Interview with Edward F. Edinger

Lawrence Jaffe, Interviewer

Jaffe: I'm going to start by reading you a paragraph from Jung that you are very familiar with:

I had to understand that I was unable to make the people see what I am after. I am practically alone. There are a few who understand this and that, but almost nobody sees the whole.... I have failed in my foremost task: to open people's eyes to the fact that man has a soul and there is a buried treasure in the field and that our religion and philosophy are in a lamentable state.[1]

Obviously Jung felt, at that time in his life, that not too many people understood his basic message. Now, that was about forty years ago. Do you feel that he's more understood now than in his time?

Edinger: No. Less so, because there are fewer people now—visible to me, anyway—who understand even his basics. It's a very sad sight to see.

J: Are you thinking of Jungian analysts and candidates who are becoming more eclectic and getting interested in ideas of object relations theorists, like Winnicott?

E: They're all examples of that phenomenon because they don't get the basic point. You hear all this talk about "post-Jungians"; they're pre-Jungians.

J: Yeah. Absolutely.

E: It's an arrogant term that's offensive to the ear.

J: At a recent analyst meeting, I said we're not post-Jungian because we haven't yet understood Jung. (I meant his metapsychology—his religious message.) At the same meeting, analysts were asking why were there people like Noll who wanted to pick on Jung.

E: I'll tell you why, Larry: because Jung is numinous, because he carries the opposites, and though he's carried them very carefully insofar as his public work is concerned, nevertheless intuitive people can pick up that he's at a whole level of reality that they don't know anything about. And it includes a shadow area for people who have no conscious connection to that aspect of life which can evoke projections.

J: And envy...and suspicions?

E: That can be part of it too. Jung's magnitude is such that he dwarfs all of us. And that can be a very humbling experience. A lot of people don't like to be humbled, especially a certain type of rational intellectual.

J: You have called Jung an "epochal man," one whose life inaugurates and is emblematic of a new age in cultural history. Christ was such an epochal man, and Paul had the role of mediating Christ's message to the world. Do you believe that you have played a similar role for Jung?

E: Well, in a very small sense...in a miniature sense. The pattern is similar,

---

Lawrence Jaffe, Ph.D., is a Jungian analyst in private practice in Berkeley. He is a graduate of the C.G. Jung Institute of San Francisco and is a member of its faculty. He is the author of Celebrating Soul: Preparing for the New Religion (Inner City Books, 1999), Liberating the Heart: Spirituality and Jungian Psychology (Inner City Books, 1990), and editor of a lecture series by Edward Edinger, Transformation of the god-image: An Elucidation of Jung's "Answer to Job" (Inner City Books, 1992).

but the magnitude is vastly different. Paul's devotion to his task was just monumental, and not many can equal that level.

J: You've written, now, sixteen books, nine of them since 1990, and some of them are among your finest....

E: There are a couple more in the works.

J: Oh, are there? I didn't know that. Tell me about them.

E: Well, *The Psyche in Antiquity*, which will include ancient philosophy, Gnosticism, and early Christianity, is in the hands of Inner City Books. They're pretty busy right now; they don't expect to get that out until the beginning of 2000. And there's another one looking for a publisher now, called *The Archetype of the Apocalypse*, which is an interpretation of the Book of Revelation.[2]

J: You once said that of the books you've written, *Anatomy of the Psyche* is your favorite or your most original contribution. Do you still see it that way?

E: Well, it's hard to make a hierarchy of one's books because they indicate different aspects of one's interests, but what I had in mind was that my love of chemistry goes back to boyhood. Therefore, the chemical and alchemical symbolism is a particularly important strand in my whole life history, and *Anatomy of the Psyche* is probably the most substantial sustained and fully organized contribution that I've made. It's very hard to say which book one likes most because they all go together, really. They're different facets of the same thing.

J: With the death of Marie-Louise von Franz, is there anyone who comes to mind, other than yourself, as a leader in the Jungian world?

E: Well, I'm not really very familiar with the people in Zurich. I know Theodor Abt, who seems to be a very promising fellow. He's a protégé of von Franz's. He spoke down here a year or so ago, and I got to meet him, and he's promising. We'll see what he produces. He's doing work on a text of Egyptian alchemy. It's really quite scholarly. You have to learn Arabic in order to go into it.

J: Did you find something in common with Abt?

E: What we had in common was alchemy and also our affection for von Franz. I don't know who else she's left behind who is promising. I understand the Zurich Institute as a whole has pretty much gone to the dogs so far as Jung is concerned.

