

Jung's Kabbalistic Visions

Sanford Drob

Abstract

Jung's 1944 kabbalistic visions are examined from the standpoint of Jung's earlier provocative remarks about Jewish psychology and National Socialism, his attitude towards the Jewish sources of his own theories, and from the perspective of both Jungian and kabbalistic dream theory. The author suggests that (1) Jung's visions signaled a change in his attitudes and personality that is critical to a full understanding of his complex relationship to Judaism, (2) the kabbalistic understanding of dreams highlights significant points of contact between Jewish mysticism and analytic psychology, and (3) Jung's own mystical interpretation of his kabbalistic visions raises important questions regarding his understanding of religious symbolism and the boundaries between psychological science and religious experience.

Keywords

Jung, Kabbalah, mysticism, dreams, visions, Zohar, anti-Semitism, National Socialism.

I myself was, so it seemed, in the Pardes Rimmonim, the garden of pomegranates, and the wedding of Tifereth with Malchuth was taking place. Or else I was Rabbi Simon ben Jochai, whose wedding in the afterlife was being celebrated. It was the mystic marriage as it appears in the Cabbalistic tradition. I cannot tell you how wonderful it was. I could only think continually, "Now this is the garden of pomegranates! Now this is the marriage of Malchuth with Tifereth!" I do not know exactly what part I played in it. At bottom it was I myself: I was the marriage. And my attitude was that of a blissful wedding.

(Jung, 1961, p. 293)

In this paper I explore Jung's 1944 kabbalistic visions, examining them from the standpoint of Jung's earlier provocative remarks about Jewish psychology and

Sanford L. Drob, Ph.D., holds doctorates in both philosophy and psychology and is a clinical and forensic psychologist in practice in New York City. He is a supervising psychologist at New York University-Bellevue Hospital Medical Center and a professor at Fielding Graduate University. His recent publications include "Towards a Kabbalistic Psychology: C. G. Jung and the Jewish Foundations of Alchemy" [JJTP, 5(2), 77-100]; Symbols of the Kabbalah: Philosophical and Psychological Perspectives, and Kabbalistic Metaphors: Jewish Mystical Themes in Ancient and Modern Thought (both Jason Aronson, 2000). He is currently completing books on Jung and the Kabbalah and on Jewish mysticism and postmodern thought.

National Socialism, Jung's attitude towards the Jewish sources of his own theories, and from the perspective of both Jungian and kabbalistic dream theory. An important goal of this study is to show that Jung's visions signaled a change in his attitudes and personality that is critical to a full understanding of his complex relationship to Judaism. We will see that Jung's visions not only had deep personal, psychological, and even mystical significance, but also portended an enormously creative period in Jung's career, during which his psychological theories became closely aligned with the Jewish mystical tradition. A second goal of this study is to explore significant points of contact between Jewish mysticism and analytic psychology. Finally, I will briefly indicate how Jung's own *mystical* interpretation of his kabbalistic visions raises important questions regarding his use of religious symbols and vocabulary, and the boundaries between psychological science and religious experience.

Before examining Jung's kabbalistic vision, it will be important to address certain questions regarding Jung's relationship to Judaism and "Jewish psychology."

Jung and Judaism

Jung's inflammatory remarks regarding Judaism, the Jewish people, and National Socialism have been well described and, at least since the "Lingering Shadows" Conference in New York in 1989, have been recognized, debated, and to a certain extent painfully borne by the Jungian community. The subject of Jung's presumed anti-Semitism and his initial positive or at least hopeful attitude towards National Socialism is an extremely complex one, which is nonetheless essential to our comprehension of his kabbalistic visions. The issues surrounding Jung's early attitudes towards Judaism can only be summarized here. The interested reader is referred to the edited volumes of Maidenbaum (1991, 2002), which explore these issues in depth.

- 1) Even prior to meeting Freud, Jung shared in and expressed the negative stereotypes about Jews that were prevalent in his day.¹
- 2) Freud accused Jung of leaving the fold of psychoanalysis because of certain racial prejudices (Freud, 1957, vol. 14, p. 43). Jung, for his part, developed an animosity towards Freud, which later generalized to what Jung termed "Jewish psychology" in general.²
- 3) Jung early on believed it was scientifically and ethically sound to inquire into and discuss differences in national and ethnic psychology, and he continued to distinguish between Jewish and Aryan psychology after the Nazis rose to power in Germany.
- 4) As early as 1918 Jung spoke about the distinctive histories of Jews and Aryans creating a difference in their respective psychologies. Jung's characterization of the Jew as overcivilized and the German as barbarous and brimming with both creative and destructive potential established a pattern of thought that was to persist for him throughout the 1930's (Jung, 1964/1918).
- 5) Jung's characterization of the German psyche was indeed premonitory of events that were to transpire in Germany.

- 6) In 1934 Jung published an article, "The State of Psychotherapy Today," which led to accusations of Jew-baiting and anti-Semitism. In it he wrote, "The Jews...being physically weaker...have to aim at the chinks in the armour of their adversary," that the Jew "has never yet created a cultural form of his own and as far as we can see never will, since all his instincts and talents require a more or less civilized nation to act as host for their development" (Jung, 1970/1934, p. 165).³ In *Mein Kampf* Hitler (1999) had written: "The Jewish people, despite all apparent intellectual qualities, is without a true culture, and especially without any culture of its own. For what sham culture the Jews today possess is the property of other peoples, and for the most part ruined in his hands" (chap. 12).
- 7) With the rise of Nazi Germany Jung saw an opportunity to make gains for his own analytical psychology at the expense of psychoanalysis and other "Jewish" psychologies that were condemned by the Nazi regime. Jung took the opportunity in 1934 to distinguish his psychology as being more suitable for the Aryan race (Jung, 1934, pp. 165ff).
- 8) Jung was ambivalent towards National Socialism but was initially hopeful that it would renew the creative spirit of the German people, with which he strongly identified. He continued to hold out such hope even after the Nazi's anti-Semitic agenda became clear.
- 9) While Jung was prescient in his understanding of the "barbaric" forces that were rising within pre-war Germany, his view of Hitler hovered between optimism, fascination, and fear. At times his fascination with Hitler's and the Nazis' archetypal power over the collective seemed to him to be overwhelming. For example, in a 1935 lecture at the Tavistock Clinic in London Jung (1976) stated: "When I am in Germany, I believe it myself, I understand it all, I know it has to be as it is. One cannot resist it. It gets you below the belt and not in your mind, your brain just counts for nothing, your sympathetic system is gripped. It is a power that fascinates people from within, it is the collective unconscious which is activated....We cannot be children about it, having intellectual and reasonable ideas and saying: this should not be" (p. 164).

It has been said in Jung's defense is that his "anti-Semitism" was typical of his times and in contrast to many "anti-Semites," Jung, during the '30s, sought to help many Jewish colleagues⁴ (possibly including Freud [Hannah, 1976; McCully, 1987]),⁵ treated a number of Jewish patients for free, and signed numerous attestations of financial support in order to arrange for their entry from Germany into Switzerland.⁶ In 1933 after Kretschmer resigned as president of the General Medical Society for Psychotherapy, Jung assumed the post on condition that (while Jews were banned from the German section of the organization) the society would be reorganized as an international organization that permitted Jewish psychotherapists to join as full members (Bair, 2003, pp. 448–9).⁷ Many of Jung's more provocative comments, especially those about Hitler and the rise of National Socialism, were purely descriptive and carried little, if any, hint of approbation.

Further, many of his remarks on Hitler and National Socialism, including those which suggested that the German people regarded Hitler as a prophet or Messiah (Jung, 1977, p. 120), were quite astute, if very unsettling. Finally, there can be little doubt that by 1938 Jung took a cynical and even foreboding view of Hitler and his regime (pp. 133–5).

After the war Jung wrote that he did not realize how deeply he had been affected by the Nazi era. However, he exhibited a clear tendency to reinvent rather than repent of his earlier views. For example, in contrast to his earlier description of the fascination that Hitler and National Socialism held over him, he now reflected in 1946 that “Hitler’s theatrical, obviously hysterical gestures struck all foreigners (with a few amazing exceptions) as purely ridiculous” (Jung, 1970a, pp. 194–217). Whereas in a 1938 BBC interview with Knickerbocker Jung (1977, p. 117) had stated that he was struck by Hitler’s “dreamy look,” in his 1946 article Jung says, “When I saw him [Hitler] with my own eyes, he suggested a psychic scarecrow (with a broomstick for an outstretched arm) rather than a human being.” Now, instead of appealing to the analogies with Jacob, Jesus, and Mohammed (p. 118), which in the ‘30s he had used as explanations of Hitler’s hold on the German people, Jung (1970b) pins the label “psychopathic inferiority” on the whole of the German nation, and says that this is “the only explanation which could in any way account for the effect this scarecrow had on the masses” (pp. 203–4).

