



GTU

Berkeley Journal of
Religion and Theology

Berkeley Journal of Religion and Theology

Volume 4, Issue 1

ISSN 2380-7458

**A Charitable Warp for the Weft of Will:
Building the Framework for a Theoanalytic Typology**

Author(s): Gordon Gilmore

Source: *Berkeley Journal of Religion and Theology* 4, no. 1 (2018): 146-167.

Published By: Graduate Theological Union © 2018

Online article published on: August 1, 2018

Copyright Notice:

This file and its contents is copyright of the Graduate Theological Union © 2018. All rights reserved. Your use of the Archives of the Berkeley Journal of Religion and Theology (BJRT) indicates your acceptance of the BJRT's policy regarding use of its resources, as discussed below.

Any redistribution or reproduction of part or all of the contents in any form is prohibited with the following exceptions:

- You may download and print to a local hard disk this entire article for your personal and non-commercial use only.
- You may quote short sections of this article in other publications with the proper citations and attributions.
- Permission has been obtained from the Journal's management for exceptions to redistribution or reproduction. A written and signed letter from the Journal must be secured expressing this permission.

To obtain permissions for exceptions, or to contact the Journal regarding any questions regarding further use of this article, please e-mail the managing editor at bjrt@ses.gtu.edu

The Berkeley Journal of Religion and Theology aims to offer its scholarly contributions free to the community in furtherance of the Graduate Theological Union's scholarly mission.

A Charitable Warp for the Weft of Will:

Building the Framework for a Theoanalytic Typology

Gordon Gilmore

*Graduate Theological Union
Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*

ABSTRACT: In the postmodern period, the concepts of “self” and “selfhood” have come under trenchant criticism, usually in their associations with the Cartesian *cogito*, its sense of entitled sovereignty, and the ills that have been produced therefrom. This article works from the assumption that the concept of selfhood need not be rejected, but must be fundamentally re-visioned. Many theorists point to St. Augustine as the root of this problematic notion of self arising from modernity, casting him as a proto-Cartesian; however, it can be argued that this reading of Augustine requires one to read modernist notions of subjectivity back into his writings. By showing how the Augustinian psyche is not guilty of the charges of proto-Cartesianism when it is properly seen as being undergirded by the *caritas* of the Holy Spirit, and then combining it with Jungian ego typology to put this spirituality of late antiquity into a language that has been effective in communicating to contemporary understandings of selfhood, this article will hope to illustrate an image of subjectivity that both breaks from modernist egoism and stays true to the tradition of Western Christianity.

Berkeley Journal of Religion and Theology, Vol. 4, No. 1
© Graduate Theological Union, 2018

Elaine Aron correlates the introverted type in Jungian psychology to her highly sensitive type, those persons who have a low amygdalar threshold for activation (i.e., those who sense input from their environment more intensely).¹ This would indicate that, for those of the introverted type, the

¹ Elaine Aron, “Revisiting Jung’s Concept of Innate Sensitiveness,” *The Journal of Analytical Psychology* 49: 337-67.

subjective factor of experience is amplified as a means of preventing themselves from being overwhelmed by input from the objective world. In the postmodern period, the concepts of “self” and “selfhood” have come under ill repute, usually in their associations with the Cartesian *cogito*, its sense of entitled sovereignty, and the ills that have been produced therefrom. Thus, those who focus on how we can rework our concept of self so as to meet with the needs of the postmodern era generally come under the critique that they are perpetuating the egocentrism that lead to the problems arising from the modern era in the first place. However, as Carl Jung presciently pointed out:

It is characteristic of our present extraverted sense of values that the word ‘subjective’ usually sounds like a reproof; at all events the epithet ‘merely subjective’ is brandished like a weapon over the head of anyone who is not boundlessly convinced of the absolute superiority of the object [...]. But since the introverted attitude is based on the ever-present, extremely real, and absolutely indispensable fact of psychic adaptation, expressions like ‘philautic’, ‘egocentric’, and so on are out of place and objectionable because they arouse the prejudice that it is always a question of the beloved ego. Nothing could be more mistaken than such an assumption. Yet one is continually meeting it in the judgments of the extravert on the introvert.²

In this paper, I try to develop a notion of subjectivity from the Augustinian psyche, wherein the will is grounded in Christ’s will, the love of God via the Holy Spirit, as a way to grant us a sense of selfhood while also having our wills directed by the ultimate good. My reasons for choosing Augustine as my theological interlocutor are twofold: 1) both his and Jung’s concepts of the psyche get much of their content from Neo-Platonic thought, ultimately finding their roots in the analogy of the line from the end of book 6 of Plato’s *Republic*, and 2) Augustine’s thought forms the basis of the lion’s share of both theology and mysticism in Western

² Carl W. Jung, *Bollingen Series XX: The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, 2nd ed., Vol. 6: Psychological Types. Eds. Herbert Read, et. al. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), 622. Hereafter, the *Bollingen Series XX* will be abbreviated as *CW* with Volume number. (So, for this reference, *CW* 6.)

Christianity, and thus will be conducive to connecting this model of psyche with that tradition.

