X. SELECTED WORKS ABOUT THE INWARD TURN OF CONSCIOUSNESS

NOTE: See Orality and Literacy: 174-76.

(X.1) Adler, Mortimer J. Desires Right & Wrong: The Ethics of Enough. New York: Macmillan; Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan; Oxford: Maxwell Macmillan International, 1991. Topic: History of Philosophy; Therapy. Also see Adler (VII.2; IX.1; IX.2; IX.3); Lacy (XII.83b).

(X.2) Agamben, Giorgio. The Highest Poverty: Monastic Rules and Form-of-Life. Trans. Adam Kotsko. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 2013. Topic: Roman Catholic Spirituality; Therapy. Also see de Mello (I.42); Leclerc (I.99); Manuel (X.32a). The Jungian theorist Robert L. Moore of Chicago Theological Seminary has aptly characterized Jesuit training as Warrior training (i.e., training in learning how to access the energies of the Warrior archetype in the archetypal level of the psyche). However, it strikes me that the novitiate period in the training of all religious orders in the Roman Catholic Church involves Warrior training. In short, Warrior training appears to be a necessary preparation for becoming a mystic, as all people who enter religious orders in the Roman Catholic Church aspire to become. It takes courage to become a mystic. This is why would-be mystics should engage in Warrior training.


(X.3) Anderson, Susan. The Journey from Abandonment to Healing. New York: Berkley Books, 2000. Topics: Nondeath Mourning; Therapy. Also see Bradshaw (X.7); Critchley and Webster (X.12a); Frank (X.20; X.21); Fromm (III.72d); Janov (X.23a); Jeffreys (X.24); Koulouris (X.28); A. Miller (I.112a; III.122a); Moore (X.36); Pollock (X.41b); Stevens (X.44f). To show the importance of Susan Anderson’s detailed account of mourning nondeath losses, I want to discuss the contributions made by Erich Fromm, Robert Moore, and Anthony Stevens in order to establish the context for considering her account of mourning nondeath losses. Failed mourning of nondeath losses is the root condition that gives rise to what Fromm refers to as the authoritarian character. Fromm worried about what he styled as the authoritarian character, which is the default character type of all humanity at all times. As the antidote and preferred alternative to the authoritarian character, Fromm advances the person who has been liberated as the result of the optimal experience of psychoanalysis. So this is Fromm’s in-group, the avant garde. In Escape from Freedom (III.72d), Fromm explains that people who have
the authoritarian character are “the kind of persons whose whole life is in a subtle way related to some power outside themselves” (172). But all people live their lives “in a subtle way related to some power outside themselves.” By living this way, we are not escaping from freedom, as Fromm claims. On the contrary, this is the way in which we are exercising our freedom. This is simply the human condition. We are social animals. In David Riesman’s terminology (X.44), outer-directed character types (also known as tradition-directed) are authoritarian; inner-directed character types are authoritarian; other-directed character types are authoritarian. As a result of being authoritarian, we humans go about forming in-groups, which are formed to stand over against a real or imagined out-group. No authoritarian tendencies = No in-groups = No social cohesion. (If you want to live alone in the desert, you could escape from your authoritarian tendencies.) Next, I want to examine further Fromm’s explanation of the psychodynamics of the authoritarian character and connect his explanation with the work of the Jungian theorist Robert L. Moore of Chicago Theological Seminary (I.115a). So how would Moore explain the psychodynamics involved in what Fromm refers to as the authoritarian character? Moore likes to say that when we project the King archetype in the archetypal level of our psyches onto somebody, we are giving away our power. In other words, we should stop projecting the King archetype onto others and instead learn how to access the energies and power of the King archetype in our psyches. (Moore claims that we also have a Queen archetype in the archetypal level of our psyches.) In Escape from Freedom (172-76), Fromm describes what he refers to as magical helpers – that is, helpers in our lives who seem to have a kind of magical touch in our lives. He allows that such magical helpers can include “a teacher, a husband, or a psychoanalyst” (176). In other words, when we project the King archetype onto somebody, we thereby enlist that person as a magical helper in our lives. Because Moore claims that we also have a Queen archetype in the archetypal level of our psyches, I assume that we would also be able to enlist a magical helper by projecting the Queen archetype onto her. As long as magical helpers are respectful of us and responsible and ethical in their relationships with us, they may play constructive roles in our lives until we are ready to stop projecting the King archetype and/or Queen archetype and instead access the power of the King archetype and the Queen archetype in our lives. In any event, Moore’s observation about giving away our power dovetails with Fromm’s basic concern about the authoritarian character – that people who have the authoritarian character will give away their power to people who are not trustworthy – and to movements that are not trustworthy such as fascism in Germany under Hitler and in Italy under Mussolini and communism in the former Soviet Union under Stalin and in China under Mao. It’s not hard to understand how dangerous it is if people give away their power to untrustworthy individual persons and/or untrustworthy movements. For understandable reasons, we may not be able to find enough trustworthy persons to serve as magical helpers in our lives. For this reason, we should undertake to stop projecting the King archetype and the Queen archetype (according to Moore, all people have both of these archetypes in the archetypal level of their psyches). Instead of projecting archetypes, we should work to access the energies and power of the archetypes.
These two steps sound straightforward enough. But it’s not easy to carry out these two steps. We engage in projecting the King archetype or the Queen archetype because of archetypal wounding that occurred when we were small children or later in life. In The Two-Million-Year-Old Self (X.44f), Jungian theorist Anthony Stevens says that archetypal wounding requires archetypal healing. In other words, the King archetype and the Queen archetypes in our psyches have goals that have been frustrated along the way in our lives. As a result, the King archetype and the Queen archetype need to be healed as it were so that they can be optimally empowered in our psyches. But what about our magical helpers, the trustworthy people onto whom we have projected the wounded King archetype or the wounded Queen archetype? Why don’t out projections onto magical helpers produce archetypal healing of our archetypal woundedness? Well, at times, they may. As a result, we may grow and develop. However, at other times, our magical helpers may just provide us with temporary relief of our archetypal woundedness, instead of providing us with archetypal healing. In any event, the would-be healer can help us go only as far as he or she has gone, but no further. This appears to be a law of our psychological nature. Simply stated, I cannot give you what I myself do not have to give. Your psychotherapist cannot give you what he or she does not have to give. The key ingredient in archetypal healing involves mourning. We need to mourn our nondeath losses in life in a healthy way. In the self-help book The Journey from Abandonment to Healing (X.3), Susan Anderson describes the course of healthy mourning of nondeath losses, which, by definition, involve abandonment feelings. When we do not mourn our nondeath losses in a healthy way, this results in unresolved mourning. Unresolved mourning leads to depression, often accompanied by suicidal thoughts. In other words, the anger involved in the unresolved mourning of nondeath losses is turned inward, producing depression. Finally, we need to consider what happens to a man when he does not give his power away by projecting his King archetype onto another man. Instead, he learns how to access the energy of his King archetype in his psyche. As a result of accessing the King archetype in his psyche, he will probably be more careful about giving his power away, but if he wants to join with others in any organized group effort, his authoritarian tendencies will have to kick in.

(X.3a) Aristotle. Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics: A New Translation. Trans with an interpretive essay, notes, and glossary by Robert C. Bartlett and Susan D. Collins. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 2011. Topics: History of Philosophy; Classical Studies. Also see Buell (X.8a); de Mello (X.14); Faulkner (III.48a); Garver (X.22g); McNamee (III.121); Sparshott (X.46c). What Anthony de Mello (X.14) refers to as awareness is equivalent to what Aristotle refers to as contemplation.

