though he is on the paradoxes of the human dimension he has come to experience, as indicated in his parabolic speech.

Besides his love of mankind a certain irascibility is noticeable in Christ's character, and, as is often the case with people of emotional temperament, a manifest lack of self-reflection. There is not evidence that Christ ever wondered about himself, or that he ever confronted himself. (Jung, 576)

Christ is the good shepherd, the artfully authoritative, 'removed' psychotherapist, until--

. . . the despairing cry from the Cross: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Here his human nature attains divinity; at that moment God experiences what it means to be a mortal man and drink to the dregs what he made his faithful servant Job suffer. Here is given the answer to Job. . . . (Jung, 576)

Yahweh's intention to become man, which resulted from his collision with Job, is fulfilled in Christ's life and suffering. (Jung, 578)

The sinless shepherd must die to bring the possibility of 'full' consciousness to the archetypal Self. The healer must be wounded. This wounding of 'divine mortality' has an important consequence. It creates an 'intermediary' entity between the thus far opposed forms of consciousness in the absolute, archetypally immaterial divine and the temporary, suffering matter of humanness.

The Counselor is the Holy Ghost, who will be sent from the Father. [Subsequent to His experience of incarnation!] This "Spirit of Truth" will teach the believers "all things" and guide them into "all truth." According to this, Christ envisages a continuing realization of God in his children, and consequently in his (Christ's) brothers and sisters in the spirit, so that his own works need not necessarily be considered the

greatest ones. (Jung, 582-3)

So some 'Spirit of The Middle', some Go-Between is created. A knowing with gnosis of both the divinely inhuman and the humanly personal is available to 'counsel' our efforts to know God. But it is a knowing that works in both directions.

God's incarnation in Christ requires continuation and completion because Christ, owing to his virgin birth and his sinlessness, was not an empirical human being at all. . . . Job, on the other hand, was an ordinary human being, and therefore the wrong done to him, and through him mankind, can, according to divine justice, only be repaired by an incarnation of God in an empirical human being. This act of expiation is performed by the Paraclete; for, just as man must suffer from God, so God must suffer from man. Otherwise there can be no reconciliation between the two. (Jung, 583-4)

Psychological reconciliation, a coming to know the complexities of psyche hidden by the 'complexes' in the compressed imagination of monotheism, a re-alignment of ego with self/Self, of consciousness with personal and collective unconsciousness, must be an on-going process.

The continuing, direct operation of the Holy Ghost on those who are called to be God's children implies, in fact, a broadening process of incarnation. Christ . . . is the first born who is succeeded by an ever-increasing number of younger brothers and sisters. (Jung, 584)

Alas, the progeny of Christ's divinely conscious humanity, His disciples and theirs, seemed not to have "ears to hear, nor eyes to see" that wisdom "hidden from the foundation of the world." The process of incarnation of the Wisdom as Living Word seemed stillborn in literalistic, linear, logical bound rules and interpretations. The rule of the autocratic Father persisted in the thoughts of humans. Apocalypse in fantasy and historical action were inevitable. Some context was lacking. When The Holy Ghost found those with ears to hear they often lacked eyes to see, or eyes that saw lacked ears that heard. But then, the parabolic language of the Living God is difficult. For it is surely ghost language that says:

Those who find their life will loose it, and those who lose their life for my sake will find it. (Matthew 10:37)

So it may be that:

[I]f the Ghost be allowed to come, theological language, like Christ, may need to disappear . . . . Surely one must imagine that the Ghost could help theology more than theology could ever help the Holy Ghost. (Miller, 190)

The failure of the 'fatherly' ordering of theology to 'save humankind' begets, historically, its logocentric 'son' in scientific materialism and rationalistic Enlightenment humanism. If God cannot make right order of the universe, stand aside! Let the human ego take the task without the interfering projection of divinity! The 'Son' shall know more of in-carnate, empirical existence than the superior Father. Yet the son is cast in the father's singular, authoritative, disembodied molding once again. It sees complexity only in hierarchies of mechanical science and empires -- and sees its own consciousness all too simplistically. The offenses of the new Rationalist Ruler against the body and soul must again be expiated. Again the incarnation of more complex consciousness comes through the feminine -- this time the female bodies of the hysteric patients of the hypnotist Mesmer and Freud.

In Vienna in the latter part of the nineteenth century a new style of discourse appears, a language of suffering whose figurative dimension reveal themselves at the intersections of symptoms, symbols, memories, events dreams. (Romanyshyn, 14)

And this time the mothers of consciousness are multiple not singular, human not Divine. And the "Counselor" becomes the spiritual midwife of the analyst/therapist, a ghostly presence in between God and personal human, who attends to the 'revelations' of complex consciousness, of archetypal eros between aspects of psyche, personal and collective. And the language of that chaotically ordered incarnation is paradoxical and parabolic. It is not the language of YHVH or theology but that of ghostly dreams and irreducibly significant images -- the 'koans' of incarnate gnosis of Spirit, whose denial has brought the patient suffering the body to the doctor. YHVH and Job sit down together with a third presence mediating—that Spirit of the 'Humanly Divine Human' struggling with many denied identities. And --

