MA in Myth, Cosmology and Sacred
Dissertations
Supervisor: Dr. Geoffrey Cornelius

Re-visioning the myths for soul-making

- In the context of James Hillman and

archetypal psychology

Sawako Gomi

24 September 2017

Contents

Introduction

> Once upon a time, I dreamt I was a butterfly, fluttering hither and thither, to all intents and purposes a butterfly. I was conscious only of my happiness as a butterfly, unaware that I was myself. Soon I awaked, and there I was, veritably myself again. Now I do not know whether I was then a man dreaming I was a butterfly, or whether I am now a butterfly, dreaming I am a man. (Wu, 1990, p. 47)

This is a famous story from *Chuang Tzu*. He points out, before this part, that when we are in a dream, we don't realize that we are dreaming. He says only when we wake from a dream, do we know that we are in a dream. Likewise, if we are in myth, is it possible for us to realize that we are in myth? Do we know whose myth that we are in? Do we live our lives, or do the Gods and Goddesses live through our lives? These questions might sound strange, yet these are the kind of inquiries presented to us by James Hillman and archetypal psychology. This reversion of perspective towards myth is the radical challenge of archetypal psychology and is the central theme of this dissertation: do we live myth or does it live through us?

As a counsellor, I have always been interested in myths and stories. It is safe to say that clients bring their life stories to sessions. I feel their stories need a witness. Their stories need to be heard. In a way, one could say that our job is to listen to their stories, re-vision them, and recreate new stories by which they will be able to live. Therefore, for counsellor or therapist, it may be natural to be attracted by myths. It was Sigmund Freud who cast myths in a new light with a new psychological understanding of human nature and neurotic disease with his concept of the Oedipal complex, named after a Greek myth. Carl Gustav Jung followed him and deepened our comprehension of myth. Hillman (1991, p. 91) writes, "The first to recognize the implications of Sigmund Freud's recognition of the relation between myth and psyche, between antiquity and modern psychology, was C.G. Jung."

It seems as if myth is coming back into our society after a long exile. Currently, myths tend to be treated as if they are maps or models of our psycho-spiritual personal development, as is done in depth psychology. Many books tell you that you are a Hero or the Goddess. For example, the subtitle of *Awakening the Heroes Within*, the best selling book of Jungian analyst Carol Pearson (2016), is "Twelve Archetypes to help us find ourselves and transform our world." At the end of this book, there is

an appendix – The Heroic Myth Index – which is designed to help people to identify various archetypal activities in their lives. Such books tell people which Hero or Goddess you are, or what you should do next in order to solve the problems. It's all in myths! The Jungian analyst and author Jean Bolen (2014, p. 2) explains, "Knowledge of the "goddesses" provides women with a means of understanding themselves and their relationships with men and women, with their parents, lovers, and children." All of them sound fascinating. I was excited when I read them, at first. However, some people may feel something is wrong with it. Hillman did. He is alarmed by that stream of thinking:

> … the chief danger lies in taking myths literally even as we aim at taking syndromes mythically. For if we go about reversion as a simple act of matching, setting out with the practical intellect of the therapist to equate my themes with syndromes, we have reduced archetypes to allegories of disease; we have merely coined a new sign language, a new nominalism. The Gods become merely a new (or old) grid of classificatory terms. (Hillman, 1997, p.p. 101-102)

It feels difficult and dangerous to step into an unknown world, so we try to explain the unknown using known terms. Doing so, we end up in the same familiar world: we cannot arrive in the new land. Hillman (2014, p. 221) describes the danger of psychological practice, using alchemical language: "If psychological practice neglects its yellowing, it can never leave off psychologizing, never redden into the world out there, never be alive to the cosmos - from which today come our actual psychological disorders."

So, let us stop here to listen to Hillman's warnings. How can we avoid the danger of literalising myth or simply psychologizing it? Perhaps, it might demand that we re-vision myth. But first, what is myth in archetypal psychology? Hillman (2013, p. 28) says it is not the role of myth in archetypal psychology "to provide an exhaustive catalogue of possible behaviors or to circumscribe the forms of transpersonal energies," but more truly "to open the questions of life to transpersonal and culturally imaginative reflection." Hillman (2013, p. 28) emphasizes the function of myth that "allow events to be recognized against their mythical background." However, for Hillman, the mythical life of the soul is the most important aspect of studying mythology. He (Hillman, 2013, p. 28) writes, "More important, however, is that the study of mythology enables one to perceive and experience the life of the

soul mythically."

The purpose of this dissertation is re-visioning myth for soul-making in accordance with James Hillman and archetypal psychology. I also follow psychological philosopher Robert Avens' study, which clarifies the archetypal psychology's movement toward mythical thinking. He (Avens, 1980, p. 29) says, "Thus the main task of archetypal psychology which claims to reflect a refining and deepening of Jung's later work, will be to "re-mythologize consciousness." So what should I do first in re-visioning myth? Hillman (1997, p. 158) says, that "Myths do not tell us how. They simply give the invisible background which starts us imagining, questioning, going deeper." So, I would follow Hillman's phenomenological methodology in imagining, in questioning.

Methodology

When I was a child, I felt myth was so fascinating and confusing, yet I sensed that there was a reality beyond my comprehension. Now, there is still excitement when I read myths, but I feel differently from my childhood. The more 'knowledge' I got, the less numinous feeling I could have. Why did I lose this? One of the founders of modern studies in Greek mythology and Jung's co-worker, Carl Kerenyi (1985), maintains that we have to understand mythology from an immediate and direct experience of it, yet we are far from genuine mythology. Kerenyi (1985, p. 1) says, "We have lost our immediate feeling for the great realities of the spirit - and to this world all true mythology belongs - lost it precisely because of our all-too-willing, helpful, and efficient science." Furthermore, he (Kerenyi, 1985, p. 1) argues that true science would free us from this falsity, and what we require from science is a "feeling of immediacy between ourselves and scientific subjects." Kerenyi continues:

> Science herself must throw open the road to mythology that she blocked first with her interpretations and then with her explanations - science always understood in the broadest sense, in this case the historical and psychological as well as the cultural and anthropological study of myths. (Kerenyi, 1985, p.p. 1-2)

So, neither interpretations and explanations, nor historical, psychological, cultural and anthropological methods are suitable for understanding myths directly. Kerenyi

(1985, p. 4) compares mythology and music, and says, "every true mythologem has its satisfying meaning", as music does. Therefore, he (Kerenyi, 1985, p. 4) claims that "the right attitude towards it: to let mythologems speak for themselves and simply to listen." He continues:

> Any explanation has to be along the same lines as the explanation of a musical or poetic work of art. That a special "ear" is needed for it, just as for music or poetry, is obvious. Here as well "ear" means resonance, a sympathetic pouring out of oneself. (Kerenyi, 1985, p. 4)

This approach – of 'listening' to myth as it is rather than explain it or analyse it – may be called phenomenological methodology. Hillman explains his phenomenological attitude in his psychological work:

> Phenomenology deals with things as they appear as such. It sets aside speculations about origins, causes, explanations, theories. This is how I work in psychology… I do not know the primary sources of any of the things I greet in practice… Instead, I regard the phenomena. (Hillman, 1997, p. 6)

Thus, I have conducted this research in the phenomenological way. However, from the point of view of both Hillman and archetypal psychology, we have to remember that we are not only listening but also playing the music. Hillman (2013, p. 27) points out that the " soul can be an object of study only when it is also recognized as the subject studying itself by means of the fictions and metaphors of objectivity." We try to keep our objectivities, especially in the academy – we believe that we can be objective. However, Hillman thinks objectivity itself is fantasy. We are "never beyond the subjectivism given with the soul's native dominants of fantasy structures." (Hillman, 2013, p. 32) That is to say, "we can never be purely phenomenal or truly objective." (Hillman, 2013, p. 32) Therefore, what I can do is to keep the idea in my mind that I also think in fantasy, and that archetypes and mythical images might emerge through my own perspective, which leads me to remember the importance of seeing through 'how' I think and 'what' I think through writing this paper, as well.

