

eventually by all of humanity. Each succeeding level of the unconscious may be thought of as going deeper and becoming more collective in its nature. The wonder of the collective unconscious is that it is all there, all the legend and history of the human race, with its unexorcised demons and its gentle saints, its mysteries and its wisdom, all within each one of us—a microcosm within the macrocosm. The exploration of this world is more challenging than the exploration of the solar system; and the journey to inner space is not necessarily as easy or a safe trip.

Are archetypes the  
human equivalent of  
"group soul" for animal  
see pp 118-119  
where the speaker of  
animal instincts

4

## ARE ARCHETYPES NECESSARY?

Are archetypes necessary? Most academic psychologists, if they have addressed themselves to the question at all, have answered *no*. It is difficult for me to imagine that there can be those who have failed to recognize that man is often moved by strange, mostly inexplicable forces; yet those very people who profess expertise in dealing with the human psyche have hesitated to name the mysterious pattern-forming elements which play so fundamental a role in the experience of man. Consciousness consists primarily of what we know, and what we know we know. As far from conscious experience are the archetypes as the center of the earth is from its crust. That the archetype defies the scientific mind is clear enough when we read one of the leading interpreters of Jung's thought: "It is impossible to give an exact definition of the archetype, and the best we can hope to do is to suggest its general implications by 'talking around' it. For the archetype represents a profound riddle surpassing our rational comprehension. . . . [It] expresses itself first and foremost in metaphors; there is some part of its meaning that always remains unknown and defies formulation."<sup>1</sup> Since archetypes cannot fully be grasped by man's mind—their being, in a sense, the very source of his thought processes and, consequently, of his attitudes and be-

behavior—the concept of the archetype is bound to raise more questions than it can possibly answer.

It is understandable that most psychologists might consider archetypes beyond the area of their competence. They work painstakingly to try to remove vagueness and mystery from mental functioning. I, for one, have no wish to plunge the infant science of psychology back into the realm of metaphysical speculation from which it has only in this century emerged. But I do not believe we can avoid questions about the ultimate ground of human thought and behavior simply because answers do not present themselves with clarity and precision.

Nor can I, as a Jungian, be satisfied with reducing the primordial forming elements to a few well-known instincts such as hunger, self-preservation, sexuality, power drive. These are important, to be sure, but they do not account for the richness and productivity of the human mind when it is rooted in its ancient ground.

Are archetypes necessary? Are typical patterns of behavior potential present in the young at birth? Perhaps the experimental psychologist will be the last to know. But the great playwrights and artists have always known, and the poet has asked the right questions:

With what sense is it that the chicken shuns the  
rav'nous hawk?

With what sense does the tame pigeon measure out the  
expanse?

With what sense does the bee form cells? have not  
the mouse and frog

Eyes and ears and sense of touch? yet are their  
habitations

And their pursuits as different as their forms and  
as their joys.

Ask the wild ass why he refuses burdens, and the  
meek camel

Why he loves man: is it because of eye, ear, mouth  
or skin,

Or breathing nostrils? No, for these the  
wolf and tyger have.

Ask the blind worm the secrets of the grave, and why  
her spires

Love to curl round the bones of death; and ask the  
rav'nous snake

Where she gets poison, & the wing'd eagle why he  
loves the sun;

And then tell me the thoughts of man, that have been  
hid of old.<sup>2</sup>

W. D. Blakely

Psychologists have turned away from the *whys* of behavior, even while they have attempted to manipulate the *hows* of behavior. Even the great pioneer of depth psychology has hesitated at the portals of the darkest level of the collective psyche. It may be that Freud's bent toward speculative abstraction was so powerful that he was afraid of being mastered by it, and so he felt it necessary to counter this tendency by piling up concrete scientific data. Ernest Jones reports in the biography that he had once asked Freud how much philosophy he had read. The answer was, "Very little. As a young man I felt a strong attraction toward speculation and ruthlessly checked it."<sup>3</sup>

It was Jung's belief that Freud had repressed the archetype spirit in his own nature, with his insistence on his sexual theory. David Bakan develops this idea more fully in his book *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition*, the thesis of which is that in the background of Freud's development were Kabbalistic mysteries which had occupied his grandfather had been transmitted to him—not directly, but through the negativistic attitude toward those ideas on the part of his father, who told him in effect: "We don't any longer subscribe to these antiquated superstitions." Yet Jung knew that the two problems which most occupied Freud were sexuality and archaic vestiges in modern man.

Jung said that he alone of all Freud's followers logically pursued these two problems which most interested Freud. He recognized the large part that sexuality plays as an essential—though not the sole—expression of psychic wholeness. But Jung's main concern, he said, was to "... investigate over and above the personal significance and biological function

[of sexuality] its spiritual aspect and its numinous meaning and thus to explain what Freud was so fascinated by but unable to grasp."<sup>4</sup>

The record of Jung's divergence from Freud and the discovery of his unique position vis-à-vis the unconscious is to be found in the autobiography of his own soul's wandering. There, in a chapter titled "Confrontation with the Unconscious," he tells how he observed the formation of various sub-personalities which appeared as personifications of aspects of the unconscious. Gradually over the years these images fell into categories, as though they were formed on specific patterns. Jung came to know the forming elements out of which these patterns emerged as *archetypes*. The dynamic symbols based on the interaction between the archetype and a particular culture, he called *archetypal images*.

Are archetypes necessary? That Jung found the concept of the archetype fundamental to the understanding of the psyche would be merely a metaphysical assertion if the archetypal elements did not manifest themselves in human experience and particularly in that experience of the deeper levels of the psyche that are exposed in psychological analysis. The collected works of Jung are, of course, filled with examples of archetypal phenomena. The archetype always seems to lie behind and beyond the personal experience. The poet perceives that the child is born out of the primordial past of humanity. A few lines from Tennyson's *De Profundis*<sup>5</sup> express the human condition—consciousness emerging from the great mystery:

Out of the deep, my child, out of the deep,  
Where all that was to be, in all that was,  
Whirl'd for a million aeons thro' the vast  
Waste dawn of multitudinous-eddy light—  
Out of the deep, my child, out of the deep,  
Thro' all this changing world of changeless law,  
And every phase of ever-heightening life,  
And nine long months of antenatal gloom  
With this last moon, this crescent—her dark orb  
Touch'd with earth's light—thou comest . . .

. . .

Out of the deep, my child, out of the deep,  
From that true world within the world we see,  
Whereof our world is but the bounding shore—

The recognition of the two worlds which are really one, that of consciousness and the unconscious, is necessary if we are to make the concept of the archetype meaningful in our own lives. But were it only in theory or poetry that the archetype occurred, it would be of little significance. Therefore, I want to indicate, through the use of some examples from my own analytic practice, how the archetype takes on meaning for people in our own day, indeed, how the archetype concept may deliver the suffering individual from a sense of personal disaster.

Sara is a woman of about forty. She is a business executive, well respected by her peers and subordinates. To the public she looks like a successful career woman, and the fact that she is not married is accepted as probably a matter of her preference. But this is far from the truth. Sara has never been able to establish a close love relationship with a man. In college she had dated some, but whenever it came to the possibility of physical intimacy, she would find some pretext for breaking off. Sara had always been very close to her widowed mother, and though the mother now lived in another city, she would spend many weekends with her mother and most vacations. She was frequently on the phone with her mother. "We kept in touch and looked out for each other," as she put it. She felt responsible for her mother's happiness and sense of security. Gradually, in the course of her analysis, Sara was able to recognize the domineering element in the old woman's protectiveness. She brought into consciousness her resentment for the mother's having kept her in a very restricted life-style, making her remain close to home, criticizing all friends of her own age until she gave up inviting them to her house. There had been always the ominous, inexplicit warnings about "keeping away from boys." As well as about modesty and humility and going to church. And being good to maiden aunts.

As the analysis progressed, Sara reviewed the events of her

childhood, adolescence and young womanhood, and she began to express the anger she felt against her mother. She arrived at the point where she could verbally release her hostility to her mother, but still there was much bitterness. She relived traumatic episodes. She cursed. Although she understood the personal bases of her mother problem, it was by no means resolved. She was as tense as ever in relationships, even while she was trying to free herself from the sense of being watched over, controlled. The hypothesis that repressed affect is at the root of the neurotic development did not seem to be useful here. Repressions had been lifted. There was insight into the "cause" of the problem, but the insight did not bring relief.

Affect is the way in which feelings and emotions are experienced. In the psychologically healthy person the affects are freely expressed; feelings surrounding pleasant or unpleasant experiences are accompanied by appropriate facial expression and body postures and movements. These same affects can be noted when the person is merely talking about the experiences. The observation of affects is one of the most important diagnostic tools of the therapist. When the affect is inappropriate, when the patient laughs in recounting a sad event or becomes anxious totally out of any anxiety producing context, it may be assumed that the real affect has been repressed. This then becomes a clue to investigate in attempting to uncover the workings of the defenses—to try to discover what kind of material is being covered up.

It was more difficult in the case of Sara to determine the basis of her difficulty. If liberating the repressed affect was not the key, then it might be possible that the root of the neurosis did not stem from some personal experience entirely. I had, after all, dealt quite thoroughly with the personal history of the patient.

Then suddenly one day everything was different. Although in the past several sessions she had been vituperative in her anger against her mother, I had had the feeling that there was still more there, and that perhaps the still more did not really center on her mother at all. I did not intend to tell this

the patient because I thought she would have accepted it intellectually, as she had accepted other ideas I had presented in the past, and she would have continued as before, confident that she had achieved another bit of insight. So I waited, expecting that what I knew and what I was attempting to stimulate by keeping her as close to her affects as possible, would erupt in its own time. I was not surprised therefore when one morning she came to our session deeply shaken. I could see she had not slept much that night, that whatever had occurred had been a deeply moving experience. I listened as she told me about it:

"A few days ago I awoke in the morning before daybreak in a sweat, aware of a 'presence' within me; so intensely aware that I can recall exactly how it had felt:

"In the middle of the marrow of the bone in me, as far in as you can go without coming out, there was a mist in me that condensed into this shadowy form. . . . I felt it in every portion of my being . . ."

Then she went on to talk about the maternal image which she recognized not *as her mother*, but as existing in *herself* and in *her mother* as well, and also in her grandmother, and through the maternal line throughout generations. Each generation had carried that possessive and devouring style of behavior from the generation before—as a wraith, permeating the body and the soul. The image was so impressive that Sara was able to confront it, to speak to it. She did this in her fantasy, and it was so vivid that she was able to write down the words afterward:

"You have controlled me, stunted my growth, kept me from fulfilling mature sexual function. You frightened me with a story of men who have a big organ they stick into you—I thought it was a stick. You said not to disagree in public, you cut off my expression. You told me to 'come on in'—to see your friends—I wasn't ready to, I was angry, you forced me. You threw a murky shade over me, undermined my own expression, my own confidence. I was not me. You controlled my brothers—usurped their lives, decimated the identity of my father.

