

International Library of Psychology
Philosophy and Scientific Method

Psychological Types



International Library of Psychology
Philosophy and Scientific Method

GENERAL EDITOR :

C. K. OGDEN, M.A.
(Magdalene College, Cambridge)

VOLUMES ALREADY ARRANGED

- PHILOSOPHICAL STUDIES by G. E. MOORE, Litt.D.
THE MISUSE OF MIND by KARIN STEPHEN
Prefatory Note by Henri Bergson
CONFLICT AND DREAM by W. H. R. RIVERS, F.R.S.
PSYCHOLOGY AND POLITICS by W. H. R. RIVERS, F.R.S.
PSYCHOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY by W. H. R. RIVERS, F.R.S.
THE ANALYSIS OF MATTER by BERTRAND RUSSELL, F.R.S.
TRACTATUS LOGICO-PHILOSOPHICUS by L. WITTGENSTEIN
Introduction by Bertrand Russell
MATHEMATICS FOR PHILOSOPHERS by G. H. HARDY, F.R.S.
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MYTHS by G. ELLIOT SMITH, F.R.S.
THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE UNCONSCIOUS by E. VON HARTMANN
Introduction by Professor G. Elliot Smith
CHARACTER AND THE UNCONSCIOUS by J. H. VAN DER HOOP
INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOLOGY by ALFRED ADLER
SCIENTIFIC METHOD by A. D. RITCHIE
SCIENTIFIC THOUGHT by C. D. BROAD, Litt.D.
THE MEANING OF MEANING by C. K. OGDEN and I. A. RICHARDS
THE THEORY OF MEDICAL DIAGNOSIS
by F. G. CROOKSHANK, M.D., F.R.C.P.
THE ELEMENTS OF PSYCHOTHERAPY by WILLIAM BROWN, M.D., D.Sc.
THE MEASUREMENT OF EMOTION by W. WHATELY SMITH
Introduction by William Brown
EMOTION AND INSANITY by S. THALBITZER
Introduction by Professor H. Höfding
THE LAWS OF FEELING by F. PAULHAN
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MUSIC by EDWARD J. DENT
COLOUR-HARMONY by JAMES WOOD
THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHINESE THOUGHT by LIANG CHE-CHIAO
THE HISTORY OF MATERIALISM by F. A. LANGE
THE PRIMITIVE MIND by P. RADIN, Ph.D.
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF PRIMITIVE PEOPLES
by B. MALINOWSKI, Ph.D., D.Sc.
THE STATISTICAL METHOD IN ECONOMICS AND POLITICS
by P. SARGANT FLORENCE
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF REASONING by EUGENIO RIGNANO
THE PRINCIPLES OF CRITICISM by I. A. RICHARDS
THE PHILOSOPHY OF 'AS IF' by H. VAHINGER

Psychological Types

or

The Psychology of Individuation

By

C. G. JUNG

Dr Med. et Jur. of the University of Zürich
Author of "Psychology of the Unconscious"

Translated by

H. GODWIN BAYNES, M.B., B.C. Cantab



NEW YORK

HARCOURT, BRACE & COMPANY, INC.

LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., LTD.

1923

By the Same Author

PSYCHOLOGY OF THE UNCONSCIOUS

A Study of the Transformations and Symbolisms of the Libido: a Contribution to the History of the Evolution of Thought

COLLECTED PAPERS ON ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY

STUDIES IN WORD ASSOCIATION

DEMENTIA PRÆCOX

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
THE EDINBURGH PRESS, 9 AND 11 YOUNG STREET, EDINBURGH

CONTENTS

	PAGE
TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE	i-xxii
FOREWORD	7
INTRODUCTION	9
The Two Mechanisms: Extraversion and Introversion. The Four Psychological Basic Functions: Thinking, Feeling, Sensation, and Intuition, 9	
CHAPTER I. THE PROBLEM OF TYPES IN THE HISTORY OF CLASSICAL AND MEDIEVAL THOUGHT	15
1. <i>Psychology in the Classical Age: the Gnostics, Tertullian, and Origen</i>	15
2. <i>The Theological Disputes of the Ancient Church</i>	30
3. <i>The Problem of Transubstantiation</i>	33
4. <i>Nominalism and Realism</i>	37
(a) The Problem of the Universalia in the Classical Age, 38; (b) The Universalia Problem in Scholasticism, 52; (c) Abélard's Attempt at Conciliation, 62	
5. <i>The Holy Communion Controversy between Luther and Zwingli</i>	84
CHAPTER II. SCHILLER'S IDEAS UPON THE TYPE PROBLEM	
1. <i>Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man</i>	87
(a) The Superior and the Inferior Functions, 87; (b) Concerning the Basic Instincts, 123	
2. <i>A Discussion on Naïve and Sentimental Poetry</i>	163
(a) The Naïve Attitude, 165; (b) The Sentimental Attitude, 166; (c) The Idealist and the Realist, 168	

PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPES

	PAGE
CHAPTER III. THE APOLLONIAN AND THE DIONYSIAN	170
CHAPTER IV. THE TYPE PROBLEM IN THE DISCERNMENT OF HUMAN CHARACTER	
I. <i>General Remarks upon Jordan's Types</i>	184
2. <i>Special Description and Criticism of the Jordan Types</i>	191
(a) The Introverted Woman (the more-impassioned woman), 191; (b) The Extraverted Woman (the less-impassioned woman), 195; (c) The Extraverted Man, 200; (d) The Introverted Man, 204	
CHAPTER V. THE PROBLEM OF TYPES IN POETRY	
CARL SPITTELER'S <i>Prometheus and Epimetheus</i>	
I. <i>Introductory Remarks on Spitteler's Characterization of Types</i>	207
2. <i>A Comparison of Spitteler's with Goethe's Prometheus</i>	215
3. <i>The Significance of the Reconciling Symbol</i>	234
(a) The Brahmanic Conception of the Problem of the Opposites, 242; (b) Concerning the Brahmanic Conception of the Reconciling Symbol, 247; (c) The Reconciling Symbol as the Principle of Dynamic Regulation, 257; (d) The Reconciling Symbol in Chinese Philosophy, 264	
4. <i>The Relativity of the Symbol</i>	272
(a) The Service of Woman and the Service of the Soul, 272; (b) The Relativity of the Idea of God in Meister Eckehart, 297	
5. <i>The Nature of the Reconciling Symbol in Spitteler</i>	320
CHAPTER VI. THE TYPE PROBLEM IN PSYCHIATRY	337
CHAPTER VII. THE PROBLEM OF TYPICAL ATTITUDES IN ÆSTHETICS	358

