

THE MASTER-DISCIPLE RELATIONSHIP AS A METAPHOR FOR HEALING IN
JUNGIAN PSYCHOANALYSIS:
EXPLORING ARCHETYPAL TRANSFERENCE BETWEEN ANALYST AND PATIENT

by

Zsolt Thomas Deak

A dissertation to be submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Transpersonal Psychology

Institute of Transpersonal Psychology

Palo Alto, California

November 8, 2011

I certify that I have read and approved the content and presentation of this dissertation:

Rosemarie Anderson, Ph.D., Committee Chairperson

Date

Helen Marlo, Ph.D., Committee Member

Date

Greg Bogart, Ph.D., Committee Member

Date

UMI Number: 3509615

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent on the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3509615

Copyright 2012 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This edition of the work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Copyright

©

Zsolt Thomas Deak

2012

All Rights Reserved

Formatted according to the *Publication Manual
of the American Psychological Association, 5th edition*

Abstract

The Master-Disciple Relationship as a Metaphor for Healing in Jungian Psychoanalysis:

Exploring Archetypal Transference Between Analyst and Patient

by

Zsolt Thomas Deak

This study investigates the experiences of archetypal transference in Jungian psychoanalysis using a hermeneutically informed, qualitative method called intuitive inquiry. In archetypal transference, the transference does not emanate from a past personal experience, but relates to the collective unconscious; archetypal image or situation, which is projected on the analyst or patient. One of these possibilities that may appear in the analytic relationship is rooted in the archetype of the spiritual master-disciple relationship. The literature of Jungian psychology and spiritual traditions from around the world provide the background for this work. In the research study, 8 senior Jungian analysts have been interviewed, providing their own experiences with archetypal transference, about its relevance and effects on the therapeutic relationship. The interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. In accordance with the procedures of intuitive inquiry synthesized and compared the data with the initial set of assumptions and statements. Through successive cycles of interpretation, the results were discussed and formulated into a theory by supporting the initial concept. Findings suggest that archetypal transference is inevitably present in the analytic relationship even if it is not evident or hard to distinguish from other transferences, and serves the psychological and spiritual growth of both the analyst and patient.

Dedication

To my past, present, and future teachers with my deepest gratitude and love.

Acknowledgements

This paper would never have been written without the invitation of the wonderful community of the San Francisco Jung Institute and the generous scholarship the Institute of Transpersonal Psychology offered for my studies. Therefore, I would like to thank the contributions of donors, officers, and every individual who established and supported this great international program I could also take part.

Herewith, I wish to acknowledge the many individuals who guided and supported me during my dissertation journey. First of all, I owe a great many thanks to my committee. I am especially indebted to Rosemarie Anderson, the Chair of my committee, for her generous help, down-to-earth sensitivity, consistency, and intellectual honesty in making me transforming my research idea into dissertation. Besides her professional tasks as Chair, she taught me how to employ her method, the intuitive inquiry not only for my research, but for liberating myself in the research work. My deepest gratitude is extended to my dissertation committee members, Helen Marlo and Greg Bogart, for always being available and supportive, their valuable comments and useful advice along the way. I am grateful for their untiring encouragement and patience.

Many thanks to my research participants for generously sharing their thoughts and experiences with me. I cannot reveal the names of these fine Jungian analyst here due to the research policy, but without their contributions I would not have been able to collect rich and in-depth data to be reflected upon and to gain deeper insight into my research topic.

I also wish to express my gratitude to my editors, Panna Jaroch and Colleen Bosholm, for their tutorial advice, tolerance, and expert competence in correcting the text written by a non-native English speaker.

In addition to the contributors, many others at ITP and elsewhere, have assisted, directly or indirectly, in the final completion of this work. In particular, I am indebted to: my mentors Dr. Patricia A. Sohl and Ana Perez-Chisti; my many professors among whom—due to space limitations—I can only mention a few names including Judy Schavrian, William Braud, James Fadiman, Robert Frager, Arthur Hastings, Mark Goneremann, and Kartikeya Patel; professors from the ITP Dissertation Office such as Paula Yue, Genie Palmer, and Ryan Rominger. Furthermore, I am grateful for the inspiring community, support, and critical-listening skills of my cohort members, and to all the professors and students in the residential as well as the global programs at ITP. I felt lucky to meet and study with these people during my doctoral studies; and, last but not least, thanks to the always helpful ITP librarians, Katrina Rahn and Lucy Erman.

I am also deeply indebted to all my Jungian teachers and friends from the San Francisco Jung Institute, among them particularly to Dr. Jean Kirsch, Dr. Thomas Kirsch, Jan Robinson, Dr. Lou Vuksinick, Dr. Dennis Turner, Dr. John Beebe, Jean Shinoda Bolen, Joan Chodorow, and Dr. Brian Feldman. I owe a lot to my group of analytic candidates for many ways of their support and friendship. I am also grateful for Marianne Morgan, Director of Virginia Allan Detloff Library who helped me find and access great sources of Jungian literature. Special thanks to my analyst who taught me first how to be a good patient, then how to be a good analyst, just by giving my best self. He provided unlimited sources of inspiration and trust in my dissertation process, which kept the spirit alive in me, even in difficult times.

These acknowledgements cannot be complete without mentioning the tremendous support of my family. Without support of my parents and the financial help of my brother I could not have pursued my studies and completed my dissertation. Much gratitude to Kriszti, my wife

and our children, Franci and Matyi, who have lovingly and generously supported me and shared the best and worst moments of my dissertation journey.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
List of Tables	xii
List of Figures.....	xiii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Overview.....	1
Personal Relevance	1
Context.....	2
Purpose Statement.....	3
Research Questions.....	4
Research Design and Methodology	4
Significance of the Study.....	5
Chapter 2: Review of Relevant Literature	6
The Master-Disciple Relationship in Spiritual Traditions.....	7
In Hindu traditions	7
In Buddhism.....	9
In Sufism.....	13
What is the Master-Disciple Relationship?	15
Historically and culturally formulated model.....	15
Archetypal image	18
Master-Disciple Relationship and Psychotherapy	22

Similarities and differences between master-disciple and therapist-patient relationships	23
Psychotherapeutic perspectives	28
Exploration of the relationships between the spiritual teacher and student, and between the psychotherapist and patient	40
Further applications and potentials in psychotherapy	42
Conclusion	44
Chapter 3: Research Methods	46
Research Approach	46
Procedure	51
Cycle 1: Clarifying the research topic	52
Cycle 2: Identifying preliminary lenses	52
Cycle 3: Collecting original data and preparing summary reports	53
Cycle 4: Transforming and refining lenses	65
Cycle 5: Integration of findings and literature review	66
Internal and External Validity	67
Chapter 4: Results	69
Research Findings	72
Importance of trials or previous training for a psychoanalyst	73
Similarities and differences between master-disciple and therapist-patient relationships	75
Guru as a metaphor of healing and personal or spiritual development	79
Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman archetypes	80
The Self and the analytic third	83

Exploring transference, countertransference, and archetypal transference	84
Research participants' experiences with the archetypal transference and variety of analytic techniques	87
Legacy of C. G. Jung and the analysts' lineage	90
Jungian psychoanalysis is unique	92
Experiencing myself as a wounded researcher	94
Summary of Results	95
Chapter 5: Discussion	99
Central Interpretation	103
Seed Lenses	107
The master-disciple and analyst-patient relationships have similarities and also many differences	107
The forms of Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman archetypes which appear in the analytic relationship	118
The trials or previous training are essential for becoming a spiritual master or a psychoanalyst	127
Change Lenses	135
The spiritual master-disciple relationship is a metaphor for healing in Jungian psychoanalysis	135
What Jungian psychoanalysis says about the question of Self and the analytic third	143
Exploring transference, countertransference, and archetypal transference between the analyst and analysand	151
The qualities which make Jungian psychoanalysis unique	161
The legacy of C. G. Jung and the analysts' lineage are important for the Jungians, but differently	173

New Lenses	181
Variety of techniques of dealing with archetypal transference in the research participants' practice	181
Experiencing myself as a wounded researcher is the hidden source of intuition during the research process	193
Summary	199
Delimitations and Limitations	202
Suggestions for Future Research	203
References	207
Appendix A: Sample Invitation Letter	216
Appendix B: Participant Informed Consent Agreement	217
Appendix C: Transcriber Confidentiality Agreement	219
Appendix D: Sample Interview Questions	220
Appendix E: Sample Follow-Up Letter	222
Appendix F: Interviews	223
Appendix G: My Personal Notes After Each Interview	3044
Appendix H: Feedback From Participants	3066
Appendix I: My Dream and Its Interpretation	310
Appendix J: Sample of TCA in Cycle 3	312
Appendix K: Changes Between Cycle 2 and Cycle 4 Lenses	314

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Cycle 2 Lenses	55
2	Overview of Connections Between My Main Research Questions and Research Findings	71
3	Cycle 4 Lenses	102
K1	Changes Between Cycle 2 and Cycle 4 Lenses	314

List of Figures

Figure		Page
1	Themes 1, 2, and 3 with subthemes and participants' responses.....	96
2	Themes 4, 5, and 6 with subthemes and participants' responses	97
3	Themes 7, 8, 9, and 10 with subthemes and participants' responses.....	98

Chapter 1: Introduction

Overview

My purpose in this research study was to explore the experience of the archetypal transference in psychotherapy with the use of case studies, personal reports, and in depth interviews with senior Jungian analysts. I proposed the term “archetypal transference” to describe a special type of transference and countertransference, where an archetypal situation, in my research topic the spiritual master-disciple relationship is projected out. This may influence the analytic process between therapist and patient, and serves the psychological and spiritual growth of the patient in psychotherapy. I employed intuitive inquiry, which is an emerging research methodology of transpersonal psychology. Using intuitive inquiry, the aim of my research was, to identify and evaluate specific elements of the analytic relationship and to compare this with major characteristics of the spiritual master-disciple relationship across historical time, in different cultures and religions.

Personal Relevance

The relevance of this topic was a personal one. In late adolescence, when I started studying Eastern philosophy, I experienced a lot of confusion when my worldview, based on Protestant-Christian religious education and my studies of Western philosophy, collapsed. I yearned for and was looking for a spiritual teacher, but could not find one. However, I did find Carl Jung’s (1969c) writing. After reading his commentary on *The Tibetan Book of the Great Liberation* (Jung, 1969c), immediately I knew that something important had happened to me. This revelatory experience of my encounter with Jung’s work inspired me both to study psychology and to continue my Buddhist studies in authentic sources, in the Tibetan language. A few years later, I completed my master’s degree in psychology and Tibetan studies. When I was

working on my master's dissertation, a translation and interpretation of a Tibetan scripture, *Asvagosha: Fifty Verses of Guru-Devotion* (Deak, 1991), I became aware of the similarities between the guru-disciple relationship and the therapist-patient relationship in psychotherapy. That was 20 years ago. Now it made sense, during my doctoral studies, to explore this topic in depth.

Context

Since the second half of the 20th century, there has been a continuous interest in Eastern knowledge and practices expressed by Western psychology. Depth psychologies, including analytical psychology, psychoanalysis, and its derivatives, existential psychology and personal psychotherapy, have reached similar understandings of the human psyche as revealed in Eastern traditions (Assagioli, 1961; Fromm & Suzuki, 1960; Maslow, 1963; Watts, 1961). Carl Jung (1969a, 1969c, 1969d) was one of the first Western psychologists to recognize the importance of the Eastern religious and spiritual traditions in understanding and healing the human psyche. Jung respected and thoroughly investigated the major Eastern spiritual practices such as the Chinese Tao, the Hindu Yoga, and the Tibetan Buddhism. Jung found that the goal of these age-old systems is the same, reaching Liberation, which he described psychologically as self-realization (Vasavada, 1968). Jung also insisted that Westerners not simply adopt Eastern spiritual practices and concepts. He had serious reservations about the application of Eastern spiritual practices by Western practitioners (Odajnyik, 1993). However, Jung (1970) did believe that psychotherapy could serve as an alternative for personal development and growth, and that it was a more appropriate method for Westerners than imitating the Eastern practices.

We can be sure that the essence we extract from our experience will be quite different from what the East offers us today. The East came to its knowledge of inner things in childlike ignorance of the external world. We on the other hand, shall explore the psyche and its depths supported by an immense knowledge of history and science. At present,

our knowledge of the external world is the greatest obstacle to introspection, but the psychological need will overcome all obstructions. We are already building up a psychology, a science that gives us key to the very things that the East discovered—and discovered only through abnormal psychic states. (Jung, 1970, p. 43)

Since Jung, the world has changed significantly. Increasingly, the East and the West influence each other; they are not as separate as they were in the past. “Jung, no doubt, would have been horrified by this wholesale embracing of alien religions and abandonment of western foundations” (Spiegelman & Vasavada, 1987, p. i). Jung was not mistaken when he warned Westerners not to take on new or foreign viewpoints before understanding and integrating them into their culture. However, even though some of Jung’s arguments have lost their validity (Wilber, 1989), his recommendations and contributions still remain valid and frame a psychological understanding of Eastern spiritual traditions and practices (Jung, 1969a, 1969c, 1969d).

In the last decades, several books and articles have been written regarding the psychological implications of the master-disciple relationship (Bogart, 1992, 1997; Coukoulis, 1976; Kakar, 1991; Vigne, 2001), that have discussed the healing process and the spiritual development in psychotherapy generally. Though recently several empirical research studies were also published (Magnussen, 2003; Matsu-Pissot, 1995; Phelon, 2001), they addressed the topic partially and differently. Inspired by my transpersonal studies, reading the contemporary Jungian literature and especially my training analysis, which provided rich experiences, I thought to revisit my old idea of drawing parallel between Jungian psychoanalysis and the master-disciple relationship.

Purpose Statement

My research study addressed this topic by exploring the relationship between the psychoanalyst and patient, and by looking for evidence of appearances of the archetypal pattern

of master-disciple relationship in Jungian psychoanalysis. I discussed the analytic relationship by using the concepts of archetype, transference, countertransference, and archetypal transference as C. G. Jung and other Jungian scholars described them.

Research Questions

My primary research question was: How does the archetypal transference appear and influence the therapeutic relationship between therapist and patient? A secondary question was: What similarities and differences can we find between master-disciple and therapist-patient relationships? Finally, a third and most important question was: What can we learn from this experience from a transpersonal perspective?

Research Design and Methodology

To explore these questions, I employed a qualitative research method, the intuitive inquiry developed by Rosemarie Anderson (1998, 2004, 2011a, 2011b). This methodology includes a sequence of cycles that invites the researcher, the co-researcher (or participants), and the reader into a repetitive, in-depth, and reflective process of interpretations. I chose intuitive inquiry due to the topic's complexity, and my own personal involvement. Furthermore, the intuitive inquiry provided an open and flexible structure that invited both freedom of expression and intellectual thoroughness throughout the method, and supported shaping my research in a meaningful way.

In my research, I was going to collect and formulate themes, assumptions, and questions regarding the archetypal transference. Then, I conducted semi-formal interviews with nine senior Jungian analysts, male and female, about their experiences in the same topic. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. Through the lenses of the intuitive inquiry, the data

were distilled and compared with the initial set of assumptions and statements. At the end, my findings were discussed and concluded by explicating the initial concept.

Significance of the Study

During my research I gathered and distilled empirical data, which may contribute to learning more about the archetypal foundation of the analytic process in psychotherapy. Bringing awareness of its existence and understanding the process may help therapists and analysts to work more effectively with patients and foster the healing process. This research may also be interesting, because it offers more insights into the nature of initiatory or transformational experience, a frequently investigated topic within transpersonal psychology.

I have written this dissertation for the Global Program of the Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, where research methods and topics are emphasized expressing an appreciation and understanding of our interdependence on one another and on the natural world, and should also contribute to the greater well-being of humanity and the natural world as a whole (Anderson & Braud, 2007). To support this vision transpersonal researches consider one or more of the four foci or emphases as follow:

1. Nonverbal (art, image, symbol, movement) and storytelling approaches
2. Inclusive and multicultural research approaches and ways of knowing
3. The study and application of local, indigenous, and spiritual wisdoms and experiences that serve positive end goals
4. Re-conceptualization of ordinary, neglected, anomalous, or pathologized experiences in transpersonal terms (Anderson & Braud, 2007, p. 1).

My research work met two of the above goals as it included cross-cultural comparison of ways of knowing, and incorporated spiritual wisdoms and experiences that serve positive end goals.

Chapter 2: Review of Relevant Literature

In this chapter, I review the master-disciple relationship in historical, cultural, and its psychological aspects, which suggest how we might use it as a metaphor for the therapist-patient relationship in psychotherapy (Kopp, 1971). I compare and contrast these two relationships and offer a review of their literature. Detailed descriptions of the master-disciple, *guru-chela* relationships in each and every spiritual tradition, wherever they have appeared, would go beyond the scope of this review. Therefore, I do not discuss its alternatives in the Christian and Jewish religions, and in the European traditions at large. I do not discuss their modern appearances, the vast amount of so-called *guru papers* either. I borrow this expression from the book with the same title *The Guru Papers: Masks of Authoritarian Power* (Kramer & Alstad, 1993), in which the authors explored the guru appearance, Eastern gurus in the Western societies, and analyzed its negative effects from their own cultural and socio-historical perspectives. Instead, I primarily focus on literature that has compared the Eastern forms of master-disciple relationship and the therapist-patient relationship from a psychological perspective. I use the term Eastern, and do not change it for Asian, which I recognize as less Eurocentric, because the usage in the literature I review consistently used the term Eastern.

First, I present the master-disciple relationship from the perspectives of different Eastern religious and spiritual traditions, including the Hindu, the Buddhist, and the Sufi traditions. Then I review the current psychological literature through the lens of the specific characteristics of the master-disciple relationship as well as discussed the psychological implications of this relationship in psychotherapy. Finally, I present my conclusions and discuss possible directions for my research.

The Master-Disciple Relationship in Spiritual Traditions

In Hindu Traditions

As Sudhir Kakar (1991) stated, the idea of guru bridges thousands of years of history and influences the thinking of Indian people even today. It is an integral part of Hindu culture.

Guru is Brahmana. Guru is Vishnu. Guru is Mahasvara himself. Guru is the place of pilgrimage. Guru is sacrifice. Guru is charity (that is religious merit acquired by means of charity). Guru is devotion and austerities. Guru is Surya (sun). The entire Universe is Guru. (Avalon, 1960, p. 535)

The word of *guru* is equivalent to the western word *teacher*, and refers to one who teaches any kind of knowledge within a broad context. The term *shishya* is roughly equivalent to the western term *disciple*, and in some parts of India is synonymous with the term *chela* (Vigne, 2001). In addition, the etymology of *guru* sheds light on the deeper meaning of the guru-shishya relationship. One of the meanings of the *guru*, “heaviness of the sacred,” relates to the same root as the Latin *gravis*, which means grave, serious, or weight. Another meaning, one who dissolves the darkness, often quoted by the Hindus, *gu* means “darkness,” and *ru* means “to destroy or to dissolve” (Vigne, 2001, p. 17). In Hindu context, the guru is indispensable in realizing the Hindu life goals. The guru does not simply transmit knowledge (*dharma*), but is one who helps disciples reach liberation (*moksha*) from human suffering.

The principle of the relationship between guru and disciple is that knowledge is best transmitted through a strong human relationship based on the ideals of the student’s respect, commitment, devotion, and obedience. It is also transmitted on personal instruction by which the student eventually masters the knowledge that the guru embodies (Vasavada, 1968). This knowledge is expressed as theory on highest level of Hindu wisdom in *Advaita Vedanta* (Dayananda, 1993), one of the most important philosophical texts in Hinduism, and as an advanced practice in Yoga (Eliade, 1969).

The guru image has been formulated and has received different meanings across time, as Kakar (1991) has summarized it.

In Hindu terms, the dominant image of the guru seems to have decisively shifted toward the moksha (liberation) guru rather than dharma (virtue) guru, toward the bhakti (devotional) guru rather than jnana (knowledge) guru or, in tantric terms, toward the diksha (initiation) guru who initiated the novice into methods of salvation rather than the shiksha (teaching) guru who taught the scriptures and explained the meaning and purpose of life. (p. 35)

Kakar (1991) proposed that the modern Indian gurus, who became known in West, also had these attributes. Yet he suggested that the modern Hindu guru image has gone through a transformation. Two aspects have been emphasized, the mystical (divine) and the healing. We can find examples of the divine guru in the most philosophical part of the oldest Hindu epos, *The Bhagavad Gita* (1962). Krishna appeared in human form to teach his disciple, Arjuna, when he got into trouble. The shift toward the healing guru was brought by Ramakrishna, a 19th-century saint.

The spiritual teacher has been described in the *Guru-gita* and other books as the “physician of the world-disease.” We did not at all understand that so much hidden meaning was there in it before we had the blessing of meeting the master. We had no notion of the fact that the Guru was indeed the physician of mental diseases and could diagnose at first sight the modification of the human mind due to influence of spiritual emotions. (Saradananda, 1983, p. 521)

Ramakrishna’s extraordinary life and teachings, which were based on the classical Hindu traditions and adjusted for everyone’s understanding at that time, made him one of the greatest and highly respected spiritual teachers in the world (Coukoulis, 1976). Not surprisingly, after his death many books and articles were written about his life, including two psychological studies (Coukoulis, 1976; Kakar, 1991). Ramakrishna often emphasized the ideal of the Hindu liberation, “Self-realization depends on the individual temperament and makeup of each person and no one method is suitable for every aspirant” (Coukoulis, 1976, p. 58). Moreover,

Ramakrishna frequently spoke about the difference between the human guru and the divine or supreme guru. In his view, the supreme guru is someone, who has realized his inner God, and therefore is able to teach others (Coukoulis, 1976).

In Buddhism

Theravada Buddhism. In the Hinayana, later called Theravada Buddhism, the main goal of spiritual practice is reaching Buddhahood by following the teachings and practices of the historical Buddha, Siddhartha Gautama. Traditionally, the monastic life, and the disciplined practice of meditation, Samadhi, are the major agents of reaching this goal (Kornfield, 1983). The role of the master-disciple relationship is more like the teacher-student relationship. There are wide varieties of teaching styles, where gurus consider themselves either good friends or spiritual brothers, sometimes objects of devotion, but most often teachers. “They will direct you to find your own inner truth independent of any outside authority, independent of any opinions, fresh, clear, and totally liberating” (Kornfield, 1983, p. 288).

Zen Buddhism. According to Alan Watts (2000), Zen’s philosophy is simple and has in common with all mysticism: “awakening to the unity or oneness of life, and inward—as opposed to outward—existence of ‘God’” (p. xiv). Instead of a theological speculation, Zen is a certain kind of personal experience, the religion of action. It is embodied in the Japanese martial arts of judo, aikido, and archery, as well as in painting and poetry. “The practice of Zen is to experience the overall pattern directly” (Watts, 2000, p. xviii), here and now, “and to know one’s self as the essence of the pattern” (p. xviii).

What is really essential and unique in Zen is the *sanzen*. This is a peculiar dialogue between the master and student, person-to-person contact that is able to change the student’s

ordinary mind set and develops deeper insight. It may lead to *satori*, the “sudden way of seeing through into one’s nature” (Watts, 2000, p. 36). As Watts (2000) stated:

In effect, this dialog acts as a mirror to one’s own mind, because the teacher always throws back to the student the question he has asked! He really does not answer any questions at all, he merely tosses them back at you, so that you yourself will ask why you are asking it, and why you are creating the problem the question expresses. (p. 39)

The psychological aspects of master-disciple relationship in Zen were discussed by Jung (1969a), who wrote commentary to D.T. Suzuki’s *Introduction to Zen Buddhism*. In his foreword, Jung (1969a) highlighted the enlightenment experience of the Zen *satori* as transformation to wholeness for practitioners. Although he warned about the inadequacy of Westerners’ attempts to comprehend *satori* with our Western intellectual background, Jung (1969a) contended:

The only movement inside our civilization which has, or should have, some understanding of these endeavors is psychotherapy. It is therefore no accident that it is a psychotherapist who is writing this foreword. Psychotherapy is at the bottom a dialectical relationship between doctor and patient. It is an encounter, a discussion between two psychic wholes, in which knowledge is used only as a tool. The goal is transformation. (p. 553)

Erich Fromm explored the similarities between the Zen master and the psychoanalyst in *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis* (Fromm & Suzuki, 1960). He found that both the Zen master and the analyst are characterized at the same time by the complete lack of irrational authority and by the equally strong affirmation of that “undemanding authority, the source of which is genuine experience” (Fromm & Suzuki, 1960, p. 121). Another affinity between Zen master and analyst that they share a similar attitude in communication. As Fromm paraphrased Suzuki (Fromm & Suzuki, 1960), for the master “There is nothing to explain by means of words, there is nothing to be given out as a holy doctrine. Thirty blows whether you affirm or negate. Do not remain silent, nor be discursive” (p. 49). He believed that the analyst works or should work in some similar

manner. The analyst must avoid the error of too many interpretations and explanations, which only prevent the patient from making the jump from thinking into experiencing. On the contrary, the analyst attempts to help patient in psychoanalysis experiencing other way than rationalization in making conscious the unconscious.

Marvin Spiegelman and Mokusen Miyuki (1985), both Jungian analysts and experts of Zen Buddhism, have provided descriptions and analyses of the famous Zen teaching, the *Ox-herding pictures*. They revealed parallels between the circle depicted in the 10 pictures and the Jungian individuation process.

Psychologically, the *Ox-herding Pictures* can be taken as portraying in an art form what Jung calls individuation. Our study, employing Jung's concepts and methodology, has afforded us a psychological understanding of Zen *satori* (enlightenment) in terms of self-realization, or the urge of the Self to realize itself. The essential feature of *satori* does not consist in ego-transcendence or ego-negation, but rather in a lifelong process, which demands that the ego make ceaseless efforts towards the integration of the unconscious contents. (Spiegelman & Miyuki, 1985, p. 39)

Spiegelman and Miyuki (1985) interpreted the master-disciple relationship in Zen practice as the way that "the Self is projected onto the master as the ideal self-image; hence, the encounter of the ego with the Self takes place, as projected on the master-disciple" (p. 34).

Tibetan Buddhism. In Tibetan Buddhism the person of *lama*, and the relationship with him or her, is important. The term refers to the Indian guru: spiritual teacher, but apparently has other, more complex meanings as well. It implies both the divine mother and father (Deak, 1991; Magnussen, 2003). Alexander Berzin (2000) differentiated between Buddhist teachers based on their accomplishments for three types: Buddhist professors, Dharma professors, and spiritual mentors. The first two can teach the sutra and help seekers in practicing *morality*, *wisdom*, and *meditation*. The last is equivalent with the root guru (personal spiritual teacher in whom the disciple takes refuge), who is indispensable in practicing the highest Tantra, the Guru yoga.

The *lama* is so importantly regarded that Tibetan Buddhism speaks of this person as the *Fourth Jewel* in addition to the *Three Jewels of Buddha, Sangha, and Dharma* (Deak, 1991). The Guru yoga is based on oral transmission, an initiatory process between the guru and disciple. This tradition goes back to prehistoric time through the linkage of gurus (Deak, 1991). The guru-disciple connection is a strong bond. It is believed that there is a karmic connection between them through a previous birth. In this context, Coukoulis (1976) commented on the relationship between Milerapa, one of the greatest Tibetan yogis, and his master, Marpa:

Regardless of the metaphysical implications of the statement, which will be ignored here, there is great psychological significance linking causally, in a personal way, the guru with the disciple. It helps both of them to accept more personal responsibility regarding their respective roles. The meaning of their relationship is accepted at a deeper level of psychic reality; it is not just a well-meant, conceptually perceived but psycho-emotionally uninvolved relationship and commitment. (p. 80)

The establishment of the guru-disciple relationship needs cautious preparation. The Buddhist scriptures contain rich of descriptions of the different qualifications of the guru and the disciple (Patrul Rinpoche, 1998). In reality, most teachers have good and bad qualities. It is considered important to see only good qualities in the guru in order to foster a positive process within the relationship (Magnussen, 2003). This aim is served by the preliminary practice of the Guru-yoga. This is the guru-devotion, which helps to invoke the divine nature of the guru (Deak, 1991). “All the Buddhas of the past, present and future, residing in every land in the ten directions, have paid homage to the Tantric Masters from whom they have received the highest initiations” (p. 9).

According to the tradition, Guru yoga means union with the nature of guru. As Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche (1988) summarized:

Guru yoga, the union with the nature of the guru, forms the foundation for all practices, and there are many different techniques for its practice. . . . There are outer, inner, secret, and most secret methods. . . . The outer method . . . is to visualize the guru dwelling above our head and to pray to him ardently with fierce devotion. The inner method is to realize . . . that our own body, speech, and mind of the guru . . . the secret method is to

meditate upon the guru in his Sambhogakaya form, the body of divine enjoyment. The most secret method introduces us to the natural state of awareness. . . . On the absolute level, the teacher is one with the very nature of our own mind, which is itself the essence of Buddhahood. (pp. 8-9)

The Dalai Lama (2003) explained how the Guru-yoga practice reflects on the two dimensions, the human and divine nature of the guru that transcends into the ultimate recognition of the unity with one's own Buddha mind.

The tantric texts often mention that all realization comes from the guru. This is true, but it can be understood in two different ways. On the one hand, the guru is the human teacher we interact with; on the other hand, the guru is our inner wisdom, our own fundamental clarity of mind. (p. x)

The importance of recognizing the positive qualities of the guru, the differentiation between the human and divine natures of the guru, the dynamics of the relationship between the guru and disciple, and its similarities with the therapist-patient relationship—all of these similarities will be discussed later.

In Sufism

The relationship between the sheikh and dervish (the Sufi names for master and disciple) is essential and has played a central role in the practice of Sufi mysticism for thousands of years. Sufism is the mystical core of Islam. It offers a path for the seeker that leads to direct experience of the Divine and Self-realization (Fadiman & Frager, 1997). Since the road is unknown and full of dangers, the seeker needs an experienced guide, a spiritual teacher who knows the way to God. Rumi said, “Whoever travels without a guide needs two hundred years for a two-day journey” (as cited in Fadiman & Frager, 1997, p. 145).

In Sufism, the sheikh is considered the source of knowledge that goes back through the living chain of traditions to the prophets—Adam, Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, the founder of Islam, and others. Therefore, finding and having a sheikh for a teacher is a great blessing.

Students often spend many years searching for a teacher. They undergo a long trial period before being accepted as dervishes (Fadiman & Frager, 1997).

A sheikh has four major attributes—maturity, patience, awareness of the student, and being in the world while free of the world. Each attribute is important and can influence the relationship between the sheikh and the dervish. The sheikh's awareness of the student is an example of the psychological impact of the true nature of teaching.

Real teachers are intuitively aware of the inner state and inner thoughts of their students. The teacher serves as a mirror in which the students can see themselves. In many ways, the relationship between sheikh and dervish is similar to the relationship between psychotherapist and client. There is often an intense emotional connection, as well as deep inner insight. (Fadiman & Frager, 1997, p. 2)

The relationship between the sheikh and the dervish is often described by the metaphor of love in Sufi poetry. The spiritual transformation of the dervish is happening within the relationship between the dervish and the sheikh. The love toward and back from the sheikh helps to open the dervish's heart and will result in love of himself or herself, and finally in love of everything. The sheikh's love mirrors or transmits the love of God (Frager, 1999). Sheikh Muzaffer (as cited in Frager, 1999) stated:

The relationship between the sheikh and dervish is a complex, mystical, living process. It is in some ways like the relationship between a husband and wife. However, in this profound teaching relationship, the act of love is not physical; the connection occurs between the mouth of the sheikh and the ear of the dervish. (p. 189)

Fadiman and Frager (1997) explicated love as a strong emotional connection that serves as a vehicle of submission between master and pupil:

In short, the pupil should love the guide with a genuine, sincere, and unhypocritical affection. It should be well understood that there is a path from heart to heart. Therefore, pupils are repaid for their love and affection toward the guide by the blessings they experience from the guide. This has stood the test of centuries and constitutes the essence of practical truths. (p. 138)

How does the sheikh know what the dervish needs? According to Sufi teachings, a sheikh used to be a dervish. He went through an initiation. He or she has realized each of the seven levels of the self and transcended himself or herself in union with God (Fadiman & Frager, 1997). This spiritual transformation happened with the help of an initiated master. The purpose of the sheikh-dervish relationship was to reach Self-realization. Thus knowledge, which was the experience of initiation, was transferred through the unbroken chain of sheikh-dervish relationships generation by generation.

What is the Master-Disciple Relationship?

Historically and Culturally Formulated Model

As we saw the master-disciple relationship was an important vehicle of spiritual development within the Great Eastern traditions. However, the master-disciple relationship did not exist exclusively in the East or only in a religious context. The various forms of this special relationship can also be seen in every period and geographic place in the history of humanity.

The relationship with a guru is fundamentally based on the human need to relate to another human. Yearning for a guru is part of human nature, like the desire for the mother in early childhood. A need for a guide or healer in an individual's life is always there, especially when unexpected changes and turmoil occur or when simply growing into adulthood. This essential human need expresses itself in the metaphor of the guru (Kopp, 1971).

And so it seems that wherever men have sought the counsel and guidance of other men, a creative minority of helpers, healers, and guides has arisen to meet this need. Though their words and their dress have differed in the many times and places in which they have appeared, these gurus have come forward as spiritual guides, as those special sorts of teachers who help other men to make their passage from one stage of their lives to another. (p. 149)

According to Kopp (1971), the Wizards and Shamans, Desert Monks, Zen Masters, some Greek philosophers, Christian saints, the Alchemists of the Renaissance, Hasidic Rabbis, and others, are

all manifestations of the same metaphor of the guru. Kopp went further, and wrote about how this metaphor, in the form of Wise Old Man, or Wise Friend, is revealed in our myths and fairy tales.

Bogart (1992, 1997) discussed parallels between guru-disciple relationships and mentoring relationships, where the apprentice, pupil, or disciple acquires a special knowledge, particular skills, and expertise from the master, professor, or artist (Bogart, 1992, 1997). The spiritual apprenticeship is more complex and challenging however, because the student is required to undergo a profound change and a personal transformation under the instruction of his or her spiritual teacher. As Bogart (1992) concluded “despite these real differences, both guru-disciple and student-mentor relationship have many in common. Both types of relationship involve collaboration for the purpose of fostering the student’s learning and growth” (p. 5).

The other field of comparison was the psychotherapy. As Kopp (1971) stated, “Psychotherapy is the twentieth-century attempt to achieve the improved, the ultimate, the finally lasting form of spiritual guidance” (p. 131). His statement suggested that psychotherapy—besides healing and psychological development—could also serve some spiritual functions in the Western world. Moreover, in the last few decades approaches and exchanges between the Eastern spiritual traditions and Western practices, developed needs for finding new ways of integration. Indeed, great numbers of Western trained psychologists, who had direct experience in Eastern practices; yoga or meditation, took inspiration and knowledge from their masters, studied and integrated some of the new idea and methods into psychotherapy (Bogart, 1991; Engler, 1984; Kornfield, 1983; Welwood, 1996).

One of the most popular field of study, where the Eastern model of knowledge transmission, the master-disciple relationship has influenced the Western psychotherapy is how

to use meditation and what are the effects of meditation in psychotherapy. Bogart (1991) summarized 101 books and articles that have been written concerning the therapeutic integration of meditative techniques. He examined some of the problems raised by psychoanalytic and Jungian critiques of meditation and contrasted with experiential findings suggesting that meditation leads to potential therapeutic benefits, which are more than just the traditional values and applications of meditation such as relaxation, behavioral, or cognitive technique. Bogart explored the views of the most influential transpersonal theorists such as Jack Engler, Ken Wilber, Mark Epstein, and Elbert Russell, who have done important work comparing Eastern psychologies and Western views of the self. Basically, he agreed with Russell (1986) and Engler (1984) that there are fundamental differences between Eastern meditation and Western psychotherapy, which include the aims, experiential areas, methods and techniques of these two approaches. Nonetheless, despite these differences, Bogart (1991) suggested that meditative disciplines have much to teach Western psychology, and their careful applications “can make a significant contribution to the deep transformation of personality sought in psychotherapy” (p. 406).

Recently, also numerous articles and books have been published to compare the spiritual master-disciple relationship and the analyst patient relationship in psychotherapy (Bogart, 1992, 1997; Kakar, 1991; Kopp, 1971; Magnussen, 2003; Vasavada, 1968), which I review later. At this point, I would like to anticipate that while the master-disciple relationship and the analyst-patient relationship are historically, culturally, and socially different forms, they also have a lot in common, as they express a similar archetype of healing and spiritual development.

Archetypal Image

Another perspective on the universality of the master-disciple relationship could be derived from its internal representations, namely the archetypal pattern of Wise Old Man (Jung, 1966b, 1968, 1971c). Though the concept of archetypes was fundamental and well discussed in Jungian psychology, due to the limitations of this paper, here I only give a brief summary about it.

Jung (1971a) coined the term “archetype” (p. 4) to describe those inborn forms, images and behavioral pattern of instincts, which create the collective unconscious that is universal and present in all individuals. “It is, in other words, identical in all men and constitutes a common psychic substrate of suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us” (Jung, 1971a, p. 4). Jung found inspirations for his conception of archetypes in philosophy (e.g., Plato, Kant) and through empirical evidence in dreams, fairy tales, and active imagination. In *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, Jung (1971a, 1971b, 1971c) described and discussed in detail several personified archetypes such as Anima, Animus, Shadow, Wise Old Man, Mother, Child, Trickster, and Hero. Jung admitted that the number of archetypes is limitless and that they allow for the representation of personalities and typical situations, places, ways and means that provide symbolic forms for manifold meaning of life processes such as transformation, birth, and death.

Jung also paid distinctive attention to discussion of the Self, which he considered the central archetype. The Self for Jung (1971d) was also a totality of the psyche, both conscious and unconscious, and at the same time the regulating center of the psyche, which “expresses the unity of the personality as a whole” (p. 460). Following Neumann’ (1963) and other classical Jungian authors’ tradition I prefer to capitalize “S” to distinguish it from the personal self with little “s.” However, some other scholars, including the editors of the *Collected Works*, decided against

capitalization and employed self, which I leave unchanged, and I also use the little “s,” when I quote these sources. According to Jung (1971d), the Self reveals through symbols, in dreams and fantasy in various forms.

Empirically, the self appears in dreams, myths, and fairytales in the figure of the “supraordinate personality” (v. EGO), such as a king, hero, prophet, saviour, etc., or in the form of totality symbol, such as the circle, square, *quadratura circuli*, cross, etc. When it represents a *complexio oppositorum*, a union of opposites, it can also appear as a united duality, in the form, for instance, of *tao* as the interplay of *yang* and *yin*, or of the hostile brothers, or of the hero and his adversary (arch-enemy, dragon), Faust and Mephistopheles, etc. (p. 460)

For the purpose of my research, the “Wise Old Man” or interchangeably the “Old Man” archetype is the most interesting archetype. Jung (1966e) referred this archetype to as one’s *Mana Personality*, representing a primordial energy that could assist one in growth and transformation or, alternatively, in destruction and disintegration. In its positive manifestations, this archetype appears as an authoritative guide who leads one in the quest for growth, spiritual knowledge, or self-actualization.

According to Jung (1971c), this archetype “represents knowledge, reflection, insight, wisdom, cleverness, and intuition on the one hand, and on the other, moral qualities such as goodwill and readiness to help, which make his ‘spiritual’ character sufficiently plain” (p. 222). The Wise Old Man appears in similar forms in fairy tales and dreams “in the guise of a magician, doctor, priest, teacher, professor, grandfather, or any other person possessing authority” and “is sometimes apparently the case in India, it takes over the role of a guru” (Jung, 1971c, p. 216).

Jung (1989) wrote about his revelatory experience of discovering that the image of his own internal guru existed culturally and collectively.

I could have wished for nothing better than a real, live guru, someone possessing superior knowledge and ability, who would have disentangled for me the involuntary creations of my imagination. This task was undertaken by the figure of Philemon, whom in this respect I had willy nilly to recognize as my psychagogue . . .

More than 15 years later a highly cultivated elderly Indian visited me, a friend of Gandhi's, and we talked about Indian education—in particular, about the relationship between guru and chela. I hesitantly asked him whether he could tell me anything about the person and character of his own guru, whereupon he replied in a matter-of-fact tone, "Oh yes, he was Shankaracharya."

"You don't mean the commentator on Vedas who died centuries ago?" I asked.

"Yes, I mean him," he said, to my amazement.

"Then you are referring to a spirit?" I asked.

"Of course it was his spirit," he agreed.

At that moment, I thought of Philemon.

"There are ghostly gurus too," he added. Most people have living gurus.

But there are always some who have a spirit for teacher. (Jung, 1989, p. 184)

The Wise Old Man archetype can also be correlated with other archetypes such as Sage, Prophet, and Healer and has its female equivalent in the "Wise Old Women" or "Older Women," as well.

An archetype found frequently in dreams, myths, and stories is the Mentor, usually a positive figure who aids or trains the hero. Campbell (2008) identified this image with the Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman. This archetype is expressed in all those characters who teach and protect heroes and give them gifts. For examples, whether it is God walking with Adam in the Garden of Eden, Merlin guiding King Arthur, the Fairy Godmother taking care of Cinderella, Morpheus teaching Neo in the Matrix, the archetypal relationship between hero and Mentor is one of the richest sources in literature and film. The word *mentor* originates from The Odyssey. A character named Mentor guides the young hero, Telemachus, on his journey. In fact, it is the goddess Athena who helps Telemachus, by disguising herself in the form of Mentor (Campbell, 2008).

Despite their aforementioned similarities, however, we need to differentiate the Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman archetypes as they reflect on the difference between two primordial aspects, the masculine and feminine side of the psyche. Jung recognized the distinctive features in the unconscious of men and of women (Bennett, 1971), which—in his view—complement each other like *yin* and *yang* in the Chinese mythology. He described the feminine element in the unconscious of every man as *anima*, and its masculine counterpart in women as *animus*. One of

the Jung's disciples, Erich Neumann (1963) developed further the concept of male and female archetypal symbolism. He was not talking about male and female as man and woman but as ideal-typical character of man and of women. He applied masculine and feminine as metaphor for contrasting the two psychic functions, the (ego) consciousness and unconscious. For Neumann (1963), "active ego consciousness is characterized by a male symbolism, the unconscious as a whole by female symbolism" (p. 28). According to him, *masculinity* is knowable, because it relates to the consciousness, and *femininity* is unknowable or mysterious, because it is grounded in the unconscious. Neumann (1963), in his significant book, *The Great Mother* depicted how the Archetypal Feminine differentiated, by stages, out of the archetypal ground of the collective unconscious, with emphasizing the historical and developmental differences of the female archetypes. To discuss this process in detail would go beyond the scope of this paper. Briefly, the Wise Old Woman archetype may represent a highly developed "positive transformative feminine aspect" (Neumann, 1963, p. 80) of the psyche, and can be associated with mythological figures such as Sophia or Athena (Greek goddesses of wisdom). However, in my opinion, the Wise Old Man should be a different archetype that may represent the masculine aspect of the spiritual wisdom.

Hillman (1979) examined an interesting aspect of the Wise Old Man archetype. He suggested the coexistence and inter-relationship between the archetypes of the Old Man (Maturity or Senex) and the Youth (Puer). In the Puer-Senex opposite, the archetypes complement each other. The Puer is the aspect of the self that represents possibility, agent of change, and is the subject of psychological development. The Wise Old Man is a symbol of perfection, psychic wholeness, and the internal guiding function of the Self from whom the Puer receives a sense of stability, power, and recognition. According to Bogart (1997), the Puer-

Disciple is associated with the Senex-Master in order to receive comfort, advice, and guidance for his heroic-journey and self-transformation. The Puer-Senex dualistic archetypes could represent the internal, psychic images of the external image of the master-disciple relationship.

Coukoulis (1976) reached a similar conclusion in his interpretation of the life of Milarepa, the great Tibetan yogi. “Milarepa’s psychological development, seems to correspond to the Jungian or analytical psychological stage that deals with the archetype of the Old Wise Man” (Coukoulis, 1976, p. 99). Milarepa, under the direction of his guru, could develop a relationship with his inner guru who helped him engage a higher principle and sacrifice his worldly ego in the culmination of his hero journey (Coukoulis, 1976). In analytical psychology, the hero journey of myths, the disciple’s aspiration to meet the master’s requirements, and the patient’s behavior during psychotherapy are all seen as parallels to the process of individuation, self-realization, and psychological transformation (Coukoulis, 1976; Spiegelman & Vasavada, 1987; Vasavada, 1968). As Jacoby (1984) stated, “So it is no accident that after the confrontation with the soul-image the appearance of the Old Wise Man, the personification of the spiritual principle, can be distinguished as the next milestone of inner development” (p. 164).

In this context, identification with the guru or analyst, both relating to the archetypes of Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman, takes one beyond the ego personality and reveals the experience of Self, one’s true nature. Therefore, the Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman, the inner guru is also the archetype of the Self, and the guru embodies its physical (external) and symbolic manifestations (Coukoulis, 1976; Spiegelman & Vasavada, 1987; Vasavada, 1968).

Master-Disciple Relationship and Psychotherapy

Some of the psychological literatures on master and disciple relationships have presented a broad view of the nature and effect of the relationship in the context of psychotherapy (Bogart,

1991, 1997; Coukoulis, 1976, Engler, 1984; Kakar, 1991; Magnussen, 2003; Vasavada, 1968; Vigne, 1991, 2001). Based on this literature, I discuss the similarities and differences between the master-disciple relationship and the therapist-patient relationship. I also discuss these relationships from the psychotherapeutic perspectives of regression, transference, and projection (Edinger, 1995; Fordham, 1978; Freud, 1940, 1955; Jacoby, 1984; Jung, 1966e; Kirsch, 1995; Kohut, 1971; Racker, 1968; Samuels, 2006) as well as their potential applications in psychotherapy (Magnussen, 2003; Matsu-Pissot, 1995; Phelon, 2001).

Similarities and Differences Between Master-Disciple and Therapist-Patient Relationships

In addition to the cultural and social differences between the past Eastern spiritual traditions and the present Western practice of psychotherapy, the basic motivation in searching for a guru or approaching a therapist, often, is the same human need (Kakar, 1991; Kopp, 1971; Vigne, 1991, 2001). In most cases, individuals who yearn for a guru for spiritual guidance or seek help in psychotherapy for mental illness or life problems have the same motivation to decrease suffering and reach completeness and psychic wholeness (Kakar, 1991). The relationship between spiritual teacher and aspirant or therapist and patient is founded on the recognition of the need to associate with a person who is a master of inner transformation and has reached advanced stages of spiritual or psychological development (Bogart, 1992, 1997; Kopp, 1971).

As Kakar (1991) suggested, besides the cultural encouragement of traditional societies or individual need, there is also a shared psychological need, developmental experience or “second birth” (p. 41) that he discusses in the context of self-psychology.

I have described the male child’s experience of “second birth,” a more or less sudden loss of relationship of symbiotic intimacy with the mother in late childhood and an entry into the more businesslike relationships of the world of men. Two of the consequences of the “second birth” in the identity development of Hindu men are first, an unconscious

tendency to “submit” to an idealized omnipotent figure, both the inner world of fantasy and in the outside world of making a living, and second the lifelong search for someone, a charismatic leader or a guru, who will provide mentorship and a guiding worldview, thereby restoring intimacy and authority to individual life. (Kakar, 1991, p. 41)

In reference to the question of intimacy, the guru is frequently called “mother” in Hindu spiritual texts (Kakar, 1991; Vigne, 2001) and “divine mother” in Tibetan Buddhist scriptures (Deak, 1991; Magnussen, 2003). This may be another example of the relevance for considering “Wise Old Woman” archetype and its vital force in grounding the guru experience.

The process of spiritual development through the master-disciple relationship and the process of healing through the therapist-patient relationship show interesting similarities. Both master-disciple and therapist-patient relationships can foster our psychological development, our individuation process, and our path to enlightenment (Coukoulis, 1976; Spiegelmann & Miyuki, 1985; Spiegelmann & Vasavada, 1987). For example, Coukoulis (1976) concluded that the ultimate premise of the guru-disciple relationship in the Hindu and Buddhist spiritual traditions is self-realization. Although there are conceptual differences regarding the attributes of Self and man’s relationship to this Self, there is agreement that human sufferings are inescapable parts of our life and that the final solution is “Absolute Liberation, which can be attained by transcending the human condition” (Coukoulis, 1976, p. ii). The process of Liberation aims at removing the aspirant’s false identifications of subject and object, ego and the world, and so on, all of the dualities and polarities of the world that are created through ignorance. “The realization of the Self brings one to the original wholeness” (Vasavada, 1968, p. 133).

Initially, Jung (1966d) recognized that Western concept of human nature did not differ in this respect from the Eastern view. He found that the goal of the Eastern traditions such as Yoga and Buddhism is experiencing the Self, a process that is psychologically similar in the West as

well, regardless of the biological, cultural, and other differences, a process he called individuation.

To experience and realize this self is the ultimate aim of Indian Yoga, and in considering the psychology of the self, we would do well to have recourse to the treasures of Indian wisdom. In India, as with us, the experience of the self has nothing to do with intellectualism; it is a vital happening, which brings about a fundamental transformation of personality. I have called the process that leads to this experience the “process of individuation.” (Jung, 1966d, p. 102)

Jung (1966d, 1966e, 1967) claimed that individuation is a universal human phenomenon that is essentially about transformation of the personality. “The aim of individuation is nothing less than to divest the self of the false wrappings of the persona on the one hand, and the suggestive power of the primordial images on the other” (Jung, 1966e, p. 174).

However, Jung was clear that westerners seeking individuating are on a different path than those seeking enlightenment through the yoga of the East. As John Clarke (1994) pointed out Jung was ambivalent about Eastern thought. Besides similarities, Jung also saw major differences between his self-concept and the Hindu (and the Buddhist) view. According to Jung (1969d), the ultimate goal of yoga was not merely the integration of the ego into the higher self, but rather a state of complete absorption, *samadhi*, in which the ego practically dissolved. Jung (1971b) believed that *samadhi* was a trance-like state in which identity with “universal consciousness” is logically identical with unconsciousness . . . a state in which subject and object are almost completely identical” (p. 287). Jung supposed that this way of ego assimilation could only work in East, where people traditionally were less egocentric. He warned that our Western psyche must be culturally different and, therefore, we would not be able to stimulate a similar kind of consciousness without an ego, and any attempt toward this goal would be dangerous for us.

In addition to the initial goals of spiritual development versus healing, Spiegelman & Vasavada (1987) saw a major difference between the Hindu approach of self-realization and that of Western psychotherapy. The Hindu approach is through the study and understanding of a conscious problem, the conflict between the false sense and the true nature of world, whereas Jungian analysis deals with both conscious and unconscious material, through techniques primarily focused upon the unconscious. Whereas the spiritual relationship between the master and disciple is predetermined by tradition or culture right from the start, the therapeutic relationship between analyst and analysand may develop only at a later stage, through transference. However, according to Spiegelman and Vasavada (1987), the root of Western psychotherapy is the same psychological foundation as Eastern self-realization. “Psychological illness results from alienation from Self and/or world, the empirical realization of man as he is, and the methods of exploring the unconscious” (Spiegelman & Vasavada, 1987, p. 150).

Vigne (1991) compared the guru and the psychotherapist by discussing in detail the guru-disciple relationship in India. In this comparison, he recognized three major differences between the psychotherapist and the guru from the Indian point of view:

First, he specialized in the pathological mind, while the Guru works with a mind not only basically normal, but purified by regular practice of meditation (sadhana). Second, the therapist is not a renunciate: he leads a family life, and makes payment a necessary condition for his intervention. According to the Hindus, renunciation is clearly connected to spiritual power: “no renunciation, no power” is a basic equation for them. Third, the relationship in therapy may be considered short, even if it lasts for years, in comparison with the life-long Guru-disciple relationship. (Vigne, 1991, p. 136)

In my view, Vigne’s (1991) comparison remained on the level of describing different cultural contexts and said little to nothing about the psychological process in the guru-disciple relationship. However, his contribution, along with others (Bogart, 1992, 1997; Kakar, 1991) was significant in recognizing and understanding the cultural differences that could result in

misunderstanding, disappointment and confusion in cross-cultural communication, such as in Eastern patients in Western psychotherapy or Western seekers in Eastern spiritual disciplines that I did not discuss here in detail.

Many transpersonal psychologists (Bogart, 1991; Engler, 1984; Kornfield, 1983) make a clear distinction between spiritual practices and psychotherapy, as they do not have in many respects the same goals, methods, or outcomes. However, in some cases the spiritual practice that intends to lead the student toward transegoic and transpersonal stages of evolution and the spiritual teacher-disciple relationship may become complicated by unresolved egoic issues and concerns (Engler, 1984) and would need healing. On the other hand, while the main purpose of psychotherapy is working with the patient's emotional conflicts and healing, we see—especially in Jungian psychoanalysis—that the analytic process also fosters the patient's spiritual development toward Self-realization and experiencing wholeness through the analyst-patient relationship.

Bogart (1997) examined problematic aspects of spiritual apprenticeship and suggested that similar dynamics of transference and countertransference, which operate in psychotherapy, may also be present in teacher-student and guru-disciple relationships. For instance, some disciples approach gurus for learning and spiritual development, but get stuck because of childhood problems or other developmental issues regarding individuation and separation from parents. Some students who revolt against parents may have difficulties in accepting the teacher's authority. Others who have not resolved issues of separation and differentiation may be too needy and dependent in their relationship with the guru or never be able to individuate. Some gurus who are narcissistic or not matured enough take advantage of the students' devotion and abuse the relationships.

Positive and negative transferences can occur both in master-disciple and analyst-patient relationships. The major difference may be that gurus and disciples are less aware of, and reluctant to work with, transference-countertransference; whereas, psychotherapy considers elaboration of this phenomena as an important part of the analytic treatment, as I will discuss in the next section.

In summary, despite significant cultural, conceptual, and methodological differences among the Indian, Buddhist systems and Jungian psychoanalysis, the spiritual master-disciple relationship and the analyst-patient relationship have analogies that are based on similar psychological foundation of reaching wholeness, in Jungian terms, self-realization, and individuation through these relationships.

Psychotherapeutic Perspectives

Now that the similarities and differences between master-disciple and therapist-patient relationships have been discussed, I describe the psychological relationship between them in terms of transference and projection. The term “transference” was coined by Freud in 1905 to describe the patient’s impulses and feelings directed toward the analyst, transferred from other previous object relations, primarily with parents. Freud also discovered a similar, reverse process in the analyst toward the patient, and called this phenomenon countertransference (Racker, 1968). Initially, transference and countertransference were considered disturbing phenomena for Freud and his followers, but these soon became important and highly valuable and essential part of the analytic work (Samuels, 2006). Freud learned that transference could inform about the nature of patient’s past experiences with parents, and putting the analyst into their place could be helpful in re-experiencing and modifying these feelings in the analytic treatment. Freud (1940) distinguished positive transferences (love and trust in analyst based on positive experiences with

parents) from negative transferences (expectations of misunderstanding and harm by analyst that are based on painful experiences with parents). According to Freud (1955), both positive and negative interfere with the analytic treatment, and can be considered “resistances” to opening to another perspective. However, handling transferences is difficult, but an important part of the analytic work.

The transference is made conscious to the patient by the analyst, and it is resolved by convincing him that in his transference-attitude he is re-experiencing emotional relations, which had their origin in his earliest object-attachments during the repressed period of his childhood. In this way, the transference is changed from the strongest weapon of the resistance into the best instrument of the analytic treatment. Nevertheless, its handling remains the most difficult as well as the most important part of the technique of analysis. (Freud, 1955, p. 42)

Freud understood transference as a universal phenomenon of the human mind, which decided the success of all medical influence, and in fact dominated the whole of each person’s relations to his human environment.

When Freud and Jung had their first meeting, Jung, in response to Freud’s question about transference, assured Freud about the centrality of the idea of transference as the “alpha and omega of analysis” (as cited in Samuels, 2006, p. 178). Nevertheless, Jung extended Freud’s concept and proposed that transference was not limited to sexual contents and early experiences with parents, but appeared in a broader sense in the analytic relationship and human relatedness in general (Kirsch, 1995). As Jung (1966c) said: “Indeed, in any human relationship that is at all intimate, certain transference phenomena will almost always operate as helpful or disturbing factor” (p. 171). Jung suggested that transference was an archetypal paradigm, universal, and characterizing every human connection. However, Jung repeatedly said that transference phenomena are complicated, involve various feelings, fantasies, and reflections that sometimes

make it difficult to identify and handle them in either therapy or our everyday life (Hillman, 1972).

Jung (1966b) also early recognized the significance of countertransference. Unlike Freud, he considered the appearance of unconscious contents in the analyst in response to the patient's transferences as an indispensable part of the analytic process. Therefore, Jung (1989) insisted that analysts should undergo analysis themselves in order to obtain a firsthand experiences of the different transferences. In Jung's view, the personality of the analyst contributes to the therapeutic relationship, where transformation is mutual and affects both the analyst and patient.

In *Psychology of the Transference*, Jung (1966c) described and interpreted the transference, drawing close parallel between the stages of the analytic process and the symbolic images in a medieval alchemical text, the *Rosarium Philosophorum*. He observed the transference as an unconscious identity between doctor and patient, taking part in a kind of *participation mystique*, similar to *projective identification*, which was later described by psychoanalysts (Kirsch, 1995).

An unconscious tie is established and now, in the patient's fantasies, it assumes all the forms and dimensions so profusely described in the literature. The patient, by bringing an activated unconscious content to bear upon the doctor, constellates the corresponding unconscious material in him owing to the inductive effect, which always emanates from the projections in greater or lesser degree. Doctor and patient thus find themselves in a relationship founded on mutual unconsciousness. (Jung, 1966c, p. 176)

Jung (1971b) assumed that beyond the personal level there must be a more universal, timeless, and impersonal level of human consciousness, formed by the archetypes of the collective unconscious. Jung recognized two major archetypal urges in the individual psyche: to be separated, complete, and autonomous, and to be related to the other, the incomplete and dependent. The ambivalence of these two primary drives is at the root of transference and resistance in human relatedness, constituting a fundamental paradox to be evolved and resolved

in individuation and analysis (Kirsch, 1995). In order to differentiate the personal and impersonal or archetypal level of the transference-countertransference and to illustrate the development of transference-countertransference fantasies in the analytic process, Jung (1966c) turned to the *Rosarium*, this alchemical treatise, because, as he wrote:

It is for the most part a projection of unconscious contents, of those archetypal forms, which are characteristics of all pure fantasy-products, such as are to be met with myths and fairy-tales, or in dreams, visions, and the delusional systems of individual men and women. The important part played in the history of alchemy by hierosgamos and the mystical marriage, and also by the coniunctio, corresponds to the central significance of the transference in psychotherapy on one hand and in the field of normal human relationship on the other. (p. 321)

Jung saw the kinship libido and its flow between alchemist-adept and his mystic sister depicted on the alchemical pictures as a metaphor for the unconscious bond and its evolution and resolution between the analyst and patient during the analytic course. The analytic process itself was unconsciously directed by the archetype of individuation, a psychological need to develop in depth and complexity, and provided relationship with the self, the archetype that embraces and comprises all other archetypes. Consequently, the transference for Jung and in the analytical psychology is understood as having archetypal roots by nature and a teleological dimension as it is progressing in the individuation or psychotherapy. In the Jungian view, the transference also reflects on the collective unconscious, in contrast to the regressive projection of exclusively personal unconscious material or other experience in classical psychoanalysis (Kirsch, 1995). The transference includes the archetypal, connects the individual with the collective, and facilitates development as its symbolic intent and meaning is revealed and experienced in the analytic process. In this context, I propose that the archetypal transference is a special sort of transference that emanates from the collective unconscious and relates to archetypal content: archetypal fantasies, images, or situations, which can be projected on both the therapist and

patient. I assume that the “Wise Old Man or Women” and other relating archetypal images, including the “guru” archetype, are few of these possibilities, which may appear in the psychotherapy room between analyst and patient and can influence the psychotherapy process.

According to Kirsch (1995), Jung knew the personal level of transference and recognized clearly the demands for its resolution in the therapeutic relationship between analyst and patient. Nevertheless, he was fascinated more by the symbolic potential of the archetype in the analytic process, particularly the archetype of the Self, which he recognized as a deeper level of transference, “an objective, unseen force that acts upon both analyst and analysand through the unconscious” (Kirsch, 1995, p. 198). Jung assumed that if the personal level of transferences were assimilated, then the archetypal level would be opened up. As Edward F. Edinger (1995) said, “That feature is utterly unique to Jungian psychology—no other school of psychotherapy knows beans about the archetypal transference. It is unknown. That is a treasure we carry, the awareness of that archetypal dimension of the transference” (p. 316). Jung was engaged by examining the problems of transference in psychotherapy in the last decade of his life and dedicated his last major work for the subject. Jung (1970), in *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, returned to the alchemical imagery of *coniunctio*, first explored in his earlier essay, *The Psychology of Transference* (1966c), to describe the parallels to psychological process of transference between therapist and patient, and gave a fuller discussion of the topic. The *coniunctio* in alchemy signifies the union of opposites, *unio mystica* and the holy wedding.

The *coniunctio*, an important alchemical symbolic image of sexual intercourse between a man and a woman, refers metaphorically to the deep and pervasive intermingling of two personalities involved in therapy. At the same time, the image of the *coniunctio* depicts in dramatic form the movements between parts of the unconscious psyches of both therapist and client. (Samuels, 2006, p. 186)

At the same time, *coniunctio* is also the symbolic expression of the goal of the opus. Thus, in Jung's view, the psychological parallel is that the analytic transference should be the unconscious manifestation of an archetype that attends the process of individuation. It may result in synthesis and healing, the aim of psychotherapy (Edinger, 1995).

Jung's original vision of the nature of transference has been extended and elaborated by subsequent generations of analysts (Kirsch, 1995), who had grouped them into three main schools: the classical, developmental, and archetypal schools. Though these three main directions within the analytical psychology have different emphases and attributions, they all acknowledge the importance of transference-countertransference and differentiate the personal and archetypal transferences in psychotherapy.

According to Samuels (1985), the classical school (Marie-Louise von Franz, Joseph Henderson, Aniela Jaffe, Erich Neumann, Gerhard Adler, Jolanda Jacobi, and Edward Edinger) focused more on the Self and its archetypal symbolism. They looked for the meaning of dreams and images brought by patients into therapy and on their relevance for the patients' individuation process. Transference in psychotherapy was viewed as an archetypal projection of the Self onto the analyst, which directed the analytic process. This was an archetypal view of transference.

The developmental school (Michael Fordham and Andrew Samuels), as Samuels noted, differed from the classical by giving less emphasis to the Self and focusing more on the development of personality. In clinical practices, developmentally trained analysts gave more attention to personal interactions between analyst and patient in terms of transference and countertransference. This was what Fordham called "interactional dialect," and this approach was known as a clinical view of the transference. They understood transference as projection in the here and now from the patient's past experiences, which was mostly determined by the

patient's early childhood development based on archetypes. Michael Fordham (1978), founding member of this alternative London school, innovated the idea of countertransference in many ways. He formulated the concept of *syntonic countertransference* to cover the analyst's introjective experience toward the patient's transference. Furthermore, he used and propagated the psychoanalyst Racker's (1968) description of *concordant countertransference* for the reciprocally shared positive transference between analyst and patient. Fordham also borrowed and interpreted Racker's *neurotic or complementary countertransference* to describe the analyst's introjection of the patient's negative transference.

According to Kirsch (1995), the orientation of the archetypal school (James Hillman and Murray Stein) was more theoretical. Their representatives were primarily concerned with conceptualizing archetypes in the context of mythology, history, and culture. In Hillman's (1972) view, transference went beyond the individual level. There were "social and cultural aspects that influence the soul's needs and reactions beyond the behavior transferred to it from childhood and parents" (Hillman, 1972, p. 111). Hillman declared that the sources of patient's psychic needs and erotic desires for love in psychotherapy always involve historical dimension as well.

Contemporary Jungian approach is interrelational and defines the transference in a broader sense as a web of mutual interactions on different levels: interpersonal and intrapsychic, conscious and unconscious, occurring simultaneously within, and between, analyst and patient (Samuels, 2006). To discuss the results of interviews with my research participants I address some of these issues in depth, and also include further contemporary Jungian literatures (Beebe, Cambrey, & Kirsch, 2001; Carter, 2010; Schwarz-Salant, 1995; Stein, 2010) in the discussion section.

Though modern psychoanalytic theories of self, projective identification and intersubjectivity all had antecedents in the work of Jung, they also had different emphases. Heinz Kohut (1971) talked about different types of transferences: mirroring, alter ego and idealizing that help patients to establish relationship to the psychoanalyst and also seem to be part of most intimate relationships. According to Kohut, the mirror transference arises from the basic human need for belonging expressed through “empathic resonance” (as cited in Jacoby, 1984, p. 43). In mirror transference, one cannot experience the other in his or her actuality and otherness, but rather perceives the other as an extension of the self that self-psychology calls a *self-object*. A healthy self-object is necessary and helps one develop self-esteem and a sense of specialness that is important for self-development (Jacoby, 1984; Winnicott, 1980). According to Kohut (1971), the mirroring transference is the most mature form of the mobilization of the grandiose self because the self-object experienced as a separate person.

I propose that as the guru and disciple as the therapist and patient are mirroring each other. “When students receive extensive mirroring, they may overvalue the guru or spiritual teacher, who becomes essential to their internal equilibrium and self-esteem, and without whom they may feel empty, depleted, lost, or depressed” (Bogart, 1997, p. 177). It also may be flattering for a teacher to feel admiration and love of a student, and thus a teacher may overvalue this student, the mirroring self-object. Inversely, a teacher may become angry or jealous if he or she would not receive enough attention or the students’ love would direct to other teachers (Bogart, 1997). Another good example for mirroring is the *sazen*, the dialogue with the master, which was developed in Zen. According to Spiegelman and Vasavada (1987), the basic condition of mirroring is a nonjudgmental and positive attitude which both spiritual teachers and psychotherapists represent. The alter-ego transference or twinship is a little more archaic form of

the activation of the grandiose self, where the other person (self-object) is experienced as being alike or as being similar to oneself (Kohut, 1971). Patient's dreams and fantasies referring to a relationship with an alter ego or twin or desire for such a relationship are frequently encountered in psychotherapy. In spiritual practice, the alter-ego transference may be helpful in those cases where the relationship proceeds smoothly and the student starts developing a strong identification with the spiritual teacher, which is the basis of *guru yoga* practices in several traditions (Bogart, 1997).

Kohut (1971) described the idealizing or merger transference as the most archaic form of experiencing the grandiose self. It is based on the child's early experience of the parents as all-powerful, omniscient, and perfect self-object. This idealizing capacity, developed in infancy, also plays an important role in establishing self-esteem by the fusion with the mirroring transference, which potentially remains active throughout life. Mario Jacoby (1984) assumed that this capacity was connected to a creative archetypal fantasy. "Omnipotence, for instance, is an archetypal quality which in general is attributed to godhead" (Jacoby, 1984, p. 51). He stated that when a patient sees his analyst as omnipotent, this idealizing transference works as a projection of archetypal content upon the analyst. Thus, the archetype mediates the patient's developmental experience (H. Marlo, personal communication, November 4, 2009).

Kakar (1991) interpreted the appearance of guru-devotion in the Hindu traditions and surrender in Sufism as an idealizing transference. As discussed previously, disciples have a strong need for a positive experience with a wise, powerful figure, a master. "The Guru is disciple, but perfected, complete. When he forms a relationship with the guru, the disciple is in fact forming relationship with his own best self" (Muktananda, 1983, p. ix). Kakar (1991) surmised that the self-object experience, which often simply comes from being present in the

relationship, “transfers the location of the fount of grace from the person of the guru to the psyche of the devotee” (p. 47). The idealizing transference is the core of the master-disciple relationship. Healing happens as an alchemical transformation of the self: “When iron comes in contact with the philosopher’s stone, it is transmuted into gold. Sandalwood trees infuse their fragrance into the trees around them” (Muktananda, 1983, p. 4). As Bogart (G. Bogart, personal communication, November 4, 2009) concluded, the idealizing and merger transference phenomena both in discipleship and in therapy may reflect perceptions or anticipations of our own innate wholeness, seen embodied in the visible form of the guru or therapist, which awakens in the student or client a desire to rouse their own potentials, to actualize the Self.

According to Kakar (1991), surrender to the master is indispensable for transformative change in the spiritual student’s self as well as being a strong emotional experience. The experience of surrender often brings inconvenient and negative feelings into both relationships, that of guru-disciple and psychotherapist-patient. The task of a master or a psychotherapist is to give guidance in order to remove obstacles and diffuse the disciple or patient’s weaknesses.

Surrender of the self may also result in regression. Berzin (2000) discussed regression in the relationship between guru and disciples and stated that this relationship can be both healthy and unhealthy.

Restorative regression ideally happens in a healthy disciple-mentor relationship in which the example of the teacher inspires a seeker to drop rigid modes of thinking and behaving that cause only suffering. Transference and degenerative regression, on the other hand, commonly occur in an unhealthy disciple-relationship, especially when a mentor fails to respond in the ways a disciple would like. (p. 196)

In an unhealthy relationship, the student may regress in a degenerative manner, feel frustration, anger, and rage toward the teacher, then guilt at having had these negative feelings (Berzin, 2000). The student may transfer and project onto the teacher the image of someone with whom

he or she had a bad experience with in the past. Bogart (1992), in writing about the possible outcome of such a process stated, “The disciple may begin to negatively idealize the master, viewing him or her as the embodiment of absolute Evil” (p. 13). Jacoby (1984) suggested that transference projections have not only personal but also impersonal or archetypal elements. Therefore, the negative projections of the disciple upon the guru could also be understood, on an archetypal level, as the features of the negative or terrible father (Coukoulis, 1976). In reference to this, Neumann (1954/1995) said, “Thus waiting and testing, the divine father may easily be confused with the negative father, for the father who sends forth his son into danger is an ambiguous figure with personal and impersonal characteristics” (p. 177).

