

The Archetypal Symbolism of Animals

Lectures given at the C.G. Jung Institute, Zurich, 1954–1958 A series edited by Emmanuel Kennedy-Xypolitas



The Archetypal Symbolism of Animals

Lectures given at the C.G. Jung Institute, Zurich, 1954–1958

Barbara Hannah

Edited by David Eldred

Chiron Publications Wilmette, Illinois

© 2006 by Stiftung für Jung'sche Psychologie and Emmanuel KennedyXypolitas. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher, Chiron Publications, P. O. Box 68, Wilmette, Illinois 60091.

Book and cover design by Peter Altenberg Chapter Illustrations by Carsten Scheinpflug Printed in the United States of America

Excerpts from the following texts are reproduced with permission: Jung, C.G., *Symbols of Transformation. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 5. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1967.

Jung, C.G., *Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 9ii. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1969.

Jung, C.G., *Mysterium Coniunctionis. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 14. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1970.

Jung, C.G., *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 8. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1970. Jung, C.G., *Dream Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1984. Jung, C.G., *Visions*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1997.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The archetypal symbolism of animals : lectures given at the C.G. Jung Institute, Zurich, 1954/1958 / Barbara Hannah ; edited by David Eldred.

p. cm. — (Polarities of the Psyche)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-888602-33-3

1. Symbolism (Psychology) 2. Archetype (Psychology) 3. Animals—

Psychological aspects. 4. Psychoanalysis. I. Eldred, David. II. Title. BF175.5.S95H36 2006

156—dc22

2005032172

Contents

Foreword of the Series Editor vii Editor's Preface. xi

 The Archetypal Symbolism of the Cat, Dog, and Horse [I. Introduction 3](#)

[II. The Cat: Notes on the Biological Background 20](#)

[III. The Cat: Maternal and False Nature 25](#)

[IV. The Cat: Rage and Emotion 28](#)

[V. The Cat: Coziness and Laziness 38](#)

[VI. The Cat: Independence and Self-Reliance. 41](#)

[VII. The Dog: Notes on the Biological Background 54](#)

[VIII. The Dog: Friend and Betrayer 58](#)

[IX. The Dog: Guide and Trickster. 71](#)

[X. The Dog: Watchdog and Thief 78](#)

[XI. The Dog: Healer and Corpse Eater 85](#)

[XII. The Horse: Notes on the Biological Background. 90](#)

[XIII. The Horse: Obedient Worker and Unruly Spirit 95](#)

[XIV. The Horse: Helper and Victim 99](#)

[XV. The Horse: Imparter of Vitality and Destruction. 112](#)

[XVI. The Horse: Panic and ESP 116](#)

[XVII. Conclusion of the Cat, Dog, and Horse 122](#)

 The Archetypal Symbolism of the Serpent

[XVIII. Introduction to the Symbolism of the Serpent. 129](#)

[XIX. The Serpent: Notes on the Biological Background . . . 152](#)

[XX. The Serpent as Demon of the Earth, Darkness, and Evil. 168](#)

[XXI. The Serpent in Christianity 193](#)

[XXII. The Serpent as Spirit of Light and Wisdom 202](#)

[XXIII. The Serpent as the Uroboros of Cyclic Life. 227](#)

[XXIV. The Serpent as a Symbol of Ghosts and Renewal 230](#)

[XXV. The Serpent as Union of the Opposites and Communication with the Divine 236](#)

 The Archetypal Symbolism of the Lion

[XXVI. Introduction to the Lion 267](#) [XXVII. The Lion: Notes on the Biological Background. 270](#) [XXVIII. The Lion as a Solar Symbol. 275](#) [XXIX. The Lion as a Symbol of Order. 282](#) [XXX. The Lion as a Symbol of Urge, Desire, and Possession 309](#) [XXXI. The Lion: Sublimation and Transformation 321](#) [XXXII. The Lion as Resurrection and Spiritual Mana 340](#)

 The Archetypal Symbolism of the Bull and the Cow [Editorial Foreword. 346](#) [XXXIII. The Bull and Cow: Notes on the Biological Background 347](#)

[XXXIV. The Bull as Generative Power, Strength, and Fertility 351](#)

[XXXV. The Bull as a Symbol of Impetus and Piercing 355](#)

[XXXVI. The Bull as the Constant Victim 358](#)

[XXXVII. The Bull as Spiritual Regeneration. 363](#)

[XXXVIII. The Cow as Mother 372](#)

[XXXIX. The Cow as Nurturer and Provider 376](#)

[XL. The Docility of the Cow 379](#)

[XLI. The Cow as the Feminine par Excellence 382](#)

[Notes 387](#)

[Sources 395](#) [Index 401](#)

Foreword of the Series Editor

The focus of the series “Polarities of the Psyche” is the broad theme of the opposites in the psyche, which are, according to the great Swiss psychiatrist Carl Gustav Jung, the basis of every life process. Apart from Jung himself, there may be no Jungian analyst who was more concerned with the opposites in human nature than Barbara Hannah, who was both a pupil and a close friend of Jung.

The Archetypal Symbolism of Animals is the second volume in the series “Polarities in the Psyche” and contains lectures of Barbara Hannah on the symbolic meaning of some domestic and wild animals. She noted that “the study of the symbolism of animals is indeed a great need of our age, for – broadly speaking – animals represent [various aspects of] instincts, and our time is notoriously badly divorced from its instincts. We call all this progress, and it does make life easier, but a modern kitchen nevertheless is very symbolic of the distance at which we live from nature. One of the symptoms of the need to reestablish connection with our instincts is the frequency with which animals appear in dreams. This is indeed no modern phenomenon, for the motif of the animal is

viii *The Archetypal Symbolism of Animals*

one of the earliest and most common themes in myths and fairy tales all over the world. But it is above all the dream that obliges the modern psychologist to study the subject of animals, primarily in mythology and fairy tales, in order to find what their meaning as dream symbols really is.... [A]lthough it is very difficult to interpret [animal] symbolism adequately, animals usually point to a very important fact when they turn up in a dream, a fact that can almost always be understood, however, by the method of amplification.”

