Document généré le 24 avr. 2024 09:52

Laval théologique et philosophique

Jung's Collective Unconscious

Antonio Moreno

Volume 23, numéro 2, 1967

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1020110ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/1020110ar

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

Laval théologique et philosophique, Université Laval

ISSN

0023-9054 (imprimé)
1703-8804 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer cet article

Moreno, A. (1967). Jung's Collective Unconscious. *Laval théologique et philosophique*, *23*(2), 175–196. https://doi.org/10.7202/1020110ar

Tous droits réservés © Laval théologique et philosophique, Université Laval, 1967

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

https://www.erudit.org/fr/

Jung's Collective Unconscious

In psychology, the present century has been characterised by important research on the layers of the human psyche we call the unconscious, on the methods of dealing with it, and on the relations between mental health and the contents belonging to it. Nobody denies the existence of consciousness, because everybody possesses certitude of his own. But in the literature concerning the subject, consciousness is a vague concept, which makes it difficult to know its exact meaning and, in consequence, that of unconsciousness. Aristotle seems to relate consciousness to knowledge, for it is the awareness immanent in cognitive acts which constitutes consciousness. And not exclusively the awareness corresponding to cognitive acts ordained to the knowledge of external objects, but of any human act related to knowledge, of whose activity we are aware. There is not only consciousness of thinking, but there is also consciousness of feeling, of anxiety, of suffering, as well as other vital phenomena. Consciousness is a special kind of reflective knowledge, which is obtained by the mere perception of the acts corresponding to the activity of human functions. The acts may be of different kind, but the awareness is a common cognitive perception underlying all of them. Not every vital act is conscious, as for instance sleep ; but the vital conscious acts are such on account of the special cognitive awareness which grasp their existence by means of their activity. For example, we are conscious of a suffering, because we perceive the existence of human vital acts connected with it.

Jung identifies consciousness with the relation between the ego, which he defines as "a complex of representations which constitutes the centrum of the field of consciousness," and the psychic contents ; an inward perception of the objective life process.[1] Thus, he points out the intimate connection of consciousness with the process of life manifested by immanent vital acts. Their perception constitutes the essential feature of consciousness.

Unconscious phenomena, however, are so little related to the ego, that most people do not hesitate to deny their existence outright. There is, nevertheless, Jung says, abundant evidence showing that consciousness is far from covering the psyche in its totality. Many things occur semi-consciously, and a great many entirely unconsciously. The unconscious, thus, embraces the totality of all psychic phenomena

1. C. G. JUNG, *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung.* Pantheon Books, (New York). (C.W. 5), p.540 ; (C.W. 8), p.137. The collected works of Jung shall be quoted as (C.W.).

that lack the quality of consciousness.[1] Hence we may say that the unconscious embraces the totality of the life processes existing in man but not perceived by knowledge, because knowledge is the necessary prerequisite for consciousness.

Jung and Freud hold different conceptions on the unconscious ; differences that led them to a final break. For Jung, there exists an unconscious composed of two parts which should be distinguished from one another : (i) One of them contains the forgotten material, and the subliminal impressions and perceptions which have little energy to reach consciousness. In addition, it also contains all psychic contents incompatible with the conscious attitude ; this comprises a whole group of elements which appear morally and intellectually inadmissible, and are repressed on account of their incompatibility. This is a more or less superficial layer of the unconscious and it closely corresponds to Freud's conception of it.[2] (ii) There is yet a deeper layer called impersonal, universal, collective, common to all men, even though it expresses itself through personal consciousness. Its contents are not personal, they do not belong to any individual alone, but to the whole of mankind. There are modes of behavior that are the same everywhere, identical in all men. The collective unconscious is a common psyche of super-natural kind, whose contents are not acquired during the individual's life time.[3]

For Jung, consciousness and unconsciousness represent two stages in the process of man's evolution. Man evolves from animal, and consciousness from unconsciousness. Thus, the unconscious is, historically speaking, before consciousness and the mother of it : "Consciousness grows out of the unconscious psyche, which is older than it, and which goes on functioning together with it, and even in spite of it."[4] The collective unconscious is made up of two related although different contents, namely, the archetypes and the instincts.

I. ARCHETYPES

The term archetype, Jung says, occurs as early as Philo-Judaeus with reference to the *Imago Dei* (God image) in man. But actually Jung borrowed, not the term, but the idea of archetypes from Saint Augustine who speaks of 'principle ideas,' which are themselves not formed, but contained in the divine understanding. These principles ideas can be translated literally as archetypes.[5]

---

1. (C.W. 8), p.133. (C.W. 9, i), p.275, p.76.

2. (C.W. 8), pp.310-311. (C.W. 9, i), pp.3-4. (C.W. 17), p.116.

3. (C.W. 9, i), pp.3-4. (C.W. 8), pp.310-311. (C.W. 9, i), pp.186-187.

4. (C.W. 9, i), p.186.

5. (C.W. 9, i), p.4. (C.W. 8), p.136. Mircea Eliade, in *Cosmos and History*, (New York, 1959), writes : "In using the term archetype, I neglected to specify that I was not

Jung uses several expressions to define archetypes. Archetypes are universal dispositions of the mind, a kind of readiness to produce over and over again the same and similar mythical ideas ; the treasure of the collective psyche, of collective ideas, of creativity ; ways of thinking, of feeling, and imagining, found everywhere and at all times, independent of tradition ; typical forms of behavior which once they become conscious present themselves as ideas and images ; the forms, or river beds, along which the current of psychic life has always flowed.[1]

Although these expressions are different, the idea underlying them is always the same. The archetypes are typical and universal forms of apprehension, which appear as primordial images charged with great meaning and power, and impart a decisive influence upon our collective pattern of behavior.

a) Existence of archetypes

Jung has to prove the existence of contents in the unconscious that fulfill the above mentioned definitions. Hence he has to show that certain psychic forms of apprehension have always been found in man throughout the ages. This can only be done if : (i) one observes the same thing in different individuals ; (ii) then, others observers must confirm that they have made the same observations ; (iii) finally, and this is important to understand Jung's method, one has to establish that the same or similar phenomena can be shown to occur in the folklore of other peoples and races and on the texts that have come down to us from earlier centuries. His method is, therefore, historical. The collective pattern of behavior proper to the archetypes presupposes a certain uniformity through the ages, which can only be demonstrated using historical sources, and the subsequent comparison of these sources with observations on the pattern of behavior of contemporary man. In other words, the old and the new pattern of apprehension and behavior have to show similar characteristics.