In the examples of myths that Joseph Campbell discusses in his classic study *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (III.20), the hero undertakes the perilous journey and returns with the boon of life. For all practical purposes, John Bradshaw has undertaken the perilous journey of serious mourning and returned with the boon of life. According to Bradshaw, healthy grief is the boon of life. Grief is the healing feeling, he likes to say. Now, in the story of the cave in Plato’s *Republic*, the philosopher who works his way out of the cave and sees the light of the sun then goes back into the cave to work with others who are still struggling in the cave and have not yet seen the light of the sun. Figuratively speaking, Bradshaw has returned to the cave and worked to help others undertake serious mourning. In addition, he has written books and given lectures and workshops. In his book *Healing the Shame That Binds You* (1988; expanded and updated ed. 2005), Bradshaw sets forth an explanation as to how and why some people may be incapable of serious mourning. He says that people who are incapable of serious mourning are suffering from toxic shame that binds their emotions, except for the emotion of anger. For Bradshaw, grief is an emotion. He characterizes grief as the healing feeling (i.e., the feeling that can allow healing to occur, when healthy mourning has run its course). However, when toxic shame binds our emotions, our capacity to experience grief in a healthy way is bound (i.e., limited so that we do not mourn in a healthy way). When we are incapable of serious mourning in a healthy way, our experiences of mourning in an unhealthy way leave us with unresolved (i.e., uncompleted) mourning. Paradoxically, Bradshaw’s prescription for healing toxic shame is grief work, because, according to Bradshaw, grief is the healing feeling. In other words, according to Bradshaw, a person who is incapable of serious mourning, as Dr. Justin A. Frank claims George W. Bush is, will overcome this inability through the experience of
serious mourning. This is probably the case. But I would point out that it is not easy to engender serious mourning in oneself or in others. Moreover, serious mourning can be an overpowering experience leading at times to a mental breakdown. So if you want to experience serious mourning as the way to overcome being incapable of serious mourning, you should be forewarned that you might experience a mental breakdown instead. Serious mourning resembles clinical depression, a form of mental breakdown. Bereavement (i.e., serious mourning due to the death of a loved one) is not clinical depression because it is bereavement. In other words, it is obvious that a loved one’s death precipitated one’s bereavement. But nondeath losses can also precipitate serious mourning, as Susan Anderson describes in her fine book *The Journey from Abandonment to Healing* (X.3). However, it strikes me that clinical depression, a form of mental breakdown, should be understood as a signal that the person needs to experience serious mourning in a healthy way, if this is possible for the person to experience. Similarly, the symptoms of post-traumatic stress syndrome (PTSD) should be understood as signals that the person experiencing the symptoms of PTSD needs to experience serious mourning in a healthy way, if this is possible for the person to experience. No doubt certain other kinds of symptoms should also be understood as signals that the person experiencing the symptoms needs to experience serious mourning in a healthy way, if this is possible for the person to experience. But serious mourning in a healthy way is a powerful experience. So when the symptoms are already showing that ego-consciousness is being overpowered, the first order of business for the individual person should be to work out a suitable containment pattern, which usually involves the help of one or more other persons such as psychotherapists and Exquisite Witnesses, to use J. Shep Jeffreys’ term in his book *Helping Grieving People — When Tears Are Not Enough: A Handbook for Care Providers*, 2nd ed. (X.24). By working out a suitable containment pattern, the individual person may be able to develop the inner strength in his or her ego-consciousness to undertake the arduous and at times perilous work of serious mourning. The most famous imagery that I know of for containment occurs in the *Odyssey* when Odysseus is tied to the mast of his ship with his ears plugged as his ship navigates Scylla and Charybdis. Navigating your way through Scylla and Charybdis is a perilous journey. In real life, President Abraham Lincoln did undertake the work of serious mourning while he was in office. But it remains to be seen if President Barack Obama will follow President Lincoln’s example and undertake serious mourning while he is in office. For understandable reasons, President Obama may prefer to work out a suitable containment pattern instead. After all, President Lincoln was assassinated. For understandable reasons, President Obama may prefer not to run the risk of being assassinated if he can help it. Unfortunately, we do not understand how to help people experience serious mourning in a healthy way. Nevertheless, by definition, serious mourning in a healthy
A containment experience that is comparable to the containment experiences that babies need to experience when they are distressed. By definition, containment experiences help us contain our abandonment feelings. When individual persons voluntarily seek help through psychotherapy, they are usually seeking help in establishing a containment pattern in their lives that will enable them to cope more effectively with their abandonment feelings. At times, containment is the best way to proceed, especially if containment helps the individual person develop inner strength. Serious mourning in a healthy way requires a certain amount of inner strength, because mourning can be an overpowering experience leading to a mental breakdown. Serious mourning involves what C. G. Jung refers to as legitimate suffering.

(X.8) Brakke, David. *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity*. Cambridge, MA; and London: Harvard UP, 2006. Topic: Roman Catholic Spirituality. Also see Forsyth (III.67); Loyola (III.113); Pagels (III.141); Russell (III.153; III.154; III.155; III.156).

(X.8a) Buell, Lawrence. *Emerson*. Cambridge, MA; London: Belknap P/ Harvard UP, 2003. Topics: American Studies; Cultural Studies. Also see Aristotle (X.3a); Buell (X.8b; XII.17a); Engberg-Pedersen (I.55); Gelpi (XII.50a); McNamee (III.121); Mieder (VII.17b); Ong (X.40; XII.130a); Sherry (X.44c); Wilshire (XII.169). Because I was favorably impressed with Lawrence Buell’s new book *The Dream of the Great American Novel* (XII.17a), I decided to go back and read his earlier book, *Emerson*. Evidently, Buell is a life-long Emerson fan. As a result, I learned much from Buell’s book. But I also noted a few odd things. I will briefly discuss six items here. (1) For example, in Buell’s lengthy and instructive account of Emerson's view of Self-Reliance (Buell’s capitalizations), I learned that Emerson’s “aim was to theorize greatness on the world stage” (87). Fine. I can understand that much. But I do not understand why Buell does not even advert in passing to Aristotle’s discussion of the great-spirited person in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (X.3a). Also see McNamee (III.121). (2) To take another example, Buell refers to possible “platform communion” with Emerson in his public lectures (page 103). But if and when such platform communion occurs, it surely involves what Aristotle refers to as the speaker’s ethos in his treatise on civic rhetoric (I.10). Also see Grimaldi (I.76). When I turn to the index in Buell’s book, I find multiple page references for the entries Plato/(Neo)Platonism, and E (394) and Socrates/Socratic (396). But there is no index entry about Aristotle, because Buell mentions Aristotle only in passing (201). (3) In a similar way, Buell is incisive and instructive in his various comments about the American Protestant tradition of thought. But he is silent about any possible historical sources of Protestant thought in the Christian tradition of thought before the Protestant Reformation. Gee whiz, Professor Buell, Harvard University, where you teach American studies, still has a Divinity
School. Scholars there could bring you up to speed about such things as the history of the divinity of the self/soul (16) and the apophatic mystic tradition in Christianity before the Protestant Reformation (see especially Buell’s “long list of proposed essentializations” in Emerson’s thought, including nous, on page 132). Evidently, Buell is not even familiar with the minor classic about the apophatic mystic tradition known as *The Cloud of Unknowing*. For an informed scholarly discussion of nous from the standpoint of a secular humanist, see Troels Engberg-Pedersen’s book *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (1.55). (4) To take another example, Buell discusses at length the question of whether or not Emerson could be considered to be a philosopher (199-241). However, even though Buell discusses Nietzsche perceptively at different places (see the index for all the specific page references to Nietzsche), he takes it for granted that Nietzsche should be considered a philosopher. But see Claude Pavur’s book *Nietzsche: Humanist* (Marquette University Press, 1998). Indeed, if we were to accept Pavur’s argument for considering Nietzsche as a humanist, then we might also see Emerson as a humanist. (5) My next example of an opportunity that Buell misses involves his failure to mention John Henry Newman’s famous quip that “the whole man moves” in his discussion of Emerson’s thought on pages 283-84. He quotes Emerson as writing about “generat[ing] the energy of the will” (I added the bracketed addition here). Emerson then goes on to say, “There can be no driving force except through the conversion of the man into his will, making him the will, and the will him” (283-84). (Buell mentions Newman in passing on pages 46, 185, and 357n40.) For a learned discussion of Newman’s point that “the whole man moves,” see Walter Jost’s book *Rhetorical Thought in John Henry Newman* (XII.79a: 76-84). (6) But, arguably, the greatest oversight in Buell’s fine study of Emerson’s thought is his failure to discuss Jesuit spirituality in connection with Emerson’s thought about Self-Reliance. I know, I know, the expression “self-reliance” is usually not mentioned in connection with Jesuit spirituality. So I can forgive Buell for not making this connection. However, Buell’s elaborate explanation of Emerson’s thought about Self-Reliance invites making this connection. Anthony de Mello, S.J. (1931-1987), the Jesuit spiritual director and lecturer from India, writes about spirituality in his posthumously published book *The Way to Love* (X.14) in ways that parallel certain points in Emerson’s thought. But he also makes a number of points that Emerson does not make. In any event, I learned much from Buell’s running discussion of Nietzsche and Emerson. But I learned the most from Buell’s extended discussion of Emerson’s thought per se, especially from his discussion of Self-Reliance.

(X.8b) ---. *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing, and the Formation of American Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap P/ HaUP, 1995. Topics: American Studies; Cultural Studies. Also see Buell (X.8a; XII.17a);
Bugbee (X.8c); Farrell (I.62a); Fixico (II.8); Mooney (X.35a); Ong (X.40a); D. M. Smith (I.168); Wilshire (XII.169).

(X.8c) Bugbee, Henry. *The Inward Morning: A Philosophical Exploration in Journal Form*. 2nd ed. Athens, GA; and London: U of Georgia P, 1999. Topic: History of Philosophy. Also see Buell (X.8b); Mooney (X.35a); Ong (X.40a).

(X.9) Burrow, Rufus. *God and Human Dignity: The Personalism, Theology, and Ethics of Martin Luther King, Jr*. Notre Dame, IN; and London: U of Notre Dame P, 2006. Topics: American Protestant Spirituality; Personalism. Also see King (III.108); Mieder (VII.17); Miller (VII.18).


(X.12a) Critchley, Simon and Jamieson Webster. *Stay, Illusion! The Hamlet Doctrine*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2013. Also listed as Critchley and Webster (IX.17c). Topics: Literary Studies; Psychoanalytic Theory. Also see Bloom (X.6); Boitani (VII.3d); de Mello (X.14); Fromm (X.22d); Koulouris (X.28). In this wide-ranging short book of 48 bite-sized thought-provoking essays about Shakespeare’s most famous play, Simon Critchley and Jamieson Webster discuss Hamlet’s mourning and melancholia in connection with Sigmund Freud’s famous 1917 essay “Mourning and Melancholia” (119-25). In Shakespeare’s famous play, young Prince Hamlet’s father, King Hamlet, has died. As a result, young
Hamlet is mourning his father’s death. But his mother has proceeded to marry the dead king’s brother in rather short order. As a result, young Hamlet’s understandable mourning of his father’s death has turned into what Freud terms melancholia. Today we would say that young Hamlet is experiencing complicated grief. Based on my own experience of complicated grief, I would say that Hamlet’s mourning of his father’s death has been complicated by his nondeath loss of his idealization of his mother, because she has married the deceased king’s brother so shortly after the king’s death. Susan Anderson (X.3) has described the process of mourning mourning nondeath loss. According to her, the process of mourning nondeath loss includes an advanced step of rage. But when rage is turned inward, it produces depression (Freud’s melancholia) and also at times the bipolar opposite – a manic reaction. Young Hamlet manifests both depression and manic reaction. In general, when complicated grief occurs, it probably involves the concurrent activization of mourning nondeath loss. In other words, the concurrent activization of mourning nondeath loss turns bereavement into complicated grief.


