

**C.G. JUNG'S ARCHETYPAL APPROACH TO PSYCHE AND ITS
IMPLICATIONS FOR THE STUDY OF LITERATURE
By EDWARD H. STRAUCH"**

The names of Sigmund Freud and Carl G. Jung are so familiar to students of literature that one is tempted to assume that everyone knows with some precision the major concepts of psycho-analysis and of analytical psychology. However, if you have ever read the vehement arguments of critics or heard impassioned students arguing for their particular depth psychologist, the realization emerges that ignorance, bias and dogmatic opinion all too frequently prevent any dispassionate and intelligent discussion. Since I have treated the Freudian approach elsewhere, this essay will aim primarily at examining the Jungian approach to psyche in order to consider what consequences this approach may have for literary study. Within this general aim, the essay has three distinct purposes (1) to examine C.G. Jung's hypotheses about psyche in contrast to Freud's, (2) to describe and define Jung's analytical psychology; and (3) to show how the Jungian archetypal approach can significantly enrich our understanding of literature.

In an essay entitled "Sigmund Freud and his Historical Setting", C. G. Jung assesses the scope and limits of psychoanalysis. Although admitting that Freud's system does make a self-consistent whole, Jung points out that it is limited to a few transparent principles, which exclude all else.¹ Nowhere does Freud seek to connect his thought with historical predecessors nor does he show its affinities with contemporary concepts in other fields. Indeed, Freud's peculiar terminology further isolates his theory.

Freud's fundamental tenet that repressed sexuality adversely affects mental health is based largely on Freud's negative reaction to the false religiosity and values of the Victorian age.² In fact, Freud interprets all cultural phenomena as being the result of the repression of the sexual instincts, for every positive gift or creative activity derives from some negative or infantile experience.³ If the hypocrisy of the age twisted the instinctual inclinations of the adult into moralistic sentiments, Freud reduced everything to infantile sexuality.⁴

Because Freud's thought is dominated by his unconscious Weltanschauung,⁵ which in turn is conditioned by the Zeitgeist into which Freud himself was born,⁶ Jung considers Freud's theory to be of little

scientific value. In short, Freud's theory of neuroses is his own instinctual response to Victorian morality and prejudice.

Nor will Jung admit that Freud pursues truth in the impartial and unbiased way of science. At best, Freud's dogmatism belies the rationalism he is heir to, and he offers only part truths. Therefore, since Freud's approach is limited, largely to the 19th century materialistic understanding of psyche, his vision is limited temporally, culturally, and scientifically.

In a second essay, "In Memory of Sigmund Freud", Jung acknowledges the extensive influence Freud has had on contemporary thought and recognised Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* (1900) as an epoch-making work.⁸ Yet Freud's greatest weakness was his inadequate training in philosophy so that his theory lacked sound philosophical premises. Confined as it was to 19th century materialism, Freud's psychology restricted itself to the study of neurotics, but when he used his conception of neurotics to explain and interpret broader cultural phenomena, as in *Totem and Taboo* and in *The Future of an Illusion*, the insufficiency of these clinical concepts became self-evident. Freud's obsessive preoccupation with neuroses led him to deal solely with the diseased and defective and, correspondingly, to ignore the helpful and healing powers in the unconscious. Freud's skepticism was such that he disbelieved man has any genuine creative capacity, for the source of much of mankind's achievements, sublimation, turns out to be like dreams—merely disguised wish-fulfillment.^{9 10}

In *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, Jung makes clear other points of difference from his teacher. To begin with, Jung does not deny that many neuroses have a traumatic origin, but he does contest Freud's belief that all neuroses arise from some Critical Childhood experience.¹¹ Furthermore, Jung finds Freud's concept of sexuality so vague and elastic that it can be made to account for virtually any neurotic disturbance.¹² In other words, Jung rejects the Freudian view of psyche as providing an adequate interpretation of human experience. If Jung is prepared to admit that Freud's viewpoint does correspond to psychic realities, Jung finds that it fails to represent the whole truth.¹³ Because Freud interprets man almost exclusively in the light of the individual's neuroses, Freud's generalisations are one-sided and delineate only neurotic states of mind. Within these limits "... Freud's teaching is true and valid.", but it does not describe the psychology of the healthy personality.¹⁴ Whereas Freud failed to examine his assumptions adequately,¹⁵ Jung came upon facts

which required him to seek out a new method and a new theory to account for the manifestations of man's sound, creative psyche.¹⁶

Basically, Jung questions one main assumption which Freud evidently ever doubted. Freud believed that human events are the inevitable outcome of antecedent conditions. In short, psychic and environmental factors determine how we react and what we do. Free will is a myth in so far as our psychic wounds inhibit our capacity to choose. To Freud, man is the psychically wounded animal. Therefore, man's actions are caused by subconscious impulses and forces over which the individual has little or no control.

Jung does not believe that the present development of psychology allows anyone to attempt to establish those rigorous causal relations expected of science.¹⁷ Since Jung regards creativity as the very antithesis of causality, he finds Freud's attempt to impose causal explanations on art to be a more or less senseless exercise. Jung finds it an error to try to explain the artistic creation from the artist's personal history as Freud attempted to do in Leonardo da Vinci, is "The truth is that it (such explanation) takes away from the psychological study of the work of art and confronts us with the psychic disposition of the poet himself. Even when we study the poet himself, we must bear in mind that the artist as a person must be distinguished from the artist as creator since his passion to create may override every personal desire.²⁰ It is "...not the insufficiencies and conflicts of his personal life..." which explain the artist.²¹

To reinforce this viewpoint, Jung distinguishes between two modes of artistic creation. The Psychological deals "... with the lessons of life, with emotional shocks, the experiences of passion and the crises of human destiny.²² The poet often interprets these events. On the other hand, visionary artistic creation reverses all the conditions of the psychological. It comes from the hinterland of man's mind, the superhuman world of light and darkness. Out of timeless depths, it may be a vision of other worlds, of the beginnings of things before men, or an intimation of the future.²³ This vision is represented in works of Melville, Dante, Goethe, Jacob Boehme, Wagner, and perhaps Walt Whitman. It is out of this hinterland and out of timeless depths of human experience that the archetypes well up and manifest themselves in men's lives and in literature. Beyond the limitations of any single personality or life, these archetypes account for the imagery, situations, figures, and

stories which continue to convey human understandings of man's existential condition across cultures and over eons.