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER VIII. THE PROBLEM OF TYPES IN MODERN PHILOSOPHY	
1. <i>William James' Types</i>	372
2. <i>The Characteristic Pairs of Opposites in James' Types</i>	382
(a) Rationalism v. Empiricism, 382; (b) Intellectualism v. Sensationalism, 387; (c) Idealism v. Materialism, 387; (d) Optimism v. Pessimism, 389; (e) Religiousness v. Irreligiousness, 391; (f) Indeterminism v. Determinism, 393; (g) Monism v. Pluralism, 396; (h) Dogmatism v. Scepticism, 396	
3. <i>General Criticism of James' Conception</i>	397
CHAPTER IX. THE TYPE PROBLEM IN BIOGRAPHY	401
CHAPTER X. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE TYPES	
A. Introduction	412
B. The Extraverted Type	416
(I) <i>The General Attitude of Consciousness</i>	416
(II) <i>The Attitude of the Unconscious</i>	422
(III) <i>The Peculiarities of Basic Psychological Functions in the Extraverted Attitude</i>	428
1. Thinking, 428; 2. The Extraverted Thinking Type, 434; 3. Feeling, 446; 4. The Extraverted Feeling Type, 448; 5. Recapitulation of Extraverted Rational Types, 452; 6. Sensation, 456; 7. The Extraverted Sensation Type, 457; 8. Intuition, 461; 9. The Extraverted Intuitive Type, 464; 10. Recapitulation of Extraverted Irrational Types, 468	
C. The Introverted Type	
(I) <i>The General Attitude of Consciousness</i>	471
(II) <i>The Unconscious Attitude</i>	477
(III) <i>Peculiarities of the Basic Psychological Functions in the Introverted Attitude</i>	480

PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPES

1. Thinking, 480; 2. The Introverted Thinking Type, 484; 3. Feeling, 489; 4. The Introverted Feeling Type, 492; 5. Recapitulation of Introverted Rational Types, 495; 6. Sensation, 498; 7. The Introverted Sensation Type, 500; 8. Intuition, 505; 9. The Introverted Intuitive Type, 508; 10. Recapitulation of Introverted Irrational Types, 511; 11. The Principal and Auxiliary Functions, 513

CHAPTER XI. DEFINITIONS

1. Abstraction, 520; 2. Affect, 522; 3. Affectivity, 523; 4. Anima, 524; 5. Apperception, 524; 6. Archaism, 524; 7. Assimilation, 525; 8. Attitude, 526; 9. Collective, 530; 10. Compensation, 531; 11. Concretism, 533; 12. Consciousness, 535; 13. Constructive, 536; 14. Differentiation, 539; 15. Dissimilation, 540; 16. Ego, 540; 17. Emotion, 541; 18. Enantiodynamia, 541; 19. Extraversion, 542; 20. Feeling, 543; 21. Feeling-into, 547; 22. Function, 547; 23. Idea, 547; 24. Identification, 551; 25. Identity, 552; 26. Image, 554; 27. Individual, 560; 28. Individuality, 561; 29. Individuation, 561; 30. Inferior Function, 563; 31. Instinct, 565; 32. Intellect, 566; 33. Introjection, 566; 34. Introversion, 567; 35. Intuition, 567; 36. Irrational, 569; 37. Libido, 571; 38. Objective Plane, 572; 39. Orientation, 572; 40. "Participation Mystique", 572; 41. Phantasy, 573; 42. Power-Complex, 582; 43. Projection, 582; 44. Rational, 583; 45. Reductive, 584; 46. Self, 585; 47. Sensation, 585; 48. Soul, 588; 49. Soul-Image, 596; 50. Subjective Plane, 599; 51. Symbol, 601; 52. Synthetic, 610; 53. Thinking, 611; 54. Transcendent Function, 612; 55. Type, 612; 56. Unconscious, 613; 57. Will, 616.

CONCLUSION

PAGE

518

618

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

IN presenting this, Jung's crowning work, to the English-speaking world, I would like to make a brief sketch of the curve of the author's thought; for, like everything that is rooted in reality, Jung's standpoint shows a definite line of development, and the following of this progression may add a historical sidelight to the understanding of the present work.

I would have preferred to avoid the troubled waters of controversy, but it does not seem possible to relate the history of Jung's standpoint without at the same time contrasting it with that of Freud. That this somewhat thankless task was necessary is proved by the still frequent coupling of the two schools of thought under a common denomination, suggesting that the general mind has, as yet, failed to make a clear distinction between the contrasting standpoints.

Freud undoubtedly is an analytical genius. One has only to read his early studies upon the aetiology of hysteria to be struck by the virtuosity of his subtle reasoning. It was an intuitive capacity of no ordinary shrewdness that revealed the hidden significance of the hysterical syndrome. For it opened the way to an entirely new conception of the unconscious, and led to a rediscovery of the dream as a significant and purposeful product of that same unconscious activity of which the hysterical manifestations were a somatic expression.

Freud was like a master-detective tracking down the incriminating complex in the unconscious, while Breuer, his colleague, contented himself with exorcizing the repressed elements from above by abreaction under hypnosis.

In medical science we can discern two main human types or attitudes whose behaviour towards the therapeutic problem presents a characteristic contrast. The chief interest of the one lies in the welfare of mankind and the healing of his patient; the other's interest is monopolized by the ætiological problem presented by the patient's condition, and is concerned in a less degree with its remedy. The one attempts to discover a remedy before understanding the problem; the other tends to become so completely immersed in the problem that the original objective, *e.g.* the healing of mankind, is often lost to view.

