

The Problem of the Individuality of Archaic Man According to Carl Gustav Jung: A Complementary File to See Mircea Eliade's Thesis on Primitive Religions in a New Light

César Enia

UNIVERSITY OF MONTREAL

In trying to understand the nature of modern civilization's discontent, the famous Swiss-German psychiatrist Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961) is struck by the following paradox: while the acquisition of an ego comes hand in hand with the development of the conscious mind, the frantic individualism of modern man makes him lose the acquired individuality and makes him behave in highly unconscious and savage ways, as is shown by the mass totalitarian movements which marked the 20th century. According to Jung this indicates that the ego, even though necessary, is not sufficient to constitute the human individual. If modern man has ended up where he is, it is because he was not attuned to his unconscious mind. Having a negative bias toward it, he has rejected it, seeing in it only an obstacle to the development of consciousness. But this is only the definition given to it by consciousness which divides things in order to establish clear and distinct identities. In so doing, consciousness simplifies reality. Jung thinks that this reduction is the result of an ego which, once it has grown, imbued of its own power, has chosen to forget that which has brought it to life and has nurtured its growth, that is to say, the unconscious, a more comprehensive totality than ego-consciousness, because, while being itself, it contains also its opposite, consciousness. Detaching itself *deliberately* from the obscurity of the unconscious, ego-consciousness blinds itself with its own light, and then, imagines being, on the psychic level, the only reality. Everything must then be thought through consciousness, considered as the original psychic reality. The

Dionysius, Vol. XXXVII, December 2019, 196-234.

unconscious is therefore represented as being a simple privation of consciousness: the more one moves away from it, the more one sinks into the unconscious (understood as a relative psychic non-being). This conception cannot, however, encompass all the complexity of the nature of the unconscious in its *sui generis* reality. Now, according to this point of view, the unconscious can also be the condition for the possibility of consciousness.

If the unconscious cannot be reduced to a lack of consciousness, but is something in its own range, which is therefore also able to make consciousness possible, it is then not surprising to notice the formation of an ego-consciousness even in the case of archaic man, who lives, according to Jung, in the unconscious. It is this double dynamic which we propose to determine here. First we will exhibit everything that indicates the unconscious character of primitive man, and second, we will see how it is, paradoxically, that unconsciousness which serves as the basis for the emergence of individuality, as rudimentary as it may be at this level. This is possible precisely because archaic man lives at the level and within the reality of the unconscious. Just as modern man can display unconsciousness by attributing an excessive value to his ego, to the same extent, archaic man can begin to develop his individuality by making use of the positive aspect of the unconscious, with which he cohabits. Whence the fact that modern man has much to learn from the one he qualifies as "savage". Notably, that the primitive possesses the half of what is necessary to constitute real individuality. This nuance, which must be made concerning archaic man, allows us to understand why the historian of religion, Mircea Eliade (1907-1986), was able to see in primitive religions, despite the so-called Platonic structure of their ontology, the prefiguration of the Incarnation of Christ, considered by the Romanian scholar as being the supreme hierophany, because it presents the highest form of "individualization" of the sacred.¹

1 Mircea Eliade, *Histoire des croyances et des idées religieuses II/De Gautama Bouddha au triomphe du christianisme* (= HCIR/II) (Paris: Payot, 1978) 388; *Traité d'histoire des religions* (= THR) (Paris: Payot, [1949] 1968) 38; *Océanographie* (= O) (Paris: L'Herne, [1934] 1993) 84-85; *Images et symboles* (= IS) (Paris: Gallimard, 1952) 169-170; *Sacré et profane* (= SP) (Paris:

1. PROJECTION AND MYSTICAL PARTICIPATION

1. 1. *Projection and a Unified Relation to Reality*

The more we move backwards in history, the more we notice that personality loses itself under the cover of the community. This is so because archaic man refers to reality on the mode of mystical participation, that is, the mode of unity and lack of differentiation with that which is other than himself. Because of this indistinctness, primitive man projects his being on the world.

In fact, Jung recognizes that the word “projection” that he constantly uses to talk about mystical participation,² is not completely appropriate when one is to describe the primordial condition of the psyche because that term seems to refer to an act, whereas it is in fact an *a priori* given state.³ The psyche starts by being melded with its environment, and then comes to be distinguished from it. It is this differentiation that is in a sense the first act, and is called by Jung “withdrawal of projections”. A somewhat awkward expression since it leaves us thinking that, previously, there were projections. It would be better to say that at a basic level the psyche is always already projected. This is why Jung asserts that projection is not voluntarily controllable,

Gallimard, [1957] 1972) 15. Many of these references were quoted in two of my previous articles, Cézar Enia, “La dimension historique du sacré et de la hiérophanie selon Mircea Eliade”, *Laval théologique et philosophique* 62: 2 (2006) 319-344; “Le temps et l'éternité dans les religions archaïques selon Mircea Eliade: les éléments préfiguratifs de l'Incarnation dans l'ontologie primitive”, *Dionysius* 31 (2013) 161-190. The present article tries to solve a problem raised in the conclusion of the last article on Eliade, which applies to primitive thinking a new interpretation of Eliade's works already proposed in the first article.

2 Carl Gustav Jung, *Gesammelte Werke von C.G. Jung* (= GW) 20 vol. (Solothurn & Düsseldorf: Walter-Verlag [1971-1983] 1995) GW 6, 9 (§ 12); 84 (§ 123); GW 10, 81-82 (§ 129-131); GW 17, 53 (§ 83); GW 18/I, 223 (§ 465) – We have translated in English all German and French quotations; “Essai d'exploration de l'inconscient” (= EEI) *L'homme et ses symboles*, Laure Deutschmeister (trans.) (Paris: Robert Laffont, [1964] 1992) 45. Jung borrows the expression “mystical participation” from Lévy-Bruhl (GW 6, 313 (§ 495); 486 (§ 780); GW 10, 51 (§ 69); 81-82 (§ 130-131); GW 13, 52 (§ 66); GW 17, 53 (§ 83); R. F. C. Hull & William McGuire, *C. G. Jung Speaking. Interviews and Encounters* (= CGJS) (Princeton University Press, 1977) 214-216).

3 GW 6, 313 (§ 495); GW 9/I, 34-35 (§ 54).

but is always unconsciously made.⁴ Primitive man is subjected to the projection of his thoughts and feelings to such an extent that he distinguishes with difficulty subject and object,⁵ and therefore the “representation” that the object signifies for him (as subject).

This lack of differentiation is visible in the way archaic man conceives memory, thought and some of his dreams. For primitive man *memory* is not a simple representation of an object which is no longer there, but the re-actualization of the thing he is remembering:

Among the primitives, the *imago*, the psychic echo of sensory perceptions, is so strong and coloured by the senses, that it [the echo] reproduces itself, that is to say when it appears as a spontaneous memory image, it has on occasion even the quality of a hallucination. Thus, when the memory image from the dead mother comes to the primitive’s mind, he sees and hears, so to speak, her spirit. Whereas we “only” think of the dead, primitive man perceives them precisely because of the extraordinary sensitive character of his spiritual images. Therefrom arises the belief in spirits among the primitive. The spirits are what we simply call thoughts. When primitive man “thinks”, he has in fact visions, whose reality is so impressive, that he constantly confuses the mental with what is real. Powell says: “But the confusion of confusions is that universal habit of savagery – the confusion of the objective with the subjective” (*Sketch of the Mythology of the North American Indians*, p. 20). Spencer and Gillen say: “What a savage experiences during a dream is just as real to him as what he sees when he is awake” (*The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*).⁶

The same goes for thought, which has a visionary and auditory character for archaic man. It takes on, for him, the aspect of a revelation.⁷ Since the frontiers merge, the body is animated and the spirit is corporeal.⁸ This is why the magician or the healer is also the thinker of the primitive tribes and at the same time the one who mediates the revelations of spirits and divinities.⁹ Primitive man often feels he is not the author of his thoughts,

4 GW 6, 308 (§ 468); GW 9/I, 75 (§ 121); GW 14/I, 133 (§ 125); 135 (§ 127); GW 14/II, 105 (§ 151); GW 18/I, 155 (§ 315).

5 GW 10, 84 (§ 135); GW 13, 53 (§ 66).

6 GW 6, 29-30 (§ 46).

7 GW 6, 30 (§ 46). Jung thinks that we find this feature also in the Hindu thinking. The Hindu, he says, does not think, but perceives its thoughts (CGJS 396, 398).

8 GW 6, 578 (§ 961-962); GW 8, 142-143 (§ 251).

9 GW 6, 30 (§ 46).

because “what for example manifests itself in thinking is that this act is not *conscious*, but that thoughts *appear*. Primitive man cannot pretend that he thinks, but rather ‘it thinks in him’. The spontaneity of thinking is not causally connected to his consciousness, but to his unconscious.”¹⁰ His thoughts appear to him as external realities. Therefrom arises the idea that they have magical effects, and are as effective as facts. The word can conjure up a “real” memory image as if it was a real effect¹¹: “In short, for the primitive mind, the name creates the thing.”¹²:

The fact that immediate experience is only mental and that, for this reason, immediate reality can only be mental, explains why, for primitive man, the minds and magical effects have the same concrete character as physical events. Primitive man has not yet torn into opposites his original experience. In his world, mind and matter still interpenetrate, and the gods still wander in the forest and in the field. He is still a child, half-born, still dreaming in his soul, in a world not really deformed by the difficulties inherent in the knowledge of a newborn mind.¹³

The same is true also for certain dreams that have, for archaic man, the character of reality: “It is known that, for the primitive, certain dreams have a much higher value than for cultural man. Not only does he talk a lot about his dreams, but they are for him so significant that he sometimes has difficulty to distinguish them from reality.”¹⁴ The waking and sleeping state are less distinct than for us, so that it is sometimes difficult to know if he is talking of reality or of dreaming. He attributes a higher value than we do to the products of the unconscious (dreams, visions, fantasies). Dreams are for him a significant source of information. What he dreams is as important as what happens to him in the real world, sometimes even more so¹⁵: “The dreams often mean for them the voice of God. They distinguish thus two kinds of dreams: the ones that are not significant – they are the usual dreams – and

10 GW 9/I, 167 (§ 260).

11 GW 6, 30 (§ 46).

12 GW 8, 415 (§ 735).

13 GW 8, 387 (§ 682).

14 GW 8, 333 (§ 574).

15 GW 18/II, 594 (§ 1290).

the ones they call the large face [...] the big dreams."¹⁶ And so Jung says: "primitive man does not have a psychology. What is mental is objective and happens outside. Even his dreams are realities; otherwise he does not take them into account."¹⁷

Thus there is between the subject and the object an unconscious identity.¹⁸ And since he is melded with the object,¹⁹ the primitive subject, not being able to grasp himself as such, is not able to differentiate himself from other subjects. That is why his consciousness is thoroughly collective.²⁰

1. 2. *Unity and the Two Forms of the Unknown*

When we speak of the unity of the mind with the world, it is useless to specify if we're talking about the external or the internal world, because it is precisely this distinction that is lacking here. Indeed, the two forms of the unknown, the outside and the inside world (the unconscious), are welded in the projection. The unconscious universe is projected on the outside world. The primitive carries out this operation without the help of the unconscious will,²¹ because his unconscious is what appears to be exterior to his ego. So reality seems to contain all the possibilities, which normally belong to dreams. The myths give us the

16 GW 18/II, 595 (§ 1291). For this distinction between small and big dreams (coming respectively from the personal or collective unconscious) see also *Briefe* III, 262 – Carl Gustav Jung, *Briefe 1906-1961*, 3 vol.: I 1906-1945; II 1946-1955; III 1956-1961, Aniela Jaffé & Gerhard Adler (eds.), Aniela Jaffé (trans. into German of the English and French letters) (Olten & Freiburg im Breisgau: Walter-Verlag, [1972] 1990 (4thed.)).