Archetypal Psychology is logos of psyche

To begin with, I would like to explore what archetypal psychology is for Hillman. In the book *Archetypal Psychology,* which was originally written as an introduction of archetypal psychology for inclusion in the Enciclopedia del Novecento, Hillman defines it:

> Archetypal psychology can be seen as a cultural movement, part of whose task is the re-visioning of psychology, psychopathology, and psychotherapy in terms of the Western cultural imagination. (Hillman, 2014, p. 13)

As he (Hillman, 2014, p. 13) says, the term of "archetypal" not only reflected the theory of Jung's later work, which was an attempt "to solve psychological problems beyond scientific models", but also Hillman's aim to go back to its original meaning of archetypes, that is the "primary forms that govern the psyche." So, archetypal psychology "is an attempt at a psychology of soul." (Hillman, 1997, p. 2) So what does 'soul' and 'psyche' mean for Hillman and archetypal psychology? For him, soul is not a metaphysical entity but a perspective. He explains:

> By soul I mean, first of all, a perspective rather than a substance, a viewpoint toward things rather than a thing itself. This perspective is reflective; it mediates events and makes differences between the doer and the deed, there is a reflective moment-and soul-making means differentiating this middle ground. (Hillman, 1997, p. xvi)

As Avens (1980, p. 31) points out, Hillman uses the term 'psyche' and 'soul' interchangeably, for the most part. It is important to emphasize his view that psyche is a perspective, for it implies psyche is the subject of psychology as well as the object at the same time. Yet, why does he have to re-vision psychology? Here, it is helpful to go back to the origin of psychology first. According to the Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology (1993), it is said that the word 'psychology' originates from the modern Latin 'psȳchologia', which started being used around mid seventeenth century, meaning 'science of the human soul or mind'. Hillman (2013, p.25) puts it, "Psychology (logos of psyche) etymologically means: reason or speech or intelligible account of soul." As we see, for Hillman, 'logos' means "reason

or speech or intelligible account." Thus, primarily, "It is psychology's job to find logos for psyche, to provide soul with an adequate account of itself." (Hillman, 2013, p.25) Nonetheless, as Hillman (2013, p. 16) points out, "In the dualistic tradition, psyche never had its own logos. There could be no true psychology." Why so? In the dualistic tradition, every thing is divided into two, so we have body (or thing) and spirit (or mind), but there is no space for soul. There are two reasons that psyche is unable to have its own logos in the dualistic tradition. The first is that, as Hillman (1997, p. 172) argues, the word 'psȳchologia' was used first in theology. He writes:

> Textbooks always say it was introduced by Melanchthon, Luther's close friend and co-worker. It makes its appearance together with the new terms of the Reformation: self-regard, self-love, self-conceit, self-destruction. The new word selfness, and the self as a reflective intensive pronoun, expressed a new reflective style, a new interiority and intensification of person. (Hillman, 1997, p. 172)

So, the logos of soul was not brought into this world in the way that archetypal psychology attempts, it reflected a new inward tendency in the theological circumstance of that time. Secondly, as Hillman (2013b, p. 67) claims, we lost the realm of soul at the Fourth Council of Constantinople in the year 869 CE. He (Hillman, 2013b, p.67) writes, "Because at that Council in Constantinople the soul lost its dominion." At this Council, "our idea of human nature, devolved from a tripartite cosmos of spirit, soul, and body (or matter)" moved "to a dualism of spirit (or mind) and body (or matter)." (Hillman, 2013b, p.67) Moreover, according to Hillman (1997, p. 68), soul had been confounded with spirit since St Paul. He writes:

> Already in the early vocabulary used by Paul, *pneuma* or spirit had begun to replaced *psyché* or soul. The New Testament scarcely mentions soul phenomena such as dreams, but stresses spirit phenomena such as miracles, speaking in tongues, prophecy, and visions. (Hillman, 1997, p. 68)

In this way, when soul came back to the world with a new name, psȳchologia, in the context of religion in seventeenth century, it had already been mixed up with spirit. In western culture, people don't realize that they confuse soul with spirit, for soul has been rejected intentionally and systematically for a long time. Hillman (2013b, p.

8

68) claims that this "traditional denial of soul" remains in our unconscious attitudes, whether we are Christian or not, since we are so deeply affected by our culture's tradition unconsciously.

As we have seen, religion, in western culture, came from spirit rather than soul, and soul lost its own unique realm. As a result, western culture does not possess a religion that is concerned with soul-making. Instead, it has a psychology which reflects religion. "Since the religion in our culture has been monotheistic, our psychologies are monotheistic." (Hillman, 1997, p. 168) Yet, soul's nature is not monotheistic. As Hillman (1997, p. 167) says, the polycentricity is soul's primal nature. Therefore, Hillman had to re-vision monotheistic psychology in order to transform psychology for soul-making. He writes:

> By keeping our focus upon soul-making, we cannot help but recognize that the Gods in the soul require religion in psychology. But the religion that psychology requires must reflect the state of soul as it is, actual psychic reality. This means polytheism. For the soul's inherent multiplicity demands a theological fantasy of equal differentiation. (Hillman, 1997, p. 167)

Thus, in order to move toward mythical thinking, polytheistic imagination is indispensable, for "mythology is the mode of speaking religion in polytheistic consciousness." (Hillman, 1997, p. 158) Hillman (1997, p. 158) says mythology reminds polytheistic consciousness of "the ambiguity of meanings and the multiplicity of persons in each event in each moment." Therefore, to seek for polytheistic consciousness and psychology, Hillman went back to Jung and Henri Corbin, who were the fathers of archetypal psychology, which is rooted in the Neoplatonic tradition. Hillman (2013a, p.p. 40-41) writes, "The tradition of thought (Greek, Renaissance, Romantic) to which archetypal psychology claims it is an heir is set in polytheistic attitudes." So, what are the characteristics of this tradition? Fundamentally, according to Hillman (2013a, p. 16), it is a tradition focusing on soul as a primal basis, claiming this soul as a '*tertium quid*' ('third thing)' between body and spirit. Hillman writes:

> Soul as tertium, the perspective between others and from which others may be viewed, has been described as Hermetic consciousness (Lopez-Pedraza 1977), as "esse in anima" (Jung, CW 6:66, 77), as the position of the *mundus imaginalis* by

Corbin, and by Neoplatonic writers on the intermediaries or figures of the metaxy. (Hillman, 2013a, p. 16)

In other words, it is an image-oriented tradition. Hillman (1997, p. xvii) says, "I am working toward a psychology of soul that is based in a psychology of image." That is to say, a psychology of soul is almost the same as a psychology of image, for the image is psyche in archetypal psychology. This identification of image with psyche originated with Jung as I will discuss in the next section.

Jung and Hillman

Now, I would like to go back to one of the fathers of archetypal psychology, C.G. Jung, to explore how he understood mythology and how it influenced archetypal psychology. According to Hillman (2013a, p. 17), archetypal psychology begins with the image, which was identified with the soul by Jung, leading archetypal psychology to the principle of soul: "soul is constituted of images, that the soul is primarily an imagining activity most natively and paradigmatically presented by the dream." He writes:

> So, Jung said, if you are in search of soul, go first to your fantasy images, for that is how the psyche presents itself directly. All consciousness depends upon fantasy images. All we know about the world, about the mind, the body, about anything whatsoever, *including the spirit* and the nature of the divine, comes through images and is organized by fantasies into one pattern or another. (Hillman, 2013b, p. 70)

Moreover, Hillman (2013b, p. 70) continues that these patterns of fantasy images are archetypal, that is "we are always in one or another archetypal configuration, one or another fantasy, including the fantasy of soul and the fantasy of spirit." He (Hillman, 2013b, p. 71) emphasizes what Jung said; 'Every psychic process is an image and an imagining', therefore the only knowledge we can have is knowledge "that is immediate and direct is knowledge of these psychic images."

It was Jung who brought in the concept 'collective unconscious' which he (Jung, 1990, p. 3) regarded as "identical in all men and thus constitutes a common psychic

10

substrate of a suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us." Jung (1990, p. 5) argued that the contents of the collective unconscious are of a "primordial type", that is, "universal images that have existed since the remotest times." Jung (1990, p. 78) argued that every psychic function must be preformed, for all psychic content is preformed. As a shape of products of imagination, those primordial images can be seen in our sensible world. Jung named those primordial images, especially universal primordial images, as archetypes, although, as he says(Jung, 1990, p. 4), it was not his original idea. He brought the concept from the Hermetic and Platonic traditions into the modern psychological perspective. He wrote:

> "Archetype", far from being a modern term, was already in use before the time of St. Augustine, and was synonymous with "Idea" in the Platonic usage. When the Corpus Hermeticum, which probably dates from the third century, describes God as τό ἀρχέτυπον φῶς, the ʿarchetypal light', it expresses the idea that he is the prototype of all light; that is to say, pre-existent and supraordinate to the phenomenon "light." (Jung, 1990, p. 75)

Jung (1990, p. 79) emphasized the importance of his discovery, especially in his study that illustrated that archetypes can regenerate spontaneously beyond time and place, regardless of traditions and languages. Moreover, he (Jung, 1990, p. 79) implied the autonomic nature of archetypes; "there are present in every psyche forms which are unconscious but nonetheless active-living dispositions, ideas in the Platonic sense, that preform and continually influence our thoughts and feelings and actions." That is to say, Jung acknowledged the causal aspect of archetypes, which led him to compare archetypes and the gods. Jung wrote:

> Today, we call the gods "factors" which comes from *facere*, 'to make.' The makers stand behind the wings of the world-theatre. It is so in great things as in small. In the realm of consciousness we are our own masters; we seem to be the "factors" themselves… Only an unparalleled impoverishment of symbolism could enable us to rediscover the gods as psychic factors, that is, as archetypes of the unconscious. (Jung, 1990, p. 23)

