

A Dichotomy of Freedom

Emma Pierce

Abstract:

Theology and psychology appear to have perceptions of freedom that are not just fundamentally different, but may well be diametrically opposed. Exploring two apparently contradictory perceptions of freedom, both buried deep within the western psyche, may assist not simply to dispel myths and clarify perceptions of freedom, but to ‘name’ what it is to be human.

This paper explores freedom from two perspectives that appear to be in contradiction with one another. The one is psychological, and is here called “effective freedom”. The other is theological, and is here called “essential freedom”.

Effective freedom is posited as the right/ability to make choices. Under this banner falls what is often referred to in modern times as ‘human rights’. It is less the ‘right’ to make choices – more often than not a political issue – than the ‘ability’ or more precisely the psychological capability that is the focus here.

Essential freedom is posited as loving response made in truth to the Primordial Caller, the Creator, the one who knows who one is and calls one forth to *be*. It might be better understood by Christians as “the freedom for which Christ has set us free” (Gal. 5:1). Put another way, essential freedom is participation in the divine life. It might be described simply as the freedom to *be*.

A correct understanding of the relation between freedom and being can shed much light on the problem. The relation of created freedom to God is then seen as an aspect of the relation of participated being to Absolute Being. God is this very relationship at its maximum intensity. Human freedom participates in divine freedom.¹

Is freedom the ability to *be*, or the right to make choices? Or are ability and rights two facets of the one gem we call ‘freedom’? Is the purpose of freedom to give a sense self-satisfaction or the ability to actualise potential; to *be/become* who one was created to *be/become*? A sense of satisfaction seems to be the natural product of being what we call ‘true to self’. But is self-satisfaction, or what is commonly called a sense of self-worth, the

purpose of freedom, or only the inexorable result? And if it is not the purpose of freedom, then what is the purpose of freedom?

Psychological Concept of Freedom



Image Source:
[Wikimedia Commons](#)

The western psyche was open to the Freudian theories of the unconscious due at least in part to its hinterland, Greek philosophy, which was unable to grant freedom.²

Ancient Greek philosophy posited an ontological monism, perceived to be a necessity for cosmic harmony. While they intuited freedom, their ontological monism denied them the ability to logically acknowledge freedom.

Whatever [in Greek philosophy] threatens cosmic harmony and is not explained by “reason” (*logos*), which draws all things together and leads them to this harmony

and unity, is rejected and condemned. This also holds true for man (sic).³

At the level of *logos* Greek philosophy was a well developed, strictly logical philosophy. At the level of *mythos*, it was rich in myth, yet indigent in the un-knowing wisdom dormant in its myths.⁴ Freedom, including human freedom, fell at the altar of the ontological monism so necessary to cosmic harmony. Ontological monism characterizes Greek philosophy from its inception. Not even God can escape from this ontological unity and stand freely before the world, “face to face” in dialogue with it. He too is bound by ontological necessity to the world and the world to him.⁵

The Greek intuition of freedom can be seen in their many tragedies where the great Greek heroes fight valiantly against invincible forces for the prize they can never attain – freedom.⁶ Sophocles’ play “Oedipus Rex” was one Greek tragedy among many where the hero strives and fails to overcome the inevitability of fate.⁷ In this story the biological parents of Oedipus consult the famous Oracle at Delphi. She tells them that their son will grow up to slay his father and marry his mother. In an effort to avoid this fate the child is abandoned to die in the wilderness. However he is found, saved, and ultimately becomes the son of the king and queen of Thebes. As a young man Oedipus consults the same Oracle who tells him what she told his biological parents. Unaware that the king and

queen of Thebes are not his biological parents, Oedipus runs away from home in his effort to avoid fate. In his travels he meets a stranger in a tavern and in a fight slays the stranger – his biological father, Laius. He then meets Jocasta, unbeknown to him his biological mother, and marries her. Ultimately the truth of the relationships is revealed, with dire consequences for all.

