

On Feb 15, 2009, at 3:32 PM,
Maryann Barone-Chapman wrote:

Dear All,

Is there anyone who can direct me to
the volume in the CW where I
suspect
the following quote from Jung may be
found - "The Gods have become
diseases." ????

Best wishes,
Maryann

On 15/2/09 20:26, "Daniel Anderson"
<danielmelanderson@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Maryann,

13 CW ¶54. It's one of Hillman's favorite quotes of Jung.

Best wishes,
Dan

On Feb 15, 2009, at 8:33 PM, Maryann Barone-Chapman wrote:

Thanks for this Dan. Why do you think Hillman is so attached to
this quote?

Best wishes,
Maryann

On 16/2/09 00:07, "David Tacey" <D.Tacey@latrobe.edu.au> wrote:

I will look forward to Dan's reply, but meanwhile, the time

> difference allows me to butt in:

> Answer: firstly, because it is a polytheistic statement, which

> Hillman likes. Secondly, because the gods becoming diseases is a

> very dramatic and powerful idea. In other words, they stop being

> objects of intellectual interest or library curiosities, and
become

> matters of physical and medical urgency.

But alas, the statement has become something of a cliché these days, and I bet there is a fridge magnet, t-shirt or coffee mug with this quote on it. But back in 1929, when he wrote on the Golden Flower for Wilhelm, it was a novel idea.

David

On February 16, 2007 Maryann Barone-Chapman wrote:

This is useful David, thanks. I've not seen the fridge magnet, but can imagine your somewhat jaded view speaks volumes on your feelings about Hillman and his plugging away at polytheism. Would you call this a post-Hillman position? I'm late to understanding Hillman and it slightly worries me that I'm beginning to get interested if only for plurality.

None the less Jung's original quote remains a very powerful idea regarding psyche-soma, individual-collective and seems to go with the question "What ails thee?"

Good to hear from you and I hope you're safe.

Maryann

On 16/2/09 13:34, "Daniel Anderson" <danielmelanderson@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Maryann,

In addition to David's comments, I'll add these. Jung, when he developed the idea of the archetypes, limited them to certain ones that seemed present in all times and places: the divine child, the hero, the puer, the Great Mother, the wise old man/woman, the shadow, the anima/animus, trickster, etc. These are *generic* categories which Jung feels are empirically supported.

Hillman had a slightly different approach. He just decided to import the whole Greek pantheon *in toto* into his archetypal psychology. The Greek pantheon = the archetypes for Hillman. In the referenced quote, Jung also appears to identify the gods with archetypes - or at least complexes. Since this is Hillman's project (to identify the archetypes with the Greek gods) he loves the quote.

Another one of Hillman's favorite statements is that the psychology of the Greeks was their mythology. To put a finer point on it, he seems to even suggest that *because* the Greeks had their mythology,

they were less in need of a psychology. The statement that the 'gods have become diseases' supports Hillman's corollary principle that we are so neurotic because we don't recognize the archetypes/Greek gods.

There are multiple difficulties with Hillman's approach - but to keep this post short, I'll just leave it with these thoughts.

Best wishes,
Dan

On Feb 16, 2009, at 2:27 PM, Maryann Barone-Chapman wrote:

Thanks for differentiating Jung and Hillman regarding the quote – the first identifies the gods with archetypes/complexes, the latter identifies the archetypes with Greek gods.

Very generous of you.
Best wishes,
Maryann

On 17/2/09 23:21, "David Tacey" <D.Tacey@latrobe.edu.au> wrote:

Dear Dan and Maryann,

Who are the archetypal Jungians? I don't think there are too many left in the clinical field. The only ones I know of are in the cultural studies field - I guess the value of that is that an "archetypal" approach is not foisted upon any "patients" anywhere. As you suggest Maryann, such an approach with clients could be tricky.

I have to say that, as one of Hillman's former "patients", he was a wonderful analyst (since both of you are using this word "wonderful" about each other, so I will join in). Hillman was not an archetypal analyst - I was waiting for that to emerge, but it never did, or rarely did. He was a classical Jungian analyst, and hardly ever introduced his intellectual interests into the clinical sessions. He was a lot like Von Franz, but a male version of her insight, deft skill, and shrewd "seeing through" to the underlying problem. I had no complaints, and it was everything (and more) that I had wanted. The fact that Andrew has now wiped

"archetypalists" off the clinical map is ironic in hindsight: as I don't think the archetypal school ever used their archetypal positioning in the clinical situation. They were always Jungians when and where it counted.

To understand Hillman, I think we need to understand that he enjoyed quarreling with people, especially with Jung. He attacked Jung for being this or that, for being too monotheistic, too enamored of the ego, stuck in the hero archetype. In more recent times, he attacked Jung because his concept of soul was individual, personal, and not worldly or collective enough (and followers of Hillman still parrot this accusation today).

But if I had time or energy, I think I could dismantle each one of these arguments, and reveal them as baseless. Hillman often set Jung up as a straw man, so he could knock him over and replace Jung with his own "postmodern" image of the psyche and its functioning.

Yes, a fair bit of Oedipus in there, I would argue. The fact is that Jung is so huge and vast, that one can "select" various aspects of his writings, and make a case based on the selection. [The same can be said of Hegel - there are so many Hegels.] But a different selection of quotes would concede that Jung was as much a passionate polytheist as he was a monotheist. He was not stuck in the hero archetype, but like Hillman, had a special affinity for Hermes. He was not obsessed with the ego, but rather he emphasised the self. And finally: Jung's vision of soul was not personal or clinical, but very much worldly, universal, and he was a passionate supporter of the idea of anima mundi.