How is it possible to prove this assumption ? Since the collective unconscious contains material of a supra-personal and archaic nature, it is difficult to prove its existence by observing the behavior of normal individuals, who will chiefly manifest the traits of their irreducible

---

referring to the archetype described by Professor Jung. This was a regrettable error ... I need scarcely say that, for Professor Jung, the archetypes are structures of the collective unconscious. But in my book I nowhere touch upon the problems of depth psychology nor do I use the concept of the collective unconscious. As I have said, I use the term archetype, just as Eugenio d'Ors does, as a synonym for 'exemplary model' or 'paradigm'." pp.viii-ix.

1. (C.W. 11), p.517, p.519. (C.W. 16), p.35, p.91. (C.W. 5), p.228. (C.W. 8), p.227. Perhaps the most complete definition is the following : "In this deeper stratum we also find the a priori, inborn forms of intuition, namely the archetypes of perception and apprehension, which are the necessary determinants of all psychic processes." (C.W. 8), p.133.

individuality. Jung, however, observes modern man, and finds collective forms and ideas in the following phenomena.

1) Certain dreams ; dreams are spontaneous products of the unconscious not distorted by conscious purposes. In order to show that dreams manifest a collective unconscious, one must look for motifs that could not possibly be known to the dreamer and, yet, coincide with motifs known from historical sources. These dreams are valueless, Jung says, unless one can adduce convincing mythological parallels and the same functional meaning. For instance, he found in the dreams of pure negroes living in the South of United States motifs from Greek mythology ; motifs absolutely unknown to the dreamers.[1] Where do they come from ?

In *Two Essays on analytic psychology* he relates the case of a woman patient with a mild hysterical neurosis, caused by a father complex. In the course of the treatment, the patient transferred the father image to the doctor, but she was unable to cut off the transference. Then she had the following dream : "her father (who in reality was of small stature) was standing with her on a hill that was covered with wheat-fields. She was quite tiny beside him, and he seems to her like a giant. He lifted her up from the ground and held her in his arms, like a little child. The wind swept the wheat fields, and as the wheat swayed in the wind, he rocked her in his arms."[2]

Jung interprets the dream as a transpersonal dream, as a vision of God. The dreamer swells the human person of the doctor to supra-human proportions making him a gigantic primordial father who is, at the same time, the wind (a symbol of God), and in whose protecting arms the dreamer rests like an infant. The God-image of the dreamer, who was agnostic, corresponds to an archaic conception of God, but not a conscious idea of Him. Hence the unconscious seems to contain supra-personal acquisitions and belongings. This material, which seems to appear free from the control of our will has to be impersonal, collective.[3]

2) The second way of testing the existence of archetypes is by a technique known as "active imagination," namely, a sequence of fantasies produced by deliberate concentration. There exists a correlation between dreams and fantasies ; when the fantasies are made conscious the dreams became weaker and less frequent, which proves that they stem from the same source, the unconscious. The resultant sequence of fantasies relieves the unconscious and produces material rich in archetypal images.

---

1. (C.W. 9, i), pp.48-53. (C.W. 8), p.111.
2. (C.W. 7), p.129.
3. (C.W. 7), pp.125-135. (C.W. 17), pp.116-117.

3) Archetypal images are also found in the dreams of early childhood, from the third to the fifth year, and chiefly in the case of mental derangement, especially schizophrenics. Insane people frequently produce combination of ideas and symbols that could never be accounted for by experiences in their individual lives, but only by recourse to the history of the human mind, by recourse to mythological thinking. The material of neurosis, Jung insists, is always understandable in human terms, and is related to the personal life of the neurotic ; neurosis presupposes individual fantasies, but not a loss of reality. The material appearing in psychosis, however, is not understandable in personal terms ; schizophrenia implies a loss of reality, and a reactivation of archaic fantasies and thinking, that cannot be derived from the conscious mind. We cannot suppose, however, Jung says, that certain minds (psychotics) contain elements that do not exist at all in other minds. Mental disorders manifest material of a hidden but nonetheless general condition of man.[1]

In all these phenomena Jung finds a parallelism and similarity between the manifestation of contemporary and primitive man. The motifs and forms of the unconscious of the former, though spontaneously clothed with new dresses, are similar to the motifs and forms of mythologies of the latter, proving thus the existence of a collective unconscious, and of permanent forms of apprehension and behavior through the ages that he calls archetypes.

Archetypes are crucial factors for the understanding of Jung's philosophical structure of personality. "The more I have studied Jung's works," says L. Stein, "the more I have come to see that the essence of his greatness lies in his concept of archetypes, with their contrasting and complementary meaning."[2] And Igor Caruso writes, "Jung deserves credit for having shown that the most powerfull formative forces of the soul manifest themselves in primitive archetypes. These are in no sense 'illusory,' but genuine functional capacities of the soul, which must be studied seriously."[3] It is therefore important to analyse Jung's arguments leading to the concept of the collective unconscious, as well as the semantics involved in his writings.

The deeper layer of the unconscious, Jung says, is supra-personal, collective, universal, because its content is not acquired during the individual's life time, and is identical in all men. It was not perhaps a happy idea to call these contents collective and universal, because

---

1. (C.W. 9, i), p.278. (C.W. 5), p.140. (C.W. 8), pp.310-311. (C.W. 9, i), p.285. Frank de Greave, s.j., an anthropologist who worked in Africa, mentioned to me the following fact : although the members of the tribe in which he worked were polytheists, those who were afflicted by schizophrenia were monotheists. A remarkable phenomenon.

2. L. Stein, in "Language and Archetypes," *Contact with Jung*, Ed. Michael Fordham (London, 1963), p.77.

3. Igor Caruso, *Existential Psychology* (New York, 1964), p.101.

all the 'specific' properties of man are collective and universal, insofar as they are partaken of by all the individuals composing the human race. These specific properties, and not their individuals marks which are as such accidental, are what make intellectual knowledge and science possible. As Bertrand Russell put it, "the essence of individuality which always eludes words and baffles description, but which, for that reason, is irrelevant to science."[1] Therefore, the existence of a supra-personal layer in the unconscious, not only presupposes the manifestation of identical properties in all individuals. It also presupposes the existence of primitive images, like gods, heroes, demons, dragons, monsters, spirits, etc., that usually appear in myths. "Such contents," Jung says, "are the 'mystical collective ideas' (*représentations collectives*) of the primitive described by Levy-Bruhl ... he shows that for the primitive, collective ideas also represent collective feelings. By virtue of this collective feeling-value, he also terms the *représentations collectives 'mystiques,'* since these representations are not merely intellectual, but also emotional."[2] Hence the value of Jung's discovery lies mainly in the appearance of archaic elements and primitive ideas. There seems to exist in man a natural tendency to produce again and again the same primordial images, the archetypes.