17 GW 10, 80 (§ 128). The mystical participation is visible in that many of them think they have, in addition to their personal soul, a "bush soul". The latter would incarnate in a wild animal or a tree with which it feels a sort of psychic identity (EEI 24, 45). They consider then this animal or vegetable as man's brother. For example, a man who would have a crocodile for a brother would be able to swim in peace in a lake full of them. Or, if a fraternal identity is established with a tree, all the harm that would be done to it would affect him also (EEI 24).

18 GW 13, 53 (§ 66); 224 (§ 253); GW 14/II, 262 (§ 356).

19 GW 6, 486 (§ 780); GW 13, 53 (§ 66); GW 14/II, 262 (§ 356); GW 18/I, 157 (§ 322).

20 GW 6, 9 (§ 11-12); GW 10, 159-160 (§ 277-280).

21 GW 6, 29 (§ 46); GW 8, 177 (§ 329).

topography of his unconscious.²² In a certain way, archaic man lives in the unconscious.²³ He has a relation to his unconscious but this relation is largely unconscious because the primitive is too close to it.

1. 3. Introjection

While the subject is projected on the object, the object finds itself introjected in the subject.²⁴ Jung uses the word *Einfüllung* (filling) to designate the operation that consists in giving an object one's own subjectivity (soul, unconscious), to fill it with its own life, all in all to transfer its identity.²⁵ The subject feels itself in the object.²⁶ Not that he has the sensation of being projected in the object (this operation escapes him completely), he rather has the impression that the object has a soul.²⁷ He individualizes animals, plants, and even inanimate things.²⁸ Everything has its spirit. Nature is not simply an object at hand, but appears to him as having a soul. This projection of the psyche establishes relations between beings that seem to us inconceivable.²⁹ The introjection is easier when the object is not too different from the subject.³⁰ Moreover, the more an object is passive, the more it can

22 GW 10, 40 (§ 44).

23 Edward Armstrong Bennet, *Meetings with Jung* (Zurich: Daimon, 1985) 35. The myths and symbols are not discovered by archaic man but are experienced by him (GW 9/I, 168 (§ 261); EEI 81). At the beginning there was action. The human being starts to act and then reflection comes. The latter is a late acquisition in the evolution. Directed by his unconscious, archaic man acts without being perfectly conscious of the nature of what he does. It is only much later, that man has stopped to reflect on the meaning of his actions and on what causes him to act (EEI 81). Archaic man experiences the myth that regulates his actions without, however, being fully conscious of the meanings that are immanent in them (GW 18/I, 260 (§ 551)). Modern man, on the other hand, disposes of a wide symbolic knowledge of the myths, but he does not have always a living experience of them.

24 GW 13, 53 (§ 66).

25 GW 6, 308 (§ 486); 310-316 (§ 489-501); 325 (§ 513); 452 (§ 703); GW 8, 299 (§ 516); GW 10, 40 (§ 44).

26 GW6, 308 (§ 486); GW 8, 299 (§ 516).

27 GW6, 308 (§ 486).

28 GW 5, 40-41 (§ 23-24); GW 10, 159 (§ 280).

29 GW 10, 81 (§ 129).

30 GW 6, 311 (§ 491).

be easily assimilated.³¹ It is as if the object was empty.³² Because of this, false analogies and resemblances can be generated.³³ Archaic man covers these objects with a veil that hides their true nature.

1. 4. *Disguise of Reality and Maladjustment*

Indeed, in the absence of the distinction between the conscious and the unconscious, the contents of the unconscious are projected on the exterior objects to the point where these are no longer differentiated from the projected contents:

and it is only insofar as we recognize certain distinctive features of our objects as projections, as *imago*, that we succeed in distinguishing their real properties. But insofar as we do not become conscious of the projective character of the properties of objects, we absolutely cannot do otherwise but be naively convinced that they also really belong to the object.³⁴

The frequency of this kind of projection is as certain as the fact of not being aware of their character. In these circumstances, it is by no means astonishing that the naïve mind accepts immediately as self-evident that when he dreams of Mr. X, this image of the dream, called "Mr. X", is identical to the real Mr. X. This supposition corresponds to the general and non-critical consciousness that sees no difference between the object in itself and the representation that one has of it. From a critical point of view – nobody can deny it – the image of the dream has only a very limited and external relation to the object. In fact, it is a complex of psychical factors that has form itself and which, especially for this reason, is formed in the subject from subjective factors characteristic of the subject and, most of the time, hardly concerns the real object.³⁵

Projected, the unconscious content is not assimilated to consciousness but is instead dissimulated.³⁶ By falsifying the nature of the object,³⁷ the projection isolates the subject, preventing it from opening itself to his otherness:

The success of the projections has as a consequence the isolation of the subject from his environment insofar as he has, instead of a real

31 That is why Nature more than history is more spontaneously made sacred.
 32 GW 6, 310-311 (§ 490-491).
 33 GW 6, 310 (§ 489).
 34 GW 8, 292-293 (§ 507).
 35 GW 8, 294 (§ 508). See also GW 6, 252 (§ 402); 493 (§ 793); GW 9/I, 75 (§ 121); GW 13, 53 (§ 66); 102 (§ 122); 224-225 (§ 253); GW 18/I, 154 (§ 313-315).
 36 GW 6, 443-444 (§ 685-687); 493 (§ 793).
 37 GW 14/II, 273 (§ 369); GW 18/I, 154 (§ 313-315).

relation with the latter, only an illusory one. The projections transform the environment in his image, though this remains unknown. This is the reason why it leads finally to an autoerotic or autistic state, in which one dreams a world whose reality remains inaccessible. The “feeling of incompleteness” which follows, and even worse, the feeling of sterility, are explained again by the projection seen as being caused by the evilness of the environment, and because of this vicious circle, the isolation grows. The more the projections insert themselves between the subject and the environment, the more it becomes difficult for the ego to see through its illusions.³⁸

Hidden by the projections, the real properties of beings always remain there and wait to be discovered by the withdrawal of the projections. This applies to the external world, as well as to the subject himself. Projection/introjection affects negatively the knowledge that a person can have of himself, because he is not able to realize that these contents are within himself.³⁹ The individual cuts himself off not only from a part of the environment, but also from himself. Hiding his own identity from himself, he is unconscious.

1. 5. *Passivity and the Original Parcelling Out*

Since the subject is originally separated from himself, the primitive state of the mind is one of parcelling out. The individual has no will of his own, but is inhabited by a whole net of complexes in conflict,⁴⁰ each having its own will.⁴¹ Since the will is divided against itself, the ego is unable to occupy the dominant position at the centre of consciousness.

38 GW 9/II, 18-19 (§ 17).

39 GW 14/II, 262 (§ 356); 273 (§ 369).

40 A complex is an “image of a particular psychic situation which is highly emotionally charged and which proves to be, in addition, incompatible with the usual state of consciousness or the usual conscious attitude. This image has a strong internal cohesion, its own integrity, and provides in addition a relatively high level of autonomy, that is to say, it is subjected to the conscious dispositions only in a relative way and behaves thus in the space of consciousness as a living *corpus alienum*. The complex can normally be repressed by a certain effort of the will, but it cannot be eliminated, and, when the appropriate occasion emerges, it returns with its original force” (GW 8, 115 (§ 201)). In fact, it is a grouping of psychic elements that revolve around a highly affectively charged content; a conglomerate of ideal and emotional representations whose content is composed of a central core and a high number of secondary constellated associations.

41 On the autonomy of the complex see GW 3, 46 (§ 83); 51 (§ 93); GW 5, 87 (§ 95); GW 6, 263 (§ 421); 563 (§ 923-925); GW 8, 113 (§ 198); 143-144 (§ 253); 216 (§ 387); GW 18/I, 89 (§ 149-150).

In mystical participation, the object on which the subject has bestowed his libido exerts on him a dangerous fascination, and creates an emotional dependence and thorough passivity⁴² which can make the adaptation problematic: "The exclusion of knowledge, which is conditioned by such a state, and the impossibility of a conscious experience, signify a considerable loss in the capacity of adaptation which has an enormous importance, considering the absence of weapons and human protection and the lengthy helplessness of man's descent."⁴³

1. 6. *The Frailty of Archaic Man's Ego*

This lack of freedom, and therefore of individuality, comes from the fact that primitive man is still much too dependent on the unconscious that dominates him and prevents him from forming a powerful ego. Subject to fragmentation, primitive man often thinks that he has many souls, that is, as Jung would say, he possesses many complexes of a relatively high independence.⁴⁴ The ego has not yet attained its unity. Surely, his souls are related in some way, but their unity stays fragile and risks fragmenting itself under the influence of uncontrolled emotions.⁴⁵ The conscious identity of primitive man is always precarious because its foundations are not solid. In fact, he lives in the collective unconscious; it is only minimally that he functions at the conscious level.

Feeling that his soul is in jeopardy,⁴⁶ he erects ramparts around his space. These fortifications, before having a military function, are a psychological measure destined to protect him from the invasion of unconscious forces that could put his ego in danger.⁴⁷ To submit to the unconscious forces would imply a return to the original absence of differentiation, to nothingness.