As Dan has said about Jung on Dionysus - it is possible to find a few quotes to support the idea that Dionysus is a trouble-maker and not loved by Jung, because of the dangers of inflation and identification. But even more quotes can be found to suggest that Jung loved Dionysus, as much as Nietzsche - and perhaps Jung's negative view of Nietzsche was based on this fact, that they shared a fascination with the same archetype.

Jung tried to defend against his own fascination, because he reasoned that it was toxic, or potentially so.

Hillman also fought with himself. He spend at least a decade loudly arguing we don't need the archetype "in

itself", and we should remain happy with the phenomenology of archetypal images. In this mood, he argued that Jung's metaphysics was old hat and out of date, and Kant was irrelevant. It was all gung-ho into phenomenology for about 15 years or so. Then, in 1989, he did an about-turn, realised his former views were one-sided and not "spiritual" enough, and embraced the metaphysics that he had formerly deplored. So the question remains: which "Hillman" are people talking about? Is it Hillman in 1975 - relativist, phenomenologist, anti-metaphysical, pro-imagination? Or is it Hillman after 1989 - a return to Jung, metaphysical again, "back to beyond", the need for Kant and Hegel. The odd fact today, and this has not been raised by anyone: most so-called Hillman followers are followers of his classical period, and they mostly ignore or don't even read his late works which contradict the classical period. The same can be said for the followers of Derrida - they follow the "standard" image of Derrida, and not the late Derrida, who unravelled his earlier work and moved to an entirely new place.

best wishes,

David

On 18/02/2009, at 11:46 AM, roger brooke wrote:

The recent conference in hono(u)r of Hillman's work held here in Pittsburgh was well attended. Many papers have been brought together by Stanton Marlan in a book called Archetypal Psychologies. It is an excellent collection of essays, and includes some good clinical material.

Stanton Marlan, Paul Kugler, and some other thoughtful analysts are indebted to Hillman. Reports of death are premature. Although I am not an analyst, I am a psychotherapist deeply influenced by Hillman's work, and there is definitely an archetypal flavoring to my clinical work. Perhaps I should talk about that, but at another time.

Roger (Brooke).

On 17/2/09 14:41, "Daniel Anderson"
<danielmelanderson@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Maryann,

I should add that while Hillman identified the Greek gods and goddesses with the archetypes he did not *limit* the archetypes to the Greek gods and goddesses. He also worked with Jung's generic archetypal categories, particularly the anima, *puer* and *senex* (Hillman's version of the 'wise old man'). Hillman also worked extensively with the parallels between alchemy and psychology.

Hillman's writings on the *senex* and *puer* should be required reading for any Jungian. Here, Hillman really scores some points, in my opinion, and makes definite improvements and advances in depth psychology. His essays on *Senex & Puer* have now been collected into a single volume and I would recommend it highly.

Best wishes,
Dan

On 18/02/2009, at 6:30 AM, Maryann Barone-Chapman wrote:

Dear Dan,

I think you do a wonderful job of unpacking Hillman for those of us who are not strictly speaking *archetypal* Jungians. When I read Hillman I feel as if I'm tripping the light fantastic; no other post-Jungian is as imaginative or prolific. Every sentence hijacks the expectations of the next. He is wildly fascinating in the way he can take us up the mountain to plough the underworld. But I find him woolly and neurotic in his relationship to Jung, American culture and post-modernity. His writing feels like a mimicry of Jung's at times. Though he brings insight to the Jungian project of

archetypes, and alchemy, I don't reference him widely. Sometimes I find myself with a patient who feels like a "Hillman patient" and I think I better get some ground under our feet before s/he flies out the window. I wouldn't invite a patient to read him if they were remotely inclined to hallucination. But I would for a patient who was building concrete fortresses in the wetlands. My version of exogamy within the endogamous Jungian family; horses for courses and post-modern. And thank you for your recommendations.

Best wishes,
Maryann

On Feb 17, 2009, at 8:28 PM, David Tacey wrote:

Roger,

It's nice to know you can speak British English as well as American, Roger, with your multi-lingual hono(u)r. I always think it is a pity that my computer speaks American, but I speak British/Australian English, and when I write correctly in that mode, the computer automatically tells me it is an error. I have just finished a new book, which I was asked to write in American English, and it feels funny to me, but anyway, I did it.

Do you have a reference for that book called Archetypal Psychologies. Who published it, and when, and so on?

Why don't you tackle Andrew Samuels about his reports of the death of archetypal psychology? Everyone is believing Andrew about this matter. Even I start to believe him. But it has not died, not even in the UK itself.

regards, David

Wednesday, February 18, 2007 Maryann Barone-Chapman wrote:

Dear David,

I know many men who got a lot out of their association with James Hillman either in group work or individually. Thanks for revealing your experience of him in the room. However I couldn't help but

wonder

where the transference was, ("a wonderful analyst") and I'm not asking you to say. Idealized perhaps? You didn't just have an analysis, it sounds as though you've had a life's journey studying him and this has become a profession in itself. You bring a lot of depth of feeling to your argument. So I apologise if I seemed to be attacking one your gods. I think for many people Hillman became bigger than life, not unlike Jung.

I agree with Dan that Hillman needs to be read with a careful eye.

In London, archetypal language enjoys a spectrum of application. Andrew, as I understand him, suggests that every Jungian uses it more or less. To my mind it's the more or less obvious it is that makes it archetypal school or not. Perhaps Roger will take up your invitation to tackle this with Andrew. It's useful on list because the perception is that what Jungians do best is make archetypal formulations.

Best wishes,
Maryann

February 18, Roger Brooke wrote:

The reference is:

Marlan, S. (2008). Archetypal Psychologies. Spring Pubs. It is a great collection of papers.