Vasavada (1968) wrote that the guru should be aware of these projections. According to the Hindu texts, the guru neither rejects nor accepts projection, regardless of its nature, positive or negative. The guru is able to discern between the human and the divine or the Supreme aspects of guru. The guru, becoming aware of it, transfers this projection onto the impersonal (in Jungian terms archetypal) Guru, the original Guru or Adi-Guru. In the context of psychotherapy, the psychotherapist acts similarly, when he or she differentiates the patient’s transference from his or her own countertransference (Jacoby, 1984).

Spiritual teachers and disciples differ, just as patients and psychotherapists differ. However, the foundation of the relationship in both cases is the same recognition of a need to associate with a person who has achieved inner transformation and has skill and interest to guide the student on the path or analyze the patient. The beginnings and the endings of these relationships are relatively known (Berzin, 2000). As the old tradition says (as cited in Bogart, 1992), “When the disciple is ready, the guru appears” (p. 2), which means that discipleship requires motivation, maturity (readiness), and preparations from the student. The level and

quality of readiness, in my opinion, may differ in spiritual vs. analytical relationships. Bogart (1992) amended this to say, “When the disciple is ready, the guru disappears” (p. 20) suggesting that the function of the external guru is to revive the inner guru of the disciple and to teach the disciple to master his or her own self. At the end of this process of transformation, when the disciple internalizes the guru’s function successfully and can realize his or her own true self, the guru’s mission will be done.

However, we know much less about what happens between the beginning and the ending. Even though there are detailed descriptions in scriptures and textbooks, rules, rites, and techniques in both spiritual and psychotherapeutic traditions, what happens in the relationship between spiritual teacher and disciple and between psychotherapist and patient remains a mystery. The experience, difficult to describe, is beyond the domain of words and rationality (Vasavada, 1968). Similarly, psychoanalyst Thomas Ogden (2004b) stated, “Psychoanalysis is a lived emotional experience” (p. 857). He indicated that the role of psychoanalysis is a flow of emotions between the analyst and patient. This process fosters developing emotional understanding, acceptance, and integration that may include one’s psychological and spiritual development as well as unresolved problems in the patient. It is a special kind of communion, where all the dualities, subject and object, ego and world, master and disciple cease. Jung (1970) described this unifying experience with the following:

We could compare this only with ineffable mystery of *unio mystica*, or *tao*, or the content of *samadhi*, or the experience of *satori* in Zen, which would bring us to realm of the ineffable and of extreme subjectivity where all criteria of reason fail. Remarkably enough this experience is an empirical one in so far as there are unanimous testimonies from the East and West alike, both from the present and from the distant past, which confirm its unsurpassable subjective significance. (p. 540)

It is reasonable to conclude that transference and its strong emotional interaction extends beyond the boundaries of the relationships between spiritual teacher and disciple and between therapist

and patient. This transference experience is described as love in Sufi poetry (Barks, 1995), and in several examples of literature in psychotherapy. Jung (1989) confessed the following:

For we are in the deepest sense the victims of and the instruments of cosmogonic “love.” I put the word in quotation marks to indicate that I do not use it in its connotation of desiring, preferring, favouring, wishing, and similar feelings, but something superior to individual, a unified and undivided whole. . . . Man may try to name love, showering upon it all the names at his command, and still he will involve himself in endless self-deceptions. If he possesses a grain of wisdom, he will lay down his arms and name the unknown, *ignotum per ignotius*, that is by the name of god. (p. 354)

Jung, in this quotation, reflected to the symbolic meaning of love that relates to the union of Psyche and Eros, which is the final mystery of life. He suggested that though we know much about the cosmos, more is left unknown that we can only experience. Similarly, in psychotherapy we often do not know, but may discover an unconscious bond between us and our analyst or patient through transference, the love that leads us beyond our personalities. That is the whole premise of Jungian psychoanalysis.

Exploration of the Relationships Between the Spiritual Teacher and Student, and Between the Psychotherapist and Patient

Cortney R. Phelon (2001) explored the common words, themes and qualities that define a psychotherapist’s healing presence in psychotherapy. She gathered and distilled data from previous writings and studies concerning presence, which were then reviewed and evaluated by a group of advanced clinician-clients who claimed to have experienced presence as a powerful healing agent in their own therapy and also in working with others in psychotherapy. Phelon chose the intuitive inquiry research method to shape successive cycles of interpretation, from selecting topic through the final discussion of data. The research participants confirmed and revised six themes of the 21 Preliminary Distillation elements that are important attributes of the presence as follows; (a) Alignment With the Client, (b) Attentional Ability, (c) Integration and

Congruence, (d) Internal Awareness, (e) Spiritual Practice and Belief, and (f) Receptivity. In addition to these previously known elements, three other new themes emerged that had received less attention before: (g) Commitment to Personal Growth, (h) Kinesthetic Aspects of Presence, and (i) Seasoning (Phelon, 2001).

Phelon's (2001) study shifted the focus to the person of the therapist, which focus is in contrast to the professional role of merely practicing techniques. Furthermore, it laid emphasis on the clinician's own therapy and lifelong commitment to grow. As it relates to my own research topic, this empirical research study has also brought an interesting, but not surprising, recognition. *Alignment With the Client* was the most strongly supported factor, which also suggested that the healing professional's relational capacities; ability to hold, to absorb and understand the client were play more important role than to interpret the client or the personal qualities of the healing professional. It seems that the quality of psychotherapy ultimately depends on the relationship between the analyst and patient. Phelon's dissertation was also useful for shaping my own research design, which was also informed by intuitive inquiry.

Craig Matsu-Pissot (1995) researched the unconditional love of the spiritual teacher with the help of existential-phenomenological methodology. Twelve participants provided experiences with teachers from different spiritual traditions including Buddhist, Hindu, Native American, Jewish, Christian, and Sufi. According to Matsu-Pissot, 11 major themes emerged and assessed as significant elements of the student's perceptions; (a) a heightened sense of commitment to the spiritual, (b) the experience as psychologically therapeutic, (c) the experience as profound, (d) transpersonal qualities, (e) encouragement to express one's true self, (f) the experience of continually influencing and inspiring, (g) heightened awareness of one's authentic self nature, (h) a shift in perception of self in relationship to other, (i) the teacher as having

nurturing qualities, (j) mutuality, and (k) a heightened awareness of unconditional love within one's own being.

These findings confirmed that experiences of love and mutual acceptance between spiritual teacher and student were influential in the process of transformation. The positive qualities of the teacher and the nurturing relationship help the student to engage with his or her own inner realities and experience the divine. This process fosters the student's psychological growth and develops better relationship with self, others and the world. In my opinion, Matsu-Pissot (1995) provided little or no evidence for mutuality in the relationship between the spiritual teacher and students as he focused exclusively on the students' feelings. I was also concerned about the lack of data regarding other parts of the relationship, namely the spiritual teacher's perceptions. However, this study was inspirational and provided rich material for my own research in a context of a student's and patient's transference.

Further Applications and Potentials in Psychotherapy

Based on the psychological literature of the master-disciple relationship, as discussed above, three further recommendations were made regarding potential and application of the metaphor of the master-disciple relationship in psychotherapy as follows. First, Sandra Magnussen (2003) proposed that Buddhist meditation practice for patients and psychotherapists would be helpful in creating a stronger relationship between them. Meditation is a transformative practice, which helps us establishing a deeper sense of presence and experiencing our own true nature (Bogart, 1997; Kornfield, 1983). In deep meditation, an experienced practitioner is able to create an inner link with the spiritual teacher, proceeding into the space where teacher and student both share consciousness. Boundaries between them become more fluid and the separation of their egos will be dissolved in higher consciousness of the Self. Magnussen's

(2003) research also affirmed that any level of meditation practice can positively influence the therapist's and the patient's capabilities in being present and related to each other in psychotherapy. Using a transpersonal method known as organic inquiry, her qualitative analysis revealed evidence of a deepening of understanding, a fostering of compassion and an enhancing of the therapeutic relationship between the patient and the psychotherapist through meditation practice.

Second, a comparison between a review of guru training qualifications (Berzin, 2000; Patrul Rinpoche, 1998) and Jungian analytic training qualifications (Coukoulis, 1976) disclosed both differences and similarities. In both traditions, becoming a guru or a psychotherapist requires study and preparation, and most important, self-experience in his or her individuation and/or initiation (Coukoulis, 1976; Phelon, 2001; Spiegelman & Vasavada, 1987). Essentially, this means that with few exceptions, no one should become a master or psychotherapist without first being a disciple or patient. The significance of a psychoanalytic student undergoing analysis was first recognized, and then introduced into analytic training programs by Jung (Kirsch, 2000). Today, the training analysis is required not only in the Jungian, but in all analytically oriented schools of psychotherapy.

Third, the recognition and understanding of cultural differences between psychotherapist and patient or spiritual teacher and seeker would help to avoid false expectations, disappointments, and confusion of Eastern patients in Western psychotherapy and Western seekers in relationship with a guru (Bogart, 1992, 1997; Kakar, 1991; Vigne, 2001). Accordingly, there are several implications of the confusion of psychotherapy with spiritual discipleship. For instance, patients coming from Asian countries with strong guru tradition or patients with some practices under spiritual guidance prior to their psychotherapy may project

different expectations and assumptions on their therapist. According to Kakar (1991), first generation Asian patients frequently either tend to idealize their therapist overtly or became disappointed and confused by the therapist's passivity and "incompetency" based on their different cultural experience with the more authoritarian spiritual teachers.

The next example, some Western students approach spiritual teachers with hope or false expectations that the teachers will fulfill the role of psychotherapist (Bogart, 1997). The student's motivation of seeking spiritual teacher, often, is also colored with unresolved developmental issues or emotional difficulties. Since the teacher and the spiritual practice are concerned exclusively with the community and the student's spiritual development, they do not support or take care of the student's psychological needs. Therefore, those students may be disappointed, feel neglected and confused.

Other implication may come from the clash of the Western and Eastern different cultural assumptions regarding the authority of spiritual teacher. Western students expect spiritual teachers to follow similar standard of ethics and behavior to those of other Western professionals such as doctors, psychologists and counselors (Bogart, 1997). In contrast, the traditional guru-disciple relationship is non-democratic; the teacher is unquestionable and requires obedience and surrender from the students. These conflicts of different goals, expectations and cultural norms are always present, often misinterpreted or overlooked in those cases, where Western students have confronted their spiritual teachers with purported abuses of power.

Conclusion

What, then, can today's gurus learn from past gurus? The secular psychotherapist is not the saint-mystic, the Jewish master, Zaddik used to be. He cannot give himself over to the

devoted austerity and solitude of the Desert Father. Yet, each guru of the past has something to teach about his attempts to help other people (Kopp, 1971).

An examination of the literature currently available on the topic reveals that the psychological understanding of the master-disciple relationship in its cultural context can result in more insight into the process of healing relationships, in both spiritual guidance and psychotherapy. I propose that the analytic transference has archetypal roots, and may manifest, in one's analysis, through the archetypal pattern of master-disciple relationship. Through understanding the archetypal foundation of the analytic process and valuing its connection both to the analyst's and patient's consciousness in Jungian psychoanalysis we may also better understand connections to one another, to our true nature, and to the universe as a whole.

The studies done so far have mostly employed a phenomenological approach or have been based on a comparative literature analysis. There has been little research done to date. The few research studies (Magnussen, 2003; Matsu-Pissot, 1995; Phelon, 2001), though they were partially or differently related to the topic, suggested the importance of psychodynamics both in the relationship between the spiritual teacher and disciple, and analyst and patient. Therefore, it interests me to continue researching the relationship between the psychotherapist and patient, especially in the context of transference and countertransference. That is the purpose of this study.

Chapter 3: Research Methods

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the research approach and methods I utilize for this study, and to establish the rationale for these choices. As the Literature Review concluded, there has been little research done on the comparison of the therapist-patient relationship in psychotherapy and the traditional master-disciple relationship. To bridge this gap my research project addresses the experience of archetypal transference in psychotherapy by interviewing senior Jungian analysts.

Research Approach

Given the nature of the topic, its complexity, and my own personal involvement, I found that intuitive inquiry (Anderson, 1998, 2004, 2011a, 2011b) fit well with my study plans, and offered a manageable approach for my research design. According to Anderson, the intuitive inquiry allows “breathing space that is a capacity for interpretation, and working with data toward a general description or theory” (R. Anderson, personal communication, August 26, 2008). The intuitive inquiry also seemed to be appropriate to give a balance of intuition and conceptual precision in data treatment and its presentation. All of these reasons were promising and convincing, when I was looking for the best, most-appropriate research method. The other rationale for selecting Intuitive inquiry was that it is in-depth, reflective process allows space for emergence of new insights, recognitions, and changes unforeseen at the beginning of my research, which may reformulate or enhance my initial assumptions and biases. My first inspiration for the topic was born 20 years ago, suggesting to me that Spirit selected me for this research project and might have waited for its expression until finding this suitable research method. What exactly is intuitive inquiry?

Intuitive inquiry is a new transpersonal research method that systematically incorporates both objective and subjective knowledge of the topic through a hermeneutical process that joins intuition with intellectual precision. Intuitive inquiry was introduced by Rosemarie Anderson (1998) as a general qualitative research approach for studying subtle human experiences, first published in the book titled *Transpersonal Research Methods for the Social Sciences: Honoring Human Experience* (Braud & Anderson, 1998), and it has been continually refined since then. As Anderson (2011a) pointed out:

Methodologically, intuitive inquiry has been informed directly by the Biblical hermeneutics of Friedrich Schleiermacher (1819/1977), the philosophical hermeneutics of Hans-Georg Gadamer (e.g., Bruns, 1992; Gadamer, 1998; Packer & Addison, 1989), phenomenological and heuristic research as developed by Clark Moustakas (1990, 1994), and wide spectrum of feminist scholarship in psychology and theology. (p. 244)

Methodologically, intuitive inquiry can incorporate instruments generally employed by other qualitative and quantitative research methods. Its uniqueness comes from the process of inquiry, which contains five iterative cycles (in its most developed version) characterized by repetitions, and forms a complete hermeneutical circle of interpretation: Cycle 1, *Clarifying the Research Topic*; Cycle 2, *Identifying Preliminary Lenses*; Cycle 3, *Collecting Original Data and Preparing Summary Reports*; Cycle 4, *Transforming and Refining Lenses*; and Cycle 5, *Integration of Findings and Literature Review*. Anderson (2011b) described Cycles 1 and 2 as representing the forward arc of hermeneutical research, in which the topic and questions are clarified. Cycles 3, 4, and 5 represent the return arc “in a process of transforming pre-understanding via the understanding of others” (Anderson, 2011b, p. 28). She put it in her words:

In intuitive inquiry, lenses are both a way of viewing a topic and what is seen. We all “wear” lenses all the time. Typically, often for the sake of healthy functioning, we ignore or are unaware of the many ways our personal histories, biology, and culture shape how we perceive and understand our life worlds. In intuitive inquiry, the researcher attempts to discern and acknowledge these lenses as best he can by becoming aware of them in relationship to the research topic. . . . Specifically, lenses are articulated in order to track

and record how they change and transform in the course of the study . . . the intuitive researcher places these lenses in full scrutiny and invites their transformation, revision, removal, amplification, and refinement as the cycles of interpretation move forward. (Anderson, 2011b, p. 43)

Intuitive inquiry invites the researcher to explore a topic that is of keen interest to him or her, to provide an opportunity for inclusion of the researcher's subjective experience, and to distill the research data both objectively and subjectively in a way that in the end it may transform all who contribute to the research, the researcher and participants alike, as well as the reader of the research study. This transformative potential for researcher and others is one of the distinctive features of intuitive inquiry. According to Anderson (2011b), the major forces of the process of transformation are the researcher's intention toward transformation and the dialectic process of each of the five cycles. Whereas, several other transpersonal methods and procedures may support the personal transformation of the researcher, "the dialectic required in intuitive inquiry may be a unique impetus for personal transformation" (Anderson, 2011b, p. 60).

Intuitive inquiry is not suitable for every research topic, but "is optimally used as a full hermeneutical process of interpretation" to study "complex topics characteristic of psycho-spiritual development" (Anderson, 2011b, p. 18) such as topics in the field of transpersonal psychology. For example:

"Right body size" for women (Coleman, 2000), the healing presence of a psychotherapist (Phelon, 2001), grief and other deep emotions in response to nature (Dufrechou, 2002), true joy in union with God in mystical Christianity (Carlock, 2003), storytelling and compassionate connection (Hoffman, 2003), and the dialectics of embodiment among contemporary female mystics (Esbjörn, 2003) were among early topics studied. (Anderson, 2011a, p. 245)

Anderson (2011b) warned of the difficulties of the intuitive inquiry. It brings the intuitive researchers into *terra incognita*, where they usually must work independently by only trusting the process and their intuition.

Aside from demands of its in-depth scrutiny, intuitive inquiry requires a postmodern perspective not easily achieved in the context of the positivistic sensibilities still widespread in the human sciences. . . . The hermeneutic basis and procedures of intuitive inquiry over a world reality in flux and mutable and, therefore, challenge conventional notions of a static worldview that is separate and distinguishable from the knower. Within its interpretive structure, intuitive inquiry encourages new visions of the future and makes them possible. (Anderson, 2011b, p. 33)

To meet these challenges, intuitive inquiry requires that the researchers are rigorously subjective, which means an awareness of the researcher's own internal processes as well as openness to the process of other people's (e.g., research participants') experience (Anderson, 2011b). "Telling the truth no matters what" (Anderson, 2011b, p. 62) and "avoiding circularity" (p. 62) are necessary to sustaining credibility; whereas, "finding their own voices" (p. 63) provides authenticity in this qualitative approach. "Trickstering and bewilderment" (Anderson, 2011b, p. 64) often signal renewed understanding or new awareness and insight. Without "imaging the impossible" (Anderson, 2011b, p. 61) and "risking personal change and transformation" (p. 61) the researchers are not able to unfold complexity of the topics, nor to open up unknown paths that may lead new discoveries "toward wholeness" (p. 61).

My research approach also included elements of other transpersonal research methods that could combine well with intuitive inquiry. In collecting data, my *interview* technique was informed by phenomenological research methods, whereas in working with data the *Thematic Content Analysis* (TCA) took its roots in the hermeneutical tradition, and allowed a widely used descriptive mode of qualitative analysis.

Polkinghorne (1989) described *phenomenological interview* as a discourse or conversation between the interviewer (researcher) and interviewee (researcher participant). The personal involvement of the interviewee facilitates sharing with a researcher the details of experience. "The interview is qualitative in aiming at obtaining nuanced descriptions that are

precise and understand the meaning of the central themes of the experience being investigated” (Polkinghorne, 1989, p. 49). Furthermore, I selected a semi-formed style, 1- to 2-hour long interviews, which had a few standardized questions to every participant, and being otherwise unstructured, providing free space for engaging with the topic and interview partners. To structure an interview that is on target, in depth, vivid, detailed, and rich, Herbert Rubin and Irene Rubin (2005) recommended creating the right mix of three kinds of questions: main, follow up, and probes. During an interview, it is challenging to figure out not only what people are saying, but also what they mean, and then work out appropriate, thought-provoking follow-up questions to facilitate the discussion. To handle the fear of doing ineffective interviews, losing track, or forgetting to ask the main questions, Rubin and Rubin (2005) proposed preparing a conversational guide (protocol, checklist, or outline of the main questions, etc.). I intended to use an interview protocol that was a written version of my main research questions.

Thematic content analysis (TCA) was described by Anderson (2007) as a qualitative method used for a descriptive presentation of data. “Qualitative data may take the form of interview transcripts collected from research participants or other identified texts that reflect experientially on the topic of study” (Anderson, 2007, p. 1). Historically, this method was developed in hermeneutics, which sought to find the hidden meaning of some historical or sacred texts (Gadamer, 1998). Following its innate tradition, TCA does not work as a complete analysis, but is merely descriptive, and unless the research has its own meaning it will not provide useful data. Anderson (2007) stated:

TCA is not an analysis at all. In Phenomenological Research, an elaborate and articulate set of procedures require researchers to situate identified meaning units in relationship to context and structure for each participant and then for the participants as a whole. (p. 2)

This means that TCA is useful in selecting and sorting out data, but it can also be useful in finding correlations among them, which foster attributing meanings and interpretations in the later stages. As Anderson (2007) warned, the intersubjective meaning of TCA themes, which incorporate both the objective and subjective data, is often presented as interpretive lenses in Cycle 4 of the Discussion. In my research I employed TCA to describe data collected because this method supports the descriptive aspects of the ongoing analysis, as I explain it in the next section.

Procedure

As discussed earlier, I employed the five cycles of intuitive inquiry in my research. As Anderson (2011a) notified, “Given the spiraling aspects of interpretation in intuitive inquiry, it is not always clear where to present the five cycles of intuitive inquiry in research reports” (p. 29). This is also true for my case, because the formulation of my research project has been changed several times during the long history of my research interests, and shaped by the research process itself. As a matter of fact, I decided to employ intuitive inquiry as qualitative research method for my research study, when I was in the miniproposal class and discussed with my instructor, who later became my chairperson. By that time, I have had a more or less clear pre-understanding of the research topic and already finished my Doctoral Qualifying Paper including the Introduction and Literature Review chapters. Interestingly enough, I recognized only in retrospect that though my process went along in its own organic way, knowing little or nothing about intuitive inquiry, my choice was intuitively right. No need to say that since then I revisited, modified, and expanded these chapters by utilizing recommendations of intuitive inquiry. By all means, Cycles 1 and 2 of intuitive inquiry fit the Introduction and Literature Review chapters of the present study. I discuss Cycles 3 partly in Chapter 3: Method and its data description part goes into

Chapter 4: Results. Due to their interpretive nature, Cycle 4 and 5 are presented in the Chapter 5: Discussion section of the study. My procedures in each cycle are described as follows.

Cycle 1: Clarifying the Research Topic

As I described earlier my research interest was born as an intuition, during the process of translating and interpreting a Guru-devotion text for my thesis in Tibetan studies (Deak, 1991). I felt that the relationships between guru and disciple and analyst and patient had some parallels and I associated both of them with the Wise Old Man archetype from my early Jungian studies. Later on I clarified my research topic, exploring the archetype of master-disciple relationship in the context of psychotherapy, and discussing the relevance to both personal and transpersonal levels of development. This could be considered equal with Cycle 1 of my inquiry. According to Anderson (2011a), in intuitive inquiry the researcher selects a text or image that helps to clarify his or her research interests and to identify a research topic. The selected texts can also be helpful for the researcher's imaginal dialogue in later stages of the process. Accordingly, this Tibetan scripture of Guru-devotion became the source of my inspiration which I read time after time during the dissertation process. This and other texts of my literature review were helpful to pursue imaginal dialogue and facilitated my internal process in relation with the research topic.

Cycle 2: Identifying Preliminary Lenses

Inspired by my research idea, I started collecting and reading literature of guru-disciple relationship and its psychology as well as reviewing selected Jungian literature about the analytic relationship. I collected my readings from academic sources and selected authors who have insider views of the given spiritual practices and also possess academic background. In retrospect, I identified these two main considerations of my research as "procedural lenses" of my literature review, namely, (a) specific content and (b) professional validity. These two

respects also meant that I excluded the vast amount of so called “guru literature.” The above process was my Cycle 2, in which I reviewed the relevant literature and also set up some assumptions concerning my research topic and defined my research questions.

The assumptions and findings of my literature review served as a basis for developing the interpretive lenses of Cycle 2. It was an introspective and circular process. I was reading my literature review and looking for reflections and preliminary statements concerning the research topic. During the reading, I conducted internal dialogue with the texts and generated lenses as many as possible. Then through the creative process of combining, discerning, analyzing, and reorganizing the emerging patterns I shortened the number of lenses to 10. According to Anderson (2011a), 10 to 12 preliminary lenses are typical and sufficient to “capture” the nuance and range of most research topics. I concluded my Cycle 2 with a list of 10 preliminary research lenses.

Cycle 3: Collecting Original Data and Preparing Summary Reports

Anderson (2011b) described Cycle 3, where “the return arc of the hermeneutical circle begins and the researcher’s focus shifts to understanding the topic in light of the experiences of others” (p. 44). This stage contains identifying, collecting and selecting data from the best available sources of data for the research topic, and gathering and preparing summary data reports in as descriptive a manner as possible.

In my Cycle 3, I solicited my research participants, second- and third-generation Jungian analysts. I chose this population because their professional background provided a high probability of in-depth knowledge and experiences in my research topic. In the Jungian world, an analyst must prove his or her personal maturity and is required to undergo his or her own analysis. One who was in analysis with C. G. Jung is called a first-generation analyst. An analyst

who was analyzed by a first generation analyst is called a second-generation analyst, and a third generation analyst was in analysis with a second generation analyst, and so on and so forth. In some locations, such as in San Francisco, group processing and a series of personal evaluations by more advanced analysts are required before Jungian analysts complete their training (Kirsch, 2000). Thus, the analytic training is a long and challenging procedure that is often called initiatory, and puts the Jungian analyst first in the place of a disciple while they are in training and later, if they become a trainer or supervisor, in the place of a master. I solicited participants primarily from the San Francisco Jung Institute for multiple reasons:

1. I was lucky to take part in their analytic training program for 2 years; I could learn and experience intensively my own analytic process here, get to know great numbers of extraordinary professionals, and enjoy their wisdom and humanity. I am still in connection with many of them.
2. At first, I had met my analyst in San Francisco, with whom I am still in analysis.
3. This is one of the oldest and largest Jungian communities in the world, and also the only one that has not suffered a split since its foundation. People say that it is because of the long tradition of tolerance based on friendship of Jungian analysts, who otherwise represent a huge diversity of analytic directions and creeds.
4. The San Francisco Jung Institute has been offering an extended and profound training program that is based on the initiatory tradition of its founders.

I also wanted to invite for my research other Jungian analysts, whose books I had reviewed or about whom I knew that was interested in my research topic. In Table 1, I list the 10 lenses that manifested during Cycle 2.

Table 1

Cycle 2 Lenses

Lens	Description
1	Though the master-disciple and the analyst-patient relationships are historically, culturally and socially different forms, they also have a lot in common, as they express a similar archetypal model of healing and spiritual development.
2	The relationship between spiritual teacher and aspirant or psychotherapist and patient is founded on the recognition of the need to associate with a person who is a master of inner transformation and has reached advanced stages of spiritual or psychological development.
3	<p>These relationships are similar:</p> <p>(a) Both are related with the Wise Old Man or Women archetype described by Carl Jung and other Jungians.</p> <p>(b) Guru and analyst both represent an authority, differently though. Therefore relationship with them is asymmetrical in both cases.</p> <p>(c) They have similar processes, which can be described psychologically as transference, countertransference, and projection.</p> <p>(d) Trials or previous training are important for both spiritual master and psychoanalyst.</p> <p>(e) The initiation through the unbroken chain of master-disciple relationships is similar to the analytic training in the psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapy schools.</p>
4	<p>These relationships are different:</p> <p>(a) Goals are different in psychotherapy and in spiritual practice; one seeks healing the other seeks spiritual development. However, the goals can cross each other sometimes.</p>

Lens	Description
4 (cont.)	<p>(b) There are conceptual differences regarding the attributes of Self and man's relationship to this Self between the Hindu approach of self-realization and that of Western psychotherapy.</p> <p>(c) Gurus and disciples are less aware of, and reluctant to work with, transference-countertransference; whereas, psychoanalysis considers elaboration of these phenomena as an important part of the analytic treatment.</p> <p>(d) The level and quality of readiness, in my opinion, may differ in spiritual vs. analytical relationships. Whereas, the spiritual relationship between the master and disciple is predetermined by tradition or culture right from the start, the therapeutic relationship between analyst and analysand may develop only at a later stage, through transference.</p>
5	<p>In analytical psychology, the hero journey of myths, the disciple's aspiration to meet the master's requirements, and the patient's behavior during psychotherapy are all seen as parallels to the process of individuation or self-realization or psychological transformation.</p>
6	<p>Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman, the inner guru is also the archetype of the Self. Therefore, the guru can be seen as embodiment of this archetype, is a kind of external and symbolic manifestation of the Wise Person. Similarly, the psychotherapist may represent the Self sometimes.</p>
7	<p>Gurus neither reject nor accept projections, regardless of their nature, positive or negative. In the context of psychotherapy, psychotherapists act similarly, when they differentiate the patients' transference from their own countertransference.</p>
8	<p>We know relatively less about the process of transformation or healing in the analytic relationship.</p>
9	<p>The quality of psychotherapy ultimately depends on the relationship between the analyst and patient.</p>

Lens	Description
10	Experiences of love and mutual acceptance between spiritual teacher and student are influential in the process of transformation. The positive qualities of the spiritual teacher and psychotherapist, their nurturing relationship help the student and patient to engage with his or her own inner realities and experience the divine.

My objective was to recruit and select at least 6 participants. I strove to provide symmetrical gender distribution or a balance in participation of the female and male analysts. To secure the professional validity, participants were required to possess membership in the International Association of Analytical Psychology and the local agency, as well as extended psychotherapy experience. The primary inclusion criteria was the participants' willingness to take part in, and curiosity about, the study, but they were not be required to be familiar with the details and specific procedures of the study prior to the research.

To enroll participants, I used my existing network of Jungian friends for possible referrals. To increase the number of positive responses, once I collected a long list of potential participants, I preselected (with the help of my committee members) the most appropriate research participants in terms of availability and diversity of opinions. In addition to my committee, I also received recruitment and selection advice from my previous mentor in Jungian training. In the end of this process, I had 12 names on my list of prospective participants. All 12 potential participants were from California; 10 of them were from the San Francisco Bay Area, with one person from Los Angeles, and one person from Cardiff-by-the-Sea..

I sent an invitation letter (see Appendix A) to the potential participants with the indication of a 2- or 3-week period, when I planned to interview them. The timing was crucial because of the geographical difficulties. I needed to know the exact number of research

participants in advance in order to arrange my travelling plan to San Francisco and the Bay Area. To my great surprise and delight, altogether 9 of the 12 addressed persons accepted my invitations. One analyst could not accept my invitation because of her moderated knowledge and experiences in my research topic. The other two potential participants expressed their interests in the research, but they could not take part in the interview because of their health conditions and ongoing medical treatments during the short period of my planned visit.

In the end the total number of research participants in this study was 9. There were 4 women and 5 men. Their ages ranged from 60 to 95. All participants were European Americans, with the exception of 1 participant, who was Asian American. Each participant was a certified Jungian analyst, 7 of them were second-generation analysts, and 2 of them were third-generation analysts. The participants had work experience ranging from 25 to 50 years (as practicing analysts). Of the 9 participants, I knew 4 of them well. I met 4 participants one time only, and I never met 1 participant (whom I only knew based on our written exchanges as a result of the study). After receiving back their acceptance, I sent them the Informed Consent Form, and the Transcriber Confidentiality Agreement for their review (see Appendices B and C).

Parallel with the recruitment of my interviewees, I started preparing for the interviews. The preliminary lenses of Cycle 2 provided the basis for the interview questionnaire used in the study. Once I arrived in San Francisco, I called each of the interested participants to schedule appointments and to give them an opportunity to discuss any questions and/or concerns. If a participant asked me about the interview questions (prior to our meeting), I would send them a sample of my questions (see Appendix D). This would help the participant to get oriented and prepared for the interview.

My first interview was a pilot study. It was a kind of rehearsal, a preparation for the research interview by getting an experience of the interactive process. For the pilot, I approached my own Jungian analyst, who not only met the requirements of being a research participant, but also provided a “safe” research environment for this trial. Before the pilot, we discussed and ruled out the potential risk of our dual relationship. We agreed that our situation did not violate any ethical standard as it was the reverse of what would cause a boundary violation in the therapeutic relationship, when an analyst invites his or her patient to take part in his or her research.

My analyst was pleased to take part in the research and talk about his own ideas and experiences related to my topic as he usually did in our analytical sessions at other times as well. Furthermore, we agreed that our year-long relationship in psychotherapy, as well as his empathy and insightful presence would likely decrease my tension about making errors and it could also help me to develop my own interview style. The procedures for the pilot were expected to be the same as for the actual interview. After the interview, I asked my analyst for feedback and we shared our experiences with each other (please see the *Feedback From Participants* section in Chapter 4). Our pilot interview brought up rich and subtle data, and succeeded so well that I decided to include its content in my research data. The pilot also helped me to refine my interview questions. It became clear that 1 or 2 hours were not enough to talk about each question at length. Therefore, I decided to be more focused and selected my main questions and left others as follow-up questions for the interviews with other analysts (as you will see later).

After the pilot interview, I started the formal interview process. I interviewed all research participants individually in an in-depth interview. All but one interview took place in one sitting. The exception to this was with 1 participant, where we realized after 1.5 hours that we were only

about halfway through the interview. The interviews ranged from 50 minutes to 2.5 hours and took place in the psychotherapy office of each participant. The form of the interview was semi-structured. I asked a few standardized questions of every participant; however, the rest of the interview was unstructured, which provided us free space for engaging with the topic and each other. During the interviews, I attempted to figure out not only what my interviewee said, but also what they meant and, when appropriate, to ask thought-provoking follow-up questions to facilitate our discussion. It was quite a challenge to find the right balance between the structure needed for an interview to keep on target, and the free space needed to provide in-depth, vivid, detailed, and rich conversations.

I began each interview by establishing rapport, following Mertens' (2005) recommendations, briefly introducing the purpose of the interview, my credentials, and the information needed, including confidentiality. If the participants had no additional questions, I asked them to sign the Consent Form and then we started the interview. I intended, with my initial questions, to facilitate the setting of intentions and to create space for our dialogue. Although these questions varied for each person and for each situation, there were several questions referring to the analyst's personal background (as you can see in the Sample Interview Questions in Appendix D). I also asked other personal questions in regard to experiences with their "master," transferences during their training, and their feelings about the research topic. Once the research participants were engaged, I asked the same main research questions (or their variations) during each interview. To organize myself better, I wrote down these questions and their follow-up questions and prepared an interview protocol in advance (see Appendix D: Sample Interview Questions).

The treatment of data was already started with the interviews. All interviews, including the pilot interview, were audio recorded. Each participant was given a random numerical identification in the form of RP1, RP2, through RP9 to be used with all further data for the purpose of maintaining confidentiality. Immediately after each interview session, I also took notes to document any nonverbal, situational, emotional, and/or experiential circumstances I noticed during the interview, including my feelings, thoughts, and reflections. The aim of these procedures was to increase credibility through expanding the sources of data.

Originally, I had planned to transcribe all of the interview data myself to facilitate my intention and capacity for sitting with the data, and to increase my sympathetic resonance with the material. Instead of this, however, I decided to use a Transcription Agency that was recommended by other ITP students. I chose them because of their efficiency and grammatical accuracy; I felt that a group of native speakers could complete this task in less time and with fewer errors than I could, a non-native English speaker. To secure confidentiality, each transcriber signed the Transcriber Confidentiality Form (see Appendix C) prior to my sending the audio recording.

After receiving the transcribed text I edited them. I corrected the grammatical failures and edited the interview transcripts in order to make the text more readable. Though most of my interviewees spoke in a highly articulated way, if there were any difference between the spoken and written language, I always changed it for the more literate form. Furthermore, I deleted formalities, irrelevant, and/or redundant elements, and I was also careful to remove any personal accounts that could potentially threaten the participant's anonymity.

Listening to the audio records and editing the transcribed interviews was a fascinating experience. The process of editing the transcribed interviews somehow substituted for my not

having done the transcriptions myself. The process (a) enabled me to revive the encounters with my participants, (b) helped me to delve into the research data, and (c) facilitated my engagement with the research material. By working with data, I discovered new details and subtle nuances that I had not been aware of before.

Once I finished the editing, I sent the participants the transcription of their session, encouraging them to share their reflections and thoughts on it (see Appendix E: Sample Follow-Up Letter). The rationale behind this procedure was that gathering feedback from the participants could result in a secondary source of data. After repeated inquiries, I received feedback from each research participant, and all but one approved the transcribed interview text. The one exception withdrew her participation due to an undisclosed personal reason (see Appendix H). I regretted losing this participant's material from the study; however, in accordance with our research agreement, I accepted her decision and I destroyed her interview (in all its forms). This is why you will see that RP8 (Research Participant #8) has been removed from the *Summary of Results* (see Figures 1, 2, and 3). At this final point, besides getting each participants approval regarding their interview transcripts, only a few of the participants wrote some additional comments and/or second thoughts that would enrich the data already collected. I have also included all of the letters I received from the participants in this study (see Appendix H).

The analysis of data was done after (a) all interview transcription was completed, (b) any further feedback from participants was collected, and (c) reflections and research notes had been gathered. Initially, I planned to edit the transcribed interview texts and present them, in their entirety, one after the other, to ensure the integrity of the interviews and preserve the flow of the verbal interactions between the participants and the researcher. I was convinced that this form of presentation was the best fit for the descriptive mode of intuitive inquiry. Therefore, I hoped that

this method would provide a fuller sense of my research experience; I also believed that it would help the reader to become more engaged with the topic and to develop more sympathetic resonance with the text.

However, as my Chair and other committee members indicated, the size of the material was really problematic—it was just too much material to include everything. One of the transcribed interviews was 15 pages long, and another 30 pages long. Due to the limits of a dissertation and keeping the reader's kind attention alive as well as focusing on the most relevant parts, I edited the interview transcriptions several more times. I shortened the text wherever I could by deleting further irrelevant and/or redundant elements; however, the text still remained lengthy. Another problem associated with such lengthy narratives was that a great deal of information was presented; thus, it did not allow the readers to easily discern among interesting and important or relevant data. In the lack of clear structure or guidelines, readers could not follow my research interests.

After evaluating each pro and con, with my Chair and the committee members, I chose to present a data summary sorted by thematic content analysis (TCA) into themes and subthemes with examples from, and summaries of, the texts. I also decided to insert my original data into the Appendices (Appendix F through Appendix I) which includes edited interview transcripts from each of the 8 Jungian analysts and other documents (feedback from participants, my personal notes, and my dream) that I had gathered during the study process. Thus, I wanted to provide the opportunity for interested readers to respond and resonate with the data for themselves, in parallel to the researcher's interpretation. I hope from this compromise that, on the one hand, the presentation of my research data is instructive, structured, and legible; while, on the other hand, it facilitates resonance and efficacy.

For this study, I employed TCA (thematic content analysis) for analyzing and presenting the data. TCA means those qualitative analytic procedures, which work with texts by identifying common themes for analysis. As Anderson (2011b) described TCA as a form “that seems to communicate the descriptive presentation of data in Cycle 3 is that of ‘low-hovering’ over the data and relaying what you see from that vantage point” (p. 49). My idea was to identify, collect, select, and group the similar patterns of thoughts, keywords, and statements related to the guru and analyst parallel, the presence or absence of archetypal transference in psychotherapy, and its influence on the relationship between analyst and patient.

At the beginning, my research questions and the participants’ responses provided an organic and logical structure of data processing, which were helpful in finding themes and subthemes, tracking back, and grouping them together. See Table 2 which is titled *Overview of Connections Between My Main Research Questions and Research Findings*.

Nevertheless, this was a long and circular process, which took approximately a month and a half. I employed a color-coding system. I read each interview and highlighted the relevant content by a color that was identical with my classification. I superimposed the colors on the text which helped me to follow and discern the various themes (please, see a sample of this process in Appendix J). If the text was relevant to and fit a certain group of meanings I highlighted it with the group’s color. If I felt the text was relevant but did not fit into any group then I created a new group marked by a different color. When I had finished editing each interview, I repeated the process and began to “re-read” them again. I then marked the text, then checked and compared the colors with the groups, and then fine-tuned them, wherever necessary. Sometimes, it was difficult to explain each and every step I made during this process; creativity and intuition were key factors. In working with the data, I used the written text in its different modalities to provide

more space for intuition and tested various methods (e.g., printing out and highlighting text, cutting and comparing pieces to each other, indexing with numbers, and pairing), especially in the more problematic cases.

Then I grouped and distilled common themes from the texts across participants. While sorting and naming themes, I attempted to use the actual words of participants to group themes in a manner that directly reflected the text as a whole. Following Anderson's (2007) warning, I worked diligently to avoid mixing my own feelings and thoughts about the themes and to keep interpretations to a minimum. Finally, I was able to identify 41 subthemes, which could be grouped and organized into 10 main themes. My subthemes and themes helped to select and structure my data in the form of a data summary (see Figures 1, 2, and 3). In the presentation of my data summary, I provided an overview of the themes resulting from my thematic analysis. Short descriptions of data in major themes and examples with excerpts from, and summaries of, the text in each subtheme produced the body of Chapter 4—the results chapter.

Cycle 4: Transforming and Refining Lenses

Anderson (2011a, 2011b) wrote that the purpose of Cycle 4 is for the researcher to expand and refine his or her pre-understanding of the topic through the understanding of others and to present these changes for the reader of an intuitive inquiry. In this stage, the researcher revisits and changes the preliminary interpretive lenses developed in Cycle 2 through analysis of the data gathered in Cycle 3. If necessary, the intuitive inquirer also introduces new lenses that, along with the modified lenses, will construct the final interpretive lenses of Cycle 4. Then through a lens-by-lens comparison of the Cycle 2 and Cycle 4 lenses, the reader can assess the changes in the researcher's understanding of the study topic during the research process.

In my Cycle 4, I developed my final interpretative lenses by modifying, removing, and expanding Cycle 2 lenses. These modifications and changes reflect my new insight and nuanced understanding of the topic in light of my own personal engagement with the data gathered in Cycle 3. Then I prepared a lens-by-lens comparison of Cycle 2 and Cycle 4 lenses in order to help the reader resonate with the changes in my understanding of the topic during the course of the study. To make substantive and subtle changes obvious to the reader and to present them in a reader-friendly manner, I employed Esbjörn's (2003) innovation. She proposed the so-called new, change, and seed lenses to describe the three different modes of transformation between Cycle 2 and Cycle 4 lenses. I also developed a new group, a fourth group of lenses, and named it the "dark lenses." This fourth group, or dark lenses, was for the Cycle 2 lenses that I could not categorize in Esbjörn's (2003) new, change, or seed lenses—as they were not comparable with Cycle 4 lenses (i.e., neither changed nor unchanged). Further discussion of this process and conclusion of Cycle 4 is presented in Chapter 5: Discussion.

Cycle 5: Integration of Findings and Literature Review

Cycle 5, a formal presentation that integrates the researcher's interpretative lenses in light of the theoretical and empirical literature, is the latest development of the intuitive inquiry method (Anderson, 2011b). This cycle was added to clarify and emphasize the importance of integrating research findings and previous researches and theories as it is usually done in the Discussion section of any academic paper.

In my Cycle 5, I discussed my research findings based on the spiraling process between Cycle 1 and Cycle 4, and integrated them in the context of the original literature review, which if the research data indicated, I broadened and reviewed the most contemporary literature as well. I discussed my own process along the course of my research study and included my journal

entries, dreams, and notes to provide a measure of changes in my understanding of the topic. Finally, I summarize my research findings from the perspective of my initial research questions. Moreover, I discuss the possible clinical applications and contribution to the field of transpersonal psychology as well as the delimitations and limitations of my research study. The dissertation closes with some suggestions for future research.

Internal and External Validity

Intuitive inquiry offers a unique way for validity assessment. *Resonance validity* refers to the capacity of a study to produce sympathetic resonance in the researcher, the research participants, and the readers (Anderson, 2011b). To describe my own resonance, I took notes immediately after each interview as a means of monitoring my own reflective process throughout the study. In order to gather participants' resonance, I sent the transcription of their own interview to the analysts and asked them to share their reflections and thoughts. Finally, the readers' resonance were provided in the form of a review and feedback from my dissertation committee members during the dissertation process, specifically in the committee meetings as well as written communication.

In my research, I expected the participants, the Jungian analysts, to be engaged with the questions related to my research topic of the archetypal transference, and to respond in a coherent way that brought enough data. The major challenge is that due to the low number of participants and their homogeneity, the study cannot provide a multiplicity of sources to enhance credibility. To handle this threat, I employed *triangulation* (Mertens, 2005) in collecting data for my research from different sources (i.e., interview transcripts, other interviews, case stories with Jungian analysts, and personal experiences in my own therapy) to improve validity.

To establish the external validity of the study, that is to determine the degree to which readers can generalize the study's conclusions to other situations (Mertens, 2005), I employed *efficacy validity*. According to Anderson (2011b), efficacy validity supports the notion that the study has high transferability if the researcher and/or participants and/or readers experience personal transformation during the research process or, as a result of, its findings. This personal transformation can be manifested for them through gaining compassion, depth of understanding about the topic, themselves, or the world, get inspiration and vision provided by the study, and thrust toward action and service in the world. To meet these challenges I had a responsibility to provide "thick description" (Mertens, 2005, p. 256), an extensive and careful description of time, place, context, as well as the culture of the study. Bearing this in mind, I present my research data in the next chapter.

Chapter 4: Results

In this chapter, I present my data summary based on all the information I have gathered during the course of my research. The presentation refers to the organic process of intuitive inquiry, and includes the themes and categories with examples from, and summaries of, the texts of edited interview transcripts.

As mentioned previously, I had good reason to change my strategy of data presentation. Originally, I had planned to only present the participants' edited interview transcripts, but then I decided to do a thematic content analysis (TCA). However, to preserve the integrity of the interview transcripts as well, I decided to include the edited interview transcripts from each of the 8 Jungian analysts as well as other important documents (e.g., feedback from participants, my personal notes, and my dream) in Appendices F through I.

I believe this varied form of data presentation will (a) provide a better sense of my research experience, (b) help the reader to become more engaged with the topic, and (c) aid the reader in developing a deeper sympathetic resonance as they read the text. Therefore, I invite the reader (before or after reading this chapter) to review the transcripts and to observe any thoughts, feelings, images, and/or associations that may emerge as they familiarize themselves with the stories, opinions, and wisdom of my research participants.

For this research project, I employed TCA in the editing and presentation of my research findings. First, I was looking for connections between my main research questions and the research participants' responses, which provided a process for sorting and structuring my data around my research interests. Initially, my primary research question was: *How does the archetypal transference appear and influence the therapeutic relationship between therapist and patient?* My second question was: *What similarities and differences can we find between master-*

disciple and therapist-patient relationships? Finally, my third and equally important question was: *What can we learn from this experience from a transpersonal perspective?* However, during the research process, I decided to modify this third question and, instead, I asked each interviewee: *What can we learn from this comparison for doing Jungian psychotherapy?* I also asked a fourth question, with which I started each interview: *How do you become a Jungian analyst?*

These four research questions provided a guideline for the identification of thematic categories for data analysis. TCA of the participants' responses resulted in 10 major themes; (a) seven themes related to the research questions directly, (b) two themes related to more than one research question, and (c) one theme emerged that did not relate to any of my main questions as Table 2 shows.

Table 2

Overview of Connections Between My Main Research Questions and Research Findings

Research question	Connection to research findings
How do you become a Jungian analyst?	Research findings: —Importance of trials and previous training for psychoanalysts
What similarities and differences can we find between master-disciple and therapist-patient relationships?	Research findings: —Guru as metaphor of healing and personal and spiritual development —Similarities and differences between master-disciple and therapist-patient relationships
How does the archetypal transference appear and influence the therapeutic relationship between therapist and patient?	Research findings: —Exploring transference, countertransference, and archetypal transference —Wise Old Man and Woman archetypes —The Self and the analytic third
What can we learn from this comparison for doing Jungian psychotherapy?	Research findings: —Participants' experience with the archetypal transference and variety of techniques
Other themes emerged in relation to more than one of the above questions:	Other themes found: —Legacy of C. G. Jung and the analysts' lineage —Jungian psychoanalysis is unique
A special theme emerged based on the researcher's own involvement in the topic:	One special theme found: —Experiencing myself as a wounded researcher

Thereafter, I continued the analysis of the texts and, as I described earlier, with the help of TCA, I identified 41 subthemes within the 10 main themes. During this process, I also

selected relevant quotes for each theme and subtheme and/or created data summaries. I grouped information into data summaries and relevant quotes and presented my key findings in separate sections for each of the 10 major themes.

Research Findings

The 10 main themes, which I distilled and clarified in Cycle 3, are as follows:

1. Importance of Trials or Previous Training for a Psychoanalyst.
2. Similarities and Differences Between Master-Disciple and Therapist-Patient Relationships.
3. Guru as Metaphor of Healing and Personal and Spiritual Development.
4. Wise Old Man and Woman Archetypes.
5. The Self and the Analytic Third.
6. Exploring Transference, Countertransference, and Archetypal Transference.
7. Research Participants' Experiences With the Archetypal Transference and Variety of Techniques.
8. Legacy of C. G. Jung and the Analysts' Lineage.
9. Jungian Psychoanalysis Is Unique.
10. Experiencing Myself as a Wounded Researcher.

Each of these 10 main themes is discussed in detail in the sections to follow with each section expanding on subthemes and participant quotes which relate to each of the 10 key themes.

Finally, at the end of this chapter, a concise summary is presented (see Figures 1, 2, and 3) which lists the 10 major themes as well as the corresponding subthemes. In addition, the three figures list which participant discussed which theme and/or subtheme.

Importance of Trials or Previous Training for a Psychoanalyst

Research participants answered questions about their career path with stories and anecdotes. All of the participants confirmed the significance of analytic training in becoming an analyst; and, most importantly, they emphasized the influence of having had personal analysis. They agreed that analysts need to see a therapist and do their own work (i.e., analyze themselves) prior to analyzing others. All participants decided to become Jungian analysts due to being in analysis with Jungian analysts. Each had an interesting narrative about meeting and working with his or her analyst; these stories (interviews) are presented in Appendix F. Furthermore, an interesting topic, *symbolic friendship* between the analyst and analysand emerged. Here are some examples divided by sub-themes, not at all exhaustive:

Importance of training analysis was discussed by RP1, RP2, RP3, RP4, RP5, RP6, RP7, and RP9.

First of all, you need your own analysis. That's for sure. You need your own analysis, and if it's convenient, to work with different analysts so you have—different kinds of experiences are evoked. There are advantages to work with one person long-term, also of working with different people, different aspects. So in that sense, you have different mentors, so you're not dependent on any one particular person. (RP5)

Personal effect of the training analyst was discussed by RP1, RP2, RP3, RP4, RP5, RP6, RP7, and RP9.

Yeah, I did from 1962. I didn't see him for a few years and then I went back to see him. And I mean I really, I stopped seeing him when he was—At 101 and a half, he had pneumonia, which 90, at least 95% of other people would've died of. He survived it, but I mean mentally he was never the same after that . . . The first part was what Fordham would call the dependent transference. And the second part was, I mean it was, it didn't have that same dependency. I mean there was still a dependency. (RP1)

It meant a tremendous amount to me that he had that confidence in me and then essentially invited in. I think of this because I know we're going to talk about my personal analyst, Don Sandner, who was just wonderful. But in some ways, the day that Wheelwright invited me and encouraged me and asked me sort of was worth maybe 2

years of analysis, in terms of the confident—the mirroring of the Self, you know. What it did to my sense of Self. (RP6)

Symbolic friendship was discussed by RP1, RP6, and RP7.

But on the other hand, it was much more, over time it became much more collegial. And Joe developed a concept, which he called the symbolic friendship and I would say that that, he became more and more of that. (RP1)

I think you end up in a place where you're both devoted to the same psyche. That the individual psyche sort of spreads out into something and you each have your own personal psyche and your own work on that. But there's something that's broadened out by many years of work together. And, there's a feeling of camaraderie in it or, I guess, it's what Joe called the symbolic friendship, you know, you're friends but it's for this particular task. (RP7)

Other effects. Besides the importance of training analysis, my research participants also talked about other components in their career choice, which showed a great number of individual differences. For example, RP1 was born into a family of Jungian analysts, thus, his calling happened through his parents. As he said, he “incarnated as a divine child” and he felt he did not have “any other choice” than to follow his parents’ profession and become an analyst.

RP2 “married to be a Jungian analyst” as her interest was first raised by her analyst husband. For RP2 the analytic training was important, but she admitted that she really grew as an analyst during her term as president of the San Francisco Jung Institute. RP3 developed her idea of becoming a Jungian analyst during her psychiatric training, when she first read Jung’s writings and met her training analysts, who, synchronistically, happened to be Jungians. RP4 decided to be a Jungian analyst due to her positive experience with a Jungian analyst and, as a result, went into training. RP5 followed his call from within and traveled to Switzerland to receive a classical Jungian training as well as C. G. Jung’s blessing.

RP6 became a psychiatrist in order to help others and then his experiences (such as: reading Jung, studying from, and working with Jungian analysts) transformed him into a Jungian

analyst. First, RP7 was interested in the studies of consciousness by Sri Aurobindo's yoga parallel with Jung's writings. His decision to become an analyst was affirmed during his analytic training. RP9 recalled his path as a natural development inspired by his childhood curiosity in spirituality. After qualifying himself as a Jungian analyst, he also became interested in Kriya-yoga and was initiated into the practices of the highest consciousness.

Jung's Personal Influence was discussed by RP1 and RP5, and *Jung's Indirect Influence* was discussed by RP2, RP3, RP6, RP7, and RP9. Please, see the section titled *The Legacy of C. G. Jung and the Analysts' Lineage* for more information on these two subthemes.

Similarities and Differences Between Master-Disciple and Therapist-Patient Relationships

The research participants confirmed my statement that there are some *similarities* and also many *differences* between the guru and disciple relationship in some traditional religious-spiritual traditions with the analyst-analysand relationship in psychotherapy. Participants suggested that they are not the same, but they do overlap in some respects.

Guru refers to spiritual teachers in India, and in its larger meaning in other spiritual traditions as well. I think that the culture holds that relationship. When you say guru, I think, India, but there are a lot of kabalistic teachers. There are Sufi teachers. There are Christian mystic paths where there's a similar relationship (RP7).

Guru also is a universal phenomenon. Jungian analysis is the West development of the guru-disciple relationship (RP5).

Both the analyst and guru can be related to the Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman archetype through idealizing transference. All the interviewed Jungian analysts, with one exception (RP4), agreed that in some situations this image can be projected onto the analyst in psychotherapy as well.

The Guru archetype and the Wise Person archetype do overlap for many people. There are people who go through this—[at some] phases of therapy where their unfortunate friends and relatives are hearing: “What my analyst said . . .” So, this [is] very much being like analyst as guru. (RP3)

Well, I think it’s very problematic. I would not want to use it, to be honest.(RP4) I don’t think that what goes on between the analyst and the analysand in these senses is at all the same kind of thing that goes on between the guru and his disciple. Now, are there some similarities? Yeah. (RP9)

Both the analyst and guru can be Self-representative. When discussing Self-representation of the guru and the analyst, the researcher asked: “Peter Coukoulis suggests that guru is a kind of Self representative. And I’m wondering, whether the analyst can also be a self representative and holding the Self? What is your opinion?” The research participants replied:

I think that happens and it’s kind of what I’m talking about when there’s that kind of— You can say it’s an idealizing transference. But when that’s projected on the analyst it’s a lot of work. (RP7)

Not the analyst, but the guru carries the Self and intentionally holds the archetype of Self. (RP5)

But, I think, anyway, getting back to your question about the difference between the analyst as a carrier, the projection, and the guru, I think that first of all the analyst is not necessarily a spiritual figure. (RP7)

Well, you know, you were asking also in there about archetypal transference. And, of course, I think archetypal transference exists constantly in every human relationship we have. I mean, can I meet someone that doesn’t in some way represent some aspect of the self or some aspect of spirit? No. (RP9)

Guru and analyst have different roles. When discussing the different roles of a guru and an analyst, here is what some of the participants had to say. Please note that the role of the researcher (the person asking the “Questions”) is indicated by a “Q” and, as stated previously, each research participant is indicated by RP1 through RP9. The following sections are excerpts of participant interviews which are relevant to the subthemes being presented and discussed.

I think the question is that when I’m with a person I don’t think, oh, I’m a wise old man and I’m going to tell them, you know, what to do. In fact, if I’m a wise old man, then I

know better than to tell them what to do. Okay? (RP1)

Yes. Here comes one of the major differences between the traditional guru-disciple . . . and analyst-patients relationship. Because analysis is less direct and the analyst doesn't say what to do. (Q)

Yeah. (RP1)

A guru is usually less of a personal relationship, and a psychotherapist is more somebody who carries the self so that the therapist is experienced as though they are the self, not as though they're helping you connect with it. And you connect with it through your relationship. . . . Well, you know, a guru is seen as someone who has wisdom to impart. But I think an analyst should be very wary of ever taking on that role. I think that we have some understanding of the process, but in terms of having any kind of answers, what's unique really about the analytic process is that it believes that the ancestors are going—the answers will come from inside the patient. (RP4)

Guru does not deal so much with personal material . . . the disciple could never really complain to the guru and be negative toward him. However, the analyst deals totally with personal material, even with the archetypal. (RP5)

I never thought of him as some above-it-all person . . . he was very present, generous, loving, and, again, it was just that personal day-to-day—I think of Suzuki Roshi's *Everyday Mind*. (RP6)

But, I think, there's a way to relate to those things as an interested maybe knowledgeable onlooker, as an analyst, which is different than the role of a guru who knows. I think you might say it just in a slightly different way. You could say it seems to me that this practice is not right. Whereas, the Zen master or guru might say, don't do this, do that. (RP7)

Yeah. I'm just trying to think of how to look at that. You know, as a therapist and analyst, we use the techniques that we've learned and that we know. We try to analyze the unconscious and be alert to it and everything else to help us to find out where that person is. But a true guru—now I'm not talking about every spiritual teacher, you know, and they're wonderful to have, and I've known some who have been very helpful to me—but the guru knows all of your incarnations, and he knows all of your karma. (RP9)

Different goals in psychotherapy and in spiritual practice. Participants (RP4, RP7)

agreed that the basic motivation of turning to psychoanalysis involves healing trauma, personal wounds or suffering. RP7 stated the following:

I think that's a big difference because in this practice and in the west we're dealing with all kinds of people from all walks of life. And in India somebody goes to a guru because they want spiritual awakening. So the intention behind it, I think, is different . . . there's a cultural difference in terms of analysis comes out of psychiatry primarily which is about healing a wound or healing suffering. And at the largest level you could say the spiritual teachings are addressing that but it's more universal. It's not about the personal wound and the personal history. (RP7)

Cultural differences between East and West. When asked about the cultural difference between the East and the West, here are some of the participants' responses:

But you know the therapy—this goes way, way back before the 19th century, as long as human beings have existed. When you're in pain, emotional pain, the instinctual impulse is to go talk to somebody about it. Even when you feel ashamed, you know, you're looking for someone who you could tell this terrible, shameful thing to. It is the nature of human beings to take their troubles to each other and essentially say, "Can you help me?" So this is just the latest incarnation of that process. We used to have priests. We certainly always have had parents, friends. These are all incarnations. And what has happened—what Freud began and so many other people continued, was formalizing that and trying to figure out what is it about that that's helpful? (RP4)

It's one of those issues that I later agreed with about westerners doing yoga, I agreed with Jung's criticism because we do have an empirical mind and a level of psychological development. Or you could say it's coming out of a cultural history with the importance of Kant, of how do we know what we know? That we can't skip over that. And so I think there's validity to that. (RP7)

I've had a guru. He takes care of these things for me, you see. And when I get a little scared and so forth, he comes in right away and helps, you know. Jung didn't have that. His relationship with Philemon wasn't that. It wasn't that—it hadn't had a chance to get to that point . . . I don't feel that I imitate anything from the East. I practice a meditation and some scientific techniques in meditation that work, in terms of how the body and the psyche are structured. And, are there differences between the Eastern psyche and the Western psyche? Yeah, there's some. I'm not sure they're all that big, and I don't see them as monumental, and I don't see them certainly as unchanging. (RP9)

Both guru and analyst represent an authority, but differently. Commenting on the differences between how a guru and how an analyst represents authority:

Guru is seen as someone who has wisdom to impart. But the analyst has to be very, very centered in the fact that he or she is not a guru and doesn't have the last word and is not a wise old person. It's just a stumbling human being. (RP4)

And I don't feel I have the knowledge or authority to speak to people that way. And I also think as a westerner, we value autonomy and independence and other people's right to do what they're going to do in a different way than a lot of Asian cultures. I think the role of authority is quite different. So that maybe one of the big differences between the guru and the analyst. (RP7)

Surrender. Some participants (RP3, RP5, RP7, and RP9) agreed that there is something similar to the surrender, but it works differently in Jungian psychoanalysis than in spiritual traditions. For example, RP3 rather called this attitude in the analytic relationship trust instead of surrender:

I mean there's possession and being taken over, is also at some level surrender, too, and I find it difficult to conceive of doing this kind of work and making a demand on the people who work with me that they surrender anything to me. (RP3)

It is a combination of confrontation with the unconscious and surrender, which is different from the East, and it is coming from working with the unconscious typically in Jungian psychoanalysis, either with dreams or in active imagination. (RP5)

But then the moments come where you do surrender. And we surrender together, and the person surrenders to the Self internally as they do the work. But you can't ask for surrender nor force it. (RP5)

I think one difference in the analytic way of doing things and the eastern spiritual practice is the attitude about the ego. Jung says over and over again you need an ego to be conscious. And you need an ego to dialogue with active imagination or to think about your dreams. And I think the same goes for the transference. . . . So it's a different level of surrender, but I think it's still an important aspect of it. (RP7)

Guru as a Metaphor of Healing and Personal or Spiritual Development

Transference may be different with true guru and in psychoanalysis (RP3, RP4, RP7, and RP9). However, like the spiritual relationship between guru and disciple psychoanalysis is also considered as an archetypal relationship (RP4), where the healing may come through this relationship (RP6) and/or from the idealizing transference (RP7). Besides possible projections of the guru image (idealizing or guru transference) in psychotherapy, sometimes guru appears in dreams. For example, in patients' dreams, which RP6 and RP7 presented and also in my own

dream (see Appendix I). When discussing concept of the guru as a metaphor, here are some of the participants' responses:

The important thing about the transference is that the patient is having a living experience of their complexes and of themselves in their relationship with another person, and I don't think it's important that they admire the therapist. It's just important that they experience something powerful. (RP4)

A guru is usually less of a personal relationship, and a psychotherapist is more somebody who carries the self so that the therapist is experienced as though they are the self, not as though they're helping you connect with it. And you connect with it through your relationship. That's how I work and, in my opinion, that's how people work. (RP4)

When someone is in therapy, they make an attachment to their personal therapist based on the kinship libido that we all use to attach to whomever and also infused with the energy of the archetype of the healer. Now, I would see that as more primary than the archetype of the guru. I would think of the guru as a particular version of the healer sort of. (RP4)

I think there was a practice of being a healer, having a healing relationship with patients. I was already doing that and I never did that based on theory. I did that on having a relational conversation between me and the patient. I think that's one reason why these people call themselves Jungians. (RP6)

Well, you know, you were asking also in there about archetypal transference. And, of course, I think archetypal transference exists constantly in every human relationship we have. I mean, can I meet someone that doesn't in some way represent some aspect of the self or some aspect of spirit? No. (RP9)

I don't think that what goes on between the analyst and the analysand in these senses is at all the same kind of thing that goes on between the guru and his disciple. Now are there some similarities? Yes. (RP9)

Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman Archetypes

Many of my research participants have experienced the WOM archetype. For instance, RP1 and RP5 talked about projections on Jung, others associated the WOM image with their training analysts like RP1 and RP7 with Joe Henderson, and RP6 with Wheelwright. Some of my research participants (RP1, RP3, RP4, and RP7) reported such cases when they were also seen as a Wise Person by patients.

Ambivalence. On the subtheme of ambivalence, participants said:

Is hardly related to this question, and ambivalent: So I don't think I have anything to say about the Wise Old Man because I don't know one. . . . Jung was the wise old man. I had no doubt about his incarnation of that archetype, but I think they encompassed all of his foibles. (RP2)

RP4 disputed the Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman in psychoanalysis:

The analyst has to carry that just the way the parent has to carry it. But the analyst has to be very, very centered in the fact that he or she is not a guru and doesn't have the last word and is not a wise old person. It's just a stumbling human being. (RP4)

Wise person archetype could be projected on both guru and analyst. On projecting wisdom, RP3 had this to say:

Maybe they just see an image of such a person and the interior archetype is activated out of their need for that archetype, because the archetypal realm makes it very aware that even if you've never been properly mothered, the archetype of the Good Mother is there and so when you meet someone who embodies that, you respond to it. You recognize it. (RP3)

Wise Old Man archetype is an emergent phenomenon. RP2 had the following comment:

And so likewise with an archetype like the image of the wise old man there has to be a set of human circumstances and accidents of fate and a receptive pair, I think, it's always in the dialectic arises interpersonally, because how can one be wise except in contrast to other human beings? It's a human trait. . . . Most people that we think of as wise old men have interactions with other human beings in some form. (RP2)

The Wise Person archetypes and genders. RP3 had the following comment:

We also know from the brain research that the age they're in now, the testosterone adrenaline energies are much less, that men become much more like . . . like women as they get past the aggressive, assertive, competitive phases of their lives and they get mellowed out and they get interested [in humanity]. (RP3)

RP3 saw some differences between the ways and expressions of the masculine and feminine wisdom. "Wise Man is usually wiser about the ways of the world, wiser about uses of power, wiser about the lessons learned from failure"; whereas, the Wise Woman who "has grown through relationship" or loss of relationship, if the Wise Woman does not have children or her

children have died. RP3 stated that “the grandmother energies that she moves into, where she has a feeling for all the children of the world is more the Wise Woman.” However, according to my research participants, the soul is not gender specific:

I think of the Wise Person archetype is very androgynous... that describes the Crone archetype. . . . Exceptional men can be Crones because the most notable Crones in the world are actually men right now. It's that generation that is the Dalai Lama and Bishop Tutu and Nelson Mandela. They are men who embody an understanding through suffering and of compassion. And we also know from the brain research that the age they're in now, the testosterone adrenaline energies are much less, that men become much more like . . . like women as they get past the aggressive, assertive, competitive phases of their lives and they get mellowed out and they get interested. (RP3)

Well, it's confusing only from a theoretical level if you want to sort it out. You have to—you know, you can't make a—but in active practicality, it's not, because the anima for man is the anima, not the Self. (RP5)

So if you go deep enough, you see—if you go to the abstract level of the Self, as Jung does, then it's the union of masculine and feminine. And I look for that very often. But with women, they need to get that feminine Self. And very often they need to get there to deal with—see, Jung talked about going via the extra—the other side—man going by the anima to the Self and the woman by the animus. So the anima or the animus becomes a function of relationship to the Self, which I think is right. (RP5)

I always laugh, because the Western idea of the masculine and feminine doesn't always match the idea of masculine and feminine, for example that you find in talking to yogis. I mean, as you know, what is the energetic force in the universe? It's Shakti. It's Divine Mother. I mean, Divine Mother has the power, even though the power is shared, of course, between Divine Mother and then Brahma, Vishnu, Shiva. But whenever they got into trouble, they gave all the power back to Kali and had her go out and take care of things, you know. And in the West, we tend to think of the power being masculine. And it's not that. (RP9)

Probably because of my guru—but on the other hand, I think by the time I got into this body, it was also pretty well going on in me—you know, I prefer certainly to worship Divine Mother more than the Heavenly Father. And doesn't mean I don't have to worship both, because they're both existent. But on the other hand, it's much easier to relate to the mother than to the father, not just for me, but for almost everybody, because the mother is warmth and compassion and form. And the masculine is formless and no identity and so forth. And we've been in form for so many incarnations it's really hard for us to know quite how to do that. And so for most people, that's a much slower path. (RP9)

Personified Self figures and the impersonal Self. RP7 had the following comment:

Well, I think there are different levels to it. And the “Wise Old Man” and “Wise Old Woman” even in the “Red Book” the “Wise Old Man” who’s “Philemon” initially becomes more an impersonal figure of the Self. (RP7)

I think that the levels we’re talking about that the “wise old man” is at a level of personality that it takes on an anthropomorphic image. And that does fit the guru projection. But I think there are also levels that are more about states of consciousness than they are about pure personality. And I think the East goes into those much more deeply than depth psychology has. I think it’s been one of the critiques of Jung that he stays at the level of the image. (RP7)

The Self and the Analytic Third

Self represents the oneness and also the multiplicity of the archetypes. “The paradox of the Self [that it] is a central archetype, and yet, all the archetypes are aspect of the Self . . . there are many symbols of the Self. The Self is everything and nothing, so, of course it’s paradoxical” (RP5). To solve the paradox RP7 turned to Hindu philosophy for analog. The Jungian concepts of the Self and the analytic third are in the centre of discussions of Jungian analysts. However, all participants agreed that the Self can be directly experienced in Jungian psychoanalysis.

They do seem to be representatives who live closer to the Self than most of the other archetypes that—and since the ego has a limited grasp of the Self and what we are doing, in our conversation conceptually as well as in the work with analysis, is making the observing ego more conscious of what's going on in the larger psyche. So that's so much of the nature of what a person learns in analysis, is to stay present, to have the ego not get overwhelmed by the complexes and not get overwhelmed by the negative or positive transferences that they’re putting out there, but to maintain an observer’s position on what is going on, which is so much greater than it can grasp anyway, including whatever the Self is. (RP3)

But, in the West, we can, and then we deal with what’s constellated now. The difference is one can, instead of being embodied the guru only, it’s brought into the room. The old wise man and the Self are in the room. That’s the archetypal transference, so that we, the patient and I, experience it together. (RP5)

I think that the levels we’re talking about that the Wise Old Man is at a level of personality that it takes on an anthropomorphic image. And that does fit the guru projection. But I think there are also levels that are more about states of consciousness than they are about pure personality. (RP7)

Definitions of the Self. Self is relational (RP1), Self is “an emergent phenomenon” (RP2), Self “emerges in that unique one-to-one relationship” between the analyst and analysand (RP6), the analyst co-creates and holds Self (RP5, RP6, and RP7). Self is a “spark of life” (RP3, RP4, and RP5). The analyst cannot do anything in order to create the Self, other than being there and being available for the patient. According to RP4, the Self is constellated in therapy situation all by itself:

I don't think you do anything to constellate it. It comes when it is ready to come. Jung talks about the common situation where at a certain point in the therapy process the patient has a dream that seems to image the bursting forth of the transference. I was just reading about a patient who had a dream that a flying saucer landed on their lawn. That would be the eruption of the Self, I would guess would be one way to put it. But it's nothing that you do. It's like listening. It's like if you wait and are open to it, it will happen. (RP4)

Connection between Self and the analytic third. Self is a *liminal space* (RP3) or *field* (RP7).