42 GW 6, 252-253 (§ 402-403).

43 GW 6, 252 (§ 403).

44 GW 6, 261 (§ 419); GW 8, 335 (§ 577); EEI 24.

45 EEI 24.

46 GW 9/I, 31 (§ 47); GW 10, 162 (§ 287); GW 16, 268 (§ 477); GW 18/I, 212 (§ 443).

47 GW 9/I, 32 (§ 48-49).

This explains that “the *horror novi* is one of the most striking properties of primitive man.”⁴⁸ Otherness is likely to break him. This fear is called by anthropologists “misonism”.⁴⁹ That is why primitive man is fundamentally conservative and attached to tradition. He is especially dependent on his unconscious regulated in its depth by archetypes and instincts. Living at the level of instinct is something quite reassuring: there is no possibility of doing things otherwise than how they present themselves, and therefore no doubt as to the procedure to follow.⁵⁰ This explains, according to Jung, why archaic man was able to live for so long without changing. If he were to discover that an exterior object does not correspond to his projection, then his adaptation to reality would be threatened.⁵¹ When panic is awakened, this object tends to be perceived as dangerous, and can even in certain cases be demonized.⁵²

The more archaic he is, the more important would be his dependence on his instincts and less important would be his will.⁵³ Primitive man does not possess the degree of concentration and intensity of modern consciousness. He is not naturally equipped with the aptitude to will.⁵⁴ His consciousness is threatened by the imperious forces of the unconscious. That is why he fears the magic influences that could at any moment counteract his intention and hamper his will.⁵⁵ To start an action, he needs beforehand to generate a mood of the will. He does that by having recourse (ex: entering and exiting) to rituals. The latter aims at gathering its energies.⁵⁶ The act of the will must not be a simple emotional and instinctive

48 GW 17, 92 (§ 146). See also GW 7, 211 (§ 324); GW 9/I, 177 (§ 276-277); GW 10, 75 (§ 119-120); GW 13, 21 (§ 12); EEI 31.

49 GW 5, 530 (§ 653); EEI 31.

50 GW 8, 428 (§ 750-752).

51 GW 13, 21 (§ 12).

52 GW 8, 299 (§ 517); GW 10, 160 (§ 282).

53 GW 8, 227-228 (§ 398).

54 CGJS 102-103.

55 GW 9/I, 167-168 (§ 260).

56 GW 8, 56 (§ 87).

reaction.⁵⁷ All in all, his will requires an artificial construction. Modern man, having more energy at hand,⁵⁸ has acquired and interiorized a more powerful will than primitive man. He does not need a ritual when he is required to undertake an action.⁵⁹ It is only when he must launch out into something that exceeds his strength and could go wrong that he uses a ritual.⁶⁰ The directed thought is an asset of modern times that is lacking in archaic cultures.⁶¹

1. 7. The Identity of Archaic Man with the Divine According to Mircea Eliade

Mircea Eliade has well shown how primitive man lacks individuality because he has not really differentiated himself from the divine. Sure enough, primitive man apprehends his being insofar as he participates in the divine, “repeating” the paradigmatic actions of the gods (revealed *in illo tempore*). Only then is he able with symbolism to reproduce the divine reality without any loss anywhere in time and space. Archaic societies display “theocentrism”. The Absolute does not have an “other”, because everything is the Absolute. Repeating always the same thing, man cannot become different from God. A real distinction between the natural and the supernatural is absent. Indeed, in archaic religions, the Absolute (being) and the world (the representation) are in a sense “one”. Eliade would therefore agree with Jung that primitive man refers to reality through the mode of mystical participation,⁶² and that he functions at the level of the unconscious. Here is how this repetition is realized according to Eliade.⁶³

57 GW 9/I, 133 (§ 213); 167-168 (§ 260); GW 18/II, 594 (§ 1289); CGJS 103.

58 He has mastered the art of moving psychic energy.

59 GW 8, 56 (§ 87); GW 18/II, 594 (§ 1289).

60 GW 8, 56 (§ 87).

61 GW 5, 36 (§ 17).

62 Jean Cazeneuve, *La mentalité archaïque* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1961) 42-43.

63 I am just presenting here a summary of what I had developed in my article at length: “Le temps et l'éternité dans les religions archaïques selon Mircea Eliade : les éléments préfiguratifs de l'Incarnation dans l'ontologie primitive”.

First, the gods create the world. These series of events constitute the Great mythical time. Archaic man imagines that the gods have left their mark in the structure of Nature, which recapitulates (thus repeats) the essence of the divine world. Nature is the representation that encapsulates the divine being, such as a *fractal*, where each part (as small as it may be) reproduces the whole. It announces the mode of all the representations that will follow. Then, primitive man, in contemplating Nature which seems, through its structure, to speak to him, obtains knowledge of the divine reality, and imitates the gestures enacted by the primordial divinities, in order to regenerate the Cosmos, timeless at the beginning, but which became afterwards, for obscure reasons, subjected to time and corruption, and thus to suffering and finally to death. These divine actions constitute exemplary and eternal models to be followed (archetypes) because they were able to produce being where there was nothingness. This repetition is first carried out during the period of festivities. Inside this small period of time, which reproduces at a reduced scale the whole year, the Great mythical time of the origins becomes, so to speak, “incarnate”. Man is then co-present with the “origin”. Eternity is actualized in the world, saving it from death, and assuring its perpetuation. He recovers his initial fullness. This constitutes a *necessary* repetition of the cosmogony, which manifests itself not only in the intense time of the festivities, but also on a daily basis, on certain days of intensification, at other moments of the year. The cosmogonic myth, serving as a model for all creation, is recited at pivotal moments of existence dealing with the generation or the perpetuation of life, such moments as birth, marriage and death.⁶⁴ But its manifestation can also be improvised with relation to contingent events, unforeseen by the calendar. The cosmogonic myth is used each time there is a critical existential situation, such as when someone falls ill or when a harvest is compromised.⁶⁵ In such case, we are dealing with a *contingent* repetition of the cosmogony.

64 AM 48.

65 AM 44-45.

The more we penetrate in time, the more we meet contingency. This contingent repetition transports the centre to its periphery. Thus, because of the symbol, archaic man is able, whatever the gap, to nullify the distance with his divine origin, so that he can stay “united” with it, for then there is no loss between the representation and its original.⁶⁶ Archaic man feels that he “exists” insofar as he repeats the divine, so that he is “one” with him. Living in eternity, he is in a relation of “simultaneity”, and not of succession with the origin. From this perspective, the human being is not differentiated from God, just as a child who is unconscious of its being, identifies with its parents whom he tends to imitate.

Insofar as theocentrism keeps man in a state of non-existence, Jung, from his point of view, can state: “‘Metaphysics’ has for us the same psychological significance as the term ‘unconscious.’”⁶⁷ It follows that the content of the unconscious (especially collective: the archetypes⁶⁸) are projected and hypostasized into a metaphysical space,⁶⁹ because primitive man is unable to make the difference between God and his image.⁷⁰

66 We are not on the mode of degeneration, where the world imitates imperfectly the divine order, such as in Plato’s system or in Hindu thought.

67 GW 6, 149 (§ 233).

68 The recurrence of certain themes, features, figures, ideas, in symbolic or religious representations of individuals or social groups unknown to each other led Jung to postulate the existence of *archetypes*, which he considered to be *a priori* categories of the imagination (GW 3, 274 (§ 527); 291 (§ 550); GW 9/I, 81-82 (§ 136-137); GW 10, 23 (§ 14); GW 11, 519 (§ 845); GW 13, 21 (§ 12); GW 15, 93 (§ 126)) (innate possibilities of representations) situated in the collective unconscious. The representations are determined in their *structure* by the archetypes and in their appearance by the socio-historical and cultural environment in which they occur (*Briefe* II, 168). The archetype is a sort of empty form, different from the (archetypal) images that are its expressions (GW9/I, 61 (§ 99-100)). The hypothesis of the archetypes aims to explain the structural homologies between the different objectifications of the divine. The representation of the Absolute would be conditioned by the archetype of the self (GW 9/II, 31 (§ 42); 41 (§ 60); GW 11 173 (§ 233); 176 (§ 237-238); 205 (§ 281-282); 209 (§ 289); 469-470 (§ 755, 757); GW 18/I, 116 (§ 218-222); *Briefe* II, 498).

69 GW 9/I, 74 (§ 120).

70 GW 6, 50 (§ 73); GW 8, 306 (§ 528), *Briefe* II, 501. *Briefe* III, 104-105, 108-113; GW 11, 369 (§ 558); GW 14/II, 330 (§ 442); *Briefe* II, 502. The numinosity of the archetype is responsible for the fact that the human being has much difficulty wrenching himself free from the hypnotic fascinating power of the images produced by the archetypes, a situation that does not allow him to consider other points of view. No variation of opinion, no discussion or bringing into question is permitted (GW 14/II, 330 (§ 442)). Everyone must think the same way.

However, things get more complex when one understands that the unconscious is not necessarily for Jung the contrary of consciousness, that it *can also* be the condition for its possibility of being. Thus the repetition of the origin carried out by primitive man can also be interpreted at the same time as something other than an expression of a regressive desire leading to the abolition of consciousness. As we will see, this intuition also finds an echo in Eliade's analysis of archaic experience.

2. PROPERTIES OF THE UNCONSCIOUS

The question is to know how the unconscious has the possibility both to hinder consciousness and to nurture its development; how can it be itself and its opposite at the same time. This is possible because, contrary to consciousness, everything in the unconscious is "one" and "simultaneous".

2. 1. *Unity, Eternity and Femininity of the Unconscious*

Moving from consciousness to the unconscious, we go from differentiation to lack of differentiation, and therefore from visibility to invisibility: at that level we perceive less the contour of objects, these having become fuzzy; that is why it is harder to become conscious of them. They all end up melding into the one and "same" reality. As we descend into the unconscious we pass from multiplicity to unity, from history to Nature. The birth of consciousness is related to the apparition of spatio-temporality,⁷¹ an essential condition of our three-dimensional world.⁷² As we penetrate into the unconscious, space and time become more and more relative⁷³ (the personal unconscious) until they erase themselves completely⁷⁴ (the

71 GW 9/II, 33 (§ 45); *Briefe I*, 379.

72 *Briefe II*, 28.

73 "Insofar as the past, the present and the future coalesce in the unconscious, the latter certainly has its 'own time'" (GW 11, 505-506 (§ 815)). See also *Briefe I*, 282; *Briefe II*, 41; 148; *Briefe III*, 135; 188; Carl Gustav Jung, *Erinnerungen, Träume, Gedanken von C. G. Jung* (Aufgezeichnet und herausgegeben von Aniela Jaffe) (= ETGCGJ) (Zürich & Düsseldorf: Walter-Verlag, [1961] 1997 (14th ed.)) 143.

