Preface

The Introduction to this volume shows that the twentieth century’s conceptualisation of humanity was strongly based on the materialist understanding of the human body defined by biomedical science, and individual contributions explore tensions in the history and literary reception of biomedicine, between the dichotomies of human and inhuman, humane and inhumane. This chapter argues that this fourfold semantic field of medicine, revolving around the corporeal, has always been encompassed by a *quinta essentia*, a fifth element that is the non-human other, namely God: according to the Swiss pastor and theologian Karl Barth, ‘the pure and absolute boundary and beginning of all that we are and have and do’, yet also ‘the Unknown, who is never a known thing in the midst of other known things’.¹ The psychiatrist and philosopher Karl Jaspers used the term ‘transcendence’ to denote a mode of being that is the complete other, a mode in which we do not have a share, but on which we are nonetheless based and to which we relate.²

It was another psychiatrist, C.G. Jung, contemporary of Jaspers, who attempted to bridge the separation between the scientific medical discourse of the mind on the one hand, and philosophical and theological theories of transcendence on the other hand. By arguing for the ability of
the human soul to recognise and even integrate transcendent content, Jung opposed Kantian or post-Kantian notions of religious agnosticism. Following Sonu Shamdasani’s contribution to this volume on Jung’s psychological self-experiment and the consequent shift of his psychotherapy from being solely a cure for pathology, to becoming a theory of higher psychological and spiritual awareness, this chapter in turn outlines the key role Jung attributed to spiritual meditation as part of the psychological process of individuation. Jung describes the aim of psychological individuation as the Ego experiencing the archetype of the Self, or the unity of the individual with the collective unconscious.

Such an idea invites reflection as to what extent a psychotherapeutic treatment is justified in incorporating such a practice as spiritual meditation that expands or even dissolves the boundaries of the Ego. The psychological incorporation of the hitherto non-human other, that is, God, experienced in an ecstatic union through meditation or other spiritual practices, challenges our understanding of what it is to be human, which in modern Western thought is firmly rooted in the subject–object duality. In the last analysis, such a notion raises the question of whether integration of the non-human other leads to an inhuman illusion or even delusion in the Freudian sense, or brings with it a heightened responsibility for creation and humanity.

Introduction

I am a doctor; I have no preparation for [being a *directeur de conscience*]. It is the natural calling of the clergyman; he should do it. Therefore, I wish that a new generation of clergymen would come in and do the same as they do in the Catholic Church: that they would try to translate the language of the unconscious, even the language of dreams, into proper language. For instance, I know that there is now in Germany the ‘Berneuchener Circle’, a liturgical movement; and one of the main representatives is a man who has a great knowledge of symbolism. He has given me quite a number of instances, which I am able to check, where he translated the figures in dreams into dogmatic language with the greatest success, and these people quietly slipped back into the order of the Church. They have no right to be neurotic. They belong to a church, and if you can help them to slip back to the Church you have helped them.

Carl Gustav Jung (1939)

What is the relation between Jungian psychotherapy and *Seelsorge*? As outlined by Sonu Shamdasani in his contribution to this volume, C.G. Jung’s understanding of psychotherapy changed around the time of the beginning of the First World War from being a mere treatment of neurotic ailments to a practice aimed at reaching a higher spiritual development. Jung’s change of direction was mainly triggered by the effects of the psychological self-experimentation that he undertook at the time. During an intense process of active imagination, he engaged with visionary images that seemed to point the way towards not only psychological healing, but some kind of elaborate state of self-awareness. He later called this the process of individuation.

In the following decades, Jung embarked on research into the fields of anthropological, historico-cultural, mythological and religious studies, in a quest to find human experiences similar to the psychological individuation process that he had discovered. One practice that seemed to have much in common with his own experiences was spiritual meditation, as depicted in various sacred texts of the East and Christian spiritual exercises in the West. But whereas the Buddhist and tantric sutras were part of a living tradition of meditation, Christianity, according to Jung, had no equal to them, with the exception of the *Exercitia Spiritualia* of Ignatius of Loyola (1491–1556). In the following, I will argue that Jung’s claim was not only wrong, but that his understanding of Christian meditation was directly shaped by his contacts with members of the Berneuchener movement, a High Church movement that attempted to reintroduce meditation into German Protestantism. Hitherto unknown
letters between founding members of the Berneuchen movement and Jung will show how this intellectual exchange formed their respective understanding and practice of meditation and active imagination.

From 1938 to 1940, Jung’s weekly lectures at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zürich (ETH) were dedicated to the role that spiritual meditation could play in the psychological process of individuation. He contrasted the yogic understanding of meditation in texts such as the *Amitâyur-dhyâna-sûtra*, *Shrî-Chakra-Shambhâra Tantra* or Patanjali’s *Yoga Sutra* with Christian meditative practice as depicted in works by mystics such as Ignatius of Loyola, Meister Eckhart (c.1260–c.1328) or Richard of Saint Victor (d.1173). The aim of the spiritual practice of meditation in the Buddhist and Yogic tradition is to reach a higher state of awareness that will overcome the duality between subject and object (*samadhi*). By contrast, the practitioner of Ignatius’s *Exercitia Spiritualia* is looking for the ‘discernment’ (*discretio*), the realisation of the difference between good and evil that will ultimately lead to a mystical self-abandonment in God. Jung describes this process as the aim of psychological individuation, when the Ego encounters the archetype of the Self, which is the unity of the individual with the collective unconscious.

Thus, Jung’s psychotherapeutic treatment accepts the incorporation of a practice that aims to expand the boundaries of the Ego as defined by the Freudian model of the psyche. The psychological incorporation of the hitherto non-human (and also in-human) Other, experienced in an ecstatic union through meditation or other spiritual practices, questions the understanding of what it means to be human, an understanding that in the tradition of enlightened Western thought has been firmly rooted in the subject–object duality. By contrast, Jung argues for the psychological wholeness of the soul that transcends this divide, resorting to examples from medieval Christian mysticism.