From the above, the theoretical and methodological differences between Freud and Jung become clearer. First of all, Jung saw Freud's psychoanalysis as based on an inadequate hypothesis. Although all the instances Freud tested bore out his point of view, he apparently failed to include evidence which might have contradicted his theory. For this reason, Jung thought Freud's approach lacked applicability to the many experiences which characterize the healthy, resourceful, and mature human being. Jung sought to be more comprehensive by taking into account factors beyond his original hypothesis. So doing, he found himself broadening his perspective to include experiences widely shared by human beings who manifested no marked mental aberrations in their day-to-day existences. Such experiences, representative of mankind's psyche in general, he called archetypes. In a way, then like Sir Isaac Newton's theory of gravitation, which explained one series of natural phenomena, Freud's theory accounted for certain, deterministic psychic phenomena. Later, Einstein's theory of relativity explained the interdependence of matter, energy, and time, thereby accounting for more natural phenomena than did Newton. Similarly, Jung's theory apparently encompasses more psychic phenomena than Freud's does. Somewhat like Einstein's discussion of the interconvertibility of mass and energy, Jung described the polar tendencies of mind which make possible the dynamic interchange between the personal ego and the archetypal Self through the process of individuation or through the artist's creativity. For Jung, it is this psychic exchange and integration which enables human intelligence to enlarge its understandings. In sum, Freud's study of the negative (neurotic, decentralising) depths- of the private psyche led to corresponding conclusions whereas Jung's study of archetypes, which include both negative and positive poles of psyche, led to an enlarged comprehension of psychic dynamics. Jung's study, therefore, widens our consciousness of Man's practical and imaginative handling of existential situations and of man's intuitive creativity in the arts. The clue to man's deeper psychic capacities came to Jung when he discovered that a third of his patients were not suffering from clear cut neuroses but from "...the senselessness and emptiness of their lives"²⁴. This led him to acknowledge the individual possess "... not only a present day, personal consciousness, but also a suprapersonal consciousness ..."& This presence points to the archetypes, which embody experiences of a quasi-universal nature, containing the essence of human awareness or understanding. In this sense, archetypes are centers of psychic and

existential meaning. In other words, the archetype may be seen as the hiatus between one's personal consciousness of life problems and the suprapersonal consciousness of any racial group, between individual pathos and racial ethos. Indeed, this interplay between personal and suprapersonal consciousness seems to derive from Jung's concept of psychic energy as a "... play of opposites in much the same way as physical energy involves a difference of potentials."²⁶ Having compared and contrasted Freud's and Jung's hypothesis, we are ready to examine Jung's central theory.

Jung's Analytical Psychology

Jung complements Freud's causal exposition of psychic phenomena a teleological interpretation. Jung regards behaviour as conditioned by one's individual and racial history (causality) but also by one's goals and ambitions (teleology). Any given moment, one's life is influenced by the past and by expectations of the future. Indeed, such prospective orientation indicates the individual seeks out a particular destiny. It is Jung's view that man is endowed with teleological purpose which radically separates his theory from Freudian determinism.

For Jung, the personality undergoes creative development in its search for wholeness and completeness. Because of man's embryonic and phylogenetic heritage and history, the human personality contains a built-in system of self—transformation, and this accounts in part for such intuitive and creative manifestations as myths, religions, and the arts. Put another way, the individual has inherited, along with parental intelligence and talents, a racial collective unconscious which enables the individual to assess experience with the wisdom of his race and to modify or elaborate that experience for his own purposes.

The structure of the psyche embraces a number of distinct but interacting systems as: the ego, one's personal unconscious and its complexes; the collective or racial unconscious and its archetypes; the person; the animus and anima and the so-called shadow. One might add that this psychic interaction itself appears to be an archetypal process.

Let us define these terms in a preliminary way. The ego represents one's conscious mind, one's sense of identity through time, one's awareness of oneself as a personality. On the other hand, the personal unconscious adjoins the ego and stores experiences that one has consciously lived through. Within this personal unconscious exist complexes which represent clusters of feeling, thought, perception, and memories. An

example would be the mother complex, i.e., all those personal and racial associations one imputes to one's own mother or to mothers in general. A complex focuses energies and notions so that it may be thought of as pursuing a life or destiny all its own.

It should be emphasised that Jung does not see such complexes as negative. For instance, in *The Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*, Jung describes the mother complex or archetype, found in comparative religion, as manifesting both benign and malign characteristics. She may be associated with maternal solicitude and sympathy, with wisdom and spiritual exaltation, with the protective and sustaining. Or the mother complex may connote the secretive, hidden, the seductive, poisons; the devouring, or anything as inescapable and terrifying as fate itself. She may be regarded as the source of life or linked with the grave and death.²⁷

This example of the mother archetype admirably illustrates the breadth and depth of psyche largely ignored by Freud. Such archetypes well up from what Jung calls the Collective Unconscious, which contains the latent dispositions man has from his animal inheritance and from his ancestral heritage. This means man is born with certain patterns of perceiving, feeling, and thinking which individual experiences actualize. Such patterns Jung calls archetypes. An archetype is a pattern, process or form which focuses considerable emotional energy and which draws on experiences shared by widely separated faces in different climes and ages. Jung speaks of birth, death, rebirth, the divine child, the culture hero, the wise old man, demons, and God as archetypes present in dreams, myths, folktales, and religions.