Naturally, all historical proofs are in general hypothetical, which is what is to be expected here. The existence of archetypes is not a conclusion derived from psychological data. As the majority of hypotheses concerning modern science, they are suggested by empirical observations, but not derived from them. Archetypes are — using the well known expression of Einstein 'free inventions' — free inventions of the mind of Jung, who later verified them in thousands of patients who passed through his hands. And yet, for a better understanding of this bold hypothesis it is timely to emphasize two facts : 1) The usual manifestation of the archetypes occurs when man is placed in special circumstances, like dreams, schizophrenia, and active imagination. All these manifestations, however, presuppose a common denominator, namely, the diminution of the state of consciousness, which is also the characteristic of primitive mentality. "Reduced intensity of consciousness and absence of concentration and attention, Janet's *abaissement du niveau mental,*" Jung says, "corresponds pretty exactly to the primitive state of consciousness in which, we suppose, myths were originally formed. It is therefore exceedingly probable that the mythological archetypes, too, made their appearance in much the same manner as the manifestations of archetypal structure among individuals today."[3] Hence both contemporary man in this special state and archaic man, share a common psychological attitude that

1. Bertrand RUSSELL, *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy* (London, 1960), p.61.
2. (C.W. 6), p.530.
3. (C.W. 9, i), pp.119-120, pp.155-156.

enhances the revelation of the unconscious, which appears in consciousness as primitive images.

The archetypes, however, are not peculiar symptoms of unusual or psychotic states. Psychotic states provide the occasion for their appearances, but they are not the causes of their existence. Primordial thinking, Jung always protests, is neither psychotic nor infantile thinking, but the normal manifestation of modern man under special conditions of consciousness.[1] Moreover, though the existence of archetypes is proved by recourse to unusual states of consciousness, Jung insists in the fact that, "the archetypes can arise spontaneously at any time, at any place, and without any outside influence."[2]

2) The archetypes reveal themselves as clothed in modern dress and they appear simultaneously with conscious material. In practice it is arduous, and even dangerous, to sort out the contents belonging to the archetypes from those belonging to the conscious mind, for they are intimately interwoven. We must remember that although consciousness and unconsciousness represent different psychological functions, they are, however, manifestations of a unique psyche. The same phenomenon is charateristic of mythical thinking : the paradigm, the sacred history, appears clothed in a variety of concrete forms, depending on the concrete historical circumstances in which they emerge.

b) Archaic man

To understand the nature of archetypes it is decisive to explore the psychology of primitive mentality, because man is still, especially in his unconscious, archaic. Hence it is natural if he shows in his behavior the trait of primitive thought ; "just as our bodies still retain vestiges of obsolate functions in many of our organs," Jung says, "so our minds, which have apparently outgrown these archaic impulses, still bear the mark of the evolutionary stages we have transversed, and re-echo the dim bygone in dreams and fantasies."[3]

This view is not new. Mircea Eliade blames Western philosophers for refusing to recognize as important the experience of primitive man. "Better yet," he says, "the cardinal problem of metaphysics could be

---

1. (C.W. 5), pp.28-29. (C.W. 8), p.122. (C.W. 9, i), p.279. In (C.W. 9, i), p.39 Jung says : "When therefore, the analyst penetrates the background of conscious phenomena, it discovers the same archetypal figures that activate the deliriums of psychotics. Finally, there is any amount of literature and historical evidence to prove that in the case of these archetypes we are dealing with normal types of fantasy that occur practically everywhere and not only with the monstrous products of insanity. The pathological element does not lie in the existence of these ideas, but in the dissociation of consciousness that can no longer control the unconscious."

2. (C.W. 9, i), p.79.

3. (C.W. 5), p.28.

renewed through a knowledge of archaic ontology."[1] According to Nietzsche, dreams carry us back to remote conditions of human culture,[2] and even Freud, who violently opposed the existence of Jung's collective unconscious, half admitted the archaic nature of dreams. Regarding myth, he says that it seems extremely probable that myths are distorted vestiges of the wish-phantasies of whole nations, the age-long dreams of young humanity.[3]

Jung regards the archaic trait of human nature as most significant. Children go through a phase of archaic thinking and feeling, and there exists a layer, the unconscious, which behaves in the same fashion as does the archaic psyche productive of myth. The unconscious brings to our present the unknown psychic life belonging to a remote past. It is the mind of our ancestors, their way of thinking, feeling, and experienced life, the world, God and man.

For our purpose, the outstanding property of archaic man is the property which Lévy-Bruhl terms *participation mystique*. For primitive mentality, the French anthropologist says, "subject and objects are simultaneously thought and felt as homogeneous, that is to say, just as if they would share the same essence, or the same ensemble of qualities ... The true unity is not the individual, but the group."[4] This peculiar psychological state, Jung says, presupposes a special connection of the subject with the object, to which it is bound by an immediate relation that he describes as a partial identity in mutual unconsciousness. When two persons have an unconscious relation to the same fact, they become in part identical, as often happens to children whenever they identify themselves with their parents. These matters are natural and happen even now, although in rather more civilized form.[5]

Projection explains the dynamic of this partial identification. Projection is an automatic process whereby a content unconscious to the subject transfers itself to an object, so that it seems to belong to that object. Every autonomous component of the unconscious is projected and personified upon external objects ; this is a principle in analytic psychology verified by experience. Hence unconscious projection is a most common human activity inasmuch as everybody possesses autonomous complexes. But projection is especially the characteristic feature of primitive man, because the state of his mind lacks differentiation. By way of projection, he identifies himself with nature and mankind, and in this sense, he loses his soul to share that of the cosmos and mankind.[6]

---

1. Mircea ELIADE, *op. cit.*, p.xii.
2. (C.W. 5), p, pp.22-23.
3. (C.W. 5), p.24.
4. LÉVY-BRUHL, *Bulletin de la Société française de Philosophie*, Vol.29, p.105.
5. (C.W. 10), pp.64-65. (C.W. 6), p.572. (C.W. 10), p.37, p.452.
6. (C.W. 10), p.67.

