



## Psychology and Religion

*C.G. Jung*

[Download now](#)

[Read Online ➔](#)

# Psychology and Religion

*C.G. Jung*

## Psychology and Religion C.G. Jung

In this book, Dr. Jung, who has been the author of some of the most provocative hypotheses in modern psychology, describes what he regards as an authentic religious function in the unconscious mind. Using a wealth of material from ancient and medieval gnostic, alchemistic, and occultistic literature, he discusses the religious symbolism of unconscious processes and the possible continuity of religious forms that have appeared and reappeared through the centuries.

## Psychology and Religion Details

Date : Published September 10th 1960 by Yale University Press (first published 1940)

ISBN : 9780300001372

Author : C.G. Jung

Format : Paperback 138 pages

Genre : Psychology, Religion, Nonfiction, Philosophy

 [Download Psychology and Religion ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online Psychology and Religion ...pdf](#)

**Download and Read Free Online Psychology and Religion C.G. Jung**

---

# From Reader Review Psychology and Religion for online ebook

## Andrea says

Carl Jung's conference on the religious experience inside the realms of clinical psychology. El primer capítulo trata sobre cómo el fenómeno religioso es abordado en la clínica. En el segundo, defiende la función del inconsciente y sus contenidos para explicar dicha experiencia, y el tercero, describe los elementos religiosos desde su psicología analítica.

Over all, I value his pragmatism: Psychologists do not need to judge if religion is good or bad, if someone's belief is apt or not. A psychologist needs to identify what is behind the religious experience and how is it influencing in a person's functioning. Anything other than that, attacks domains out of its scope.

---

## Lanier says

I'm not sure if reading this has tapped into my subconscious, but I've been remembering my dreams twice in the last three days. That's the reason I'm even UP at this hour [5:30 a.m.].

Whatever the reasons, this short book or LONG essay will probably keep me guessing....

### The Unconscious Mind

In the first few pages of Jung's essay, he discusses numinosum OR ---an English adjective describing the power or presence of a divinity. The word was popularised in the early twentieth century by the German theologian Rudolf Otto in his influential book *Das Heilige* (1917; translated into English as *The Idea of the Holy*, 1923). According to Otto, the numinous experience has two aspects: mysterium tremendum, which is the tendency to invoke fear and trembling; and mysterium fascinans, the tendency to attract, fascinate and compel. The numinous experience also has a personal quality to it, in that the person feels to be in communion with a wholly other. The numinous experience can lead in different cases to belief in deities, the supernatural, the sacred, the holy, and/or the transcendent.---

Pg 2—“...'experience' is the process of assimilation without which there could be no understanding. As this statement indicates, I approach psychological matters from a scientific and not a philosophical standpoint. I am dealing with [religion] from a purely empirical point of view.”

Here, it echoes much of what I was trying to relate to Hunter about the intrinsic intertwining connections between science and religion which only Kyle can attempt right now.

Pg 4—1st ¶ ½ way down

Religion “seizes and controls the human subject which is always rather its victim than its creator.” Later he mentions the root of “religio” on page 5, however he comes closer to the Latin meaning of “To bind” with this above definition, he doesn't exactly state the meaning I learned seven years ago in Queens College.

Why is it so important to be bound to some things: love, family, beliefs? Does life lose meaning without strongly founded grounded ideologies?

This goes perfectly along with Weisel's Wiesel's struggle with seeking death as an end to world sufferings and losing faith in God as benevolent savior.

Pg 6—footnote—#3 pg 115

“But our esteem for facts has not neutralized in us all religiousness. It is itself almost religious. Our scientific temper is devout,” William James—from Pragmatism [1911 – pg 14 et reg]

Here again, a scientist stating that their search for truth in fact is religious in nature.

Pg 7—opening ¶—last sentence

The psychologist, in as much as he assumes a scientific attitude, has to disregard the claim of every creed to be the human side of the religious problem, in that he is concerned with the original religious experience quite apart from what the creeds have made of it.”

notes from 3-13-12

Pg. 8—Even after a client overcoming hurdles of trust and/or shyness, “he will be reluctant or even afraid to admit certain things to himself, as if it were dangerous to become conscious of himself.”

