TILLICH AND JUNG: A NEW MYTHOLOGY OF "SALVATION"?

WALLACE B. CLIFT

Tillich is said to have remarked in one of his last seminars that if he had more time, he would turn to a study of Jung. Jung repeatedly deplored the fact that he had never been able to work closely with a theologian, one who would not be shocked at his ideas, but with whom there could be an intellectual exchange. In *Answer to Job,* one of his later books, he wrote: "Today we have an empirical psychology, which continues to exist despite the fact that the theologians have done their best to ignore it."[1] So far as I am aware, a direct dialogue between Jung and Tillich unfortuately never occurred. It would have been fruitful for both psychology and theology. The confrontation of their two systems will have to be accomplished by their students. In this article, I propose a preliminary sketch of some of the interesting possibilities in a comparison of their systems.

The question in the title suggests a direction for the comparison. Both men regarded myth and symbol as the language of meaning for man. Tillich wrote, "Man's ultimate concern must be expressed symbolically, because symbolic language alone is able to express the ultimate."[2] Jung wrote about "two kinds of thinking"—rational thinking and the developmentally earlier kind of thinking in primordial images or symbols which were older than the historical man. Jung concluded that this symbolic thinking was a given for man, "inborn in him from the earliest times, and, eternally living, outlasting all generations, [and which] still make up the groundwork of the human psyche."[3] Only in the symbolic language of myth, Jung saw, had man been able to appropriate meaning, both personally and communally. Jung said that the man who thought he could live without myth, or outside it, was an exception. He was like one uprooted, "having no true link either with the past, or with the ancestral life which continues within him, or yet

---

WALLACE B. CLIFT is Assistant Professor of Religion, The University of Denver.

[1]C. G. Jung, "Answer to Job," in *Psychology and Religion: West and East,* in *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung,* trans. R.F.C. Hull, Vol. XI. (Bollingen Series, Vol. XX; New York: Pantheon Books, 1958), p. 408. (Hereinafter referred to as *C.W.*, Vol. XI.)

[2]Paul Tillich, *Dynamics of Faith* (Harper & Row, Publishers, 1958), p. 41.

[3]C. G. Jung, "The Stages of Life," in *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche,* in *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung,* trans. R.F.C. Hull, Vol. VIII (2nd. ed., Bollingen Series, Vol. XX; New York: Pantheon Books, 1960) p. 402. See also, Jung's "Two Kinds of Thinking" in *Symbols of Transformation* in *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung,* trans. R. F. C. Hull, Vol. V (2nd ed., Bollingen Series XX; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), pp. 7-33. (Hereinafter referred to as *C.W.*, Vol. V.)

with the contemporary human society."[4] Tillich wrote, "A new myth is the expression of the reuniting power of a new revelation."[5]

Both Tillich and Jung, from the standpoint of their different disciplines, had a deep concern for modern man and his problem of meaninglessness. For Tillich, the anxiety of meaninglessness was "aroused by the loss of a spiritual center, of an answer, however symbolic and indirect, to the question of the meaning of existence."[6] The title of one of Jung's early collections of essays was *Modern Man in Search of a Soul.* For Jung, "modern man" was the man who, having left traditional society, had to find for himself some meaning and purpose in life. As Jung expressed it, to recover from the problem of meaninglessness, modern man had to find "a religious outlook on life."[7] Both men, in a sense, offer us meaning in life through a new mythology, a story of how healing (reconciliation) is accomplished. Tllich offers the image of the "New Being," a "new reality" which can, through a kind of "openness" in the midst of our "estrangement," result in our being "grasped." Thus a reunion or communion is effected. Jung offers us an image of "individuation," or a vision of a goal, to lead us on our difficult journey from a situation of strife—a strife necessitated, in Jung's view, by the fact that individual consciousness itself means separation and opposition. Man longs for wholeness, and so lays hold of the images of wholeness offered by the unconscious, which, Jung said, "independently of the conscious mind, rise up from the depths of our psychic nature."[8]

The two images, the New Being and individuation, suggest their understandings of how modern man's problem can be solved, or, in older theological language, salvation. "Salvation" implies at least two questions: from what? and to what? From these, a third question arises: how? or, by what process? or, as the jailer asked Paul and Silas, "Men, what must I do to be saved?" (Acts 16:30) These three questions provide a way of organizing the discussion.