We do not find the greatest minds succumbing to either of these frailties, but it is not out of place to outline such typical predispositions, since the vague benevolence and imperfect understanding of the one are as far below the scientific desideratum, as are the other's exclusive ardours for the "scientific" chase a blemish upon the ideal of humanity.

While Breuer, therefore, seems to have been content with the therapeutic efficacy of hypnotic abreaction, Freud found in this procedure merely a starting-point for a further investigation of those avenues which the abreacted material opened out, and, as he rather naively admits, no one was more surprised than himself to observe that this further investigation of the patient's subterranean activities

produced valuable therapeutic results. It is, of course, true that some of the most beneficent therapeutic measures have been discovered in precisely this way, as incidental by-products as it were, of the process of scientific investigation, but for the purpose of comparison it is important to stress the fact that Freud's approach was pre-eminently that of the empirical investigator, because it is in this attitude that we find both his strength and his limitation as a psychologist. We will return again to this point when the picture has been more fully outlined.

While Freud was enduring the obloquy of the psychological pioneer in Vienna, Jung was approaching similar conclusions from a very different angle in Zürich. By a further elaboration of the word-association experiments formerly employed by Galton and Wundt for other ends, he succeeded in the most delicate task of devising objective criteria for the recognition of unconscious complexes. The discovery of prolonged reaction time, perseveration, etc., associated with affect-toned presentations led to his invaluable formulation of the complex, from which he advanced to the same fundamental concept of repression which Freud had reached by the clinical route. This naturally brought the two pioneers together, and Jung found in Freud's masterly analytical technique the admitted highroad to the unconscious processes.

In so far as it was purely a question of method, Freud and Jung found themselves in harmony, but the study of psychological processes can never remain a mere question of method; sooner or later

it must challenge the investigator to produce a philosophic standpoint. And here a basic psychological difference began to make itself felt. Freud the empiricist wanted to limit his psychological principles to empirically ascertainable matters of fact. On the lines of orthodox scientific determinism he preferred an exclusively causal and reductive account of the psyche. Jung, on the other hand, appreciated the fact that man was more than a variously disordered object—he was also a self-creating subject. He argued that the causal explanation cannot be regarded as exclusive in the psychological realm, since the final or purposive explanation finds equal justification in human experience. He began to feel that the inevitable sexual interpretations, however widely the term might be stretched, were too poor a rendering of the passionate and infinitely diverse aims of the human soul. In harmony, therefore, with Robert Mayer's conception in the realm of physics, he developed the energetic conception of the libido, thus lifting the whole subject from a one-sided and purely empiricistic standpoint to the level of universal concepts, where science and philosophy are able to understand one another.

The actual point of divergence between the two standpoints occurred, significantly enough, over the question of the mother-imago. As is well known, Freud's interpretation of the mother-image in dreams is exclusively referred to the actual mother or mother-surrogate. Jung contended that the almost magical influence of the parent-imago with its supreme dynamic effect upon the whole course of a man's life, not only

...ing his actions, thoughts, and relations to the world with secret and invisible determination, also creating the figures of the father and other deities in his religious and fantasy life, could find no final explanation in the actual contents of infantile and adolescent experience. The difficulty was admitted by Freud, but the acceptance of inherited racial experience as an integral factor in psychic life opened such menacing vistas¹, involving frank disaster to the comprehensive system he had devised and was prepared to demonstrate to the world, that he resolutely shut his eyes to the possibility of this boundless and primeval continuity. He was only prepared to explain the discrete, individual psyche, and Jung's conception of the collective unconscious opened the door to unnamed things from the jungle and primeval forest: it introduced a world of unknown elemental forces which must be unconditionally excluded from a scientific system.

But, apart from the considerations above alluded to, Jung's argument was incontestable. The lungs of the new-born infant know how to breathe, the heart knows how to beat, the whole co-ordinated organic system knows how to function, only because the infant's body is the product of inherited functional experience. The whole story of man's struggle for adaptation to life, his whole phylogenetic history, are represented in that 'knowing how' of the infant's body. Is it then blindness or fear that urges us to deny to the infant psyche that same functional inheritance which is so mani-

¹ Cf. Jung's treatment of the "terrible mother" motif, in the *Psychology of the Unconscious*.

festly present in the other organs? What is this dark fear of our archaic past which prompts us to reject the possibility of any psychic experience other than that of our individual lives?

At all events it is clear that, once the existence of these inherited psychic structures is admitted as the basis of psychic activity, that conception of the unconscious and its contents which regards it as derived exclusively from objective experience in the single individual life must go by the board. Here, then, was the alternative which, from the historical standpoint, we must regard as crucial. Either Jung's conception of the collective unconscious must be admitted, and with it the whole inner world of the subject, wherein the inner images or archetypes are granted an equal determining power with the objects of the outer world, or the one-sided empirical system must be maintained with its somewhat arbitrary postulates, and the whole disturbing vision of the collective unconscious be rejected as a fantastic impossibility.

Jung's great work, *Psychology of the Unconscious*, was the final statement of his separation from and advance beyond the Freudian standpoint, and Freud's reaction to this work made it clear that he too recognized an insuperable opposition. For in this work Jung did not confine himself to a reduction of the Miller fantasies to their instinctive roots; he also identified the personal themes with universal religious and mythological conceptions, thus raising them to a level of general importance. But, in so doing, he also proved the necessity of the synthetic standpoint in analytical psychology—a demonstration that bore unavoid-

the implications unfavourable to the Freudian position.

That the divergence between Freud and Jung must sooner or later have become acute will, I think, be clear when we remember that between the two men there existed not only the difference of race but also a radical difference of type. An extravert, by his very nature, is bound to produce a psychology differing essentially from that of the introvert. For Freud the aims of empirical science, with its centripetal bias towards a minute and detailed analysis of observable facts, were absolute; whereas for Jung a purely objective psychology was not enough, in that it entirely omitted the undeniable reality and power of the idea.

