

# Jung, the trickster writer, or what literary research can do for the clinician

Susan Rowland, *London*

*Abstract:* This paper aims to show how literary scholarship can contribute to clinical debates by offering different methods of reading and interpreting works by Jung. Firstly, as texts form much of the means by which Jungian ideas are transmitted and worked upon, literary research offers methods of examining the way we read for authority and orthodoxy. Secondly, it is invaluable to look at the way in which Jung actually wrote. Jung portrays a dynamic psyche *in action* in his writings. His works are not only about a creative archetypal psyche, they enact and perform this creativity in the way in which he uses words. The rich playfulness demonstrated in *The Collected Works* is an example of a writer as a mythmaker of the psyche, one who absorbs unconscious creative energies into his writing in ways that dissolve modernity's cultural boundaries of science and art.

In addition, the aesthetic component in Jung's writing is not a decoration of his ideas. Rather, his 'literary' qualities are themselves forms of argument about the fragile state of modern subjectivity. Using his essays on 'Synchronicity', and the 'Trickster', the paper will show these works to be responses to three related crises that still face clinicians and scholars today: the problematic role of the hero myth as an individuation narrative, the nature of 'science', and the crisis of western modernity itself in desperate need of psychic healing. The paper will show that where writing on synchronicity aims to individuate science by adding a 'feminine' Eros to its Logos biases, the Trickster essay is designed to ameliorate modernity by providing frameworks to make visible marginal or excluded material. In these works Jung tries to rejuvenate the modern world by re-connecting traditional symbolic systems with the psyche through myth as a language of psychic relating.

*Key words:* archetype, interpretation, Jung, literary theory, modernity, myth, trickster, Eros, Logos.

---

## Introduction

At first glance it would appear unlikely that literary research in an academic context could offer much to the clinical practitioner. Surely an academic discipline, removed from therapeutic practice, can have little to say to the analytic field? However, while Jung regarded literature and art in themselves as intrinsically interesting to the 'psychologist' (his term), literary consideration of his own writings is a neglected task. My paper aims to show how literary

scholarship can make a contribution to clinical debates by offering different methods of reading and interpreting works by Jung.

This has two valuable potential starting points. In the first place, texts form a great deal (not all) of the means by which Jungian ideas are transmitted and worked upon. Literary research offers methods of scrutinizing the way we read for authority and orthodoxy. Secondly, and more powerfully Jungian, is the way in which he actually wrote; Jung portrays a dynamic psyche *in action* in his writings. His works are not only about a creative archetypal psyche; they enact and perform this creativity in the way in which he used words. The rich playfulness demonstrated in *The Collected Works* is an example of a writer as a mythmaker of the psyche, one who absorbs unconscious creative energies into his writing in ways that dissolve modernity's cultural boundaries of science and art.

Crucially, the aesthetic component in Jung's writing is not a decorative adornment to his ideas. Rather, his 'literary' qualities are themselves modes of argument about the perilous state of modern subjectivity. Using his essays on 'Synchronicity', and the 'Trickster', my paper will show these works to be responses to three related crises that still face clinicians and scholars today: the problematic role of the hero myth as an individuation narrative, the nature of 'science' in rational modernity, and the crisis of western modernity itself in desperate need of psychic healing.

Where writing on synchronicity aims to individuate science by adding a 'feminine' Eros to its Logos biases, the Trickster essay is designed to ameliorate modernity by providing frameworks to make visible marginal or excluded material. In these works, Jung tries to rejuvenate the modern world by re-connecting traditional symbolic systems with the psyche through myth as a language of psychic relating.

Such a methodology has the merit of working with material inside the frame of modernity, of looking at the 'other' within culture in ways that is made explicitly ethical. It resists appropriating the cultural resources of another. Moreover, it seeks to mobilize what Jung believed to be integral to psychic functioning, the historical residue found in archetypal symbolism that connects unconscious powers to cultural forms. By historical residue I mean the way in which archetypes link actual symbolism to psychic functioning through time and space. On the one hand the collective culture influences the specific form of archetypal images. On the other the collective unconscious provides a dynamic creative input linking culture to time, making time itself psychic.

So therefore, although 'Trickster' shows a tendency to gender polarization, which I will examine, it demonstrates an accretion of meaning through a dialogue between inner content or image, and the outer frame of history, other culture, or myth. Such texts are explicitly ethical. They describe culture as an intrinsically ethical mode of relating, and moreover, they are an ethical performance in their own strategies for representation and meaning. When Jung writes in 'Trickster' of a soldier who is unable to question orders from

above, he is a writer for our own age. The soldier, as I shall show, has no means to connect his inner being to his social role; what Jung signifies by 'trickster' is lacking. Jung's writings such as 'Trickster' demonstrate a further stage in culture making: how archetypal images become meaningful in relation to their contexts; how they become texts. As a trickster writer, Jung can bring multiple points of view and forms of (un)consciousness to the surface of his text in an ethical weaving of meaning-in-relationship.

