JUNG’S LIVES

ALAN C. ELMS

Forty published life histories of C. G. Jung are grouped into eight categories: autobiography, hagiographies, pathographies, professional biographies, intellectual biographies, illustrated biographies, religious biographies, and joint Jung/Freud biographies. Each work is briefly reviewed in terms of its scope, its main contributions to the biographical literature on Jung, and its principal shortcomings. A short list of selected readings on Jung’s life is recommended.

“I am not my own history, or my historiographer.”
—C. G. Jung, BBC Television interview, 1959

Jungian psychology will soon enter its second century as a distinct theoretical approach. By now it has accumulated quite enough history to attract its own historians, some of whom have traced its elaborations and diversifications in considerable detail (e.g., Kirsch, 2000; Samuels, 1985). But even more than in the case of Freudian psychoanalytic theory, analytical psychology (or as some would have it, archetypal psychology) has remained closely tied to the person of its founder. Jung himself was the first theorist to argue emphatically that psychological theories are expressions of their authors’ personalities, though his focus at the time was on Freud’s and Adler’s theories rather than his own (Jung, 1917/1953). Thus, Jungian psychology’s history has been written largely in the form of biographies of C. G. Jung.

Jung biography has not yet produced its own Ernest Jones (1953–1957) or Frank Sulloway (1979) or Peter Gay (1988). Despite their biases, each of those Freud biographers produced a work of detailed and original scholarship, widely seen upon publication as a biographical masterwork and still regarded as worthy of close study. In contrast, even a devoted Jungian scholar asked a few years ago, “Why are Jung biographies so bad?” (Shamdasani, 2000, p. 459). Though the literature on Jung’s life includes no master biography, some of it is notably better and some notably worse than mediocre. A brief guide through the thicket of published Jung biographies may therefore be helpful to the interested reader. An attempt is made here to review all book-length biographies of Jung published in English, regardless of their particular perspectives on Jung’s life and work. The biographies are categorized loosely in terms of their overall emphasis, so that comparisons may be made more readily among works similar in content.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

The primary source of information about Jung’s life is his autobiography, published first in English translation as Memories, Dreams, Reflections (Jung, 1963a; final revised edition, 1973). This “autobiography” (as Jung himself sometimes framed it in quotation marks) is in certain regards less than it appears. Only the first three chapters, covering his childhood, ado-
lescence, and university years, were written by Jung as a consecutive autobiographical account. He later added two chapters of philosophical reflection. The rest of the book was cobbled together by his secretary, Aniela Jaffé, from her notes on interviews with Jung, several of his lectures, scraps of memoirs, and unpublished papers. As Elms (1994, Chapter 4) and Shamdasani (1995, 2005) have discussed, the complete manuscript as generally approved by Jung was then edited, censored, partially restored, and further reshaped by a variety of individuals before it was published posthumously. Concerns for the Jung family’s reputation, for Jung’s own reputation, and for marketability to a wide audience transformed the book into autobiography-by-committee.

Nonetheless, Memories, Dreams, Reflections (hereafter referred to as MDR) remains the essential account of Jung’s inner life at crucial periods in his personal history. Though some of his blunt language about his parents and his religious visions was softened or deleted, his first three chapters as finally published reveal intimate details of his psychological development, which he had told almost no one until he reached his eighties. Chapter 5, an account of Jung’s psychological collapse after his break with Freud and his subsequent years of inner struggle, is also revelatory, even though it was assembled by Jaffé rather than written by Jung specifically for the autobiography. Every biography of Jung since the publication of MDR has depended heavily on those chapters.

Several other sources of autobiographical material are available. Although the German version of the autobiography, Erinnerungen, Träume, Gedanken (Jung, 1963b), was edited before publication to conform to the general shape of the autobiography’s English-language version, it contains several passages that were deleted from MDR. One source from which Jaffé borrowed material for MDR, a set of seminars presented by Jung in 1925, was later published in its entirety as Analytical Psychology (Jung, 1989); it contains a small amount of autobiographical material that she did not use. Jung’s collected Letters were chosen by their editor (Adler, 1973–1975) mainly for their theoretical content, omitting more “intimate” letters, but occasional bits of autobiographical material are included. A quite intimate set of letters between Jung and his first extramarital lover, Sabina Spielrein, has been separately published under the title A Secret Symmetry (Carotenuto, 1982). At the Jung family’s insistence, the English-language edition includes only paraphrases and brief quotations from Jung’s letters to Spielrein; a German-language edition (Carotenuto, 1986) contains both sides of the correspondence. A collection of interviews with Jung over the course of his career, C. G. Jung Speaking (McGuire & Hull, 1977), is sprinkled with autobiographical comments, especially in the late interviews by Richard Evans and John Freeman. Finally, the General Index volume for The Collected Works of C. G. Jung (Forryan & Glover, 1979, pp. 374–375) cites a number of brief autobiographical references in Jung’s theoretical books and papers.

HAGIOGRAPHIES

Among the early biographies were several written by devout Jungians who knew Jung personally and/or practiced Jungian psychotherapy. Each writer sought to achieve one or more of these related aims: to assert Jung’s genius and his outstanding virtues as a human being; to defend him from criticism and excuse his apparent misdeeds; and to link the biography’s author as closely to Jung as possible.

A biography by the British psychiatrist E. A. Bennet, C. G. Jung (1961/1962), appeared even before MDR. However, the book was based in part on interviews Bennet conducted with Jung during the period when Aniela Jaffé was also interviewing Jung for the autobiography and, to some extent, while Jung was writing his own chapters for MDR. Thus, there is con-
siderable overlap between Bennet’s rather brief anecdotal account of Jung’s life and Jung’s more elaborate recounting of the same stories. Bennet’s book is therefore of interest mainly as it presents slightly different versions of Jung’s key autobiographical tales. These different accounts may be regarded as a sort of check on Jung’s reliability. (However, in at least one instance, Bennet’s own reliability is doubtful: he describes the phallic god that Jung encountered in his first remembered dream as 12 inches rather than 12 feet tall [p. 10]. The height of the phallus is corrected in a posthumously published volume, Meetings with Jung [Bennet, 1985], where Bennet’s interviews are presented without paraphrase.)