This is not the place to enter into a discussion of the relative values of the extraverted empiricistic and the introverted abstracting attitudes in human thought; the struggle of these two elements, as Jung shows in the present work, is synonymous with the history of human culture. They are both essential as mutual correctives, and it is only when either tendency becomes a one-sided habitual attitude that commonsense steps in and makes its inscrutable judgment. In science these two general tendencies appear as the twin capacities of empirical observation of facts and of intellectual abstraction from the facts observed of generally valid principles, but only in the man of genius do we find both capacities fully and symmetrically developed.

In my view, criticism of Freud's achievement should be based not upon the fact that he failed to perceive the possibility of a general application

of his ideas—this he apprehended only too clearly—but upon his inability to frame concepts of general validity.

He attempted to make the infinitely complex phenomena of the psyche harmonize with theories intuitively derived from clinical material; but he was unable to enlarge or reconstruct his theoretical system to embrace the wider aspects of human experience and culture. The normal was considered in terms of the pathological.

A gradual, but very definite, movement of intelligent opinion away from the Freudian standpoint at the present time is, in my view, a commonsense reaction to the damaging depreciation of essential human values involved in this reductive valuation of the psyche. For the reductive standpoint fails to see that every complex is Janus-faced, and that the energy invested in it is never purely regressive, but is rather a *reculer pour mieux sauter*. The extraordinary vitality of the infantile complex would be quite inexplicable on the supposition that it was a wholly regressive tendency. But it demands a synthetic standpoint to perceive that every dawning possibility in life is heralded by the image of the child, the symbol of eternal youth, and that the infantile complex with its simplicity and trust in life is also the growing point of the developing personality. Every child perceives, what the investigator may fail to see, that a living man in his most eager and productive moments exhibits certain essential characters of childhood. Creative activity demands the power and complexity of the man as well as the simple attitude of the child. But Jung himself

deals so fully and so much more ably with the limitations of the purely reductive standpoint, that I need not elaborate this aspect of the subject here.

It has been argued that psycho-analysis does not claim to be more than a therapeutic technique and a method of research, and that it is irrelevant for the psychologist to concern himself with the question of human development or with the inevitable ancillary problems of morality, religion, and human relationship. In this very argument the essential limitations of this standpoint stand self-confessed, since a psychology that excludes the most vital problems of life from its sphere of responsibility requires no further criticism. It is already moribund. Actually, of course, a psychologic nihilism which broke down every individual form into its elements and put nothing in its place could not, conceivably, have anything but disastrous therapeutic results. But Freud does put something positive and definite in its place; for there always remains the transference to the analyst, which, in the case of a positive transference, involves a gradual assimilation by the patient to the analyst's general attitude to life, and in the alternative case a very definite rejection of the man and all his ways.

This unconscious identification with the analyst is quite outside the sphere of the latter's control. It is inherent in the analytical relationship. But for the analyst to wash his hands of this unconscious effect, with its far-reaching moral influence upon the patient's subsequent development, is as irresponsible as though a surgeon were to shut his eyes to the inevitable dangers of hæmorrhage and

sepsis. The question of moral responsibility, therefore, is inherent in analytical practice, and, since this is so, we have every right to demand of a practical psychological system that it shall attempt to discover the fundamental laws of human development and, as far as possible, to formulate them.

We said at the beginning that Freud was an empirical investigator, and that this was both his strength and his limitation. It is his strength, because it required the empirical attitude to discover and establish the psycho-analytic technique; and it is his limitation, because the general attitude to life which is governed solely by objective facts and considerations is quite incapable of judging man as a subject. If, as Freud points out in *Totem and Taboo*, human morality can be traced back to the first primeval act of parricide, a derivative of some remote arboreal conflict between the parent's authority and the son's lust for his father's wives, then morality can exist only as a constituent of herd-psychology, and the individual moral law is as much a delusion as is free will to a determinist. It is obvious that a purely objective standpoint must similarly interpret all the realities of the inner world as mere derivatives or reflects of objective facts. Man is wholly determined, therefore, by things outside himself. He is nothing but a "*singe raté*", a mere mechanism that gets out of order, and, by an appropriate use of the correct method, can be put right again.

This standpoint is well illustrated by the Freudian interpretation of dreams, which always explains the dream-figures as carefully disguised images of real people or concrete things, quite

ignoring the possibility that such images may also be symbols of subjective realities existing in their own right.

The Freudian standpoint, then, in attempting to explain all the phenomena of human psychology in terms of objective facts, remains one-sided, and the extent of its limitations may conceivably be measured by the intolerance with which it discusses or ignores every standpoint that ventures beyond its circumscribed terrain.

Since there have always been large numbers of men for whom the objects and experiences of the psychic life bear a more immediate sense of reality than the world of objective facts, it is clear that a purely objective account of the psychological processes could not win any considerable support beyond the specialized limit of its own peculiar faculty. But, however much the historical eye may regard the wider subjective valuation and synthetic method of Jung as the inevitable response of psychology to essential human demands, the greatest honour must none the less be given to Jung, for, not only was he the first psychologist to perceive these demands, but he also voiced them in principles whose universality could embrace the heights and the depths of the psyche and comprehend its manifold diversity.

In establishing the two typical mechanisms of introversion and extraversion together with the main categories of human types based upon this fundamental antithesis, Jung has demonstrated the impossibility of every attempt to formulate a generally valid theory of human psychology which ignores these typical differences. For a theory whose validity is incontestable for the psyche from

which it originated proves itself worthless and even misleading for an individual of another type. From considerations such as these we must confess our inability to devise any rigid or dogmatic formula which can be authoritatively promulgated as a general system of psychological therapy. A physician once justly complained to Jung that he had made analysis so difficult. It is certainly true that the pronouncements of Freud relieve the analyst of a very considerable onus. He is not required to ask himself What is the individual way of this particular subject? He has merely to reduce his patient's psychological material to its elementary constituents according to prescribed 'orthodox' formulations, and if the patient is not satisfied he either proves himself psychologically inadequate to receive the truth, or so immersed in his morbid state that the analytical light serves only to reveal its impenetrable obscurities.

