

Jungian Psychoanalysis

WORKING IN THE SPIRIT OF
C.G. JUNG

Edited by
Murray Stein



OPEN COURT
Chicago and La Salle, Illinois

Unveiling Emergent Patterns of Meaning," discusses the analyst's important contribution to this dialogue. The method of amplification was specifically designed by Jung to expand the meaning of dreams and other material from the unconscious to include collective in addition to personal references.

In addition to working with dreams, active imagination was a preferred method employed by Jung for coming into contact with the unconscious. Sherry Salman, in her chapter "Peregrinations of Active Imagination," connects this traditional Jungian method with contemporary discussions on Jungian psychoanalysis and postmodern perspectives and reviews traditional and contemporary forms of using this technique in analysis. A somewhat neglected instrument among Jungian psychoanalysts in recent decades, active imagination is again being highlighted by a new generation as an indispensable technique for working analytically in depth. Mary Dougherty ("On Making and Making Use of Images in Analysis"), Eva Patis ("Sand Play"), and Cedrus Monte ("The Body and Movement in Analysis") extend the discussion of active imagination by introducing specific further techniques that have been developed by themselves and other Jungian psychoanalysts to elaborate the potential of active imagination in various modes.

With all of these methods, instruments, and techniques, the intent is to create a dialectical process between consciousness and the unconscious that will release creative energies and build up a stable psychic structure that is maximally representative of the whole personality. In the wrong hands, of course, they can become straitjackets and be more poisonous than healing. The skilled Jungian psychoanalyst will presumably know when and how to use them, and when to put them aside.

7

THE RECOGNITION OF PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE

John Beebe

The late Jo Wheelwright, the analyst who in the years between 1940 and 1980 did so much to keep Jung's theory of psychological types alive as a clinically relevant modality of interpretation, liked to say that the ability to recognize psychological type is a "knack." Jo was, as he explained in his inimitable way (Wheelwright 1982), an "extraverted intuitive feeling type," which in his case meant an uncanny ability to enter into the minds of others and to know how they were feeling. Some of his expressions of intuitive compassion, at a time when the term "emotional intelligence" had not yet come into common usage, were legendary. A woman colleague battling alcoholism received a bouquet of flowers from him every week during her first year of recovery. Jo once greeted a younger male colleague with, "It must feel great being in a fresh new suit!" to the amazement of the colleague, who had recently purchased the suit and wondered how Jo, who didn't see him every day, could know that.

To arrive at his type, Jo assumed (1) that he was an extravert (no one who knew him doubted this), (2) that his leading consciousness—what Jung would have called his "superior function of consciousness"—was "intuition," and (3) that his auxiliary function (Jung's term for the "second" function of consciousness that pairs with the first to produce the individual's "type") was feeling. Jo concluded he was pairing "extraverted intuition" with "extraverted feeling" to achieve the extraordinary feats of empathy for which he was noted. But it seemed to me, and to those who had studied type using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), that Jo was pairing "introverted feeling" (which remembered how certain categories of experience tended to feel deep inside) with "extraverted intuition" (which latched onto the new thing in a person's life on which the individual with whom Jo was empathizing was staking her or his future). Jo himself always insisted that his feeling was extraverted, however, claiming that there was not a shred of evidence that he had introverted feeling. There is a recording of a seminar we shared with Jo's wife, Jane, in which I patiently explain the basis of my competing conclusion while Jo thunders back, until Jane finally shouts to me, "Will you stop it?!"

This argument about Jo Wheelwright's type reflects the confusion Jungian clinicians often experience when trying to use type theory, despite the extensive groundwork laid out by Jung (1921) in *Psychological Types* and by Katherine Briggs Myers (1980) in *Gifts Differing* and the later clarifications in both Jungian and MBTI circles that I have summarized in a recent review article (Beebe 2006). To use the theory with precision, one has to be able not only to (1) recognize and accurately name the main "functions" that a person is using to express his or her consciousness (Jung gives only four choices for this: thinking, feeling, intuition, and sensation), but also to (2) figure out which of the two functions that are likely being most often used is primary and which secondary—and beyond that to (3) make clear the "attitude" with which each function is being deployed. (The choices Jung and Myers give us here are only two, extraverted and introverted, and it is Myers's view, and my own, that if the primary function is extraverted then the auxiliary will be introverted, and vice versa. This natural alternation of extraversion and introversion in our functions of consciousness is, by my observation, very adaptive: it keeps us from becoming too one-sided.)