“Is there anything in man that is stronger than himself?”

pg—11—1¶

“It is almost a ridiculous prejudice to assume that existence can only be physical. As a matter of fact, the only form of existence we know of immediately is psychic. We might well say, on the contrary, that physical existence is merely an inference, since we know of matter only in so far as we perceive psychic images transmitted by the sense.”

Pg 11—bottom – 12

Psychical dangers are [far more] dangerous than epidemic or earthquakes.

Jung asserts that it's through these non-physical “imaginings” or truths, that we create dilemmas and conflict. While natural disasters and diseases kill millions, many millions MORE are killed due to one's truths differing from another's.

12-Psychic “imaginary” diseases must be attacked more aggressively than real cancers or other debilitating physical ailments.

pg 15-17 Homo homini lupus

Man is a wolf [to his] fellow man

Mob mentality—the evils within all of us are brought to light when surrounded by others allowing us to release the BEAST.

Again, working with a student today, [3-13-12] how Disturbed's “Down With the Sickness” comes to mind. That 14-year-old struggling with who and what he's supposed to be while his psyche struggles with who it KNOWS he's to be.

“It would be bad strategy to convince the patient that he is somehow, though in a highly incomprehensible way, at the back of his own symptoms, secretly inventing and supporting it.”

However, since this was written 75 years ago, we know better that those “on the couch” are led to see how they actually are far more complicit in their illness than once believed. Patients follow a more proactive role of responsibility than once prescribed. In this way, it’s fascinating to see how the practice and society has grown toward acceptance in order to more readily “heal thyself!”

Connections to “Zero Limit” – we are all responsible for all the ills in our world, and only by looking inward and thanking, loving, repenting and asking for forgiveness of SELF can we truly heal these ills.

18—On Walden Pond – The more Technological – Scientific we become the less we’re able to reward or accept the true NATURE of our dreams.

“How could an intelligent man be so superstitious as to take dreams seriously! The very common prejudice against dreams is but one of the symptoms of a far more serious undervaluation of the human soul in general.”

Pg 21 – top— the Death of Dreams

Upon English arrival the chief nor the Medicine Man/Woman recalled dreams. “This strange statement is based upon that dreams were formerly the supreme political guide, the voice of ‘mungu’. Therefore it would have been unwise for an ordinary man to suggest that he had dreams.’

With these trends AWAY from natural hints and clues into self through our series of dreams we “lack [access to] wisdom and [through] introspection”.

Here dreams were diminished since those calling the shots would’ve seen these connections as subordinate or blasphemous to their religious beliefs. History is written by the winners, is this basic premise, which leads to the Christian church’s denouncing dreams EVEN when they’d recognized that some were coming from the Divine. However, due to their inconsistencies – many coming from Demonic sources and others being too difficult to discern, they were negated all together. – page 22

Currently on 53, and it's far easier to read, though re-reading certain sections a third or fourth time is always helpful - I thought I was going to give up on this essay, but I'm glad I found some footholds. Another student, I recently met expressed interest in Christianity, Psychology and Economics, so I happened along this book while looking for a copy of this tome called The Bible so I could try reading it cover to cover.....wish me luck! 3-16-12

3-23-11

pg. 64 - - -

One of my favorite quotes from Jung is a footnote from...

Nietzsche's Human, All Too Human, II, 27

“In our sleep and in our dreams we pass through the whole thought of earlier humanity. I mean, in the same way that man reasons in his dreams, he reasoned when in the waking state many thousands of years. The first causa which occurred to his mind in reference to anything that needed explanation, satisfied him and passed for truth. In the dream this atavistic relic of humanity manifests its existence within us, for it is the foundation upon which the higher rational faculty developed, and which is still developing in every individual, The dream carries us back into earlier states of human culture, and affords us a means of understanding it better.”

But the most fascinating aspect of Jung's analysis of a series of 400 dreams from a patient who'd fallen of the Christianity wagon, is his relating how perhaps the Trinity is neglecting other vital aspects of any society. For instance, WOMEN. In another, the absence of evil or "the devil".