Jung’s early relationship to Judaism, Jewish psychology, and National Socialism is obviously far more complex than can be described here. The reader should, however, be aware that an assumption of this study is that even when all mitigating contexts are fully considered, Jung’s words, as recorded in his published writings and private correspondence prior to World War II, were probably anti-Semitic even by the standards of his own time. As will become clear, part of my analysis of Jung’s visions is predicated on the assumption that Jung himself believed that he had something to atone for with respect to his attitudes towards Judaism and the Jewish people. At a very minimum I believe that during the rise of National Socialism Jung was seriously misguided in his optimism regarding the Nazi regime and heavily one-sided in his view of Judaism and “Jewish psychology,” and that these attitudes were, in Jung’s own terms, in need of compensation. One of the important questions that I will address in this paper is whether Jung’s visions in some ways heralded or even constituted such compensation.

“The Great Maggid...anticipated my entire psychology.”

Despite all the attention to Jung’s attitude towards Judaism, it is curious that Jung’s later positive comments about Jewish mysticism (as well as his Jewish mystical visions) are neglected in most discussions of Jung’s alleged anti-Semitism. By the 1950s Jung began to include numerous references to Jewish, and especially kabbalistic, ideas and sources in his works. For example, in *Psychology and Religion* Jung (*CW 10*) approvingly quotes a Talmudic view on the interpretation of dreams. In *Answer to Job*, Jung undertook a serious meditation and study of the God of the Old Testament, and made significant use of Jewish mystical categories to come to grips with the purpose of creation, the darkness inherent in a divinely created world, and the depths of the human soul (*CW 10*, pp. 355–70).⁸ Finally,

Jung's last great work, *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, completed in his 80th year in 1954, though ostensibly a treatise on alchemy, is filled with discussions of such kabbalistic symbols as *Adam Kadmon* (Primordial Man), the *Sefirot* (the archetypes of creation), and "the union of the Holy One and his *Shekhinah* (his feminine aspect or spiritual bride)" (Jung, 1963/1955–6). These *Jewish* symbols (which in some but not all instances were mediated for Jung through the Christian Kabbalah) became important pivots around which Jung constructed his final interpretations of such notions as the archetypes and the collective unconscious, and his theory of the ultimate psychological purpose of man. While the Jewish mysticism which became increasingly significant for Jung late in his life differed from both the normative Judaism and "Jewish" (i.e., Freudian) psychology that Jung had targeted in the 1930s, it was, I believe, the catalyst for a reappraisal of his own attitudes towards the Jewish tradition as a whole.

During the 1950s Jung began to take a sympathetic view of the distinctively Jewish origins of both psychoanalysis and his own, analytical psychology. In response to a letter from a Ms. Edith Schroeder, Jung commented sympathetically on the Jewish mystical origins of Freudian psychoanalysis, stating that in order to comprehend the origin of Freud's theories

one would have to take a deep plunge into the history of the Jewish mind. This would carry us beyond Jewish Orthodoxy into the subterranean workings of Hasidism...and then into the intricacies of the Kabbalah, which still remains unexplored psychologically. (Jung, 1973, vol. 2, pp. 358–9)

Jung ultimately concluded that not only Freud's but his *own* psychological theories were anticipated by the Jewish mystics. In an interview in 1955 on the occasion of his 80th birthday Jung (1977) made the offhand remark that "the Hasidic Rabbi Baer from Mesiritz, whom they called the Great Maggid...anticipated [my] entire psychology in the eighteenth century," calling the Maggid "a most impressive man" (pp. 268–72; pp. 271–2). The Maggid had held that the Godhead has a hidden life within the mind of man and that while the Godhead himself is the foundation and source of thought, actual thinking can only occur within the framework of the human mind (Uffenheimer, 1993, p. 207), a notion that clearly anticipates Jung's own psychologization of the objects of religious discourse.

Jung's post-war writings and statements obviously reflect a profound turn in Jung's (at least acknowledged) understanding and appreciation of at least some aspects of the Jewish faith, and, in particular Judaism's potential contribution to his own analytical psychology. What happened between 1934, when Jung was railing against a Jewish psychology, and the mid-1950s, when he was hailing Jewish mysticism as a forerunner and confirmation of his own thought? Two factors can be hypothesized to have played a role in Jung's transformation. The first is that while Jung had motives for ignoring the Jewish sources of his own psychology during the 1930s, after the war he felt free to acknowledge them, both to himself and others. The second is that Jung experienced a more profound psychological, spiritual, and potentially redemptive transformation in the mystical, specifically kabbalistic, visions he experienced after his near-fatal heart attack in 1944.

Did Jung Ignore the Jewish Mystical Bases of His Thought?

In a letter to the Reverend Erastus Evans written on February 17, 1954, Jung (1973) describes what he says was his *first* encounter with the kabbalistic symbols of *Shevirat ha-Kelim* (the Breaking of the Vessels) and *Tikkun ha-Olam* (the Restoration of the World), which express the idea that man must help God in completing creation:

In a tract of the Lurianic Kabbalah, the remarkable idea is developed that man is destined to become God's helper in the attempt to restore the vessels which were broken when God thought to create a world. Only a few weeks ago, I came across this impressive doctrine which gives meaning to man's status exalted by the incarnation. I am glad that I can quote at least one voice in favor of my rather involuntary manifesto. (vol. 2, p. 157)

Jung is here commenting on the similarity between the kabbalistic symbols of the broken vessels (shards) and *Tikkun* (their repair or restoration) and the views he himself expressed in *Answer to Job*. Jung's report that he first came across this kabbalistic notion in 1954 is difficult to understand, because, as Jung's editors point out, he alludes to these kabbalistic doctrines in chapter 2 of *Answer to Job*, which was first published in 1952, and there expresses a number of other quintessential Lurianic ideas (1969/1952, p. 48, p. 73 n. 7, p. 206). Amongst these ideas are that God must have man for a partner in completing creation (an idea, which as Jung [1975, p. 157] points out in his letter to Evans, has a strong antecedent in the Lurianic notion of *Tikkun*), that "Whoever knows God has an effect on him" (a parallel to the kabbalistic doctrine of theurgy), and that the worlds are born as a result of the divine marriage (*hieros gamos*) of God and his feminine counterpart (a prominent theme in the *Zohar* which was passed on to alchemy via the Kabbalah) (Jung, 1969/1952, pp. 64, 74).

While it is certainly possible that some of Jung's ideas came to him independently of any knowledge of kabbalistic sources, it is difficult to take Jung completely at his word that he found "confirmation" of his theodicy after first coming across the Lurianic concept of *Tikkun* in 1954, if only for the fact that he had reportedly read the "whole of *Kabbalah Denudata*" (a Latin compendium of kabbalistic writings) (Kirsch, 1991, p. 68), cited the works of Gershom Scholem,⁹ and, as we shall see, evidenced a sophisticated awareness of kabbalistic symbols in his 1944 visions. One possibility is that Jung's theodicy in *Answer to Job* is at least in part a result of "cryptomnesia," a reworking of old ideas that Jung experienced as his own because he had forgotten their source. However, it is also possible that a more malignant cause than cryptomnesia may well have been at work in Jung's own case, as during the 1930s Jung saw an opportunity to distinguish his "Christian/Western" psychology from the "Jewish" psychology of Freud:

In my opinion it has been a grave error in medical psychology up till now to apply Jewish categories—which are not even binding on all Jews—indiscriminately to Germanic and Slavic Christendom. Because of this the most precious secret of the

Germanic peoples—their creative and intuitive depth of soul—has been explained as a morass of banal infantilism, while my own warning voice has for decades been suspected of anti-Semitism. (Jung, 1970/1934, pp. 157–173)