Several years after MDR appeared, Aniela Jaffé wrote From the Life and Work of C. G. Jung (1968/1971) under her own name, rather than disguising it as part of his autobiography. Jaffé had not been counted among the prominent scholars and therapists in the circle of women around Jung, but she knew him for a quarter-century and worked closely with him as his secretary, then as his collaborator on MDR, during the last seven years of his life. In one of the book’s essays, she assigned herself the task of supplementing the insistently inner-directed MDR with an account of Jung’s daily life and his necessary interactions with “external reality” (p. 101). Jaffé’s picture of him is in large part endearing, though sometimes embarrassingly adulatory (“I must confess that the approach of the old magician never lost its excitement in all those years” [p. 123]), and at other times indulgent toward his petty tyrannizing.

Soon after Jaffé’s account appeared, the most serious scholar in Jung’s inner circle, Marie-Louise von Franz, wrote a quite different biography of her mentor, C. G. Jung: His Myth in Our Time (1972/1975). Taking her biographical details from MDR, von Franz added extensive glosses in the form of discussions of theoretical concepts that grew from Jung’s personal experience. Readers who seek a sophisticated but orthodox embellishment of Jung’s “personal myth” will find the book helpful; those looking for further information on Jung’s life will not.

Von Franz’s housemate Barbara Hannah chose instead to write a “biographical memoir,” Jung: His Life and Work (1976). Like von Franz, Hannah was a Jungian therapist and a member of his inner circle. She depends as heavily on MDR as von Franz does, but her exegesis takes the form of quotations from her many conversations with Jung. She often elaborates on the life events surrounding the quotations, so her book has become an additional source of information beyond MDR for later biographers. Hannah appears to be, for instance, the first writer to report Jung’s often-quoted remark contrasting himself with his more dogmatic disciples: “Thank God, I am Jung, and not a Jungian!” (p. 78). She makes no effort to be an objective observer; she is as devoted to the great man as Jaffé or von Franz is and she accepts Jung’s perspective on every issue, theoretical or clinical or personal. When she recounts (again for the first time in any biography) Jung’s long extramarital relationship with his second lover, Toni Wolff, she fully excuses his behavior, endorsing “his own scrupulous fairness to all parties,” and even agreeing to his rationalization that by keeping a mistress he avoided “the untold damage that fathers can do to their daughters by not living the whole of their erotic life, which is seldom completely contained in marriage” (p. 119).

Anthony Stevens is another Jungian therapist, but he did not know Jung personally. His book On Jung (1990) contains little biographical information beyond what can be found in MDR, except for some further information on Toni Wolff. The book is organized in terms of what Jungian theory has to say about each stage of the human life cycle, using incidents from MDR to illustrate each theoretical point. Thus, Stevens reverses von Franz’s approach by going from Jung’s concepts to Jung’s life. However, as with von Franz and Hannah, he makes no concerted psychobiographical effort to examine the processes through which Jung’s experiences evolved into theory.
Laurens van der Post, the charismatic author of many books and articles about his native South Africa and his world travels, breathlessly narrated a widely shown documentary film about Jung (Stedall, 1971), then wrote an effusively enthusiastic book, *Jung and the Story of Our Time* (1975). Van der Post came rather late to the Jungian cause, after his second wife was trained in Jungian psychotherapy by Toni Wolff. Though he claims close friendship with Jung and is often cited in later biographies, his book is a peculiar document. Like Barbara Hannah, he repeatedly takes biographical details from *MDR*, then embroiders them with paraphrases or approximate quotations from his frequent conversations and correspondence with Jung. But in contrast to Hannah’s book, van der Post seldom if ever adds anything substantive to what was already known about Jung from *MDR* or from Jung’s published letters and other writers’ published accounts. Van der Post says he took no notes of the conversations and he apparently held no letters in hand as he wrote his book. (Two published letters from Jung to van der Post [Adler, 1975, pp. 200–201 and 292–293] are mainly thank-you notes for small gifts.) A recent biography of van der Post (Jones, 2002) characterizes him as a “compulsive liar” throughout his life (p. 359), who exaggerated or totally misrepresented such matters as his South African childhood, his wartime military service, and his many romantic relationships. It is reasonable to wonder, as Jones does, just how close a friend van der Post was to Jung and whether most of his cited letters from Jung ever existed. It is also reasonable to question whether any original observations van der Post reported about Jung can be trusted. Jones quotes Ruth Bailey, who was a genuinely close friend of the Jung family and who served as Jung’s housekeeper/companion in his final years, as saying that Jung liked van der Post “well enough at first, and then he decided that he was a pea who had grown too big for its pod” (p. 330).

**PATHOGRAPHIES**

While *MDR* offered disciples ample grounds for praise and adulation of Jung, it gave others grounds for a darker view of his psychological development, leading to arguments that his theories were defenses against or symptomatic expressions of his personal psychopathology. Ernest Jones (1913/1974) anticipated such negative views of Jung and his theories some 50 years earlier, in an essay titled “The God Complex.” Jones described patients who were convinced of their own godlike qualities, expressing what he saw as pathological narcissism. While he was writing the essay, he reported to Freud, “This week I hope to finish my paper on God-men, in which there is the opportunity of saying some sweet things, quite indirectly, about Jung; it is very enjoyable” (Paskauskas & Steiner, 1993, p. 189). Though Freud did not respond directly, Richard Noll has suggested that Freud’s defining paper on narcissism, published the following year, “is indirectly concerned with his experience with Jung” (Noll, 1994, p. 204).