Freud used this particular story to explicate the nucleus of his analytical theories, the Oedipus Complex.⁸ He heard the myth not just with analytical ears, but from the context of his own atheistic belief system. Transplanted from its own home soil, so to speak, the story took on new meaning. Essential freedom in the world of psychology was severely undermined, if not negated, by theories of unconscious drives and instincts, fuelled by the theoretical Oedipus Complex.

Underpinning the Oedipus Complex is the implicit assumption that the Unconscious of Oedipus in some sense recognised his biological parents.⁹ From there the Freudian theories are able to determine human behaviour, whereas impersonal fate determined the destiny of the Greeks. In either scenario freedom can only be an illusion.

Psychological ‘Redemption’: Retrieving Lost Freedom

For western culture psychoanalysis has become the heuristic tool able to disclose the unknown that lurks in the Id, the deepest level of the Unconscious. The presumption is that once the unknown is made known, the Ego, the Conscious, can take control and the person can better steer his/her life towards a chosen goal. The ultimate and universal goal, according to Freud, is pleasure.¹⁰

While there are now disputes about the universal goal (Alfred Adler believed it was power), the ultimate purpose of psychoanalysis is to assist the analysand to be better informed in order to determine a more effective path to that goal. A sense of self-satisfaction (self-worth) is the self-evident criterion of the psychologically healthy person.

The fact that Freud did not believe in any god, and did not accept as reality a spiritual dimension that perceived a reality with values beyond self-satisfaction, did not negate the ‘grains of wheat’ in his theories of what it means to be a human being. Many who did not share his atheistic belief system could not deny the theory of an apparently unconscious dimension: deep, abiding drives and instincts that can indeed control a human being, bringing about attitudes and behaviours that are detrimental to human life

and human happiness. Those who suffer any form of addiction, and what mental health professionals call 'compulsive obsessive disorder', would certainly agree.

What is now all too readily accepted is that unconscious drives and instincts control human behaviour. These must be brought to the surface where some degree of control may be gained. The fundamental purpose of psychoanalysis is to retrieve the originating 'cause' of such drives and instincts, which is presumed to be some event that occurred in the life of the analysand.¹¹ The logic behind this is that humans do not choose to *be*: human *being* is determined by the experience(s) of life.

Psychology has accurately identified the pleasure principle and power drive as core issues in behavioural problems. The quandary resides not in the validity of these as fundamental issues, but in the interpretation psychology has given them. Professional treatment at its best seeks to exchange harmful pleasures for beneficial pleasures and futile power-play or control for effective power-play or control. One choice replaces another. Is this ability to substitute one choice for another truly freedom?

Evolution: Theological to Psychological Perceptions of Freedom

The simple fact that human beings are creatures of habit has been overlooked. We currently approach habitual behavioural problems as a disorder emanating from unconscious drives and instincts, where a past age recognised what it called slavery to sinful habits. In the naming of the problem, essential freedom was recognised. That insight was lost with the dominance of intellectual ways of knowing that undermined the spiritual world and gave birth to modern psychology.¹² *Logos* (intellect) ever seeks a logical explanation and believes all can be explained. Sinful habits destroy the one who practises them, and that is not logical. From this it is logical that 'sick' and 'bad' merge to be retrieved by psycho-logical explanation (psycho-analysis). Bad habits must be generated by unconscious drives and instincts for no one *in her/his right mind* would choose behaviours that are self-destructive.

The originating cause that Christian theology calls 'the fall' is unacknowledged by psychology. This originating cause suggests that whatever the bad behaviour, and whenever it first came into practice, it was initially and probably for quite some time a choice. Compulsion to bad habits, once called enslavement to sin, was once believed to have its healing in regaining the essential freedom that was lost in habitual practise of the bad habit. It had less to do with unconscious drives and instincts than with long forgotten self-control.