Like Native peoples, Jung felt that the animal was sublime, that it was indeed the “divine” side of the human psyche. Animals live much more in contact with a “secret” order within nature itself and – far more than man – live closely connected with the “absolute knowledge” of the unconscious. In contradistinction to man, the animal is the living being that follows its own inner laws beyond good and evil. And herein lies the superiority of the animal. Presumably out of similar reflections Marie-Louise von Franz expressed the idea that the utmost fulfillment is that human ritual follows the order of the animal, for here we experience absolute harmony with nature. The greatest consciousness, she once said, “is like a return to the animal, but on a higher level.” Both Jung and von Franz set a premium value on the study of animal symbolism and felt that it was an indispensable tool for the correct interpretation of the representations of animals as they appear in dreams, visions, spontaneous paintings, autonomous fantasies, active imagination, and so forth.

Apart from discussing extensively the symbolism and psychological meaning of the cat, dog, horse, serpent, lion, bull, and cow, Barbara Hannah lays great importance – particularly in her introduction – on the images of animals in general, for they represent instinctive forces with which we have lost touch in our rational days – a terrible falling-off from the days of the Asclepian physicians, who even used actual serpents and dogs to determine the diagnosis of their patients.

One great merit of Hannah’s lectures lies in the fact that, with an abundance of amplificatory material, she illustrates both the positive and negative sides of these animals as archetypal images and

Foreword of the Series Editor i x

emphasizes that we have the choice of experiencing either side of the archetype. Regarding the importance of being on good terms with the animal in us, Hannah once said that “We can make a great effort and become conscious of an animal, say the lion, in ourselves, and then there is every hope of this image developing positively, or we can remain unconscious of it. But it will still function [within us, and], will possess us inevitably without our knowledge.”

Speaking about the numinous side of the animal within, Marie-Louise von Franz once noted that it was beyond human capacity to actually deal with this side, and that “the only thing to do is to accept the animal as a divine and secret mystery, a divine secret. If this attitude is lacking, if there is an attempt to draw the divine into the human realm, there can only be a catastrophe.”

Throughout her lectures Barbara Hannah illustrates how, in the light of consciousness, archetypal images of animals are positive and helpful, and how our animal nature can become the psychic source of renewal and natural wholeness. However, if allowed to go off on their own into the unconscious, then the archetypal images – and forces – of animals become negative and destructive, bringing chaos and war.

In presenting her material on animal symbolism, Hannah was fond of quoting the incident in which Jung was asked in a discussion at the Psychological Club of Zurich whether he thought that there would be an atomic war. Jung replied that it depended on how many people could stand the tension of the opposites in themselves. If enough people could, he added, then we might just avoid the worst – as we had, up until now, mercifully been able to do. But if not, then he feared the opposites would sooner or later clash in atomic war and this would mean the end of our whole civilization. All we can do from the standpoint of the archetypal images of animals, Barbara Hannah once said, “is to do our best to become ever more conscious of the extreme opposites that they contain within us and thus perhaps also lay an ‘infinitesimal grain on the scales of humanity’s soul.’ ”

Emmanuel Kennedy-Xypolitas

Editor's Preface

Attending Barbara Hannah's lectures was simply a pleasure. One could sit back and enjoy the presentation and development of the material quickened by her warmth, her dramatic touch, and her humor and irony. One had no trouble following her lectures from start to finish. And one's mind had no need to wander. She was well versed in her material, regularly added spontaneous reflections and stories, and ad-libbed freely. Never one to be all that impressed by the long-winded and erudite, Barbara Hannah had the gift of bringing analytical psychology to life for both the learned and those who were new to Jungian thought.

After studying the original handwritten notes that Hannah used for her lectures, it seems likely that her book *The Cat, Dog, and Horse Lectures* was based on stenographic records written by a member of the audience (Hannah 1992). Discrepancies and errors in the transcription were found to occur on numerous occasions. There is no question that Dean Frantz's text is a commendable rendition of these transcriptions, capturing the best

xii *The Archetypal Symbolism of Animals*

of Hannah's nature and spirit. But in this present edition of her lectures on the archetypal symbolism of now seven animals, the editorial board has set new guidelines.

In one sense, Hannah herself set the main editorial parameters of this edition of her work. In her own preface to Jung's E.T.H. lectures on St. Ignatius, she writes: "As the written word seems to me something totally different to the spoken word, I have made no attempt to make a verbatim report or a literal translation. I have again aimed at a clear account of the main concept of each lecture" (Jung 1939b). Although the editorial approach for this present edition is far more conservative, it is in this spirit that four editorial priorities have been designated.

The first priority was to preserve the content and spirit of Hannah's work along with her personal weave of intellectual discussion and warm colloquial style. The second priority was to make adjustments to the psychological concepts discussed to meet the standards of a written manuscript. The third priority entails adjusting syntax, punctuation, and the flow of ideas when appropriate. Minor changes in the order of sentences serve to unify and improve the clarity and development of her analyses. Hannah set supplementary information directly into her lecture. When appropriate, such inserts have been moved to footnotes. The final priority was to revise the layout so that the topics, not the dates of the lectures, determine the chapter format.