Even those who recognized both Jo Wheelwright's intuition and his feeling (and there were many who could only see one or the other of these functions) did not always know what to call them (some thought Jo's extraverted intuition was simply intrusiveness, or narcissism), and few could figure out which of these functions was primary and which secondary (most people assumed that he had "extraverted feeling" as his main *modus operandi*, not realizing, I believe, that they were conflating the extraversion of his superior function (intuition) with the introversion of his auxiliary function (feeling).

Nor should my need to define type so sharply be promoted as a value without my admitting that my thinking function has a need to define type precisely, but also to pull away from the person to do so into an ideal model in my own mind of how a person's type can be parsed. This is so evident in me that it would be easy for the reader to conclude that I have introverted thinking as my leading function. But, no, I would argue, extraverted intuition is my leading function, and introverted thinking my auxiliary. Notice the strange inner confidence in my own thinking that led me to believe I had a right to type Jo Wheelwright at all. Also notice, though, the way this article begins, jumping right into the middle of the type muddle. That is extraverted intuition, and it has a certain verve and immediacy. The article starts to bog down, however, as soon as I try to specify Jo's type or my own too precisely in my thinking way, because then I am writing as if consulting a model of the mind that is particular to me, one not easily accessible to the reader who doesn't already know this model. Now the reader has to work to follow my argument. If the reader consults his or her own experience of reading this chapter so far, the evidence for making a type assessment of its author is already at hand.

To check the assessment that this author is using extraverted intuition and introverted thinking, the reader may consider that neither the feeling nor the sensate aspect of the chapter is its strong point. Have I considered how Jo

Wheelwright felt about the conclusion he had reached about his type—that, as he would have put it, "his thinkings" might "be hurt" by an analysis that contradicted his own? Am I giving the reader much secure fact to base any kind of analysis on? Isn't the overall feel of the chapter so far, despite the personal example, abstract rather than concrete? And isn't it hard to tell what I as author feel about the algorithm of type choices I seem to be trying to convey?

It is not hard to see, if you simply consult your experience while reading this chapter, that its author does not particularly emphasize feeling, and that he exhibits even less sensation. And, if you are already fairly familiar with Jungian type theory, you may find the pattern of my consciousness that is emerging to be consistent with the view that when thinking is the second of the two leading functions, feeling (its opposite on the same axis of "rational" functions) will be tertiary, and that when intuition leads, sensation (intuition's opposite on the axis of "irrational" functions) is going to be the inferior function. Knowing this enables us to map out the type of the author of this chapter—that is, my type—as Jung might have, by starting with a vertical line, which we can label at its top intuition and at its bottom sensation and next by crossing it with a horizontal line to define an axis at right angles to this spine. We will then label this horizontal axis's leftmost extent "thinking" and its rightmost "feeling." The stick diagram that has resulted can then be labeled "John Beebe's type profile." It is meant to convey this author, for the purpose of typing him, visualized as if facing the reader, arms spread apart with his right hand to the viewer's left and his left hand to the viewer's right, and his head, trunk and legs all lined up to suggest an upright spine.

Why would anyone want to turn himself into a diagram? If such model-making is introverted thinking (a function which we might define as the need to make experience conform to a thinking model held and checked within for "internal" consistency), possibly the answer to this question is found by saying: "This is what introverted thinking likes to do!" James Hillman has pointed out that the very word "function" comes from a Sanskrit root *bhunj*, which means "to enjoy," and from which his own introverted thinking draws the conclusion that "The exercise and performance of a function is something to enjoy, as a pleasant or healthy activity, as the operation of one's powers in any sphere of action" (Hillman 1971, 75). In my case, it is true that I enjoy typing consciousness and fitting it into a thinking model.