The aesthetic qualities of the way Jung wrote embody his argument that meaning is a function of a relation to the other (as unconsciousness, or by transference to another person etc.). For Jung offers a writing of multiple pathways and many voices. Respecting the *plurality* of possibilities for meaning in his work is to read aesthetically, to treat it more like a novel with characters embodying different, not necessarily compatible points of view, or as poetry with haunting figures of the human and non-human. It is this decentring of single, authorized interpretations that is Jung's most profound challenge to a modern culture that has promoted rationality as a journey towards a single coherent truth, or truth as single and coherent. Such imaginative writing amounts to re-writing the script of modernity. Literary research enables the modern reader to find such a Jung in our own (multiple) relationships to his written word.

### Who is speaking?

The anima has an erotic, emotional character, the animus a rationalizing one. Hence most of what men say about feminine eroticism, and particularly about the emotional life of women, is derived from their own anima projections and distorted accordingly. On the other hand, the astonishing assumptions and fantasies that women make about men come from the activity of the animus, who produces an inexhaustible supply of illogical arguments and false explanations.

(Jung 1925, para. 338)

I want to start by looking at this small quotation taken entirely out of context from 'Marriage as a psychological relationship' (*ibid.*). In these three sentences, connected in meaning, are at least three types of writing. We open with a dialectical expression expressed in a divided sentence: the anima, erotic and emotional, the animus, rationalizing. The second sentence shifts from neutral conceptual language to an embedded point of view: it speaks *from* the position of 'men' in their liability to project and distort. Not only the content of the sentence, but the perspective is shifting to 'men'. The third sentence usually makes people laugh when read aloud after the preceding two. Why is this?

Compared to the previous sentences, the third one on 'astonishing assumptions', is verbose, overblown, rambling and uncontrolled. There is indeed something 'inexhaustible' about its sentiments. Who is speaking? How does this utterance, this vehicle of psychic energy, relate to the former revelation of the

role of the anima in distorting perceptions of women? Here, I venture to suggest *is* the anima, as the pressure of the irrational in the authorial psyche overmasters the urge to write of gender ‘objectively’, conceptually. Writing in these three sentences shifts from the dialectical psychologist to the point of view of one gender, looking at it *as* a man, and finally to hearing the voice of the ‘erotic emotional character’ from within the (man’s) psyche.

Such an analysis begs more questions. Is Jung deliberately enacting his own theory? Providing a conscious demonstration of anima distortion? Or is he just letting go without considering the risks of first time that Jung’s writing became the medium for the cries of an inner multitude. I am suggesting that the famous ‘recording’ of *Septem Sermones*, when Jung permitted ‘voices’ to dictate a text to him is a model of composition that never entirely left him (Jung 1963/1983, pp. 215–16).

### A demand for monotheistic reading

It is significant, I would suggest, that it is impossible to ascertain whether this particular eruption of the anima is intentional on Jung’s part or not. Such undecidability has important consequences. For, if it is typical of his writing in general, then I would want to argue that instead of being primarily a dialectical thinker, who is preoccupied with the reconciling of opposing positions, Jung is more intrinsically dialogical in the sense that *his writing performs an inner and outer dialogue from different positions/voices in the psyche*.

‘Dialogical’ here could be regarded as an expansion, a spatialization, of what is usually regarded as the classical dialectical position of the confrontation and transcending of oppositions. For, as M.M. Bakhtin suggests, dialogical argument emerges from an *a priori* tension between a drive to singleness and purity, and an equally powerful drive to pluralize and disperse (Bakhtin 1981). Culture, language and texts result from the continuous interchange of these innate impulses, as the human urge for purity, truth and power encounters the inevitable psychological and social diversity of actual, lived experience. My point is that Jung’s notion of archetypes and archetypal images fascinatingly resembles Bakhtin’s dialogics, but on a psychological rather than linguistic level. For the centralizing power of the archetype represents a singleness that is impossible to purely incarnate in the complications of lived experience. Rather archetypal images arise from a *dialogue* between the irrepresentable shaping purity of the archetype and its inevitable partial dispersal as the image is formed in the context of an individual’s personal, social and historical life (see Rowland 2005, chaps. 5 & 6).

Additionally, Jung’s tricky practice might lead us to examine the way in which it violates traditional expectations that gather around the notion of authorial intention as something stable. For Jung is not fulfilling the inbuilt cultural assumption that an author of a text *intends* it to have a coherent, ultimately rational meaning. It is an expectation so innate to modernity as to

appear natural: the author of non-fiction, especially so called 'scientific' texts *must* be trying to convey a comprehensible straightforward meaning. We appeal to 'what the author really means' as a way of demanding coherence. Yet, when we exclaim, puzzled by something opaque and shifting in *The Collected Works*, 'what does Jung really mean by this', what is the nature of our demand? Is it that the text will yield a rational truth, transcendent of its messy textual matter?