So much for Jung, but let us now inquire about the kind of identification corresponding to this psychological state. Victor White, in *God and the Unconscious*, after quoting the well known scholastic aphorism, *intelligibile in actu est intellectus in actu* goes on to say, "subject and objects are not ultimate *a prioris*, they are conscious data which presuppose a pre-conscious identity, a *participation mystique* in the deepest sense."[1] Why? Because according to Aristotle, actual knowledge is identical with its object, that is to say, the subject by knowing becomes the object known, in a mysterious way. "The property of a thing," Aquinas says, "is itself also encountered in another thing because insofar as the knower knows, the thing exists within him, in a certain way ... and as a consequence of that mode of perfection, it is possible for the perfection of the whole universe to exist in a solitary particular thing."[2]

It would be, however, illusory to believe that pure knowledge is capable of explaining completely the identification proper to primitives. Knowledge is required, and yet is not enough, because feelings and emotions play an essential role among them. Hence it is rather the appetite, the factor making mystical identification a reality : "Love," Aquinas says, "implies a certain connaturalness or complacency of the lover for the thing beloved ... Likeness, properly speaking, is the cause of love, for the very fact that men are alike having, as it were, one form, makes them to be, in a manner, one in that form. Hence the affection of one tends to the other, as being one with him ; and he wishes good to him as to himself."[3] Likeness, similitude, seem to underlie the mystic unity of primitives, because, as the unconscious of primitive, man lacks differentiation, it has to be everywhere similar, alike. Hence the unity of the collective unconscious, equally shared by everybody, produces by projection an unconscious complacency among the members of the tribe, on which follows love, and the unconscious unity of affections, which is the essential feature of mystical participation.

At the end of his life, Lévy-Bruhl abandoned his views, and regarded the pre-logic state of primitives as "an hypothesis inadequately founded ;" primitives share the logic of our own. He also denied the existence of any law of participation, "but although there is not law," he says, "it is a fact that the primitive is often possessed by the feeling of participation, of identity with nature and the supernatural, with which he enters in contact."[4]

---

1. Victor WHITE, *God and the Unconscious*, (New York, 1961), p.118.

2. ARISTOTLE, *De Anima*, 430 *a* 20. *Ibid.*, 430 *a* 14 : "Mind is by virtue of becoming all things." THOMAS AQUINAS, *De Veritate*, q.2, a.2.

3. THOMAS AQUINAS, *Ia IIae*, q.27, aa.1 and 3.

4. LÉVY-BRUHL, *Les Carnets de Lucien Lévy-Bruhl*, Ed. M. Leenhardt, (Paris, 1949), pp.77-78. Also, pp.60-62.

And yet, Jung, in his writings, continuously borrows Lévy-Bruhl's original standpoint. He does this, however, in such a personal fashion that it is difficult to say whether he expresses faithfully or not the views of the French anthropologist. Here is a sample : " We call it pre-logic, because to us such an explanation seems absurdly illogical. But as a matter of fact primitive man is no more logical or illogical than we are. Only his presuppositions are different, and this is what distinguishes him from us."[1] Words that look like a re-echo of these others, written by Lévy-Bruhl, at the end of his life : "In everything that concerns everyday experience, no essential difference is to be found between the mentality of primitives and our own, ... Where complication arrives is in the matter of mystical experiences. How much is the extent of the difference which springs from the mystical orientation of the mentality of primitive ? Is there a logical rebound ? ... It is there that the reflection of Einstein make us reflect for ourselves. For he shows that the intelligibility of the sensible world as ordered and ruled by science is itself without meaning. Compared to the rational world of our sciences, the mythical world is unintelligible, imaginary, cannot be real. How can it happen that, irrational as it is, with its inconsistencies and absurdities, the primitive mentality seriously accepts it as real ? In looking for the answer to this question we know that the intelligibility of the rational world is itself unintelligible. Could it be that it is simply a difference of degree ? A transfer from the unintelligibility of the detail to the world as it is in its totality ?"[2] In other words, whether the pre-logical state of primitives be true or not, it affects but little the general principles entailed is the theory of archetypes.

c) Myth

For many anthropologists of the 19th century, myth was the science of primitive man. But not for many modern ones, or for Jung, who asserts that primitive man is not interested in objective explanation of the obvious. Myth is mainly a psychic phenomenon that reveals the nature of the soul, "myth explains to the bewildered human being what was going on in his unconscious and why he was held fast."[3]

Therefore a myth is a symbolic expression of the inner unconscious drama of the psyche, which becomes accessible to man's consciousness by way of projection, as mirrored in the events of nature. The

---

1. (C.W. 10), p.52.

2. LÉVY-BRUHL, *op. cit.*, pp.70-72.

3. (C.W. 9, i), p.6. Also, A. RADCLIFFE-BROWN, *The Andaman Islanders*, p.397. Bronislaw MALINOWSKI, *Magic, Science and Religion*, (New York, 1955), p.108 : "Myth... is not an explanation in satisfaction of a scientific interest, but a narrative resurrection of primeval reality."

language of nature for primitive people is not the language of nature as such, but the language of an unconscious psychic event which is projected in natural events. The projection is fundamental, but unconscious ; hence, as men were unaware of the automatic mechanism it took thousands of years to detach it from the outer world. Man thought of everything except the psyche to explain the myth, for his failure to understand projection. The projection of the inner life of the psyche on physical events is the key for the understanding of myth.[1]

Primitives seldom think consciously, nor do they invent myths, as modern man invents a physical theory. They simply experience them, and thoughts emerge spontaneously, for myths convey vital messages to primitives. They are the psychic life of the archaic tribe, a tribe mythology is its living religion whose loss, Jung says, is always and everywhere, even among the civilized, a moral catastrophe.[2]

How is the myth formed? The explanation of the formation of myths is a most obscure phenomenon regarding archaic man, and it would be too much to demand absolute cogency in the thought of Jung. There are objective and subjective conditions for its formation. (i) Subjective reduced intensity of consciousness and absence of concentration and attention correspond to the primitive state of consciousness in which myths were originated. (ii) Objective and subjective because the unconscious of primitive man possesses an irresistible urge to assimilate all outer sense experiences to inner psychic events. As the body adapts itself to environmental conditions, so the psyche must exhibit functional systems which correspond to regular events ; a sort of parallelism to regular occurrences. For instance, the primitive man sees the rising and setting of the sun, this is the objective happening. But the external observation must, at the same time, be a psychic happening, and the daily course of the sun through the sky imprints itself in the psyche in the form of an image from primordial time. The sun in its course represent the fate of a hero who, in the last analysis, dwells nowhere, but in the soul of man. The myth contains a reflection of a physical process, not an astronomical theory.[3]

Naturally, the Jungian theory of myth does not entail a revival of Leibniz's pre-established harmony, the harmony between the external world and the cognitive powers. But it holds the principle that natural events produce in the psyche, by means of subjective reactions, a distorted image of the physical happening that, when projected, originates the myth. There exists a certain harmony between the physical event, the image produced by the physical event, and the myth originated by the image.