Jung also singles out the persona, which is a mask the individual wears in response to social convention and to ethnic tradition. In contrast to one's private individuality, the persona is the public personality, and this persona grows out of the dominant archetype in one's nature.

In particular, one archetype strives to unify the character into a totality or self. As centre of the personality, it is the goal of one's life. Exemplified in such figures as Christ and Buddha, the self motivates the individual to seek out a destiny that unifies and integrates his life into a meaningful whole worthy of one's highest humanity, this archetype of the self is usually sought out in middle age after the personality has become fully developed and individuated.

This aspiration to selfhood is one consequence of the individual attempting to resolve the polar tendencies of his personality. Jung visualizes the personality as governed by antithetical attitudes: extraversion which encourages the individual to come to grips with the external, objective world/ and introversion, which inclines him to remain in the safety and secrecy of his inner, subjective world.

These polar tendencies most likely stem from the individual's basically bisexual nature, for, according to Jung, everyone has both masculine and feminine characteristics. The feminine archetype in man is named the anima; the masculine archetype in woman is called the animus. Interacting, these archetypes mature the individual and engender his finality in life. As the male and female themes in a symphony, the animus and anima together give the psyche its direction, and meaning. The human personality is also endowed with functions of thinking, feeling, sensing, and intuiting, which may act in any inferior way in dreams and fantasies or in a superior fashion when it constructs detailed models of reality.

Such efforts at synthesis point to the way that systems within the personality interact. Although a strong system may seek to compensate for a weak one, or two systems may directly oppose each other, two or more often seek to unite to form a synthesis/When this occurs, the personality effects a progression by adjusting the ego in a healthy way to the unconscious or to the environment. Or the personality undergoes sublimation such that instinctual energy is transformed and integrated into reasonable, noble, or spiritual undertakings. To be sure, an unsuccessful adjustment of ego can lead to regression, and the blockage of instinctual drives, repression, tends to disintegrate personality and cause irrational behaviour.

Jung acknowledges, therefore, that the psyche is an arena of a struggle between rational and irrational forces, but he denies that such elements can only oppose each other to bring about neuroses and psychoses. To the contrary, certain psychic powers attract each other and ultimately unite so as to enable the individual to survive. Indeed, Jung names the prevalent tendency of psyche to unify, this transcendental function which operates to balance and synthesize contrary systems into an integrated self.

In other words, for Jung the maturing personality goes through two dominant phases in order to achieve true selfhood. A man is born with

an undifferentiated organic-psychic wholeness along with his shadow, the animal side of his nature. As he grows and matures, certain aspects of personality unfold and develop. This means that the various systems of personality become completely differentiated. The way that the healthy, integrated personality achieves the fullest degree of differentiation and development is called the individuation process. The second phase of personality maturation occurs in middle age when individuation has been achieved. At this moment the transcendent function of psyche begins to integrate all hitherto opposing trends of the diverse systems so that the personality may strive toward some ideal goal and attain completeness and selfhood. Complexes

In *Complex/Archetype/Symbol in the Psychology of C.G. Jung*, Jolande Jacobi admirably explains the differences between Freud's concept of the Complex. To Freud, the complex is a manifestation of illness reflected between man's primitive sexual urges and the restraints imposed on him by the morality of his society. Stemming strictly from one's private life, complexes are symptomatic of a diseased psyche.²⁸

By contrast, to Jung the complex is a stimulus to greater effort. Because of Jung's fundamentally teleological view, the complex takes a positive and prospective direction, yet he sees the complex as having a dual nature. Complexes do derive from childhood, but they also arise during the spiritual crises of middle life. Furthermore, complexes stem from both one's personal life and the collective unconscious, and the complex is to be regarded as a healthy component of psyche. The reintegration of a complex into the total personality heals the psyche and releases positive energies. Jung stresses the need of the conscious to understand, assimilate and integrate the complex.

Archetypes

Although Dr. Jacobi states that an exact definition of the archetype is not possible, she does a thorough job of examining its multifarious aspects. Originating in the archaic man still within us, archetypes arrange psychic elements into certain images so that certain structural dominants of psyche emerge as patterns of behaviour.²⁹ Seen as latent possibilities of the psyche, archetypes find expression in all sorts of configurations, patterns, and happenings. Archetypes are a factor which determine our modes of apprehension so that they may be viewed as living dispositions and ideas which influence our thoughts, feelings, and actions.³¹ Inherited with the structure of the brain, archetypes are systems of readiness for action and may be considered as images of the instincts.³² Moreover,

archetypes have a transcendental function that prompts the unconscious to reach beyond consciousness. Hence although they are the primordial forms which make cognition possible.³³ they are affected by time and environment so that the individual in his lifetime can direct and foster the archetype through his unique and creative personality.

Symbol

To Jung, when the archetype is expressed in some form by the conscious mind, it becomes a symbol, and in fact, the symbol is the mode of the archetype's manifestation.³⁴ Obviously, then, Freud's use of the term symbol differs markedly from Jung's. What Freud calls symbols are actually signs or symptoms of subliminal processes. Freud's symbols are unipolar and causal whereas Jung regards symbols as bipolar, effecting a dialectic of psychic systems and reconciling opposites, such as the reconciliation of the masculine and feminine in the individual.³⁵

Freud thinks of sublimation as a unipolar transformation of libido whereas Jung thinks in terms of a bipolar transformation of libido, leading to a synthesis of conscious and unconscious.³⁶

Also, Jung recognizes individual and universal symbols arising out of the psyche. They unfold their meanings because they are the result of a psychic process of development. For Jung, every symbol has an individual and a collective context of meaning.³⁷ In sum, the perceptible or represented archetype is a symbol.³⁸ An archetype can manifest itself on a lower biological plane, as Freud maintained, or on a "higher spiritual plane, as Jung averred. Complexes and symbols appear automatically in the healthy and the Sick, but for the artist, they become part of his process of artistic creation.³⁹

Implications of the Archetypes for Literary Study

The general aim of this essay is to give a clearer idea of the implications of the archetypes for literary study. Such implications are conveyed in Jung's Introduction to the Essence of Mythology, in which he discusses the archetype of the divine child. In general, archetypes emerge as images in order to protect and deliver the psyche from danger.⁴⁰ Although primitive man may have distinguished himself by a neophobia and an attachment to traditions,⁴¹ the archetypes in mythology, religion, and poetry actually exhibit a creative tendency to synthesize-experience, integrate personality, and synchronize energies with spiritual goals. The theme of the infant, in particular, displays the effort at individuation to

create a superior self which can come to terms with all experience, evil and good.