J: And the von Franz group has started their own institute, I understand....Would you care to say what you think of Jim Hillman's work?

E: Well, Jim Hillman is an interesting phenomenon, I must say. Very bright, intelligent, knowledgeable, but he's not related to the reality of the psyche. He's an author. He's got a literary and artistic mentality rather than a scientific, psychological mentality. He's a kind of intellectual playboy who can dazzle people with his brilliance and play around with images and ideas, but he's not the genuine article. He's a living example of what Jung warned us against, namely, the aesthetic attitude toward the psyche. He leaves out of account the moral dimension, the ethical dimension of relation to the depths. In fact he scorns it

J: It's the earth dimension. He likes to dwell in the sky.

E: That's part of it. There's another angle to it. It's the responsibility that one has for every new piece of consciousness acquired.

J: What do you see as the future of Jungian psychology?

E: Well, in the near future I see the Jungian collective, the International Association and its connections as losing more and more of Jung's true essence and becoming more and more preoccupied with personalistic angles. You see, the advantage of Freudian/Kleinian personalistic kind of psychology is that it allows for interminable theorization, intellectualization, conceptualization, and it skates above the more profound realities. This is what collectivity does to Jungian psychology. That's going to get worse and worse in my opinion. There will probably be little enclaves, little oases of small groups that try to hold on to the authentic Jung, and they may not be fully professional groups either. But that's just a guess. But Jung himself had the anticipation and some of his followers had certain dreams indicating that Jung will be more or less forgotten for several hundred years and then rediscovered. So that could well be.

J: So far as the present and near future is concerned, I have a somewhat different angle on it and I'd like to present it to you and get your feedback on it. I think I can speak for a number of analysts and candidates in California who have reached out to people like Kohut and Winnicott who offer techniques which seem to be helpful in healing their patients. I feel that we need more in the way of clinical technique than Jung has taught us. Jung himself did not need technique. He could help his patients through the impact of his greatness. Others of us don't have Jung's greatness, though I agree it is through the person of the therapist that the most important therapeutic effect comes. But sometimes I feel you need ideas, for instance on how complexes were formed during childhood—how childhood wounding can be healed and how to handle the therapeutic relationship. But I don't think it makes me any less of a Jungian to be interested in such techniques.

E: The fact is there are many different schools of psychotherapy, and that tells us something. That tells us that there are different groups of people who are satisfied by different approaches to the psyche. That would just be a fact. Whatever one finds helpful and worthwhile in practice or in one's development I respect, because each individual has to find his own particular thing. You have to remember that Jung went through that personalistic phase with Freud and the Freudian approach. He did not deny it, he just transcended it. And it's not something that I think should be disputed between individuals and between schools because we're dealing with psychological experiences that can't be argued away. I must admit that it continues to surprise me that people who have initially chosen Jungian training and have some experience with Jung's work find themselves so satisfied with personalistic approaches and from my standpoint that's grammar school. It's not that it's wrong...all these approaches are linked to psychological facts or they would never have gained any credence in the first place. So of course they have some empirical connection with the psyche. But the overall view of the psyche that the personalistic schools engender is so shallow to me that it really surprises me that so many people who have been exposed to Jung find so much in them to favor. But they do, and that's just a fact that's not to be argued with.

J: Maybe the part of them that was attracted to Jung, the Jungian part of them, compensates for the shallowness of the personalistic approach. So then they have both.

E: I'm not so sure about that. It's a matter of individual perception. I perceive Jung's vision of the psyche as incompatible with that of the personalistic theories. You, however, perceive them as compatible. This is a basic problem of communication between depth psychologists—differences of consciousness in individuals and what they see. I guess we have to recognize basically that all those psychological judgments are subjective ones, and that will keep us tolerant, I guess.

J: What do you think of the popularity of Buddhism in the light of Jung's dim view (as I read him) of the wholesale adoption of Eastern religion? But many people say that they've felt benefit from what their spiritual practice of one kind of another of Eastern approach.

E: For one thing it's a symptom of the breakdown of the collective Western myth. So that as people fall out of containment in the conventional religious mythology, they go looking for an alternative. Buddhism, of course, offers the additional attraction of emphasizing introversion, which counterbalances the excessive extraversion of the West. The system is all there. All they have to do is walk into it and embrace it. It's got a long history behind it. It's all there. You don't have to build anything up from scratch. You know, of course, what Jung thought of Westerners embracing Eastern religions: He thought it was an evasion of their own destiny and heritage.