It is my hope that, in establishing a theory based around Augustine's understanding of subjectivity in combination with Jungian typology—which, through the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) helps people within the contemporary clime better understand themselves in a more holistic manner—it will be possible to salvage a notion of selfhood that can start the work on repairing the damage caused by the self as *cogito*.

Willing as we Ought

Charles Taylor and subsequent postmodern theorists who have followed in his footsteps would have us believe that Augustine is a proto-Cartesian, and thus is the true progenitor of this deficient concept of self.³ The charges against Augustine can be boiled down to structural similarities his *si fallor/dubito sum* argument shares with the Cartesian “Cogito, ergo sum” argument and the conclusions these reach about where we can place our ground of certainty regarding our subjective consciousness.⁴ These fundamental similarities cannot be denied. However, “Descartes’ original contribution does *not* consist in advancing the proposition ‘I think, therefore I am’ but in interpreting it as the discovery of a first principle—Descartes will even say, of a substance.”⁵ This fundamental, cosmological difference places the Augustinian self wholly at odds with the Cartesian self, for as Augustine says, “It is man’s great misfortune not to be with him without whom he cannot be.”⁶

Augustine’s first principle is God, and it is from God that our soul derives its being. “So the good the soul turns to in order to be good is the

³ Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989); see also Stephen Menn, *Descartes and Augustine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) for a philosophical reading of continuity between Augustine and Descartes; Eric Alliez, *Capital Times: Tales from the conquest of time*, trans. Georges Van Den Abbele (Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1996) for a Marxist reading; and Catherine Mowry Lacugna, *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life* (San Francisco: Harpers, 1991) and Colin Gunton, “Augustine, the Trinity, and the Theological Crisis of the West,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 43 (1990): 33-58 for a theological critique of a similar nature.

⁴ Matthew Drever, *Image, Identity, and the Forming of the Augustinian Soul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 126.

⁵ Jean-Luc Marion, *On Descartes’ Metaphysical Prism*, trans. Jeffrey L. Kosky (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 133, 166, quoted in Michael Hanby, *Augustine and Modernity* (London: Routledge, 2003).

⁶ Augustine, *The Trinity*, 14.3.16.

good from which it gets its being soul at all. This is when the will accords with nature to perfect the soul in good, when the will turns in love toward that good by which the soul is what it does not forget being.”⁷ He references Cicero in making the claim that it is paramount for us to will as we ought to in order to serve our ultimate interests and therefore truly wish our greatest good.⁸ From this, he concludes that “two things are required to make you happy: to wish well and to be able to do what you wish...the perversion should be avoided of a man choosing to be able to do what he wants and neglecting to want what he ought.”⁹ When the soul wills toward proximate ends instead of ultimate ends, “[i]t does not know it is wishing itself ill while it imagines that what it wants is not to its disadvantage [...] while everyone wants to do himself good, many people do nothing but what is absolutely destructive of themselves.”¹⁰ The soul, being incapable of knowing the ultimate ends of its actions, often acts against its own best interests, and in so doing acts against itself.

Thus, Augustine exhorts that in order for us to act in accord with our own best interests, we must allow God to work through us in the charity of the Holy Spirit. “In order that faith might work through love, *the charity of God has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us (Rom 5:5)*”¹¹:

[W]hen the mind loves God, and consequently as has been said remembers and understands him, it can rightly be commanded to love its neighbor as itself. For now it loves itself with a straight, not a twisted love, now that it loves God; for sharing in him results not merely in its being that image, but in its being made new and fresh and happy after being old and worn and miserable.¹²

From this, the natural conclusion reached is that happiness is attainable for those who will from the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit, thus aligning their will both in regard to their best interests and

⁷ Ibid., 8.2.5.

⁸ Ibid., 13.2.8.

⁹ Ibid., 13.4.17.

¹⁰ Ibid., 14.4.18.

¹¹ Ibid., 13.4.14.

¹² Ibid., 14.4.18.

those of their neighbor. "Now all wills or wishes are straight, and all the ones linked with them too, if the one to which they are all referred is good [...]. And thus a sequence of straight wishes or wills is a ladder for those who would climb to happiness, to be negotiated by definite steps."¹³ Augustine cites the Pauline epistles in order to further substantiate his claim: "*Whoever cleaves to the Lord is one spirit [sic]* (1 Cor 6:17). This will come about with the mind attaining to a share of [God's] nature, truth, and happiness, not with him growing in his own nature, truth, and happiness."¹⁴

And thus the image begins to be reformed by him who formed it in the first place. It cannot reform itself in the way it was able to deform itself: "*Be renewed in the spirit of your minds, and put on the new man who was created according to God in justice and holiness of truth* (Eph 4:23). *Stripping yourselves [...] of the old man with his actions, put on the new man who is being renewed in the recognition of God according to the image of him who created him [sic]* (Col 3:9)."¹⁵

How, then, are we to actually bring ourselves into touch with the will of God, putting on the "new man"? From the perspective of postmodern consciousness, putting on this new personhood by embodying the will of the transcendental Other is a completely alien concept. Augustine dealt with a similar predicament when addressing those who, in his time, sought God solely via manifest creation, for they "are in fact being swept away from him [...] not in terms of distance but of divergence of values; [...] they would not think of imitating his piety, by which the divine rest is attained [...]. A down-to-earth lowliness is stronger and safer than a wind-swept *hauteur* [sic]."¹⁶

In these times when so much of our thinking is defined by secular reasoning, we easily lapse into the everyday thought that is without ground in God, and thus we can be accused of the same *hauteur*. In his Sermon on Psalm 144, Augustine compares the person of down-to-earth lowliness and him of windswept *hauteur* to David and Goliath, respectively.¹⁷ "God is calling you and ordering you to do something, and he himself gives you the

¹³ Ibid., 11.3.10

¹⁴ Ibid., 14.4.20

¹⁵ Ibid., 14.5.22

¹⁶ Ibid., 8.5.11.