In *C. G. Jung: The Haunted Prophet* (1976), Paul Stern pursued similar issues without crediting either Jones or Freud. Stern was an eclectic psychotherapist who had received part of his training in Zurich. His account of Jung’s life depends almost as heavily on *MDR* as the Jung disciples’ hagiographies do. But Stern adds unattributed information about such matters as Jung’s family life (pp. 76–77) and his relationship with Toni Wolff (pp. 134–142), which appears to derive from Zurich gossip rather than from published sources. Stern also offers several interestingly non-Jungian interpretations of Jung’s dreams and fantasies. For instance, Jung’s recurrent adolescent daydream of owning a device that “drew a certain inconceivable something” from the air and transformed it into gold coins (*MDR*, pp. 81–82), later regarded by Jung as anticipating his interest in the psychology of alchemy, is instead seen by Stern as “pointing to Jung’s future adroitness in extracting money from ‘spirituality’” (p. 34). Unfortunately, Stern is so insistent on interpreting everything about Jung in the most negative
ways that the result is outright pathography rather than a thoughtfully critical biography. He insists that Jung was “semi-psychotic,” but is rather loose in his diagnosis. At one point he says Jung’s pathology was “his phobia of being ‘invaded’ and his fear of women” (p. 123). Elsewhere, he refers to Jung as having a split personality and describes the “emptiness at his core, plastered over with self-idolatry” (p. 36). This terminology sounds much like Ernest Jones’s description of “god-men”; today such characteristics would probably get Jung diagnosed as having a narcissistic personality disorder.

George Atwood and Robert Stolorow, clinical psychologists with a self-psychological orientation, have made that diagnosis explicit and have attempted to explain how Jung got that way. In a journal article (Atwood & Stolorow, 1977) that became a chapter in Stolorow and Atwood’s *Faces in a Cloud* (1979; later revision by Atwood & Stolorow, 1994), they identify key events in Jung’s early life that left him with a major psychological split (his self-identified Number One and Number Two personalities). According to their account, Jung struggled with boundary problems, fearing both absorption into others (especially his mother) and isolation from others. In childhood, he used certain transitional objects, such as a wooden manikin that he treated as a secret friend, to help him cope temporarily with such problems. When his close friendship and professional collaboration with Freud failed in his late thirties, he turned again to a sort of transitional object for comfort and reassurance: the archetypes, the inherited “primordial images” that he experienced as bubbling up from the deepest levels of his unconscious. His anxieties about self-dissolution could then be controlled by defining and naming these archetypes as discrete psychological entities. At the same time, he could deal restitutively with his extreme feelings of alienation and isolation by sharing these archetypes with the rest of humanity, both by conceptualizing them as aspects of a collective unconscious and by becoming the leader of a group of disciples who welcomed his concepts as a description of their psychological reality.

Jung’s narcissistic tendencies are approached somewhat differently in Richard Noll’s two books, *The Jung Cult* (1994) and *The Aryan Christ* (1997). The first book presents Jung principally as a con man, promoting a psychotherapy cult based on nineteenth-century German volkisch movements and cynically offering himself as the cult’s new messiah. In the second and more biographical book, Jung is pictured as actually believing in his own transformation into a god; here Noll cites Ernest Jones’s essay on the God complex. In both books, much is made of a manuscript found in an archive of Jung-related papers, which Noll identifies as the transcript of a talk Jung presented at the Psychological Club in Zurich to proclaim his godhood. Noll sounds somewhat less certain about Jung’s authorship of the talk in *The Aryan Christ*, but his language in describing other evidence of Jung’s narcissistic pathology becomes more colorful. *The Aryan Christ* is especially interesting for its discussion of diaries and memoirs left by several of Jung’s patients, advanced as evidence of Jung’s belief in his own messianic qualities.

Jungian therapists and disciples were greatly provoked by both of Noll’s books. One response was a small book by the Jung historian Sonu Shamdasani, *Cult Fictions* (1998). Shamdasani systematically examines and ultimately rules out Noll’s contention that Jung was the author of the transcribed Psychological Club talk; thus, the talk cannot be used as strong evidence that Jung wished to start a cult with himself as its messiah. Readers of either of Noll’s books should read Shamdasani’s as well, in order to get a more complete picture of Jung. Noll’s Jung is a self-indulgent and devious irrationalist; Shamdasani’s Jung is a somewhat misunderstood rationalist, concerned with helping his followers explore their psychological depths and not intending to mislead them. It is fair to say that Jung at one time or another showed both of these sides, which overlap but are not totally congruent with his Number
One (extraverted, reality-grounded) and Number Two (introverted “wise old man”) personalities. He delighted in presenting himself as a serious scientist, able to give objective consideration to the psychological extremes in himself and in his patients. But he also enjoyed disrupting his patients’ attempts to maintain rationality, at times assuming the role of Trickster or Zen master.

**PROFESSIONAL BIOGRAPHIES**

These are biographies written by people whose main qualification is that they write biographies. Jung has so far received the attention of five professional biographers, none of whom have been entirely successful in developing a comprehensive and at the same time genuinely readable view of the man and his work.

The first such biographer was Gerhard Wehr, a German scholar of religion. He wrote several other biographies as well, including one of Rudolf Steiner (with whose anthroposophic movement Wehr was affiliated), but he could be categorized as a “professional biographer” simply from his three biographies of Jung. The first of these, *Portrait of Jung: An Illustrated Biography* (1969/1971), is poorly illustrated despite its subtitle; it is also quite brief and unoriginal, a minor biographical effort at best. The second, *Jung: A Biography* (Wehr, 1985/1987), contains few illustrations but is a good deal more substantial. Its main shortcomings are again its lack of originality (depending heavily on *MDR* and on Jung’s published letters) and its ponderous style. It is useful for its citations of the German-language secondary literature, which tends to be scant in Jung biographies written in English. Wehr’s third book on Jung is discussed below in the category of illustrated biographies.