74 *Briefe I*, 379; *Briefe II*, 177.

collective unconscious⁷⁵): “Since the forms of the unconscious do not belong to any time, and seem therefore eternal, they procure, when they are made conscious, a strange feeling of timelessness.”⁷⁶

The primitive state of our psyche is mythologically expressed by the figure of the *ouroboros*, the snake which bites its own tail, forming a circle that refers to our original unity⁷⁷ and eternity (since the beginning (the head) and the end (the tail) are simultaneous). A symbol of chaos (the primordial waters), the snake is also the primitive androgynous and can be qualified here as feminine. And, explains Jung, “from this One and by this One all came into being”.⁷⁸ The One unifies in itself unity (itself) and duality (its otherness). Similarly, in eternity, eternity (itself) and time (its otherness) are simultaneous.⁷⁹ The same goes for the feminine, which, as indicated by its curved edges, tends towards unity, and is therefore said to be at the same time androgynous. Indeed, in the unconscious, which Jung understands to be feminine/androgynous, the feminine (itself) and the masculine (its otherness) are to be found together, not apart as in consciousness.⁸⁰

Finally, the circle traced by the *ouroboros*, representing its capacity to fertilize and give birth to itself in order to transform itself into a flying dragon, expresses mythologically the self-determination of the original will, the unconscious, which, from the nothingness that it is, “can” choose to come into being.

75 GW 11, 498 (§ 792); *Briefe* III, 136-137.

76 GW 11, 492 (§ 782). See also GW 16, 308 (§ 529).

77 GW 9/II, 183 (§ 264); GW 11, 303 (§ 440); 506-508 (§ 816-819).

78 GW 16, 306 (§ 527).

79 That is why Eliade, on his side, can describe the Great mythical time as an eternity already containing in itself a history!

80 Consciousness is characterized by Jung as masculine in that it promotes a certain form of differentiation understood as division and exclusion. It can be qualified as “phallic” insofar as potential things, by being actualized, are rendered visible and exterior, like the male sexual organ which allows itself to be seen (in contrast to the feminine sexual organ which is invisible and internal). In consciousness the other and the same are separate, as are also the feminine and the masculine, while they were united in the unconscious, which is, as we just said, feminine/androgynous. This femininity is somehow different from the one apprehended by the conscious mind, for it is not in opposition to masculinity.

2. 2. *The Unconscious as Original Freedom*

While consciousness is spatio-temporally limited, the unconscious is an infinite reality containing an infinite number of possibilities that just wait to be actualized: “We name the unconscious nothingness, and yet it is a reality *in potentia*.”⁸¹ It is nothingness because nothing exists in a state of actuality. Where consciousness is actuality, the unconsciousness is possibility. That is why it can be defined as an original and indeterminate freedom.⁸² This is what Jung implies when he identifies the libido, that he defines as psychic energy,⁸³ with A. Schopenhauer’s concept of the will. Already in his *Zofingia-Vorträge* given in 1898 Jung could say:

The Kantian criticism has left the problem of the thing in itself unresolved, even though Kant, as a positive philosopher, had accepted the idea of a plurality of noumena [...] and that was fundamental especially for the deduction of the thing in itself, developed above. The first post-Kantian philosopher who rendered this problem useful in philosophy once more was Schopenhauer. We know that he interpreted the thing in itself as a blind will. Eduard von Hartmann, as spiritual heir to Schopenhauer, endorsed this idea of the will, adding to it the element of transcendental representation, and interpreted the thing in itself as unconscious will and representation.⁸⁴

54 years later, in 1952, Jung grants an interview where he elaborates on his position. The journalist gives an account of Jung’s words and comments on them:

“My conceptions are much more those of Carus than those of Freud.” Kant, Schopenhauer, C. G. Carus, and Eduard von Hartmann “had provided me with the tools of thought.” [...] “To Schopenhauer I owe the dynamic view of the psyche; the ‘Will’ is the libido that is behind everything.” It is a force outside consciousness, something that is *not* the ego. Kant had shown that the world is tied up to the “I”, to the thinking subject, but here was this non-ego, this “Will”

81 GW 9/I, 297 (§ 498). See also GW 11, 505 (§ 812); GW 14/I, 228 (§ 247); GW 16, 308 (§ 529); *Das rote Buch – Liber Novus* [= RB] (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 2009) II (Book), 21 (chap.), 164 (p. in the original calligraphic volume), p. 318 (in the published version).

82 RB II, 21, 164, p. 318.

83 GW 6, 483 (§ 774).

84 Carl Gustav Jung, *Die Zofingia-Vorträge 1896-1899* (Zürich & Düsseldorf: Walter-Verlag, 1997) 110. Nevertheless for Eduard von Hartmann, will, and not reason, is the primordial aspect of the unconscious.

that was outside the Kantian critique. When Jung came to study the dissociation of consciousness observable in schizophrenia, where people talk under the influence of something other than the ego, this non-ego struck him as being the same thing as Schopenhauer's "Will." "The great question was, is there a non-ego, is there something that can pull me out of the isolation-in-the-ego of the Kantian world picture?"⁸⁵

Indeed, psychosis,⁸⁶ even more than neurosis, reveals in the individual the presence of a foreign (unconscious) will, a counter-will, more powerful, because more original than the ego. It is this autonomy of the unconscious that explains the psychic dissociations. But "the existence of this second subject is in no way a pathological symptom, but a normal fact that we can observe everywhere and at any time."⁸⁷ The dissociative troubles are not due to the presence in us of a second subject, but are due to our incapacity to harmonize consciousness with the unconscious. The unconscious can even function without consciousness,⁸⁸ such as the heart that is beating or digestion occurring without one's thinking about it. This autonomy confers on the unconscious an objective character. That is why Jung can say that the unconscious is the objective psyche, and consciousness the subjective one.⁸⁹ This autonomy grows progressively when we penetrate the unconscious.

The freedom of the conscious will is not a natural phenomenon,⁹⁰ but something historically and slowly acquired at the price of many efforts. Indeed, ontogenetically as well as phylogenetically

85 CGJS 207. In personalizing the forces of Nature, archaic man doesn't believe, as does modern man, that the world is simply governed by causal laws; he imagines instead that behind each event hides a *will*, which he tries sometimes to retrace: "Everything has its source in an arbitrary invisible power, in other words, everything is chance, only he does not call it chance, but rather intention. Natural causality is only a simple appearance and therefore not worthy of being mentioned" (GW 10, 73 (§ 115)). For Jung, *the primitive has the intuition that the thing in itself is will and that everything that happens is willed* because he lives in the unconscious.

86 Jung's field of specialization.

87 GW 18/I, 220 (§ 459).

88 GW 9/I, 299 (§ 502).

89 GW 5, 12 (Foreword to the 4th ed.); GW 10, 171 (§ 312); GW 17, 107-108 (§ 168); GW 18/II, 712-713 (§ 1505); *Briefe* I, 487; *Briefe* III, 168.

90 GW 17, 107-108 (§ 166-169).

the conscious mind emerged from the night of the unconscious.⁹¹ But this autonomy is structural before being phenomenologically observable. Consciousness has its roots in the unconscious.⁹² Nothingness is the crucible of things wherefrom being and consciousness could spring out. In this sense, between the unconscious and consciousness there is a certain asymmetry. The ego does not create itself, but rather appears to itself. Psychic processes were already in place before consciousness emerged and the individual could think and say: "I am."⁹³

The goal of the psyche is to actualize the infinite possibilities that reside in the unconscious. As a potential totality, the unconscious has in itself the possibility of its opposite, consciousness, which is in the unconscious the possible alternative to unconsciousness. Since a possibility does not comprise by definition any necessity, the unconscious is freedom. It is this freedom that has the choice, and not the conscious mind, which doesn't exist yet, to create consciousness. As finite reality, consciousness cannot generate itself. Its existence rests upon something "else", of which it is precisely "unconscious". Without it, consciousness would not have been able to exist and to grow. This is the reason why the unconscious is not only freedom but original freedom. It is only when the unconscious has produced the ego-consciousness that the latter can have certain autonomy and be able to determine itself. Freedom is *given* to it because the unconscious is freedom – the creature being is in the image of the creator. But the freedom is not reducible to its manifestation. Indeed, if the unconscious had not produced consciousness, this non-creation would have not stopped being an act of freedom, because the unconscious in its freedom had the choice not to cause consciousness, and remain in its state of unconsciousness (psychic nothingness). The freedom is so free that it is free not to be free; but at the same time it is not free not to be free because the act of negating

91 GW 9/I, 298-299 (§ 499-503); GW 18/I, 26 (§ 15).

92 GW 4, 392 (§ 782); GW 5, 13 (Foreword to the 4th ed.).

93 GW 9/I, 298 (§ 500).

freedom is itself an act of freedom. In which case, there is freedom without creation, without causation. So that, the freedom where a person determines himself by causing his own movement, thus becoming himself through an *historical* act, is but the phenomenal expression of a more original freedom, one that refers to *Nature*.

3. ORIGINAL EXPERIENCE AND WITHDRAWAL OF PROJECTIONS: BIRTH AND FORMATION OF EGO-CONSCIOUSNESS

3. 1. *Withdrawal of Projections and Emergence of Consciousness*

Without consciousness, the unconscious would not be able to explore its possibilities.⁹⁴ That is why it gives itself consciousness. The maternal state of original unconsciousness must be sacrificed in order that the world might appear to a subject in the process of constituting himself while bringing back to himself the images which he always already projected on it.⁹⁵ The withdrawal of projections leads to the emergence of consciousness, which is the *sine qua non* condition of all experience. For this reason, Jung characterizes it as being the original experience (“Urerlebnis”).⁹⁶ Without a conscious subject, one cannot talk of a *recognition of the world and of being*:

Without it [the original experience], there is in fact practically no world, for the latter exists as such, only insofar as it is reflected and expressed consciously by the psyche. *Consciousness is the condition for being*. With it, the psyche obtains the dignity of a cosmic principle that assigns it – philosophically and *de facto* – a position equal to the principle of physical being.⁹⁷

“The existence of the world rests on two conditions: the first, is its being, the second, is its recognition.”⁹⁸ It is reflexive consciousness that gives the world its meaning.⁹⁹

94 GW 16, 291 (§ 503).

95 GW 5, 529 (§ 652). A part of the psychic energy is used by instincts, which try to perpetuate the species and keep people alive. But there is a surplus, which will be used to create consciousness (GW 8, 209 (§ 379)).

96 GW 5, 416 (§ 500).

97 GW 10, 299 (§ 528).

98 GW 16, 99 (§ 201). See also GW 6, 401 (§ 621-622); GW 11, 304 (§ 442); 482 (§ 769-770); GW 14/I, 136 (§ 128); GW 16, 99 (§ 201-203); *Briefe* III, 231; ETGCGJ 259-260; 341-342.