A. Saved from what? — the Fall and Modern Man's Neurosis.

For Tillich, salvation is from estrangement and all that means in his system. It is a kind of healing and it is a kind of reunion. Healing is the reuniting of "that which is estranged, giving a center to what is

---

[4]C. G. Jung, "Foreword to the Fourth Swiss Edition," *Symbols of Transformation, C.W.*, Vol. V.. p. xxiv.

[5]Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), pp. 91-92. (Hereinafter referred to as *S.T.*, Vol. 1.)

[6]Paul Tillich, *The Courage to Be* (New Haven: Yale Universitv Press. 1952), p. 47.

[7]C. G. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, trans. W. S. Dell and C. F. Baynes (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1933), p. 229.

[8]C. G. Jung, "Answer to Job," *C.W.*, Vol. XI, p. 469.

split, overcoming the split between God and man, man and his world, man and himself."[9] For Jung, salvation is from a state of dead-end meaninglessness. And, as with Tillich, it is an experience of healing and reunion. Jung has said that as a doctor and as a fellow human being, he could not stand behind his medical persona. He felt compelled to attempt to accompany his patients on their journeys of spiritual suffering. Jung concluded that in many cases (especially for those in the "second half of life") a patient's psycho-neurosis had to be understood as "the suffering of a human being who has not discovered what life means for him."[10] Jung said that he undertook the helping task as a doctor because, for so many of the people who came to him, there was no one else. They "flatly refused" to consult a clergyman, and still less the philosopher whose ideas seem to them "more barren than the desert." Jung himself was a "modern man in search of a soul," which probably gave him his sympathy for these patients.

In Jung's view of its structure, the psyche contains consciousness and unconsciousness, the latter consisting of both a "personal unconscious" and a participation in a "collective unconscious."[11] In his understanding of development there is a movement from a global to a differentiated to an integrated state. The development of consciousness is a slow differentiation of unconscious contents, resulting in a tension between the opposites. One is reminded of Tillich's concept of polarity between dynamics and form. As Jung sees it, man's predicament is a continuous struggle; consciousness floats like an island on a vast sea of unconsciousness and is subject to being "overwhelmed" by unconscious contents, as by a tidal wave.[12] Tillich has rightly used the word "strife" to characterize Jung's view.[13]

Tillich's article, "The Theological Significance of Existentialism and Psychoanalysis," describes man's situation before "salvation." In it Tillich suggests that the common root of existentialism and psychology described man's existential predicament—in time and space, in finitude and estrangement. Tillich says that there are three considerations of human nature taken from Christian tradition that are present in all genuine theological thinking: essential goodness, existential estrangement, and the possibility of something, a "third," beyond

[9]Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 166. (Hereinafter referred to as *S.T.*, Vol. 11.)

[10]C. G. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, p. 225.

[11]There are other features, of course, to the structure of the psyche in Jung's view, but these are the ones relevant to this discussion. No attempt is being made in this paper to give complete descriptions with respect to either "system."

[12]C. G. Jung, "The Meaning of Psychology for Modern Man," in *Civilization in Transition*, in *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, Vol. X (Bollingen Series XX; New York: Pantheon Books, 1964), p. 138.

[13]Paul Tillich, *S.T.*, Vol. 1, p. 179.

essence and existence, through which the cleavage is overcome and healed. And, in regard to this, Tillich says that in philosophical terms, one can say this means that "man's essential and existential nature points to his teleological nature (derived from *telos*, aim, that for which and towards which his life drives)."[14]

It is precisely here that Jung's view is to be sharply distinguised from Freud's. One of the distinctive features of Jung's view of man is that it combines teleology with causality. Man's behavior *is* conditioned by his history (causality), as Freud emphasized, but Jung would insist that it is also conditioned by his aims and aspirations (teleology). For Jung, a neurosis has a future orientation as well as past. I would say that Jung and Tillich both share this teleological view of man, in contrast to Freud.