Such a demand forms the core of a culturally driven and powerful form of reading. It is the practice of reading by extracting a coherent argument from the vagaries of writing, and, according to the literary theorist Roland Barthes, it is inherently theological, meaning that it derives from religious heritage, as I shall show (Barthes 1968). When we read for the wholly rational, such as the dialectical exchange of neatly opposing positions, we do so under the guarantee that an authorial intention validates such a drastic intervention into the multiple possibilities of words. We imagine the author as the *one god* of the text; 'he' is the only source of the textual matter and we bestow upon him omniscient powers over the significance of his words. I will be arguing that Jung's work, intentionally or not, draws upon 'other' theological models. In particular, his notions of Eros, Logos and synchronicity both enact and challenge modernity's rational and monotheistic practices.

Furthermore, not only is reading for rational coherence a monotheistic practice because it adheres to the model of one single and transcendent truth, but it is also one that provides the crucial link between theology and rational science. For as the critic Christopher Manes describes, it was the theological technique of interpreting the bible to find comprehensible answers about the mind of God that constructed the notion of the ultimate truth as a rational Logos (Manes 1992). Such a practice built upon Christian borrowing from Greek philosophy, notably Plato. Theological exegesis *produced* the exaltation of rationality and the discourse of reason in pre-modernity. Allegorical reading, for example, directed meaning 'upwards' into the truth of God as separable from his creation. Of course such a discourse grows out of the notion of the divine as transcendent of nature, body and matter. With such a mindset, exegesis can be applied to two sorts of texts, the holy books and the book of nature. While not being sacred in itself, nature is nevertheless the product of the divine mind, and so can be read similarly to extract the rational truth of a Logos that transcends natural and textual matter. Nature became an allegorical 'book' whereby its animation was converted from animism (spirits inherent in nature, sacred in matter) to a signification of moral and divine truth 'above' and separate from nature. So it is theology that inaugurates reading the natural world for 'laws of nature' that are regarded as abstractable truths from their material expression. Eventually, theologians studying nature for Logos re-define themselves as natural scientists. An innately monotheistic technique of reading bequeaths the elevation of the discourse of reason and science to modernity. So there is a direct link between the construction of

rational truth as separable from matter to the practice of reading for rational understanding, which is thereby privileged *above* other ways of interpreting both nature and texts.

### Trickster and two creation myths

So where does that leave the undecidability of our small Jung fragment? My argument is that within the tricky nature of Jung's writing, a second theological model is operating alongside, and often challenging, the reading for rational Logos. The Trickster has a very different kind of divine lineage from the hidden god of rational science. We could pause briefly on the next quotation that shows Jung aware of a price to be paid for a singular reading practice, one that structures truth as transcendent.

We must interpret, we must find meanings in things, otherwise we would be quite unable to think about them. We have to break down life and events, which are self-contained processes, into meanings, images, concepts, well knowing that in doing so we are getting further away from the living mystery.

(Jung 1922, para. 121)

Such an attitude by Jung is integral to two key aspects of his work that I want to look at in the rest of this paper: his descriptions of Logos and Eros as forms of consciousness, and of synchronicity. To begin with Logos and Eros, by treating these as types of mental functioning, Jung is bringing two different creation myths into his understanding of psyche. Logos is the myth of the monotheistic God, who is transcendent of the nature he creates. 'He' is a sky-father and his essential separation from nature sponsors rationality as dependent upon a division from matter and body (Jung 1951, paras. 29, 41). Eros, in Jung's terms, connectedness and relatedness, is, at root, the creation myth of an earth-mother, in which matter is sacred and the divine is immanent in nature (*ibid.*, paras. 29, 41). And although modernity is heavily dominated by the sky-father Logos (and to his credit Jung saw this as the key problem), earth-mother Eros persists in all sorts of feminine practices, in the arts (which evade logo-centric reading), and in the images of the goddess (Mary) embracing her son-lover (Christ) present in Christian iconography. Here we see in the *images* of Christianity (as opposed to its argument), traces of an earth-mother religion woven into its mythical structure as in the emphasis on the sacred garden, or the serpent, traditional image of the regenerating sacred mother (Baring & Cashford 1991).

Jung's entire project, I am suggesting, is, in mythical terms an attempt to re-balance modernity that has been brought to crisis by an over-valuing of Logos at the expense of Eros-relating. Hence the profoundly ethical nature of his enterprise. On the other hand, Jung is a conservative with revolutionary ideas. He views the *solution* to the rigidities of Logos as being an employment of the feminine Eros to shore up fragile masculine symbolism. It is this desire

to retain masculine symbolism, while re-configuring the marginality of the earth-mother, that leads to his defiant and unsustainable gendering of Eros and Logos as more proper to the consciousnesses of women and men respectively. By essentializing the creation myths, he is able to stabilize the masculine signifying he wants to retain it, while insisting upon its re-formation to include the feminine, which remains marginal.