(X.14) de Mello, Anthony. *The Way to Love: Meditations for Life*. New York: Image, 2012. Also listed as item (I.42). Topics: Biblical Studies; Mystic Experience; Spirituality; Therapy. Also see Agamben (X.2); Aristotle (X.3a); Critchley and Webster (X.12a); Eliade (I.53); Engberg-Pedersen (I.55); Fromm (X.22d); Fromm and Suzuki (X.22g); Leclerc (I.99); Manuel (X.32a); Moore and Gillette (I.116); Sherry (X.44c). In this perceptive series of meditations, Anthony de Mello, S.J. (1931-1987), explains certain challenging gospel passages by elucidating how a mystic understanding could inform our understanding of the challenging texts. In doing this, he centers our attention of what he refers to as attachments. Instead of craving our attachments and clinging to them, he urges us to cultivate the optimal spirit of nonattachment or unattachment. Because de Mello was a Jesuit spiritual director, we should note that the spirit of nonattachment or unattachment that he recommends is also recommended in the Principle and Foundation section of the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius Loyola (standardized section number 23). What Robert Moore and Douglas Gillette (I.116) describe as the Lover archetype in the archetypal level of our psyches is involved in our attachments -- not only in our craving them and clinging to them, but also in our optimal spirit of nonattachment or unattachment. As noted, de Mello points out that we tend to crave our attachments and cling to them. In Moore and Gillette’s terminology, the craving and clinging involve one or the other “shadow” forms of the Lover archetype. But the mystic antidote that de Mello recommends to replace our craving and clinging tendencies is
nonattachment or unattachment. I would suggest that the attitude and orientation of nonattachment or unattachment involves what Moore and Gillette refer to as the optimal form of the Lover archetype. In addition, de Mello explains how awareness is involved in bringing about natural change and growth. What Moore (X.36) describes and explains as the archetype of initiation is involved in what de Mello describes as natural change and growth. Finally, I would say that in this posthumously published book of de Mello’s meditations and in his lifework as a retreat director, de Mello was a shaman in spirit. In other words, he was drawing on the shaman energies of the Magician archetype in the archetypal level of his psyche that Moore and Gillette discuss in their book *The Magician Within: Accessing the Shaman [Archetype] in the Male Psyche* (I.117).


(X.16a) Erikson, Erik H. *Young Man Luther: A Study in Psychoanalysis and History*. New York: Norton, 1958. Topics: Psychoanalytic Theory; Cultural Studies. Also see Gregg (III.77); Friedman (X.22a: 243-302); Meissner (X.34a).


(X.19a) Francis, Pope [formerly known as Cardinal Jorge Mario Bergoglio, S.J.]. “A Big Heart Open to God: The Exclusive Interview with Pope Francis [Conducted in Italian by Antonio Spadaro, S.J.]” *America* 209.8 (September 30, 2013): 14-18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38. Topics: Jesuit Spirituality; Religious Studies. This lengthy interview of Pope Francis was published in English in the Jesuit-sponsored magazine *America* and in other languages in 15 other Jesuit-sponsored magazines.
around the world simultaneously. The editor of a Jesuit magazine in Rome, Antonio Spadaro, S.J., had conducted the interview in Italian, using questions submitted by various Jesuit magazine editors around the world. Pope Francis is the first Jesuit to be elected pope. Unlike the Benedictines, the Franciscans, and the Dominicans, the Jesuits have no branch of women religious, just as the Roman Catholic Church has no women priests. In recent decades, women religious around the world have been far more credible witnesses to gospel teachings than have the all-male Catholic bishops and the all-male Catholic priests and the all-male Jesuits. (Disclosure: Many years ago now, I was in the Jesuits for approximately eight years. However, for many years now, I have not been a practicing Catholic.) Evidently, Pope Francis was not given the list of questions before the interview. As a result, his responses appear to be extemporaneous. But the Jesuit who conducted the interview did not ask Pope Francis any challenging follow-up questions asking him to clarify anything or to give examples of what he meant. Why bother to have a face-to-face interview, if the interviewer does not ask any challenging follow-up questions? For example, in response to the interviewer’s question about who he is, Pope Francis first says that he is a sinner. Then upon further reflection, he adds, “Yes, perhaps I can say that I am a bit astute, [and] that I can adapt to circumstances, but it is also true that I am a bit naïve” (16). Then he returns to the theme that he is a sinner. OK, at times, he is a bit astute. At times, he can adapt to circumstances. At times, he is a bit naïve. And the interviewer asks no questions. However, as I will discuss momentarily, later in the interview, Pope Francis gives us reason to wonder about his statements regarding women. Do he thinks those statements show how he can at times be astute, or how at times he cannot adapt, or at times how he is naïve? In the lengthy interview, Pope Francis uses a lot of Catholic mumbo-jumbo, the kind of Catholic mumbo-jumbo that usually appeals to conservative American Catholic theocons who tend toward papalolotry. However, so much of this interview is given over to Jesuit mumbo-jumbo that I would say that this published interview is by far the best Jesuit propaganda in recent decades. Not surprisingly, the pope is thoroughly grounded in Jesuit spirituality. But it remains to be seen if this will help him be an effective pope. In any event, buried in the pope’s vast outpouring of Catholic mumbo-jumbo were a few pointed remarks criticizing the Roman Catholic Church for over-emphasizing its teachings against legalized abortion in the first trimester, artificial contraception, and same-sex marriage. Pope Francis says, “We cannot insist only on issues related to abortion, gay marriage, and the use of contraceptive methods. This is not possible. I have not spoken much about these things, and I was reprimanded for that. But when we speak about these issues, we have to talk about them in context. The teaching of the church, for that matter, is clear[,] and I am a son of the church, but it is not necessary to talk about these issues all the time” (26). Wow! American Catholic theocons are not going to be happy with Pope Francis. As a matter of fact, they might want
to organize a recall election to have him removed as pope and have the cardinal-electors re-convene and elect another pope more to their liking. Not surprisingly, the secular news media in the United States helped get the word out about Pope Francis’s criticisms of the over-emphasis on certain well-known Catholic teachings. But let’s not get carried away here with the selective coverage of the U.S. news media. After all, Pope Francis did not criticize the church’s teachings, which I would say deserve to be roundly criticized and rejected. On the contrary, his specific criticisms come down to trying to curb the religious zealotry of Catholic theocons. In effect, he is urging them to stand down from their favorite political emphases, because there is more to the church’s overall teachings than just their few favorite hobby-horses. In plain English, Pope Francis is criticizing tactics used to supposedly witness to and thereby supposedly advance the cause of winning over the hearts and minds of people to the church’s teachings. But he is not criticizing the substance of the church’s ridiculous teachings, as they deserve to be criticized. In the interview, Pope Francis actually devotes more time and attention to expounding his positive views of the church and what it should be than he devotes to expounding his few pointed criticisms of over-emphasizing selected church teachings. But his positive views of the church are so general and so over-arching that American Catholics who favor emphasizing the church’s faith-and-justice teachings might not feel that their favorite hobby-horses have been endorsed by the pope. Nevertheless, the good news is that Pope Francis clearly and unequivocally says, “I have never been a right-winger” (20). But the bad news is that he clearly indicates that he is a male chauvinist if there ever was one. When Pope Francis was asked about the role of women in the church, here is how he responded: “I am wary of a solution that can be reduced to a kind of ‘female machismo,’ because a woman has a different makeup than a man. But what I hear about the role of women is often inspired by an ideology of machismo. Women are asking deep questions that must be addressed. The church cannot be herself without the woman and her role. The woman is essential for the church. Mary, a woman, is more important than the bishops. I say this because we must not confuse the function with the dignity. We must therefore investigate further the role of women in the church. We have to work harder to develop a profound theology of the woman. Only by making this step will it be possible to better reflect on their function within the church. The feminine genius is needed wherever we make important decisions. The challenge today is this: to think about the specific place of women also in those places where the authority of the church is exercised for various arenas of the church” (28). Give the man a prize for out-doing the Vatican’s notorious claim about women religious in the church being influenced by so-called “radical feminism” -- by coming up with a far more sweeping indictment of a supposedly female ideology of machismo. The man is a male chauvinist if ever there was one. He’s against the ideology of female machismo, because he favors the ideology of male
machismo that has dominated the Roman Catholic Church in recent centuries. So should the Roman Catholic Church be renamed the Roman Catholic Church of Male Patriarchy, or the Roman Catholic Church of Male Chauvinism, or the Roman Catholic Church of Male Machismo? Granted, at least Pope Francis appears to speak positively about the “essential” role of women in the church. Indeed, if all the Catholic women around the world today abandoned the church, there would not be many practicing Catholics left. So Pope Francis would be well advised to re-think his claim that “woman has a different makeup than a man.” Yes, women and men admittedly have different anatomical features. For example, women have wombs and give birth to children. Men don’t. Men have more testosterone and less estrogen. But in the final analysis, just how important are these differences in physiological makeup? Why should the Roman Catholic Church put so much emphasis on gender politics by claiming that women should not serve the church as ordained priests? Why not? Didn’t ancient gender politics influence the portrayal of women in the canonical gospels? I know, I know, Pope Francis says that he did not receive a good education in philosophy. Referring to “decadent Thomistic commentaries,” he says, “Unfortunately, I studied philosophy from textbooks that came from decadent or largely bankrupt Thomism. In thinking of the human being, therefore, the church should strive for genius [such as “the genius of Thomas Aquinas”] and not for decadence” (38). Fair enough. Would some genius please tell Pope Francis that his statement that “woman has a different makeup than a man” sounds remarkably out-dated as a philosophical position? In my estimate, the only tenable philosophical position is that women and men both have a human nature, regardless of the obvious anatomical and physiological differences between them. Now, if both women and men have the same basic human nature, then they are born equal and should have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as the American Declaration of Independence puts it. But should women in the Roman Catholic Church have the same rights that men do? For example, should Roman Catholic women have the right to become validly ordained priests, or to become cardinals, or to become pope? But if Roman Catholic women are to be denied the right to become validly ordained priests, or cardinals, or the pope, on what grounds should they be denied these rights – on the grounds of debatable interpretations of culturally conditioned scriptural texts? Because the Jesuits do not have a branch of women religious, perhaps we should not be surprised that Pope Francis is a male chauvinist. Nevertheless, not only Roman Catholic women religious but also other Roman Catholic women should pray for him to have a change of heart and mind about the alleged ideology of female machismo and the alleged “different makeup” of a woman. In addition to praying for him to have a change of heart and mind, both Roman Catholic women religious and other Roman Catholic women should speak out against his out-dated views. Indeed, all women and men of goodwill who are concerned about
the rights of women, including their legal right to abortion in the first trimester, should speak out against Pope Francis’s out-dated views. Somebody always has to bring up the rear. But in the case of the Roman Catholic Church, the rear has really fallen way behind. So let Pope Francis bring up the rear if he wants to. But tell him to bring the rear up from the mid-20th century and the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) in the Roman Catholic Church, because we are now in the 21st century. He’s back there with the American television show Father Knows Best, as are many conservative American Catholics.