¹⁷ Augustine, *Sermons*, 32.

strength, so that you are able to carry out his orders. What you have to provide is a large faith, humbling yourself under the flood of grace [...] stripping yourself of Goliath, putting on David.”¹⁸

[God] gives him his grace, which is what David relied on. Goliath on the other hand relied on himself, on his own strength, so proud, so haughty and full of himself that the first thing he did was to take upon himself alone the entire responsibility for victory for his whole side. And because pride carries its insolence on the brow, he was felled by the pebble coming whizzing at his brow. The brow marked with the humility of the cross of Christ was victorious [...]. That’s why we too bear the sign of the cross on our foreheads. [...] If you carry the sign of Christ’s humility on your forehead, then carry the imitation of Christ’s humility in your heart.¹⁹

In order to discard this notion of ourselves as being able to will the good outside of God’s grace, i.e. Goliath, we must strip ourselves of the notion of self as the center of will and, putting on David, we must bear the cross of humility on our forehead and act in accordance with God’s flood of grace. In so doing, we will be conduits for that “justice that overcame *the strong man*, this the rope that *tied him up* so that *his furniture* could be *carried off [sic]* (Mt 12:29),” and so that “*the furniture of wrath* in his house together with him [...] could be turned into *the furniture of mercy [sic]* (Rom 9:22).²⁰ Ultimately, we turn to Christ to find an image of this humility, for “what greater example of obedience could be given to us, us who had been ruined by disobedience, than God the Son obeying God the Father *even unto death on the cross [sic]* (Phil 2:8)?”²¹

When placed in this context, though, we seem to have lost our sense of self. For the self, as currently envisioned through the lens of postmodernity, is primarily a center of will, devoid of substantive content. After stripping this will away, there is not much left for the postmodern subject to stand on. However, if we allow our will to be the grace of God through whom we can act in accord with our best interests, we can build a

¹⁸ Ibid., 32.9.

¹⁹ Ibid., 32.12-13

²⁰ Augustine, *The Trinity*, 13.5.19.

²¹ Ibid., 13.5.22

picture of our psyche that is grounded in God, as God's image. And this is precisely what Augustine did, tracing the image of God and finding its various forms as distributed throughout the levels of our conscious experience.

The Structure of the Augustinian Psyche

A blueprint for the Trinitarian image in the psyche is provided with a fundamental understanding of God as lover, beloved, and love, for "what is love but a kind of life coupling or trying to couple together two things, namely lover and what is being loved? [...] Thus we have said enough to provide ourselves as it were with the frame of a kind of warp on which we can weave what remains to be said."²² With this trinitarian framework, Augustine is able to move inward through the human psyche to find the image of God proper, understanding ourselves as undergirded by this image. That said, we must understand the trinitaries to be discussed below as founded on this trinitarian image of love.

Augustine begins with our sensuous experience, using the example of vision as the grounds from which we can understand the trinity in our other four senses. This trinity is first glimpsed in our vision as applied to the objects of our experience, for "these three, the body which is seen, and the actual sight, and the intention joining the two together, are clearly distinguished not only by what is proper to each but also by the difference of their natures."²³ He explicates the difference in their natures with reference to the body and soul. "The first of these [...] does not pertain to the nature of the living being [...]. The next pertains to it in that it happens in the body [...] it happens in the sense, which is neither without body nor without soul. The third belongs only to the soul."²⁴ Given that these three are not consubstantial, he finds this to be a faulty image with which to imagine the creator.²⁵

From here, Augustine traces the path of this trinity one step further inward, to the sensual experience of our memory or our imagination. In this triad of "memory and internal sight and the will [...] this image you get

²² Ibid., 8.5.14.

²³ Ibid., 11.1.2.

²⁴ Ibid., 11.1.5.

²⁵ Ibid., 11.3.1.

when consciousness thinks about the look of some body it has seen, does in fact consist both of the body's likeness held in the memory and that which is formed from it in the conscious attention as you actually recall something."²⁶ The fact that the first member of this trinity relates to an object of creation, even if indirectly, makes it another faulty image in Augustine's opinion. Though the image held in memory is a part of the soul that is the conscious subject, it is an imprint on the soul of something from outside of the subject, and thus fails to meet the requirement of consubstantiality.²⁷

In the tier of our psyche relating to reason we find two strata of knowledge and wisdom, for "wisdom is concerned with the intellectual cognizance of eternal things and knowledge with the rational cognizance of temporal things."²⁸ Even though knowledge, like those trinities found in external and internal vision, "is carried on with sensible things and with what the consciousness has imbibed from them through the senses of the body, [it] is nonetheless not without its share in reason, and so is not common to man and beast."²⁹ Despite this share in reason making knowledge unique to humanity, who is the image of God, this trinity remains one step removed from God's image deep within us, for in wisdom we "make judgments on these bodily things according to non-bodily and everlasting meanings."³⁰