"Why have you done these things? Why do you live in me now? You *are* in me, specter-form. My mother is not my enemy—You are. You hold her captive too. You are not even my mother's image in me—separate spirit—Thing that has lived in her to capture me—I should slay you!

"I refuse to keep the peace—which is on your terms. I will awaken, arouse you—confront you. You may wrap me in difference but I shall needle you enough to engage you. You shall answer why—maybe, even, I can forgive you—but it may be dangerous to think thus."

What more striking example could there be of the emergence into consciousness of an archetypal image, the Great Mother? She is the terrible female whose awesome power looms over the child—boy or girl—she knows all there is to know and from her everything must be learned—she metes out punishment or affection according to her own unfathomable laws, she has control over life and death through giving nourishment or withholding it, through inflicting pain or offering comfort and healing. Each mother-child pair acts out the archetypal drama in the nursery—of power standing over weakness, wisdom looming over ignorance. And if, in the confrontation with the Great Mother—a symbol arising from the unconscious depths—the enemy can be seen in its archetypal rather than its personal form, then there is a chance that the personal aspect of the problem can be separated from its archetypal core. Through such a separation, the profound effect of the archetype upon the individual can be markedly depotentiated.

The archetype of the Great Mother can also present itself in a positive way, unlocking the strength and power of the individual. The Mother image appeared under strange circumstances to my analysand Margaret in an hour of very great stress, providing her with an experience of heightened consciousness.

Margaret is a mature woman who had been recently widowed when she came to me. She was working with the problem of discovering inner resources within herself which would help her to compensate for the loss of a strong and competent

partner. She insisted that she had no religious faith, and that she did not believe that there could be any possible help outside of herself. And, since she felt quite inadequate to the demands of readjusting her life, she had come to me to help her find new ways of thinking about her problems. When I probed the question of whether she had ever been open to the possibility that some of the helpful character she associated with her husband or with her relationship with her husband might still be accessible to her, she brushed off my remark as unrealistic. However what I said must have struck a responsive chord below the level of her awareness, for shortly after that in the course of her analysis she revealed the following incident:

"Some years ago I was spending a few days with a friend of mine in a remote area of the country. Her husband had to be away on a business trip, and since she was well advanced in pregnancy she had been reluctant to stay alone. One night a tremendous storm came up and there was a power failure so that the lights went out and even the telephone service was interrupted. We both became anxious, though I tried to hide my feelings as much as possible and to reassure my friend. At this time it happened that she went into labor, and there was no hope of getting any help to deliver the child. I felt absolutely lost, not having the faintest idea of what to do, except that I busied myself making sure that there were candles around and heating on the gas stove the water we had thoughtfully drawn while the storm was approaching.

"I guess you might say it was the classic situation of being 'beside myself' with fear of what might happen and with no one to turn to. And at the same time the feeling grew within me that help would come. It arose at first, I think, as a wordless sureness, and then I felt myself relaxing, growing nearly numb, but no longer anxious. I sensed the formation of words in my head, something like, 'I will do it' or 'I know how to do it,' and then the words became distinctly audible and seemed to come from a certain direction. I turned my head from my friend who was breathing heavily between her pains, lying there sweating on her bed, and saw in the gloom in the

far corner of the room up near the ceiling a faint glow of light. As I stared at it, the light took the form of a woman, my mother, who had been dead some fifteen years. In the same moment I knew that the voice I had heard was her voice. Then the scene shifted, and I could see my mother standing by the bed, next to my friend, and it was as though I was off in the corner of the room observing. And yet I was also with my mother. As her hands moved to soothe the woman in labor, to help her bear down, as her voice gently encouraged my friend, I felt a great relief that it was going all right. I saw, to my great wonder, the baby slowly emerge from between the thighs of his mother, saw as though I were right there that this was a strong active little boy, heard him cry, and yet the cry was heard still from the distance of the corner of the room. Soon my mother was holding him, wrapping him in a tiny blanket, placing him beside his mother.

"What occurred then is vague in my mind, but it seemed that I swam out of that dark corner and entered into the place of my mother, or I came there and she entered into me, and then departed. A shimmer of dim light in the far corner of the room was there for an instant, then disappeared, and I found myself fully present and fresh as though just awakened from a good night's sleep, sitting at my friend's bedside. There was blood on my hands and on my apron. Her child was cradled in her arms and sucking at her breast, and she smiled up at me and said, 'Margaret, I felt so calm, so secure—how ever did you manage?' I never told her, and in fact did not allow myself to think about it, and soon the memory of those uncanny moments faded. I have never spoken of them until this day."

Margaret is an upper-middle-class, well-educated woman who has always been well adapted to her life as a suburban matron with family and community responsibilities. She is not a person whom one would ever suspect of seeing spirits, nor has she ever shown an interest in the lore of the occult, quite the contrary. I have chosen her experience to indicate that she represents a very great number of people who have had one or more experiences with archetypal phenomena. In

this case the mother-archetype was embodied in the familiar image of Margaret's own mother. The experience is not explainable by the rules of ordinary sense perception, the ways in which we come to know the external world. It rather belongs to those intuitive phenomena by which we apprehend directly the inner experience, without the intervention of rational thought or inference.

The experience of the archetype in the parent-child relationship requires an explanation that goes beyond the theory of infantile sexuality as propounded by Freud. This experience was the subject of research which occupied Jung's major attention during the period from 1911 to 1913 when he was most active in the Vienna circle. At this time he had become so valuable to the psychoanalytic movement that Freud had designated him as "crown prince" in the hope that he would some day assume its leadership. However, Jung's independent spirit demanded that he follow where it led, and at this time it was leading him far from orthodox psychoanalytic doctrine. He had for a long time struggled with Freud's theory of infantile sexuality as delimited with respect to the personal experience of the individual, and now he began to investigate the archetypal roots of the oedipal situation.

This was a difficult and painful period for Jung. As he was clarifying his own ideas he was drawing further and further away from Freud, for whom he had all the ambivalent feelings of an aspiring son for a brilliant father.

For one thing, Jung felt that he had been overpowered to some degree by his older colleague, who had advanced his sexual theories with all his usual vigor for which he was well known. In the main Jung was highly interested and agreed in principle, but he did hold certain doubts and hesitations. When he tried to advance these reservations he was met with Freud's suggestion that his questions were due to his lack of experience. Here the "patient father" figure exercised a gentle control over the ebullient Jung. And Jung, for his part, may have expected to be joined in a discussion as an equal, even though he recognized that he did not, indeed, have enough experience to support his objections.

In his autobiography Jung referred to the crucial essay "The Sacrifice," saying that while he was working on it he knew it was the statement which would cost him his friendship with Freud.<sup>6</sup> Here Jung presented his own conception of the meaning of incest, which had been the cornerstone of Freud's sexual theory. Jung felt that the incest problem was to be understood symbolically and not literally. Thus libido had become for him more than the force behind sexuality; it had become the divine creative force of nature. The problem of incest was seen no longer as a purely individual dilemma, but as a phase in the collective experience of man as he develops toward a higher form of consciousness.

The problem of the sacrifice, the dissolution of the oedipal tie, had been treated by Freud as an individual problem. Each child had to work it out with his own mother or mother-surrogate in the process of moving toward maturity.

Jung saw the child's sacrifice of the paradise of the early and rewarding unity with the mother in a far wider context. He turned to a series of myths, which he regarded as the language of the collective unconscious, to Greek and Norse mythology, to Goethe's *Faust*, and to the Gilgamesh Epic of the Babylonians, finding everywhere the eternal and ubiquitous theme of sacrifice—of slaying the primal being in order that the world may be born. Perhaps this theme was most beautifully expressed in the Rig Veda:

Purusha (Man, Anthropos) was the primal being who

Encompassed the world on all sides  
And ruled over the ten-finger place  
The highest point of heaven.

Jung wrote:

As the all-encompassing world-soul, Purusha had a maternal character, for he represented the original "dawn state" of the psyche: he was the encompasser and the encompassed, mother and unborn child, an undifferentiated, unconscious state of primal being. As such a condition must be terminated, and as it is at the same time an object of regressive longing, it must be sacrificed in order that discriminated entities—i.e., conscious contents—may come into being.<sup>7</sup>

Then came the sacrifice of this primal being by gods and men and it was said:

The moon was born from his mind;  
From his eye was born the sun;  
From his mouth Indra and Agni;  
From his breath Vayu was born.  
From his navel grew the atmosphere;  
From his head the sky; from his feet the earth;  
From his ear the directions.  
Thus the worlds are made.<sup>8</sup>

Jung declares it is evident that "by this is meant not a physical, but a psychological cosmogony. The world comes into being when man discovers it. But he only discovers it when he sacrifices his containment in the primal mother, the original state of unconsciousness. What drives him toward this discovery is conceived by Freud as the 'incest barrier.' The incest prohibition blocks the infantile longing for the mother and forces the libido [Freud's term for sexual energy] along the path of life's biological aim. The libido, driven back from the mother by the incest prohibition, seeks a sexual object in place of the forbidden mother. Here the terms 'incest prohibition' and 'mother' etc. are used metaphorically, and it is in this sense that we would have to interpret Freud's paradoxical dictum: 'To begin with we knew none but sexual objects.'"<sup>9</sup> Jung insisted that the fact that the infant takes pleasure from sucking does not prove that it is sexual pleasure, for pleasure can have many different sources. That the archetypal experience appears in the young child by no means implies that it is limited to the young child. Archaisms are a dynamic factor in the psychic life of adult civilized men as well, according to Jung, and the evidence is all about us if we will but notice it. One place where it may appear is in our dreams.

An example of an archetypal dream in a young adult will show how a Jungian analyst looks at a dream which contains material which the patient cannot connect with his early life or indeed, with any personal experience. David, a patient of mine, began his university career studying physics. Behind this

choice of a field of concentration, he told me, lay his desire to find out how the world works. But as he gathered more and more knowledge he found himself becoming increasingly dissatisfied. It seemed to him that there was more that he needed to know, or a different kind of knowledge, from what he was being taught. Seeking an understanding of the logical structures behind the processes observable in the material universe, he turned to philosophy. This too, failed to provide him with answers; it only gave him neater ways to deal with the questions. Finally, he had taken up theology. Here he sought a wider meaning behind the apparent order of nature, one that would go beyond the logical processes which could be contained and controlled by his own intellect. But even theology disappointed him—"Who can say what God is, and how much less, what He wants?"