J: Related to what we've been talking about is another quotation from Jung:

The Book of Job serves as a paradigm for a certain experience of God which has a very special significance for our time. These experiences come upon man from the inside as well as from outside, and it is useless to interpret them rationalistically and thus weaken them by apotropaic means. It is far better to admit the affect and submit to its violence than to try to escape it by all sorts of *intellectual tricks or by emotional value-judgments*. Although, by giving way to the affect, one imitates all the bad qualities of the outrageous act that provoked it and thus makes oneself guilty of the same fault, that is precisely the point of the whole proceeding: the violence is meant to penetrate to man's vitals, and he to succumb to its action. He must be affected by it, otherwise its full effect will not reach him. But he should know, or learn to know, what has affected him, for in this way he transforms the blindness of the violence on the one hand and of the affect on the other into knowledge.[3]

When Jung speaks of "intellectual tricks" or "emotional value-judgments," do you think he might be referring, in part, to taking up Eastern religions where you can imagine yourself as enlightened, above it all, peaceful, or whatever?

E: Here's an example of an emotional value-judgment which can cheat a person of the impact of the experience. I'm sure you know of those who have said in response to the Holocaust, "I won't believe in a God who would allow that to happen." That's an example of an emotional value-judgment, as though God's reality had anything to do with whether one believed in Him or not. It's an utterly infantile attitude, you see.

J: In an interview in the newsletter *In Touch* some years ago, you concluded with Jung's words to the effect that "death is the goal of life." This is a statement I don't quite understand,

because when we speak of a goal we usually mean a conscious intention, a desire of the ego. But our ego does not usually desire death. Death is certainly the end of life or the completion of life. And in death, I sense, there is a return to the unconscious from which we arose. I think it would be more accurate to say death is the culmination of life. But Jung says "goal." Would you like to say anything about the idea of death as the goal of life?

E: You don't like the word goal because it implies intention—but that's just what I intended to imply. Not just the ego's intention, but life's intention. We are built to be born and go through a series of typical experiences and come to the end and die. And what comes after that, we don't know. Would you have trouble with the idea that it's the intention of life to be born? To come into existence, to run a course, and then go out of material existence.

J: Have you yourself had any thoughts about death, aging, the afterlife?

E: Yeah, I've had a lot of thoughts.

J: Would you care to share any of them?

E: I don't know anything more about the afterlife than anybody else. That's an unknown quantity as far as I'm concerned. But in my experience the aging process makes death easier because of the progressive withdrawal of libido from the interests of worldly existence. Just not interested anymore. So that makes death much more palatable. I have no concerns about death at all. I look forward to it. What I do have concerns about is the process that I'm going to be subjected to in reaching that goal. Nature can be pretty cruel in that regard, you know. One hopes that the executioner will deal you a nice clean solid blow and not a lot of little sidelong hacks that wound you but don't finish you off. So that concerns me, but I'll have to take whatever I get. I don't have any choice in the matter. But the prospect of death doesn't bother me at all.

J: Do you feel that you've lived a reasonably complete life–that looking back on your life, it seems full?

E: I'm very grateful for the life I've been given. It's got a lot of defects in it, needless to say, but my basic reaction is one of great gratitude that I was permitted to have the life I've had.

J: Well, I, too, am grateful for your life and your achievements; thank you. I want to talk about Jung's idea that our complexes come from God. As you've written, our affects also come from God. The Old Testament informs us about how complexes are formed and how they determine our fates. Yahweh is the unconscious God who saddles us with our complexes. Christ represents the redemptive side of God which holds out the hope, indeed the promise, that we can be healed of our complexes or at least not have to succumb completely to them or that if we live our lives sincerely and devotedly as Christ lived his we can somehow overgrow our complexes at least in part. The way it came to me is that the Old Testament God wounds us while the New Testament God offers us the hope of healing. Do you have any thoughts about that idea?

E: Well, I'd want to ask you some questions about it. What is your evidence or data that Yahweh is the creator of our complexes?

J: When I read the Old Testament it seems to me to be all about family complexes. For example, it starts off with a couple, Adam and Eve, father and mother, and they have children who

hate each other, fight with each other and rebel. It reminds me of my home.

E: It's not quite the way I would put it.

J: How would you put it?

E: Well, it depends on what the *it* is.