I think when things are working well and this isn't always the case, but when they are the Self is holding the analyst and the patient. That's what I mean when I said something can constellate. I feel as the analyst free to be myself and in my own ego of consciousness and respect the patient as an equal. And something bigger than both of us is operative. And, I think, sometimes you see that in more mature people and sometimes you see it in people who've worked in analysis a long time, and you've sort of arrived at that together. (RP7)

The individuating Self. According to RP3, “essentially there is something in the person's psyche that the ego-Self connection that can tap into the accumulated wisdom of that life,” which she called “inner Self” directs our individuation.

Exploring Transference, Countertransference, and Archetypal Transference

Research participants (RP1, RP2, RP3, RP4, RP5, and RP7) reported the significance of both the negative and positive transference, which often cause difficulties in the analytic treatment. All participants agreed that transferences in psychoanalysis also have an archetypal

perspective. They (RP6, RP7) reported cases to illustrate that in practice it is hard to differentiate the various levels of transference because the archetypal comes through the patient's personal and cultural context.

Difficulties with transferences. This subtheme was discussed by RP1, RP2, RP3, RP4, RP5, and RP7. For example, RP1's case study of the loving woman with red bottle, whom he had to transfer eventually, because of her overtly positive and invading transference.

We have such an influence on each other, so to project positive or negative is an energy field that we have to deal with, and so when somebody comes in and is really hostile or angry or mistrustful or something, it's hard work. (RP3)

Archetypal transference. This subtheme was discussed by RP1, RP2, RP3, RP4, RP5, RP7, and RP9.

I also don't make a distinction between the archetypal transference and the personal transference in the same way that some people might. (RP4)

I think I never experienced archetypal transference as separate from just the relationship with Don. I knew it was full of transference and I'm sure that part of that was and still is archetypal . . . but what it clearly was, was a healing relationship with a father figure which gave me a new sense of being fathered. (RP6)

Archetypal transference in practice. RP5 talked about the transference less in Freudian or classical terms. He does not explore transference and countertransference or archetypal transference as separate and, therefore, he puts less effort into sorting them out:

It seems to be that, insofar as the Self is constellated in the work and both parties are relating to it, that individuation of the analyst is also enhanced . . . I'm always working with the Self. So my individuation is in that work. (RP5)

RP6 recalled a case story that may illustrate his analytic work, primarily focusing on the connection with patients, in relation with transference, countertransference, and archetypal transference. RP7 discussed a clinical case for a multigenerational trauma, in which the patient's

unresolved personal issues, his family's history and his ancestors' experiences with the holocaust unconsciously interrelated.

Possible dangers of transference. RP7 had the following comment:

I think the most important thing from the analyst's point of view is how to recognize an archetypal transference when it's there and how to hold it. And, you know, we've been talking mostly in positive terms, but the other way this comes up is horrendous negative transferences that are totally exaggerated and demonizing. And [in] the chapter on the mana personality Jung writes about that, that the other phase of the great healer and wise doctor is the evil witch doctor or the demon. (RP7)

The one thing you have to do is to be careful not to eat the transference, because if you eat the transference, you're going to have to eat its opposite too. (RP9)

Difficulties with borderline patients. RP7 had the following comment:

You now, that the borderline is actually seeing real evil. It's not that they're making it up. They've lived through something that opens them up to a dark part of the psyche. And if you're going to work with them you have to take it seriously. You can't wish it away. (RP7)

Inflation of guru transference. RP3 had the following comment:

It's very problematical to be a guru, because it's like you're imposing something. The person is becoming a follower, not listening to their own inner wisdom. And what I see in the guru world is almost every single one of them has betrayed the trust of their disciples by crossing boundaries. (RP3)

Participants (RP1, RP3, and RP6) reported the Dr. John Weir Perry case that shook the whole Jungian community in San Francisco.

So I think that's a really bad one to identify with because it's about power and it's about not recognizing that the other person is vulnerable because they have trusted you. And if you are a spiritual leader of this person, psychological therapist, if you actually do heal them, because the violations usually occur after a lot of good has happened in the therapy. (RP3)

It was at a tremendous upset and loss of innocence of—that somebody so bright and creative and that we all admired could fall so below the fundamental ethical standard of—by using his young female patients for his sexual objects. It was a terrible experience for me and I'd say, you know, many of us, of my generation, were influenced by Perry. (RP6)

Research Participants' Experiences With the Archetypal Transference and Variety of Analytic Techniques

All research participants agreed that archetypal transference is significant in the analytic relationship, and it is hard to grasp and discern from other transferences. The work with transference requires the analysts to respond in their own authentic ways. Research participants expressed peculiar experiences with the archetypal transference and also discussed the great variety of different methods and approaches they employed in their analytic practice.

Dream analysis. RP1 had the following comment:

The subjective level of interpretation is where every image in the dream is some aspect of the dreamer him or herself. The objective level of interpretation is where—Well, let's say I'm dreaming about X and she's doing something in the dream. It's, the primary meaning can well mean that I'm having some feelings. The dream is bringing up some, what I, unconscious feelings that I had about X that I didn't know about. And it's not about, and it's also internal. It's also about my anima. But it's also about some feeling about the object, she being the object. Okay? Now a third level of interpretation is the transference level. Now the transference level is a combination of the subjective and the objective. (RP1)

Sandplay therapy. RP2 had the following comment:

Well, first of all archetypes are not limited to personifications. What Jung called "individuation" is in a way an archetype. It's a process and it takes many forms, but if you accept that such an archetype exists then you begin to see signs of its appearance or a series of sandtrays. Sometimes sandtrays are more than dreams actually because they seem more constructive in a way than most dreams do. Dreams seem to more evanescent, and they can, of course, have an impact on the psyche and set up a dialogue, internal dialogue, that can be transformative and move along the process of individuation. But I think it's somehow more immediate impact of a sandplay when it's done seriously, meaningfully. (RP2)

Through all of that, her father was the most stable person and she has openness to the spiritual dimension of the personality and sees somehow in the death of her father an opening to that archetype of the father, and does sandplay. And there are many manifestations of something that's transpersonal, of something that transcends it. I have a little magic wand, for example, this little plastic tube with glittery fluid in it, and she tends to work vertically in the sand from short end the long way, and so she put that at the very top edge of the sandtray and then had some other abstract figures at the top and as the sandtray progressed it became more related, water and ocean. And this is one of the

most recent sandtrays that she made but there's a very definite archetypal theme in there. An appreciation and of openness to a kind of evocation through the sandplay of something of a larger dimension opening up for her with the death of her father which itself is an archetypal experience. (RP2)

What can we learn? Well, I think it is humbling. We can be grateful for the opportunity occasionally to be part of a process that's larger than anything we could accomplish independently. And I think that would go for the analysand as well as the analyst. That there is a dimension of the interpersonal that is somewhat mystical and it transcends what we think of as immediate reality and comes close to touching on what is been described in various ways as being in metaphysical terms or mysticism or it's humbling because it invokes a kind of not knowing and acceptance and a kind of joy. (RP2)

Being spiritual. RP3 had the following comment:

I think the archetype of the Self or the wise person is really what inspires and deepens the work. So if we are sitting in a vessel where we are mutual workers in this alchemical process with the symbol of the Self being the energy that actually heals and deepens and puts us on the track of what we are here for. Because I think we all . . . come in with a sense of the numinous and come in with a sense that we have a soul. (RP3)

This is, for me, holy work that I do. Every day and with every person, connecting to the Self, it's a way. But also, I have other practices. I did 8 years of Reichian therapy, for example. And I was interested in magic, so I do a middle-pillar meditation, which derives from Kabbalah, in my own origin. So I do that and a walk every day, a half-hour walk in which I do that meditation. And I've been doing that for 40 years. But my main spiritual practice is working with my own dreams and working—it's my main spiritual practice. (RP5)

The work of the analyst trying to connect and get connected inside the patient, after a while, you don't know the content, what belongs to the patient and what belongs to the analyst. And that condition is very good for the evocation of the collective unconscious. You see, when the complexes are united and you don't know who's who, then the archetypal level comes in. (RP5)

The archetypal level appears in the dreams, and I make a comment. But I usually can tell by something that I've experienced. For example, I'll get bodily symptoms, and I'll say something about that, and usually the patient has had the same symptom, either at the moment or—so I know that there is this somatic unconscious that's connected, and that's archetypal . . . And the clearest way, as I've said, is the subtle body. When that energy is evoked in my fingers and the hands or the body, then I say something. And sometimes it gets very intense, and that's when the archetypal level is activated. (RP5)

And then I remembered how Jung was with me. Jung is the model to being spontaneous and being present . . . You know, you don't hold back. You're totally present. But, of

course, I have to deal with the transference thing, because this had impact into all that. (RP5)

Working in the archetypal field. RP4 had the following comments:

Okay, a matrix. The culture contains us all the time . . . They all come as a unit. You wouldn't have a personal transference if it wasn't fueled by the archetypal layer of being human. And you can't be a human being if you don't live in a culture. You would die, really. You know, you'd be all on your own out in the middle of the desert, as it were. So they're all together all the time. (RP4)

Basically what he [Jung] says is, you know, the patient comes in and starts to talk to you about whatever troubles him, and fairly quickly this result in the patient having emotional experiences in relation to you, and you become important to him. In the same way, he becomes important to me because he's telling me things that are not normally told and he's telling me about his suffering, and it touches into my suffering, whatever that is. (RP4)

I think that the more often you meet with your patient, the more the heat is turned up and the more intense the experience that the Self will be. But just meeting more often won't do it. It really is just a question of being available. And, you know, sometimes it won't happen. Sometimes it just won't. And I don't think that that's—the only thing you might be doing wrong is talking too much. Not leaving enough space. But other than that, we don't have any control. (RP4)

Being relational. RP6 had the following comments:

I'm always just receiving and participating in what emerges in that unique one-to-one relationship and everyone is completely and utterly different. And that's the beauty of it because I think . . . that's where the Self is. (RP6)

That's why I love—if I only could read 20 pages of Jung's collected works for over and over again, it would be the Introduction to *The Psychology of the Transference* . . . that's where he talks about this pioneer work, this absolutely unique meeting of the two individuals in conscious and unconscious. And that's what transference is to Jung. (RP6)

Then, you know, the other thing about the archetypal is . . . *Vocatus* or . . . *Non Vocatus*, called or not called it's always there. So I don't particularly worry about it or look for it unless somehow for the other person it emerges as something—I think the main way it would emerge is as a problem where there's some discrepancy to the personal and what they need for the archetypal. (RP6)

Being emotional. RP7 had the following comments:

Seeing those levels even if you're not interpreting them with those names, but just the fact that you can reflect with somebody that their personal issue they're wrestling with

may have familial and multi generational issues that go back is enormously relieving. (RP7)

I think, it's poison to interpret too much with the people like that. You tell them this is the problem that's why you're feeling this and they're still in their head. So, I think, it's much more important to understand what they're saying. But as much as possible stay in an emotional field with them and rather than making intellectual interpretations. (RP7)

Meditation and psychoanalysis. This subtheme was discussed by RP7 and RP9.

Occasionally—I used to meditate with my—my second analyst was Don Sandner and I used to meditate with him sometimes if I was rushed or agitated or something and I came into a session we would meditate together. I've, over the years, had a few patients who have asked to do that but they're people who are already meditating on their own. And I don't offer it or initiate it, but if somebody wants to I'm certainly happy to do that. And I've had people ask me to teach them some simple meditation practice to help with anxiety or sleep disorders or things like that. If somebody asks me, I'll talk about it. (RP7)

Religious practices and psychoanalysis. This subtheme was discussed by RP5 and RP9.

I want to know what's going on in that person's unconscious, because the guidance comes from there. And, it's like Jung—and as you know, Jung had over the entry into his office, “Invited or not, God is always present.” And the only thing I would add is, “But better invited.” And I would never sit down with a client—I wouldn't say this to everybody, believe me, but I can say it to you—without praying first. Not that I pray openly to the person or in front of the person, but just inside, say, “Okay, Master, I don't know what's going on here. I don't have any power,” because I don't, “But you do. Please help me.” (RP9)

Others such as “active listening” (RP4) and “active imagination” (RP5).

Legacy of C. G. Jung and the Analysts' Lineage

C. G. Jung influenced many of the research participants in their vocational choice of becoming psychoanalysts. Some of them (RP1, RP5) met Jung personally and recounted vivid memories. Others (RP2, RP3, RP4, RP6, RP7, and RP9) became influenced through his writings and/or hearing stories and anecdotes from other analysts who were in direct contact with Jung. Memories and excerpts show how a living tradition of doing Jungian psychoanalysis has been formed.

Jung's personal influence. This subtheme was discussed by RP1 and RP5.

It was very meaningful [meeting]. I mean between the initial handshakes and then having tea with him and then having this hour with him where he was so direct with me, I said this man's tremendous. So I had archetypal guru transference on him. Although he did not like being a guru. He didn't, that didn't fit him. (RP1)

It came at the end of my training, where he acknowledged, "Yes, you are an analyst." And he's been in my dreams quite a lot, and he's present to me. So in a very supportive way, to going my own way, even when I didn't go with the Jungian collective. He was still with me, as was von Franz, who was my control analyst. She supported me too. (RP5)

Jung's indirect influence. This subtheme was discussed by RP1, RP2, RP3, RP4, RP5, RP6, RP7, and RP9. RP5 talked about his Jungian ancestors from whom he learnt psychoanalysis. "Jung's pupils were first—Meier, von Franz, Wheelwright, Henderson, Kirsch, and Zeller" (RP5).

Those first-generation are ancestors to people like me of second-generation. So I had the benefit of working with them analytically, and they were so connected through Jung, but I also was directly with Jung. (RP5)

But Jung was always there. I mean so when I added the fourth person to my original three teachers . . . Jung was there behind Perry and Jung was a much more sort of human presence delivered by Joe Wheelwright . . . So if in the sense Wheelwright was the grandfather and Sandner was the father, I mean, symbolically or in my lineage and I suppose Jung was the great-grandfather, who you never meet in life, but it has enormous importance and presence. So I mean, this is all part of the synchronicity of me. (RP6)

Jung was not a guru. This subtheme was discussed by RP1, RP2, RP5, RP7, and RP9.

Jung was the wise old man. I had no doubt about his incarnation of that archetype, but I think they encompassed all of his foibles. (RP2)

And the story was, he went to Jung, and he threw himself on the floor. He was like a guru, because Vasavada had a guru in India. He himself was a guru in India later on. So he threw himself on the floor, and then Jung was embarrassed and lifted him up and said, "You know, Vasavada, you're a guru." (RP5)

I am terribly indebted to Jung. I'm not indebted to him in the way I am to my guru. That's a different thing. I mean, Jung is for this lifetime, and my guru, of course, is for all lifetimes. I mean, I'm sure this isn't the first lifetime that I have been his disciple. You know, and I'm not trying to claim anything here. I don't mean that. It's just that I don't

see how I could have the feeling and devotion, and so forth, and loyalty to Paramahansa Yogananda if I had not some way or another known him before. (RP9)

I don't expect Jung to be perfect. Jung was not an avatar. He was a great man. He had some hang-ups with . . . really high states of consciousness that he didn't understand. . . . But, my God, what he made of himself, and what he brought to the rest of us, it just—it's unbelievable to me. And I, if anything—you see, that's really one of the reasons I would say, well, I don't feel like I left the Jungian path at all, because with my Jungian colleagues and so forth, I am more openly devoted to Jung than almost any of them. . . . And now I do I hope I've gone beyond him? Well, of course. He had awful limitations. I do too. But I have gone beyond his in some places, you know, and I can see some things that Jung didn't see. But I doubt that I would have seen them if he hadn't come along first. (RP9)

Jungian Psychoanalysis Is Unique

Research participants (RP2, RP3, RP4, RP5, and RP7) had various perspectives when they referred to similarities and differences between the Freudian and other analytic schools, and Jungian approaches. They proposed that Jungian psychoanalysis is unique.

Differences between the Freudian and other analytic schools, and Jungian approaches according to the research participants (RP2, RP3, RP4, RP5, and RP7).

I think that one concept that Jung talked about in numerous ways is possession. That the ego, the psychic energy, is somehow overtaken by the archetypal phenomena, and I think that is not a concept that psychoanalysis even understands. (RP2)

It's hard work and the person has to know that the thing I have about why it's positive to do a Jungian transference work versus a Freudian work, which I think is much harder, because they invite themselves to be a blank slate, or they did in the traditional way. (RP3)

So, in my view, when the archetypal transference is activated, we're in the process together, and there's no use messing about with it, that you work with it together. So then it's joining of forces. And the Freudians have that too, joining together to work with the unconscious. But this is where the Self clearly comes in. And most Freudians, they don't know about—they're dealing with the personal unconscious all the time. And the archetypes come in, of course, but they tend to reduce it or analyze it away, so they don't get to that level. (RP5)

Archetypal transference is a unique concept of the Jungian psychology (RP4, RP5, and RP7).

Similarities between the Freudian and Jungian approaches. RP4 and RP5 raised this topic.

I don't make a big distinction between Jungian and other kinds of analysis or depth psychotherapy. I feel that there is good therapy and not such good therapy. And Jungians, Freudians, Klineans, anybody can fall into either group. (RP4)

When you're in pain, emotional pain, the instinctual impulse is to go talk to somebody about it. Even when you feel ashamed, you know, you're looking for someone who you could tell this terrible, shameful thing to. It is the nature of human beings to take their troubles to each other and essentially say, "Can you help me?" So this is just the latest incarnation of that process. We used to have priests. We certainly always have had parents, friends. These are all incarnations. And what has happened—what Freud began and so many other people continued, was formalizing that and trying to figure out what is it about that that's helpful? (RP4)

Jungian psychology and spirituality. RP2, RP3, RP5, RP7, and RP9 raised this topic.

Jung [was] frustrated with the whole enlightenment project with the emphasis upon reason and scientific proof, and the denial of the spirit, the spiritual dimension of the psyche. So in his way of writing . . . he is to breakdown those barriers, those artificial dichotomies between the differentiations the intellect makes for the purpose of understanding like the division between mind and body, between mind and soul or spirit from the body. (RP2)

So the work of analysis, as I see it in the spiritual direction, is to strengthen and grow the energy of the ego-Self axis. The Self, which manifests itself, is bigger than the ego. The ego has a capacity to tap into love, compassion, an understanding and a sense of the numinous. The observing ego is attracted to, that there's a sense of where Self overlaps the ego, there's this liminal place where numinosity and meaning come together. (RP3)

Special Jungian techniques. Among my research participants, RP1 discussed the different methods and opportunities that make Jungian dream interpretation special. Besides dream interpretation, other techniques and methods were described in the interviews, such as sandplay (RP2), "active listening" (RP4), active imagination (RP5), combining meditation (RP7, RP9), prayer and other spiritual practices (RP5, RP9). See more details in the theme called *Research Participants Experiences With the Archetypal Transference and Variety of Technique*.

No technique approach. RP3, RP4 and RP6 discussed the no-technique approach. RP4 had the following comment:

We do a lot of logos stuff, but I'm not sure it's very important. You maybe know more about this than I, but I believe that the research on psychotherapy indicates that what people really value is feeling loved. And you just about never have anybody say, "Oh, the really valuable thing was when my therapist told me this." It's sort of like people don't even remember what you say. I'm not sure I remember hardly anything my analyst ever said to me, but I sure remember what it felt like being in his presence and feeling cherished. (RP4)

Experiencing Myself as a Wounded Researcher

During the research process a special theme emerged, which reflected on the researcher's own involvement in the topic. The hint was born in the proposal stage, interviewing participants amplified that feeling, which finally the researcher put into words in one of his analytic sessions. The following text is my researcher's journal which I wrote in throughout the study:

When I was in my teenager age, I was a problematic child and became a runaway child. At that time, I left my parental house and I got only correspondence with my grandfather, so he was the only contact with my relatives. Actually, I saw him as a wise man. As a young child, at the age of 4 or 5, when I first entered into his church, I saw him as a great man who was standing above the audience. His loud voice is still in my ears. I saw him, you know, like a god, I would say. He introduced the Holy Bible to me that was one of my first readings, and taught me. Later, when I grew up we pursued religious talks regularly, which made me feel like very honored and blessed. When my faith has collapsed in the Christian religion, because I got too many questions unanswered by the Bible, and I asked my grandfather, you know, about those questions, we got very interesting philosophical conversations. I remember that time I might've been around 18 or 19 years old I also read *Bhagavad Gita* first. That was a kind of magic, when I found long awaited answers to my questions and my interests turned to the Eastern philosophies. So all in all, I got only correspondence with my grandfather, and it turned out that he reported about me and our relationship to my parents. That was a kind of betrayal, which changed everything in our relationship. Although roughly a year later I normalized my situation with my parents, I could never feel the same for my grandfather and I lost my trust in him.

Summary of Results

As the research findings show, conducting TCA of the research participants' responses generated 41 subthemes in 10 main themes. The distribution of the themes and subthemes across the participants are presented the summary of results shown in Figures 1, 2, and 3.

The main themes, which I have distilled and clarified in Cycle 3 were; (a) Importance of Trials or Previous Training for a Psychoanalyst, (b) Similarities and Differences Between Master-Disciple and Therapist-Patient Relationships, (c) Guru as Metaphor of Healing and Personal and Spiritual Development, (d) Wise Old Man and Woman Archetypes, (e) The Self and the Analytic Third, (f) Exploring Transference, Countertransference, and Archetypal Transference, (g) Research Participants' Experiences With the Archetypal Transference and Variety of Techniques, (h) Legacy of C. G. Jung and the Analysts' Lineage, (i) Jungian Psychoanalysis Is Unique, and (j) Experiencing Myself as a Wounded Researcher.

Summary of Results

Theme 1: Importance of trials or previous training for a psychoanalyst								
Subthemes	RP1	RP2	RP3	RP4	RP5	RP6	RP7	RP9
Importance of training analysis	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Personal effect of the training analyst	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Symbolic friendship	•					•	•	
Other effects	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Jung's personal influence	•				•			
Jung's indirect influence		•	•			•	•	•
Theme 2: Similarities and differences between master-disciple and therapist-patient relationships								
Subthemes	RP1	RP2	RP3	RP4	RP5	RP6	RP7	RP9
Guru is a spiritual teacher in India							•	
Guru also is a universal phenomenon					•			
Both can be related to the WOM archetype	•	•	•		•	•	•	•
Analyst and guru can be self representative					•		•	•
Guru and analyst have different roles	•			•	•	•	•	•
Different goals in psychotherapy and in spiritual practice				•			•	
Cultural differences between East and West				•			•	•
Authority				•			•	
Surrender			•		•		•	•
Theme 3: Guru as a metaphor of healing and personal or spiritual development								
Subthemes	RP1	RP2	RP3	RP4	RP5	RP6	RP7	RP9
Theme 3 has no subthemes			•	•		•	•	•

RP = Research Participant.

Figure 1. Themes 1, 2, and 3 with subthemes and participants' responses.

Summary of Results

Theme 4: Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman archetypes								
Subthemes	RP1	RP2	RP3	RP4	RP5	RP6	RP7	RP9
Ambivalence		•		•				
Could be projected on both guru and analyst			•					
Emergent phenomenon		•						
The wise person archetypes and genders			•		•			•
Personified self and the impersonal self							•	
Theme 5: The Self and the analytic third								
Subthemes	RP1	RP2	RP3	RP4	RP5	RP6	RP7	RP9
Participants' experienced in psychoanalysis	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Definitions of the Self	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Connection between Self and the analytic third			•				•	
The individuating Self			•					
Theme 6: Exploring transference, countertransference, and archetypal transference								
Subthemes	RP1	RP2	RP3	RP4	RP5	RP6	RP7	RP9
Difficulties with transferences	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Archetypal transference	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Archetypal transference in practice					•	•	•	
Possible dangers of transference							•	•
Difficulties with borderline patients							•	
Inflation of guru transference	•		•			•		

RP = Research Participant.

Figure 2. Themes 4, 5, and 6 with subthemes and participants' responses.

Summary of Results

Theme 7: Research participants' experiences with the archetypal transference and variety of analytic techniques								
Subthemes	RP1	RP2	RP3	RP4	RP5	RP6	RP7	RP9
Dream analysis	•							
Sandplay therapy		•						
Being spiritual			•		•			
Working in the archetypal field				•				
Being relational						•		
Being emotional							•	
Meditation and psychoanalysis							•	•
Religious practices and psychoanalysis					•			•
Others; active listening, active imagination				•	•			
Theme 8: Legacy of C. G. Jung and the analysts' lineage								
Subthemes	RP1	RP2	RP3	RP4	RP5	RP6	RP7	RP9
Jung's personal influence	•				•			
Jung's indirect influence	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Jung was not a guru	•	•			•		•	•
Theme 9: Jungian psychoanalysis is unique								
Subthemes	RP1	RP2	RP3	RP4	RP5	RP6	RP7	RP9
Differences between Freudians and Jungians		•	•	•	•		•	
Similarities between Freudians and Jungians				•	•			
Jungian psychology and spirituality		•	•		•		•	•
Special Jungian techniques	•	•		•	•		•	•
No technique approach			•	•		•		
Theme 10: Experiencing myself as a wounded researcher								

RP = Research Participant.

Figure 3. Themes 7, 8, 9, and 10 with subthemes and participants' responses.

Chapter 5: Discussion

In this chapter, I summarize and discuss my research findings. First, I present how my preliminary interpretive lenses of Cycle 2 have been expanded and changed through hearing voices of my research participants along with analysis of other data gathered in Cycle 3. These modified lenses along with some new lenses construct my final interpretive lenses of Cycle 4. Then I compare the Cycle 2 and 4 lenses and discuss the transformations, lens by lens, in order to make visible the changes in my understanding of the topic during the research process. In my interpretations I attempt to integrate my research data with the reviewed literature, which is extended by reviewing the new publications. I conclude this chapter with comments and reflections on the challenges to method and design of my intuitive inquiry, its limitations and delimitations, and I make suggestions for future research.

As I mentioned earlier, the process of analyzing and editing the interview text resulted in the presentation of data, and also served for revisiting and revising the Cycle 2 lenses (see Table 1). Thereafter I modified, removed, and/or expanded the groups and categories created during that stage and, after some period of incubation, I distilled and finalized my interpretative lenses of Cycle 4 (as shown in Table 3).

The parallel of Cycle 2 and Cycle 4 lenses reveal that many of the anticipated similarities and differences between the guru-disciple and analyst-patient relationships were confirmed by the research participants (see Appendix G). The comparison of lenses also made obvious that the interviews brought up several new things and also shed a different light on some other research issues.

However, the major change in my understanding, and my central interpretation, was that the analytic relationship is grounded in the archetypal field. Based on this recognition, I assume

that the archetypal transference is always present, when two persons meet in an intimate relationship, including the guru-disciple and analyst-patient relationships, even if it is hardly separated and distinguishable from other personal transferences and projections.

To make substantive and subtle changes obvious to the reader and to present them a reader-friendly way, I followed Vipassana Esbjörn's (2003) innovation. She proposed seed, change, and new lenses to describe the different mode of transformations between Cycle 2 and Cycle 4 lenses. Like her, first, I employed *seed lenses* to describe those interpretations of Cycle 4 that can be traced back to one of the Cycle 2 lenses. Their seeds are embedded in my earlier assumptions and interpretations, even if they might have received more nuanced insights throughout the duration of the study.

Second, employing what Esbjörn (2003) calls *change lenses*, I categorized those interpretations and themes, which might have been present in my earlier understandings and assumptions, but received different meanings, changed, or transformed during the course of my research. Therefore, these lenses in some forms, one to one or combination of a few lenses, should have been presented in both Cycle 2 and 4 and show direct relationships, in which the modifications and changes in my understanding can be measured at most.

Third, *new lenses* are those understandings or findings that are unexpected, entirely new, and not related directly to any of my earlier assumptions or intuitions of Cycle 1 and 2. These themes only appeared in Cycle 3 or 4 or if they were present before, it might have been unconsciously and I only recognized and made them conscious later. In many ways, these Cycle 4 lenses contain somewhat surprising discoveries, which became rewards of my research by knowing the unknown.

Finally, I admitted a fourth category to Esbjörn's three lenses, which I called *dark lenses*. In my case, I could not categorize some of my Cycle 2 lenses into any of above groups as they were not comparable with any Cycle 4 lenses. They have simply remained indifferent because of lack of relevant data during the research; therefore, I could not even discuss them in Chapter 5. To describe these specific Cycle 2 lenses I introduced this fourth group, the *dark lenses*, which I also notified in the Appendix G. To provide opportunity for the reader to follow my comparison of Cycle 2 and 4 lenses, I have included a chart in the appendix section (see Appendix G). In addition, I give a summary of final interpretive lenses in relationship to each of the categories (just presented) in the Table 3.

Table 3

Cycle 4 Lenses

Central Interpretation:

The analytic relationship is grounded in the archetypal field. This recognition is part of the assumptions that archetypal transference is always present, when two persons meet in an intimate relationship, including the guru-disciple and the analyst-patient relationships, even if it is hardly separated and distinguishable from other, personal transferences, or countertransferences.

Seed Lenses:

1. (a) The master-disciple and analyst-patient relationships have similarities and also many differences.
2. (b) The forms of the Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman archetypes, which appear in the analytic relationship.
3. (c) The trials or previous training are essential for becoming a spiritual master or a psychoanalyst.

Change Lenses:

1. (d) The spiritual master-disciple relationship is a metaphor for healing in Jungian psychoanalysis.
2. (e) What Jungian psychoanalysis says about the question of Self and the analytic third.
3. (f) Exploring transference, countertransference, and archetypal transference between the analyst and analysand.
4. (g) The qualities, which make Jungian psychoanalysis unique.
5. (h) The legacy of Jung and the analysts' lineage are important for the Jungians, but differently.

New Lenses:

1. (i) Variety of techniques of dealing with archetypal transference in the research participants' practice.
2. (j) Experiencing the wounded researcher is the hidden source of my intuition during the research process.

In the next section, I will discuss each of the lenses presented in Table 3. This discussion helps to structure and articulate my understandings of this complex research material, which combines other people's knowledge and experiences through my engagement with the interview texts as well as my own thoughts, feelings and intuitions reflected upon in my studies, readings, and personal experiences.

Central Interpretation

Now I present my central interpretation, which is at the heart of my findings during the course of research study. This is not an independent lens, derived from other lenses as it reflects on the transformations I went through from my initial assumptions until I reached my conclusion. The idea of articulating this kind of summary along with the lenses originated from Esbjörn (2003) who also began the discussion section by briefly mapping out her interpretations. For the same reason, to give the reader an overview of my understandings I think it may be helpful to look back and grab the essential meaning of my research study.

From the beginning, I wanted to learn more about the analytic relationship, which I presumed to be archetypal in nature and working as a container of archetypal transferences among other transferences. After Jung (1966c), I also assumed that transferences would come from the unconscious, both of the patient and analyst, which determine the analytic process, ultimately the possible outcome of psychoanalysis, the healing and spiritual development.

However, in retrospect I recognized that I might have mystified the analytic encounter by employing the metaphor of the traditional master-disciple relationship along the Cycles 1 and 2 of the study. My overtly idealistic vision of the analytic relationship has changed due to the ongoing experiences with my psychoanalyst, supervisors, and patients in my own psychotherapy practice, and foremost due to the experiences and understanding coming from writing this paper.

During the forwarding arc of my inquiry, I was developing and working on the intuition that became my initial lenses, namely that the analyst-patient and master-disciple relationships were similar and could both be related to the Wise Old Man archetype. Through spiraling in and out of texts, I was looking for evidence, sorting, and comparing them to prove the universality of the relationship between the Wise Old Man and his pupil across time, place, and culture.

In the great Eastern traditions, this can be manifested in the form of the *guru-chela* relationship; whereas, in some cases, the analytic encounter between analyst and patient offers space for similar projections in the modern Western society. On the one hand, I found extensive literature about the topic (Coukoulis, 1976; Kakar, 1991; Kopp, 1971) which indicated that my intuition was right. There are number of psychological implications in understanding the specialties of master-disciple relationship from which we can learn a lot about the analytical relationship. On other hand, I realized that they are not the same. Besides the cultural differences, the master-disciple relationship is aimed at spiritual development; whereas, the analyst-patient relationship serves healing—even if spiritual development and emotional healing may, sometimes, overlap each other (G. Bogart, personal communication, January 16, 2010). I will discuss these similarities and differences later.

Nevertheless, I also recognized that I was walking on a paved road, and simply giving evidence for the archetypal nature of the analytic relationship did not add more to our previous knowledge. At the same time, I became aware of how little we know about the analytic relationship itself and how it works between analyst and patient. Therefore, I came up with a new research question that aimed to learn about the analytic process through comparison of the master-disciple and analyst-patient relationships. This was the first major shift in my research that also led me to the topic of archetypal transference.

Concerning the archetypal transference, I also modified my opinion during the returning arc of my inquiry. I learned more about the paradoxical nature of archetypes and also gained insight into transferences from my research participants, which colored my earlier knowledge and deepened my understanding of the topic. I understood that there is no reason to talk about a single archetype instead of a *system* of archetypes or archetypal patterns, which means that the archetypes are interconnected and most often emerge in a relational context. The central archetype is the Self, paradoxically, the one and many, void and wholeness, which is also related to and organizes other archetypes, including the Wise Old Man and Woman archetypes as well.

Although there were some differences among my research participants in understanding the connections between the Self, guru, and psychoanalyst, they all agreed that archetypes might be activated by the “unique meeting of two individuals in conscious and unconscious. And that’s what transference is to Jung” (RP6). During the conversations with Jungian analysts, I came to understand that archetypal transference is not simply a projection of an archetype. One might say that the guru image is transferred onto the analyst, but the analytic relationship itself is an archetypal situation that creates space for its manifestation. The analytic relationship is rooted in the archetypal field, formed by the unconscious of both the analyst and patient and, therefore, this is a kind of symbolic partnership by nature. At the same time, the analytic relationship is inevitably personal as well, analyst and patient interact with each other in a dialogue by presenting histories, sharing thoughts and feelings, and so forth.

Then, of course, the analytic relationship is also a cultural product created during the history of psychoanalysis and other psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapies. The relationship between the analyst and patient is also determined by written and unwritten rules,

and expectations and beliefs about the psychotherapy process from both parties. By all means, each of these layers; personal, cultural and archetypal are always present.

Accordingly, transferences occurring in the analytic session can also be understood as personal, cultural and impersonal or archetypal phenomena at the same time, because those layers are intertwined and almost indistinguishable. This is why it is extremely difficult to work with transferences in psychoanalysis. Actually, Jungian psychoanalysis does not focus primarily on transferences. RP2 told that this tradition goes back to Jung, who considered the transference significant, but disturbing phenomena. Therefore, as I came to understand Jungian analysts rather treat transferences not as content, but both, content and context of the analytic relationship. This is what the Jungian analysts call the analytic container, *temenos* or alchemical vessel that is co-created by analyst and patient, who mutually became involved in the process.

Similarly, other therapeutic directions also put stress on the therapeutic relationship as the most influential factor of changes and healing in psychotherapy, especially attachment theory and inter-subjectivity influenced and fertilized Jungian psychoanalysis. Contemporary theorists interpreted the analytic process differently (Beebe, 1988; Carter, 2010; Schwartz-Salant, 1995) and suggested a shift from the more traditional view of transference, countertransference, and projection toward the concept of inter-subjectivity. In their view, the analytic process “happens” no longer between analyst and patient, but with- and within their unconscious that mutually forms an archetypal field they called the “analytic third.”

In addition, there has been a reformed emphasis on the relationship between the analyst and patient based on attachment theory. These ideas are not foreign from Jungian psychology, as C. G. Jung anticipated many of these findings. However, these contemporary theories and case studies brought new energy and more systematic approaches to exploring the analytic process.

Bearing in mind the importance of the relationship, clinically the work of a Jungian analyst is to establish and nurture a good-enough analytic relationship, where the patient can relate to his or her wholeness through experiencing his or her personal complexes and cultural realities as well as their archetypal dimension. Murray Stein (2010) reflected on this multiplicity, when he described the promise of Jungian psychoanalysis:

One gains as well a wide perspective on how one belongs to one's personal, cultural, and historical context. Personal and cultural complexes and archetypal images rise to the surface of consciousness and merge with ego consciousness to form an image of self that is much greater than it had been before analysis began. (p. xvii)

He suggested that the analyst's task is nothing else than "work with the whole self in mind" through the engagement with the analytic process, which is basically a multi-direct dialogue between conscious and unconscious, and between analyst and patient. Jungian psychoanalysis is unique, because it provides space for the analyst and patient to delve into and merge in this mutual process as no other psychotherapies do.

In summary, through the whole dissertation process, spiraling in and out of texts, interviewing others, spiraling in and out again, and inquiring, I explored the analytic relationship, got a more profound insight into its archetypal nature and went through a transformation as I will discuss in the next sections.

Seed Lenses

The Master-Disciple and Analyst-Patient Relationships Have Similarities and Also Many Differences

After having compared the guru and disciple relationship in some traditional religious-spiritual traditions with the analyst-analysand relationship in psychotherapy, I concluded in my literature review that there are similarities and also many differences between them. The research participants confirmed my statement that, indeed, they are not the same, but they do overlap in

some respects. In this section, I collected interview texts related to this topic and discussed my findings.

Previously, we agreed that the guru, in its most narrow meaning, refers to a highly realized spiritual teacher in the great Eastern traditions, in those historical, religious, social, and cultural contexts. I have employed it as a metaphor of healing and spiritual development for this paper and also discussed it in larger context, in its archetypal meaning across time and different cultures. RP7 reflected on this distinction: “I think that the culture holds that relationship. When you say guru, I think, India, but there are a lot of kabalistic teachers. There are Sufi teachers. There are Christian mystic paths where there’s a similar relationship.” This makes clear the cultural differences, but also emphasizes the universality of this phenomenon. RP5 added that “Jungian analysis is the West development of the guru disciple relationship.” According to him, the master-disciple and analyst-analysand relationships are similar in their own contexts, but obviously represent different cultural milieus.

The similarities. In addition to the cultural and social differences between the Eastern spiritual traditions and the Western practice of psychotherapy, the basic motivation in searching for a guru or approaching a therapist, often, is the same human need (Kopp, 1971; Vigne, 1991, 2001), namely looking for someone who can help in solving life problems, decreasing suffering, reaching psychological or spiritual wholeness (Kakar, 1991). Most of the Jungian analysts I interviewed in my research agreed that both models of human relationship implied, and are based on, archetypal transference. As RP9 articulated this:

Well, you know, you were asking also in there about archetypal transference. And, of course, I think archetypal transference exists constantly in every human relationship we have. I mean, can I meet someone that doesn’t in some way represent some aspect of the self or some aspect of spirit? No.

Besides the same human need, which makes relationship with them alive, the analyst and guru share other commonalities. One of the similarities is that both the analyst and guru can be related to the Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman archetype through the idealizing transference. All the interviewed Jungian analysts, with one exception, agreed that in some situations this image can be projected out on the analyst in psychotherapy as well. RP4 disputed whether the guru-disciple would be the best metaphor for the analytic relationship.

Well, I think it's very problematic. I would not want to use it, to be honest. There is, you know, just the way the infant naturally sees their parents as the self, as all powerful, a god. But the infant is mistaken. I mean really mistaken. Similarly, the patient comes in and they're in pain and they look to the therapist to heal them. In order, I mean, because that's what they want, they naturally put on the therapist one of two—either a negative or a positive self image. One could be, “Oh, you are so great. You are a Wise Old Man or a wise old woman, and you are going to heal me, and I will take everything you say as though it was the gospel truth.” The other one is, “Oh, you're so powerful. You're going to heal me. I have to resist you because you'll get under my skin and change me and I won't be myself anymore.” But it's both the same projection of the self.

She proposed the archetypal transference would be more fundamental, and would go beyond this image. However, RP4 acknowledged the possibility of being seen as wise person in some circumstances and remembered some cases in her practice, when it also happened to her.

Furthermore, RP4 doubted that guru transference should always be constellated. Though the transferences are substantial in psychotherapy, she warned that we must differentiate the idealizing transference from the twinship transference, where the patient imagine himself or herself to be the same as the analyst, thinking and feeling exactly the same everything. Or instead of that the patient may have a problematic parental transference, where he or she would transfer his or her feeling toward a weak mother to the analyst who, therefore, always seems pathetic. I agree with her that there are various transferences, and the guru transference is only one of the possible transferences I mentioned in the literature review earlier (Bogart, 1997).

However, my research data shows that especially in cases of idealizing transference or with borderline patients, the Wise Old Man or guru images can be projected on the analyst in psychoanalysis. Likewise RP3 discussed it:

The Guru archetype and the Wise Person archetype do overlap for many people. There are people who go through this—[at some] phases of therapy where their unfortunate friends and relatives are hearing “What my analyst said.” So, this [is] very much being like analyst as guru.

Other analysts I interviewed (RP5, RP7, and RP9) also agreed that in some situations Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman archetypes may emerge in psychoanalysis as well. This issue was crucial for my research, and the interview persons discussed it at length; therefore, I decided to create a separate lens which I will discuss further in the next section.

The Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman archetypes are also somehow connected to the Self, the central archetype or the archetype of wholeness. I proposed that in some cases, most often in idealizing transference the analyst may become a Self representative in similar way as Coukoulis (1976) suggested that the guru holds the Self and helps the disciple to connect with it through his devotion. My research participants (RP4, RP5, RP7, and RP9) agreed that the analyst is somehow also connected and works through the Self, but also emphasized the similarities and differences between the guru-disciple and analyst-patient relationships in the context of connecting to the Self.

The differences. In RP4’s opinion the psychotherapist is more likely experienced as God or a kind of self-representative; whereas, the guru is someone who connects the disciple to Self.

A guru is usually less of a personal relationship, and a psychotherapist is more somebody who carries the self so that the therapist is experienced as though they are the self, not as though they’re helping you connect with it. And you connect with it through your relationship. (RP4)

RP4 suggested that the psychotherapist's "Godhead" was created in the patient's fantasy and projected out in the analytic relationship.

In contrast with this opinion, RP5 recalled Vasavada, his expert colleague, who insisted that not the analyst, but the guru carries the Self and intentionally holds the archetype of Self. Jungian analysts work differently than gurus; their aim is "to help the individual to find the Self within himself and to be as human and direct as possible, and as involved." According to RP5, the true guru embodies the Self, whereas in psychoanalysis the Self is something, which is constellated in between, and within, the analyst and patient.

However, when the Self is constellated and projected on the analyst, it depends on the analyst whether he or she is inflated by such projections. RP7 warned of the possible dangers of working with the self-transference: "It is a lot of work because you eventually get the negative side of it if you stay in it long enough. So that means you have to tolerate not only being God but the devil." As RP5 remembered, Jung disliked this kind of idealizing transference and did not treat patients who overtly idealized him. He rather referred them out to his colleagues. Similarly, RP7's analyst Joe Henderson did not like carrying the idealizing transference either. RP7 claimed that, indeed, idealizing transference could happen in psychoanalysis. Yet, he never felt with his analyst that type of idealizing transference he had had with Sri Aurobindo or the Mother.

RP9 also had firsthand experiences in both spiritual apprenticeship and psychoanalysis, and articulated the differences. "I don't think that what goes on between the analyst and the analysand in these senses is at all the same kind of thing that goes on between the guru and his disciple. Now are there some similarities? Yeah" (RP9). Similarly, RP7 distinguished the self-transference with his guru and the feeling of respect, admiration for his analyst, and idealization.

These feelings are different, which is hard to explain because they are experiential. RP7 assumed that probably the analyst's different attitude on the archetypal transference makes the analytic relationship different than the guru relationship.

There is also an important difference between psychoanalysis and spiritual relationship concerning the awareness of the transferences and working with them. As I discussed in the literature review (Bogart, 1997; Vigne, 1991), *gurus and disciples are less aware of, and reluctant to work with, transference-countertransference; whereas, psychotherapy considers elaboration of this phenomena as an important part of the analytic treatment*. RP5 affirmed by referring his conversation with Vasavada that “guru does not deal so much with personal material”; whereas, “the analyst deals totally with personal material, even with the archetypal,” which can be manifested in the personal life. In India, “the disciple could never really complain to the guru and be negative toward him” (RP5). Doing so would be disrespectful and unusual there. At the same time, as RP5 explained, in the Western psychotherapy this is exactly what analyst and patient do and they deal with what is constellated in the analytic relationship.

The other difference comes from the different goals in psychotherapy and in spiritual practice. My research participants agreed that the basic motivation of turning to psychoanalysis involves healing trauma, personal wounds or suffering. RP7 stated:

I think that's a big difference because in this practice and in the west we're dealing with all kinds of people from all walks of life. And in India somebody goes to a guru because they want spiritual awakening. So the intention behind it, I think, is different.

He and also RP9 clarified that patients come with personal issues into psychotherapy, whereas disciples look for gurus for help with religious and spiritual questions. Gurus are primarily interested in spiritual teachings and universal wisdom, not the personal history of the disciples. RP7 also pointed out the differences:

There's a cultural difference in terms of analysis comes out of psychiatry primarily which is about healing a wound or healing suffering. And at the largest level you could say the spiritual teachings are addressing that but it's more universal. It's not about the personal wound and the personal history.

We need to discern them. One is aimed toward spiritual development, the other serves personal healing. However, they sometimes overlap each other. The spiritual path may also bring solution for personal problems and vice versus the in-depth psychotherapy may address religious and spiritual questions, and also relates to the spiritual realm through its archetypal dimension (Ulanov, 2005; Vaughan, 2000).

Jung's sense of the guru and of cultural differences between East and West. RP9 recalled the anecdote from the *Memories, Dream, Reflections*, in which Jung (1989) got to know an Indian scholar whose guru was Adi Shankaracharya. Thus Jung learned that everyone may have inner guru, and this idea became relevant and also a huge relief for Jung in understanding his experiences with Philemon, his own "spirit guru." In reference with this example RP9 clarified the difference between inner guru and having a living guru.

I've had a guru. He takes care of these things for me, you see. And when I get a little scared and so forth, he comes in right away and helps, you know. Jung didn't have that. His relationship with Philemon wasn't that. It wasn't that—it hadn't had a chance to get to that point.

Since RP9 found his own guru, he could tell the difference what was like having a real guru, and claimed that Jung had limitations because of not having such experiences. Furthermore, RP9 argued with some of Jung's warnings concerning Eastern thinking. He commented:

I don't feel that I imitate anything from the East. I practice a meditation and some scientific techniques in meditation that work, in terms of how the body and the psyche are structured. And, are there differences between the Eastern psyche and the Western psyche? Yeah, there's some. I'm not sure they're all that big, and I don't see them as monumental, and I don't see them certainly as unchanging.

RP9 thought of Jung as someone who got far away in depth realizing and describing the work of the human psyche from his own. RP9 deeply indebted to Jung and appreciated his achievements because as he said “I can see some things that Jung didn’t see. But, I doubt that I would have seen them if he hadn’t come along first.” According to RP9, Jung carried to the point, however, it is obvious that he stopped where other spiritual practices like the *kriya yoga* go beyond by realizing a higher consciousness. RP9 claimed that Jung was not a self-realized person, and not without some mistakes. For instance, RP9 pointed out that Jung failed to understand in depth of the Eastern self-realization concept, which he equaled with his own individuation theory.

Although Jung was right about the goal of the Eastern self-realization that he thought of experiencing the wholeness, Jung did not have firsthand experiences in certain practices, which lead to reaching “pure consciousness” typical for the self-realized state, and thus, he could not discerned it either from other states of consciousness can be reached in psychotherapy. As I proposed earlier: *There are conceptual differences regarding the attributes of Self and man’s relationship to this Self in between the Hindu approach of self-realization and that of Western psychotherapy.*

Though my interview persons (RP7, RP9) claimed that Jung’s idea became outdated at many points, however, RP7 suggested that some of Jung’s perceptions and warnings concerning the cultural differences between East and West still have actualities.

About westerners doing yoga, I agreed with Jung’s criticism because we do have an empirical mind and a level of psychological development. Or you could say it’s coming out of a cultural history with the importance of Kant, of how do we know what we know? That we can’t skip over that. (RP7)

Besides that the Westerners more rational thinking and skepticism, there are other differences as, for instance, RP7 referred to meditation researches, which showed that westerners take much longer to learn *Vipassana* meditation than equivalently educated people from Burma. By all

means, I think these differences have been developed by culture and will be probably disappearing by the time because of the globalization and the increasing cultural exchanges.

Authority. The other interesting issue related to the cultural differences is the authority, which I addressed in the Cycle 2 lens as *Guru and analyst both represent an authority, differently though. Therefore, relationship with them is asymmetrical in both cases.* Basically, after hearing my research participants' opinions, I now think that the guru-disciple and analyst-patient relationships also differ from the viewpoint of authority. Though the analytic setting is also asymmetrical, which is undeniable, the analyst represents a different kind of authority and attitudes than a guru. RP1 and RP4 claimed that unlike the guru the analyst is not perfect, his or her knowledge is limited. RP4 warned:

Guru is seen as someone who has wisdom to impart. But the analyst has to be very, very centered in the fact that he or she is not a guru and doesn't have the last word and is not a wise old person. It's just a stumbling human being.

The analyst needs to be aware of his or her limitations and that he or she is less authoritarian figure. RP7 admitted that the differences concerning the authority come from that the analyst and guru have different roles.

I think you might say it just in a slightly different way. You could say it seems to me that this practice is not right. Whereas, the Zen master or guru might say, don't do this, do that. And I don't feel I have the knowledge or authority to speak to people that way. And I also think as a westerner we value autonomy and independence and other people's right to do what they're going to do in a different way than a lot of Asian cultures. I think the role of authority is quite different. So that maybe one of the big differences between the guru and the analyst. (RP7)

Here RP7 interpreted the different roles as the result of culturally diverse expectations and the various relationships with the authority in the Western versus Asian cultures. RP9 also insisted that an analyst has different role than a guru, but approached this difference from another perspective. He suggested that there are various levels of help; a guru sees the disciple's

unconscious and is able to change it; whereas, an analyst is trained and skillful in working with the unconscious, but does not have that kind of alertness and consciousness a true guru possesses. RP9 explained:

We try to analyze the unconscious and be alert to it and everything else to help us to find out where that person is. But a true guru—now I'm not talking about every spiritual teacher, you know, and they're wonderful to have, and I've known some who have been very helpful to me—but the guru knows all of your past incarnations, and he knows all of your karma.

In contrast with gurus the analyst does not know the karma. However, the analyst provides a safe, warm and accepting relationship. As RP6 remembered on his analyst: “I never thought of him as some above-it-all person . . . he was very present, generous, loving, and, again, it was just that personal day to day—I think of Suzuki Roshi's *Everyday Mind*.” In short, a true guru seems to take more responsibility, which is expressed in the Buddhist tradition by providing refuge for the disciple. Accordingly, guru seems to represent a higher authority as well.

Surrender. In relation with the authority the question of the disciple's surrender has been emerged. According to Kakar (1991), the appearance of guru-devotion in the Hindu traditions and surrender in Sufism, both can be interpreted as an idealizing transference as we saw in the literature review. At the beginning of my research I was wondering whether we could experience similar with the disciple's surrender for the guru in case of idealizing transference in psychotherapy.

All my interview persons agreed that even in idealizing transference the surrender works differently in Jungian psychoanalysis than in its original, religious context. Psychologically, surrender means a kind of self-denial and regression. RP3 defined:

Surrender, when it involves people, I think there's a necessity to surrender, to become humbled by an awareness that there's something really greater than yourself or that there is a mystery or a meaning that is—and that you do trust where this is taking you, somehow I don't think that means going unconscious. I mean there's possession and

being taken over, is also at some level surrender, too, and I find it difficult to conceive of doing this kind of work and making a demand on the people who work with me that they surrender anything to me.

RP3 would not use this term for the analytic relationship, because, based on her experiences, she and her patients do not behave that way. And even if surrender would appear in psychoanalysis, in her opinion, it would constellate an unhealthy co-dependency and regression. Instead of surrender, RP3 proposed using the term “trust,” which expresses better the essence of psychoanalysis. She trusts in the process and gives directions in working with the unconscious. There is no guarantee for the patients, but the analytic process is “trustworthy,” secure and gives hope for getting support.

According to RP5, surrender is indispensable in the guru and disciple relationship, but is not necessarily needed in psychoanalysis. He claimed that surrender is against and strange for our Western culture, which places more emphasis on developing a critical mindset. However, RP5 confessed that he personally surrenders to the Self, when it appears in the analytic room. He explained that “it is a combination of confrontation with the unconscious and surrender, which is different from the East,” and it is coming from working with the unconscious typically in Jungian psychoanalysis, either with dreams or in active imagination. RP5 commented: “But then the moments come where you do surrender. And we surrender together, and the person surrenders to the Self internally as they do the work. But you can’t ask for surrender nor force it.” Essentially, RP7’s standpoint concerning surrender in psychoanalysis is similar with the above statement. He suggested that psychoanalysis needs a different level of surrender than religious or spiritual practices, but it can also be an important aspect of the analytic relationship in some circumstances. The major difference between Eastern and Western views of surrender may originate from their different attitudes to the ego. In the analytic relationship there is no

need for such surrendering like in the spiritual traditions and there is no complete dissolution of the ego. As RP7 explained:

I think one difference it the analytic way of doing things and certainly Jung and the eastern spiritual practice is the attitude about the ego. Jung says over and over again you need an ego to be conscious. And you need an ego to dialogue with active imagination or to think about your dreams. And I think the same goes for the transference.

However, as RP7 illustrated in his vignette, both analyst and analysand need some sort of surrender, which he would rather call “openness or willingness to resonate.” He said that from the patient’s viewpoint “There has to be a willingness to give up something”; for example, the intellect, “to sacrifice with a strong attitude” in order to cultivate his less developed emotional function, and to change a fixed ego constellation. From RP7’s viewpoint, the analyst also needs surrender certain prejudices and being receptive for the analysand’s world.

The Forms of Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman Archetypes Which Appear in the Analytic Relationship

After having reviewed the relevant readings of Jung (1966b, 1968, 1971b, 1989) and some Jungian literature (Campbell, 2008; Coukoulis, 1976; Spiegelman & Vasavada, 1987; Vasavada, 1968) I concluded that the Wise Old Man archetype may appear in fairy tales, mythologies and dreams in various forms such as magician, doctor, priest, teacher, professor, grandfather, and also guru in India, which all are persons who possess authority and can help others. This archetype was also identified in all those characters that teach and protect heroes and give them gifts. Furthermore I reflected upon the Wise Old Woman archetype that is the feminine equivalent of the Wise Old Man. However, we need to differentiate them as they express the differences between two primordial aspects, the masculine and feminine sides of the psyche (Bennett, 1971; Neumann, 1963). In this context, identification with the guru or analyst,

both relating to the archetype of Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman, takes one beyond the ego personality and reveals the experience of Self, one's true nature.

In my research, I was exploring the thoughts and experiences of my interview persons about these archetypal images. I was also interested in their opinions about the difference between the Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman archetypes, whether they would be different forms of the same archetype or two separate archetypes.

Wise Old Man and Woman in my participants' experiences. Many of my research participants have experienced the Wise Old Man in one or another form. For instance, some of them (RP1, RP5) talked about projections on Jung, others associated the Wise Old Man image with their training analysts, as RP1 and RP7 did with Joe Henderson, and as RP6 did with Wheelwright. Some of my research participants (RP1, RP3, RP4, and RP7) reported such cases when they were also seen as a Wise Person by patients. RP3 did not see much difference between guru and analyst from the perspective that the Wise Person archetype could be projected on both. She surmised that sometimes patients may internalize the analyst like disciples follow the guru. RP3 explained:

Maybe they just see an image of such a person and the interior archetype is activated out of their need for that archetype, because the archetypal realm makes it very aware that even if you've never been properly mothered, the archetype of the Good Mother is there and so when you meet someone who embodies that, you respond to it. You recognize it.

She reflected on two significant moments in her example. First, the archetypal realm is a common source of both behavioral and psychic events, and a place where one archetype can trigger other archetypes in certain circumstances. This is the "archetypal actualization," a Jungian concept, which postulates that the archetype has a dynamic property of seeking its realization in life through behavior and personality of the individual (Stevens, 2006). In our case, when a patient has guru transference or idealizing transference toward his or her analyst, the

Wise Person projection implies the existence of an inner guru in this patient, and also its archetypal needs to be transferred on his or her analyst. As we saw in the literature review and also in RP9's explanation, this is similar to Jung's experiences with Philemon, his inner guru, which was also an archetypal manifestation of the Wise Old Man. Second, a Wise Person archetype is relational by nature, which means that it always emerges in between two persons. According to RP2, the Wise Old Man archetype, as any other archetypal pattern, is an emergent phenomenon.

And so likewise with an archetype like the image of the Wise Old Man there has to be a set of human circumstances and accidents of fate and a receptive pair, I think, it's always in the dialectic arises interpersonally, because how can one be wise except in contrast to other human beings? It's a human trait. . . . Most people that we think of as wise old men have interactions with other human beings in some form. (RP2)

RP2 was thinking of the image of Wise Old Man as it would emerge sporadically, situationally, entirely within a context. In her opinion, this archetype is a human potential and regardless whether it is encoded biologically or it is just phenomenological, its appearance depends on the immediate circumstances. Therefore, I cannot but agree with Campbell (2008) who stated that there is no Wise Old Man without pupil and discussed it not as a single archetype, but in the context of the *Puer-Senex* dyad. Similarly, I also think of a pair of archetypes, the guru and disciple, and discuss the parallel of their relationship to the analyst-analysand relationship in this research study.

Moreover, Papadopoulos (2006) suggested that we have strong reason to think about archetypes as a network of different impulses and images. They are interrelated among themselves and it is more likely that not only one single archetype is activated in a certain situation, but other archetypes will also participate in the relational network with other individuals.

Even in the context of one individual, one archetype does not act on its own but triggers off related archetypes (in a compensatory or supplementary way). This means that mostly, archetypes affect individuals and groups not in isolation but in cluster/networks/constellations. (Papadopoulos, 2006, p. 32)

This means that the Wise Old Man archetype is related to several images such as: Guru, Sage, Prophet, Professor, Healer, and so forth; but may also be connected to other archetypes such as Father and King. Their influences may be further complicated, if not only archetypes, but also some complexes would be involved in the given situation. This fact, obviously, hardens the way of reductionist approach and causal thinking in the analytic understanding, however, it provides a multi-colored context of associations and feelings for reflections and meaning making in Jungian psychoanalysis. For instance, we could learn from RP1's account how his personal myth, the relationship with his parents, meetings with Jung and other analysts, different changes of his life expectations, and his Wise Person imagery, and so forth emerged in his psychoanalysis with Joe Henderson. Similarly, RP6's example showed that his psychological development was shaped by the interactions and mutual influences of RP6's troubled relationship with his father, his expectations toward the archetypal Father, and feelings for his psychoanalyst, Don Sandner.

Wise person type archetypes and genders. The other interesting question is whether the Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman would be two gender specific forms of the same or equivalent archetypes, as one may emerge in men's individuation process, whereas the other would appear in woman's individuation process. In reply, RP3 proposed that the Wise Person archetype is basically androgynous. There are exceptional men, as she said, like the Dalai Lama, Bishop Tutu and Nelson Mandela "who embody an understanding through suffering and of compassion" and unify the best capacities of both genders, male and female. RP3 explained:

We also know from the brain research that the age they're in now, the testosterone adrenaline energies are much less, that men become much more like . . . like women as

they get past the aggressive, assertive, competitive phases of their lives and they get mellowed out and they get interested [in humanity].

In RP3's opinion both man and women can reach this high level of wisdom, where gender differentiation counts less. However, she saw some differences between the ways and expressions of the masculine and feminine wisdom. On the one hand "Wise Man is usually wiser about the ways of the world, wiser about uses of power, wiser about the lessons learned from failure," because that is a certain course how a younger man becomes a wise man through experiencing and learning the world. On the other hand RP3 considered the Wise Woman who "has grown through relationship" or loss of relationship, if the Wise Woman does not have child or her child has died. RP3 proposed that "the grandmother energies that she moves into, where she has a feeling for all the children of the world is more the Wise Woman."

Concerning the differentiation of the archetypal masculine and feminine, Anthony Stevens (1982) insisted that Jung was clear about the differences of the masculine and feminine principles, yet he held both in equal respect as they must be mutually complementary and interdependent like the ancient Chinese Taoist concept of *yin and yang*. Jung argued that masculine and feminine principles are fundamental and "held to permeate all reality and to be present and active in both men and women" (as cited in Stevens, 1982, p. 175).

Furthermore, Stevens (1982) also commented on the works of Jung's followers, Toni Wolff and Edward C. Whitmont on the psychological implications of the masculine and feminine principles. Wolff continued Jung's studies and completed the concept of archetypal feminine. Besides the Great Mother and Love Goddess she added other two basic types, which she described as Amazon and Medium. Without going into details, I focus here only on the Medium aspect, which I believe is connected to our topic, the Wise Women figure. This type is said to live in close relationship with the collective unconscious, to have access to knowledge denied to

others, and speaks with the conviction of an oracle. If such women turn their gifts to professional use, they will consult people as clairvoyants, spiritual guides or also psychotherapists (Stevens, 1982). Whitmont has done a similar job and perfected the yang principle. As Stevens (1982) discussed his work, he defined four predominant traits in masculine psychology, which correlated with those feminine aspects described by Wolff. These he called the Father, Son, Hero and Wise Man. His Wise Man is concerned with ideas and knowledge, and less oriented to practical values and actions. It is characteristic of the personality of sage, teacher, scholar and philosopher. Thus, this type corresponds to our Wise Old Man archetype.

As Stevens (1982) noted, the above formulations of the masculine and feminine archetypes and other contra-sexual archetypes such as animus and anima are based on little more than clinical intuition and theoretical discussions of Jung and Jungians, which sometimes are a little bit confusing and neglected in larger scientific circles. On the contrary, RP5 approached the plurality of the archetypes and their controversies in a practical way.

So if you go deep enough, you see—if you go to the abstract level of the Self, as Jung does, then it's the union of masculine and feminine. And I look for that very often. But with women, they need to get that feminine Self. And very often they need to get there to deal with—see, Jung talked about going via the extra—the other side—man going by the anima to the Self and the woman by the animus. So the anima or the animus becomes a function of relationship to the Self, which I think is right. (RP5)

RP5 also reflected on the differences between the masculine and the feminine Self, Logos and Eros, which have foundations in our biological gender differences and also their different social-cultural perceptions. RP5 suggested that men's and women's spiritual development also have some differences, because a man's development is supported by his anima, the archetypal feminine, whereas in women's development the animus, the archetypal masculine plays a crucial role. Ultimately, the Self is where all the masculine and feminine principles will be unifying after the course of individual development for both men and women.

At first, RP9 considered the question of masculine and feminine principles superficial. “In other ways it’s not,” he said, “because it’s also in the entire fabric of the universe. The soul has no sex. You know, my soul isn’t a man, and my soul’s not a woman.” However, RP9 surmised that we all should have some experiences with our masculine and feminine nature through our incarnations, which inherited in archetypes in order to help individuals playing and accepting the different gender related roles. He warned about these stereotypes, which are primarily based on historical and cultural circumstances, and as such they significantly differ in the Western and Eastern thinking. RP9 said:

I always laugh, because the Western idea of the masculine and feminine doesn’t always match the idea of masculine and feminine, for example that you find in talking to yogis. I mean, as you know, what is the energetic force in the universe? It’s Shakti. It’s Divine Mother. I mean, Divine Mother has the power, even though the power is shared, of course, between Divine Mother and then Brahma, Vishnu, Shiva. But whenever they got into trouble, they gave all the power back to Kali and had her go out and take care of things, you know. And in the West, we tend to think of the power being masculine. And it’s not that.

In accordance with the Eastern concept, all creation is feminine on an archetypal level and every creature belongs to the Great Mother or Divine Mother, as RP9 explained. In contrast with this, Christian culture overtly emphasizes the masculine principle; the genesis is more related to Logos and bonds to the act of Heavenly Father. RP9 saw the masculine and feminine principles as equally important, and recommended cultivating worship of both of them, as he confessed, he personally could relate better to the feminine side of the divine in his own spiritual practices. He admitted:

Probably because of my guru—but on the other hand, I think by the time I got into this body, it was also pretty well going on in me—you know, I prefer certainly to worship Divine Mother more than the Heavenly Father. And doesn’t mean I don’t have to worship both, because they’re both existent. But on the other hand, it’s much easier to relate to the mother than to the father, not just for me, but for almost everybody, because the mother is warmth and compassion and form. And the masculine is formless and no identity and so

forth. And we've been in form for so many incarnations it's really hard for us to know quite how to do that. And so for most people, that's a much slower path. (RP9)

To explain individual differences of our choices, RP9 exemplified his guru's influence.

However, we can also think about individual varieties of our personal psychology, which are primarily determined by our relationship with parents. RP9 discussed the different traits of the archetypal masculine and feminine based on his own experiences quite graphically. This is such a big topic and after having discussed it, I saw its complexity even better.

I could not get answer for all the questions concerning the differences of the Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman. By all means, it seems to be clear that gurus are usually seen as masculine manifestations, and the Wise Old Man archetype is, most often, projected on an older man, guru or analyst in that kind of way. However, there are female gurus and also feminine manifestations of the Wise Person. Interestingly, for Jung the Wise Old Man is also one of the archetypal personifications of the *mana personality* that represents an extraordinary inner power of the unconscious (Jung, 1966b). In contrast to the animus-anima, which are contra-sexual soul images, the mana personality reveals or is projected onto same-sex figures. Besides Wise Old Man they can be the Puer Aeternus, Hero, Father, and so forth; whereas, for women, it may appear in the form of Puella Aeterna, Amazon, Great Mother, and so forth (Daniels, 2005).

RP9 agreed that the Wise Person can be manifested both man and woman. For example, we have many wonderful women in the Jungian profession, we see wonderful women next to gurus, and we know a lot of great saints like Mother Theresa and the Divine Mother (Sri Aurobindo's female collaborator). In addition, RP9 also mentioned Ananda Moi Ma, who was a fully realized master as she achieved the highest state of realization. RP9 finished talking about the polarity of masculine and feminine at the point where he started, namely the idea that the soul does not have gender.

And it's the same thing with Ananda Moi Ma. If you think you're relating to this little feminine thing that's there, that you can see. But as somebody said, you know, it's kind of like for yourself. When you get up in the morning and you look in the mirror, be careful. That isn't you. That's your package. That's how you happen to be packaged up for this lifetime. And that's okay, but don't mistake it for who you are. (RP9)

RP9's warnings reminded me to think about the impermanent nature of the present and everything that has been created. His teaching also reminded me not to forget that our personality has visible and invisible parts, which create the emergent phenomena of our body-mind-spirit.

Personified Self figures and the impersonal Self. RP7 talked about, and discerned, the Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman archetypes and other personified Self figures and the impersonal Self by referring to the Hindu philosophy that also made clear distinction between the personal image and the impersonal form of the divine.

I think that the levels we're talking about that the "wise old man" is at a level of personality, that it takes on an anthropomorphic image. And that does fit the guru projection. But I think there are also levels that are more about states of consciousness than they are about pure personality. And I think the East goes into those much more deeply than depth psychology has. I think it's been one of the critiques of Jung that he stays at the level of the image. (RP7)

This differentiation between form and empty form is important in Eastern thinking, which Jung seemed to not quite understand. In my opinion, we must distinguish two different forms of the Self, one that is personal, living and manifested form, whereas the other is impersonal and archetypal, the eternal form of the Self. For instance, this differentiation may explain the dichotomy of human guru versus divine guru, which means that the guru has personal qualities, as a human being, but the guru also must be seen as embodiment of the *Adi guru* or archetypal entity, as a divine being.

In a recently published article, *The Snapshot of the Void. Reflections on Jung's Relationship to Indian Yoga*, Richard Stein (2010) explored Jung's venture into the Hindu

philosophy that led him to describe the concept of individuation, and also discussed Jung's limitations, questions, and mistakes he left behind. The author showed how Jung's early life experiences and cultural biases influenced his understanding, and ideas about the yoga systems. In some way, I felt during the conversations with my interview persons, especially with RP5, RP7, and RP9, that they bravely went further than where Jung had stopped in exploring the Eastern philosophies. As Western scholars, against Jung's warnings, they successfully practiced yoga and could integrate their spiritual experiences into the Jungian system, making it more complete.

By all means, Jung was a genius, as RP7 and RP9 underscored, because he did not have a true master, yet recognized the age old wisdom by himself, which otherwise transmitted through the master-disciple relationship in many spiritual traditions. Jung understood that as individuals we are not alone, there are plenty of archetypal figures, images and situations in our psyche, which are based on the multi-generations knowledge of humanity. This archetypal heritage can then be realized in the right moment of each individual's life. The results of my research suggest that the analytic relationship can also be such a context, where the inner source of wisdom, the archetypal Wise Old Man or Woman may be personified in the form of fantasies, dreams, or even in transferences to guide the patient to healing and wholeness.