But I am not performing this exercise in a vacuum, autistically, just for myself. It is my way of teaching, of conveying, even of trying to *take care of* the reader, who I imagine is reading this chapter in hopes of understanding how to use type in an analytic practice. My auxiliary function, introverted thinking, is actually trying to take care of you as you read, by getting you to draw the stick figure of me so that you can visualize both the type theory and the man who is explaining it to you in the typological terms I have found most helpful. Whether you *feel* taken care of, and whether your unclarity about type is actually lessened by this instruction, is of course a result of how you receive me, which depends in

part on your own typology. But I can count on your having at least some experience of me while reading this chapter, and it's on that that I want you to build your own sense of my type, just as you would watching and listening a patient presenting himself to you.

Elsewhere (Beebe 2004), I have argued that, regardless of an individual's psychological type, there is a presiding genius associated with each of the ranked "positions" of our typology—superior, auxiliary, tertiary, and inferior—in Jung's original four-function model of consciousness. For each position, an archetype flavors the expression of the function in that place. (Although it is beyond the scope of this short article, I have also identified archetypes associated with the four functions that are in shadow.) It was my discovery that the auxiliary function is used parentally—as a way of taking care of others. (Again, I am focusing on the individual's intent when using a particular type of consciousness.) It follows that when making a type assessment, we need to take into account the archetypal stance that accompanies the deployment of a particular function. If you can experience me as at least trying to take care of you using an intricate, even private, logic, based on my love of my own particular version of type theory, then you can begin to see how my introverted thinking is auxiliary, because that's what an auxiliary function aims at, *taking care of another*.

Following a professional meeting, Jo Wheelwright was once in a hotel bar leading some other colleagues in an informal sing-along when the woman playing the piano suddenly realized her period had come. She stopped playing, got up gracefully and walked to the bathroom, at which point the pool of blood that had been hidden by her skirt was evident on the piano bench. The moment was naturally uncomfortable for all present: no one knew what to say or do. Wordlessly, Jo went over to the bar, picked up some paper napkins and used them to wipe off the bench. Then he sat down and began playing the piano so the sing-along could continue. When the woman reappeared ten minutes later, she was able to resume playing. I believe Jo used his introverted feeling to know how humiliating such an experience might be for the woman and how helpless everyone else might feel about what to do, and he simply concentrated on removing the thing that was producing the embarrassment: the blood on the bench. He himself would likely have read his action as an extraverted feeling one. I think it is clear that it was just as much a parental gesture, one that involved using his authority as a senior analyst to make the caretaking move of cleaning up a junior colleague's mess in his exquisitely calibrated feeling way. I cannot imagine approaching the typology of that story, whether as an example of extraverted or introverted feeling, without also looking at the fatherly way that whichever kind of feeling it may have been was being deployed. And I doubt that few present could have experienced the gesture, though involving the sensation function (wiping up the blood), as motivated by anything other than feeling.

By contrast, the superior function is less involved in the care of others and more in the assertion of self. In describing the night-sea journey of the hero in *Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido*, Jung gives a beautiful depiction of the way

a heroic introverted intuition approaches the problem of relating to the unconscious. In asserting this vision of a consciously irrational ego (i.e., an intuitive type), he sacrificed his caretaking role with regard to Freudian psychology, which was the very basis on which Freud had anointed him his "Crown Prince." He was ever after accused by Freud of abandoning the scientific study of the unconscious, which for Freud could only be accomplished rationally through a dialectic of thinking and feeling.

In an essay completed shortly before his death, Jung described how the need to assert his own more intuition-and-sensation-based (and thus in his own language for these functions, "irrational") standpoint developed out of the unconscious itself. He recounts a dream that he shared with Freud when the two men were on their way to America to a conference at Clark University at which many leading psychologists, including William James, would be present. Freud expected Jung to help him "sell" the theory of psychoanalysis to the American psychologists. In the dream, Jung encountered for the first time his own house, which mirrored through its furnishings and contents not only his intellectual history and interests but also a multilayered model of the psyche. Discussing the dream with Freud, he tells us, he had the "sudden and most unexpected insight that my dream meant myself, my life and my world, my whole reality as against a theoretical structure erected by another. . . . It was not Freud's dream, it was mine; and suddenly I understood in a flash what my dream meant" (Jung 1961/1980, 215).