David came into therapy in despair; everything he had tried to study had led him to *culs-de-sac* in the labyrinth that was his world. He felt that life was pointless. He had learned so much and he had discarded so much that he found it difficult to communicate with anyone who had not achieved a very high level of education. Even many of his professors, he found, saw only one view. "You can't talk to them." He felt isolated, and he derived little joy from anything except possibly his compulsion to add more and more books to the library that overflowed his shelves.

One night he had the following dream: *I am watching a rocket take off. Suddenly it curves around and becomes a ship. I am aboard—there is a tempest. The rocket-ship pitches me about on a stormy sea until finally it overturns. I manage to escape drowning by getting into a small lifeboat. Then a dragon rises out of the water and swims rapidly toward me. I am terribly afraid. For a moment I try to hide in the bottom of the boat, but I know it will be of no use. He has come up to the edge of my boat. Nearly paralyzed with fright, I do the only thing I can do. I reach my hand overboard and into the water and grab the fearsome dragon by its leg. In this moment he turns into a small horse, a toy made of wax about ten inches tall.*

David commented on the dream: "In thinking about this the morning after I awoke, I was amazed at how the dragon became small and harmless after I reached out and grabbed its leg. Also, I think of it in a positive way ever since. It seems like a psychological victory for me. I felt in a festive, jovial mood as I held up the small horse as if to say 'this is the great giant that I feared; he is really small and harmless.'"

The etymology of the word "jovial" was not overlooked. David had broken out of the boundaries of a constricted intellect by making an immediate and direct contact with the fantastic dragon, which symbolized the irrational element within himself. Victorious in bridging the gap between his own limited powers and the mysterious power he ascribed to a totally exterior supernatural force, he was able to assimilate to himself some of the energy that had been until then inaccessible to him. The psychic energy that had previously been contained in the unconscious, "bound up in the dragon," or in his fear of the non-rational, now became accessible to the conscious part of him, his ego. No wonder that he felt suddenly strong, like the immortal Jove, ruler of Olympus. No longer would the student have to live off the frothy scum of knowledge on the sea of the unknown and unknowable. Now he understood that he could reach into the depths, and bring up contents of the unconscious, rational or irrational—no matter how they might appear—and take hold of them and see what they might look like.

The archetype may be manifested in archaic form and so be terrifying when one faces it as a helpless individual. But when we know that our own experience of fear or disillusion or futility is more than a matter of personal dismay, that it is an experience that shares a common core with all mankind, then we become aware that there must always have been ways of dealing with the archetypal problems. Mythology provides us with classic solutions—sometimes we can become aware of them through a diligent search, but more often we bump into them somehow, without ever having been told how to apply them.



Another patient of mine was introduced to his personal myth in a peculiar way. Murray was an artist who lived in a shabby apartment with his girl. He loved her very much, but he was not entirely sure of her affections. She had told him that she wanted to go on a trip for a couple of weeks to visit her parents in another city. While she was gone he wanted to do something for her which would show her how deeply he loved her. He thought about what to do, and then he hit upon an idea. He found a few planks of wood around his studio and he built a bedstead of his own design, to surprise his girl when she returned. I asked him why, of all things, he had done *just that*. He told me that the idea just occurred to him one day as a very strong impulse; he knew it was the right thing to do to express his feelings, so he did just that.

I asked Murray if he had ever heard the story of Ulysses' return after the long years of wandering on his way home from the Trojan War. I told him how the traveler had returned incognito to the palace of his wife so that he could look over the situation without being recognized by the suitors who had taken control of his lands and were contending over who should have the hand of his beloved Penelope. A contest was suggested, in which it was agreed that the strongest among the suitors should win the lady. Ulysses, in rags, displayed his strength by stringing the great bow which he had left behind him, and which none of the suitors could even begin to bend. But Penelope, fearing some trick, or that some god was attempting to seduce her, demanded still further proof from her professed husband that he really was who he said he was. Thereupon he told her what no one knew but the two of them and the single maid who took care of the bedchamber, the guarded secret of how he had built with his own hands from a living olive tree the bed that they shared when their love was young. No one else could have known that he had constructed their bedchamber around a sturdy tree, that he had cut down the branches, and had used the stump for the centerpost of their bed.

My lovesick analysand may or may not have known the

myth of the *Odyssey*; he did not recall it. Yet he had somehow known that the act of fashioning the bed had a symbolic meaning to him which he had not understood, but truly felt.

The mythologem reappears and reappears.

The archetype, as we have seen in the case of Sara, manifested itself by a sudden awareness in the course of the analytic process. In the case of David, it became apparent in a dream. Murray came to it through the work of his hands. Still another way in which the archetype emerges in the psychic life of man is through language. As a matter of fact, only recently have scientists begun to recognize the "innate symbolic machinery, common to all men, [which] may have been used before the beginnings of formal language to communicate about such basic concerns as birth, life, death, love, combat and fear of the elements, which are common to both animals and men."<sup>10</sup>

According to a report headed "Language study indicates collective unconscious exists," Joseph Jaffe, M.D., is willing to admit that "the existence of a collective unconscious common to all men is quite believable when translated into terms of recent studies on the foundation of language." He notes that babies all over the world begin to exhibit language behavior at the same time and in the same way. This behavior, he says, is not taught but is innate and preprogrammed and coincides with certain stages of brain maturation and the ability to form concepts. "The specific language being spoken in the environment serves only as a model for selection of a set of rules and distinctions which are automatically abstracted by the child" as his powers of conceptualization grow. . . . That which is innate and common to the world's babies in forming a language, then, is a schema or catalogue of conceptual categories [this is exactly what Jung has understood as the archetypes of the collective unconscious] that are related by the brain to the subject matter of the environmental language by means of transformations (i.e., sentence X fits into category Y in such and such a way)." Dr. Jaffe concludes, "The fact that there is no natural language which does not contain a comparable catalogue of directions, assertions, negations, etc.,

is evidence for the existence of a universal grammar and semantics in all races."<sup>11</sup>

The evidence produced by research like that referred to above is often supported in surprising ways by the unconscious itself, which produces its own proofs for its existence and its nature. A dream brought to me by Ben, a schoolteacher in his first year of teaching elementary-school children and only beginning to perceive the manifold ways in which learning takes place, is a case in point: *I am in some kind of underground laboratory, teaching animals to speak. I'm trying to teach them to say words with a long "e."* A man comes in, some kindly caretaker, and asks me if I've lost my mind. He says that animals have their own language. They don't care about my goddam phonics.

The kindly caretaker, the man who knows animals because he has watched them day after day, is intuitively aware of what the teacher often does not know, and the scientist strains to discover. What the caretaker has known for a long time and what he has to teach the teacher, is not so very different from what Noam Chomsky, one of the outstanding linguistic scholars in our time, had to say on television recently. I cannot reproduce what he said verbatim, but based on the notes I took as I was listening, the sense of his remarks was that the major properties of language structure are inherent in the human mind. The child is born possessing these qualities, and he has only to learn the particularities of the specific language of his own culture. Chomsky cautioned: Do not underestimate the originality and initiative of the human mind to develop language.

How very different is this point of view from that of the behaviorists who look upon the human organism as born possessed of a more or less inert and vacant machine called the brain which is programmed by the effects of the environment (television, parents, teachers, etc.) as input. If the organism-machine has been inadvertently fed the wrong data, been programmed badly by exposure to the wrong stimuli, well, then, let's get busy and pull the switches to extinguish the objectionable concepts, and then reprogram man in

own way. In the dream, is not the unconscious (personified by the old caretaker) telling the dream ego (Ben's schoolteacher aspect) that he is not to overlook the innate potential for development that expresses itself spontaneously in children as in all forms of life?

Two ways of thinking must be considered in connection with archetypal experience: *convergent* and *divergent* thinking.

A *convergent* way of thinking is to try to reduce psychic experience down to its "causes"—which may be found in the early experiences which established behavioral patterns, and which in their turn set the stage upon which future episodes of his life's drama would be enacted. The residues of the past must be examined, of course, for they contaminate the present with their content, and I cannot imagine that any depth psychologist would deny that. But we must not forget that the archetypal core, too, is present in all human experience. Its importance is that it not only helps to explain the past, but that it also provides a basis for anticipating possibilities in attitude and behavior for the future. Of course it is possible to change behavior without resorting to an understanding of archetypal processes. Men and women and children can be trained and retrained much as animals can be domesticated. People can become useful citizens, adapted to their world, willing to accept its glories and defeats, to fly the flag of their country, even to march off to senseless wars—for the glory of those who sit back and pull the strings or push the buttons and smile as they regard their profit-and-loss sheets. People can be changed, they can be made more productive, they can be pacified, they can learn to live in our world—all this without ever a reference to the concept that each man carries within him the potentiality for initiative, for independent thinking, for becoming what he is meant to be.

*Convergent thinking* conceives of life processes as being susceptible to being broken down into "problems" which then have to be solved. For every problem there is only one answer, or there is a "best" answer, and the objective is to find that answer. Sometimes problem-solving takes the form of a search

for the cause of the trouble, the single traumatic event. Sometimes problem-solving consists in attempting to resolve difficulties by shifting behavior from a less acceptable kind to a more acceptable kind. Invariably the idea that there is a right way which has only to be found and instituted permeates convergent thinking. If you can figure out what the teacher wants, you get an "A." Pick the right answer from the multiple choices offered.

Problem-solving is not the primary aim or goal of archetypal psychology. If anything, the ability to handle problems may be a by-product. If we are ever to effect constructive and lasting changes in our own lives, we must strive for a *transformation* (note: I did not say a "cure") of the potentially disturbing or disrupting problems, by reaching toward their archetypal cores. Such a transformation cannot take place before one has gone beyond the personal to the universal dimension. In this process man, becoming more and more conscious, will not be satisfied by being told what his place in society is. The modern man needs to rescue himself from his cultural provincialism. No one can do it for him. To accomplish this the convergent way of thinking is often just the wrong approach. The view that directs man's thinking reductively, always and again backward toward his childhood, infancy, and birth, soon reaches the limits of consciousness.