The Trials or Previous Training Are Essential for Becoming a Spiritual Master or a Psychoanalyst

As I concluded my literature review, a comparison between a review of guru training qualifications (Berzin, 2000; Patrul Rinpoche, 1998) and Jungian analytic training qualifications (Coukoulis, 1976) disclosed both differences and similarities. Both traditions require study and preparation, and most importantly, self-experience from the applicants. This special, empirical

knowledge can be gained through the disciple's direct relationship with the master in the spiritual traditions or through training analysis with a senior analyst (Coukoulis, 1976; Phelon, 2001; Spiegelman & Vasavada, 1987). Essentially, this means that no one should become a guru or psychoanalyst without first being a disciple or patient.

The significance of a psychoanalytic candidate undergoing analysis was first recognized and introduced into analytic training programs by Jung (Kirsch, 2000). Jung's (1989) words about the importance of the analyst's analysis:

The psychotherapist, however, must understand not only the patient; it is equally important that he should understand himself. For that reason *sine qua non* is the analysis of the analyst, what is called the training analysis. The patient's treatment begins with the doctor, so to speak. Only if the doctor knows how to cope with himself and his own problems will he be able to teach the patient to do the same. Only then. (p. 132)

He pointed out that the analyst needs to confront his or her own problems in the training analysis in order to get more insight into the nature of the mental problems and to experience the work of the psychotherapy on his or her own. Today, the training analysis is required not only in the Jungian schools, but in all analytically oriented schools of psychotherapy.

The Jungian analytic training. Despite the obvious differences between the religious, spiritual rites of passage and the psychoanalytic tradition of becoming psychoanalyst, they have lots in common as both are based on a kind of initiatory process. The psychoanalytical training combines theoretical and practical parts (exams, diploma work, clinical supervisions, etc.) during which the candidate acquires necessary skills, knowledge, and awareness of the ethical standards of this profession, and may also transform the candidate's personality. As Jung (1989) recommended, training analysis has great importance and plays a crucial role within the analytic training program today. The personal analysis is the way a candidate in training can develop his or her highly integrated personality (will be the analyst's instrument ultimately), and also to get

an in-depth experience in work of unconscious on his or her own. Before the final exam a candidate also needs to present his or her analyst's written recommendation concerning psychological maturity, character and professional proficiency of the candidate. At the end, the candidate's readiness is evaluated by a committee of practicing psychoanalysts; however, there are no written rules or precise definitions when a candidate's personality is mature enough. It is not clear when exactly the final stage, crossing the threshold, will be completed. Similarly, just as the spiritual teacher recognizes when the disciple is ready, when the committee finds a candidate appropriate, they will accept him or her as an analyst. Therefore, getting certified as Jungian analyst is an open ended, sometimes a long and painful process, especially, if one cannot pass the exam at first. As an international student, I took part in the analytic training program of the San Francisco Jung Institute for two years and I knew a few analysts who suffered, because they needed to make extra efforts until they were finally certified. Since I have been continuing my analytic training as an individual member of the International Association of the Analytic Psychology and writing my dissertation in this Jungian topic, I can also experience similar feeling and feel the pressure of this initiatory process, which has been reflected in my unconscious. Please see my dream and dream notes concerning my initiation in Appendix I.

Training analysis. I postulate a parallel between the spiritual initiation and the analytic training, which revealed *Trials or previous training are important for both, spiritual master and psychoanalyst* in a Cycle 2 lens. My interview question, "How did you become a Jungian analyst?" aimed to serve two functions. First, this question helped the research participant tune in and become personally involved in our topic. Second, I asked this question in order to open up a space for the interviewee's free floating narrative, which I expected to validate my comparison between the guru and analyst.

It was no surprise that all my research participants confirmed significance of analytic training in becoming an analyst, in which process they emphasized the influence of the personal analysis. They reported that during the course of personal analysis they developed a strong relationship with either their psychoanalyst or control analysts (in supervision). My interview persons recognized personal analysis as useful and beneficial not only for training purposes but for supporting their own clinical practice as well. This is one of the requirements of the analytic profession, the idea that even the analyst needs to see an analyst or mentor on a regular basis.

RP5 proposed:

First of all, you need your own analysis. That's for sure. You need your own analysis, and if it's convenient, to work with different analysts so you have—different kinds of experiences are evoked. There are advantages to work with one person long-term, also of working with different people, different aspects. So in that sense, you have different mentors, so you're not dependent on any one particular person.

The analyst “works from the Self” (RP5), which means that the analyst has to be concerned with his or her own unconscious and the patient's unconscious simultaneously. Therefore, this inner work requires constant outer control from the analyst, which can be provided by a mentor, clinical supervisor or a group of peer analysts. This is how an analyst can keep his or her personal integrity and not become lost in the turmoil of the patients' problems or burned out by his or her clinical practice in case of a heavy workload. RP5 also raised the question of the analyst's independence and discussed pros and cons of consulting with more than one supervisor. These issues are fascinating, but they fall outside of the scope of the present paper.

Personal effect of the training analyst. Turning back to my research findings, many of my research participants (RP3, RP4, RP6, and RP9) decided to become Jungian analysts due to being in analysis with Jungian analysts. Each of them had their own interesting narratives about meeting and working with their analysts, which are presented in the interview texts in Appendix F. To illustrate the importance of the analyst's personality, I reflect on a single example, in

which RP6 recalled his encounter with Joe Wheelwright, who happened to become his first Jungian analyst after this momentous meeting.

It meant a tremendous amount to me that he had that confidence in me and then essentially invited in. I think of this because I know we're going to talk about my personal analyst, Don Sandner, who was just wonderful. But in some ways, the day that Wheelwright invited me and encouraged me and asked me sort of was worth maybe 2 years of analysis, in terms of the confident—the mirroring of the Self, you know. What it did to my sense of Self. (RP6)

RP6 discussed the significance of this special encounter, whose therapeutic effect was comparable with the impact of his other important analytic relationship, even if he, obviously, did not intend to compare these two experiences. RP6's story reminded me of Milarepa's search for his true master, Marpa (Coukoulis, 1976), and other Zen anecdotes of acquiring a master (Suzuki, 1960). "The booming voice" of Joe Wheelwright and his collegiality, as RP6 recalled his first interaction with the famous Jungian teacher and analyst of that time, made RP6 forget everything and opened up a new approach in his understanding of the analytic relationship. This was a shift from the intellect toward the emotional and relational side of the analyst's experience with the patient. Probably, the confidence and openness he gained from this discourse oriented him during his analytic training with other analysts as well and in some way or other it is still influential for him in doing psychoanalysis.

Symbolic friendship. The importance of the personal analysis, the analyst's personality and the analytic relationship were noticeable in the case of my other research participants as well. It was common that my research participants stayed in psychoanalysis and maintained a relationship with their analyst after finishing their training and working in their own clinical practice (RP1, RP6, RP7, and RP9). To measure the significance of the analytic relationship let me quote RP1, who has been in analysis with some breaks for about 40 years, until his analyst's passing away.

Yeah, I did from 1962. I didn't see him for a few years and then I went back to see him. And I mean I really, I stopped seeing him when he was—At 101 and a half, he had pneumonia, which 90, at least 95% of other people would've died of. He survived it, but I mean mentally he was never the same after that. . . . The first part was what Fordham would call the dependent transference. And the second part was, I mean it was, it didn't have that same dependency. I mean there was still a dependency. But on the other hand, it was much more, over time it became much more collegial. And Joe developed a concept, which he called the symbolic friendship and I would say that that, he became more and more of that. (RP1)

As we could see, though RP1's analytic relationship has transformed several times and turned into a "symbolic friendship" with his analyst, they stayed in a lifelong connection. This kind of long-lasting relationship is not unusual in the Jungian world, however, its frequency is rather decreasing recently. The significance of the length of the analytic relationship is that the longer the psychoanalysis the more the chance of experiencing the Self for both the analyst and patient.

RP7 commented:

I think when things are working well and this isn't always the case, but when they are the Self is holding the analyst and the patient. That's what I mean when I said something can constellate. I feel as the analyst free to be myself and in my own ego of consciousness and respect the patient as an equal. And something bigger than both of us is operative. And, I think, sometimes you see that in more mature people and sometimes you see it in people who've worked in analysis a very long time, and you've sort of arrived at that together.

In this context, RP7 referred to the "symbolic friendship" as a possible end of a long analysis.

Joseph L. Henderson (2005) coined this term to describe what happens when the analyst and analysand get beyond the Freudian personal transference, surpass the Jungian archetypal transference and then they would operate in a kind of impersonal field together. He proposed different opportunities of "individuating either into discovery of vocation or into spirit" (Tresan, 2007, p. 26) and addressed "a third kind of resolution of transference" (p. 26); namely, "that an analysand could individuate into a symbolic friendship with the analyst" (p. 26). RP7

remembered how his long-term analytic and professional relationship worked with Joe

Henderson. RP7 stated:

I think you end up in a place where you're both devoted to the same psyche. That the individual psyche sort of spreads out into something and you each have your own personal psyche and your own work on that. But there's something that's broadened out by many years of work together. And there's a feeling of camaraderie in it or, I guess, it's what Joe called the symbolic friendship, you know, you're friends but it's for this particular task.

Similarly, RP1 and RP6 talked about much the same feelings with their analysts at the end of their long analytic relationship.

Parallel with spiritual traditions. What Jungians call “symbolic friendship” to describe the mature relationship between analyst and analysand can also be found in some spiritual traditions as well. For example, in Tibetan Buddhism the spiritual teacher is, sometimes, called “spiritual friend,” whereas the disciple is called “spiritual companion.”

“This particular task” in the quotation, which RP7 meant about the analytic relationship, can also be understood in a larger context as the aim of training analysis and becoming a psychoanalyst. This is actually parallel with the disciple's aspiration of obtaining the ultimate knowledge and being initiated in a spiritual context. Likewise, Patrul Rinpoche (1998) taught the disciple how to relate a master: “In the beginning, skillfully examine the teacher; in the middle, skillfully follow him; in the end, skillfully emulate his realization and action. A disciple who does that is on the authentic path” (p. 153). Despite the obvious differences between the analytic candidate and spiritual disciple, I found that both realize their tasks in essentially a similar manner. They follow the analyst or master, practice a lot, and if everything goes well, they eventually “unite in soul” with the analyst or master. The final stage of spiritual apprenticeship leads to an experience of wholeness within the Self or in God realization, enlightenment, and Highest Consciousness, and that is considered the end of training or initiation.

Other effects. Besides the importance of training analysis, my research participants also talked about other components in their career choice, which showed a great number of individual differences. For examples, RP1 was born into a family of Jungian analysts, thus, his calling happened through his parents. As he said, he “incarnated as a divine child,” and actually “he have not had any other choice” than following his parents’ profession and becoming an analyst. RP2 “married to be a Jungian analyst” as her interests was first raised by her analyst husband. For RP2 the analytic training was important, but she admitted that she really grew as an analyst during her presidency of the San Francisco Jung Institute. RP3 developed her idea of becoming Jungian analyst during her psychiatric training, when she first read Jung’s writings and met her training analysts, who, synchronistically, happened to be Jungians. RP4 decided to be a Jungian analyst due to her positive experience with a Jungian analyst, and then went into training. RP5 followed his call from within and travelled to Switzerland to receive a classical Jungian training as well as C. G. Jung’s blessing. RP6 became a psychiatrist in order to help others, and then his experiences such as reading Jung, studying from, and working with, Jungian analysts transformed him into a Jungian analyst. RP7 first was interested in the studies of consciousness oriented by Sri Aurobindo’s yoga parallel with Jung’s writings. His decision to become an analyst has been affirmed during his analytic training. RP9 recalled his path as a natural development inspired by his childhood curiosity in spirituality. After qualifying himself as Jungian analyst, he also became interested in Kriya-yoga and was initiated into practices of the highest consciousness.

In summary, my research participants talked about their many different avenues of becoming Jungian analysts, in which, however, they all emphasized the ample influence of their training analysis. They all were analyzed by training analysts, with whom they often created

strong relationships, which I described after Henderson as “symbolic friendship” and compared with the final stage of the spiritual master-disciple relationship. I also recognized that they were influenced not only by their own analysts in their choice of vocation, but all of them were somehow inspired by C. G. Jung, whose effect I will explore in the section of *The Legacy of Jung and the Analysts’ Lineage Are Important for the Jungians, But Differently*.

Change Lenses

The Spiritual Master-Disciple Relationship Is a Metaphor for Healing in Jungian Psychoanalysis

This lens expresses the essential meaning of my research work and thus also became the title of the dissertation. Originating from two previous lenses of Cycle 2, I have transformed and distilled them during Cycle 4.

At the beginning, my intuition along with some of the reviewed literatures suggested that *though the master-disciple and the analyst-patient relationships are historically, culturally, and socially different forms, they also have a lot in common, as they express a similar archetypal model of healing and spiritual development*. Originally, by exploring the similarities and differences I intended to find evidence validating my hypothesis, namely, that they both are fundamentally related to the same archetype first described by Jung (1966b, 1968, 1971a) as the Wise Old Man and that later Hillman (1979) amplified as *Puer-Senex* relationship. I thought that this archetypal dyad would be applicable for understanding and describing better the psychodynamics of the analytic relationship as well. Furthermore, I proposed that healing and spiritual development happens through the activation of this archetype that can be manifested in the forms of either *guru-chela* or psychoanalyst-patient. I hoped that my research participants would share their opinions and experiences to be compared and contrasted with my assumptions.

I was not disappointed; the rich material gathered from the interviews modified my views and advanced my understanding of the topic.

Idealizing transference has healing potential. As we saw earlier, my research participants have experienced the Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman archetype in some forms and projected this out in relationship with their analyst. Almost all of them reported cases when they were also seen as a wise person by patients. At the same time I agree with RP4's critiques that the guru-transference is a special kind of idealizing transference that does not happen and is not typical in most analytic situations. However, if idealizing transference happens, RP4 warned that the analyst must stay separate from this idealization.

The analyst has to carry that just the way the parent has to carry it. But the analyst has to be very, very centered in the fact that he or she is not a guru and doesn't have the last word and is not a wise old person. It's just a stumbling human being. (RP4)

RP4 emphasized that it is dangerous when the analyst imposes his or her ideas and norms of behaving and gives direct advice to a patient. Such is never wise. Otherwise, transferences are always there in the psychoanalysis and the analyst needs to work with the patient's transference as well as his or her own countertransference. RP4 admitted:

The important thing about the transference is that the patient is having a living experience of their complexes and of themselves in their relationship with another person, and I don't think it's important that they admire the therapist. It's just important that they experience something powerful.

Although we cannot talk about idealizing transference in every analytical case, some other form of transferences will be created in the analytic process. In RP4's opinion, recognizing the patient's transference is only the first step. The analyst also must be aware of his or her own transference, and able to perceive, feel, and live through the patient's feelings. Analyst and patient are interconnected not by their intellectual properties, but rather through their

unconscious. Thus the analytic process is a living experience that needs the analyst's full attention, his or her personality and all his or her functions.

My research participants do not consider themselves wise persons in this archetypal sense. For instance, RP1 argued that if someone wants him to be a wise old man, he could not accept this projection mostly because he does not know everything, and he is not able to tell the patient what to do or not to do. If, however a patient idealizes him as a wise person, he just holds the transference and does not react to the projections themselves.

I mean I don't analyze them particularly. I let them sit there. And then if it's a positive wise old man, then I just let it sit there. In that sense it's also like Jung because Jung didn't like to talk about the transference unless it, he had to. But he didn't, he rather just let it play out and interfere. But he was happy not have to analyze it. He only analyzed it when he had to. So when it became a problem, either positively or negatively. (RP1)

Similarly, RP7 also emphasized the importance of recognizing the archetypal transference in healing and not identifying with it. He saw some training analysts who were struggling to handle the patients' idealizing transference and whom he advised in practically the same way as RP1.

RP7 said:

And to the issue of the archetypal level of the transference, I think it's very important to see it and not identify with it. And one of the things I see with some of the people who are therapists and training to be analysts who consult with me is people are very uneasy with the archetypal transference because it feels like this enormous idealization that's wrong. It's like I know I'm not that great and you just ask my wife and she'll tell you I'm not that great. But you sort of have to sit there and tolerate a projection that has value and meaning even though it's not, quote, "true" in the literal sense.

On the hand this idealization is uncomfortable and seems to be dangerous for psychoanalysts; on the other hand, this seems to be required and expected by the gurus, which is one of the major differences between the guru and the analyst.

Healing comes from experiencing wholeness. However, as we saw in the previous sections, in spite of the historical, cultural, and social differences, the master-disciple and

analyst-patient relationships have some mutuality. What is also common that guru and the analyst in some circumstances can carry the Self. According to RP5, if it is constellated, Jungian psychoanalysis will work. Spiritual development and healing overlap in Jungian psychoanalysis through the work of Self, which is the archetype of wholeness and also connected with the Wise Old Man archetype. RP4 said:

A guru is usually less of a personal relationship, and a psychotherapist is more somebody who carries the self so that the therapist is experienced as though they are the self, not as though they're helping you connect with it. And you connect with it through your relationship. That's how I work and, in my opinion, that's how people work.

I learned wonderful examples from my research participants how they experienced something similar with this in their clinical practice. RP2 explained a case with a severely traumatized patient who, after some work, could relate to her complexes through the personal transferences developed between them. They made tremendous progress, when the patient became able to reflect her problems also on another level through her archetypal transference.

RP3 works similarly with her patients and helps them “to recognize what’s meaningful for them.” She cannot tell what is meaningful to them, but she “can intuitively feel when they are moving in that direction and support them.” She believes that healing comes from acknowledging that there is something greater than us that we all possess, beyond our ego. The presence of a wise person, guru or even the analyst helps to remind us of this thing.

Healing comes from the analytic relationship. Healing comes from the relationship, as RP6 also emphasized:

I think there was a practice of being a healer, having a healing relationship with patients. I was already doing that and I never did that based on theory. I did that on having a relational conversation between me and the patient. I think that's one reason why these people call themselves Jungians.

For him, Jungian psychoanalysis is a kind of “living experience”; therefore, he represented a practical standpoint in discussing the issue of how the archetypal transference fosters healing in psychotherapy.

Case examples. RP7 told a case story that also confirmed the healing potential of idealizing transference and gave details of the healing process in psychoanalysis. He had a patient who developed a strong guru transference toward him. He held the patient’s projections, did not take it personally, not react to it, and just tolerated them. Eventually, the dream projections subsided over time and the patient realized that the analyst in her dreams was not a real person, it was her inner figure though. RP7 interpreted this case:

I mean in the case that Jung talked about, and actually it’s true of my patient that had the very inflated image, it’s healing the father wound. She didn’t get that. And that process of idealization which normally would be, you know, a little girl projects it on daddy and daddy’s wonderful and then she finds out he isn’t. And she finds out she has abilities she didn’t know.

Like other examples, this case also shows how the personal and archetypal transferences are interrelated in the analytic situation, where the analyst sometimes may become a guru in the patient’s dream or imagination, and through this process helps the patient’s personal development and healing. My findings confirmed what I learned about the Jungian understanding of healing, which is primarily based on the work with unconscious. According to Barbara Sullivan (1989), “psychological healing follows an inherent pattern which emerges from the depths of the psyche” (p. 47). Her opinion also suggested viewing the analytic relationship from an archetypal perspective.

Jungian psychoanalysis is an archetypal relationship. The second component of the present Cycle 4 lens was my previous assumption, which said that *The relationship between spiritual teacher and aspirant or psychotherapist and patient is founded on the recognition of the*

need to associate with a person who is a master of inner transformation and has reached advanced stages of spiritual or psychological development. Whereas this Cycle 2 lens is evident for the guru-disciple relationship as we saw the reviewed literature (Bogart, 1992, 1997; Kakar, 1991; Kopp, 1971; Magnussen, 2003; Spiegelman & Vasavada, 1987; Vasavada, 1968), it was not confirmed by my research participants in the analytic setting. They shared different opinions as we saw in the previously presented examples (RP4 vs. RP5, RP7, and RP 9).

However, all my research participants understood psychoanalysis as an intimate relationship that is grounded in the archetypal field between two persons. This notion goes back to Jung (1966c), who explored the analytic relationship by inviting an alchemical metaphor from the *Rosarium Philosophorum* as we saw in the literature review. Jung (1966b) assumed that beyond the personal level of connection there must be a more universal, timeless, and symbolic level of human bond, formed by archetypes of the collective unconscious. He proposed the kinship libido, its evolution and resolution between the alchemist-adept and his mystic sister, depicted by the alchemical images as a metaphor for the unconscious process occurring between analyst and patient during the course of analysis. Jung (1966c) believed that all humans share something common called *unus mundi* in alchemical tradition and postulated as the archetype of Self, which can emerge where two individuals become involved in a relationship. RP9 put this idea nicely in words:

Well, you know, you were asking also in there about archetypal transference. And, of course, I think archetypal transference exists constantly in every human relationship we have. I mean, can I meet someone that doesn't in some way represent some aspect of the self or some aspect of spirit? No.

In Jungian understanding, the analyst and patient relationship may evolve this archetypal or transpersonal experience of the Self. Along these lines came up an association in our conversation with RP4, and we reflected on Jesus' promise: "For where two or three are gathered

in my name, I am there among them” (Matthew 18:20). As we saw in the literature review, Jung (1971d) defined the Self as both the center and the totality of the psyche and equaled its projection with such images as Christ, Buddha, the Atman and so on. Jung also early recognized and promoted the relational model of experiencing the Self, as I will discuss in detail in the next section titled *What Jungian Psychoanalysis Says About the Question of Self and the Analytic Third*.

According to RP4, the analytic relationship is archetypal, not especially because of the possible guru-transference as the Cycle 2 lens would suggest, but because it is rooted in a primary human drive to be related to the other, the incomplete and dependent. RP4 explained that Jung’s kinship libido is, actually, the basis of the archetypal transference and also the infant’s attachment to its mother and father.

And then it’s the basis of all of us making attachments to spouses or friends through life and that when someone is in therapy, they make an attachment to their personal therapist based on the kinship libido that we all use to attach to whoever and also infused with the energy of the archetype of the healer. Now I would see that as more primary than the archetype of the guru. I would think of the guru as a particular version of the healer sort of. (RP4)

RP4 reflected on Jung’s kinship libido as the archetypal ground of the possible transference between patient and analyst. Besides personal complexes, the transference may include archetypal contents. Thus, it connects the individual with the collective, and facilitates development, when the symbolic intent, images and meaning of archetypes will be revealed and experienced in the analytic process. The research data confirmed that in the analyst-patient relationship not only the Wise Old Man or Woman archetypes and the related images (teacher, doctor, guru and so on) are projected out by patients, but other complexes, such as problems with parents, shadow, and so forth, and other personal elements may emerge as well.

Metaphorical connection between analyst- patient and guru-disciple relationships.

However, I found evidence for the guru-transference during several of the interviews and discussed this special type of archetypal transference with my research participants. I consider the connection between analyst-patient and guru-disciple relationships metaphorical. Although they are otherwise historically, culturally, and socially different relationships, they are analogous from my viewpoint. Thus, exploring the meaning of this metaphor may bring some psychological understanding of the topic. Metaphor is the concept of understanding one thing or idea in terms of another. This analogy we use in order to show that two things have something in common and to make one's description by the other more vivid and powerful. Besides conveying comparison and abstraction the metaphor connects not only meanings, but also affects. Ellen Siegelman (1990) described the metaphoric process as "the mode of praise" (p. 6). She explained this further:

In my view, an image-laden metaphor that is novel is usually born out of intense feeling: the need to communicate something never communicated in that way before, to make others see what you have seen, and very often to express psychological states that can only be approximated in words. These ineffable feelings are either too vague, too complex, or too intense for ordinary speech. (Siegelman, 1990, p. 6)

Campbell's (2002) book, *The Inner Reaches of Outer Space: Metaphor as Myth and as Religion*, discussed metaphor as fact and fact as metaphor by comparing them without using "like" or "as." According to Campbell, this quality of the metaphor made it especially applicable in discussing psychological transformation, threshold figures, metaphorical journey, and metaphorical identification.

Likewise, I believe that my intuition might have grasped some qualities of the analytic relationship, which I identified and compared to some features of the traditional master-disciple relationship. Through invoking the *guru-chela* metaphor I could reflect on and comprehended

the analogy with the analytic relationship that I interpreted as a symbolic space co-created by the analyst and patient. In accordance with this, the present Cycle 4 change lens concludes the modifications of two Cycle 2 lenses discussed above and expresses the changes in my understanding of the topic.

What Jungian Psychoanalysis Says About the Question of Self and the Analytic Third

Having discussed in the literature review, Jung's (1971d) theory of Self is extraordinarily rich and provides a framework for his psychology. Yet this framework is incomplete, not concerned with the development of Self from birth and during the first half of life, and not without controversies and difficulties, which the contemporary Jungian literatures has criticized (Cambray, 2010; Colman, 2006; Daniels, 2005). For instance, it is paradoxical of how can the Self be both a single archetype within the psyche and the totality of the psyche. The Self represents the oneness and also the multiplicity of the archetypes. As RP5 articulated "The paradox of the Self [that it] is a central archetype, and yet, all the archetypes are aspect of the Self . . . there are many symbols of the Self. The Self is everything and nothing, so, of course it's paradoxical." RP5 explained that for Jung the resolution of this paradox was the union of opposites that elevated the question onto an abstract level of the Self.

Dual and non-dual understanding of the Self. Discussing the problem of the Self in the Jungian psychology RP7 turned to the Hindu philosophy for analogy. He argued that there are different levels of the Self, personal and impersonal, and compared it to Sri Aurobindo's *Nara* and *Narayana*, which are two forms of the divine emanations in the Hindu philosophy, the personal and impersonal reality. One has qualities, but the other does not have qualities or definition at all. In this respect, the Wise Old Man archetype and also the guru projection can be

seen as personifications of the Self. However, there is an impersonal Self that goes beyond the images and is indescribable. RP7 commented:

I think that the levels we're talking about that the Wise Old Man is at a level of personality, that it takes on an anthropomorphic image. And that does fit the guru projection. But I think there are also levels that are more about states of consciousness than they are about pure personality. And I think the East goes into those much more deeply than depth psychology has. I think it's been one of the critiques of Jung that he stays at the level of the image. And the image is very powerful and very valid, I mean, when it's a real symbol. But there are also things . . . going into states of being or non-being that are not imagistic.

RP7 admitted that Jung also clarified in his later writings that the Self is more than its symbols and images and we cannot define the Self exactly because of its being so inclusive.

Epistemology of the Self. Other questions arose concerning the epistemology of the Self. Jung (1971d) insisted that the totality of Self cannot be attained since its major part is unconscious and therefore unknown to us. It is not graspable by our intellect, however, it gives the archetypal basis of our personalities, which also contain the capacity to conceptualize the Self through its symbolic manifestations. Jung (1971d) defined the Self as an empirical concept: "As an empirical concept, the self designates the whole range of psychic phenomena in man. It expresses the unity of the personality as a whole" (p. 460) that is based on a kind of direct experience. Yet, as Colman (2006) suggested, besides the empirical level there are other two levels of arguments, the phenomenological and the intellectual, which Jung employed by exploring and describing the Self. The second is the phenomenological level that concerns with Jung's classification of the symbolic representations of the Self. Jung (1969b) explained that "the self is no mere concept or logical postulate; it is a psychic reality" (p. 157) even if it "is inconceivable except in the form of symbols" (p. 157). The third level of Jung's argument can be seen as an abstract viewpoint or an intellectual attempt to define the Self as a *postulate*. Jung (1971d) was careful to make distinction between these levels: concept and experience, an

intellectual objective view and a phenomenological subjective approach. He surmised that “in so far as the total personality, on account of its unconscious component, can be only in part conscious, the concept of self is, in part, only potentially empirical and is to that extent a postulate” (Jung, 1971d, p. 460). Nevertheless, his view of the essential nature of the Self remained unclear, and scientifically it is hard to validate. Jung (1970) addressed this difficulty:

It is not worth the effort to try to describe totality character. Anyone who has experienced anything of the sort will know what I mean, and anyone who has not had the experience will not be satisfied by any amount of description. Moreover there are countless descriptions of it in world literature. But I know of no case in which the bare description conveyed the experience. (p. 547)

By no doubt, the post-Jungian developments of the Self concept contributed a lot in reflecting, complementing and modifying Jung’s intuitions and original idea of Self. Erich Neumann’s (1995) ontology of the Self and Edward Edinger’s (1992) studies of the development of the ego-Self axis during the course of individuation, Michael Fordham’s (1978) research studies of the perinatal period of life and early mother-child relationship are just a few among many studies, which have extended our knowledge, though still many questions remained. As Cambray (2010) concluded:

We end with a return to the unknown, though enhanced, I hope, by ideas from contemporary science that are forming a new paradigm. Jung’s concepts, especially of the self, cannot be put through such reflections without some modification, but in this I believe they are strengthened. Jung’s entire opus has an emergentist feeling to it. His amazing intuition honed in on many features that could be associated with such perspective, though he did so without the benefit of scientific explorations, which were not yet available during his lifetime. (p. 65)

Experiencing the Self in Jungian psychoanalysis. By all means, all of my interviewed Jungian analysts agreed that the Self can be directly experienced in psychoanalysis regardless of the definition of the (Jungian) Self, whether it is scientifically provable or not, metaphysical or phenomenological, innate or developmental. As Beebe et al. (2001) emphasized in their

summary of the significance of the Self in Jungian psychotherapy, it “is not just a classical museum of once-potent images seeking to reassert their hegemony over the mind. An archetypal image has both process and content aspects, which provide immediately experienceable perspectives on psychological events” (Beebe et al., 2001, p. 229). Furthermore, Edinger (1992) proposed that the Self is the archetype that guides psychotherapy, in which—if it goes well—both analyst and patient may experience its unfolding and vital mystery, reaching not just the aims of the one-sided ego, but the totality of psyche.

In reference to Peter Coukoulis (1976), I asked my research participants whether the analyst in psychotherapy, and also the guru in spiritual context would be representatives of the Self. RP3 replied:

They do seem to be representatives who live closer to the Self than most of the other archetypes that—and since the ego has a limited grasp of the Self and what we are doing, in our conversation conceptually as well as in the work with analysis, is making the observing ego more conscious of what's going on in the larger psyche. So that's so much of the nature of what a person learns in analysis, is to stay present, to have the ego not get overwhelmed by the complexes and not get overwhelmed by the negative or positive transferences that they're putting out there, but to maintain an observer's position on what is going on, which is so much greater than it can grasp anyway, including whatever the Self is.

She explained that the ego is part of the Self and many times does not allow us to see the larger part because we are busy with our ego complexes. So the work of analysis in spiritual direction is to strengthen and energize the patient's development along the ego-Self axis. According to RP3, the analyst's task is much like the guru's work in the guru-disciple relationship as they both show the way toward the Self.

Concerning the Self and the analytic third, RP1 immediately associated with Jung (1992), who, in one of his correspondences, wrote:

With regard to your patient, it is quite correct that her dreams are occasioned by *you*. The feminine mind is the earth waiting for the seed. That is the meaning of the transference. Always, the more unconscious person gets spiritually fecundated by the more conscious one. Hence the guru in India. This is an age-old truth. As soon as certain patients come to me for treatment, the type of dream changes. In the deepest sense, we all dream not *out of ourselves* but out of what lies *between us and the other*. (Jung, 1992, p. 172)

For someone like me, who used to believe that we dream simply from our unconscious mind, this statement may sound revelatory. Furthermore, this is evidence that Jung thought early on about the jointly created unconscious life of the analyst and patient, thus anticipating the intersubjectivity theory that has evolved within modern psychoanalysis (Kohut, 1971; Stolorow et al., 1987). Thomas Ogden (2004a) proposed that the analytic relationship involves dialectical movements of the individual subjectivity of both analyst and analysand, and also their intersubjectivity at an unconscious level that he called the analytic third. He discussed examples of clinical case studies, in which the individual subjectivities of analyst and analysand were interrelated through projective identification and co-created a third subject of analysis. Ogden (2004a) also suggested that successful analytic work is based on the mutual recognition of analyst and analysand that this subjugating third is a separate subject, in which they can both re-experience and transform their individual subjectivities.

Definitions of the Self. In this relational approach to psychoanalysis, the Self is “an emergent phenomenon” (RP2), one that “emerges in that unique one-to-one relationship” between the analyst and analysand (RP6), suggesting that the analyst is more like a partaker of co-creating and holding the Self (RP5, RP6, and RP7) rather than simply being a Self representative for the analysand’s projection. However, the analyst cannot do anything in order to create the Self, other than being there and being available for the patient. RP4 surmised that the Self is constellated in therapy situation all by itself.

I don't think you do anything to constellate it. It comes when it is ready to come. Jung talks about the common situation where at a certain point in the therapy process the patient has a dream that seems to image the bursting forth of the transference. I was just reading about a patient who had a dream that a flying saucer landed on their lawn. That would be the eruption of the Self, I would guess would be one way to put it. But it's nothing that you do. It's like listening. It's like if you wait and are open to it, it will happen. (RP4)

She proposed that the Self is like a “spark of life force inside us” and everywhere in the universe.

When two persons meet in psychotherapy, they both bring their tiny little spark into it, which if the psychotherapy goes well, will be heated up by each other to ignite a bigger force, the Self.

Interestingly enough, the idea of “spark” is not new, it can be found in a great number of religious and philosophical traditions such as Manichaeism, Jewish mysticism, Sufism, Sri Aurobindo's philosophy, and more. Though the meaning of “spark” can vary in different religious contexts, it is similarly associated with the spirit or the Divine in all beings (Daniels, 2005). This concept may have also influenced Jung and widely spread among Jungian analysts, including my research participants (RP3, RP4, and RP5) who also employed this metaphor. By all means, as RP4 pointed out, the Jungian approach is unique because of its belief that the life force or Self in each of us is interested in us, and is actually interested in helping us. It is on our side, even if it might also be demonic and hostile in some circumstances.

The connection between Self and the analytic third. Concerning the connection of the Self and the analytic third, I have not received much information from my research participants other than that the analytic third may be one of the emerging forms of the Self. While I was editing the interview texts I recognized that I had not discerned the Self and the analytic third, and had used them interchangeably in my interview questions. My research participants did not distinguish the Self and the analytic third either, and that left in me a sense that the Self and the analytic third should be somehow interconnected. It is as if the Self would occur in the analytic third, which is

a kind of *liminal space* (RP3) or a field (RP7) co-created by the unconscious of both the analyst and analysand. Nevertheless, the issue of the analytic third and the Self is paradoxical because if we assume that the analyst holds the Self, then what is the analytic third? RP7 resolved the paradox by saying:

I think when things are working well and this isn't always the case, but when they are the Self is holding the analyst and the patient. That's what I mean when I said something can constellate. I feel as the analyst free to be myself and in my own ego of consciousness and respect the patient as an equal. And something bigger than both of us is operative. And, I think, sometimes you see that in more mature people and sometimes you see it in people who've worked in analysis a long time, and you've sort of arrived at that together.

Again, RP7 emphasized that the Self is something to be constellated in an intangible field where analyst and patient will meet and mutually experience it as something bigger than both of them.

Ann Belford Ulanov (1999) approached the question of the Self and the analytic third differently. She clearly distinguished them and articulated the role of the Self as an analytic fourth in addition to the patient, analyst, and their co-created dyadic material of the analytic third. Ulanov described the presence of Self in psychoanalysis as a transpersonal experience shared by analyst and patient, and such an influence, from a Jungian perspective, extends beyond the ego.

The fourth, the Self, must enter into the analytical encounter if it is to work . . . If I am correct in believing that the Self functions like a bridge to reality that transcends the psyche as well as dwells in it, then consciousness of consent summons a religious dimension, what Jung called that "decisive question" we must answer: Are we related to the infinite or not? (Ulanov, 1999, pp. 22-23)

The connection of the Self and the analytic third, whether they were same or different, whether they should be viewed as the third and fourth factors of psychoanalysis, these can be interesting topics of further research. I feel that Ulanov's discussion of the Self does not differ essentially from what I could learn from my research participants.

The individuating Self. RP3 raised the issue about the importance of the internal Self. She told that Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman, guru, professor and also the psychotherapist can be seen as they all contribute and nourish an archetypal part of ourselves, which is much deeper and wiser than them because “essentially there is something in the person’s psyche that the ego-Self connection that can tap into the accumulated wisdom of that life.” RP3 warned that we ought to trust and follow this inner Self, which sometimes hangs around a guru or psychotherapist, because it feels good. In RP3’s opinion, however, it is neither guru nor psychotherapist, but rather it is the Self that directs our individuation. From a different perspective, however, Bogart (1992, 1997) concluded, the function of the external guru ceases after reviving the inner guru of the disciple. At the end of this process of transformation, when the disciple internalizes the guru’s function successfully and can realize his or her own true self, the guru’s mission will be done. Similarly, the analyst and patient can conclude their work once the patient has established a living connection to the Self.

In conclusion, I discussed changes of my preliminary lens influenced by my research findings and their interpretations. There is no data to refute my previous statement, namely *Wise Old Man or Woman, the inner guru is also the archetype of the Self. Therefore the guru can be seen as embodiment of this archetype, is a kind of external and symbolic manifestation of the Wise Person. Similarly the psychotherapist may represent the Self sometimes.* However, I simply moved from this kind of hypothetical or merely intellectual level (learning through my readings) toward the empirical (learning through my own analytic experiences and others experiences via interviewing analysts) understanding of the Self. The major shift in my understanding was that the Self is an “emergent phenomenon” in psychoanalysis. When the Self is personified and projected onto the analyst, the Self will be co-created mutually by the unconscious of analyst and

analysand. Here I could only partly review and discuss Jung's and the post-Jungians' theory of the Self, because it would go beyond the scope of this section. Having discussed what my interviewees said about the Self in relation with our topic, their opinions reflected a variety of views and some contemporary approaches to the Self as well.

Exploring Transference, Countertransference, and Archetypal Transference Between the Analyst and Analysand

As I mentioned earlier in the literature review (Kirsch, 1995), Jung acknowledged the importance of personal transference and its role in the analytic process. Yet, he did not like to handle it, as RP1 recalled Jung's infamous ambivalence: "He did not like to focus on it. He would only tend to focus on it, when it was a problem. Either a love problem, where the patient had an erotic transference on him or a hate problem." Indeed, my research participants (RP1, RP3, RP4, RP5, and RP7) reported that both the negative and positive transference can be powerful, which often cause difficulties in the analytic treatment. For example, RP1 told the case of the loving woman with red bottle, whom he had to transfer eventually, because of her overtly positive and invading transference. RP3 also discussed some examples of transferences and concluded:

We have such an influence on each other, so to project positive or negative is an energy field that we have to deal with, and so when somebody comes in and is really hostile or angry or mistrustful or something, it's hard work.

RP3 usually received positive transferences from patients and rarely negative transference.

However, if they are present they both need her skills to let them work for healing the patients' wound.

Archetypal transference. Like we saw in the literature review, the Jungian approach of transference is unique also because its archetypal dimension. According to Kirsch (1995), Jung

(1966c) identified the archetypal transference as a deeper level of transference, acting in the unconscious of both the patient and analyst. He proposed that if the personal level of transferences were assimilated, then the archetypal level would be opened up. Since Jung the subsequent generations of analysts extended and elaborated his original vision of transferences. For instance, the contemporary Jungian approach does not separate the personal and archetypal transferences. In accordance with this new understanding, RP4 surmised that both transferences happen at the same time.

I also don't make a distinction between the archetypal transference and the personal transference in the same way that some people might. I believe that—you know Jung had a metaphor where the personal unconscious was at the top and the archetypal was underneath it. But I feel that that's a misleading metaphor. I believe that the two layers of the unconscious are completely interpenetrated. So that when I have a feeling, say about my father. It's a feeling about my personal father, and it is also filled with the energy of the—with the archetypal energy that surrounds the father. And so I think of the same thing as happening in the transference. That what Jung called kinship libido—is the basis of the archetypal transference and that is actually the basis that the infant attaching to its mother and father. (RP4)

RP4 argued that transference often synchronizes the personal and archetypal unconscious; personal feelings and memories of the patient are often fueled by archetypal energy and images as well. This is why RP4 did not like to address the different sources of transference as “layers.” Instead she preferred the term “matrix,” which expresses better how the personal, cultural and archetypal motifs are intertwined.

Similarly, when RP6 recalled the relationship with his analyst he could not distinguish the personal and archetypal elements of his transference. He remembered:

I think I never experienced archetypal transference as separate from just the relationship with Don. I knew it was full of transference and I'm sure that part of that was and still is archetypal . . . but what it clearly was, was a healing relationship with a father figure which gave me a new sense of being fathered. (RP6)

RP6 could not separate his feelings felt for his own father, the missing part of the Father archetype, which was healed through the overtly positive feelings and the larger transference toward his analyst. RP6 admitted that he saw the personal, cultural and archetypal levels of transference as one, and if they manifested in the analytic relationship, he called it *interpersonal*, following the tradition of the San Francisco School of Jungian Analysis. He explained: “I think as you live them out, rarely are they distinguished. They are all just in the flow of the experience of the relationship.”

Archetypal transference in practice. Furthermore, RP6 recalled an interesting case story that may illustrate his analytic work, primarily focusing on the connection with patients, in relation with transference, countertransference, and archetypal transference. He had a patient, a woman in her 30s, an immigrant from India. She was hard to relate to as a person and it was not an easy relationship with RP6. But she presented a number of dreams, and one of them was an icebreaker. In her dream, she went in the therapy office and they sat in their chairs as usual, but on the wall over RP6’s head it was a portrait of an Indian guru in all its usual archetypal manifestation. She did not know what to make of that dream and was not really able to amplify it. However, it changed RP6 who became just relaxed with this patient, who remained difficult, but stayed in analysis for a couple more years. The dream helped RP6 understand why he felt her differently or could not connect with her. He did not think of this dream as a sign that he as her psychoanalyst successfully took over the role of her guru as I would have interpreted it. On the contrary, in RP6’s opinion this dream could be viewed in opposite way as he explained:

The way I understand the dream is that this was very real for her. She didn’t see me, she saw the guru. Yes, there was something I was doing by who I am or that I have the office and the two chairs and that allowed her to do this, but it’s almost like she didn’t turn me into the guru. She was able to find her guru internally in spite of me or playing off of me. It’s a little different. It may amount to the same thing, but it’s a little different.

In this transference dream the patient presented a strong archetypal transference; her psyche created a guru image that is an archetypal and also a cultural pattern in India. First the patient seemed to be ambivalent with the psychoanalysis due to her different cultural background and unconscious expectations, having this familiar image helped her accept the analytic relationship eventually. It was so, if the patient had talked to her internal guru, instead of her analyst. At the same time the analyst's countertransference that might have unconsciously directed at the patient's "foreignness" has dissolved through the process of analyst's insight into the archetypal transference and his or her trust its healing power. RP6 explained the positive change in their analytic relationship with this patient as a result of the positive interferences of these various personal and archetypal transferences.

RP5 also talked about the transference less in Freudian or classical terms. He does not explore transference and countertransference or archetypal transference as separate, and therefore he puts less effort into sorting them out. For him, working with transferences in psychoanalysis means primarily focusing on the archetypal as it emerges in the relationship between the analyst and analysand, and the process of, making the unconscious conscious through their mutual efforts. He put it poignantly:

It seems to be that, insofar as the Self is constellated in the work and both parties are relating to it, that individuation of the analyst is also enhanced. . . . I'm always working with the Self. So my individuation is in that work. Each patient brings a whole new psychology and issues and problems and differences. And my relationship to them and the archetypes that are evoked is like my doing a kind of active imagination, keeping the reality of this person, who is a person, and also the unconscious, which is more collective. (RP5)

As the selected text shows, RP5 considers the analytic relationship with patients as an interactive field of a mutual process, or as he called it, mutual individuation occurring between the partners.

Concerning the archetypal transference, RP7 told me that this was one of the first ideas that grabbed his attention when he started reading Jung's writings.

I came across the idea of if you think of the patient and the doctor as A plus B in the equation, then what comes out the other side is C plus D, that they're both changed by it . . . if you think beyond just that simple personal equation and the transference the implications are already there for the archetypal transference. That something gets activated in the process and particularly if the analyst has had a deep enough experience of his own inner life that then the two are sharing something that does change both and really becomes a field phenomenon that it's less personal and more about that field. And the personal work is important and the frame is important and it all helps to hold that field in a way that it's transformative and not just careless, but it's a field that we're in.
(RP7)

In contrast with the classical Freudian concept, where the analyst only reflects and acts upon the patient without being affected, it felt true to him that the analyst is not a blank screen, but also an active agent in the process. Here RP7 also talked about the analytic relationship as "the field," which, referring to the intersubjective approach (Schwartz-Salant, 1995), articulates well the immeasurable multiplicity of interactions and inter-dependent effects occurring in the analytic relationship, both within and between analyst and analysand.

Furthermore, RP7 agreed that in practice it is really hard to differentiate the various levels of transference because the archetypal comes through the personal, which is also embedded in the given cultural context. To illustrate the experience with the archetypal transference, RP7 recalled a clinical case with a man, who presented his personal "hell" in the form of several life issues and physical pain in psychotherapy. During treatment it turned out that the patient had a Holocaust history in his family background, and this multigenerational trauma and the patient's unresolved personal issues, pain, self-blame, and criticism, were, in some way, unconsciously interrelated.

But the cultural level of that hell is what happened to his grandparents and their families in Eastern Europe. And the archetypal level is what we normally think of as hell. It's the

place of pain and self blame and criticism. So, I think, seeing those levels even if you're not interpreting them with those names, but just the fact that you can reflect with somebody that their personal issue they're wrestling with may have familial and multi generational issues that go back is enormously relieving. (RP7)

RP7 explained in this vignette that even if there was no solution for each personal issue, having some archetypal amplifications could help the patient relate to the problem differently. He associated this process with the "The Mustard Seed" story in Buddhism about the woman whose child dies and who is in inconsolable grief.

Dangers of transference. All my research participants emphasized that it is important to work with transference to recognize it, but not to identify with it, just hold it. The archetypal transference needs careful treatment. On the one hand, archetypes open more space for interpreting the transference and personal complexes of the patients, and thus are helpful. On the other hand, archetypal transference may amplify the effects of either the positive or negative transference, making them problematic, more dangerous and sometimes even unbearable as I learned from my research participants.

RP9 explained the danger of inflation in the idealizing transference, referring to Joe Wheelwright, a famous Jungian analyst, who used to say: "The one thing you have to do is to be careful not to eat the transference, because if you eat the transference, you're going to have to eat its opposite too." RP9 meant that sometimes not only an overtly positive transference is projected out on the analyst, it can also turn negative, going to the other extreme. RP7 agreed that archetypal transference is not always positive, and sometimes it creates a lot of work for the therapist, who has to tolerate not only being God but also the devil. He stated:

I think the most important thing from the analyst's point of view is how to recognize an archetypal transference when it's there and how to hold it. And, you know, we've been talking mostly in positive terms, but the other way this comes up is horrendous negative transferences that are totally exaggerated and demonizing. And [in] the chapter on the

mana personality Jung writes about that, that the other phase of the great healer and wise doctor is the evil witch doctor or the demon. (RP7)

Difficulties with borderline patients. According to RP7, this phenomenon is especially true for the relationship with borderline patients, which “can be really toxic to the analyst, not to mention the hell the patient goes through.” Talking about borderline dynamics, RP7 referred to the debate among the psychoanalysts, particularly between Heinz Kohut and Otto Kernberg. Kohut thought that aggression was a reaction to empathic failure, whereas, as RP7 stated, Kernberg was more an “old-style hard-ass Freudian” analyst and argued that these people really do have deep aggressive feelings. RP7 took a stand more on the Kohut side, but clinically also recognized the value in Kernberg’s approach. However, in RP7’s opinion they were only partially right, and we can create the full picture of borderline psychodynamics only through understanding archetypal transference, this uniquely Jungian concept.

One of the leading Jungian theorists of the borderline personality, Nathan Schwartz-Salant (1989) argued that the traditional approaches, which operate solely in terms of psychotic and/or neurotic mechanisms, are insufficient to a full apprehension of this disorder. Schwartz-Salant explored case studies and found that borderline patients lack the transcendent function that is an important channel of the unconscious for becoming conscious. Therefore such patients do not know the differences between the real and dream or imaginal, and they apt to identify with the unconscious. This dysfunction appears in psychoanalysis as the patient’s symptoms such as expressing overtly positive or negative feelings toward the analyst, difficulties in accepting the therapeutic frame, and problems in relating to the analyst, which make the analytic work difficult. This is similar to what RP7 said about the work with borderline patients.

You now, that the borderline is actually seeing real evil. It’s not that they’re making it up. They’ve lived through something that opens them up to a dark part of the psyche. And if you’re going to work with them you have to take it seriously. You can’t wish it away.

Due to the prevalence of negative transference, keeping and working with borderline patients in psychoanalysis is a challenging task for even the most experienced analyst.

To gain more insight into the borderline states of mind, Schwartz-Salant (1989) offered a different view through “the unconscious dyad,” which he meant the analytic field of transferences and projections between the analyst and patient, and thus a different analytic treatment. Bearing in mind the Jungian notion that the source of healing is in the patient’s unconscious, Schwartz-Salant suggested a possible treatment strategy, the therapeutic work through the analytic dyad, which may help recreate the lost transcendent function of the patient.

Another Jungian analyst, John Beebe (1988) interpreted the borderline syndromes as the primary ambivalence toward the Self due to a developmental trauma or failure. According to him, this is the source of the intense ambivalence characteristic of borderline transference in psychoanalysis. Beebe (1988) suggested a sequence of 20 steps, “the interpersonal moves by which the ambivalence toward the Self is acted out, recognized, and finally resolved within the context of a relationship to an analyst” (p. 99). In spite of these attempts to conceptualize the nature and the treatment of the borderline symptoms from archetypal perspectives, RP7 suggested that this subject would need further clinical research studies.

Inflation of transference. Turning back to the possible danger of archetypal transference in psychotherapy, RP3 explained that if the patient’s idealizing transference meets the psychotherapist’s needs for omnipotence or some narcissistic wound, then the relationship between them will easily become a kind of codependency. In such situations, the psychotherapist is becoming more powerful; whereas, the patient is getting more vulnerable. RP3 drew parallel between the possible dangers in psychotherapy and those “gurus” who abused their power sexually, and said:

It's very problematical to be a guru, because it's like you're imposing something. The person is becoming a follower, not listening to their own inner wisdom. And what I see in the guru world is almost every single one of them has betrayed the trust of their disciples by crossing boundaries. I mean, gurus from abroad who've come to America, almost every single one of them, of the important ones, have slept with their disciples, mostly women, but some of them have been male gurus who slept with the men or the boys. And then rocked the faith of these people that trusted them so. (RP3)

Although I felt that RP3's opinion was not without some exaggeration, and she did not explain the topic of "American gurus" in detail, I did not ask her further about it, because it was far beyond my own research topic. As I mentioned in the literature review (Bogart, 1997), the topic of Eastern gurus in America is a complex issue, which has many religious, cultural, and psychological connotations, as well as clinical implications. Yet, here I reflect one of the psychological aspects of this topic, crossing the boundaries in psychoanalysis. Similar to the guru-disciple relationship there is an unequal relationship between the analyst and patient that in some instances it may create a sense of inflation and crossing the boundaries. This topic became interesting here because some similar incidents happened in the Jungian world as well involving sexually exploiting the analytic relationship and betrayal of the patient's trust in healing by some analysts.

The Perry case. Along these lines, my research participants (RP1, RP3, and RP6) reported the Dr. John Weir Perry case that shook the whole Jungian community in San Francisco. It had strong and long lasting effects that still make this issue sensitive today. To protect my research participants and those innocent individuals who may be involved in the topic I edited out some related parts of the interview texts. Perry was an eminent Jungian scholar, admired teacher and respected training analyst who, due to his repeated sexual misconduct with female patients and psychoanalysts in training, was expelled from the Institute and lost his analytic practice after a long and painful procedure. RP6 stated poignantly:

It was at a tremendous upset and loss of innocence of—that somebody so bright and creative and that we all admired could fall so below the fundamental ethical standard of—by using his young female patients for his sexual objects. It was a terrible experience for me and I'd say, you know, many of us, of my generation, were influenced by Perry.

RP6 explained that his and his colleagues' upset and disappointment in Perry grew, because even after he was disciplined and essentially severed ties from the institute, he made open public statements justifying his behavior and never expressed remorse for what he had done. RP3 saw Perry as one who fell because of inflating in response to the idealizing transference and mistakenly identified with its power. She concluded:

That's a really bad one to identify with because it's about power and it's about not recognizing that the other person is vulnerable because they have trusted you. And if you are a spiritual leader, psychological therapist, if you actually do heal them, because the violations usually occur after a lot of good has happened in the therapy. (RP3)

RP3 also emphasized the terrible damages that Perry's "guru-possession" caused to the sexually abused patients and pupils, other colleagues, and the whole Jungian community.

The message of the Perry case is still alive today. Perry fell into the trap of his own psychology and also a powerful archetype of being a guru-therapist. His example must be a warning for Jungian practitioners and healing professionals. A powerful archetypal transference emerging between the healer and patient can be nurturing and healing. However, it can also easily turn out to be dangerous and poisoning, if the healer is not aware of the nature of the archetypal transferences, inflates or disregards his or her own shadow side. Therefore, those in healing professions must be cautious with the potentials of the transferences, maintain their boundaries, and protect themselves as well as their clients.

Nevertheless, beyond the personal and archetypal factors there is also a cultural dynamic, as Peter Rutter (1989) concluded after analyzing 1000 cases of sexual abuses, when men in power, such as therapists, doctors, clergy, and teachers and others betrayed women's trust. His

thesis was that the intimate psychodynamics of transference and countertransference interact with the cultural dynamic of the admiration for male sexual conquests in Western European and North American culture. The studies showed that the countertransference of the violating therapist meets a psychological approval of conquests and set free about 13% of male therapists to act on it. This free-floating admiration for conquests emerges in other professional relationship as well and is often also dissociated from ethical considerations.

In conclusion, I did not hear much about the psychological process between guru and disciple during the interviews, therefore I cannot validate its comparison with analyst-patient relationship, as the Cycle 2 lens suggested: *They have similar processes, which in both can be described psychologically as transference, countertransference and projection.* However, we can learn from the past gurus the power of the idealizing transference, and its danger if one identifies oneself with it and inflates upon it. I could not validate the other related Cycle 2 lens either: *The guru neither rejects nor accepts projection, regardless of its nature, positive or negative. In the context of psychotherapy, the psychotherapist acts similarly, when he or she differentiates the patient's transference from his or her own countertransference.* However, hearing my research participants' experiences with transferences helped to change my previous concept, in which shifted from a more static, layer-like perspective of transferences toward a more dynamic, matrix-like understanding of their interactions. Furthermore, accounts from my Jungian analysts confirmed that transferences are embedded in the analytic relationship; they happen all the time in an unconscious process within and between the patient and analyst.

The Qualities Which Make Jungian Psychoanalysis Unique

Among Jungians there is a widely shared consensus that there is nothing like Jungian psychoanalysis, but it is hard to define what it really is. Jung did not elaborate a systematic

method based on his theories, and he always distanced himself from creating dogmas or his own school. His followers also agree that being Jungian should not mean imitating C. G. Jung or other Jungians, but following one's own individual path in becoming, and practicing as, a psychiatrist or psychotherapist. In my view, being Jungian also means accepting the differences and diversity within the Jungian community and being open to other healing practices and other therapeutic approaches.

Nevertheless, there are certain traditions, preferences, recommendations and also some analytic techniques that differentiate Jungian psychoanalysis from other psychotherapies, which themes also emerged organically during the interviews. Therefore, I decided to create a lens in which I can collect those features and qualities, which characterize Jungian psychoanalysis today, according to my research participants. I consider this lens as a change lens because, as such, it can replace three other Cycle 2 lenses as follows:

1. We know relatively less about the process of transformation or healing in the analytic relationship.
2. The quality of psychotherapy ultimately depends on the relationship between the analyst and patient.
3. Experiences of love and mutual acceptance between spiritual teacher and student are influential in the process of transformation. The positive qualities of the spiritual teacher and psychotherapist, their nurturing relationship help the student and patient to engage with his or her own inner realities and experience the divine.

Initially, these lenses related to psychotherapy and the therapeutic relationship in general. During the interviews I did not hear enough about each of these lenses. My research participants rather talked about their own clinical practices and specifically the Jungian way of doing psychotherapy. Although these accounts can be explored from the above perspectives the data

varied by each research participants and showed differences. Thus, I united these modifications of the above Cycle 2 lenses in this new change lens.

Similarities and differences with other psychoanalytically oriented schools from historical perspective. Jung used to be Freud's pupil and once the "crown prince" of the psychoanalytic movement. Because of some personal issues and also professional debate between them, Jung departed early and established his own psychology, which was later called analytical psychology, in order to differentiate it from psychoanalysis and other analytically-oriented schools (e.g., Adler). Jung's followers, especially the first and second generation Jungians, subsequently emphasized the fundamental differences in their theories and practices, which are well discussed in the literature. It is also known that Jung's ostracism, devaluation, and criticism by Freudians also widened the gap between the schools and isolated the Jungians for a long time.

Only in the last decade, more than three quarters of a century after the break between Jung and Freud, has the dialogue restarted among Jungians and different analytic schools, as the growing number of jointly organized events and mutual interests in the clinical field such as the infant researches and new findings of neurosciences show. To foster the interchange of ideas between the various analytic orientations, several articles have been published. For instance, in the *What Freudians Can Learn From Jung*, renowned Jungian authors and analysts, John Beebe, Joseph Cambrey, and Tom Kirsch (Beebe et al., 2001) presented the key areas of Jungian theory that they viewed as unique and offering as a potential sources of fresh clinical insights for Freudian psychoanalysts. Without discussing this thought provoking essay in detail, they reviewed Jungian dream interpretations, Jung's theories of complexes, archetypes, the Self, the dialectical approaches of the therapeutic relationship, and individuation. They concluded:

At the core of Jung's approach to psychological treatment is his belief that clinical analysis catalyzes a natural developmental process that wants to take place anyway. If

the work on the patient's complexes is pursued diligently in a spirit of honest dialogue, it may be rewarded by the patient's willingness to enter a dialectical relationship to the unconscious. Out of such relationship, not only the resolution of conflict between ego and unconscious but also the energy-laden symbols that foster individuation are likely to emerge. (Beebe et al., 2001, p. 239)

Despite the differences, from which Freudians, Jungians and other analytic schools can learn from one another, there are also several areas of agreement, which unite them in one family of psychoanalytic psychotherapy. From the beginning, Jung was apt to acknowledge Freud as predecessor and valued his work as a major influence in the development of his own ideas and analytic practice. Both Jungian and Freudian psychoanalysis have developed since Freud and Jung, and modified or newly interpreted many of their original concepts. For instance, today a great number of Jung's ideas and formulations are known and accepted even among conventional psychoanalysts.

Similarities and differences between Jungians and other psychoanalytic schools from archetypal perspective. Barbara S. Sullivan (1989) discussed convergences and divergences between Jungian and other analytic schools, saying that contemporary analytical theorists such as Erikson, Winnicott, Fairbairn, Kohut, and others explored different concepts of person-ego-self, which are much closer to the Jungian ego-self concept than the classical Freud's system ego. Furthermore, Sullivan saw similarities between Jungian and some object relations thinkers in understanding the role of body and psyche in human development as the two equally important entities interacting with each other and forming the individual's life experiences, even if they used different vocabularies. Sullivan (1989) cited examples of how the non-Jungians have described the archetypal aspects of psyche without recognizing it as Jung's collective unconscious.

Spitz, for example, talks about psychic "organizers"; Klein's hypothesis of unconscious phantasies operating from birth is equivalent to the hypothesis of archetypally determined

psychic concomitants to physical experiences; Piaget's idea of "innate schemata" depicts the operation of the archetypes in human cognitive development. (p. 158)

All these concepts attempted to explain the same universal patterns of human development in their own languages, yet they had a common assumption of an innate structure that was comparable with the Jungian notion of the archetypal foundation of the psyche. Talking about the approximation of various analytic concepts, we can also mention the similarities between Kohut's Self-psychology and the Jungian's Self concept, as Corbett (1989) and other Jungians (Jacoby, 1984; Wiesenfeld, 1980) explored. According to RP7, Kohut complements Jung's writings and "he fills in an area for me that Jung doesn't talk about so clearly." These are only the few of many examples depicting how the analytically oriented psychotherapies are coming closer to each other today. Similarly, as Murray Stein (2010) concluded, recently great number of Jungian oriented practitioners, who variously called themselves analytical psychologists, Jungian analysts or psychotherapists, "have increasingly recognized their historic, if not untroubled, kinship with the greater family of psychoanalysis and have taken to naming themselves Jungian psychoanalysts" (p. xv).

Differences between the Freudian and other analytic schools, and Jungian approaches according to the research participants. However, as the brief historical overview might have suggested, analysts from various analytic schools still have some ambivalence toward each other. My research participants (RP2, RP3, RP4, RP5, and RP7) also had various perspectives when they referred to similarities and differences between the Freudian and Jungian approaches, which I will now summarize.

According to RP2, the archetypal transference makes Jungian analysis unique. "I think that one concept that Jung talked about in numerous ways is possession. That the ego, the psychic energy, is somehow overtaken by the archetypal phenomena, and I think that is not a concept that

psychoanalysis even understands.” I learned from RP2 that archetypal transference combines two central themes of Jungian psychology, namely the archetypes and transference. One is more theoretical and takes examples from mythology, philosophy, anthropology, and so on. The other is more pragmatic, process-like phenomena that can be experienced during the analytical relationship. These two approaches, theory and practice, conjoin and complement each other in this Jungian term.

RP3 assumed that in cases of strong transference, either positive or negative, the Jungian way of working with archetypes can be more helpful for the analyst compared to the Freudian approach to transference.

It’s hard work and the person has to know that the thing I have about why it’s positive to do a Jungian transference work versus a Freudian work, which I think is much harder, because they invite themselves to be a blank slate, or they did in the traditional way.
(RP3)

Similarly, RP5 saw the major difference between Jungian and Freudian concepts is the conception of the scope of the unconscious. Though Freudians also work with the transference and countertransference, they do not accept the notion of the collective unconscious and miss working on archetypal level. RP5 explained this difference:

So, in my view, when the archetypal transference is activated, we’re in the process together, and there’s no use messing about with it, that you work with it together. So then it’s joining of forces. And the Freudians have that too, joining together to work with the unconscious. But this is where the Self clearly comes in. And most Freudians, they don’t know about—they’re dealing with the personal unconscious all the time. And the archetypes come in, of course, but they tend to reduce it or analyze it away, so they don’t get to that level.

RP7 agreed that psychoanalysts do not have language for what Jungians consider archetypal. He admitted that recognizing and understanding the archetypal transference, and generally working with archetypes is especially helpful in borderline dynamics.

Similarities between the Freudian and other analytic schools, and Jungian approaches according to the research participants. Although RP4 also feels that the archetypal transference is important, she did not mark the line among different transferences as we saw in the previous section. In contrast with other research participants' opinion, RP4 did not see great difference between Freudian and other analytically oriented psychotherapies either.

I don't make a big distinction between Jungian and other kinds of analysis or depth psychotherapy. I feel that there is good therapy and not such good therapy. And Jungians, Freudians, Klineans, anybody can fall into either group. (RP4)

She rather emphasized the similarities. Although the history of psychotherapy goes back only the 19th century, in some forms it might have existed way back before as long as human beings have existed. RP4 surmised:

When you're in pain, emotional pain, the instinctual impulse is to go talk to somebody about it. Even when you feel ashamed, you know, you're looking for someone who you could tell this terrible, shameful thing to. It is the nature of human beings to take their troubles to each other and essentially say, "Can you help me?" So this is just the latest incarnation of that process. We used to have priests. We certainly always have had parents, friends. These are all incarnations. And what has happened—what Freud began and so many other people continued, was formalizing that and trying to figure out what is it about that that's helpful? And how can we optimize the helpfulness, rather than making it kind of a hit or miss thing where, you know, just as a friend would listen to you.

According to her, psychotherapies have roots in the same human need of relating to someone else who listen us, when we are in trouble or have a problem. This is similar with Kopp's (1971) assumption I referred to earlier in the literature review. We all need a friend, guide or psychotherapist to consult about the difficulties of our life, especially when unexpected changes and turmoil occur or when simply growing into adulthood. This need gives the archetypal foundation of psychotherapy and, in my opinion, the guru-disciple relationship as well.

However, most of my research participants agreed that none of the other analytic psychotherapies comprehended the archetypal dimension of healing as well as Jungian psychoanalysis. As Linda Carter (2010) nicely concluded:

For me, Jung's analytical psychology with inclusion of the archetypal dimension brings a depth of meaning not found in other psychologies. The cultural and collective layers of the psyche are ever present and influencing the intrapsychic and interpersonal interactions. At the personal level, emergent moments in analysis as the one described above could be seen as a "moment of meeting," or a constellation of "transcendent function." Under such circumstances, Jungian psychology offers words and language for the spiritual, mysterious or numinous experience that comes into being through these moments of interaction that really transcend individual psychologies and dyads reaching farther to webs of connection and communication as a transpersonal collective psyche. (p. 201)

Jungian psychology and spirituality. As we saw in the previous sections, the Jungian archetypes also open up space for spirituality, which plays an important role in analytical psychology. RP2 recalled memories from the time when her rationalistic view was reformed through reading Jung's writings.

Jung [was] frustrated with the whole enlightenment project with the emphasis upon reason and scientific proof, and the denial of the spirit, the spiritual dimension of the psyche. So in his way of writing . . . he is to breakdown those barriers, those artificial dichotomies between the differentiations the intellect makes for the purpose of understanding like the division between mind and body, between mind and soul or spirit from the body.

RP2 explained that reading Jung was a significant experience in her becoming Jungian as it began to reshape her view of herself, others, the world, and the psyche. RP3's choice of taking Jungian analytic training was also influenced by the fact that in the 1960s Jungian psychoanalysis was the only depth psychotherapy that considered spiritual questions and working with the psyche. For her the goal of Jungian psychoanalysis can be spiritual, which means a kind of "soul work" of the analyst and patient, an effort to understand and integrate the

patient's personal life (ego) and archetypal possibilities (Self), developing ego-Self axis and seeking the goal of individuation. RP3 explained:

So the work of analysis, as I see it in the spiritual direction, is to strengthen and grow the energy of the ego-Self axis. The Self, which manifests itself, is bigger than the ego. The ego has a capacity to tap into love, compassion, an understanding and a sense of the numinous. The observing ego is attracted to, that there's a sense of where Self overlaps the ego, there's this liminal place where numinosity and meaning come together.

This means that the ego is temporary, whereas the Self is permanent and inherent. Sometimes we are able to experience the Self spontaneously, which that Jungians call “numinous,” or, as RP3 suggested that in some instances the analytic relationship may help the patient reconnect with the Self and thus experience a kind of spirituality in psychoanalysis.

Similarly, RP5 was also approaching Jungian psychoanalysis as a spiritual practice. For him analytic practice meant, as he said, “holy work.” His way of working in psychoanalysis was “every day and with every person, connecting to the Self.” Besides other spiritual practices and his own dream analysis, RP5 considered seeing his patients to be his main spiritual practice. He is also often seen by people from different religions, sometimes priest and highly ordered religious leaders. RP5 experienced that he could work with those patients more intensely because they are more disciplined and accepting based on their religious training. RP7 shared a similar experience with a Zen monk, with whom they could conjoin in an intense presence, session by session, because of the patient's “laser sharp attention” trained by meditation.

However, RP7 told me that Jungian psychoanalysis was spiritual by its nature, regardless of the patient's or analyst's spiritual interests. According to him, spirituality is embedded in the therapeutic situation in form of the analytic third or Self, even if it is not necessarily unfolded and revealed in each case or every analytic session. However, he insisted “that first of all the analyst is not necessarily a spiritual figure. And Jung's idea of individuation is not necessarily a

religious project” in that he reflected the differences in goals of the spiritual practice and the analytic treatment. RP9, a long time spiritual practitioner and Jungian analyst, agreed and had no doubt about the spiritual nature of psychoanalysis. He admitted that Jung himself was a deeply spiritual person and his spirituality came through his psychology as well. RP9 has his own clinical practice and also pursues other spiritual practices. Although he also considers the Jungian psychoanalysis as a spiritual experience, based on his experiences, he differs this from the feeling of his other spiritual practice.

The examples of my interview persons, each in their different ways may also affirm that Jung’s vision about spirituality and the role of spirituality in clinical work was larger than what other depth psychotherapies offer. Their opinions based on clinical experiences are much in accord with the standpoint of the transpersonal psychology, which respects C. G. Jung among their most significant pioneers. Yet, Ben Cortright (1997) called Jung’s concept of the archetypes and the collective unconscious for the first model of the transpersonal psychology. Furthermore, Ulanov’s (2005) claimed that Jung reintroduced the “psyche” into medical treatment, which lost its meaning during the evolution of western medicine disciplines.

Jung reaches to the psyche that exists objectively in our subjectivity, addressing us, pushing, prodding, luring us to meet its unfolding as we try to construct meaning, individually and collectively. I find that we enter a new zone of communication when we accept the fact of psychic reality. Then we are able to the process of unconscious mentation in our social, political, and family life as well as in our inner conversation with ourselves. Surely we see in the psyche an incomparable witnessing to the mystery that invokes us and undergirds our callings. What Jung inaugurated was not just another treatment modality for emotional distress; it was a new way to perceive reality. (p. 137)

Special Jungian techniques. Jungian analysis is also unique due to its diverse techniques. In RP4’s opinion, there are as many different styles of psychoanalysis, as there are as many analysts because everyone does the work in their own unique way. Jung’s preferred analytic method was dream interpretation. He analyzed tens of thousands of dreams in his practice,

developed various methods and published great volume of literature of the dream analysis. Jung distinguished his approach to dreams from other analytic schools by linking them to spirituality. Since Jung, Jungians also sustain the living tradition of dream-work. Among my research participants, RP1 discussed the different methods and opportunities that make Jungian dream interpretation special. Besides dream interpretation, I heard other techniques and methods described in the interviews with my Jungian analysts; sandplay (RP2), “active listening” (RP4), active imagination (RP5), combining meditation (RP7, RP9), prayer and other spiritual practices (RP5, RP9). I will discuss these in more detail in the section titled *Variety of Techniques of Dealing With Archetypal Transference in the Research Participants’ Practice*.