### Jung, the Society of Jesus and Roman Catholicism

In June 1939, Jung followed up his lecture series on Eastern meditation with one on Ignatius of Loyola’s *Exercitia Spiritualia* as an example of Christian meditative practice. His interest in the Society of Jesus and its founder is already evident in his encounters with the unconscious, as noted in his *Black Books*, where he cites on 19 April 1914 the Jesuit motto *In majorem Dei gloriam*. Or one can go even further back to Jung’s earliest childhood memories, a time when he developed an intense fear connected to the image of a Jesuit priest. One day, the young boy was
gazing at a figure with ‘breitem Hut und langem schwarzen Gewand vom Wald herunter kommen’ / ‘a strangely broad hat and a long black garment coming down from the wood’:


At the sight of him I was overcome with fear, which rapidly grew into deadly terror as the frightful recognition shot through my mind: ‘That is a Jesuit.’ Shortly before, I had overheard a conversation between my father and a visiting colleague concerning the nefarious activities of the Jesuits. From the half-irritated, half-fearful tone of my father’s remarks I gathered that ‘Jesuits’ meant something specially dangerous, even for my father. Actually I had no idea what Jesuits were, but I was familiar with the word ‘Jesus’ from my little prayer.⁵

From 1933 onwards, Jung had an opportunity to discuss the *Exercitia Spiritualia* with theologians such as Ernesto Buonaiuti (1881–1946) at the annual Eranos conferences in Ascona. At those conferences, the former Catholic priest and historian of Christianity, who due to his defence of Catholic modernism was excommunicated in 1925, lectured on topics such as ‘Meditation and Contemplation in the Roman Catholic Church’ (1933) and ‘The Exercises of Saint Ignatius of Loyola’ (1935). But it was probably after 1945 that Jung’s interest in Roman Catholicism was strongest, when he befriended the Dominican priest and Professor of Dogmatic Theology in Oxford, Victor White (1902–60). In his first letter to White, Jung writes:

I am highly interested in the point of view the church takes with reference to my work. I had many discussions with catholic priests in this country too and it is on my instigation that catholic scholars have been invited to the Eranos lectures of which you presumably have heard.⁶
One of those scholars was the Jesuit, theologian and Church historian Hugo Rahner (1900–68), one of the leading experts on Ignatius of Loyola at the time, and Jung had ample time to discuss the *Exercitia Spiritualia* with him. Jung was also in contact with the mystic Père Bruno de Jésus-Marie (1892–1962), the editor of the *Etudes Carmélitaines*, who came to see Jung in June 1946 together with Hans Schnyder von Wartensee (1895–1987), senior lieutenant of the Swiss Guard and later founder of the Swiss section of the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem.⁷

**Jung, Reformed Protestantism and Dialectical Theology**

Although some of Jung’s close allies were reformed Protestant theologians such as Hans Schär (1910–67), Professor of Science of Religion, Psychology of Religion, and Pastoral Theology at the University of Bern, and the pastor and theologian Adolf Keller (1872–1963),⁸ Jung held a strong, although ambivalent fascination with Roman Catholicism. As Jung remarked in his memoirs:


> For years afterward I was unable to set foot inside a Catholic church without a secret fear of blood and falling and Jesuits. That was the aura or atmosphere that hung about it, but at the same time it always fascinated me. The proximity of a Catholic priest made me even more uneasy, if that were possible. Not until I was in my thirties was I able to confront Mater Ecclesia without this sense of oppression. The first time was in St Stephen’s Cathedral in Vienna. (MDR, 17)

But Roman Catholicism also presented Jung with the opportunity to encounter a living Christian tradition of meditative practice that he could compare with Eastern meditation. According to Jung, Protestantism did
not offer any equal to that tradition. As a child, he had experienced the spiritual helplessness of his father Johann Paul Achilles Jung (1842–96), a reformed Protestant pastor, who instead of addressing and solving the child’s religious anxieties, resorted to learned formulas and even admitted that he did not understand doctrines such as the Holy Trinity (ETG, 58; MDR, 53). In hindsight, Jung would interpret his father’s failure as part of a serious crisis of faith, to which Johann Paul Achilles Jung reacted with an ever-firmer subscription to the dogmas of the church, rather than with openness to the possibilities of personal religious experience. What Jung saw in the case of his father was the weakening of his faith by the historical-critical method of liberal theology.

The controversial debates surrounding the appointment of Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette (1780–1849) as Professor of Theology at Basel University in 1822 – Wette’s critical account of the Bible was heavily rejected by members of pietistic circles close to the ‘Deutsche Christentumsgesellschaft’ – left their mark on the city of Basel. The attempt to hold a fragile balance between pietism on one hand and critical theology at the university on the other hand was to find a late echo in Jung’s description of his father’s struggle and his own preference for mysticism. By the end of the First World War, the Basel-born pastor and theologian Karl Barth (1886–1968) published his Der Römerbrief / The Epistle to the Romans (1918), which in its second edition of 1922 can be regarded as the swansong of the age of liberal theology. Disappointed by the theological justification for the Great War offered by his former professors, Barth argued against the possibility of any personal experience of God in the sense of the philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher’s ‘absolute feeling of dependence’.

According to Barth, God was transcendent:

Gott, die reine Grenze und der reine Anfang alles dessen, was wir sind, haben und tun, in unendlichem qualitativem Unterschied dem Menschen und allem Menschlichen gegenüberstehend, nie und nimmer identisch mit dem, was wir Gott nennen, als Gott erleben, ahnen und anbeten, das unbedingte Halt! gegenüber aller menschlichen Unruhe und das unbedingte Vorwärts! gegenüber aller menschlichen Ruhe, das Ja in unserm Nein und das Nein in unserm Ja, der Erste und der Letzte und als solcher der Unbekannte, nie und nimmer aber eine Größe unter andern in der uns bekannten Mitte, Gott der Herr, der Schöpfer und Erlöser – das ist der lebendige Gott!