---

1. (C.W. 9, i), pp.6-7.
2. (C.W. 9, i), p.154.
3. (C.W. 9, i), p.156, p.6. (C.W. 8), pp.153-154.

But why is the physical happening distorted in the myth ? Partly on account of the strong emotional subjectivism of primitive man. Partly on account of his identification with nature, proper to him, namely, the lack of distinction between object and subject, between man and the external world. What happens outside happens also inside and, naturally, for primitive mentality emotions are more important than physics. For example, night for archaic man symbolizes snakes and the cold breath of spirits ; morning, however, the birth of a beautiful god. In other words, not the rain, storms, thunders, sun, and moon remain as images in the psyche, but the fantasies, the subjective reactions, caused by the effects they aroused.[1]

Jung gives a psychological interpretation to myth, whose implications he was compelled to study when he discovered mythical traces in contemporary man. And as against the common objective explanation of myth held by anthropologists of the 19th century, he attempts a subjective-objective interpretation bold and original, though not free from criticism. He discovered the connection between the contents of the unconscious and myth.[2] He emphasizes, as George Frazer does, the solidarity of the human psyche with the natural process of nature. With Eliade he stresses the essential necessity of projection.[3] Less clear and more problematic, however, is the double correspondence existing between physical and psychic occurrences ; the physical event produces the psychical image which in its turn, through projection, originates the myth. Jung's theory may perhaps be correct ; it seems, however, more plausible to ascribe the cause of myth, not to the external event, but to the urge of basic inner needs inherent in human nature, needs that are expressed and solved in the history related in myths. Death, birth, resurrection, love, struggle, religion, and survival, are but a few basic human problems haunting man for millennia, basic even for primitives, who project them upon physical occurrences. The physical event does not produce the myth, it rather provides the projection with the occasion for its appearance ; thus the coming of the sun provides the occasion for the birth of a hero who dwells nowhere but in the soul of man. "The foremost function of myth," Eliade says, "is to reveal the examplary models for all human activities — diet or marriage, work or education, art or wisdom. This idea is of no little importance for the understanding of archaic and traditional societies, and we shall return to it later."[4]

---

1. (C.W. 8), pp.154-155.

2. Lévy-Bruhl, *op. cit.*, p.199, points out also this connection : " parenté intime de rêve et du mythe."

3. Mircea ELIADE, *Myth and Reality*, (New York, 1963), p.185.

4. *Ibid.*, p.8.

Since archaic man relates and subordinates all human needs to spirits and gods, myths by their very nature are sacred histories explaining the work of gods upon the cosmos and man. Jung considers myth as the living religion of primitive man, in agreement with modern anthropologists. "Myths," Eliade says, "describe the various and sometimes dramatic breakthrough of the sacred into the world ... the myth is regarded as a sacred history and hence a "true history," because it always deals with realities."[1]

d) Archetypes and myths

There does not always exist in Jung's writings a clear distinction between myth and archetypes. Perhaps their distinction may lie in the concepts of act and potency, whole and part, and cause and effect. Archetypes are a kind of readiness to produce over and over again the same or similar mythical ideas. Thus, archetypes are potencies that, when actualized, bring forth the same mythical ideas ; they are whole and parts because myth seems to be only a partial expression of the content of archetypes that manifest themselves in forms not always equivalent to myth, as in fairy tales, and religious dogmas ; finally, they are causes and effects, because the existence of archetypes depends on myth: "It is the myth of the sun-hero, and not the physical process, that forms the sun archetype."[2] Thus archetypes are originated as a consequence of the subjective fantasies-ideas aroused by myths ; archetypes are recurrent impressions made by subjective reactions. On the other hand, once the archetype is formed, it possesses a kind of readiness to produce over and over again the same or similar mythical ideas.[3]

In spite of Jung's explanation, the relation of myth and archetypes is not yet clear. It is the myth which forms the archetype and, at the same time, it is the archetype which produces mythical ideas. Is it a vicious circle? Not likely, because for Jung the subjective fantasies of myths are the causes of archetypes. But once the archetype is formed, it is endowed with a kind of readiness to arouse the same mythical ideas which were the cause of its formation, a familiar psychological process. Habits and dispositions are formed in the same way ; repetition of acts form the habit, but once the habit exists, it possesses a readiness to produce the very acts that were the causes of its existence: "Not only are archetypes, apparently, impressions of over-repeated typical experiences, but at the same time, they behave empirically like agents that tend towards repetitions of the same experiences."[4]

---

1. *Ibid.*, p.6. LÉVY-BRUHL, *op. cit.*, p.81 : "les mythes sont l'histoire sainte des sociétés 'primitives'."

2. (C.W. 7), p.68.

3 (C.W. 7), pp.68-69.

4. (C.W. 7), p.69.

The origin of archetypes is also related to history, because they are explained by assuming them to be the deposits of constantly repeated experiences of humanity. Experiences of thousands of years of adaptation and existence have been ingraved in our psychic constitution as forms without content. Not every experience, however, produced these forms, but the mental processes of our ancestors traced them.[1] Hence Jung regards the archetypes as the historical background of the psyche and, as such, they contained in a concentrated way the entire succession of engrams (imprints) which for time immemorial have determined the psychic structure as it now exists, and which is inherited with the brain structure. Thus the investigation of the unconscious yields recognizable traces of the archetype structure which coincides with the myth motif, because the creative substratum is everywhere the same human psyche, and the same brain, which, with minor variations, functions everywhere in an identical way.[2]

But no such engrams have ever been found in the brain, and Jung himself realizes that the repetition of experiences does not totally clear the enigma : "Naturally, this assumption," he says, "only pushes the problem further back without solving it."[3] Moreover, although Jung discovered reminders of Greek mythology in the dreams of pure American negroes, he also reports the experience with European immigrants, whose dreams were similar, not to European mythologies, but to those of American Indians, which rather shows the importance of soil and weather in the psychology of societies. But Jung never denies the significance of these elements. On the contrary, he regards them as vital elements in the making of our mental structure : "Just as, in the process of evolution, the mind has been moulded by earthly conditions, so the same process repeats itself under our eyes today ... Our contact with the unconscious chains us to earth, and makes it hard for us to move ... He who is rooted in the soil endures."[4]