In his sub-title to this book Jung has called it the Psychology of Individuation, and therewith affirms the essential principle of his philosophy; for to Jung the psyche is a world which contains all the elements of the greater world, with the same destructive and constructive forces—a pluralistic universe in which the individual either fulfils or neglects his essential rôle of creator.

The individuality is the central co-ordinating principle of this realm, analogous to the principle of royalty in the nation; and, in so far as this co-ordinating will achieves an effective command of the diverse and conflicting elements which constantly tend to disrupt his kingdom, are we justified in speaking of a differentiated individual.

The individuality is universally present, but as

a rule it exists mainly in the unconscious, often finding expression in dreams and fantasies in some royal or princely figure. It is a principle, therefore, which has to be created out of the unconscious by accepting individuation as a deliberate and conscious aim.

It may be asked what has individuation got to do with the treatment of nervous disorders? This question springs from the assumption that there is no fundamental relation between the realities of the psychic life and the symptomatic conditions of the body. And yet the lives of religious founders one and all bear witness to the fact that the healing of the body is not unconnected with the inner life.

If differentiation and co-ordination of function are admitted as the vital principles of organic life, it is difficult to see how one can regard psychic or functional disorders as anything else than a statement of the relative suppression of these principles in the individual in question. The psyche, therefore, has to be considered as a totality, and not as an ill-assorted collection of instincts and faculties. For, if man is not a mere passive mechanism to be shaped to the pattern of a chosen formula, he stands before us as a self-creating subject whose individual way may be directly opposed to the analyst's most cherished theories.

It has often been levelled against Jung that his is a pedagogic system, that he tries to teach people how they should live, how they should settle their problems, instead of merely indicating the unconscious state of affairs and leaving them to find their way out. We are told that the physician should confine himself to the purely medical aspect

of the case, and that to voice any criticism which might suggest a definite moral or religious standpoint is to encroach upon other domains for which he has no qualifications. This point of view is very common and has a certain justification, supported as it is by the whole traditional constitution of society. But, in spite of an argument apparently so overwhelming, the individual psyche persistently over-rides the social categories, and, notwithstanding every rational attempt to regard it in terms of "mechanisms" and functions, its claim to be considered as a whole has never once abated.

Since this claim appears to have a socially subversive tendency and occasions very real fear in a great many minds, it might be well to examine its character. If we assume—and without this assumption no system of psycho-therapy has any reasonable basis—that a neurosis is an act of adaptation that has failed, we are faced, in an individual case, with the question: What is the nature of the reality to which this individual has failed to adapt? The materialist would fain have us believe that the only reality demanding psychic adaptation is represented by the sheer concrete facts of the physical environment. But, if concrete facts were the only reality, there would be no spiritual problem, and consequently no neurotics. The minimal adjustment to objective conditions demanded by social life could present no insuperable difficulty to anyone but an imbecile *unless* there were another reality of a very different nature always competing with the concrete world for prior claim upon our energy.

This other psychic or spiritual reality, which

comprises the whole inner life of the subject, is as **constantly** demanding new forms and expressions **of its energy** as is the world of external objects, **even though** it does not make the same **compelling demand** upon our attention. The fantastic **hallucinations** of the delirium tremens patient or **the paranoid** are equally strong evidence for the **reality** of these inner claims as are the ecstatic **experiences** of the religious mystic; only in the **former case** they are seen from the reverse side. **For this reality** the evidence is necessarily **subjective**. The snakes and frogs seen by the patient in his delirium, however delusional to an objective valuation, possess an indisputable reality to the man himself. Clearly, therefore, there are two quite different kinds of reality, both of which, while **pressing their respective claims** upon our capacity for adaptation, are nevertheless mutually dependent in the sense that neglect or disregard of either eventually destroys the validity of both.

Again, thousands of lives are fruitlessly spent in a neurotic attempt to escape an overpowering parental influence, just as there are innumerable lives seeking a release from the unconscious tyranny of collective authority. The need of the growing child to differentiate himself as an individual from the magical parental influence is **essentially the same** as the individuating impulse to distinguish oneself as a "single, separate person" from the collective "*en masse*". But the developing child who seeks to adventure beyond the **magic circle** of the family encounters not only the **authority and conservatism** of the older generation, **but also** the far more dangerous inertia and infantilism of his own psychology.

In either case it is essentially the same conflict between the individual and the collective elements, whether within or without, and what could prevail against the authority without or the inertia within, but an inner necessity or law whose incontestable superiority can stand firm against every attack.

The genuine rebel in his resistance against the law can win our sympathy in spite of ourselves. Notwithstanding every rational resistance, the inner superiority enforces our recognition of its power. The genuine neurotic (as opposed to the social deserter) is typically a man who cannot reconcile the claims of traditional forms and values with those of the obscure, but unbending, law within. For him, the inner and outer claims are contradictory and mutually exclusive. In answer to the persistent demands of the social tax-collector he can only guarantee the overdue payments to Cæsar when Cæsar shall first have recognized the paramount claims of God.

For such a man to be delivered over once again to the orthodox representatives of traditional values, whatever the formula may be, is merely to hand him over to his creditors. Before he can do justice to traditional forms or fulfil his social task, he must first submit himself unconditionally to the fundamental law of his own being. This is his stronghold, this his root in an enduring reality, and with this security he can go out into the world, not only to settle the old imperial demands, but also, perchance, to reanimate the forms that are with the vision of what is to be.

To the critic then who charges Jung with pedagogic interference, we would reply: Jung does not teach a man how he shall act or think or live,

but he gives him a technique by which he can comprehend and finally submit to the laws of his own nature. The basic principles of human development are not vested in any faculty—they have no academic formula, for they embrace every function of human activity. They are commensurate with life. It is not surprising, therefore, that it is from just those quarters where authority reigns and where 'truth' is already congealed into a dogma, that this particular criticism usually springs. It is easier to teach and practise a formula than to try to interpret the meaning of life; but a rational formula is doomed from the outset, because it tends to seduce men to turn away from the enigma of life by offering them a formula in its stead: thus it opposes life, and its inherent destructiveness determines its own fate.