J: I was born a Jew, but the New Testament and the image of Christ as the Redeemer hold appeal for me. Also I consider myself a wounded person, almost crushed in childhood, who somehow, through analysis and through people like you and Jung, was able to gain hope and enough healing to go on with life. It's the two sides of God I'm talking about as Clement of Alexandria says to the effect that God rules with a right and a left hand. The right hand is Christ and the left hand, Satan. I know Yahweh is not equivalent with Satan but it's that left hand of God that deals us the wounds of childhood which results in complexes, and it's the right hand of God which offers us the possibility of redemption or healing.

E: Certainly, in childhood, major complexes can be created in the child through the encounter with parents who are identified with an archetypal dynamism. So a certain kind of paterfamilias, for example, can be seen as having an identification with Yahweh. Hence harsh treatment that causes traumatic complexes could then be thought of as caused by Yahweh. That's on the personal level. On the level of the biblical drama, encounters with Yahweh are pictured as having various effects, some of which may be categorized as complexes (I'm not sure, I'd have to reflect on what examples might come to mind).[4] The basic point, I think, is that what Jung calls the "not yet transformed god," in the Kotschnig letter,[5] is what's responsible for the vast majority of interpersonal human suffering.

J: Is the "not yet transformed god," identical with Yahweh?

E: Yes. That's the gist of *Answer to Job*: that Yahweh's encounter with Job required him to undergo some transformation and that incarnation in Christ was then his answer to Job. It takes us back to what we were talking about earlier, how personalistic psychological theories are helpful in clinical practice. They're helpful only if you stay at that certain level, and if the individual is indeed satisfied with that level of understanding, then so be it; but the religious dimension behind the childhood experience never comes into view. Even if dreams allude to it, for it to have a healing effect the person must be sufficiently knowledgeable to know what the dream was referring to rather than interpreting it in personalistic terms.

Going back to when you were talking about the Old Testament God and the Christian God, your implication seemed to be that they were two separate gods, and in response to that I'd like to say that they're *not* two separate gods; that's Marcion's heresy. There's just one God that undergoes differentiation and transformation through His encounter with human consciousness in the form of Job.[6]

J: In *The New God-Image* you discuss the "offended God-image," which describes a situation where the human ego is possessed by what might be called "the wrath of God." You offer the example of "road rage," where a driver who believes he has been treated unjustly might behave recklessly and commit battery or even murder in order to "avenge" himself. You also quote an evocative passage from Melville's novel *White Jacket* where a sailor is about to be flogged for an offense he did not commit. He gets the opportuni-

ty to make a sudden rush against the captain, which would pitch the two of them off the deck of the ship to a certain death, and so let Yahweh decide between them, as the sailor says. That would be an example of being infected with the offended God-image. What would be a human way to handle a gross injustice of this nature?

E: What happens in that case is what Jung refers to in a paragraph I use as the epigraph to a little book of mine called *Transformation of Libido*. This is a very important quotation, which includes the phrase, "onslaught of instinct."[7] Onslaught of instinct and archetypal possession are the same thing. So what happens to that man who is about to be flogged unjustly is that he experiences within himself an onslaught of instinct, a possession by Yahweh, who will not permit the injustice to take place and will even offer up this poor sailor (using him as an agent for His justice) in order to execute the captain. In that case, that onslaught of instinct—that onslaught of archetypal possession—that's a religious phenomenon potentially highly deleterious to the individual if he succumbs to it, because he then becomes the sacrificial victim who lives out the agency of divine wrath. What is required in such a situation is sufficient consciousness to wrestle with that onslaught of instinct. Jung is talking about Jacob wrestling with the angel at the ford Jabbok—that's one of his images in that [epigraph]. And by wrestling with it, one refuses to identify with it. And that means, then, that he will not give himself up as a sacrificial agent of divine wrath, but he will accept what he must. It's a matter of consciousness; otherwise he will be destroyed by his own lack of consciousness.

J: You mentioned earlier the phrase "reality of the psyche," and as we know it captures the essence of Jung's ideas and yet it's so hard to keep in mind. Is there any way to help people stay with the reality of the psyche?

E: That's really the big problem, because the whole question is *seeing* it. That's all that's required: you just have to *see* it. And apparently all of us live on the level of concepts and hence what we talk about are intellectual concepts. That's what makes *Mysterium Coniunctionis* so difficult. The conceptual content is minimal, and the psyche is just laid out as it is. And since we're so totally unfamiliar with that, we don't know how to deal with it. Just that little example of being on the freeway and inadvertently cutting off an angry person who then expresses rage to you and the way it makes you feel—*that's the psyche*. We've been talking about it as Yahweh's wrath. *That is the psyche*. And if you evoke a reaction like that from somebody, you feel like the wrath of God is being directed at you. That's what it evokes. And of course what often happens in people is that then the wrath of God is evoked in them too and they go at each other—stupidly, because they're both possessed by the divine energy seeking "justice." Now, that's the psyche, and we're encountering small examples of that everywhere, but I don't think it's recognized for what it is. It's the psyche, and it's the transpersonal psyche, and it can be a matter of life and death. Anything that reaches that level is more than personal. And personalistic categories don't describe it appropriately—once you've seen what it really is.