In his discussion of the divine child myth, Jung emphasizes how an archetype has a purpose as definite as the function of any organ in the body.⁴² In fact, the function of the child archetype is to correct the peculiarities and extravagances of the conscience.⁴³ Although Jung is rendering the image of the divine child only, one is led to infer that the emergence of any archetype in myth; folktale, or literature directly or indirectly" aids in the synthesis of the conscious and unconscious elements of the artist's and the reader's personality.⁴⁴ Reuniting contrasts, the child archetype, therefore, abets the process of individuation in both artist and reader.

In an analogy to man's organic and phylogenetic nature, Jung sees the archetype as striving to realize a similar entelechy which represents the totality or wholeness sought out through individuation.⁴⁵ Despite the constraints of one's personal or ethnic consciousness, an archetype thrusts itself into one's cognizance. Acknowledgement of its presence affects one like a law of nature and becomes a means of maturation and self-transformation from a limited to a larger self and from an inferior to a superior awareness.

Archetypes as psychic residue or the genetic capacity of the individual, inherited from thousands of generations of survivors, represent a direct line from man's archaic origins to the present moment. The presence of archetype in myth, folktales, and poetry is a clue to the significance of the racial expedience embodied in literature. Such archetypes depict the existential situations and problems man has faced and solved, and where man has failed to resolve these crises, the archetypes show why, for their lesson everywhere is the need for man to draw on his ageless" experience and in a sense to create form out of the inchoate.

Hence the archetypes are positive powers and patterns or generative forms"and functions with which mankind is endowed by reason of the survival of the most, creatively fit individual and species. Even as instincts, archetypes are guides to survival. For this reason, the study of archetypes in literature should not be considered a mere academic preoccupation but be viewed as a vital part of man's education to the changes of survival.

Is The Artist a Neurotic?

In contrasting the psychological and visionary mode of artistic creation, Jung made clear his opposition to Freud's psychoanalytical interpolation of the poet's psyche according to artist's traumata, neuroses, and possibly psychoses. In my own view, Freud's choice of Leonardo da Vinci to illustrate the efficacy of his psychoanalytical method could not have been a worse choice for two reasons: 1.) Freud demonstrated how tenuous and far-fetched his reasoning could go on the basis of the flimsiest evidence. Certainly no bona fide scientist would accept Freud's evidence of Da Vinci's homosexuality as a proof of anything. 2.) Da Vinci's whole inventive and experimental approach to a wide variety of fields of knowledge and art transcends any causal explanation of his imaginative mind or works. Da Vinci exemplifies the archetypal creative mind, which largely frees itself from the limitations of one's historical and sociological influences and even from one's own psychic past. In transforming the known and unknown to the new, the creative mind transcends the "tawefcasuafitv".

Therefore, what Jung shows is that art is not repression due to some complex, but is release, and this release is not merely Freudian subordination, transforming the instinctual into the socially acceptable. On the part of the artist, this release helps him to surpass the past and integrate his new self, which seeks to express the stages of the growing personality.

As shown elsewhere, -Dr Ernest Jones committed a similar error to Freud (in the da Vinci essay) by selecting to study Shakespeare's complexes via the tragedy Hamlet. Since Jones was Freud's disciple, one is[^]empted to say, "Like father, like son." Fortunately, as with Jung versus Freud or with Aristotle versus Plato, some spiritual sons enrich the knowledge of the world by surpassing the limitations of the spiritual father. These instances are further proof that a causal interpretation of human events in life or literature is fruitless.

The "Case History" Versus Literature

Personages in literature seldom exhibit any neurotic or psychotic traits, and therefore, they rarely represent "case histories" in the psychoanalytical sense of that expression. To be sure, 20th century authors have made use of Freudian theory to write vivid works. Sherwood Anderson, Eugene O'Neill, William Faulkner, and D.H. Lawrence are examples of artists who have consciously explored Freudian themes. On the other hand, it can be argued that O'Neill,

Faulkner, and Lawrence actually delved into archetypal depths of psyche as well as into Freudian neuroses and that the archetypal dimension is what actually makes their fictional works effective and unforgettable.

The fact that personages seldom manifest neurotic or psychotic traits should prompt the conscientious critic to exercise precaution when examining a literary work as an amateur psychologist or psychoanalyst. In other words, Occidental literature hardly offers statistical evidence that literary works largely portray "case histories" of mental patients or that authors are usually neurotics or psychotics working out their mental aberrations through fictions. (Ken Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* may be an exception in that it does sketch a phase of such "case histories"). However, unlike the case history which depicts how a patient succumbs to his particular mental illness, the overwhelming majority of literary works shows the hero struggling for archetypal identity or "normalcy". That is, in literature the hero strives either to be reinstated or to reinstate "normal" familial, social, and ethnic relations with others. In this effort, the hero represents the characteristic ability of human kind to confront problems creatively. This is the archetypal meaning of problem-solving. Throughout the ages, existential circumstances and events have tested, strengthened and developed this archetypal gift in man.