*Divergent thinking* is a more creative approach. It is an approach whereby many avenues fan out from the central core—which is the situation in which man finds himself in a given moment. The roads may indeed lead backward, but they may just as well lead forward, and there are ways that lead in other directions: neither backward nor forward. The divergent thinking man regards his situation as being a "given" simply because he is there at the moment in which he contemplates it. It does not matter that he could have avoided it, nor that he should be somewhere else right now; the fact is that he is there, and that is what he must deal with. Recognizing this, it is not difficult to see that the situation in which man finds himself is similar in certain fundamental respects to the experiences other people have had before. There are, he finds

fundamental life experiences, which become apparent when he begins to observe the nature of human experience. He will see the importance of discerning in which ways men are alike or similar—and where their experiences are primarily collective in nature. For only by knowing what we have in common with other men does it become possible to understand how we stand away from the mass, as free individuals. The study of mythology and fairy tales, and of literary forms and comparative religions, helps us to understand and recognize the power of the archetypal elements within all people, and then to put our personal experiences into the larger perspective. The archetypal idea, as Jung has said, "is essentially an unconscious content that is altered by becoming conscious and being perceived, and it takes its colour from the individual consciousness in which it happens to appear."<sup>12</sup>

At this point one might be tempted to ask how the world managed to get on so long without Jung's concept of the archetype. It did not. Jung did not lay claim to having discovered the concept—it is a very ancient one. In his essay, "Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious,"<sup>13</sup> Jung traces the history of the concept back to antiquity. He informs us: "the term archetype occurs as early as Philo Judaeus, with reference to the *Imago Dei* (God-image) in man. It can also be found in Irenaeus, who says: 'The creator of the world did not fashion these things directly from himself but copied them from archetypes outside himself.' In the *Corpus Hermeticum*, God is called . . . 'archetypal light.' The term occurs several times in Dionysius the Areopagite, as for instance . . . 'immaterial archetypes' and . . . 'Archetypal stone.'

"The term 'archetype' is not found in St. Augustine, but the idea of it is. . . . He speaks of '*ideae principales*, which are themselves not formed, but are contained in the divine understanding.' 'Archetype' is an explanatory paraphrase of the Platonic *eidos*." And Jung concludes, "so far as the collective unconscious contents are concerned, we are dealing with archaic or—I would say—primordial types, that is, with universal images that have existed since the remotest times."<sup>14</sup> In the literature of the late nineteenth century, which Jung read

during his student years, the concept of the archetype was implicit if not mentioned by name. In the field of comparative religion, scholars Hubert and Mauss referred to "categories of the imagination." The anthropologist Adolf Bastian, a hundred years ago, predicated "elementary" or "Primordial" thoughts (*Elementargedanken*). And Immanuel Kant stated that all human cognition possesses a priori sources of cognition, which seem to transcend the limits of all experience. Jung wrote that from these references it should be clear that his idea of the archetypes, literally a pre-existent form—does not stand alone but is something that is recognized and named in other fields of knowledge.

Students of animal behavior have coined the term "innate releasing mechanism" (IRM) to designate the inherited structure in the nervous system that enables an animal to respond in a predetermined way to a circumstance never experienced before. Chicks with their eggshells still adhering to their tails dart for cover when a hawk flies overhead, but not when the bird is a gull, duck, heron or pigeon. Furthermore, if the wooden model of a hawk is drawn over their coop on a wire, they react as though it were alive—unless it is drawn backward when there is no response.<sup>15</sup>

Tinbergen, who has given particular attention to the problem of animal learning, has shown that not only do different species have different dispositions to learn, but that such innate dispositions come to maturity only in certain critical periods of the animal's growth. He writes about the Eskimo dogs of east Greenland, living in packs of five to ten individuals. The members of a pack defend their group territory against all other dogs. All dogs of an Eskimo settlement have an exact knowledge of the limits of their territories and where attacks from other packs may be feared. Immature dogs, however, do not defend the territory. They often roam through the whole settlement, sometimes trespassing into other territories from which they are promptly chased away. In spite of frequent attacks during which they may be severely hurt, they do not learn their territorial boundaries, and in this respect they seem amazingly stupid to the observer. When the young

dogs are growing sexually mature, however, they begin to learn the extent of the other territories and within a week their trespassing forays are over. In two male dogs the first copulation, the first defense of territory, and the first avoidance of strange territory, all occurred within one week.<sup>16</sup>

A number of popular motion pictures have shown the phenomenon of the laying and hatching of eggs of the sea turtle. The female comes out of the water, and finds a point on the beach safely above the tide lines. There she digs a hole and deposits hundreds of eggs, covers the nest, and returns to the sea. Eighteen days later a small army of tiny turtles comes flipping through the sand and unerringly makes for the waves as fast as possible before the gulls overhead can dip low enough to pick the little ones off. Campbell, in describing this scene, observes that no more vivid representation could be desired of the spontaneity of the quest for the not-yet-seen. There is no opportunity here for trial and error, nor is there a question of fear. The tiny turtles know that they must hurry, and they know how to do it. Evidently they know where they are going, too, and that when they get there they must swim; and they know how to do that immediately as they reach the water.<sup>17</sup>

What does it all mean, the awakening to the functioning of the archetype all about us, and especially in our own lives? How shall we utilize this recognition? Is it a way of synchronizing the beating of our own hearts in time with the cosmic rhythms? Is it a way of sensing that we are not only the products of our history, we are also the makers of history, and moreover that we are living history itself?

That which is now known as myth and legend was once the core of belief. Today, because another age has created another language, the ways in which the archetypes manifest themselves are strange to us. We may recognize the archetypal image in the cathedral, but it is not so easy to be aware of it when it beams upon us from the television tube. The contents of the archetypes have changed, as they change with every age. But the forms of the archetypes are the same—there is still the encompassing Great Mother, the awe-inspiring

Father-God, the Divine Child, the Hero, the Trickster, the Old Wise Man, the Mana personality, and all the rest. Only they appear in new shapes. There is a new format. Dialogues have a new twist, but themes recur and recur.

Are archetypes necessary? It is not the task of the investigator, it seems to me, to determine whether what he discovers is necessary or not. (Is a walk on the moon necessary?) The investigator's task is to make his observations and report on them, on "what is." Whether the investigator is an experimental psychologist studying animal behavior in the laboratory, or a clinical psychologist interpreting test results, or a psychotherapist analyzing a patient's dreams—certain conditions inherent in the subject become evident to him. He formulates them in concepts. These concepts, when traced back to their roots, lead eventually to the archetypes. It is not that the *archetypes are necessary*—that would be the kind of value judgment the scientist is often reluctant to make. It is simply that the *archetypes* exist as categories for thinking and that they become manifest in images which point toward their ultimate meaning.

## 5

## ANALYSIS AND THE COUNTER-CULTURE

I am concerned about the university students who speak so freely to me about what is bothering them. They tell me that they are unhappy within the halls of academia where the goddess is sweet rationalism, her handmaidens logic and order and objectivity. Of course I recognize that the students whom I see professionally are the unhappy ones. The others do not seek psychotherapy. On the other hand the students say that at some of our "best" universities, the "shrink" is at least as important to the progress of the student as is the professor. Some say the first makes it possible to endure the second. A bright young woman undergraduate studying in the humanities told me not long ago: "The academic role drops like an albatross around my neck when I step into a university building. My posture changes, I get constricted, I feel that I am expected to fit into a pattern as outmoded as the fake gothic architecture of the quadrangle. It all reminds me of when we were kids—there were things that we were graded on:

- How does she perform?
- Is she cheerful?
- Does she do as she is told?
- Is she prompt?
- Is she neat?

had spaced the sessions wider and wider apart as he acquired the independence successfully to interpret his own unconscious material. There was an affectionate tie between us, for we had joined hands in a complicated and trying mutual endeavor. Still, the analysis was not ended, although we were both aware that soon it must end.

To the last session he brought two dreams, which had come to him just a week apart. These are the dreams.

The first: *I am in an airplane which is flying over the mountains. It is a stormy day, and the passengers are upset as the plane rises and falls upon hitting air pockets. I go about the cabin reassuring people, calming them, making sure that every one is securely fastened in his seat. I look to see where the exits are and I plan in my head how I will handle an evacuation if we should make a forced landing. I am not afraid, and I am prepared for whatever might happen. But we do not have to land there in the mountains after all.*

The second dream: *Again I am in an airplane, but this is a small one, a two-seater. I am beside the pilot. We find ourselves in difficulty. This time we are over a deep forest. We are not far from the treetops, and the pilot is trying very hard to handle the controls. I say, I think I can manage it, I'd like to try. I take over the controls as the pilot exchanges places with me. The wheel is very hard to handle. It takes all my strength, but I am determined to hold through. I look around and notice that the pilot is perfectly relaxed. The wheel now becomes more responsive to my direction. It is still difficult, but now I know that I am going to make it.*

There was not much to say after this. Both Mark and I knew that he was ready to take charge of his own life. He had learned as much as I could help him with, and now it was time for him to go away. At the door, we embraced as he was leaving. He looked back at me and smiled as he went down the hall. I smiled back at him. Only after the door had closed did I realize that my eyes were wet. In good time as well as in bad, it is a hard thing to be an analyst.

## 11

UNDERSTANDING  
OUR DREAMS

I believe that the experience of dreaming is the clearest proof we have that the unconscious exists. The inner life of an individual unfolds through dreams, and whoever carefully observes his dreams may gain access to dimensions of his nature that would otherwise remain impenetrable. The way we approach our dreams depends very much upon our own attitude toward the unconscious.

Long before they met, both Freud and Jung were committed to the importance of interpreting dreams as a means of gaining access to unconscious processes. Freud's monumental study, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, provided a basis for experimentation by the members of the Vienna psychoanalytic circle. This group collected a great deal of dream material from their patients to provide the basis for their scientific research. They discussed methods of treating mental disorders and advanced new theories about the way hidden processes of the mind affected attitudes and behavior. A controversial aspect of psychoanalysis was its insistence that dreams not only contained important clues to the unknown, but that they were also a means to healing. Freud showed that the unconscious mind resists the pressure of uncomfortable ideas. Non-psychoanalytically oriented doctors and psychologists objected that the psychoanalysts were exposing aspects of the human

personality that they would have preferred to ignore. No one likes to have his secret wishes revealed, or to be told that beneath apparently respectable adult behavior there lurk unresolved sexual conflicts, or even infantile, incestuous aspirations. Under the most virulent kind of criticism, Freud steadfastly maintained his theoretical position.

During their early years together Jung supported this position publicly, against the advice of his elder professional colleagues in Zurich, and knowing that by doing so he was risking his promising career in academic medicine. In 1909 Jung published a paper entitled "The Analysis of Dreams,"<sup>1</sup> which is a straight explication of Freud's theory of dream interpretation. At that time he agreed fully with Freud's contention that dreaming, like everything else we do, has a meaning that does not arise out of bodily sensations felt during sleep, or even out of the events of the day. These merely furnish the elements upon which the psychological processes do their work. He explained how Freud saw the manifest content of the dream as a cover story for the real situation of the dreamer, which had to be a state of conflict between a repressed wish seeking expression and the need to keep the wish unconscious. In this essay, Jung made a passing reference to the possibility of getting to the latent content of the dream—the story hidden behind the dream events—through the use of the association experiment. Then he went on to explain how Freud would use the entirely different method of "free association" to lead back to the real basis of the dream.