99 *Briefe* III, 239.

3. 2. *The Differentiation of the Subject and the Object through Abstraction*

Since conscious subjectivity does not exist at the beginning, it is the *motherly*¹⁰⁰ unconscious mind that constitutes it by causing the withdrawal of the projections¹⁰¹ made on the object, so that the latter can discover its own reality, its difference. The subject wrenches himself free from the fascination that the object exerts on him and which defines him, so as to distance himself somewhat. The projection ceases from the moment the person, realizing that the projected content draws its origin from his subjectivity,¹⁰² rescues his libido from the object and appropriates it for himself.¹⁰³ He realizes that he had given the object a meaning it did not have,¹⁰⁴ and that the representation of the objects does not necessarily correspond to the objects as they are in themselves. Once this split has occurred,¹⁰⁵ the subject becomes conscious not only of the object as such, but of himself as subject.¹⁰⁶ And so consciousness distinguishes the opposites *contra naturam*.¹⁰⁷ At the beginning, therefore, unconsciousness accounts for both the object and the subject. Since the individual appropriates for himself that part of the object that he had always already put into the latter unconsciously from the start, the withdrawal of the projections is an act of self-reflection, self-knowledge and finally self-constitution. By developing his

100 This is the figure of the nurturing Mother (promoter of difference), which contrasts with the devouring/castrating Mother (destroyer of difference) – expressed in mythology by the image of the *vagina dentata*. Indeed, the unconscious, which possesses in itself its other, can also promote differentiation if it *chooses* to generate consciousness (its opposite) instead of *deciding* to stay closed on itself (that is, in an incestuous state). This form of differentiation, which is specific to the unconscious, and usually overlooked, is no less valuable than the one associated with consciousness.

101 *Abstraction* is another term used by Jung for “withdrawal of projections”.

102 GW 9/I, 75 (§ 121-122).

103 GW 6, 310 (§ 490); 313 (§ 495).

104 GW 6, 405 (§ 626).

105 GW 5, 416 (§ 500).

106 GW 5, 417 (§ 501).

107 GW 5, 510 (§ 624); GW 9/I, 110 (§ 178); GW 12, 40-41 (§ 30); GW 13, 261 (§ 291); GW 14/II, 188 (§ 271).

consciousness in this manner, the subject acquires a freedom of action, as much with relation to the object as to himself.¹⁰⁸

3. 3. *The Freedom of the Subject*

At this stage there occurs a fundamental differentiation between faith and knowledge,¹⁰⁹ because by withdrawing from Nature the soul that belonged to it,¹¹⁰ the subject removes its sacred character. The sacred begins consequently to be distinguished from the profane. By not perceiving Nature as reality filled with divinities, as a huge organism endowed with a universal soul (*anima mundi*), the subject does not have any scruples about appropriating it for himself, submitting it to his will, making it an object of experimentation, that is to say, using it for his own ends. With the withdrawal of the projection, man becomes free to impose himself, at least in part, on his natural environment and to transform it.¹¹¹ He becomes a historical subject, and is not, as is natural man, determined by his external environment and his instincts.¹¹² Not being possessed by the projected contents, he is not divided against himself, fragmented into contradictory wills. His personality is more unified. The ego-complex becomes central and dominant.¹¹³

And so a double differentiation is carried out: 1) one between the ego and its environments;¹¹⁴ and 2) another between the external environment and the internal one (the unconscious). It is with these two worlds that the free will of ego-consciousness will be dealing with.¹¹⁵

108 GW 6, 252 (§ 402); GW 13, 52 (§ 65); GW 14/II, 262 (§ 356).

109 GW 6, 581 (§ 965).

110 GW 6, 581 (§ 965-966).

111 GW 6, 314 (§ 497).

112 GW 8, 210 (§ 380).

113 The withdrawal of projection represents a liberation not only from Nature, but also from all that is similar to it, such as family and tradition.

114 GW 9/II, 14 (§ 6, 9).

115 GW 9/II, 14-15 (§ 6-9). The differentiation between the external and internal worlds is accompanied by a second differentiation, that of the *persona* and the *anima*. The *persona* conditions our "relation" with the external world, while the *anima* determines the relation to the internal world (GW 6, 498 (§ 803); 500 (§ 805); 502 (§ 808-809); GW 10, 412 (§ 715); *Briefe* II, 105; 113). This is why, in mythology, the *anima* takes on the form of the psychopompos. She is the mediator between the conscious and the unconscious mind.

3. 4. *The Frailty of Modern Man's Ego*

At the outset, the withdrawal of projection is not as easy to achieve as one would like to believe. Projection is so deeply rooted in us, that many thousands of years of culture were needed to remove it from the objects.¹¹⁶ Our modern consciousness is still at a stage of childhood. It has hardly begun to say "I".¹¹⁷ Although considerable, our development is far from over.¹¹⁸ Still at an experimental stage, consciousness has not had time to crystallize, and is therefore fragile.¹¹⁹ Far from being free from all his irrational beliefs, modern man is a strange mixture of scientific scepticism and naive belief.¹²⁰ The unity of his consciousness is still easily wounded. Sometimes not much is needed (a certain weariness or loss of interest) for his identity to be fragmented under the blow of the psychic content that possesses him.¹²¹ Paradoxically, without the support of the unconscious, the withdrawal of projections remains superficial. This is what modern man still has to learn.

4. ADAPTATION TO ENVIRONMENT AND THE ACTUALIZATION OF THE POSSIBILITIES

4. 1. *Adaptation to the Inner and Outer Environments*

As consciousness evolves, the external and internal environments are created. Consciousness is first of all an organ of orientation.¹²²

The *persona* is the medium between the ego and the community. Since they are relational, both are feminine. The *persona* is the conscious feminine; the *anima* is the unconscious feminine. The *persona*, being the mask that we wear in public, enables us to be in relation with society (GW 6, 498 (§ 803); GW 7, 165-166 (§ 245-247), 202 (§ 306-307)). The *anima* is at the same time the relation to the unconscious and the personification of the contents of the unconscious itself (GW 6, 262 (§ 421)). She represents the collective unconscious (GW 16, 291 (§ 503)). The Eros is the relational function of the psyche, the force of attraction to the other, outside and inside of us.

116 GW 9/I, 16 (§ 7); GW 10, 24-25 (§ 16); GW 18/I, 210 (§ 439).

117 GW 10, 161 (§ 284).

118 GW 18/I, 210 (§ 439-440).

119 EEI 24-25.

120 GW 18/I, 211 (§ 442); 277 (§ 586-587); GW 18/II, 592 (§ 1288).

121 EEI 25.

122 GW 8, 145 (§ 256).

To do that, it must not only perceive the external environment and respond to its requirements but also apprehend its internal world and have it manifest itself.¹²³ The progression consists in a forward movement towards adaptation to the surrounding (external and internal) conditions.¹²⁴ It is to this need that the development of consciousness responds:

The reason why consciousness is present and why the latter seeks to broaden and to deepen itself is very simple: *without consciousness, things function less well*. Apparently, this is why Mother Nature has agreed to give birth to consciousness, a creation which is the strangest among all the most amazing curiosities of Nature. Primitive man who is almost unconscious can, he too, adapt himself and hold on, but only in his primitive world, and that is why he becomes in other circumstances the victim of innumerable dangers, while we, situated at a higher level of consciousness, avoid them without pain.¹²⁵

4. 2. *The One-Sidedness of Consciousness*

Because of its natural finiteness, the conscious mind cannot actualize all at once the totality of the possibilities within the unconscious. Besides, it does not have to do so, for it would be overloaded with useless information that could most of the time put sticks in its wheels.

Once created, ego-consciousness is able to adapt itself to reality for a while. But since the latter evolves, there comes a time when the ego, in order to continue its adaptation, must renew itself by drawing new possibilities from the unconscious.¹²⁶ Depending of what the situation will require, the individual will have to actualize possibilities from the personal or collective unconscious.¹²⁷

However, one should specify, that if the original unity must be overcome in order that consciousness and individuality can appear, it must not be completely abandoned because psychic projection normally weaves relations between man, animals, and

123 GW 8, 182 (§ 342).

124 GW 8, 43-51 (§ 60-76); GW 18/II, 481-482 (§ 1084-1090).

125 GW 8, 397-398 (§ 695).

126 GW 8, 47 (§ 65-67). See also 43-51 (§ 60-76).

127 GW 7, 85 (§ 118).

things that our consciousness cannot apprehend.¹²⁸ Furthermore, it puts the person, in a certain way, in relation with himself and, in so doing, constitutes its subjectivity. The state of mystical participation allows one to acquire truth about things in the universe because by being “one” with the world man has an immediate contact with reality beyond time and space.¹²⁹ The opposition that Jung establishes between projection and its withdrawal is therefore not as harsh as we were led to believe in the first place. As an “inevitable instrument of knowledge”¹³⁰, projection plays an important role in the constitution of the object, and, finally, of the subject. That is why the unconscious must remain present, as a source where the ego can renew itself.

However, when the ego refuses to renew itself in the unconscious, then its one-sidedness becomes an obstacle to the actualization of the new possibilities necessary for the adaptation.¹³¹ Since the conscious and the unconscious mind are dissociated,¹³² the psyche finds itself in a state of unbalance.¹³³ When it persists in following this path, then neurosis or psychosis (according to whether the

128 GW 10, 81 (§ 129).

129 Jung, who believes in paranormal phenomena, goes even so far as to state that mystical participation is, in its positive dimension, the mode of being of the unconscious which perceives the world and acts on it through extrasensory channels. That is why, despite its subjectivist coloration, the archaic worldview maintains a certain real and objective efficiency that was lost by us of the modern world. The problem is that, when there is no withdrawal of (false) projections, the intuitions of primitive people are often mixed up with superstitions. Within the unconscious, the sub-rational and the trans-rational manifest themselves often together. However, if the conscious differentiation is made without cutting the contact with the unconscious, then the intuition is purified from the irrational elements. For example, if, as primitive man perceives, everything is interconnected, it is not surprising that the unconscious, in order to communicate symbolically to consciousness the content necessary for his individuation, does not delve only in our inner world (ex: via dreams), but also, especially when these contents are archetypal, in what transcends the psyche, that is, the external world, in which events (parapsychologically generated) take on a symbolic meaning that is meaningful for the subject. That is what Jung called synchronicity. Primitive man, who believes that Nature talks to him, and who, for this reason tries to decipher its symbolic language, is not therefore totally wrong!

130 *Briefe* II, 210.