The point about people such as Stanton Marlan, Paul Kugler, and others is that they are highly respected for their clinical work and theoretical sophistication, and they are influential in training the next generation of analysts in this country.

In my doctoral course on Jungian psychoanalysis I include quite a bit of Hillman, and it is always linked to clinical material.

I would enjoy a bit of arm wrestling, but I have other projects and deadlines right now.

Roger.

Daniel Anderson wrote:

Dear David,

Thank you for your comments on the *senex*. You are onto something, so let me clarify. First, Hillman focuses seriously and systematically on the *senex* and *puer* in a way that Jung did not.

That's not to say Jung's analysis was flawed. Hillman, in my opinion, just went into the issue in more depth. That is why I think his work on this issue represents a genuine contribution and step forward. So, Hillman's *senex* includes the 'wise old man' but also includes the 'old king,' that dried-up has-been clinging to power, Richard Nixon in his last days in office. Hillman's *senex* archetype embraces both of these, and in the following passage he differentiates between the two:

'Thus the crucial psychological problem expressed by the terms "negative senex" and "positive senex," ogre and wisdom ... arises from a fundamental split between senex and puer within the same archetype. Negative senex attitudes and behavior result from the split archetype, while positive senex attitudes and behavior reflect its unity; so that the "positive senex" or "wise old man" refers merely to a transformed continuation of the puer. Here the first part of our thesis reaches its issue: *the difference between the negative and positive senex qualities reflects the split or connection within the senex-puer archetype.*'

That's from "Puer Papers."

So, according to Hillman, the *senex* archetype will display 'wise old man' characteristics provided it remains in connection with the puer. It will display 'shriveled old king' characteristics when severed from the puer. You are right that Hillman's 'wise senex' requires a connection with the puer as a precondition to its 'wisdom.'

Best wishes,

Dan

On February 18, David Tacey wrote:

Dan,

How amazing to find that quote - and so quickly! - do you have it all on a computer document?

This post is intriguing, but I still do not find it convincing.

You see, if you read that passage closely, Hillman is saying that the senex "by itself" is not wise or a carrier of wisdom. In fact, "by itself", the senex is negative. The senex is only wise if he has a connection with the puer - who is seen as the font of wisdom, by Hillman. The "positive" senex is only positive if he is married to the boy, puer - in a kind of homoerotic coupling, as in ancient Greece.

It is doubly fascinating, not only to see this tendency to idealise the boy as wise, but also to see Hillman, who normally espouses disunity, sing the praises of "unity", if it means that old man and young man are brought together in holy matrimony. "And what God has brought together let no man or woman tear asunder".

The larger point to make is that Hillman reverses the normal order of things (yet again). In conventional terms, wisdom is always linked with age, and folly with youth. But for Hillman, age is a kind of folly, and youth is wise. He is closer to Wordsworth in this regard, and the Romantic poets, who also placed wisdom with youth. In most indigenous cultures, such as our own Aboriginal culture, youth is regarded as folly, and only the elder is wise. For Hillman, an elder can be wise, but only if the spirit of youth has been able to "hang around" and infuse the older person. Otherwise, the old person is just old, not an elder.

Jung reverses Hillman's position, and is far more likely to attribute wisdom to old age, not to youth. Jung is closer to indigenous people in this regard, and Hillman to Wordsworth and the Romantic point of view. Jung does not idealise youth at all, but in fact, sees it as something we have to outgrow (joke).

I take your other point: yes, I agree, that the senex/puer relation was not explored by Jung to the degree that Hillman was able to explore it. Have you explored the tension between Hillman and Von Franz, regarding the puer? Hillman reads puer as the son of the Father, and Von Franz almost constantly attributes the puer to the mother complex, as an appendage of the Great Mother, as in her book, *The Problem of the Puer Aeternus*. Which side do you come down on? I think both positions have much to offer, and I think the

wily and shrewd approach of Von Franz ought not to be cast aside by the brilliance of Hillman's rhetoric.

best, David

On 18/02/2009, at 5:58 PM, Andrew Samuels wrote:

Aside from the tendentiousness of the quote, I bet if you showed it to a lot of people they'd say 'that's Jung'. (I realise the theoretical nuances are different but the main conceptual apparatus and even the ethos (whole is better than split) is Jungian. Andrew

PLEASE VISIT MY WEBSITE: WWW.ANDREWSAMUELS.COM
<<http://WWW.ANDREWSAMUELS.COM>>

Dear Andrew,

I was trying to steer you and Roger to a show-down or arm-wrestle, but Roger says he has too many deadlines.

I am sorry if I got you wrong, but I felt sure you had argued - in several papers - that the archetypal school had died. You claim, instead, it has been subsumed, into the classical school. But isn't there a hint of Oedipal satisfaction in you when you announce that one of our father figures has died? I had assumed an Oedipal impulse on your part all along, which you are now denying. But Oedipus aside, I always felt that your comments about Hillman's influence were conditioned by you living in London, where his influence is muted, to say the least. In my country, Hillman's

influence is huge. For instance, tonight, I am launching a new book by Bernie Neville at the major bookstore downtown - and it is an application of Hillman's psychology to the study of business and organisational cultures. We are expecting a huge crowd there - anything to take our minds off the catastrophic fires (!)