How, then, are we to picture this trinity that is proper to knowledge? This is primarily reviewed in regard to matters of doctrine, whether they are from Scripture or from the mouths of others. From these words of knowledge regarding doctrine, Augustine forms a trinity in that "the sounds of those words are in his memory even when he is not thinking about them, and from them he forms his attention by recollection when he does think about them; and it is his will to recollect and think that joins the two together."³¹ Thus we have a trinity of memory, thought, and will in this tier of rational knowledge regarding temporal things. In so mulling over the words of doctrine, "he is now indeed doing something proper to the inner

²⁶ Ibid., 11.2.6

²⁷ Ibid., 11.3.12.

²⁸ Ibid., 12.4.25.

²⁹ Ibid., 12.1.2.

³⁰ Ibid., 12.1.2.

³¹ Ibid., 13.6.26.

man, but he is not yet to be thought of, or talked of, as living according to the trinity of the inner man, unless he loves what these meanings proclaim, command and promise.”³²

For we are not capable of grasping the truth of doctrine with our knowledge alone; we need the supplement of *appetitus inveniendi*, or *amor studentium*, the faith in and love for the general form of that which we seek to understand.³³

Why then look for something when you have comprehended the incomprehensibility of what you are looking for, if not because you should not give up the search as long as you are making progress in your inquiry into things incomprehensible, and because you become better and better by looking for so great a good which is both sought in order to be found all the more delightfully, and it is found in order to be sought all the more avidly.³⁴

Thus, this knowledge is provisional, always seeking to understand what it has faith in being true; we seek “the word which is neither uttered in sound nor thought of in the likeness of sound which necessarily belongs to some language, but which precedes all the signs that signify it and is begotten of the knowledge abiding in the consciousness, when this knowledge is uttered inwardly just exactly as it is.”³⁵ The trinity on the level of knowledge can then be understood to be memory, intellect, and the will, specifically as loving faith binding together the sign with the preconceptual word which it signifies. But if we are to find the image of God proper in the “inner man,” we must move inward from knowledge to wisdom, for “only in that part which is concerned with the contemplation of eternal things can one find something that is not only a trinity but also the image of God.”³⁶

In this level of the psyche, as wisdom addressing the nature of the subject, it is again memory, understanding, and will that form the trinity of wisdom, for these three are consubstantial, coeternal, and not adventitious to the mind.³⁷ But these become highly qualified in that “[t]his trinity of the

³² Ibid., 6.26

³³ Ibid., 10.1.

³⁴ Ibid., 15.P.2.

³⁵ Ibid., 15.3.20.

³⁶ Ibid., 12.1.4.

mind is not really the image of God because the mind remembers and understands and loves itself, but because it is also able to remember and understand and love him by whom it was made. [...] In this way it will be wise not with its own light but by sharing in that supreme light.”³⁸

Anyone who has a lively intuition of these three (as divinely established in the nature of his mind) and of how great a thing it is that his mind has that by which even the eternal and unchanging nature can be recalled, beheld and desired—it is recalled by memory, beheld by intelligence, embraced by love—has thereby found the image of that supreme trinity.”³⁹

And so we finally come upon the image of God proper in humankind.

We must be conscious of this as still a provisional *image* of God, and not God proper, for “[w]e see now through a mirror in an enigma, but then it will be face to face [*sic*] (1 Cor. 13:12).”⁴⁰ In his exegesis of this Pauline passage, Augustine cites Galatians 4:24 to define biblical statements as allegorical, and defines enigma as a species of the genus allegory.⁴¹ Thus our image of ourselves, upon reflection, presents us with a particularly puzzling form of allegory for understanding God in his perfection. As temporal creatures, given our limitations, we are always at danger of deforming this image of the Divinity, but by turning to God and acting in accord with his will as charity/love, we can become arbiters of the good.

To summarize, this Augustinian soul is a four-tiered chain of trinities that ascend from the sensual, through the intellect, to wisdom as their proper end. The first tier is that of physical vision, consisting of object seen, the vision that sees, and the will that joins these two together. The second, spiritual vision, relates the will and vision to the memory of something seen; thus it is the visual process internalized. The third tier of knowledge consists of thoughts recalled from memory, the thought as formed by these recollections, and the will in faith that binds these together and holds to

³⁷ Ibid., 14.3.11-14

³⁸ Ibid., 14.4.15.

³⁹ Ibid., 15.5.39.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 15.3.14.

⁴¹ Ibid., 15.3.15.

the truth of that which is recalled. Finally, in the tier of wisdom, it is the recollection of the fact that we are God's image, the understanding of ourselves formed with regard to this image, and the loving affirmation of this fact that form the true image of God within us. It must be recalled that, in order to see ourselves this way, we must strip ourselves of the ego we have formed outside of God's image (i.e., "shedding Goliath") and, becoming humble in our piety, we must imitate Christ to connect to the divinity (i.e., "putting on David").