In many other theologies and philosophies, there's Mother Earth, Wind, Fire and Air? In others there's mention of negative essences, which a Trinity of all positive negates other elements naturally existing in Nature.

page 67

"This image of the Diety, dormant and concealed in matter, was what the alchemists called the original chaos, or the earth of paradise, or the round fish in the sea, or merely the rotundum or the egg. That round thing was in possession of the key which unlocked the closed doors of matter. As it said in Timaeus, only the demiurge, the perfect thing, was capable of dissolving the tetrakys, the embrace of the four elements, that is, the four constituents of the round world. One of the great authorities since the 13th century, the Turba Philosophorum, says that the rotundum can dissolve copper into four."

Again alluding to Milton's ideas of CHAOS as all matter contained within and without the Earth and its surrounding universes.

Equally fascinating, these other references to quaternity not the traditional trinity. What or WHOM is the Catholic church leaving out?

---

### **Jana Light says**

Jung attempts to give an account and explanation for religious experience. It's a short, readable work, but there isn't a lot of illuminating content (and not just because the field of psychology has made considerable progress since Jung). He uses the dreams of one of his patients as the basis for his three lectures, and tries to argue archetypes and historical religious experience from the imagery therein. Jung spends a good deal of time explaining different symbols (round, square, the number 4, etc.) and how they show up across a variety of ancient and modern religions, and not a lot of time exploring the religious experience itself. He concludes that religious experience is a fact even if the religion is false, and that individuals' personal, psychical experiences of the numinous produce more good than the lack of experience, by helping individuals address and reconcile their unconscious with their conscious selves, and helping the world by enabling and even producing whole, at-peace, moral individuals. Obviously, I like the conclusion, but I am not impressed with how he got there. I should have known Jung would be very concerned with addressing symbols and archetypes, though.

---

### **Erik Graff says**

Having been exposed to aggressive Christian fundamentalism in high school and to similar variants of Judaism and Islam through the media, "the religions of the book" perplexed me a great deal while growing up. Some mystical traditions made some sense, but the exclusivist revealed religions didn't. Jung, much of

whose work dealt with religion, promised early on to offer some handle on the phenomenology of religions.

The framework of the Jungian take on religion is founded upon the idea of biophysical parallelism. Just as the healthy body functions as a dynamic, homeostatic self-regulating system, so too, in his opinion, does the psyche. Distinguishing ideas of god from the unknowable thing itself, a caution inspired by Kant, Jung treated the religious concept as equivalent to what he called the Self, the telos of human wholeness, that is, the balanced realization of psychic potentials--a healthy balance quite naturally sought by everyone. His views, in this very general sense, were taken over by Alcoholics Anonymous, one of whose founders was profoundly influenced by him.

This framework is at least plausible in general, though I never found other archetypes--puer aeternus, anima/us, wise old man etc.--as having quite the universality of the Self and, perhaps, the Shadow--god and the adversary as it were.

---

## M says

Phew! This one was a travail. All right.

The first section of the book is about Western Religion, which is to say, Jesus. Jung has this habit of getting way too hype about Jesus and alchemy, and then prattling in semisensical circles until he hits the end of a chapter, catches his breath, and lapses back into coherence. It is possible I don't care enough about Jesus to properly appreciate these episodes.