Emerging differences in approach to dream material became explicit in 1909, during a lecture trip to the United States which Jung and Freud made together. They saw each other daily on board ship and spent a good deal of time analyzing one another's dreams. In the very uncomfortable process, each must have withdrawn from the other in terms of revealing his own inner life. Jung described the whole affair in his autobiography. From his point of view this encounter foreshadowed the dissolution of the relationship. Freud had presented a dream of his own, and Jung had indicated that he could do much better in interpreting it if he knew some more details

about Freud's private life. Freud is said to have regarded Jung in that moment with a look of "utmost suspicion" and to have replied, "But I cannot risk my authority!" For Jung, in that moment he had already lost it.<sup>2</sup>

Jung also related a dream to Freud at that time, a dream which Jung regarded as extremely important. It showed him descending through several levels of a house, each level representing an earlier period of history, until at last he was in a low cave cut into a rock, with thick dust on the floor and in the dust scattered bones and broken pottery and a couple of human skulls, all like remains of a primitive culture. For Jung the dream was a gripping experience; it seemed to him as a ritual of passage from the personal unconscious into the collective unconscious, where the remnants of his archaic heritage rested.

Freud had paid relatively little attention as Jung related the succession of downward transitions which brought the dreamer from a cheerful room such as might have been inhabited by his grandparents, to older and more ancient dwelling places, the deepest of which contained only the two skulls as evidence that it had ever been a human habitation. Out of all this wealth of dream material, what Freud had focused upon was the two skulls. He hinted that these must be some manifestations of a death wish, for were not all dreams instigated by an unfulfilled wish in the unconscious? He demanded that Jung say whose the skulls were.

Jung knew perfectly well what Freud was driving at, but he could not see the dream in purely personal terms. Yet he was still somewhat sensitive about challenging the older man, or at least about doing so openly. Jung found his own way to the significance of the dream, after he rejected Freud's interpretation. He was unable to agree with Freud that a dream is a façade behind which the meaning lies hidden—"a meaning already known but maliciously, so to speak, withheld from consciousness."<sup>3</sup> Jung saw the dream as an image of the dreamer's unconscious psychic situation, expressed in symbolic terms that could be unravelled to reveal an underlying meaning.

In this particular dream, Jung saw the house as representing an image of his own psychological space, with the room on the upper story referring to the conscious level with its experiences of everyday life. Below were the strata of the unconscious, retreating into successively greater depths, each one being farther removed from personal experience and embodying more and more of the collective nature of mankind in which all individuals participate. The deepest layer to which the dream allowed him to penetrate displayed the most primitive aspect of his own psyche. The skulls were decaying images of the primitive aspects of his own nature, far removed from conscious functioning, but still contributing their substance to the fundamentals of his individual personality. Jung thought that those skulls were as much a part of his psychological heritage as remainders of the genetic patterns of our ancestors are a part of our biological heritage. The latter is apparent in our physical structures, while the former is manifested in dreams and images and visions and, paradoxically, in "new" ideas.

The dream proved an important factor in bringing Jung's growing awareness of the collective aspect of the psyche into conflict with Freud's more personalistic approach to the dream. Many years later Freud was able to integrate into his own theory, his realization of the role of the "archaic heritage" in the life of the individual. At this time, however, the disparity between the approaches of the two men to the dream was a source of crucial conflicts. These served to stimulate Jung's own unconscious processes. He questioned: "On what premises is Freudian psychology founded? To what category of human thought does it belong? What is the relationship of its almost exclusive personalism to general historical assumptions?"<sup>4</sup>

By 1914, several of Freud's closest collaborators, including Jung, had broken away from the Vienna circle in order to work in settings where they could treat their own patients without being bound by what seemed to them a rigid orthodoxy. None of the dissenters challenged Freud's assumption that dreams were meaningful phenomena, but all of them

disputed to some extent the specific kinds of meaning he ascribed to dreams and the techniques he employed to interpret them. Jung was dissatisfied with the emphasis Freud placed on wish fulfillment, and also with what seemed to him to be Freud's overvaluation of the sexual aspect of the unconscious.

Not that Jung denied the importance of the unconscious wish in the formation of dreams. He recognized the role of this factor, and saw how exploring the element of the unfulfilled wish could often lead the investigator back to the antecedent factors behind the formation of a particular dream. He had some skepticism about the use of this approach as a standard technique, however, for he felt that the analyst and analysand need not engage in a long and distracting search for the origin of the dream when the immediate situation in which the dream took place could provide all the information necessary to proceed with diagnosis and treatment.

An example from my own practice will show how a dream which was brought to the second analytic session enabled me to move in on the problem of the analysand without first recovering irrelevant sexual details of the patient's childhood. Alex, twenty-nine, had drifted from job to job over the past several years. In discussing his jobs, there was always something wrong with the employer or with "conditions." His objective seemed to be to make as much money as possible while expending as little effort as possible. In his sex life he was always haunting the dating bars for a good-looking girl whom he could get into bed as quickly as possible. He had come into analysis with the statement that life was empty and meaningless for him, that he was bored, and that he was afraid to get married because he had never stayed with anything he had started. He came to me for help saying, "I hope you can do something for me."

I did not accept Alex unequivocally in the initial session. I told him that we would give it a three-month trial to see if he was able to make the kind of commitment that an analytical relationship requires. He returned the following week for the second session, and brought this dream: *I am fooling*



around with a bolt that is about three inches long and a quarter of an inch in diameter. I have a nut but can't seem to find the way to get the nut and bolt together and I ask you to help. You place your hands on mine and show me how, by patient and careful movements, I can get them to fit together perfectly.

The symbolism of the nut and bolt was "obvious" to Alex. He was sure that the root of his difficulties was his inability to find the right way to get along with women. This was, in his eyes, the result of a long history of failure with women; it probably stemmed from his early problems with his mother, he said. This was in fact why he had decided to come to a woman analyst. He felt that if he could somehow re-enact his early history with an analyst who would substitute for his mother, that he might be able to get to the bottom of his inability to find sexual fulfillment on a stable basis. He had pinned his hopes on me; I was the one who would help him. He saw the dream as expressing his "unconscious" wish, that my help, my laying on of hands, would solve his problems.

I realized what Alex was up to. He wanted to take control of the process, and to lead it back to the events of childhood, where we could spend many sessions reviewing his early history including all his childhood frustrations. I suspected that when this did not produce quick results he might follow his characteristic pattern, saying, "I tried analysis, but it just didn't work out. I know why I can't get along with women, but that doesn't really help to change things." Alex was like so many people who seek psychotherapy in order to absolve themselves of the responsibility for their failure to come to grips with their own reality. The act of sitting with an analyst is supposed to work a miracle. You come and talk about yourself, you reveal your secrets, you pay your bills, and you wait for something to happen. There is little or no change, and heaven knows you have tried, so it must be the analyst's fault.

I followed the practice described by Jung of looking into the context of the dream itself, instead of moving back in time to try to find the supposed "cause" of Alex's difficulties.

This is based on the principle that the dream really means what it says. The unconscious presents a point of view which enlarges, completes, or compensates the conscious attitude. Through the dream it supplies the missing elements of which the ego is unaware, thus exercising its function of striving toward wholeness.

To discover what is missing from the conscious viewpoint, it is helpful to *amplify the associations* to specific elements of the dream itself. This means to widen the associations by bringing to them analogous material from myth and fantasy which has the power to illuminate the dream symbolism. Even in Alex's very brief dream there were numerous such elements. I was interested, first of all, in the associations that he would bring to the material of the dream.

I asked him what he thought "fooling around" meant. He supposed it meant playing with something, not taking it very seriously. I asked him whether he thought fooling around was purposeful activity. No, he felt it was idle or aimless. We explored some other meanings. To fool is to speak in jest, to joke, to tamper with something carelessly or ignorantly. It can also mean to deceive another person, or to take advantage of him. As these meanings came out, I could see that Alex was growing distinctly uncomfortable as he considered the role the dream portrayed him in.

The next elements of dream material were the nut and the bolt. Alex was sure that the bolt was a penis and the nut was a vagina. And clearly the root of his problem was that he couldn't get the two together properly. Or was it?

Jung's research had led him to say: "The sexual language of dreams is not always to be interpreted in a concretistic way . . . it is, in fact, an archaic language which naturally uses all the analogies readiest to hand without their necessarily coinciding with a real sexual content . . . As soon as you take the sexual metaphors as symbols for something unknown, your conception of the nature of dreams at once deepens . . . So long as the sexual language of dreams is understood concretistically, there can be only a direct, outward and concrete solution . . . There is no real conception of, and attitude

to, the problem. But that immediately becomes possible when the concretistic misconception is dropped."<sup>6</sup>

I asked Alex to try to free himself of the stereotyped interpretation and to consider what a bolt really was. He knew, of course, that a bolt was a metal pin used to fasten things together, and usually secured by a nut.

I asked him, "Is this all you can think of in connection with a bolt?"

He thought awhile, and then mentioned a thunderbolt, or a bolt of lightning.

"What do these images mean to you?" I asked him.

"They mean great power, something I can't manage, it's out of my control. Energy is all bound up in that."

"Anything else?"

"You can bolt a door. The bolt is what fastens it, keeps it closed, keeps out intruders."

We then moved on to look at the associations occurring to Alex around "nut." The nut in the dream was the kind of nut which has internal screw threads and fits on a bolt.

I asked him what the purpose of a nut was.

"To connect something to something else, or to tighten a connection."

"Is there anything else that the word 'nut' means to you?"

This brought a wealth of associations from Alex. "A nut is a kind of fruit or seed, its kernel is a seed. Also, a nut is something hard—when you have a real problem you say that you have a hard nut to crack. Or, in business, the nut is how much you have to make before you can begin to show a profit."

"Anything else?" I asked him.

"Well, nuts are testicles. That certainly fits in with the sexual theory."

"Maybe so," I replied, "but notice also that nuts as testicles have something in common with nuts as fruit-bearing seeds, they both carry the potentiality for germination into something new. That's not exactly unrelated to sex."

This was clearly something he had not thought of, he said. I wondered aloud why it had not occurred to him, and he

quickly realized that his ideas about the sex act had very little to do with procreation, in fact it held very little meaning for him beyond immediate pleasure. Little by little the dream was beginning to yield up clues to the source of Alex's difficulties. These sources were not in the past, but were ongoing, giving rise each morning to problems he would experience before the evening.