Here it is useful to consider the religious form of animism as finding a home in Jung's psyche. Animism is a religious expression of the plural voices of the goddess within nature. It is the notion that the non-human is *animated* with spirits in rocks, animals, rivers etc. that under certain circumstances can enter into a dialogue with humans (White Jnr. 1967). Jung's Logos *and* Eros in the psyche is transcendent monotheism in a dialogue with immanent animism. And of course, that dialogue between transcendent and immanent is enacted in the writing. It finds a home in the psyche of the reader when we are presented with conceptual Logos thinking *and* the opportunity to connect to the 'living mystery' of animated voices.

I now want to look at three areas in which this grand project is just visible in Jung's writing: in Eros and Logos, in the trickster, and in synchronicity. Synchronicity is when two events, or an event and a psychic state, occur separated by time or by space, or by both, in ways that resist conventional notions of causality for explanation. They are therefore linked by meaning not mechanism, and this form of connection is an additional principle to causality, not its opposite as Roderick Main shows (2004). Consider how Jung writes of synchronicity and nature here:

For [experimental science] there is created in the laboratory a situation which is artificially restricted to the question and which compels Nature to give an unequivocal answer. The workings of Nature in her unrestricted wholeness are completely excluded....[W]e need a method of enquiry which...leaves Nature to answer out of her fullness.

(Jung 1952, para. 864)

Here, I suggest, is one of those pressure points in Jung's writing where its revolutionary treatment of modernity's mythical structures is *almost* explicit. He tells us that the rational science of the Logos has become problematic because it excludes so much that is 'other'. In 'Nature in her unrestricted wholeness', we discern the goddess as earth-mother, the immanent sacred within/as nature. In Jung's call to recognize non-causal, non-rational connections as meaningful, synchronicity is an-other demand, to read reality *aesthetically* for the intuitive inexplicable coherences of art, as well as to read logo-centrally. It is Eros reading to go alongside Logos reading: synchronicity, then, is the immanent creation of the earth-mother, of Eros embedded in/as nature.

Synchronicity, by virtue of its role in augmenting the understanding of events beyond causal explanations, is a response to a perceived problem with science as solely concerned with rational truth formed out of a transcendent

reading of matter. Of course, it is not an attempt to replace rational science, just as Jung does not want to replace traditional monotheistic symbolism. Rather he wants to supplement (and so heal) Christian culture and its Logos descendent, science, with feminine attributes. He wants to strengthen the modern soul by demonstrating the need for *dialogue* between the two myths: his dialogical psyche is one of a rationalizing ego hero deeply engaged with his immanent inner voices. Or to put it another way, in Jung's writing the monotheistic God makes 'his' meaning *as a process of exchanges* with another model of the sacred that disperses meaning as the plural voices of matter and nature.

### Gender, modernity and trickster

To illustrate something of the ethical dimension to Jung's dialogical psyche, I want to turn to a highly gendered essay, that of the 'Trickster' (Jung 1954, paras. 456–88). Here, I am going to argue, is another half-concealed characterization of the earth-mother goddess. Like its companion piece on the 'Kore', 'Trickster' is focused upon the way the psyche produces meaning out of a dialogue between an inner image and a framing narrative. Even though the framing narrative in both is mythical, I will suggest that 'Trickster' also daringly suggests that history can perform this function for modernity. In effect, Jung re-frames the general term 'history' until it stands for the way psyche and narrative unite to structure the ethical function of the modern European.

First of all, the trickster is the myth of an-other (Jung 1954, para. 456). It stands for the other as another culture, here the Native American Winnebagos. Yet also for Jung, the trickster is a figure of the medieval carnival in European heritage (*ibid.*, paras. 458–64). Jung's trickster is in a dialogical narrative with the other, as other culture or as the past. As Jung describes the trickster in Europe 'he' comes to signify a social mechanism now past and gone with the loss of medieval culture. For modernity, the trickster *figure*, Jung says, gives way to the shadow *image*. Why is this? In superbly tricky manoeuvres, the shadow image proves to be both a symptom of modernity's weakness—a sign of the fragile ego in danger of being engulfed by an irrational psyche turned dark through neglect—and, an opportunity for Jung, the assiduous restorer of the masculine. The trickster is not the masculine principle, of course, for 'he' is androgynous. However, Jung's essay makes only one (and one crucial) reference to 'him' in feminine form. For conservative Jung, the trickster's adventurousness is an opportunity to disguise his radical gender ambivalence in masculine dress.

The trickster incarnates a protean otherness. As a figure he is not mere singularity, but rather a multiplicity of potential stories involving confusion, delight, and humiliation at the co-presence of human, animal and divine, and so 'he' hints of larger mythological frames. The trickster is narrative; perhaps 'he' stands for narrative itself as a tricky, undecidedable foundation of



knowledge. Trickster is foundational mythos rather than Logos as coherent abstractable truth.