God, the pure and absolute boundary and beginning of all that we are and have and do; God, who is distinguished qualitatively from
men and from everything human, and must never be identified with anything which we name, or experience, or conceive, or worship, as God; God, who confronts all human disturbance with an unconditional command ‘Halt’, and all human rest with an equally unconditional command ‘Advance’; God the ‘Yes’ in our ‘No’ and the ‘No’ in our ‘Yes’, the First and the Last, and consequently, the Unknown, who is never a known thing in the midst of other known things; God, the Lord, the Creator, the Redeemer – that is the living God.\textsuperscript{11}

It is Barth’s view of a transcendent God that Jung found to be the most unacceptable aspect of his dialectical theology. As a psychologist, Jung was primarily interested in the individual psychological experience of a God image. Around the time Barth began to write his commentary on Paul’s epistle, Jung was deeply involved in his own spiritual journey. Archetypal images of a new-born God called Abraxas emerged from the collective unconscious, a God who seemed to be personal and transcendent at the same time.\textsuperscript{12} Jung described these experiences in his notebooks known as the \textit{Black Books}.\textsuperscript{13} Ultimately, these encounters with what he at first called primordial images formed the basis of his analytical psychology.

Barth’s theology of the transcendent God and his consequent rejection of any mystical experience stood in sharp contrast to Jung’s God image as the archetype of the Self. But Jung shunned an open debate with the representatives of dialectical theology. It was only some thirty years later, in the preface to \textit{Psychology and Alchemy} (1944), that Jung argued against the concept of a ‘transcendent God’, albeit without mentioning Barth explicitly: ‘aber auf alle Fälle muß die Seele eine Beziehungsmöglichkeit, das heißt eine Entsprechung zum Wesen Gottes in sich haben, sonst könnte ein Zusammenhang nie zustande kommen. Diese Entsprechung ist, psychologisch formuliert, der \textit{Archetypus des Gottesbildes}.’ / ‘at all events the soul must contain in itself the faculty of relationship to God, i.e., a correspondence, otherwise a connection could never come about. This correspondence is, in psychological terms, the archetype of the God-image.’\textsuperscript{14} But in a corresponding footnote, the addressee of this remark becomes obvious when Jung writes that it was ‘psychologically quite unthinkable for God to be simply the “wholly other”’, a term associated with Barth’s understanding of the transcendent God, for a “wholly other” could never be one of the soul’s deepest and closest intimacies – which is precisely what God is.\textsuperscript{15}

In a letter of 12 July 1947, Jung described his critical relationship with dialectical theology as follows:
It would be a big surprise indeed if there came anything from the side of dialectical theology that could be of practical interest to man. I have never been able to find any connection to this theology and the actual nature of the dialogue has remained obscure to me. That seems to be missing completely. I have more connection with opponents of dialectical theology, even with Catholic theologians, what I find particularly interesting.  

This letter was addressed to the German Lutheran pastor and theologian Walter Uhsadel (1900–85), who would in later years occupy chairs for practical theology at the universities of Hamburg and Tübingen. It is no surprise that Jung’s critical remark on dialectical theology appeared in a letter to Uhsadel, who was a member of the Evangelische Michaelsbruderschaft, an offshoot of the Berneuchen movement, which was in turn part of the Lutheran High Church movement.

The Berneuchen Movement and the Brotherhood of Saint Michael

The Berneuchen movement originated from the German youth movement of the nineteenth century. In the 1920s, German Lutheran clergy and laymen sought to develop a new way forward for Protestantism. The failure of liberal theology and the end of the state church in Germany prompted a series of annual meetings between 1923 and 1928 on a country estate in Berneuchen in the Neumark (also known as East Brandenburg; today Lubuskie in Poland). In contrast to Barth, this group saw a new path for the church in a renewal and deepening of its spiritual life. The results of the meetings were published in the Berneuchener Buch (1926) by Karl Bernhard Ritter (1890–1968), Wilhelm Stählin (1883–1975), Ludwig Heitmann (1880–1953) and Wilhelm Thomas (1896–1978). The group’s programme had seventy signatories, including
the philosopher and theologian Paul Tillich (1886–1965). According to the Berneuchen movement, restoration of spiritual life in German Protestantism demanded the renewal of liturgical practice with a stronger emphasis on the celebration of the Eucharist, the practice of daily office and the study of the Bible. The idea of a return to early aspects of liturgical and spiritual practices also brought the Berneuchen group closer to Roman Catholicism, and in the years to come it formed an important cornerstone of the ecumenical movement in Germany.

At Michaelmas 1931, 22 members of the Berneuchen movement met in the Upper Chapel of the University Church of Marburg to form the Evangelische Michaelsbruderschaft. They shared in the conviction that it was not sufficient only to discuss the renewal of the Church, but that first and foremost such a renewal needed to be practised as part of the committed togetherness of a Christian brotherhood. The principles of the Brotherhood were based on the trias of martyria (witness), leiturgia (church service) and diakonia (service in society).

The Brotherhood was led by an elder. The first of these was Karl Bernhard Ritter, who initiated the foundation when he invited the brothers to the ceremony of 1931 at the University Church of Marburg, where he was pastor at the time. Ritter had studied theology and philosophy in Heidelberg, Halle and Erlangen before he volunteered as a soldier at the front in 1914. After the war, he became a member of the Prussian Landtag for the Deutschnationale Volkspartei, a national-conservative party that was founded in 1918. He was also a founding member of the Jungdeutscher Bund, a national-conservative offshoot of the Wandervogel movement. There he first met Wilhelm Stählin, later Bishop of Oldenburg, who was slightly older than Ritter. Stählin had studied theology in Erlangen, Rostock and Berlin. His strong interest in psychology and pastoral care led him to found the Gesellschaft für Religionspsychologie / Society of Religious Psychology and the journal Archiv für Religionspsychologie / Archive of Religious Psychology in 1914. These two pastors shared wartime military experience. When Ritter and Stählin were invited to join the foundation of the Jungdeutscher Bund, they encountered young Germans who were highly critical of the church. This younger generation regarded the church as having been stripped bare of its spiritual qualities; for them the church had lost its appeal as a place where words could form the unmediated expression of concrete life. Thus, both Ritter and Stählin thought that if the Church was ever to attract this younger generation, it would need to reflect on its authentic values rather than merely engaging with ideological questions: ‘Die Kirche entfaltet ihre stärkste werbende Kraft, sie ist dann am meisten ein wirkliches Zeugnis für die Welt, wenn sie als
Kirche da ist.’ / ‘The church unfolds its strongest attraction and is the most real witness to the world, if it is there as a church.’ Ritter recollected the mood of the times as follows:


Zusammenhänge, die in der ärztlichen Wissenschaft des letzten Jahrzehnts immer klarer geworden sind und den kranken Menschen an Stelle des bloßen erkrankten körperlichen Organgefüges entdecken ließen, kurz und gut, die Einbettung des Menschen in den Kosmos, theologisch gesprochen, die Wahrheit und das Gewicht des ersten Artikels, der Lehre von der Schöpfung, wurden uns unmittelbar zum Erlebnisinhalt.