In Tillich's view Freud did not see this tripartite view of human nature; Freud saw *only* the existence side (estrangement), yet Tillich says he knew something about the third aspect of healed man. The trouble is, Tillich says, Freud's "pessimism about the nature of man and his optimism about the possibilities of healing were never reconciled in him or in his followers."[15] But, Tillich continues, Freud's followers, including Jung, rejected his insight about existential libido and the death instinct and moved more to an essentialist and optimistic view of man. While Jung knows much about the religious symbols and the depths of the human soul, Tillich concludes, Jung still "thinks that there are *essential structures* in the human soul and that it is possible (and one may be successful) to search for personality."[16] (emphasis added)

The question I would ask Tillich is: What is the difference between Jung's "essential structures" (as Tillich calls them) and his own concept of "being grasped by a new reality" as overcoming estrangement? In saying Jung finds these "essential structures *in the human soul,*" I believe Tillich fails to do justice to the distinction between Jung's "collective unconscious" and all other depth psychologists' understanding of the unconscious. I do not think Jung (if the question were posed in this way) would ever say man could "take credit" for producing them. Tillich speaks of Jung as "optimistic"; yet I wonder if Jung's attempt to describe the appearance of a "uniting symbol" in man is any more optimistic than Tillich's possibility of "being grasped" by the power of the New Being. Tillich points to the source

[14]Paul Tillich, *Theology of Culture*, p. 119.
[15]*Ibid.*, p. 120.
[16]*Ibid.*, p. 122.

and historical expression of the new reality; Jung points to the individual encounter.

B. SAVED TO WHAT? — THE NEW BEING AND THE GOAL OF INDIVIDUATION.

Jung's goal of individuation is not a return to an original state, for that would be falling back into a lack of consciousness. While urging upon us an experience of images and symbols and "living out our own myth," he does not think we can turn the clock back. We cannot force ourselves to believe what we know is not true; but, Jung suggests, we could give thought to what the symbols really mean. In this way, he feels, we could gain "access to the old truths which have vanished from our 'rational' purview because of the strangeness of their symbolism."[17] The goal as he sees it is also (as with Tillich) a kind of "third state" in which there has been an *auseinandersetzung*, a "having-it-out-with" the opposites, as the contents from the unconscious are brought into consciousness. The "third state" is reached by struggle. Tillich speaks of this kind of struggle in saying "the temptations of Christ were real."[18] For Jung, too, this "third state" involves a "something more," a transformed reality. In "coming to terms with the unconscious," Jungians always insist on the necessity of "maintaining a conscious point of view." Jung has described this "third state" as involving a shift of the center of gravity of the total personality. This means that both conscious and unconscious demands are accepted as far as possible.

In the Jungians' discussions of this third state, one is reminded of Tillich's discussion of the transmoral conscience. A conscience may be called "transmoral," in Tillich's view, if it judges not in obedience to a moral law but in accordance with its participation in a reality which transcends the sphere of moral commands. Tillich says, "Transmoral can mean the re-establishment of morality from a point above morality, or it can mean the destruction of morality from a point below morality."[19] In discussing the dangers of the idea of the transmoral conscience, Tillich says that it cannot, nevertheless, be dismissed or else both religion and analytic psychotherapy would have to be dismissed also, for in both of them the moral conscience is transcended. In religion, Tillich says, it is transcended by the acceptance of the divine grace which breaks through the realm of law and creates a joyful conscience. In depth psychology it is transcended by the acceptance of one's own conflicts when looking at them and suffering under their

[17] C. G. Jung, "A Psychological Approach to the Trinity," *C.W.*, Vol. XI, p. 199.
[18] Paul Tillich, *S.T.*, Vol. 11, p. 127.
[19] Paul Tillich, "The Transmoral Conscience," *The Protestant Era*, pp. 145-48.

ugliness without an attempt to suppress them and to hide them from one's self.

When a man attempts to move toward this third state he can neither foresee what the end result of his movement will be nor "make it happen" by some defined, manipulative technique. As Tillich says, "The existential structures cannot be healed by the most refined techniques. They are objects of salvation."[20] To this I think Jung would be only too ready to agree. Jung argues that no one can know what the ultimate things are. Rather, he would say, you must take them as you experience them. If such experiences help to make life healthier, more beautiful, more complete and more satisfactory to yourself and to those you love, then, Jung says, you may safely say: "This was the grace of God."[21] I think Jung is saying you may call it "grace" for it is a "*given*," but one cannot say anything about the "giver."

It seems to me that such distinctions between the "giver" and the man receiving the gift of grace demonstrate that in Jung's theories man is not identified with God, an accusation sometimes made against Jung. In fact, Jung speaks of the insufferable inflation that occurs if a patient makes this mistake.[22] Rather, Jung's position is that man participates through an image or symbol in a reality which is experienced as "divine" and which has a healing, integrating effect on the personality.