The therapy room, as place for speaking the confessions of soul, is invented, and it is located midway between the university academies of rational discourse and the scientific laboratories of empirical discourse. (Romanyshyn, 14)

At last a place where:

In all these anxieties and concerns, the complex reader discovers, however, how very much the effort at making sense is a means of mastery and control, the perspective of an ego consciousness in its stance of detached observer of the world. Complex reading challenges the position of ego consciousness by undercutting its fantasies of power and progress, of virtue and purity, of efficiency and comprehensiveness. [of YHVH-ism] (Romanyshyn, 19)

Then again come the attempts to explain, to write about this ghostly speech of the 'on-going incarnation.' But the desiring to have 'eyes to see and ears to hear it' founders yet again on the 'Fatherly complex of making order.' Theology -- the logical telling of the divine -- becomes Psychology: the logical telling of psyche.

In listening to Dora, Freud was hearing the language of the unconscious, the speech of the suffering soul, the voice of symptom and dream [incarnate divinity], with a literate mind. A history that was not at all linear was made into a text, which by definition required linearity. (Romanyshyn, 22)

. . . grammar is a defense of the literate mind against the speech of the suffering soul, its psychopathology. . . . (Romanyshyn, 25)

So to this day, and forever some would say, we will struggle with seeing and hearing, with 'reading' the texts of such complexity as the incarnate interplay of selves, personal and archetypal whose plurality is compressed into fantasies of linear singularity. 'Ologies' and '-ologists' bear witness to these dramas but are barred from speaking in ghostly tongues. They can only explicate and schematize the paradoxed consciousness 'objectively'-- though in ever more exquisitely torturous detail. Psyche's stories are mythical and myths are not myth-ologies -- however hard we try to make them so.

We could avoid much trouble if we did not constantly transform our myths into ideologies and if we did not try at all costs to force them into a system that is free of contradictions and that cannot tolerate any other ideology. (Guggenbuhl-Craig, 75)

The quest for freedom from doubt, contradiction, paradox --to get the parabolic psyche into line-- bring untold suffering and endlessly postpone the coming of the kingdom of heaven with all its complexities 'revealed.' Getting Body and Spirit together soulfully requires --

. . . emphasizing paying attention to the body as a way of recovering the body of psychological gnosis. (Romanyshyn, 18)

Such an 'idea' one can only see in embodied images, hear in the ghostly language of poetic incarnation:

What would really be abominable, offensive, unthinkable, and lacking in faith, hope, and love, would be to have to imagine that there were no salvation in suffering, no depth here and now in life, no Paradise in Hades. Perhaps this is why the poet Charles Olson penned the lines . . . "hell is now / is not exterior, is not to be got out of, is / the coat of your own self. " (Miller, 83)

Hell is incarnate, in *this* embodiment. And so Heaven. And Job. And Elihu. And YHVH. The more singularly we imagine ourselves, ethically or psychically, the more explosive the reaction of our plurality, for:

The question of polytheism is posed by the soul itself as soon as its perspective experiences the world as animated and its own nature as replete with changing diversity. That is, as soon as the soul is freed from ego domination, the question of polytheism arises. (Hillman, 35)

Paradoxically: The more singularly we imagine our deities and identities, the more complex we shall have to become to know our selves in the gnosis of our psycho-logical bodies. The progressively complex reading of depth psychology owes its privileged position of dislocated but participatory observation of psyche to the compression of polytheism into psycho-pathological monotheism.

\* \* \* \* \*

© Copyright 1997, June 3, 2005  
by Leslie M. Emery

## Works Cited

American Heritage Dictionary, William Morris Ed., Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1978

Holy Bible, New Revised Standard, Zondervan Publishing, Grand Rapids, 1989

Jung, C. G., Answer to Job, in The Portable Jung, Joseph Campbell Ed., R.F.C. Hull Trans., Viking Press, New York, 1971.

Miller, David L., Hells & Holy Ghosts, Abingdon, Nashville, 1989

Romanyshyn, Robert, "Complex Knowing: Toward a Psychological Hermeneutics," The Humanistic Psychologist, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 10-29, 1991

Guggenbuhl-Craig, Adolph, The Old Fool and the Corruption of Myth, Spring, Dallas, 1991

Hillman, James, Archetypal Psychology, Spring, Dallas, 1983

### Bibliography

Corbett, Lionel, The Religious Function of the Psyche. Routledge, New York, 1996

Hillman, James, A Blue Fire, Thomas Moore ed., Harper Perennial, New York, 1989

Bultman, Rudolph, Jesus Christ and Mythology. Charles Scribner, New York, 1958

Bohm, David, Wholeness and the Implicate Order. Ark, New York, 1980, 1983.

Duncan, Robert, "Opening the Dreamway," Spring Journal 59, Putman, Connecticut, 1996

James, William, The Varieties of Religious Experience, Mentor, New York, 1958

Jung, C.G., On the Nature of the Psyche, R.F.C. Hull trans., Bolingen, New

York, 1960