(X.20) Frank, Justin A. *Bush on the Couch: Inside the Mind of the President*. 2nd ed. New York: Harper, 2007. Topics: Kleinian Psychoanalysis; Therapy. Perceptive, empathic, and penetrating. What difference does it make, if any, if the president of the United States is incapable of serious mourning? What benefit, if any, is there to being capable of serious mourning? Justin A. Frank, M.D., is a psychiatrist and psychoanalyst. As a psychoanalyst, he follows Melanie Klein’s approach to psychoanalysis, using her model of our psychological condition. I read Dr. Frank’s book *Obama on the Couch* (X.21) before I read Dr. Frank’s earlier book *Bush on the Couch* (2004; rev. ed. 2007). In his book about President Barack Obama, Dr. Frank sets forth a far more lucid explanation of Melanie Klein’s thought than he does in his book about President George W. Bush (GWB). In addition, Dr. Frank’s book about Obama includes a helpful glossary of psychoanalytic terminology toward the end of the book. In his book about GWB, Dr. Frank suggests that GWB probably suffers from the kind of learning disability known as attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). But Dr. Frank’s most important diagnosis of GWB is that he suffers from megalomania (200-06, 231). However, the most moving and at times poignant part of Dr. Frank’s book is his recurring discussion of the death of GWB’s younger sister Robin in October 1953, when GWB was about seven years old (2-3, 14-16, 68, 84, 105,187, 224-225, 246). Evidently, GWB’s mother and father did not themselves mourn Robin’s death in a healthy way, thereby tragically depriving GWB of the kind of nurturing he needed to learn himself how to mourn in a healthy way. Dr. Frank discusses the importance of mourning extensively (xvi, 15, 16, 67, 68, 110, 185, 187-188, 255). He concludes that “[a]cceptance of who we are, with all our limitations, requires serious mourning – something that Bush is incapable of doing” (255).

(X.21) ---. *Obama on the Couch: Inside the Mind of the President*. New York: Free Press/Simon & Schuster, 2011. Topics: Kleinian Psychoanalysis; Therapy. Accessible and insightful. Because Dr. Frank diagnoses President George W. Bush as suffering from megalomania, it is not surprising to find that Dr. Frank discusses mania in his book about GWB (202, 232, 254). Because Dr. Frank differentiates megalomania from what I will refer to as simple mania (he refers simply to mania, without a modifying word or
it is not surprising to find that Dr. Frank also works with the term manic in places in his book about Obama (34, 52, 221). However, after Dr. Frank’s extensive discussion of mourning in his book about GWB, mentioned above, I was surprised to find that Dr. Frank refers to mourning only once in his book about Obama (97). But Dr. Frank’s extensive discussion of how Obama’s otherwise nurturing mother did not herself exemplify for young Barack healthy mourning about her own nondeath loss of Barack’s Kenyan father or help young Barack himself learn how to mourn his nondeath loss of his father in a healthy way. Because Dr. Frank connects GWB’s being incapable of serious mourning with his megalomania, as diagnosed by Dr. Frank, why is Dr. Frank silent about how Obama’s mother evidently failed herself to engage in serious mourning her nondeath loss of Obama’s father and also failed to help young Barack learn how to mourn his nondeath loss of his father in a healthy way? I do NOT mean to suggest that President Obama suffers from the kind of megalomania that Dr. Frank diagnoses GWB as suffering from. However, if Obama does not suffer from megalomania, does he suffer from what I referred to above as simple mania? What I am here referring to as simple mania, to differentiate it from megalomania, may not be uncommon in American culture. See John D. Gartner’s book *The Hypomanic Edge: The Link between (A Little) Craziness and (A Lot of) Success in America* (New York and London: Simon & Schuster, 2005) and Peter C. Whybrow’s book *American Mania: When More is Not Enough* (New York and London: Norton, 2005). In any event, I want to quote a telling passage from Dr. Frank’s book about Obama: “Still there is no question that Obama’s passion lies in the drive to heal the split he sees as red and blue. And he sees speeches as transformative, no matter what actions are taken” (33). Now, if John Bradshaw is correct is claiming that grief is the healing feeling, then Obama’s drive to heal the split he sees as red and blue should lead him to advocate grief work, as Bradshaw does. However, instead of advocating grief work as the way to bring about healing, Obama gives big-sounding speeches that have no connection with grief work. Nevertheless, he evidently sees his big-sounding speeches as transformative, as though healing and the transformation that accompanies healing were brought about by listening to big-sounding speeches instead of by undertaking the work of mourning in a healthy way. I know, I know, people do not live on bread alone. For the sake of discussion, I am willing to allow that certain people may find Obama’s speeches uplifting and encouraging. I understand uplifting and encouraging speeches have a valid place in our public lives. But people also do not live on big-sounding speeches alone. Besides that, I do not understand why Obama sees the split between red and blue states as something that he should work to heal. Does he really imagine that he is going to heal megalomaniacs? For understandable reasons, Obama might prefer not to be assassinated by megalomaniacs. However, it strikes me that he should undertake a policy of containment regarding the megalomaniacs not only in red states but
also in other parts of the world today. As Dr. Frank intimates, the first task at hand for President Obama is to work out a more realistic understanding of his mother and his father and their relationship. But to do this, Obama would have to undertake the work of serious mourning of nondeath losses in his early life. In other words, the real split that Obama should work to heal is the split in his own psychological world. As Bradshaw says, grief is the healing feeling. To help himself heal the split in his own psychological world, Obama needs to undertake serious mourning. If his grief work were to heal him from the split in his own psychological world, then he would emerge far more capable of following a policy of containment of the megalomaniacs in red states, instead of hoping in vain that he will somehow heal them through his big-sounding speeches. To be sure, the megalomaniacs in red states do indeed truly need to be healed of their megalomania. However, they are not going to be healed by big-sounding speeches. To be healed, they will have to undertake serious mourning. In the meantime, in the presidential campaign of 2012, President Obama should use big-sounding speeches to rally blue-state liberals against the red-state megalomaniacs. The Republicans are up to no good. So liberals should work against Republicans running for elective office.


(X.22c) --- (with assistance from Anke M. Schreiber). *The Lives of Erich Fromm: Love’s Prophet*. New York: Columbia UP, 2013. Also listed as L. J. Friedman (III.67a). Topics: Psychoanalytic Theory; Therapy; Cultural Studies. Also see Critchley and Webster (X.12a); de Mello (X.14); Fromm (X.22d); Malone and Malone (I.107); Sherry (X.44c). In this perceptive and penetrating biography, Lawrence J. Friedman explains that Eric Fromm (1900-1980) became friends with David Riesman (1909-2002) after Riesman had seen Fromm for professional psychotherapy. I would say that both men were exemplars of what Riesman (X.44) refers to as inner-directed persons – as was Ong, and as am I. What Fromm refers to as authoritarianism involved a noxious and virulent form of what Riesman refers as the outer-directed character type, not an optimal form. As a result of being inner-directed, both Fromm and Riesman were understandably wary of the emerging other-directed persons in the 1950s and 1960s in the United States and elsewhere, which Riesman and Fromm saw as the lonely
crowd. I understand their critiques of other-directedness, which they feared could give way to the noxious and virulent kind of authoritarianism that Fromm had studied. But I think that their critiques of other-directedness are unduly negative. Perhaps inner-directed persons will always look askance at other-directed persons, as Arthur Miller looks askance at Willy Loman in *The Death of a Salesman*. On the one hand, it strikes me that other-directed persons do not have a monopoly on living tragic lives, because inner-directed persons may also live tragic lives. On the other hand, it strikes me that inner-directed persons do not always experience the greatness of soul that Fromm did and that President John F. Kennedy, an other-directed person if ever there was one, did.

(X.22d) Fromm, Erich. *The Art of Loving*. New York: Harper & Row, 1956. Topics: Psychoanalytic Theory; Therapy; Cultural Studies. Also see Critchley and Webster (X.12a); de Mello (X.14); L. J. Friedman (X.22c). According to Lawrence J. Friedman (X.22c), “In all, the book [*The Art of Loving*] sold roughly twenty-five million copies in fifty languages” (183). When I was an undergraduate, I had read *The Art of Loving*. Then in my junior year at Saint Louis University (1964-1965), I attended a reception and dinner in honor of Erich Fromm and his wife early on a Sunday evening, April 25, 1965. Fromm was scheduled to deliver a public lecture on campus later Sunday evening. During the reception, Fr. Ong dropped in to greet Fromm and his wife briefly. But Ong then quickly departed from the reception.