Tillich points out elements of Christianity which support Jung's criticism of Christianity as he saw it in his own father (who was a pastor) and in his patients. Tillich says that while Christian theologians quite properly criticized the nonpersonal, nonsocial and nonhistorical attitude of the mystical religions, they nevertheless had to accept the countercriticism of the mystical groups that their own personalism was primitive and needed interpretation in transpersonal terms. To some extent this has been accepted, he says, by those who are ready to agree with the Christian mystics of all ages that "without a mystical element—namely, an experience of the immediate presence of the divine—there is no religion at all."[23] Certainly, this element ("an experience of the immediate presence of the divine") is what Jung had found missing in Christianity, and this is the element he was interested in. He wrote: "Only that which acts upon me do I recognize as real and actual."[24]

In part A the diagnosis by Tillich and Jung of modern man's pre-

---

[20]*Ibid.*, p. 123.
[21]C. G. Jung, "Psychology and Religion," *C.W.*, Vol. XI, p. 105.
[22]C. G. Jung, "Answer to Job," *C.W.*, Vol. XI, p. 470.
[23]Paul Tillich, *Christianity and the Encounter of the World Religions* (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1963, 1964), pp. 88-89.
[24]C. G. Jung, "Answer to Job, *V.W.*, Vol. XI, p. 469.

dicament was examined. In part B their solution to his problem and the implications of this for their view of God were examined. Inevitably, something of their understanding of the process by which change is effected has been implied, but now this question may be turned to directly.

C. THE HOW OF SALVATION — THE PROCESS.

In Part III of his *Systematic Theology,* Tillich says "salvation" has a threefold character: participation in the New Being (regeneration), acceptance of the New Being (justification) and transformation of the New Being (sanctification).[25] In Part IV, Tillich describes this process of transformation in this way. The spirit as a dimension of finite life, can be driven into a successful self-transcendence when it is grasped by something ultimate and unconditional. Tillich speaks of this as the "transcendent union." The human spirit is still what it is, but it goes out of itself under the impact of the divine Spirit. This human experience, he says, is best described by the classical term, "ecstasy." The transcendent union "appears within the human spirit as the ecstatic movement which from one point of view is called 'faith,' from another, 'love.' "[26] It is a matter, then, of faith and of that which accompanies it, love; these are the "content" of the manifestation of the Divine Spirit in the human spirit, which is the way the "ambiguities of life" (estrangement) are overcome. This is, I suppose, a restatement of the great Lutheran theme: "justification by grace through faith."

Faith in the "formal" sense, Tillich goes on to say, is being grasped by an ultimate concern; in this sense every human being has faith. The question is whether the concern is truly ultimate or only ultimate to the person; or, as the Old Testament suggests: the only sin is idolatry. Faith in the "material" sense is being grasped by the Spiritual Presence and opened to the transcendent unity of unambiguous life. Material faith has three elements: an element of *being opened up* by the Spiritual Presence, an element of *accepting it in spite of* the infinite gap between the divine Spirit and the human spirit, and an element of expecting final participation in the transcendent unity of unambiguous life. What has happened to hope? It is of little or no significance for Tillich. He says, "Hope is either an element of faith or a pre-Spiritual 'work' of the human mind."[27] Faith and love go together; logically, faith is prior, Tillich says, but you do not have one without the other. Faith and love are two sides of the same coin, so to speak—namely, two sides of an ecstatic state.

---

[25]Paul Tillich, *S.T.*, Vol. II, pp. 176-180.
[26]Paul Tillich, *S.T.*, Vol. III, p. 129.
[27]*Ibid.*, p. 135.

It is interesting to compare Tillich's "three elements of salvation" (Part III) with his "three elements of material faith" (Part IV). The former have more or less been taken up into the latter. "Faith" is, indeed, for Tillich, ultimate concern! The first element of salvation (regeneration) was described in Part III as participation in the New Being. This participation involves turning away from an old reality to a new reality. The first element of material faith in Part IV involves *being opened up* by the Spiritual Presence. The second element in both sets of three involves acceptance; it is both our being "accepted" and our accepting the acceptance "in spite of" what we know about ourselves—hence, "courage." Even more interesting is what happens to the third element in each set of three. As an "element of salvation," Tillich speaks of "sanctification" and a "process"; as an "element of material faith," it is described as "expecting." "Expecting" is, as we shall see, closely connected with hope; and, further, as I suggest below, it is also basic to the "process" of how change is effected. Yet, even though he still has a "threeness and has ended up with love and faith, Tillich declines to accept hope, the third of St. Paul's "three that abide." Tillich seldom discusses hope; he associates hope, for one thing, with the problem of correcting false ideas people have about "life hereafter."[28] In the index to Volume III of his *Systematic Theology* "hope" is listed only 7 times, whereas "love" has 18 references and "faith" has 39! In volumes I and II together, there are 17 references to "love" and 18 to "faith" and none at all to "hope." Having subsumed love and dismissed hope, *sola fide* is triumphant.