If it is wise for critics to exercise caution in psychoanalyzing an artist or a literary work, it may also be wise to think twice before applying scientific determinism (inherent in Freud's theory) to literature. Let us take the extreme case of 19th century naturalistic fiction in England (T. Hardy) and in France (Goncourt brothers, de Maupassant, and Zola). To be sure, as every literature student knows, literary naturalism showed man as a victim of heredity, environment and natural selection so that interpreting such works by the avowed theory of naturalistic authors seems a perfectly logical direction to take. After all, bad genes and an unwholesome milieu can largely account for individual tragedy, and yet because these fictional figures also fit into the larger patterns of (Darwinian) nature where physiological influences and existential conditions must be overcome if the race is to survive, it would seem that archetypal forms and patterns emerge out of the struggle to teach us grim lessons about life. Indeed, in this respect naturalistic fiction seems to serve much the same purpose as ancient myths and folktales, warning mankind against the overt and covert evils in existence. Wherever, man is confronted with dangers so that his survival necessitates self-realization through bravery and creative deeds, there we have in actuality

archetypal situations and themes. Seen in this light, scientific determinism, whether as part of psychoanalysis or of literary naturalism, is simply an inadequate or incomplete means of analyzing man's archetypal capacity for survival.

Causality versus Synchronicity.

The fundamental disagreement between Jung and Freud reflects the disenchantment of 20th century scientific thought with 19th century determinism and its all-encompassing explanation of natural phenomena via the concept of causality. This mechanistic concept asserts that every effect has a cause, whether direct or indirect. Having its source in the physical sciences and Newtonian physics at that, the concept could be effectively used to explain the law governing motion, matter and energy as distinct from those governing chemistry or living matter. When behavioral scientists unconvincingly attempted to explain human choice as the result of inherited or environmental factors, the philosophy of determinism and the concept of causality discovered the limits of its applicability. In sum, to 20th century scientists, the analogy of causality drawn from the physical sciences simply proved itself an overextended simile which does not work when trying to account for matters of biology or of human thought and deed.

It is in this context that we can better understand Jung's own stand. In his "Foreword" to the Chinese literary work *I Ching* or *Book of Changes*,⁴ Jung maintains, "The axioms of causality are being shaken to their foundations: we know now that what we term natural laws are merely "statistical truths and thus must necessarily allow for exceptions." Since causality is not an absolute but only "... a wording hypothesis of how events evolve one out of another...", Jung offers the term Synchronicity which takes "... the coincidence of events in space and time as meaning something more than mere chance, namely, a peculiar interdependence of objective events among themselves as well as, Vi: h the subjective (psychic) states of the observer..."⁴⁸ Thus in agreement with the millennia old mind represented in *I Ching*, Jung considers coincidence to prevail over human events, in other words, the conditions and circumstances of an archetypal situation are not caused, and this state of affairs challenges man's ability to interpret correctly and acutely what his situation is, to accept it or resolve it.

There may be an even more fundamental reason for the difference in viewpoint between Jung and Freud than the evolution of scientific thought between 19th century determinism and 20th century causality.

The differences between the psychanalysts seem to bear some similarity to the distinctions between two cultural currents in western civilization. In an essay entitled "Hebraism and Hellenism" Matthew Arnold perceptively described these historical influences.⁴⁹ Both Hebraism and Hellenism arose out of wants in human nature, and together they represent a law of human development. Indeed, both aim at man's salvation and perfection. On the one hand, Old Testament Hebraism stressed man's needs to obey the will of God so that strictness of conscience became the uppermost virtue of the Hebraic mind. Consciousness of sin and abhorring and fleeing it was the Hebrew's lifetime duty, thus self-conquest was the main striving of the Hebraic personality. On the other hand, ancient Greek Hellenism strove to see things as they really are, yet enjoyed an unimpeded play of thought. Sweetness and light may be said to be the attitude they sought to develop by seeing things in all their beauty. Hence Hellenism is most strikingly characterised by Spontaneity of consciousness.⁵⁰

To a certain extent Freud truly represented the ancient Hebraic mind in his emphasis on neuroses, psychoses, and complexes whereas Jung more clearly adhered to the outlook that man's myths, religions, and folklore reflected man's natural spontaneity of consciousness. In a very broad sense, the fearful, obedient, and awed attitude of archaic Hebraism versus the hopeful, disobedient, self-confident and creative attitude of Greek antiquity both seem to reflect archetypal tendencies in western man, and as such, these archetypes present a more convincing argument in favor of Jung's philosophy than it does of Freud's because Jung takes into account both the dark and the lighted side of man's collective unconscious and man's ethnic consciousness. Most of all, the Hellenic spontaneity of consciousness represents an argument against the causal interpretation of psyche and offers additional evidence that Jung's concept of synchronicity is a truer explanation of psychic phenomena and existential events.

Matthew Arnold's interpretation of Hebraic and Hellenic influence on the development of the western mind finds a corollary in Friedrich Nietzsche's version of the psychic forces which shaped Occidental culture. In his *Birth of Tragedy* (1872), Nietzsche describes the Apollonian and Dionysian impulses inherited from ancient Greece. As absolute, nonrational powers, they work through a poet but transcend his personal life or feelings.

To the ancient Greeks, Apollo was the god of medicine, the arts, light and prophecy. For Nietzsche, Apollo symbolizes the poet's intuition of form which enables the artist to create a symmetric, beautiful, and understandable world. By contrast, Dionysus characterizes the poet's musical sense, which indicates his awareness of the irrationality, pain, and suffering in existence. Dionysus' tale assured his worshippers that death would be followed by resurrection. This faith was part of the Eleusinian mysteries, and out of this form of worship Greek drama is born.

Now it is obvious that faith in resurrection after death „ rejects the causal interpretation of existence and asserts that the teleological purpose of the universe ultimately transcends the natural law of earth. Moreover, it is self-evident that the Christian belief in a life after death also denies causality as an adequate explanation of human destiny. Implicit in Christianity is a sense of life's synchronicity; that is, any given moment in life may challenge us to decide our future in eternity. Although no modern Christian would deny the influence of the subconscious and of society on human decision, the decision is still ours to make. Whatever the coincidence of circumstances; we often are inspired to surpass the impasse of what seems a hopeless situation.