In 1935, Erich Neumann, who had recently emigrated to Palestine, wrote Jung expressing his fear that his absorption in Jungian psychology would place him in “danger of betrayal to [his] own Jewish foundations.” One of the things that Jung said in response was that “analytical psychology has its roots in the Christian middle ages and ultimately in Greek philosophy, with the connecting link being alchemy” (Jung, 1973, vol. 1, p. 206). What Jung failed to mention is that the Kabbalah was an important spiritual foundation for alchemy (see Drob, 2003). It is only after World War II that Jung openly acknowledged this important connection. “Directly or indirectly,” Jung writes in the *Mysterium*, “the Cabala [Jung’s spelling] was assimilated into alchemy” (1963/1955–6, p. 24; cf. p. 384). Jung was aware that by the end of the 16th century the alchemists began making direct quotations from the *Zohar* (ibid.), that a number of alchemists, including Khunrath and Dorn, made extensive use of kabbalistic symbols, that works by Reuchlin (*De Arte Kabalistica*, 1517) and Mirandola had made the Kabbalah accessible to non-Jewish Alchemists (ibid., p. 410; Reuchlin, 1983), that Paracelsus had introduced the sapphire as an “arcanum” into alchemy from the Kabbalah, that two of the alchemists (Knorr and Khunrath) he most frequently quoted wrote treatises on the Kabbalah, and others (e.g., Dorn and Lully) were heavily influenced by kabbalistic ideas. Given Jung’s claim to have extracted the psychological and spiritual gold from the dross of alchemical pseudoscience, it is hard to imagine that he was not aware that in doing so he was, at least in part, reconstituting aspects of the Kabbalah.

Admittedly, it is difficult to ascertain exactly how well versed Jung was in Kabbalah prior to his 1954 letter to Evans. As we will see, his later report of his 1944 kabbalistic visions, if they can be taken at face value, suggests a quite sophisticated knowledge of kabbalistic texts. Werner Engel (Maidenbaum & Martin, 1991) relates that Siegmund Hurwitz, whom he describes as a “Jewish Jungian in Zurich deeply involved in Kabbalah studies” (pp. 261–72) confirmed to him that Jung, with occasional assistance from Hurwitz, had “undergone intensive studies to deepen his knowledge of Judaism, including Isaac Luria’s Kabbalistic writings” (p. 267). Hurwitz himself told Maidenbaum that subsequent to Jung’s 1934 *Zentralblatt* article, Jung changed his point of view. At that time, Jung “did not know much about Judaism but in the later years he was very much interested in Kabbalah and he bought books [on the topic]...I brought him together with [Gershom] Scholem and I helped him with Kabbalistic texts (Maidenbaum, 2002, pp. 193–217; p. 211).

I do not know for a fact that Jung ignored the Jewish mystical origins of some of his ideas. Space considerations prevent me from exploring the evidence on this issue in any greater detail. I should, however, point out that given Jung’s avowed efforts to distinguish his psychology from Freud’s “Jewish psychology,” and the opportunities such a distinction would have afforded him, he certainly had a powerful motive for denying or suppressing any of his own Jewish sources. As we will see, if Jung had consciously or unconsciously ignored or suppressed

the Jewish mystical sources of some of his ideas, his kabbalistic visions during his mortal illness in 1944 might be understood (in Jungian terms) as a powerful compensation for that suppression, as well as for his anti-Jewish writings and sentiments (Maidenbaum & Martin, 1991, p. 10).¹¹

Jung's Kabbalistic Vision

Jung (1961) described his visions, which he experienced after his heart attack in 1944, in his autobiographical *Memories, Dreams and Reflections*, where he writes that they were “the most tremendous things I have ever experienced.”¹² The visions, which occurred at a point when, according to Jung’s own report, he “hung on the edge of death” (p. 289), involve decidedly Jewish, kabbalistic themes. Jung describes these visions as having occurred in a state of wakeful ecstasy. He relates that it was “as though I were floating in space, as though I were safe in the womb of the universe” (p. 293). The visions involved the divine wedding between *Tifereth* and *Malchut*, which, in the Kabbalah, are the divine archetypes or *Sefirot*,¹³ which represent the masculine and feminine aspects of both God and the world. Jung describes his experience as one of indescribable “eternal bliss,” relating:

Everything around me seemed enchanted. At this hour of the night the nurse brought me some food she had warmed....For a time it seemed to me that she was an old Jewish woman, much older than she actually was, and that she was preparing ritual kosher dishes for me. When I looked at her, she seemed to have a blue halo around her head. I myself was, so it seemed, in the *Pardes Rimmonim*,¹⁴ the garden of pomegranates, and the wedding of *Tifereth* with *Malchuth* was taking place. Or else I was Rabbi Simon ben Jochai,¹⁵ whose wedding in the afterlife was being celebrated. It was the mystic marriage as it appears in the Cabbalistic tradition. I cannot tell you how wonderful it was. I could only think continually, “Now this is the garden of pomegranates! Now this is the marriage of *Malchuth* with *Tifereth*!” I do not know exactly what part I played in it. At bottom it was I myself: I was the marriage. And my beatitude was that of a blissful wedding. (p. 293)

The vision continues with what Jung describes as “the Marriage of the Lamb” in Jerusalem, complete with “angels and light.” “I myself,” he tells us, “was the marriage of the lamb.” The vision concludes with Jung in a classical amphitheater situated in a verdant chain of hills: “Men and woman dancers came on-stage, and upon a flower-decked couch All-father Zeus consummated the mystic marriage, as it is described in the *Iliad*” (p. 294).

Jung relates that as a result of these experiences he developed the impression that this life is but a “segment of existence,” and that time as it is ordinarily experienced is an illusion, since during the visions, past, present, and future fused into one. There can be little doubt that Jung took these impressions seriously, as according to him, “the visions and experiences were utterly real; there was nothing subjective about them” (p. 295).

It is certainly noteworthy that what Jung describes as the most tremendous and “individuating” experience of his life should involve kabbalistic themes and images. In this vision he finds himself in the “garden of pomegranates,” probably an allusion to a kabbalistic work of that name (*Pardes Rimmonim* in Hebrew) by Moses Cordovero (1522–70). Further, Jung identifies himself with the union of the *Sefirot Tifereth* and *Malchuth*, which in the Kabbalah are the masculine and feminine aspects of God, and whose union, according to the theosophical Kabbalah, restores harmony to both God and the world. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, in his kabbalistic vision, Jung identifies himself with Rabbi Simon ben Yochai, who, according to Jewish tradition, is the author of the classical kabbalistic text *Sefer ha-Zohar*.

Not only is the content of Jung’s visions kabbalistic, but the impressions that were imparted to him as a result of his visions echo both general mystical, and specifically kabbalistic, themes. Jung describes these visions as filling him “with the highest possible feeling of happiness,” and “a sense of “eternal bliss.” He reports that he came away from these visions with the conviction that he had somehow been granted a glimpse into a higher reality or world. By comparison, Jung tells us, our own world is grey, boxlike, overly material, and ridiculous.

In describing his vision Jung expresses the idea that this world is but “a segment of existence” (p. 295), an idea that calls to mind the kabbalistic doctrine that ours is but one of a myriad of levels or “worlds.” His impression that life in this world “is enacted in a three-dimensional boxlike universe especially set up for it” is reminiscent of the Lurianic doctrine that the spatio-temporal universe is a function of God’s contraction (*Tzimtzum*), a contraction that creates a metaphysical square within which space, time, and finite beings appear.¹⁶ Further, Jung describes experiencing a non-temporal state in which present, past, and future are one, and “everything that happens in time [is] brought together in a concrete whole.” Such atemporality is also characteristic of the kabbalistic conception of “higher worlds” and God.¹⁷

It is important to note, however, that the vision Jung describes does not *remain* kabbalistic. Indeed, Jung’s vision moves from the Garden of Pomegranates to the Jerusalem described in Revelations (the “marriage of the lamb,” the “angels of light”), and then to ancient Athens. Such a movement through Jewish, Christian, and Greek images is reflective of Jung’s intellectual odyssey, i.e., his movement away from what he later termed the “Jewish psychology” of Freud to a psychology rooted in Christian and Greek ideas. One way of understanding the transitions from the Kabbalah to Christianity and Hellenism in Jung’s visions is that these transitions represent Jung’s psychological need to establish both the basis of his thought and his personality in Christianity and Greece as opposed to Judaism. We should here again recall Jung’s 1935 letter to Neumann in which he claimed that “analytical psychology has its roots in the Christian middle ages and ultimately in Greek philosophy, with the connecting link being alchemy” (Jung, 1973, vol. 1, p. 206). However, Jung himself later acknowledged that many of the alchemists he studied regarded the Kabbalah to be the spiritual foundation of their work. I have argued that, in extracting the psychological “gold” that lay buried within the alchemist’s pseudo-chemical operations, Jung was in effect reconstituting aspects of the Kabbalah (Drob, 1999, 2003).