I did care about his analysis of the Godhead, and his finally reckoning out what the Holy Spirit is. I was raised Catholic. Have you ever been raised Catholic? Have you ever been a little boy full of weird ideas, deviant impulses, and a tremendous imagination that hungers to comprehend everything, up to and including God? Have you ever asked any question whatsoever to your catechism teachers? In the event you answered "no" to one or more of these questions, let me assure you these people exist only to obfuscate, and also, it is terrible. I've read so heavily on religion that I border on freelance theologian, and up until this book, I've still had no idea what the Holy Spirit is. Carl suggests that God ran the whole creationistic gamut in an effort to express himself in the form of a human, to eventually redeem humanity after balancing out his DID (which Carl tactfully referred to as "antinomy", as God is comprised of a series of contradictions and conflicting beliefs, which I'll explore more when I talk about the Answer to Job.) Yahweh was bowel-clenchingly jealous and insecure back in the Old Testament days, and demanded constant sacrifice and appeasement for his delicate li'l celestial ego. He was also a big fan of genocide upon perceiving an insult. Come New Testament, he took a few steps back, felt bad about the mass slaughter and sadism committed in his halcyon, schizophrenic youth, and decided to redeem everybody by manifesting in the physical form of Jesus the Christ. He did, pissed off the Romans, got tacked up like Christmas tinsel, etc. etc., you know this story. That wasn't just God sacrificing his son, that was God sacrificing himself a la Odin as a means of apology for all the bullshit previously heaped on mankind. The ascension returned him to Heaven, whereupon he will hang out (no pun intended) until the end of days when he will become General Jesus and raise a little Hell. Or banish it, rather, for 1000 years. In the meantime, God is communicating his Godliness into mankind indirectly, via the Holy Spirit, which is sort of like the demiurgic effluvia left over from Creation (initially) and then from the last time God did anything directly (New Testament, potentially Koran). The Godhead can be understood as God the Father, Jesus the Son, and The Holy Spirit the imprecise god-juice that permeates the universe and gives truth to the statement "God is everywhere". Or, for a more modern analogy, God the proton, Jesus the Neutron, and The Holy Spirit the unobservable and theoretical electron cloud surrounding

them that actually comprises everything.

Carl talked a lot about making it a quatrain, too, but couldn't seem to be able to decide between Lucifer, Mary, or Sophia. Sophia, for those not well versed in obscure Gnostic conjecture or Biblical euphemism, was potentially the feminine counterpart to Yahweh who was his "daily delight" before the Creation -- contrast with the devil's emanation, Lilith.

The Answer to Job was where we got the psychological profile of Yahweh as uncertain, insecure, dependent, and in constant need of reassurance and approval. His inability to suffer criticism was well established prior, but could no longer be ignored by the innocent Job, a simple shepherd just trying to make it in this workaday world. Lucifer popped up and bet God that Job could be swayed from faith. To prove him wrong, God destroyed Job's life. Killed his flocks, murdered his children, drove his wife away from him, made all his friends turn on him, afflicted him with diseases and sores -- unmade the poor man. Then, taunted him, dared him to critique Him further. Thing is, Job never critiqued him. Jung pulls a handful of quotes from the Bible to help illustrate that Job was a beaten man, grovelling and wormlike, praying for mercy and protection to God FROM the same God, even as this omnipotent maniac had a shouting match with Himself about "WHO'S THE BITCH NOW!" And by Himself, I don't mean a pseudopod thereof, as would've been the case if He had been addressing Lucifer directly since He made Lucifer from Himself, denied him free will, and orchestrated his fall and subsequent antagonism. No, Yahweh yells at no one, as though there were an opponent with any power to challenge him, and projects this on Job, who is cowering in existential terror because everything was already taken from him for no reason and this mad deity still has the damnation card up his sleeve. Job's sycophancy eventually punches through Yahweh's delusional rambling, and He removes the boils and gives him a new wife and flocks. "You'll make new children, they'll be better, in My mercy."

Yeesh.

Carl concludes this 400 page rant with the revelation that God is real, though not in a necessarily Christian sense. He's not real as in a Tall White Sky Man With A Beard Who Will Spank You For Masturbating. He's a phenomenon. God is acknowledged by billions of people, and the thought of Him shapes their behavior. Even if He has no physical form, and never did, he exists as a "psychical event" and, from a psychological perspective, can't be disregarded.

The latter third of the book was about Eastern Religion, and much of it was just Carl checking his privilege about how he can't properly understand the depth of Eastern philosophy and thought, being a European. Still, he was a strong advocate for Zen, which resonated with me. The suggestion was that Eastern vs Western thought could be best summarized with their views of introversion and extraversion. In the West, introversion is frequently viewed as undesirable or maladaptive. Anyone who needs to scamper away, who spurns community to deliberately be a loner, is not to be trusted. Something is wrong, there. They should be out, engaging their peers and the world! In the East, it's seen as the opposite. Those who need the constant chatter of others to cloud their phenomenology are deceiving themselves and filling the void with irrelevant distractions to keep from confronting themselves through honorable contemplation. It's only by looking inward that we can achieve our balance.