Thus, archetypal images were identified with the gods by Jung. Furthermore, he related archetypes to myths. He (Jung, 1990, p. 5) wrote, "Another well-known

expression of the archetypes is myth and fairy-tale." More importantly, Jung pointed out the primal connection between myth and soul. He (Jung, 1990, p. 6) put it: "The fact that myths are first and foremost psychic phenomena that reveal the nature of the soul is something they have absolutely refused to see until now." Jung (1990, p. 22) explained that the nature of the collective unconscious (the nature of the soul in archetypal psychology) is the reverse of the state of daily consciousness, that is, we are the objects of every subject. He wrote:

No, the collective unconscious is anything but an incapsulated personal system; it is sheer objectivity, as wide as the world and open to all the world. There I am the object of every subject, in complete reversal of my ordinary consciousness, where I am always the subject that has an object. There I am utterly one with the world, so much a part of it that I forget all too easily who I really am. "Lost in oneself" is a good way of describing this state. But this self is the world, if only a consciousness could see it.(Jung, 1990, p. 22)

He (Jung, 1990, p. 23) admitted that "we are the objects of unseen factors" outside the realm of consciousness. Here, we can see signs of the reversion of perspective towards myth in Jung. Avens (1980, p. 26) clarifies this reversion: "Our point, however, will be that not only is there a substratum of mythical mentality in every person, but that mythical or archetypal images constitute the very essence of psychic life, that they are the psyche." He also clarifies the reversion of subject and object relationship of myth and human. He writes:

Arguing against the nineteenth-century evolutionistic fantasy, Barfield suggests that the picture of the primitive man as "always projecting his insides onto something or other," i.e., as animating a dead world with arbitrarily concocted shapes of monstrous or benevolent beings, must be reversed to say that "it was not man who made the myths but myths or the archetypal substance they reveal, which made man." (Avens, 1980, p. 26)

However, as Jung (1990, p. 75) himself mentioned, Jung was a modern scholar, who wanted to be a scientist rather than philosopher, something that might have made him refrain from going further. He wrote:

Were I a philosopher, I should continue in this Platonic strain and say: Somewhere, in "a place beyond the skies," there is a prototype or primordial image of the mother that is pre-existent and supraordinate to all phenomena in which the "maternal," in the broadest sense of the term, is manifest. But I am an empiricist, not a philosopher; I cannot let myself presuppose that my peculiar temperament, my own attitude to intellectual problem, is universally valid. (Jung, 1990, p. 75)

Moreover, as we can see what he says above, it seems that his mind set is Kantian, leading him to separate archetypal images and the archetypes themselves, as Kantian-distinct phenomena and "things in themselves." Avens (1980, p. 43) says, "Admittedly Jung was philosophically so steeped in the Kantian world view that it was difficult for him to regard it in the light of his own revolution." Yet, Avens (1980, p. 43) claims that it did not mean Jung could not overcome his Kantian precondition. Avens writes:

As a neo-Jungian writer puts it, he remained a Kantian while steadily undoing Kant, by developing "an epistemological stance which renders the noumena phenomena distinction wholly unnecessary… The Jungian world view dissolved… its Kantian counterpart." Archetypes for Jung are not ultimate psychic "things in themselves" or metaphysically real; their 'unknowability' is only a portent of their ambiguity and the wealth of reference. (Avens, 1980, p. 43)

Although Jung realized the limitations of subject-ism and noumenalism, and noticed the significance of a reversion of subject and object relationship between our consciousness and the images, he was still in the territory of Kantian dualism. For Jung, archetypes "transcend the empirical world of time and place and, in fact, are in themselves not phenomenal." (Hillman, 2013a, p. 14) This is the crucial distinction between Jung and Hillman. Therefore, in the next section, I would like to explore Kantian dualism and how Hillman deals with it.

Image and Romanticism

As we saw above, suspending Jung's Kantian dualism is Hillman's challenge.

Therefore, in this section, let us examine what Kantian dualism is – and Kant's discovery of the fundamental function of imagination – in aiming to clarify Hillman's challenge to move beyond this Kantian view. I will also explore how Romanticism, which is one of the roots of archetypal psychology, tackled dualism in post-Kantian circumstances and how it helped the resolution of this dualism.

The Neo-Kantian philosopher Ernst Cassirer (2009, p.p. 50-51) mentions two fundamental philosophical conflicts or different directions between Plato and Aristotle, which were clarified by Goethe. He quotes from Goethe's *Materials on the History of the Doctrine of Colors*:

> Goethe says: Plato relates himself to the world as a blessed spirit, whom it pleases sometimes to stay for a while in the world; he is not so much concerned to come to know the world, because he already presupposes it, as to communicate to it in a friendly way what he brings along with him and what it needs… He moves longingly to the heights in order to become again a part of his origin… Aristotle, on the contrary, stands to the world as a man, an architect. He is only here once and must here make and create. He inquires about the earth, but not farther than to find a ground… He draws a huge circumference for his building, procures materials from all sides, arranges them, piles them up, and climbs thus in regular form, pyramid fashion to the top; whereas Plato, like an obelisk, indeed like a pointed flame, seeks heaven. (Cassirer, 2009, p.p. 50-51)

Cassirer (2009, p. 51) says after the appearance of these two men, the world was forced to follow one or the other. Cassirer continues that it was Kant who brought a concession to this opposition. He (Cassirer, 2009, p. 52) argues that Kant's interpreters do not understand Kant's fundamental intention, which supposes a certain relationship between experience and thought. According to Cassirer (2009, p. 52), Kant did not "entrust human reason with the power, nor does he grant it the right to build up such a supersensible world on the strength of the pure concept." Conversely, Cassirer (2009, p. 52) continues, Kant thought "all power of the pure concept" should "make experience itself understandable and transparent to us, its logical structure and its logical laws, its general principles and conditions." Moreover, according to Avens (1980, p. 14), it was also Kant who could distinguish between two different type of imagination: reproductive and transcendental. This distinction enhanced the role of imagination as middleman. He (Avens, 1980, p. 14) explains that

14

transcendental or productive imagination is an autonomic process, and it has its own internal agent without outside influence. It is prior to experience. He writes:

> Kant holds that this imagination gives rise to the transcendental synthesis combining purely sensory data with purely intellectual apprehension (categories of reason). Imagination is the mediatory power, the synthetic medium which orders the chaos of sensuous intuition according to certain unchanging general forms or schemata. (Avens, 1980, p. 14)

Kant notices the primacy of imagination; however, he did not go to that direction. Instead of exploring the realm of imagination, according to Cassirer (2009, p. 55), Kant led us "back into the depths of our own reason." Avens (1980, p. 15) explains it using Martin Heidegger's study of Kant, "Kant retreated from the primacy of imagination because he saw that its foundational function points to a ground more basic than sense and thought." Avens (1980, p. 15) continues that it was obvious to Kant that the basis of all our experiences is established by an unknowable union of imaginative scope, yet Kant drew back from his realization, for "it led to an "abyss"." In the second edition of the *Critique*, Avens (1980, p. 15) writes, "Kant reaffirmed the supremacy of reason thus reverting to the more traditional path of rationalism." Avens (1980, p. 15) concludes "he merely transposed the subjectivism of Western metaphysics,… to the transcendental level of the "I think."

Thus, Kant did not appreciate primacy of imagination, and the realm of imagination remained abandoned. According to Avens (1980, p. 17), the task of the English and German Romantics was to raise imagination's position to "the primary creative agency of human mind or the Self" in the circumstances of post-Kantian idealism. Avens (1980, p. 17) mentions, "Romanticism justifiably rebelled against the Cartesian *cogito ergo sum* as well as against the 'I' principle of the Kantian 'I think,' converting it into a Self which was held to be primordial, active and unlimited by the objective world. However, the attempt of the Romantics to elevate the imagination deteriorated into an irrational and "sentimental enthusiasm." (Avens, 1980, p. 17) Avens (1980, p. 17) points out this was because Romanticism was still under the influence of "the idealist and the subjectivist tradition of the West." He (Avens, 1980, p. 18) continues that "the only major exceptions to subject-ism are Coleridge, Blake and Goethe." He writes:

In Blake, imagination is an inclusive concept implying and containing within itself all the powers of cognition. Somewhat like in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century German Idealism (and in Coleridge), it is the central element not only in man but also in cosmic creation itself: the subjective pole of being and the objective pole of natural phenomena interpenetrate through imagination. (Avens, 2006, p.26)

This concept of interpenetration amongst everything in this world can be seen in Goethe, too. According to Avens (1980, p. 19), Goethe thought that only particular concrete things could hold "the perduring archetypes (Urphänomen)," which can be perceived in this living world through sensation. Therefore, as Avens (1980, p.p. 20-21) points out, "imagination is said to link harmoniously ("psychosomatically" is Barfield's word) matter and spirit; it stands before the object and experientially, or rather imaginatively, knows "I am that." Avens (1980, p. 22) also mentions William Blake's "double vision", which is the capacity to recognize at least two different aspects at the same time. Avens (1980, p. 22) writes, "When Blake looked at the sun, he saw not only "a round thing somewhat like a guinea" but also "an immeasurable Company of the Heavenly Host crying Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord God Almighty." Blake could see beyond a thing through imagination, therefore the world itself is filled with spirit for him. Hillman (1997, p. xv) explains that the term soul-making in archetypal psychology is derived from the Blake's *Vala*, yet the phrase was articulated in a letter of John Keats to his brother: "Call the world if you please, 'The vale of Soul-making.' Then you will find out the use of the world…." Thus, there was a sign of awakening of soul or imagination as a tertium between the matter or body and the spirit or mind in Romanticism, which is clarified in archetypal psychology.