With all this discussion, has Tillich answered modern man's question? Has he told him what he can do, or even described what happens to him in a movement from estrangement to a third stake? I think the answer must be: not very well. Before turning to Jung, we might look at this element of "hope" which I think Tillich, despite his great appreciation of symbols, has neglected.

It is psychotherapy that has had the most to tell us about how the change is experienced in the human psyche—and not just the Jungians. One of the most provocative suggestions in this whole area has been that of William F. Lynch in his *Images of Hope: Imagination as Healer of the Hopeless.* Hope, he argues, is not something vague and negative, something to be dismissed as childish, but rather, it is something quite definite and positive and lying at the heart of life itself. It will take generations to explore hope and imagination, he thinks, but he has three central ideas to suggest which are quite relevant and helpful

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 397.

in or comparison of Jung and Tillich, especially with respect to the "process." First, Father Lynch equates the life of hope with the imagination—a realistic imagination which imagines the real, and which does not give up. Secondly, he says, hope is a matter of *imagining with.* Too much have we conceived of the imagination as a private act of the human spirit. And finally, he suggests, "there is a strong relationship between hoping and wishing."[29] Taking a clue from Freud perhaps, he suggests that man needs to be in touch with his wishes.

Tillich skirts this question of the imagination, of the effect of images and of hope, but never quite sees an appropriate and respectable place for it. In his discussion of healing and its relation to salvation he speaks of "concentration" and "autosuggestion" as being the factors involved in "faith healing," which he goes on to define as "magic." In turn, he defines magic as "the impact of one being upon another which does not work through mental communcation or physical or mental effects."[30] Although he recognizes "concentration" as a factor, he never connects it with a constructive use of the imagination.

For Jung, salvation is a matter of the recovery of a lost wholeness; but the recovery arises from a new perspective, a third position. One is not simply reabsorbed into unconsciousness (out of which consciousness developed). The process is a matter of attention to the unconscious and integrating its contents to whatever extent possible. Jung says this results in a new center of the personality which he describes as a kind of "mid-point" between the ego and the unconscious.[31] One is reminded of Tillich's discussion of centeredness.[32] From such new center (in Jung's view) the ego is able to direct activities of life in the outer world, yet maintain a relation with the creative forces of the unconscious. Communication is by means of images.[33] One gives these images attention and seeks to take a conscious stand with respect to them.

In addition to living with one's dreams as a means of receiving guidance from the unconscious, Jung also has a technique of "active imagination" as a way of letting symbols and images "speak" to con-

---

[29]William F. Lynch, *Images of Hope: Imagination as Healer of the Hopeless* (Baltimore: Helicon, 1965), pp. 23-25.

[30]Paul Tillich, *S.T.*, Vol. III, p. 279.

[31]C. G. Jung, *Two Essays, C.W.*, Vol. VII, pp. 221, 223.

[32]Paul Tillich, *S.T.*, Vol. III, pp. 30-50.

[33]C. G. Jung, "Fundamental Questions of Psychotherapy," in *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung,* trans. R.F.C. Hull, Vol. XVI (2nd ed.; Bollingen Series XX; New York: Pantheon Books, 1966), pp. 122-25. See Ira Progoff's discussion of the "proto-image" and the self in *The Death and Rebirth of Psychology* (New York: The Julian Press, 1956), pp. 186-87. Also, Progoff's *Depth Psychology and Modern Man* (New York: The Julian Press, 1959), p. 197. See also Herbert W. Richardson's interesting discussion of "Images of the Felt-Whole" in *Toward an American Theology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), pp. 60-61.

sciousness.[34] Jung's use of active imagination is comparable to Tillich's understanding of prayer, which gets its meaning (for him) from his understanding of "directing creativity." Thus Tillich says, "God's directing creativity is the answer to the question of the meaning of prayer, especially prayers of supplication and prayers of intercession".[35] As Tillich sees it, God is not expected to interfere with the existential conditions, but rather to direct a given situation toward its fulfillment. Prayers contribute to this and are an element in the situation.