Theoanalytic Psychology: The Frame of a Kind of Warp

At a number of points throughout his exploration of the Trinitarian image in man, Augustine seems puzzled by that which "is something that we have not thought about for a long time and are unable to think about unless we are reminded of it [for] heaven knows what curious way it is something, if you can say this, that we do not know we know."⁴² This, along with what has been previously addressed in the section on the intellectual tier of the psyche and the preconceptual word it struggles to grasp through its knowledge, provides the image of what can be seen as a precursor to contemporary notions of the unconscious. Augustine, however, had no need to posit the existence of something like the unconscious, for where the unconscious is for contemporary thinkers, there was wisdom in the Holy Spirit for Augustine.

Additionally, as this preconceptual level of wisdom is within the Holy Spirit, so it is interpersonal in nature. We can see this in Augustine's discussion of how one can love their neighbor due to belief in their virtue:

Thus on the one hand love of that form we believe they lived up to makes us love their life, and on the other belief in their life stirs us to a more blazing charity toward that form; with the result that the more brightly burns our love for God, the more surely and serenely we see him, because it is in God that we observe that unchanging form of justice which we judge that a man should live up to.⁴³

⁴² Ibid., 14.2.9.

⁴³ Ibid., 8.5.13.

This interpersonal wisdom regarding justice, what is good and what is true, can further be argued from within Augustinian thought to be in touch with the very substance of God himself, for “[w]hatever appears to be predicated of [God] qualitatively is to be understood as signifying substance or being. It is unthinkable that God should be called spirit by way of substance and good by way of quality; he is called both by way of substance.”⁴⁴ Given this, all the qualities Augustine predicates of God, namely “[e]ternal, immortal, incorruptible, unchangeable, living, wise, powerful, beautiful, just, good, happy, spirit” are in fact substantial elements of God’s nature.⁴⁵

From what has been said thus far, it can be concluded that this level of wisdom within the subject is a preconceptual amalgam of forms that exist within the collective psyche of humankind and constitute the *imago dei* mirroring God’s nature. Given this, it is not too far a leap of the imagination to make a comparison between this and Carl Jung’s concept of the collective unconscious. I will spend the rest of this section drawing out how this analogy can inform a Christian understanding of Jung’s collective unconscious and will build on this understanding as a foundation for the remaining material to be discussed.

In the Jungian psyche, psychic elements (images, concepts) “constellate” around feeling-toned nuclear elements that exist in the unconscious to form what he refers to as complexes:

The feeling-toned content, the complex, consists of a nuclear element and a large number of secondarily constellated associations. The nuclear element consists of two components: first, a factor determined by experience and causally related to the environment; second, a factor innate in the individual’s character and determined by his disposition.⁴⁶

We can see the formation of something similar in the thought of Augustine when he discusses the objects of thought for which we care:

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 15.2.8.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 15.2.8.

⁴⁶ Jung, *CW* 8, 18.

Yet such is the force of love that when the mind has been thinking about things with love for a long time and has got stuck to them with the glue of care, it drags them along with itself even when it returns after a fashion to thinking about itself [...] images made in itself out of itself. For it gives something of its own substance to their formation; but it also keeps something apart by which it can freely make judgments on the specific bearing of such images.⁴⁷

We can talk about complexes being formed within the Augustinian psyche, imaginal contents adhering to feeling-toned nuclei with the “glue of care.” If directed aright, these nuclei will be located in the substance of God, where the root of our wisdom is to be found.

What serves as the lodestone for these nuclei are the forms of what is true and good within Augustinian thought, which are analogous to the “archetypes” of the collective unconscious, to use the Jungian term. “[These forms are] the *a priori* inherited foundations of the unconscious. These archetypes, whose innermost nature is inaccessible to experience, are the precipitate of the psychic functioning of the whole ancestral line. [...] The archetype would thus be, to borrow from Kant, the noumenon of the image which intuition perceives and, in perceiving, creates.”⁴⁸ When Augustine speaks to the standards by which we know truth, we find that “these standards are unchangeable [...]. Where indeed are they written but in the book of that light which is called truth, from which every just law is copied, and transferred into the heart of the man who does justice, not by locomotion but by a kind of impression, rather like the seal which both passes into the wax and does not leave the signet ring?”⁴⁹ Upon seeing this supreme truth, “[w]e observe [...] it as both not being far away from us and yet being above us, not spatially but in its august and marvelous eminence, and in such a way that it also seemed to be with or in us by presence of its light.”⁵⁰ This feeling of it both being above us and coming from within us arises from the fact that, when we are oriented aright and find our

⁴⁷ Augustine, *The Trinity*, 10.2.7.

⁴⁸ Jung, *CW* 6, 659.

⁴⁹ Augustine, *The Trinity*, 14.4.21.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 15.2.10.

foundation in God, the hallowed forms of eternal truth are allowed to shine out from within us as conduits for *God's* truth.

This is where we must make an important ontological distinction between Augustine and Jung. For Jung, these archetypes are formed genetically through ancestral inheritance, for they are “the accumulated experiences of organic life in general, a million times repeated, and condensed into types. In these archetypes, therefore, all experiences are represented which have happened on this planet since primeval times.”⁵¹ For Augustine, however, these forms are located in the very substance of God Godself, imaged within us as the Inner Word.