As we saw, although it was Jung who brought imagination back in an attempt to return to the soul, he maintained the existence of archetype as an *a priori* form in the collective unconscious. However, Hillman (2013a, p. 14) points out that archetypes "are in themselves not phenomenal." He continues:

Archetypal psychology, in distinction to Jungian, considers the archetypal to be always phenomenal (Avens 1980), thus avoiding the Kantian idealism implied in Jung (de Voogd 1977). (Hillman, 2013a, p. 14)

According to Avens (2006, p.34), Hillman thinks "the phenomenal archetype" reveal itself in images, and he points out that "archetypal image precedes and determines

the metaphysical hypothesis of a noumenon." Avens (1980, p. 43) says that Hillman thinks the noumenalism of archetype is unnecessary and constraint. Then, "The third-generation Jungian", as Avens (1980, p. 43) describes, "profess to be more interested in images, in the primacy of the imaginal life than in the "a priori organizing potential" of the archetypes." Avens describes:

> Instead of asking how archetype and image are related (as two distinct events), one begins with and concentrates on images in all their multiple implications. The adjective "archetypal" stands, not for an unknowable and noumenal content in the unconscious, but rather for the unfathomable and polymorphous nature of the images themselves. (Avens, 2006, p.34)

Moreover, Avens (2006, p.34) points out that Hillman refuses the expression "unconscious", for it is not considered as the vessel of archetypes, which are unknowable, in archetypal psychology any longer. It is an implement for intensifying and internalizing the images. Avens (2006, p.36) argues Hillman's phenomenology can be understood "in terms of what he calls "archetypal episteme," which is "a psychological method to dismantles metaphysics by relativizing the pivotal points of its traditional edifice: "pure reason" (Kant)." Hillman sticks with "things and events themselves" (Avens, 2006, p. 37) and lets them speak, so that "the primary, and irreducible, language of these archetypal patterns" becomes the "metaphorical discourse of myths." (Hillman, 2013a, p. 14) Therefore, Hillman's method becomes "archetypal reversion – a return to mythical patterns and persons of the psyche." (Avens, 2006, p. 37) I would explore this "reversion" more a bit later.

Thus, by dealing "with things as they appear as such" or confronting "the phenomena right under your nose" (Hillman, 1997, p. 6), Hillman tries to move beyond the Kantian dualism in Jung. Archetype is not hidden for Hillman, but rather reveals itself in image and mythical perspective. Therefore, in order to appreciate this notion, it is crucial to understand the danger of considering images or myth as allegories.

Image and soul

We saw in the previous chapter that Hillman and archetypal psychology tries to move

beyond dualism by focusing on image and returning to myth, which is the phenomenal archetype. However, it is difficult for the modern mind to take images or myths as they are as such, for images or myths have started to be seen as allegories. Therefore, in this section, I will discuss that how images and myths became just symbols or allegories and lost their power. Furthermore, I will examine how Hillman's distinction between the literal and imaginal, and his notion of soul-making, were influenced by Henri Corbin.

To begin with, we have to go back to the Second Council of Nicaea in 787 CE, for at this Council, as Hillman (2013b, p .67) points out, "images were deprived of their inherent authenticity." According to Hillman (2013b, p. 69), the fear and aversion to images is very strong and has a long history; he regards it as another conflict of "those long battles between spirit and soul, between abstractions and images, between iconoclasts and idolaters." So, what was done to images at Nicaea? Hillman (2013b, p .67) says that although hundreds of bishops continued to adhere to the significance of images it was a triumph of the iconoclasts, since "a subtle and devastating differentiation was made" (Hillman, 2013b, p.69) by them. It was a separation between the image itself and what the image expresses. "Thus, image became allegories." (Hillman, 2013b, p.69) He describes:

The image itself has become subtly depotentiated… Yes, the image is allowed, but only to be venerated for what it represents: the abstract ideas, configurations, transcendencies behind the images… They become representations, no longer presentations, no longer presences of divine power. (Hillman, 2013b, p.69)

Since then, images such as statues, icons and paintings became just matter or things. This restriction stops us from exploring and experiencing our intuition and strong emotions which arises when looking at astonishingly beautiful statues and images. Furthermore, as Angela Voss (2006, p. 201) points out, we are unable to "trust in the 'marvellous truth' revealed to the imagination through sense-perception of image", for our modern minds are so accustomed to "a Cartesian duality that distinguishes between thought and action, conception and perception." In our dualistic cosmology, things or images are neither able to have their own feelings and personalities nor souls. Therefore, it does not allow us to enter an intimate and 'erotic' relationship outside the humanistic one. Voss continues:

Added to which, our Christian-Platonic legacy of the past two thousand years in

the West has left us wary about the nature of sensuality and desire. In not allowing Eros to reveal his divinity through the arousal of our senses, we have separated soul from body, sacred love from profane passion, and ultimately divinity from matter. (Voss, 2006, p. 206)

Thus, images became mere symbols or allegories. Perhaps, in our modern view, it sounds natural that statues and icons are just stone or wooden things. People might view them as man made or artificial things. We are thus trained to distinguish the symbols and the essences that they are expressing, yet the second father of archetypal psychology, Henri Corbin, would say the act of separation itself is what makes them into an icy stone object. According to Cheetham (2015, p.p. 28-29), Hillman's essential insight, which is the distinction between the literal and imaginal, comes from directly from Corbin. So, how does Corbin distinguish between the literal and imaginal? Cheetham (2015, p. 28) says Corbin's whole "psycho-cosmology" hangs on "Corbin's distinction between the idol and the icon." For Corbin, according to Cheetham (2015, p. 29), although the aim of our life in the world is to be "in sympathy with being" or to live "in love", this could be a trap in two ways. One is to "love a being without perceiving its transcendence," in which case "it becomes an idol, and you become an idolator, a fundamentalist." (Cheetham, 2015, p. 29) The other was is to love "transcendence itself" and disregard "the reality of being" under our nose. (Cheetham, 2015, p. 29) Here, "the icon loses its grounding in the world." (Cheetham, 2015, p. 29) Therefore, the separation itself between the image and what the image represents deprives the image of its power. You have to fall in love with the icon without separating the icon itself and what the icon expresses.

I will explore a bit more of Corbin later, for now let us focus on myths. We also tend to consider myth as an allegory, as we do for images. However, what might happen once myth becomes just allegory? Hillman says:

First, allegory keeps the autonomy and reality of the Gods at bay. By being "used" for moral examples or educational homilies, they are no longer powers but rather technical tricks, categories, conceits. They become instruments of reason rather than the very forms that organize reason. (Hillman, 1997, p. 7)

Thus we cannot understand the myth of Pygmalion, who fell in love with a sculpture

that he had carved. Instead, it became an allegory of the phenomenon which shows that higher expectation can increase performance. Hillman (1997, p.1) argues that the dualistic way of seeing the world imprisons autonomy and spontaneity within humans. He describes:

> This view confines the idea of subjectivity to human persons. Only they are permitted to be subjects, to be agents and doers, to have consciousness and soul. The Christian idea of person as the true focus of the divine and the only carrier of the soul is basic to this world view. (Hillman, 1997, p.1)

Thus, we lost an ability to have a close and intimate relationship with mythical figures, and the relationship became *I-It* rather *I-Thou*. Then, we ask "Are things alive or dead?" or " Are Gods real or are they symbolic projections?" (Hillman, 1997, p. 16) However, as Hillman says:

> Mythic consciousness answers with Cassirer: "There is nowhere an 'it' as a dead object, a mere thing." Subject and object, man and Gods, I and Thou, are not apart and isolated each with a different sort of being, one living or real, the other dead or imaginary. The world and the Gods are dead or alive according to the condition of our souls. (Hillman, 1997, p. 16)

Therefore, Hillman claims that "To enter myth we must personify, to personify carries us into myth." What does 'to personify' mean for Hillman? He explains:

> All three terms-anthropomorphism, animism, personification- contain one basic idea: there exists a "mode of thought" which takes an inside event and puts it outside, at the same time making this content alive, personal, and even divine. These three terms, by saying that human beings tend to imagine things into souls, are actually describing a manner of soul-making. But by calling this activity a "mode of thought" it becomes an act we perform-conscious or unconscious -rather than something we immediately experience. (Hillman, 1997, p. 13)

Hillman (1997, p. 13) describes that personifying "is a way of being in the world." It is a way of experiencing the world as a field of soul-making, where mythical figures are

given with events so that they attract and move us. Therefore, as Hillman (1997, p. 17) says, it is not us who actually personify. He writes:

Mythical consciousness is a mode of being in the world that brings with it imaginal persons. They are given with the imagination and are its data. Where imagination reigns, personifying happens… Just as we do not create our dreams, but they happen to us, so we do not invent the persons of myth and religions; they, too, happen to us… To mythic consciousness, the persons of the imagination are real. (Hillman, 1997, p. 17)

Hillman (2013a, p. 21) points out that hidden reality of the world can only be revealed through those mythical figures. He writes:

Archetypal psychology *axiomatically* assumes imagistic universals, comparable to the *universali fantastic* of Vico (Scienza Nuova, par. 381), that is, mythical figures that provide the poetic characteristics of human thought, feeling, and action, as well as the physiognomic intelligibility of the qualitative worlds of natural phenomena. By means of the archetypal image, natural phenomena present faces that speak to the imagining soul rather than only conceal hidden laws and probabilities and manifest their objectification. (Hillman, 2013a, p. 21)

However, in order to let those mythical figures or the Gods appear as they are, and to let them speak to us, we need to be open to the realm for them, the *mundus imaginalis*. So, in the next section, I will discuss Corbin's *mundus imaginalis* and Neoplatonic cosmology, which is the basis of Hillman's cosmology.