I am as Western as they get. I am a big, loud American with a superiority complex and no sense of proportion or moderation. That said, I'm of a mind with the Eastern school of thought. We need to decompress, and to look inward, not necessarily in a spiritual sense but as a means of understanding who and what we really are. If you have doubts vis-à-vis this method's efficacy, refer to the second sentence in this paragraph and then corroborate with the fact I just used fuckin' "vis-à-vis" in an online book review I don't even need to be doing.

The last chapter, Jung talks about the Tao Teh Ching, the book of changes. For the uninitiated, it's basically Chinese tarot cards. You bring a problem or question to the book, you do its little magic trick with a pendulum and it'll point you to one of the pages where you will get a vague answer that will help illuminate and advise your situation. Witchery! Pseudoscientific pap. Sure, sure, sure. Jung did it, and he loved it because it all applied to his situations. At the end he says -- and I paraphrase -- **"Anyone with half a brain could step up and say, 'Well, Jesus, Carl, of course it seems to apply to your situation, but it's not because it's magic. It's just you projecting your subconscious onto the I Ching.' To which I would respond, 'Duh! That's sort of the point! I'm a scientist, dude. Think before you talk."**

I'll end this with Jung's savage attack on reductionism, which is more or less how he decided to end this giant book:

**If [man] is a slave to his quasi-biological credo, he will always try to reduce what he has glimpsed to the banal and the known, to a rationalistic denominator which satisfies only those who are content with illusions. But the foremost of all illusions is that anything can ever satisfy anybody. That illusion stand behind all that is unendurable in life and in front of all progress, and it is one of the most difficult things to overcome.**

---

### **Karson says**

Through a little research I became aware of and interested in Jung's idea of "The Shadow," so I started getting my hands on some of his stuff. "The Shadow" is a part of every human beings personality. It is the other side of us that we shove way deep down inside and hope no one else sees. This concept is related to the idea of "projection." We project onto other people the parts of us that we do not like, or would rather not look at. So when we say, "O my gosh doesn't she look fat in that," we are really saying something like, "I couldn't wear that. I'd probably look fat in that," or, "Wow. She looks good in that, but I would probably look fat wearing that outfit." This is a tough idea to swallow, but I think it is legit. There is a quote in the book that will probably stay with me for life about how much courage it takes a person to look their shadow in the face and deal with it and try to understand it. The whole of your shadow side and the side you show to the world (your unconscious and conscious sides) should ideally be united and equally accepted. Unfortunately, most of us end up walking around like half-people alienating ourselves from the people that remind us of the things we don't like about ourselves. If someone can walk through and accept their own shadows they are on the beginning of an interesting journey of possibly being a full person with more of a full true picture of themselves.

---

### **Noor Sharba says**

?????? ???? ?? ??? ?????? ??????? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????? ?? ??????? ?? ??????? ?????????? ??  
?????? ?? ??? ?????? ??????? ?? ?????? ??? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????? ?? ??????? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????? ??????  
?????? ?? ??? ??????? ?? ?????? ??????? ?? ?????? ??????? ?? ??????  
????? ?? ??? ?????? ?? ?????? ??????? ?? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ??? ?? ???

**Ana M says**

escuchandolo mientras pinto, es impresionante los casos en los que nuestras neurosis, nuestros "demonios" toman posesion de nuestros cuerpos y se presentan sintomas psicosomaticos de los mas comunes hasta los mas graves. Te deja pensando si tu condicion, es un producto de tu psique, realmente invita al autoanalisis.

J. Alfred says

This book wasn't what I expected, which on reflection is fine because I had no real idea of what I expected. By the end it felt like William James mixed with the Aldous Huxley of Heaven and Hell, by which I mean weird stuff in the uninitiated modern psyche seems to match up with weird esoterica of old cults, so there must be some layer of symbols waiting latently to take their shape in all of us; and we should forget ultimate truth claims because if these things exist in people they are true for those people. It was kind of an exhausting read. Here's a taste.