131 GW 8, 86 (§ 136); GW 18/I, 211-212 (§ 442); EEI 25.

132 GW 8, 411 (§ 724).

133 GW 6, 553-554 (§ 902).

content to integrate belongs to the personal or to the collective unconscious) develops. The individual must recognize the limits of his conscious mind and understand that to exist and grow he needs the unconscious.¹³⁴ In the psyche there is a *function* characterized by Jung as *transcendent* that regulates the process of totalization.

4. 3. *The Transcendent Function*

The transcendent function aims to compensate the one-sided attitude of the psyche¹³⁵ so that the contents, that have never been present to consciousness, finally find their way to it, and so that the conscious mind can embody the totality, or at least embody it more.¹³⁶ It creates a bridge between the conscious and the unconscious minds.¹³⁷ Its goal is to reconcile the opposites, to nullify the separation (but not the distinction) between the unconscious (that tries to actualize its possibilities) and the conscious mind (that refuses to assimilate them).¹³⁸ It is an intelligent unconscious self-regulative mechanism¹³⁹ that tries to keep the conscious mind anchored in the unconscious, so that it does not lose its roots.¹⁴⁰ It is characterized as “transcendent” because each psychic dimension is pushed to surpass itself through the confrontation with the other, thereby leaning towards totality.¹⁴¹ This reconciling function is carried out by the mediation of symbols, which alone have the sufficient malleability to make new unconscious contents appear to consciousness.

134 GW 8, 108 (§ 193).

135 GW 5, 91 (§ 98); GW 6, 514-515 (§ 830-833); 554-555 (§ 902, 904); GW 14/I, 231 (§ 251); GW 16, 158 (§ 330-332).

136 GW 6, 477-479 (§ 763-765); 513-515 (§ 830-833); GW 11, 491 (§ 780-781).

137 GW 7, 88 (§ 121); GW 8, 90 (§ 145).

138 GW 8, 90 (§ 145); GW 9/I, 307 (§ 523-524).

139 GW 16, 158 (§ 330-332); GW 18/I, 127 (§ 248).

140 GW 9/I, 188 (§ 293).

141 GW 11, 491 (§ 780). It takes care of balancing all the polarities so that they can develop themselves in a harmonious way, not at the cost of one another.

4. 4. *The Symbol*

The symbol is defined by Jung as being *the best possible expression of something unknown*. C. A. Brown¹⁴² highlighted well its different components:

1. The word “expression” refers to the representations, images, words, acts, creations and even the events of man.
2. More than the expression of something unknown, the symbol is the “best” possible expression of the thing it refers to. There are, however, certain limitations because it is only the best “possible” expression.¹⁴³
3. The symbol refers to “something”. It represents the qualities of something real. It is the signifier of a signified.
4. The reality to which the symbol refers is other than itself. The symbol is not its own reality.¹⁴⁴
5. The thing expressed is not just any reality, but an “unknown” one.¹⁴⁵ It is not absolutely opaque since it is partly knowable *via* the symbol whose function is to make it more transparent. The unknown reality is potentially knowable, while maintaining its aura of mystery.¹⁴⁶

The symbol can communicate novelty because it refers not only to what is known, as does the sign – which relates to consciousness (or to the personal unconscious) – but also to something fundamentally unknown (such as the collective unconscious): “The symbol is not an allegory and not a *semeion* (sign), it is an image of a content that, for the most part, transcends consciousness.”¹⁴⁷ Since it opens to a wider totality, the symbol has a *transpersonal* dimension,¹⁴⁸ whereas

142 Clifford Alan Brown, *Jung's Hermeneutic of Doctrine. Its Theological Significance* (= JHDTS) (Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1981) 38-40.

143 The relation between the signifier and the signified differs between the symbol and the sign. As for the symbol, there is no better way to designate the reality in question than through the signifier that is used. The signified is accessible only through this signifier, remaining otherwise unknown. As for the sign, however, the signified reality is known independently of the signifier. The sign, which plays here the role of the signifier, is in this case more or less arbitrarily chosen to represent the reality in question according to certain conventions (JHDTS 40-41).

144 GW 8, 367-368 (§ 644).

145 GW 5, 284 (§ 329); GW 18/I, 201 (§ 416); GW 18/II, 805 (§ 1691). The concept is certainly clearer but it is too rigid to fulfil this function.

146 EEI 20-21.

147 GW 5, 105 (§ 114). Referring to something known (GW 5, 160 (§ 180); 284 (§ 329); GW 18/I, 271 (§ 571-572); GW 18/II, 805 (§ 1691); EEI 55), Jung qualifies it as semiotic.

148 GW 7, 142 (§ 217).

the sign refers only to *personal* contents.¹⁴⁹ Because it cannot be reduced to our history, the content conveyed by the symbol is still to come. Being prospective,¹⁵⁰ it points towards our future possibilities, while working to actualize them. The transmitted meanings will be added to the ones already known, producing a synthesis, whereas the sign has a more analytical character.¹⁵¹ The meaning of the causal relation of the symbol is revealed at the end, where the part is harmonized with the whole, instead of doing so at the beginning as does the sign. This gives the symbol a *teleological* significance.¹⁵²

The psyche produces symbols in order that the new possibilities arising from the unconscious can be communicated to consciousness and assimilated by it, the symbols having been understood by the latter.¹⁵³ The transposition of the libido is realized because of the symbol¹⁵⁴ whose function is to be the bridge between unconsciousness and consciousness,¹⁵⁵ to heal their dissociation, to reconcile them, so that the psyche can aim towards totality.¹⁵⁶ It is by the intermediary of the symbol that the transmutation of the psychic energy¹⁵⁷ is carried out. The contents of the unconscious are indeed too vast for the conscious mind. The symbol is a condenser that transforms this energy in order to make it

149 For Jung causality is personal (GW 9/I, 57 (§ 91)).

150 GW 4, 336-338 (§ 675, 679); GW 6, 481 (§ 770); 495-496 (§ 798); GW 8, 283 (§ 492-494); 285-286 (§ 495-496); GW 9/I, 188 (§ 293); GW 18/I, 466-467 (§ 1060).

151 GW 4, 336 (§ 673-675); 338 (§ 679-680); 379 (§ 759); GW 6, 481 (§ 770); GW 7, 89 (§ 122); GW 8, 286 (§ 496); GW 18/I, 466-467 (§ 1060-1061).

152 GW 4, 336 (§ 674); 341-343 (§ 687-690); GW 7, 142 (§ 217); GW 8, 33-34 (§ 41-46); GW 18/I, 466-467 (§ 1060).

153 GW 5, 397 (§ 468); GW 6, 513 (§ 829-830); GW8, 201 (§ 366).

154 GW 8, 72 (§ 113).

155 GW 6, 134 (§ 211); 280 (§ 446-447); 513 (§ 829-830); GW 9/I, 182 (§ 285-287); GW 9/II, 193 (§ 280); GW 10, 31 (§ 24-25); GW 11, 206 (§ 283-285); GW 16, 131 (§ 252).

156 GW 11, 206 (§ 284-285); GW 16, 131 (§ 252).

157 GW 8, 58-59 (§ 91-92). It is indeed one of the major functions of religions (GW 8, 71 (§ 111)). The idol is a petrified symbol (*Briefe I*, 86), a symbol that has lost its vitality and evocative power because it no longer refers to something beyond itself. The symbol enriches consciousness (*Briefe I*, 88), while the idol maintains the person in a state of unconsciousness (*Briefe I*, 86). Whereas the symbol teaches, the idol blinds (*Briefe I*, 87).

accessible to consciousness which would otherwise explode.¹⁵⁸ This applies especially to the archetypes, which cannot be rationally integrated in a simple way. Because of the symbol, which unifies opposites within itself, what is infinite can be *embodied* in the finite! In freeing the subject from the part and opening it to totality, the symbol gives *energy*¹⁵⁹ to the receiver by feeding him with new possibilities, thus making him a *creator*.¹⁶⁰ And it is in creation that the self accomplishes itself, consciousness being the creation of the unconscious, forming together an open totality.

5. THE SELF AND THE PROCESS OF INDIVIDUATION

Reality being infinite and changing endlessly, the adaptation of the individual to his environment will always have to be renewed.¹⁶¹ Since the unconscious is structurally infinite and the conscious mind finite, the new synthesis will be in itself relative and therefore polarized. Broader than the preceding synthesis, the latter remains, however, relative compared to the absolute. There is no integral synthesis. The psyche tends towards it without ever fully accomplishing it. It remains beyond the accomplishment because of the *irreducibility of the unconscious*.¹⁶² The goal of individuation is not a close perfection, but an open totality understood as *Ganzheit*.¹⁶³ What counts is the journey. Each time that consciousness is under the impression of having attained a close perfection, the unconscious intervenes to make it understand that this is an illusion, and that there is still something unknown that has not been integrated. It indicates

158 GW 6, 280 (§ 446).

159 GW 8, 13-14 (§ 2-4); 33 (§ 41).

160 GW 6, 111 (§ 171); 120 (§ 185); GW 10, 22 (§ 12-13).

161 GW 8, 89 (§ 143-144). In general, a person chooses to actualize a possibility basing his choice on his experience, that is to say, on what is known to him (GW 8, 86 (§ 136)). But a new situation requires a possibility adapted to it and not an old one that is recycled in a new form. This choice, based on memory and reason, usually only perpetuates the one-sidedness of consciousness as it already stands.

162 GW 9/I, 305 (§ 520).

163 Jung establishes fundamental differences between *Ganzheit*/Totalität and *Vollkommenheit*/Perfektion.

to consciousness (through a dream, myth or intuition) that there are other possibilities which remain to be explored, thus getting the individual back into motion. Jung thinks that conflict is the normal state of man. Most psychological illnesses do not arise from the conflict itself, but from our inability to manage them.

The individuation process consists in becoming oneself,¹⁶⁴ accomplishing what we are potentially, so that it cannot be reduced to a simple actualization of the ego, which is only the centre of consciousness. Therefore one should avoid assimilating the "individuated" to the "individualist":

I always still see, however, the process of individuation getting confused with the conscious becoming of the ego, and thus the ego being identified with the self. Wherefrom, there follows naturally a deplorable conceptual entanglement. For in so doing, one equates the process of individuation with mere egocentrism and autoerotism. The self includes far more than the simple ego, as is proven by symbolic reality since time immemorial: it is as much the other or the others as it is the ego. Individuation does not exclude the world, but on the contrary includes it.¹⁶⁵

To equate the self with the ego would make the ego an absolute, in religious terms make man into God.¹⁶⁶ Surely, even though it is only a part of the psyche, ego-consciousness is, all the same, indispensable to the realization of the self. It is necessary, but not sufficient. The totality is both the ego and the non-ego.¹⁶⁷ One must not underestimate or overestimate ego-consciousness.¹⁶⁸ One needs also the unconscious of which consciousness is always only the partial actualization. Without the integration of the unconscious the withdrawal of projection remains precarious, as it is often the case for modern man. The individual ends up losing his individuality because he is deprived of his infinity, the condition of his uniqueness (indefinable for the intellect).