Barbara Hannah wrote two introductions to the symbolism of animals: one for her lectures on the cat, dog, and horse given in 1954, and one for her lectures on the serpent and the lion, which took place three years later. In the latter introduction to the serpent and lion, Hannah repeated much of the material in the introduction to the first lecture series while she clarified, deepened and expanded a few of her earlier points. In this present volume certain details of the latter lecture series have been moved forward and synthesized with the former. In addition to these two introductions, Hannah also wrote an introduction to animal symbolism in her lecture on "The Cat as an Archetypal Image"

Editor's Preface xiii

given at the Psychological Club, Zurich, on June 2, 1973. Several exemplary points from this introduction, along with revisions of Jung's concepts that were clarified during the two decades separating the lectures and additional notes on the symbolism of the cat, have also been integrated into this present volume.

Many citations from the works of Jung were not available in English at the time of these lectures; thus Hannah provided the translations herself. At other times she had access to translations that were prior to the work of R.F.C. Hull. All of the citations from Jung have been revised to correspond to the contemporary standard edition of his Collected Works.

In order to consolidate syntax, grammar, and punctuation, the editorial style is based on the guidelines set in C.G. Jung's Collected Works. Yet in order to meet the standards of the twenty-first century, a simplified orthography is used based on *Collins Word Power*, published by Harper and Row in 2000.

Bracketed material within quotations is by Barbara Hannah. When a discussion in a book is cited without exact page numbers, the book was not available to the editors. Texts mentioned without any bibliographical reference whatsoever were not able to be located. More recent publication dates of books that Hannah referred to are given whenever possible.

David Eldred

Zurich, April 2004

The Archetypal Symbolism of the Cat, Dog, and Horse

Barbara Hannah's lecture series on the archetypal symbolism of the cat, dog, and horse was given at the C.G. Jung Institute, Zurich, Switzerland. The first lecture occurred on April 26, 1954, and the final lecture on June 1, 1954.

|

Introduction

Lecture One: April 26, 1954¹

From the viewpoint of the psychology of C. G. Jung we can say that animals generally represent instincts when we meet them in dreams and active imagination. Each animal represents a different instinct, or, if you prefer, another aspect of instinct. As we discuss our separate animals and, in particular, the attributes associated with them in their mythology, we shall see how multifaceted they are and that their symbolic meaning necessarily depends on the context in the dream and the conscious situation of the dreamer. Speaking in general about animal symbolism, Jung says:

Theriomorphic symbols are very common in dreams and other manifestations of the unconscious. They express the psychic level of the content in question; that is to say, such contents are at a stage of unconsciousness that is as far from human consciousness as the psyche of an animal. Warmblooded or cold-blooded vertebrates of all kinds, or even invertebrates, thus indicate the degree of unconsciousness. It is important for [psychotherapists] to know this, because these contents can produce, at all levels, symptoms that are localized to the corresponding organic or physiological functions. For instance, the symptoms may be distinctly correlated with the cerebrospinal and the sympathetic nervous system. (Jung 1969, par. 291)

This gives us a very good idea of why it is so vitally important for anyone who is dealing with the products of the unconscious to study the symbolism of animals.

It is too cheap to hang a label around the neck of an animal and always take the cat, for instance, as a woman's catty feminine nature or as the anima cat, or to mention witchcraft vaguely, as the cat is undoubtedly a witch animal, a stigma it shares, however, with a great many other small animals such as hares, mice, rats, snakes, toads, spiders, ravens, crows, and so on. The cat does have a great deal to do with feminine nature, and the anima is very often a cat, but it has many other shades of meaning that appear in its actual characteristics and still more in its mythology. One needs to know something at least about these nuances of meaning before one can be at all sure what a cat is likely to represent in individual dreams and fantasies. Hanging a label about the animal's neck is really as bad as the labeling system of the Freudians, which we are always ready to criticize. An animal – and every animal is different – has at bottom something intensely mysterious that lies beyond our powers of comprehension. By considering the animal itself as we know it along with its mythology, we can attempt to get some idea of the quality and meaning of its specific mystery.

There is to me generally something relaxing or reassuring in dreaming about an animal, although of course this again depends on the context. But one often gets the feeling of a return to nature and of being reunited with something very healing.

In his essay on the transcendent function Jung says that to go back to nature in the primitive sense would be a mere regression, but to strive to reach it through psychological development is something quite different, for this time it means doing consciously what we previously did unconsciously, consciousness being “continually widened through the confrontation with previously unconscious contents” (Jung 1970b, par. 193). Therefore it is obvious that if we follow our animals back into nature, we must on no account lose our hard-won consciousness. If we can achieve this, however, we shall find it restful, for we shall be going with the stream instead of battling against it.

Except in very rational situations, we are able to do little without the help of our instincts. In fact, one of the most threatening symptoms of the present day is the extent to which many people are divorced from their instincts. The primitive, as you know, can do hardly anything without a sort of *rite d'entrée*. Probably most of you know the story Dr. Jung tells of his courier in Africa whom he asked to take some letters to the post. This messenger simply sat and looked at them and did nothing. Then the “Head Man” came and rushed up to him brandishing his *sjambok* and shouting that the courier had a very important mission as a link between two great Chiefs because the white Chief was sending a message to another great Chief across the sea and the runner was to be the link. The man was so impressed that he just seized the letters and ran ten hours to the post without stopping.

The Curatorium of the C.G. Jung Institute, Küsnacht, Switzerland, asked me to speak on the subject of the symbolism of the cat, dog, and horse. As it is not a theme on which I have been working for years, like the ego and shadow, the animus, active imagination, or the Brontës, I felt a certain reluctance. But I was struck by the fact that these were the three animals with which I have had most to do in my own life, although I should like to have had months instead of a few weeks to prepare the material.