Mundus Imaginalis

In this chapter, I also want to mention the mythical figure or Angel in Corbin as well as to explore *mundus imaginalis* and Neoplatonic cosmology, for it is crucial to understanding Hillman's ideas about myths. According to Hillman (2013a, p. 15), it was Corbin who brought the idea that "the *mundus archetypalis'* ('alam al-mitbal') is also the *mundus imaginalis*", meaning the realm of archetype is a specific field of "imaginal realities requiring methods and perceptual faculties different from the

spiritual world beyond it or the empirical world of usual sense perception and naïve formulation." This notion takes two fundamental ideas in archetypal psychology from Corbin: "(a) . . .the fundamental nature of the archetype is accessible to imagination first and presents itself first as image, so that (b) the entire procedure of archetypal psychology as a method is imaginative." (Hillman, 2013a, p. 15) Thus, the purpose of therapy in archetypal psychology is aimed at the "development of a sense of soul, the middle ground of psychic realities" (Hillman, 2013a, p. 15), that is, the *mundus imaginalis*. Avens explains:

> Corbin's *mundus imaginalis* is the necessary mediatrix (theologically conceived as *Deus revelatus*, revealed God) between the hidden Deity (*Deus absconditus*) and man's world. It is the world of the soul or psyche which in the Platonic and esoteric tradition is called *Anima Mundi*, the Soul of the World. (Avens, 2006, p.3)

According to Voss (1986, p. 12), Corbin is the scholar who makes claims for the soul of the world, and "stands in the line of Platonic interpreters from Plotinus, Iamblichus and Ficino through to the archetypal and depth psychologists Carl Jung and James Hillman." Voss (1986, p. 12) describes that they all value "the imagination as a faculty of perception which can penetrate far deeper into the mysterious nature of being than any abstract or conceptual thought." It seems fundamental to understand what the *Anima Mundi* is and what kind of quality it has in the Neoplatonic and esoteric sense, in order to comprehend Corbin's *mundus imaginalis* and soul in archetypal psychology, for they are rooted in the notion that we are in the *Anima Mundi* or the soul of the world rather than the soul being in us. Hillman writes:

> The primary metaphor of psychology must be soul… Psyche as the *anima mundi*, the Neoplatonic soul of the world, is already there with the world itself, so that a second task of psychology is to hear psyche speaking through all things of the world, thereby recovering the world as place of soul (soul-making). (Hillman, 2013, p. 25)

Therefore, when Hillman says soul-making, it indicates the soul of the world, the *anima mundi*. So, how can we understand the *Anima Mundi*? It was clarified by one of the most influential Italian Renaissance scholars, Marsilio Ficino, in his books, *Three*

Books On Life. Geoffrey Cornelius (2005, p. 4) explains Ficino's cosmology delineated in those books. He writes:

> Ficino observes that the whole cosmos is animate, which is demonstrated not only by the arguments of the Platonists but also by the testimony of the Arabic astrologers. The foundation of astrology resides in the working of the World Soul (*Anima Mundi*), who contains in herself the 'seminal reasons of things'. These 'reasons' reflect or correspond to the *Ideas* in the Divine Mind; but for the Ideas to become materially manifested, they have to be brought to birth in the womb of the World Soul. (Cornelius, 2005, p. 4)

In other words, all matter or things in this world are endowed with the celestial gift of Ideas, with each genus agreeing to its own Ideas. Thus, the *Anima Mundi* links matter and Ideas. Voss (1986, p. 4) describes Neoplatonic cosmology as being composed of three strata of reality; "the divine intelligible realm, the material realm, and linking them a mediating dimension which partakes of both: a spiritual body or celestial earth." This intermediate realm reveals itself to us through images, and those images are caught through sense-perception. Voss writes:

> It is the 'intermediate place' in the neoplatonic cosmos of emanation from spirit to matter where the former is given a perceptible form through an image, and the latter loses the density of embodiment and is 'seen through' to its immaterial essence. (Voss, 2004, p. 1)

However, Hillman (1992, p. 67) claims that, "Let us imagine the *anima mundi* neither above the world encircling it as a divine and remote emanation of spirit, a world of powers, archetypes, and principles transcendent to things, nor within the material world as its unifying panpsychic life principle." Instead, he (Hillman, 1992, p. 67) argues that we imagine the *anima mundi* "as that particular soul spark, that seminal image, which offers itself through each thing in its visible form." Therefore, Hillman does not consider the *anima mundi* as metaphysical world, but, as we have seen, "the phenomenal archetype" (Avens, 2006, p.34) revealing itself in images.

As Voss (2004, p. 5) says, to perceive those images from that intermediate plane, a correspondence of soul is required. It expresses itself through agents such as gods, angels or daimons. That is, the special 'ear' and 'eye' are indispensible in order to

listen and see them through imagination. Voss writes:

> These celestial souls are empowered by the desire to return to their particular archangel, and at each level they form a couple. Each level of the material cosmos too resonates with its soul and thereby with its angel, but the soul or angel of the world is only perceptible through the cultivation of what Corbin terms the active imagination. The imagination is the angelic mode of perception, for being immaterial they do not possess the sense- perception of human beings. (Voss, 2004, p. 5)

Now, we can understand Hillman's "archetypal reversion" which I mentioned before. Hillman's "reversion" is based on Plotinus's method, "reversion" (*epistrophe*) - the idea that all things desire to return to the archetypal originals of which they are copies and from which they proceed."(Hillman, 1997, p. 99) Hillman (1997, p. 99) claims, "Pathologizing, too, would be examined in terms of likeness and imagined." Moreover, he (Hillman, 1997, p. 99) says, "These archetypal resemblances are best presented in myths in which the archetypal persons I am like and the patterns I am enacting have their authentic home ground." Thus, for Hillman, as Avens (2006, p. 37) says, "archetypal reversion" is "a return to mythical patterns and persons of the psyche."

As we saw above, the *mundus imaginalis* is "a realm of angelic being or archetypal images that provides cosmological grounding for physical reality." (Avens, 2006, p.1) According to Cheetham (2015, p. 22), Corbin accuses Aristotle of interpreting "the Platonic forms not as personified principles, as he should have done, but rather as abstract intellectual categories." (Cheetham, 2015, p. 22) Corbin thinks we cannot meet angelic beings alive in a rational Aristotelian cosmos. Cheetham (2015, p. 20) says if we cannot look at them and have intimate personal relationship with them, they cannot be more than abstract things. He writes:

> The angelic function of beings is their capacity to serve as subjects, as icons, gateways into the divine. In this sense every being has an Angel. The Angel is the immediate source of the personal face of every beings. For anything whatever to be present, it has to be present to someone and it has to be regarded, looked at, in a mutual, personal relation. Otherwise, at the outer limit of Creation, there

can only be abstract objects which are not looked at by anyone. And they disappear. Presence and personhood are complementary terms. You can't have one without the other. (Cheetham, 2015, p. 20)

Thus, "the person is the first and final fact. Everything is personified, everything is personal." (Cheetham, 2015, p. 20) However, we have to avoid the trap of literalism. The reality of the existence of angels does not mean beautiful divine creatures with wings existing out there, for, as Voss (1986, p. 5) says, in "this dynamic cosmos, the angelic hierarchies are not things, but *events*." Voss writes:

Angel, soul and world are not separate entities 'out there', but modes of perception: the world is perceived through sense, soul through imagination and angel through intellect (which is intellect in the Platonic sense of the pre-conceptual knowing described earlier by Iamblichus). (Voss, 1986, p. 5)

Now, we can identify those modes of perception with the mythical perspective. Hillman describes:

Myths talk to psyche in its own language; they speak emotionally, dramatically, sensuously, fantastically. Through the mythical perspective we perceive significances and persons, not objects and things: "Primacy of expression-perception over thing-perception is what characterizes the mythical world-view." (Hillman, 1997, p. 154)

Hillman (1997, p. 154) also concludes that "myth is metapsychology and metapsychology", for myth is the act of seeing. Hillman writes, "Myth, says Hermann Broch, is the archetype of every phenomenal cognition of which the human mind is capable. Archetype of all human cognition, archetype of science, archetype of art - myth is consequently the archetype of philosophy too." If our perception is the perception of the anima mundi too at the deepest level, we see through "eye of the soul"(Avens, 2006, p. 20).

