

D0091

"the archetype which it is most important for modern man to understand"

The Self.

It was only toward the middle of the 1920's ^{25 yrs. into the dev. of his psychology} that Jung made the notion of the self the focus of his psychology. In 1928 he speaks of the self as "strange to us and yet so near, wholly ourselves & yet unknowable, a virtual centre of so mysterious a constitution that it can claim anything-- kinship w. hearts & gods, w. crystals & with stars -- w/o moving us to wonder, w/o even exciting our disapprobation." He called it "a psychological concept, a construct that serves to express an unknowable essence which we cannot grasp as such, since by definition it transcends our powers of comprehension."

The self is both the beginning of psychic life & the goal toward which it ~~was~~ is oriented. All symbols of the self-- the mandala, the stone, Christ, ^{the Buddha,} the steadily burning flame-- are experienced as a central point, not coinciding with the ego. In fact, Jung says "the self has as much to do with the ego as

the sun with the earth." The self is "something ^{Self-2}irrational, an indefinable existent, to wh. the ego is neither opposed nor subjected, but merely attached, & about which it revolves very much as the earth revolves round the sun." Furthermore, he says that seeing (not knowing) the self in this way is the goal of individuation. "The individuated ego serves itself as the object of an unknown and supraordinate subject." In 1928, ^{he} said, "psychological inquiry must come to a stop here with the idea of a self, for such an idea is "a transcendental postulate which, although justifiable psychologically, does not allow of scientific proof." But also: "This step beyond science is an unconditional requirement of the psychological development I have sought to depict, because w/o this postulate I could give no adequate formulation of the psychic processes that occur empirically. At the very least, therefore, the self can claim the value of an hypothesis

(ewy)
238ff

analogous to that of the structure of the atom." Self-3-

Some symbols of the self have an other quality besides that of midpoint, however, and that is the quality of totality. The self is the wholeness of consciousness and unconscious and the point of reference for the numerous fragments, complexes, and autonomous figures of the psyche.

In 1958, Jung stressed that the self was only potentially empirical, precisely because it is a totality. Its major portion remained unrecognizable and indeterminate. (Tied in w. later development). Only certain symbols could convey its reality. Read PT, p. 460.

Some symbols or archetypal images of the Self:

1. The Anthropos. Many myths about the origin of the world contain mention of the figure of an original man, parading the whole cosmos.

Jung's most comprehensive treatment of the archetype of the Self appears in Vol. 9 b of CW: Alion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self. I am relying chiefly on this

for this lecture, because it will also help us deal ^{Self-4} with several other important questions. Jung tells us that this investigation "seeks, with the help of Kien, Gnostic, and alchemical symbols of the self, to throw light on the change of psychic situation within the 'Christian aeon.'" Thus, concentrating on this volume will help us deal with Jung's interpretation of where we stand historically today as participants in what he read to be a major transformation occurring in this aeon occurring in our time. It will serve to introduce us to Jung's contribution to what I do not hesitate to call the birth of a new religion in our time. It will help introduce us to the complex intricacies of his thought on evil and will propel us into examining his controversial thought about God in Answer to Job.

Many of Jung's reflections about the Self in this book gravitate around the symbol of the Fishes, because Jung puts serious synchronistic stock in the fact that astrologically Pisces is the concomitant of 2000 years of Kien development,

Self-5

and around the symbol of the Anthropos, the emergent symbol of the Age of Aquarius. The Christian aeon coincides with the Pisces age; the emergent age is that of Anthropos. For Jung the Christ-image, as an Anthropos figure uniting humanity, has, at least up to now, been inadequate to the task of liberating "the true man," so just as, in the East, the Buddha-image was unable to protect against the invasion of communist ideology. At least the Christ-image, as we have known it, is too one-sided to be able to represent man's wholeness adequately. It is, says M.-L. von Franz, "lacking in darkness and in bodily and material reality." (135) The medieval alchemists perceived this and attempted to free from matter a divine Anthropos, "an image of man in which good and evil, spirit and matter, were genuinely united & thru wh. not only man but also all of nature would be made whole.... At bottom it is the image of man in the Aquarian Age which is being formed in the collective unconscious. The astrological image of the

Aquarian period is an image of man, which, according to Jung, represents the Anthropos as an image of the ^{Self} Self, or of the greater inner personality wh. lives in every human being & in the collective psyche. . . . The task of man in the Aquarian Age will be to become conscious of his larger inner presence, the Anthropos, and to give the utmost care to the unconscious and to nature. " 136.

Crone discusses the relations between the traditional Christ-figure and the natural symbols of wholeness or the self. Wholeness, Jung says, is no abstract idea. It is empirical, in that it is anticipated by the psyche in the form of spontaneous or autonomous symbols. These include the quaternity or mandala symbols, whose significance as symbols of unity and totality is amply confirmed by history as well as by empirical psychology. Wholeness is an objective factor that confronts the subject independently of him, a priori, just like anima or animus. Its value is higher than these, although the syzygy represents a portion of wholeness, the tension of opposites from which the divine child is born as the

symbol of unity. For Jung, unity & totality stand at ^{Self-7} the highest pt. on the scale of objective values because their symbols cannot be distinguished from the imago Dei.

Why so? Why do they have this value? Quote: "Experience shows that individuals' mandalas are symbols of order, and that they occur in patients principally during times of psychic disorientation or re-orientation. As magic circles they bind and subdue the lawless powers belonging to the world of darkness, and depict or create an order that transforms the chaos into a cosmos." The integration of the meaning of these symbols is painstaking work, for the disorientation of the psyche usually means that many projections must be withdrawn before the symbol can be realized. The philosophic intellect can understand the meaning of the symbols w/o ^{the individual} being changed by them. The function of value -- feeling -- is also attached to these symbols, and only when it is part of the judgment passed upon their meaning is the subject affected by the process.