Stählin’s text about the ‘meaning of the body’ also belongs in this context. In conversation with this young generation we experienced that the mere intellectual word is no longer effective for contemporary man as it has not been incorporated in the fundamental context of a perception saturated by images – and this was long before psychological research had highlighted the significance of images for the soul’s balance as well as, through the examples of song, dance or play, the importance of the physical gesture and the inclusion of the whole physical human being as part of any true and effective experience of reality.

These are connections that have become significantly clearer in the medical science of the last decade and that have allowed us to see the ill human being rather than a mere diseased physical assemblage of organs. In summary, the embeddedness of man in the cosmos, in theological terms, the truth and the weight of the first article, that is to say the doctrine of creation, became for us an unmediated experience.

In these recollections of Ritter’s from 1953, clear reference to Jungian psychology can be detected when he writes about the psychological
research that emphasised the importance of psychological images (Bilder) for the economy of the soul or the wholeness of man. However, Ritter also claimed that this emphasis on the image was discovered prior to and independently from psychology, including Jungian psychology.

Carl Happich, Pastoral Advisor and Spiritual Guide

Another important aspect linking the spiritual practice of these theologians to Jung’s psychology was the practice of meditation. The introduction of meditation into the Michaelsbruderschaft was an initiative of another founding father, the medical doctor Carl Happich (1878–1947). Ritter and Happich shared political views. Happich was a member of the Stahlhelm Bund der Frontsoldaten, a right-wing paramilitary organisation with close ties to the Deutschnationale Volkspartei. Both men were also Freemasons at the Lodge of St John Zum flammenden Schwert in Darmstadt. Happich presided over this Christian-oriented Masonic lodge from 1921 to 1930. He was also an active participant in Hermann Graf Keyserling’s Schule der Weisheit, where Jung lectured on a number of occasions. There Jung first met Richard Wilhelm (1873–1930) in the early 1920s, and also became acquainted with Erwin Rouselle (1890–1949). Both men were friends of Happich’s, and Rouselle was even a member of the same Masonic lodge as Happich. Other friends in common included Rudolf Otto (1869–1937) and Heinrich Zimmer (1890–1943). Although his father was a Lutheran pastor, Happich’s understanding of Christianity soon exceeded the limitations of his own denomination and opened his faith to the spiritual wealth of Catholicism and to ecumenical dialogue. This openness, and the desire to help his patients, led him to experiment with forms of therapy that combined physical, psychological and spiritual elements. Ritter described Happich’s approach as follows:

Neben einem ganz ursprünglichen Interesse für alle Erscheinungsformen des seelischen Lebens war es wohl vor allem anderen sein leidenschaftliches Arzttn, sein Wille zu helfen, das ihn in der Erforschung und praktischen Erprobung jener uralten Wege zur Herzmitte des menschlichen Seins, zu der verborgenen, fruchtbaren Welt der Bilder und Gesichte Schritt für Schritt weiterführte. In seiner ärztlichen Praxis erschloss sich ihm sowohl die diagnostische wie vor allem die therapeutische Seite der Meditation. Mit wenigen überaus glücklich gewählten Leitbildern gelang es ihm in ungezählten Fällen, ordnend, heilend auf das Innere seiner
Patienten einzuwirken. Es ging ihm nicht um Analyse der seelischen Verfassung, sondern um wirksame Synthese, um Befruchtung des seelischen Mutterbodens für neues, gesundes Wachstum, um Anregung seelischer Kristallisationsvorgänge. Das Gesunde muss das Kranke, das Gebild alles Chaos überwinden.

Besides his natural interest in all forms of spiritual life, it was probably his passion for being a doctor, his will to help, that gradually led him on to discover and probe, in practice, those ancient paths to the heart’s centre of human existence, to the hidden and fruitful world of images and visions. In his medical practice, the diagnostic and especially the therapeutic sides of meditation revealed themselves to him. With a few remarkably well-chosen guiding images he was able in countless cases to have a structuring and healing effect on the internal life of his patients. He did not care as much about an analysis of the mental state as about an effective synthesis, a fertilisation of the spiritual mother soil for new and healthy growth, a stimulus for a process of crystallisation. That which is healthy must overcome that which is sick, and structure must overcome chaos.

Happich introduced the method of meditation that he used to treat his patients to a selected group of the Brothers at an Easter retreat at the Westerburg in Rhineland-Palatinate in 1931. According to Ritter, Happich had derived his method from his comprehensive knowledge of the meditative practises of the East and of the Christian Middle Ages, in connection with extensive practical research that had led him to remarkable spiritual discoveries.

Happich’s initial introduction to his method of meditation initiated the Brotherhood’s deeper engagement with the meditative tradition of the Church and a revitalisation of meditation in German Protestantism. As Ritter wrote:

So half er uns durch Jahre hindurch vorwärts, auch als wir dann dazu übergingen, meditative Übungen zur Vertiefung des geistlichen Lebens zu schaffen, die Brücken zu schlagen von der Meditation zum Kultus, zur versenkenden Betrachtung in das Schriftwort und zur andächtigen Schau der ‘Zeichen’ und ‘Gleichnisse’. Er ermutigte, warnte vor Irrwegen, machte auf Gefahren aufmerksam und ließ uns so in der Meditation eine unvergleichliche Schule der Andacht, des Gebets, des ‘Gehorsams’ entdecken. So schuf er schließlich die Voraussetzung dafür, daß wir nicht hilflos und verständnislos vor den Dokumenten einer meditativen Tradition
standen, die im deutschen Protestantismus jedenfalls seit langem abgerissen ist, obwohl die Reformatoren selbst, wie es z. B. nicht wenige Äußerungen Luthers verraten, in ihrem Frömmigkeitsleben zweifellos mit von dieser Tradition geprägt waren.