Jung's kabbalistic vision can be understood as reflecting Jung's (not fully conscious) recognition of the significance of the Kabbalah for his own work. Indeed, these visions coincide with what appears to have been a profound alteration in both Jung's personality and his attitude towards Judaism. Rosen (1996) describes Jung's 1944 heart attack and visions as a "'soul/spirit attack' based on the realization that he'd been wrong about the German psyche (and his own)" (p. 118). Jung himself recognized that his visions, which he experienced on a nightly basis for approximately three weeks, were instrumental in transforming and individuating his own psyche. He clearly believed that the visionary experiences of his 1944 illness enabled him to forge a more fully differentiated self, enabling him to affirm his own individual nature, thoughts, and destiny as well as the unified timeless world he had experienced. Jung (1961) says: "After the illness a fruitful period of work began for me. A good many of my principle works were written only then. The insight I had had, or the vision of the end of all things, gave me the courage to undertake new formulations" (p. 297). As a result of these visions Jung also experienced both a sense of immortality as well as personal individuation. Jung relates that his experience involved an "objective cognition," which transcended the normal interpersonal economy of desire. It was an experience in which all emotional ties, "relationships of desire, tainted by coercion and constraint" were transcended in favor of a real *coniunctio*, a relationship with oneself, others, and the world which is beyond, yet also *behind*, desire.

A Redemptive Vision?

A specifically redemptive theme appears in Jung's description of his kabbalistic vision. Jung tells us: "There is something else I quite distinctly remember. At the beginning, when I was having the vision of the garden of pomegranates, I asked the nurse to forgive me if she were harmed" (p. 295). While Jung opines that it was the "odor of sanctity in the room" (a Christian notion)¹⁸ that might have been harmful, it is important to note that it was this nurse who appeared in Jung's vision as an old Jewish woman and who prepared "ritual kosher dishes" for him. Further it was this "kosher" nurse who Jung describes as seeming "to have a blue halo around her head" (p. 294). It is not a great interpretive leap to propose that in his vision, Jung appears to be asking forgiveness of the Jews, from whom he has been spiritually fed, and with regard to whom he is concerned that he has caused significant harm. A possible confirmation for this can be inferred from something Jung (1969/1952) tells us in his *Answer to Job*, where Jung writes, "Yahweh must become man precisely because he has done man wrong" (p. 88). Following Jung's own reasoning we might be entitled to surmise that in his vision Jung *must become a Jew* for the same *redemptive* reason. By in effect becoming a Jew on his "deathbed" in 1944, by later promulgating an increasingly Jewish/mystical psychology, by developing many close ties with Jewish disciples towards the end of his life, and finally, by acknowledging that a Hasidic rebbe had anticipated his entire work, Jung can be said to have instantiated something akin to his own maxim: *Jung must become a Jew precisely because he had done Jews wrong.*

Jung's 1944 visions might be understood as a turning point, what in Hebrew is spoken of as *teshuvah* ("turning," i.e., transformation) with respect to Jung's earlier views regarding "Jewish psychology." However, just as, according to

Maidenbaum (2002), Jung may never have been fully conscious of what others saw as his anti-Semitism,¹⁹ he may never become fully conscious of (in the sense of being able to own and articulate) his *teshuvah*, his transformation with respect to Judaism, Jewish psychology, and the Jewish people. This was no small flaw, for as Jung (1970a) himself said in “After the Catastrophe,” “Anything that remains in the unconscious is incorrigible; psychological corrections can be made only in consciousness” (pp. 203–4). Indeed, even after experiencing his kabbalistic vision, Jung continued to express rather negative views about the Jews in his private correspondence. In a letter to a former patient, Mary Mellon (through whose efforts the Bollingen Foundation, publisher of Jung’s *Collected Works*, would be endowed) Jung in 1945 angrily defends himself against accusations of having been a Nazi, and in the process suggests that the Jews might well have been complicit in their own destruction. Jung writes that it is “difficult to mention the anti-Christianism of the Jews after the horrible things that have happened in Germany. But Jews are not so damned innocent after all—the role played by the intellectual Jews in pre-war Germany would be an interesting object of investigation” (Samuels, 1993, p. 269).

As has become painfully apparent since the question has been explored openly and in depth (Maidenbaum & Martin, 1992; Jaffe, 1989), Jung never fully acknowledged, nor publicly apologized for, his earlier, seemingly sympathetic view of Hitler and the Nazi regime, and his insensitive and inflammatory remarks on the Jewish people and Jewish psychology. However, in contrast to many who are transformed in word but not in deed, Jung seems to have, in a sense, been transformed in deed, but not fully in word, as he not only embraced Jewish mysticism in his later years but became something of a “rebbe” for a number of his Jewish disciples.

The *Zohar* on (Jung’s) Dreams and Visions

One of the more remarkable aspects of Jung’s account of his kabbalistic vision is that it reflects a view of spirituality and mysticism that is decidedly non-psychologistic and even non-scientific, especially in comparison to his earlier point of view. J. W. Heisig (1979) has argued that Jung’s views on God and the spiritual world traversed three distinct stages. In the first stage (roughly, 1900–1921) Jung understood religious experience to be a projection of the individual’s emotions; in the second stage (1921–45), such experience was understood as corresponding to the archetypes, and thus a projection of the deepest layers of the collective psyche; and in the third stage Jung appears to have suspended judgment regarding the objective nature of that which the archetypal patterns of the psyche represent. We should recall that regarding his 1944 visions Jung (1961) stated emphatically: “It was not a product of imagination. The visions and experiences were utterly real; there was nothing subjective about them; they all had a quality of absolute objectivity” (p. 295). Indeed, these mystical visions appear to mark the beginning of a stage in Jung’s thought in which he seriously entertained the possibility that “this life is [but] a segment of existence” and that the archetypes point not only to an inner transpersonal reality but an outer, “objective” one as well.

It is in this context that I undertake an examination of Jung’s kabbalistic vision from the point of view of the kabbalists’ own theories of dreams and

visions. Such an examination will inevitably raise a series of questions regarding Jung's claims regarding the "objectivity" of his visionary/mystical experiences, and similar claims that serve as the foundation for the Kabbalah and mysticism in general, which I will address briefly at the close of this essay.

According to the classical text of the Kabbalah, *Sefer ha-Zohar*,²⁰ in sleep and dreams the soul leaves the body, ascends into the upper worlds, leaving only a fraction of its energy to sustain the life of the dreamer.²¹ As the Talmud had affirmed, "Sleep is a foretaste of death" (Talmud, *Berakhot*, 57b).²² Because of its association with death and destructiveness, sleep, in the *Zohar*, is connected to both the *Shekhinah* (God's feminine "presence") and the *Sitra Achra* (the "Other Side"), the former because of its association with "stern judgment" (*din*),²³ the latter because the Other Side is the negative counter-world of evil and death. Sleep, the *Zohar* tells us, is ruled by the "Tree of Death" and when the individual awakens in the morning it is as if he or she were reborn (3:119a; Sperling, vol. 5, pp. 170–1). Further, upon awakening, the dreamer is, at least potentially, spiritually reborn and renewed (2:213b–214a; Sperling, vol. 6, pp. 225–6).²⁴ This occurs after the soul has ascended on high and testified regarding the dreamer's wakeful deeds (3:121b; Sperling, vol. 5, pp. 178–9).

While on the one hand sleep is a frightening sojourn into the realms of judgment, evil, destruction, and death, it is also an opportunity for the soul to journey from earth and return to its place of origin in the higher worlds (1:83a; 2:213b; Sperling, vol. 4, p. 225).²⁵ In these worlds the souls of the righteous learn the mysteries of the Torah, as they are clothed by the *Shekhinah* (God's feminine presence) and bathed in the light of the upper *Sefirot*. While the journey is a dangerous one, for in its ascent it must traverse realms dominated by destructive spirits, the highest soul (*nesh'amah*)²⁶ of one who is worthy is able to pass beyond the evil realm and ascend to the place where it enjoys not only the splendor of the *Sefirot* but a vision of the King (3:25a; Sperling, p. 377; Tishby, vol. 2, p. 811). While the souls of the wicked are entrapped by the dark forces of the Other Side during sleep, the souls of the righteous escape its clutches and ascend on high.