No technique approach. Nevertheless, Jung was famous for neglecting the question of “technique” in analysis. As Murray Stein (2010) described, Jung insisted on focusing on the individuality of the person coming for treatment.

He was convinced that the most important thing an analyst has to offer is an open and receptive mind, and if technique gets in the way of this it is far better to set aside and sit with a person without knowing what to do or how to do it.” (p. 69)

Similarly, none of my interview persons was in favor of technique over personal presence. The priority is forming the relationship with patients and the interactions one has with them, in which the analyst holds the analytic frame but otherwise let the unconscious work (RP3, RP4, and RP6). Therefore, being a Jungian analyst means, as RP6 quoted his clinical supervisor, to give one’s best self and trust in the process. The analyst is present, pays attention to the patients, and interacts with them consciously and unconsciously. For instance, RP3 recalled her experience with one of her first patients in psychoanalytic therapy, who did not remember her interpretations years later, but rather the analyst’s smiles and kindness. Also, RP4 prioritized the

analyst's listening skills, receptiveness, and emotional availability to the patient over the analyst's intellectual capacities in the analytic treatment. She explained:

We do a lot of logos stuff, but I'm not sure it's very important. You maybe know more about this than I, but I believe that the research on psychotherapy indicates that what people really value is feeling loved. And you just about never have anybody say, "Oh, the really valuable thing was when my therapist told me this." It's sort of like people don't even remember what you say. I'm not sure I remember hardly anything my analyst ever said to me, but I sure remember what it felt like being in his presence and feeling cherished. (RP4)

In *The Analyst's Love: An Exploration*, Ellen Y. Siegelman (2002) concluded that besides the analytic container and the symbolic space the person of the analyst is also an important factor in containment of the patient in psychoanalysis. The analyst's dedication to the calling, committed presence, skills, respect, and love for the patient serve as a container of healing.

The source of healing in the unconscious. Concerning the analytic process and the analyst's approach to the work of the unconscious, we could see several examples previously, especially in the section, *Exploring Transference, Countertransference, and Archetypal Transference Between the Analyst and Analysand*. I am, again, reminded of the healing force of transformation triggered by the archetypal transference between analyst and patient, as Jung (1966c) originally depicted using alchemical metaphors. As M. Stein (2010) stated:

The most defining goal of Jungian psychoanalysis has traditionally been discussed as transformation of the personality. This means a deeper than merely cognitive change in the analysand's attitude's toward self, others, and the world . . . Jung's main contribution to the psychoanalytic tradition as a whole, it could be said, revolves around his understanding of transformation. (p. 4)

Similarly, this is what I also heard from my interview persons about the significance of the analytic relationship. Maybe this is why RP6 also said that "if I could only read 20 pages of C. G. Jung's *Collected Works* over and over again, it would be the Introduction to *The Psychology of Transference*" in which Jung (1966c) discussed the analytic relationship as a

unique meeting of two individuals that evokes the Self of both persons for the purpose of transformation. In Jungian psychoanalysis this unconscious process is considered the source of healing that can be fortified by the analyst's right attitude; "not knowing" (RP4) replaces interpretation by emotional attunement (RP7) with the patient and the analytic situation. This is a mutual process, in which, if the treatment is going well, both the analyst and patient can grow (RP3, RP5).

In summary, this section gathered some features of Jungian psychoanalysis, which my research participants considered typical and may distinguish Jungian psychoanalysis from other psychotherapies. Without aiming to cover the topic in full, I found and discussed several nuances and a unique view of the analytic relationship in Jungian psychoanalysis on the basis of my research participants' opinions and some contemporary Jungian writings. By all means, most of my research participants agreed that working with archetypes and especially the archetypal transference, which make Jungian psychoanalysis unique. My research participants also emphasized the importance of the relationship in the analytic process, in which, if it works well, both the analyst and patient will mutually be transformed by the healing force of the unconscious.

The Legacy of C. G. Jung and the Analysts' Lineage Are Important for the Jungians, But Differently

Like we saw in a previous section, C. G. Jung influenced many of my research participants in their vocational choice of becoming psychoanalysts either personally (RP1, RP5) or through his writings (RP2, RP3, RP6, RP7, and RP9). In his life Jung was considered as the headmaster of his analytic psychology, and he is still influential 50 years after his death. Works of Jung and his followers, the Jungians, are getting more and more popular. In addition to this,

there is a so-called “oral tradition” that we cannot find in books, which goes back to Jung and is inherited through the chain of Jungian analysts. For instance, Jung’s famous approach to psychotherapy, he liked to address as “analyzing from the Self” (Haule, 2000, p. 255), that is nowhere to be found in the Collected Works. It is based on the reports from “what Jung’s close associates have to tell us about the meeting with him, how he influenced them, and what it was like to engage with him, Self-to-Self” (Haule, 2000, p. 255). In this section, I will discuss some of the questions concerning Jung’s legacy; how it is kept alive through the lineage of analysts and why it is important for my interview persons based on my research data.

The Jungian’s oral tradition. The Jungian’s oral tradition, as I proposed in one of my preliminary lenses, reminded me of similarities with the great spiritual traditions inasmuch the ultimate knowledge is inherited through the lineage of masters. Likewise, Patrul Rinpoche (1998) commented the essence of the Guru-yoga:

First you followed a supreme Master and obeyed him;
Then you practiced, undertaking great hardships;
Finally, your mind and your teacher’s became one and you inherited the lineage.
Peerless Teacher, at your feet I bow. (p. 309)

In the Guru-yoga everything is the master, who represents his master, his master’s master and Buddha’s wisdom based on an oral lineage, passed on from teacher to student over the centuries. Therefore, disciple, who is in love with the truth, looks for his or her master, devotes and services to him in order to obtain the master’s knowledge. Similarly, Jung’s person and his legend are also treated specifically; anecdotes about him and his extraordinary talents in working with patients are circulated among Jungians. As Haule (2000) concluded:

When we listen to the oral tradition wherein Jung’s disciples tell us of Jung’s greatness in being a conduit for the wisdom of the Great Man, we invariably identify with them in their transference projection” onto Jung as the Old Wise Man of Zurich. (p. 270)

We clearly see an idealization and adulation of Jung in his disciples' accounts. It was easy to idealize Jung, because—as we can reconstruct from memories and documents—he was a charismatic person with skills in influencing others. Mario Jacoby, for instance, in the interview with Robert and Janis Henderson (2008), reflected on the event, when he first saw Jung. Jacoby told this story:

And then came the day when the great master appeared. Everybody attending was in awe—even the great training analysts of the time (there were only a few) who were sitting there—and they seemed, to my astonishment, to be obviously quite tense, even afraid. . . . Jung's voice was already very hoarse and weak. Yet when he spoke, his presence filled the room. I felt that his charisma was such that there was no space left around him, and my critical side (which is always also present) wondered what effect this might have on someone in analysis with him. It surely could be an enormous inspiration, yet at the same time also a hindrance to his analysands in finding their own inner space. (as cited in R. Henderson & J. Henderson, 2008, p. 10)

Another Jungian analyst, Marvin Spiegelman described Jung as “He was everything that I had anticipated—vital, spontaneous, enormously informed, passionate—just like he appears in the films” (as cited in R. Henderson & J. Henderson, 2000, p. 22). In this same report, Spiegelman remembered this session with Jung as the highlight of his life and commented: “I had the experience, as have others, that he ‘spoke to my condition’ (as the Quakers say) and connected with my process and questions without my even asking” (as cited in R. Henderson & J. Henderson, 2000, p. 22)!

Analyzing from the Self. Jung was famous for his analytic presence, which easily brought his analysand into a deep, unconscious status or an altered state of mind. Jane Wheelwright (1982) spoke about a similar experience in her memories.

It was hard to going with Jung because, once in his presence, one felt as though all the surrounding matter had turned into whizzing molecules. Everything there seemed to be moving, melting, changing forms. Everything stirred. Reality blurred, conversation happened unplanned. I felt someone, not me, spoke through me and someone not Jung was speaking through him. There was also the feeling of being swept into depths of a

perilous, dangerous underworld but since Jung had descended into this strange world and emerged so could I. In his presence I did not register on the difference of our statures! An archetype had taken over? (p. 99)

The above reports from Jung's students help us to create a picture of Jung and to get some sense of his style, "analyzing from the Self." Jung often spoke of Self that each of us should possess within our psyche. It is distinct from the ego and unconscious, but can be experienced for each of us. To describe the Self, Jung employed metaphors as Haule (2000) commented:

Clearly "soul," "Great Man," and "Self" can be used interchangeably to refer to the unitary state experienced in an "analysis from the Self." Furthermore, this notion of a personified superior being which comes to presence between therapist and patient is no mere theoretical abstraction for Jung. For, as he told the students at the Zurich Institute: "If you take the unconscious intellectually, you are lost. It is not a conviction, not an assumption. It is *Presence*. It is a *fact*. It is there. It *happens*." (p. 260)

According to oral tradition, Jung's approaches to the Self was phenomenological and pragmatic, whereas Jung's writings were rather intellectual, as I previously discussed in the section *What Jungian Psychoanalysis Says About the Question of Self and the Analytic Third*.

Research participants experiences with Jung. A few of my research participants (RP1, RP5) knew Jung personally and recounted important memories. RP1 met three times with Jung and recalled these encounters as fortunate and influential events in his life that helped to form and to motivate him to become a Jungian analyst. He remembered:

It was very meaningful. I mean between the initial handshakes and then having tea with him and then having this hour with him where he was so direct with me, I said this man's tremendous. So I had archetypal guru transference on him. Although he did not like being a guru. He didn't, that didn't fit him. (RP1)

The most interesting of these occasions was, RP1 said, when he had an analytic hour with Jung. Strangely, he remembered nothing of what they had exactly talked, but what happened before and after the meeting, because, as he explained, he was hypnotized by Jung's "electrifying" presence and got into a kind of altered state at the first moment. This experience was somewhat

similar to others' experiences as well. When RP1 went to training analysis, he approached Joe Henderson, one of the few American analysts who were analyzed with Jung at that time. RP1 commented, "It was important for me to see somebody who had been analyzed by Jung. And that idea that I need to be touched, you know, see somebody who'd been touched by Jung personally." RP1 explained that Joe related to Jung with great respect, but differently and more independently than other first generation analysts, including RP1's parents, who normally developed a huge idealizing transference on Jung. RP1 was grateful to Joe for distancing him from that kind of idealization. Nevertheless, RP1's psyche held Jung, who became one of the important symbols of the Self in his analysis as he reported several dreams with Jung. In those dreams, Jung appeared as a kind of inner figure in helping RP1 to find himself in a larger way.

RP5 visited Jung's lectures and went to him for "blessing" at the end of his training. RP5 explained that for him as a Jewish person the blessing was profound, and he needed it particularly, just as he had received it from his grandfather when he had gone to the WWII. RP5 admitted that receiving Jung's blessing was spiritual, and also a kind of validation and support of his work that he felt important.

It came at the end of my training, where he acknowledged, "Yes, you are an analyst." And he's been in my dreams quite a lot, and he's present to me. So in a very supportive way, to going my own way, even when I didn't go with the Jungian collective. He was still with me, as was von Franz, who was my control analyst. She supported me too.
(RP5)

RP5 spoke about how Jung became a living reality for him. Sometimes, he experienced him in active imagination in a supportive way and occasionally in dreams. Jung was also helpful when RP5 was confused in searching his own analytic style, and became his model of being spontaneous and present in analytic sessions.

Idealizing Jung. After Jung's death those experiences of meeting or being in relationship with him became even more important and overvalued, naturally, for disciples and friends. As RP1 put in words: "He was great in his life and became even greater after his death." Especially the first generation Jungians, who were analyzed with Jung, then emigrated to the United States and became isolated, overtly idealized Jung" (RP1). It is much in accord with Jacoby's experience:

Today, I feel that the immensity of his personality might account very well for the kind of "missionary zeal" often found among the first generation of Jungians, together with their enormous idealization of him. (as cited in R. Henderson & J. Henderson, 2008, p. 11)

In comparison with the enormous idealization of the first generation Jungian analysts the next generation's experience with Jung was somehow different. For instance, although RP1 and RP5 knew Jung personally, they discussed memories and personal effects of Jung in self-reflecting, critical and more distanced way. By expressing their greatest respect and gratitude for Jung, they noticed Jung's human side and were open to speak about his errors and limitations as well. RP1 and RP5 idealized Jung less and they became more independent from his impact and also influenced by other Jungians, whose effects led them developing a more complex view of Jungian studies.

Jung's indirect influence. My other research participants (RP2, RP3, RP4, RP6, RP7, and RP9) did not meet with Jung in person, but have been influenced by reading Jung's works (RP2, RP6, and RP7) and most of all by oral tradition transferred through Jungian teachers and personal analysts (RP4, RP5, RP6, and RP7). For instance, RP6 explained how his Jungian identity has been shaped by his teachers, whose teacher was Jung by himself.

But Jung was always there. I mean so when I added the fourth person to my original three teachers . . . Jung was there behind Perry and Jung was a much more sort of human presence delivered by Joe Wheelwright. . . . So if in the sense Wheelwright was the grandfather and Sandner was the father, I mean, symbolically or in my lineage and I

suppose Jung was the great-grandfather, who you never meet in life, but it has enormous importance and presence. So I mean, this is all part of the synchronicity of me. (RP6)

From RP6's account we can measure how Jung and his direct disciples impacted him, as if he sometimes felt them present in his analytic room.

Likewise, RP5 talked about his Jungian ancestors from whom he learnt psychoanalysis. "Jung's pupils were first"—Meier, von Franz, Wheelwright, Henderson, Kirsch, and Zeller. "Those first-generation are ancestors to people like me of second-generation. So I had the benefit of working with them analytically, and they were so connected through Jung, but I also was directly with Jung" (RP5). RP5 compared the lineage of his analysts to the image of Eastern teachers often depicted by images of their own gurus and their guru's gurus behind them. They bow to, and respect, their traditions.

Jung was not a guru. Despite the idealizing transference and guru projections, which Jung disliked and harshly rejected (RP1, RP5), Jung was not a guru. In this context, RP5 told a story about Jung that he had heard from an analyst friend, Vasavada, the first Indian who received a diploma from the Zurich Institute.

And the story was, he went to Jung, and he threw himself on the floor. He was like a guru, because Vasavada had a guru in India. He himself was a guru in India later on. So he threw himself on the floor, and then Jung was embarrassed and lifted him up and said, "You know, Vasavada, you're a guru." (RP5)

When RP5 and Vasavada had discussed the incident they agreed that the guru carried the archetype of the Self, and "Jung's way was not that. His way was to help the individual find the Self within himself and to be as human and direct as possible, and as involved." Similarly, RP9 distinguished his respect and feelings he felt toward Jung from another kind of strong bond he experienced with his personal guru in India.

I am terribly indebted to Jung. I'm not indebted to him in the way I am to my guru. That's a different thing. I mean, Jung is for this lifetime, and my guru, of course, is for all

lifetimes. I mean, I'm sure this isn't the first lifetime that I have been his disciple. You know, and I'm not trying to claim anything here. I don't mean that. It's just that I don't see how I could have the feeling and devotion, and so forth, and loyalty to Paramahansa Yogananda if I had not some way or another known him before. (RP9)

According to my research participants, Jung was absolutely human, sometimes made mistakes and had limitations in his view (RP1, RP5, RP7, and RP9). RP9 commented:

I don't expect Jung to be perfect. Jung was not an avatar. He was a great man. He had some hang-ups with . . . really high states of consciousness that he didn't understand. . . . But, my God, what he made of himself, and what he brought to the rest of us, it just—it's unbelievable to me. And I, if anything—you see, that's really one of the reasons I would say, well, I don't feel like I left the Jungian path at all, because with my Jungian colleagues and so forth, I am more openly devoted to Jung than almost any of them. . . . And now I do I hope I've gone beyond him? Well, of course. He had awful limitations. I do too. But I have gone beyond his in some places, you know, and I can see some things that Jung didn't see. But I doubt that I would have seen them if he hadn't come along first.

On the one hand, RP9 acknowledged Jung's achievement in general, and was also grateful for Jung's inspiration and support in his spiritual development. On the other hand, he clearly saw Jung's shortsightedness and fear of the depth of the Eastern wisdom, which I discussed earlier, and was brave enough to follow his own path of exploring himself. This is the true Jungian way, not imitating, but following Jung's example of the modern man in search of a soul. Marvin Spiegelman said nicely about the importance of Jung and his heritage:

We are all lucky that our teacher led the way. He showed us, in words and example, what the psyche is really like and gave us the tools to get on with the work. The rest is up to us, individually. If we can extend this work, so much the better, but staying in connection with the Self, is our heritage and calling. (as cited in R. Henderson & J. Henderson, 2000, p. 32)

In summary, I collected my interviewees' experience with personal effects and idealization of Jung. Furthermore, I discussed the question of legitimacy in Jungian analysis to be compared with the lineage of masters in spiritual traditions. Jung's legacy is still important in

Jungian psychoanalysis and analysts are aware of his lineage. However, the significance of oral tradition is decreasing generation by generation. This is what I noticed during my elaboration of interview data, and because of this smooth change I decided to discuss this topic in a change lens. All in all, Jung inspired many of us, including my research participants and myself, and his heritage still impresses and invites many others to pursue their spiritual quest of self-knowing.

New Lenses

Variety of Techniques of Dealing With Archetypal Transference in the Research Participants' Practice

The archetypal transference is a subtle and idiosyncratic phenomenon, and as we learned, is hard to grasp and discern from other transferences in the analytic relationship. Accordingly, it requires the analysts to respond in their own authentic ways. Maybe this is why my research participants expressed peculiar experiences with the archetypal transference and also discussed the great variety of different methods and approaches they employed in their analytic practice.

In this section, I will comment on selected interview texts, clinical vignettes, thoughts, beliefs, and feelings of the interview persons concerning my research topic. My interview question: “What can we learn from the comparison of the guru-disciple and analyst-patient relationships for doing Jungian psychoanalysis?” aimed, initially, to open up space for hearing my research participants’ experiences and also possible clinical applications related to my topic. The responses reflected to the different analytic styles of the interview persons and also brought up new information, which I could not associate to any of my preliminary lenses of Cycle 1 or 2. Therefore, I decided to create a new lens for this data during Cycle 4. Despite the new and individual responses the interview texts obviously contain common traits of practicing Jungian psychoanalysis and, not surprisingly, show similarities with other statements of previous

sections. I hope that this collection of texts and the relating comments will shed new light on my research topic and may also help even the uninformed reader to create a more comprehensive view of Jungian psychoanalysis.

Guru transference and how to work with it in psychoanalysis. Concerning guru projection and how he deals with this archetypal transference in psychoanalysis, RP1 said: I know that I'm seen as a Wise Old Man by some of my patients . . . but I don't consciously think of myself as the wise old man." RP1 explained that he did not analyze such transferences particularly, if they were not necessary, and let them sit there. In that sense, RP1 drew parallel to Jung's example, who did not like to talk about the transference either, unless he had to.

To illustrate how this can work in his practice, RP1 spoke about his recent case with a young businessman. This patient was stressed out and overwhelmed by different expectations, and looked for direction in his life. Shortly after they started the treatment he developed an overtly positive transference for RP1, who concluded:

I advised him. I tried not to be too direct though. And I'm not, because one of the things I learned from being in analysis with Joe Henderson is that you let things happen . . . So in that sense, I'm a, like a father figure for him. I mean I don't call myself a wise old man. (RP1)

Dream analysis. Like this patient and with others as well, when one presents a dream, RP1 employs dream analysis, which that is also useful to process the archetypal transference. In our interview, RP1 summed up Jungian dream theory and also illustrated it by small vignettes. He distinguished the objective, subjective, and transference levels of possible interpretation:

The subjective level of interpretation is where every image in the dream is some aspect of the dreamer him or herself. The objective level of interpretation is where—Well, let's say I'm dreaming about X and she's doing something in the dream. It's, the primary meaning can well mean that I'm having some feelings. The dream is bringing up some, what I, unconscious feelings that I had about X that I didn't know about. And it's not about, and it's also internal. It's also about my anima. But it's also about some feeling about the

object, she being the object. Okay? Now a third level of interpretation is the transference level. Now the transference level is a combination of the subjective and the objective.
(RP1)

In a transference dream, for instance, as RP1 explained, the person of the analyst can appear both directly and indirectly. In both cases, the transference level of interpretation relates not to the person of the analyst, but to the whole analysis, and looks for a connection to the analysis that is less obvious. Therefore, from dream interpretation the analyst can learn a great deal about how the patient feels about their therapeutic relationship. However, RP1 also warned that the basic principle of Jungian dream analysis is that sometimes a dream should not be fully or definitively interpreted. Similarly, Beebe et al. (2001) commented:

The Jungian view is the meaning a dream is capable of bringing to a dreamer will change as the psychology of the individual unfolds in the course of analysis and development. Most Jungian analysts seek to preserve this healthy core of mystery to the dream, which they think has a certain energy that moves the psyche to develop over time. (p. 219)

Our discussion convinced me that RP1 is one of those Jungian analysts who consider dreams as a revelation of nature, images and interpretations of the unconscious that sometimes go beyond the scope of clinical treatment.

Sandplay therapy. RP2 has a long time affiliation and great expertise in sandplay therapy, which is one of the distinctively Jungian analytic methods developed by Dora Kalff. Briefly, in sandplay patient is given the possibility, by means of figures and the arrangement of the sand in the sandtray, to set up a world corresponding to his or her inner state. Then, the patient and analyst may interpret the “product” together. I interviewed RP2 about her sandplay session, whether she has worked with idealizing transference or wise person archetype. RP2 replied:

Well, first of all archetypes are not limited to personifications. What Jung called “individuation” is in a way an archetype. It’s a process and it takes many forms, but if you accept that such an archetype exists then you begin to see signs of its appearance or a series of sandtrays. Sometimes, sandtrays are more than dreams actually because they

seem more constructive in a way than most dreams do. Dreams seem to more evanescent, and they can, of course, have an impact on the psyche and set up a dialogue, internal dialogue, that can be transformative and move along the process of individuation. But I think it's somehow more immediate impact of a sandplay when it's done seriously, meaningfully.

In her answer, RP2 compared and contrasted the sandplay with dream analysis, and distinguished the sand world as a more concrete, visual, and tangible product of the psyche to be reflected in the analytic process. This trait makes sandplay like “dreaming by hands.”

RP2 presented a recent sandplay case, in which she worked with a young lady, who turned to psychotherapy shortly after death of her father. The patient was in deep grief, because she saw her father as the primary parent, the one who offered her secure guidance, the one that she identified with. On his death-bed her father told the patient all about his life, the family and their travels. They were from an Eastern European country, which the patient and her family had to flee at her age of 5, and after staying in many different countries for a while, they arrived in the United States eventually. I quote RP2 about her sandplay process:

Through all of that her father was the most stable person and she has openness to the spiritual dimension of the personality and sees somehow in the death of her father an opening to that archetype of the father, and does sandplay. And there are many manifestations of something that's transpersonal, of something that transcends it. I have a little magic wand, for example, this little plastic tube with glittery fluid in it, and she tends to work vertically in the sand from short end the long way, and so she put that at the very top edge of the sandtray and then had some other abstract figures at the top and as the sandtray progressed it became more related, water and ocean. And this is one of the most recent sandtrays that she made but there's a very definite archetypal theme in there. An appreciation and of openness to a kind of evocation through the sandplay of something of a larger dimension opening up for her with the death of her father which itself is an archetypal experience.

This session was about a definite archetypal theme, the image of Father that triggered both personal and archetypal transferences, which then were unfolded and interpreted in the analytic process between the analyst and patient. According to RP2, usually the sandtray shows how the

patient relates to his or her complexes and signs of the personal level of transferences, if there are any, which was made visible in the moment. However, this particular case, as RP2 commented, brought up a larger transference that was happening for the patient in the context of what they were doing. The process itself, namely connecting the individual to the archetypal, and thus relating to the wholeness through the archetypal transference, decreased the pain and brought healing to the patient. This example also teaches what an analyst may need to learn from the archetypal transference. RP2 commented it in her own words:

What can we learn? Well, I think it is humbling. We can be grateful for the opportunity occasionally to be part of a process that's larger than anything we could accomplish independently. And I think that would go for the analysand as well as the analyst. That there is a dimension of the interpersonal that is somewhat mystical and it transcends what we think of as immediate reality and comes close to touching on what is been described in various ways as being in metaphysical terms or mysticism or it's humbling because it invokes a kind of not knowing and acceptance and a kind of joy.

Being spiritual. For RP3 Jungian analytic work means a mutual kind of growing and spirituality. She considers the therapeutic relationship as configuration of the analytic vessel, in which analyst and client do a collaborative work, "not one higher than the other." She helps people to recognize what is meaningful to them, and in return she keeps learning from people through the analytic process and the Self.

I think the archetype of the Self or the wise person is really what inspires and deepens the work. So if we are sitting in a vessel where we are mutual workers in this alchemical process with the symbol of the Self being the energy that actually heals and deepens and puts us on the track of what we are here for. Because I think we all . . . come in with a sense of the numinous and come in with a sense that we have a soul. And so humans have worshipped forever and have worshipped such a variety of things. So the process of the Jungian vessel for me is that, that it is the psyche which is another word for soul, is the deeper work and to put a person on their own track, that is, to meet life authentically, to not have suppressed their suffering, but to incorporate it into who they are and to grow in compassion and to get a sense that their talents at the time that they come into the world that all of these impinges on choices to be made over and over again that shape who they are and will become and what we're here for. (RP3)

RP3 stated that spirituality is deeply rooted in the human nature, which statement reminded me of a quote: “We know that we are spiritual beings on a human path rather than human beings who may be on a spiritual path” (Bolen, 2007, p. 10). In this context, RP3’s explanation of Jungian analysis can be understood as a kind of mutual work and spiritual collaboration between the analyst and analysand, which foster spirituality and enhance the life as whole.

Similarly, RP5 approached Jungian psychoanalysis as one of his special spiritual practices. His attitude can be understood in the light of what he said in the previous sections concerning “his working style,” which was “to analyze from the Self.” RP5 commented:

This is, for me, holy work that I do. Every day and with every person, connecting to the Self, it’s a way. But also, I have other practices. I did 8 years of Reichian therapy, for example. And I was interested in magic, so I do a middle pillar meditation, which derives from Kabbalah, in my own origin. So I do that and a walk every day, a half-hour walk in which I do that meditation. And I’ve been doing that for 40 years. But my main spiritual practice is working with my own dreams and working—it’s my main spiritual practice.

Though his art of doing psychoanalysis was influenced by his formal Reichian training in psychotherapy, and applied symbolism and body techniques from the Kabbalah, the Jewish mystical system, he was mainly engaging with the Self in his analytic practice. Concerning the question of how he connected to the archetypal transference or to the Self, he said that he followed his teachers, C. A. Meier, his analyst, and C. G. Jung who had advised him:

The work of the analyst trying to connect and get connected inside the patient, after a while, you don’t know the content, what belongs to the patient and what belongs to the analyst. And that condition is very good for the evocation of the collective unconscious. You see, when the complexes are united and you don’t know who’s who, then the archetypal level comes in. (RP5)

When RP5 was concerned with the archetypal level in psychoanalysis, he usually worked from dreams, which reflected in some bodily symptoms or revealed symbolism. Through the

interpretations of the dream, he and the patient could be connected to the unconscious that was already archetypal. In RP5's own words:

The archetypal level appears in the dreams, and I make a comment. But I usually can tell by something that I've experienced. Like let's say, for example, I'll get bodily symptoms, and I'll say something about that, and usually the patient has had the same symptom, either at the moment or—so I know that there is this somatic unconscious that's connected, and that's already archetypal. Or I know from the symbolism in the dream. I'll say something about that, and it's evoked. And the clearest way, as I've said, is the subtle body. When that energy is evoked in my fingers and the hands or the body, then I say something. Then we say it. And sometimes it gets very intense, and that's when the archetypal level is activated.

In order to be more connected RP5 usually pays attention to managing the appropriate physical distance with the patient, and he is conscious of the process, what is going on between him and the patient. RP5 said: "It's psychological distance, you see. It's a flow. You're close and together, and then you're back and reflecting." RP5 also emphasized that regardless of any kind of techniques, the most important thing was to find his own best style: just to be present and responsive. He commented:

And then I remembered how Jung was with me. Jung is the model to being spontaneous and being present . . . You know, you don't hold back. You're totally present. But, of course, I have to deal with the transference thing, because this had impact into all that. (RP5)

As I heard RP5 proposed that the analyst's job is to keep his eyes on some basic rules of psychoanalysis: the analytic frame, work with transference and, otherwise, just to be connected and available for the mutual process of the unconscious.

Working in the archetypal field. RP4 considered psychotherapy as something archetypal. She talked about a matrix of transferences in which transference, countertransference, and archetypal transference can be hardly separated. RP4 stated:

Okay, a matrix. The culture contains us all the time . . . They all come as a unit. You wouldn't have a personal transference if it wasn't fueled by the archetypal layer of being human. And you can't be a human being if you don't live in a culture. You would die,

really. You know, you'd be all on your own out in the middle of the desert, as it were. So they're all together all the time.

In contrast to the conventional approach she rather thought about transference as a subtle, most often unconscious process involving both the analyst and patient, which bond them in the analytic relationship. Referring to Jung RP4 said:

Basically what he says is, you know, the patient comes in and starts to talk to you about whatever troubles him, and fairly quickly this result in the patient having emotional experiences in relation to you, and you become important to him. In the same way, he becomes important to me because he's telling me things that are not normally told and he's telling me about his suffering, and it touches into my suffering, whatever that is.

To illustrate how transference may appear in the analytic relationship, RP4 talked about her analytic session with a man whom she has been seeing for a while. This man came to analysis because he could not really feel his grief following his oldest son's death a few years ago. In that particular hour the patient talked about some of his disappointments and being distressed by his other living children and then went into silence. After a while, RP4 did not know why, but she, the analyst started to cry. And the whole hour they just sat there and nothing happened other than her crying. RP4 commented:

Well, he was trying to tell me about his grief that he can't fully feel and I got it unconsciously, and it very much touched—I mean when I was crying, I was thinking of difficulties with my son and grandson, but it was for his difficulties with his dead son.

RP4 explained that she knew on a feeling level what the patient meant about his grief of this dead young man, which moved something in her unconsciously and made her feel a countertransference reaction.

When I asked RP4 about experiencing the Self in psychoanalysis, she could not recall any special situation other than her strong analytic relationship with the patient. In her own words:

I think that the more often you meet with your patient, the more the heat is turned up and the more intense the experience that the Self will be. But just meeting more often won't

do it. It really is just a question of being available. And, you know, sometimes it won't happen. Sometimes it just won't. And I don't think that that's—the only thing you might be doing wrong is talking too much. Not leaving enough space. But other than that, we don't have any control. (RP4)

Being relational. When I asked RP6 about his analytic experiences, he told that he learned Jungian psychoanalysis in Joe Wheelwright's style.

He meant that within the therapeutic relationship, there can be a sense of friendship and relatedness . . . You practice relatedness and relationship and attunement to the patient and their suffering and you just put forth your own best therapeutic self. (RP6)

RP6 explained that, of course, there were theories and rules to be followed in psychoanalysis; however, for him doing analysis was something essentially practical and all about the relationship with the patient. He described his work as an analyst:

I'm always just receiving and participating in what emerges in that unique one-to-one relationship and everyone is completely and utterly different. And that's the beauty of it because I think . . . that's where the Self is. (RP6)

According to RP6, psychoanalysis is based on archetypal transference generated by this unique one-to-one relationship of two persons, in which the Self is evoked and both the analyst and analysand find their ways. This is what he learned from Jung and his analyst teachers, Joe Wheelwright and Don Sandner. He confessed:

That's why I love—if I only could read 20 pages of Jung's collected works for over and over again, it would be the Introduction to *The Psychology of the Transference* . . . that's where he talks about this pioneer work, this absolutely unique meeting of the two individuals in conscious and unconscious. And that's what transference is to Jung. (RP6)

RP6, normally experienced and worked with transference as it emerged in the analytic relationship, and could not tell which one was the personal, cultural or archetypal part of it. He surmised that the different levels of transference are enmeshed and interwoven with each other and cannot usually be distinguished. "I think as you live them out, rarely are they, at least for me, distinguished. They are all just in the flow of the experience of the relationship." However, RP6

accepts the analytic relationship, fundamentally, as archetypal and that is why he lets the Self work in the analysis. He commented:

Then, you know, the other thing about the archetypal is . . . *Vocatus* or . . . *Non Vocatus*, called or not called it's always there. So I don't particularly worry about it or look for it unless somehow for the other person it emerges as something—I think the main way it would emerge is as a problem where there's some discrepancy to the personal and what they need for the archetypal. (RP6)

Here RP6 referred to the famous inscription Jung had carved above the door of his house in Kusnacht, Switzerland: “*Vocatus Atque Non Vocatus Deus Aderit*,” which reads in English: “Called or not called, the God will be there.” Jung took this sentence from one of the Latin writings of Erasmus, but this was a Delphic oracle originally. Jung put the inscription there to remind his patients and himself of the true nature of psychoanalysis. It suggests: Yes, the God always manifests, but no one knows in what form and to what purpose. Holding the notion of the Self, RP6 admitted that he was especially careful of the archetypal transference, when the patient's personal issue and his or her archetypal needs would be conflicted with each other. In this case, he usually attempts to understand and also helps the patient understand what she or he can learn from the Self for his or her better.

Being emotional. RP7 agreed with other research participants that it is hard to differentiate various transferences in psychoanalysis, and shared some of his clinical experiences, where the archetypal level of transference came through the cultural to the personal level as well. RP7 stated:

Seeing those levels even if you're not interpreting them with those names, but just the fact that you can reflect with somebody that their personal issue they're wrestling with may have familial and multi generational issues that go back is enormously relieving.

His case studies, which the interested reader can find in the edited interviews, exemplify that “respecting the truth of those experiences” of the patient, even if the analyst does not interpret

them, strengthens the healing and potency of the archetype. As an analyst, he attempted “to be open to the validity of someone’s spiritual experience.” In more difficult cases, RP7 confessed, he did not even know rationally what those experiences meant but knew they were meaningful and important to the patient. RP7 usually focuses on what the patient says, listens, and allows the patient and himself to elaborate those feelings that emerge. However, his attitude differs from being in the position of someone who knows and tells the patient what the patient should experience or think. RP7 commented:

But, I think, there’s a way to relate to those things as an interested maybe knowledgeable onlooker, as an analyst, which is different than the role of a guru who knows . . . I think you might say it just in a slightly different way. You could say it seems to me that this practice is not right. Whereas, the Zen master or guru might say, don’t do this, do that. And I don’t feel I have the knowledge or authority to speak to people that way. And I also think as a westerner we value autonomy and independence and other people’s right to do what they’re going to do in a different way than a lot of Asian cultures. I think the role of authority is quite different. So that maybe one of the big differences between the guru and the analyst.

Essentially, RP7 expressed that this discrepancy of attitudes made the major difference between the analyst and guru. About his own “analytic style,” RP7 told me that he avoids too much interpretation because it goes to the patients’ intellect and abandons something important in the emotional realm, which often, based on his clinical experiences, are less developed part of his patients. He explained:

I think, it’s poison to interpret too much with the people like that. You tell them this is the problem that’s why you’re feeling this and they’re still in their head. So, I think, it’s much more important to understand what they’re saying. But as much as possible stay in an emotional field with them and rather than making intellectual interpretations. (RP7)

In RP7’s opinion, psychoanalysis should be an affect-based relationship between analyst and analysand, a kind of emotional attunement to each other, rather than an intellectual discourse. He admitted that his beliefs have been influenced by the inter-subjective and relational analyses,

which now seem to be the main movements in other analytically oriented psychotherapies as well.

Meditation and psychoanalysis. Concerning meditation and psychoanalysis I learned from RP7 that he, in his youth, was immersed in Sri Aurobindo's yoga, which included *Hatha Yoga* and also meditation practice, which he continues practicing today. Although he never intended to combine his spiritual practices into the analytic work, RP7 reported that his knowledge of meditation was beneficial for him in many ways. First of all, the regular exercise helps keep him sane and be more focused in the sessions. "I think a lot of both doing analysis and practicing yoga is about consciousness and about having a steady consciousness, having a resiliency, a solid witness that can stay present." He meant, for instance, that if an analyst conducts *Vipassana* practices on his or her own, it will also sharpen his or her listening ability in the analytic hour. Those practices can also be useful with some patients who have anxiety disorder, depression or some neurotic symptoms and are interested in learning them. Once at the Jung Institute, RP7 also offered seminars for candidate groups on mindfulness meditation as a way to foster their active listening and other analytic skills. RP7 normally does not combine meditation into his analytic practice, however, there are some exceptions:

Occasionally—I used to meditate with my—my second analyst was Don Sandner and I used to meditate with him sometimes if I was rushed or agitated or something and I came into a session we would meditate together. I've, over the years, had a few patients who have asked to do that but they're people who are already meditating on their own. And I don't offer it or initiate it, but if somebody wants to I'm certainly happy to do that. And I've had people ask me to teach them some simple meditation practice to help with anxiety or sleep disorders or things like that. If somebody asks me, I'll talk about it. (RP7)

Religious practices and psychoanalysis. RP9 shared some of his experiences concerning the similarities and differences between the guru-disciple and the analyst-analysand relationships. They are obviously different, but they also do overlap in some traits, as RP9

recounted, for instance, through the archetypal transference. Concerning the relevance of archetypal transference in his analytic work, RP9 expressed his trust in the guidance of the unconscious. He is not simply paying attention to the unconscious, as other Jungian analysts would do, but RP9 also says a prayer before his sessions, whenever it is possible, to invoke the spirit world and to create space for healing. In his own words:

I want to know what's going on in that person's unconscious, because the guidance comes from there. And, it's like Jung—and as you know, Jung had over the entry into his office, "Invited or not, God is always present." And the only thing I would add is, "But better invited." And I would never sit down with a client—I wouldn't say this to everybody, believe me, but I can say it to you—without praying first. Not that I pray openly to the person or in front of the person, but just inside, say, "Okay, Master, I don't know what's going on here. I don't have any power," because I don't, "But you do. Please help me." (RP9)

Here RP9 also referred to Jung's famous inscription, which we discussed a few paragraphs earlier. RP9 said that he would like to know what is going on in the patient's unconscious and to be there fully with his own conscious and unconscious capacities. However, he does not have knowledge, and ultimately the healing comes from the unconscious. RP9 is aware that his healing is not from him, but, as he stated, the work of his Master that reveals itself through his unconscious.

In conclusion, I learned a variety of techniques for doing Jungian analysis, and almost as many different styles and approaches as many analysts I interviewed. However, all my research participants agreed on the significance of the archetypal transference, and respected, trusted, and worked with the unconscious of both the patient and themselves in the analytic process.

Experiencing Myself as a Wounded Researcher Is the Hidden Source of Intuition During the Research Process

Again and again, I ask myself what made me believe in and work on this project, which spanned, with several breaks, the past 20 years from the first inspiration through accomplishing it

in this dissertation. I found the answer as I recognized my unconscious complexes around the research topic and discovered the “wounded researcher” in myself along the research process. In this section I am going to discuss the pathway that led me from a youthful wound to my research interests that became the hidden source of my intuition, as I understood only in retrospect.

According to Anderson’s (2011a), experiences in supervising doctoral researches it is not unusual “that a researcher’s intuitive style tends to settle along the fault lines or wounds in the personality of the researcher in a manner akin to the concept of the wounded healer in religious, spiritual, and shamanic circles” (p. 248). The notion of the “wounded healer” dates back to antiquity, as seen for instance in Kerényi (1960) discussion of Asklepios’ myth in Greek mythology. However, first Jung (1966a) coined the term to describe this archetype of healer. He stated:

We could say, without too much exaggeration, that a good half of every treatment that probes at all deeply consists in the doctor’s examining himself, for only what he can put right in himself can he hope to put right in the patient. It is no loss, either, if he feels that the patient is hitting him, or even scoring off him: it is his own hurt that gives the measure of his power to heal. This and nothing else, is the meaning of the Greek myth of the wounded physician. (Jung, 1966a, p. 116)

Jung believed that wounding of the soul could be the best possible form of training for a physician, who will thus be more sensitive to the patients’ suffering and treat them most effectively. The archetype of the wounded healer refers to the healing powers born by going through our wounds, as opposed to getting stuck in and endlessly recreating our trauma. Jungian analyst Adolf Guggenbühl-Craig (1976) explained the healing process between the healer-physician and the wounded patient that is actually triggered by the physician’s own wound. Furthermore, the healing is a two way interaction between them, because the patient treated by the doctor will also be instrumental in the doctor’s own healing. Thus, the analytic encounter can be transforming and creative for both the analyst and patient. Another Jungian author, David

Sedgwick (1994) also concluded that the analyst's involvement and countertransference reactions in the analytic process are based on the analyst's own experience of being wounded. There are further Jungian and non-Jungian authors on this topic, for instance, as Anderson (2011a) mentioned, the Catholic priest and contemplative Henri Nouwen (1979) and Buddhist Roshi Joan Halifax (1983). For them "our human wounds are sites of both suffering and hospitality to the divine" (Anderson, 2011a, p. 26). Spiritually, these injuries can open us "to the world, enabling personal and research explorations . . . to invite change that transforms these wounds to sources of inspiration for others" (Anderson, 2011a, p. 26).

Similarly, Robert Romanyshyn (2007) proposed in *The Wounded Researcher* that the researcher may delve "into his or her unconscious complexes, which he or she then strives to make conscious" (p. 108) in order to progress even in scientific research. From this perspective, "re-search" is a spiritual work because it is as if the researcher's soul mediates between the past and the future, and between the individual and the collective. Romanyshyn (2007) described this process:

The work that the researcher is called to do makes sense of the researcher as much as he or she makes sense of it. Indeed, before we understand the work we do, it stands under us. Research as a vocation, then, puts one in service to those unfinished stories that weight down upon us individually and collectively as the wait and weight of history. As a vocation, research is what the work indicates. It is re-search, a searching again of what has already made its claim upon us and is making its claim upon the future. (p. 113)

In Romanyshyn's view, this is how the wounded healer myth is reborn in the researcher's individual life through his or her wound and inviting soul into writing research (Anderson, 2011a, 2011b). One could claim there is a parallel between research and psychotherapy, however, Romanyshyn was clear on their differences as well. As Susan Rowland (2007) reviewed and commented *The Wounded Researcher*, the disease of the soul is treated differently;

in psychotherapy the soul is going to free the patient from suffering whereas in research the work will be “ensouled” (Rowland, 2007, p. 2) and freed from the researcher’s person. She wrote:

While therapy seeks out the healing and playful qualities of the soul for the sake of the patient, re-search must be a process of self-immersion and detaching, with an emphasis on the detaching—for here it is the work that must live. (Rowland, 2007, p. 2)

From the perspective of my research something similar has happened to me, which I vaguely felt at the beginning, and can completely reconstruct only now as I approach the end of my research project. Although I became aware that the relevance of my research topic was a personal one early on, I recognized myself as a wounded researcher with the help of the research process and only recently.

As I mentioned in the Introduction, in my late adolescence when I started studying Eastern philosophy, I experienced a lot of confusion when my worldview, based on Protestant-Christian religious education and my studies of Western philosophy, collapsed. I yearned for, and was looking for, a spiritual teacher, but could not find one. However, I did find C. G. Jung’s writings, which inspired my psychological and Tibetan Buddhist studies. When I was working on my Master’s dissertation, a translation and interpretation of a Tibetan scripture, I became aware of the similarities between the guru–disciple relationship and the therapist–patient relationship in psychotherapy. At that time, I think I was too immature to completely cover the topic for many reasons, mostly because of missing first hand experiences with psychoanalysis. However, the seeds were sown and have been growing in me, and a lot of things happened until these seeds became ripened. 20 years later I turned to this idea again and have researched it for my Ph.D. dissertation.

For a long time I did not even have an idea that there must have been something deeper and more personal behind my pure intellectual interest in the topic. First, I started thinking of this

possibility on our Proposal Meeting, when Greg Bogart, one of my committee members, kept asking about my motivation in the subject and any possible personal wound around the topic of the guru-disciple relationship; however, I could not answer his questions. It was only later, when my personal analysis and interviews with my research participants helped me to realize and to articulate, that indeed, I was attached to this topic deeply in my soul through a repressed old story, a personal wound with my grandfather.

To tell my long story short let me start with this. I was born into a Protestant family that produced numbers of ministers and other religious persons who used to work for the church through many generations, until my parents' generation. At that time, in my country the Socialist government oppressed any kind of religious and spiritual practices and believers were ostracized. Accordingly, my parents did not keep their faith, did not go to church and did not even talk about religion due to the pressure of the reigning political and social climate. There was one exception, when we went to see my grandfather who served as Protestant minister in a small village, where all of us including our parents, went to the church. As kids my brother and I regularly spent school breaks in Eastern and summer time in the grandparents' house. I recalled my memories about him and our relationship in one of my analytic sessions followed by taking notes. My journal entry said:

When I was in my teenager age, I was a problematic child and became a runaway child. At that time, I left my parental house and I got only correspondence with my grandfather, so he was the only contact with my relatives. Actually, I saw him as a wise man. As a young child, at the age of 4 or 5, when I first entered into his church, I saw him as a great man who was standing above the audience. His loud voice is still in my ears. I saw him, you know, like a god, I would say. He introduced the Holy Bible to me that was one of my first readings, and taught me. Later, when I grew up we pursued religious talks regularly, which made me feel like very honored and blessed. When my faith has collapsed in the Christian religion, because I got too many questions unanswered by the Bible, and I asked my grandfather, you know, about those questions, we got very interesting philosophical conversations. I remember that time I might've been around 18

or 19 years old I also read *Bhagavad Gita* first. That was a kind of magic, when I found long awaited answers to my questions and my interests turned to the Eastern philosophies. So, all in all, I got only correspondence with my grandfather, and it turned out that he reported about me and our relationship to my parents. That was a kind of betrayal, which changed everything in our relationship. Although roughly a year later I normalized my situation with my parents, I could never feel the same for my grandfather and I lost my trust in him.

My childish adoration and honesty for my grandfather ended because I felt cheated by him at the time, when I needed his help and good advice. He was the only one to whom I could turn and also a servant of God who I expected to answer my questions. This unhealed wound contributed to losing my faith in the Christian religion, which deepened my huge disappointment, alienation and confusion. Maybe this religious complex brought me to pursuing the guru issue. I have been looking for guru all in my life ever since then, and could not find one, probably because I lost my trust in any kind of (religious) authority as a consequence of this trauma. However, I found Jung's writings eventually, and Jung became a kind of internal guru who guided me in my religious quest. Jung not only helped me to understand Eastern philosophy in a different way, but inspired me to follow a new path of Jungian psychology in pursuing my spiritual interests. As a matter of fact, since I have been doing analysis with my current Jungian analyst I stopped searching for a guru, because received something meaningful for my Self. Or, perhaps, this was a way I, unconsciously, was facilitated to uncover and comprehend this complex that led me into Jungian psychoanalysis eventually. Thereafter, my Jungian studies and analytic experiences provided opportunity and framework to revisit my research topic, the "guru search," on a new level. This is how my trauma is related to the ground of my research study and gives the source of intuition for my research process.

From the perspective of my present research I find it interesting how the personal-, cultural- and archetypal layers of the psyche are interrelated with each other and enmeshed in my

own case. As a young man, because of my troubled relationship with my father, I was partly looking for a father in my grandfather, but I was also partly looking for God. This was the archetypal part in me that intuitively or unselfconsciously walked this path. Actually, I returned to the legacy of my ancestors, who were all spiritual persons. My father denied his spiritual heritage because of the socialist *Zeitgeist* that attempted to repress all religious activities. This is how the history, politics and social life, which usually influence one's life, could become important in my personal life as well. From this perspective, my birth can be understood as a continuation or incarnation of the old spiritual tradition of my ancestors, conflicted by my father and the environment at that time. If I think back in a general kind of social way, I was alienated from my parents and their ordinary culture, and part of my psyche, its transpersonal dimension, allowed me to keep moving, finding a culture where it could belong.

In the context of the “wounded researcher” theory, my “re-search” was, indeed, a searching again for the guru whom I could not find in my life so far. I found a hurt young man in my soul who once hit the road in search of healing the loss of trust in his guru-grandfather. My youthful trauma drove me unconsciously to find my way to Jungian psychology and to heal the wound through my psychoanalysis. Now, as I am approaching the end of my journey, I find some relief and the sincerity of what I have done in this research, which helped me to make conscious this process and to understand the nature of my “guru search” as an organic expression of the wisdom of my psyche.

Summary

Having explored the archetypal transference in Jungian psychoanalysis, the data have shown that this experience involves both the analyst and analysand in a mutual process grounded in the archetypal field. Findings suggest that archetypal transference can be hard to distinguish

from other transferences; however, it is inevitably present in the analytic relationship and serves the psychological and spiritual growth of both the analyst and patient.

Besides many differences, in some instances analytic relationship resembles the archetypal image of master and disciple relationship, which works as a vehicle of spiritual development crossing different times and cultures in the history of mankind. What can future analysts learn from gurus? One of the most important recommendations (inherited through the chain of Jungian analysts) is that the analyst has not to react on the guru transference but just needs to tolerate it, and to give his or her best self in the relationship with the patient. If the analyst rejects the transference, he or she will either lose the patient or an opportunity for the healing force of transformation. If the analyst inflates upon the idealizing transference, then he or she will experience its negative side, as we saw the destructive force of the guru's shadow. Therefore, it is wise for every analyst to take part in training analysis, where one can experience and learn the unconscious processes of the analytic relationship on one's own prior to seeing patient in psychoanalysis. On the other side, what can patients learn from disciples? To avoid any failure and mismatch in the future, one has to select his or her analyst carefully. One may or may not to develop an idealizing transference, but one can establish a "good enough" analytic relationship. Thereafter, a patient needs to trust the analytic process that ultimately ignites and fosters the healing force of the patient's own unconscious.

My research study gathered and distilled empirical data on this topic that may broaden our knowledge about the theory of the archetypal foundations of the analytic process in psychotherapy. Bringing awareness to its existence and understanding this process may help healing professionals to work more effectively with patients and support them in their healing and spiritual development, which are often one and the same.

I acknowledge the way in which the topic of my dissertation changed and expanded in the course of the research process, and led me to delve into the theory and practice of Jungian psychoanalysis. This paper embraces the richness of Jungian studies from comparing and contrasting the analytic psychology to the different approaches of other analytical schools through the comprehensive understanding of the main Jungian concept: “The archetypal reality of human psyche,” including the contemporary Jungian perspective, to discussing the clinical applications and introducing the variety of Jungian techniques and practices in psychoanalysis.

My study also showed the transpersonal aspect of Jungian psychoanalysis through discussion of questions of the Self and spirituality in Jungian context, and pays tribute to Jung’s tremendous contribution to the transpersonal psychology. This research is a transpersonal endeavor as it has developed more insights into the nature of an interesting transformational experience, incorporated cross-cultural comparison of ways of knowing and addressed spiritual wisdom and experiences that serve healing and self-development.

My research study employed intuitive inquiry, and may contribute to the development of this research method through sharing experiences, but also may add some nuances to the methodology. As Anderson (2011a, 2011b) and other intuitive inquiry researchers suggested the nature of this method includes the potential of change. Intuitive inquiry is a participatory method which may change the researcher, the research participants, the research findings transforming through the research process, and the reader; however, the method itself can also be changed. This gives a freedom for the researcher to try new solution and modify the methodology as Esbjörn did with her system of *seed*, *change*, and *new lenses*. During my inquiry process, a fourth type of lenses emerged, which I named *dark lens* and add to her system as a small innovation.

Furthermore, I hope that I could articulate my own transformation through this research process in a way that the future reader can follow and resonate with. I also invite readers to respond to the original data (transcripts) and my final Cycle 4 lenses (interpretations) using Resonance and Efficacy validity, and to think about the potential of their own transformation.

Delimitations and Limitations

This study is delimited by its scope, the nature of the topic, and the research participants as well as the circumstances of data gathering. Given the fact that the experience of archetypal transference was interpreted and understood exclusively in Jungian analytical psychology, I included only Jungian psychoanalysts among the research participants, and disregarded other professionals of different therapeutic orientations. All my participants live and work in the United States, most of them from the San Francisco Bay Area; thus, my study was comprised of a relatively homogenous socioeconomic group with similar interests. Due to my own geographical limitations, and difficulties in traveling, the execution of the research was somehow challenging. I, therefore, was not able to increase the number and diversity of the research population outside the delimited group I solicited.

The primary limitation of the study is related to the small size of the sample. However, I am convinced that the careful selection of the participants, their in-depth contributions, and the intuitive inquiry resulted in rich and subtle data to interpret.

Other limitations could be regarding the credibility and transferability of the study. To handle this issue I proposed Resonance validity and Efficacy validity methods as I have described in the section of *Internal and External Validity*. Unfortunately these conditions have been fulfilled only partially during the research process. I received feedback from each research participant after reading their own transcribed interview text, I took notes about my own

resonances and managed a notebook of the process, and also learned the resonances of my Chair and committee members through our correspondences and meetings. However, I could not measure the sympathetic resonances in other, more precise ways (e.g., a resonance panel).

Finally, the selected research methodology also imposed some limitations. Intuitive inquiry is inevitably subjective, which was both a limitation and an opportunity for my research study. Because I, as the researcher, could only see through such lenses, which I was created on the basis of my own experiences, I could not tell anything about something what was outside my perspectives. However, while I accept this subjectivity as a possible limitation in the method, I believe along with Anderson (2011a, 2011b), Esbjörn (2003) and other intuitive inquirers that virtually all modes of knowing are subjective. Furthermore, this subjectivity of the method was also a gift because it allowed me to delve into the richness of data, provided high level of reflectivity and a new dimension of interpretations through intuition. Anderson (2011a, 2011b) was right when she wrote that intuitive inquiry was not an easy path to walk on, as sometimes one could not see what was next. Indeed, this methodology many times required my discipline, intuition and trust in the process. All in all, I believe that I could meet these challenges, and that the intuitive inquiry was especially helpful to unfold and learn more about the experience of archetypal transference.

Suggestions for Future Research

For future research, I recommend to develop some aspects of this research study, which I meant as delimitations and limitations in the previous section. First of all, it would be interesting to continue interviews and broadening the scope of research population in terms of size, location and analytical orientation of the participants. I am wondering whether involving more Jungian and also non-Jungian psychoanalysts, possibly from European, Asian, and other countries than

the U.S. would produce a richer and larger variety of data to process and/or to change my present research findings. The cultural context of my research topic, the archetypal nature of the analytic relationship and its manifestation in psychotherapy also raise intriguing questions as the Jungian psychology is spreading around the world. Interestingly enough, while Jungian analysis is stagnating in the developed countries, recently the fastest development of the Jungian movement is happening in China, India, Eastern and Central Europe, and the former Soviet countries. Future research might explore the effects of different cultural complexes in archetypal transference.

Concerning the limitations of the credibility and transferability of this study I propose to employ resonance panel in future research, which can measure the sympathetic resonances of research participants in more precise ways, thus, increases the validity of research data. Phelon (2001) reviewed a few examples of possible arrangement of resonance panel. In one example the researcher gathered and distilled data from a group of research participants and, thereafter, organized a resonance group from other research participants who reviewed the data. The resonance occurred between two different groups and confirmed the research findings. In the other example the researcher used a resonance panel to lend consensual validity to the data generated in her study. She presented her research findings to a panel of research participants and facilitated a group discussion about these topics. Participants' experiences of resonance provided secondary data which the researcher could compare to her own data and helped her to confirm or disconfirm the outcomes of the study. Finally, Phelon (2001) employed a research design in which two resonance groups worked parallel with same research agenda. In processing data four resonators helped the researcher to assess the participants' resonance and observations coming

from the group meetings. Future researchers may also consider employing a resonance panel when designing their research processes.

Intuitive inquiry is a full hermeneutical circles (as it is described in Chapter 3: Research Methods) in which the inward arc of the first two cycles generates assumptions and questions for the research; whereas, the other three cycles construct the return arc of the research. The third cycle gives the research, from the research design through conducting the research to the collection and presentation of data, the fourth cycle is about data distillation, and finally the fifth cycle integrates the research findings and the whole research. In reality, the research process is not linear, but spiraling across the cycles as a specialty of the research method as Anderson (2011a, 2011b) also mentioned. This challenge needs flexibility and discipline from the researcher. For me it was helpful that I wrote a research journal from the beginning, and when I was stuck I could track back my own process, and restart where I finished. For future researchers I recommend following and registering their internal process in any forms, because this can be useful for them as well.

The official process of writing a dissertation created another challenge for my research process, because they sometimes conflicted. For instance, I chose the research method after completing my ITP Doctoral Qualifying Paper (DQP), which means that I had finished the first two cycles (in terms of intuitive inquiry: the selection topic and the literature review) before I would have known anything about the intuitive inquiry. Naturally, as soon I started writing my proposal, I revisited and revised my literature review from the intuitive inquiry's perspective.

In return arc of the inquiry, when research process shifts from projecting to evaluating of data the researcher's subjectivity often means a limited perspective of assessment. I also struggled with this challenge while I was modifying, expanding and clarifying my lenses in

Cycle 4. The interference of different cycles caused difficulties when I was writing my discussion chapter (Chapter 5). It was, sometimes, hard to separate the data presentation (voice of the research participants) and the researcher's interpretation (my own voice), and to integrate with the findings of the literature review (other researchers' voice). In both cases hearing feedbacks from my Chair and other committee members regularly helped me cope with obstacles. However, I propose that application of outside source, employing outside reader and/or resonator at some points of the process may provide further support in controlling the risk of the researcher's subjectivity.

There are other suggestions, which I can also offer for future research topics. Although my research study addressed interesting questions I could not discuss each of them in details due to lack of sufficient data or being out of scope of my main topic. For instance, the issues of transmission, surrender, shadow, and their role and dynamism in the analytic culture vs. the spiritual traditions would also be worth of future study.

Participants of this study and several authors discussed the question of spirituality in Jungian psychoanalysis, and proposed that healing happens through the unconscious and evolving of the Self. However, many questions left open regarding the topic, including the correlation of Self and the analytic third in psychoanalysis. Future research might be interesting to explore and to clarify these elements.

Moreover, although I discussed the possible clinical applications of the archetypal transference in the analytic work with borderline patients to some extent, future study and application of my findings could continue to expand on the possibilities embedded in this paper.

References

- Anderson, R. (1998). Intuitive inquiry: A transpersonal approach. In W. Braud & R. Anderson (Eds.), *Transpersonal research methods for the social sciences: Honoring human experience* (pp. 69-94). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Anderson, R. (2004). Intuitive inquiry: An epistemology of the heart for scientific inquiry. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 32(4), 307-341.
- Anderson, R. (2007). *Thematic content analysis (TCA): Descriptive presentation of qualitative data*. Retrieved May 10, 2010, from <http://www.wellknowingconsulting.org/publications/articles.html>
- Anderson, R. (2011a). Intuitive inquiry: Exploring the mirroring discourse of disease. In F. J. Wertz, K. Charmaz, L. M. McMullen, R. Josselson, R. Anderson, & E. McSpadden (Eds.), *Five ways of doing qualitative analysis: Phenomenological psychology, grounded theory, discourse analysis, narrative research, and intuitive inquiry* (pp. 243-276). New York: Guilford Press.
- Anderson, R. (2011b). Intuitive inquiry: The ways of the heart in human science research. In R. Anderson & W. Braud (Eds.), *Transforming self and others through research: Transpersonal research methods and skills for the human sciences and humanities* (pp. 15-70). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Anderson, R., & Braud, W. (2007). *Transpersonal research from a global perspective*. Unpublished manuscript, Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, Palo Alto, CA.
- Assagioli, R. (1961). *Self realization and psychological disturbances*. Greenville, DE: Psychosynthesis Foundation.
- Avalon, A. (1960). *Principles of tantra*. Madras, India: Ganesh & Company.
- Barks, C. (1995). *The essential Rumi*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Beebe, J. (1988). Primary ambivalence toward the self: Its nature and treatment. In N. Schwartz-Salant & M. Stein (Eds.), *The borderline personality in analysis* (pp. 97-129). Wilmette, IL: Chiron.
- Beebe, J., Cambrey, J., & Kirsch, T. (2001). What Freudians can learn from Jung. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 18(2), 213-242.
- Bennett, E. A. (1971). *What Jung really said*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Berzin, A. (2000). *Relating to a spiritual teacher: Building a healthy relationship*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion.

- Bhagavad Gita, The (1962). *Translated from the Sanskrit with an introduction by Juan Mascaro*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- Bogart, G. (1991). Meditation and psychotherapy. A review of the literature. *The American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 45(3), 383-412.
- Bogart, G. (1992). Separating from a spiritual teacher. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 24(1), 1-21.
- Bogart, G. (1997). *The nine stages of spiritual apprenticeship. Understanding the student-teacher relationship*. Berkeley, CA: Dawn Mountain Press.
- Bolen, J. S. (2007). *Close to the bone. Life-threatening illness as a soul journey*. San Francisco: Conari Press.
- Campbell, J. (2002). *The inner reaches of outer space: Metaphor as myth and as religion*. Novato, CA: New World Library.
- Campbell, J. (2008). *The hero with a thousand faces*. Novato, CA: New World Library.
- Carter, L. (2010). Countertransference and intersubjectivity. In M. Stein (Ed.), *Jungian psychoanalysis. Working in the spirit of C. G. Jung* (pp. 201-212). Chicago: Open Court.
- Clarke, J. J. (1994). *Jung and eastern thought: A dialogue with the orient*. New York: Routledge.
- Corbett, L. (1989). Kohut and Jung: A comparison of theory and practice. In D. W. Detrick & S. B. Dentruck (Eds.), *Self psychology: Comparisons and contrasts* (pp. 189-208). Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.
- Cortright, B. (1997). *Psychotherapy and spirit. Theory and practice in transpersonal psychotherapy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Coukoulis, P. (1976). *Guru, psychotherapist, self: A comparative study of the guru-disciple relationship and the Jungian analytic process*. Marina Del Rey, CA: DeVorss & Company.
- Dalai Lama. (2003). Foreword. Choosing a guru. In R. Mehrotra (Ed.), *The mind of the guru. Conversations with spiritual masters* (pp. ix-x). New Delhi, India: Penguin Books.
- Daniels, M. (2005). *Shadow, self, spirit. Essays in transpersonal psychology*. Exeter, England: Imprint Academic.
- Dayananda, S. (1993). *The teaching tradition of Advaita Vedanta*. Saylorsburg, PA: Institute of Vedanta and Sanskrit.

- Deak, Z. T. (1991). *A láma magasztalás ötven verse (Translation and interpretation of Asvagosha: Fifty verses of guru-devotion)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Tibetan Faculty of Budapest University, Hungary.
- Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche. (1988). *The wish-fulfilling jewel: The practice of guru yoga according to Longchen Nyingthig tradition*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Edinger, E. F. (1992). *Ego and archetype: Individuation and the religious function of the psyche*. Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books.
- Edinger, E. F. (1995). *The mysterium lectures. A journey through C. G. Jung's Mysterium Coniunctionis*. Toronto, Canada: Inner City Books.
- Eliade, M. (1969). *Yoga: Immortality and freedom*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Engler, J. (1984). Therapeutic aims in psychotherapy and meditation: Developmental stages in the representation of self. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 16(1), 25-61.
- Esbjörn, V. C. (2003). *Spirited flesh: An intuitive inquiry exploring the body in contemporary female mystics*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, Palo Alto, CA.
- Fadiman, J., & Frager, R. (Eds.). (1997). *Essential Sufism*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Frager, R. (1999). *Heart, self, and soul: The Sufi psychology of growth, balance, and harmony*. Wheaton, IL: Quest Books.
- Fordham, M. (1978). *Jungian psychotherapy. A study in analytical psychology*. Chichester, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Freud, S. (1940). An outline of psychoanalysis. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 21(1), 27-84.
- Freud, S. (1955). An autobiographical study. In J. Strachey (Trans.), *Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 20, pp. 7-74). London: Hogarth Press.
- Fromm, E., & Suzuki, D. T. (1960). *Zen Buddhism and psychoanalysis*. New York: Harper.
- Gadamer, H. (1998). *Praise of theory: Speeches and essays* (C. Dawson, Trans.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Guggenbühl-Craig, A. (1976). *Power in helping professions*. Zurich, Switzerland: Spring.
- Henderson, J. (2005). *Thresholds of initiation*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron.

- Henderson, J., & Henderson, R. (2000). From the Cave: An interview with J. Marvin Spiegelman. *The San Francisco Jung Institute Library Journal*, 19(3), 21-32.
- Henderson, R., & Henderson, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Living with Jung: Interviews with Jungian Analysts* (Vol. 2). New Orleans, LO: Spring Journal Books.
- Hillman, J. (1972). *The myth of analysis. Three essays in archetypal psychology*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Hillman, J. (1979). Senex and puer. In J. Hillman (Ed.), *Puer papers* (pp. 3-53). Dallas, TX: Spring.
- Jacoby, M. (1984). *The analytic encounter: Transference and human relationship*. Toronto, Canada: Inner City Books.
- Jung, C. G. (1966a). Fundamental questions of psychotherapy. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *The practice of psychotherapy: Essays on the psychology of the transference and other objects. The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 16, 2nd ed., pp. 111-125). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1966b). On the psychology of the unconscious. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *Two essays on analytical psychology. The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 7, 2nd ed., pp. 3-119). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1966c). The psychology of the transference. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *The practice of psychotherapy: Essays on the psychology of the transference and other objects. The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 16, 2nd ed., pp. 163-323). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1966d). Psychotherapy today. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *The practice of psychotherapy: Essays on the psychology of the transference and other objects. The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 16, 2nd ed., pp. 94-110). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1966e). The relations between the ego and the unconscious. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *Two essays on analytical psychology. The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 7, 2nd ed., pp. 123-241). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1967). Alchemical studies. In H. Read, M. Fordham, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 13, 1st ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Jung, C. G. (1968). Psychology and alchemy. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 12, 2nd ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1969a). Foreword to Suzuki's Introduction to Zen Buddhism. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *Psychology and religion: West and East. The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 11, 2nd ed., pp. 538-557). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1969b). A psychological approach to the dogma of the Trinity. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *Psychology and religion: West and East. The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 11, 2nd ed., pp. 107-200). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1969c). Psychological commentary on The Tibetan book of the great liberation. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *Psychology and religion: West and East. The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 11, 2nd ed., pp. 475-508). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1969d). Yoga and the West. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *Psychology and religion: West and East. The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 11, 2nd ed., pp. 529-537). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1970). Mysterium coniunctionis: An inquiry into the separation and synthesis of psychic opposites in alchemy. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire (Eds.), *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 14, 2nd ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1971a). Archetypes of the collective unconscious. In H. Read, M. Fordham, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *The archetypes and the collective unconscious. The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 9i, 2nd ed., pp. 3-72). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1971b). Conscious, unconscious, and individuation. In H. Read, M. Fordham, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *The archetypes and the collective unconscious. The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 9i, 2nd ed., pp. 275-289). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1971c). The phenomenology of the spirit in fairytales. In H. Read, M. Fordham, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *The archetypes and the collective unconscious. The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 9i, 2nd ed., pp. 207-254). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Jung, C. G. (1971d). Psychological types. In H. Read, M. Fordham, & W. McGuire (Eds.) (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 6, 1st ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1989). *Memories, dreams, reflections* (A. Jaffé, Ed., R. Winston & C. Winston, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
- Jung, C. G. (1992). *C. G. Jung: Letters: 1906-1950, Vol. 1* (G. Adler & A. Jaffé, Eds., R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kakar, S. (1991). *The analyst and the mystic: Psychoanalytic reflections on religion and mysticism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kerényi, C. (1960). *Asklepios: Archetypal image of the physician's existence*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Kirsch, J. (1995). Transference. In M. Stein (Ed.), *Jungian analysis* (pp. 170-209). Chicago: Open Court.
- Kirsch, T. (2000). *The Jungians: A comparative and historical perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of the self*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kopp, S. B. (1971). *Guru: Metaphors from a psychotherapist*. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- Kornfield, J. (1983). *Living Buddhist masters*. Boulder, CO: Prajna Press.
- Kramer, J., & Alstad, D. (1993). *The guru papers. Masks of authoritarian power*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.
- Magnussen, S. (2003). *The effect of the spiritual practice of Tibetan Buddhist Guru Yoga on the clinical practice of psychotherapy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, Palo Alto, CA.
- Maslow, A. H. (1963). Fusion of facts and values. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 23, 117-131.
- Matsu-Pissot, C. (1995). *On the experience of being unconditionally loved by a spiritual teacher*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California Institute of Integral Studies, San Francisco.
- Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research methods in educations and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Muktananda, S. (1983). *The perfect relationship*. Ganeshpuri, India: Gurudev Siddha Vidyaapeeth.