(X.22e) ---. *To Have or to Be?* New York: Harper & Row, 1976. Topics: Psychoanalytic Theory; Religious Studies. Also see de Mello (X.14); Marcel (X.32b). Lawrence J. Friedman (X.22b) reports that Pope John-Paul II “spoke of *To Have or to Be?* As a great spiritual book with humane values – not the problematic values of consumption and the marketplace” (327).


(X.23a) Janov, Arthur. *The Feeling Child*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973. Topic: Therapy. Also see Bradshaw (X.7); A. Miller (I.112a; III.122a). Because the part of the human brain known as the hypothalamus is so important, Arthur Janov characterizes it as the hormonestat (102). Evidently hallucinogens work by impacting the hypothalamus. Concerning hallucinogens, see Huxley (I.87a); Masters and Houston (I.108a); H. smith (I.168a).

(X.24) Jeffreys, J. Shep. *Helping Grieving People – When Tears Are Not Enough: A Handbook for Care Providers*. 2nd ed. New York and London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2011. Topics: Bereavement; Therapy. As a result of my own experience of bereavement, I started reading works by other people about their own personal experiences of bereavement such as Joan Didion’s book *The Year of Magical Thinking* (New York: Knopf, 2005). In addition, I started reading works in the professional literature about loss and mourning, including Freud’s famous essay “Mourning and Melancholia” (1917). Incidentally, if you are going to read only one thing about serious mourning, read Freud’s essay. There’s a fine mind at work in that essay. Then I recently read the second edition of J. Shep Jeffreys’ book *Helping Grieving People – When Tears Are Not Enough: A Handbook for Care Providers*. In my case I am not trying to be a care provider for anybody else but myself. Jeffreys ably covers certain works in the professional literature that I had read as well as other works that I had not read. In the spirit of giving credit where credit is due, he surveys the professional literature and summarizes what each author says – without trying to adjudicate competing claims made by different authors. But his own contribution is in the overall editorial apparatus that he uses in organizing the book and in the direct editorializing that he occasionally provides as he proceeds, most notably on pages 46-49. As Jeffreys explains, attachment theory as advanced by John Bowlby and others dominates the professional literature about loss and mourning. Briefly stated, we form attachments, which are also referred to as attachment bonding and attachment bonds. We feel a sense of loss in our lives when we experience the loss of an attachment bond with someone or something (including the loss of our dreams in which we had invested ourselves). In other words, no attachment bond = no experience of loss = no experience of mourning a loss. As Jeffreys indicates, there are two broad categories of loss: (1) loss due to the death of someone significant in our lives, which is also known as bereavement, and (2) nondeath loss. When we speak of the death of a loved one, we usually think of the death of a marital partner or a romantic lover or a family member, where we have established a personal
two-way love relationship with another individual person. However, I would note that presidential candidates in the United States try to win our votes and approval. In a sense, they try to win our love. When they succeed in winning our love, then we run the risk of falling out of love with them, in which case we may experience our own falling out of love with them as nondeath losses. To be healed of such nondeath losses, we will have to undergo the work of mourning our losses that Susan Anderson describes in her book *The Journey from Abandonment to Healing* (X.3). Tragically, at times, certain politicians such as President John F. Kennedy and other public leaders such as the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., may be assassinated. In those cases, because of the love that we invested in the public figures, their assassinations result in our bereavement. As Jeffreys discusses nondeath losses, it turns out that nondeath losses can include a wide range of losses, because we can and usually do form a wide range of attachments in our lives. As Dr. Justin A. Frank reminds us in his fine book *Bush on the Couch* (X.20) we have seen, the Bush family experienced bereavement due to the death of Robin Bush. But we have not seen bereavement due to a loved one’s death enter the life of young Barack Obama. However, as I will discuss below, young Barack Obama did experience the nondeath loss of his Kenyan father, and his mother also experienced the nondeath loss of young Barack’s father. So loss = loss of attachment bond. Whenever we experience loss (i.e., the loss of an attachment bond), we need to mourn our loss. At first blush, this sounds straightforward. But there is a serious complication. Depending on our earliest attachment bonding, we may or may not be able to mourn in a healthy way. Jeffreys refers to our earliest attachment bonding in terms of secure attachment bonding and nonsecure attachment bonding. Blessed are those who formed secure attachment bonds with both mother and father. Blessed are those who formed secure attachment bonds with either mother or father. Blessed are those who formed secure attachment bonds with other significant persons in their lives. Secure attachment bonds are needed in order to undertake serious mourning in a healthy way. As a result, we need to speak of (A) a healthy way of mourning, which, as mentioned, is connected with secure attachment bonding, and (B) an unhealthy way of mourning, which is connected with nonsecure attachment bonding in our earliest experiences in life. Jeffreys identifies three patterns of nonsecure attachment bonding (52-57 and 307): (1) anxious-ambivalent nonsecure attachment bonding; (2) dismissive-avoidant nonsecure attachment bonding; and (3) fearful-avoidant nonsecure attachment bonding. Any one of these three nonsecure attachment bonds will produce the conditions for the kind of grief work that John Bradshaw writes about. From what we know about young GWB’s family life, it is hard to imagine that he experienced a secure attachment bond with either his mother or his father. Of the three patterns of nonsecure attachment bonds that Jeffreys discusses, GWB most likely experienced the fearful-avoidant nonsecure attachment bond. Of the three
patterns discussed by Jeffreys, this one strikes me as the one most obviously connected with megalomania. However, from what we know about young Barack Obama, it appears likely that he did indeed form a secure attachment bond with his mother. But it does not appear likely that he formed a secure attachment bond with his father. Instead, it appears most likely that young Barack Obama formed a dismissive-avoidant attachment bond with his father. For example, Candidate Obama famously dismissed the Reverend Jeremiah Wright, who had been a father figure in Obama’s life in Chicago, and threw him under the bus when Wright proved himself to be a liability of Candidate Obama’s presidential campaign. (Concerning Wright and Obama, see the index of Dr. Frank’s book for specific page references.) Dr. Frank does not diagnose President Obama as being incapable of serious mourning. On the contrary, Dr. Frank says that President Obama has got some work to do still regarding his father and mother. People who experienced nonsecure attachment bonding in their early lives will not be able to mourn losses in their lives in a healthy way, unless and until they somehow experience what Bradshaw refers to as grief work and what Dr. Frank refers to as serious mourning and an accompanying new kind of containment experience that they had not experienced early in life. Containment experience is the opposite of abandonment experience, and vice versa. In the professional literature about loss and mourning, the terms “resolved” and “unresolved” are used. When the healthy mourning process has run its course and been completed, the mourning process is described as having been resolved. However, people who are not able to mourn in a healthy way do not experience the resolution of their mourning process. As a result, their uncompleted mourning process is described as unresolved. Unresolved mourning remains in their lives – perhaps to be resolved at a later time, if and when they later learn how to experience a new pattern of containment experience to replace their old pattern of abandonment experience. The mourning process is work, the work of mourning. The mantra to feel the feelings applies to the mourning process. In addition to feeling the feelings of mourning, one needs to express one’s feelings somehow, sharing them with others who are able themselves to serve as Exquisite Witnesses (or care providers), as Jeffreys describes them. The Exquisite Witnesses serve the purpose of containment. The emerging process of containment facilitated with the help of the Exquisite Witnesses enables the mourner to learn a new pattern, the pattern of containment, to replace the old dysfunctional pattern of abandonment. However, as Jeffreys emphasizes, there is no one right way to mourn. Jeffreys forewarns would-be Exquisite Witnesses to be alert to experiencing what he vividly terms Cowbells. He tells a personal story to explain his use of this term (5). The basic point is that the Exquisite Witness needs to be alert to how she or he is responding to the mourner. In other words, the mourner is expressing her or his feelings. As the Exquisite Witness listens attentively and empathetically, the Exquisite Witness may experience feelings in herself or himself that
signal some unfinished business (i.e., unresolved mourning) from the past. Now, regarding the work of mourning nondeath losses, such as the nondeath losses that young Barack Obama and his mother experienced, I would suggest that Susan Anderson's book *The Journey from Abandonment to Healing* (X.3) is basically about mourning nondeath losses. Even though she focuses on the experience of being abandoned by one’s marital partner, or by one’s lover, she is basically discussing abandonment feelings. In nondeath losses, we experience abandonment feelings. For this reason, her book can be read by anyone experiencing abandonment feelings connected with nondeath losses. At her website, Susan Anderson, C.S.W., makes her essay “Suffering the Death of a Loved One” (2006) available. The URL for her website is www.abandonment.net. In this essay, she emphasizes that mourning losses due to death is not the same as mourning nondeath losses, even though both kinds of losses involve attachment bonds. Anderson’s claim that mourning the death of a loved one (bereavement) is not the same as mourning nondeath losses strikes me as an important claim. Her efforts to explain as explicitly as she could how the two mourning processes are different helped me sort out my own experiences into the two broad categories discussed by Jeffreys, mentioned above: (1) mourning the loss due to death and (2) mourning nondeath losses. However, Anderson herself does not explicitly discuss how mourning the death of a loved one (also known as bereavement) might be accompanied by mourning a backlog, as it were, of unresolved mourning of nondeath loss or losses.


(X.25a) ***. *Jung’s Seminar on Nietzsche’s Zarathustra: Abridged Edition.* Ed. and abridged James L. Jarrett. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1998. Topics: History of Philosophy; Jungian Theory; Therapy. Also see Sherry (X.44c); Neumann (X.36e). Jung suggests that we should see the proclamation that God is dead as a report of Nietzsche’s own personal experience. Nietzsche was the son of a Protestant pastor and had as a result presumably assumed that God was alive and well somewhere. For Nietzsche, then, the experience of the supposed death of God was a significant experience. In theory, his experience of the death of God to him could have been a potentially positive experience. However, in actuality, things did not work out well for him. Jung also suggests that we should see the figure of Zarathurstra as representing the archetype of the wise old man in Nietzsche’s psyche.