Jung's understanding of this direction from "outside" is expressed as "guidance" in a more direct and concrete way even than Tillich, who would be cautious lest "supranaturalism" get in the back door with this term. Jung, on the other hand, says: "In his striving for unity, therefore, man may always count on the help of a metaphysical advocate, as Job clearly recognized."[36] In fact, Jung says that man does not find help in his suffering by what he thinks of for himself; it has to come from outside the personal willing activity of the ego. Jung found in his practice of psychotherapy that for the patient, "it is nothing less than a revelation when something altogether strange rises up to confront him from the hidden depths of the psyche."[37] Such an experience is brought about, Jung says, by the archetypes awaking to independent life and taking over the guidance of the psychic personality. A religious person might well describe this as getting guidance from God. Jung says, however, that he generally had to avoid this formulation with his patients, "apt though it is, for it reminds them too much of what they had to reject in the first place."[38]

In Jung's active imagination, attention is paid to an image or symbol, and through fantasy it is allowed to "speak." Attention is "directed" as it is in Tillich's notion of "concentration," yet the result is not a matter of conscious will and may not be at all what one anticipated. Interestingly enough, Tillich speaks of the hidden content of prayer as "the surrender of a fragment of existence to God." Jung, also, speaks of an element of "humiliation and surrender" that is involved in the technique of active imagination.

Someone has observed that people in a Jungian analysis tend to have dreams with archetypal motifs, and the people in a Freudian analysis have dreams with Freudian motifs. Perhaps Father Lynch's

---

[34]See Jung's discussion of the "subjective interpretation" of dreams in *Two Essays, C.W.*, Vol. VII, pp. 84-89, and in "Fundamental Questions of Psychotherapy," *C.W.*, Vol. XVI, pp. 122-25. On active imagination, see Jung's *Two Essays, C.W.*, Vol. VII, pp. 201-03, and Jung's "The Transcendent Function," *C.W.*, Vol. III, p. 78.

[35]Paul Tillich, *S.T.*, Vol. 1, p. 267.

[36]C. G. Jung, "Answer to Job," *C.W.*, Vol. XI, p. 456.

[37]C. G. Jung, "Psychotherapists or the Clergy," *C.W.*, Vol. XI, pp. 345-46.

[38]*Ibid.*, p. 345.

analysis of "images of hope" tells us why this is so and how healing takes place as a consequence. One is given an image of hope, a picture of what wholeness is like and toward which energy can be directed. It is not done alone; there must be "imagining with." The analyst in a Jungian analysis sees it as a joint venture and begins the process by painting the picture and holding out the possibility to the analysand. He gives him hope. This, too, is perhaps what happens when a person finds redemption in a Christian community. It is why the personal witness is the most effective means of evangelism. Tillich says, simply, "Personal life emerges in the encounter of person with person and in no other way.[39]

Tillich and others have pointed to the "acceptance" by the analyst as a basic factor in the healing process and have compared it to the Christian understanding of the healing activity of God. Tillich says that it is depth psychology that has served to remind Protestant theology of its own tradition.[40] The recent best seller lists have reminded us what it is man longs to hear; the "good news" is: "I'm OK, you're OK." With regard to the elements involved in this experience, Tillich says: "The healer, in this relationship, does not stand for himself as an individual but represents the objective power of acceptance and self-affirmation."[41] That is, even though the patient feels himself unacceptable, in the psychoanalytic relationship by being accepted by the analyst he participates in the healing power of the larger framework of acceptability. Thus, as one is grasped by the other reality, one is enabled to "move away from the old reality and turn toward the new reality." It is this initial acceptance (forgiveness, love) which initiates and continues to make possible the forward movement of the psyche from one position to another. The "openness" is a gift of grace, as Jung called it also, as we noted earlier. Comparable in Christian understanding is the *arrobon,* the "first installment," the pledge, the down-payment of which St. Paul speaks. (II Cor. 1:22; 5:5 and Eph. 1:14), which we have now and which is to be fully realized "at the end." St. Paul also speaks in *Romans* (8:23) of our having now the "first fruits of the Spirit." Tillich's concept of "eternal life" is, of course, based on this; one participates in eternal life now as the process of "essentialization" is undertaken.