Jung, pressed by criticism, gradually modified his hypothesis on the origin of archetypes, and says : "The primordial images, if ever originated, their origin must have coincided with the beginning of the species,"[5] which is probably true, and equivalent to saying that they were not originated by recurrent experiences. Finally, he also confesses that, "whether the archetypes were originated at all is a metaphysical question, and therefore unanswerable."[6]

The origin of archetypes is shrouded in mystery, but it is of great importance to emphasize and make clear that the validity of the

---

1. (C.W. 7), p.69. (C.W. 6), p.272. (C.W. 8), pp.53-54. (C.W. 9, i), p.48.
2. (C.W. 6), p.211. (C.W. 8), p.170. (C.W. 5), pp.xxix, p.390.
3. (C.W. 7), p.69.
4. (C.W. 10), p.49.
5. (C.W. 9, i), p.78. (C.W. 11), p.89.
6. (C.W. 9, i), p.101.

existence of archetypes is totally independent of the knowledge of their origin. They are like migrant birds ; we clearly see them, although we do not know where they come from.

e) Properties of archetypes

Archetypes are not innate ideas by means of which we know, as in Plato's theory of knowledge. They are, however, inborn dispositions to produce parallel images, ideas in the Platonic sense, influencing our thoughts, feelings and actions. In his first work Jung calls the archetypes "dominants," that is, *types*. There are types of situations and types of figures that repeat frequently, which Jung designates as 'motifs.' They emerge often in dreams, not only as typical dreams, but also as 'motifs' in them, which may be situations or figures that appear regularly, like the shadow, the wise, old man, the mother, the anima, etc. These 'motifs' are prominent archetypes and crucial factors in Jung's process of individuation.[1]

Archetypes are typical, universal, uniform, and regular modes of apprehension, which manifest themselves everywhere in identical fashion, not as concrete forms, but as forms without content, representing merely the possibilities of certain type of perception and action. The typical form of apprehension of archetypes is not a pure intellectual apprehension of external objects, as is the activity of the speculative intellect productive of science. Nor is it the apprehension proper to the practical intellect, pre-requisite for the appetite that being blind, needs the presentation of objects by the cognitive power which directs the action and judges the value of its operation. Archetypes gaze inward, and their apprehension falls upon the inner primordial images, images directly connected with myth. The archetype represents the authentic element of what Jung calls *the spiritus rector*, which apprehends the internal psychic world, not the nature of external objects, or the value of them.[2]

Although archetypes are supra personal factors composing the collective unconscious, they are, nevertheless, camouflaged in modern attire and interwoven with concrete elements of the individual psyche. Archetypes are forms without content, and their pre-existent traces are filled out by individual experiences. Hence although the archetypes always manifest themselves in identical fashion, their concrete expression, filtered through individual consciousness, may assume a diversity that is just as great. Personal life actualizes the potentialities of archetypes, because they possess an invariable nucleus of meaning, but always in principle, never as regards their concrete manifestation. For instance, the specific appearance into conscious-

1. (C.W. 5), p.158, p.301. (C.W. 9, i), p.75, p.183. (C.W. 11), p.519.
2. (C.W. 8), pp.137-138. (C.W. 8), p.206.

ness of the mother image at any given time, cannot be deduced from the mother archetype alone, but it depends on the conscious and concrete experiences with mothers, and innumerable other factors.[1]

Archetypes are not intellectual modes of apprehension of the external world. But as primordial images, they underlie all thinking and have considerable influence on scientific ideas, religion, philosophy, and ethics. For example, the idea of the principle of conservation of energy, discovered by Robert Mayer is, according to Jung, archetypal. It is connected with the idea of power, an idea which has been stamped in the human brain for centuries. Only certain conditions are needed for its appearance, which were evidently fulfilled in the case of Robert Mayer. The ideas of atoms, and ether, for example, he says, are also primitive intuitions. Wolfgang Pauli, Nobel Laureat and one of the leading physicists of the century, ascribes to archetypal ideas the root of Kepler's scientific theories.[2] The archetypes seem also to have influence in all states of the mind requiring intuition, creative fantasy, artistic elaboration, and the inner experience of the mystic.

However, in spite of the support of such an outstanding physicist as Pauli, very few scientists and philosophers will accept without reservations Jung's astonishing interpretation. The discovery of the principles of modern physics, and of science in general as well, presupposes a painstaking, slow, and reflective intellectual elaboration. These principles, history of science teaches, never appear abruptly, as archetypes do, but only after a long period of meditation. When Newton was asked how he came to make the discovery of gravitation, he replied, "I keep the subject constantly before me, and I wait until the first glimmer of light begins to dawn slowly and gradually, and changes into full light and clarity."[3]

The archetypes cannot be known directly because they are unconscious. But they reveal themselves and are made visible in the products of fantasy, where they find their specific and concrete application. Archetypes are inherited dispositions of the mind to produce parallel fantasy-images which are only indirectly related to external objects. They depend much more upon the unconscious fantasy activity, and appear more or less abruptly, as visions, dreams, and sudden intuitions. The image is like a concentrated symbolic expression of the total psychic situation ; it never takes the place of reality, and as a rule it lacks all projection in space. Images are visual, primordial, and collective, proper to the mentality of primitives.

---

1. (C.W. 5), p.64. (C.W. 8), p.3. (C.W. 9, i), p.80. (C.W. 8), p.110.

2. (C.W. 11), p.289. (C.W. 7), p.68. (C.W. 8), p.158. (C.W. 8), p.137, ft.

3. Quoted by Pierre DUHEM, *The Aim and Structure of Physical Theory* (Princeton, 1954), pp.256-257. Of course, the discovery of modern scientific theories presupposes a certain amount of intuition and creative imagination. But these two factors are conscious and reflective, not unconscious.