No psychological formula can ever explain life. At the best, it can only present the living process in a thinkable form to our reason. As soon as it claims to have explained a living process, its effect is destructive, since it interposes an authoritative, ready-made explanation between the individual and the real problems life presents, thus apparently relieving him of the need to seek his own individual solution.

This is what Jung describes as negative, in contrast to positive or creative, thinking; for what we call character is nothing but the measure of sincerity with which an individual creates a positive adaptation to the essential problems of life.

A formula is an artefact, a rigid and arbitrary frame into which the plastic and changing forms of life are impressed. The resistance of the unconscious to this imposition is perceptible in the

impassioned dogmatism of the man who has accepted a formula as an explanation of life.

A principle, on the other hand, acquires its validity not from the authority of the man who lays it down, but from life itself, whose manifold processes it correlates and brings into abstract form. Formulæ live and die like their authors—one might almost say with their authors; whereas the validity of an abstract principle is just as durable as the processes it embraces and comprehends. It needs neither authority nor defence. It bears within it its own prerogative.

Jung's analytical interpretations are admittedly based upon the principles established in the present work, but practical application of them, *i.e.* their translation again into life, rests wholly with the individual subject.

The individuality is the alpha and omega of Jung's system, not, however, as an expression of personal power as the egoist would like to interpret it, but essentially as a function of the whole. This in itself sufficiently disposes of the pedagogic critics, for a system which aims at individual autonomy cannot justly be described as pedagogic. Naturally there could be no interpretation at all without a standpoint. In practice, therefore, the most that we can humanly demand is that the standpoint of the analyst should constantly be orientated towards the individual way, or "greatest ought" of the subject. It is, of course, true that, however genuinely an analyst may strive to realize this aim, his interpretation will, to a large extent, be subjectively conditioned. This is psychologically unavoidable, but the very sincerity with which he strives to interpret the fundamental

needs of his patient from the material at his disposal must surely make for individual autonomy. Whereas the opposite standpoint that would reduce psychic experience into terms of arbitrary mechanisms must inevitably tend to standardize mankind; because, in this case, the main criterion of judgment is the relative measure of conformity with the orthodox formula.

From the point of view of social economy, there can surely be no two opinions that a psychological technique whose aim it is to create individuals is of greater value to society than a system which aims at conformity. For an individual who is at one with himself seeks a creative collective expression from inner necessity, while the dragooned neurotic is of as little service to society as an unwilling conscript.

But how, it may be asked, can a physician learn to forgo the customary collectivized view of his fellow-man and train himself to an unprejudiced view of his patient's individuality unobscured by his own unconscious projections?

It will, I think, be clear, that before a physician can fully recognize and respect the individuality of his patient, he must first have given allegiance to this principle in himself. This does not mean to say that only a differentiated individual is fitted to practise analysis—such a condition would disqualify every candidate—but it does demand that the analyst shall himself have been analysed and shall have made a sincere attempt to deal with his own life-problems before undertaking to deal with those of his patients.

The aims of the individuality can never be fully apprehended by exclusive reference to the biological

or instinctive life of the subject; in fact, just as little can they be explained in terms of instinct as a work-of-art in terms of energy. One might attempt to formulate the chief aim of the individuality as the effort to create out of oneself the most significant product of which one is capable. On the biological plane this is clearly the child but on the psychic level this must be interpreted more broadly as something that bears for the individual, in the fullest sense of the term, a significance at least analogous to that of the child. For the greatest individual value is always pregnant with value for mankind.

Hence the budding personality with its potentialities for good or ill is frequently represented in dreams in the form of a child.

The whole symbolism of rebirth is quite unintelligible from a purely biological standpoint; hence a system that is blinded by its preoccupation with purely instinctive interpretations presents a definite obstruction to the whole transforming or spiritualizing tendency of the libido. The obvious prospective significance of the rebirth symbolism in dreams is, to my mind, so apparent that one is tempted to accuse the reductive school of wilful blindness. But this would, of course, be quite absurd, and one has to remind oneself that the dream, like the lily of the field, is a natural product unassisted by human intention, and that it is quite as rational to regard the lily as a fortunate accidental grouping of basic organic elements as to conceive it as a symbol of purity. The standpoint, therefore, eventually decides the interpretation, as it also decides the manner in which the interpretation is employed.

I have now revealed the very practical motive which prompted me to bring this whole question of the underlying opposition of standpoint into the foreground of discussion. This attempt, although foredoomed to excite controversy, will, I hope, in spite of the obvious inadequacy of such a brief outline, help to clarify the situation in a way that a more cautious and non-committal statement would fail to do.

The great value of the present work lies in the fact that it is a mature and conscious survey of the psychological field, viewed by a mind of unique range and development whose astonishing wealth of psychological experience illumines the whole work. The range of Jung's thought has developed with his experience. The *Psychology of the Unconscious* was the shaft of the tree—this work is its ample spread.

For practical psychologists it must assuredly be regarded as the foundation of the science, for in no other work do we find basic psychological principles whose validity is commensurate with the undeniable facts of man's historic development and the realities of individual experience.

The actual translation of the work was a task of such difficulty that often I despaired of giving the book an adequate rendering into English. Fortunately I had exceptional opportunities of assistance from the author himself, for whose unstinted patience and generosity in listening to my translation week by week and offering invaluable suggestions I cannot be too grateful.

For most valued assistance in the various preparatory stages of the work I wish to tender my warmest acknowledgments to my wife, to Mrs

Lilian A. Clare, to Mr John M. Thorburn of Cardiff University, and finally, to Mr W. Swan Stallybrass (of Messrs Kegan Paul & Co. Ltd., my publishers) for whose friendly offices and indefatigable care in the matter of punctuation and typography throughout the book I offer my very cordial appreciation.