What can we do? Tillich does not often tell us; however, in the course of his last public appearance before his death in 1965, Tillich

[39]Paul Tillich, *S.T.*, Vol. III, p. 40.

[40]Paul Tillich, "The Impact of Pastoral Psychology on Theological Thought," *Pastoral Psychology,* Feb. 1960, Vol. II, No. 101, reprint pp. 2, 4. See also, Don Browning, *Atonement and Psychotherapy* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966).

[41]Paul Tillich, *The Courage to Be,* p. 165.

said, in a dialogue with Carl Rogers, "you cannot produce the Divine Spirit in yourselves, but what you can do is open yourselves, to keep yourselves open for it."[42] To stay open is to have hope, although Tillich avoids this formulation.

Jung's response to our question of "how salvation" is that "we can draw near to the experience" even though ultimately it is not in our hands. He writes: "Experiences cannot be *made*. They happen—yet fortunately their independence of man's activity is not absolute but relative. We can draw closer to them."[43] There are ways which bring us nearer to living experience. However, church evangelism programs should perhaps take note of Jung's warning that we should beware of calling these ways "methods," for, he says, the very word has a deadening effect. It is anything but a clever trick, Jung says; it is a venture which requires us to commit ourselves wholly. If the old maxim is right that "faith is caught rather than taught," then to draw near the experience, we must suffer ourselves to be exposed in the fellowship or community where it is raging.

St. Paul's "way of salvation" seemed to have turned the triad, "faith, hope and love," of which he felt the "greatest" was love. Perhaps the way of salvation discussed by Tillich and Jung might also be discussed this way. The "process" is something like this. In the beginning, there is love, which, as Tillich has said, has an element of "participation" in it. It is the prevenient grace of Christian theology, that which comes first, the "down-payment." It is the acceptance by the therapist which comes first in the analytic process. Love is the creator, the "kosmoskonos," as Jung calls it.[44] Secondly, there is faith. Man's situation raises the question of an ultimate concern; and when united with love and hope or in reaction to them, faith (ultimate concern) becomes: *pistis*, commitment, trust—the stance of continuing in the "difficult journey," as the Jungians would say. Sanctification is a process, a development.[45] Thirdly, there is hope, the means whereby the individual leaps out of the prison house of the moment, the given situation. Hope is nourished by images and the use of the imagination, sparked by the analyst or fellow-Christian who "imagines with." Finally, the direction in which one is moving is toward love, being grasped in every area and aspect of life—the full participation to which one

---

[42]Paul Tillich, in "Paul Tillich and Carl Rogers: A Dialogue," *Pastoral Psychology*, Feb. 1968, Vol. 19, No. 181, p. 62.

[43]C. G. Jung, "Psychotherapists or the Clergy," *C.W.*, Vol. XI, pp. 331-32.

[44]C G. Jung *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, recorded and edited by Aniela Jaffe, trans Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Pantheon Books, 1961), p. 353.

[45]Herbert W Richardson goes so far as to argue: "Sanctification, not redemption, is the *chief* work of Jesus Christ—'God with us' rather than 'God for us.' " *Toward an American Theology*, p. 130.

looks forward "in the end." It is the goal of integration and reunion. Love is a "fruit of the Spirit." Love is the beginning and the end. The circle is complete. It is, as St. Paul said, "the greatest." It is the alpha and the omega, or as St. John said, "God is love." Jung wrote: "Whatever the learned interpretation may be of the sentence 'God is love,' the words affirm the *complexio oppositorum* of the Godhead."[46] There is no explanation for the mystery of love, Jung concluded.

Finally, to make some broad generalizations about the implications for the dialogue between psychology and theology, this comparison of Jung and Tillich would seem to suggest that psychology has something to contribute to theology with respect to "how." This is to say, in terms of a salvation schema, psychology has more to say about *how* one gets from the situation as it is to the situation as it ought to be. The focus is on the method of intervention. However, the question of values cannot be avoided even in the midst of the process. Theology, in our day at least, seems unsure of the "how"—unsure of how to answer the question, "What must I do to be saved?" On the other hand, theology has more to say about the goal and what is implied by that—the ethical implications for the present. Psychology, in its concern with how it happens, rightly focuses on hope. Imagination is the technique, and this is man's peculiar gift—the unique element in the human psyche. It is the quality to which the theological term *imago Dei* points.

[46]C. G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, pp. 353-54.