- Neumann, E. (1963). *The great mother. An analysis of the archetype* (R. Manheim, Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Neumann, E. (1995). *The origins and history of consciousness* (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (Original work published 1954).
- Odajnyik, V. W. (1993). *Gathering the light. A psychology of meditation*. London: Shambhala.
- Ogden, T. (2004a). The analytic third: Implications for psychoanalytic theory and technique. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 73, 167-195.
- Ogden, T. (2004b). This art of psychoanalysis. Dreaming undreamt dreams and interrupted cries. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 85, 857-877.
- Papadopoulos, R. K. (Ed.). (2006). *The handbook of Jungian psychology. Theory, practice, and application*. London: Routledge.
- Patrul Rinpoche. (1998). *The words of my perfect teacher. Forewords by the Dalai Lama and Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche* (Rev. ed.). Boston: Shambhala.
- Phelon, C. R. (2001). *Healing presence: An intuitive inquiry into the presence of psychotherapist*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, Palo Alto, CA.
- Polkinghorne, D. (1989). Phenomenological research methods. In R. S. Valle & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological perspectives in psychology* (pp. 41-60). New York: Plenum.
- Racker, H. (1968). *Transference and countertransference*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Romanyshyn, R. D. (2007). *The wounded researcher. Research with soul in mind*. New Orleans, LO: Spring Journal.
- Rowland, S. (2007). Book review, Robert D. Romanyshyn, the wounded researcher: Research with soul in mind. *Journal of Jungian Scholarly Studies*, 3(7). Retrieved from <http://www.thejungiansociety.org/Jung%20Society/e-journal/Volume-3/Rowland-Review-2007.pdf>
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing. The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Russel, E. W. (1986). Consciousness and the unconscious: Eastern meditative and Western psychotherapeutic approaches. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 18(1), 51-72.
- Rutter, P. (1989). *Sex in the forbidden zone. When men in power—therapists, doctors, clergy, teachers, and others—betray women's trust*. Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Tarcher.

- Samuels, A. (1985). *Jung and the post-Jungians*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Samuels, A. (2006). Transference/countertransference. In R. Papadopoulos (Ed.), *Handbook of Jungian psychology* (pp. 177-195). New York: Routledge.
- Saradananda, S. (1983). *Sri Ramakrishna, the great master*. Mylapore, India: Sri Ramakrishna Math.
- Schwartz-Salant, N. (1989). *The borderline personality: Vision and healing*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron.
- Schwartz-Salant, N. (1995). On the interactive field as analytic object. In M. Stein (Ed.), *The interactive field in analysis* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-36). Wilmette, IL: Chiron.
- Sedgwick, D. (1994). *The wounded healer: Counter-transference from a Jungian perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Siegelman, E. (1990). *Metaphor and meaning in psychotherapy*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Siegelman, E. (2002). The analyst's love: An exploration. *Journal of Jungian Theory and Practice*, (4)1, 19-34.
- Spiegelman, J. M., & Miyuki, M. (1985). *Buddhism and Jungian psychology*. Phoenix, AZ: Falcon Press.
- Spiegelman, J. M., & Vasavada, A. U. (1987). *Hinduism and Jungian psychology*. Phoenix, AZ: Falcon Press.
- Stein, R. (2010). The snapshot of the void. Reflections on Jung's relationship to Indian yoga. *Jung Journal: Culture and Psyche*, 4(2), 62-84.
- Stevens, A. (1982). *Archetype. A natural history of the self*. London: Routledge.
- Stevens, A. (2006). The archetypes. In R. K. Papadopoulos (Ed.), *The handbook of Jungian psychology. Theory, practice, and application* (pp. 74-93). New York: Routledge.
- Stolorow, R. D., Brandchaft, B., & Atwood, G. E. (1987). *Psychoanalytic treatment: An intersubjective approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
- Sullivan, B. S. (1989). *Psychotherapy grounded in the feminine principle*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron.
- Tresan, D. (2007). Thinking individuation forward. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 52, 17-40.
- Ulanov, A. B. (1999). Countertransference and the self. *Journal of Jungian Theory and Practice*, (1)1, 5-26.

- Ulanov, A. B. (2005). *Spirit in Jung*. Einsiedeln, Switzerland: Daimon Verlag.
- Vasavada, A. U. (1968). Analytical psychology of C. G. Jung and Indian wisdom. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 13, 131-145.
- Vaughan, F. (2000). *The inward arc: Healing in psychotherapy and spirituality*. Lincoln, NE: iUniverse.com.
- Vigne, J. (1991). Guru and psychotherapist: comparisons from the Hindu tradition. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 23(2), 121-137.
- Vigne, J. (2001). *The Indian teaching tradition. A psychological and spiritual study*. Delhi, India: B. R. Paperback.
- Watts, A. (1961). *Psychotherapies: East and West*. New York: Pantheon.
- Watts, A. (2000). What is Zen? In *Eastern wisdom. Three classics in one volume* (pp. 1-124). New York: MJF Books.
- Welwood, J. (1996). Reflections and presence: The dialectic of self-knowledge. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 28(2), 107-128.
- Wheelwright, J. (1982). Jung. In J. Ferne & S. Mullen (Eds.), *C. G. Jung, Emma Jung, Toni Wolff: A collection of remembrances* (pp. 97-105). San Francisco: The Analytical Psychology Club of San Francisco.
- Wilber, K. (1989). *The spectrum of consciousness*. London: Theosophical Publishing House.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1980). *The maturational process and the facilitating environment*. New York: International Universities Press.

Appendix A: Sample Invitation Letter

Dear Research Participant,

I'm writing to invite you to participate in my research interview about the experience of archetypal transference in psychotherapy.

I'll be traveling to San Francisco Bay Area between July 16-31 and I would be more than happy to visit you in your therapy office or to meet you at the San Francisco Jung Institute at your convenience.

You may remember me from the time I was an international student in your Institute's analytic training program back in 2005-2007. Since then I've been continuing my Ph.D. at the Institute of Transpersonal Psychology and now, I am working on my dissertation.

My topic is the archetypal transference, which is fundamental in both the guru-chela and analyst-patient relationships that I'd like to compare and comprehend better through this research study.

In this framework, I plan interviewing several senior Jungian analysts to learn more about the relationship between the psychotherapist and patient, especially in the context of archetypal transference, transference, and countertransference. The interview will be approximately 1 to 2 hours in length.

Your participation would be a great honor and would provide significant support to the field of psychology, and I would appreciate your participant very much.

If you are interested and available, please, let me know, and I will call you to discuss any concerns or questions regarding the interview, as well to schedule an appointment at least 2 weeks prior to our meeting.

Best Regards,

Zsolt Deak

Appendix B: Participant Informed Consent Agreement

The Master-Disciple Relationship as a Metaphor for Healing in Jungian Psychoanalysis: Exploring Archetypal Transference Between Analyst and Patient

Dear Research Participant:

You are invited to participate in this qualitative research study exploring your experience of archetypal transference in Jungian psychoanalysis. This inquiry seeks to learn more about the relationship between the psychotherapist and patient, especially in the context of transference and countertransference.

My primary research question is: How does the archetypal transference appear and influence the therapeutic relationship between therapist and patient? A secondary question is: What are the similarities and differences between the therapist-patient and the master-disciple relationships? And, finally, a third question is: What can we learn from this experience from transpersonal perspective?

If you decide to volunteer in this study, you will be asked to participate in a one-time interview that will be conducted at a neutral location, either the C. G. Jung Institute located at 2040 Gough Street, San Francisco, CA 94109 or your psychotherapy office. The appointment will be set up with you at your convenience at least 2 weeks prior to our meeting. The interview will be approximately 1 to 2 hours in length. The interview will be audio taped and transcribed. It is the researcher's intention to personally transcribe the interview. However, if outside transcribing were to take place, it would occur only after the transcriber signs a Transcriber Confidentiality Agreement.

All information you provide will remain strictly confidential. To protect your privacy in this and any future publication of the study's results, you will be asked to provide a pseudonym for the interview. Only the researcher will know your identity. Your signed consent form and interview data will be filed separately in a locked file cabinet and only the researcher will have access to them. Additionally, any information stored on the researcher's personal computer will be password protected.

The participant may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or prejudice.

This study involves no physical or psychological risks to the research participant. However, in any form of self-exploration there are risks for the ego. During the interview, some painful or disturbing experiences might arise from sharing experiences of this intimate and often both powerful and painful type of transference-countertransference experience. The background and careful selection of research participants, the set up of research interviews, and the privacy protection provide a safe container and minimize the risk of such problems, which you would not be able to handle. If, however, any problem emerges that may need professional help, the primary researcher will offer referral suggestions.

Working in psychotherapy involves mental, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual challenges, which you and your patients meet in the psychotherapy office. Your participation in this study may help to gain more insights into the psychodynamic of the analytic transference and countertransference. As a possible outcome of this research study, you as participant may be able to take away information that guides you in working clinically with individuals around this issue. Participants will also be able to learn and to have access to their colleagues' views, which can help with their analytic practice.

If you have any questions or concerns about this research project, please direct them to the primary investigator, Zsolt Deak, at 800.800.8000 or e-mail.address@yahoo.com.

If you have questions or concerns about your rights or the manner in which the interview was conducted, you may contact the Chairperson of my Doctoral Dissertation Committee, (Rosemarie Anderson, Ph.D., e-mail.address@yahoo.com), or the Chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee at the Institute of Transpersonal Psychology (Frederik Luskin, Ph.D., e-mail.address@yahoo.com).

Participation is entirely voluntary and no pressure has been applied to encourage participation. The participant may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or prejudice. The student/researcher has explained the study to the participant and answered his or her questions.

I attest that I have read and understood this form and had any questions about this research answered to my satisfaction. My participation in this research is entirely voluntary and no pressure has been applied to encourage participation. My signature indicates my willingness to be a participant in this research.

Participant's Signature

Date

Researcher's Signature

Date

Participant's contact information (in order to receive a copy of the study findings)

Thank you for your participation

Zsolt Deak
Primary Researcher

Appendix C: Transcriber Confidentiality Agreement

As a transcriptionist, I agree to maintain confidentiality with regard to all participant information, specifically the tapes from the interview sessions, but also the assessments and any other related written material. I will also help to aid the researcher in protecting the identity of participants to ensure anonymity.

Transcriber's Signature

Date

Researcher's Signature

Date

Appendix D: Sample Interview Questions

1. How did you become a Jungian analyst?
2. During your process of becoming Jungian analyst what kind of experiences or persons can you recall as the most influential factors?
3. What makes special the Jungian psychotherapy for you in comparison with other psychotherapy directions?
4. How long have you been in practice? What are your areas of expertise and specialization?
5. How would you describe the experience of archetypal transference (ATR)?
6. Have you had transference (TR), countertransference (CTR), or ATR in your training analysis?
7. What was this experience like (e.g., its source, meaning, quality, and result)?
8. In working with patients how did you experience TR, CTR or ATR? Please, describe your experiences in as much detail as possible!
9. How did the experience of TR, CTR or ATR change your perception of the other (either therapist or patient)?
10. How can you differentiate the TR, CTR and ATR ?
11. How does ATR appear and influence the analysis (what forms or images, affects, contents, events, actions, etc., can you recall in this context) ?
12. How do you work or relate to the ATR, when it appears in the analysis?
13. Do you see any difference between training analysis (either when you were trainee or are supervisor) and working with patients in term of transferences?

14. Some Jungians distinguish the personal, cultural and archetypal levels of transference.

How do you relate to this differentiation? How relevant they might be in your practice?

15. It may be hypothesized that both the master-disciple and analyst-patient relationships were grounded in the same archetype, though they are, obviously, two different forms of human relationship. What is your opinion about this hypothesis?

16. Would it be possible to consider (psychologically) the analyst in psychotherapy and also the guru in his/her spiritual context as they both would be representatives of the Self?

Appendix E: Sample Follow-Up Letter

Dear Research Participant,

Thank you so much for having me this summer. It was a wonderful experience meeting you and talking about my research topic. While I was listening you on the audio record and editing the transcribed text I relived the joy of each moment of interviewing you, learnt a lot from your insightful thoughts and felt blessed by your loving presence.

I hereby send you the transcript of your interview for your reading and would appreciate if you would please, share your reflections, thoughts and/or feelings on it. Your kind feedback may provide a secondary source of data for my research.

In regard to further procedure, I can inform you that after gathering feedbacks from you and other participants I will discuss the research findings and complete my dissertation, hopefully, by early next year. Should you be interested in, please, let me know, and I'd be more than happy to inform you about the final result and send you a copy of my dissertation.

Once again, thank you so much for taking part in the research and giving this wonderful interview, which I hope you will also like.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Warmly,

Zsolt Deak

Appendix F: Interviews

Q: As I informed you earlier, I'm researching the archetypal transference in Jungian psychotherapy. And I took the guru image as a metaphor and like to learn from this cross-cultural comparison something new for the psychotherapy. I'm focusing on three main questions. The first, what are similarities and differences between a traditional master-disciple relationship, and analyst and patient relationship in psychotherapy? The second, how does the archetypal transference work? And the third one, what can we learn for psychotherapy. Before we would go there, I'd like to ask you about your personal background.

RP1: Sure.

Q: So karmically you were born into the Jungian psychotherapy, having both of your parents first generation Jungian analysts.

RP1: Well, in terms of your hypothesis about the archetypal transference, in terms of my parents, part of what happens in the transference, the archetypal transference is the rebirth. You know, is the image of rebirth. And if I look at what happened to my mother's analysis with my father, that in a sense she acted out the archetypal transference by getting physically involved with him. Right? And so instead of having a symbolic love relationship, she had an actual love relationship. And instead of having the rebirth of a symbolic child, she actually gave birth to a real child.

Q: Who is, actually you.

RP1: To whom she projected the archetype of the divine child. Right? So that's a very—I haven't ever talked about it this way before, but it's true. So, I mean . . .

Q: What it feels like being a divine child?

RP1: Well, I mean that was very difficult because, as one of my mentors used, who lived in London at the time I was born, said that I was a love child. That's how he described it. But it meant that the projection of, onto me was of this kind of archetype of the divine child, which meant that I had to live up to certain expectations, which weren't always, which in a sense kept me from a certain human relationship. That's how it came out, as a golden boy. And how I experienced it when I was growing up is I did very well in school in the beginning. And so, and all my teachers loved me. And, but there was a very other, another very funny thing that would happen is that my, I think especially my mother would talk about what a wonderful boy I was to her patients. And so for years afterwards, maybe 30 years after—I mean when I was already in my 50s and where I would go somewhere, people would come up at, when I would talk and they'd been in analysis with my parents and they'd say I'd heard so much about you. And you know, on one level of course that made me feel good. But on another level it was a very—I don't know what they said, you know? And I don't know what kind of magical archetypal projections they had on me, okay? So I mean we're talking archetypal transference here.

Q: It was the beginning.

RP1: That was the beginning.

Q: And you said in the interview that your calling of being Jungian analyst went through your parents.

RP1: Yeah.

Q: And you considered them as your role models.

RP1: Well, especially my mother. Much more my mother, naturally I followed her. What I would say is that my father was more of a learned experience because it took me many years to really accept and value what he did, whereas my mother was just right there. I mean I experienced it, the immediacy of her, you know, caring and sensitivity and insights.

Q: How the meetings with Jung helped you become who you are?

RP1: Well, that's interesting. The first time I met Jung was by accident, which was that I was traveling in Europe with two other students my age and I developed gastrointestinal symptoms. And I was in London with my uncle, my mother's brother . . . My mother—this gives you a side of my mother, which she did on many other occasions. She was in Zurich. She talked to her brother, my uncle. And she said, put him on a plane to Zurich and I'll take care of it, which she did. So I got to Zurich and she took me to the Hospital. And the professor, Professor Kaiser, under ether took my appendix out. . . . And during that week that I was recovering, there's this public birthday party for Jung at the Hotel Dolder . . . And so there was a party for Jung, birthday party, and my mother snuck me into the receiving line. And Jung liked that. You know, he didn't like people always following all the rules. And what I remember from that was a handshake. It was the warmest handshake I can ever remember. And it was electrifying. Now I have played that down, until last month I was at the Library of Congress in Washington D.C. and there were members of the Jung family there for the event. And one of them was the youngest grandson of Jung. Heinz Hoerni. He's probably 55 or 60 now. Fifty-five, I'd guess. He was 10 at the time. And he talked about, he got up and he talked about his grandfather. And the thing he remembered about his grandfather was the handshake.

RP1: That was such a revelation to me.

Q: This clicked your old memory.

RP1: Oh, I knew it, but I was—I thought, well, this is just archetypal transference. I mean, I've been so kind of primed to see Jung as this magical figure that that's why it hit me so, okay? But when he said it I then realized that this, there was something about Jung and his handshake that really was special. That it wasn't just kind of a projection of my

own internal, you know, archetypal constellation. So that's how I met him the first time. It was 1955. So that was 55 years ago. Then the next year I went with my parents to Europe . . . and so when we were in Zurich, my dad arranged to have a tea with Jung. Now Emma Jung had died November of [19]55, so that my dad was also expressing condolence. And so he took me along and we sat out in the garden and we spent about an hour and a half. I don't know. Maybe two hours. I can't remember exactly. And you know, I asked my naïve questions and talked how I'd been reading his books and, which I had been. I'd been read "Modern Man, in Search of a Soul" and I was reading two essays on analytical psychology. And there wasn't that much out in English at that time. I mean this is before the collected works really had started in English. So it was interesting. It was fun. And so that was good. And that was a good visit and I thought this is great. Then . . .

. . . then I decided I would go to Zurich and I saw C.A. Meier. Actually, I went to see C.A. Meier in summer of [19]57 and then I went to, saw this other man in New York in '57, '58. And then I went back in summer [19]58, and I saw Meier again . . . So here I am in July '58. I'm 22. I'm in medical school and I'm unhappy with the medical school I'm going to. So I want to transfer, which in the United States is highly unusual . . . So my dad is there too, and I'm actually living with him in an apartment in Zurich. And my dad is teaching at the institute. And he gets a call from Aniela Jaffe, who's Jung's secretary at the time and says, "Professor Jung could see you this Friday morning. Can you make it?" So my father says, "Unfortunately, I can't because I'm teaching at the institute that morning." But he asks, "Would it be okay if my son came?" So she says, "Well, I'll check it out with Professor Jung." Now I don't know if Professor Jung remembered me from the 2 years before sneaking in line. I've come to realize through, this is correspondence with my dad and Jung, that there was quite an intense relationship there between the two of them. So I think that helped. So Aniela Jaffe calls back and says, "Professor Jung would be very happy to spend an hour with your son." So now I'm seeing Meier and he says, well, what you've got to do at this point is you don't go in with your own problems or your own situation, but you present something that Jung would like to hear. So at the time he was working on a monograph on the myth of the flying saucers. You know the unidentified flying objects. So Meier looked, we mentioned a couple of dreams that I'd said to him that he thought Jung would be interested in because they would be connected to flying saucers. So I said okay. So I, nervous as hell, take the train out to Kusnacht and find my way to Jung's house. And I walk in the door and I wait. You know, and then Jung comes out, and he lets me in. He's very nice and he says, "So you wanted to see the old man before he dies." Knocked me over. And honestly, I've told this story to many people and then I tell them I don't remember another thing from the hour. And they're irritated with me. Why can't you remember what else happened? And I can't...

Q: You said something in the Robert Henderson interview that you were in an altered state.

RP1: I was. I was in an altered state. I've checked . . .

Q: And his first sentence hypnotized you.

RP1: It did. And I've talked to another man who's exactly 10 years older than I am. . . . And he said he had a similar experience. Not that he said that same thing to Mel, but Mel doesn't remember anything from the interview. All he remembers is that he went in and out. He came out. It was meaningful, but he doesn't know what happened. Well, that's the way it was for me. It was very meaningful. I mean between the initial handshakes and then having tea with him and then having this hour with him where he was so direct with me, I said this man's tremendous. So I had archetypal guru transference on him. Although he did not like being a guru. He didn't, that didn't fit him. So I mean I've, you know, and I put away all these experiences for years. Because there were so many other people for most of my career that—you know, Henderson and Wheelwright here. And Jane Wheelwright. People here, who really knew Jung. But you know, at this point in my life, it's rare. Okay? It's really—and who were in, you know, who can speak coherently what happened. So those are my three experiences with Jung. And that certainly helped to form and to motivate me to become a Jungian analyst.

Q: Again, in the interview you said a very influential dream with Jung, which has happened when you actually decided to be a Jungian analyst.

RP1: Was that the dream where Jung was a young man?

Q: Yes. Would you talk how this happened and what do you think about this dream now?

RP1: Now, you know, I'm having trouble remembering exactly what the dream was. That dream, I was . . . in Menlo Park. We had just come here and I'd just started analysis with Joe Henderson. And I had let Joe know a year in advance that I wanted to see him, because that was very important. And you see, that was part of my mother's influence on me, was that it was important for me to see somebody who'd been analyzed by Jung. And that that idea that I need to be touched, you know, see somebody who'd been touched by Jung personally. So Joe Henderson was the logical person for me to do that with. And I had this dream, as I remember, that Jung was a young man and that I had to pee. I had to go to the bathroom and he was watching me. And it was very uncomfortable for me and I was vulnerable while I was peeing and having him watch me and he was this young man. Now, look, this is 1962 that I had the dream. It was part of, and it, my, it was probably my initial dream with Joe Henderson. And I'd seen actually Jung in [19]'58 . . . I could have had much different image of Jung in my dream. But I think the fact that Jung was in that figure was, as a young man, that obviously I projected this self onto Jung as a young man. That was my self-image. And that the urination was part of my own ambition or power and I was vulnerable to kind of getting caught up in my ambition or power drive. And that would've been, that was very important. Because what my parents wanted me to do as a Jungian analyst was to write books, lecture on alchemy and become famous and kind of the Messiah of Jungian psychology.

Q: You did, but differently.

RP1: Very differently, very differently . . .

Q: For staying a little bit more with Jung's image . . . if Carl Jung was so great in life, like you said before, I can imagine how great he might have been in his myth, even [more than] in his life.

RP1: Sure.

Q: You said in the interview that he was greater than in life, which means that maybe his myth already in his life was great.

RP1: Well, I think what it means also is that I was projecting onto him kind of the archetypal wise old man, which I did, especially then. I think much more, I hope much more than now.

Q: I'm for sure that he was conscious of this kind of projection. How he dealt with these . . .

RP1: Well, he got it all the time from people.

Q: How Jung dealt with these projections?

RP1: He could be rather nasty, get angry. He had a tremendous temper. And he would scoff at people and he'd say nasty things to people. And if he didn't like something, he'd just tell you. So I mean he didn't do that to me, but I mean the part of the problem for me was that my parents just idealized him completely, and so I did too. It's taken me all these years to kind of have it, de-potentiate that, because he was a charismatic person, to taken me all these years to kind of realize what, more about his shadow, more that he was kind of a hard guy to get along with in many ways because he didn't have much of a feeling function, didn't relate well to particularly men. He was difficult.

Q: So the rumor is true, that Jung could work in transference very hardly and any time he met someone with strong transference toward him sent to Toni Wolff right away.

RP1: I think Jung didn't really like to talk about transference. If he could get away with it, he would rather—you know if it was going smoothly he would rather not talk about it. I mean he knew and he wrote that book, "Psychology of the Transference." He was really much attuned to what transference was about, but he didn't like to focus on it. And he would only tend to focus on it when it was a problem. Either a love problem, where the patient had an erotic transference on him or a hate problem.

Q: This is the hardest part of the transference, the negative transference.

RP1: I don't know. I think the love part is harder.

Q: What do you mean by that?

RP1: I'll tell you about a patient I had about—I can't even remember now—30, 35 years ago. She was a French woman. Actually, she was from Morocco, but she'd lived in France for a long time. She was married to an American Midwestern guy and they read "Man and His Symbols." And she'd gone and they'd contacted Joe Henderson because he's the only American in "Man and His Symbols." And at the time, "Man and His Symbols" was kind of the main kind of introductory book on Jung out here. I mean this is in the [19]70s. And this woman, she was an attractive woman but, she fell in love with me. And that's all she could talk about. And she brought me one time a big bottle like this . . . It's very similar to cognac. And it was in this red felt, special bottle. And I mean it was so erotic, you wouldn't be. The whole thing. So I mean I didn't know what to do with the bottle. I mean I never opened it. I couldn't. I mean it just was so charged, I couldn't do that. She became so obsessive and so intrusive, that's all she could talk about, that I finally, for my own sanity, I referred her to somebody else. I couldn't see her anymore. So that's what I mean that a positive transference can also be very disturbing.

Q: Yeah. I'd like to hear more about your relationship with Joe Henderson because this is kind of missing part from the Robert Henderson's interview. How was like working with Joe? . . .

RP1: Yeah, I did from 1962. I didn't see him for a few years and then I went back to see him. And I mean I really, I stopped seeing him when he was—At 101 and a half, he had pneumonia, which 90, at least 95 percent of other people would've died of. He survived it, but I mean mentally he was never the same after that . . . The first part was what Fordham would call the dependent transference. And the second part was, I mean it was, it didn't have that same dependency. I mean there was still a dependency. But on the other hand, it was much more, over time it became much more collegial. And Joe developed a concept, which he called the symbolic friendship and I would say that that, he became more and more of that. That we had a symbolic friendship. And as he aged and began to lose a little bit of his everything, I began more and more taking care of him. And since he didn't have any children, I became more or less like a son to him . . .

RP1: So I started in '62, stopped, and stopped in [19]'73 because I had a dream and Joe interpreted this dream. And the dream was that Joe had come to our house and I was showing him around our house. And he interpreted this dream. It was amazing. He says, well, you see usually the transference is you going to the analyst's office, either getting there, not getting there, your resistance, whatever. But here the analysis is coming into your house. And he said that to me, that this is a sign to me that your unconscious is ready to do it on your own. That, you know that you've brought your analysis home with you, your analyst home with you. And even though it was a very difficult time in my . . ., I stopped and I handled it. And so what came in the dream was actually, was accurate. I mean it did foretell a change in my own psyche. Well, then for several years I didn't do any analysis . . .

RP1: So what happened—Okay, so then I went back to seeing Joe . . . And he was happy to see me again. And then for the next 25 years, I'd see him two or three times a

month. And I'd talk to him about, you know, everything that was going on in my life, whether it was with my marriage. But a lot of it now became professional stuff. And I talked to him—you know, and I realized that I was also—as he got older, he was traveling less. I kind of kept him up to date with what was going on in the Jungian world, which he liked. Well . . . and by then it was a much more social relationship. You know, and we could keep the two separate. Joe had an amazing way of being able to see people and work with them analytically and work with their transference and everything, and yet could also be with them socially and it was okay.

Q: So we could learn from your life experience a lot about the wise person. Let me change the scene a little bit.

RP1: Okay.

Q: I mean Joe Henderson was obviously, and Jung and your parents . . . could fit this image very well, I think.

RP1: Right.

Q: So let's change the scene a little bit.

RP1: Sure.

Q: Now as you are aging, you can be very often projected on.

RP1: Sure, the other way around, yeah.

Q: Other way around. Please tell me something. How do you work with these kinds of projections if . . . ?

RP1: I think the question is that when I'm with a person I don't think, Oh, I'm a wise old man . . . and I'm going to tell them, you know, what to do. In fact, if I'm a wise old man, then I know better than to tell them what to do. Okay?

Q: Yes. Here comes one of the major differences between the traditional guru-disciple . . . and analyst-patients relationship. Because analysis is less direct and . . .

RP1: Yeah.

Q: . . . the analyst doesn't say what to do.

RP1: Sure. So, but I have, for instance, now—But I have a man whose father died when he was a, 13 or 14. And, he lived with his mother, who was a psychiatrist. And he's gotten married in the last year and it scared the shit out of him. Scared—you know he's got all kinds of anxieties about it. And so I find myself at times relating some experiences that I've had to him. What I have found in terms of—I think this is important—boundary

violations and what I will say about myself to a patient is that if I feel that I have worked out a particular issue relatively well, then I will be, I will maybe say something about myself to that patient. If they're touching on something which is still problematic for me and I can feel it by my kind of visceral physiological response, I will, I keep it to myself. And if I've got any question, I won't say anything. But I would do there with them what I'm doing with you today. Because I'm telling you some rather, for me, personal experiences. But I feel that they're all kind of within—they're contained. I don't feel I'm asking you to carry them for me. Do you see what I'm saying?

Q: Yes. It's something crucial.

RP1: Yeah. And that's a crucial difference.

Q: So you don't bring content . . .

RP1: Right.

Q: . . . into the analytic process.

RP1: Right. Exactly. And I don't want support from my patient for my position. So, but I don't consciously think of myself as the wise old man. What I am beginning to find, and I've said it already today, is that you know I'm, there are not many people around who knew, can say they met with Jung and who can remember it, you know. And so I get, I'm put more into that category. And so I get asked about that now in a way that I, and it's, and I'm more, I'm much freer to speak about it now than I was. I was very reluctant to ever talk about it before. Because, you see, on one level my meeting Jung was not based on my own merit. Okay? It was based upon my parents and it was because my parents knew Jung. That's how I got to see Jung. If I hadn't had those parents, I never would've gotten to see Jung. So it wasn't about something uniquely about me that got me to see Jung.

Q: This is a kind of differentiation between the person and the archetype, what I'm hearing now . . . And also the cultural, the layer Joe [Henderson] brought into the Jungian psychology.

RP1: Hm-hmm, hm-hmm. And you see what I also got from Joe Henderson— because you won't hear this from others. Maybe you will. You may have heard it from R. Joe was infinitely grateful to Jung, had felt very good about his analysis. But he also wanted to separate from Jung. So for instance, he didn't keep all his letters that he got from Jung, like my dad and everyone else did. You know. He came to San Francisco and he kind of separated himself. He was always on very good relationship with Jung. He had him as "Man and His Symbols." He's the only American.

Q: Yeah. Yes.

RP1: So obviously liked him and he sent patients to him. But he didn't have this kind of, he wasn't god, he wasn't caught in this kind of projection that everything about Jung

was always wonderful. I cannot tell you how grateful I am that I saw Joe because it helped me to free myself from what, this kind of idealization that my parents had on him.

Q: So Joe was a real Jungian. He was on his own way.

RP1: He really was on his own way. And you know the people in Zurich were caught one way or the other. Meier ended up feeling kind of, in a sense, overpowered by the presence of Jung, that he couldn't somewhere be his own man. And the women in Zurich adored Jung. Von Franz, Barbara Hannah, Aniela Jaffe, and Liliana Frey and—you name it. They were all just [sighs], you know.

Q: Talking about the archetypal process, I think it would be useful to turn to dreams because this is one of your specialties.

RP1: Right.

Q: So I would very appreciate to hear more about how you work with dreams. Because one of the possibility of the archetypal appearance is working with dreams and images.

RP1: No question, no question. Look. I'm thinking how to answer this, okay? You know, let me do this briefly and see if this answers it for you.

Q: Thank you.

RP1: Jung in two essays talks about two levels of interpretation. He talks about the subjective and the objective. You're familiar with this.

Q: Yes.

RP1: The subjective level of interpretation is where every image in the dream is some aspect of the dreamer him or herself. The objective level of interpretation is where—Well, let's say I'm dreaming about J. and she's doing something in the dream. It's, the primary meaning can well mean that I'm having some feelings. The dream is bringing up some, what I, unconscious feelings that I had about J. that I didn't know about. And it's not about, and it's also internal. It's also about my anima. But it's also about some feeling about the object, she being the object. Okay? Now a third level of interpretation is the transference level. Now the transference level is a combination of the subjective and the objective. And let me give you some examples. For instance, one of the dreams from this pedestrian dream paper, the woman dreamt that she was in my office here and it looked—this is what got me. It looked, it was glitzy and with lights all over the place and the walls were bright orange and it was all lit up like a Christmas tree. Now this woman was a, from southern California. She was, she was still attractive, but she'd been a very attractive younger woman. Lot of men in her life. And she kind of, in many ways, lived out the Hollywood star life, okay? Now when I told this dream to this conference in the Chiron . . .

Q: Yeah.

RP1: In New Mexico, the Chiron Conference. These people in that room thought that that's how my office really looked.

Q: [laughs]

RP1: You know they took it as objective. Okay? So you see, so this tells you about this woman's—she's dreaming about being in my office, but it's not about me per se. I mean if I take it personally, then it's wrong. It's, then I'm personalizing something that really is the archetypal transference and really is something subjective for her. This is what she's grown up with. Okay? Now, let me give you another example. Let's . . .

Q: Please.

RP1: Another example would be where a patient dreams that they're going to see a doctor about a particular problem. The doctor's an unknown doctor. He's not somebody they know well or they can associate to the person—so what does it mean? The doctor in the dream is a healer. The image of the doctor is a healer. So that really means it's something really about, again, about the archetypal level. Something about his or her psychology. And to say that the primary interpretation, the primary level of interpretation is about the transference to me is to personalize something that should be archetypal. Okay, you get it?

Q: Yeah.

RP1: Now I have had patients who dream about me doing certain thing. Now a very common dream. There are two kinds of common dreams I'll tell you about in terms of transference. One is that many people would dream that they were sitting in the chair opposite me and that the phone would ring and then I would get up and talk to them, talk to whoever called, and they would feel my lack of care or lack of concern. Now I don't do that. I mean unless, in an emergency situation I'll tell somebody in the beginning of a session that there's a call I have to take. But that happens once a year or something like that, or once—so here's where the feeling of the patient is that they are not getting the full attention so that there's some break, a disruption in the analytic container. Okay?

Q: Yes. And the other common dream?

RP1: Another common dream is that the patient is sitting here and they're trying to talk to me, but there are all these other people in the room. And they can't talk to me because these other people are there and they, they're either chatting away or making it impossible to have a personal relationship to me. And I've learned over the years that those people are a personification of that person's complexes, which keep that person from being able to relate to their deeper self. Does that make sense?

Q: Yes.

RP1: Yeah. Okay? So those are kinds of dreams that are—I mean I’ve had, you know, they’ve happened many times with many different patients.

Q: Thank you. . . .

RP1: The analytic third?

Q: Analytic third. Exactly. And you with Rob talk about the possibility that would be or not the analytic third god, and then you stop at this point. My interest is coming toward the relationship between the analytic third and the Self. Does that make any sense or . . .

RP1: Okay, hm-hmm.

Q: And this would very much relate to my research subject as well because my, one of my hypotheses is that analysts often can be representative of self, as a guru can be a self-representative. And I would like to know more about this, how, what is your take on this issue.

RP1: Do you know, are you familiar with Jung’s letter to my father in 1934?

Q: No.

RP1: I don’t know if I have it here. Let’s see if I do. I may. And I want you—you have to read this, okay? You do. I mean it’s unbelievable. Okay? Now see if I can find it. Okay, here it is. Read this last chapter, this last paragraph. “With regard . . .”

Q: “With regard to your patient, it is quite correct that her dreams are occasioned by you. The feminine mind is the earth waiting for the seed. That is the meaning of the transference. Always, the more unconscious person gets spiritually”—I don’t know this word.

RP1: Fecundated.

Q: Fecundated?

RP1: Yeah, fertilized.

Q: “. . . by the more conscious one.”

Q: “Hence the guru in India. This is an age-old truth. As soon as certain patients come to me for treatment, the type of dream changes. In the deepest sense, we all dream not out of ourselves but out of what lies between us and the other. Cordial greetings. Ever sincerely, C. G. Jung.” It is amazing.

RP1: Isn’t that amazing?

Q: This must be important.

RP1: It's so important. Because you can read that to the inter-relational psychoanalytic school or the analytic, you know, Tom Ogden and the analytic third.

RP1: This is 1934. It's right there.

Q: Yeah, it's huge. Thank you very much.

[RP1: Interview Part 2]

Q: Can you recall some case, examples when this archetype, especially the wise old man archetype, can occur?

RP1: You know, I rarely think of myself in those terms. And we're going to go back to something. I saw Joe Henderson from 1962 to 1973. I mean really, basically from 1980 until he died. As a result, I always felt that there was somebody above me. I never felt like I was the wise old man because Joe Henderson was always the wise old man. In some way, to X's credit, after 25 years with Joe, he stopped when he finished his analysis. And I think there was a freedom that X had that I didn't have by staying in analysis with Joe until the end. And I could tell a shift in me since Joe died, [though I] did not have a lot of positions of authority that I'd been [before], you know, because there's nobody above me anymore.

Q: You mean nobody whom you can turn for advice or . . .

RP1: Right, right. That's what I mean by above. I don't mean god-like. I mean it somehow, I was protected from being in the older generation. —It was something I wasn't willing to give up and I wanted to continue to see Joe. And X didn't do that. X actually had stopped in a good way. I mean what way he should've gone on . . . But I carried more of a kind of son projection for him. So I got into a much more both analytical and personal relationship with Joe, I think more than anyone else. I mean I got, that's just the way it worked out for me. So one of the positives was to have that sense of being a son to Joe. But one of the negatives was that I'd never, I didn't, I couldn't feel the wise old man archetype in the same way.

Q: I have a sense of what we are struggling here, that talking about archetypal transference is really hard because it's a kind of lived experience and it's really hard to articulate. It's actually it's why I'm caught in this process because, you know, I'd like to learn more about, of course, my transference. So I [got to this] topic and my grandfather and all my Jungian stories. So, and I'm saying this because I feel that so many personal details and personal, cultural, archetypal, it's kind of embroidered each other and it's really hard to tell like which is personal, which is archetypal.

RP1: Right. Archetypal, right.

Q: Is this what you are thinking about?

RP1: Hm-hmm, hm-hmm. Partly. And also—What else? I'm—I mean I know that I'm seen as a wise old man by some of my patients.

Q: And what are you doing with this?

RP1: I mean I don't analyze them particularly. I let them sit there. And then if it's a positive wise old man, then I just let it sit there. In that sense it's also like Jung because Jung didn't like to talk about the transference unless it, he had to. But he didn't, he rather just let it play out and interfere. But he was happy not have to analyze it. He only analyzed it when he had to. So when it became a problem, either positively or negatively. I mean [if] became the erotic transference or kind of a negative. Now, I think I told you I'm seeing a young man. Just got married [at the age of] 31. And he came to me several years ago because he was dating the daughter of a Jungian analyst here in the Bay area. They broke up very soon after and then he met another woman. And he, over a period of time, almost never recorded his dreams. He, in time, he got engaged and they got married. And he came back. He left. He'd said I've had enough . . . he was feeling better. He came in more stressed about his work . . .

So actually, I advised him. I tried not to be too direct though. And I'm not, because one of the things I learned from being in analysis with Joe Henderson is that you let things happen . . . So in that sense, I'm a, like a father figure for him. I mean I don't call myself a wise old man. I don't know if it's wisdom or not, okay?

Q: You mentioned something that you didn't feel yourself very really deeply into my research subject, and you mentioned something that you didn't have too much to say about a wise old man.

RP2: That's true. I think more and more over the years I've come to see these patterns, archetypal patterns as emergent phenomena. Then as such they require a whole set of circumstances, and I think this corresponds to what Jung said that the archetype occurs in a pattern and he used the example of leaf cutting ant where so many factors have to come together for this to fulfill its image. And so likewise with an archetype like the image of the wise old man there has to be a set of human circumstances and accidents of fate and a receptive pair, I think, it's always in the dialectic arises interpersonally, because how can one be wise except in contrast to other human beings? It's a human trait.

Q: I see.

RP2: I suppose that one could say a man who lives in harmony with nature is wise, and his wisdom doesn't have to be measured in human terms because he's fulfilling his functions as a human being in a natural environment and perhaps this in isolation. That's a rare example. Most people that we think of as wise old men have interactions with other human beings in some form.

Q: Maybe this is why I like to think about this image not as guru but rather talking about guru-shishya or master-disciple relationship as we talk about analyst-analysand or patient relationship...

RP2: But I think it's something that can emerge sporadically, situationally, entirely within a context. And sometimes it seems as though the phrase "Out of the mouths of babes" wisdom, etc. Children can sometimes say some surprising things when they synthesize a situation that has human, moral implications and say something wise, and somehow in a flash fulfill that archetype.

Q: So you mean the wisdom coming from the collective unconscious regardless, you know, who says and what age and . . .

RP2: Right.

Q: . . . the circumstance is important.

RP2: Right, circumstance, and that it would be collective unconscious. It's human potential and it's that that gets back to whether it's encoded biologically or whether it's just phenomenological and dependent on the immediate circumstances. But there has to be something encoded for a human being to react that way. Chimpanzees just don't. They come pretty close to it but they don't manage somehow to have the full complement of humanity, and I think that's what Jung was talking about, the collective unconscious is that potential rather than a repository of emergence. So that's the way I use it.

Q: Yes.

RP2: So I don't think I have anything to say about the wise old man because I don't know one.

Q: Well, you know so many other forms and images can occur and, for example, wise old woman who may differ from the wise old man but the unconscious finds many different ways to be expressed, and I hope that, you know, our discussion we can hear more about how you work with these images in your practice. But before we would go there I'd like to hear about your personal background, how did you become Jungian analyst?

RP2: I married into the family.

Q: [Laughs]. Okay, but there must've been some calling.

RP2: Yeah, yeah, how did Diana become a princess? She married into the family that kind of a thing.

Q: So, this is a kind of fate.

RP2: Yeah, yeah. And it did have a big impact on me although I rejected it at first, the skeptical, very critical me, it still had a fascination for me.

Q: Would you like to talk more about your rejections and fascination, and what was the most influential factor in . . . ?

RP2: Well, I found the kind of adulation puzzling surely for my in-laws. Jung was the wise old man. I had no doubt about his incarnation of that archetype, but I think they encompassed all of his foibles. And so coming from . . . that's the other story . . . I was still in medical school when I met them at Stanford, and there was a high premium on rationality and being able to prove things scientifically, a logical argument, scientific research and so this seemed totally out of the blue, totally off the wall and simplistic in my sophomoric opinion. And yet the closer I came to it the more puzzled I was about what I was seeing and experiencing; the dreams that I began to have and the ways that X particularly were responding to my dreams. I think it was X more than anybody else and the way that he reacted to my dreams that made me most curious. It was that personal relationship that gave me a view of myself that was totally unexpected and had an element of truth to it that was a kind of truth that I had never seen before, never experienced before.

Q: Are you reflecting on the objective level of dream interpretation?

RP2: No, no, not at all. I didn't see anything objective, I mean, I acknowledged that this was a way of reading it that was unique and opened up many other possibilities, but I didn't see that there was anything objective about it that it held a truth it was only a relative truth, so I wouldn't say that. And I don't really know whether there's an objective psyche, but I have come over the years to recognize that there is a reality of the psyche and to that degree I suppose it's an objective.

Q: What was the point when you decided to become an analyst?

RP2: A Jungian analyst? I don't know that I decided that. It was more like, well, I might as well. I certainly had no adequate defense against the kinds of perceptions I had and know. I felt in my own defense I had to know more about it. I started analysis and then when I had so many years of analysis I finished my residency and it just seemed like a natural progression.

Q: Thank you. As you may know from our earlier correspondence I'm researching the archetype of transference, and in my research I'm looking for answers for how does this archetypal transference work, and actually I took the guru image or guru disciple image as a metaphor for the analytic dialogue and I try to somehow approach this very experiential field and learn something from transpersonal perspective. After reading your fine essay in [Book title], I learned that literally archetypal transference combines two central themes of the Jungian psychology, namely the archetypes and transference. One is more theoretical and takes examples from mythology, anthropology and so on and so forth. And other is very experiential, very pragmatical and as I understood these two things, the theory and the practice somehow are two avenues of human understanding and maybe

because of this like you've written in this essay several different schools have been developed the Jungian psychology to somehow to bridge these two different avenues. Would you talk a little a bit more how these different approaches understand archetypal transference differently?

RP2: What approaches for example?

Q: You wrote about the classical, the developmental and the archetypal schools as the three main avenues of the Jungian psychology . . .

RP2: Context of transference.

RP2: Well, I think that the classical school emphasized the archetypal dimension as lined it up and the developmental school emphasized the experiential immediacy of the—and the relationship of the developmental of the psyche of the individual through influences with other people. And those are the two main schools of therapy. I'm not quite sure how the archetypal school deals with or uses transference. I think their writing is more theoretical, more poetic, and I'm not sure that the nature of the transferences of major interest to them, most of their writers and practitioners. It's not clear to me how many of them actually practice analysis...

Q: There are different views theoretically. I would be more interested in practice. How do you work with the archetypal transference, what is your take on of it?

RP2: An archetypal transference when it's very powerful, stands in the way of individuation on a practical level and stands in the way of the analytic relationship, and I think that's what Jung saw somehow being a nuisance. I think it was in Tavistock [19]'35 and somebody asked him to talk about the transference and he said it was a nuisance?

Q: Yes. Actually I quoted something from the Tavistock lectures, where Jung said something very controversial, that [the transference] is disturbing but significant.

RP2: Important but annoying. Right. And so it's very difficult to work analytically in my experience impersonally and effectively in terms of real substantial growth in the individual when one is either invokes terror and the primary defenses of the Self or idealization. And in both instances the development of the psyche is in media terms is obstructed, and so I think it is something to bear with and to try to ameliorate to accept not to try to protest, fight against it because it is useless because it simply has the individual in its grip. And I was talking to a colleague last night about a lecture that she had heard on the treatment of severely traumatized people. And the method used by this person doing the treatment was to with the patient generate an image of a safe place in the context of the relationship in the fantasy of the traumatized individual, and this safe place was a haven to which they could return; a lot of work establishing that. And then the trauma was approached and the story of the trauma was approached that at a certain level of anxiety the therapist would then stop the story and say, "Return to your safe place, let's go back there." The unfolding of the story around the trauma and the experience of it were done in an

effective way. One could say that what she was looking for were the first evidences of a primary defense of the Self. [This was the same] what Michael Fordham wrote about that it might be turned in archetypal defense, massive protection against invasion, further invasion, of the psyche or response to the trauma. And I think it would be a little trickier to try to do the same thing with an idealizing transference.

Q: The major question comes up what is the difference between the personal and impersonal or archetypal transference. Do you sense this difference in your session with the patient and I'd like to hear more about this differentiation because as you pointed out nicely in this essay that the archetypal transference makes Jungian psychology unique, so this is something which other psychoanalytically oriented therapies don't accept.

RP2: I think that one concept that Jung talked about in numerous ways is possession. That the ego, the psychic energy, is somehow overtaken by the archetypal phenomena, and I think that is not a concept that psychoanalysis even understands. They don't perceive the experience of phenomena that way as possession, and I think Jung did and how he used that term, he never fully explained it but it just crops up . . . So that's one way in which we differ in our view. We come out somehow to accept the concept of possession and of different sectors of the personality which we call archetypes or complexes overtake psychic energy and narrow it down to a certain range of functions.

To answer your question from another perspective, what makes a Jungian as in opposition to a differentiation from other therapists or psychoanalysts. It's the Jungian scholar, Susan Roland, who's influenced my perspective on Jung greatly. She writes a lot about how Jung writes and what his goals were, and she sees Jung as frustrated with the whole enlightenment project with the emphasis upon reason and scientific proof and the denial of the spirit, the spiritual dimension of the psyche. So in his way of writing she says this—he is to breakdown those barriers, those artificial dichotomies between the differentiations the intellect makes for the purpose of understanding like the division between mind and body, between mind and soul or spirit from the body. He works to break down all those areas of the differentiation, and in the process you don't read Jung for concepts. You read him to undergo a process, and long reading, frequent reading of Jung begins to reshape, reform the perspective on yourself and other human beings and on the psyche and in the way listen and the way you begin to formulate, the way you synthesize, and it's subtle. I think some people reject that being reformed in that way and Susan has helped me understand what puzzled me so much about X when I first met him. He didn't think the way other people thought. Yes, he was capable of thinking the way I thought or I had been trained to think as a medical student. He was perfectly capable of thinking that way, and when he did so it always surprised me because I had been pigeonholed over here in these strange ways thinking and perceiving the world that it was Jungian. X never had to have his psyche reformed along the Jungian path the way I did because he grew up with it, he grew up with parents who their psyches had already been reformed and they naturally imparted that to him.

Q: I see, yeah.

RP2: And yet I came at it fresh and Susan Roland has helped me to get perspective on that aspect, that dimension of it. John Beebe said he was a young analyst, he had been an analyst, I don't know, for 2, 3, 4 years and I heard him talk to a group of candidates, I was a candidate at the time, and he said, "I don't know how they did it but after 4 or 5 years being here in this group and having this Jungian training I became a Jungian." I always thought that was a mysterious statement. I didn't know what he was saying but I think he was speaking to that experience. So how can you say what differentiates a Jungian from other therapists? I guess when it's that subtle and that complex in that individual because everybody's going to be reformed reading Jung in a different way.

Q: What I heard reminds me several dichotomies, I mean, rational-irrational, intellectual- emotional, Logos-Eros. Is this what you're talking about?

RP2: Yes, exactly. He wanted to make both of them equal and see that we don't reject one in favor of the other, to hold the tension between those two and then that notion of the transcended function grows out of the process of not falling into one dichotomy and rejecting the other, but if having to accept the other as equal and truly another.

Q: This would be the dialectical part of the Jungian psychology which is nicely embodied in the psychotherapy session because two persons meet and they bring their consciousness and unconsciousness and then the analytic third is . . .

RP2: I suppose that you taking these tapes, these transcriptions, you have a whole slew of analytic thirds in a way, the product of your mind and my mind coming together. Every one of your interviews must be different.

Q: They are. They are different. Same subject but different manifestations.

RP2: Different manifestations, yeah, yeah.

Q: It is well known that you have a long time interest, affiliation with sandplay. I'm wondering how you work with archetypes in sandplay sessions. You know, my main interest is the idealizing transference or something about the wise old man or woman projected out on the therapist. How this thing can occur while you are working with a patient through sandplay?

RP2: Well, first of all archetypes are not limited to personifications. What Jung called "individuation" is in a way an archetype. It's a process and it takes many forms, but if you accept that such an archetype exists then you begin to see signs of its appearance or a series of sandtrays. Sometimes sandtrays are more than dreams actually because they seem more constructive in a way than most dreams do. Dreams seem to more evanescent, and they can, of course, have an impact on the psyche and set up a dialogue, internal dialogue, that can be transformative and move along the process of individuation. But I think it's somehow more immediate impact of a sandplay when it's done seriously, meaningfully.

I have one young woman whose father recently died and he was the primary parent for her, one that offered her great, more secure guidance; the one that she identified with. So, in the process of his dying she was going to interview him about his life, about their travels. She was from an Eastern European country and at the age of five her family had fled to come to Germany and then to the United States where she arrived when she was 9 speaking two languages and not knowing a word of English, thrown into a fourth grade. She's had . . .

Q: That might've been hard.

RP2: Be hard, yeah. Through all of that her father was the most stable person and she has an openness to the spiritual dimension of the personality and sees somehow in the death of her father an opening to that archetype of the father, and does sandplay. And there are many, many manifestations of something that's transpersonal, of something that transcends it. I have a little magic wand, for example, this little plastic tube with glittery fluid in it, and she tends to work vertically in the sand from short end the long way, and so she put that at the very top edge of the sandtray and then had some other abstract figures at the top and as the sandtray progressed it became more related, water and ocean. And this is one of the most recent sandtrays that she made but there's a very definite archetypal theme in there. An appreciation and of openness to a kind of evocation through the sandplay of something of a larger dimension opening up for her with the death of her father which itself is an archetypal experience. So that's one example.

Q: Thank you for this wonderful example because some theories would say about the idealizing transference in context—let's say—about this whole guru business that often an unresolved complex triggers images and these projected out on someone else and these going to be—let's say—guru or wise old woman. On the other hand what I'm hearing that okay there is a personal level of transferences and how the patient relates to his or her complexes but there are also an archetypal level which is much greater and the healing comes from this wholeness. Is this what . . . ?

RP2: In this particular instance it's very, very clear that that's what's going on. We have a very good personal relationship. She comes regularly, there's no doubt that she respects me, and sees me as an important participant in this process, but don't say that there is much of a transference, it's not prominent in her work, it doesn't stand between us. And when I do sense it and comment upon it it's very readily acknowledged and used, made use of if you can understand what I mean. If I see certain signs of evasion or of being unsettled, for example, and I ask what's going on in her *vis a vis* with me what we're talking about, this always is an invitation to her to reflect on another level. And so the transference then is made visible in the moment, the personal transference. But I think there is a larger transference to something that she perceives is happening for her in the context of what we're doing.

Q: Yeah. This is why sandplay is something very special because everything is getting visible.

RP2: Yeah, yeah. Her dreams on the other hand are related to a personal conflict. An interesting kind of distinction.

Q: As we are going to the end of our discussion I'd like to ask my last question. What can we learn from the archetypal transference? So if you would say very briefly something about archetypal transference to a non-Jungian audience, what would you say?

RP2: Within the context of what we've been talking about in the last hour? You know, I would say something entirely different . . . So this has been not from my relationship to that hypothetical audience but a relationship to you. What can we learn? Well, I think it is humbling. We can be grateful for the opportunity occasionally to be part of a process that's larger than anything we could accomplish independently. And I think that would go for the analysand as well as the analyst. That there is a dimension of the interpersonal that is somewhat mystical and it transcends what we think of as immediate reality and comes close to touching on what's been described in various ways as being in metaphysical terms or mysticism or it's humbling because it invokes a kind of not knowing and acceptance and a kind of joy.

Q: How did you become Jungian analyst?

RP3: I think it was a matter of synchronicity and possibly grace that got me here because I had no intention when I entered medical school to either be a psychiatrist or a Jungian analyst. We residents were distributed us in some kind of random way. And it's amazing, but in my training, without any effort to select Jungians, I had four analysts as seminar leaders or supervisors. I had John Talley as a continuous case supervisor, I had Don Sandner, John Perry and Joseph Wheelwright as seminar leaders or supervisors . . . So it begins with the training and it dovetails with my interests that are—always been in the some more liberal arts questions and always had a very strong soulful or spiritual quality and Jung was the only [depths] psychology that I was exposed to that considered creativity and considered spirituality or so as significant in the psyche of people . . . So when I finished my residency I had enough Jungian exposure to know that the Jungians knew things about working with dreams and mythology that I couldn't get anywhere else, so I applied to the Jung Institute . . . So that's how it all began.

Q: In your opinion what makes the Jungian psychotherapy special in comparison with the Freudian approach or any other psychoanalytic directions?

RP3: The first thing that attracted me was theoretical, actually. It was a text that described the differences between the different psychotherapies. And it was describing Jung's model as being like a chemical reaction between two substances that for one substance the patient to change or be transformed in the process the doctor also had to be affected by it. And this was what was happening to me as a resident. I was affected by my patients. I cared what happened to them. I wasn't indifferent. I didn't have the attitude that was the psychoanalytic text that I was reading for psychotherapy . . .

I really did have to go to the Institute to read Jung, to learn more and things like that. But my liberal arts background made me very much aware, what is this, we just have one myth? There's this Oedipus myth and to read the Oedipus myth as applying to women, which a woman named Helena Deutsch had done, and some others, was just such a mind-twisting effort to fit women's psychology into the into what isn't even the entire Oedipus myth. You know, I knew the liberal arts that I learned, I knew there were a lot of other myths. Why do we have this just one myth? And also I really wasn't very good at being a blank slate upon which things are projected.

Q: I see, so your approach from the very beginning was more emotional, spiritual, than intellectual, if you can say this would be the major difference?

RP3: Yes. That was what was going on inside of me.

Q: From your heart?

RP3: Yes. The conducting of my sessions followed the model that I was supposed to, pretty much so. Never was that good at it, though, because I think I'm too transparent and the truth of the matter is I do care about what I'm hearing. And one affirmation for me was that I saw a man for over 2 years twice a week in a very psychoanalytically oriented continuous case and was supervised by a senior psychoanalyst. And I really did do probably a fairly good job of behaving like a psychoanalytically oriented therapist. Well, after I graduated, he came to see me in my private practice a number of times and he said, "You know what made a great difference to me was after I kept telling you all the things that I was having trouble with and how bad I was behaving or acting or whatever, when you saw me to the door, you smiled. And I got the feeling that I was okay, no matter what I had told you during the session." Now, that's when I stepped out of my role and became real and that's what he really picked up and that actually is what probably kept him coming back. So that was an affirmation.

Q: Could you tell me more about this process? How does it happen in your practice?

RP3: Well, my practice, as you can see by sitting in my office, I've got two equal chairs. As it turned out, I got this rather large painting and then happened to come across this pelican and liked it for itself. And then when I brought it to my office, I realized that it sort of fit in the whole scene. Well, at the time that the pelican moved into the office, I was working with an Episcopalian priest who said, "Did you know that the pelican is the only feminine symbol of Christ?" Well, I didn't, but clearly any symbol of Christ is a Self-symbol. So what I'm seeing in this configuration is that I consider the work that I do with my people as being collaborative, not one higher than the other. That the material that we both will work on is what the person brings. I contribute my insights, my reactions, my experience, make suggestions, and drawn in certain directions. And if the person—I do a lot of work with dreams and I work with the sense that the patient or client or analysand is the expert on whether the interpretation really fits. So I'm free to make suggestions of possibilities, but I'm not the expert on that other person's dream, and I know that. So there is a way in which I think the archetype of the Self or the wise person is really what inspires

and deepens the work. So if we are sitting in a vessel where we are mutual workers in this alchemical process with the symbol of the Self being the energy that actually heals and deepens and puts us on the track of what we are here for. Because I think we all are here on this—I think that human beings have a sense of the numinous and of having a soul, which makes us different as a species, really, from all those others that we may share 99% of our DNA with. I think that we, as a species, come in with a sense of the numinous and come in with a sense that we have a soul. And so humans have worshipped forever and have worshipped such a variety of things. So the process of the Jungian vessel for me is that, that it is the psyche which is another word for soul, is the deeper work and to put a person on their own track, that is, to meet life authentically, to not have suppressed their suffering, but to incorporate it into who they are and to grow in compassion and to get a sense that their talents at the time that they come into the world that all of these impinges on choices to be made over and over again that shape who they are and will become and what we're here for. So it's a long answer to your question.

Q: What I heard now is—resonated me, something you said earlier. I quote you, “Look at us all as spiritual beings on a human path rather than human beings who may or may not be on a spiritual path.”

RP3: And so the task then is to help people to recognize what's meaningful for them. And I can't tell them what is meaningful to them, but I can intuitively feel when they are moving in that direction and support that direction . . . I mean this work has a lot to do with the first part of the work where it keeps on happening is healing of the trauma and the pain and the misconceptions people have about themselves on one hand. And the other is then to provide a way of knowing, to becoming conscious—but I think consciousness first and then once you're conscious you know when you reach your choice point and what choice are you going to make. Each choice shapes the next step you take. And most of them are kind of inner—I mean they're the outer choices that people see you make, but all along the way there are much more significant inner choices that have to do with courage and what you stood up for or what you did from the shadow or what you did from the Self. It's wonderful work to do Jungian analytic work because it's a mutual kind of growing. I keep learning from the people I see.

Q: Transferences can appear in Jungian psychotherapy, but we know that there are possible negative effects of transferences. Did you experience any negative effects of transference, counter transference in your practice so far?

RP3: Of course. But I think I actually did a lot less negative transference than a lot of colleagues I hear about and hear talk about such things. The assumptions about—the places where it has been strongest have been in people that have been pretty severely, in some part of their psyche, narcissistically wounded and discounted in some way. And I can remember a couple of occasions where I stepped into a triggering it, which, of course, I wouldn't have known about it that much if I—like it's always interesting to see when you make a mistake and say—I remember one time that the rage and therefore the hurt that got triggered because I double-booked, and so of course it feels, to a person who has been wounded, totally discounted. The transference was broken . . . and, therefore, tapped into

anger that was well deserved earlier in life about not mattering to a significant parent, being discounted, not being that important. The anger that he had believed that he was that important to me and now it was obvious that I . . . and on and on, of course. But how important that was to see and to know. Because the timing was always so good in that there had been enough. See, one of the things about Jungian transference that I think is especially helpful, because I think negative transferences are very hard on the analyst. We have such an influence on each other, so to project positive or negative is an energy field that we have to deal with, and so when somebody comes in and is really hostile or angry or mistrustful or something, it's hard work. It's hard work and the person has to know that the thing I have about why it's positive to do a Jungian transference work versus a Freudian work, which I think is much harder, because they invite themselves to be a blank slate, or they did in the traditional way.

Q: You know my main interest in this research is finding some relevance of a very special archetype, namely Wise Old Man and I would add Wise Old Woman. I'm wondering how you could experience these archetypes—

RP3: Yes.

Q: And one more important question, how do you think about these two, would be two different, as one is coming often in men's individuation process and the other is a woman's individuation process, or you approach as the same or equivalent archetype?

RP3: I think of the Wise Person archetype is very androgynous . . . that describes the Crone archetype . . . Exceptional men can be Crones because the most notable Crones in the world are actually men right now. It's that generation that is the Dalai Lama and Bishop Tutu and Nelson Mandela. They are men who embody an understanding through suffering and of compassion. And we also know from the brain research that the age they're in now, the testosterone adrenaline energies are much less, that men become much more like... like women as they get past the aggressive, assertive, competitive phases of their lives and they get mellowed out and they get interested—

Q: It's going to be good news. Isn't it?

RP3: In grandchildren—yes, it's good news. So I think that there is a Wise Person archetype. I think that there are some differences in that the Wise Man is usually, at least archetypally, wiser about the ways of the world, wiser about uses of power, wiser about the lessons learned from failure because that's the course he was on as a younger man and he's learned from it and become a wise man. And I think the Wise Woman has grown through relationship and loss of relationship and having children or not having children, children dying. I think that the grandmother energies that she moves into, where she has a feeling for all the children of the world is more the Wise Woman. I think they are, but because the archetypes are in both men and women, a man can have a Wise Woman and a woman can have a Wise Man in the psyche.

RP3: I think archetypally, the Wise Person is not just a last phase of life, but an archetype that is present for some throughout life. And some people aren't able to have them as real people in their lives. Maybe they just see an image of such a person and the interior archetype is activated out of their need for that archetype, because the archetypal realm makes it very aware that even if you've never been properly mothered, the archetype of the Good Mother is there and so when you meet someone who embodies that, you respond to it. You recognize it . . .

Now, the Guru archetype and the Wise Person archetype do overlap for many people. There are people who go through this— [at some] phases of therapy where their unfortunate friends and relatives are hearing “What my analyst said.” So, this very much being like analyst as guru. It's very problematical to be a guru, because it's like you're imposing something. The person is becoming a follower, not listening to their own inner wisdom. And what I see in the guru world is almost every single one of them has betrayed the trust of their disciples by crossing boundaries. The major American guru—I mean, gurus from abroad who've come to America, almost every single one of them, of the important ones, have slept with their disciples, mostly women, but some of them have been male gurus who slept with the men or the boys. And then rocked the faith of these people that trusted them so. Well, that happens in the Jungian analyst world, because a Jungian world without boundaries creates a sense of inflation in the guru . . .

Q: It would also be interesting to hear more about your personal experiences with the Wise Persons. I mean I can easily imagine that the Wise Person image is often projected on you in your practice. How do you work with this projection, for instance?

RP3: Well, I hear a lot of dreams of people who incorporate me into their dreams and I listen to them because I want to know what their unconscious is saying about me. And actually I haven't heard grand elevated dreams. Very often I am—they may be compensatory, but they are usually positive and ordinary. It's like I'm in their house or they come across me in some kind of setting and I seem to behave reasonably. I know I work with a lot of positive transference. I think the positive transference is in the mirroring effect of being seen and understood. I think it really helps people to grow. I think that there is for some people the mixed experience. It's like having a very accomplished parent, that if that parent, if you're related to that parent and that parent has a sense of your development, that's all very positive, but you also, I've been aware that some people have had to go through that period of contrasting what they have done so far in their life and what their analyst has done so far in her life. And that makes them smaller, so the open discussion of the different paths people are on and really the sort of unfoldingness of the paths we're on at any given place. This is my story over here and it's their story over there. That is a subtle negative transference that can, the comparative one that can get evoked.

Q: How do you see, would it be possible to consider psychologically the analyst in psychotherapy and also the guru in spiritual context as if they were representatives of the Self?

RP3: They do seem to be representatives who live closer to the Self than most of the other archetypes that—and since the ego has a limited grasp of the Self and what we are doing, in our conversation conceptually as well as in the work with analysis, is making the observing ego more conscious of what's going on in the larger psyche. So that's so much of the nature of what a person learns in analysis, is to stay present, to have the ego not get overwhelmed by the complexes and not get overwhelmed by the negative or positive transferences that they're putting out there, but to maintain an observer's position on what is going on, which is so much greater than it can grasp anyway, including whatever the Self is. So the work of analysis, as I see it in the spiritual direction, is to strengthen and grow the energy of the ego-Self axis, which is a way in which the Self, which manifests itself—it's bigger than the ego, so it has a capacity, the ego has a capacity to tap into love and compassion and an understanding and a sense of, say, the numinous, being what the ego, the observing ego is attracted to, that there's a sense of where Self overlaps the ego, there's this liminal place where numinosity and meaning come together. And when the activated archetypes which give us meaning or depth are lived through an ego that integrates it into the world. That's where meaning is. If you live, if your archetypes are consistent with who you are in the world, there is a sense of living your story, living—because whenever you live from an archetype or from the Self . . .

Q: This can be the personal myth that you often say.

RP3: This is the personal myth, yes. And when I think about the gods and goddesses as archetypes, which I do, obviously, the presence in every temple, metaphorically, in ancient Greece, you couldn't have a temple without having a fire at the center of a round hearth in that temple to illuminate and warm the building. So that, to me, is an image of the archetype of the Self that illuminates and warms that archetype. Because every archetype has its potential to be very shadowy or very superficial or very power-in-the-world-minded, or it can be access to the Self. And that image of the Self is, for me, Hestia's image of the fire at the center of the round hearth or the mandala, which is Jung's image of the Self.

So yes, I think that when archetypal lies in an ego-Self axis it's because the Self, the archetype—I don't think there's just one archetype, either. I also sort of think that we have an interior console of sorts and by the time we are more onto the Self, that a person, for example, who actually follows a guru would have that guru as teacher as part of that inner console, would have the psychotherapist that have helped along the way as part of that inner console, all of them contributing to what could be a person's counsel of sages or Wise People, that it not be shorthanded to be The Crone or The Wise Man or The Wise Woman or the Guru, but essentially there is something in the person's psyche that the ego-Self connection that can tap into the accumulated wisdom of that life. But everyone is an archetype so it also taps into the deeper accumulated wisdom of humanity, as well. And we can take some of it into us and some of it out, that kind of thing. So maybe that helps put these various guru folks together with the archetypes.

And it's then a useful concept for whoever needs one, to think about having a Wise Person or an Inner Guru, the direction needed to take it off the outer guru because he's going to

turn out to sleep with his disciples and you're going to crash if you think it's all out there. And if it's your analyst that you make into and you consider yourself a disciple, then this analysis is not going to do you much good if you have to stay in it forever and turn over your life to this Wise Person who really has taken your power. I mean this is very bad. But to internalize all of those people and to recognize that they carry a spark that's really good to have and they're human beings with shadows and flaws and stuff. And also you don't help your—sometimes I have the concept that we're here to help each other's karmic life here, too. And then this other theory, if you're in a co-dependent relationship with any other person, you help make them into a narcissist if they're not already one. And that's really not a very loving thing to do. And so the co-dependent that thinks they're so wonderfully caretaking of everybody, but if they're making that other person into a distorted—distorting their sense of who they are is really not being very helpful.

So I think that a lot of men who, especially men because men don't have the experience of women's friendships and conversations, as a general rule, so it's much easier to be isolated. And if you were wounded as a boy or a young man and you get into a position of considerable power as an older man, and you never get any feedback about your human dimension and you're just looked to as the Guru or the Wise Person, I think that really causes a lot of difficulties that people have. And so the man who's basking in it does also need to see that though it may feel good, it's really not contributing to his particular individuation journey.

Q: The other thing is that without surrender, this relationship cannot be really helpful. If you talk about guru-disciple relationship in its traditional meaning, surrender is one of the most crucial elements of this relationship.

RP3: That's why I don't believe in gurus.

Q: And if you talk about analysis, some Jungians say that surrender, both of the analyst and patient is necessary to go into the unknown and having trust to follow the path toward the unknown. What is your opinion?

RP3: There's something to be said for both the -- to surrender one's ability—I don't like the word surrender, to start with.

Q: What would be your wording for that?

RP3: Surrender, when it involves people, I think there's a necessity to surrender—the necessity to surrender, to become humbled by an awareness that there's something really greater than yourself or that there is a mystery or a meaning that is—and that you do trust where this is taking you, somehow I don't think that means going unconscious. I mean there's possession and being taken over, is also at some level surrender, too, and I find it difficult to conceive of doing this kind of work and making a demand on the people who work with me that they surrender anything to me.

Q: What do you mean by that?

RP3: I think trust and surrender are two very different things. Trust grows over time and one learns that this person is very trustworthy when we're talking about X but not very—doesn't know very much about Y. So you don't give away your capacity to be discriminating. You can love somebody and hopefully I think that this work doesn't work unless there's a certain amount of real love in the vessel. But that doesn't mean being blind. And surrender imposes, to me, says I will blindly turn to you for direction and somehow in this vessel that there's an implicit promise, if not an explicit promise that there's some real good that will come out of this surrender, that I don't see how an analyst can every promise that. It feels so arrogant to say if you surrender your soul to me in this vessel, what? I don't—maybe I . . .

Q: So this can be one of the major differences between these two culturally and historically shaped models. I mean between guru-disciple and analyst-patient relationships?

RP3: I'm reminded of a book by Eric Hoffer called "The True Believer" and it was describing the people who especially followed Hitler, but also other charismatic leaders which are the Gurus, often that it does, it was that kind of an explanation that is along the lines of co-dependency. It is a giving up to identify with the cause or the other person or something. And it can lead to great disillusionment because the person who identifies with the Guru grows—the narcissistic part of the person is really fed by such things, I would think.

Now, the process, I think that when people enter a Jungian analysis and learn to understand their dream language and also when you start factoring in synchronicity and dreams as giving feedback, I trust that a lot. I know that I can make a mistake about the meaning of the direction the person I seem to be supporting this direction or this interpretation of this dream. And I can trust that dreams and synchronicities are probably going to come into my psyche or my person's psyche and there'll be some correction of the course. So I'm in a process I trust. I don't fully surrender to this process, either. I just say it's really a very trustworthy—if people maintain their boundaries and are attuned to such things as we are attuned to, it's a very trustworthy process, but there are no guarantees here, either.