Now as far as our superior functions are concerned, the efforts of many generations have detached a certain amount of energy from the instincts that are under the control of the will; but otherwise we are very much dependent on the instincts. Further, we experience the same phenomenon the moment we touch our inferior function. (I will discuss this later in more detail.) For these reasons, I think we may find it very helpful to study the archetypal images of three animals that represent instincts that, like these animals themselves, are very close to us. Perhaps they are even the closest.

One point about which we must be as clear as possible from the beginning is the difference between instinct and archetype. They could be called two aspects of the same thing, as they have a secret connection that can be exceedingly confusing. For the sake of clarity, therefore, I will read you Dr. Jung's definitions in his article “Instinct and the Unconscious” in *Contributions to Analytical Psychology*:

Instincts are typical modes of action, and wherever we meet with uniform and regularly recurring modes of action and reaction we are dealing with instinct, no matter whether it is associated with a conscious motive or not.... (1978a, par. 273)²

Archetypes are typical modes of apprehension, and wherever we meet with uniform and regularly recurring modes of apprehension we are dealing with an archetype, no matter whether its mythological character is recognized or not. (1978a, par. 280)

As an illustration there is the famous story of Socrates' daemon who whispered to him to turn to the left, by which he escaped being trampled down by a great herd of runaway swine (Jung 1984, 58). We can call this archetypal, for he heard his daemon speaking, that is, he apprehended it from within. But if he had acted blindly, turning into the other street with no idea why, it would have been blind instinct. Instinct is an automatic outer way of behaving and archetype is a disposition for apprehending the inner meaning.

In the Visions Seminar of Autumn 1930 Jung repeatedly speaks about how animals often represent the lower instinctive forces in man, for example, how often the horse actually knows the way when the rider feels completely lost. Or how helpful animals in fairy tales and myths save the hero by showing him something nearby and self-evident that he just has not seen; sometimes they do even more and bring the whole solution. It is these lower instinctive forces in man that help:

...in situations where nothing else helps, when your mind leaves you completely. There are certain difficult situations in life when everything you have learned, everything you have slowly built up, crumbles away, nothing helps.... So people who can follow their instincts [in certain situations] are much better protected than by all the wisdom of the world. (Jung 1997, 133)

Earlier, in the same seminar, he gives a practical example of a woman who was working with him and who had suicidal ideas. She had made up her mind to throw herself into the lake but on her way saw a lovely pair of shoes in a shop, and after buying them her wish to die was gone, her

melancholy lifted (Jung 1997, 132f).

Jung likens this to a camel that might have passed her in the desert and shown her the way she had completely lost. In all natural situations the instincts are far better protection than all the intellectual wisdom in the world (although in most civilized situations we require the mind, as instinct alone would only lead us deeper into the soup). It is always a case of Scylla and Charybdis, for if we stay too long with our instincts we might indulge in them and lose our consciousness entirely, and if we live entirely in the mind, we are lost in the natural situations of which our lives largely consist.

Jung often speaks of the piety of animals and of how much nearer they live to God's will – to their true nature – than we do. He frequently quotes the logion in the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus where Christ is asked what draws us to the Kingdom of Heaven and gives the answer: the fowls of the heavens, all the beasts upon and under the earth, and the fishes of the sea. In the Visions Seminar he says:

That means the instincts, one could almost say the blind instincts; the way of nature will bring you quite naturally where you have to go. This is the idea of Tertullian, *anima naturaliter christiana*, the soul is naturally Christian; in other words, a natural process leads one to the Christian formulation. (Jung 1997, 402f)³

This, of course, applies to the people whose natural law coincides with Christianity. Jung adds later that if you follow the way of nature, you will quite naturally come to your own law.

Then comes the question: what is the law of man? According to preconceived ideas, man is all wrong, sinful, little better than an earthworm. But that is an absolutely wrong idea. Who created the religions of the world? Who produced Christ? Who produced the Buddha? All that is the natural growth of man. If left to himself, he can bring about his own salvation quite naturally; he has always produced symbols that redeemed him. So if we follow the laws that are in our own nature, they will lead us to the right end. (Jung 1997, 403)

He goes on to point out that this is just what active imagination can do for us. Our fantasies do not lead us straight to hell (unless we indulge in them and use active imagination the wrong way) but, if we learn to trust our own experience, it will, accordingly to the natural law, lead us to a state of completeness, to what we really are. I must emphasize that it is not a case of simply following the instinct, but of seeing the meaning of it. In the spring session of his Visions Seminar in 1933 Jung says:

So the original unconscious primitive condition of man is a sort of rock that contains gold, and if you put that body through such a chemical – or in this case psychological

– treatment, the rock will yield gold; that is an analogy for the so-called transformation of instincts. You simply separate certain instincts that were contained in the original unconscious, you lift them up into consciousness, and so you naturally change the original condition of the primitive man – he becomes conscious; consciousness is the gold that has been contained in the unconscious, but so distributed that it was invisible.

There is a lot of gold in the unconscious of primitive man; his unconscious is different from ours, and it shows far more signs of vitality. Our unconscious still occasionally behaves in the same way, but only when we are unconscious as primitive man remains continuously. Through the process of civilization you slowly bring out all the gold and other precious metals that were contained in the original unconsciousness; the philosopher's stone, the diamond, the gold, the *elixir vitae*, the fluid that makes you immortal, etc., all these are symbols for the various substances extracted from that rock of original unconsciousness. Through that process things surely change, but if you make a solution of the gold and pour it into the heap of ashes, in time it will form a rock as before. So if you allow your consciousness to be dissolved, you will create again the original unconsciousness, because everything is there. In this respect we have not transformed the instincts, we have only taken out of them something which they contained. For instinct is the unconscious mental functioning of man, in which there are the possibilities of extracting the gold of consciousness. (Jung 1997, 1065)

We see here the vital importance of keeping consciousness intact. Dr. H.G. Baynes once expressed a similar thing in the simile of a boat. At first, in natural consciousness, you go blindly along with the current until you hit a snag or come to grief in the rapids. Then, warned by the catastrophe, you learn to row against the stream and you usually go on doing that until you collapse with exhaustion. And only then are you ready to learn both ways; that is, to let your boat go with the stream and use your consciousness to steer.