One could say that in response to this dream Jung's identity emerged, and that his identity was expressed through a rather characteristic burst of introverted intuition. In contrast to the type diagnosis of introverted thinking given Jung by many Jungians, including occasionally Jung himself, I tend to read Jung as an introverted intuitive type, with thinking (and I would argue that it is extraverted thinking) his auxiliary function. What is important here is to note that in the way he approaches the dream he tried to share with Freud, Jung asserts his intuition at the moment he sees it as presenting his "own" standpoint. There is narcissism in this as well as a certain heroic combativeness. He is emphatically *not* taking care of Freud, as he does in the more "rational" writings he was publishing at the time of the dream where he uses extraverted thinking to argue for the validity of psychoanalysis. Jung's dream, and the way he interprets it, is compensatory to letting himself be used in this way. The dream fosters the emergence of an extreme self-assertion carried by the intuitive function, which (at that moment of insight at least) became the superior function for Jung (and his preferred guide for thinking ever after).

With a patient in the therapeutic situation, we often have to distinguish between the way the patient asserts self and the way the patient takes care of an other. This is not so hard to do because in the analytic situation the 'other' will usually be the analyst. There is something heroic about self-assertion (it should be noted that many patients have a considerable difficulty asserting themselves with anything like the definiteness Jung describes in taking ownership of his own

dream), and there is something parental about taking care of the other. The analyst may want to note the ways the patient is parental in the transference, and not just the ways the patient is infantile. (Developing Winnicott's [1987] notion of the analyst's way of "holding" the patient throughout an analysis, contemporary relational psychoanalysts have implied that the patient holds the analyst during treatment quite as much the analyst holds the patient [Samuels 2008] and of course there are wide variations both in patients' capacities to do this and in the ways they do this, into which both the strength and the typology of the patient's auxiliary function figures.) This distinction helps us to differentiate the patient's (heroic) superior function from his or her (parental, caretaking) auxiliary function, and that can be an enormous help in establishing a reliable type diagnosis. Because of the way Jung's introverted intuition is so involved in his self-assertion at the moment of realizing the possibility of his own theory of mind (and so uninterested in any longer supporting Freud's model), I am led to diagnose Jung's superior function as introverted intuition and to read him as being (when he is being most characteristically himself) an introverted intuitive thinking type.

Although "position" is critical in the assessment of type, it is of little help if one does not also know how to recognize and distinguish the different types of consciousness (eight in all) that can appear in particular positions such as "superior" and "auxiliary." (These two do not exhaust the positions in which a type of consciousness may appear, but I am concentrating on them because they are the most frequent to manifest relatively early in treatment in most people.) One has, in other words, to be able to recognize, and tell the difference, between introverted thinking, introverted feeling, introverted sensation, introverted intuition, and extraverted thinking, extraverted feeling, extraverted sensation, and extraverted intuition. Learning to do this requires conscious practice. It is not unlike the way one learns how to read music. Unfortunately, we don't have a mnemonic song like "Do-Re-Mi," which Mary Martin, and later Julie Andrews, sang in *The Sound of Music*, to learn type recognition the way we learn to recognize the basic tones of the Western musical scale. There is, however, a European story, "A Dinner Party with the Types," which is included as an appendix in Daryl Sharp's book, *Personality Types: Jung's Model of Typology* (113–19), that does a very good job of describing the eight different types of consciousness personified as guests at a dinner party. The hostess, appropriate to her role, embodies extraverted feeling. Her husband, a quiet, slender professor of art history, doubtless excels at noticing the minute differences between similar works of art. He represents introverted sensation. An extraverted thinking lawyer is the first guest to arrive. An industrialist, well dressed but loud, and a greedy though appreciative eater, comes later. He stands for extraverted sensation. His wife, a quiet, extremely ladylike woman with mysterious eyes, the type in whom "still waters run deep," is with him. She exerts a strangely magnetic effect on the other guests with her introverted feeling. An introverted thinking professor of medicine is next. He comes without his wife, and is apparently preoccupied with the disease he has been studying. He is followed by an extraverted intuitive engineer who