Vincent Brome’s several other biographies include a competent treatment of Freud and the standard work on Ernest Jones, whom he knew well. In writing his earlier books, he interviewed a number of people who shared anecdotes about Jung. In specific preparation for *Jung: Man and Myth* (1978), Brome went on to interview a broad array of other friends, acquaintances, and relatives of Jung, including several of his children plus the two women closest to him in his final years, Ruth Bailey and Aniela Jaffé. Thus, although Brome cites *MDR* and the published Jung letters at appropriate points, he provides a good deal of additional biographical information that was previously unavailable. Some of this additional information may not be altogether reliable, especially when it comes from individuals who chose not to be identified in print, but Brome is usually judicious in offering such information without asserting its absolute accuracy. He also indicates at least mild skepticism about some of the information from *MDR*, at times offering alternative accounts from other sources. And he suggests non-Jungian interpretations for several of Jung’s dreams (along more or less Freudian lines), without arguing that they are any more correct than Jung’s own interpretations.

Frank McLynn, previously a biographer of such figures as Henry Morton Stanley and Robert Louis Stevenson, made no effort to interview anyone for *Carl Gustav Jung* (1996/1997). He says with apparent pride that he “deliberately did not seek expert advice or academic readings . . . . The errors and shortcomings in this volume are mine and mine alone” (p. xii). Had he solicited some of that expert advice, or simply the services of a good fact-checker, he might have learned for instance that Jung could not have “commandeered jeeps” (p. 286) for part of his African journey in 1926. McLynn did read widely in the published literature by and about Jung (including Brome’s biography, which he repeatedly cites or silently paraphrases), but he failed to consult any archival sources. Lacking a feel for the accuracy or inaccuracy of his various published sources, he displays more confidence in his conclusions than his evidence warrants. He engages in frequent overstatement (e.g., “in later life he [Jung]...
always reacted so violently to the sight of women in trousers” [p. 11]), and makes dogmatic inferences from limited data (e.g., “What is clear is that Jung did not, in any significant sense of the word, love Emma,” his wife. McLynn’s main evidence for this conclusion is that Emma Jung is mentioned only twice in MDR and “in entirely trivial contexts” (p. 83). Actually, she was mentioned a good deal more than trivially in the urtext from which Aniela Jaffé assembled the published version of MDR, but the Jung children insisted on removing most such passages, as well as several references to Toni Wolff, to maintain family privacy.

Ronald Hayman’s previous biographies are even more numerous than McLynn’s, mainly of literary figures but also including Nietzsche and Hitler. In writing A Life of Jung (1999/2001), Hayman was considerably more resourceful than McLynn, relying in part on his own interviews, in part on Gene Nameche’s oral history interviews (deposited at Harvard’s Countway Library), and in part on Aniela Jaffé’s “unused material” for MDR (available mainly in the Library of Congress), as well as on the standard sources: the published versions of MDR (Hayman did his own translations from the German edition), the published letters, and so forth. Hayman does not always fully identify his sources, but he avoids use of unnamed informants. He struggles while attempting to explain certain of Jung’s core concepts (e.g., the collective unconscious, archetypes) and Jung’s use of the I Ching. On the other hand, he offers clear accounts of such episodes in Jung’s life as the affair with Sabina Spielrein and the much longer relationship with Toni Wolff. Hayman expresses appropriate skepticism about Jung’s terminological ambiguity concerning his “visions,” as well as about the accuracy of Jung’s detailed late-life recollections of his childhood dreams. Though Hayman’s book does not come close to being a pathography, he repeatedly challenges Jung’s excuses for his bad behavior (especially toward women), as well as Jung’s often self-serving account of other life events. One of the book’s best chapters (Chapter 37) addresses the “mythification” of MDR by Jung, as well as its “auntification” (Jung’s term for bowdlerization) by others.

Deirdre Bair wrote biographies of Samuel Beckett, Anais Nin, and Simone de Beauvoir before taking on Jung. Her Jung (2003) is impressive in size, some 250 pages longer than its nearest competitor among the professional biographies. It is written in an insistently assertive style that appears designed to give readers little room to doubt its accuracy. Unfortunately, Bair’s account is seriously compromised by heavy reliance on “private sources” and “private archives,” none of which can be independently confirmed. Readers concerned enough with biographical accuracy to check the endnotes for evidence of Bair’s assertions will find themselves, uncomfortably often, back in the world of Paul Stern’s (1976) unattributed Zurich gossip.

There are other problems with Bair’s book in addition to those unnamed sources (whose identities Bair promised “never to reveal” [p. xii].) Though Bair did her homework and more in gathering life-history data about Jung, she appears to have made little effort to understand his theories. Whenever the narrative seems to require a discussion of, say, archetypes or individuation, she briefly quotes or cites someone else’s definition and moves on to other aspects of Jung’s life. Given that Jung located those ideas at the very center of his life, this largely theory-free approach to his biography feels hollow at its core. Further, even when Bair deals strictly with life-history data, she often patches together a misleading account of events. For instance, her version of Jung’s 1925–1926 African journey contains doubtful inferences, inaccuracies, or factual errors large and small on nearly every page. Among these, Bair tells us that “the African continent was so vast that long periods of time were needed to traverse even the small area [Jung’s] party covered” (p. 340). Africa is indeed vast, but the “small area” of Jung’s journey encompassed the breadth of Kenya, a slice of Uganda, and the full south-to-north length of Sudan and Egypt, for a total of some 3,000 miles. Along the way, according to Bair, “there were many welcome ‘rest stations,’ fairly civilized encampments with running
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water and toilet facilities” (p. 351). She does not explain where the expert plumbers and janitors might have come from to install and maintain these wondrous (but in actuality very minimal and plumbing-free) rest stations. She tells us that despite their slow progress across their “small area” of Africa, the Jung party had plenty of time to spend in Cairo near the end of their land journey—three months, according to Bair (p. 353). Actually, they had little more than two weeks to enjoy Cairo before they hurried on to Port Said to catch their homeward-bound ship. (Bair apparently failed to subtract from their six-month journey the several weeks required to sail in each direction, from England to Africa and back to Europe.) And so on.