For many years he helped us progress, including when we began to create meditative exercises for a deepening of the spiritual life and to build bridges between meditation and cultus, immersive reflection on the scriptures and devout contemplation of ‘signs’ and ‘similes’. He encouraged us, warned of erroneous paths, hinted at the dangers, and thus enabled us to discover in meditation an incomparable school of devotion, prayer and ‘obedience’. Thus he ultimately created the conditions which preserved us from a helpless and uncomprehending encounter with the documents of a meditative tradition that had long since been cut off in German Protestantism, at least, although the pious lives of the reformers, as e.g. not a few of Luther’s statements reveal, were without any doubt shaped in part by this tradition.26

Happich summarised his experience of meditation with the Michaels-bruderschaft in a small book entitled Anleitung zur Meditation / Guide to Meditation in 1938.27 As early as 1932, he had published the outlines of this method in an article for the Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie und ihre Grenzgebiete / Review of Psychotherapy and Related Areas, in which he differentiated between two kinds of consciousness: one of images and the other of thinking.28 The image-consciousness is said to form an early state in the development of human consciousness, forming a layer of experience between the imageless unconscious and rational consciousness.29 Thinking in images, according to Happich, provides a different form of knowledge from rational thought.

Happich criticised the one-sidedness of the Western mind that failed to attain the refinement of Indian and Eastern Asian meditation.30 Rational thinking had disconnected the Western mind from image-consciousness. According to Happich, the only comparable method to Eastern forms of meditation was the Exercitia Spiritualia as taught by Ignatius of Loyola, something that Jung would also claim in his ETH lectures on Active Imagination at the end of the 1930s. Happich recommended his own method of meditation for finding access to the images and their symbolic meaning. Alongside breath awareness he used visualisation to enter this realm of image consciousness: a meadow, a mountain and a chapel were used as symbolic representations of three stages of spiritual development, which consisted in a return to one’s origins, taking part in life’s quest and finding creative ways to overcome obstacles,
with the ultimate goal of complete renewal. The final stage touched on
the religious aspect of healing. From this starting point, Happich contin-
ued to work with the Michaelsbruderschaft on meditations concerning
Christian symbols such as the cross.31

Of crucial importance for the development of his theory was the
work of Herbert Silberer (1882–1923), a Viennese psychoanalyst and,
like Happich, a Freemason, especially his Probleme der Mystik und ihrer
Symbolik / Problems of Mysticism and Its Symbols (1914). This text was
also well known to Jung. Happich discovered in Silberer’s work not
only a similar concept to image consciousness, but a link to Eastern and
Yogic mysticism. Although Happich could not have known about Jung’s
personal experiments with active imagination, he found a comparable
notion in what Silberer called the spontaneous production of symbols.
Jung’s assistant and close collaborator Marie Louise von Franz acknowl-
edged Happich’s independent achievement:

Als Jung den inneren Weg der aktiven Imagination zuerst an sich
selbst und später mit seinen Analysanden ausprobierte, waren alle
solchen innersten Möglichkeiten der Psychotherapie noch weitge-
hend unbekannt. Seither aber ist eine ziemliche Wandlung in die-
sem Gebiet geschehen. Man verwendet zum Beispiel die Methode
Carl Happichs, eine vom Arzt dirigierte Bildmeditation, René
Desoille hat die Technik des rêvé éveillé eingeführt … Zum Schritt
der ästhetischen Gestaltung hat die Psychotherapie heute weitge-
hend den Weg gefunden, noch nicht aber zum nächsten Schritt, der
urteilenden Einstellung oder ethischen Auseinandersetzung; diese
scheint allgemeiner noch nicht verstanden zu werden.

At the time Jung was experimenting with active imagination, first
on himself and later with analysands, all such potentialities for psy-
chotherapy via the inner way were still virtually unknown. Since
that time, however, the situation has changed somewhat. Carl
Happich’s method, which is one of therapist-directed meditation, is
being used, for example, and René Desoille has introduced the tech-
nique of waking dream … Contemporary psychotherapy, generally
speaking, has found the way to the aesthetic stage of creativity, but
not yet to the next stage of an ethical confrontation with its prod-
ucts, nor to a convinced standpoint of moral attitude; it appears
that this stage is yet not generally understood.32

Although it seems that Jung and Happich developed their theories of
active imagination and visualisation of images independently – Jung had
not introduced his theory to a wider public in the 1920s – they certainly
drew on some similar sources. Nevertheless, it must have come as a sur-
prise to Jung when Happich published his article in the Zentralblatt and
sent him a letter with a copy of the article on 10 January 1932, as this
text contained thoughts similar to Jung’s ideas about active imagination
and the understanding of the symbol. Happich acknowledged the signifi-
cance of Jung’s psychology when he wrote that his research owed a great
debt to Jung’s groundbreaking studies about the images inside man.33
Happich also sent Jung a copy of his book Anleitung zur Meditation /
Introduction to Meditation on 18 March 1939, at a time when Jung was
just about to finish his lectures on Eastern meditation, in order to provide
an introduction to the psychological aspects of Christian meditation in
the Exercitia Spiritualia.

In the first letter of his correspondence with Jung, dated January
1933, Happich referred to himself as ‘seelsorgischer Berater vieler evan-
gelischer Geistlicher in Deutschland … die in einer evangelischen (nach
einem Gut in Berneuchen genannten) Bewegung zusammengeschlos-
sen sind, welche die Misstände in der evangelischen Kirche ganz ähnlich
sehen wie Sie.’ / ‘pastoral advisor to many Protestant clergymen in
Germany, who are united in a Protestant movement (named after the
country estate Berneuchen) and who see the bad state of affairs in the
Protestant Church much as you do.’34 As he did not receive an acknowl-
edgement from Jung, he sent another letter on 14 May 1933, in which
he claimed to have worked with a large group of theologians for six
years, meaning that he had already started to teach meditation to the
Berneuchen group in 1927. Yet both Ritter and Stählin stated in their
accounts that they were first introduced to Happich’s meditation at
Easter 1931. Happich also introduced himself to Jung as a trained psy-
chiatrist and psychotherapist.35 Jung and Happich shared an interest in
alchemical literature and the Rosicrucians, which led to the exchange of
some letters. Apparently Happich visited Jung in Küsnacht at the end of
1936 or beginning of 1937.