Even [the trickster's] sex is optional despite its phallic qualities: he can turn himself into a woman and bear children...This is a reference to his original nature as a Creator, for the world is made from the body of a god.

(Jung 1954, para. 472)

In fact, perhaps the trickster isn't masculine after all, as Jung is forced to admit in a telling elaboration of the trickster's tricky evasion of straightforward definitions. In the earthy sexuality and embodied creativity of the trickster is Jung's most striking incarnation of the goddess as earth-mother Eros. It is worth recalling that 'feminine' earth-mother shares the trickster's androgyny. As goddess of complete being 'she' exists prior to the division into two genders. Moreover, it is in the goddess creation myth, not that of the sky-father Logos, in which the world is made from the *body* as sacred. For the earth-mother myth, humans do not share in monotheism's transcendence of nature. Rather humans are part of the Nature's embrace, 'her' web of being, and in dialogue with 'her' many voices. The trickster's interaction with humankind enacts the dance of multiple stories and meanings that weave the psyche together. And the notion of psychic reality as *woven* brings in Jung's recognition of the role of the goddess in ethical relating.

### Trickster-Goddess and ethics

In Jung's essay, for Native Americans and for European medieval culture the narrative aspect of the trickster myth has a vital social function. The trickster story works by keeping the inferior and immature aspects of the psyche before a community (Jung 1954, para. 470). It does by means of story what Jung has to do for modern Europe by means of history: remind the present of the unpleasant aspects of the past *so that they remain past* and do not become incarnated again in social dysfunction.

It is therefore important in 'Trickster' that causality is criticized if it represents a claim to understand the psyche as a simple progressive mechanism. Jung draws attention to the overtly colonial assumption that modern Europe has abandoned its trickster myths because it is so far ahead of Native cultures as to be able to forget the part-animal, part-divine forms of consciousness such myths signify. Using history to deconstruct the European assumption of superiority, Jung posits a dialogical relation between image and narrative contained in the living quality of the myth for other cultures. Far from being merely a 'primitive' survival, it is actively developed by consciousness as the best way of criticizing the shadow (*ibid.*, para. 474). For the Native Americans, the shadow is integrated collectively by their appreciation and repudiation of the 'bad' behaviour of the trickster. The myth consists of stories (narrative)

that mobilize the imperative to come to terms with inferiority. The engagement with the capacity for destructive behaviour occurs, for the Native Americans, by collective immersion in the *story* as a dynamic ingredient of the moral evolution of the group.

Modern Europe, on the other hand, is weaker than Native American culture because it has lost the narrative mobilization of inferiority and is left mired in its own repression of the irrational. The logocentric desire for transcendence of earthy matter condenses the fertility of trickster narrative to immobile shadow image. Modernity lost a valuable psychic resource in abandoning its trickster/medial fool myth. The only *solution* to the static imprisonment of the shadow in image (as opposed to its dialogical integration as image enacts a dialogue with narrative frame), is to recognize the potential role of history as the location of multiple stories of questionable human activity. Connect the narrative resources we call 'history' to the inner shadow image and you have the potential for a psychological narrative of ethics and relating: a myth.

History, Jung suggests, is the modern world's trickster narrative. It works by enabling the past to remain past, by keeping it before consciousness as a possible present: that is how conscious discrimination works. Where the myth is an active social phenomenon it is a structure by which the individual modern psyche is dialogically engaged with the collective. Jung shows that psychic *images* are the method by which the individual psyche is imbued in the collective. Images are *animated* by a dialogical relation to a cultural narrative that 'frames', makes possible, their meanings. Hence his study in the 'Trickster' and 'Kore' essays of how myth consists of psychic images gaining living energy through a narrative framework. Such a dialogical relationship of image and narrative develops collective consciousness by its very participation in the collective unconscious as the source of the shaping energy of archetypal images. Mythical narrative without psychic images would appear comparatively uninvolved and meaningless. Meaning is both created and found, here in the interaction between 'inner' image and 'outer' narrative structure. The strategy that Jung adopts for his 'Trickster' text, that of the frame, is how he regards the individual psyche as working in the collective space of a social group: powerful narratives, 'frame' and make 'intelligible' inner contents through dialogical relationship. The result is myth. So myths animate the dialogical psyche: they are made of images made psychologically dynamic by interacting with framing narratives. The trickster is a signifier of a certain type of 'framing' which enables narrative to be flexible and multiple.

So this is not just an essay about trickster/goddess consciousness, it is also an exercise in it, designed to incorporate the reader. Therefore it is unsurprising that the most urgent address occurs in the middle. If the trickster is a means of coming to terms with the modern shadow, then it becomes a matter of ethics. Without the self-consciousness only possible through individuation with the inner 'other', the image, the outer 'other', such as another person, may be subjected to devastating 'mindless' violence. Jung evokes the modern soldier

who does not know how to subject his orders to ethical scrutiny (Jung 1954, para. 479). Since he is unable to connect his inner being of images with outer social reality (via a powerful narrative), he is unable to function as more than an empty machine obeying orders.