Bair does provide interesting accounts of certain topics previously undiscussed or little mentioned in the biographical literature, such as Jung’s role as an informal consultant to American spymaster Allen Dulles during World War II. She also provides much more detail than earlier published accounts on such matters as the writing and editing of MDR, though she does not necessarily clarify these matters by piling detail upon detail. Readers interested in specific topics about which she introduces new material, such as her discussion of the so-called “Solar Phallus Man” (whose psychotic visions Jung regarded as solid support for the collective unconscious) may well benefit from a reading of her book. On the other hand, readers interested in learning more about the problems inherent in Bair’s frequent use of anonymous sources will benefit from a reading of Sonu Shamdasani’s latest book, punningly titled Jung Stripped Bare by His Biographers, Even (2005), which includes a lengthy critique of her work. Shamdasani also discusses the weaknesses, and occasionally the strengths, of other professional biographies of Jung. Though his bias against Freudian psychobiography leads him at times to reject potentially productive interpretations of Jung’s dreams and fantasies, Shamdasani’s biographical criticisms are usually based firmly on his unparalleled knowledge of both the published literature and the unpublished archives dealing with Jung’s life.

INTELLECTUAL BIOGRAPHIES

Biographies of Jung by professional biographers have not done a particularly good job of tracing the intellectual evolution of his major concepts. That job has been left principally to a small number of biographers who have been able to resist the lures of Jung’s spectacular fantasy life and his sexual liaisons.

Henri Ellenberger, in his massive work The Discovery of the Unconscious (1970), includes a chapter on Jung that is as long as a short book. Ellenberger, a Swiss psychiatrist, did some of the earliest systematic research on Jung’s life and work beyond the material covered in MDR. Ellenberger did not yet have available, or did not use, information on the roles that Sabina Spielrein and Toni Wolff played in Jung’s theoretical development, and few of Jung’s letters (including those to Freud) had been published when he did his research. But with his knowledge of European intellectual history and especially the history of psychiatry, Ellenberger was able to place Jung’s ideas firmly within a broad intellectual context. Much of his work has been incorporated into later Jung biographies or superseded by more recently discovered biographical data. But he is still worth reading for his discussion of some of the obscure intellectual origins of such Jungian concepts as extraversion/introversion (pp. 702–703) and the anima (pp. 708–709).

Anthony Storr’s little book, C. G. Jung (1973), is in its entirety briefer than Ellenberger’s chapter. Storr provides only the essentials of “The Personal Background,” using most of his book to discuss Jung’s main concepts and their role in the overall theoretical structure. Storr is a skeptical but often insightful writer, coming from a broadly psy-
choanalytic rather than a Jungian position. He identifies aspects of Jung’s theorizing that remain unclear even after careful study, and questions Jung’s belief in ghosts, synchronicity, and other matters lacking scientific validity. But Storr also makes an effort to identify Jungian concepts that remain broadly useful.

F. X. Charet, a Canadian scholar of religion, delimits his intellectual biography of Jung in his book’s title: *Spiritualism and the Foundations of C. G. Jung’s Psychology* (1993). By “spiritualism,” Charet refers to the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century movement that sought empirical evidence of “communication between the living and the dead” (p. 1) and of related phenomena such as ghosts and mediums. Jung was exposed to spiritualism as a child through his mother and other close relatives, developed an intense intellectual interest in it as a young man, and continued to believe in its central components throughout his life. Charet argues from extensive biographical evidence (mostly but not exclusively drawn from *MDR* and the published letters) that Jung’s major theoretical concepts grew out of these spiritualistic beliefs. Charet could have usefully looked at a wider range of intellectual influences; at the same time, he could have been more concise than a 328-page book, given his narrow focus. But he makes an interesting case for his provocative central thesis.

Though the present review does not attempt to cover the extensive journal literature on Jung, mention should be made of one paper that is repeatedly cited by Charet: William B. Goodheart’s “C. G. Jung’s First ‘Patient’” (1984), which discusses Jung’s first substantial engagement with spiritualism, a series of séances that Jung later analyzed in his doctoral dissertation. The medium in these séances was Jung’s first cousin Helly, a young woman who fell in love with him and apparently became the focus of his strong erotic interest as well. According to Goodheart, “Jung’s initial concept of the ‘autonomous psyche’ arose to serve as a self-protective, isolating but stabilizing conceptual construct in this threatening and impossibly entangled and contaminated interpersonal relationship with Helly” (p. 13). Goodheart’s psychobiographical analysis provoked sharp controversy among Jungians (e. g., Kugler & Hillman, 1985), but it remains an insightful study of the partial origins of Jung’s key concepts.