Walter Uhsadel, Pastoral Care Based on Jungian Psychology

Earlier, in the summer of 1936, Jung received another letter from a
Michaelsbruder. The aforementioned Walther Uhsadel, at the time a pas-
tor in Hamburg, sent Jung, along with a letter that is no longer in exist-
ence, a copy of the Jahresbriefe des Berneuchener Kreises / Berneuchen
Circle Annual Bulletin of 1936, in which Uhsadel had written a review of
the Eranos Yearbook 1934 and an article on ‘Der Mensch in der Kirche’ / ‘On Man in the Church’. In that work, he argued for the significance of Jung’s psychological insights for the renewal of the Protestant Church:

Ist es ein Zufall, daß zur selben Zeit, da in der Theologie sich Ansätze zeigen, die Kirche aus dem intellektualistischen Mißverständnis zu befreien, auch eine neue Psychologie ein völlig neues Bild des Menschen vor uns hinstellt? Die Psychologie C.G. Jungs stellt Erkenntnisse vor uns hin, die vielfach in überraschender Weise dem begegnen, was uns als die biblische Lehre vom Menschen langsam wieder lebendig zu werden beginnt. Sie lehrt uns zunächst wieder sehen, daß der Mensch sehr viel mehr ist als das, was er sein Ich nennt, ja geradezu, daß das Ich nur ein Komplex unter anderen im Bewusstsein des Menschen ist, daß sich aber ein großer Teil unseres Lebens im Unbewussten abspielt.

Is it a coincidence that just as theology is beginning to liberate the church from its intellectual misconception, a new psychology presents us with an entirely new image of man? The psychology of C.G. Jung presents us with insights that in many and surprising ways join hands with that which is slowly being revived for us as biblical teaching about mankind. Initially it teaches us to realise once more that the human being is much more than what he calls his I, indeed that the I is only one complex amongst many in the consciousness of man, yet that a great part of our life takes place in the unconscious.

Uhsadel continued with his praise of Jung's psychology for opening up a realm of humanity that went beyond ego consciousness. The word of God would speak to all dimensions of human experience, including its unconscious layers, something the righteous could only fearfully intuit. The new psychological image of man would give renewed access to a knowledge that had been clear to the contemporaries of the New Testament or the first Christians. Thus Jung’s psychological image of man based on the theory of archetypal symbolism would teach a new approach to the understanding of the message of the Bible. According to Uhsadel, a new theology that could view man in his entirety as body, soul and spirit should not neglect what the Bible taught about the soul, a message that former generations of Christians had understood naturally.

In his reply of 4 August 1936, Jung informed Uhsadel that by coincidence someone had already told him about the Berneuchen circle, and in particular its attempt to create a liturgical renewal, and that he had gained a most positive impression of this movement:
Soll eine Erneuerung oder, wie ich geneigt wäre zu sagen, eine Begründung der protestantischen Kirche überhaupt erfolgen, so kann dies nur schrittweise von einzelnen geschehen, die es nicht nur reden, sondern denen es auch eine Tatsache ist. Massenerfolg ist ein schlechtes Zeichen. Wenn die Kirche keine selbstverständliche Ewigkeit ist, so ist sie überhaupt nicht, deshalb halte ich auch die Continuität des Ritus für außerordentlich wichtig.

Should there be renewal or, as I tend to say, a justification [foundation] of the Protestant church at all it can only happen gradually through single individuals, who do not only speak, but for whom it is also a fact. Success with the masses is a bad sign. If the church is not a self-evident eternity, it is nothing at all. That is why I deem the continuity of the ritual exceptionally important.

Uhsadel had been a member of the Michaelsbruderschaft since 1934. A generation younger than Ritter and Stählin, he studied theology, psychology, pedagogy and sociology after the war. He became a pastor in Hamburg, where he founded the north German section of the Stuttgart organisation Arzt und Seelsorger / Doctor and Pastor. From 1929 to 1933 Uhsadel was the editor of the Evangelische Jugendführung / Guidance for Protestant Youth and, between 1935 and 1942, the Evangelische Jahresbriefe / Protestant Annual Bulletin, both journals linked to the Berneuchen movement. At the time of his first contact with Jung in 1936 he was the elder of the Brotherhood for the convent of Hamburg-Schleswig-Holstein. Uhsadel's theological interest was mainly in practical theology, where he advocated the importance of Jungian psychology for pastoral care. In 1954 he published Der Mensch und die Mächte des Unbewussten. Studien zur Begegnung von Psychotherapie und Seelsorge / Man and the Powers of the Unconscious. Studies on the Encounter of Psychotherapy and Pastoral Care, which he dedicated to Jung, and in 1966 Evangelische Seelsorge / Protestant Pastoral Care appeared, in which he gave an account of his first meeting with Jung on 29 May 1938:


When I visited Jung for the first time in the year 1938, our conversation revolved around the question, which pastoral means of assistance the old but neglected Protestant form of spirituality and practice [geistliche Lebensordnung] could be offered to present-day man if he were correctly guided in how to make use of them. I was able to give Jung an account of many practical experiences in this respect, which I had collected during a period of pastoral care and which, even if to a modest degree, still sustained their use. As I took my leave, he led me into a small room in which he treated his patients. He had in this room a copy of a very lovely Gothic stained-glass window of the Crucifixion. Through this, the room had acquired the character of a spiritual place. While Jung was pointing to this window, he said to me: ‘Just look, this is the crucial thing for us.’ When I asked him why he said that, he replied in his calm, collected way: ‘I have just returned from India, where this problem has arisen for me anew. Mankind has to cope with the problem of suffering. Eastern man wishes to free himself from the problem of suffering by stripping off life. Western man, on the other hand, attempts to suppress suffering with drugs. However, suffering must be overcome insofar as one endures it. This we learn solely from him.’ And with this he pointed to the Crucified One.43