Yet further in the essay, Jung's tricky writing can also be used to limit the potential narrative disruption caused by the trickster-goddess to Christian Logos symbolism. Here we see a more conservative example of how images can be 'framed', in all the ambiguity of the term. Jung, ever keen to retain masculine Logos symbolism as dominant, manages to mitigate the revolutionary nature of the trickster-goddess by 'framing' her in Christian narrative.

Only out of disaster can the longing for the saviour arise – in other words, the recognition and unavoidable integration of the shadow create such a harrowing situation that nobody but a saviour can undo the tangled web of fate.

(Jung 1954, para. 487)

Here the pivot from trickster *myth* to shadow *image* is overtly onto Christian ground: it enables the narrative frame to switch to Christian Logos. Explicitly, the protean possibilities of narrative myth (of the immanent goddess) are *converted* into a more rational dialectic of shadow versus saviour-hero (of monotheistic transcendence). Symptomatically, the saviour challenges the *woven* nature of trickster-goddess's relating to many voices. He, heroic in his transcendence, *undoes* the tangled web of fate. After this moment, the essay offers three more arguments: on the level of the individual the problem of the shadow is answered by the anima as relatedness; that consciousness is the most important aspect of the history of the collective; that as myth and image, the shadow contains within it the possibility of conversion into its opposite (*ibid.*, para. 488).

The shadow's tricky reversals betray its legacy of goddess consciousness in relating both positively and negatively to the irrational psyche. By bringing 'the saviour' in as one who unpicks a web, Jung provides Christian heroic consciousness undoing the trickster-goddess's relational web of the universe. The function of relating in consciousness is feminized and relegated by being assigned to the anima; it is essential, yet positioned as serving the succeeding figure of the wise old man/monotheistic self in the heroic narrative. Nevertheless the final note about the persistence of psychic reversals is yet another twist in the analogous, reflective, slippery parallel game of culture being read through an-other. The trickster-goddess is still in the frame.

### Conclusion: animated writing

In conclusion, I am suggesting that Logos and Eros are more than creation myths manifesting as forms of consciousness in Jung's work. They are also reading practices that construct and deconstruct rational knowledge. Logos is

a descendant of Christian exegesis that produces and exalts reason, so shaping the dominant mode of western science. Eros is immanent reading dependent upon multiple ways of relating to the text. Reading erotically is to inhabit the multiplicity of textual matter, what cultural theorists call reading post-structurally. I call this reading 'textual animism' as an alternative model to monotheism's transcendence.

Textual animism is *animated* writing. Jung as a trickster writer both describes and performs his psyche in writing. The writing itself could be regarded as an attempt to heal modernity in seeking to incorporate the reader into a new alignment of Logos-god and Eros-goddess. So I am suggesting that we need to read Jung animistically as well as monotheistically, to enter many dialogues as well as to look for rational meanings and concepts.

In so doing we will be participating in a dialogical exchange between Logos and Eros that is necessary for ethical relating. For example, Jung shows that history becomes ethical if it is read *both* ways: for rational arguments and as remembered in the psyche. Ultimately, Jung sees Eros and Logos as never entirely separable. For modernity to survive, they must be brought into a more explicit embrace. The hero myth as the model for modern consciousness is fatally flawed if it depends upon straightforward conquest of the other. Jung the conservative believes he can restore 'him' by reforming him as both transcendent of the other and in a dialogue with its many voices. So the return of the hero as saviour is not the restoration of monotheism at the expense of goddess-animism, but a dialogical web structured between the two modes of conscious being. Jung is never more true to the trickster than in his simultaneous attempt to shore up masculine modernism while at the same time drawing in a post-structuralist ontology as immanent to his textual matter.

Despite the persistence of the hero myth in Jung's preference for masculine symbolism, the trickster's synchronous activities secrete goddess consciousness back into modernity as a necessary ethical process. For it is not only the world that is made from the body of a god; Jung weaves the body of the goddess into his writing so that the reader can be part of its dialogical making of meaning. His response to modernity and science is to promote immanent reading, to incorporate the reader into acts of creation.

---

#### TRANSLATIONS OF ABSTRACT

Cet article cherche à montrer comment des études littéraires peuvent apporter une contribution aux débats cliniques en proposant des méthodes différentes de lecture et d'interprétation des œuvres de Jung. Premièrement, dans la mesure où les textes constituent le véhicule majoritaire par lequel les idées jungiennes sont transmises et travaillées, la recherche littéraire offre des méthodes pour examiner la façon que nous avons de lire pour établir l'orthodoxie et faire autorité. Deuxièmement, regarder la façon dont Jung a effectivement écrit est un point de vue inestimable. Jung dans ses écrits dessine le portrait d'une psyché dynamique en action. Ses œuvres ne parlent pas

seulement d'une psyché archétypale créative, elles mettent en acte et font jouer cette créativité dans la façon qu'il a d'utiliser les mots. Cette richesse de jeu démontrée dans l'ensemble de son œuvre en fait un exemple d'écrivain fabriquant de mythe de la psyché; quelqu'un qui absorbe les énergies créatrices inconscientes dans son écriture d'une façon qui dissout les barrières culturelles de la modernité entre science et art.