I don't know if that answers your question or not, but it's something that comes to mind. The question of recognizing the reality of the psyche is the

whole point of Jungian psychology. That's why Jung says in that quote you read at the beginning: that his major task was to open people's eyes to the fact that *man has a soul*. The psyche is real.

J: Seeing the reality of the psyche seems to be our major task. Were you implying that once you see it, you get it?

E: Well, it's a gradual process. But certain major experiences in life impress it on your mind, especially. But it is a gradual process. A lot of people talk about the reality of the psyche, but not very many really know what they're talking about. They're talking about ideas rather than the actuality. Ideas are so easy. You move them around at will, you see.

Reality is hard, heavy.

J: Looking back, can you identify anything in your background, childhood, or heritage that led you into your vocation as psychiatrist, teacher, author, and, one could almost say, prophet?

E: What had a profound effect on me was my parents' religion. They were Jehovah's Witnesses and very devoted to their fundamentalist apocalyptic standpoint. And I couldn't subscribe to it. I was appalled by the lack of self-critical reflection that they demonstrated. But probably what impressed me most was the power of their conviction. It formed their lives, you see, it formed the basic content of their lives. And so what I realized much later is that in order to escape that containment in that simplistic fundamentalist view—in order to escape it entirely, I had to do more than reject it and establish a counterview (which I did do for a number of years). I had to penetrate to the same psychic level that it originated in, and understand it. And I could never have done that without Jung. Jung gave me the tools to penetrate to that level of what he calls "the religion-creating archetypes," and that then enabled me to understand that whole religious phenomenon of my parents, and I didn't have to fight it anymore; I could accept it because I understood it. It was their living reality. Very likely, without that particular childhood background I would never have gone into Jungian psychology and probably would never have gone into the depths at all. We don't know for sure, but it's possible.

J: Your experience you were talking about of your parents' religion molding their whole life experience—would you call that an experience of the reality of the psyche?

E: Well, in retrospect it's a beautiful example of the reality of the psyche—when I could finally understand it on those terms, whereas earlier I had to fight my way out of there.

J: Jung was an only child for about eight years, and then a sister was born; and you were an only child for about the same number of years, and then a brother was born. Do you think that there's something in this family constellation that contributes to greatness or spiritual life or something along those lines?

E: Not greatness. I talk about this matter somewhere, I forget where—the "only begotten son." I was an only child, in effect. My brother came along so late—I never felt him as any kind of a threat. So my psychology was essentially that of an only child, and Jung's was, too. It has its advantages and defects. The advantage is, of course, that it gives you a kind of natural tendency to deification, but on the other hand, one isn't prepared so well for the frustrations that life offers.

J: By deification you mean something like thinking you're the center of the universe?

E: Yes, exactly.

J: Here's a quote from Jung I don't quite understand: "Unconscious wholeness therefore seems to me the true spiritus rector of all biological and psychic events." Is he talking about individuation?

E: It has to do with certain simple forms of life, peasant life perhaps, where the archetype of wholeness lives itself out and realizes itself completely on a biological and unconscious level. I think in that passage he's talking about certain kinds of old people who are not very psychological but they have a certain kind of innate dignity, and they've lived their worthy lives but without benefit of consciousness of what it all means. I think the basic meaning is that the Self governs one's life more or less totally, when it's unconscious.

J: There's a lot to think about in that idea. Now to something a bit more homely: do you have much interest in computers?

E: No, none at all.

J: You were quoted once as saying computers represented ego inflation. My wife, who's in the computer industry, thought that was right on.

E: The whole world has gone almost mad with that level of inflation, and I'm very much afraid of what will happen when the year 2000 rolls around and all this vast network is in danger of collapse. I don't think people appreciate how terribly vulnerable this whole world system has become by virtue of all these linkages. It strikes me as exceedingly dangerous.