In fairness to psychology, one must acknowledge that where theology offered little solution but the ‘too hard basket’ of prayer, psychology sought to ‘roll up its sleeves’ and address lost self-control with practical application.

A Theological Concept of Freedom



Image Source: [Wikimedia Commons](#)

Ancient Judaism was unique in history in as much as it was the only religious culture that embraced a relational deity. Yahweh was personally, intimately, even passionately involved in the history of the Jewish people. The Israelites were his ‘chosen people’ and immediately the freedom of God, as opposed to the Greek ontological unity of God, is revealed.

Relationship was the context of divine-human interaction in the Jewish *mythos*. In the context of relationship the Israelites entered into a covenant with Yahweh. The covenant was a promise of freedom made by Yahweh to his

people. Free himself, Yahweh promised eternal freedom to the people he called his own. He would send a Messiah to free them, to redeem them in such a way that they would be forever free. For their part his people would live by a set of rules, the Decalogue, that would maintain fidelity to Yahweh as their one and only God. Freedom in this context was to be endowed within that relationship.

From a Christian perspective, in time the long awaited Messiah came. He was the God-man Jesus of Nazareth. The promised freedom was delivered. The promised freedom was unimaginable. In Christian understanding it is beyond covenant; it is participation in the divine life; the freedom to *be* – under all circumstances – including, or perhaps especially under the yoke of cruelty and injustice. Yet that same freedom to *be* exists outside the Christian tradition. Victor Frankl makes this point in contradicting the Freudian Pleasure Principle.¹³ Not even the Nazi yoke of injustice could destroy the essential freedom of the Jews they oppressed and murdered. They had the freedom *to choose how they would react/respond* to their suffering. Those who chose to remain ‘faithful unto death’ were able to do so, in spite of the violence and oppression that stripped them of all effective freedom.

One might say that prior to redemption in the Christian understanding freedom could only mean freedom from the yoke of oppression. The freedom to *be* would have been extremely difficult to grasp prior to the incarnation of the Word of God into human flesh. Even the Israelites did not, perhaps could not, anticipate the gift of essential freedom until it was gifted and explained to them. They, no less than the rest of the human race, did not appreciate the need they had to be free of their own ego-concerns, a freedom vital to participation in the divine life; to *being* in a relational reality. Freedom emanating from restoration of relationship with God – redemption – could not easily be imagined in a world that had not experienced such freedom. Not surprisingly the Israelites expected freedom that would be visible on the human landscape.

The Messiah of popular expectation was a purely worldly figure: a great king, a national hero and liberator who would free them [the Israelites] from the yoke of the Gentiles and give them dominion over the peoples of the earth.¹⁴

In the opening chapter of *The Temptations of Christ*, from which comes the above quote, the authors make a valid point. The temptations of Jesus are little used by spiritual writers as material for meditation. Their point is well made. While there is an amount of biblical exegesis on this subject, there is little material written for spiritual meditation. Yet the story is full of “significant detail, demanding an almost word by word study; moreover in its symbolism we can see represented the whole life and ministry of Jesus.”¹⁵ In the life and ministry of Jesus there is symbolically represented the whole life and ministry of the ordinary person who seeks, however intuitively, to *be*; a prerequisite for which is the *freedom* to be. Yet even biblical exegesis reveals the spiritual significance. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* notes that:

The temptation of Jesus has universal significance: (a) Jesus stands for Israel because he is the beginning of the new people of God, the founder of a new humanity; (b) the basic temptation is not to love God with a unified heart, at the risk of life, at the cost of wealth, Jesus is here shown to be the perfect lover of God.¹⁶

For the perfect lover there is no choice other than the choice to love. Theologically speaking freedom terminates itself in love and paradoxically, it retains itself only in love for the *Being* for whom it was created to *be*. Termination in any ‘other’ than the *Being* for whom it was created to *be* is enslavement. Indeed such termination of freedom is the fundamental cause of both addiction and idolatry.