They show similarities with familiar mythological motives, and they are usually connected to the sacred.[1]

Besides images there are also ideas, which owe their origin to images, because they constitute, as it were, their maternal soil. Ideas are abstract elaboration of the intellect, as against the concrete manifestation of fantasy, the image. They are imparted with creative force, vitality, and operation ; they also condition feelings.[2]

The contents of the archetypes emerge into consciousness in the form of tendencies, or definite ways of looking of things. These subjective tendencies are stronger than the objective influence of the external world, on account of their psychic value, which is higher. Hence they superimpose themselves upon all external impressions, for the inner world is more valuable than external realities. When the archetypes are revealed in dreams, fantasies, or in life, it usually bring a certain influence or power which either exercises a numinous or fascinating effect, or impels to action. These effects are so strong as to produce extensive alterations in the subject, such as religious conversions, suggestions, and even schizophrenia. In the case of religious phenomena, characterized by the numinous, the subject is gripped by the unconscious as though by an instinct. Where does this power of archetypes come from ? Jung answers : from the feeling of being a part of the whole.[3]

The archetypes are not obscure corners of the mind, but the mighty deposit of ancestral experiences accumulated over millions of years. It is the echo of pre-historic happening to which each century adds an infinitesimal amount of variation and differentiation. The archetypes bring to contemporary man the mind of our ancestors, their mode of thinking, feeling, and experiencing life. They are the unwritten history of mankind from time unrecorded, making the past to be present. Rational formulas, Jung continuously insists, may satisfy the present, the immediate past, but never the experience of man as a whole. We think in term of years, the unconscious thinks in term of millennia.[4]

The archetypes, Jung says, dispose of the whole world of images, whose boundless range yields in nothing to the claims of the world of external realities. But insofar as archetypes go, they are as many as there are 'typical situations in life,' since they typify the most frequently and intensely used functions of the human soul. Therefore, the most ordinary events with immediate realities, like husband, wife, father, mother, child, hero, danger, birth, death, and resurrection, etc., emerge as an exalted group of archetypes endowed with tremen-

---

1. (C.W. 9, i), p.78. (C.W. 5), p.158. (C.W. 6), pp.554-555.
2. (C.W. 6), pp.547-550.
3. (C.W. 6), p.476. (C.W. 7), p.69. (C.W. 5), p.158, p.178.
4. (C.W. 8), p.376. (C.W. 11), p.168.

dous power. They are, besides, the supreme regulating principles of religion and political life. Some of them are "dominants," like the anima, animus, wise old man, witch, shadow, earth-mother, and so forth. Others are the "organizing dominants," usually with the function of combining and unifying several archetypes, as the self, the circle, and the quaternity.[1]

The archetypes bring forth to the present individual the mind of our ancestor, their way of thinking, feeling and experiencing life, which is probably an objective fact, as revealed in dreams, schizophrenia, and other observed phenomena. More problematic is the share we are supposed to possess of the wisdom of our ancestors, which we inherit with the archetypes. Where does the wisdom of archaic man lie ? Why do archetypes think in terms of millennia ? There exists, indeed, a natural wisdom in the process of evolution and adaptation of man to environmental circumstances. Primitives, living in the jungle, know the science of survival, of hunting, of fishing, and of justice. Even more, they possess a mythical wisdom in order to explain and solve the basic human riddles, as well as a healthy psychological attitude toward certain family and tribal problems, as for instance in their initiations. But they are often the victims of nature rather than its masters. Probably the best wisdom we can learn from archaic mentality lies in their unselfish approach toward the problems of the tribe, and in their stoic acceptance of suffering which, in their case, is an inexorable law they know to be part of their lives.

In other words, we go back, once more, to the disputed origin of archetypes. The wisdom, force, and value of archetypes, is not necessarily linked to the archaic activity of primitives, nor their wisdom. It would rather depend on their intrinsic nature and properties, especially those properties connected to religion and other spiritual values.

II. INSTINCTS

Instincts are psychological factors pertaining to the collective unconscious. Thomas Reid defines them saying : "By instinct I mean a natural impulse to certain actions, without having any end in view, without deliberation, and without any conception of what we do."[2] Jungs finds this definition insufficient ; it is just the uniformity of the phenomenon and the regularity of its recurrence that is the characteristic trait of instincts. Instincts are "typical modes of action, and wherever we meet with uniform and regularly recurring modes of action and reaction we are dealing with instinct, no matter

1. (C.W. 9, i), p.48. (C.W. 8), p.156. (C.W 6), p.211.
2. (C.W. 8), p.130.

whether it is associated with a conscious motive or not."[1] Instincts are collective, universal, and regularly occurring phenomena whose energy consciousness has no disposal, because their root is unconscious. They manifest themselves as natural impulses toward certain activities, expressed as patterns of biological behavior. They are motivating forms of psychic events which long before there is any consciousness pursue their inherent goals.[2] In other words, for Jung instincts are psychic elements, free from the control of the conscious mind, and endowed with a natural inclination towards the objects fitting for them. This idea reminds us of the following words of Aquinas : "The natural appetite is that inclination which each thing has, of its own nature, for something ; wherefore by its natural appetite each power desires something suitable to itself ..."[3]

Instincts and archetypes are different psychological factors making up the collective unconscious. They are different because instincts are modes of existence and archetypes are modes of apprehension ; instincts are natural impulses expressed as typical and regular modes of action and reaction while archetypes are dominants which emerge into consciousness as ideas and images.[4] And yet while instincts and archetypes are different, they are not independent ; they are, on the contrary, intimately related because the archetypes are the images of instincts themselves. Archetypes are the patterns of instinctual behavior, that is to say, the forms and categories that regulate the instincts. The image is the instinct perception of itself, the self portrait of the instinct in exactly the same way as consciousness is the inward perception of the objective life process. The image of archetypes is the bridge unifying instincts and archetypes.[5]

However, this connection is not always clear in Jung's own writings. For example, he quotes Freud in the following passage : "An instinct can never become an object of consciousness, only the idea that represents the instinct can. Even in the unconscious, moreover, an instinct cannot be represented otherwise than by an idea." Jung criticizes the second part of the sentence saying : "Exactly who has the idea of the instinct in the unconscious state? For unconscious ideation is a contradiction *in adjecto*."[6] Ideas are exclusive elaboration of the conscious mind, hence an unconscious idea is an impossibility. But Jung seems to fall in the same pitfall, because he says that just as the conscious apprehension gives our actions form and direction, so the unconscious apprehension, by mean of arche-

1. (C.W. 8), p.135.
2. (C.W. 8), pp.200-201, p.118, p.115, p.158. (C.W. 6), p.565. (C.W. 9, i), pp.43-44.
3. THOMAS AQUINAS, *Ia IIae*, p.78, a.1, ad 3 ; *Ia*, q.80, a.1.
4. (C.W. 8), pp.133-135, pp 217-218. (C.W. 6), p.476.
5. (C.W. 9, i), p.44. (C.W. 8), p.137, p.158.
6. (C.W. 8), p.200 ft.