For Nietzsche, Aeschylus' tragedy best illustrated the interaction of Apollonian and Dionysian forces. Although Socrates' irony and skepticism taught us to separate reality from appearance, and although modern rationalism taught men to speak of the "objective" and "subjective" sides of their nature, Nietzsche regarded the Apollonian and Dionysian impulses as perennial archetypal forces able at any time to recreate great tragedy and to make man whole and great once more.

Thomas Mann supported the view that music is a materialization of ageless Dionysian power in his literary works *Tristan*, *Death in Venice*, and *Doktor Faustus*. Furthermore, Mann's consciousness of the conflict and interaction of the Apollonian and Dionysian is clearly manifest in *The Magic Mountain* where the spiritual dual between Settembrini and Naphta represents the intellectual struggle of western culture to find, in Jungian terms, a synthesis which would dialectically resolve the archetypal opposition. More important, Mann makes clear that the Apollonian-Dionysian dialectic has no predictable outcome. Even though causality may influence human affairs, writers as Matthew Arnold, F. Nietzsche, and T. Mann point to a synchronicity of dialectical powers

within and without man as being equal to or a greater influence in human affairs.

Jung's concept of synchronicity, therefore, shows striking affinities to major world views: the Taoist explanation of change in human life, - ancient Greek spontaneity of consciousness influencing man's development along with Hebraic strictness of conscience, the interaction of man's Apollonian and Dionysian forces, and the Christian credo of the soul's survival after biological death. Taken altogether these world views offer considerable cultural evidence that scientific determinism and the concept of causality are inadequate to explain the synchronicity of men and events.

Further weight to Jung's central argument is the advent of 19th and 20th century existentialism. Developed through thinkers as Kierkegaard, Jaspers, and Heidegger and through fiction writers as Unomuno, Dostoyesky, and Kafka, existentialism emerged in the 1940's as the doctrine that man is what he makes himself. Regarding life as dynamic and in a constant state of flux, the literary existentialists Jean Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir refused to consider man as predestined by society, fate, or God. Instead of the individual being determined by forces outside himself, he possessed "the free will to decide his destiny and has, therefore, the responsibility to Choose an authentic way to live. The existentialists believe in taking positive action, called engagement, even though they at the same time of irrationality in human affairs. The fact that western man has come to think of himself as a rational being is the reason that, faced the realization that existence is actually absurd, man feels in our age a keen sub-conscious and conscious anxiety.

At the centre of atheistic existentialism is the conviction that contingency hovers over human life. In other words, events depend on something that may not occur; events are unforeseeable because accident and uncertainty are an important part of human occurrences. The surest thing that can be said is that circumstances may make an event probable, but not certain. In short, the sure predicability associated with casual explanations of the physical world is simply impossible for human life in general. Obviously, this acausal concept of contingency bears marked similarities to Jung's definition of synchronicity.

To further examine the implications of Jung's concept in a very general way, let us consider the well-known figures of Don Juan, Romeo and Juliet, and Tristan and Isolde to see whether their destinies may be

regarded as caused or whether synchronicity provides a better context by which to interpret their stories.

In Jung's Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious, he delineates the psychological aspects of the mother complex in the son. A boy may have quite opposite reactions to the fixation. He may become impotent, turn homosexual, or develop characteristics of Don Juanism, which means that he unconsciously seeks his mother in every woman he meets.⁵¹ However, beyond these psychopathological limitations, a man with a mother complex may develop "...a finely differentiated Eros instead of ...homosexuality" in which case he may become a supreme gifted teacher due to "...his almost feminine insight and tact." In addition, he may have a sense of history and keen receptivity to spiritual experiences.⁵² Or in opposition to the negative side of Don Juanism, he may be bold and resolute, "... striving after the highest goals," willing to make sacrifices for the sake of justice, persevering, tough, and endowed with "...a curiosity that does not shrink from the riddles of the universe..."⁵³

From these possible destinies springing out of a single synchronic situation, we can draw a number of conclusions. Probably it will always remain a mystery as to why a son follows one direction rather than another. However, it should be quite clear that the mother did not cause the boy to become Don Juan rather than a homosexual or vice versa. In fact, if the boy had the intelligence or receptivity to tap a deeper archetype, he might become a supremely gifted teacher or a decoder of the riddles of the universe. In this way he would creatively overcome his complexes. To be sure, his temperament influenced him to take one direction and not another. Furthermore, multiple circumstances of his milieu were present to condition his choice. Yet ultimately Don Juan did choose the more virile rather than the more passive way to love and live. As teacher or researcher, the son would pursue a destiny freed from the debilitating influences of his "complex" and of the past. Thus synchronicity set the stage, causes were at work, but the son decided; and such decision meant that he made a creative choice in so far as his subsequent actions consciously avoided humiliation and self-destruction and sought out an archetypal destiny with intellectual rewards and spiritual fulfillment.

Literary examples also illustrate the difference between causality and synchronicity. In Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet the lovers are kept apart by the fact that their families are enemies. The social and ethnic

circumstances should, therefore, have caused the youngsters to fear or even to hate each other out of loyalty to their families and out of respect to the blood spilt on each side. However, the fact remains that love, the most powerful and noblest form of all human emotions, simply overwhelmed all the "causes" against it. The story of Romeo and Juliet, the "Star-crossed lovers" dramatizes how circumstances and the influence of sheer chance (the plague which separated them for a while) "fated" them to take their lives, for to them life without love Was not life at all. Yet the example of their love finally freed the families from the ancient enmity, proving the efficacy of spiritual flowers in human life and the capacity of men, faced with tragedy, to free themselves from the past by sensitive and sensible decision.

to, Romeo and Juliet love is recognized as a higher self in human nature, in contrast to hatred "caused" by our bestial or selfish instincts. The recognition of a higher and nobler self, awakened by love, can only be associated with man's intuition of teleological purpose. For love, the ultimate archetypal wisdom, urges One to grow beyond one's lustful, self-centred being, to recognize the humanity and beauty in another person; love moves us to found a loving family, to be worthy fathers and mothers, to be faithful in all one does for the sake of our offspring and the future. In a Jungian context, love leads us to emulate God the Father and Sophia the Mother. Love awakens us to a higher self.