Your other point is interesting: Fordham and the SAP made a complete break with Jung - yes, agreed. But the point I have to make is: were they still Jungians? The post-Jungian is not a non-Jungian or a pre-Jungian, because it implies critical distance from Jung, not complete dissociation from him. Didn't "they" at the SAP set the pathway toward abandoning the Jungian perspective, which led to what you now call the psychoanalytic school? In my view, Hillman did NOT make a complete break with Jung - and that, precisely that, is why he had to keep fighting with Jung all his life, and keeping him at bay. He only fought Jung because he was so tangled up in him. And after 1989 (in the book *Archetypal Process*), Hillman "returns to Jung", almost in the same way that Lacan "returns to Freud". But as Roger Brooke has just said, Hillman returns to Jung so that we can read Jung better than before. For me, the major contribution of Hillman is that he replaced Jungian interpretation with Jungian imagination. That was already in Jung, but the stoical and pietistic "Jungians" lost sight of imagination, and went gung-ho into interpretation, thus losing an essential part of Jung which Hillman helped us recover. Only Hillman had the guts to say that Jungian work was essentially a right-brain activity, and could not be appropriated by left-brain methods and techniques. (not that Jung's followers were left-brain, they were all right-brain, but for social acceptance and credibility they were pretending to be left-brain, conceptual, theoretical, systematic, etc. Hillman blew that out of the water, and we are all better off.

But we can extrapolate from this: you and I argue with Hillman, precisely because we are still so tangled up in him. I will never extricate myself from Hillman, despite whatever I say about it, or what freedom I might claim to have achieved.

And by the way, in the *Cambridge Companion to Jung*, Mike Adams, one of the best historians of post-Jungian thought, expressly denies that Hillman has introduced a "school" into the Jungian tradition. Instead, Adams claims Hillman has introduced a new "direction". It may be that some of our confusion has arisen by the very terms we are using, such as "schools".

regards,

David

PAT BERRY wrote:

I'm sending along (attached) for anyone who wishes to read it a description of how I use Archetypal Psychology in practice.

Pat

On Wed, Feb 18, 2009 at 1:20 PM, Andrew Samuels
<andrew@andrewsamuels.net> wrote:

Beautiful writing, Pat. It made me feel that everyone I know, including myself, is an a.p.! And the Hermes work I mentioned earlier is all about the role of criminality on depth transformations so, yes, thieves.

When I was training at the SAP, there were other but reminiscent rules of thumb around such as 'always be prepared to be surprised', 'the catastrophe the patient fears has already happened', 'therapy begins before the first interview', 'there's no such thing as a patient (as in 'there's no such thing as a baby')', 'there's no such thing as originality except on the basis of a tradition', 'the first thing an analyst has to do is survive' etc etc. Yes, it is an art.

I'm thinking about training which you bring in at the end. And you're once again the Director of Training for Inter-Regional. What I am interested in is whether there is a training that is in archetypal psychology. You see, the way you write it, everything is so. Or - and this shows in the last rule of thumb - nobody is consciously doing it

but when things go well in such and such a way then, whether called or not, a.p. is present. This, along with all the other posts about or from Roger, Paul, Stan etc etc strengthens my point which is that this isn't a school.

Maybe it doesn't much matter if it is a school or not. But then why is everyone getting so upset with me? Do you remember when I put the Archetypal School in the first classification there was uproar, particularly in Germany and Britain, because I had over-rated Hillman and the others? It's play, a game, heuristic, orientating, imaginative - and with the shadow I've admitted in writing of control.

The worrying thing for me is that my main point in the new classification has got lost - it was to take a swipe at the twin extremisms in the field of Jungian analysis - the Fundamentalist and Psychoanalytic Schools. These strike me as horrid but forceful deviations from the Classical School (absorbing the Archetypal School in my view) and the Psychoanalytic School.

It isn't a school like British object relations is. When the likes of Fairbairn, Winnicott, Milner and Guntrip broke from classical psychoanalysis, they started a tradition in which one can train - a school, if you will.

I'd like to propose an exercise. Would it be possible to circulate the training outline of Inter-Regional? I realise there are local groups but I bet there's some sort of overall protocol that we could have a look at.

Andrew

PS When did you write it? And in what context?

PLEASE VISIT MY WEBSITE: WWW.ANDREWSAMUELS.COM
<<http://www.andrewsamuels.com/>>

Andrew-- the "Rule of Thumb" paper was written for the Arch Psychologies volume Roger mentioned, published last summer. So it is explicitly in honor of Hillman (sub rosa I am chiding & teasing him a bit as well). Seem to me construing situations within an imaginal field is what distinguishes Arch. Psy. If I've convinced you we are all Archetypalists, as you say-- well then, hey, that's good..(tho I am not sure every school takes the imaginal, reflective, contextual as seriously) (Note Roger, who in earlier post maintains not.)

I think I tend to agree with you (& others) about Arch. Psy. not being quite a field. From the beginning it was more an association of whomever was attracted to it, a kind of rolling party. (I suspect it's the same now.) People were quite different in terms of how they thought.. some primarily imaginal (Bosnak, Miller, Moore, Sandello, me), some from a more rational base (Kugler, Giegerich), some simply on another theoretical boat (Kapacinskas). I think some sort of affection for Hillman or love for that energy is what connected people.

It is difficult for me to think of ArchPsy as part of the Classical school. In the early years, Hillman & Lopez (who really was cofounder of this thing) spent so much energy differentiating themselves from 'Kusnacht', as we termed the von Franz-ites (Kusnacht being where they lived). The Classical emphasis included much more structure (the Self, diagrams), was more mystical, stressed synchronicity, took more often a prophetic attitude toward dreams/events. In retrospect I can see why at the time it was

important to debunk them. We needed to clear the way for a more phenomenological view with more specificity (the image). But most important was that upsetting the Classical upset the applecart. this was quite necessary in order to make room for new insights & energies...puer driven, yes! (& why Hillman's attitude toward puer is importantly distinct from von Franz's &, I think, why he wrote it in the first place). In the end does Arch Psy belong with the Classical, as a subset of it? Maybe. Tho speaking for myself (& nobody could be more born & bred of AP than I), I personally am drawn toward whatever/whomever shows me new things & awakens new awareness. The Classical generally does not. Right now I'm interested e.g., in Bollas, Bion.. There is a lot of interesting stuff out there that appeals to the puer/puella mind. It seems to me this puer mind (in its imaginative, self-reflexive form) is pretty basic to Hillman & a basic part of what's been the spirit of Arch Psy.