Self-8

In discussing the Self in the context of the Christian world, Jung is preoccupied by the saturation of Christian tradition with vague premonitions of the conflict of Christ and Antichrist. He finds parallels to this conflict in "the dechristianization of our world, the Luciferian development of science and technology, and the frightful material and moral destructions left behind by the second World War. Christ is still, says Jung, the living myth of our culture, "our culture hero, who, regardless of his historical existence, embodies the myth of the divine Primordial Man." 36 It is he who occupies the centre of the Christian mandala, he whose kingdom is the pearl of great price, the treasure buried in the field, the grain of mustard seed which will become a great tree, and the heavenly city. Christ, then, represents the archetype of the self, a totality of a divine kind, a glorified man, a son of God unspotted by sin, the true image of God, after whose likeness our inner man is made. Jung quotes theologians through the ages to substantiate this archetypal

1
significance of Christ in Christian tradition: ^{Self-9} Tertullian, Origen, Augustine. Now, for all of these authorities, the image of God in man is not in the corporeal man, but in the invisible, incorporeal, incorrupt, and immortal anima rationalis. This God-image was not destroyed by the Fall but only damaged and corrupted, and can be restored through God's grace. Christ is the King, whose bride is the human soul. Thus the spontaneous symbols of the self ^{are} appeal to by the Christian language of restoration. There is an ever-present archetype of wholeness which may never be perceived at all until one recognizes it in the person of Christ. This recognition restores an original state of oneness with the God-image in the human soul. Jung says, "There can be no doubt that the original Christian conception of the magus Dei embodied in Christ meant an all-embracing totality that even includes the animal side of man."

But what has happened to this image of Christ?

Self-10

It came to lack wholeness in the modern psychological sense, since there came to be excluded from it the dark side of things, which was made into a Luciferian opponent. Christ became a symbol of the heroic ego instead of a symbol of the self. (As I hope to show in the next lecture, Jung incorrectly ascribed this perversion to the metaphysical doctrine of the privatio boni.) The figure of the Redeemer became bright and one-sided. The dark side of the self, the dark half of the human totality, became ascribed to the Anti-Christ, the devil, evil. But "the psychological concept of the self, in part derived from our knowledge of the whole man, but for the rest depicting itself spontaneously in the products of the unconscious as an archetypal quaternity bound together by inner antinomies, cannot omit the shadow that belongs to the light figure, for w/o it this figure lacks body and humanity. In the empirical self, light and shadow form a paradoxical unity. In the Christian concept, on the other hand, the archetype is hopelessly split into

two irreconcilable halves, leading ultimately to a ^{Self-11} meta-physical dualism. " The dogmatic figure of Christ was made so sublime and spotless that everything else turned dark beside it. It became so one-sidedly perfect that it demanded a psychic complement to restore the balance. " Every intensified differentiation of the Christ-image brings about a corresponding accentuation of its unconscious complement, thereby increasing the tension between above and below. "

This complement was provided in Christian doctrine by the notion of Satan ~~or~~ Antichrist.

Jung highlights what he considers the fatality of this perfectionism in the Christian disposition. It leads, he says, inevitably to a reversal of its spirit, and this by a necessary psychological law. I quote from Jung: " The ideal of spirituality striving for the heights was doomed to clash with the materialistic earth-bound passion to conquer matter and master the world. This change became visible at the

time of the 'Renaissance.' The word means 'rebirth,' and it referred to the renewal of the antique spirit. We know today that this spirit was chiefly a mask; it was not the spirit of antiquity that was reborn, but the spirit of medieval Christianity that underwent strange pagan transformations, exchanging the heavenly goal for an earthly one, and the vertical of the Gothic for a horizontal perspective (voyages of discovery, exploration of the world and of nature). The subsequent developments that led to the Enlightenment & the French Revolution have produced a worldwide situation today which can only be called 'anti-Christian' in a sense that confirms the early Christian anticipation of the 'end of time.'"

Christian tradition has made Christ into only one-half of the archetype of the self. The other half it has ~~to~~ labelled as Antichrist, Satan, evil. "The Christian image of the self -- Christ -- lacks the shadow that properly belongs to it." Tradition did not allow God or Christ to be a paradox. They

had to have a single meaning, and, Jung says, ^{Self-13} "this holds true to the present day." By this perversion, Christians have fallen prey to the same perfectionism that crucified Christ in the Pharisees. They have overlooked, suppressed, rejected, neglected, ^{denied,} the dark side within them. In the process they have bifurcated the self in the interests of a false spiritualism. They have preferred an ethic of perfection to one of ^{or} wholeness. They have mistaken one-sidedness for wholeness, for Christ represents the self for this tradition, and Christ is one-sided. By representing him as simply "good" and "spiritual," by equating "good" with "spiritual," they have placed something "evil" and "material" on the other side; they have equated instinct, the dark side, with evil. But if the self is not exclusively "spiritual," "light," its shadow side turns out to be much less evil, threatening, than the Christian tradition has made it out to be. The self includes the light and dark, just as includes the contrasexual. Individuation becomes

a mysterium coniunctionis, a nuptial union of ^{Self-14} opposite halves. The body acquires once again a special and, to the trad'l Christian, unexpected and alarming significance. Matter has considerable numinosity in itself, since it is part of the composite which is the totality, the Self. Not to recognize this splits the individual into two halves. The conscious half is identified with Christ, who then becomes an ego-ideal rather than an archetypal image of the self. The dark half, regarded as evil, is suppressed or repressed, and, to the extent it remains unconscious, is projected outside, so that the world must act out the conflict that is ultimately the moral problem of the individual.