De plus, les constituants esthétiques de l'écriture de Jung ne sont pas une décoration pour ses idées. C'est plutôt que ses qualités «littéraires» sont elles-mêmes des formes d'argument sur la fragilité de la subjectivité moderne. S'appuyant sur les études de Jung sur la synchronicité et le trickster, l'article montrera que ces œuvres sont des réponses à des crises qui sont en rapport les unes avec les autres, et que rencontrent encore les cliniciens et les chercheurs de nos jours: le rôle problématique du mythe du héros en tant que récit d'individuation, la nature de la «science», et de la crise dans la modernité occidentale qui est en recherche désespérée d'une guérison psychique. Cet article montrera que alors que le texte sur la synchronicité cherche à permettre une individuation de la science en ajoutant un Eros «féminin» à son axe du Logos, le texte sur le trickster tend à améliorer la modernité en lui procurant des cadres de travail permettant de rendre visible du matériel généralement marginal ou ignoré. Dans ces textes, Jung essaie de donner une nouvelle jeunesse au monde moderne, en reconnectant les systèmes symboliques traditionnels avec la psyché à travers l'utilisation du mythe comme langage de lien psychique.

---

Die Autorin versucht zu zeigen, wie die Literaturwissenschaft etwas zu den klinischen Debatten beitragen kann, indem sie unterschiedliche Methoden anbietet, um Jungs Werke zu lesen und zu interpretieren. Zunächst bilden die Texte die Mittel, mit denen Jungs Ideen übermittelt und bearbeitet werden können, literarische Forschungsarbeit zeigt Methoden der Untersuchung über die Art und Weise, wie wir im Dienste der Autorität und der Orthodoxie lesen. Zweitens ist es von unschätzbarem Wert, zu beobachten, in welcher Weise Jung tatsächlich schrieb. Jung stellt in seinen Schriften eine dynamische Psyche *in Aktion* dar. Seine Arbeit behandelt nicht nur die kreative archetypische Psyche; in der Art, wie er die Wörter benutzt, stellen sie seine Kreativität dar. Der Reichtum an Spielfreude, der in den gesammelten Werken zum Vorschein kommt, ist ein Beispiel eines Autors als Mythenerschaffer der Psyche; ein Autor, der die unbewussten kreativen Energien in seinem Schreiben aufnimmt – in einer Art, die die kulturellen Grenzen der Wissenschaft und Kunst in der modernen Welt auflöst.

Darüber hinaus ist die ästhetische Komponente in seinem Schreiben keine bloße Dekoration seiner Ideen. Vielmehr sind seine 'literarischen' Qualitäten selbst Formen des Arguments über den fragilen Status der modernen Subjektivität. Anhand seiner Artikel über 'Synchronizität' und den 'Trickster' wird gezeigt, dass diese Artikel Antworten auf drei in Beziehung stehende Krisen bieten, die bis zum heutigen Tage die Kliniker und Gelehrten beschäftigen: die problematische Rolle des Heldenmythos als Narrativ der Individuation; die Beschaffenheit der 'Wissenschaft' und eine Krise in der westlichen Modernität an sich – in verzweifelter Bedürftigkeit nach psychischer Heilung. Es wird gezeigt, wie das Schreiben über Synchronizität versucht, die Wissenschaft zu individualisieren, indem der feminine 'Eros' der Ausrichtung des Logos hinzugefügt wird. Der Essay über den Trickster soll die Modernität abmildern, indem er einen Rahmen bereitstellt, um sonst marginales und ausgeschlossenes Material sichtbar zu machen. In diesen Arbeiten versucht Jung, die moderne Welt zu verjüngen, indem er

traditionelle, symbolische Systeme mit der Psyche verbindet – durch den Mythos als eine Sprache des psychischen Bezogenseins.

---

Lo scopo di questo lavoro è di dimostrare come una cultura letteraria possa contribuire a dibattiti clinici offrendo modi diversi di leggere e interpretare i lavori di Jung. In primo luogo, dal momento che i testi formano molti dei significati con cui le idee junghiane vengono trasmesse e pensate, la ricerca letteraria offre dei metodi per analizzare il modo con cui leggiamo secondo l'autorità e l'ortodossia. In secondo luogo, è inestimabile il modo in cui Jung di fatto scrive. Jung, nei suoi scritti, descrive una psiche dinamica in azione. I suoi lavori non sono solo su una psiche creativa archetipica, essi sottolineano e rappresentano tale creatività nel modo in cui egli usa le parole. L'abbondante gocosità dimostrata in *The Collected Works* è un esempio di uno scrittore in quanto costruttore di miti per la psiche; di uno che assorbe nei suoi scritti le energie creative inconscie in modo da dissolvere i moderni limiti culturali della scienza e dell'arte.