(X.28) Koulouris, Theodore. *Hellenism and Loss in the Work of Virginia Woolf*. Surrey, UK; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011. Topic: Literary Studies. Also see Critchley and Webster (X.12a). I found Theodore Koulouris’ book to be a wonderfully engaging study. However, I did not find Koulouris’ writing style to be wonderfully engaging, to put it mildly. He does not write short sentences very often. But he ably contextualizes Virginia Woolf’s life and work in her times. Virginia Woolf was married to Leonard Woolf. Her maiden name was Virginia Stephen. Her father was Leslie Stephen, an agnostic. Virginia Woolf is often regarded as a feminist writer among a group of feminist writers known as first-wave feminists. From the 1970s onward, second-wave and later feminist scholars have enriched our resources for understanding Virginia Woolf’s life and work. Koulouris ably draws on the scholarly resources now available about Virginia Woolf. However, he also manages to find previously unexplored angles of her life and work to explore in his new fascinating study, most notably her study of ancient Greek. But of course Virginia Stephen undertook her study of ancient Greek within the larger historical context of British Hellenism in her day. (There has not been an American counterpart to British Hellenism.) Koulouris mentions and briefly discusses Virginia Woolf’s 1937 published eulogy for Janet Case, who had been her first tutor for her private lessons in Greek years earlier (65). As a result of her early lessons in Greek with different tutors over the years, Woolf could read Greek with relative ease, but “she was unable to compose in Greek” (37). From the time of Erasmus and Thomas More and others, including Peter Ramus, in the educational movement that we refer to as Renaissance humanism onward, formal education in Great Britain and in the American colonies involved cultivation of Latin and Greek, and the veneration and emulation of ancient Greek and Latin works. During the roughly thousand-year period known as the Middle Ages, Latin had been the lingua franca of educated people and of formal learning. And Greek was not unknown. But the style of medieval Latin authors did not compare well with the style of Cicero. But Erasmus and Thomas More were concerned with style in their Latin writings. For them, Cicero was understandably the great exemplar of style in Latin. But Cicero’s decidedly rhetorical style was kind of long-winded and windy – or, in the word that Koulouris dwells on in his engaging study of Virginia Woolf, voluble (volubility arises as the result of cultivating what Erasmus refers to as “copia”). Incidentally, Koulouris, who mentions Erasmus and Thomas More only in passing and doesn’t mention Cicero at all, writes skillfully precise but nevertheless lengthy sentences that are not unlike the voluble style that he painstakingly delineates, the voluble academic and public style that Virginia Woolf
reacted against. Virginia Woolf’s reaction against voluble people reminded me of Emily Dickinson’s short poem “I’m Nobody! Who are you?” She compares being nobody to being somebody. In Virginia Woolf’s terminology, those people in the world who think they are somebody tend to be voluble. I understand that educated men may be over-represented in the group of voluble people. I understand that voluble people can seem unduly self-important and overbearing at times, especially to the group of people who would agree with Dickinson that they are nobodies in the world. For the nobodies, private conversations can be wonderful. I-thou communication can be memorable. In addition, academics who make classroom presentations and all variety of people who speak in public, including people who talk in public on television and radio talk shows running the risk of loving to hear the sound of their own voices. But it strikes me that being voluble is probably always going to be part of public speaking, as distinct to speaking in a private conversation that is not being broadcast on radio or television or being recorded for broadcast or for the purposes of oral history. I’ve briefly explained the word “Hellenism” in the title of Koulouris’ book, so it remains for me next to explain the word “Loss” in his title. When Virginia’s mother died, Virginia was thirteen (70, note 94). No doubt the custom of funeral orations delivered in public to a live audience at a funeral or a memorial service continued in Great Britain during Virginia Woolf’s entire lifetime. However, her father, Leslie Stephen, was famously an agnostic. His agnosticism ruled out church services for him and his family, including his daughter, Virginia Stephen. (But Koulouris is silent about any funeral orations that may have been part of the family’s graveside burial service.) Koulouris explains that “after her mother’s death Woolf suffered her first mental breakdown” (37). Bereavement due to the death of a significant person in one’s life such as one’s mother is a powerful experience for anyone to undergo at any age. But Virginia was only thirteen, and she was not a paragon of psychological strength. In any event, her experience of bereavement due to her mother’s death was more than she could handle psychologically, resulting in her first mental breakdown, the first of several. Under the enormous impact of bereavement due to her half-sister’s death and her father’s death and her older brother’s death, Virginia had to endure a lot of psychological suffering. Over a span of eleven years, Virginia lost not only her mother but also her half-sister and her father and her older brother (7). For an example of a voluble and public form of mourning someone’s death, Koulouris discusses the voluble Jacques Derrida’s memories following the death of Paul de Man, as an expression of mourning (69; also see 10). To be sure, Derrida’s memories of Paul de Man were published in a publication. The word “publication” does contain the word “public.” So Derrida’s memories of Paul de Man are available to the reading public. However, for an example of a voluble and public form of mourning, I would have thought that Koulouris would have mentioned Pericles’ famous funeral oration, as reconstructed from
memory by Thucydides in his *History of the Peloponnesian War*. But Koulouris does not mention Pericles or Thucydides. But Pericles delivered his famous funeral oration in public to a live audience. To be sure, we Americans today still have the custom of having funeral orations delivered in public to a live audience at a funeral or a memorial service. In the case of somebody as important to our civic enterprise as Hector and Beowulf, were to their respective civic enterprises, funerals or memorial services might even be broadcast by television or radio, so that the funeral orations might reach people who were not present in the live audience at the funeral or memorial services, just as printed funeral orations might reach people who had not been present. However, in addition to bereavement due to the deaths of four significant persons in her life, Virginia also had to undertake to mourn other significant losses in her life that were not due to the death of an significant person in her life, but were all the same significant losses in her life. For example, the losses in her socio-cultural life due to her gender. The losses that Virginia experienced in her life due to her gender are, mutatis mutandis, losses comparable to the losses that many girls and women around the world historically down to the present time have experienced to one degree or another. For this reason, Virginia Woolf’s enormous body of work can be seen as a resource for feminists today. However, we should remember Virginia’s social location. Virginia Stephen was the daughter of a prominent upper-middle-class family. She did not come from a lower-class background. Yes, we could describe her as having been home-schooled. But her father was in the habit of reading aloud to his family, and she did have access to her father’s extensive library. In addition, she did receive private lessons in Greek, even though she did not receive the kind of formal education that her older and younger brothers received. As a young woman, she socialized with her older brother’s classically educated friends from Cambridge University, marrying Leonard Woolf. As long as she socialized with classically educated men from Cambridge University in the social group that has become known as the Bloomsbury group (or simply Bloomsbury), she was living in a social context in which she would daily be reminded of her already acute awareness of her lack of a formal education. But let us not forget Shakespeare. As the title of T. W. Baldwin’s monumental two-volume study *William Shakspere’s Small Latine and Lesse Greeke* (VII.3) reminds us, Shakespeare in his day also did not have the full benefit of a formal education in his day. But what he did have by way of formal education was good enough for him to get by on in English, even if he was not fluent enough in Latin or Greek to write poetry or prose work in either of those languages. In any event, out of this enormous matrix of loss and of mourning, Virginia’s creative spirit emerged as almost indomitable -- up to the end of her life. For Virginia, the work of mourning contributed to her literary creativity. Let’s be as clear here as we can be. She was going to have to work out her work of mourning, or else she would run the risk of succumbing to the powerful undertow of bereavement and mourning,
leading to another mental breakdown or to suicide. So she set to work. However, in the end, she did commit suicide. Her suicide shows how powerful and overpowering bereavement and mourning can be at times for some people. However, I myself prefer to work here with a far more comprehensive way of contextualizing her life and work than the admittedly learned and highly circumstantial way of contextualizing her life and work that Koulouris ably works with. War was a way of life in the ancient world and in many other predominantly oral cultures around the world in ancient and medieval and modern times. In oral cultures, warfare required courage and manliness (Greek, “andreia” means both courage and manliness) battle often involved up-close physical combat. Ancient Greek men worked out at the gym to stay fit as warriors. The so-called games in the ancient Olympics involved warrior-training exercises. In imaginative literature, exemplars of warrior courage include Achilles and Hector and Odysseus and Aeneas and Beowulf and Othello and Okonkwo in Chinua Achebe’s novel *Things Fall Apart* (I.2). Oral epic poetry celebrated the heroic ideal. As Virgil’s *Aeneid* shows, the heroic ideal of oral epic poetry survived the emergence of phonetic alphabetic writing and the emergence of the written epic. But an alternative heroic ideal emerged with the heroic death of Socrates in Plato’s *Apology* and the heroic death of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark and the three other canonical gospels. Thus Socrates and Jesus exemplified the non-violent heroic ideal of cultural resistance. Later, after the emergence of the Gutenberg printing press, the anti-hero emerged as exemplified by Falstaff’s critique of honor. Why be courageous and die in the process when you can eat, drink, and be merry, eh? Of course the famous literary heroes I have mentioned are male characters, and so is Falstaff. But Virginia Woolf’s life of creative mourning of loss strikes me as resembling the live of non-violent resistance of the historical Socrates and the historical Jesus. Her creative life on non-violent resistance was heroic. She did not live the life of an anti-hero. On the contrary, she lived a heroic life of courage and resistance in the face of mental breakdowns.