Again, in a discussion of a buffalo in his Visions Seminar Jung says:

You see, in practical psychology, there is always the great and important question for the analyst whether a series of emotions is really correct, whether it is in accordance with the instincts, that is. If it is against the instincts, it is all morbid waste, but if the instincts are with it, you know it is all right. Whatever it is, it is along the line, those emotions belong, they are the right food, the correct magic procedure. And instinct is usually represented by an animal – a dog, a horse, an elephant for instance. In this case, a buffalo is there as a sort of exponent indicating that it is correct, the emotion is backed up by instinct. (Jung 1997, 1059)

Now, in extracting the gold from these emotions that are with the instinct, the first thing to do is to make a difference between yourself and your own emotion. If you cannot do this, you are its prey, and you become a wild animal divorced from consciousness simply dissolved in the unconscious. But when you are no longer identical, then you begin to extract the gold from the heart of your instinct, and here you leave *Manipura* and enter *Anhata* where you catch your first glimpse of the *Purusha*, the first man, the Adam of the *Upanishads*. The Eastern point of view is much more rooted in the instincts than ours. We always think we can command our instincts whereas we really can do nothing of the kind. We can merely learn to accept them and to dis-identify with them and thus extract some of the gold of their archetypal meaning.

Before we turn to our actual animals, I should like to make an attempt to show how such images fit into our psyche and how we are to regard them psychologically. I would like to read you a few passages from Dr. Jung's text on the *Theoretical Reflections Concerning the Essence of the Psychical*:

As we know from direct experience, the light of consciousness has many degrees of brightness, and the egocomplex many gradations of emphasis. On the animal and primitive level there is a mere "luminosity," differing hardly at all from the glancing fragments of a dissociated ego. Here, as on the infantile level, consciousness is not a unity, being as yet uncentered by a firmly knit ego-complex, and just flickering into life here and there wherever outer or inner events, instincts, and affects happen to call it awake. At this stage it is still like a chain of islands or an archipelago. Nor is it a fully integrated whole even at the higher and highest stages; rather, it is capable of indefinite expansion. Gleaming islands, indeed whole continents can still add themselves to our modern consciousness – a phenomenon that has become the daily experience of the psychotherapist. Therefore we would do well to think of ego-consciousness as being surrounded by a multitude of little luminosities. (Jung 1970b, par. 387)

This already gives us a valuable hint as to how we can regard our instincts. Unless they are extraordinarily integrated, instincts are like dim luminosities that encompass and extend beyond the consciousness of our ego-complex, luminosities that can guide us in places where our ego-consciousness is not yet up to the situation.

Jung speaks of how Paracelsus regarded these luminosities, the *lumen naturae* as he and many of the other alchemists call them. Jung says: It strikes me as significant, particularly in regard to our hypothesis of a multiple consciousness and its phenomena, that the characteristic alchemical vision of sparks scintillating in the blackness of the arcane substance should, for Paracelsus, change into the spectacle of the "interior firmament" and its stars. He beholds the darksome psyche as a star-strewn night sky, whose planets and fixed constellations represent the

archetypes in all their luminosity and numinosity. The starry vault of heaven is in truth the open book of cosmic projection, in which are reflected the mythologems, i.e., the archetypes. In this vision astrology and alchemy, the two classical functionaries of the psychology of the collective unconscious, join hands. (Jung 1970b, par. 392)

Paracelsus was directly influenced by Agrippa von Nettesheim, who also assumes a “luminosity of *sensus naturae*” (literally: “sense of nature”). Dr. Marie-Louise von Franz says it actually means being instinctively or intuitively linked with the whole surrounding cosmic nature.⁴ It is from this sense that clairvoyant or prophetic luminosities descend on four-footed animals, birds, or other living creatures and enable them to foresee future events. Agrippa quotes the *sensus naturae* from William of Paris.⁵ Many of William’s works influenced Albertus Magnus. William of Paris assumes that the *sensus naturae* has a higher sense than the usual human form of perception, and he particularly emphasizes that animals possess it as well. The teaching of the *sensus naturae* developed from the earlier idea of a world soul that permeated everything. The world soul represented a natural force that animated all the phenomena of life and the psyche.

Later in his paper on synchronicity Jung speaks of an “absolute knowledge” that is actually a subsequent formulation of this same phenomenon (Jung 1970b, pars. 816–968, in particular pars. 923, 931, & 948). Absolute knowledge is considered to be a type of “knowledge” or “luminosity” inherent in the unconscious and accessible, for instance, through intuition, dreams, visions, foresight, and synchronistic phenomenon. It is not a knowledge mediated by the sense organs or by the ego, but rather a selfsubsistent, inborn “unconscious” knowledge, a quasi “perceiving” of images that constitute formal factors in spontaneous fantasy products. Jung cites Chuang-tzu:

“The state in which ego and non-ego are no longer opposed is called the pivot of Tao.... Tao is obscured when you fix your eye on little segments of existence only.... Outward hearing should not penetrate further than the ear; the intellect should not seek to lead a separate existence, thus the soul can become empty and absorb the whole world. This is Tao that fills this emptiness.... Use your inner eye, your inner ear, to pierce to the heart of things, and have no need of intellectual knowledge.”