Q: How did you become Jungian analyst?

RP4: Oh, well, I think probably the most important thing was that I found a Jungian therapist who really helped me and so that made me feel like this was what I wanted to do, too. I was already a therapist and then I connected with a man who really helped me enormously, and so I thought well I would like to be an analyst, too, and so I went into the training. You want more?

Q: Yes. I'm wondering whether you had any type of transference toward your analyst and how did you work?

RP4: You know I don't make a big distinction between Jungian and other kinds of analysis or depth psychotherapy. I feel that there is good therapy and not such good therapy. And Jungians, Freudians, Kleinians, anybody can fall into either group. I also don't make a distinction between the archetypal transference and the personal transference in the same way that some people might. I believe that—you know Jung had a metaphor where the personal unconscious was at the top and the archetypal was underneath it. But I feel that that's a misleading metaphor. I believe that the two layers of the unconscious are completely interpenetrated. So that when I have a feeling, say about my father. It's a feeling about my personal father, and it is also filled with the energy of the—with the archetypal energy that surrounds the father. And so I think of the same thing as happening in the transference. That what Jung called kinship libido—is the basis of the archetypal transference and that is actually the basis that the infant attaching to its mother and father. And then it's the basis of all of us making attachments to spouses or friends through life and that when someone is in therapy, they make an attachment to their personal therapist based on the kinship libido that we all use to attach to whoever and also infused with the energy of the archetype of the healer. Now I would see that as more primary than the archetype of the guru. I would think of the guru as a particular version of the healer sort of. So when you say, "Did I have a transference?" I had an enormous transference. I've always been very good at making transferences. And I don't actually believe that anybody could be in therapy without developing a substantial transference. Even if it's a resistance to the transference, that that would still take a lot of energy, and the person becomes very important to the patient, even if it's in a negative way.

And it's like it takes a huge amount of energy to hold off the other person's influence, you know, to say, "You don't matter to me," when it's someone who you spend your time telling them all your deepest secrets. Of course, they matter to you.

Q: So, in your view, psychotherapy is actually something archetypal.

RP4: Yes.

Q: And this is why no reason to talk about archetypal transference and personal transference [as separate].

RP4: They're both together.

Q: They are both together and maybe the third layer can come between them as Joe Henderson exemplified the cultural layer. What do you think? How these three work together in psychoanalysis?

RP4: Yeah. I really would prefer not to use the word "layer" because that has such a visual image, and I'd rather say that they're interpenetrated. It's one unit.

Q: More texture or a matrix.

RP4: Okay, a matrix. The culture contains us all the time. You know, you would have more insight into the culture than I would, because you come from a different culture. For me, I'm just swimming in the water I've always swum in, and I'm not going to notice anything about it. But you might say, "Oh, wow, look. This is different." I mean to me it's just the way the world is. To talk about how they relate to each other, I just don't quite understand how I would do that. They all come as a unit. You wouldn't have a personal transference if it wasn't fueled by the archetypal layer of being human. And you can't be a human being if you don't live in a culture. You would die, really. You know, you'd be all on your own out in the middle of the desert, as it were. So they're all together all the time.

Q: To me, this kind of differentiation is important because the guru, obviously, is a different kind of cultural expression of the same archetype, namely the wise old man as I would identify the guru image with, which is one of—the well elaborated images by Jung. And I'm wondering how this metaphor can be applied for the analytic relationship.

RP4: Well, I think it's very problematic. I would not want to use it, to be honest. There is, you know, just the way the infant naturally sees their parents as the self, as all powerful, a god. But the infant is mistaken. I mean really mistaken. Similarly, the patient comes in and they're in pain and they look to the therapist to heal them. In order, I mean, because that's what they want, they naturally put on the therapist one of two—either a negative or a positive self image. One could be, "Oh, you are so great. You are a wise old man or a wise old woman, and you are going to heal me, and I will take everything you say as though it was the gospel truth." The other one is, "Oh, you're so powerful. You're going to heal me. I have to resist you because you'll get under my skin and change me and I won't be myself anymore." But it's both the same projection of the self. The analyst has to carry that just the way the parent has to carry it. But the analyst has to be very, very centered in the fact that he or she is not a guru and doesn't have the last word and is not a wise old person. It's just a stumbling human being. So I mean to the extent that that's constellated and that that's active, the analyst wants to stay separate from it, at least in his own head. And while you don't want to hurt the person's feelings or, you know, sort of pour cold water over their head and say, "Now don't think that of me," in your head or in your heart you need to be keeping separate from it. Because it's terribly, terribly dangerous when the analyst falls into imagining that he knows best. I can't even begin to say the many stories I've heard where analysts tell their patients what to do because they know, and it is—I don't know, maybe sometimes it's right, but the stories you hear, it's always wrong. You know, it's never a good idea. So the archetype is constellated, but the analyst's job is not to believe in it, or is to not believe in it. And it isn't always a guru that's constellated. You know you could have transference, where you imagine that you and your analyst are just the same and you think just the same and you feel just the same about everything. That's not really guru transference, it's more a twin transference. You could have a very problematic parental transference, you know, where maybe your mother was very weak and so the analyst always seems quite pathetic to you. No matter what they say, it's like, "Oh, my God, so dumb." I mean that's just as real a transference and it's just as useful really. The important thing about the transference is that the patient is having a living experience of their complexes and of themselves in their relationship with another person, and I don't

think it's important that they admire the therapist. It's just important that they experience something powerful.

RP4: But you know the therapy—this goes way, way back before the 19th century, as long as human beings have existed. When you're in pain, emotional pain, the instinctual impulse is to go talk to somebody about it. Even when you feel ashamed, you know, you're looking for someone who you could tell this terrible, shameful thing to. It is the nature of human beings to take their troubles to each other and essentially say, "Can you help me?" So this is just the latest incarnation of that process. We used to have priests. We certainly always have had parents, friends. These are all incarnations. And what has happened—what Freud began and so many other people continued, was formalizing that and trying to figure out what is it about that that's helpful? And how can we optimize the helpfulness, rather than making it kind of a hit or miss thing where, you know, just as a friend would listen to you.

Q: So while one hand archetypes, particularly the wise old man archetype, are universal and we can find in different time and different cultures, and it seems to be that the psychotherapy would provide a kind of same model in our modern time for it?

RP4: Yes.

Q: And on the other hand, of course, there are many different forms, images, you know, through—that could be expressed, this very same archetype. Is this what you are saying?

RP4: Well, I would not think that the guru—the guru archetype is not really the one I would turn to. You know, for example, I have a patient now who's been working with me for a very long time, and for the first 8 or 10 years of the work her focus was really on tearing me down. She had all kinds of opinions about how pathetic I was. I dressed really badly. In normal circumstance this would be rude, but in the psychotherapy everything is allowed. Well, what I tell people is I want them to say out loud whatever comes to mind, so when rude thoughts come to mind, I do expect them to try to say them out loud. And so this went on for many years, and it was after a very long time I began to understand that the point of it was to diminish me because I seemed so big and she felt so ashamed of how little she felt in relation to me. Certainly, all those years she did not experience me as a wise old woman. Now she much more does. But I don't know. It wouldn't have felt helpful to me to think about it in those terms at that time. And even now it feels much more like she experiences me like a god, actually, rather than a guru. A guru is like it connects you to god.

Q: So the psychotherapist can help the patient to reconnect with the Self in a similar way like a guru helps the disciple to get in contact with something divine.

RP4: Yes, but a guru is usually less of a personal relationship, and a psychotherapist is more somebody who carries the self so that the therapist is experienced as though they are the self, not as though they're helping you connect with it. And you connect with it through

your relationship. That's how I work and, in my opinion, that's how people work. But I know that there are analysts who work differently and who have different opinions. . . . Well, you know, a guru is seen as someone who has wisdom to impart. But I think an analyst should be very wary of ever taking on that role. I think that we have some understanding of the process, but in terms of having any kind of answers, what's unique really about the analytic process is that it believes that the answers are going—the answers will come from inside the patient. It's similar like with a priest, you know. You go to a—say you're a Catholic and you go to a priest, the priest knows the right way to be. The analyst doesn't know the right way to be. You know the priest maybe will say, "You should be true to your wife." But the analyst will say, "I don't know if you should be true to your wife. I don't know if you should be married or divorced. Let's pay attention to what comes up in you and see what you say." I can say things to a person that are statements, but it would be based on—it should be based completely on what they are telling me, on what I notice. You know so like I might notice that somebody shrugs at a certain point, and they didn't notice that themselves, so I could point that out. Or I might even say, "When you said that, you shrugged as though you were throwing it away at the same time as you said it." So that would be, in a way, giving them some wisdom, but it isn't wisdom I came into the room with. It's just based on my ability to notice things because I've been spending a lot of years paying attention and trying to notice things. It's quite different, it seems to me, and from someone who comes in believing that they know something about how to live life, which I believe, is the guru model that the guru has some knowledge that they're going to impart. And, you know, I try to start by saying I don't have any knowledge.

Q: Anyway I see something paradoxical here, because the Jungian psychotherapy has some knowledge and a Jungian analyst or any kind of analyst has a kind of certainty. . . . There is a frame and several assumptions which can be a guideline for a therapist during the session.

RP4: I believe it's very important to hold the frame which means to start on time and end on time and to what charge and all that sort of thing. But there's like about five things or something, you know. It's really very few, although they're very hard to hold. And I do believe you have to hold that, but everything else I think you should throw away. You know, you can read it, but when you come into the room, whatever you know about the Self, I would urge you not to have it in mind, but to see what the patient is going to tell you or show you about how the Self operates in them. Certainly, as you work for years and years and years, you develop some theories that feel pretty compelling. Let's say the idea that people project or the idea that people split, but still it should be as though you're discovering it anew and would—I mean everybody does it in their own unique way. It's sort of like no two people do anything the same. And what's most important is not to fall into thinking that you know. I feel like that's in many ways the biggest danger for a therapist. To come in imagining that they understand something. And one of the most unhelpful things that people do is when they try to help people by telling them something that they know already sort of. Instead of you finding this out for yourself, I'll just help you and I'll tell you. And that is never—

Q: It's a kind of countertransference on the—possible idealizing the transference presenting kind of omnipotence.

RP4: Yes. I guess I keep saying that. The most dangerous thing is to fall into imagining that the idealizing transference is accurate. Because it's not.

...

Q: Would you like to say more about your understanding of the feminine principle in doing psychotherapy?

RP4: Well, you know, we do a lot of logos stuff, but I'm not sure it's very important. You know, you maybe know more about this than I, but I believe that the research on psychotherapy indicates that what people really value is feeling loved. And you just about never have anybody say, "Oh, the really valuable thing was when my therapist told me this." It's sort of like people don't even remember what you say. I'm not sure I remember hardly anything my analyst ever said to me, but I sure remember what it felt like being in his presence and feeling cherished, you know. And, also, I think the experience of feeling that somebody actually wanted to listen to me, which I had never had that experience before. People were always telling me. You know, my parents had a lot to tell me, and my teachers had a lot to, everybody had a lot to tell me, but nobody had ever really wanted to listen. So I tend to think that that's by far the biggest element, you know. And then it is sometimes helpful to say things, too, but I think of my problem as a therapist as being talking too much. You know, I don't know. I know that there are some people who complain that their therapists don't talk enough. I don't know what that's about, but I think it's about a way that the therapist is not emotionally attuned to the patient so that they don't offer something when the patient needs something. But if you're attuned and listening, most of the time, I mean for me, no one's ever said I don't talk enough. I can sit for a whole hour saying one or two sentences and people seem totally happy with that because I'm listening. So, you know, that's just my personal experience but somebody else might have a different one.

Q: This reminds me what another Jungian analyst said "sitting there in psychotherapy doesn't mean that the analyst would be passive," so this is something very important. You said that the analyst's presence is something very important.

RP4: Well, the analyst listening. Listening is not passive, you know, listening is quite hard and exhausting. It's hard to be open and receptive. It's a lot of work, but it comes out quiet.

Q: Yes, but even the analyst only, put in quote, "listens," she or he is there, and this is how a kind of energetic field will be created.

RP4: Yeah, but you see, even what you said, "Even if the analyst only listens." It's a really amazing thing, because most people, sound comes into their ear, but they're not listening. Listening is not just hearing, you know. It's letting it come in and feeling where it goes inside you and what it brings up inside you, what kind of memories or fantasies or whatever, and, certainly, what kinds of emotions. And it's quite exhausting.

Q: This is a very subtle process and, actually, this is what I would like to learn more about. So, how you work with the patient transference and maybe you can recall some memorable cases along this line.

RP4: You know these words have so many different meanings. I think the most common way to use the words “transference” and “countertransference” today is simply to talk about the whole relationship so that whatever feelings I have about my patient and whatever he or she means to me, that’s my countertransference, and the transference is whatever I mean to them and whatever they feel about me. There’s a thing on the Internet, and I don’t know what the website is, but there’s a thing of—a movie of Jung being interviewed and talking about the transference.

Basically what he says is, you know, the patient comes in and starts to talk to you about whatever troubles him, and fairly quickly this results in the patient having emotional experiences in relation to you, and you become important to him. In the same way, he becomes important to me because he’s telling me things that are not normally told and he’s telling me about his suffering, and it touches into my suffering, whatever that is. It’s a little hard for me to talk to you right now, because the last person I saw is a man who I’ve been seeing for quite a while, and his oldest son died quite a few years ago. That’s what brought him in. He hasn’t been able to really feel his grief. And so what happened in this hour that I just finished is that almost nothing was said. You know, I mean I know all about what’s going on in his life, so he told me that this thing that was supposed to happen on Friday had gone wrong and he—it’s a sad event. And he told me some things about his other living children that are distressing. And I knew he was talking about his grief about this dead young man as well as all the disappointments he has about his other children, although they’re doing okay. I don’t know if he knew that, but I started to cry. And the whole hour we just sat there with me crying. That’s almost the only thing that happened is I was crying.

Q: Physically?

RP4: Physically. Tears were running down my face and he started to cry, and he said, “Oh, that’s not fair. It’s not fair for you to cry.” And I couldn’t stop. I just couldn’t stop. I cried for 20, 25 minutes. And that’s what happened in the hour. So that’s my countertransference.

Q: So what I’m hearing here is that your countertransference was a kind of unconscious—so something unconsciously happened to you.

RP4: Well, he was trying to tell me about his grief that he can’t fully feel and I got it unconsciously, and it very much touched—I mean when I was crying, I was thinking of difficulties with my son and grandson, but it was for his difficulties with his dead son.

Q: Please, let me ask you about the most mysterious part of the psychotherapy. This is the Self and the relation to the Self. How this relationship can work in psychotherapy?

RP4: Well, I think of us as having a spark of life force inside us. There's all this life force on the Earth and I think in the universe, and we each have a little, tiny spark of it. And that's how I think of the Self. That's what I think the Self is, is that life force. And there's the little spark inside me and the whole great big force of it in the universe. I think that what is unique about a Jungian approach is the belief that the life force in me, the Self in me, is interested in me and is actually interested in helping me. It's on my side. Although, you know, really if you were going to write a book about this, you'd probably have to wind up talking an awful lot about how the Self might also be demonic and hostile. But I do believe that there is a spark that is rooting for the person. And that spark is certainly constellated in the therapy situation.

Q: By being there? So I mean some analyst quotes Jesus Christ who said that, "If you will be three or more, I will be present."

RP4: "You will be two or more," it should be. It's all by itself. Yes. I don't think you do anything to constellate it. It comes when it is ready to come. Jung talks about the common situation where at a certain point in the therapy process the patient has a dream that seems to image the bursting forth of the transference. I was just reading about a patient who had a dream that a flying saucer landed on their lawn. That would be the eruption of the Self, I would guess would be one way to put it. But it's nothing that you do. It's like listening. It's like if you wait and are open to it, it will happen.

Q: I would have another question concerning the archetypes and in particular regarding the wise old man or wise old woman archetypes. Is there any special situation when they are more likely to appear on the basis of your experience with the Self?

RP4: I think that the more often you meet with your patient, the more the heat is turned up and the more intense the experience that the Self will be. But just meeting more often won't do it. It really is just a question of being available. And, you know, sometimes it won't happen. Sometimes it just won't. And I don't think that that's—the only thing you might be doing wrong is talking too much. Not leaving enough space. But other than that, we don't have any control.

Q: Dr. RP5, you wonderfully wrote in your books about how you became Jungian. You emphasized the importance of the calling. And as I understood well, you had very influential experiences with Carl Jung, with himself, which influenced you in your process. Would you please, tell about—?

RP5: First of all, nobody ever called him Carl, not even his mother. They called him C. G., C. G. Jung. When I was there, he gave a couple of, you know, did some public lectures, which were very interesting and very moving. And he gave the advanced students a seminar, which I attended, and it was wonderful. And then at the end, I went to him for a last session for a blessing. When I went to war, World War II, my grandfather—there's his picture up there—who was a rabbinical scholar, you know. And he gave me the blessing

going to war. But it was more than the blessing going to the war. It was the blessing like Jacob's blessing. And in my tradition from which I come, the blessing is not "Be safe." It's a calling to pursue a spiritual path. So I had that from my grandfather.

Q: Was it physical touch?

RP5: Was it touch? Yes, at the prayer you touch. And I went to Jung to get for his blessing. And when I went to see him I said, "This is why I'm here. I don't know." He said, "Well, we'll see." So we did the hour, and I got the blessing.

Q: We reached a very interesting point, I think, which fascinates several Jungian scholars and other religious scholars as well. This question is the transmission. Do you think that your blessing were a kind of transmission?

RP5: I feel emotional. No. I think it was a validation. The calling was from within, because I had had experiences as a child and as an adolescent, and so on. And I took the collective route, the scientific materialist position, and so on. But my soul was different. So it was there waiting to be aroused. I think it was Zeller—that meeting with Zeller was the calling. And with Jung, it was the validation of all my work. It came at the end of my training, where he acknowledged, "Yes, you are an analyst." And he's been in my dreams quite a lot, and he's present to me. So in a very supportive way, to going my own way, even when I didn't go with the Jungian collective. He was still with me, as was von Franz, who was my control analyst. She supported me too. My regular analyst was Meier, C. A. Meier.

Q: Yes. Do you think Jung was a guru?

RP5: No.

Q: Could you tell more about this? I'm asking because one of your colleagues, Dr. Vasavada, approached him [with the same question].

RP5: I know. It's in the book.

Q: And they got correspondence on this issue, and Jung clearly rejected this proposition.

RP5: Of course he did. Well, the story was—you know, Vasavada was a good friend of mine. We wrote the book together. And the story was, he went to Jung, and he threw himself on the floor. He was like a guru, because Vasavada had a guru in India. He himself was a guru in India later on. So he threw himself on the floor, and then Jung was embarrassed and lifted him up and said, "You know, Vasavada, you're a guru." And Jung said no. And he's right. And then my discussion with Vasavada is that the guru is, carries, and intentionally carries the archetype of the Self, and is the teacher and so on. And Jung's way was not that. His way was to help the individual find the Self within himself and to be

as human and direct as possible, and as involved. For example, when I saw him in a session, he was like this, this close. He talked to me like this...

Q: So close.

RP5: Yes. I had to back up. It was too much. And during the course of it, he was talking at one point about being in Africa, and he had this dream about being in Africa where his hair was getting curly. He thought he was going African. And my mouth went like this. It sounded a bit racist to me, actually. And he stopped, he saw that, he said, “What does a dream mean?” Jung asked me to interpret his dream. I was speechless. Now I can talk to him. Then I couldn’t. But, no, he intentionally was not, intentionally not a guru, because it was the dialogue.

So in my day, they didn’t work with the transference so much there. I have to tell you that story too, of how I came to work with the transference much more actively as a consequence of my experience. But they—mostly, my Jungian analysts accepted the transference. It was in that context of that sort of *temenos* wherein I could do all that work. Well, for example, with Meier, when I, at one point, the negative sort of transference, and he was always, you know, sitting there with his pipe—

Q: It was more theoretical . . .

RP5: No, he didn’t say much. He said very little for all those years, you know.

Q: . . . like the classical Freudian—

RP5: Yeah. No, he was very much a Jungian, very deep, but he didn’t say a lot. He didn’t okay that I was—at one point, I said that I was experiencing the utter impersonality of the Self. I said, “I could drop dead here on the floor and you wouldn’t give a damn.” What did he do? He laughed.

Q: So you say that the guru—Jung wasn’t a guru. On the other hand, you wrote in your book [title] that your grandfather and Jung both are very influential.

RP5: Oh, tremendously.

Q: Still today, and they are kind of living psychic reality in your dreams and in your active imagination.

RP5: Yes. Oh, yes, yes. But they’re not—see, the traditional guru, as I said, as Vasavada said, where the person comes, and there’s a prescribed procedure to help them get to the Self in that Hindu sense, and they do that.

RP5: But as Vasavada also said in our discussions, the guru does not deal so much with personal material. An analyst deals totally with personal material, even with the archetypal, is how it manifests in the personal life, in the personal relationship. And Vasavada said,

“This is the great contribution. This is Jung’s contribution to India, which he was unable to fulfill.” So that is the difference between—it seems to me—between the guru-disciple relationship and the analyst. Because of, I mean, I think in India or the disciple could never really complain to the guru and be negative toward him. It so would be a shock, disrespectful. But, in the West, we can, and then we deal with what’s constellated now. The difference is one can, instead of being embodied the guru only, it’s brought into the room. The old wise man and the Self are in the room. That’s the archetypal transference, so that we, the patient and I, experience it together. And I know this, usually, when it happens. If I know it physically, I get tingling in my hands where the subtle body it manifests. Then I know—it’s one of the ways I know. Also bodily symptoms and things like that.

Q: So are you saying that both the guru in its traditional meaning and the analyst in the psychotherapy room can be representatives of the Self?

RP5: Oh, sure. Oh, definitely represented.

Q: But there are several cultural, historical, and other differences.

RP5: Well, here’s an example that comes to mind at the moment. A Hindu professor came to work with me from India—a professor of engineering at a university—whose heart had been broken because he was in love with a girl, a Thai girl, Thai young woman—he was a little older—where marriage was impossible because of the Thailand vs. India, Buddhist vs. Hindu—you know, it was impossible. So he was brokenhearted. And he came with that issue plus some other ones. And as we discussed this issue—he was a follower of Kali. You’re, of course, familiar. And as I said to him, I said, “Well, I think perhaps you need to bring this issue to Kali.” He hadn’t thought of that. He thought it was a good idea. And he went home, and he prayed for an hour or so, and then he went to sleep. He had a dream, and Kali appeared to him, but in the form of his beloved. She took a form of his beloved. And he embraced and wed his beloved as Kali. And he came into the room. He tells me this dream. And Kali was present. We both felt it. There it was.

Q: So a kind of invocation?

RP5: Yes, because he brought it and, you know, I felt it. I’m connected with Hinduism too, of course. So it was in the room. So he wasn’t Kali. I wasn’t Kali. Kali was there, but she joined us in this room. She was there.

Q: By hearing that you are a psychoanalyst of priests and Buddhist monks and other spiritual persons, maybe in this context, my question would sound stupid. Do you think that Jungian psychology is a spiritual practice?

RP5: Oh, sure. It’s my spiritual practice.

Q: In what sense? What do you mean by that?

RP5: This is, for me, is holy work that I do. Every day and with every person, connecting to the Self, it's a way. But also, I have other practices. I did 8 years of Reichian therapy, for example. And I was interested in magic, so I do a middle pillar meditation, which derives from *Kabbalah*, in my own origin. So I do that and a walk every day, a half-hour walk in which I do that meditation. And I've been doing that for 40 years. But my main spiritual practice is working with my own dreams and working—it's my main spiritual practice.

Q: I see. So you have your own spiritual practice, and you consider the session should be spiritual.

RP5: Also. Yes. It is for me.

Q: And both somehow interrelated to each other.

RP5: It is for me. It may not be for the patient that they come differently. So I've—you know all sorts of people. I see—

Q: Would you please, tell a little more about your work in psychotherapy? How do you connect to the archetypal transference, and how do you connect to the Self, and all that kind of stuff? I've read your book, and you are very articulate about this, but I'm wondering, how would you—

RP5: Well, of course, one takes the patient where they are, what they bring, what their issue is. Often, it has nothing to do with the archetypal level. But, as Jung says, usually, if the analysis lasts long enough, it's likely to get archetypal. And I think my own teacher, Meier, my analyst, wrote a very good article about this that I follow. It said that the very—the work of the analyst trying to connect and get connected inside the patient, after a while, you don't know the content, what belongs to the patient and what belongs to the analyst. And that condition is very good for the evocation of the collective unconscious. You see, when the complexes are united and you don't know who's who, then the archetypal level comes in, which I think is an accurate statement. Now how do I know this? Well, I work from the dreams. The archetypal level appears in the dreams, and I make a comment. But I usually can tell by something that I've experienced. Like let's say, for example, I'll get bodily symptoms, and I'll say something about that, and usually the patient has had the same symptom, either at the moment or—so I know that there is this somatic unconscious that's connected, and that's already archetypal.

Or I know from the symbolism in the dream. I'll say something about that, and it's evoked. And the clearest way, as I've said, is the subtle body. When that energy is evoked in my fingers and the hands or the body, then I say something. Then we say it. And sometimes it gets very intense, and that's when the archetypal level is activated.

RP5: Now the extent to which—that I'm seen as the old wise man—I don't know. When I started out, I wanted to be the old wise man, and I got the projection of the lover. And now I have too much—like Jung, I'm too human, I mean, too much who I am, to really be the old wise man. So I am appreciated for evocation or being present to the

unconscious, but it's—is it more in the room that I'm it, I think. But certainly, they look to me, because of my knowledge and experience. But nobody sort of worships me or anything like that.

Q: Well, not that way, but maybe through kind of idealizing transference.

RP5: Oh, yeah, initially, yeah. Some are like that, but they usually change after a while. For example, initial sexual transference and then it changes, and that can turn either way, negative, and so on. Oh, yeah. Yeah, some aspect of the idealizing can continue. I see some people for many, many years. I don't think they idealize me though. They may for a while, but they don't after a while. They see my humanity and flaws. And they see that, and I accept their humanity and flaws. So we're dealing with that, with the shadow, all the time, so . . . So I see that. I see the transference less in the Freudian terms and more in the underneath archetypal one that's taking place, and making that conscious. If I make that conscious, they take it back. See, if I appear in the dream in a certain way, okay, who am I? What am I carrying for you in this regard? You know, discuss the symbolism of what it is I'm carrying at that moment, or sometimes in compensation. They see me very positively, so I could be negative in the dream in some way. So it's analyzing to make things conscious, which is not what a guru does.

Q: So you mean sorting out what is personal, what is archetypal, what is meaningful, and what would relate to you as an analyst, what would relate to the collective and to the person?

RP5: Just understand what's theirs. That's not what a guru does. And you could say, in a way, that analysis in the West, especially Jungian analysis, is the West's development of the guru-disciple relationship. But it's not in that Hindu context.

Q: Two things stirred up in me while I was listening to you. The first is the question of the surrender. Another Indian scholar, Sudhir Kakar—I'm not for sure whether I pronounced his name correctly—proposed that in idealizing transference can happen something similar like in religious context, in terms of surrender. And [you said] in one of your interviews that you are somehow much friendlier with being surrender in your professional context than even C. G. Jung and your colleagues. Would you say more about this question and the differences between surrender in religious meaning and surrender in psychotherapy?

RP5: Surrender to what? What are you referring to?

Q: Surrender to the analyst from a patient's point of view and surrender from the shishya toward the guru, which is obviously a devotional part and, you know, devotion is—

RP5: Yeah. No, they demand it.

Q: Yes, that's the start.

RP5: You see, the guru disciple, they demand surrender.

Q: Yes, no question about it. Yes.

RP5: And in order to get to where they're going, they have to accept that the guru is a representative of the Self.

Q: Yes.

RP5: Well, we don't do that. Analysts, we don't do that, no.

Q: So this is also what Kakar would suggest, that through the idealizing transference, the situation as if.

RP5: Yes, and they get where they want to go. I'm not critical of that. It's just, we have Western history and 500 years of science and a different path. So we don't surrender so—and these are valuable things—developing a critical mind and those things. Unfortunately, they kill the soul. But you don't want to abandon it. You bring the critical mind back in the service of the soul, like Plato says, not the other way around. So we don't demand that.

Q: What is your personal take on the soul?

RP5: My surrender to the Self is what happens to me, you see. Or when the Self appears in the room, I surrender to it. I say, okay—I tell, where are you with this? What's happening with it? And it's mixed, because it's a combination of confrontation with the unconscious and surrender, which is very different from the East. For example, people will do active imagination in the room. I try this and teach it or do that or something. But it's back and forth between confrontations with the Self—the Self-image may not just be wonderful and ideal—it's terrible, so that you have to battle it and struggle. But then the moments come where you do surrender. And we surrender together, and the person surrenders to the Self internally as they do the work. But you can't ask for surrender nor force it.

Q: Sure.

RP5: It happens.

Q: It has been created by the Self.

RP5: That's right. And I guess the Christians would call it an act of grace. I'm not sure that's the answer to your question though. There's something more there. Does it answer?

Q: Yes, you answered.

RP5: Because the distinction is clear on the one hand. Yeah. You see, all those methods of—the teacher, the guru, the psych—who keep themselves apart—see, Jung did not keep himself apart. You know, Freudians too, you keep yourself, namely, for the sake of the patient, presumably. You deal with your countertransference to dissolve it, but you don't bring it in.

I don't do that, and Jung didn't with me. So, in my view, when the archetypal transference is activated, we're in the process together, and there's no use messing about with it, that you work with it together. So then it's joining of forces. And the Freudians have that too, joining together to work with the unconscious. But this is where the Self clearly comes in. And most Freudians, they don't know about—they're dealing with the personal unconscious all the time. And the archetypes come in, of course, but they tend to reduce it or analyze it away, so they don't get to that level. So I think this is why also. But even among Jungians, my own way of mutual process is—people get suspicious or skeptical. Am I getting too involved and getting swept up, surrendering too much? Like you said, too, I do surrender. They don't.

Q: You can easily find out why, because here's something dangerous. I mean, being involved in a process which we don't know where we'll go.

RP5: Yes, you trust the Self. But also, see in my images, I'm in the work with the two hands, okay? My right hand is connecting, supporting, controlling, you know, making sure. The left hand is open to the unconscious. So I go back and forth in the sessions, back and forth, back and forth, until there's wholeness.

It also comes from *Kabbalah* in Jewish mysticism. There are the two pillars, left and right. And the middle pillar reconciles them. It's also—that meditation I do is a middle pillar of reconciling the opposites. So it works. And I think you see, what people always worry about the danger of being too—for them it's probably true. They'll be too involved and it will get ruined. But the other danger is, I've had many patients come to me who had failed Freudian and Jungian analysis where the analyst always kept himself apart. That's dangerous, because it leaves—as you read my first article, the very first one I wrote—the patient carries the whole thing. What kind of crap is that?

Q: Yeah, 20, 30 minutes ago, you just showed how is important the distance between analyst and patient. And you explained that, as Jung did, nobody does today.

RP5: I do. Well, this is—it's not that close. He was even closer than I [to you now].

Q: So the distance is very important. So managing the distance between the two and being conscious of the process, what is going on.

RP5: It's psychological distance, you see. It's a flow. You're close and together, and then you're back and reflecting. You know, it's a flow.

Q: You said something very interesting about the mutual process. At one point you talk about not only about an interactive field, but you propose that a kind of mutual individuation occurring between the partners. Do you mean analyst and analysand, and even around them?

RP5: Yes.

Q: Honestly, I can't understand what you are saying here about mutual individuation. Would you amplify this a little further?

RP5: Yeah. It seems to be that, insofar as the Self is constellated in the work and both parties are relating to it, that individuation of the analyst is also enhanced. He's working with the self all the time. That's why I say, in my work with patients, I'm always working with the Self. So my individuation is in that work. And each patient brings a whole new psychology and issues and problems and differences. And my relationship to them and the archetypes that are evoked is like my doing a kind of active imagination, keeping the reality of this person, who is a person, and also the unconscious, which is more collective.

Q: Are you saying that patient by patient is a kind of circle or constant flow? Like you said before, you repeat your different stages of individuation.

RP5: Oh. That Jung stage is—it's not like that. It doesn't go that way.

Q: Okay. I can accept that this is not linear, but—

RP5: No, they all take place, but not linear. They go this way, that way, around and—but he did that as a classificatory system in the second essay, just as a phenomenology of the kinds of things that show up. But they can show up all in one session. And you got there, and you're back to the beginning. So it's not linear, no.

Q: Thanks for saying this. Some scholars would like to believe that—

RP5: Well, I thought so too when I started it. And I thought so too when I started my analysis. I said, "What phase am I at now?" But then the big games come and wipe you out, and it's never mind, you know. You're in it no more. Things like that, it doesn't occur. It's true. You work on the shadow, the anima shows up. You work on the anima enough, the anima becomes a function of relationship. It happens in the long term. I mean, there is a certain progression. If you look at it over a long time, there is a progression. But it can go back and forth any minute.

Q: Maybe this is why it is extremely important to have some mentors with us.

RP5: Oh, yeah.

Q: So if we do—psychoanalysis then, we need a supervisor. We need a mentor.

RP5: First of all, you need your own analysis. That's for sure. You need your own analysis, and if it's convenient, to work with different analysts so you have—different kinds of experiences are evoked. There are advantages to work with one person long-term, also of working with different people, different aspects. So in that sense, you have different mentors, so you're not dependent on any one particular person. And, ultimately the patient too is connected with their own inner analyst. That's my aim with patients. I'm very happy when they're finally with their inner analyst, because the more they're with their inner analyst, the more there's mutual process. See, more they have their inner authority. That's why it was very nice for me to work with religious people who are connected to the Self in their own way. They come with their authority already. What they learn is how to work psychologically. But they come with a connection to the Self. They did—priests put it all. So I am happy to work with them. I have always some, when I practice.

Q: I love this wonderful metaphor you brought up in the interview with the Henderson couple. Guru and their gurus and their gurus' pictures behind them, and you took this as a metaphor for your own active imagination or lived—

RP5: Well, interest in my ancestry, you see. I'm not out to kill my father. I mean, I liked him very much. No, because the guru—the Eastern way is, as you say, I mean, the Oedipus complex—

Q: But they are here. So if you can imagine them, they are here. So it is a kind of invocation. Is this what you mean?

RP5: Well, they're here literally. I mean, my [dad], his grandfather's up there. I look at that. And underneath him is Jung with von Franz on Jung's shoulder, okay? And then underneath that is an old map of Zurich. And under that is an illustrated first page of the Bible from medieval times. So it tells the whole story. That's what I look at.

Q: So if you would forget—

RP5: I look at it. It's all there.

Q: You will be reminded.

RP5: Yeah.

Q: And they are also internal, don't they?

RP5: Oh, yeah. Oh, sure.

Q: Another important and hard question, to me at least—archetype and Self, the relationship between both of them. How does it work? And I found very paradoxical.

RP5: Yeah, exactly.

Q: The Self as an archetype and also the center of all archetypes.

RP5: Absolutely. I was going to say the same word. The paradox of the Self is a central archetype, and yet, all the archetypes are aspect of the Self. So the Self can be carried by the divine child, or the child that can be carried—that's why the fascination with the child. The psychoanalysis behind that is the archetype of the divine child, which is of the Self. So it's a paradox, and it is such.

Q: And along this line, the other difficult question to me is how to understand the feminine generations of archetypes and the masculine generations of archetype, which one understanding could be that, you know, every archetype—so there are feminine and masculine, there's a distinction between them. And if we talk about the wise old man archetype, then we could talk about masculine archetypes, and one would propose that the wise old man is a kind of animus figures as well. So the many masculine archetypes and also, of course, the feminine archetypes would somehow interrelate to that.

RP5: Oh, yes, they're very important.

Q: So a little bit—to me, at this point it's a little bit confusing.

RP5: Well, it's confusing only from a theoretical level if you want to sort it out. You have to—you know, you can't make a—

Q: This is what I'm doing.

RP5: But in active practicality, it's not, because the anima for man is the anima, not the Self. And yet, at the highest levels, it's the goddess, or at the lowest levels.

Q: And also the wise old woman.

RP5: Yes. But you're working with a—

Q: It's like in Hinduism.

RP5: Yes, yes.

Q: So multiplicity, but the oneness.

RP5: Yes, they have that, the polytheism and the mono together. They have that. And that's why they're still around, I mean 5 - 6000 years, because they've carried those, you see.

Q: So they would be different manifestations, expressions, which depends on the current situation.

RP5: Yes, you know, on the same—

Q: Different forms, and basically, the archetype is an empty.

RP5: Is a form. It's filled in by the time, the period. You know, Hinduism was marvelous, but monotheism is also a tremendous invention. So it's the West, and we have the interplay in the world too. It's East and West are the opposites, you know.

So if you go deep enough, you see—if you go to the abstract level of the Self, as Jung does, then it's the union of masculine and feminine. And I look for that very often. But with women, they need to get that feminine Self. And very often they need to get there to deal with—see, Jung talked about going via the extra—the other side—man going by the anima to the Self and the woman by the animus. So the anima or the animus becomes a function of relationship to the Self, which I think is right.

But very often, the women in particular are—modern women are so bedeviled that they have to go to the feminine Self to deal with the animus. It doesn't help them get to the Self. It's so powerful because they've lost their moorings. The modern woman can't go the old—that's why it's so difficult. They can't go that way, so they have to go to the feminine Self, which gives them the strength then to deal with the animus. But, ultimately, it's the union of male and female.

But there are many ways, many symbols of the Self. The Self is everything and nothing, so, of course it's paradoxical. So if you put it down here, it pops up there. So from a theoretical point of view it's difficult. But it's like saying too that the transference is both personal and archetypal, so it goes back and forth.

Q: How does it feel like being one of the few first-generation Jungians?

RP5: Well, I think of myself as second. I think that Jung's pupils were first—Meier and von Franz and so on. Wheelwright and Henderson, they were here, and our people here, Kirsch, Zeller. And I get very moved, because, see, here's—you asked about the ancestors.

Q: Yes.

RP5: Those first generation are ancestors to people like me of second-generation. So I had the benefit of working with them analytically, and they were so connected through Jung, but I also was directly with Jung. Not through an analysis, except for a session in sessions, but I was with him. And as you said, you have this experience of even being in the presence of his room, you felt moved. Okay? So there is a bit of *numinosum* there, you see. And then, so it matters. And then he's also—by the way, I'm very moved, but he's very human, Jung. He made some bad mistakes.

In the [19]30s, he was a fool, politically, and he almost added to the destruction of my people. So my original question—was Jung a Nazi? No, but he inadvertently carried some of that same crap, and based on his own Christian tradition, which has been murdering my people for 2,000 years. And yet, I'm deeply connected to Christianity. So, you see, those—

Q: Anyway, how would you classify yourself?

RP5: I'm a classical Jungian, except I work a lot with the transference.

Q: And some Reichian flavor?

RP5: Well, because of the body connection. But I work with the transference a lot. And I can tell you how that happened, if that's interesting.

Q: Yes, please.

RP5: Okay. When I came back from Zürich and I was trained, and I started doing analytical work, my patients were very much like the ones I saw in the Veterans' Administration and in the Army, clinical patients, not analytical work. And I would come home exhausted. And I had my wife and my two young children and, you know, ugh. So I was trying, and said, "Why am I so exhausted?" And I realized I was pretending to be an analyst like Meier. Meier sat back with his pipe, said very little, which is good for me, because my first analyst, Zeller, was very interactive, the feeling type. And Meier was an intellectual, a thinking type. So I was trying to be like him, and it wasn't working. And then I remembered how Jung was with me. Jung is the model to being spontaneous and being present. Okay, said, "Okay, well, I'll start being . . ." I was taking notes, so I gave up the notes, and I was present and responsive. And I was fine. I would come home, and I would be, had still an energy, because I left it all. It's like in sports. You leave it all on the field.

RP5: You know, you don't hold back. You're totally present. But, of course, I have to deal with the transference thing, because this had impact into all that. So I had to keep working on the transference. And that's how I began to write those papers on the transference, because I had to deal with the process because I was in it with the patient.

Q: If you were in my position, what would you ask?

RP5: If I were in your position. What would I ask myself in your shoes? A-ha. Well, I have to think about that a bit. I don't know if this is right, what comes to me. I'm not sure it's—it's not to do with your topic. But it has to do with what do you think about the state of Jungian psychology today? That's what comes to me. I don't know if that's relevant for you.

Q: It is some way, because my personal take on it is that I'd like to be a Jungian analyst in a way I imagined, you know, in a way I experienced it in Kusunoki and in San Francisco. And I know that this is a kind of illusion and—

RP5: No!

Q: Oh, in one way it is a kind of illusion, because back in Hungary, there are different Jungian analysts, and I know that the world is not about this kind of very faithful, honest, straightforward approach. That's my—just a kind of personal feeling.

RP5: No. Then I think what came to me is correct, because you have to deal with your calling, and where you—and you have to—like I did. I had to give up being a Jungian analyst when I came back from Zurich after I was an analyst.

Q: Yes, I read this part of your book—

RP5: So you have to be who you are, but you have to deal with the reality of your country, of your profession, of what they do. So this is like this question. I think Jungian psychology is wonderful and terrible now.

RP5: Yes, it's wonderful. See, and I think that's wonderful everywhere, because they'll filter through Jung in their reality, their national reality, religious reality, personal reality. And that's what Jung would have wanted. And I think that's great. On the other hand, I see a lot of politics and a lot of narrowing down of Jung. Narrowing down is becoming more and more "clinical" which means reductive. They don't really stay with the symbolic approach, okay? And I see it. So, in terms of your place now, it's very important that you stay connected to your soul and to Jung as you experience it internally, and you develop your practice accordingly. But you have to deal with that reality. And if there are a bunch of frauds around you, that's a hard thing to deal with. Then you go via the router or something of individual connection. I know nothing about this. I'm just making up . . .

Q: Actually, this is what I'm doing. I've just applied for the individual membership.

RP5: Okay, that's fine. So then you have your validation, and do your own way. Good.

Q: Dr. RP5, thank you very much for this—

RP5: You're very welcome. I enjoyed it too.

Q: Dr. RP6, how did you become a Jungian analyst?

RP6: I became a Jungian analyst because—I was in my second year of training in psychiatry . . . and I met some wonderful teachers and people and role models. I had no idea what they called themselves something or what they were. And there were maybe three or four of them. I really liked how they thought about things, I really liked them as people, I liked the way they suggested taking care of patients, and one by one, over the period of a few months, I found out that they all—independently—called themselves Jungian. Now, I had heard of Jung and I had read *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* as part of just humanities in college, but not as a clinical practice. So I found out that these were Jungians and there was this entire alternative analytic training. I thought I was going to be a Freudian analyst.

Q: If you look back on your analytic training as a process, I don't know how many years did it last.

RP6: It was—well, I did it rather rapidly compared to the others, which I was in and from beginning to end, 5 years.

Q: During this 5 years period, can you recall some special experience or special persons who influenced your decision of becoming Jungian? And then if so, how has been changing your decision from the very beginning until you received your Jungian license?

RP6: Well, I would say the two people I already mentioned, Joe Wheelwright, who I stayed in touch with the whole time. He and John Perry. Joe Wheelwright was really the most influential. John Perry, I worked with it in his house that he set up to deal with psychotic people without medication. So I've learned an enormous amount from John Perry. And then my personal analyst was the third—we're going to make a troika here, was Donald Sandner.

RP6: So they were the—that's all I needed. I mean, there were a few others, but that's really all I needed. They were three very powerful teachers. And how did it change? It didn't change in terms of my vision and motivation. I think once I realized that I was internally aligned with Jung—being Jungian, this thing called Jungian and Jung because each of—well, Perry and Wheelwright had a direct experience of Jung. And Sandner, by one step removed through Wheelwright.

RP6: So I would say — I left somebody out of my three, the fourth would be Jung directly. Yeah, I don't think it—I think my original vision just developed and became informed, and as I developed as an adult person, it just got integrated into my identity. And, you know, I learned a tremendous amount, just in the 5 years, but I think what mean, this is—I hadn't thought about this until you're asking now, but my original vision was set already. And never wavered or changed, just got filled out by my own maturity since. It's—it'll be 30 years since I got my certificate . . . And I've never changed or wavered in the rightness of this. And as an inner vision and an outer practice.

Q: So coincidentally, your calling and the external—well, opportunity, I mean, this eminent group of people just were a nice match.

RP6: I wouldn't have known that it had an outer social dimension unless I had met those people and put a name and a practice on it. And a wonderful community of people on it. It just yes. It was a good alignment, but what if I had never had the good fortune of meeting this community of people, I would have had to struggle to define my own way and not—not gotten nearly as far. And—as you—to do it in isolation. You can't do it as—you can't do it as well.

Q: So if I understand well what you said, to be Jungian means to you having a nice community. It's just one . . .

RP6: In the sense that that's where it started because it did not start with ideology or theory. I think there was a practice of being a healer, having a healing relationship with patients. But I think the . . .

Q: This is why you became psychiatrist.

RP6: I was already doing that and it seemed to me the only—I never did that based on theory. I did that on having a relational conversation between me and the patient. I think that's one reason why these people who call themselves Jungians. I felt so, I mean, compatible with because that's how they practiced. That they didn't practice primarily from theory. And so I know that if I had not met them and entered the Freudian, I probably would have not stayed there because they do it this other way where the theory drives and constricts the relationship. So, yes. So, *prima materia* was my calling to be a psychiatrist and a healer and then next was finding this wonderful community of people, and then eventually, you know, I found out that there was, you know, there were many wonderful ideas, but that was last.

Q: Before we'd talk about these wonderful ideas, I'd like to ask you about these three persons and generally the Jungian community you met during your residency. What made them special? So as a Jungian, why you became hooked in these relationships?

RP6: I'll take them in chronological order. The first one was John Perry.

Q: What was your relationship with him?

RP6: Well, at first, he was just my seminar teacher. He wasn't even my official case supervisor. Unofficially, I would go to him and say my psychotic patient is producing. This because it matched some of what he had been writing about. His 12 stages in psychosis . . . I think because of these discussions, when Perry the next year worked with some other people to start this house which became to be called *Diabasis* in San Francisco, he told me about it and asked me if I'd be part of the initial group that was trying to start this. And I, of course, I was only too happy to be part of that . . .

Q: You became a colleague of him, so that was . . .

RP6: Yes, we worked together and I was, you know, the younger colleague of these two chiefs Perry and Levine. And so, he continued being a mentor and teacher in this other context.

Q: How did you experience this whole upheaval around John Perry, his ethical violation?

RP6: Oh, I was horribly upset. I mean, it was a real . . .

Q: Once he was your teacher and mentor and—and you witnessed his falling, so what kind of experiences were there? I know that this is very hard to talk about . . .

RP6: You know, for me, it's not so hard to talk about because in its own paradoxical way, it led me to my own creative process to write a book about this problem, in which I actually . . .

Q: You mean, [Book title]?

RP6: Yeah, and at the beginning of the book, I use it—I don't use his name, I give him a pseudonym, although it's public knowledge that this is who this is. But I gave him a pseudonym and I describe how my experience with him led to the writing of the book. Right out—it was at a tremendous upset and loss of innocence of—that somebody so bright and creative and that we all admired could fall so below the fundamental ethical standard of—by using his young female patients for his sexual objects. It was a terrible experience for me and I'd say, you know, many of us, of my generation, were influenced by Perry. He was a great teacher and he was personal analyst to several of my friends and they really were, I think, were hurt more than I was because he wasn't my personal analyst. But it was terrible. I mean, it was a catastrophe for us as individuals, the younger generation of Jungian people in training or newly minted analysts. And for the whole institute, it was a terrible catastrophe. And my response to it eventually over the next few years after he was disciplined, essentially severed from the institute, during which time he made open public statements justifying his behavior, he never backed off what he had done. So I—over the next few years, I tried to understand this or put this together. I had to—it was, in a sense, a traumatic fragmentation of my basic belief in how the world was organized, and so I had to—I reconstructed it by researching this issue.

Q: Maybe we can talk about the topic of your book later because . . .

RP6: Okay. But that's the—it's interesting because that's the Perry lineage. The lineage. So, you know, it's interesting you said a couple of minutes ago, it lasted about 20 years, well, internally it lasted about 20 years because I had to recover from the actuality of Perry and . . .

Q: What I find amazing that John Perry has not only violated his patient, but also violated your transference, your relationship through this unfortunate incident . . .

RP6: Although I—yeah, that's true. But when I think of the people for whom he was the personal analyst, I don't complain too much about the violation on me because it was much more devastating for those who Perry was the personal analyst.

Q: So we may talk about this more because of obviously this belongs to the topic of the possible negative effects of asymmetrical relationship . . .

RP6: Absolutely.

Q: . . . the therapist-patient, and also a guru-disciple relationship maybe.

RP6: Yes, because he wasn't my analyst, but he was as a guru [for many persons], yes.

Q: Okay. Would you please tell me about your relationship with John Wheelwright and then Donald Sandner? Because you mentioned that these two other persons were also very influential in your becoming a Jungian analyst.

RP6: Yes, yes. So Perry was first, but I think it would have been about 6 months later, I was actually by, I call it now, synchronicity, I was placed in a supervisory seminar, through no choice of my own, that was a Jungian-oriented—it was part of a research project for short-term therapy . . . the unofficial leader of this was Joe Wheelwright, who was kind of just he . . . this kind of, you could call it archetypal presence. He was there, but not there officially, but once Joe Wheelwright started talking, he was more there than anyone else on Earth, right?

. . . We were to tape our sessions and then maybe analyze in the group's supervision, and—one day it was my turn. . . . I played a few minutes of this tape and Howard Levine asked me, you know, for some comments and observations and it was with a young woman, single mother who was having all sorts of economic problems and depression and I made some theoretical comments. I don't remember what. And we went back and forth for and suddenly, out of the back comes this booming voice challenging me, and it's Wheelwright challenging me and saying something about, "What is all this theory? This woman is just badly in need of a friend." And I don't—you know, I was, yeah, capable of being argumentative. He was challenging me and so I kind of argued back and we went back and forth a little. And then this—the seminar ended for the day and then I went—we met up with each other and he said to me something like, "RP6," he didn't know me well then, but, you know, he—he said, "RP6, I just want you to know I've—many of the closest friends I've made in life have started with this kind of argument." And I—this was just wonderful.

Q: It's a wonderful start.

RP6: Yeah, it was like a blessing on me because I didn't really know about the Jungian establishment or who he was. I knew him, who he was a famous Jungian analyst. He must have been 70 by then, but 70 for Joe Wheelwright was flourishing. He was in all his glory, all his extroverted glory, extroverted feeling, which means he said whatever he felt like and didn't care. He didn't care when he said it, what the other person thought, but he cared deeply once that person told him how they felt because he was such a feeling man. So that was Joe Wheelwright and out of that, I asked him to be my individual case supervisor for the whole third year of my residency.

Q: This is how you learned Jungian psychotherapy?

RP6: Well, not . . .

Q: From them who learned from Jung.

RP6: I—well, I learned Jungian psychotherapy Joe Wheelwright style. Which is kind of based on that thing he said.

I think this woman is badly in need of a friend, and, of course, that occasioned a lot of discussion in subsequent seminars, what did that mean, and he didn't mean that in an unsophisticated way. He didn't mean you go out for a beer or, you know, you have a date like Perry would do. So he meant that within the therapeutic relationship, there can be a sense of friendship and relatedness. And so that's what I learned for the next few years from Wheelwright.

Q: In terms of transference, countertransference, what did you learn from Joe Wheelwright?

RP6: He didn't talk about it. He really didn't. He was so tuned in to the relationship itself that nothing had to be said or explained.

Q: He was not interested in theory.

RP6: Right. You practice relatedness and relationship and attunement to the—the patient and their suffering and you just—you put forth your own best therapeutic self.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP6: So actually nowadays whenever I explain what I think the Jungian approach is to someone who doesn't already know it, if somebody finds that more or less what I say, I say it—to be Jungian is to use your own best self as a therapist. So that's the legacy of Wheelwright and then he encouraged me to apply to be an analyst. . . . It meant a tremendous amount to me that he had that confidence in me and then essentially invited in. I think of this because I know we're going to talk about my personal analyst, Don Sandner, who was just wonderful. But in some ways, the day that Wheelwright invited me and encouraged me and asked me sort of was worth maybe 2 years of analysis, in terms of the confident—the mirroring of the Self, you know. What it did to my sense of Self.

Q: While hearing this anecdote, it reminded me the legacy of Jung, in terms of how Jung made people analysts and it's a kind of continuation of this old Jungian tradition.

RP6: Yes.

Q: Anyway, did Joe talk about Jung and his relationship with Jung?

RP6: Now and then. He didn't overdo it and he would give lectures to, you know, professional audiences. And I went to them and that's where he kind of went through the history of Jung and his relationship to Jung in the—how out of that came the San Francisco Jung Institute. So in my personal meetings with him, we didn't really go over that. We mainly talked about patients or if I had a personal issue, even though I was also an analyst, I knew I'd always get something different from Wheelwright. So, yeah. But Jung was always there. I mean, so when I added the fourth person to my original three . . .

Q: Yes, it is why I was asking this.

RP6: Yeah, there is no doubt that Jung was there behind Perry because—well, I don't think he did analysis with Jung, but he met Jung when he was a child in his father's home when his father was the presiding Episcopal Bishop of the U.S. and Jung was a houseguest. And then he saw Jung in Zurich at the beginning of his training, Perry. And so Jung was there behind Perry and Jung was a much more sort of human presence delivered by Joe Wheelwright.

Q: Please tell me about Donald Sandner, who was also a fathering figure as far as I know well.

RP6: Yeah. So if in the sense Wheelwright was the grandfather and Sandner was the father, I mean, symbolically or in my lineage and I suppose Jung was the great-grandfather, who you never meet in life, but it has enormous importance and presence. So I mean, this is all part of the synchronicity of me.

Q: How many years have you been in analysis with him?

RP6: I'd say it's probably 12 years.

RP6: And there's something very, again, sort of iron—no, poignant, which is I stopped seeing him regularly. I would go back, you know, a couple times a year.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP6: He was always available for me, but I stopped seeing him regularly, and I talked to him for a long time about this because I was seized by this need to write this book. So all the circles come around here.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP6: All the strings into it that weave together because I was possessed with this—my being troubled by what had happened with Perry and I talked a lot to Sandner about it in my analysis. And that was interwoven with just a free-floating idea that I needed to write. Just I needed to write. . . . So I just have this idea I have to write and then this issue came. So it took a long time to form. I got to write. I got to write about this issue with Perry, and I decided I needed the symbolic space that had been the analytic hour to start.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP6: And that—and so I stopped seeing him and started writing, but . . .

Q: So writing became psychotherapy.

RP6: It became—yes. I kind of internalized my process.

Q: Getting back to Don. Twelve years of analysis with him. I'd like to invite the main topic of my research study, transference, countertransference, and archetypal transference.

RP6: Hm-hmm.

Q: I assume that you might have gone through many stages during these 12 years. In terms of transferences, could you recall some experiences with—with Don or some teachings?

RP6: Well, I don't know . . . I think we learned—so I may be a bad interviewee because they were . . .

Q: No, you're not.

RP6: . . . pretty much all positive and . . . I don't remember any negative transference, and in terms of—I'll sort of talk myself into an answer and, you know, with starting with some ideas. You know, when I read the questions and now the question, it may be this Joe Wheelwright influence, you see, I didn't think of it this way, but I think the interview with you today is helping me see these influences.

RP6: . . . just very brief in my—my own father being overly intellectual. He was a lawyer and a legal scholar and a law professor, and he was very accomplished and intellectual and very critical. And of all things, didn't think that a son who wanted to go to medical school was an admirable thing. He wanted me to be a lawyer like him, which was kind of strange, very unusual, especially in a Jewish family. But you know, the son to be doctor is the best thing you can—no, not for me, but I was second class. But that—he read psychology intellectually, but he didn't approach other people psychologically like he approached—or with a good feeling function.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP6: He was very over on the thinking side and very critical. So it was hard to please him. So . . .

Q: Spiritually, you need a different . . .

RP6: Yes.

Q: . . . type of father that is . . .

RP6: So Don—well, I had already gotten, you know, a nice taste of it with Perry and—and Wheelwright, but this was the real thing because this was very—12 years and every week and very personal and I really felt like, you know, he was like a father. And then—so clearly that's transference, but, I mean, this is when—that, you know, you're gonna be talking to people and several people in San Francisco, I wonder what the bias is of—what we call it the Wheelwright factor, just the interpersonal, where we didn't necessarily

identify the archetypal and the personal relationship carries all these levels. The archetypal transference, the personal transference, the cultural level, the community level.

RP6: So I didn't think, again, in terms of stages, it was similar to what I said at the beginning about my training, the initial vision wasn't quite the sense of it being—and me being in the right place with Don Sandner was there, and it just accumulated. It's like a work of alchemy that just gets to sort of brew itself and enrich itself . . .

Q: Yeah.

RP6: . . . because that, to me, that is archetypal in the sense that the psyche, through some mysterious way, knows how to do that when allowed—when given the right conditions. But I never thought of him as some, you know, above-it-all person. And I knew he took groups out and beat drums with people and—not with me, so—but I didn't really mind because I wasn't, you know, I wouldn't have been comfortable beating drums and doing the shamanic things that he did.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP6: But I knew he did it and all it meant to me was that he was very present, generous, loving, and, again, it was just that personal day to day—I think of Suzuki Roshi's *Everyday Mind*, you know.

Q: So far we talked about your personal experiences during your training therapy. I'd like to ask you about differences between analysis in training and analysis in general. Do you see any differences between training analysis and analysis with patients or when you are a supervisor or in psychotherapy? How did you experience transferences? Does it make sense? Maybe too many questions . . .

RP6: The difference between—say—I'm the analyst to someone who has nothing to do with being a therapist at the Jung Institute and someone who is?

Q: Yeah.

RP6: I think fundamentally there's no difference because you're really helping me articulate this by sort of allowing me to talk, and I keep coming back to the Wheelwright—we'll call it the Wheelwright ultimatum, this woman is very much in need of a friend. And I don't mean everyone—every therapy ends up with that sense of a friend, but it's—what emerges in the interpersonal . . .

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP6: . . . feel that, I think, in that sense, it's no different because I'm always just receiving and participating in what emerges in that unique one-to-one relationship and everyone is completely and utterly different. And that's the beauty of it because I think

that's where the—and I know you said the end you mentioned the Self because that's where the Self is.

RP6: I guess my personal orientation that was so wonderfully met and fostered by this. Well, in his own way, even Perry with his shadow did this because this was the psychosis, this one-to-one and really deeply taking in and interacting with one—another person. So Perry, Wheelwright and Sandner all did this. And whatever they got from Jung just helped them do it. I don't know. You hear stories about Jung one way or the other.

Q: Yes.

RP6: I don't care because what these three people got from Jung was brought to me in this wonderful way of the very personal. So I think the Self—to me, emerges in that unique one-to-one, and that's why I love—if I only could read 20 pages of Jung's collected works for over and over again, it would be the Introduction to *The Psychology of the Transference*. The first 20 pages before he gets to the images, because that's where he talks about this pioneer work, this absolutely unique meeting of the two individuals in conscious and unconscious. And that's what transference is to Jung. And I think that's beautiful and that really evokes this—this self of both people finding their ways. So there is no difference in or out except somebody in that's going to be an important reality of who they are and who they're becoming, but really it's not different.

Q: Are you saying that the personal, cultural and archetypal levels on the basis of your experience, many times, you know, couldn't be distinguished and enmeshed and interwoven each other?

RP6: I think as you live them out, rarely are they, at least for me. For me, rarely are they distinguished. They are all just in the flow of the experience of the relationship. If you step back later and want to say, well, what was archetypal and personal? You could, you know, I can do that. I mean, you know, I've said some things about my own father and, you know, and what I got from Sandner that was so wonderfully different, but personal. And then, you know, the other thing about the archetypal is, and I guess I sort of sensed this before I read Jung, *The Psychology of the Transference*, but he articulated it so well. You know, and let's face it, the archetypal has always been called or what is it? *Vocatus* or what is it again?

Q: *Non Vocatus*.

RP6: Oh—called or not called it's always there. So I don't particularly worry about it or look for it unless somehow for the other person it emerges as something—I think the main way it would emerge is as a problem where there's some discrepancy to the personal and what they need for the archetypal. And, you know, I can give an example of that from my work as an analyst if you want.

Q: Please. It would be useful.

RP6: Some of these things I may have told you over the years, but now it's on the record, on the tape. But now I think one of the clearest examples is I had a patient who was a young woman, you know, about 30, who was from India, and she was an immigrant and she was raised in India until she was like probably 20, but she was now living here and working here and becoming Americanized in various ways, and so she came to analysis. And she was very hard to relate to just as a person and I'm sure she would have said the same thing about me because it was not an easy relationship. She was very dour and she wasn't warm and she was very exacting and questioning and critical and—but she produced a number of dreams and then in one of the dreams, this is maybe after 6 or 8 months of very difficult work with me wondering are we connecting, and since that's my, you know, I mean, I need to feel connected.

Q: That might have been personal, cultural differences.

RP6: Right. So here's what happened. She had a dream that she came in and which we were sitting in our chairs and as usual, but over my—in back of me on the wall was a portrait of an Indian guru, you know, in all its usual archetypal manifestation. And she didn't know what to make of that dream. She remained difficult. She was not really able to amplify very much, but it changed me. Once she told me that dream, it changed me and I just relaxed with her. And she stayed for a couple more years. She didn't visibly change much, but I just relaxed because I knew who she was talking to when she came to see me. It helped me understand why I didn't feel she was talking to me or that I couldn't connect with her.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP6: It told me that she was talking to this archetypal guru figure. And . . .

Q: So this was a sign to you that you, as a psychotherapist, successfully took over the role of her guru, which is a kind of culture thing you may know that in India, almost every—for middle class, almost everybody has a guru for the whole life.

RP6: Yeah, yeah.

Q: And this spiritual . . .

RP6: Yes, in that sense, yeah.

Q: . . . role could have been replaced by you in this Western society.

RP6: Yes. But I think that—no, that's very true and yet I think about it almost the other way around that she took me and found her—she didn't make me into the guru. She played the guru off me.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP6: Because the way I understand the dream is that this was very real for her, that she came into my office and she didn't see me, she saw the guru. Yes, there was something I was doing by who I am or that I have the office and the two chairs and that allowed her to do this, but it's almost like she didn't turn me into the guru. She was able to find her guru internally in spite of me or playing off of me. It's a little different. It may amount to the same thing, but it's a little different, yeah.

Q: I think this is a wonderful end of this wonderful interview. Thank you very much.

Q: How did you become Jungian analyst?

RP7: Well, in medical school I was originally quite interested in research and immunology and genetics and going for an M.D., Ph.D. . . . So when I later encountered—and that really changed my career direction toward psychiatry and it was a number of years later in my first year of psychiatry residency that I encountered Jung. And when I began reading him I realized his description of the psyche was much more applicable to that kind of problem. And I had also seen a lot of schizophrenia and bipolar illness and things of that nature that I appreciated the fact that Jung was a psychiatrist and he was grounded in that medically. I was also, this was in the late [19]60s, early [19]70s, and I was sort of part of that movement of people who were seeking something new in consciousness and exploring and experimenting. So after my first year of psychiatry residency I left and I went to India. I took a year off. I wasn't in India the whole year but I went to Pondicherry which is the home of Sri Aurobindo ashram. And I arrived a day-and-a-half before the Mother passed away. So I was there at a time that was a great deal of turmoil, intra-spiritual intensity without knowing all of that. I wasn't aware of at the time of what I had come into. But it really activated something very powerful in my psyche.

And during the 4 months that I spent there in my visit I began to read Jung as well as Sri Aurobindo probably because my dreams were so powerful. And toward the end of that 4 month stay I met Robert Johnson who was there visiting for the first time and he gave me a referral to an analyst here. And it was sort of a natural progression. But the result of that was that my interest in eastern spirituality and my interest in Jung arose at the same time. And there were questions and concerns and tensions between the two. And yet, at the same time, I always felt that Jung as a western psychiatrist was going farther toward the east than anyone else I was aware of with the possible exception of Assagioli. And Sri Aurobindo being educated at Cambridge was the most western thinking and articulate eastern teacher I had found and also his collaborator, the Mother, who was French and very aware of Kabala and a lot of western esotericism. So those two streams have held me. I have other interests and have explored other things along the way but they're really both central to me.

So that was really what led me to apply for training as a Jungian analyst. And I actually was quite concerned about applying to the Jung Institute because of my experience of yoga. And, of course, I had read the things Jung wrote in the 1930s about westerners should study yoga but not practice it and I was clearly practicing it. I couldn't pretend it was just an academic study.

Q: So at that time, you were already critical with Jung's view on...

RP7: Oh, yeah. But I also felt that there was no man of truth in it. It wasn't black and white for me. I felt there were two sides to the argument. But, anyway, I went to my admission interview and quite anxious that I would be asked about this, but I had written pretty directly and honestly about it in my admission material. And Donald Sandner was the chair of the committee that year. And the first question out of his mouth is, "So what do you do with all of what Jung had to say about westerners doing yoga?" And I thought, okay, here we go, but very quickly got into a conversation with him that made me realize he was quite curious and genuinely interested and not coming from a judgmental place.

Q: May I repeat this same question? What do you do with yoga in San Francisco and in the Jungian community and in your practice?

RP7: Well, I mean I think you know I write about it. I teach about it. It's been a gradual evolution over these 30-some-odd years. That I was very private about it in the early years, particularly, when I was a candidate. And in 1983 which was right before I got certified I published a paper in the library journal here about Sri Aurobindo. It was actually John Beebe encouraged me to write about it and publish it. And it was really a bigger deal to me than my certification process because in a sense it was coming out publically with what my own personal interest was.

It's interesting you asked because, I think, part of my keeping that private for as long as I did was related to this question of archetypal transference. I don't know that I had thought it through that fully at that time. But I think I felt uneasy with being seen or labeled in a certain way as a representative of that.

Q: What do you mean transference? Transference toward Jung and . . .

RP7: No, no, from patients. If I was open about it and publishing it in writing that it might attract certain projections that I didn't want or might not be good for the patient. So it's been a long gradual process. And what's happened is naturally in the course of teaching Jung and Neumann and Zimmer and other things I'm interested in I couldn't help but bring in insights and readings from Sri Aurobindo. So over time, it's been something I've become much more comfortable with. And I see a number of patients who, without I wouldn't say a number, but over the years it's been several people who on their own have become very interested in Sri Aurobindo. And, I think, it's similar to the fact that as Jungian analysts many people deepen their interest in Jung. I think who the analyst is and what their own passion is—is going to affect people. And one thing I did want to mention to that I thought of when I read your questions was I put on a conference a number of years ago, I think it was 2002 on depth psychology and spiritual practice. And one of the speakers I really wanted to get as a participant was Hameed Ali. And I had dinner with him in Berkeley to meet him in person.

Q: The Diamond Heart movement, the founder of it.

RP7: Yeah, right. Almaas. And I asked him if he would speak at this conference and he said he had two questions, one was why was I doing this, which got us into this kind of a conversation that I thought there was a lot of cross interest between spiritual community and the depth psychology community. And it felt to me like the time to offer something like this. And I know that's very much the Diamond Heart work. And the other question he asked me is how do you think a Jungian audience would respond if I spoke about transmission? And I thought about it a minute and I said, "Well, I think some people would be open to it but I think there would be people who would talk about it as inflation." He said, "Okay." In fact, in his talk he didn't discuss transmission. So I thought that was a very perceptive question. And, I think, it touches on these areas that you're raising in your interview.

Q: Now, we landed deep into the heart of my research work. And one of my questions is the same what is the difference between Jungian psychotherapy and spiritual guidance or spiritual practice? . . .

RP7: Well, and I mentioned to you my interest in science before I turned toward psychiatry. And I was chemistry major in college and then started a Ph.D. in biochemistry. And when I first started reading Jung I didn't know anything about alchemy let alone what Jung did with alchemy. But I came across the idea of if you think of the patient and the doctor as A plus B in the equation, then what comes out the other side is C plus D, that they're both changed by it. And I remember that was one of the first things I saw in reading Jung that really grabbed my attention. I thought this feels true to me that you can't pretend to be a neutral screen and only reflect an act upon the patient without being affected as well.

And I think if you think beyond just that simple personal equation and the transference the implications are already there for the archetypal transference. That something gets activated in the process and particularly if the analyst has had a deep enough experience of his own inner life that then the two are sharing something that does change both and really becomes a field phenomenon that it's less personal and more about that field. And the personal work is important and the frame is important and it all helps to hold that field in a way that it's transformative and not just careless, but it's a field that we're in. And more and more, I think, of the Self as that field and not as a thing or an object or an image.

Q: In your opinion what are the similarities and differences between the guru disciple and the analyst, analysand relationships?

RP7: I don't know first of all. I think that the culture holds that relationship. When you say guru, I think, India, but there are a lot of kabalistic teachers. There are Sufi teachers. There are Christian mystic paths where there's a similar relationship. But let me just narrow it to India. I think know a little more about that than some of the others.

Q: We can talk about guru as in large in the same meaning. You've just said that and in my understanding this is an archetype and relates to Jung's Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman archetype in some way.

RP7: Well, I think there are different levels to it. And the Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman even in the *Red Book* the Wise Old Man who's *Philemon* initially becomes more an impersonal figure of the Self. And in India there is—and Sri Aurobindo writes about it—*Nara* and *Narayana* or the divine as person and the divine as an impersonal reality. Or they also talk about *Brahman*. Everything is *Brahman*, but there's *Nirguna Brahman* which has no qualities or definition at all. And there's *Saguna Brahman* which has qualities.