I did not permit him to get off the track by letting him free-associate to the associations. Since the dream is a self-portrait of the unconscious at a given moment, I find that the best way to understand it is to fix my total attention upon it, and to establish the context. I bear in mind that Jung wrote: "Free association will get me nowhere, any more than it would help me to decipher a Hittite inscription. It will of course help me to uncover all my own complexes, but for this purpose I have no need of a dream—I could just as well take a public notice or a sentence in a newspaper. Free association will bring out all my complexes, but hardly ever the meaning of a dream. To understand the dream's meaning, I must stick as close as possible to the dream images."<sup>7</sup> I have found that this course makes for immediacy in the relationship of analyst, analysand and dream material.

The next part of Alex's dream consisted of the words you showed me how . . . A typical mode of operation in the dreamer was demonstrated here. He was always expecting the other person to perform the magic. The analyst was to be no exception. Everything would work out if the analyst would just take the dreamer's hands in hers and show him how to do what had to be done. Alex was prepared to play a passive role again, as usual.

The dream says that the way to resolve the problem is by "patient and careful movements with my hands." He has to learn a different way of functioning from the way in which he has been approaching problems in the past. The old way is "fooling around." The alternative that is presented is "by patient and careful movements." By its versatility, the hand distinguishes man from lower animals and makes possible all sorts of specifically human accomplishments.

The dream brings into awareness the message from the unconscious, that in his habitual conscious approach to his problems Alex is only half serious. He is not as interested in the meaning of what he does, as he is concerned with deceiving someone, or taking advantage. Sexuality is a part of his problem, but not the whole of it, and it would be a mistake to overemphasize this. What is more important than a concretistic approach is the joining of the disparate elements of the dream into a chain. This cannot be done carelessly; no amount of struggling or forcing will do it; but if the task is approached with care and delicacy, it can be accomplished quite easily. Openness to the implications of the associations is needed. Locked into the components of the dream is the natural power of the psyche to restore its own balance. Our task in interpretation is to free that power.

We can move through the entire dream and relate to the associations to Alex's life situation. In this way the dream serves as a diagnostic tool. It opens up to exploration several possible avenues for therapy.

An important aspect of this sort of approach to dreams is that the major portion of responsibility for bringing up material that would lead to interpretation rests with the analysand and his unconscious. When the analyst offers interpretations, these always have a tentative quality. "Understanding a dream" requires agreement between the analyst and the analysand. It must grow out of the dialogue between the two, and it must be *felt* as valid by the analysand, it must "click" with him. Otherwise the analyst's pronouncements are mere intellectualizations. The analysand may follow what the analyst is saying, but the words will have little effect upon him.

There is the further danger, if interpretation is a unilateral function of the analyst, that the analyst's own projection onto the patient may be mistaken as the message of the dream. Unless the analyst can say, "I think it may be like this; what is your reaction?" there is no way for the analyst to check as to whether he is really on the right track. If the analyst's interpretations are allowed to go unchallenged, if the analyst

sand is led to believe that any objection on his part will be treated as a mechanism of defense against a truth he is expected to recognize, the analysis stands in grave danger of being controlled by the preconceived notions or theoretical scheme of the analyst. The questionable "results" which stem from the impositions of the analyst's interpretations depend largely on suggestion. The analyst in the dialogue imposes his ideas on the analysand, a process which can easily lead to dependence of the analysand upon his analyst. This is a condition which I usually try to avoid, and, certainly, in the case of a man like Alex, whose problems were complicated by his need to get as much help as he could from external sources while making the minimal contribution from his own inner resources.

Jung stated the case very clearly, "The analyst who wishes to rule out conscious suggestions must therefore consider every dream interpretation invalid until such time as a formula is found which wins the patient's assent."<sup>8</sup> The whole point of dream analysis is to teach the patient eventually to become independent of the therapist, by acquiring the ability to carry on the dialogue with his own inner aspect which has a therapeutic quality, that is, with "the therapist within."

The dream images themselves point to the causes of the dream, that is, to the immediate events that preceded the dream and provided material for its formation. By tracing the causal material backward we can bring about the recollections of an earlier time. Through systematic inquiry concerning antecedent events it is sometimes possible to return the patient to a childhood trauma, and to recapture with him the intensity of feeling which accompanied the incident. When repressed feelings which have been contained for a very long time break through into consciousness a tremendous emotional release may occur. Pent-up feelings of anger and hostility burst forth with unimagined fury. It is like a copious bowel movement after a long period of constipation; hence Freud's term, "catharsis." It does a great deal for the individual at the moment, and helps to deal with the emotion of the past, but it does not necessarily imply any promise for the future.

Understanding the cause of a neurosis is not enough to explain its nature, and it is surely not effective in transforming the neurosis into a productive and rewarding aspect of being. Nor is belated railing against the evildoing parents. The causalistic point of view is insufficient; a second viewpoint must be brought into play. This second view is called by Jung the finalistic standpoint. By finalistic he means to suggest that the neurosis can be seen as striving for a purpose, an end or goal.

"All psychological phenomena," Jung says, "have some such sense of purpose inherent in them, even merely reactive phenomena like emotional reactions. Anger over an insult has its purpose in revenge; the purpose of ostentation over mourning is to arouse the sympathy of others, and so on."<sup>9</sup> In a wider sense, the neurosis, and the dream which carries its message, has, as its purpose, the drive toward individuation. This involves correction of some conscious attitude that prevents the individual from more fully realizing his total capacity. When normal productive means of achieving one's purpose are blocked off, neurosis develops as an effort to find a way over or around the obstruction. Neurotic symptoms often direct a person's attention to his inner development through the medium of dreams.

Steven brought a nightmare to his analytic session which was so full of horror that he was deeply shaken for several days after it occurred. He could hardly bear to read it to me, and broke into tears as he did so, more than once. He could have looked at the dream from the causalistic point of view without coming close to the meaning of it. But in the end he was able to take a finalistic view of it, and the effect was transformative. I present the dream in its entirety, not because the details need to be discussed here, but because anything less than the total presentation of the dream would diminish its impact.

*The scene seems to be in an open area. There is a brick structure with two openings on one side and on the opposite side from it are two more openings. In each of these openings is fitted a long, heavy iron box that slides on rollers into*

*the hole in the brick wall. In the opening scene my aunt has crawled into one box and is pushed into the wall. On the inside of the brick walls is a hot fire. My aunt had been told that she had cancer of the lungs and that she was going to die anyway and this would be an easier death than by cancer. I found this very horrifying, but didn't question it.*

*Then I am told the same thing about myself and am again horrified because now I'm supposed to follow my aunt. However, I want to check with another doctor because I just had a chest X ray and no one reported cancer then. Before this, however, I was standing at the furnace thinking I had incurable cancer of the lungs and I thought I must take the furnace as the way out. After I thought about it, I decided to get some X rays somewhere else, or to ignore the whole thing. As I am hurrying to get X rays somewhere else, my Dad runs up from behind and hands me the keys to his car and the papers in his pockets. I am glad to see him. He too has cancer of the lungs, he says, and is preparing to go to the furnace. It is as though this is what one has to do. I tell him there is not much point in his handing over his things to me because I've been told I have the same thing. He insists, though, and I accept. I go to get an X ray done elsewhere and my father goes toward the furnace. The brick walls to the furnaces are only one layer thick of non-firebrick, with a rather thin layer of concrete on the top. The fire in such a construction would be hot enough to kill one, but not hot enough to cremate one, which would appear to be what the furnaces are for.*

We need to know that the patient had been suffering for a long time from a depressive neurosis. He had feelings of great personal inadequacy, feelings which restricted him from attempting new relationships or from accepting challenging opportunities in his work. He had grown up as the third and youngest child in an unloving household. His mother had been a strict disciplinarian, using the authority of religious doctrine as the basis for her unloving, moralistic rigidity. The best that young Steven could hope for was to be saved from hellfire if he would behave as his mother required him to do. There

was never any commendation or appreciation of his efforts that he could remember, but he stood in constant terror of his mother's anger and rejection should he displease her. His father was cool and distant. While he did not necessarily support his wife in her zealous attitudes, he did not take Steven's part either. Steven's brother and sister were older than he, and did not show much interest in him. He thought that they were the favored ones, that he had been born late and was probably unwanted. He tried in vain to justify his existence before his parents, but he never felt that he had been able to do so. The pain in Steven was evident in the lines on his face, the expression in his eyes and in his carriage. When he first came into analysis he had been taking large amounts of antidepressant medication for a long time and had become something like a zombie—a certain vacancy of expression was superimposed over his suffering face.

During the course of analysis, Steven began to face his buried angers and to give voice to them. Each confronting experience was accompanied by a burst of relief; then a reactive depression would set in, in which he was filled with guilt and shame. The analytic relationship, specifically the transference aspect of it, carried him. Here his expectations that he would be punished or rejected for expressing his feelings were not met, instead his expressions were seen as indications that attitudes can change and that change is acceptable. During this time Steven gradually stopped taking the antidepressants, and concurrently his dream life increased in activity and in the powerful way it affected him. The above dream was the climax of a series.

Reading the dream, Steven could hardly manage to get his words out. At the point of relating where his father appears and tells him that he has cancer and is preparing to go to the furnace, Steven broke into uncontrollable tears. "You don't know the worst of it," he cried, "you don't know where this led me." He managed to pull himself together enough to read the rest of the dream, then quietly wept until it was all out. Then he told me what he understood of the dream: "I interpreted it to mean, I am going to have to think for myself.

I cannot accept what people have told me, that my life is hopeless, that I am dying inside and that it may as well be all over. I will have to find out what is in me, or it will be a wasted life—I must, else I will die and burn in hell. But you don't know where the dream leads—the meeting with my father . . ." Here he could hardly go on. But he soon continued, "He didn't make it, but he thought I could. The last time I saw him, a few weeks before he died, I realized for the first time that under his cool, critical attitude—there was love there. It came too late." Steven recalled the last days of his parents. His father had, indeed, softened in his attitude toward him. And later, when his mother was terminally ill she had called Steven to her bedside. She had given him two goblets from her wedding crystal, and six silver iced-tea spoons. Similar cherished items were given to his brother and sister. But for Steven there was a special gift, the small hand-carved table that his mother's parents had brought with them from Austria when they had come to settle in America, the only remainder from the life in the old country. Steven realized from this that he, the youngest child, had been selected to carry on; that in her way, his mother had indeed loved him, although she was unable to let him know until the end of her life.