In short, in archetypal psychology, our soul is identified with the *anima mundi* or world soul, which is filled with angelic beings having their faces and talking to us through imagination. Thus, "Earthly phenomena are elevated (or "reduced") to the

level of soul, not soul to the level of earthly phenomena." (Avens, 2006, p. p. 20-21) Therefore, our next chapter Is about distinction between the human and the soul, for "soul is not confined by man, and there is much of psyche that extends beyond the nature of man." (Avens, 2006, p. 23) The distinction between the soul and the human seems significant to Hillman's understanding of myth.

Differentiation between the soul and the human

In modern academy, it is natural to categorize psychology as a human science, which sits between science and the humanities. However, Hillman (1997, p. 172) says "archetypal psychology is not a science or a religion, so too it is not a humanism." This division is crucial for archetypal psychology, for archetypal psychology is not of the human, but of the soul. However, as Hillman (1997, p. 173) says, the distinction between the soul and the human does not mean "a division between the human and psyche." It "merely repeats the honored religious idea that a man may lose his life and not his soul, or lose his soul and keep his life." (Hillman, 1997, p. 173) As we saw earlier, in archetypal psychology, our soul is in the world soul. Hillman says:

> Philosophy, from Plato and his Neoplatonic followers (especially Plotinus) and from Hegel and his neo-Hegelians, also supports this idea. Its tradition is that even if psyche refers to an individual soul here and now lived by a human being, it always refers equally to a universal principle, a world soul or objective psyche distinct from its individuality in humans. (Hillman, 1997, p. 173)

And the world soul has "inhuman reaches", for it extends into every event and matter. Hillman explains that the our experience of soul as our "own" and "within" expresses "the privacy and interiority of psychic life" (Hillman, 1997, p. 173) Again, we have to be careful not to be trapped by literalism. "The sense of "in-ness" refers neither to location nor to physical containment." (Hillman, 1997, p. 173) If we can admit this distinction between human and soul, then it leads us to significant consequences. Hillman writes:

> If we conceive each human being to be defined individually and differently by the soul, and we admit that the soul exists independently of human beings, then our

essentially differing human individuality is really not human at all, but more the gift of an inhuman daimon who demands human service. (Hillman, 1997, p. 175)

Thus, we have to devote our individuation to the daimons or the Gods, for it is "not my fate that matters to the Gods, but how I care for the psychic persons entrusted to my stewardship during my life." (Hillman, 1997, p. 175) Furthermore, Hillman (1997, p. 175) says if our soul is not ours but belongs to daimons' or the Gods', then our emotions must belong to them too. In scientific psychology, as Hillman (1997, p. 176) points out, they were referred to as "instinct", which implies indirectly an inhuman background of human affections by illustrating its "phylogenetic sources." Hillman (1997, p. 177) also distinguishes emotions and the human, yet he claims that emotions, too, belong to soul of the world, the anima mundi. He writes:

Whereas our distinction between human and emotion treats it as a "divine influx,"… Emotion is a gift that comes by surprise, a mythic statement rather than a human property. It announces a movement in soul, a statement of the process going on in a myth which we may perceive in the fantasy images that emotion accompanies. (Hillman, 1997, p. 177)

If emotion is "a gift that comes by surprise" or "a mythic statement," the client's story needs to "return to mythical patterns and persons of the psyche," that is to say, an "archetypal reversion" as we saw earlier. However, this reversion may be unacceptable, especially for psychological practitioners, for they consider emotions and afflictions to be human traits. In addition, "therapy makes its patients individually responsible and personally guilty for universal archetypes." (Hillman, 1997, p. 177) On the other hand, Hillman (1997, p. 177) says that archetypal psychology aims to conjecture emotions less as products of human potencies, for "when freed from human centricity, reverted to fantasies, and then to mythic patterns, emotions have a different quality of experience." Hillman (1997, p. 177) asks: is the subject of the experience human or "a psychic faculty who is "as if" human" - an internal person who has autonomous psychological functions such as intention, selection and organization of experiences? Hillman (1997, p. 177) raises the question that the subjectivity we call "I" or "my" may well be a mythical fantasy. Hillman (1997, p. 177) points out that scholastic psychology always linked the interior integrating sense with imagination. He answers the question:

Imagination is the organizer. If so, then our experiences are organized by mythical images, for it is by means of the imagination that the imaginal realm of archetypes plays through the psyche. (Hillman, 1997, p. 177)

Furthermore, Hillman (1997, p. 177) claims it is the archetypal fantasy of self-hood that we have a stable core at the middle of us. He says if humans are a compound of various inner persons who cast back to mythical figures of myths, then the subject is also in myths. Yet, in humanism's psychology, they do the opposite – they reduce significant divine events to personal psychodynamics. Hillman thinks this is the serious problem of inadequacy in the humanistic approach. "Myth become man-made." (Hillman, 1997, p. 190) He writes:

So much is the depotentiation of myth the continuing concern of humanism that this becomes its definition: humanism's psychology is the myth of man without myths. (Hillman, 1997, p. 190)

Therefore, in humanism's psychology, we cannot have myths. The myths are reduced to implements for human benefit, to allegorical stories, and to fictions. Hillman writes:

Myths that shape human lives become in humanism instruments which the mind invents to explain itself to itself. The inherent otherness of myth in an imaginal other realm, the creative spontaneity of these stories and the fact that they are tales of Gods and their doings with humans - all become something a man makes up. (Hillman, 1997, p. 190)

Thus, we have lost the direct and immediate experience of myths, as I wrote earlier. We cannot taste or listen to myths. Moreover, we have lost the experience of "ourselves as passing through them, of being lived by them, and the sense that "myths communicate with each other through men without their being aware of this fact." (Hillman, 1997, p. 190) Therefore, we need a reversion, as Cassirer did first and then Hillman clarified it. Avens writes:

In conclusion, Cassirer is convinced that the usual anthropomorphic nature of the

mythical process must be reversed: the primitive, instead of transferring his own finished personality to the god, first discovers himself as active spiritual principle through the figures of his gods: the human 'I' finds himself only through a detour of the divine 'I.'

However, although we have lost the direct experience of myths, the Gods did not disappear, for they "are part of our life today just as they were in the past and will be in the foreseeable future." (Avens, 1980, p. 61) So, where are they now? I have to start being reflective in order to see where are they in our society currently. In the next section, for this purpose, I would like to examine the great success of the film *Star Wars* and how it expresses heroic myth in our society.

The Myth of Ego without myth

As we saw above, we have lost myths that we can share in modern society. Myth has been driven away not only from the academy but also from society. It became a synonym of foolish fiction or irrational and meaningless primitive stories. However, is it possible for society to exist without myth? According to Joseph Campbell (1993, p. 3), myth appears whenever and wherever humans live. He writes:

> Throughout the inhabited world, in all times and under every circumstance, the myths of man have flourished; and they have been the living inspiration of whatever else may have appeared out of the activities of the human body and mind. It would not be too much to say that myth is the secret opening through which the inexhaustible energies of the cosmos pour into human cultural manifestation. (Campbell, 1993, p. 3)

Carl Kerenyi (1985, p. 4) also says "Mythology, like the severed head of Orpheus, goes on singing even in death and from afar." If this is true, even though we believe that we have pushed myth away from our societies and our lives, yet, we might still live myths without noticing it. As Kerenyi (1985, p. 4) says, myth was "not only sung like a kind of music" but "it was lived". He (Kerenyi, 1985, p. 4) writes, "Material though it was, for those peoples, its carrier, it was a form of expression, thought, and life." If so, what kind of myth are we living in?

"A long time ago in a galaxy far, far away…" It is the phrase of the opening sequence from the film *Star Wars.* Many myths and folktales begin with this kind of phrase, which enables you to enter another world or reality. *Star Wars* is the heroic story of an orphan boy who sets out on an adventure to rescue a captured princess and save a world. It is filled with mythical themes such as getting a special weapon, meeting a master who disguises himself as a bizarre outsider, and awakening to his own destiny and gift. It started with a single film in 1977, yet two other sequels and a prequel trilogy followed by 2005. The new sequel was just released in 2015. Furthermore, many spin-off films have been created. So, it has not yet been completed. It seems to be welling up from somewhere, as groundwater comes from the ground. People may call this a pop culture phenomenon, yet what can we make of all this?