With regard to the use of italics in this book I wish to explain that, with the exception of titles of books, italics have been reserved to denote stress. Had all the numerous foreign words occurring in the text been printed in italic type, in accordance with English typographical convention, the special value of this type, from the point of view of the author's meaning, would have been lost. Our only other alternative was to use quotation-marks, but in many places foreign words occur so frequently that this would have served merely to blur the page and confuse the eye. There are a few exceptions to the above rule, the reasons for which will be obvious. Double quotation-marks are used for actual quotations; single marks for indicating philosophical terms used in special senses, *façons de parler*, etc.

For the fact that, with the exception of the quotations from Kant, I have nowhere availed myself of existing English translations either of the Oriental or the European authors quoted in the text, I must plead my residence in Zürich, where the various works were inaccessible.

H. G. BAYNES.

24 CAMPDEN HILL SQUARE,
LONDON, W.8.

FOREWORD

THIS book is the fruit of nearly twenty years' work in the domain of practical psychology. It is a gradual intellectual structure, equally compounded of numberless impressions and experiences in the practice of psychiatry and nervous maladies, and of intercourse with men of all social levels; it is a product, therefore, of my personal dealings with friend and with foe; and finally it has a further source in the criticism of my own psychological particularity.

I do not propose to burden the reader with casuistry; it is, however, incumbent upon me to link up the ideas, derived from experience, both historically and terminologically with already existing knowledge.

I have done this not so much from a sense of historical justice as from a desire to bring the experiences of the medical specialist out of narrow professional limits into more general relations; relations which will enable the educated lay mind to make use of the experiences of a specialized terrain. I would never have ventured to attempt this expansion, which might well be misunderstood as an encroachment upon other spheres, were I not convinced that the psychological points of view presented in this book are of wide significance and application, and are therefore better treated in a general connection than left in the form of a specialized scientific hypothesis.

With this aim in view I have confined myself to a discussion of the ideas of a few workers in the field of the problem under review, and have omitted to mention

all that has already been said concerning our problem in general. Quite apart from the fact that to catalogue such a collection of correlated material and views with even bare adequacy would far exceed my powers, the inventory, when completed, could make no sort of fundamental contribution to the discussion and development of the problem. Without regret, therefore, I have omitted much that I have collected in the course of years, confining myself as far as possible to the main questions. A most valuable document, that afforded me great help, has also been sacrificed in this renunciation. This is a bulky correspondence which I exchanged with my friend, Dr H. Schmid of Basle, concerning the question of types. I owe a great deal to this interchange of ideas, and much of it, though of course in an altered and greatly revised form, has gone into my book. This correspondence belongs essentially to the stage of preparation, and its inclusion would create more confusion than clarity. But I owe it to the labours of my friend to express my thanks to him here.

C. G. JUNG.

Küsnacht, Zürich.
Spring, 1920.

INTRODUCTION

"Plato and Aristotle! These are not merely two systems; they are also types of two distinct human natures, which from immemorial time, under every sort of cloak, stand more or less inimically opposed. But pre-eminently the whole medieval period was riven by this conflict, persisting even to the present day; moreover, this battle is the most essential content of the history of the Christian Church. Though under different names, always and essentially it is of Plato and Aristotle that we speak. Enthusiastic, mystical, Platonic natures reveal Christian ideas and their corresponding symbols from the bottomless depths of their souls. Practical, ordering, Aristotelian natures build up from these ideas and symbols a solid system, a dogma and a cult. The Church eventually embraces both natures—one of them sheltering among the clergy, while the other finds refuge in monasticism; yet both incessantly at feud."—H. HEINE, *Deutschland*, i.

In my practical medical work with nervous patients I have long been struck by the fact that among the many individual differences in human psychology there exist also typical distinctions: two types especially became clear to me which I have termed the *Introversion* and the *Extraversion Types*.

When we reflect upon human history, we see how the destinies of one individual are conditioned more by the objects of his interest, while in another they are conditioned more by his own inner self, by his subject. Since, therefore, we all swerve rather more towards one side than the other, we are naturally disposed to understand everything in the sense of our own type.

I mention this circumstance at this point to prevent possible subsequent misunderstandings. As may well be understood, this basic condition considerably aggravates the difficulty of a general description of the types. I must presume a considerable benevolence on the part of

the reader if I may hope to be rightly understood. It would be relatively simple if every reader himself knew to which category he belonged. But it is often a difficult matter to discover to which type an individual belongs, especially when oneself is in question. Judgment in relation to one's own personality is indeed always extraordinarily clouded. This subjective clouding of judgment is, therefore, a frequent if not constant factor, for in every pronounced type there exists a special *tendency towards compensation for the oneness of his type*, a tendency which is biologically expedient since it is a constant effort to maintain psychic equilibrium. Through compensation there arise secondary characters, or *types*, which present a picture that is extraordinarily hard to decipher, so difficult, indeed, that one is even inclined to deny the existence of types in general and to believe only in individual differences.

I must emphasize this difficulty in order to justify a certain peculiarity in my later presentation. For it might seem as though a simpler way would be to describe two concrete cases and to lay their dissections one beside the other. But every individual possesses both mechanisms—extraversion as well as introversion, and only the relative predominance of the one or the other determines the type. Hence, in order to bring out the necessary relief in the picture, one would have to re-touch it rather vigorously; which would certainly amount to a more or less pious fraud. Moreover, the psychological reaction of a human being is such a complicated matter, that my descriptive ability would indeed hardly suffice to give an absolutely correct picture of it.