rhapsodizes about his ambitious plans, which one suspects will come to fruition only if someone else carries them out. While speaking, he gobbles his food without noticing what he is eating. The last intended guest, a poor young poet, forgets to come to the party but, when he realizes his mistake, plans by way of apology to send his hostess the poem he was working on while the party was taking place. (Sharp's own descriptions of these eight types of consciousness follow Jung and are presented at more length in the main section of his book.)

The functions are not as easily recognized in therapy. A real life person, unlike a stereotyped character identified with a single function, has access to all eight functions of consciousness, even if some are in shadow, and will deploy one or another depending on the context and the type of consciousness called for by that context. Also, the patient in analysis is often in the grip of complexes, which notoriously produce what Jung, quoting Janet, called an *abaissment du niveau mentale*, a reduction of the mental level, such that the energy that normally attaches itself to the superior and auxiliary function, allowing them to surface, is absent. When these functions are not active, the tertiary and inferior functions emerge. "Tertiary" and "inferior" are terms that imply that there is a gradient of differentiation in the four types of consciousness that normally describe someone's "ego," at least as that sometimes inexact term is understood by analytical psychology. As the least differentiated of the functions consciously available to the patient, the tertiary and inferior functions tend to be less adapted to reality and more influenced by unconscious complexes, which are in fact usually dominating the psyche when the third and fourth functions emerge in recognizable form. Their presentation is thus often floridly neurotic, easily characterized as obsessive, cyclothymic, hysterical, or paranoid, creating an obvious link to psychopathology. When it is easy to diagnose neurotic traits or character pathology in an analytic patient, it is a tip-off that one is looking not at the patient's natural (superior and auxiliary function) typology but at "a falsification of the original personality" (Jung 1959, para. 214). Naturally, a person can also falsify his or her original personality in a more adaptive way by conforming to the expectations of a family, school, occupation, or culture.

We should be cautious, therefore, in making a type diagnosis. It is best not to try to type someone who has not yet made a connection to the self that would be natural to him or her because all you may be doing is noting the "negative personality" (Jung 1959, *idem*) that has swallowed up the patient's true self (Beebe 1988). Sometimes, however, knowing that the inferior and tertiary functions reflect what someone "is least good at" can be a clue to the actual type. The person who constantly obsesses about small feeling matters, finding other people's feelings an endless burden, may be not an extraverted feeling type for whom other people's feelings matter but who finds it easy to deal with them, but someone with inferior extraverted feeling, that is, an introverted thinking type. Marie-Louise von Franz (1971) has written the definitive text on the inferior function, and in many ways her monograph is also the best book on type for clinicians because it portrays the way many kinds of patients present themselves in the office when in

the grip of the inferior function. It should be required reading in all Jungian training programs. A companion essay by James Hillman on the feeling function shows the number of other psychological entities that can confuse the identification of a function of consciousness and the need for clinicians to differentiate all of these. To cite just one example:

Extraverted feeling ought not to be confused with the persona. Although in Jung both refer to the process of adaptation, extraverted feeling is a function of personality. It is a manner of performing and can be an expression of an individual style. By means of it a person gives values and adapts to values in ways which can be highly differentiated, uncollective and original. The persona, on the other hand, is a fundamental archetype of the psyche referring to the manner in which consciousness reflects with society. The persona in Jung's stricter usage of the term would mean a developed reflection of the collective consensus. If one is a prisoner, or an addict, or a hermit, or a general, one can have a developed persona by behaving in the styles and forms collectively belonging to these patterns of existence. They are archetypal patterns. Feeling may have little or nothing to do with this adaptation, for one can be connected very well to the collective through thinking, intuition and sensation. In a nutshell: classically the persona is a collective way of playing a role in the world; the feeling function is an individual instrument of self-affirmation. (Hillman 1971, 102)

To discover a patient's typology, it is better to wait until the patient shows an original gift for accurately construing or managing some aspect of what comes up in therapy, rather than attempt to "type" the person when he or she is manifesting a collective persona that could belong to anybody in the patient's situation, or when the patient is so evidently suffering from psychopathology that a syndrome has all but replaced the person.