(X.29a) Lewis, Richard D. *When Cultures Collide: Leading Across Cultures*. 3rd ed. Boston and London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing, 2005. Topic: Cultural Studies. Also see Riesman (X.44). Richard D. Lewis works with three basic cultural types: (1) Linear-actives, (2) Multi-actives, and (3) Reactives. Linear-actives strikingly resemble David Riesman’s inner-directed character types; Multi-actives, Riesman’s outer-directed character types; and Reactives, Riesman’s other-directed character types. According to Lewis, Germany, Switzerland, and Luxembourg provide the strongest examples of cultural conditioning that produces Linear-actives, followed
closely by the United States and the United Kingdom. Historically, Germany, the United States, and the United Kingdom spearheaded the Industrial Revolution. As a result, it is not surprising that Lewis sees these three countries as providing cultural conditioning that produces Linear-actives – Riesman’s inner-directed character types. Riesman and his friend Erich Fromm were both inner-directed character types, and both of them worried about the the other-directed character types that they saw emerging around them in American culture in the 1950s. No doubt American cultural conditioning to this day produces a certain number of inner-directed character types, most notably academics and business entrepreneurs. As a result, Lewis has correctly characterized many Americans as Linear-actives. Nevertheless, Lewis’s cultural schema actually bepeaks and encourage a strong other-directedness.

(X.30) Lonergan, Bernard. *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*. 5th ed. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran. Vol. 3. Toronto; Buffalo; London: U of Toronto P, 1992. Also listed as Lonergan (IX.48). A classic. Topics: History of Philosophy; Personalism; Therapy. Also see Ellis (X.16); Lonergan (X.30a); M. D. Morelli (X.36b); Nadler (X.36a); Newman (X.36f). When we consider the inward turn of consciousness, Bernard Lonergan’s *Insight* deserves special recognition for its concerted and self-conscious cultivation of the inward turn of consciousness and self-awareness and self-appropriation. In this work Lonergan famously champions the pure, detached, disinterested desire to know. Now, Anthony de Mello (I.42) claims that “[t]he royal road to mysticism and to Reality . . . passes through the world of actions that are engaged in for themselves without an eye to success or gain – or profit actions” (66). If de Mello’s claim is correct, then the pure, detached, disinterested desire to know in one’s intellectual work would be one way to proceed down the royal road to mysticism and to Reality.

(X.30a) ***The Lonergan Reader***. Ed. Mark D. Morelli and Elizabeth A. Morelli. Toronto; Buffalo; London: U of Toronto P, 1997. Topics: History of Philosophy; Therapy. Also see Lonergan (X.30); M. D. Morelli (X.36b); Nadler (X.36a). In Part One of *The Lonergan Reader* (29-359), the Morellis have expertly selected key parts of Lonergan’s *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (X.30) that help interested readers follow Lonergan’s central line of thought in his philosophical masterpiece. In Part Two (361-597), they have included numerous selections from his various other publications over the years. As far as I know, no one has examined Lonergan’s views of subjectivity and conversions in connection with the ancient and medieval ideas of deification discussed by Norman Russell (X.44b) and A. N. Williams (X.50a).

Sources, 1992. Also listed as (III.113). A classic. Topics: Roman Catholic Spirituality; Jesuit Spirituality; Therapy. Through the repeated detailed instructions calling for application of the sense to meditating of specific biblical passages, Ignatius Loyola leads people to engage in the kind of imaginative meditation that resembles what Eric A. Havelock (I.81) refers to as imagistic thinking. This kind of meditation opens the way for the person to engage in what C. G. Jung refers to as active imagination. See Jung (X.25).


(X.35) Menn, Stephen. *Plato on God as Nous*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1995. Topics: History of Philosophy; Psychodynamics of Mystic Experience; Therapy. Also see Moran (X.36a); Engberg-Pedersen (I.55); van Beeck (X.48c).

(X.35a) Mooney, Edward F. *Wilderness and the Heart: Henry Bugbee’s Philosophy of Place, Presence, and Memory*. Athens, GA; and London: U of Georgia P, 1999. Topic: History of Philosophy. Also see Buell (X.8b); Bugbee (X.8c); Ong (X.40a).

Jungian theorist Robert L. Moore of the Chicago Theological Seminary, the archetype of initiation is involved in natural change and growth, including mourning both nondeath loss and loss due to somebody’s death and other kinds of life-world transitions in the course of life such as the transition into old age. For about ten years, I got to experience the co-occurrence of three psychological events: (1) bereavement (Freud’s mourning) due to the death of my former teacher and friend Walter J. Ong, S.J. (1912-2003); (2) mourning a backlog of unresolved mourning of certain non-death losses in my adult life (Freud’s melancholia); and (3) the transition into old age (Erikson’s stage eight: ego-integrity versus disgust, despair). The melancholia that can accompany bereavement is a totalizing biochemical experience.


(X.36d) Nadler, Steven. The Philosopher, the Priest, and the Painter: A Portrait of Descartes. Princeton and London: Princeton UP, 2013. Topics: History of Art; History of Philosophy. Short and accessible introduction to Descartes’ Meditations. Also see Augustine (X.5a); Lonergan (X.30; X.30a); Novak (X.37); Ong (X.40); Teilhard (X.48).


(X.36f) Newman, John Henry. An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent. Notre Dame, IN; and London: U of Notre Dame P, 1979. Topics: History of Philosophy; Religious Studies. Also see Jost (XII.79a); Ker (XII.80b); Lonergan (X.30); Newman (XII.104a); Ong (X.40). In today’s parlance, Newman’s Grammar of Assent can be understood as a postmodernist critique of the philosophers of modernity. Bernard Lonergan (X.30) was deeply influenced by Newman’s Grammar of Assent.

(X.38) Nussbaum, Martha C. *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994. Topics: History of Philosophy; Therapy. Also see Cushman (X.13); Lain Entralgo (I.98); Lloyd and Sivin (I.102); Nussbaum (III.130a; X.38a); Sorabji (X.44d).

(X.38a) ---. *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. Cambridge, UK; and New York: Cambridge UP, 2001. Topic: History of Philosophy. Also see Nussbaum (III.130a; IX.55a; X.38). In Jesuit spirituality and in other Catholic traditions of spirituality, the expression “discernment of spirits” is commonly used. The basic idea is that we should work carefully to evaluate the various movements of the spirit within us. Of course the movement of the spirit within us can involve emotions and upheavals of emotion. But what is the intelligence that these emotions, or upheavals of emotion, are communicating to us? To evaluate and assess the intelligence that emotions are communicating to us, we need to engage in careful discernment.


(X.40) ---. *Hopkins, the Self, and God*. Toronto; Buffalo; London: U of Toronto P, 1986. Accessible. Also listed as Ong (II.15; XII.121). Topics: History of Philosophy; Literary Studies; Jesuit Spirituality; Cultural Studies; Evolutionary Theory. Also see Buell (X.8a).


(X.44) Riesman, David with Nathan Glazer and Reuel Denney. *The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character.* Ed. with a foreword by Todd Gitlin. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2000. Accessible. Also listed as Riesman (XII.147a). Topics: American Studies; Cultural Studies. Also see Lewis (X.29a). In this widely known book David Riesman works with three categories of character types: (1) the outer-directed person (also known as tradition-directed); (2) the inner-directed person; and (3) the other-directed person. Riesman himself was an inner-directed person. In terms of well-known literary characters, King Lear exemplifies an outer-directed person, and young Prince Hamlet exemplifies an inner-directed person. In Arthur Miller’s play *The Death of a Salesman,* Willy Loman exemplifies an other-directed person. In real life, President John F. Kennedy exemplified the other-directed person, as did President Bill Clinton and President George W. Bush. However, President Barack Obama exemplifies the inner-directed person.

(X.44a) Roland, Allen L. *Radical Therapy: Surrender to Love and Heal Yourself in Seven Sessions (Not Seven Years).* Novato, CA: Origin P, 2002. Topic: Therapy. Also see S. Anderson (X.3); de Mello (X.14); Teilhard (X.48). Allen L. Roland claims that his approach to therapy was inspired, in part, by the thought and life of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, S.J.