The story of Tristan and Isolde is another literary example. As the emissary of his uncle to his uncle's betrothed, Isolde, Tristan is supposed to respect the relationship. Both the young persons owe a kind of loyalty to the uncle, for a marriage had been agreed to, Respect for one's solemn word, for society, law, order, and decency should have been sufficient "cause" to prevent any breach of promise, and yet the promise was broken. Whether the young couple, yielded to lust, due to their drinking a magic potion as some medieval versions of the story imply, or whether they simply yielded to their mutual youthful attraction, the same archetypal event took place between them. They experienced an irresistible passion for one another.

Because the tale of Tristan and Isolde may be regarded as nothing more than a story of brute sexuality in chivalric disguise, an astute reader would point out that the tale exemplifies Freud's theory of the power of the libido. Of course, there is no small truth to that allegation. Yet why in virtually all love stories is the world nearly always on the side of the lovers against convention, taboos, social restrictions, family obedience,

and the like? The reason is that love is the universally recognized source of human happiness. It not Only reassures the human race of survival. True love required, as portrayed in the medieval tale of Aucassin and ISlcolette and numberless other stories down through the ages, is the revelation to free choice, two persons choosing one another for all life against all odds, for better or for worse. Love leading to a marriage of sincere minds and true hearts seems touched by a holy power. As creative choice beyond brute pleasures, such love cannot be considered a neurotic or psychotic complex waiting to destroy the individual. Rather, out of ageless human experience, the feeling of love strongly urges the individual to freely decide to pursue a nobler life. For this reason genuine love represents the highest archetypal destiny open to common mortals. Hence we see there are good reasons of critics and writers to be drawn to Jung's theory of psyche. A well known example is Thomas Mann, in his speech "Freud and the Future", delivered on the occasion of the celebration of Mann's 80th birthday in 1936, the novelist highlights his artistic transition from a basically Freudian view of human character of an appreciation of the mythical identities manifest in literature and scripture.

In retracing the evolution of his growing awareness of the archetypal in human existence, T. Mann refers to Arthur Schopenhauer's essay, "Transcendent Speculations on Apparent Design in the Fate of the Individual". The great idea contained in the essay was that our own will leads us inexorably to our own fate and that "...we are actually ourselves bringing about what seems to be happening to us".⁵⁴ Then when referring to the psychology of the order school of biography, Mann points out how human beings tend unconsciously to live a certain kind of life, the destiny of rank, class or calling. It is at this point in life that psychological self-awareness changes to an identification with the mythical.⁵⁵ i.e., inJungian terms, we acquire a consciousness of the archetypal in life. Myth, says Mann is "the timeless schema which provides insight into the higher truths and into the authentic and eternal in life". Understood in this light, life is a sacred repetition of some higher destiny.⁶⁶

Along with Ortegay Gasset, Thomas Mann believes man today searches the past for a pattern to live by just as ancient man sought significance through reliving a myth in flesh and blood.⁵⁷⁻⁵³ Mann illustrates his point by describing how Cleopatra fulfilled her Aphrodite destiny into death. Jesus too followed his "...loftly messianic sense of self."

Mann also recounts how ancient feasts often involve a dramatic performance retelling the story of a god, such as the life and suffering of Osiris. Thus the feasts took place ceremoniously according to a mythical prototype. Similarly, the mystery play of the Christian Middle Ages with scenes of heaven, earth, and the torments of hell also characterizes the mythical dimension as does Goeth's *Faust*.⁵⁹ Archetypal in subject, theme, and form, such literature exemplifies Jung's interpretation of human experience.

Mann also speaks of the mythical identification one has with one's father, one's imitation of him, one's developing through such emulation a higher and more evolved character of one's own.⁶⁰ Indeed, this shaping of the human being, this *Bildung*, is engendered through admiration and love, through the child's identification with the father image because of the profound affinities which exist between them. Ultimately, such emulation becomes *imitatio dei*.⁶¹ Thus in myth lies concealed the seeds of our figure as individual and as humanity.⁶²

Mann's observations make us look back over the history of the humanities, and that glance makes us realize that the thousands of geniuses who have made contributions to art, literature, and philosophy can hardly have been preponderantly neurotic or psychotic in Freud's sense of those terms. The mentally ill rarely produce coherent beauty. To corroborate their thesis, the Freudians might point to a handful of artists as Novalis, Baudelaire, and a few others who took narcotics, were confined to mental institution, or committed suicide. However, the hundreds of geniuses who did not yield to such self-destructive tendencies point, rather, to a healthy and virile force in the human personality which we can call the archetype of creativity. It is thanks to this archetype that man has created and developed societies, cultures, and civilizations.

Indeed, creativity seems to be the intuitive and intellectual manifestation of our embryonic and phylogenic heritage and history, and the mandala of the arts focus our archetypal search for wholeness and meaning, wherever meaning means the birth of higher stage of awareness or understanding. Implicit in this process is the racial and individual self-transformation called forth by the archetypes from the collective unconscious, modified by ethnic consciousness, which help decide which archetype's "to actualize."

In general, world literature dramatizes those quasi-universal existential situations that human beings can do something about. Art and literature rarely depict situations where the possibility of human decision does not exist. Although life does face man with cataclysmic events and biological death, literature usually shows man at grips with his destiny, not as an unresourceful victim.