It would be a regrettable mistake if anybody should understand my observations to be a kind of proof for the existence of God. They prove only the existence of an archetypal image of the Deity, which to my mind is the most we can assert psychologically about God. But as it is a very important and influential archetype, its relatively frequent occurrence seems to be a noteworthy fact for any theological naturalist. Since the experience of it has the quality of numinosity, often to a high degree, it ranks among the religious experiences.

I'll probably come back to Jung one day, but I'll be looking for the stuff that made him famous, instead of this, the lecture notes from when he was already famous.

## Barnaby Thieme says

This collection of three lectures given by Carl Jung in 1937 presents an early version of his mature view on the role of the unconscious in formulating religious symbols. The three foci of this book are a case study of a neurotic man plagued by irrational fears of cancer, a natural history of the generation of religious symbols, and a consideration of the psychological consequences of the crisis of faith that was striking the heart of Europe.

Jung's case study is absolutely fascinating -- he presents and interprets a small number of the patient's dreams and relates them to the symbolic literature of the Gnostics, Hermetics, and Alchemists, three of Jung's favorite symbolic modalities. It's extraordinary to see a modern man completely disinterested in religion or esoterica unwittingly produce symbols that clearly serve the same psychological function as similar images in these somewhat obscure traditions.

His social analysis is crude and in my eyes profoundly misguided. Jung waxes nostalgic for a medieval Europe governed by the Catholic church in which the common folk could assimilate the transpersonal symbolic structures of the ecclesiastical matrix as a bulwark against the intrusion of the unconscious into their daily lives. He polemicizes in a most disagreeable fashion against the Protestant church and blasts the Utopian fantasies of Communism.

In his odious analysis Jung shows himself to be completely disinterested in, and probably ignorant of, the economic or material realities that govern man's existence. There is no sense that liberation from theocratic regimes produced a commensurate reduction of the degree to which the great majority of people were ruthlessly exploited by the great minority.

Perhaps Jung can be forgiven for making a classic error of Modernism and nostalgically aggrandizing a great old Europe that never was. The tenor and focus of his occasional social critiques was dramatically different post World War II, when his primary concern rightly shifted to the conditions of nationalistic totalitarianism. But as they stand in this work his social views are repugnant and anachronistic, and lack all sense of self-awareness.

One additional quarrel I have is that Jung's protestations that he is not interested in theology and philosophy, and that he deals with religious images purely as a psychological phenomenon, are not persuasive in the face of the many metaphysical claims that he in fact makes, such as offhandedly referring to atheism as a "stupid error". Few readers will agree that he has no particular religious convictions of his own, or that they don't absolutely play a core role in shaping his scientific theories.

Despite these problems the book on the whole provides a powerful and persuasive argument that he carefully builds to a gripping crescendo. His consideration of mandala symbolism in the last lecture is absolutely riveting and offers a vital empirical glimpse at the state of the religious mind in modernity.

---

### **Carol Flores says**

[Reto lector Mayo 2018: Uno que debiste leer en la escuela y no lo hiciste.] 2.5/5 En realidad.

Es la primera vez que leo a Jung de un modo tan cercano, gracias a que un amigo mío me prestó el ejemplar puesto que no tenía ni idea de qué título escogería para el reto lector; y es que todos los libros que me dejaron en toda la vida académica, fueron leídos así que tuve que recurrir a títulos que pudiesen interesarme pero que siguieran estuviesen ligados a la vida académica de mis conocidos.

Y vaya, no pensé que sería tan denso, no por el texto en sí o las ideas que plantea, si no porque vienen mil y una referencias que honestamente empecé a saltarme porque no le veía caso interrumpir mi lectura de esa forma. Lo mismo me pasó en su momento con La Divina Comedia y he allí la razón por la que nunca terminé ese libro.

Pero en fin, Jung básicamente plantea los diversos puntos de vista que tienen las culturas con respecto a la religión, a 'dios' en específico. Cómo la sociedad se ve maravillada por ese amigo imaginario (como me gusta decirle) y que en general repudian la idea de que exista más que uno, o que éste sea diferente a la imagen que tienen en su cabeza porque así se lo han planteado desde generaciones anteriores. En resumen, no es nada que no haya pensado antes.