Jay Sherry’s painstakingly thorough book *Carl Gustav Jung: Avant-Garde Conservative* situates Jung in the intellectual context of his times. In addition to being a historian of psychoanalysis, Dr. Sherry is a scholar trained in Germany in German intellectual history. Dr. Sherry portrays Jung (1875-1961) as what we in the United States today would call a likely Republican voter. However, even though Jung once ran for a minor elective position in Switzerland – and lost – he usually claimed to be non-political because he did not tend to advocate specific political policies. But Dr. Sherry says, “Jung’s sensibilities were essentially those of a conservative humanist rather than a liberal humanitarian” (210). As Dr. Sherry makes clear, the humanists whose thought most influenced Jung were Jacob Burckhardt (1818-1897) and Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900), both of whom lived in Basel, where Jung grew up. Earlier, for a long period of time, the Renaissance humanist Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536) also lived in Basel, as Dr. Sherry notes (22). But Jung was not especially influenced by Erasmus’s thought, probably because Erasmus was a Roman Catholic but Jung was not. Jung “was raised in the Swiss Reformed Church” (20). However, in his mature years Jung was also a critic of Christianity, criticizing “the four exclusions of Christianity” – “the repression of nature, animals, primitives, and creative fantasy” (64). As Dr. Sherry notes, “Jung held an English-language seminar on Nietzsche’s *Zarathustra* from 1934 to 1939” (151). Because Dr. Sherry does not happen to mention it, we should note that Nietzsche was enthusiastic about Ralph Waldo Emerson’s idea of self-reliance, as Lawrence Buell points out in his book *Emerson* (X.8a). So we could say that Emerson’s idea of self-reliance contributed indirectly, via Nietzsche, to Jung’s development of the idea of psychological individuation (the Freudian equivalent idea is ego-integrity). Buell says, “John Dewey admired Emerson immoderately. . . . Dewey’s Emerson was ‘the Philosopher of Democracy’” (158). By contrast, Nietzsche could be described as the Philosopher of the Nazis. As is well known, a streamlined version of Nietzsche’s thought was popularized among the Germans and influenced Adolf Hitler’s thought. Jung was fascinated with Hitler, but he was not quick to detect what a threat Hitler was. Hitler and the Nazis represented Emersonian self-reliance on steroids, as do today’s conservative libertarians in the United States. Dr. Sherry considers the humanist tradition of thought to be conservative. Of course Thomas Jefferson and John Adams were also products of the humanist tradition of
education, as was President Franklin D. Roosevelt later on. But Dr. Sherry
does not mention Jefferson or Adams, even though he does mention
Roosevelt in passing. If we were to follow Dr. Sherry’s classification of
the humanist tradition of thought as conservative, then we would also
classify the thought of 19th-century Roman Catholic popes as
conservative as well. To this day, the Roman Catholic tradition of thought
tends to be conservative, except for certain aspects of the Catholic
tradition of social justice. In the Roman Catholic tradition, the elaborate
educational training of Jesuits was part of Renaissance humanism, and
Jesuit education, both secondary education and undergraduate education,
in the United States was strongly oriented toward humanist education at
least until the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) in the Roman Catholic
Church. In any event, Ong’s Jesuit education and his educational training
as a Jesuit was in the humanist tradition. As an orthodox Roman Catholic
priest, he could be characterized as a conservative – in the way in which
Dr. Sherry characterizes Jung as a conservative. Ong’s thinking was at the
time and still is avant-garde thinking. So Ong can also be characterized as
an avant-garde conservative.DIGRESSION: For a history of anti-Semitism
in the Roman Catholic Church, see James Carroll’s book Constantine’s
Sword: The Church and the Jews: A History (III.21a). For a survey of
modern liberal American Protestant theology, Gary Dorrien’s three
volumes titled The Making of American Liberal Theology (XII.28). END
OF DIGRESSION. In any event, if we were to take President Franklin D.
Roosevelt as an exemplar of a liberal humanitarian, then we
would have to
say that Jung, by contrast, was basically non-political in the sense that he
did not usually propound specific political proposals. According to Dr.
Sherry, Jung was interested “in exploring the psychological basis of
human behavior and culture rather than promoting social programs for
ameliorating human suffering” (210). However, Dr. Sherry reports that
Jung made the following comment in a 1936 interview: “A decent
oligarchy – call it an aristocracy if you like – is the most ideal form of
government” (15; also 162). Jung’s preference resembles in spirit at least
Jefferson’s famous reference to a natural aristocracy. But of course
Jefferson was strongly opposed to having a hereditary aristocracy. For
Jung, the French Revolution represented the Left (61). After the Bolshevik
Revolution in Russia in 1917, communism also represented the Left for
Jung. He was anti-communist (210). During the Cold War, after World
War II, Jung was a staunch anti-communist, as were most Americans.
Now, if we were to take the contrast that Yuval Levin works with in his
recent book The Great Debate: Edmund Burke, Thomas Paine, and the
Birth of Right and Left (III.111d), we would have to align Jung with
Edmund Burke (1729-1797), not with Thomas Paine (1737-1809), even
though Jung did not usually advocate specific political policies. For Jung,
the Symbolist movement in the arts represented the avant-garde (61).
However, when the movement known as modernism in the arts emerged
later on in his life, he had a strong distaste for it (47, 191). So did Adolf
Hitler, who considered modernist art to be degenerate. But Dr. Sherry does not mention this point of similarity between Hitler and Jung. Now, after commenting on “Jung’s anecdotal anthropologizing” (80), Dr. Sherry then includes the following quotation: “He had opinions about everything” (81). Throughout his book Dr. Sherry provides an ample array of Jung’s many opinions. Now, if we understand what Jung terms intuition to be the psychological function that we employ whenever we detect patterns (80), then we could say that Jung’s own intuition was in overdrive in producing his numerous opinions based on his anecdotal anthropologizing. For understandable reasons, people might get tired of listening to Jung’s anecdotal anthropologizing. Dr. Sherry reports that “Jung characterized Hitler as the medicine man leader in contrast to the other two [Mussolini and Stalin] who fit the profile of the chieftain type” (165). According to Dr. Sherry, Jung thought that “Hitler was highly susceptible to information coming from the unconscious and so was in tune with the collective unconscious of the German people” (165). Oddly enough, if we were to take Jung’s claims about Hitler being a medicine-man leader type seriously, then we would have to note that Jung himself had certain characteristics that he attributes to the medicine-man type, as Jung’s recently published Red Book (2009). But of course he was not a political leader. For the sake of discussion, let’s say that Hitler may have been “the medicine man leader” type. Would this way of understanding Hitler have helped President Roosevelt or Winston Churchill formulate more effective ways to cope with him? I doubt it. Would understanding Mussolini and Stalin as “the chieftain type” leaders have helped Roosevelt or Churchill formulate more effective ways to cope with them? I doubt it. But Allen Dulles and other guys in the spy business would probably like Jung’s kind of profiling – you know, the kind of guys who told us that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. But Saddam Hussein was undoubtedly the chieftain-type leader, like Mussolini and Stalin, not the medicine-man leader type like Hitler. For further discussion of Allen Dulles, see Stephen Kinzer’s book about the Dulles brothers (III.109). In any event, I take Jung’s characterization of Hitler as the medicine-man leader type to mean that Jung saw Hitler as embodying an aspect of the spirit of the shaman that Robert Moore and Douglas Gillette discuss in their book The Magician Within: Accessing the Shaman [Archetype] in the Male Psyche (I.117). I take Jung’s characterization of Mussolini and Stalin as the chieftain-type leaders to mean that Jung saw them as being warrior-kings in spirit. Warrior-kings combine aspects of the archetypal energies that Moore and Gillette discuss in their book The Warrior Within: Accessing the Knight [Archetype] in the Male Psyche (I.118) and The King Within: Accessing the King [Archetype] in the Male Psyche (I.115a). In the Homeric epic the Iliad, the chief male Greek characters are portrayed as warrior-kings: Agamemnon, Achilles, Odysseus. In the Hebrew Bible, Moses is portrayed as one example of the shaman-type leader. But King David is portrayed as one example of the warrior-king. In
the Christ myth in Christianity, in the Second Coming, the Christ figure is envisioned as the triumphant warrior-king. Now, according to Dr. Sherry, Burckhardt and many German intellectuals singled out “the Jew” as “the prime catalyst of the process of modernity” (25). Modernity here appears to mean late 19th century and early 20th century. (However, in certain other places in the book, modernity clearly refers to the Enlightenment.) Not surprisingly, Jung also subscribed to this view – and advanced it later on after his famous break with Sigmund Freud (1856-1939). Freud of course was a secularized Jew. Dr. Sherry says, “Adopting Burckhardt’s view of the assimilated Jew as the ‘agent of modernity’ he [Jung] was alienated more from their atheism rather than their ethnicity” (40). After Jung’s break from Freud, Freud, according to Dr. Sherry, dismissed Jung’s new methodology as “‘Aryan religiousness’” (41). For his part, after his famous break with Freud, Jung constructed the elaborate contrast between Germanic and Jewish psychology (118). In a nutshell, Jung held out for an experience of religiousness over against Freud’s explicit atheism. The experience of religiousness that Jung held out for was Rudolf Otto’s experience of the numinous. Basically, what Otto refers to as the experience of the numinous is the equivalent of what Mircea Eliade refers to as the experience of the sacred in his book The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion (I.53). Also see Anthony de Mello’s book The Way to Love (X.14). But we should note that atheists and agnostics and people of monotheistic religious faiths and people of polytheistic religious traditions can all experience the numinous. We could say that the experience of the numinous is an equal opportunity employer. However, Jung and Freud had not figured this out. As I read Dr. Sherry’s book, I noted all the words associated with roots imagery: roots/ rootedness (8, 59, 115, 126, 128, 212); rootless/ rootlessness (25, 54, 59); uprooted/ uprootedness (9, 127, 191, 211). In the contrast that Jung constructed between Germanic psychology and Jewish psychology, he characterized modern Jews as rootless – uprooted, presumably from their ancient Jewish religious roots (he always seems to be referring to secular Jews). By contrast, Jung characterizes Germans as having roots. But our human ancestors were hunter-gatherers, before they became farmer and established roots in certain places. So if Jung’s idea of a collective unconscious is valid, then all of us are carrying collective-unconscious memories of our hunter-gather ancestors as well as of our farmer ancestors. In conclusion, Dr. Sherry has written a superb scholarly account of Jung’s life and work, contextualizing his thought in the relevant thought of his times. Dr. Sherry’s book nicely complements Lawrence Friedman’s book The Lives of Erich From: Love’s Prophet (X.22a).


(X.44f) Stevens, Anthony. *The Two Million-Year-Old Self*. College Station: Texas A&M UP, 1993. Topics: Jungian Theory; Therapy. Anthony Stevens claims that archetypal wounding requires archetypal healing. All archetypal wounding involves experiencing abandonment feelings. Therefore, archetypal healing requires mourning the losses involved in archetypal wounding. But there are two different kinds of mourning: (1) mourning the death of a loved one (also known as bereavement); and (2) mourning nondeath losses in life. Both of these kinds of mourning may be involved in archetypal healing.


(X.48c) van Beeck, Frans Jozef. “Divine Revelation: Intervention or Self-communication?” *Theological Studies* 52 (1991): 199-226. Topic: Psychodynamics of Mystic Experience. Also see Engberg-Pedersen (I.55); Menn (X.35); Moran (X.36a); van Beeck (I.186). I do not see how Engberg-Pedersen (I.55) could rule out the possibility of what van Beeck refers to as “intervention” (i.e., the influence of the transcendent divine
ground of being in the otherwise intrapsychic experience of mystic experience in meditation).