164 GW 7, 183 (§ 266-267); GW 9/I, 44 (§ 73); 49 (§ 83); 178-179 (§ 278-280); GW 16, 22 (§ 11).

165 GW 8, 252 (§ 432). See also GW 7, 183-184 (§ 267-269); 245 (§ 400); GW 9/I, 204 (§ 315); GW 12, 215 (§ 247).

166 GW 7, 245 (§ 400).

167 GW 12, 131 (§ 137); GW 16, 265 (§ 474).

168 GW 9/II, 242 (§ 355).

It is the individuation and not individualism that assures real individuality. It is precisely because the self is not reducible to the ego, even though it presupposes it, that Jung can say that he did not create himself, but that he “occurs” to himself.¹⁶⁹

*The self is the centre of the psyche*¹⁷⁰ and not the centre of the unconscious, which also is only a part of the psyche. It regulates the extension and the maturation of personality. It is its teleological principle, the fundamental archetype, which mobilizes all the others towards the realization of its ultimate goal, the totality.¹⁷¹ But this more encompassing aspect of the psyche is in the beginning only a virtuality, which emerges progressively only when the ego and the unconscious accept to collaborate. This is the reason why, if the self is the centre of the psyche, it is also its circumference, embracing all at once the conscious mind and the unconscious mind.¹⁷² As coincidence of the two,¹⁷³ it is the “unknowable totality of man”.¹⁷⁴ The self is not a substantial subject, easy to grasp, but a *relationship*. Individuation presupposes the recognition of the other in oneself: the unconscious, with whom the ego enters into dialogue.¹⁷⁵ In this exchange, consciousness becomes other than itself, without being destroyed, however. On the contrary, it is enriched. Finally, this relation with what is other within us (the unconscious) is also what makes possible our relation with the other outside of us (the world) and the other beyond us (the divine), as soon as we withdraw the false “unconscious” contents that we have projected on them. Our

169 GW 11, 275 (§ 391).

170 GW 6, 464 (§ 730); 505-506 (§ 814-816); GW 12, 131 (§ 137); GW 13, 53 (§ 67); GW 18/I, 183 (§ 373); GW 18/II, 518 (§ 1159).

171 GW 18/II, 518 (§ 1158-1159).

172 GW 5, 464 (§ 569); 469 (§ 576); GW 6, 403 (§ 623); 464 (§ 730); 505-506 (§ 814-816); GW 7, 187 (§ 274); GW 9/I, 204 (§ 315); 413 (§ 717); GW 9/II, 14 (§ 9); GW 12, 59 (§ 44); 214 (§ 247); GW 14/I, 137 (§ 129); GW 16, 265 (§ 474); *Briefe* II, 470; CGJS 328.

173 GW 9/II, 282 (§ 423); GW 11, 277 (§ 398); GW 12, 34-35 (§ 22-24); GW 16, 265 (§ 474); GW 18/II, 732 (§ 1538-1539); *Briefe* III, 198. “The self is, however, an absolute paradox in that it represents in each of the relations the thesis and the antithesis and well, at the same time, the synthesis” (GW 12, 34 (§ 22)).

174 *Briefe* I, 373.

175 Being a living psychic reality and autonomous in relation to consciousness, the unconscious is like a Thou to whom the I of consciousness addresses itself (GW 18/II, 712-713 (§ 1505)).

consciousness of these transpsychic realities is increased. Indeed, the realization of the totality of the psyche paradoxically creates awareness of the totalities which transcends our psyche, the world to begin with, and beyond it, the totality par excellence, the divine.

5. 1. Regression and Repetition

For Freud regression is caused by incestuous repressed desires seeking to surface anew. It responds ultimately to a desire of fusion with the origin, the mother, the unconscious. For Jung, however, the return to the past, to childhood and beyond, is not always and necessarily regressive *per se* (as in neurosis and psychosis¹⁷⁶). In most cases it is an attempt to activate in the unconscious the necessary elements for adaptation. Thus, in myths when the solar hero melds with the mother and fertilizes her, he does it, according to Jung, in order to reconstruct a new identity.¹⁷⁷ Also Jung proposes, contrary to Freud, a synthetic interpretation of regression:

The analytic-reductive conception states that the interest (the libido) spreads itself, in a regressive manner, on the reminiscent infantile material and attaches itself there or, otherwise, has never been liberated to start with. The synthetic or analogical conception, to the contrary, states that there are parts of the personality, capable of development, that exist in an infantile state, being still, so to speak, in the mother's womb.¹⁷⁸

This regression is said to be teleological because it is not sought for itself, but for another end,¹⁷⁹ that is, to generate more consciousness.¹⁸⁰

176 In general, what provokes regression to the past is a traumatic disorder in the present (GW 4, 207 (§ 405, 407-408); 214 (§ 421); 283 (§ 570)). The regression is a natural *defence* mechanism because the person is unable in his present state to deal with the situation and resolve the problem which confronts him. But it is also an *adaptation* mechanism which activates in the unconscious what has been excluded by consciousness and is now being prevented from adapting to reality. The regression becomes *pathological* when the person uses it to flee from his problem and not integrate with consciousness the required content for his adaptation. In which case, the person stays fixated on the personal (in neurosis) or on the collective (in psychosis) unconscious.

177 GW 5, 286 (§ 332); GW 8, 48 (§ 69). That is why Jung finds the Freudian conception very incomplete: "The point of view according to which dreams are simple fantasy wish fulfilments is long out of date. Surely, there are dreams that manifestly represent the accomplishment of desires or fears. But what more is there? The dreams can also be bitter truths, philosophical maxims, illusions, wild fantasies, recollections, plans, anticipations, indeed even telepathic visions, irrational experiences, and God knows what more?" (GW 16, 152-153 (§ 317)).

178 GW 16, 20-21 (§ 9).

179 GW 8, 33 (§ 41-44).

180 According to the Italian historian of religion Ernesto De Martino (1908-1965), the

And the deeper one penetrates into the unconscious, the more it is *possible* to produce consciousness. Thus the contents of the collective unconscious, whether they are integrated or not, are susceptible of producing either a psychosis (extreme unconsciousness – absorption of the individuality into the masses) or geniality (trans-consciousness – great individuality producing a highly original work that is unique, having at the same time a universal range). At the level of the unconscious, where the opposites coincide, what can make a person totally unconscious is also what can make him trans-conscious, depending on whether the person will integrate or not this content. The unconscious and the trans-conscious have the same appearance for the conscious mind, because the latter (in accordance with the principle of identity) sees in the unconscious a mere absence of consciousness. The individual does not think that consciousness *can* emerge from the unconscious, and that trans-consciousness *can* arise from an extreme unconscious mind. But already by choosing at the outset to create consciousness, the unconscious has shown itself able to make this distinction, which it creates by its “decision” to produce the conscious mind, that is to say, “more” than itself. Sameness (repetition) can hide within itself otherness (difference).¹⁸¹

ad uterum regression of archaic man, where he withdraws himself from profane duration and projects himself into the primordial Chaos and into the Great mythical time, is acting upon a technique of mythical-ritual dehistoricisation, whose goal would be to induce hypnotically altered states of consciousness (that is to project man into the unconscious) in which, as Silvia Mancini explains, “the confines of the ego become more permeable and porous than usual; [...] which has for effect to render more fluid the limits between his consciousness and the world, on the one hand, and between his consciousness and other conscious beings in presence, on the other hand,” and “it is precisely in this state of greater psychic lack of differentiation that certain phenomena of a psychophysical nature (extrasensory perceptions, corporal stigmatizations, self-healing, etc.) are often produced. [...] According to De Martino, it is therefore not an accident if the rite, as *action*, sets (gestural, verbal, sonorous, visual, etc.) procedures destined to instigate an enfeeblement of the unity of the ego, which is dominant in the waking state. This relative dissociation, far from constituting a marginal effect of the ritual action, constitutes for De Martino the lever of all rites as efficient transformative actions. [...] To summarize, in a rite man acts ‘as if he didn’t act’, because in order for this action to be efficient, man must remove all historical import. That is why one can say that rites are *metahistorical actions*, presumed yet to act or modify that part of the historical reality on which ordinary action has no hold.” Thus, “man manages to establish his existence, on stable foundations as well as face critical conjectures, since, being installed in this ‘protected’ mode of existence, his capability for action becomes amplified.” («Hypnose, pensée magique et déhistoricisation mythico-rituelle», *Hypnose et pensée magique*, Édouard Collot (dir.) (Paris: Auzas, 2008) 56-57).

181 Therefore the two forms of regression despite their same appearance can be

Here, abolition of the law (usually recognized as the promoter of difference) does not seek destruction but a higher creation.¹⁸² There is therefore no incest here, may it be biological, psychical or spiritual. The interdiction of incest is suspended but not destroyed as in a real regression. Even though it is bypassed, the law is recovered at another level. Therefore one should not interpret the *analogon* of the mother (ex: the Church,¹⁸³ city, cave, sea, nation), as attempts to experience incest at a different level through substitutes: "the symbolic truth, however, which introduces water instead of the mother and the spirit, or fire instead of the father, offers, on the other hand, a new inclination for the libido which is related to its so-called incestuous tendencies, thus liberating it and leading it towards a spiritual form."¹⁸⁴ "These possibilities for a life and for spiritual and symbolic progress are what constitute the ultimate unconscious goal of regression. The symbols, as an expression, a bridge and a reference, help the libido, which regresses, not to remain caught in the mother's womb."¹⁸⁵ "That is why instinct seizes the next occasion to replace the mother with another object. This object must be analogically similar to the mother so that it can really replace her."¹⁸⁶ The fact of having a symbolic relation with the mother means that the individual does not have an all-unifying, unconscious, literal relation with her (the biological mother for the infant, the divine for archaic man¹⁸⁷). The symbolization allows the subject to

entirely different (GW 16, 21 (§ 9)).