De hecho me hubiese gustado mucho más si no sólo se basara en el testimonio de uno de sus pacientes,

habiendo tantas imágenes y opiniones al respecto (en un contexto histórico, artístico etc.)

Si algo he de rescatar es que esta frase me pareció verdaderamente cierta: "Sólo es de nuestra incumbencia la elección del 'amo' al que deseamos servir para así protegernos contra el dominio de los 'otros', a los cuales no hemos elegido. 'Dios' no es producido, si no elegido."

---

### **nedim says**

Pek de ilgimi çekece?ini sanmad??m kitapt? fakat sonunda "iyi ki okunu?um" dedirtti. C.G. Jung mant?kl? adam vesselam.

"Kar??m?zdakine ak?l ve sa?duyu çerçevesinde davranışmay? ö?ütleme? ku?kusuz güzel bir ?eydir, ancak dinleyicimiz ya t?marhanelik bir deliyse ya da kolektiflik duygusuna kap?lm?? bir kalabal?ksa ne olacak? ?kisi aras?nda pek fark yoktur, çünkü hem deliyi hem de gürusu harekete geçiren, ki?isel olmayan, ki?iyi ezen ve güçlerdir."

"Ahlakl? olma, t?pk? zeka gibi, bir hediye? benzer."

"Sava? ç?kt??? s?rada, dünyan?n ak?lc? araçlarca düzeltilebilece?inden son derece emindik. ?imdi ise, eski teokrasi sav?n? , yani totaliter rejim sav?n? ileri süren devletleri ?a?k?nl?kla seyrediyoruz; bu sav kaç?n?lmaz ?ekilde, özgür dü?üncenin bask? alt?na al?nmas?n? da beraberinde getirmektedir. ?imdilerde, yine insanlar?n, yeryüzünde cenneti nas?l yaratacaklar? konusundaki çocukça teorilerini desteklemek amac?yla, birbirinin bo?az?na sar?ld???n? görüyoruz. Daha önceleri az çok ba?ar?l? ?ekilde birbirine ba?l? olan ve devasa bir zihinsel binada i?e yarar hale getirilen ve alt dünyaya ait güçlerin ?imdi, herhangi bir ak?lsal ve ruhsal çekicilikten yoksun bir Devlet köleli?i ve Devlet hapishanesi yaratt?klar?n? veya yaratmaya çal??t?klar?n? görmek çok zor de?ildir."

---

### **Rashmi Shenoy says**

Psychology & Religion by Carl Jung is anything but a light, bedtime read. The book talks about the interdependency of religion on the human psyche, written from an analytical perspective of religion as something more than an entity that is man-made. In addition to some deep reflections on the inherent nature of original religious experience, Jung devotes a large aspect of the narrative to uncovering dream symbols. Unfortunately, my lack of basic knowledge around Christian theology made it difficult for me to appreciate the book in its full glory. For a small book of 100 something pages, it is loaded with information and not a fast read if one intends to make use of it. For a reader looking to view the advent and evolution of religion analytically, this book could serve to highlight the points to consider. On the flip side, this book is not as organized in its expression as I expect in a topic of this magnitude. 3 stars

---

### **Alex says**

"But what is the difference between a real illusion and a healing religious experience? It is merely a difference in words....Nobody can know what the ultimate things are. We must, therefore, take them as we experience them. And if such experience helps make your life healthier, more beautiful, more complete and

more satisfactory to yourself and to those who you love, you may safely say: 'This was the grace of God'"

---

### **Mariam says**

Jung says, "The soul is for the most part outside the body." What an extraordinary idea! The modern person is taught to believe that the soul - or whatever language is used for soul - is contained in the brain or is equivalent to mind and is purely and humanly subjective. But if we were to think of the soul as being in the world, then maybe our work would be seen as a truly important aspect of our lives, not only for its literal product but also as a way of caring for the soul. - #CareoftheSoul #Thomas Moore

---

### **Motahareh says**

???? ?????? ??? ?? ??? ?? ????.  
?? ?????? ?? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????????? ?? ?? ?????? ?????????? ? ?????? ?????? ?? ?? ???  
????? ??????? ???.  
?? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??? ?????????? ??? ?????? ??? ? ?????? ?????? ? ?????????? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ???  
?? ???????...!