We could have reviewed the dream from the causalistic point of view, but it is doubtful whether anything particularly new or helpful would have been revealed. To retrace the agonies of his childhood, to reiterate his anger and helplessness, would have been counterproductive. It made more sense to look at the dream from the finalistic point of view. To what purpose did the dream guide him, what was its meaning for the future? His "sickness" was associated with the "sickness" in his family; he had apparently fallen heir to the orientation toward life and its problems that was characteristic for his family. But, stop, the dream seems to say, notice that just because someone has told you that you are doomed to go the way of the others in your family, you need not accept your fate without questioning it. The dream dramatizes the unconscious revulsion against the passive conscious attitude

that Steven had held up until this time—the attitude that he had been irreparably damaged in his youth and would never get over it.

The dream tells him that his father, though dead in reality, still exists as a psychic factor in him. The father *in him* once exerted control and dominated him, and, likewise, did the mother, in a different way. That father element was weak and dependent; it stemmed from the example of a man who was not able to take responsibility for his own life, much less for the rearing of his son, Steven. But now it was time for the father to go, to be deposed from his position, and the son was to take over. The keys to his car were handed over—the dream was saying that Steven was to gain the instrument from the father, which would enable him to take control of his own life. He had to let the hated father go into the furnace and be burned, not destroyed, but transformed into spirit. The confidence of the father spirit in Steven had been unconscious until this time. It now passed into consciousness via the dream. The purpose of the dream, then, was to let the father go, in one sense, and in another sense to allow Steven to assume the power of the father as his own. The keys and the papers point to this.

Discussion of this dream helped Steven to make its contents his own, to assimilate them into consciousness with an active resolve to carry forward the meaning and purpose that were seen in it, first by him, and secondly in the dialogue of analysis. I had very little to say after Steven gave his own interpretation. More important than anything that was said in the exchange, were the feelings that passed between us in those intense moments. Steven, who had always been reserved, could not be reserved with me any longer. The dream broke through all that. We were able to be in it together, for I, too, was profoundly moved by the horror of the dream and I shared the intensity of his reaction. What was unsaid between us seared more deeply than the actual verbal communication. The dream was full of the inescapable fact of death as the end of life, the tenuousness of life, and the importance of embracing the time that is left—each of us—and loving that

time and being committed to use it well. There is no room for self-pity in this brief span, we both knew that, nor for regrets about the un-lived past. The future is too swiftly upon us; but today we know what our task is and, therefore, today we must address ourselves to it.

There are moments in analysis when feelings overflow the brink of tears. Sharing this with the analyst is very different from experiencing it alone. Many people ask, why can I not interpret my own dreams? If, after all, the information that is needed is all embedded in my own psyche, why should it be necessary to come to someone else for help in interpreting my dreams? It is true that the work of analysis is directed toward helping the analysand not only with interpretations of specific dreams, but also with gaining an understanding of the dream process so that he can discover the essential meaning in his own dreams. The difficulty is that the dream comes from outside one's conscious orientation, and one often cannot assess the value of the interpretation solely on the basis of one's own work on it. It takes a long time of diligent work in relating to the unconscious before one is able to step aside from his conscious standpoint. Exploring a dream with a person skilled in interpretation, who is able to participate in the dream with one aspect of his being and at the same time remain outside of it with another, may bring the necessary objectivity. The analyst is trained to exclude his own projections from the interpretation of a dream, to leave out his own wishes, his own moral judgments.

Frequently, analysands want to discuss their dreams with their husbands or wives or close friends. Much as I dislike some esoteric aspects of analysis, there are occasions when it is absolutely necessary to maintain silence, and my feeling is that this is especially true of the "virginal dream" (the dream as it freshly appears, without having been exposed to anyone). To tell it prematurely to another person is to break the special relationship between the ego and the unconscious, a relationship that is carried by a slender bridge that can only be walked alone. I am reminded of the tradition of the earliest Jewish mysticism, having to do with the vision of God's appearance

on the throne, as described by Ezekiel. The Jewish mystic, in contemplating the "throne world" as the center which embodies and exemplifies all forms of creation, is interdicted from speaking about these most sacred matters.<sup>10</sup> There are some things, he is told, that may be discussed in groups of ten, some things in groups of five, and some may not be told to more than three; some things are to be told only to one other, and there are some which may not be uttered at all.

For the tension to be kept between consciousness and the unconscious, it is vitally important that the material be held in and contemplated, that the full feelings associated with it be experienced in all their strength and not dissipated in idle conversation. The very fact that the dream is not told to the analyst immediately as it occurs, but that the analysand has an interval of time to turn it over in his thoughts and to extract from it all that he possibly can, means that he brings his dream to the analytic hour in all its purity, and even intensified by his contemplation. In my experience I have found that those analysands who allow their dreams to work on them in solitude are likely to be the ones who find their analyses most productive. As they learn to maintain the tensions of their dreams, they also learn to live with the tensions of their lives. They learn to express their feelings in the right time and in the right way, after filtering them through the discrimination and differentiation that powers a sensitive ego which has developed a partnership with the unconscious.

Occasionally, I have the experience that an analysand may not wish to discuss a dream with me. Recently an analysand brought a dream which, he said, had very deep meaning to him, not fully understood, but so strong that he did not feel he could deal with it. He wanted me to know about it, but he said that he would show it to me only on the condition that I would promise not to say anything about it. I respected his wish, and he handed me the dream to read after the session was over. I did so, and I hold the dream and all my thoughts about it in confidence. It is important to him that I know what it was about, and that I give him the right to live with

it, while I do the same. Perhaps there will come a time when he will wish to discuss it. That will be his decision.

So far, in speaking about dreams, we have dealt mainly with single dreams. The reason for this was that the dreams were used to illustrate particular points. However, dreams do not occur generally as isolated psychological events, even when they appear to. They may be regarded rather as emerging evidence of the ongoing unconscious processes. Certain themes may be followed through series of dreams. Each dream may have its own meaning, yet take on far more significance in the light of its position with respect to other dreams. So it is necessary for the analyst to keep the "dream history" of the analysand in mind just as much as it is necessary to keep the ongoing life history before him.

The dream series that follows will show not only how dreams may be related to one another, but also how they may, in turn, direct the process of psychotherapy itself. This is possible because so much of emotional disturbance is due to a lack of correspondence between the conscious orientation and the unconscious purposes. It is necessary that the unconscious make known its own direction and we must allow it an equal voice with that of the ego, if each side is to be able to adapt to the other. As the ego listens, and the unconscious is encouraged to participate in the dialogue, the unconscious position is transformed from that of an adversary to that of a friend with a somewhat differing but complementary point of view. This process is what James Hillman has aptly called "befriending our dreams."

There will follow, greatly abbreviated, a series of four dreams, which belong in turn to four important aspects of the analytic process. The dreams took place over a long period of time, with many other dreams between, but these nevertheless show a cohesiveness of theme. The first dream is *diagnostic*, describing the situation that needs to be corrected, the "neurosis," if you will. The second dream has to do with *prognosis*, it suggests what can happen as a result of treatment. The third dream deals with the *method of treatment*. The fourth has to do with the *resolution of the transference re-*

relationship, a necessary element in the conclusion of analysis. This fourth dream is not my analyst's; it is my own. I think it admissible here, because I strongly feel that the analyst is part of the process, rather than being either an observer or the one who makes it happen. The analyst's unconscious material, then, is not excluded from the process.

Nicholas came into analysis shortly after he had accepted an important position which required him to pull together his life work, including all his education and his previous experience. He was to be in charge of a large project which involved a number of people. A high degree of talent and creativity would be demanded from him as director. He had been encouraged by friends and associates to seek the position, and he had applied for it despite a strong personal feeling that he was insufficiently qualified. When he was given the post he reacted with a depression that had within it elements of panic. He came into analysis appearing calm and well possessed, but this was altogether persona. Here is his initial dream: *I am climbing a rocky cliff made of shale and loose rocks. I have to put my foot into rough depressions and holes, and grab onto protuberances of rock. Sometimes rocks break loose and go hurtling down into the valley. I am afraid of losing my balance, or of starting a huge landslide.*

This dream offers a diagnosis of the situation. He is aiming much too high, and he is not comfortable with the task or with his own ability to master it. He feels vulnerable, and is fearful of falling from the place to which he has come through so much effort. He may lose his balance and come crashing down at any moment. Or, even if he hangs on, the people in the valley below him are in danger—he can destroy them in a moment by an accident, a miscalculation. But, judging from the way in which he was climbing, he was not concerned for anything but his goal. As we discussed the dream it became apparent that his only concerns were ego concerns.

The conscious attitude of Nicholas, which was that he must go ahead and do his job to the best of his ability and no matter who gets hurt in the process, was shown by the dream to be an unproductive attitude. The whole thing might easily

collapse if he were to go ahead and try to build on the present basis.

All of this would appear to be an external interpretation. Jungians hold that the external situation (in the world) generally reflects the inner situation of the individual. When we are feeling calm and secure and smoothly functioning on the inside, it is nearly certain that things will go well for us or, if they take a bad turn, that we will be able to cope with that and even to extricate something of value from an apparently unfavorable circumstance. On the other hand, if we are "at odds with ourselves," with the conscious and unconscious parts running at cross purposes, we tend to make a mess of even the most favorable of circumstances. The external situation in which we find ourselves is merely our way of looking at the "box" which we call experience, from the outside. We could also look at the box from the inside and call it subjective experience. But the box, "experience," is neither inner nor outer, it is that which joins together the outside and the inside. For the purpose of indicating something about the dream series, we will for the present look at these dreams from the external or objective side.

The second dream in the series: *I am standing alone at the foot of a huge mountain. It is of unimaginable size and I am so small. A footpath winds its way up on the lower slopes and disappears behind a rise in the distance. I do not know if I will live long enough to climb that mountain, but at least I will begin.*

This is a prognostic dream. Nicholas has come down from his precarious position of the first dream and his feet are on solid ground. The dream reflects the coming change in his attitude. He is beginning to realize that he will have to reorganize his work, and even before that, his attitude to the work. He must not be in too big a hurry, as he has been in the past. He must not try to salvage the mistakes of the past, but must go back and begin again on a sounder basis. The task is enormous, it is the fulfillment of his whole life, but it is not important that he concern himself too much about the end result. He has to be prepared for a long and



arduous time ahead—no man would start out on the kind of journey the dream presents without making sure that he is in good health. This means total good health, physically and psychologically. The dream suggests that the only way to go is upward, and that the process will require more attention than the goal.

It may well be asked here whether dreams predict the future. Jung has answered this question by saying that dreams are no more prophetic than a meteorologist who predicts the weather. What the dream does is to present a reading of the unconscious, so to speak, and if we are able to discern its message we have a basis for expecting that, on the basis of certain conditions present, there is a good chance of certain occurrences taking place in the natural course of events. The dream then, while not actually predicting the future, can be an aid in helping us to realize what forces are in motion and in what direction they are going.