Inoltre, le componenti estetiche degli scritti junghiani non sono una decorazione delle sue idee. Piuttosto, le sue qualità 'letterarie' sono esse stesse modi per argomentare sul fragile stato della moderna soggettività. Usando i suoi saggi sulla 'Sincronicità' e sul 'Trickster', questo scritto mostrerà come tali lavori siano la risposta a tre crisi che ancora oggi i clinici e gli studiosi devono affrontare: il problematico ruolo del mito dell'eroe come un racconto individuativo, la natura della scienza e la crisi nella stessa modernità occidentale alla disperata ricerca di una salute psichica. : In questo scritto si mostrerà che laddove gli scritti sulla Sincronicità tendono a individuare una scienza aggiungendo un Eros femminile ai pregiudizi del Logos, il saggio sul Trickster tende a migliorare la modernità fornendo delle strutture che rendano visibile ciò che è marginale o ciò che è escluso. In questi lavori Jung cerca di rinnovare il mondo moderno connettendo con la psiche sistemi simbolici tradizionali mediante il mito, in quanto linguaggio che si relaziona alla psiche.

---

Este artículo busca mostrar cómo los conocimientos literarios pueden contribuir a los debates clínicos al ofrecer diferentes métodos de leer e interpretar las obras de Jung. En primer lugar, considerando que los textos constituyen gran parte de los medios a través de los cuales se transmiten y trabajan las ideas junguianas, la investigación literaria nos ofrece métodos de examinar nuestra forma de leer para identificar la autoridad y la ortodoxia. En segundo lugar, es invaluable ver la forma en que Jung escribió. En sus escritos, Jung representa una psique dinámica en acción. Sus obras no sólo se refieren a la psique arquetípica creativa, la forma misma en que Jung usa las palabras, escenifica y representa esta creatividad en el uso de la palabra. El manejo de un lenguaje rico y lúdico que Jung muestra en sus Obras Completas es un ejemplo de un escritor que crea mitos de la psique; un escritor cuyos escritos absorben energías creativas inconscientes de una manera que disuelve las fronteras culturales que la modernidad ha colocado entre la ciencia y el arte.

Además, el componente estético en los escritos de Jung no está ahí para decorar sus ideas. Sus cualidades 'literarias' en sí mismas son más bien formas de argumentar sobre el frágil estado de la subjetividad moderna. Con base en los ensayos de Jung sobre 'La sincronicidad', y el 'Embaucador (Trickster)', el artículo muestra que estas obras son respuesta a tres crisis relacionadas entre sí que siguen enfrentando los clínicos y los

académicos de hoy: el rol problemático del mito del héroe como una narrativa sobre la individuación, la naturaleza de la 'ciencia', y una crisis en la modernidad occidental en sí misma en la necesidad desesperada de alcanzar la salud psíquica. El artículo muestra que mientras que el escrito sobre la sincronicidad busca individuar a la ciencia agregándole un Eros 'femenino' a la unilateralidad de su Logos, el ensayo sobre el embaucador (el Trickster) está diseñado para mejorar la modernidad al proporcionar un marco que haga visible el material marginado o excluido. En estas obras, Jung trata de rejuvenecer al mundo moderno a través de volver a conectar los tradicionales sistemas simbólicos con la psique a través del mito como lenguaje de la relación psíquica.

## References

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. M. Holquist, trans. C. Emerson & M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Baring, A. & Cashford, J. (1991). *The Myth of the Goddess: Evolution of an Image*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Arkana.
- Barthes, R. (1968). 'Death of the author'. In (1989/2001) *Modern Literary Theory: A Reader*, eds. P. Rice & P. Waugh. London: Arnold, 2001, 185–9.
- Jung, C. G. (1922). 'On analytical psychology in relation to poetry'. CW 15.
- (1925). 'Marriage as a psychological relationship'. CW 17.
- (1951). 'The syzygy: anima and animus'. CW 9ii.
- (1952). 'Synchronicity: an acausal connecting principle'. CW 8.
- (1954). 'On the psychology of the trickster-figure'. CW 9i.
- (1963/1983). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, London: Fontana.
- Main, R. (2004). *The Rupture of Time: Synchronicity and Jung's Critique of Modern Western Culture*. London & New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Manes, C. (1992). 'Nature and silence'. In *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*, eds. C. Glotfelty & H. Fromm. Athens & London: The University of Georgia Press, 1996, 15–29.
- Rowland, S. (2005). *Jung as a Writer*. London & New York: Routledge.
- White Jnr., L. (1967). 'The historical roots of our ecologic crisis'. In *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*, eds. C. Glotfelty & H. Fromm. Athens & London: The University of Georgia Press, 1996, 3–14.

Copyright of *Journal of Analytical Psychology* is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.