---

### **la Maga De Rayuela says**

????? ?????????????? ??????.  
?? ?????? ?????????? ??????.  
?? ?????? ?????? ??????????,- ?????? :))

---

### **Guy says**

This is a brilliant book on so many levels that I am struggling with how to express my reaction to it. I look forward to reading it again because the ideas within it are dense and nuanced and evocative and will change as my understanding and self-awareness change. And of course, this simple encomium is a poor excuse of a review. So how to review *Psychology and Religion*?

It is a collection of three lectures he gave to the religious studies group at Yale University. In this very short book Jung provides a clear and concise argument why his approach to the psychic reality of the human animal is empirical and not irrational. He makes clear that that criticism of his work, that it is irrational, is a common but a mistaken one because, to paraphrase his argument, the human creative energy creates ideas that have common themes throughout history and across all continents. These creations are often, even normally, recreated by people in dreams or through neurotic behaviours without any conscious knowledge of such common themes, as they struggle with meaning and purpose in being alive. And these creations will, when the time is right in the collective consciousness of society's members, become a religion, even *the* religion that defines an era. That era will remain extant until such time as the development of human consciousness requires the next religion. He argues that 'religion' is a natural *empirical* manifestation of the human animal and worthy of study no less than migratory patterns of birds or the behaviour of sub-atomic

particles.

I enjoyed the simple and powerful argument about the existence of an unconscious that exists beyond our personal experience. His argument, which is similar to that above, rests on the rational acceptance that *all* creations of the psyche are like the natural creatures and phenomena nature. Dreams exist, and so they are 'real' and not something to be dismissed because they are 'irrational' or difficult or easily ignored.

And now I'll include a rather long quotation. Likely such a thing is inappropriate in a review. However I'll rationalize my action, likely based on my irrationally liking this passage because of its humour, with the argument that it gives the reader a good taste of the humour, intelligence and nuanced argument Jung provides in this book: that religion is a natural phenomena of the human experience worthy of empirical rational investigation, with the caveat that we humans will be examining ourselves, making the investigation far more difficult than observing even the most obscure non-human phenomena.

... The well meaning rationalist will point out that I'm driving out the devil by Baalzebub and that I replace an honest neurosis by the cheat of religious belief. Concerning the former I have nothing to reply, being no metaphysical expert, but concerning the latter, I must point out that there is no question of belief, but of experience. Religious experience is absolute. It is indisputable. You can only say that you never had such an experience, and your opponent will say: "Sorry, I have." And there your discussion will end. No matter what the world thinks about religious experience, the one who has it possesses the great treasure of a thing that has provided him with a source of life, meaning and beauty and that has given a new splendour to the world and to mankind. He has *pistis* and peace. Where is the criterium by which you could say that such a life is not valid and that such *pistis* is mere illusion? Is there, as a matter of fact, any better truth about ultimate things than the one that helps you live? This is the reason why I take carefully into account the symbols produced by the unconscious mind. They are the only things able to convince the critical mind of modern people. They are convincing for very old fashioned reasons. They are simply overwhelming, which is an English rendering of the Latin word "convincere." The thing that cures a neurosis must be as convincing as the neurosis; and since the latter is only too real, the helpful experience must be of equal reality. It must be a very real illusion, if you want to put it pessimistically. But what is the difference between a real illusion and a healing religious experience? It is merely a difference in words. You can say, for instance, that life is a disease with a very bad prognosis, it lingers on for years and to end in death; or that normality is a generally prevailing constitutional defect; or that man is an animal with a fatally overgrown brain. This kind of thinking is the prerogative of habitual grumblers with bad digestions. Nobody can know what the ultimate things are. We must, therefore, take them as we experience them. And if such experience helps to make your life healthier, more beautiful, more complete and more satisfactory to yourself and to those you love, you may safely say: "This was the grace of God" (p113).

**Mahya Moq says**

?? ????? ?????? ?????? ?? ???(??? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ?? ?????? ?? ?????????? ????) ??? ??????  
????? ?????? ?? ??? ?? ?????? ?? ?????????? ??? ?? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????????.

---