Oh, Inter-Regional. No, I'm not training director but Vice Pres. But I do know that for students familiarity with a diversity of Jungian approaches is assumed.

Back into lurk mode,

Pat

In a message dated 2/18/09 12:18:21 PM, johnbeebe@msn.com writes:

In Jung's case, the archetype is rather different when it belongs to the "objective psyche" than when it belongs to the "collective unconscious," and different from that when it is a "primordial image."

Dan Anderson's post continues:

Dear John,

I would be appreciative if you could elaborate on this thought. It's not one I've heard articulated before.

Also, as to the development of Jung's thinking ... certainly it evolved. But I don't feel it necessarily developed in a linear fashion. Rather, much like in his writing, throughout the years, Jung circled back the same ideas, tweaking them, yes, but I think it's hard to find a straight line of development.

Best wishes,

Dan

February 18, John Beebe replies:

Dear Dan,

Rather than try to explain my own sense of the differences between the way Jung presents his notion of the archetypes at different periods of his development, I think it might be more useful for me to offer sample statements so that others can make up their own minds.

Though the paragraphs I am quoting seem to me to be representative moments of his thought during chronically successive stages of his oeuvre, and though each of the formulations I quote seems to me to adduce a different conception of archetypes, I agree with you that any development that may be here is not linear. There is certainly overlap between the formulations, and, just as in the study of the developmental stages of an individual, one can find anticipations, regressions, and returns. The quotes I've chosen to illustrate the stages I identified in my earlier post as "primordial images," "archetypes of the collective unconscious," and "objective psyche" are as follows:

In *Collected Papers in Analytical Psychology*, edited by Constance Long, second edition (1920), p. 410, Jung writes:

In every individual, in addition to the personal memories, there are also, in Jacob Burckhardt's excellent phrase, the great "primordial images," the inherited potentialities of the human imagination. They have always been potentially latent in the structure of the brain..." [Jung has stated that the primordial images are discovered in treatment at a stage of the transference that takes the patient and doctor beyond the projection of personal contents; so he continues:] "It is ...in this further stage of the transference that those phantasies are produced that have no basis in personal reminiscence. Here it is a matter of the manifestation of the deeper layers of the unconscious, where the primordial universally-human images are lying dormant... This discovery leads to ...the recognition of a differentiation in the unconscious itself. We are now obliged to differentiate a personal unconscious and an impersonal or superpersonal unconscious. We also term the latter the absolute or collective unconscious, because it is quite detached from what is personal, and because it also absolutely universal, wherefore its contents may be found in every head, which of course is not the case with the personal contents....The primordial images are quite the most ancient, universal, and deep thoughts of mankind. They are feeling just as much as thought, and might therefore be termed original thought-feelings....We have therewith now found the object selected by the libido when it was freed from the personal-infantile form of transference. Namely, that it sinks down in to the depth of the unconscious, reviving what has been dormant there from immemorial ages. It has discovered the buried treasure out of which mankind from time to time has drawn, raising thence its gods and demons, and all those fine and most tremendous thoughts without which man would cease to be man.

15 years later, in the *Tavistock Lectures* (1935, p. 37 ¶80), Jung says:

The unconscious processes, then, are not directly observable, but those of its products that cross the threshold of consciousness can be divided into two classes. The first class contains recognizable material of a definite personal origin; these contents are individual acquisitions or products of instinctive processes that make up the personality a whole. Furthermore, there are forgotten or repressed contents, and creative contents. There is nothing specially peculiar about them. In other people such things may be conscious....I call that class of contents the personal unconscious, because, as far as we can judge, it is entirely made up of personal elements, elements that constitute the human personality as a whole....Then there is another class of contents of definitely unknown origin, or all events of an original which cannot be ascribed to individual acquisition. These contents have one outstanding peculiarity, and that is their mythological character. It is as though they belong to a pattern not peculiar to any particular mind of person, but rather to a pattern peculiar to mankind in general. When I first came across such contents I wondered very much whether they might not be due to heredity, and I thought they might be explained by racial inheritance...I was able to satisfy myself that these images have nothing to do with so-called blood or racial inheritance, nor are they personally acquired by the individual. They belong to mankind in general, and therefore they are of a collective nature....These collective patterns I have called archetypes, using an expression of St. Augustine's. An archetype means a *typos* [imprint], a definite grouping of archaic character containing, in form as well as in meaning, mythological motifs....{For instance,] the Descent into the Cave, the *Nekyia*...is found everywhere in antiquity and practically all over the world. It expresses the psychological mechanism of introversion of the conscious mind in to the deeper layers of the unconscious psyche. From these layers derive the contents of an impersonal mythological character, in other words, the archetypes, and I call them the impersonal or collective unconscious.