The good news of the New Testament speaks of the great gift Jesus of Nazareth brought to the whole human family. Through him God was offering salvation to the whole human race. Through him each person could participate in the divine life. Each person was, through the God-human union, enabled to *be* one-with the Eternal Living God. The temptation of Jesus, or more precisely his resistance to temptation, is the paradigmatic example of participation in the divine life, the restoration of essential freedom, a gift beyond the gifting of psychology. “The Spirit, given Jesus at his baptism does not lead him into temptation, but is the sustaining power with him during temptation”.¹⁷

The first questions raised with regard to the temptations in the desert are raised in relationship to the humanity of Jesus. These are raised not only at the commencement of his ministry, but also at its conclusion, in his suffering and death on the cross. Was he really tempted? Was he fully human? Did he suffer as all human beings suffer?¹⁸

Temptation is seen too readily as a clear choice between good and evil. The very human experience of temptation suggests that this is not the case. More often than not any evil in temptation is subtly woven into thoughts and desires that are of themselves quite lawful.¹⁹

Reflection upon the temptations of Jesus and comparison with one’s own experience of temptation make it clear that in the *first instance* temptation is a ‘reasonable’ alternative to an inner, intuitive ‘knowing’ of how to go about achieving what might be called the ministry of one’s life, of coming-into-being true to one’s potential. Jesus was assaulted by the three temptations that are the root cause of all temptation if we see temptation as a test between ‘my way’ to fulfil my ministry or coming-into-being, and God’s way for me to achieve the same end.

A distinction needs to be made here between what we shall call primary temptation and secondary temptation. It is the movement from primary to secondary temptation that signals *the difference between* essential and effective freedom. Understanding the assault of temptation in this context is vital.²⁰

Primary temptation is what Jesus experienced. It is the most difficult and the root of all temptation. It is an assault upon essential freedom. In primary temptation the objective or goal is not questioned. Rather options regarding the ‘way’ to the goal are opened. Secondary temptation presents different goals or objectives. Will I do this or that? rather than *how* will I do *this*? Secondary temptation is an attack upon effective freedom. It creates the moral dilemma often articulated in debates about whether or not

the means justifies the end, or the end justifies the means. Secondary temptation needs the doorway – the very narrow doorway – of essential freedom to be at least partially closed before rationalisations can begin the work of dividing and fragmenting personhood.²¹ Fragmented personhood, or ‘the divided soul’ (James 1. 5-8.) is necessary to secondary temptation. Essential freedom maintains the wholeness of self, of being, that guards against the self-division that gives secondary temptation its potential for success.

Given that essential freedom is the concern here only primary temptation will be explored. It is his resistance that makes the temptations of Jesus so paradigmatic: they were in no way tinged by the self division that allows secondary temptation.

Satan is very clever. He knew he needed some level of success in closing the door to essential freedom before any assault on effective freedom could be launched with any hope of success. That is, he needed to first succeed in enticing Jesus to *different ways* of carrying out his ministry, altering his *being* by inches, before he could launch an attack that would divert him from his ministry. Primary temptation presents options on how one might go about doing the right thing. The temptation resides in choosing the right action/thing for the wrong reason, or the wrong action/thing for the right reason. This of course impacts on the way in which one goes about achieving the goal.

Evidently the early Church Fathers saw something similar in the temptations of Jesus. St Irenaeus saw in the temptations a summing up of all things in Christ. St Gregory the Great noted that Satan tempted Jesus with the same three temptations with which he had tempted Adam and Eve; namely pleasure, ambition and vainglory.²²

In a more modern language the temptations are to pleasure, power, and pride.²³ In all of these we are tempted to believe that attributes such as physical beauty, prowess, intelligence, talent, personality, all originate in, and belong to, the individual self, and the achievement(s) of ‘self’ are cause for pride in self. Incongruently, if ‘self’ fails to achieve, the very vice of vainglory – pride – demands that we abdicate responsibility. Failure is the fault of fate ... environmental and/or genetic heredity. In modern psychology pride in one’s self and one’s achievements is perceived to be the virtue of self-esteem. The ‘sin’ of vainglory has become obsolete.²⁴

Satan tempted Jesus with pleasure when he suggested he turn stones into bread. He tempted him to power when he showed him the kingdoms of the world, promising him power over them all – a promise the Prince of this world could deliver! He tempted him to vainglory when he invited him to test God by throwing himself off the mountain.