The third dream: *I have reached a plateau high in the mountains. Before me stretches a calm, smooth mountain lake. Seated crosslegged with his back toward me is a man whom I do not know. He is facing the lake, immovable.*

The dream left Nicholas with a peaceful feeling. He felt, upon awakening, like taking the time to make a small drawing of the scene. He did, and he taped it to his bedroom mirror where he could see it often, so that he would be reminded of the dream and the feeling it engendered. The dream seemed to have two functions. The first was to compensate the one-sided attitude of consciousness, which from time to time became obsessed with the responsibilities of work and with other problems, and made it difficult for Nicholas to concentrate his energies. The dream showed a thoughtful figure, representing perhaps an unconscious demand, perhaps a repressed wish, for distancing himself from pressing problems and finding perspective and restfulness. The second function of this dream was to suggest a method of treatment. It clearly indicated that meditation of some sort would be helpful for Nicholas. He could find the necessary balance for his life if he would set aside time from his busy schedule for quiet reflection.

tion. He should turn his back on the upward struggle, gazing instead over the smooth waters, in which he himself could be revealed.

Other dreams reiterated this message in varying ways. Nicholas began to recognize the importance of taking time for those practices which would provide for him a temporary separation from the demands of his external life, and then allow him to return with new energy and vigor. He followed the attitude prescribed by the dream, and though there were better times and worse times, he gradually gained the capacity to return at will to the high mountain plateau when it was necessary to view his situation from another prospective.

The fourth dream was my own. It occurred near the end of the analysis, and let me know that my role in Nicholas' development was nearly finished. My dream: *I have climbed to the top of a snowy mountain with Nicholas. We look down and see some men and machines cutting a hole in the ice, maybe for fishing. It is noisy. But atop the mountain the sun is warm. I lie back in the snow and enjoy the sun. Nicholas remains standing.*

I have said that this fourth dream had to do with the end of analysis which requires the dissolution of the transference relationship. The dream points to the unconscious relationship between analyst and analysand, from the point of view of the analyst. This is more properly called "countertransference." Countertransference in orthodox psychoanalysis was thought of as dangerous, a condition which the analyst should by all means try to avoid. He was advised to remain remote and objective and not to allow his personal feelings to enter into the analytic relationship. In contrast to this view, it is accepted as a matter of course by Jungians that in an analysis extending over a long period, with intense emotional involvement, that the analyst will participate in depth and not purely out of the conscious position. This is confirmed when the analyst dreams of a patient and, in fact, may be helpful in letting the analyst know what is going on between himself and the patient, far better than if his judgment were based on thinking alone. The analyst must, therefore, consistently

pay attention to his own dreams. And, when he is unable to understand a dream that seems important to him, he may be obliged to discuss it with a colleague who will help him achieve the necessary objectivity.

As I regarded the foregoing dream, I had to recognize that Nicholas and I had gone as far as we could together. We had reached a stage of development which had seemed impossible when we first began our work together. I say "we" because I, too, grew in the process of this difficult analysis. The problems and difficulties which were brought to the analysis were by no means entirely solved, but the means for dealing with them were at hand. Nicholas' panic was gone and a relaxed but ready attitude took its place. It was time for me to withdraw from the relationship. I thought of how far Nicholas had come. Some words of Jung's on the goals of analysis came to mind. They seemed relevant to the image of Nicholas standing there in the sunshine:

The greatest and most important problems of life are all in a certain sense insoluble. They must be so because they express the necessary polarity inherent in every self-regulating system. They can never be solved, but only outgrown. . . . This "outgrowing" . . . on further experience was seen to consist in a new level of consciousness. Some higher or wider interest arose on the person's horizon, and through this widening of his view the insoluble problem lost its urgency. It was not solved logically in its own terms, but faded out when confronted with a new and stronger life-tendency. It was not repressed and made unconscious, but merely appeared in a different light, and so, did indeed become different. What, on a lower level, had led to the wildest conflicts and to panicky outbursts of emotion, viewed from the higher level of the personality, now seemed like a storm in the valley seen from a high mountain-top. This does not mean that the thunderstorm is robbed of its reality, but instead of being in it one is now above it.<sup>11</sup>

Jung has suggested two ways of approaching a dream, and they are not necessarily mutually exclusive. One is to analyze the dream on the *objective level*. Every character in the dream may be taken as the person in real life, and the events and

relationships in the dream may be seen as referring to real life events and relationships. The dream is seen as the reaction of the unconscious to what is happening in the conscious life of the dreamer. Or, the dream may either be confirming or objecting to some action in which the dreamer is involved. If it is a prognostic dream, it may represent the attempt of the unconscious to work out the solution of some problem in the dreamer's life situation.

Another way to take the dream is on the *subjective level*. Here we can interpret dream figures as personified aspects of the dreamer's own personality.<sup>12</sup> A person whom the dreamer knows in his daily life may appear in his dream as the embodiment of an archetypal element of the unconscious. In this case the dream figure is to be taken as referring to some aspect of the dreamer himself. Subjective-level interpretations are indicated in dreams where the dream figures evoke more emotion than one would expect from their role in the waking life of the dreamer. Steven's cremation dream is a case in point. When Steven meets his father, who is about to go to the ovens for a quicker death than that from cancer, we may be sure that the subjective interpretation—father as an internalized aspect of Steven—comes closest to the meaning of the dream.

Sometimes there are no recognizable or familiar characters in a dream. Then it is nearly impossible to interpret the dream in any way except subjectively. If the dream figures, however, can be associated to actual events in the life situation, it is simpler and usually more helpful to interpret the dream objectively. A subjective level interpretation is necessary in cases where the objective level interpretation does not strike the dreamer as relevant or meaningful.

The strange Kafkaesque dream of Edith, a middle-aged woman, may serve to illustrate this point further. *I am being chased by those who would exterminate my race. I have friends among my enemies—who would protect me by beating me lightly, in order to avoid the more destructive beating. Also, I have enemies among my friends, who would betray*

*me. Alas. I awaken feeling that something in my life has changed.*

In exploring this dream with her on the objective level I found it necessary to raise first the question of "race." Edith is Jewish, so I asked if perhaps she felt in some way discriminated against because of her Judaism. She did not respond to this probe with any particular feeling, for she was not aware of ever having suffered for this reason. There had been no event that she could think of in recent days that would have provided any basis for the content of the dream. As to friends among her enemies, she thought of some men in her business firm who were immediately above her. They would often help her in various ways, so that she had gained a reputation for excellence which she thought was better than she deserved. Enemies among her friends might refer, she conjectured, to other women on her same level who may have been jealous of her accomplishments. But somehow this objective level interpretation of the dream did not seem significant to the dreamer—it did not correspond to the strong feelings she experienced when she awakened from the dream.

Reading the dream from a subjective point of view brought quite different results. "Race" was seen to refer to the dreamer's character: Edith was an energetic and ambitious woman with high aspirations. There were inner obstacles which she felt were working against her: personal feelings of insecurity, intuitive insight into the sensitivities of others which sometimes inhibited her action, and a tendency to become distracted from something on which she was trying to concentrate. These qualities of personality were "enemies" in her eyes, yet the puzzling dream urged her to examine them and to see whether each in its way might serve as an impetus to growth. Accepting these aspects of her nature might be the "lighter beating." In the individuation process the "more destructive beating," that is, failure due to unconsciousness of her weaknesses, would be avoided. Feeling insecure would lead her to seek out and work on the less developed talents; intuitive insight could help her in establishing better relationships; and the tendency to become distracted, if not repressed,

might allow her to enjoy a wider range of interests and aspirations. So these were "friends among my enemies."

Edith had then to consider the "enemies among my friends, who would betray me." These seemed to refer to characteristics of her own which appeared to be productive in nature, but which she had a tendency to carry to excess. They were such qualities as energy, which could become compulsivity; ambition, which could become greed; singleness of purpose, which could become ruthlessness. All these inner qualities displayed her characteristic way of being which, as it happened, were also reflected in her current life situation. Naturally Edith had been totally unaware of these forces underlying her behavior. In working through the dream with the analyst, I had the distinct feeling that it was not the objective life situation which precipitated the dream, but the contrary: the condition of the unconscious which is portrayed so graphically in the dream is the same condition which, quite unknown to the dreamer, created the life situation which she was currently experiencing. The confirmation that the subjective interpretation was valid in this case came as the dreamer recalled that her ongoing life problem was not an isolated one but bore a resemblance to other situations which had come up before—all in response to the ongoing character problems which the dream indicated.

Much more could be said about the process of dreaming. We could discuss how dreams are classified, or how they may be systematically approached.<sup>13</sup> But all this would be theorizing. What we do in the analytic process is to carry on a dialogue with the dream, instead of trying to make it conform to a theory. The few general principles that have been illustrated above may be helpful to suggest avenues of approach to the dream. The important thing is to record the dream, to pay attention to it, and to allow the dream to speak for itself. It is not even absolutely necessary that the dream be understood. As in the most helpful of human relationships, where much can transpire which is not fully understood, so with dreams. This or that element reveals something that was not known before, or one is reminded of some quality

or capacity that he had all but forgotten. And there is always the possibility that more of a dream's meaning will be revealed as time passes.

The dream has been called everything from a "temporary psychosis" to the "gateway to the treasure-house of the unconscious." Much of what we see when we close our eyes at night depends upon the attitude with which we go to sleep. And much of what we do by day may be affected by the attitude we bring to our dreams.

## 12

### DREAMING THE DREAM ONWARD: ACTIVE IMAGINATION

Dreams may be a source of potential strength and wisdom, but unfortunately they present their difficulties and problems too. For one thing, I do not find that it is always possible to understand dreams. Often they are unclear and it seems that no amount of reflection and examination will produce the feeling of having come to the essence of the dream. Dreams may have to be shelved until some future time when they may become clearer—meanwhile we can keep them in view and turn them over in our thoughts, now and again.

Since dreaming is a spontaneous function of the unconscious, we cannot, by any conscious efforts, "cause" dreams to appear—much less can we command dream content that will serve our needs at any given moment in time. It seems as though the unconscious were like the vault of a great bank in which is stored all the wealth inherited from our ancestors and in which we, as individuals, also have deposited our own coin. All of this treasure is said to belong to us, to be at our disposal, but the trouble is that we cannot withdraw it on demand. We have to wait until the guard at the door is ready to open up, and we must be present at that moment and ready to receive what is offered to us. We cannot withdraw more than what the guard may decide to give us. This may be more than we need at this particular moment, or