Jung and Uhsadel agreed on the importance of ritual and experience of cultus. For modern, intellectually well-educated man, the church had lost its former attraction, and it was the task of the soul’s educator to show the way to primordial experience, similar to Saint Paul’s experiences on the road to Damascus.44 Uhsadel introduced Jung to the way in which the Brotherhood tried to evoke such experience. According to Uhsadel, the
human being in his or her contact with God needed to be understood as an entirety of body, soul and mind, and should not be reduced to his or her intellectual capacity alone. A new emphasis on the liturgy and the sacraments, the revitalisation of the practice of confession and the importance of absolution were some of the thoughts that Uhsadel put forward, and Jung certainly agreed with them. Needless to say, such ideas about revitalising spirituality within German Protestantism were central to the Bernuchen circle and the Brotherhood of Saint Michael. In advance of their meeting, Uhsadel even sent Jung the liturgical order of worship and confession as developed by the Brotherhood, to which Jung replied: ‘Schon die bloße Lektüre der liturgischen Ordnung hat etwas sehr befriedigendes an sich, indem die unpersönliche Institution der Kirche und deren Handeln gegenüber dem rein Persönlichen des gewöhnlich-protestantischen Betriebes gebührend hervorgehoben wird.’ / ‘There is something utterly satisfying in the mere reading of the liturgical structure, for the impersonal institution of the Church and its actions are appropriately highlighted, in contrast to the purely personal level of everyday Protestant activity.’

Meditative Practice in the Brotherhood of Saint Michael

Uhsadel’s main interest was in the psychological understanding of the human soul as part of pastoral care. The topic of meditation did not play a vital part in his correspondence with Jung. In contrast, the Brotherhood was very much engaged with adapting Happich’s form of meditation to Christian spiritual needs. Stählin, in his 1936 study Vom göttlichen Geheimnis / On the Divine Secret emphasised the importance of meditation alongside prayer as part of Christian spiritual life. He distinguished it from the common Christian understanding of meditation, seen as contemplation of a biblical text as part of sermon preparation, and described it in line with all Western and Eastern schools of meditative practice as follows:

Es ist eine eigentümliche Art des Denkens, bei der wir nicht mehr über die Dinge uns Gedanken machen, einen Inhalt denkend durchdringen und uns um ein kritisches Urteil bemühen, sondern wo wir uns einer Sache völlig hingeben, in sie eindringen oder – was das Gleiche ist – sie in uns eindringen lassen. Es ist in der Tat eines und dasselbe, ob ich von meiner Versenkung in den Inhalt meiner Meditation rede oder davon, dass in meiner Meditation die Sache in mich eingeht, sich in mich versenkt. Immer verzichtet der Meditierende auf seine vorsichtig abwägende Zuschauerhaltung,
immer gibt er sich dem, worüber er meditiert, völlig hin, gewährt ihm Raum in seiner Seele und Macht über sein Denken und Sein.

It is a peculiar kind of thinking in which we no longer think about things, push our way into the core of some matter and work towards a critical verdict, but rather one in which where we give ourselves fully over to a subject, penetrating into it, or – which is the same – letting it enter into us. In fact, it is one and the same, whether I speak of my sinking into the content of my meditation or say that in my meditation the thing enters into me, is submerged in me. The person meditating always renounces the cautious, weighing-up attitude of a spectator; he gives himself up entirely, always, to the subject of his meditation; he makes space for it in his soul and gives it authority over his thinking and being.\textsuperscript{48}

The aim was to clear away the blockages produced by critical analysis and reason, which, like an impenetrable screen, bar one from the life of grace.\textsuperscript{49} Stählin’s argument that the over-intellectualism of the modern human being would prevent him or her from experiencing the mystery of God was similar to the ideas shared by Jung and Uhsadel in their correspondence. Jung had a copy of Stählin’s book in his library. The two men even met at a seminar week in Königsfeld in the Black Forest in January 1937 organised by the Freundeskreis der kommenden Gemeinde, formerly Bund der Kön-gener, to discuss questions of teachings and guidance of the soul.\textsuperscript{50} Jutta von Graevenitz took part in the conference and later recalled:

Early in 1937 my husband and I participated in a conference of a group which had developed out of the Christian youth movement. C.G. Jung and the Lutheran bishop Stählin, well known in Germany, spoke on the relation between depth psychology and Christian religion. I thought Jung far superior to the forceful and lively bishop. It turned out that this conference at Königsfeld in the Black Forest was Jung’s last sojourn in Nazi Germany. At that conference, under the impression of Jung’s personality, the decision was made that I would myself become an analyst.\textsuperscript{51}

As Stählin’s article on ‘Spiritual Exercises’ from 1938 had indicated, the Brotherhood did not adhere to a purely psychological understanding of the human soul. Similarly to Uhsadel, Stählin put forward a diagnosis of humanity entangled in a crisis of the hitherto prevailing culture of consciousness. In Stählin’s view, the human being was separated from the hidden psychological layers beneath his or her consciousness, where both
healing and destructive forces lay dormant and where the fragmented psyche would find its expression in many different forms of illness. According to Stählin, those diseases are not only individual, as in the case of neurotic conditions, but can also have a collective expression. When the human seeks to understand and dominate the universe through the limited scope of human consciousness, he or she is confronted with the reappearance of primal fears related to images of giants, elves, gnomes and trolls, ‘in denen die Phantasie früherer Geschlechter die unheimliche andere Seite der Welt bildhaft erkannte und anerkannte.’ / ‘in which the fantasy of previous generations recognised and acknowledged the uncanny other side of the world.’

Aware of this dangerous situation, the human being might grasp what is needed for his or her rescue, but does not find a connection to his or her inner depths. The only result he or she gains from these attempts is a theory of the unconscious.

By contrast, through spiritual exercises one can prepare oneself for an encounter with the reality of God, gain the ability to understand the divine word and be touched and penetrated by the power of the divine spirit. Here, the Brotherhood referred not to a knowledge of the East that is inaccessible to the Christian, but to the European tradition of meditation, which had been alive during the Reformation and was lost in the course of the Enlightenment. As Stählin reminded the Brothers at the feast of Saint Michael in 1961, the aim of meditation was to dive into the layer buried beneath consciousness, where human thinking is childlike and occurs in images. This practice was less concerned with teaching a particular type of meditation than with achieving a complete change in thinking through meditation, to enter a space that had been impossible for Protestants to reach because of their one-sided and over-intellectualised theology. Stählin noted: ‘Wir können nicht hoch genug rühmen, welche Bedeutungen dieses meditative Denken für den Umgang mit Zeichen und Bildern hat.’ / ‘We cannot praise highly enough the significance of this meditative thinking for our treatment of signs and images.’