Satan's suggestions (temptations) implied that Jesus should win over the world to God (an extremely clever liar is Satan!) by becoming the visible hero the Israelites expected. Such a 'way' would mean a glorious career, a successful mission in a manner congenial to his human nature, and without the prospect of horrendous suffering and death at the end of it all.²⁵ Psychologically speaking the humanity of Jesus experienced the inner struggle with this alternative, more humanly palatable, 'reasonable' view.

Jesus chose of course, to be himself – “the Way, the Truth and the Life” (Jn. 14:6), rather than to become Satan's puppet. He knew where and how he 'fitted in'. But how did he know? What made him aware that he was choosing to be true to himself? If he is the example, the role model, the paradigm, then surely he knew in a way that we can all know. The picture Satan painted was perfectly logical. Jesus knew pleasure was not of itself sinful. He knew, or surely believed, that given the power he would rule the kingdoms of the earth with wisdom at least the equal of Solomon. As to throwing himself off the mountain, was that not an invitation to trust the God he sought to serve? What alerted Jesus to the lie embedded in choices that looked perfectly reasonable?

From a close scrutiny of Jesus' responses to Satan, the native partnership between *mythos* and *logos* (a partnership severed by the Enlightenment) can be retrieved.²⁶ Jesus was not only intelligent, he was also wise. He not only acknowledged what his intellect knew, he trusted the un-knowing at the deepest depth of himself where he encountered, not demonic drives and instincts, but the angelic of which the Christian mystics speak. The mission of his life was response to the Primordial Caller; *Being* who called him to *be*. He might ask a question, but he never faltered in his fidelity, or in his openness to receive an unpalatable answer. He was indeed 'faithful unto death.'

In his responses to the temptations Jesus reveals his wisdom, including a perception of reality beyond mere appearance and certainly beyond predetermined destiny. His response to the first temptation to pleasure is straightforward. “Human beings live not on bread alone.” (Lk. 4. 4). He seems to know that meeting one's bodily needs – even to the point of gluttony – cannot satisfy human hunger. Satan's temptation to power is very clever. Bringing order to the chaotic human landscape presents an attractive picture to one whose priority is peace and justice. Jesus demonstrates a wiser priority. True peace and justice come from only one source. “You must do homage to the Lord your God, him alone you must serve.” (Lk. 4. 8). Perhaps irritated by Jesus' unshakeable faith Satan invites him to test that faith in an adventurous act. But Jesus knows that human faith cannot commit itself to anything less than the Absolute. He is

also aware that participation in the divine life includes, rather than exempts personal responsibility. “Do not put the Lord your God to the test”. (Lk. 4.12). He seems to understand that his mission is to serve God, not to test and make sure God is serving him. He is not interested in his own glory – a vain glory.

It would seem that the very human Jesus of Nazareth perceived himself to be part of a reality greater than, but not separate from himself: a radically relational reality, a reality that originated in, and flowed from, the primordial relationship. To give in to Satan’s temptations would commence the severance of that relationship, denying his own *being*, negating the potential of his *being* to come-into-being. He was and is indeed the paradigm of essential freedom, the *Logos* ever one-with the primordial *Mythos*.

Jesus knew that however reasonable Satan’s temptations appear on the surface, they are a lie. Not only does surrender to temptation undermine essential freedom, it also does violence to the divine-human relationship. But it is *surrender* to temptation, not temptation itself that does this violence.