And I think that the levels we're talking about that the "wise old man" is at a level of personality, that it takes on an anthropomorphic image. And that does fit the guru projection. But I think there are also levels that are more about states of consciousness than they are about pure personality. And I think the East goes into those much more deeply than depth psychology has. I think it's been one of the critiques of Jung that he stays at the level of the image. And the image is very powerful and very valid, I mean, when it's a real symbol. But there are also things that I touched on it in the paper about the void of going into states of being or non-being that are not imagistic.

Q: Which is one of the original description of the archetype which is a kind of unformed and then more energetic and instinctual as Jung defined.

RP7: Yeah. And in his later writings about the Self he makes it clear that it goes beyond the images of the—That those are images of the Self and we can't really say what the Self is that's so inclusive. But, I think, anyway, getting back to your question about the difference between the analyst as a carrier, the projection, and the guru, I think that first of all the analyst is not necessarily a spiritual figure. And Jung's idea of individuation is not necessarily a religious project.

Joe Henderson helped me understand that when he begun to publish and write about his work on psychological attitudes, I realized that I had assumed because of the origin of my interest in Jung I had assumed it was always about a religious sort of spiritual development. And hearing that there's a philosophical attitude and a social attitude and an esthetic attitude as well as what he later posited a psychological attitude made me realize that in some subtle way I had a counter transference problem that I was assuming that everyone I was working with was aiming at a spiritual goal or even a religious goal and that wasn't the case.

And that one of the questions you hold in addition to holding questions about complexes and typology and all of that is the question, what is this person really aiming at? What is their psyche naturally oriented to? And that's different for different people. So I think that's a big difference because in this practice and in the west we're dealing with all kinds of people from all walks of life. And in India somebody goes to a guru because they want spiritual awakening. So the intention behind it, I think, is different.

And, I think, there are people here who come to analysis with that as their primary purpose. And sometimes it's very conscious and they know it and other times it's something in their unconscious they haven't yet discovered. So I think the most helpful attitude on the analyst's part is to be as open as possible to looking and listening and seeing what's emerging, what this person is really—what the Self in them is trying to do rather than imposing on them a plan. So I think that's a difference. And, I think, there's a cultural difference in terms of analysis comes out of psychiatry primarily which is about healing a wound or healing suffering. And at the largest level you could say the spiritual teachings are addressing that but it's more universal. It's not about the personal wound and the personal history. And actually that was one of the things that both attracted me to Sri Aurobindo and put me off about some of the other Indian teachings. Before I ever heard of Sri Aurobindo I had gone to a 10-day retreat with a guru who came here periodically and Swami Satchidananda. I don't know if you . . .

Q: I heard his name.

RP7: Very good. Very pure. There was something very real and authentic about him, but I remember in one of the discourses somebody asked him about dreams and approaches to dream interpretation. And it was a purely Vedantic answer. It was all it's all dreams. You know, what your mind does with the dream, the dream many of it is dreaming. And there was an attitude I began to notice that to me felt anti-intellectual. And I wasn't ready for that or didn't want it. And, I think, it's one of those issues that I later agreed with about Westerners doing yoga, I agreed with Jung's criticism because we do have an empirical mind and a level of psychological development. Or you could say it's coming out of a cultural history with the importance of Kant, of how do we know what we know? That we can't skip over that. And so I think there's validity to that . . .

Q: Or it takes more time than for an Easterner . . .

RP7: Mm-hmm. And, you know, there were studies done teaching *Vipassana* meditation that, I think, were published in the *Transpersonal Psychology Journal* back in the '70s that westerners take much longer than equivalently educated people from Burma. They did control groups and the Burmese went much faster. And I think it's probably part of the culture that these things were accepted and known and you know people who had done it. And, you know, had met someone through the family who's a monk and you can feel something in their presence. And they don't have as much skepticism about it as we do. Anyway, one of the things I deeply appreciated by Sri Aurobindo right away when I started reading him was that he valued the intellect. That he said it's one level, it's not the highest level. But it's very useful and don't throw it away.

And it's also been, I should say, very helpful to me that I have Jungian psychology as another perspective. I see people in that world getting very inflated and caught up in things that seem very complex ridden. And, you know, some of them are very mature and don't do that. But there are people who exemplify to me what Jung was saying the dangers are of Westerners doing yoga. So I've always sort of felt grateful to both.

Q: Are you still practicing yoga?

RP7: Oh, yeah.

Q: How does your spiritual practice help your analytic work?

RP7: Well, it keeps me sane. It helps keep me sane.

I practice Hatha Yoga. And Sri Aurobindo's yoga is much broader than that. He includes Hatha Yoga but it's not central. And I have a meditation practice and that varies over time but it's been consistent for a long time. I think a lot of both doing analysis and practicing yoga is about consciousness and about having a steady consciousness, having a resiliency, a solid witness that can stay present.

And, in fact, at the institute for a number of years, during the—probably in the [19]90s, I was offering a seminar to different candidate groups on mindfulness meditation which comes out of the *Vipassana* as a way to help analytic listening, that not to practice mindfulness when you're in sessions with people. I mean, you can practice it all of the time but the actual *Vipassana* practice you do on your own but it can sharpen your listening ability when you're with patients. So I think there are very simple practical ways of applying it and with some patients who are interested or having anxiety disorders or depression or get caught in complexes and can't remember it's a complex, those skills are really useful.

Q: Do you see patients who also practicing some spiritual way?

RP7: Yeah. And I think that's been, I told you earlier I was hesitant to bring out my own interests and so forth early on. But as I've been more open about that, what's happened is patients who want to pursue that sort of thing are more likely to come and it's a joy to work with people like that. I learn a lot from them. I see people who are deeply immersed in other spiritual paths that I wouldn't know much about. And I see how it works together with the analysis. I worked with a Zen priest for a number of years and really was amazing. I was so impressed—He was somebody who hadn't paid attention to his dreams at all. And it was like he had this laser focus of his consciousness from his Zen practice. And as soon as he took up dream work it was like he turned into that and things moved very quickly.

Q: Do you meditate with your patients?

RP7: No. No.

Q: So you don't combine your spiritual practices into your analytic work?

RP7: Occasionally—I used to meditate with my second analyst, who was Don Sandner and I used to meditate with him sometimes if I was rushed or agitated or something and I came into a session we would meditate together. I've, over the years, had a few patients

who have asked to do that but they're people who are already mediating on their own. And I don't offer it or initiate it, but if somebody wants to I'm certainly happy to do that.

And I've had people ask me to teach them some simple meditation practice to help with anxiety or sleep disorders or things like that. If somebody asks me, I'll talk about it but . . .

Q: Let's go to my second question which is about the archetypal transference . . .

Well, I would be very interested in this archetypal process or alchemical process how you work with this? I know that this is a stupid question because as many patients you have as many cases, but maybe if you have some summary of your working style.

RP7: Let me see if I can think of an example or two. Well, I think, the first thing is to be open to the validity of someone's spiritual experience. I think if you judge it from a rational point of view—I have a patient who had an earlier psychoanalysis and he was seeing somebody quite well-respected in the Bay Area. And he had dreams and then some following waking, they weren't visions, but like daydreams about Christ. And his analyst was an existential analyst who said, "You know you're not facing the reality of your life in the moment and this is medieval mysticism what you're doing." And the patient was very wounded by it. And that analysis ended and he came to me somewhat—you know, quite a few years later. This came up, again, in his analysis with me and it turned out to be very important to heal that because it was really was as though this prior analyst had inflicted a wound on his spiritual nature. And I didn't know in any kind of rational ultimate way what these experiences meant but I knew they were meaningful and important to him. So, I think, just that kind of an attitude makes a big difference than being in the position of I'm the analyst and I know and I'm going to tell you what you should experience or think.

The first patient I ever saw when I was going for my residency in psychiatry to private practice had a story from her childhood that her father was an ex-marine or been in the army in World War II and was a violent man, probably had PTSD. And so she grew up in this household where there was this continual fighting and threats to her mother who was abused and she was Catholic. And she would go to church and pray to Mary and Mary would smile and Mary would nod and Mary would tell her it was going to be okay. And I was like 30 years old and it was all pretty new to me. But I knew from the way she told me about it that she wasn't crazy. That it had done something very effective in helping her as a child get through a very different—And then I later read in Hillman that numinous comes from the fact that the statues nod when she first was telling me about that I didn't know that.

So I think there's something about respecting the truth of those experiences that even if you don't say a word the patient knows that you're with them. And that strengthens the healing and potency of the archetype. And that can go negatively too. The other patient I remember from early in my practice was a young woman who was sort of furiously practicing Zen and, I think, probably had some sort of a schizoid or borderline disorder. She came to me because she was having nightmares in which there were two triangles and one pointed up and one pointed down and she, in the dream, would try to put the two together and she never . . .

But in her dream she could never get the two together and she would wake up with a headache. And I tried to say something to her about her Zen practice and this was on the side of what Jung said about westerners pursuing Indian practices or eastern practices. And I tried to talk to her that I thought the Zen practice was somehow not right for her or that she was going about it in too—I don't think I used the word compulsive but too energetic a way and it was something in her was rebelling against it. And she didn't come back. So that was a case where I was saying something against, in her mind anyway, against the spiritual practice, but what can you do? I told her what I thought.

But, I think, there's a way to relate to those things as an interested maybe knowledgeable onlooker, as an analyst, which is different than the role of a guru who knows. I think you might say it just in a slightly different way. You could say it seems to me that this practice is not right. Whereas, the Zen master or guru might say, don't do this, do that. And I don't feel I have the knowledge or authority to speak to people that way. And I also think as a westerner we value autonomy and independence and other people's right to do what they're going to do in a different way than a lot of Asian cultures. I think the role of authority is quite different. So that maybe one of the big differences between the guru and the analyst. I'm not sure I've answered your question.

Q: You did. I think this is a very important difference. This would also be a huge issue, I mean the authority, the question of authority but I wouldn't go there. I would be more interested in the archetypal process . . . how is your experience about that?

RP7: Well, I think the archetypal often comes through the cultural to the personal as well. I'm thinking about somebody I consult with and that I just heard this story from. It may be too fresh to talk about but maybe if I fictionalize it a little. A man comes and he's got late mid-life issues, what have I accomplished and I'm not married and I could have done this and didn't, those sorts of things. And it turns out that he feels he's in hell. He's having physical pain that's psychic. It can be anywhere in his whole body. And he's got a Holocaust history in his family background, Polish and Russian Jews. And the hell that he's in is personal in the sense that he's stuck in his life and he's facing old age alone and has issues of regret and being an underachiever. Those are all personal issues.

But the cultural level of that hell is what happened to his grandparents and their families in Eastern Europe. And the archetypal level is what we normally think of as hell. It's the place of pain and self blame and criticism. . . . So, I think, seeing those levels even if you're not interpreting them with those names, but just the fact that you can reflect with somebody that their personal issue they're wrestling with may have familial and multi generational issues that go back is enormously relieving.

At Joe Henderson's memorial, one of the analysts, Carol Lucero spoke about how he worked and it was the most concise description of it I had ever heard. She said you would tell him a personal problem that meant you might have a dream or a personal story that went with it and he would tell you an archetypal amplification that lined up with the personal in a way that you felt the truth of your problem but also the universality of it. And without him telling you that's what he was doing.

And I think it's something like that that there are skillful ways of working. I mean it's a lot like there's this story in Buddhism about the woman whose child dies and she's in inconsolable grief. And it's called, "The Mustard Seed" story.

Q: It's also in the Christianity.

RP7: Yeah, go find me a handful of mustard seeds from the household that hasn't known death. And there's something about that, about the humanness of it that you go, oh okay, I'm alone in this. So, I think, understanding those levels is an enormous tool. And then how you apply them is part of personal skill.

Q: How do you work with the transferences? I mean on personal level, archetypal level or cultural level?

RP7: Well, I have talked about and taught about something that, I think, somebody in England now has actually used the term in writing implicit work with the transference.

Q: What does it mean?

RP7: That instead of saying you're angry at me because I remind you of your father, kind of personal transference, you may see that in a dream or understand that about the interaction you're having with somebody but work in a very relational way with the feelings that are going on between two people. You may know what it's really about in a patient, but rather—And particularly what I've seen is—For some reason I end up seeing a lot of people who are very bright and probably as children became intellectual precociously. That there were painful things in the family and they couldn't tolerate. They didn't feel held or they didn't feel safe. So instead of sort of gradually growing through that emotional development, they went to their intellect and abandoned something in their own emotionality.

I think, it's poison to interpret too much with the people like that. You tell them this is the problem that's why you're feeling this and they're still in their head. So, I think, it's much more important to understand what they're saying. But as much as possible stay in an emotional field with them and rather than making intellectual interpretations. I think, to be a fair a lot of the other schools of analysis have embraced that inner-subjective and relational analysis. They're much attuned to that. I think it's really sort of the main movement analytically now. And it's much more affect based.

Q: Is this what you mentioned in this article, instead of being informative, the analyst should work in transformative way?

RP7: Yes. It's much more important than somebody feel differently than they can figure it out. I mean, I think, the cultural cliché is in old Woody Allen movies where he plays this neurotic character who's been in analysis for all of these years. And he can tell you inside out what the causes are and he's still neurotic. It's like what good does that do?

And to the issue of the archetypal level of the transference, I think it's very important to see it and not identify with it. And one of the things I see with some of the people who are therapists and training to be analysts who consult with me is people are very uneasy with the archetypal transference because it feels like this enormous idealization that's wrong. It's like I know I'm not that great and you just ask my wife and she'll tell you I'm not that great. But you sort of have to sit there and tolerate a projection that has value and meaning even though it's not, quote, "true" in the literal sense.

I had a patient who because of her knowledge of my connection to the Mother and Sri Aurobindo —She actually went to India for other reasons but ended up in Pondicherry and had a very powerful experience there and came back with what had been already a pretty intense idealization of me just going—I mean she would have dreams of me coming down the stairs to get her and my face looked like Sri Aurobindo and things like that that were really, really hard for me to take. And she would talk to me very directly about it that I was no longer her analyst. I was now her guru. And luckily she had a sense of humor and I could joke with her about it. And it subsided over time and she began to realize that those dreams were an inner figure. But I had to just tolerate it. I couldn't—it's like, you know, Jung with the woman . . .

Q: Walking on the moon?

RP7: No, no. The one where he's holding her as like an infant in this wheat field and the wind is blowing. It was like that. You just have to see it and know that that's what it is and not take it personally, not get inflated by it and wait for it to subside over time. And let it do its work in the patient.

Q: Are you saying that this is somehow helpful in the patient process?

RP7: Yeah, I mean in the case that Jung talked about, and actually it's true of my patient that had the very inflated image, it's healing the father wound. She didn't get that. And that process of idealization which normally would be, you know, a little girl projects it on daddy and daddy's wonderful and then she finds out he isn't. And she finds out she has abilities she didn't know. And it's what Kohut called transmuting internalization when the idealization begins to breakdown. So, I think, staying—and parenthetically Kohut is a big influence on me. I studied a lot of Kohut and I really appreciate his thinking. I think he fills in an area for me that Jung doesn't talk about so clearly.

Q: We have 15 minutes or so—May I ask you about the ego/Self dynamic because working with this material especially the Coukoulis book you may know *The Guru, Psychotherapy and the Self*, Peter Coukoulis suggests that guru is a kind of Self representative. And I'm wondering, whether the analyst can also be a self representative and holding the Self? What is your opinion?

RP7: I think that happens and it's kind of what I'm talking about when there's that kind of —You can say it's an idealizing transference. But when that's projected on the analyst it's

a lot of work because you eventually get the negative side of it if you stay in it long enough. So that means you have to tolerate not only being God but the devil. And I thought about that a lot when I was doing my early analytic work with Joe Henderson because I had the greatest admiration and respect for him and a lot of idealization. And yet because of the experience I had had with Sri Aurobindo and the Mother I don't think it was—and he and I actually talked about it. It wasn't a self transference. I mean we didn't talk about it when I was in it but later. And I was grateful for that. I think he probably was too because he didn't like it. I mean he told me carrying those transferences is a lot of work.

But, I think, it does happen. And there's a whole question in—it's an unanswered question in my mind about the difference between Westerners, Western European and Americans, and now westernized people in other countries and traditional cultures, let's say when it comes to narcissism. I think that the problem of narcissism clinically is probably at the heart of the archetypal transference versus the guru relationship. Because I think what happens—there's a place in two essays where Jung is talking about the effects of contact with the collective unconscious on the ego. And he talks about inflation where you come out of it thinking no more than you do. And deflation where you feel I'm so little compared to that. And at the end of that chapter, he says something about the dangers of becoming a prophet. And then in a very, very humorous ironic way says and the far more common danger of being the follower of a prophet. And, I think, those questions around identity and narcissistic grandiosity or narcissistic identifications are very, very complicated. And, I think, they're much harder to deal with growing up in a western culture and with a western education.

And I don't know the answer to that. I just know there's a big difference between what I saw living in India and what I've seen when I've traveled in other cultures. And what we have to deal with. And, I think, it probably goes back to roots in Greece and the Hebrew culture. You know, the expectations of ego development are quite different. So it's more a question than an answer I have. But, I think, narcissism is very, very crucial.

Q: I'm also wondering how we could solve the paradox of the analytic third and the Self question. Paradox because if we expect that the analyst can hold the Self then who is the analytic third?

RP7: That one I don't find so difficult because I think when things are working well and this isn't always the case, but when they are the Self is holding the analyst and the patient. That's what I mean when I said something can constellate. I feel as the analyst free to be myself and in my own ego of consciousness and respect the patient as an equal. And something bigger than both of us is operative. And, I think, sometimes you see that in more mature people and sometimes you see it in people who've worked in analysis a very long time, and you've sort of arrived at that together. There's a paper I think it's *JAP 2007* that David Tresan wrote about very long analysis and about just sort of growing old together. And it brings in some of Joe Henderson's material on initiation. And it really addresses the question of what happens when you get beyond the personal transference and you're operating in this kind of a field together. You might want to take a look at that.

I think, Joe was a master of that and probably knew a lot about it just because he lived so long and he practiced over 60 years and he had a lot of patients who he sort of grew old with. So it was the opportunity to see what happens his personal transference results. I think you end up in a place where you're both devoted to the same psyche. That the individual psyche sort of spreads out into something and you each have your own personal psyche and your own work on that. But there's something that's broadened out by many years of work together. And there's a feeling of camaraderie in it or, I guess, it's what Joe called the symbolic friendship, you know, you're friends but it's for this particular task.

Q: It sounds very familiar. We just talked about symbolic friendship yesterday with my analyst and this is what we are practicing for 5 years now. Yeah.

RP7: So you know what I mean?

Q: Yeah. It's really hard to talk about. This is more experiential. This is my experience. And this is why I'm very fascinated by my research because I try to articulate something what is very experiential and this is the challenge of my work.

RP7: Yeah, and it's at a feeling level.

Q: But all what you have said so far is really helpful because this is what I'm looking for, actually.

RP7: I think the most important thing from the analyst point of view is how to recognize an archetypal transference when it's there and how to hold it. And, you know, we've been talking mostly in positive terms, but the other way this comes up is horrendous negative transferences that are totally exaggerated and demonizing. And the chapter on the *mana* personality Jung writes about that, that the other phase of the great healer and wise doctor is the evil witch doctor or the demon. And when archetypal transference turns negative it's a big, big problem. And I don't want to end without mentioning that. I think it's the thing that analysts lose sleep over. Whereas, these things are—what we've been talking about is much easier to deal with.

Q: What is the affect of the possible negative transference? The patient will not show up next time? Or losing the patient?

RP7: Well, anything. It can be acting out. It can be demonizing. It can be accusing you of all sorts of things. It can be you get into certain areas of confusion. And it can take years to work through something like that. You know, it comes and goes. It isn't like every session is about it but vacations trigger it. Or if you're 2 minutes late it's triggered or the bill or who knows what, you know, different things activate it. And I think those are sometimes archetypal transferences. And it's harder to see, in a way because when you're trying to be relational and own your own shadow and you make a mistake here or do something there, you know, it's very easy for the—it gives you an opening for a projective identification to come in. And I often think that the old style hard-ass Freudian analysts were better at that work.

When I was coming through psychiatry training at USC the big debate among the psychoanalysts was between Otto Kernberg and Kohut. And Kohut was sort of a liberal and softy because he thought aggression was a reaction to empathic failure. And Kernberg was, you know, no these people really have deep aggressive feelings. And you have to stand your ground and interpret it. And I started out, sort of, more on the Kohut side but began to see the value in both Kernberg and Masterson and then dealing with—I mean and clinically those things are talked about as borderline dynamics. But they can be really toxic to the analyst, not to mention the hell the patient goes through. And, I think, the psychoanalysts don't have the language we do of looking at that as archetypal.

Q: This is very unique in Jungian . . .

RP7: Yeah. And who wrote about it, I think, very effectively was Schwartz-Salant and that book he wrote about borderlines. I think it's really a useful book. You now, that the borderline is actually seeing real evil. It's not that they're making it up. They've lived through something that opens them up to a very dark part of the psyche. And if you're going to work with them you have to take it seriously. You can't wish it away. So I hope you'll put something in your research about that because I think it's needed clinically.

Q: Thank you very much.

RP7: It's been a pleasure.

RP8: Withdrew her participation in the research.

RP9: Well, one of the things you had said in your letter that I thought, well, I really wanted to correct you on that—

Q: Yes, please.

RP9: Yeah, because what you had said was, well, you know, "Then at some point, you left a Jungian path and did this." And, you see, I don't feel like I ever left a Jungian path.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP9: I did try to expand it. I felt that Jung—you know, I'm tremendously indebted to Jung. I mean, I've learned so much from him, and he changed my life enormously.

Q: In what sense? Could you tell more about this?

RP9: Well, you know, I guess the thing to do is just to tell you this part of my story. When I was 7 years old, my mother told me about Heaven, and that just scared the hell out of me, you know, because she said, "Well, and then you go to—"

Q: Already, at the age of 7?

RP9: At seven, yeah, and she said—because, you know, some relative had died, “And then you go to Heaven and live forever.” And I thought, “Oh, my God. Live forever?” . . . and I thought, “You know”—and I’m obviously putting more rationality back there than I had at seven. But the only way I can understand to say it is that it was sort of like, “Well, I’m already not too fond of this world. I don’t understand it. Sometimes I have a little fun, but I’m also kind of bored by it. And it does scare me a bit. And now she’s telling me I have to be here forever. Well, that’s a very, very frightening thing, you know. I don’t want to be.” And of course—but now I would say, yeah, what I was afraid of is being in that state of consciousness forever.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP9: But I didn’t know about states of consciousness, of course. And so all I could see is that she was saying that I was going to be like that forever and that really frightened me. And I, within a fairly short period of time, managed to repress the whole thing so I could try to go on with my childhood. But, essentially then, I was involved in the tail end of World War II. And then when I got out of the Navy in World War II, I started going to college. And I thought, “Well, if I go to college, I’ll learn some things, and then I’ll understand this world, and then it will be okay.” So I ended up, and I got a bachelor’s degree. I’m not any happier than I was before. Well, obviously, the solution to that is you get a master’s degree. Then I got a master’s degree, and that still hadn’t done it, so now I’m going to get a Ph.D., because, man, when you have the title of doctor, you’re okay. And so I’m getting my Ph.D., I did fine.

Q: In psychology?

RP9: In psychology.

Well, I went out, and I was teaching college. I taught at Pepperdine. And I was still very young. I was only 25. And I really began to have pretty strong anxiety symptoms. So I had had some professors who—in graduate school—that were Jungians. And so I got into Jungian analysis with a guy named Kiefer Franz, who was in the Los Angeles Institute. And that helped. I mean, I really did feel like, “Oh, I have a teeniest little bit of understanding now.” And that really did help. And so I continued on my analysis, and I moved to Northern California, and I continued analysis there with a couple of people. And I really did feel better. I mean, it did really help to relieve the anxiety, and not just the anxiety attacks, but also just it was kind of okay.

But I also began to realize in there, “Yeah, but there’s something here that goes beyond this that these people aren’t addressing.” And I wasn’t quite sure what it was. And I just got a few books on yoga, and I don’t know why, because this was in, you know, the 1950s, and it certainly wasn’t a popular topic at that point. And I read them, and I got hold of some things by Vivekananda, and that I kind of liked. I thought, “Wow, this guy’s pretty smart.” I mean, he’s talking about stuff in 1890 that psychologists are just beginning to kind of discover in the 1950s, and I kind of liked that idea. And he said a lot of things

which I didn't quite understand or appreciate that went way, way beyond what psychologists were talking about. And then in the midst of all of that, someone gave me a copy of the *Autobiography of a Yogi* and said, you know, "Read this, and they also have some lessons."

And I had been trying to find a way to learn to meditate. It seemed to me that that was—everything I was hearing as though that was a key. And everywhere I went, including the Vedanta Society, which was formed, of course, by Vivekananda, they said, "Fine. Yes, come join us, and we'll teach you to meditate." I said, "No, I can't do it that way. Teach me to meditate, and if I like it, and I find that, you know, this is good and everything else, I'll be absolutely loyal to you. But I can't pledge my loyalty to you till I know what it is I'm pledging my loyalty to." That seemed very logical to me. It did not seem logical to the people I'm talking to. Well, finally—

RP9: Well, then I found out that, okay, I could take the self-realization fellowship lessons for 3 years. And all I had to do is to promise just to keep secret the secret techniques. And the only reason they wanted secrecy is so that anybody else learning those techniques gets it from the same source so they learn it correctly. Because if it goes from one person to another to another to another, by the time it gets out there 10 times, of course, it's all changed. And so I did that. I said, "Okay, I can do that." And so I took their lessons. And about, oh, two-thirds of the way through that first year, I remember I was walking in the woods, and suddenly I realized, "You know, that fear is gone." It just wasn't—I have no idea where it went. It certainly was the greatest blessing I had ever had up till that point of my life.

And I wasn't great at meditating, but I did meditate every day and everything. And it seemed like, "Wow, this really takes me where I need to go." The interesting thing is, about a year later, I was at a conference, a Jungian conference, one of the north/south meetings . . . And at that, some way or another I got to talking with Kiefer Franz, who had been my first analyst. And he looked around—because I had said something about my guru and so forth—to make sure there wasn't anybody within listening distance, and he said, "Well, I have a guru in India." You know, of course, nobody knew he had a guru in India at all, you see. And so, some way or another, man, I was just led to exactly the right person. But it never came out while we were doing analysis together. Well, that's a long story, and partly it's really trying to answer why I feel so indebted to Jung. Now I think my guru some way or another would have gotten a hold of me without Jung, but he used Jung to do it. And he also thought very highly of Jung. He quotes Jung in his autobiography, in the *Autobiography of a Yogi* several times, and felt very strongly and very highly about Jung.

Q: Even if Jung misunderstood the Hindu philosophy? And some scholar says that Jung somehow—what would be the right word to describe this—offended the Hinduist believers with some of his sayings, you know, which were obviously based on his misunderstanding or lack of information.

RP9: Oh, of course. Yes, absolutely. I don't expect Jung to be perfect. Jung was not an avatar. He was a very great man. He had some hang-ups with—and I don't think of it as Hinduism, but you can put it there if you want—really high states of consciousness that he didn't understand. I mean, of course he didn't. But he paved the way, and he did some things that are, you know. I mean, like—the one way I put it is he takes you right up to the door, and he says, “Look at this beautiful world out there.” And then he closes the door and said, “But it's not for westerners.”

Q: This is what we once started talking about.

RP9: Yeah. And he's wrong.

Q: Actually, you went against what Jung said, and all of his warnings.

RP9: Well—

Q: So he was at some point very resistant to the Hindu wisdom.

RP9: Oh, yeah. Well, he was resistant to people who had very high states of consciousness, because he didn't understand them. And Jung, he didn't pretend to understand anything. He either understood it or he didn't. And if he didn't, that was it. You know, he told you so.

Q: Fair enough.

RP9: Yeah. But on the other hand, he understood more, and really understood. I mean, a lot of the stuff that I know, I got because I have studied the wisdoms of the East. But Jung some way or another got it from inside of himself. I mean, then, there weren't any teachings around. There weren't people around saying things and, you know, that he could talk to. I remember he was so excited when he met this one Indian fellow, and he very shyly shared with him about Philemon. And Jung was so excited because the man said, “Oh, of course, all sorts of people have gurus . . .” Well, that was an enormous relief to Jung to hear that.

Q: And this guru was Shankaracharya, who is one of the first of this very wonderful lineage, as I learned.

RP9: The Adi Shankaracharya, yes. Sure. But Jung had all sorts of hang-ups. But, my God, what he made of himself, and what he brought to the rest of us, it just—it's unbelievable to me. And I, if anything—you see, that's really one of the reasons I would say, well, I don't feel like I left the Jungian path at all, because with my Jungian colleagues and so forth, I am more openly devoted to Jung than almost any of them. I mean, I just—no fooling around about it. I mean, he really helped me just enormously. And now I do I hope I've gone beyond him? Well, of course. He had awful limitations. I do too. But I have gone beyond his in some places, you know, and I can see some things that Jung didn't see. But I doubt that I would have seen them if he hadn't come along first.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP9: So I am terribly indebted to Jung. I'm not indebted to him in the way I am to my guru. That's a different thing. I mean, Jung is for this lifetime, and my guru, of course, is for all lifetimes. I mean, I'm sure this isn't the first lifetime that I have been his disciple. You know, and I'm not trying to claim anything here. I don't mean that. It's just that I don't see how I could have the feeling and devotion, and so forth, and loyalty to Paramahansa Yogananda if I had not some way or another known him before.

Q: So you accomplished a lot in the Jungian psychology. Actually, you reached everything which was possible... And you had your successful practice.

RP9: Yeah.

Q: You had clients, and everything went okay. And then at one point, you decided to follow your heart to India. And you found your guru. You found your lineage. And now you have 30, 40 years experience in that kind of spiritual practice as well. . . . What do you think? What are the major similarities and differences between these two different worlds?

RP9: Okay. In the first place, I don't believe in imitating somebody. I mean, I think that's a mistake. And I don't feel that I imitate anything from the East. I practice a meditation and some scientific techniques in meditation that work, in terms of how the body and the psyche are structured. And are there differences between the Eastern psyche and the Western psyche? Yeah, there's some. I'm not sure they're all that big, and I don't see them as monumental, and I don't see them certainly as unchanging.

But, on the other hand, if you are learning to control your mind—and Raja Yoga, the royal path of yoga that Krishna taught, really has to do—you know, I even hate to say this, because it also gives a wrong image—but it does have to do in a certain way with mind control, you know. Because what is the world composed of? It's composed of consciousness. And so anytime you're working with consciousness, you're working with the basic structure of the world—of the material world, of the astral world, of the causal world, and even back into infinity. They are the same.

Now I think psychotherapy, particularly as Jung looked at it, does that to a point. It does it as far as Jung was able to carry it. But I think you can go a long ways beyond where he was able to carry it. And that's where I think the techniques of Kriya Yoga and Raja Yoga, and so forth, come in. Because with those techniques you can directly control the currents in the spine. And a higher state of consciousness depends upon raising those currents in the spine, raising them up the chakra ladder and so forth, you know . . . And the thing about Jungian psychology that is so very, very different is that Jungian analysts—and I think most will agree with me, and maybe some won't—but when I do analysis, I try to take the plan for what we're needing to do from my client's unconscious. And that's altogether different from—and it doesn't mean I check my brain at the door—I mean, if somebody's

having great attacks of anxiety or they're having terrible bouts of depression and so forth, I know some things to do about that.

But I also know I want to know what's going on in that person's unconscious, because the guidance comes from there. And, it's like Jung—and as you know, Jung had over the entry into his office, “Invited or not, God is always present.” And the only thing I would add is, “But better invited.” And I would never sit down with a client—I wouldn't say this to everybody, believe me, but I can say it to you—without praying first. Not that I pray openly to the person or in front of the person, but just inside, say, “Okay, Master, I don't know what's going on here. I don't have any power,” because I don't, “But you do. Please help me.” But, I mean, to work with someone without doing that, for me—I don't mean for others—but for me would be a terrible thing. If all that you could get out of me is what's in my consciousness, we're in trouble, you know. And I think Jung felt that very much.

Q: Yes.

RP9: And now I feel that as a real bond with him.

Q: Yes. He articulated clearly that the healing is coming from experiencing the wholeness, which is actually pretty much the same what spiritual guys or any kind of spiritual practices, religious experience, tend to do.

RP9: Yeah. See, I don't see so much difference between Jungian psychology and Kriya Yoga. There is a difference, because in Jungian psychology, you don't try to manipulate the currents in the spine. I mean, that's a higher technique than Jung knew about. But, on the other hand, Jung did do some meditating. I've been to Bollingen.

Q: He developed the active imagination.

RP9: Well, even his active imagination was similar to, but he did some things beyond that. But I don't know a lot about it, but I did know Frau Baumann Jung, his second daughter—not real well, but we spent a few days at Bollingen with her, my wife and I and a few others. And there's of course, in Bollingen—I assume it's still the same, but it used to be at least—there was only one place you couldn't go, and that was Jung's sanctuary where he went in for his prayers and meditation and whatever it was. That was never open to anyone. And I felt, well, that was very wise. I agree with that. But he got a lot out of Philemon, and Philemon said the kind of things I would hope a guru would say. Like he used to scold him and said, “What makes you think those are your thoughts? If people come in here, and they're sitting in the room and talking to you, do those things belong to you?” and he really pushed Jung. But Jung didn't know what to do with some of these things.

RP9: Jung was a great man. He is not my guru. He is not a guru. Now I don't mean that some people might not see him as a guru. But I take a guru to be someone who's self-realized. Jung was not self-realized, but he was pretty highly developed, I'll tell you that . . . And does Jung have limitations? Oh, yeah. I mean, I told you, no, I think he made

some terrible mistakes. . . . Oh, God. Have you read that little—I know you’ve read it, but have you ever had a chance to really look carefully at that little section on that chapter in Jung’s autobiography on visions? And he talks about when he left the body.

Q: Memory, dreams, and reflections?

RP9: Yeah. In that chapter on visions, he talks about what it was like when he left the body. And that’s some of the most profound self—you know, it’s only a few pages and a couple of sentences, really. But, my God, is it profound.

Q: Yes.

RP9: And then Jung was always that profound. Well, the little bit that he talks about in visions; I thought was some of the best things that Jung said. And, you know, the other stuff I’m just terribly indebted to, and this didn’t have the intellectual trappings that some of the other things did.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP9: And sometimes made it easier for me. I believe in the rational process, but I think it only takes you so far. And I do think that, even though Jung talked about the irrational and all of that, he was a thinking type, and it was hard for him to get beyond his thoughts, very, very hard. But he did a very good job.

RP9: Now I certainly don’t have any reason to think that Jung had done that [self-realization]. Now did he do enormous things? Yeah, on an awful lot, maybe everything—I don’t know—he was way ahead of me. I do recognize that and I give him that. But, no, I don’t think he was self-realized. And I don’t think Jungian analysis takes you to being self-realized.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP9: It does take you toward individuation and so forth, and then that is wonderful.

Q: So what you are saying is a kind of discernment between individuation and self-realization.

RP9: Oh, yeah. They’re not the same.

Q: Because it’s very easy, especially in the Jungian literature, it’s easy to mix it up.

RP9: Yeah. Okay, cosmic consciousness is necessary to be self-realized. You have to have Christ consciousness or Krishna consciousness or Buddha consciousness, whichever, you know, before you can have cosmic consciousness.

Q: Yes.

RP9: Okay, what is one of the signs of Christ consciousness? It's the ability to perceive every single thought of every single person in creation and to know them individually. Now that's a high state of consciousness . . .

RP9: The first place, you know, there is the thing—and I know you know a lot of these things, so you have to let me say it, and then knowing that, of course, you already know—but this is the thing that they say. “Well, he who knows, he knows. None else.” And that's talking about that state of Christ and cosmic consciousness, you know. If you know those things, you know everything.

Q: Anyway, Jung thought many times in very Eastern way, as I realized. It stirred up something concerning this believing God versus experiencing God, so it is what I'm hearing, actually. So your way of self-realization or obtaining wisdom, eternal wisdom, is a kind of very experiential, and actually, it is what Jung did. In a report, he said that he doesn't believe in God, but he knows God, so by experiencing God.

RP9: Yes. Well, that's the difference between this and theoretical wisdom, and between this and theology and so forth. This is based on experience, not ideas. And that doesn't mean there aren't some ideas in it. . . . But I don't think—you know, one of the things that you were concerned about, of course, and that makes sense, is the business of transference. And I don't think that what goes on between the analyst and the analysand in these senses is at all the same kind of thing that goes on between the guru and his disciple. Now are there some similarities? Yeah. Yeah, of course.

Q: What are the similarities?

RP9: Well, you know, you were asking also in there about archetypal transference. And, of course, I think archetypal transference exists constantly in every human relationship we have. I mean, can I meet someone that doesn't in some way represent some aspect of the self or some aspect of spirit? No.

Q: Because God is everywhere.

RP9: Yes. Yeah. People say, “Oh, if I could just . . .”

Q: It's much simpler than in the science.

RP9: Yeah. Well, and, no, you've said it just perfectly. That's exactly the point, yeah. And so do I get archetypal transference to me? Well, of course. And I have to be very careful, because I am at a spiritual organization, and I work for them. I mean, that's not my job, but like I'm spending this whole week here working, you know, because it's wonderful. Believe me, the blessings from just being in this building are enormous. And sometimes people know that, and so then they tend to project things onto me. And I think, “Well, yeah, that is around me, but that isn't me.” I wish it was, you know.

Q: So this is how you deal with the archetypal transference, so you know that there is something, but doesn't belong to you.

RP9: Yeah. Joe Wheelwright used to say, you know, "The one thing you have to do is to be careful not to eat the transference, because if you eat the transference, you're going to have to eat its opposite too." And I don't have any knowledge. I don't have any power. But it is true that sometimes my guru works through me.

Q: Could you say examples for it?

RP9: Well, I don't know. It's just that sometimes people get well, you know. And I'm working with someone who I've worked with for almost 20 years now, who, when I first started working with them, was so anxious they weren't sure they were going to be able to get through the next day. And I mean, every time I went to India, I had to call them from India to keep some—because it was a little lifeline just to know that I would call. And this person is now thinking of taking a world trip. And I think, "Wow where did that come from?"

Q: Wonderful.

RP9: Yeah, it is wonderful, you know. A lot of anxiety about it, which I think is appropriate, you know. But I didn't do any of those things. I'm not trying to be funny about it, because I did something, and some of the things I did were pretty good. But, no, that's not my healing.

Q: So there are a lot of similarities between the traditional religious-spiritual relationship between guru and disciple and analyst-analysand. But also there are many differences.

RP9: Yeah, yeah, and they're not the same thing. But do they overlap? Goodness, yes.

Q: Through this archetype, which I name it after Jung, wise old man.

RP9: Yeah.

Q: And wise old woman. And this would be another important question, if we may go there, to discuss masculine and feminine archetypes. And I'm wondering what your opinion is? Is this the same or very different expressions of their very different ways?

RP9: In some ways, the masculine/feminine thing is superficial. In other ways it's not, because it's also in the entire fabric of the universe. The soul has no sex. You know, my soul isn't a man, and my soul's not a woman. And from the best I can tell, even though most souls have a preferred way of being in their many incarnations—and I'm pretty sure that most of my lifetimes I've been a man, but certainly not all of them. I mean, how can you be a man 100% of the time and really be able to appreciate the experiences of the feminine? You can't, and so you have to play those roles. The roles are somewhat

different. I always laugh, because the Western idea of the masculine and feminine doesn't always match the idea of masculine and feminine, for example that you find in talking to yogis. I mean, as you know, what is the energetic force in the universe? It's Shakti. It's Divine Mother. I mean, Divine Mother has the power, even though the power is shared, of course, between Divine Mother and then Brahma, Vishnu, Shiva. But whenever they got into trouble, they gave all the power back to Kali and had her go out and take care of things, you know. And in the West, we tend to think of the power being masculine. And it's not that. But . . .

RP9: So it's just that it's such a big topic. Do I—let's see—I have a kind of preference for the feminine, in terms of my worship, because it really seems to work easier for me. But on the other hand, of course, my guru was in a masculine body, and so it's not as though I don't have great attachment to that. You know, that's really terribly important to me. Did I answer it at all?

Q: Yes. I think, yes, this is very—so I see the complexity of discussion, and this question came up, obviously, because it just happened that gurus are usually masculine manifestations, and most often, the wise old man archetype is projected out on an older man, guru, or analyst in that kind of way. And I'd like to see what is the difference, because at the same time, we have wonderful women in the Jungian profession, and we see wonderful women next to the gurus, or even they are some highly divine incarnation, as we can see in the history.

RP9: Well, it's pretty hard.

Q: And Mother Theresa, and it's a long list of—

RP9: Well, there are a lot of great saints like her, but there's also Ananda Moi Ma, you know. And Ananda Moi Ma was a completely fully realized master, highest state of realization.

Q: We can say the same about the Divine Mother, Sri Aurobindo's female collaborator.

RP9: That's right, yeah. . . . And it's the same thing with Ananda Moi Ma. If you think you're relating to this little feminine thing that's there, that you can see. But as somebody said, you know, it's kind of like for yourself. When you get up in the morning and you look in the mirror, be careful. That isn't you. That's your package. That's how you happen to be packaged up for this lifetime. And that's okay, but don't mistake it for who you are.

...

RP9: Well, I have been very, very lucky. I've had a guru. He takes care of these things for me, you see. And when I get a little scared and so forth, he comes in right away and helps, you know. Jung didn't have that. His relationship with Philemon wasn't that. It wasn't that—it hadn't had a chance to get to that point. And so it doesn't surprise me that he—why would he want to see Ramana [Maharshi]? I mean, gee, he was having enough

trouble, you know, without going down to the south and meeting someone whose consciousness would completely see through him.

Q: In the mean time, you answered one of my unspoken questions—what is the role of the gurus? So the gurus are there so they are incarnated at the same time and can be helpful when a disciple's stuck or in troubles. And I see some differences here with analyst and spiritual guide who can be helpful if some individual is stuck or needs some help in life problems. What do you think? Am I right?

RP9: Yeah. I'm just trying to think of how to look at that. You know, as a therapist and analyst, we use the techniques that we've learned and that we know. We try to analyze the unconscious and be alert to it and everything else to help us to find out where that person is. But a true guru—now I'm not talking about every spiritual teacher, you know, and they're wonderful to have, and I've known some who have been very helpful to me—but the guru knows all of your past incarnations, and he knows all of your karma.

Q: Hm-hmm.

RP9: And so he can help on a very different level, you see, because he can see what's coming, and he can help you to prepare for it, or he may deflect it. I remember Yogananda had a disciple, and he told the disciple, "Look, you must learn to chant today." And he taught him a chant. I can't remember which one it was, but a very simple chant. Most chants are simple. And he said, "Chant." So the guy went off, and he comes back a week later, and he says, "You know, you taught me all that chanting stuff. And so I'm driving my car, and I get so caught up in the chanting I have an accident, and I'm going through a tunnel, and I hit the sides of the tunnel, and the car turns upside down, and it completely demolished my car. That's for your chanting." And Yogananda looked at him, and he said, "You were supposed to be killed in that accident. That's why I had you chant."

But that kind of guidance doesn't come from therapists. You know, Jung even talked about, remember, the woman who had the terror of crossing a certain bridge. He worked with her for 3 or 4 years until she was finally calm enough, she got on her cherries and went across the bridge, and halfway across was killed. And he said, "What am I doing?" Now he did his best to be a really good, helpful analyst. But how would he know the karma that was trying to come to that woman? He didn't know. And to expect him to, I mean, that's asking too much. But those are real differences. But we do the best we can, and if we're really lucky, sometimes something works through us that go far beyond our consciousness, and we can do some really wonderful things. And we don't know.

Q: Another important question, how can we differentiate the personal and the archetypal transference. Well, I think what you've already said about your spiritual experience, indicating that the archetypal level is always there.

RP9: I think it always is, yeah. I can't see any way that it could not be. Yeah. And it depends on my state. If I'm thinking—I'm thinking now checking out at a grocery store. And here's somebody who's checking out things. My experience of that person, and both in a personal way and also on an archetypal, trans-spiritual, all of those kind of ways, really

depends more on my state of consciousness, probably, than theirs, because it has to do with, well, where am I tuned in, you know, so what am I able to get.

RP9: . . . the thing I was trying to get to is that, you know, the state of consciousness that you have determines what you're going to experience. And that's one of the things it's hard to get people to see, because Jung experienced things that other people didn't, but he also didn't experience some things because of his state of consciousness. And he was very, very highly developed, but there was a place that he didn't go beyond.

Q: I see here a wonderful frame. You started an hour and a half ago telling me that what was your first experience with God.

RP9: Yeah.

Q: So when you reached some certain consciousness of mind, so you need that kind of development until you were able to realize the same wood around you as a divine creation. You might have walked many days before, several times a day, crossing the same wood without having this kind of experience, because you haven't been matured enough before that.

RP9: Yeah, yeah, of course. Yes, you're right. Well, I hope this has been of some help to what you're trying to find out.

Q: It is really helpful, yeah.

RP9: Yeah, good, good.

Q: I understand that I experience the difference, so while I'm talking with you, I feel a lot of emotions and—

RP: Yeah. Well, this has been a really moving couple of days,...

Q: Dr. [RP9], thank you very much for sharing, for your teaching, for everything.

RP9: Well, I thank you. It's been wonderful.

Appendix G: My Personal Notes After Each Interview

I love RP1 and of course I have a huge idealizing transference toward him. This is why he might have felt some resistance (he even reflected upon it) and I also was less proactive. I felt myself, sitting there like a dumb or better to say just sitting there, listening him talking and being blessed by his presence. It was a long session and a kind of abrupt end. We've clearly not finished it. In our second meeting he talked about Joe Henderson and their life long relationship. Furthermore we could also address other important topic as well, including the analytic third. I'm grateful for having this second chance.

It was a short meeting little less than an hour, an intense and rich conversation though. I didn't follow my agenda (first time) and felt that I was very connected to RP2 and the topic. I think it went well and our blending was great. However, when finished and was a kind of giving feedback to each other, RP2 said something that she'd seen through my eyes that I was thinking (which means that I wasn't there with her fully). That's true. Making an interview is a parallel process and balancing at least two; the other person and the interaction with her, and also the agenda, the next question and my thoughts at the same time. I don't know. Do I need to develop my interview skills?

It was a fascinating interview with RP3. It went well to a certain point as I'd expected. RP3 talked continuously about the topic in her smart and articulate way. Then we ran into this old memory, the unfortunate incident with her training analyst and we got frozen for a while. First it seemed that RP3 was still struggling with this powerful complex then she explained the story in details and integrated it into our topic. I felt many various feelings during the interview. Of course, I felt sorry about her disappointment in her analyst. Basically, I perceived RP3 as a highly accomplished analyst with great respect and interests. Yet, my strongest feeling was like being a child again and listening my grandma.

It was a memorable interview. I felt that RP4's opinion and approach to my topic challenged me in some way. She used to be a lecturer in one of my seminars and I also read some of her books. I knew that RP4 is a kind of overtly intellectual and critical person. I was a little nervous before the meeting, because I'm functioning differently. I think RP4 may be a feeling and thinking type, whereas I'm more intuitive and thinking type. Yet, I was surprised. Our match-up resulted a great conversation that forced me rethinking all what I had thought about my research topic before.

Meeting with RP5, a dream became true. Once I started researching my topic a good 20 years ago his books were my first readings and I always dreamt about asking some questions from him. Of course, I was nervous first. RP5 was very kind and direct to me. As soon as we entered into our discussion I forgot everything and focused only on what he said. RP5 is as good speaker as he writes. I was impressed by not only what he said but also by his energetic and expressive style. Maybe this is why RP5 seemed to me much

younger than his average. Generously, he scheduled a double hour for our meeting. I think we'd talk about everything I'd hoped.

In the pilot interview I couldn't ask all my questions RP6 I'd prepared. Actually, I asked 2-3 main questions. However, my analyst answered the most important questions, while he was talking about freely. Although RP6 never had guru or similar images, it's a kind of surprise that he reported an interesting case related to the topic. Later on, when we talked about the interview, we agreed that it brought us even closer and strengthened our "symbolic friendship," the analytic relationship that we call this way after Joe Henderson. I'm happy about and thankful that we've done this pilot.

It was a great meeting. RP7 is such a professional speaker and good interviewee. His presence calmed me down and let me forget almost everything I'd prepared to ask. During the interview I didn't want to do nothing than just listening him. It was quite impressive that RP7 spoke fluently in so many wide areas. He covered the great deal of Hindu literature and Jungian theory, but also showed encyclopedic knowledge in other fields as well. RP7 often quoted Jung and other authors with exact references. Many times he'd answered my questions before I could ask them. With a Jungian term "He spoke to my condition."

Though each interview was special, this meeting was the most awaited and unusual encountering so far. It is hard to describe my feelings that are the deepest gratitude, reverence and blessing I felt in RP8's presence. In her perfect emerald green costume she looked like the Green Tara, an embodied bodhisattva. I'd prepared with many questions and had a great agenda with me. However, I forgot all. At some point I recognized that instead of talking about my questions she kept asking me gently. I felt myself like in an analytic hour, delved into my own soul. Most of the time I was in reverie and wasn't conscious about what I talked or did. Glad that I was able to handle the technical devices and record the interview at least.

RP9 is a mysterious person I definitely wanted to interview about my research topic. His background, special knowledge and experiences made him one of the most authentic people in talking about the wisdom of East and West. However, his rare public appearances and the remote place, where he lives it was low chance for our meeting. That's why I'm thrilled and grateful that it's succeeded. RP9 is a great teacher and a great man. I learnt a lot from him about my topic, and what was unexpected and moving, the way how he talked about even a highly spiritual thing. It was emotional and very human. I can't express enough my deepest gratitude to RP9 for sharing his wisdom and feelings with me.

Appendix H: Feedback From Participants

Dear Zsolt,

I have read over the transcript, and there are lots of errors. Some are important, and others are rather minor. I won't have time to fix all the errors because I am getting ready to go to Asia on October 20th. I don't even know if you wanted me to do that or not? Basically, the interview is good enough, and you can make use of it as you will. That is fine with me.

I hope that your work is going well. If your transcription of my interview is representative, I think that you are doing well.

Warmly,

RP1

Dear Zsolt,

I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. Only now have I been able to dig myself out of the pile that accumulated on my desk.

I read the transcript and was astonished to discover how disjointed my responses were. How you made any sense of it is beyond me! I was actually embarrassed to read how disjointed I was with you.

I don't believe that I am usually so terribly disjointed when I speak. I believe part of the problem lies in my difficulty with the topic of Wise Old . . . etc. Something in me rises up in protest and won't allow me to say anything coherent. My problem with your study is my impression of your underlying assumption, which is that in the analytic relationship, it is the archetype that is most often constellated and the one that represents the analytic relationship. I do agree that this archetype does get constellated, (and I also see it as you do, as a paired phenomena, the Wise Old Man cannot exist without the Seeking Young Person like Winnicott's notion that there is no infant without a mother, no mother without an infant.) However, I think that this archetypal constellation, like all others that are personified in one sense or another, is episodic, transient, and conditional in the analytic relationship. I have major problems with the way the concept of the archetype is held in mind by some Jungians; there is a tendency to reify the concept; furthermore, too many analysts are likely to forget that it is never wise to identify with an archetype, that it will lead to inflation, dissociation, or possession. The appearance of an archetypal phenomenon in the analytic relationship is, in my estimation, a fleeting affair. One may miss it entirely or only recognize it after careful re-processing the analytic interaction.

I hope that this clarifies in some way my interview with you.

Warm regards,

RP2

Dear Zsolt,

I'm glad that I did this interview with you. Your questions drew thoughts and reflections from me about the Jungian path I have taken. I read the interview through for content, not copyediting. There was one concept toward the end of the interview about inner counsel—

I was referring to the idea that we have an inner council (or committee of archetypal-complexes and introjected influential people).

With warm best wishes and blessings on your path to become a Ph.D. and the founding-analyst in Hungary.

RP3

Dear Zolt,

Thank you so much. The interview was really interesting for me to re-read. There was one place where I changed a word but I don't know how to send it back to you and now I've closed it. Anyway, there was a place where we were talking and I was saying that the answers came from inside and there was a slip in the write-up that made it "the ancestors came from inside." But other than that it looks great.

I'd love to see your conclusions when you finish them.

RP4

Dear Zsolt,

I have read the transcript with interest and am both pleased and chagrined. I was dismayed by my occasional vulgarity, alas, but I accept that shadow, too, there were many errors in transcription but the serious ones were the senseless use of the word "betrayal" in connection with a Jung reference, and my analyst's name was C. A. Meier. but the main sense of things did come through. I am glad the interview was useful to you and I wish you every success in your project.

With best wishes.

RP5

RP6 told me after reading his part of the transcribed interview texts:

I found our discussion fascinating and engaging. Glad that I made it. I was amazed how much had to come up from the past. Especially the JP's case surprised me. This topic just emerged, and though he wasn't my analyst only supervisor, a kind of mentor figure, I only now recognized how strongly I related to him and impacted by his issue. Secondly, it's also interesting how this long forgotten case with my Indian patient and the guru motif emerged. It was unexpected, it came up in that moment and it's purely archetypal.

(RP6, personal communication, December 3, 2010)

Dear Zsolt,

I am enjoying reading and making some editorial corrections on the interview. I had to wait till after the Red Book dialogue, but I still have some other teaching in the next couple

of weeks. I am enjoying going over it, and will send it back to you when I'm done. Thanks for your patience.

Warmly,

RP7

Dear Zsolt Deak,

RP8 dictated the following letter for me to send to you.

Dear Zsolt Deak,

After I had heard the transcript of the interview which you were kind enough to send to me, I realized that I cannot be a part of your project and cannot be included in any of your research.

I regret that it is necessary to do this and I want to stress that it has nothing to do with my confidence in you or in your ability to do this kind of research.

I would appreciate your sending a letter to let me know that you have destroyed this interview in all its forms, both digital, by erasing it from your hard drive, and in any typescripts that may exist.

I regret any inconvenience to you, but after hearing the typescript it was necessary to completely withdraw my agreement to participate in your project.

My Best Regards,

RP8, Certified Jungian Analyst

Typed by Certified Jungian Analyst

RP8 dictated this letter to me, so that I could send it to you.

Dear Zsolt Deak,

I deeply appreciate your last note sent by email, and I want you to know that I genuinely felt that your interview was a gift, and was very important to me. I realized how completely individual, personal, and inner the transference work is, and having the opportunity to talk with you made this realization possible.

The questions you are asking are excellent and profound ones. And others may find themselves comfortable using clinical terminology to try to answer them, but that isn't possible for me.

Again, I want to say that I respect and value the way you are working—you gave me the opportunity to consider these questions, which made me recognize how unique the

individual experience is. But please, believe how much I respect your research, although I cannot be part of it. I will look forward to seeing your final dissertation.

With my Deepest Warm Wishes,

RP8, Certified Jungian Analyst

....., for RP8, LCSW and Certified Jungian Analyst

Dear Zsolt,

finished reading today. Hope I was not too scattered. There is so much to say. I want to go back and explain so much more than we were able to cover. Yet I am surprised and pleased at how much we were able to do. What a task awaits you in making sense of all this. Thanks for the opportunity to contribute.

RP9

Appendix I: My Dream and Its Interpretation

February 4th, 2010

I'd cancelled my analytic hour because of some unexpected family reason that week. I had a long dream the night before our regular time as follows.

We, many students in large groups stood and waited around in a campus like place, outside among community buildings. Adepts or yogis arrived, men with strange outlook. They seemed to be less sympathetic. For our biggest surprise one of them even smoked a cigarette. Without any introduction, they asked us who would follow them. None (of us) answered their invitation. After a while, one of the yogis stepped to me and commanded to follow him. . . . We arrived at a lost place . . . first he asked some questions (I can't recall exactly what) . . . few things I didn't know or couldn't reply . . . he asked me whether I didn't understand his English or maybe he didn't understand or accept my responses. . . .

I didn't understand the whole situation, I was uncomprehending and suspicious . . . all of a sudden, if an invisible elevator would have taken us, I found ourselves at a different place: my guru sat in lotus sit, dressed in traditional (expensive) silk cloth, wearing turban on your head, his face was unflinching, gazed gently and relaxed . . . he was surrounded and the chamber was fully crowded by snakes, other reptiles and leopard like wild cats... one of these cats approached me, licked my hands friendly (like dogs usually do) . . . when I offered my fist he started biting it . . . I confessed my fear to the guru . . . he relaxed me and asked for patience with saying it would work out . . . suddenly, the place has been changed again: I got into a dark room (perhaps my face was also covered by a dark scarf), where mysterious lights were glimmering and beautiful girls were dancing . . . they circulated around me . . . this was a kind of erotic situation . . . I knew, that I shouldn't have looked at them, but my curiosity became stronger than my sense of fear . . . I was peeping and lusted their seducing dance... tried to discipline myself . . . several of them pressed close to me, embraced and entwined with me . . . it turned out eventually that I knew some of them (student mates from CA) . . . then my guru disappeared . . . I felt that I'd failed on probation . . . the others tried to comfort me . . . they ensured me that I was brave and pass the exam... deep inside me, I knew that it'd be easier to accept, but this wouldn't be true . . . there is another way, which is much harder and I missed for the time being

Immediate Associations:

This is a kind of initiatory dream . . . my (inner) conflict is that I failed . . . this is why my guru disappeared . . . it means that the process (of initiation) terminated abruptly intra-psychically . . . on the other hand it seems that I met the expectations of my environment, I got positive social feed backs, interpersonally ok . . . I'm wondering what this difference should mean between opinions outside and inside.

Anyway, I'm concerning with transference on two levels: first, the personal level can be expressed interpersonally (through projective identification, participation mystique) . . . this problem can be solved in psychoanalysis . . . second, the archetypal level is rather transpersonal and it's more difficult to find solution for it in psychoanalysis or less obvious at least . . . see Jung's *Mysterium Coniunctionis* . . . I'm wondering what my dream would say about in this context.

Highlights of Our Interpretation:

We, with my analyst dedicated a whole session for talking about this dream. Herewith, I only highlight our major findings concerning the dream, related feelings and associations. The primary meaning of a guru in dream is the activation of the dreamer's higher self, Self or inner wisdom. Usually it happens, when the ego is busy to solve an unsolvable problem or if there is a need to surpass one's own capacities through learning something new. Guru or similar Wise Old Man figures like old bearded man, priest, prophet or magician represent divine knowledge and are helpful in such dangerous situation. These figures themselves can also be strange and fearful simply because of being beyond the human realm. They tame beasts, rule every desire and possess extra skills, which we humans never do.

In my dream, the "trial" or the initiatory situation takes place on a university campus, most probably at the ITP as I could also identify several other student mates from there. Therefore it's clear that the dream reflects on my ongoing PhD dissertation process that is indeed a kind of modern form of initiation, becoming a doctor through proving maturity and mastery of a certain discipline. Interestingly enough, not only the situation, but the dream content is also related to the topic of my dissertation, namely this dream may offer solution in getting more insight of the guru-disciple relationship.

In the first part of the dream is about the disconnection, lack of understanding and different expectations between the gurus and students, which make clear that I can modestly accept the authority of a traditional guru. This part may also reflect on the different cultural perceptions and expectations toward the Eastern gurus in the West. Psychologically, this can also be my own resistance against something unknown, the fear of the unconscious, it's a kind of self-defense of my ordinary world. In order to reach out my unconscious, I need to give up my ego. This is what Jung said: "the experience of the self is always a defeat for the ego."

Thereafter my curiosity or rather the "necessity" (I was commanded to follow the guru) brings me further and get into this initiatory situation. First I need to face the external dangers in the form of the guru's beasts. The guru's positive presence and support by non-doing in the dream reminds me the feeling I also feel in my analyst's presence. We discuss this parallel as possibility for transferences. If I dreamt this dream for my analyst, the guru in the dream would have been my analyst. But we agree that it's rather like his nurturing presence helps me to relate to my own inner guru or analyst, my true self. Concerning the personal and archetypal levels of transferences, we agree that they are two sides of the same coin, the both subjective and objective level of my feelings about the guru image in the dream, which can be hardly differentiated.

Then in the dream I struggle with internal dangers, my own desires and lust arising by temptations. The dream ends here and still in the dream I feel that I failed, but my friends convince me the opposite and congratulate. We, with my analyst agree that the dream's end doesn't necessarily mean the end or failure of my initiation. Writing my dissertation is still an ongoing work in which I obviously attempt to meet my own and others expectations that is a natural process.

The solution of these opposites will be—most probably—transcending them by walking along my path of transformation and finishing up my dissertation. And listening and trusting my inner guru can help to overcome the difficulties on this long way. I'm also grateful for having my analyst and our weekly meeting that always reminds me on having this great capacity.

Appendix J: Sample of TCA in Cycle 3

The following is a sample of TCA in Cycle 3:

(a) The master-disciple and analyst-patient relationships have similarities and also many differences; (b) How do the Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman archetypes appear in the analytic relationship? (c) The trials or previous training are essential for becoming a spiritual master or a psychoanalyst; (d) The spiritual master-disciple relationship is a metaphor for healing in Jungian psychoanalysis; (e) What Jungian psychoanalysis says about the question of Self and the analytic third; (f) Exploring transference, countertransference and archetypal transference between the analyst and analysand; (g) What qualities make Jungian psychoanalysis unique? (h) Why legacy of Jung and the analysts' lineage are important? (i) Some clinical applications of the research topic based on my research participant's analytic experiences; (j) Experiencing myself as a wounded researcher is the hidden source of intuition during the research process

Q: Yes. I'm wondering whether you had any type of transference toward your analyst and how did you work?

RP4: You know I don't make a big distinction between Jungian and other kinds of analysis or depth psychotherapy. I feel that there is good therapy and not such good therapy. And Jungians, Freudians, Kleinians, anybody can fall into either group. I also don't make a distinction between the archetypal transference and the personal transference in the same way that some people might. I believe that—you know Jung had a metaphor where the personal unconscious was at the top and the archetypal was underneath it. But I feel that that's a misleading metaphor. I believe that the two layers of the unconscious are completely interpenetrated. So that when I have a feeling, say about my father. It's a feeling about my personal father, and it is also filled with the energy of the—with the archetypal energy that surrounds the father. And so I think of the same thing as happening in the transference. That what Jung called kinship libido—is the basis of the archetypal transference and that that is actually the basis that the infant attaching to its mother and father. And then it's the basis of all of us making attachments to spouses or friends through life and that when someone is in therapy, they make an attachment to their personal therapist based on the kinship libido that we all use to attach to whoever and also infused with the energy of the archetype of the healer. Now I would see that as more primary than the archetype of the guru. I would think of the guru as a particular version of the healer sort of. So when you say, "Did I have a transference?" I had an enormous transference. I've always been very good at making transferences. And I don't actually believe that anybody could be in therapy without

developing a substantial transference. Even if it's a resistance to the transference, that that would still take a lot of energy, and the person becomes very important to the patient, even if it's in a negative way.

...

Q: So, in your view, psychotherapy is actually something archetypal.

RP4: Yes.

Q: And this is why no reason to talk about archetypal transference and personal transference [as separate].

RP4: They're both together.

Q: They are both together and maybe the third layer can come between them as Joe Henderson exemplified the cultural layer. What do you think? How these three work together in psychoanalysis?

RP4: Yeah. I really would prefer not to use the word "layer" because that has such a visual image, and I'd rather say that they're interpenetrated. It's one unit.

Q: More texture or a matrix.

RP4: Okay, a matrix. The culture contains us all the time. You know, you would have more insight into the culture than I would, because you come from a different culture. For me, I'm just swimming in the water I've always swum in, and I'm not going to notice anything about it. But you might say, "Oh, wow, look. This is different." I mean to me it's just the way the world is. To talk about how they relate to each other, I just don't quite understand how I would do that. They all come as a unit. You wouldn't have a personal transference if it wasn't fueled by the archetypal layer of being human. And you can't be a human being if you don't live in a culture. You would die, really. You know, you'd be all on your own out in the middle of the desert, as it were. So they're all together all the time.

Q: To me, this kind of differentiation is important because the guru, obviously, is a different kind of cultural expression of the same archetype, namely the wise old man as I would identify the guru image with, which is one of — the well elaborated images by Jung. And I'm wondering how this metaphor can be applied for the analytic relationship.

RP4: Well, I think it's very problematic. I would not want to use it, to be honest. There is, you know, just the way the infant naturally sees their parents as the self, as all powerful, a god. But the infant is mistaken. I mean really mistaken. Similarly, the patient comes in and they're in pain and they look to the therapist to heal them. In order, I mean, because that's what they want, they naturally put on the therapist one of two—either a negative or a positive self image. One could be, "Oh, you are so great. You are a wise old man or a wise old woman, and you are going to heal me, and I will take everything you say as though it was the gospel truth."

Appendix K: Changes Between Cycle 2 and Cycle 4 Lenses

Table K1

Changes Between Cycle 2 and Cycle 4 Lenses

LENSES	C2	DESCRIPTION	C4	DESCRIPTION
CHANGE	1	Though the master-disciple and the analyst-patient relationships are historically, culturally and socially different forms, they also have a lot in common, as they express a similar archetypal model of healing and spiritual development.	(d)	The spiritual master-disciple relationship as metaphor for healing in Jungian psychoanalysis.
CHANGE	2	The relationship between spiritual teacher and aspirant or psychotherapist and patient is founded on the recognition of the need to associate with a person who is a master of inner transformation and has reached advanced stages of spiritual or psychological development.	(d)	The spiritual master-disciple relationship as metaphor for healing in Jungian psychoanalysis.
SEED	3	The master-disciple and the analyst-patient relationships are similar.	(a)	The master-disciple and analyst-patient relationships have similarities and also many differences.
SEED	3.1	Both are related with the Wise Old Man or Woman archetype described by Carl Jung and other Jungians.	(b)	The forms of the Wise Old Man and Wise Old Woman archetypes, which appear in the analytic relationship.

LENSES	C2	DESCRIPTION	C4	DESCRIPTION
SEED	3.2	Guru and analyst both represent an authority, differently though. Therefore relationship with them is asymmetrical in both cases.	(a)	The master-disciple and analyst-patient relationships have similarities and also many differences.
CHANGE	3.3	They have similar processes, which can be described psychologically as transference, countertransference, and projection.	(f)	Exploring transference, countertransference, and archetypal transference between the analyst and analysand.
SEED	3.4	Trials or previous training are important for both, spiritual master, and psychoanalyst.	(c)	The trials or previous training are essential for becoming a spiritual master or a psychoanalyst.
CHANGE	3.5	The initiation through the unbroken chain of master-disciple relationships is similar to the analytic training in the psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapy schools.	(h)	The legacy of Jung and the analysts' lineage are important for the Jungians, but differently.
SEED	4	The master-disciple and the analyst-patient relationships are different.	(a)	The master-disciple and analyst-patient relationships have similarities and also many differences.
SEED	4.1	Goals are different in psychotherapy and in spiritual practice; one seeks healing the other seeks spiritual development. However, the goals can cross each other.	(a)	The master-disciple and analyst-patient relationships have similarities and also many differences.

LENSES	C2	DESCRIPTION	C4	DESCRIPTION
SEED	4.2	There are conceptual differences regarding the attributes of Self and man's relationship to this Self between the Hindu approach of self-realization and that of Western psychotherapy.	(a)	The master-disciple and analyst-patient relationships have similarities and also many differences.
SEED	4.3	Gurus and disciples are less aware of, and reluctant to work with, transference-countertransference; whereas, psychoanalysis considers elaboration of this phenomena as an important part of the analytic treatment.	(a)	The master-disciple and analyst-patient relationships have similarities and also many differences.
DARK	4.4	The level and quality of readiness, in my opinion, may differ in spiritual vs. analytical relationships; whereas, the spiritual relationship between the master and disciple is predetermined by tradition or culture right from the start, the therapeutic relationship between analyst and analysand may develop only at a later stage, through transference.	- - -	No data. However, the level and quality of readiness, in my opinion, may differ in spiritual vs. analytical relationships.

LENSES	C2	DESCRIPTION	C4	DESCRIPTION
DARK	5	In analytical psychology, the hero journey of myths, the disciple's aspiration to meet the master's requirements, and the patient's behavior during psychotherapy are all seen as parallels to the process of individuation, self-realization, and psychological transformation.	- - -	No data.
CHANGE	6	Wise Old Man or Woman, the inner guru is also the archetype of the Self. Therefore the guru can be seen as embodiment of this archetype, is a kind of external and symbolic manifestation of the Wise Person. Similarly the psychotherapist may represent the Self sometimes.	(e)	What Jungian psychoanalysis says about the question of Self and the analytic third.
CHANGE	7	The guru neither rejects nor accepts projection, regardless of its nature, positive or negative. In the context of psychotherapy, the psychotherapist acts similarly, when he or she differentiates the patient's transference from his or her own countertransference.	(f)	Exploring transference, countertransference, and archetypal transference between the analyst and analysand.
CHANGE	8	We know relatively less about the process of transformation or healing in the analytic relationship.	(g)	The qualities, which make Jungian psychoanalysis unique.

LENSES	C2	DESCRIPTION	C4	DESCRIPTION
CHANGE	9	The quality of psychotherapy ultimately depends on the relationship between the analyst and patient.	(g)	The qualities, which make Jungian psychoanalysis unique.
CHANGE	10	Experiences of love and mutual acceptance between spiritual teacher and student are influential in the process of transformation. The positive qualities of the spiritual teacher and psychotherapist, their nurturing relationship help the student and patient to engage with his or her own inner realities and experience the divine.	(g)	The qualities, which make Jungian psychoanalysis unique.
NEW	---		(i)	Variety of techniques of dealing with archetypal transference in the research participants' practice.
NEW	---		(j)	Experiencing the wounded researcher is the hidden source of my intuition during the research process.