Sonu Shamdasani acknowledged Jung’s spiritualistic sources in his introduction to a revised translation of Théodore Flournoy’s classic study of a medium, *From India to the Planet Mars* (Flournoy, 1900/1994). In *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology* (2003), Shamdasani is much more concerned with late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century developments in academic psychology and philosophy that provided a broader context for Jung’s theoretical development. In four long and thorough chapters, Shamdasani examines the intellectual sources of Jung’s ideas about the personal equation (especially William James’s idea that philosophical theories are inevitably expressions of their authors’ subjectivity), about dreams, and about the collective unconscious and the archetypes. Shamdasani notes that Jung was largely silent about his own “personal equation” until he began to write *MDR* late in life, claiming instead to have discovered unique knowledge beyond the personal equation by recognizing the literal reality and shared nature of the archetypes. The current volume may overemphasize Jung’s more intellectually respectable influences in attempting to make up for their lack of coverage by other scholars. But Shamdasani is now in the process of editing the legendary “Red Book,” Jung’s very private volume of paintings and commentary on the “extended series of waking fantasies” that emerged after he broke off his close friendship with Freud (pp. 24–25). Publication of that volume, along with Shamdasani’s editorial notes, is likely to make much clearer the role of the irrational in Jung’s theories. Meanwhile, Shamdasani’s intellectual biography situates Jung much more clearly within the mainstream of serious psychological thought than any previous study.
ILLUSTRATED BIOGRAPHIES

While most Jung biographies include at least a few pictures, three biographical volumes consist mainly of pictures. The earliest of these, Aniela Jaffé’s *C. G. Jung: Word and Image* (1977/1979), is also the best. It includes not only a wide range of family photographs but several full-page reproductions of manuscript pages handwritten by Jung, as well as the first publication of a number of his archetypal paintings from the Red Book. In editing this volume of “words and images,” Jaffé took most of the words directly from the standard American version of *MDR*. But she also included, for the first time in English, several passages that had appeared only in the German-language version, as well as some of Jung’s letters to Emma Jung that had not previously seen print.

Gerhard Wehr’s *Illustrated Biography of C. G. Jung* (1989) covers much the same ground as Wehr’s (1987) full-scale biography, in considerably fewer words. Indeed, the 1989 book repeatedly refers the reader to the 1987 biography for more detail on various matters. Not surprisingly, the illustrated biography is of interest mainly for its illustrations, especially its many handsome photographs of Jung and his personal environment. A number of Jung’s archetypal paintings are reproduced, including several from sources other than the Red Book. Unfortunately, several illustrations are inadequately or incorrectly captioned, sometimes disastrously so—as on p. 37, where Jung’s mistress Toni Wolff is identified as his wife Emma.

The third illustrated biography, Claire Dunne’s *C. G. Jung: Wounded Healer of the Soul* (2000), is largely a cut-and-paste job. Interspersed among the pictures are many lengthy quotations, mainly from *MDR*, from Jung’s published letters, and from other books about Jung. Most of the photographs of Jung and his family can be found in the Jaffé and Wehr books; other illustrations are often only tangentially related to Jung at best. The author’s choice of photographs and quotations, as well as her own limited commentary on them, appear to be aimed at depicting Jung as a New Age guru. That was surely one side of the many-sided Jung, and for certain readers this book may be just what they are looking for.

RELIGIOUS BIOGRAPHIES

Most full-scale biographies of Jung devote substantial attention to religious issues. Given Jung’s personal religious background (his father and most of his uncles were ministers), his religious visions as a child and as an adult, and his frequent pronouncements on the psychology of religious belief in his correspondence and professional writings, such attention by biographers is not surprising. Several biographers have gone further, emphasizing religious matters over all other issues in Jung’s life and work.

Of seven such biographies, two are substantial scholarly studies. The first to appear was *Jung in Context*, written by Peter Homans (1979), a professor of religion and psychological studies. Homans’s book could be categorized as an intellectual biography, tracing the development of Jung’s theoretical ideas over time. To some degree, it can also be regarded as a pathography, identifying Jung’s narcissism and its symptoms and how they shaped his ideas. What distinguishes the book from the intellectual biographies discussed earlier is that it consistently emphasizes Jung’s struggle with Christianity, both as a personal problem for him and as a source of certain of his central ideas. (Curiously, Homans does not discuss Jung’s involvement with spiritualism, an important component of his religiosity separate from his concerns with orthodox Christianity.) What distinguishes the book from pathography is that Homans ultimately sees Jung’s struggle with narcissism as being resolved in ways beneficial
to many other people, through the development of Jungian theory and therapy; thus, it proved to be a kind of “creative narcissism” rather than unredeemed pathology. Also substantial is *Jung’s Quest for Wholeness*, by Curtis D. Smith (1990), a religious historian. This book is principally an intellectual biography, but again with a particular focus on the more religious aspects of Jung’s ideas. Smith defines religious concepts as those dealing with ultimate concerns—meaning, in Jung’s case, the “quest for wholeness” and the concomitant reduction or elimination of psychological fragmentation. Smith systematically pursues Jung’s religious quest throughout his theoretical writings, using the first published version of each work rather than Jung’s later revisions—an essential means to understand Jung’s theoretical development, as the versions presented in Jung’s *Collected Works* were often heavily reworked and edited to reflect his later thinking.

A less comprehensive work is *The Adult Development of C. G. Jung*, by John-Raphael Staude (1981). The primary distinction of Staude’s book is that it applies the formal schemata of life-span developmental psychology, especially as set forth by Daniel Levinson, to Jung’s life. This approach yields no novel insights, as Levinson was himself inspired to develop his concepts of “the stages of a man’s life” (Levinson, 1978) by a close reading of *MDR* and of Jung’s theoretical writings. Nonetheless, Staude does usefully highlight certain ways in which Jung’s archetypal mythology, presented in *MDR* as a rejection of Christian orthodoxy and its replacement by a more “objective” self-knowledge, was really a repackaging of Christian myths in psychological language.

Robert C. Smith’s *The Wounded Jung* (1996) is, like Homans’s book, a semi-pathography, tracing the development of Jung’s religiously tinged or “numinous” concepts of inner healing to the serious intrapsychic conflicts established in his childhood. Smith surveys a wide range of secondary literature on Jung’s psychological “wounds,” but his attempts to synthesize this literature remain curiously tentative. Colin Wilson’s *Lord of the Underworld* (1984) is another *MDR*-dependent book, largely concerned with depicting Jung as the avatar of New Age mysticism, and impatiently dismissing his efforts to develop an objective science of personality.