From sheer necessity, therefore, I must confine myself to a presentation of principles which I have abstracted from an abundance of observed facts. In this there is no question of deductio a priori, as it might well appear: it

is rather a deductive *presentation* of empirically gained understanding. It is my hope that this insight may prove a clarifying contribution to a dilemma which, not in analytical psychology alone but also in other provinces of science, and especially in the personal relations of human beings one to another, has led and still continues to lead to misunderstanding and division. For it explains how the existence of two distinct types is actually a fact that has long been known: a fact that in one form or another has dawned upon the observer of human nature or shed light upon the brooding reflection of the thinker; presenting itself, for example, to Goethe's intuition as the embracing principle of *systole* and *diastole*. The names and forms in which the mechanism of introversion and extraversion has been conceived are extremely diverse, and are, as a rule, adapted only to the standpoint of the individual observer. Notwithstanding the diversity of the formulations, the common basis or fundamental idea shines constantly through; namely, in the one case an outward movement of interest toward the object, and in the other a movement of interest away from the object, towards the subject and his own psychological processes. In the first case the object works like a magnet upon the tendencies of the subject; it is, therefore, an attraction that to a large extent determines the subject. It even alienates him from himself: his qualities may become so transformed, in the sense of assimilation to the object, that one could imagine the object to possess an extreme and even decisive significance for the subject. It might almost seem as though it were an absolute determination, a special purpose of life or fate that he should abandon himself wholly to the object.

But, in the latter case, the subject is and remains the centre of every interest. It looks, one might say, as though all the life-energy were ultimately seeking the

subject, thus offering a constant hindrance to any overpowering influence on the part of the object. It is as though energy were flowing away from the object, as if the subject were a magnet which would draw the object to itself.

It is not easy to characterize this contrasting relationship to the object in a way that is lucid and intelligible; there is, in fact, a great danger of reaching quite paradoxical formulations which would create more confusion than clarity. Quite generally, one could describe the introverted standpoint as one that under all circumstances sets the self and the subjective psychological process above the object and the objective process, or at any rate holds its ground against the object. This attitude, therefore, gives the subject a higher value than the object. As a result, the object always possesses a lower value; it has secondary importance; occasionally it even represents merely an outward objective token of a subjective content, the embodiment of an idea in other words, in which, however, the idea is the essential factor; or it is the object of a feeling, where, however, the feeling experience is the chief thing, and not the object in its own individuality. The extraverted standpoint, on the contrary, sets the subject below the object, whereby the object receives the predominant value. The subject always has secondary importance; the subjective process appears at times merely as a disturbing or superfluous accessory to objective events. It is plain that the psychology resulting from these antagonistic standpoints must be distinguished as two totally different orientations. The one sees everything from the angle of his conception, the other from the view-point of the objective occurrence.

These opposite attitudes are merely opposite mechanisms—a diastolic going out and seizing of the object, and a systolic concentration and release of energy from

the object seized. Every human being possesses both mechanisms as an expression of his natural life-rhythm—that rhythm which Goethe, surely not by chance, characterized with the physiological concepts of cardiac activity. A rhythmical alternation of both forms of psychic activity may correspond with the normal course of life. But the complicated external conditions under which we live, as well as the presumably even more complex conditions of our individual psychic disposition, seldom permit a completely undisturbed flow of our psychic activity. Outer circumstances and inner disposition frequently favour the one mechanism, and restrict or hinder the other; whereby a predominance of one mechanism naturally arises. If this condition becomes in any way chronic, a *type* is produced, namely an habitual attitude, in which the one mechanism permanently dominates; not, of course, that the other can ever be completely suppressed, inasmuch as it also is an integral factor in psychic activity. Hence, there can never occur a pure type in the sense that he is entirely possessed of the one mechanism with a complete atrophy of the other. A typical attitude always signifies the merely relative predominance of one mechanism.

With the substantiation of introversion and extraversion an opportunity at once offered itself for the differentiation of two extensive groups of psychological individuals. But this grouping is of such a superficial and inclusive nature that it permits no more than a rather general discrimination. A more exact investigation of those individual psychologies which fall into either group at once would hold great differences between individuals who none the less belong to the same group. If, therefore, we wish to determine wherein lie the differences of individuals belonging to a definite group, we must make a further

My experience has taught me that individuals

can quite generally be differentiated, not only by the universal difference of extra and introversion, but also according to individual basic psychological functions. For in the same measure as outer circumstances and inner disposition respectively promote a predominance of extraversion or introversion, they also favour the predominance of one definite basic function in the individual.

As basic functions, *i.e.* functions which are both genuinely as well as essentially differentiated from other functions, there exist *thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition*. If one of these functions habitually prevails, a corresponding type results. I therefore discriminate thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuitive types. *Everyone of these types can moreover be introverted or extraverted* according to his relation to the object in the way described above.

In two former communications¹ concerning psychological types, I did not carry out the distinction outlined above, but identified the thinking type with the introvert and the feeling type with the extravert. A deeper elaboration of the problem proved this combination to be untenable. To avoid misunderstandings I would, therefore, ask the reader to bear in mind the distinction here developed. In order to ensure the clarity which is essential in such complicated things, I have devoted the last chapter of this book to the definitions of my psychological conceptions.

¹ Jung, *Contribution à l'étude des Types psychologiques* (*Arch. de Psychologie*, I, xiii, p. 289); *Psychological Types* (*Collected Papers on Analytical Psychology*, p. 287. London: Baillière 1916) *Psychologie der unbewussten Prozesse*, 2te Aufl. p. 65 (Zurich 1918).

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM OF TYPES IN THE HISTORY OF CLASSICAL AND MEDIEVAL THOUGHT

1. Psychology in the Classical Age: The Gnostics, Tertullian, and Origen

So long as the historical world has existed there has always been psychology; objective psychology, however, is of only recent growth. We might affirm of the science of former times that the lack of objective psychology corresponds with a proportionate yield of the subjective element. Hence the works of the ancients are full of psychology, but only little of it can be described as objective psychology. This may be conditioned in no small measure by the peculiarity of human relationship in classic and in medieval times. The ancients had, if one may so express it, an almost exclusively biological appreciation of their fellow-men; this is everywhere apparent in the habits of life and legal conditions of antiquity. In so far as a judgment of value found any general expression, the medieval world had a metaphysical valuation of its fellow-men; this had its source in the idea of the imperishable value of the human soul. This metaphysical valuation, which may be regarded as a compensation to the standpoint of antiquity, is just as unfavourable as the biological valuation, so far as that personal appraisal is concerned, which can alone be the groundwork of an objective psychology. There are indeed not a few who hold that a psychology can be written ex cathedra.