Dreams, for the *Zohar*, thus bring the soul experiences of both lower and higher worlds. As such, dreams potentially provide the dreamer with mystical and even prophetic insights (3:222b, *Raya Mehemna*; 1:183b; Sperling, vol. 2, p. 200; Tishby, vol. 2, p. 827)²⁷ that can, on awakening, be expressed in speech (1:200a; Sperling, vol. 2, pp. 259–60). Further, according to the *Zohar*, the dreamer is provided with clues regarding future events, so that he or she can take whatever corrective actions are necessary to ward off or assure their occurrence: "Happy are the righteous, for the Holy One, blessed be He, reveals to them His mysteries in dreams, so they can preserve themselves from judgment" (1:83a; Tishby, 1989, vol. 2, p. 818; Sperling, p. 277).

While theoretically dreams derive either from the higher worlds or from the evil realm of the Other Side, in practice all dreams contain a mixture of both good and evil, truth and falsehood (1:183a; Sperling, vol. 2, p. 199), and in interpreting dreams one must always be careful to separate the wheat from the straw (1:130a–130b; Sperling, p. 19).

The *Zohar* is in accord with the Talmudic dictums that a dream that is not remembered and interpreted is like a letter that is not read" (1:199b; Sperling, p.

258; Tishby, 1989, vol. 2, p. 822) and that dreams “follow the mouth” (Talmud, *Berakhot* 55b), i.e. that both the meaning and effects of a dream are dependent, not on the “dream itself” but upon the dream as it is interpreted.²⁸ According to the *Zohar*, language has power over dreams and for this reason “all dreams follow their interpretation” (1:183a; Sperling, vol. 2, p. 199).

According to the *Zohar*, a dream must be interpreted by disclosing its content to one’s friends, in order that the dream may move beyond desire and thought (*Keter* and *Chochmah*, the highest of the *Sefirot*) and enter into speech (*Malchuth*, the lowest *Sefirah*, which completes the *Sefirotic* system). “Desire,” the *Zohar* tells us, “which is Thought, is the beginning of all things, and Utterance is the completion” (1:200a; Sperling, vol. 2, p. 199).²⁹

The kabbalistic view of sleep, dreams, and visions is of interest, not only for the light it enables us to shed upon Jung’s visions, but also because the *Zohar*’s view is in many respects quite close to the perspective that Jung took upon these visions himself and, moreover, compatible with Jung’s overall perspective on dreaming.³⁰ Before returning once again to Jung’s visions, it will be worthwhile to summarize some of the key features of the *Zoharic* theory of dreams. These features, along with their “psychological equivalents” (which correspond to what Heisig refers to as Jung’s “second stage” understanding of religious experience—as a reflection of the deepest layers of the collective psyche)³¹ are enumerated in Table 1.

Each of the *Zohar*’s key ideas about dreams are clearly applicable to Jung’s own kabbalistic vision (most of them having been recognized and understood by Jung himself).

(1) With regard to the first of the *Zohar*’s premises—that dreams and visions are a kind of “death”—we find that Jung’s visions actually occurred when he was in a state of near-death, and that the images he experienced prompted him to conclude that he was indeed dying (Jung, 1961, p. 297). There is what, in psychological terms, might be called a profound “thanatic” aspect to dreams, and Jung’s vision illustrates this very clearly; his initial experience was a sense of “annihilation,” which soon yielded to an irresistible urge towards what seemed to be his “origin” (pp. 291, 292).

According to Solomon Alimoili (<1485->1542), whose book *Pitron Chalomot, The Interpretation of Dreams*, provides a Jewish, kabbalistic theory of dreaming, dreams occur during sleep and are associated with death because it is only at such times when the body is nullified that “the soul speaks out with full clarity.” He adds that for visions to occur outside of dreams, “prophetic inspiration could not take place unless the soul were on the verge of departing the body, as when one is on the point of death” (Covitz, 1990, pp. 24–5). At the time of Jung’s visions his own approach to death was so strong that he reported feeling “violent resistance” to his doctor for having restored him to life.

Jung’s proximity to death seems to have conditioned the very profundity of his vision, but like the *Zohar* Jung affirms that a sojourn into the realm of death is not without its dangers. Jung (1961) tells us that in following the path towards individuation (the very path of his own visions) “there is no guarantee—not for a single moment—that we will not fall into error or stumble into deadly peril. We may think there is a sure road. But that would be the road to death” (p. 297).

Table 1: Key Features of the Zoharic Theory of Dreams and Their Psychological Equivalents

<i>Features of the Zohar's Theory</i>	<i>Psychological (Archetypal) Equivalents</i>
1) Sleep, dreams, and visions are associated with death. The dreamer's soul leaves his body to sojourn amongst higher and lower worlds, leaving behind only a small modicum of vitality to sustain corporeal life. Further, dreams are in large measure a frightening sojourn into the realms of deceit, destructiveness, and death.	1) Dreams reflect vital existential concerns and reveal the individual's position and attitude towards his/her own death. As such, dreams enable one to access both creatively illuminating aspects of the psyche as well as aspects that are repressive, deceitful, and destructive.
2) The soul, in its ascent during sleep, must account for the dreamer's wakeful activities, and the dreamer himself is judged on high during sleep.	2) A dream provides a proposition or judgment by the unconscious self regarding some aspect of the dreamer's wakeful life.
3) A dream, however, also enables the righteous soul to sojourn amongst higher worlds, return to its origins, receive the radiance of the <i>Sefirot</i> (divine archetypes), attain mystical insight, and commune with the one on high.	3) A dream places one in touch with the fundamental collective ideals, tendencies, values of humanity. The dream, by providing one with a certain access to the archetypes of the collective unconscious, grants insights that go beyond one's personal psychology.
4) Dreams or visions can provide the dreamer with clues regarding future events in relation to which the dreamer may be advised to take action.	4) Dreams process data that may not be readily available or comprehensible to the conscious mind, but which is recorded subliminally in the individual's psyche. Dreams can therefore provide clues to future events that are relevant to the dreamer.
5) Sleep and dreams, by virtue of their partaking in a portion of both death and prophesy, provide the dreamer with an opportunity for spiritual rebirth.	5) Dreams have a great capacity to facilitate creativity and self-actualizing transformation in the dreamer.
6) All dreams contain a mixture of good and bad, truth and falsehood, and must be interpreted so as to separate out the "wheat from the straw."	6) Dreams do not always carry their interpretation on their face, are often disguised in symbols and, as Freud suggested, "intend" to deceive the waking dreamer.
7) It is the interpretation of the dream, as rendered in wakeful speech, that is significant, and not the purported (original) dream itself. Further, the greater significance of the dream is not to be found in its origins, but rather in the interpretation accepted by, and the effects the dream has upon, the dreamer.	7) Dreams must be interpreted if they are to be understood and to have a meaningful impact upon the dreamer. The importance of a dream is to be found in its impact upon the dreamer and his/her future action.
8) The interpretation of any dream is only complete when it has traversed "desire," "thought," and "speech," and, in effect, mirrors the entire <i>Sefirotic</i> system.	8) Each dream presents numerous aspects, and each dream is subject to a wide variety of interpretations from the perspective of the dreamer's desire, cognition, emotion, ethics, spiritual life, etc.

(2) The possibility for “error,” the chance that one may “stumble into deadly peril” brings us to the second Zoharic dictum regarding dreams, viz., that the dreamer is judged while he sleeps. Jung does not focus much on what Freudians would call the “superego” aspects of his vision, those said by the kabbalists to stem from the *Sefirah* of “Judgment” (*Din*). In this regard Jung relates that he remembers distinctly that he had asked the nurse (who had fed him kosher food) to “forgive [him] if she were harmed” (p. 295). While Jung does not dwell on the nature of this harm, I have interpreted it as an unconscious reference of the harm Jung felt he might have done to the Jewish people. This interpretation receives some confirmation two pages later when Jung uses the same ideas (“falling into error,” “stumbling into peril” [p. 297]) in describing the dangers associated with his path that he had used in describing his actions in relation to the Nazis before the war, i.e., when he told Leo Baeck that he “had lost his footing” and “slipped up” (Jaffe, 1989).