Jung adds: “This is obviously an allusion to the absolute knowledge of the unconscious, and to the presence in the microcosm of macrocosmic events.” (Jung 1970b, par. 923)

Curiously enough, when I was preparing this seminar a book was sent to me from America whose central theme is the forgotten and discontinued contact with animals. Allen Boone’s *Kinship with All Life* may be a bit too sentimental and is thus rather annoying to read, but it comes to a very interesting conclusion, namely that we can not only communicate with the higher animals such as dogs or horses but we can also communicate in a certain manner with all life including insects (Boone, 1954). He does not maintain that we can learn the language of an animal, but proposes that there is a guiding principle of all life – he calls it the “Mind of the Universe” or the “Invisible Primary Factor” – and when we can connect to this level within nature and ourselves, we connect as well to all other forms of life making some form of communication with them possible.⁶ Boone relates an anecdote in which he arrived at a gentleman’s agreement between himself and a pernicious horde of ants that was persistently invading his old-fashioned icebox and all the other food in his house. He spoke to them at length, praising their intelligence, concentration, and harmonious working spirit and explained that he would not poison them if they would make a gentlemen’s retreat. That night, after weeks of invasion, they were in fact gone and never came back, even though they continued to invade other houses in the neighborhood. Although such a story is simply ludicrous to our rational ears, when one considers the behavior of animals in the wild regarding some form of absolute deeper communication, and when we consider our own nonrational experiences of this level of connection to a vital source of knowledge in nature and within ourselves, then Boone’s story may not be entirely nonsense. Animals, including insects, are far more pious than we are, for they consistently fulfill God’s will and are always themselves, whereas we use that bit of free will that we have won and then disobey it and deviate from our own innate pattern time and again. And if one regard’s “God’s will” – or the terms that people such as Boone use – I do not think it is going too far to say that the real reason we must give so much attention to animals in our dreams and active imagination is that they represent forms of life that are still in touch with a form of absolute knowledge. The “animals” in our dreams and active imaginations are the ones who can lead us to this source of natural life.

I should like particularly to emphasize Paracelsus’s idea of the dark psyche as an inner firmament. For one could really regard the archetypal images of the cat, dog, and horse as stars in such an inner firmament and say that we intend to study these particular stars through the telescope as well as we can. We shall indeed find that all three of our animals are connected with the moon and the sun. Moreover they appear in the naming of the actual stars. There are the constellations Canis Major (the great dog) and Canis Minor (the little dog), known better for their brightest star, Sirius, the name of which is connected with the Greek adjectives meaning “scorching”; hence the “dog days” of August. The horse also appears in the heavens as Pegasus. I do not think there is an actual cat star – even my usual encyclopedia, Dr. von Franz, did not know one – but the cat’s first cousin, Leo (the lion), appears as the fifth sign of the zodiac and is thus also connected with August.

I should like to recommend Chapter Seven in Jung’s *Geist der Psychologie* (Jung 1947)⁷ on the pattern of behavior and the archetype. There is a passage there that I would like to quote, as it will help us in our study of animal symbolism to distinguish between instincts as patterns of behavior versus the archetypal images and the meaning associated with them. I refer to the passage where Jung speaks of a kind of scale of consciousness. He says:

Psychic process... behaves like a scale along which consciousness “slides.” At one moment it finds itself in the vicinity of instinct, and falls under its influence; at another, it slides along to the other end where spirit predominates and even assimilates the instinctual process most opposed to it. These counter-positions, so fruitful of illusion, are by no means symptoms of the abnormal; on the contrary, they form the twin poles of that psychic one-sidedness which is typical of the normal man of today. Naturally this does not manifest itself only in the spirit / instinct antithesis; it assumes many other forms, as I have shown in my *Psychological Types*.

This “sliding consciousness” is thoroughly characteristic of modern man. But the one-sidedness it causes can be removed by what I have called the “realization of the shadow.” (Jung 1970b, pars. 408f)

We will not go into this aspect of the realization of the shadow (for it belongs in another course) beyond saying that for many people today the shadow is very much connected with the instincts. Or perhaps I should say that it is difficult to get a clear view of the instincts because of their contamination with the unrealized shadow. We also, of course, often meet the opposite phenomenon: people who are on very good terms with their instincts and whose shadow is actually intellectual (the enemy of instinctive behavior). Their shadow constantly tries to confuse them in this respect and twist or destroy their natural reaction. Now, in regard to this scale of psychic processes Jung later says that:

By means of “active imagination” we are put in a position of advantage, for we can then make the discovery of the archetype without sinking back into the instinctual sphere, which would only lead to blank unconsciousness or, worse still, to some kind of intellectual substitute for instinct. This means – to employ once more the simile of the spectrum

– that the instinctual image is to be located not at the red end but at the violet end of the color band. The dynamism of instinct is lodged as it were in the infrared part of the spectrum, whereas the instinctual image lies in the ultraviolet part.... The realization and assimilation of instinct never take place at the red end, i.e., by absorption into the instinctual sphere, but only through integration of the image which signifies and at the same time evokes the instinct, although in a form quite different from the one we meet on the biological level. (Jung 1970b, par. 414)

In other words, the realization and assimilation of the instinct can never occur in our instincts themselves, for when we act out or sink into the instinctive realm, we act blindly. If we want to become conscious of what we are doing and to understand and grasp the meaning of our acts, then our struggle to apprehend the meaning must occur on the archetypal end of the spectrum. Therefore, useful as real animals are to us as an example of living the pattern to which we belong, we can only really learn something about their meaning, or the meaning of our own lives, by apprehending what the absolute knowledge can teach us about their archetypal images at the ultraviolet end of the scale.

Please do not take me too literally when I suggest that we shall meet the real animal – and the blind instinct it represents as such in us – at the infrared end of this scale while we find its archetypal image at the ultraviolet. But I think this way of thinking about animals, instinct and archetype helps us a good deal in trying to grasp and comprehend our difficult theme.