Cosmologically and ontologically speaking, these are two very different sources from which these archetypes/forms are derived. In the Augustinian account of creation, Genesis 1:1-2:42 describes the eternal creation of things in the *rationes primordiales* whereas 2:4b-2:25 describes temporal creation in the *rationes seminales*.⁵² In the *rationes seminales*, we find the ongoing creation in time that happens throughout generations of species according to their form.⁵³ The level of *rationes primordiales*, on the other hand, is the level of creation we perceive in the light of the eternal wisdom, through which Christ has his being and in which we can find our means of participating in Christ's incarnation through the church.⁵⁴ Given this way of understanding God's creation, the way in which Jung places the source of the archetypes in the collective unconscious would place their roots in the *rationes seminales*. This would make him guilty of the very same traducianism against which, in the form it took in Pelagianism, Augustine was such a critical opponent. To fit with Augustine's creationist account of the soul, we would have to understand the forms of the archetypes to have their roots in the *rationes primordiales*, in the very being of God himself as the Word. But with this ontological adjustment, the structure of the collective unconscious in Jungian thought seems to fit rather splendidly into the Augustinian account of the psyche as related to God.

⁵¹ Jung, *CW* 6, 659.

⁵² Drever, *Image, Identity, and the Forming of the Augustinian Soul*, 20-21.

⁵³ Augustine, *Literal Interpretation of Genesis*, 5.4.7-11.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.5.10-11.

To find out what good we are meant to do, we must discern how we are meant to live in relation to God. In Jungian psychology, one did this through the process of individuation, which “is the process by which individual beings are formed and differentiated; in particular, it is the development of the psychological *individual* (q.v.) as a being distinct from the general, collective psychology.”⁵⁵ The way in which we learn to differentiate ourselves from the collective psychology is by becoming cognizant of our ego typology and how to best use it to live in harmony with objective reality as undergirded by the collective unconscious. In order to give us the tools with which to do this in the Augustinian tradition, I shall attempt to show how Augustine’s theological psychology and Jungian typology can be understood to be in harmonious accord with one another.

“Putting on David”: Theological Typology

There are two attitudes and four functions that make up Jung’s system of psychological typology. The two attitudes of consciousness, extraversion and introversion, have to do with whether psychic libido flows primarily from subject to object or the reverse, where libido is defined as “an energy value which is able to communicate itself to any field of activity whatsoever, be it power, hunger, hatred, sexuality, or religion, without ever being itself a specific instinct.”⁵⁶ “Psychic energy is the *intensity* of a psychic process, its *psychological value*. This does not imply an assignment of value, whether moral, aesthetic, or intellectual; the psychological value is already implicit in its *determining* power, which expresses itself in definite psychic effects [*sic*].”⁵⁷ He further specifies the act of imbuing something with libido as interest, where that interest is either placed on an object willingly or drawn to it against our will.⁵⁸ The four functions of consciousness—sensation and intuition being those which are irrational (i.e., outside the bounds of reason) while thinking and feeling are rational (i.e., acting in accord with reason)⁵⁹—have to do with “a particular form of psychic activity that remains the same in principle under varying

⁵⁵ Jung, *CW* 6, 757.

⁵⁶ Jung, *CW* 5, 197.

⁵⁷ Jung, *CW* 6, 778.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 679.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 776.

conditions. From the energetic standpoint a function is a manifestation of *libido* [...].”⁶⁰

Out of the two attitudes within this model of consciousness, “extraversion is an outward-turning of *libido*[,] a positive movement of subjective interest towards the object[;] [it] is a transfer of interest from subject to object[,], *active* when it is intentional, and *passive* when the object compels it [*sic*].”⁶¹ In contrast to this, while “the extravert continually appeals to what comes to him from the object, the introvert relies principally on what the sense impression constellates in the subject[;] in the total psychic economy [the subjective element] makes itself felt in the highest degree, particularly in the effect it has on the ego.”⁶²

Of the irrational functions of ego-consciousness, sensation is that which “mediates the perception of a physical stimulus.”⁶³ When this function is aligned with the extraverted attitude, “those objects that excite the strongest sensations will be decisive for the individual’s psychology [...]. Hence the orientation of such an individual accords with purely sensuous reality.”⁶⁴ When used in conjunction with the introverted attitude, on the other hand, it “undergoes considerable modification[;] [the] sensing subject [...] adds his subjective disposition to the objective stimulus [...]. In this case, sensation is related primarily to the subject and only secondarily to the object.”⁶⁵

Introverted sensation apprehends the background of the physical world rather than its surface [...] the primordial images which, in their totality, constitute a psychic mirror-world [...] *sub specie aeternitatis*, somewhat as a million-year-old consciousness might see them [...] spread over it the patina of age-old subjective experience and the shimmer of events still unborn.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ Ibid., 731

⁶¹ Ibid., 710.

⁶² Ibid., 621.

⁶³ Ibid., 792.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 605.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 647.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 649.