If we bear in mind that the races alive today are the survivors of the past, that indicates those races developed the capacity to survive the archetypal situations which threatened to extinguish the individual and the race. Not only did the physically fittest survive but also those with the greatest cunning, shrewdness, and creativity. In order to survive, men needed keen perception, some form of communication, inventiveness, and an effective means of accomplishing things to supplant the magic that did not work. That means that a man or race survived by learning, obeying, and improving the racial consciousness into which he was born. Once we grasp the fact that man is not blindly impelled by the influences of the past, we come to a new understanding of human destiny. To be sure, life is full of confrontations demanding decision and action, but it is the unique synchronicity of each crisis which alerts and actuates an archetype to respond to the total situation, and each individual reacts differently according to time and place. Because learning promises survival, human intelligence represents man's archetypal capacity to learn and to think. This creative capacity is the key to the acausal interpretation of experience in life and literature. We must learn how man learns; we must understand how man has learned to think. More than life itself, literature provides us with archetypal examples of how man has learned to survive by thinking creatively.

Literature shows this capacity for creativity in action, for literature largely dramatizes those situations in which the hero or victim personates the potentials we all carry within us. Hence when literature draws on man's collective unconscious and his ethnic consciousness, it portrays the pathos and ethos of anthropos himself confronted with problems which call forth his inherited creativity.

The reason-for-being of literature seems to be to exercise this archetype

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. C.G. Jung, "Sigmund Freud and His Historical Setting", *The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966), p.33
2. *Ibid.*, p.34
3. *Ibid.*, p.35
4. *Ibid.*, p.36
5. *Ibid.*, p.38
6. *Ibid.*, p.39
7. *Ibid.*, p.40
8. C.G. Jung, "In Memory of Sigmund Freud", *The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature*, p.41
9. *Ibid.*, p.44
10. In Leonardo da Vinci, *A Study in Psychosexuality* Sigmund Freud states, "As artistic talent and productive ability are connected with sublimation, we have to admit that the nature of artistic attainment is psychoanalytically inaccessible to us." p. 119. This statement should stimulate honest and careful thought on the part of literary critics pursuing Freudian interpretations of literature.
11. C.G. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, (N.Y.: A Harvest Book, Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1933), p.6
12. *Ibid.*, p.21
13. *Ibid.*, p.56 K
14. *Ibid.*, p.116"
15. *Ibid.*, p.118
16. *Ibid.*, p.57
17. *Ibid.*, p.153
18. In ANOTHER essay, I intend to go into the obsessive mode of interpretation and the inadequacies of Freud's essay Leonardo da Vinci. Let it suffice here to say that Freud's reasoning is as tenuous and substantial as smoke. Virtually every scrap of evidence used by Freud and every assertion imputing incipient homosexuality to da Vinci adds up to sheer nonsense. My aim would not be to prove da Vinci's "innocence" of homosexuality. Freud's essay is simply an example of preposterous speculation. I agree with Jung's criticism of Freud's lack of skill in conceiving or reasoning in a sound, philosophical way.
19. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, p. 168
20. *Ibid.*, p.170
21. *Ibid.*, p.155

22. Ibid., p.157
23. Ibid., p.61
24. Ibid., p.67
25. Ibid., p.120
26. C.G. Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, (transl. R.F.C. Hull), Bollingen Series XX, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1959), p.82.
27. Jolande Jacobi, *Complex/Archetype/Symbol in the Psychology of C.G. Jung*, Bollingen Series, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press), pp.21-28"
28. Ibid., p.31
29. Ibid., p.34
30. Ibid., p.36
31. Ibid., pp.37-38
32. Ibid., p.50
33. Ibid., pp.74
34. Ibid., pp.89-91
35. Ibid., p.100
36. Ibid., p. 105
37. Ibid., p.119
38. Ibid., p.123
39. C.G. Jung & Ch. Kerényi, *Introduction a L'essence de la Mythologie, L'enfant divin, la Jeune fille divine*, (Paris: Petite Bibliotheque Payot, no publication date given but the Preface to the new edition gives 1951 as the date it was written). French transl. from German, H. E. Del Medico, p. 112
40. Ibid. p. 121
41. Ibid., p. 118
42. Ibid., p. 120
43. Ibid., pp.122-123
44. Ibid., p.123
45. C.G. Jung's "Foreword" to Richard Wilhelm's translation of *I Ching or the Book of Changes*, English translation by C.F. Baynes, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1950). The *I Ching* is a book of hexagrams with scholarly commentary and interpretation. Based on a vision of existence as manifesting continuous transformation, the Taoist philosophy supporting the *I Ching* regards the female and male principle, or the powers of dark and light (yin and yang), as effecting the continuous change man experiences in the life around him.
46. Ibid., p.xxii
47. Ibid., p.xxiv

48. Matthew Arnold, "Hebraism and Hellenism", *Culture and Anarchy* (1869).
49. cf. Erich Auerbach's chapter one, "Odysseus' Scar", *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1957).
50. C.G. Jung, *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*, p.28
51. *Ibid.*, p.87
52. *Ibid.*
53. Thomas Mann, "Freud and the Future" in *Criticism: the Major Texts*, ed. J.W. Bate, (N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace, Jovariovich, Inc., 1970), p.668
54. *Ibid.*, p.670
55. *Ibid.*, p.671
56. To Mann, "Imitation" of the past meant mythical identification. This revaluation of the term "imitation" may be of considerable consequence beyond Aristotle's *Poetics*. It may require the reinterpretation of the whole history of mimetic literary theory. For instance, not only is Eric Auerbach's first chapter in *Mimesis* clearly archetypal in implication; a number of subsequent chapters, reflecting various periods of European literature, seem to lend themselves as well to revaluation as archetypal mimesis.
57. *Ibid.*, pp.671-72
58. *Ibid.*, p.672
59. *Ibid.*, pp.672-73
60. *Ibid.*, p.673
61. To be sure, Thomas Mann's *Joseph and his Brothers* (1933-43) also manifests archetypal themes with its recounting of the Old Testament story. Implicit in it is the fact that, by recognizing an archetype as God, one's psychic preoccupation with it can become a reality and lead one to live a life according to the image.