(3) We have already seen how Jung’s visions fulfill the third of the Zohar’s dicta about dreaming, viz., that dreams enable the dreamer to experience mystical insights and the radiance of the *Sefirot* and higher worlds. Jung’s vision can be understood as a modern version of the “chariot” or “throne” mysticism of the early Jewish visionaries, whose mystical meditations created a *merkaveh*, chariot, or vehicle of ascent to God’s celestial throne. His vision can also be understood psychologically as an experience of individuation, wholeness, and completion in the face of what he perceived as impending death.

Jung (1961) attests that he came away from his experiences with a renewed “affirmation of things as they are” (p. 297) a sense of absolute wholeness regarding his own past, present, and future (p. 296), a sense of the confluence between the “void” and the safety of the universe (p. 293), and a sense that earthly life is but a mere segment of a greater existence (p. 294).

(4,5) In accord with the Zohar’s fourth teaching, regarding the prophetic aspects of dreams, Jung interpreted his dream as actually having forecast the death of his own physician, whose own mortal illness began on the very day, April 4, 1944, that Jung’s had begun to subside. While Jung regarded his vision as a portent of his physician’s death, he also regarded it as a herald of his own rebirth, the fifth of the Zohar’s dicta on dreams. In commenting on the coincidence between his own cure and the doctor’s illness, Jung tells us that he was terrified by the thought that his doctor would die in his stead (p. 293). Indeed, Jung himself describes what is tantamount to a rebirth after emerging from his illness and visions; particularly in his remarks regarding how these visions prompted his own individuation (p. 296) and enabled him to author his later, alchemical and theological writings (p. 297).

(6) The Zohar’s sixth dictum, that all dreams contain a mixture of good and bad, truth and falsehood (and therefore must be interpreted so as to separate out the “wheat from the straw”) is illustrated (on the interpretation offered here) in those parts of Jung’s vision that remove Jung from the arena of Jewish mysticism and revert to the “Marriage of the Lamb” in Jerusalem, and to “All-father Zeus consummating the mystic marriage” (p. 294). Bearing in mind the Talmudic, kabbalistic, and *Jungian* notion that each dream has many possible interpretations (see below), as I have understood Jung’s vision the transformation into a Christian and

Greek context reflected Jung's earlier concern to *avoid* any Jewish pedigree for his own psychology, and thus constitutes the "straw" mixed in with the true wheat of his kabbalistic vision. It is in this connection we should again recall Jung's letter to Neumann in which Jung underlines the Greek, Christian, and alchemical origins of his psychology (Jung, 1973, vol. 1, p. 206).

(7) It is of note that Jung pays virtually no attention to the origins of his visions in the experiences and conflicts of his past, but in accord with what I have described as the *Zohar's* seventh dictum, Jung's attitude towards his vision is future-directed, and linked to the dream's message as opposed to its underlying cause. What counts for Jung are the insights this vision provided him regarding the unity of his personality and the world as a whole. There is no "Freudian" effort to trace the dream's significance back to its latent content or historical antecedents. Of course Jung's own interpretation is hardly the only one that could fit the material of his visions.

Alimoli refers to a passage in the Babylonian Talmud (Talmud, *Berakhot* 55b) where it is recorded that a certain sage once dreamed and consulted all twenty-four dream interpreters then residing in Jerusalem. Each gave the dream a different interpretation, and yet all were "fulfilled." Alimoli tells us the reason for this is that while God's communications in dreams cannot be interpreted arbitrarily, each skilled and knowledgeable interpreter brings his unique standpoint and interpretive power in focusing upon one of the many aspects of a dream. "In other words," he tells us, "dreams have a multifarious character and do not arrive to bring only a single communication or to deal with only one of the dreamer's concerns" (Covitz, 1990, p. 46). So, while Jung himself does not focus on the origins of his visions in past concerns and conflicts, we would, on Alimoli's view, be entitled to do so, and as such we have traced Jung's vision to his conflicts over Freud, "Jewish psychology," and the Jewish mystical influences on his own thought.

Jung's vision seems to have had an enormous impact upon him both spiritually and psychologically, but it cannot, from the point of view I have adopted here, be said to have fulfilled the eighth of the *Zohar's* dicta concerning dreams and visions, i.e., that the interpretation of any dream is only complete when it has traversed "desire," "thought" and "speech," and, in effect, mirrors the entire *Sefirotic* system. Jung himself never *articulated* the significance that I am here attributing to his vision, nor did he endeavor to articulate *any personal psychological significance* for it. Had he examined this vision from a personal psychological point of view, he might have been moved to make public amends for his views on Judaism and National Socialism prior to World War II. As such, to use a Lurianic metaphor, while Jung's "vessels" seem to have broken during his heart/soul attack of 1944, his *Tikkun* (restoration-redemption) may well have been incomplete, as he failed to put his transformation/emendation into active "speech."

"Nothing Subjective"

Before concluding, I would like to return for a moment to questions raised by Jung's "third stage" regarding the objectivity of numinous psychic contents. As we have seen, Heisig (1979) has argued that during this stage Jung suspended judgment regarding the external validity of the archetypes. Jung's descriptions of

his kabbalistic and other visions illustrate this stage quite clearly, for as we have seen, Jung claimed that there was “nothing subjective” about them. In several of his later works, and most pointedly, in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, Jung (1961) used language that hung tantalizingly on the border between psychological and theological description. While the archetypes were conceptualized by Jung as psychological entities, at the same time it has been clear to many of his readers that they carry some, if not all, of the “numinosity” associated with mythical and mystical symbols. We might even then say that a certain ambiguity between the psychological and the theological is, for many, a good part of Jung’s appeal, as it seemingly permits the modern, educated man or woman to speak of religious, mystical, and mythological symbols in a “scientific” or “naturalistic” manner while at the same time retaining the wonder, mystery, and numinosity that prior generations had believed to be inherent in such symbolism. The inevitable question arises as to whether such talk involves Jung and his followers in acts of self-deception or is, rather, a path to a profound understanding of aspects of the human psyche that naturally lie on the border between the subjective/psychological and the objective/spiritual. On the latter view, Jung should be applauded for his intuitive recognition that only an ambiguous and paradoxical language can express certain matters regarding the psyche that cannot be expressed in either/or, linear form. While Jung (1963/1955–6) at one point said: “If I make use of certain expressions that are reminiscent of the language of theology, this is due solely to the poverty of language, and not because I am of the opinion that the subject-matter of theology is the same as that of psychology” (p. vii), his may not be the last (or even his last) word on this matter. As I have pointed out in some detail elsewhere (Drob, 2000a, pp. 289–343), the kabbalists and Hasidim (as do mystics of many traditions) refuse to make sharp distinctions between the outer and inner, the macrocosm and microcosm, the transcendent and the immanent, and the theological and the psychological, holding that such distinctions sever a primal unity and plunge one hopelessly into a (practically necessary, but) illusory world of dichotomous thinking and experience. Jung seems to have taken a similar approach in portions of *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. While this is an important matter its detailed exploration lies beyond the scope of this essay.

Jung’s *Teshuvah*?³²

While it is clear that Jung regretted even the appearance of having flirted with National Socialism (Jaffe, 1989; McLynn, 1996), many believe he never provided a full and satisfactory accounting of his earlier views on Jewish psychology and the Nazi state. However, in a by now famous letter to Aniela Jaffe (1989), Gershom Scholem relates that after the war Jung was confronted by the Jewish scholar Leo Baeck on these matters, and the two ultimately made peace after Jung’s confession that he had “slipped up” (pp. 97–98; Adams & Sherry, pp. 395–6). This, Scholem relates, was sufficient for both Baeck and Scholem to, in effect, forgive Jung and continue their relationship. That prominent Jews, even those who were not his disciples (i.e., Baeck and Scholem) were satisfied with his account that he had “slipped up” or “lost his footing” during the Nazi period, and that Gershom Scholem, the founder of modern Kabbalah studies, continued to

have a fruitful dialogue with Jung and his associates at Ascona, should certainly prompt those of us interested in the psychological aspects of Jewish mysticism to consider doing the same. Jung's actions and statements during the 1930s were deeply troubling—Rosen (1996), following Jacoby, has commented that he “seemed gripped by a power complex and caught in a trancelike state by his shadow” (p. 105). But can we say that Jung's actions place a shadow over his work and make it “irredeemable,” even from a traditional Jewish point of view?