Jung (1972, p. 79) argued that man identifies with the hero through "The narration or ritual repetition of sacred texts and ceremonies, and the worship of such a figure with dances, music, hymns, prayers, and sacrifices, [which] grip the audience with numinous emotions…"(Jung 1972), all of which can be seen in films. Jung says:

> If we try to see such a situation with the eyes of the believer, we can perhaps understand how the ordinary man can be liberated from his personal impotence and misery and endowed (at least temporarily) with an almost superhuman quality. Often enough such a conviction will sustain him for a long time and give a certain style to his life. It may even set the tone of a whole society. (Jung, 1972, p. 79)

If it is true, our whole society might be in the heroic tone. Furthermore, Hillman claims:

> But the Gods come back willy-nilly under the cover of heroic man-centeredness, infiltrating the structure of humanistic consciousness itself, its ideals, and its formulations about man's world-shouldering responsibility and his ego choices that create existence. (Hillman, 1997, p. 191)

In this quote, Hillman (2006, p. 338) implies that hero myths might come back as a phenomenon of the heroic man-centered perspective. He (Hillman, 2006, p. 338) claims "Civilization requires a hero myth.", and when "the gods have fled or were

declared dead, the hero serves only the secular ego." In The Cambridge Dictionary of Psychology, 'ego" is defined:

> **1.** The conscious sense of personal identity for many theorists, including Jung and Murray. . . . **2.** In psychoanalysis, the executive function of the personality, which includes the self and makes decisions about actual behavior and mediates the desires of the id, the moral restraints of the superego, and the constraints and opportunities of reality using rational thought to make plans and carry them out. **. . .** (Matsumoto, 2009, p. 179)

Therefore, the ego is considered to be the center of the person, and reflects how to live or how to survive in the world. Hillman (1997, p. 102) claims that our ego could be reverted to hero myths. He writes:

> . . . it is also possible to insight the ego, and ego psychology, by reverting it to the heroic myths of Hercules, with whose strength and mission we have become so caught that the patterns of Hercules - clubbing animals, refusing the feminine, fighting old age and death, being plagued by Mom but marrying her younger edition - are only now beginning to be recognized as pathology. (Hillman, 1997, p. 102)

If we really open our eyes, we can find heroic man-centered perspectives all over the world. He writes:

> The force that prompts action, kills dragons, and leads progress becomes the Western "strong ego"- capitalist entrepreneur, colonial ruler, property developer, a tough guy with heroic ambitions on the road to success. (Hillman, 2006, p. 338)

In psychology, as Hillman (1991, p. 143) warns, we think under the influence of a heroic perspective, thus we "turn to a Goddess not for her sake, her *therapeia*, but for our self-realization." Despite his warning, heroic or egoistic languages such as 'self-development,' 'growing up' and 'evolution' continue to be used. Hero myths are used as a guideline of "self-development", as we can see in Henderson's work. He writes:

> These godlike figures are in fact symbolic representatives of the whole psyche,

31

the larger and more comprehensive identity that supplies the strength that the personal ego lacks. Their special role suggests that the essential function of the heroic myth is the development of the individual's ego-consciousness - his awareness of his own strengths and weakness - in a manner that will equip him for the arduous tasks with which life confronts him… The hero's symbolic death becomes, as it were, the achievement of that maturity…. This is to say, the image of the hero evolves in a manner that reflects each stage of the evolution of the human personality. (Henderson, 1972, p. 112)

Hillman (1997, p. 158) repeats, "Remember, the mythic is a perspective and not a program; to try to use a myth practically keeps us still in the pattern of the heroic ego, learning how to do his deeds correctly." Although the job of the hero, according to Hillman (2006, p. 338), is to slay "the Father/Dragon/Ogre/King," and a "civilization requires the Ogre be slain" who "tempts the young and devours them to increase his own importance", yet, to slays the Ogre is "Not the myth *of* the hero, but the myth *as* the hero." He (Hillman, 2006, p. 338) notes that Campbell endowed our civilization with the "heroic function of myth", that is "myth as the hero." Hillman continues:

By recovering the myth of the hero and restoring myth itself to primary place in cultural importance, Campbell has protected the city from the nihilism of materialist science, from Christian otherworldly redemption, and from the tyranny of capitalist commodification of all values. (Hillman, 2006, p. 338)

However, we are still in heroic territory, and we cannot 'see' how we see. Until we are able to see through to another vision, we are trapped in a myth rather living a mythical life for soul-making. Therefore, seeing through myths is crucial for archetypal psychology. Yet, is there a time to which we can return that will help us see through the myth we are living now? Perhaps, the time when myths started coming back into our society might be useful to examine, and that is the time of Freud. Therefore we need to revisit Oedipus.

Oedipus and Sigmund Freud

As I mentioned at the beginning, "archetypes and mythical images might emerge

through my own perspective," and 'what' I've been thinking and 'how' I've been thinking could be reverted to myths. So, I would like to begin this section by reflecting on them. I am aware that 'the puzzle was cast on me', so I have been seeking 'the father' or 'the truth' and tried to 'solve the puzzles' in order to 'save' myths. I 'traced back to the origins' of archetypal psychology. Moreover, I 'had to kill the fathers' to get a new perspective. I had to kill the reductionism of Jung's Kantian dualism and Corbin's flight to the heights. All such language might imply that I am thinking within the perspective of Oedipus. By seeking the truth, I lost myth. I 'killed' myth. I am 'guilty.' It was 'inescapable.' Thus, I became 'guilty' and 'blind' like Oedipus. Hillman says:

We are so fascinated by what we see, we do not see our seeing: the object content of the insight stands forth and we lose the subjective factor that makes this content visible in the first place. This is the Oedipal moment in the analytical method-when surety seizes, epiphanic, following upon a long coil of unraveling and piecing together. (Hillman, 1991, p. 135)

As we have seen, myth is not an old story. Mythical figures are still alive in the *mundus imaginalis*. It was Freud who noticed the fact that they live in us. Freud thought Oedipus's voice and his fate are still in us. He wrote:

If Oedipus Rex moves a modern audience no less than it did the contemporary Greeks, the only possible explanation is that… there must be a voice within us which is prepared to acknowledge the compelling power of fate in the Oedipus… His fate moves us only because it might have been our own, because the oracle laid upon us before our birth the very curse which rested upon him. (Hillman, 1991, p.93)

Freud admitted that Oedipus story "forces us to become aware of our own inner selves" (Hillman, 1991, p. 93) However, unfortunately, the Oedipus myth became the case history of a neurotic patient. Joseph Campbell writes:

… [the] Oedipus complex, which Sigmund Freud pointed out some fifty years ago as the great cause of our adult failure to behave like rational being. As Dr. Freud has stated it: "King Oedipus, who slew his father Laius and married his mother

Jocasta, merely shows us the fulfilment of our own childhood wishes. But, more fortunate than he, we have meanwhile succeeded, in so far as we have not become psychoneurotics, in detaching our sexual impulses from our mothers and in forgetting our jealousy of our fathers." (Campbell, 1993, p.p. 6-7)

Hillman (1997, p. 100) wants to criticize Freud's reduction, saying "Freud's method of reversion took a positivistic course." He (Hillman, 1997, p. 100) argues Freud located myths on the real response of actual families instead of going back to myth as the background of the events, that seeing through the pathologizing was "the soul's return to myth." According to Avens (1980, p. 12), what Freudian psychoanalysis neglected to notice was the fact that Freud "told us less which myth was psyche's essence than that the essence of the psyche is myth, that psychology is ultimately mythology, the study of the stories of the soul." Avens writes:

Following the associationist attempt to explain the genesis of imagination reductively, Freudianism lumps together imagining, fantasying and hallucinating. All of these acts are regarded as varying ways of surrogate satisfaction of basic wishes stemming from the unconscious. (Avens, 1980, p. 12)

Therefore, Hillman has to "revisit" Oedipus. He (Hillman, 1991, p.93) claims, "if we would be faithful to the project of an archetypal re-visioning of depth psychology" Oedipus needs to be revisited, for the Oedipus myth unites psychoanalysis. Hillman (1991, p. 94) says "depth psychology is obliged to notice its fantasies in reading its theories", for, as Jung said, "psyche creates reality every day," and fantasy seems to be the most articulate statement for it. He points out:

The critics also say, because of Freud, every family reduces to the single same account, a monomyth, and myth itself reduces to compulsions and repressions derived from family. (Hillman, 1991, p. 97)

However, Hillman (1991, p. 98) argues that Freud's mistake was and is inescapable and indispensable. He (Hillman, 1991, p. 98) writes, "Freud 'got it wrong,' because it is the genius of psychology to get it wrong, to disturb, pervert, dislocate, misread, so as to lift the repression of the usual sense." Hillman (1991, p. 98) claims psychoanalysis "goes wrong in order to keep close to the wrongness in the case." The

insanity is required in the practice to access the insaneness of the case, for "Pathologizing is homeopathic: like cures like." (Hillman, 1991, p. 98) Since, as Hillman (1991, p. 137) says, blindness triggers off self-inquiry, it is vital for the Oedipal method. Therefore, we have to start in the dark without knowing what to do or where to go. Hillman (1991, p. 137) mentions two different ways of being blind: one is "as Oedipus whose eyes are open and cannot see," and the other is "as Tiresias whose eyes are closed and is a seer." He (Hillman, 1991, p. 137) argues that although it is commonly said that Oedipus's self-blinding at the ending is the disclosure of his genuine character, it is the sequel of Oedipal method of taking actions "-pursuit, questioning, getting to the truth of himself, self-discovery." Thus, blinding and blindness is inevitable as an outcome of following the Oedipal method, for "Content results from method." (Hillman, 1991, p. 138) He (Hillman, 1991, p. 138) emphasizes, "The what that is discovered is utterly tied to the way it is discovered." Perhaps, we can add to it that what we discover is the sequence of how we see, who sees it, or which Gods or Goddesses see it. Hillman (1991, p. 138) says analysts need "Teiresian eyes" to help clients to find who they are, that is to return the soul. He writes:

Analysis aims to open those of the patient by placing concrete life in the vessel (temenos, process, transference, etc.), putting out the eyes of the physical view so as to see life more clearly as a field of ignorant projections, as shadows on the wall of the cave. (Hillman, 1991, p. 138)

However, it is neither easy nor comfortable. Actually, sometimes the result is "tragedy", for "the 'I''s heroic effort to see is the symptom itself trying to see, and a symptom cannot see itself." (Hillman, 1991, p. 139) He points out:

Whatever myths may operate in the psyche, whatever contents we might disclose, as long as our method remains search for self, these other tales will yield only Oedipal results because we turn to them with the same old intention. We are still seeking a subjective identity by understanding ourselves, locating this understanding and this identity in a narrative of personal development. We can't get out of this play, this tragedy. (Hillman, 1991, p. 142)

We are stuck in the old land. Heroes cannot arrive the new land. We believe, in therapy, in the myth of family – we are so convinced that our problems are caused by

family issues. We are so accustomed to examine our family history for self-discovery. Yet, as Hillman (1991, p.p. 149-150) points out, "the psychological blinding of obsession with family" is required to descend into "the underside of his God blood-crime, and catharsis" as Oedipus did. Hillman (1991, p. 150) claims that a hero needs to move into a "foreign land" or "anima country" He writes:

> The move from Thebes to Colonus moves the mind from seeing to hearing, moves questioning from what happened to where are we now, moves family from parents to children and moves children (tekna as he called the Thebans and now calls his daughters) from duty to love, moves the revelation for ends, moves saving the city by action to blessing the city by death, and moves piety from oracles to libations. These moves have brought Oedipus into anima country; Colonus is described as argeta: silvery, radiant, white (670). This is the new land, a foreign land for a hero. (Hillman, 1991, p. 150)

Hillman (1997, p. 89) says, "For our concern is with the symptom, that thing so foreign to the ego, that thing which ends the rule of the hero-who, as Emerson said, is the who is immovably centered." He (Hillman, 1997, p. 89) emphasizes, "Pathologizing moves the myth of the individual onward by moving him first of all out of the heroic ego." Hillman (1997, p. 192) also says, the term 'therapeutes' initially meant "one who serves the Gods," therefore the "therapist is the one who pays attention to and cares for "the God in the disease." That is, we need to move from the literal world to the imaginal land, the *anima mundi*, through letting the mythical figures speak and listening to them in our symptoms. Then, the individuation in therapy becomes "the individuation of the angel" (Hillman, 1991, p. 156) Thus therapists become 'therapeutes.' Finally, the world becomes 'the vale of Soul-making.' At the end, a hero fades in the soul as "Oedipus vanishes and the daughters remain visible." (Hillman, 1991, p. 156) Only this reversion can help a hero or help our society.

Conclusion

Through this dissertation, I have re-visioned the myths for soul-making in Hillman and archetypal psychology in order to solve the puzzles that are thrown at us; do we live

our lives or does life live through us? I also wanted to discuss the problems of the current practice of using myths for self-development. For this purpose, I discussed why Hillman needed to re-vision psychology, how we never had a true psychology, the logos of psyche, and the significance of having the logos for psyche for soul-making. Then, I went back to one of the fathers of archetypal psychology, C.G Jung, who identified the images with the soul and clarified the fundamental function of myths revealing the nature of soul. I also mentioned Jung's constraint within the Kantian view, and I explored Hillman's challenge to move beyond Kantian dualism by focusing on image and returning to myth, through examining Kant's discovery and recoil from the primacy of imagination and the attempt of Romanticism to tackle Kantian dualism. Then, I argued that our difficulty in taking images and myths as they are by discussing our accustomed attitude toward images, how we view images as just symbols or allegories. I proposed that it is crucial to personify and have intimate relationship with images so we can enter myths to listen and meet mythical figures or angelic beings for soul-making. I also looked into Neoplatonic cosmology in order to understand Hillman's "archetypal reversion," which is about returning "to mythical patterns and persons of the psyche." Then, I discussed myths as metapsychology, which is the act of seeing. From this perspective, I tried to see through what is happening in our society by the Heroes myths that have returned to our culture in various ways, include Joseph Campbell's work and films. Finally, I revisited Oedipus in order to find a way to step away from the Hero myths into a mythical life.

I clarified that the mythical perspective and images are the foundation of our psychic function, on which we rely to think, feel, and understand the world. That is, myths are our existential ground. This fact led to another fundamental realization that we are in the world soul, which speaks to us through imagination and mythical language. Thus, myths "are no longer stories in an illustrated book. We are those stories, and we illustrate them with our lives." (Hillman, 1997, p. 102) Thus, individuation is not for us, but for the world soul.

As Hillman (1997, p. 163) says, "Psychologizing arrives at no conclusion, for to make a point is to come to a stop." As I wrote this dissertation, I felt I was walking around the puzzle, rather walking directly toward the conclusion. Hillman (1997, p. 163) puts it very well, "Psychological reasoning tends to be circular, thriving on the repetition compulsion and cycles of return to the same insoluble themes." However,

this "errant way leads to the less known for sure, to less knowledge as established, as accumulated into security." (Hillman, 1997, p. 163) If arriving into a new land is the way to step out of the Hero's territory to the *anima mundi*, we need to take this errant way. Now, I am imagining who is actually writing this dissertation? Is it me who is writing and imagining or is it imagining through my imagination? By imagining so, I am fading into the soul.

References

Avens, R., 1980. *Imagination is Reality Western Nirvana in Jung, Hillman, Barfield&Cassirer*, Spring Publications.

Avens, R., 2006. *The New Gnosis Heideggre, Hillman, and Angels*, Spring Publications.

Bolen, J.S., 2014. *Goddesses in Everywoman*, Harper Paperbacks.

Campbell, J., 1993. *The Hero with A Thousand Faces*, Fontana Press.

Cassiere, E., 2009. *Symbol, Myth, and Culture: Essays and Lectures of Ernst Cassirer 1935 - 1945: Essays and Lectures, 1935-45* New Haven, Yale University Press.

Cheetham, T., 2015. *Imaginal Love: The Meanings of Imagination in Henry Corbin and James Hillman*, Spring Publications.

Cornelius, G., 2005. *Moment of Astrology: Origins in Divination*, The Wessex Astrologer Ltd.

Henderson, J.L., 1972. Ancient myths and modern man. In *Man and His Symbols*, Aldus Books.

Hillman, J., 1991. Oedipus Revisited. In *Oedipus Variations Studies in Literature and Psychoanalysis*. Spring Publications.

Hillman, J., 1992. *The thought of the heart and the soul of the world*, Spring Publications.

Hillman, J., 1997. *Re-Visioning Psychology* Reissue ed., New York: William Morrow Paperbacks.

Hillman, J., 2006. *Mythical Figures Uniform Edition of the Writings of James Hillman Volume 6*, Spring Publications.

Hillman, J., 2013a. *Archetypal Psychology Uniform Edition of the Writings of James Hillman Volume 1*, Spring Publications.

Hillman, J., 2013b. *Senex & Puer Uniform Edition of the Writings of James Hillman Volume 3 Edited and Introduced by Glen Slater*, Spring Publications.

Hillman, J., 2014. *Alchemical Psychology Uniform Edition of the Writings of*

James Hillman Volume 5, Spring Publications.

Hoad, T.F. ed., 1993. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* New Ed edi., OUP Oxford.

Jung, C.G., 1972. *Man and His Symbols*, Aldus Books.

Jung, C.G., 1990. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious (Collected Works of C. G. Jung Vol.9 Part 1)* 2nd ed., Princeton University Press.

Kerenyi, C., 1985. Prolegomena. In *Science of Mythology Essays on the myth of the divine child and the mysteries of Eleusis*, Ark PaperbackS.

Matsumoto, D. ed., 2009. *The Cambridge Dictionary of Psychology*, Cambridge University Press.

Pearson, C.S., 2016. *Awakening the Heroes Within: Twelve Archetypes to Help Us FInd Ourselves and Transform Our World*, Bravo Ltd.

Voss, A., 2004. A Methodology of the Imagination, pp. 1–12.

Voss, A., 1986. Becoming an Angel: the. , pp. 1–12.

Voss, A., 2006. The Secret Life of Statues. In N. Campion & P. Curry, eds. *Sky and Psyche: The Relationship Between Cosmos and Consciousness*, Floris Books, pp. 1–19.

Wu, K.-M., 1990. *The Butterfly As Companion Meditation on the First Three Chapters of the Chuang Tzu*, State University of New York Press.