In 1947, Ritter published a summary of the method, aim and practice of meditation in the Michaelsbruderschaft entitled Über Meditation als Mittel der Menschenbildung / On Meditation as a Method of Human Education. In this work, he drew a clear demarcation line between these practices and Jung’s analytical psychology: ‘Für uns handelt es sich jedoch nicht darum, den Anschluss an die Erbmasse wieder zu gewinnen … Vielmehr sollen bestimmte und zwar religiöse Inhalte dem Zentrum des Menschen zugeführt werden.’ / ‘For us it is not about regaining the connection to the genotype … It is much more about feeding certain and specifically religious contents into the centre of man.’ He also emphasised that this meditation should have
nothing in common with suggestive methods or hypnosis. Ritter credited Happich’s method of meditation as the origin of the meditative practice in the Brotherhood, which had been developed over the years into a unique sequence of exercises known as ‘Der geistige Pfad’ / ‘The spiritual path’. But this new path was not only shaped by Happich, but also by Rouselle, from whom the brothers learned at Christmas in 1932 that ‘die abendländische Kirche nicht nur eine Hierarchie des ausgegliederten Amtes, sondern zugleich eine sehr sinnvolle Stufenordnung geistlicher Grundfunktionen und Verhaltensweisen besitzt, in denen sich das Priestertum aller Gläubigen verwirklicht.’ / ‘the occidental church does not only have a hierarchy of the external office, but at the same time also a meaningful hierarchy of basic spiritual functions and behaviours, in which the priesthood of all believers is realised.’

The spiritual path was a meditation on the different offices within the early church. The seven different offices represent the different stages of the spiritual path of life, which is a path of self-becoming and transformation into the figure of Christ:


The path is predetermined by the seven offices of the early church, which are to be understood as signposts on one’s own spiritual path. The sequence of the offices represents the increasing connection between one’s own life and the path of Christ: a path of self-becoming and a path of changing into the figure of Christ. Each of the seven
ecclesiastical offices corresponds to a particular aspect of the path with and towards Christ. Connected to the meditation of the offices is also a spatial imagination, because each office occupies a particular position in the church building, which in turn stands for the whole of the individual living space. From the entrance, over the threshold, into the spiritual living space (the gatekeeper is the first level), and all the way to the sacerdotal surrender of one’s own life to death (the office of the priest is the seventh level). Thus the ‘Spiritual Path’ connects in a complex manner different symbolic levels: meditation on the biblical words, meditation on the path of Christ, clarification of one’s personal way of life, a school of living and dying, attention to one’s specific talents and tasks in the whole body of Christ.  

Parting of the Ways

Karl Bernhard Ritter was commissioned by the Brotherhood to give a written account of the path of meditation for each of these seven stages. The first four stages were published in 1952. Similarities with Jung’s process of individuation were still visible. In his lecture series on active imagination, Jung highlighted the stages of individuation in the symbolic representations in ancient texts on Eastern and Western meditation. On the highest level, the Buddha of the Eastern tradition is represented by the inner sun and finds its Christian equivalent in the idea of the inner Christ. But when in 1962 the Brotherhood decided to replace the meditation on the different offices with a general meditation for every Brother, the similarity with the stages of Jungian individuation became less obvious. The reason for this change was the increasing acknowledgement of Eastern meditative practices, which the Brotherhood encountered through the works of Karlfried Graf Dürckheim (1896–1988) and Hugo Enomiya-Lassalle (1898–1990).

Another mediator between Jung and the Berneuchen movement was the Hamburg medical doctor Felicia Froboese-Thiele (1890–1971). She was the translator into German of Jung’s Terry Lectures on Psychology and Religion in 1938 and Jung wrote a Foreword to her monograph Träume. Eine Quelle religiöser Erfahrung / Dreams. A Source of Religious Experience (1957). But Froboese-Thiele was also close to the Berneuchen Circle and a friend of Uhsadel’s. In 1938, she published an article on Jung in the Evangelische Jahresbriefe, whose editor at the time was Uhsadel. In her article, she summarised the difference between Jung’s understanding of meditation and the Christian practice of the Brotherhood:

According to Jung’s medical pastoral care, there are no spiritual exercises in the strict sense of the word. Nevertheless, Jung demands of his analysands solitude, silence, contemplation, reflection, consideration. He lets them meditate – but the contents of the meditation are images and words, autochthonously emerging from the unconscious, from dreams, visions or so-called ‘unconscious’ drawings or paintings. This is the basic difference from all religious meditative exercises, where the content is prescribed and strictly restricted to what the wisdom and experience of the church as the repository of religious tradition acknowledges as salutary. If and as long as someone can grasp salvation as offered by the church, he or she will not, and does not need, to take the Jungian path; he or she would not even think of doing so. For the path into depths is dangerous and unsecured – and only those to whom all the other ways are closed, will and must take it if need be.66

Froboese-Thiele’s argument about the differences between the content-guided character of Christian meditation and Jung’s free-floating meditation on material from the unconscious encapsulates why the representatives of the Protestant spiritual renewal and Jung’s Analytical Psychology did finally part, in spite of their parallel development and shared convictions.

The intellectual interchange between Jung and several members of the Berneuchen movement, especially the Brotherhood of Saint Michael,
on matters of spiritual meditation was important for both parties. It was significant for Jung, as he saw in the Berneuchen movement a German Protestant revival of Christian spirituality, something he had previously denied was possible due to theological overemphasis on intellectual knowledge. Although he did not specifically refer to the Berneuchen circle or the Michaelsbruderschaft, one can hardly imagine that Jung, while drafting his lecture series on active imagination in 1938 and 1939, which dealt with the question of meditation in Eastern and Western traditions, did not have his intellectual exchange on meditation with brothers such as Happich, Uhsadel and Stählin in mind. Conversely, the Berneuchen movement found in Jung’s psychology a model of individuation that was compatible with their idea of a spiritual regeneration of the German Protestant church. But although some Brothers such as Uhsadel and Stählin continued to emphasise the potential of Jungian psychology for the pastoral care of the soul, the Brotherhood finally turned away from Jung’s psychological concept of active imagination, acknowledging the differences between a psychological and a Christian understanding of the soul.
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