When in great uncertainty as to how to arrange these lectures, it was the cats that came to my rescue in the following dream. I dreamed that:

I walked down a long garden path and went into a large room where I had not been for years. There I found eight cats and was terrified that they had been neglected. But I found a young man was with them and that they were all right and well liked. Four walked in formation and four remained behind.

Now my idea in these lectures is to follow the pattern of the dream something in the way of the crosshairs of a telescope. One year at Ascona Dr. Jung told some of us that we were inclined to be too critical of lectures because we looked at them from our own point of view instead of taking the trouble to find out the point of view of the lecturer and the “crosshairs” that he was using in his telescope. Of course these crosshairs are a human device for setting a scale or limiting the sky and you do not find them in the material itself. So the crosshairs I propose using are the four aspects of the concrete animal in the outer world, more or less corresponding to the instincts themselves. I shall amplify these four aspects by corresponding mythological material and attempt thus to find their archetypal meaning. With the overabundance of material that we have for the dog and the horse, it will be more difficult to keep to the pattern, but for the cat it is easier. The fact that my dream, however, picked on a double quaternity is certainly no accident, for each of the animal instincts is a totality in itself, although it is at the same time only a part of the whole. There would be no Sahara without the individual grain of sand, as Jung says. The microcosm is just a small image of the great macrocosm.

Although *Hundesstammvater und Kerberos* by Freda Kretschmar is one of several excellent books on dogs, there is generally less material on the cat. For instance, it is never mentioned in the Bible, practically ignored in such books as Keller's *Animals of Classical Antiquity*, and seldom occurs in the seminars or books of Dr. Jung.

I have given the dog the middle place in these lectures because he is often nearly related to the cat in mythology and also at times to the horse, whereas so far I have found little or no relationship between the horse and the cat. Also in outer stories I know far more of friendships between cats and dogs (in spite of their traditional enmity) and of dogs and horses than between cats and horses although I have learned of such stories. For instance, there is the story of the racehorse who moped so terribly when he had to be separated from his friend, a cat, that in order to run a race, the cat had to be sent for. But in my experience, cat-and-horse stories are rare.

The cat is the least domesticated of our household animals. According to *Brehm's Tierleben*, it has been a domestic animal for about four thousand years, whereas there were domesticated dogs in the Stone Age. (I turn to Brehm's classic, written in the second half of the nineteenth century, because I do not know of any English book to touch it. Brehm has indeed the rationalism of his age, but he is still much more naïve and direct and his sources more widespread than the detailed specialists of today.) It took a lot more time for the cat to become domesticated because domesticity does not seem to be fully compatible to its character. In contrast to the dog, it is a bit more of an evasive animal and does not submit completely and live with us entirely. It is also more bound to the place than to the person. In a recent lecture at the Institute, Professor Heini Hediger, the Director of the Zoological Gardens in Zurich, spoke of the so-called “elastic band” that held the animal to its territory and of the difficulties animals experience when they go beyond their usual radius. The cat is the only one of the domesticated animals that keeps its elastic band firmly attached to its home. Bombed-out cats in England were a great problem, for although their home might be in ruins, it was difficult to get them away from the place, thus it was quite a problem to feed and care for them. Their ability to find their way home over long distances is proverbial.

The dog, through domestication and his affectionate and loyal nature, has transferred his elastic band to a great extent to his master. There are exceptions, but most dogs will move quite happily with the people they love. Horses are quite as attached to their stables as a cat to its home, but they settle down in a new stable very easily.

These are signs of long domestication, for it is much more difficult to move wild animals. Professor Hediger spoke of the difficulties connected with new arrivals at the zoo. People were apt to think that the animal would be pleased to get loose. But Professor Hediger made it a practice to let them take their time to leave their cage and move into their new quarters. In some cases the cage to which they had become accustomed was even left inside their new enclosure.

As a final note to this introduction I would like to remark that the association of dogs with men and cats with women is practically universal.

The Cat: Notes on the Biological Background

I would like to begin with a few general remarks about the cat as an actual animal. Brehm's *Tierleben* notes that the *Felidae* is a large family of which the domestic cat is only one branch. Lions, tigers, pumas, leopards, panthers, snow leopards, jaguars, cheetahs, ocelots, and so forth are all members of the larger cat family. One may wonder why I use an old-fashioned book like Brehm's when there are many more up-to-date books on the subject. If we were going to study animals purely from the biological or anatomical side, the newer books would no doubt be far better, for there would be a lot of new and valuable discoveries. But our purpose is to discover what animals mean to us psychologically, how they affect us, and how we are to estimate a dog, cat, or horse when we meet them in dreams or active imagination. For this purpose Brehm remains the textbook par excellence, for he has no modern one-sided attitude and portrays a great deal of what man projects onto animals. And this is just what we need to know. One could say that he describes animals not in modern scientific concepts, but in almost anthropomorphic terms. He says, for instance, that certain animals are tricky, fierce, ill-tempered, humorous, and so on, which is of course an application of human terms projected onto an animal that is simply being itself. A tiger is fierce or cruel when we look at it from our point of view, but from its own, it is simply obeying inner laws. When it sees a weaker animal, it sees a providential meal, and to fail to add this tidbit to its larder would be to betray the law of self-preservation. It knows nothing of chivalry, protecting the weak and all that, so what meaning could the words *fierce* or *cruel* have from its point of view? But these words convey something of its nature to us, for they describe how we experience a tiger. We do not even pretend in these lectures to study animals just as they are. Therefore, the animal's anatomy and so on are only of secondary importance to us. These must, of course, be correctly considered; any illusions or delusions could be gravely misleading. It matters very much in a dream for instance whether an animal belongs to a warm- or cold-blooded species, whether it has a cerebrospinal system, what its biological functioning is, and so on; but it is much more important for us to realize the impressions each animal makes on man.