Contrary to this, intuition “is the function that mediates perceptions in an *unconscious way* [...]. The certainty of intuition rests equally on a definite state of psychic “alertness” of whose origin the subject is unconscious.”⁶⁷ Extraverted intuition is defined primarily by how it is distinguished from extraverted sensation, “as extraverted sensation strives to reach the highest pitch of actuality, because this alone can give the appearance of a full life, so intuition tries to apprehend the widest range of *possibilities*, since only through envisioning possibilities is intuition fully satisfied [*sic*].”⁶⁸ Introverted intuition is defined in a similar manner.

Whereas introverted sensation is mainly restricted to the perception, via the unconscious, of the phenomena of innervation and is arrested there, introverted intuition suppresses this side of the subjective factor and perceives the image that caused the innervation[.] [While introverted intuition] receives from sensation only the impetus to its own immediate activity; it peers behind the scenes, quickly perceiving the inner image that gave rise to this particular form of expression.⁶⁹

Thinking, the first of the rational functions, “is the psychological function which, following its own laws, brings the contents of ideation into conceptual connection with one another[.]”⁷⁰ For extraverted thinking,

the criterion supplied by external conditions is the valid and determining one, no matter whether it be represented directly by an objective, perceptible fact or by an objective idea need not necessarily be purely concretistic thinking; it can just as well be purely ideal thinking, if for instance it can be shown that the ideas it operates with are largely borrowed from outside, i.e., have been transmitted by tradition and education.⁷¹

⁶⁷ Ibid., 770.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 612.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 656.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 830.

⁷¹ Ibid., 577.

Outside of concretistic or ideal thinking of extraverted thought, introverted thinking is defined by the subjective factor.⁷² “The subjective factor expresses itself as a feeling of guidance which ultimately determines the judgment[.] Facts are of secondary importance for this kind of thinking; what seems to it of paramount importance is the development and presentation of the subjective idea.”⁷³

Feeling, the other rational function and the last of the four functions of consciousness, is often confused with emotions; however, emotions only enter the picture when feeling is tied with sensation.⁷⁴ In actuality, “[f]eeling is primarily a process that takes place between the *ego* [...] and a given content, a process, moreover, that imparts to the content a definite *value* in the sense of acceptance or rejection (‘like’ or ‘dislike’).”⁷⁵ In regard to the extraverted approach to valuation, it “is always in harmony with objective values [...] not because [they] find it ‘beautiful’ or ‘good’ from [their] own subjective feeling about it [do they call it so], but because it is fitting and politic to call it so, since a contrary judgment would upset the general feeling situation.”⁷⁶ Internal feeling, on the contrary, suppresses an automatic agreement with the objective values in a given situation to try and realize the archetypal images from which they arise.⁷⁷ “The primordial images are, of course, just as much ideas as feelings[.] In order to communicate with others, [the subject] has to find an external form not only acceptable to itself, but capable also of arousing a parallel feeling in them.”⁷⁸

The four functions of ego-consciousness can be understood as habitual flow of libido between subject and object in each of the four tiers of the theological psyche as defined by Augustine. For what remains of this section, I wish to demonstrate how this comparison can be made. As these are built from entirely different perspectives on the subject and the psyche from entirely different cultural contexts, this will of course not be an exact match, but I will argue that there are enough shared features between the

⁷² Ibid., 578.

⁷³ Ibid., 628.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 726.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 724.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 595.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 638.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 639.

Jungian functions of consciousness and the levels of Augustine's theological psyche that this analogy is warranted and could provide grounds for a model of the psyche that is in harmony with the Augustinian perspective of the Christian tradition, which plays both a pivotal role for Protestant theology and Catholic theology, and thus for Christianity in the West in general.

The irrational functions can both be seen as expressing the two parts of the "outer man": the one turned toward sensual reality and the other toward memory and imagination. The function of sensation, of course, is readily understood as the former. It takes a bit more discernment on our parts to see how intuition is comparable to the latter. This can be more readily understood, though, when Jung's extraverted intuition is compared to Augustine's connection between memory and foresight. "You can experience what I mean in speeches or songs which we render word for word by memory; clearly, unless we foresaw in thought what was to follow, we would not say it. And yet it is not foresight that instructs us how to foresee, but memory."⁷⁹ Jung's extraverted intuition has to do with an expectation of possibilities within a given situation, possibilities foreseen by an unconscious hunch. This hunch could be said to arise from the activation of a complex within the psyche by a percept in the given situation, igniting a chain of preconceptual associations built from images in memory that lead to the expectation of certain outcomes. Given this understanding, we can see the intuitive function as having its home in the memory/imagination of the Augustinian psyche.

The rational functions, likewise, can be understood as expressing the two parts of the "inner man": the one turned toward the realm of knowledge and the other toward wisdom. As with the irrational functions, the first of these is readily seen; the analogy between the "inner man" turned toward knowledge and the thinking function is self-evident. In regard to comparing the feeling function with the "inner man" turned toward wisdom, however, we make base this on the feeling-toned, archetypal nuclei of complexes within the psyche and the eternal forms of what is true and good within the substance of God. This was discussed in detail earlier when I compared Augustine's concept of *rationes*

⁷⁹ Augustine, *The Trinity*, 15.2.13.

primordiales with Jung's collective unconscious, but more specifically when I discussed the nuclei of feeling-toned complexes as coupled with archetypes. The eternal values of what is true, what is good, what is beautiful, and so on, are related to the association between a feeling-tone (a value) and an archetypal form (that which is valued). In Augustinian thought, these archetypal forms are the truths of pious wisdom, and thus the Christian who is oriented aright places their feeling in conjunction with these forms.