St Thomas Aquinas, asked whether the will of Christ was in complete conformity with the will of God, answered ‘no’.²⁷ St Thomas makes plain that the human tendency to recoil from suffering, to seek a way that is painless and visibly profitable is not of itself an evil. In the old language it is not sinful. It is to deliberately seek to suffer that is evil. It is at best pride, at worst masochism.

The fully human Jesus of Nazareth was not afflicted by demonic drives and urges, unconscious or otherwise. Neither is any other human person – unless the incarnation of the Word of God into human flesh was and is a puppet show! The potential for evil in temptation lies in the underlying motivation. Are we motivated to do it ‘my way’ or God’s way? Both ways involve similar action, similar goals. Satan has lost none of his cleverness. His lies are still very well dressed. But ‘my way’ leads to self aggrandisement. God’s way brings humility and gratitude for the gift of participation in *being* and becoming. While primary temptation carries the potential to do evil, it also carries the potential for great good. Experiencing temptation does not mean that one is evil. Temptation can and often is visited upon us to strengthen us in our resolve to come-into-being God’s way.²⁸ Upon reflection, it is comforting and affirming to realise that experiencing temptation means simply that God is interested in strengthening our fidelity. Resisting temptation can be described as moral exercise analogous to physical exercise.

Addressing the Psychological/Theological Contradiction



Image Source: [Wikimedia Commons](#)

Psychology accurately identifies the instincts/temptations to pleasure and power. But what of vainglory? Indeed vainglory seems to be the very goal of psychology. Is this the fundamental contradiction between these two perceptions?

Johannes Baptist Metz, along with the church Fathers mentioned earlier, claims that the temptations of Jesus present a biblical way of narrating the spiritual process of humanity taking

up the invitation to be one-with the divine, the freedom to *be*.²⁹ Metz explicates the three temptations as three assaults on the poverty of Jesus. He asserts that Satan wants Jesus to be strong in the way that human beings are strong. What Satan really fears is the powerlessness of God in the humanity and humility of Jesus. “Satan fears the trojan horse of an open human heart that will remain true to its native poverty.”³⁰ He tempts very cleverly, appealing to the spiritual strength of human beings. He paints human spirit as synonymous with divine will. ‘Pleasure is a good thing. It is not sinful, and it is yours for the taking. God did not make you powerless. You can take control of yourself and your life. You are free to choose your own destiny. Be fearless, courageous. Run the gauntlet. And if you do happen to fall, God’s angels will protect you from harm.’ Satan makes a virtue of self reliance. With this he is able to hide the truth that we are not self reliant.³¹

Metz articulates not simply intellectual knowledge, but its marriage with the unknown that reveals wisdom: real strength and real freedom know that we are utterly reliant on God, unable to be satisfied by anything less than the divine.

Hunger becomes a human hunger only when it can never be fully allayed; desire becomes a human desire only when it can remain unfulfilled. And nearness to the abyss becomes a human experience only when one can no longer call upon helping hands for protection.³²

Satan continually invites humanity to meet its own needs, hiding from us the truth that “God is the guardian of our humanity, who lets us be what we are.”³³ Rather than choosing our own destiny, choosing our own identity, we are invited to trust all this and more to the loving providence of the God who created and knows who we are.

We are all beggars. We are all members of a species that is not sufficient unto itself. We are all creatures plagued by unending doubts and restless, unsatisfied hearts. Of all creatures, we are the poorest and the most incomplete. Our needs are always beyond our capacities, and we only find ourselves when we lose ourselves.³⁴

Jesus is the epitome of the poverty of spirit necessary to receive *being* (to come-into-being) from the God who created *being*. “Was he not so thoroughly poor that he had to go begging for his very personality from the transcendent utterance of the Abba?”³⁵ With the poverty of spirit of which Metz speaks self-focus is lost and its corollary, anxiety, is dispersed. There is no focus upon self. Self-worth becomes merely a corollary to *being* true and truly *being*.