The world is very fast becoming interlocked, and at all levels. That means that a breakdown can't be confined just to a locality. But it will be generalized. It seems perfectly obvious to me that that's going to happen, that it's built into the nature of the system. There's a hubris about the system which is going to evoke nemesis. It's incalculable what can happen when there's such a widespread breakdown: the financial services will collapse, the stockmarket will collapse. Just the ordinary supply of basic items will be in jeopardy. It's just nightmarish to contemplate.

J: Do you take much notice of popular culture?

E: Very little.

J: Do you ever watch TV?

E: I watch PBS now and then.

J: You didn't watch the final episode of Seinfeld last night?

E: No I don't know anything about that. I read about it in the newspapers. It gets a lot of hoopla, I guess. I'm not familiar with that program.

It's an amazing thing, isn't it, how entertainment has become such a central item in modern life. It seems to have started as an American phenomenon, but now it's spread out all over the world. It's a vulgarization of the sacred drama, as I see it. It's a collectivization, a superficialization, and an infantilizing of the sacred drama and the function that used to serve, and it's an amazing collective phenomenon which indicates to me the utter ruin of our culture

J: So what would be the alternative to entertainment?

E: Drama, authentic drama. You see, the trouble with entertainment is that it's so utterly shallow. Drama was meant to be a religious experience. It was supposed to reach such depths that it has that religious dimension to it. And that's what's been totally lost, so we have just the tail end of that religious, numinous dimension in the idolization of pop stars. It's a kind of shallow, vulgarized version of what was once a genuine religious experience.

J: And what of the sports experience that's become so important?

E: Sports, likewise, were sacred games, originally.

J: It's the hero archetype that's involved in sports.

E: The agon.

J: Where in your writings do you speak about that?

E: I think you'll find it in my book on Greek mythology in the chapter on the tragic drama.[8] That's where I speak about the sacred drama and the sacred games. Those two were really the beginnings of Western culture.

J: One final question, about music. Neither Jung nor Freud seems to have taken much pleasure in music, I gather. How about yourself? I've noticed a recorder in your home.

E: I don't think that's true of Jung. That's not my impression. From what I've heard, he was quite responsive to music, but it could be quite painful to him to listen to performers because he was so aware that they didn't know what they were expressing. I'm not sure who told me that, but it may very well have been von Franz. My relation to music: I'm highly untalented musically. In my adult years I took up the recorder and played it for a while. I very much respond to Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Brahms, Schubert, Schumann. I don't like modern music. It's like modern art. It's a kind of self-destruction that's going on. It mirrors the state of our collective psyche. There's not much beauty and depth in it.

J: It doesn't comfort or console us or offer us something redemptive.

E: It doesn't touch the depths.

Notes

This interview was conducted by telephone on May 15, 1998. It is the last interview Dr. Edinger gave before he died on July 17, 1998.

1. Quoted by Gerhard Adler in "Aspects of Jung's Personality," in *Psychological Perspectives* 6/1 (Spring 1975), p. 14.
2. *The Archetype of the Apocalypse: A Jungian Study of the Book of Revelation* (London: Open Court, 1999).
3. *CW 11*, para. 562 (Edinger's translation, italics added).
4. In a phone message left on the interviewer's answering machine on May 31, 1998, Edinger added: "Major complexes have an archetypal core which does connect them to the Self. But I don't think of the archetype as causing or generating a complex in any intentional sense. I think of it rather that the complex results from the encounter or collision between the ego and the Self archetype. On the other hand, you can cite Jung's remark (which I quote in *Creation of Consciousness*, page 66) in which he says Hosea had a strange type of mother complex. Basically you're right, I guess, but it startled me to hear it put that baldly."
5. See C.G. Jung, *Letters*, vol. 2, pp. 312-16. See also Edward F. Edinger, *The New God-Image: A Study of Jung's Key Letters Concerning the Evolution of the Western God-Image* (Wilmette, Ill.: Chiron, 1997).
6. This paragraph was added, at Edinger's request, from the transcription of a phone message left on the interviewer's answering machine on May 16, 1998.
7. C. G. Jung, *CW 5*, p.338; see also Edward F. Edinger, *Transformation of Libido: A Seminar on C. G. Jung's "Symbols of Transformation"* (Los Angeles: C. G. Jung Bookstore, 1994).
8. *The Eternal Drama: The Inner Meaning of Greek Mythology* (Boston: Shambhala Publications, 1994), pp. 123 ff. Edinger, following Gilbert Murray, outlines the four stages of classical tragedy: *agon*, or contest; *pathos*, or defeat; *threnos*, or lamentation; and *theophany*, or rebirth.