I think it is a serious error to assume that the Jung of the 1950s possessed the same attitudes and character traits that he exhibited during the 1930s. To make such an assumption undermines the very possibility of the spiritual transformation and psychological change that are foundational assumptions for mysticism and psychotherapy respectively. Jung's transformation was evident not only to himself but to those who knew him, and was particularly pronounced with respect to his attitudes towards Judaism and Jewish thought. Small wonder that this should be so, given the fact that Jung appears to have transformed himself by envisioning himself as Simon Ben Yochai, the patriarch of the Jewish mystical tradition.

Notes

- 1) In 1897, while he was in medical school at Basel University, Jung delivered a lecture to a Swiss student fraternity in 1897. Making reference to Johann Zollner's scientific defense of spiritualism, he stated: “But his was ‘a voice crying in the wilderness.’ Mortally wounded in his struggle against the Judaization of science and society, this high-minded man died in 1892, broken in body and spirit.” This remark reflected the then-current prejudice that Jews were materialists who would rob both science and culture of their spiritual foundations.
- 2) Jung (1964) discusses “Jewish psychology” as early as 1914 in “The Role of the Unconscious” (*CW 10*, pp. 3–28). In 1928 he returns to the subject in “The Relations between the Ego and the Unconscious” (*CW 7*, pp. 121–241, 152n). However, the key paper in this regard is C.G. Jung (1970/1934), “The State of Psychotherapy Today” (*CW 10*, pp. 157–173).
- 3) Privately, Jung wrote to W. M. Kranefeldt on February 9, 1934, that “the Arian (*sic*) people can point out that with Freud and Adler specifically Jewish points of view were publicly preached, and, as can be proven likewise, points of view that have an essentially corrosive (*zersetzend*) character” (portion of a letter originally published by I. A. Stargard Auction House, Marburg, Germany, Catalog No. 608. Reprinted in *International Review of Psycho-Analysis*, 1977, vol. 4, p. 377; Adams & Sherry, 1991, pp. 349–396).
- 4) On December 19, 1938, Jung wrote to Erich Neumann, “I have a lot to do with Jewish refugees and am permanently occupied with finding a place for all my Jewish acquaintances in England and America” (Neumann, 1991, p. 283).
- 5) On the other hand, Deirdre Bair (2003) writes that although Jung was quietly raising money to help Jews leave Germany, “to date, no documentary evidence has been found to verify that this [i.e., the story related by Hannah and McCully of the effort to assist Freud] actually happened, and if it did, no evidence connects Jung with it” (p. 458n, 798).
- 6) Deirdre Bair (2003) has documented that Jung was indeed at this time making significant efforts on the part of individual Jews, treating many Jewish patients without charge, and assigning numerous attestations of financial support in order to arrange for their entry from Germany into Switzerland (pp. 459–60).
- 7) Bair obtained access to correspondence from Jung to Vladimir Rosenbaum, as well as Rosenbaum's recorded memoirs of his encounters with Jung. Rosenbaum was an attorney and the husband of one of Jung's patients. Jung had known Rosenbaum, and had taken a liking to him, through their mutual attendance at the Eranos conferences during the 1930s.

Jung consulted Rosenbaum in 1934 and asked him to revise Goring's proposed membership statutes for the General Medical Society of which Jung had recently assumed the presidency. Jung implored Rosenbaum to rewrite the proposal in such a way that it would contain ambiguous language and subtle loopholes that would permit Jewish psychotherapists to remain individual members of a newly organized international society, and thereby maintain their professional standing. Rosenbaum was skeptical of the whole undertaking, but to his surprise Jung was able to get the "Nazi gathering to swallow statutes prepared by a Jew." Jung was clearly grateful to Rosenbaum, but in 1937 when Rosenbaum was jailed and then released by Swiss authorities for illegally channeling money to the resistance in Franco's Spain, Jung bowed to pressure from other members of the Psychology Club who wanted Rosenbaum to resign and never attend another meeting. Divorced, disbarred, and penniless, Rosenbaum relates that in this moment of need Jung callously told him, "Even a mortally injured animal knows when to go off alone and die." (Account provided to Bair by Christa Robinson, personal friend of Rosenbaum, keeper of his archive, and president of the Eranos Foundation).

8) Jung (1960) makes specific reference to the "shards," which in the Kabbalah are the remnants of the divine *Sefirot* subsequent to the "Breaking of the Vessels" (pp. 48, 73). In various other places in this work Jung makes use of theological notions that echo fundamental kabbalistic ideas. Amongst these are the idea of God as a "totality of inner opposites" or *coincidentia oppositorum* (pp. 33, 116, 134), that such opposites facilitate or express the union of opposites (p. 198), that humanity was initially created through a Primal Anthropos (p. 36), that there is a necessity for God Himself to be completed through humankind (pp. 34, 124), that the paradoxical nature of the divine tears humankind asunder (p. 174), that God desires to regenerate himself in the mystery of the heavenly nuptials" (p. 74), that humanity has a theurgic impact on God (p. 64), and that God limits himself, forgets himself, or becomes unaware of himself in the creation of the world and humankind (p. 69, pp. 84–5). It is not possible to determine which, if any, of these notions (other than the "shards" which Jung attributes directly to "the later cabalistic philosophy" [p. 206, n. 7]) were borrowed or derived from kabbalistic sources.

9) In *Mysterium Coniunctionis* (1963/1955–6), a work which Jung began in 1941 and completed in 1954, there are at least nine separate references to the works of Gershom Scholem.

10) Interestingly, nearly fifty years earlier in a 1905 essay entitled "Cryptomnesia," Jung himself had argued that much creative work is produced in precisely this manner and in his own doctoral dissertation had gone as far as to demonstrate that Nietzsche had unconsciously plagiarized sections of his Zarathustra from an essay he had read in his youth by Justinus Kerner (Noll, 1997, p. 51).

11) This idea is suggested by Steven Martin in his introduction.

12) Jung's description is, of course, retrospective, and may not accurately reflect either the nature of his visions/dreams or his state of knowledge about the Kabbalah in 1944.

13) The *Sefirot* are value archetypes, as well as divine visages or personae that will be considered in greater detail later in this volume. I have discussed the *Sefirot* in philosophical and psychological terms (Drob, 1997, 2000b).

14) *Pardes Rimmonim*, the Garden of Pomegranates, is a 16th-century kabbalistic work by R. Moses Cordovero (1522–70).

15) Simon ben Jochai (or Shimon bar Yohai), a 2nd-century rabbi who is traditionally held to be the author of the Zohar, the most important and holiest of kabbalistic works.

16) As I have described in chapter three of my *Symbols of the Kabbalah* (2000b), the kabbalists held that the earliest reference to the *tzimtzum* is in an early midrash where it is said that when God descended to inhabit the holy *mishkan* or tabernacle, he "restricted his *shekhinah* [the divine 'presence'] to the square of an ell" (Midrash, *Shemoth Rabbah* 34:1). The description of this world as a square is also evident in Israel Sarug's conception of the *tzimtzum* as a square folding of the divine garment that provides a place for the emanation of the *Sefirot*.

17) The kabbalist Moses Cordovero, for example, spoke of the deity as progressing through “non-temporal time” (Scholem, 1974, p. 103). Further, we read in Chayyim Vital’s *Sefer Etz Chayyim* that “in Him there was no time or beginning to start, for He always existed and is everlasting and in Him there is no beginning [*rosh*] or end at all” (1:1; p. 21; Menzi & Padeh, 1999, p. 6).

18) The sweet smell or odor of sanctity would suggest both Jung’s impending death and his increasing spirituality.

19) Maidenbaum (2002) holds that “any anti-Semitism that can be attributed to Jung (and in his early career there clearly exists enough of his writings to make such a case) should be attributed to cultural, unconscious prejudice and not what one would define as consciously anti-Semitic” (p. 217).

20) In what follows I will be making reference to the traditional Zohar pagination as well as to two English translations of the Zohar: H. Sperling, M. Simon, and P. Levartoff (1931–34), which will be referred to as “Sperling,” and I. Tishby and F. Lachower (1989), which will be referred to as “Tishby.” The Tishby volumes are an anthology of Zohar texts organized by themes. My discussion here follows closely upon that of the Zoharic text and commentary in Tishby (vol. 2, pp. 810–830).