In *The Tao of Jung*, David Rosen (1996) proposes that Jung’s life and work followed a Taoist rather than a Christian path. Indeed, according to Rosen, “Jung himself, from a very early age, was Taoist in his approach to life” (p. xix). Much of the book alternates between brief biographical episodes, mainly taken from *MDR*, and quotations from the *Tao Te Ching* or other Taoist works that at least vaguely resemble each cited element of Jung’s life. Equivalences are also suggested between one or another of Jung’s theoretical concepts and selected Taoist pronouncements (e.g., between the archetype of the Shadow and Lao Tzu’s statement, “Darkness within darkness./ The gateway to all understanding” [p. 30]). Aspects of Jung’s life and work that cannot be linked to a Taoist precept are omitted or mentioned only in passing. Bringing Taoism into the discussion of Jung’s religious views is potentially useful, as he did indeed become keenly interested in the *Tao Te Ching* and the *I Ching* in midlife. But the Taoist lessons here drawn from his life and work rarely approach the level of sophistication to be found in a somewhat similar book about another Western guru, *The Tao of Pooh* (Hoff, 1982).

In *Young Carl Jung* (1996), Robert W. Brockway, a professor of religion and formerly a Unitarian minister, suggests that Jung’s religious orientation was instead “an inward-looking personal kind of Christianity akin to that of the Quakers” (p. 151). Elsewhere, Brockway proposes that “Jung was a Dionysian philosopher, like Nietzsche” (p. 164)—who does not sound much like a Quaker—and that though Jung did not “deliberately set out to found a charismatic cult” (p. 165), he ended up founding one anyway. Brockway tends to soften the extremes of Jung’s life as recounted in *MDR*; he doubts that Jung’s childhood dreams had any mythic sig-
nificance and he sees the 1913–1918 post-Freud “confrontation with the unconscious” (Jung’s term) not as a period of intense midlife crisis but as “a prolonged sabbatical” (p. 38). Brockway is often ambivalent and sometimes self-contradictory about Jung’s character and beliefs (e.g., “Jung did not believe in spooks” [p. 31]; “Jung was persuaded on other grounds that there actually were spirits” [p. 127]). He concludes without a clear view of Jung’s status as a religious thinker: “I think that he always will be an enigma” (Brockway’s italics, p. 164).

JOINT BIOGRAPHIES OF JUNG AND FREUD

The biographies discussed in previous categories make an effort to deal with Jung’s entire life span, or at least with a broad portion of it. Several other books focus selectively on a particular period lasting only six to ten years: the period when Jung and Sigmund Freud became close friends and colleagues, and in some books the further period when Jung struggled to recover from the termination of that friendship. The biographers’ decision to focus on this period appears to involve several factors: the presumed influence of Freud’s ideas on Jung’s psychological theories; the availability of an extensive correspondence between Jung and Freud during that period (published as *The Freud/Jung Letters* [McGuire, 1974]); and the greater ease of handling this important but delimited period in Jung’s life rather than undertaking a full biography.

The first book to draw upon *The Freud/Jung Letters* to any significant degree was Paul Roazen’s *Freud and His Followers* (1975), in which 70 pages are devoted to Jung’s role as Freud’s chosen “Crown Prince” and his eventual rebellion against Freud. Roazen is good on the politics of the early psychoanalytic movement, but he does not go into much depth on the emotional complexities of Jung’s relationship with Freud. The third volume of philosopher Walter Kaufmann’s *Discovering the Mind* trilogy (1980) provides a deeper analysis of both figures (as well as of Alfred Adler). Kaufmann’s bias toward Freud is evident throughout: Freud is pictured as wise, fatherly, and mostly “serene,” while Jung is deeply aware of his own inferiority, defends against it in various ways that disrupt the relationship, and remains distressed forever after by Freud’s rejection. Kaufmann is especially acute at noting Jung’s later distortions of the historical record, through comparisons of *The Freud/Jung Letters* with MDR.

Irving Alexander’s psychobiographical interpretation of the Freud-Jung relationship in his book *Personology* (1990) is more balanced than Kaufmann’s. As in other accounts, Alexander sees Jung as strongly transferring his feelings toward his father onto Freud, and Freud as responding with a father-son counter-transference (pp. 115–132). But as Alexander notes, the two men’s developing antagonisms were in part reality-based as well as transference-based; each really was a threat toward the other in terms of their competition in the theoretical arena. In a subsequent chapter, Alexander is concerned with how Jung survived the break with Freud, moving “from the angry, fearful position of the Oedipal son, to the more independent and benign role of the leader and father” (p. 192). Though Alexander does not regard himself as a Jungian, he concludes that Jung made this transition successfully and in the process came to offer others “a direction, a path, a fundamental set of concepts” that may continue to enrich the broad field of personality theory (p. 196).

In *Freud, Jung and Hall the King-Maker*, Saul Rosenzweig (1992) chose an even narrower focus than other biographers. He considers in great detail the “expedition to America” that Jung and Freud undertook in 1909 at the invitation of Clark University’s president, the developmental psychologist G. Stanley Hall. Though this journey lasted only six weeks, Rosenzweig sees it as encompassing the full psychological scope of the Freud-Jung relationship, including the clear onset of the collapse that did not occur publicly until 1912. On the
basis of extensive original research, Rosenzweig presents intriguing new information not only about Jung’s and Freud’s public lectures in America but about the private repercussions of Jung’s contemporaneous extramarital relationship on his wife and small daughter back home. In an unexpected side note, Rosenzweig also examines evidence on William James’s late-life romantic relationship with a young woman—a relationship that may have provoked James’s well-known attack of angina during a walk with Freud.