The typology of the true self (defined as the personal, little "s" self in touch with the transpersonal big "S" Self [Gordon 1985; Beebe 1998]) is rarely so stereotyped; rather it opens up the use of the most differentiated parts of the personality in an individual way that is a revelation and a pleasure to experience. It's when the patient is exhibiting his or her strengths as an authentic person that we can begin to appreciate the skill with which feeling, thinking, sensation and intuition are being used. At such moments, we can also see what effective extraversion and introversion are like when they are used as conscious attitudes.

When the patient is using a well-differentiated extraverted function, the function will seek to merge with some aspect of the analyst in a way that the analyst does not find particularly uncomfortable. When *extraverted feeling* is differentiated, the analyst feels appreciated and respected, and there is a sense of one's good will being seen and met. When *extraverted thinking* is highly differentiated, the analyst will find that it is safe to let the patient set the agenda, like a general directing the campaign of the therapy. When the patient's *extraverted sensation* is well-developed, the analyst has the experience of a ready participation in what is happening in the moment and an accompanying impatience with abstractions, as if what is already there is sufficient without much interpretation. *Extraverted intuition* can

feel intrusive, but it is also entertaining and astonishing in the way it can pick up on fresh possibilities for developing the objectives of the therapy in the world.

Introversion, when used consciously, is not as easy to discriminate, and indeed the functions of introverted feeling, introverted sensation, and introverted intuition are easily confused with each other. *Introverted thinking* can usually be distinguished by the fact that it tends not to know when to stop, and needs to define everything freshly, to the point that it becomes exhausting and hard to follow. It, like the other introverted functions, seeks to match its experience of an object with an a priori, archetypal understanding of that category of object *already present in the unconscious*. The introverted move away from the outer object is therefore the first step in a process that takes the introverted function's libido deep into the unconscious of the introverted subject, to see if the object really matches up. (That it often doesn't live up to the archetype helps to explain the frequent disappointment that introverted functions register in analysis, a disappointment that must not be confused with a condition to be treated, even if it is dysphoric to the subject. People with superior introverted functions must register this disappointment when the object simply doesn't match up. It's their normal way of reacting.) *Introverted intuition* seeks to match up the experience with an image of an archetype, something like a visual metaphor. *Introverted sensation* likes to establish whether the experience of the object checks out with an inner sense of what has already been established through long human experience as "real." And *introverted feeling* wants to know if the object as experienced is conducting itself in accord with what is fitting for such an object, that is, if a bride is acting like a bride, if a home feels like a home, if the boss is behaving as she should in her role.

The clinician should grow accustomed to the way introverted functions are constantly sizing up what happens in the therapy, to see if it checks out with the rich inner world of already-known, archetypal experience, against which an introverted function measures everything. Recognizing the introverted types in their normal functioning is one way to realize Jung's enormous contribution to opening up the introverted world as a part of healthy functioning. Simply not pathologizing introversion is perhaps the most healing thing a therapist can do in our pathologically extraverted, world-despoiling times. And it is a sign that the therapist is well along in the knack of type recognition.

REFERENCES

- Beebe, John. 1988. Primary ambivalence toward the Self: Its nature and treatment. In *The borderline personality in analysis*, ed. Nathan Schwartz-Salant and Murray Stein, 97-127. Wilmette, IL: Chiron Publications.
- . 2004. Understanding consciousness through the theory of psychological types. In *Analytical psychology: Contemporary perspectives in Jungian analysis*, ed. Joseph Cambray and Linda Carter, 83-115. Hove and New York: Brunner-Routledge.