Finally, we are left to discuss the attitudes of consciousness. In the theological psychology of Augustine, we are healthy and functioning correctly if we are properly oriented toward God, healthy when we allow his will to flow through us in the form of the Holy Spirit and our intentions are directed towards God's ends. When the functions are of an introverted attitude, they direct interest toward the collective unconscious and, given that we have compared Jung's collective unconscious to Augustine's *rationes primordiales*, this would mean that the person who is directed aright is the person whose functions operate within the introverted attitude. If seen this way, one could view Augustine as representing an introverted bias.

However, Augustine dispels this concern early on in his discussion of the person in relation to God by comparing charity and that toward which it is being charitable to a word and that which it signifies. "Just as a word indicates something and also indicates itself, but does not indicate itself as a word unless it indicates itself indicating something; so too charity certainly loves itself, but unless it loves itself loving something it does not love itself as charity."⁸⁰ Charity, the form of God's will acting through us, needs the object toward which it is directed in order to be charitable, thus in order to be His will. So, while the subject is made to be prominent, this is not in a fashion of pathological bias for the introverted attitude, for the necessity of the object, as the extraverted factor, for our ability to act in accord with charity is made salient.

Given this, the conclusion that we can reach is that an Augustinian way of understanding typology is that a healthy mind is one that knows its weaknesses and strengths in regard to its ego-functioning and chooses to

⁸⁰ Ibid., 8.5.12.

maintain cognizance of the introverted element of a function, even when that function is attitudinally predisposed toward extraversion.

One might object that I've been hoisted by my own petard by critiquing the argument of proto-Cartesianism in Augustinian thought based on the fact that it only indicates structural similarities between Augustine's concept of self and that of Descartes without acknowledging the fundamental ontological distinction between their overall systems of thought, while basing my integration of Jungian concepts into Augustinian thought about the self on structural similarities. However, I think that this only strengthens my position; by acknowledging that there are fundamental differences in ontological assumptions between Jung and Augustine, and clearly indicating that it is my wish to adhere to the Christian tradition via Augustine's thought, the structural similarities serve as a means of using the concepts from Jungian typology as tools for a clearer understanding of Augustinian spirituality within the contemporary clime. The commentary on the critique of Augustine as a proto-Cartesian helps to indicate how such structural similarities can be read into Augustine's thought without altering the ontological ground, the cosmology, on which it stands.

Gordon Gilmore is a doctoral student in philosophical theology at the Graduate Theological Union, studying the intersections of Augustine of Hippo, Carl Jung, and ecofeminist thought. On top of completing his studies in philosophy and psychology in Illinois, he has also studied depth psychology in California.

Bibliography

- Alliez, Eric. *Capital Times: Tales from the conquest of Time*. Translated by Georges Van Den Abbele. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minneapolis Press, 1996.
- Aron, Elaine. "Revisiting Jung's Concept of Innate Sensitiveness." *The Journal of Analytical Psychology* 49: 337-67.
- Augustine. *The Works of Saint Augustine: A translation for the 21st century*. Pt. I, Vol. 5, *The Trinity*. Edited by John E. Rotelle and translated by Edmund Hill. Brooklyn, NY: New City Press, 1991.
- _____. *The Literal Interpretation of Genesis*. In *The Works of Saint Augustine: A translation for the 21st century*. Pt. I, Vol. 13, *On Genesis*. Edited by John E.

- Rotelle and translated by Edmund Hill. Brooklyn, NY: New City Press, 2002. 155-506.
- _____. *The Works of Saint Augustine: A translation for the 21st century*. Pt. III, Vol. 12, *Sermons II (20-50) on the Old Testament*. Edited by John E. Rotelle and translated by Edmund Hill. Brooklyn, NY: New City Press, 1990.
- Drever, Matthew. *Image, Identity, and the Forming of the Augustinian Soul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Gunton, Colin. "Augustine, the Trinity, and the Theological Crisis of the West." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 20 (1990): 33-58.
- Hanby, Michael. *Augustine and Modernity*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. *Bollingen Series XX: The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, 2nd ed. Vol. 5, *Symbols of Transformation: An Analysis of the Prelude to a Case of Schizophrenia*. Edited by Herbert Read, Michael Fordham, Gerhard Adler, William McGuire, and translated by R.F.C. Hull. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967.
- _____. *Bollingen Series XX: The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, 2nd ed. Vol. 6, *Psychological Types*. Edited by Herbert Read, Michael Fordham, Gerhard Adler, William McGuire, and revision by R.F.C. Hull of the translation by H.G. Baynes. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971.
- _____. *Bollingen Series XX: The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. Vol 8, *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*. Edited by Herbert Read, Michael Fordham, Gerhard Adler; and translated by R.F.C. Hull. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1960.
- Lacugna, Catherine Mowry. *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life*. San Francisco, CA: Harpers, 1991.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *On Descartes' Metaphysical Prism*. Translated by Jeffrey L. Kosky. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Menn, Stephen. *Descartes and Augustine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Taylor, Charles. *Sources of the Self*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.