8 years after that, in *Psychology and Alchemy* (1943, p. 217 ¶325), in which he surveys the self-symbolism in the dreams that a then unnamed analysand [Wofgang Pauli] brought to his Jungian analyst [Erna Rosenbaum], Jung notes the “consistent development of the central symbol:”

We can hardly escape the feeling that the unconscious process moves spiral-wise round a centre, gradually getting closer, while the characteristics of the centre grow more and more distinct. Or perhaps we could put it the other way round and say that the centre—itsself virtually unknowable—acts like a magnet on the disparate materials and processes of the unconscious and gradually captures them as in a crystal lattice....[I]f the process is allowed to take its course, as it was in our case, then the central symbol, constantly renewing itself, will steadily and consistently force its way through the apparent chaos of the personal psyche and its dramatic entanglements, just as the great Bernoulli’s epitaph [Jakob Bernoulli, a Swiss mathematician who explored the calculus in correspondence with Leibniz and developed laws for large numbers, had died in Basel in 1705] says of the spiral [which adorns his grave]: “Eadem mutata resurgo [Although changed, I shall arise the same].” Accordingly we often find spiral representations of the centre, as for instance the serpent coiled round the creative point, the egg [this image was selected for the cover of the *Journal of Analytical Psychology* during my tenure as co-editor]....Indeed it seems as if all the personal entanglements and dramatic changes of fortune that make up the intensity of life were nothing but hesitations, timid shrinking, almost like petty complications and meticulous excuses for not facing the finality of this strange and uncanny process of crystallization....To the best of my experience we are dealing here with very important “nuclear processes” in the objective psyche—“images of the goal: as it were, which the psychic process,

being goal-directed apparently sets up of its own accord, without any external stimulus.

Without pre-empting others' readings of the differences or similarities in these descriptions of the archetypes, I would note that Jung's notion of the ultimate locus of consciousness underwent a shift, from ego to self, over the years that he was writing these passages. That may explain why the perspective on the archetypes seems to shift so radically.

Sincerely,

John

Dear David,

Yes, displacing one's Oedipus onto two others is a time-honoured tactic - 'let's you and him fight'. Nice one and I am happy that you wrote about it.

But there is nothing wrong with Oedipus. It's archetypal, for God's sake!!! And I wrote a whole book arguing that competition and bargaining is not only the political way but also, in many respects, the psychological way. Specifically, the different positions and ideas and approaches arise out of intense competitive interactions with each other. With Kusnacht (if you are Hillman in the 1960s), with Zurich (if you are Fordham in the 1950s), with Klein (if you are Winnicott).

And even lesser mortals like you and me receive as well as dole out our Oedipal swipes. People think of your critique of Hillman in the Post-Jungians book Ann Caseent edited. Tacey-as-son. But that's got to be looked at alongside the intense and sometimes critical interest in your work that is being shown worldwide - Tacey-as-father.

So many of the posts are fleshing out what I wrote which was that the Archetypal School does not exist as a distinct clinical entity. First, you and others translated that into the death of archetypal psychology. (I thought you'd accepted that was not what I meant.) Now, it's claimed that I announced the death of Hillman. 'Let's you and him fight'????!

The point I am making is really not that huge. I just can't see any trainings, and hence any analysts, that I'd feel comfortable in describing to a third party as belonging to the Archetypal School. The others, I can see it.

There was comment a while back about writers having different phases in their work. True. But they also have diverse interests. The question of the schools is one of mine but not really the main one any more. I've written only one book and four papers/chapters on it. The one

that has caused the furore I had to write because the Cambridge Companion entered a second edition.

Regarding Fordham etc. What has happened is that there is an extreme version of the the Developmental School that I call the Psychoanalytic. That is probably not Jungian. But Fordham was a developmental Jungian. The classification works. When I trained in 1974, the SAP was aptly described as in the Developmental School. Mostly, it still is.

Finally, with reference to us all being archetypal, the whole methodology of Jung and the Post-Jungians was based on the idea that ALL Jungian analysts use ALL of the clinical approaches and ALL of the theories available to them. The key thing is in the ordering, weighting and priority given. Using this methodology, all I have been saying is that what has happened is that the Classical analysts have placed the archetypal higher since Hillman and his colleagues.

Best wishes, Andrew

PLEASE VISIT MY WEBSITE: WWW.ANDREWSAMUELS.COM
<http://WWW.ANDREWSAMUELS.COM>

February 20, David Tacey replies:

Dear Andrew,

I guess I started this, and now I regret it - I mean, sensing "personal motives" beneath what we write and think. It is often tempting to look for the personal subtext, and I think about a year ago, we decided on this list we should not do it. It is best if we do not indulge it, but just occasionally a subtextual matter (or motive) comes to mind, and perhaps we, or I, should suppress it. Do you have thoughts on this? You said "I am happy you wrote about it" - but my response is, he must be fibbing.

Anyway, you have thrown my subtext right back into my face, as you have here. You have me as Oedipus now, and asking you and Roger to enact my own Oedipal quarrel. As you say, it is archetypal.

But this idea of finding what someone has just said as a psychological statement about themselves, and not revealing much about the object at hand, has a down side to it, don't you agree? It can look like a defence against real criticism. It becomes a way of fending off real issues at hand, and psychologising them.

You certainly know how to touch on a sore point for me. Yes, that piece I wrote on Hillman in Ann Casement's book, *The Post-Jungians Today*, has been the cause of much anguish and controversy, and marred some of my friendships, as you know. But then, we write so that others will read and take notice, don't we?

But to return to my point:

As far as I can tell, that essay of mine is almost universally read in Jungian and analytical circles as an Oedipal swipe against one of my father figures. Some Hillman followers in New York just dismissed it outright, to my face, as "unresolved problems with the transference". Isn't this an example of what Pat Berry talks about - how a key idea, theory, position, can be used as a defense? From my various conversations with people world-wide, almost 90% of the readers of that essay tend to categorise that essay as an

Oedipal swipe - in which case, the substance of what I wrote, which I would still defend by the way, has simply been ignored, and reduced to a mere "psychologism".

There is something circular and infuriating in our field, about how psychodynamics prevent criticism from flowing, and stifle debate.