types, determines the form and direction of instincts.[1] The riddle is obvious, because an 'unconscious apprehension' seems almost as arduous to understand as an unconscious ideation. The only possible ideation of the unconscious is realized by means of images — the conscious symbol of archetypes — and the corresponding ideas abstracted from them. This is perhaps Jung's interpretation, for he says : "No instinct is amorphous, as every instinct bears in itself the pattern of its situation, it always fulfills an image ... such an image is an a priori type ... The images of archetypes are these a priori instinct-types which provide the occasion and the pattern for his activities ; ... the image represents the meaning of the instinct."[2]

By relating archetypes and instincts Jung is aware of a thorny problem : the connection between the dynamism of the unconscious and its corresponding apprehension of objects. The unconscious is not a static factor but, on the contrary, a vital power which manifest its activity through the operation of instincts. Hence, there will be as many instincts as different kind of operations. And yet, how is it possible to know the different kind of operations if they are unconscious ? The originality of Jung's ideas lies mainly in the consideration of archetypes as the patterns of instinctual behavior, as the images or self portrait of instincts. Thus the archetypes specify and distinguish the different kind of instincts because to every regular and uniform form of activity there correspond a regular and uniform form of apprehension. The diversity of instincts reveal their nature to consciousness through the appearance of different kind of symbolic images, that are like the goal of the instinctual activity. "Instincts," Jung says, "have two main aspects ; on the one hand, that of dynamism and compulsion, and on the other, specific meaning and intention."[3] And even more clear, "Instincts are highly conservative as regard both their dynamism and their form. Their form, when represented to the mind, appears as an image which expresses the nature of the instinctive impulse visually and concretely, like a picture ... Instinct is anything but a blind and indefinite impulse, since it proves to be attuned and adapted to a definite external situation ... its form is age-old, that is to say, *archetypal.*"[4]

Are instinctual human activities independent of knowledge ? Is apprehension equivalent to knowledge ? Instincts are by definition uncounscious, but the cognitive power perceives their activities, as is obvious when a being enduring pangs of hunger, or deep loneliness.[5]

---

1. (C.W. 8), p.137.

2. (C.W. 8), p.201.

3. (C.W. 10), p.287.

4. (C.W. 10), p.282.

5. See for the relation between the appetite and knowledge : THOMAS AQUINAS, *Ia*, q.87, a.4, and ad 2.

But this does not answer our question directly. It is manifest, however, that in most cases the instinctual reaction underlying motion seems to be always in correspondence with specific needs, already known by a previous cognitive apprehension. This is clear in the case of the five instincts which Jung mentions, namely, hunger, sex, drive to activity, reflection, and creativity, whose objects are presented to the instincts by the intellect or senses. Sensitive and intellectual knowledge are required for the instinctual activity which corresponds to man inasmuch as he is sensitive and rational. But knowledge does not seem required for other activities, because from every form follows a natural inclination and, as Aquinas says : "In those things that lack knowledge the form is found to be inclined always towards one thing fitting to it." Although in these cases he adds, "Even natural love, which is in all things, is caused by a kind of knowledge, not indeed existing in natural things themselves, but in Him who created their nature."[1] An instinct totally deprived of knowledge seems unintelligible.

Do instincts need primordial images as their self portrait? Does instinctual human activity depend on the apprehension of archaic patterns? The continuous activity of instincts, seemingly independent of any archaic connotation, appears to deny such necessity. No primordial image is required for a hungry man, or a person in love. Appropriate concrete existing objects are sufficient to orient their activities.

Nobody would deny such observations, but these obvious facts have no bearing on the existence of archetypes because, as we explained before, archetypes appear clothed in modern dresses. The regularity and uniformity of instinctual behavior is explained in terms of the regular apprehension of archetypes ; their concrete actualization, however, by the individual external beings which fill their potentialities. Primordial images will probably appear whenever there is a slackening of consciousness, like in dreams, or other circumstances as explained before. For example, Eliade relates the following contemporary event : "When the Congo became independent in 1960, in some villages their inhabitants tore the roofs off their huts to give passage to the gold coins that their ancestors were to rain down ... Even the orgiastic excesses had a meaning, for, according to the myth, from the dawn of the New Age all women would belong to all men."[2] The myth of the destruction of the world, followed by a new creation and the establishement of the golden age, underlies these primordial

---

1. THOMAS AQUINAS, *Ia IIae*, q.27, a.2, ad 3. The complexity of human inclinations can be seen in *Ia IIae*, q.94, a.2.

2. Mircea ELIADE, *Myth and Reality*, p.3. Also in *Cosmos and History*, he says, p.4 : " Marriage and the collective orgy echo mythical prototypes ; they are repeated because they were consecrated in the beginning by God, ancestors, or heroes."

activities. Futhermore, Eliade sees unmistakable traits of myth in the behavior of contemporary man.[1] Hence, as evident in these examples, primordial images and concrete external objects are not mutually opposed, but rather complementary.

Archetypes and instincts, however, do not always behave in the way explained above. When the archetype appears in the form of spirit, Jung says, the relation between archetype and instinct follows different course. Then archetypes and instincts are the most polar opposites imaginable, as can be seen when one compares a man who is ruled by his instinctual drive with a man who is seized by the spirit. But they subsist side by side, as reflection in our minds of the opposition that underlies all psychic energy. Psychic energy flows as a consequence of the opposition between instinct and spirit. However, the question of whether a process is to be described as spiritual or as instinctual, he adds, remains shrouded in obscurity. A poorly developed archetype will see in the instinctual drives the source of all reality. Conversely, a consciousness that finds itself in opposition to the instinct can — in consequence of the enormous influence exerted by the archetype — subordinate instinct to spirit.[2]

The connection existing between the archetype of the spirit and instincts reminds us of the interwoven world of the will and lower passions. Their corresponding objects appear on occasions as opposites, and since the control of the will over the passions is far from being absolute, struggle and hardship ensue as a natural sequel. For Jung, however, opposition and polarity are prerequisites of energy ; the greater the opposition the greater the flow of energy. But this seems to contradict the facts of psychological observation. More energy is available in a man whose passions are subject to the will than in a man unable to control them, although it is also evident that no human growth is possible without struggle, fight, and even failure.

Antonio MORENO, O. P.

1. Mircea ELIADE, *Myth and Reality*, pp.181-193. As example of myths camouflaged by modern attire ; the racist myth of 'Aryanism,' the eschatological and millenialist structure of Marxist Communism. The mythological heroes in the comic strips, the fantastic character of Superman, the detective novel, etc. He points out here the unconscious process of projection and identification, p.185.

2. (C.W. 8), pp.206-207. See also THOMAS AQUINAS, *Ia*, q.81, a.3 and ad 2.