Conclusion

Psychology at its very best can offer only functional freedom. That is not enough to meet the highest realms of human dignity. Effective freedom – the ability to make choices – makes its appearance in self-control. While this is necessary to maintain freedom, it is not of itself freedom. It is not the freedom to *be*, the freedom that distinguishes the human person from all other creatures.

Perhaps it is time we acknowledged that psychology and theology are somewhat analogous to *mythos* and *logos* in human life formation. Theology struggles with practical application of self-control, ever aware of the need for surrender to the Absolute. On the other hand if the ultimate purpose of freedom is participation in the divine life, psychology of its own proficiency must always fall short.

¹*New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol 6 s.v. “Freedom”

²Richard Tarnas, *Passion of the Western Mind* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1991), 16-31. (While the Greeks were free to be or to not be virtuous, that choice impacted only on their personal state of happiness in life, and perhaps their standing in the community. It had no bearing on their ultimate destiny).

³John Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, (New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), 31.

⁴ Succinct definitions of *mythos* and *logos* consistent with the meaning intended here are given by both Raimon Panikkar and Terry Veling. Raimon Panikkar, "Terminological Clarification" in *Myth, Faith and Hermeneutics*, (Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporation, 1983), 20. Terry Veling, *Practical Theology: On Earth as it is in Heaven*, (Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2005), 159-160

⁵Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 29-30.

⁶Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 31-32.

⁷*Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes*, trans. G.M. Cookson et al., *Great Books of the Western World Vol 4*. (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1990).

⁸Freud considered his most important work was *The Interpretation of Dreams* out of which he developed his theories, including the Oedipus Complex; available http://www.age-of-the-sage.org/psychology/freuds_works.html#Sigmund_Freud Internet: Accessed 20 November, 2005.

⁹While Freud did not articulate this 'unconscious recognition' it can be retrieved from the convoluted theory of "life instincts" combined with the theoretical value of psycho-analysis.

¹⁰Sigmund Freud, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (U.S.A.: W. W. Norton & Company 1990).

¹¹Frances Moran and Tony Kelly, *Searching for the Soul*. (Strathfield NSW: St Paul's), 1999.

¹² With the Enlightenment came the birth of the modern scientific age, where knowledge has become the exclusive domain of *logos*, at the cost of the un-knowing of *mythos*, that some recognise as the very context of *logos*. See footnote 4

¹³Victor Frankl, "Preface", *The Doctor and the Soul*. (USA: Alfred A. Knopf Inc.), 1955.

¹⁴Gerald Vann & P.K. Meagher, *The Temptations of Christ* (London: Fontana Books, 1957), 27.

¹⁵Vann & Meagher, *The Temptations of Christ*, 15.

¹⁶*Jerome Biblical Commentary*, Ed. R.E. Brown, J.A. Fitzmyer and R. E. Murphy (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1990), 638.

¹⁷*Jerome Biblical Commentary*, 688.

¹⁸“During his ministry Jesus will continue to encounter the powers of evil who know who he is, and will vanquish them”. “When Jesus is on the cross in Jerusalem, he will again encounter temptations ... and will conquer them and evil by his faith”. *Jerome Biblical Commentary*, 689 & 688.

¹⁹Vann & Meagher, *Temptations of Christ*, 22. Michael Casey, *Fully Human, Fully Divine: An Interactive Christology* (Australia: John Garrett, 2004), 45.

²⁰Insole makes a distinction between what he calls negative freedom – “to do whatever one wants”, and positive freedom “to achieve proper self-realization/fulfilment”. His arguments sit well within the concept of primary and secondary temptation as they relate to essential and effective freedom. Christopher Insole, “The Worship of Freedom: Negative and Positive Notions of Liberty in Philosophy of Religion and Political Philosophy” in *Heythrop Journal* XLV (2004) 209-226.