It's a part of the analytical world that I do not much like, how so much is reduced to effects of the transference, and so on. It keeps everything in a very incestuous and circular little world - no new blood, no new air from outside, everything in-house and stifling. I feel almost gagged and bound by this problem, as if unable to move in the constraints of the situation, and how everything I might say will be reduced to my own personal psychological dynamics. At least in my university department I do not have to suffer the stifling and claustrophobic effects of this kind of response. In the university, people just read the words on my page, and are not trying to analyse me or second-guess what my real motives are. It is a much clearer and simpler atmosphere.

What fascinates me is why Hillman, more than anyone else in our field, incites such complex responses. No one cares if I criticise Neumann, or Jacobi, or Edinger or Whitmont. But if I criticise Hillman, well, a tirade is unleashed. Can you tell me what is going on here, from your perspective? Ironically, Maryann apologised to me for her criticisms of Hillman, as she said he was probably one of my gods. Actually, I agreed with Maryann's criticism, but apparently that was not made clear enough by me.

Years ago, I began a substantial and long work of (constructive) criticism on Hillman (there has been nothing written so far - perhaps everyone is terrified to attempt it?). I started to view the whole opus, from his earliest works, to the later pieces. But seeing how my earlier stuff was read, and how fruitless it seemed, I decided to abandon the project. I may pick it up later, in 10 years or so. I feel I owe his work, which has had such a powerful effect on me, the intellectual respect it deserves - ie. it deserves a critical appraisal. He is a very controversial and divisive figure, and as soon as anyone tries to be critical, supporters of Hillman wheel out the clichés about unresolved transference, attacking a father figure, ie. analysing my character instead of thinking about what I have written. It is how Freudians protected Freud from any kind of

external criticism - the same thing all over again. If someone criticised Freud, it was their own neurosis at work.

with best wishes,

David

Andrew Samuels replies February 20:

You know, David, when I started to write about the father, they said I had a mother complex. When I wrote about Jung and anti-semitism it was my Jewish complex (self-hating etc). Politics represented a flight from the inner world. Spirituality represented a flight from politics. My current writing on the social and sexual aspects of polyamory and promiscuity was smeared as a personal confession. And on it goes. Relax. Up theirs! Anthony Storr once told me to ignore reviews and count the column inches. Never be too proud to be thought superficial is what I'd say. Those who strive too hard for depth won't get it. Those who insist on the importance of play stay serious. Claiming to value the imagination doesn't mean you do. Those who say they have no ambitions to found schools are either liars or self-deceivers. Those who assert they are poets and the rest of us prosodists or worse often write badly. Andrew

PLEASE VISIT MY WEBSITE: WWW.ANDREWSAMUELS.COM
<<http://WWW.ANDREWSAMUELS.COM>>

Dan Anderson replies to an earlier message from David Tacey asking:

I just have one question about this. How does he "include the von Franz position", as you suggest? To my mind, he simply rejected it. Do you find that he included it in some way?

Dear David,

Thanks for your comments. When I say that Hillman includes the von Franz position, I mean that Hillman recognizes the clinical facts that von Franz describes. He recognizes that there are men (and women) who have certain puer/puella characteristics - "narcissistic, inspired, effeminate, phallic, inquisitive, inventive, pensive, passive, fiery, and capricious" (*Senex & Puer* [2005], p. 50) - and *moreover* that these qualities often coincide with a crippling parental (note: Hillman includes the father, too) complex. "When the collective conscious in an individual life is represented mainly by parental figures, then puer attitudes and impulses will show personal taints of the mother's boy or *fils du papa*, the perennial adolescence of the provisional life." *Id*, at 51.

Moreover, Hillman recognizes that "[p]uer figures often have a special relationship with the Great Mother, who is in love with them as carriers of the spirit; incest with with them inspires her -- and them -- to ecstatic excess and destruction." *Id*, at 52. Hillman recognizes that von Franz (and Jung) were correctly perceiving the clinical facts: there *are* these people with puer traits which also have big parental complexes. Hillman only makes a teeny adjustment to the *clinical* picture, adding the father to the mix.

Throughout the rest of this essay ("An Aspect of the Historical and Psychological Present" originally published in 1967), Hillman joins the puer with the senex, as opposed to the mother complex. He dialogues with Jung and von Franz, usually without mentioning them by name. (E.g., "Let us look at the usual recommendations for ... 'how to cure a puer': analyze the unconscious, reduce the fantasies, dry the hysterics, confront the intuitions, bring down to earth and reality. ... Note well: all these images are Saturnian." *Id*, at 56. Compare von Franz: "My experience is that if a man pulls out of this kind of youthful neurosis, then it is through work."

Problem of the Puer Aeternus, (2000): 10.) However, Hillman does not make an explicit *theoretical* break with Jung- von Franz, though the break is implicit.

He makes the theoretical break in 1973 in an essay, "The Great Mother, Her Son, Her Hero, and the Puer." This essay originally appeared in a book edited by our friend, Pat Berry, *Fathers and Mothers: Five Papers on the Archetypal Background of Family Psychology*. It's currently chapter 4 of *Puer & Senex* (2005). Hillman gets right to the heart of the matter, making explicit (in

the first paragraph, no less) the theoretical distinction that was implicit in the 1967 essay:

"We are trying to present the puer within a structure that recognizes it primarily as a spiritual phenomenon. We would differentiate puer, hero, and son, and contrary to the classical analytical view, we would suggest that the son who succumbs and the hero who overcomes both take their definition through the relationship with the magna mater, whereas the puer takes its definition from the senex-puer polarity. The young dominant of rising consciousness that rules the style of the ego personality can be determined by the puer (and senex) or by the son and hero (and Goddess). Nonetheless, analytical psychology has for the most part taken for granted that puer and great mother belong together: the puer-man has, or is, a mother-complex. The puer succumbs to the mother; the hero fights and overcomes her." *Senex & Puer*, p. 115.