Another book that goes beyond a detailed study of The Freud-Jung Letters to include substantial original research is Linda Donn’s Freud and Jung (1988). Donn gained new information and new perspectives on the Jung-Freud relationship from lengthy interviews with Jung’s son Franz (who was not altogether positive about his father’s role), as well as with Aniela Jaffé and others who knew the principal parties. Donn is a fluent writer and is careful not to take sides; however, she fails to assess the long-term impact that Jung and Freud had on each other.

At approximately three times the length of Donn’s book, John Kerr’s A Most Dangerous Method (1993) covers similar ground in much more detail—more detail, indeed, than many readers will wish to absorb. The book’s particular strength is its incorporation of “new” data on Sabina Spielrein’s connections with both Jung and Freud, including quotations from a lengthy autobiographical essay by Spielrein and extracts from Jung’s letters to her, material not previously available in English translation. A weakness of the book is Kerr’s unquestioning acceptance of rumors about Freud’s supposed sexual relationship with his sister-in-law Minna Bernays—rumors that Jung circulated late in life, with little to go on other than his uncertain memory of what Minna may have told him several decades earlier.

Three other books about the Jung-Freud relationship have less to offer in terms of biography. In Freud and Jung, Robert Steele (1982) attempts a hermeneutic approach to The Freud-Jung Letters and to the two theorists’ work. Though Steele describes his approach as opening “a new way of doing research in psychology,” one that among other things can “alert each reader to the ways in which both fiction and fact are used by people in understanding their lives” (p. viii), the approach as used here seems neither original nor unusually revealing. In Jung’s Struggle with Freud, George Hogensen (1983) says he seeks “to ground a philosophical critique of psychoanalysis in the circumstances surrounding the personal encounter of Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung” (p. x). But his book describes only “those aspects of their lives that are philosophically significant” (p. 9), and indeed he focuses even more narrowly on aspects that relate to a single theoretical issue: whether Freud’s ideas about repressing Oedipal anger are more valid than Jung’s ideas about the projection of archetypes. In Hogensen’s philosophical analysis, Jung comes out the winner; but in reaching that conclusion, Hogensen lets much biography and theory fall by the wayside. Finally, Duane Schultz, in Intimate Friends, Dangerous Rivals (1990), covers much the same ground as Linda Donn (1988), but his book lacks her original research and narrative fluency. Schultz draws not only upon The Freud/Jung Letters and MDR, but also (without attempting to determine their validity) upon such sources as Helen Puner’s notoriously unreliable biography of Freud and Paul Stern’s often-unattributed Zurich gossip about Jung. The book might be assigned as an easy read for undergraduates but is otherwise not useful.

**CONCLUSION**

Out of all these biographies of Jung, which should the reader choose? Jung said on more than one occasion that his life demanded a multiplicity of biographers, each expert in a different area. At first, that remark sounds like another example of Jung’s narcissism. On second thought,
it is probably true. Jung’s work did touch significantly on many disparate areas of endeavor, and
his long life was embedded in a variety of cultural and historical environments. The biographies
reviewed here draw upon the diverse backgrounds of many biographers, but no single biography
has yet come close to matching Jung’s own breadth and complexity of interests and capabilities.
Nor can anything like a “complete” biography of Jung be written by anyone until the Jung
archives are made fully available for unrestricted scholarly study. The Jung family has begun
to make limited moves in this direction already, but a great deal of material is still difficult to
access. The recent formation of the Philemon Foundation, with “the complete support and contractual
collaboration of the Heirs of C. G. Jung” (Philemon Foundation, 2004) and with long-range
plans to publish the bulk of Jung’s unpublished correspondence and manuscripts, offers
hope for the future. However, full archival access for all biographers without family intrusion
into the process appears unlikely to occur until at least another generation has passed.
In terms of existing biographies of Jung, different books may best serve the needs of different
audiences. The categorization of biographies in this review article may be used as
something of a guide in that regard. For the general reader who is willing to put some time
into getting as comprehensive an assessment of Jung’s life and work as is now possible, a
short collection of works is recommended over any single volume:

1. Despite its evasions and its misrememberings, its omissions by Jung himself and its
“auntifications” by others, Memories, Dreams, Reflections (Jung, 1963a) gives
readers more of the inner Jung than anything else now available.
2. MDR should be read along with a full-scale professional biography, to place it in
broader context and to provide a better sense of Jung’s external life. Hayman’s Life
of Jung (2001) is the most reliable of those currently available.
3. By giving the reader a deeper understanding of Jung’s major concepts in relation to
his life, Shamdasani’s Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology (2003) fills a
gap in all the professional biographies. As Shamdasani emphasizes the more philosophically
and scientifically respectable sources of Jung’s ideas, at least a quick
look at a treatment of Jung’s more disreputable sources—say, Charet (1993) or Noll
(1997)—is also worth taking.
4. The psychodynamic underpinnings of Jung’s life and work are not fully addressed
in any of the books so far recommended, though Jung himself provides plenty of
raw material in MDR. Here, two of the briefer treatments are recommended in tandem:
Atwood and Stolorow’s Jung chapter in Faces in a Cloud (1994) for a pathographic
treatment, plus Alexander’s Jung chapters in Personology (1990) for a more
empathic view.
5. Seeing and hearing Jung speak, in excerpts from the extensive filmed interviews by
Richard Evans (1957) or in the “Face to Face” television interview by John Freeman
(1959), gives a better sense of Jung the man than the bare transcripts in C. G. Jung
Speaking.
6. Readers who wish a second or third opinion before embarking on this program of
study may consult recent reviews by Charet (2000) and Haule (2000), each of
whom evaluates a partial selection of the books listed here.
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