21) The Zohar does not always make a sharp distinction between dreams and visions. In what follows I examine Jung’s experiences within the context of the Zohar’s discussion of dreams.

22) See Zohar I, 206b, where we learn that King David never slept consecutively for more than 59 breaths in order to avoid being entrapped by the “taste of death” and an “evil power” (Sperling, vol. 2, p. 283).

23) In the Kabbalah, God’s feminine aspect is frequently associated with the “left side” of the Sefirotic tree and thus with stern judgment.

24) “The souls of the righteous, in ascending in the night into their own celestial spheres, are woven into a crown as it were, with which the Holy One, blessed be He, adorns himself.... There all the souls are absorbed in the Supreme Point; as a woman conceives a child, so does the Supreme Point conceive them,...The souls then re-emerge, that is to say, they are born anew, each soul being fresh and new as at its former birth” (2:213b–214a; Sperling, pp. 225–6).

25) “at night all things return to their original root and source” (2:213b; Sperling, vol. 4, p. 225; Tishby, vol. 2, pp. 810–11, 828).

26) The kabbalists held that each individual possessed four souls, of which the *neshamah* is the highest and closest to God.

27) The *Raya Mehemna* is an “addition” to the basic Zohar text that is included in all traditional editions of the Zohar but which is not translated by Sperling and Simon; “For nothing happens in the world but what is made known in advance by means of a dream or by means of a proclamation...”

28) Zohar I, 183b: “since the dream contains both falsehood and truth, the word has power over it, and therefore it is advisable that every dream should be interpreted in a good sense” (Sperling, vol. 2, p. 199).

29) However, “since the dream contains both falsehood and truth, the word has power over it, and therefore it is advisable that every dream should be interpreted in a good sense” (Sperling, vol. 2; Tishby, vol. 2, p. 823). The notion that a proper interpretation of a dream must traverse and parallel the development of the entire kabbalistic system is a critical element in the development of a kabbalistic theory of dream interpretation.

30) Space prevents me from reviewing these correspondences in detail in this essay.

31) In *Symbols of Transformation* Jung (1967) writes: “For modern man it is hardly conceivable that a God existing outside ourselves should cause us to dream, or that the dream foretells the future prophetically. But if we translate this language into the language of psychology, the ancient idea becomes much more comprehensible. The dream, we would say, originates in an unknown part of the psyche and prepares the dreamer for the events of the

following day” (p. 7). By time he wrote *Answer To Job*, Jung (1969/1952) stated, “We cannot tell whether God and the unconscious are two different entities” (p. 199).

32) The Hebrew word *Teshuvah*, literally “turning,” refers to a personal atoning, transformation, and redemption.

References

- Adams, M. V., & Sherry, J. M. (1991). Significant words and events. In A. Maidenbaum and S. A. Martin (Eds.), *Lingering shadows: Jungians, Freudians, and anti-semitism* (pp. 349–396). Boston: Shambhala.
- Bair, D. (2003). *Jung: A biography*. Boston: Little Brown and Company.
- Covitz, J. (1990). *Visions of the night: A study of Jewish dream interpretation*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Drob, S. (1997). The Sefirot: Kabbalistic archetypes of mind and creation. *Crosscurrents*, 47, pp. 5–29.
- _____. (1999). Jung and the Kabbalah. *History of Psychology*, 2(2), 102–118.
- _____. (2000a). *Kabbalistic metaphors: Jewish mystical themes in ancient and modern thought*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.
- _____. (2000b). *Symbols of the Kabbalah: Philosophical and psychological perspectives*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.
- _____. (2003). Towards a kabbalistic psychology: C. G. Jung and the Jewish foundation of alchemy. *Journal of Jungian Theory and Practice*, 5(2), 77–100.
- Engel, W. H. (1991). Thoughts and memories of C. G. Jung. In A. Maidenbaum and S. A. Martin (Eds.), *Lingering shadows: Jungians, Freudians, and anti-semitism* (pp. 261–72). Boston: Shambhala.
- Freud, S. (1957). The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (J. Strachey, Ed., Trans.). London: Hogarth.
- Hannah, B. (1976). *Jung, his life and work: A biographical memoir*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Heisig, J. W. (1979). *Imago Dei: Jung's psychology of religion*. Lewisburg, Pennsylvania: Bucknell University Press.
- Hitler, A. (1999). *Mein Kampf* (R. Mannheim, Trans.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Jaffe, A. (1989). C. G. Jung's national socialism. In R.F.C. Hull and M. Stein (Trans.), *From the life and work of C. G. Jung*. Einsiedeln, Switzerland: Daimon Verlag.
- Jung, C. G. (1953). Two essays on analytical psychology. *CW 7*.
- _____. (1960). *Answer to Job* (R.F.C. Hull, Trans.). Cleveland: Meridian Books.
- _____. (1961). *Memories, dreams, reflections* (A. Jaffe, Ed.). New York: Random House.
- _____. (1963/1955–6). *Mysterium coniunctionis. CW 14*.
- _____. (1964/1918). The role of the unconscious. *CW 10*.
- _____. (1967). *Symbols of Transformation. CW 5*.
- _____. (1969/1952) *Answer to Job. CW 11*.
- _____. (1970a). After the catastrophe. *CW 10*.
- _____. (1970b). Psychology and religion. *CW 10*.
- _____. (1970/1905) *Cryptomnesia. CW 1*.
- _____. (1970/1934). The state of psychotherapy today. *CW 10*.
- _____. (1973). *Letters* (Gerhard Adler, Aniela Jaffe, and R.F.C. Hull, Eds.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1976). The Tavistock lectures. *CW 18*.
- _____. (1977). *C. G. Jung speaking* (W. McGuire & R.F.C. Hull, Eds.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kirsch, J. (1991). Carl Gustav Jung and the Jews: The real story. In A. Maidenbaum and S. A. Martin (Eds.), *Lingering shadows: Jungians, Freudians, and anti-semitism* (pp. 52–87). Boston: Shambhala.

- Maidenbaum, A. (Ed.). (2002a). *Jung and the shadow of anti-semitism*. Berwick, ME: Nicolas-Hays.
- _____. (2002b). The shadows still linger. In A. Maidenbaum (Ed.), *Jung and the shadow of anti-semitism* (pp. 193–217). Berwick, ME: Nicolas-Hays.
- Maidenbaum, A. & Martin S. (Eds.). (1991). *Lingering shadows: Jungians, Freudians, and anti-semitism*. Boston: Shambhala.
- McCully, R. S. (1987). Quadrant 20, no. 2. In A. Maidenbaum and S. A. Martin (Eds.), (1991), *Lingering Shadows: Jungians, Freudians, and anti-semitism*. Boston: Shambhala.
- McLynn, F. (1996). *Carl Gustav Jung*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Menzi, D. W., & Padeh, Z. (Trans.). (1999). *The tree of life: Chayim Vital's introduction to the Kabbalah of Isaac Luria*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.
- Neumann, M. (1991). On the relationship between Erich Neumann and C. G. Jung and the question of anti-semitism. In A. Maidenbaum and S. A. Martin (Eds.), *Lingering shadows: Jungians, Freudians, and anti-semitism* (pp. 52–87). Boston: Shambhala.
- Noll, R. (1997). *The Aryan Christ: The secret life of Carl Jung*. New York: Random House.
- Reuchlin, J. (1993/1577). *On the art of the Kabbalah (De arte Cabalistica)* (M. & S. Goodman, Trans.). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Rosen, D. (1996). *The Tao of Jung: The way of integrity*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Samuels, A. (1993). New material concerning Jung, anti-semitism, and the Nazis. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 38, 463–470.
- Scholem, G. (1974). *Kabbalah*. Jerusalem: Keter.
- Sperling H., & Simon, M. (1931–34). *The Zohar*. London: Soncino Press.
- Tishby, I., & Lachower, F. (1989). *The wisdom of the Zohar: An anthology of texts, I, II, & III. Arranged and rendered into Hebrew* (D. Goldstein, Trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Uffenheimer, R. S. (1993). *Hasidism as mysticism: Quietistic elements in eighteenth century Hasidic thought*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University.