Seems like a clear theoretical distinction: son and hero associated with the mother (or Mother) complex, and puer associated with the senex. Who's got it right? The Jungian way to resolve the conflict would be to resort to mythology. Is the puer (and we know what this youthful Apollo figure looks like) typically linked with the mother, or the senex? Hillman has a go at this for a little while (pp. 116-119), but frankly this is indecisive. Hillman must recognize the frequency of mythic son-lovers of the Mother (e.g., Attis, Adonis), and posits, instead, alchemy as supporting his vision of the puer element as belonging primarily to masculine substance, not feminine. It's interesting but probably doesn't overcome the weight of the mythic (Attis, Adonis) support of the Jung-von Franz view.

A few pages later, Hillman gets right back into the "archetypal contamination of mother and puer." *Id*, at p. 120.

I probably don't need to belabor the point. Hillman definitely believes that the puer is both conceptually and psychically distinct from the mother complex. The problem is, every human being has a mother complex, including puers, so it is a helluva task to marshal proof that the puer essentially is something separate. Hillman argues mightily, and oftentimes convincingly, that the "puer syndrome" is not inevitably tied to a massive mother (or

father) complex. But it's hard to prove, and Hillman recognizes there are plenty of cases that fit the Jung-von Franz "puer as mother-bound" picture very well.

Best wishes,

Dan

However, he diverges theoretically.

John Beebe wrote on February 23 under 'Archetypes'

Dear David and all,

I feel the need to stick up, at this point in the discussion, for James Hillman—first, for the courage it took to stand up, intellectually, for archetypes, at a time when the tide was running out on grand narratives; second, for not trying to make them too conceptually clear, but to concentrate instead on getting into their metaphoric power; and third, for the astonishing precision of some of his amplifications, which drew precisely on his ability to focus on the content-form of an image, which he understood to be the essence of the archetypal perspective (I hyphenate the word the way Chinese philosophy hyphenates the heart-mind because it is precisely the linkage of content and form that gives "archetype" power as a borderline (in archetypal language, "Hermetic" concept). Hillman, time and again, has convinced me that he's onto something when he makes an image I have found in another context where he hasn't considered it, so much more understandable, through the focus of his will to amplify images of a similar sort and his skill at doing so. I doubt, for instance that Hillman has given much attention to Dennis Hopper's character Frank in David Lynch's "Blue Velvet," but in 1989, three years after its first release, when I presented the film at the C. G. Jung Institute of San Francisco, I found it important during the lunch break, just after the workshop participants and I had all watched the film together and I was to lead them in discussion about it, to go into our library and to look at Hillman's "Going Bugs," which I hadn't yet read. I went to Hillman's essay because, trying to stick to the images

of the movie (itself a Hillman way of going about the analysis of an imaginal product) I was still pondering the peculiar way that Jeffrey, the young self-appointed detective of "Blue Velvet," is led to discover the human ear that the terrifying drug lord Frank had cut off of someone. As Kyle Mac Lachlan renders the young hero within Lynch's scenario, Jeffrey has unusually acute introverted sensation, and in the midst of investigating the lawn around his house where his father has fallen after a sudden neck fracture, he attends to something that most of us don't usually hear, the active and noisy life of insects on the ground. They are swarming around the ear. Reading "Going Bugs," to get some insight into why they were in the film, I found this passage:

...There are other traditions where the Lord of the insects is not the Devil but a Trickster. For example, the Navaho *Be 'gotcidi*, "the son of the sun, who had intercourse with everything in the world." ..."*Be 'gotcidi* means "one who grabs breasts," and details about him are too "dirty" to tell the anthropologist. "He gets his name because he would make himself invisible, then sneak upon young girls to touch their breasts as he shouted...just as a hunter was ready to shoot, he would sneak up, grab the man's testicles, and shout...similarly when a man and woman were engaged in intercourse." *Be 'gotcidi* is a 'blond or red-haired god with blue eyes dressed like a woman. He was in charge of insects, called them at will, and even sometimes appeared as a worm or an insect." Once when he was caught, hornets streamed from his mouth, June bugs from his ears, mud beetles from his nose. Hornets stung all the other Gods, and *Be 'gotcidi* swallowed all the bugs back then and could change himself into any sort of bug.

...The Tales of the Bug Lord present clear insight into the seeming spontaneity of insects, their cheeky irreverence for human intentions, their lordly power over us. We believe we shout at their sting, but perhaps it is they, by causing the shout who shout through us. As for the power of a bug, think only of the crazed state when last you tried to swat a gnat at night or demonically pursued a cockroach around the sink... (*Spring 1988*, p. 43-44)

Here was Frank indeed, in all his Frankness: I felt I had the key not only to Hopper's character but to the movie itself, as an irreverent transgressive work that makes violation itself come unforgettably alive in a scene some can hardly bear to watch, when Hopper's character walks into the Blue Lady's Dorothy's apartment, where Jeff (who is watching) is hiding in the closet, puts on a mask that makes him look like a bug, and starts to shout obscenities that like noisy ugly insects pour from his mouth as he starts to come onto Dorothy with the same sadistic, molesting fury the Navaho Bug Lord directed at the young women he violated.

To the best of my knowledge, no other amplification in the critical literature on this film, using any other conceptual scheme, has come nearly so close to illuminating the crazy power of Dennis Hopper's character in this haunting film or to unlocking its metaphoric pattern.

With all best,

John Beebe