182 GW 4, 207 (§ 406); 229 (§ 412); 391 (§ 780); GW 5, 339 (§ 398); GW 16, 46 (§ 61-62); 230 (§ 439-440).

183 GW 7, 111 (§ 171).

184 GW 5, 288 (§ 335). See also GW 17, 101-102 (§ 558).

185 GW 5, 423 (§ 510). See also RB II, 16, 110, pp. 297-298.

186 GW 7, 111 (§ 171). See also 112 (§ 172).

187 Since the repetition is capable of making otherness manifest itself, there can be a "synchronicity" between different levels of reality. That explains why ontogenesis can reproduce phylogenesis (GW 5, 43-44 (§ 26)). Jung does not hesitate to draw a parallel between the mythical thought of Antiquity, that of the child and of primitive man and finally of dreams: "Together the state of infantile thought and that of the dream is a repetition at the

free himself from the object while staying in relation with it.¹⁸⁸

This is the reason why Eliade refuses to talk of a purely incestuous relation of archaic man with his parents, the divine beings. In his opinion, the importance accorded to origins by primitive man cannot simply be viewed as a desire to return to an animal paradise or some kind of embryonic existence in the womb of Nature, as Hegel believed:

The existence of homo *religiosus*, especially that of primitive man, is open to the world: in life, the religious man is never alone, a part of the world lives in him. But one cannot say, with Hegel, that primitive man is “buried in Nature”, that he still has not found himself as being distinct from Nature, as being himself. [...] The Austro-Asian farmer who uses the same term, *lak*, to designate the phallus and the spade and, who, like many other agriculturists, assimilates the seeds with the *semen virile*, knows very well that the spade is an instrument which he makes himself and that by working in the fields he carries out an agricultural task comprising a certain amount of technical knowledge. In other words, cosmic symbolism *adds* new value to an object or an action, without impairing their own and immediate value.¹⁸⁹

The archaic repetition, which on the one hand allows staying united with the divine, allows simultaneously being different from the latter. The mythical past is not simply a completed present, it also contains a very productive future, comprising unexploited possibilities that primitive man delivers through repetition. He does not blindly accept a revelation, but deepens its meaning, constantly seeking different interpretations. By discovering ways to adapt these archetypal contents to new contexts, he brings order to the surrounding chaos.

From a Jungian perspective, the aptitude displayed by primitive man to extend the hierophany through repetition, expresses the fact *that a new meaning is constantly attributed to the mother (the divine) through symbols representing her while maintaining contact*

level of past development” (GW 5, 43-44 (§ 26)); “We speak of the ontogenetic repetition of the phylogenetic psychology in the child. We have seen that archaic thought is a characteristic of the child and of primitive man” (GW 5, 46 (§ 32)). See also GW 17, 53 (§ 83), 65 (§ 105-106); EEI 99; ETGCGJ 350-351. As does archaic man, the infant, living in a state of mystical participation (GW 9/I, 115 (§ 188); GW 17, 144 (§ 217); CGJS 288), endows surrounding objects with a soul, personalizes his environment by projecting onto it his subjectivity and therefore his will (GW 5, 41 (§ 24)).

188 GW 6, 252 (§ 402). See also 253 (§ 404). Some continuity with the past is a healthy thing (GW 10, 53 (§ 72-74)).

189 SP 141-142. See also Mircea Eliade, *Mythe de l'éternel retour* (Paris: Gallimard, [1949] 1969) 108-109, 141.

with her. The symbolization responds to a conscious-making process, because, as a *coincidentia oppositorum*, it embodies the infinite in the finite. The *analogon* do not repeat the same element in a different form, such as is the case of the Oedipal substitution according to Freud, but offer instead new meanings of the same element. The symbol is a deferred *repetition*, since the same image now also refers to something else. In the symbol, the image is reborn, its materiality being transmuted.¹⁹⁰ It reveals itself as the expression of the archetypes, wrenching itself free from its instinctual and material ground in order to develop the spirit.¹⁹¹

CONCLUSION

The aptitude of symbols to wrench man from the unconscious, without, however, cutting him off from it is, according to Eliade, in its accomplished form, to be found in Christianity, where man, while being differentiated from the divine, avoids falling into the trap of historicism¹⁹² by maintaining a relation with his origins through faith.¹⁹³ Through an act of faith, man recognizes the infinite (the Wholly Other) embodied in the finite, and in so doing, makes it real

190 In primitive cultures, this symbolization already begins with initiation rituals during puberty. Thus occurs the passage from family to tribe or to nation, the motherland, and beyond (GW 7, 112 (§ 172)). It is the process of the second birth (GW 18/I, 173-174 (§ 361-364)).

191 In the collective unconscious two transpersonal unconscious instances are to be found which occupy the same space and can yet be different from one another: 1) instinct; 2) the archetype, the source of intuition (GW 9/I, 297 (§ 498-499); 306 (§ 520)): "The unconscious does not limit itself only to the processes of instinct and reflexes managed by the subcortical centres, but goes beyond consciousness and anticipates in its symbols future processes of consciousness. It is therefore at the same time a transconsciousness" (GW 13, 205 (§ 229)). Jung describes the archetype as being the intuition that instinct has of itself (GW 8, 159 (§ 277)). Instinct is the material basis on which the archetype will be able to reveal the spirit and display its creativity (GW 4, 380 (§ 761); GW 5, 291-292 (§ 337-339)). While instinct represents the conservative aspect of the archetype, the intuition, expresses the progressive side of the archetype. Even though archaic man is dominated by the conservative side of the archetype, its progressive aspect is already at work.

192 Everything is sacred (theocentrism) = unconscious; sacred/profane distinction = apparition of consciousness; total secularisation-historicism = separation of the ego from the unconscious.

193 A faith which, according to Paul Tillich, is capable of expressing itself through symbols.

for himself. Thus, repetition of the cosmogony during the New Year feast and the human regeneration that follows attain their crowning end in resurrection. That is why Eliade sees archaic repetition as being the foreshadowing of the Kierkegaardian repetition:

This contemporaneity with the great mythical moments is an indispensable condition for the magic-religious efficacy, whatever its nature. Considered in this light, Søren Kierkegaard's effort to express the Christian condition in the formula: "being contemporary of Jesus" proves to be less revolutionary than it first seems; Kierkegaard has only formulated in new terms a general and normal attitude of archaic man.¹⁹⁴

For this reason the constant availability of the sacred for archaic man takes on a more advanced form in the Christian experience of the "eschatological present" where God's Kingdom (the end of time – eternity), is not only something to come, but is also something actual – silently among us, perceptible through a clairvoyant act of faith. This differentiation guarantees freedom, and therefore a full development for individuality without man's having to detach himself from the transcendent divine horizon which makes his existence possible.

In historicism, which Eliade considers a result of the decomposition of Christianity,¹⁹⁵ time is not only a factor of differentiation but also of separation. All that remains is a world (natural and historical) emptied of God (the sacred), in which man, having become a historical subject, is trying to make himself completely on his own. While primitive man suffers from theocentrism, modern non-religious man sins by his anthropocentrism. For Jung, historicism corresponds to ego-consciousness, which, with self-conceit, chooses to cut itself off from its progenitor, the unconscious, seeing himself as the ultimate reality. He will be subjected to the same destiny as Icarus who, flying too close to

194 THR 330. For a detailed explanation see also the sections XIII. *De la répétition archaïque à la résurrection* and XIV. *Eliade et la répétition kierkegaardienne* of my article: "La dimension historique du sacré et de la hiérophanie selon Mircea Eliade", 337-340. For a deeper analysis of the relation between faith and repetition according to Kierkegaard, one can read another of my articles Cézár Enia, "Glaube, Opfer und Wiederholung; Die "Unerkennbarkeit des Wunders" im Kampf des Glaubens gegen das Böse bei Sören Kierkegaard", *Kierkegaard Jahrbuch/Kierkegaard Yearbook*, Niels Jorgen Cappelørn, Hermann Deuser & Jon Stewart (eds.) (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004) 496-524.

195 IS 221.

the sun, saw his wings melt, and fell into the sea, and drowned.¹⁹⁶

Finally, since Nature (eternity) does not necessarily negate history (time) and is even essential to its constitution, Eliade can, as did Teilhard de Chardin, defend the idea of a cosmic Christianity,¹⁹⁷ which he calls “macro-historical”,¹⁹⁸ where Nature and history are made sacred.¹⁹⁹ Some have often blamed Eliade for wanting to add a naturalistic component to Christianity, complaining that this would limit its historicity. But for Eliade, Nature does not contradict history, just as the unconscious does not, according to Jung, contradict ego-consciousness. To reject them would not only damage history but the development of consciousness as well. It is therefore normal that they be maintained once history and consciousness have developed, thus forming together a totality. Macro-historic Christianity is not interpreted in the light of primitive religions but seen to be their fulfilment. Indeed, asserts Eliade: “In the most elementary hierophany *everything is said.*”²⁰⁰ The elementary hierophanies are failing attempts to appropriate the total hierophany.²⁰¹ That is why Eliade, as much as Jung, can observe in primitive man, who views Nature as sacred and lives in the unconscious, an

196 This would correspond to the second type of incest. Indeed, in Jung’s view, there are two kinds of incest: one that could have originated from the unconscious if it had refused to generate consciousness; and another one that comes from the conscious mind, when the ego, refusing to renew itself in the unconscious, is cut off from the nurturing support of the unconscious, and therefore collapses and regresses into the unconscious. This second form of incest repeats the first one in a reverse way. In both cases there is an act of shutting oneself from the other.

197 Mircea Eliade, *Occultisme, sorcellerie et modes culturelles* (= OSMC) (Paris, Gallimard, 1972) 23-28; *Fragments d’un journal*, t. 1, 1945-1969 (Paris: Gallimard, 1973) 425. Jung also promotes the figure of the “cosmic Christ”, which he finds particularly present in Western alchemy. According to him, who contributed many leading-edge writings to alchemy, this religious movement tried in its Western expression to compensate a form of Christianity that has become unilaterally “historical”, and has therefore repressed “Nature” from the Godhead.

198 OSMC 25-28.

199 On that subject, see my article “La dimension historique du sacré et de la hiérophanie selon Mircea Eliade”, particularly 343-344.

200 Mircea Eliade, *Le chamanisme et les techniques archaïques de l’extase* (Paris: Payot, [1951] 1974) 14.

201 THR 38.

emerging individuality which on a psychological level announces the self and, on a theological level, the macro-historic Christ.

The question that still has to be resolved is the relation between these two parallel figures: the self and the macro-historic Christ.²⁰² Jung already supplies us with clues for research which would without doubt require a more thorough analysis: if the relation to the other in itself (the unconscious) opens us, through the withdrawal of projections, not only to what exists outside of us (the world), but also to the Wholly Other beyond us (the divine), individuation would allow us to welcome the Absolute, or even better, to recognize, through an act of faith (purified from false projections), the Absolute which is always already *incarnate* in man, more precisely in the darkness of his unconscious mind.

202 This issue will be discussed in detail in my next article entitled: "La relation entre la critique de la métaphysique et la découverte de l'inconscient faites par Carl Gustav Jung".