²¹Try your hardest to enter by the narrow door, because, I tell you, many will try to enter and will not succeed. (Lk. 13. 24).

²²The “same interpretation is to be found in St Ambrose and St Augustine among the Latin Fathers and in St John Chrysostom among the Greeks.” Vann & Meagher, *Temptations of Christ*, 26.

²³Freud, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*; Alfred Adler, *The Neurotic Constitution* (New York: Routledge, 1999); *Understanding Human Nature* (U.S.A.: Kessinger Publishing, 2003).

²⁴Vainglory is a word so out of date it is difficult to find in a credible dictionary or encyclopedia. Psychologically speaking, vainglory is ego-centricity: self-aggrandisement, paradoxically vacant of responsibility. That is, when things go wrong ego-concern is able to abdicate responsibility and blame ‘other’ (including God). Where pride is ego ‘puffed up’, taking credit for achievement, vainglory maintains pride when ego fails to achieve. Vainglory is both pride in achievement and abdication of responsibility in failure. Skinner, B.F. *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*, (USA: Knopf, 1971).

²⁵Distilled; Vann & Meagher, *The Temptations of Christ*, 27.

²⁶See footnote 4

²⁷Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, translated by English Dominicans (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1947) 3. 18, 5.

²⁸Vann & Meagher, *The Temptations of Christ*, 44-52.

²⁹Johannes Baptist Metz, *Poverty of Spirit*, (New York: Paulist Press, 1968), 6.

³⁰Metz, *Poverty of Spirit*, 10.

³¹Extrapolated; Metz, *Poverty of Spirit* 11-12.

³²Metz, *Poverty of Spirit*, 12.

³³Metz, *Poverty of Spirit*, 20.

³⁴Metz, *Poverty of Spirit*, 25.

³⁵Metz, *Poverty of Spirit*, 25.

Bibliography

Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, trans. G.M. Cookson et al., *Great Books of the Western World* Vol 4. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1990.

Jerome Biblical Commentary, Ed. R.E. Brown, J.A. Fitzmyer and R. E. Murphy, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1990.

- Adler, A. *The Neurotic Constitution*, New York: Routledge, 1999.
Understanding Human Nature, U.S.A.: Kessinger Publishing, 2003.
- Aquinas, T. *Summa Theologiae*, translated by English Dominicans, New York: Benziger Brothers, 1947.
- Casey, M. *Fully Human, Fully Divine: An Interactive Christology*, Australia: John Garrett, 2004.
- Frankl, V. *The Doctor and the Soul*. USA: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1955.
- Freud, S. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* U.S.A.: W. W. Norton & Company 1990.
- Kelly, T. & Moran, F. *Searching for the Soul*. Strathfield NSW: St Paul's, 1999.
- Meagher, P. & Vann, G. *The Temptations of Christ* London: Fontana Books, 1957.
- Metz, J.B. *Poverty of Spirit*, New York: Paulist Press, 1968.
- Panikkar, R. *Myth, Faith and Hermeneutics*, Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporation, 1983.
- Skinner, B.F. *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*, USA: Knopf, 1971.
- Tarnas, R. *Passion of the Western Mind* New York: Ballantine Books, 1991.

Veling, T. *Practical Theology: On Earth as it is in Heaven*, Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2005.

Zizioulas, J. *Being as Communion*, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.

Insole, C. "The Worship of Freedom: Negative and Positive Notions of Liberty in Philosophy of Religion and Political Philosophy" in *Heythrop Journal* XLV (2004) 209-226.

Internet: http://www.age-of-the-sage.org/psychology/freuds_works.html#Sigmund_Freud

Author

Emma Pierce is currently completing a doctoral dissertation on "A Practical Theology of Mental Health" at Australian Catholic University.

Email: "Emma Pierce" <faithrough@iprimus.com.au>