According to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the domestic cat is mainly descended from the Egyptian cat, stemming from North African wild cats, which were domesticated from ancient days. Brehm estimates their domestication at about 2000 bc. A late nineteenth-century naturalist, Dr. Nehring of Berlin, came to the conclusion that our domestic cat has a dual origin stemming from Egypt and Southeast Asia (the latter from a Chinese wild cat that was domesticated). Most authorities, including Brehm, seem to take Egypt as the domestic cat's most likely origin and recognize a possible crossing with European wild cats mainly on account of the color of the pads of the paws. It seems to be most unlikely that our cats, with the possible exception of those with short bushy tails, descend in any marked degree from tamed European wild cats. Thus, for the most part, they are not indigenous to our soil. This Egyptian origin applies to the shorthaired breeds, especially the common tabby. Longhaired Persian or Angora cats, according to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, come from the "manul" cat of the deserts of central Asia. Siamese cats do not seem with certainty to originate in Thailand.

The female cat is a highly maternal animal. The cat seeks a hidden place for her kittens largely because the tomcat, their father, would eat them if he found them. The cat mother is so maternal that she not only looks after her own family in a most exemplary and tender fashion, but as they get older she instructs them in a highly educational manner as well. There are also well-authenticated examples of mother cats who have fed and brought up puppies, fox cubs, baby rabbits, hares, squirrels, rats, and even mice. (Brehm and his small son made such experiments with their cats and confirmed this.)

Brehm, who seems a little prejudiced in favor of cats, denies that they are false or vengeful and says that everything depends on how they are treated. Although he emphasizes their attachment to the house, he assures us that they can be almost as much attached to people. Many cat lovers tell us the same, and I have also met cats that seemed more attached to people than places. No doubt exceptional cats are capable of further domestication, but on the whole they remain amazingly independent.

Despite their touching maternal nature and their affectionate attachment to people, one must not forget that they are also cruel and crafty hunters who will play with their living prey before eating. They are, after all, a small edition of fierce beasts of prey, and if one loves a cat, one must love it as it is and not try to de-cat it. In that respect cats can teach us a lot in our relations to other human beings. It is also a fact (which Brehm ignores) that the cat is almost universally associated with magic and witches. The hook for this projection onto cats is probably the way that they, like serpents (with whom they have other similarities), can cast a sort of spell on their prey. A bird, for instance, is sometimes totally unable to fly away if it is caught in the spell of a cat's eyes.

Cats are, of course, immensely useful in ridding us of mice. Brehm tells us that Lehm made careful experiments and came to the conclusion that when mice were plentiful, every adult cat ate twenty mice a day on an average, that is, 7,330 mice a year. The majority of cats also rid us of rats, although this requires more courage than every cat has. As you know, cats go wild very much more easily than dogs and really take to the woods and become poachers of every kind of game that is not too large for them. In contradistinction to dogs, a cat can support itself alone at large for years. On the other hand, a cat is one of the most cozy and relaxed animals that exist. They are just cozy when it suits them, however, for they are undoubtedly the most independent of all our domesticated animals. Kipling's immortal title of the cat that walked by herself is eternally true of even the most domesticated cat. We human beings may regard them as false, for they change mood in what is to us an inexplicable way.

We might now attempt the crosshairs in our telescope as far as the actual cat – or our instinct that appears as a cat – is concerned. I must emphasize once again, however, that the qualities attributed to cats in the following schema are already to a great extent human projections. A cat is just a cat, a just-so story, and follows its nature all of a piece. Whether it plays, hunts, sleeps, meows, or purrs, it does so completely, with the whole cat. Even in this first series of characteristics ascribed to actual cats, the qualities that we attribute to it are human impressions. The examples in the second series – mainly from mythology – are, of course, still more human projections, just as we find in general in mythology and astrology.

As we will begin to discuss, the cat naturally provides us with hooks that fit its nature. As mentioned before, the fact that they are human projections is very helpful in finding out what they mean to us when we dream of them or have to analyze them in a patient's dream. Therefore, as we reflect on the main qualities of real cats – as we see them – we will go on to their mythology and then fit these aspects as well as we can into our scheme. (Clearly we cannot separate these headings at all sharply. For instance, the mothering cat can suddenly be fierce and cruel as the hunter. And when the kittens leave home, the mothering cat can return to the cat that "walks by itself," becoming again intensely independent.) Finally we will try to see the psychological meaning of our examples and thus get an idea of what the cat may represent in unconscious material. We will begin in Egypt, where there is endless material on the cat.

The Cat: Maternal and False Nature

Lecture Two: May 3, 1954

We must first turn to Egypt, probably the original home of cats, for mythological material where aspects can be found that fit into all four of our categories, that is, the cat as:

1. a symbol of maternal nature as well as of a false nature,
2. a symbol of rage and emotion,
3. a symbol of coziness and laziness,
4. a symbol of independence and self-reliance.

According to Bonnet in *Reallexikon der Aegyptischen Religionsgeschichte*, the cat in early times was more or less confined to the region of Bubastis (in the area of Memphis and the delta of the Nile), which was the center of worship for the cat goddess Bastet (Bonnet 1952, 80f). In fact in ancient times the cat was worshipped only at Bubastis. Later, in other places, it was worshipped sporadically and more anonymously, being referred to by such terms as “the beautiful one.” Bonnet states that small groups of cat worshippers liked to get their nameless cats into the neighborhood of the great goddess. Bast, or Bastet, is referred to by the *Encyclopedia Britannica* as Ubast. From the time of the earlier dynasties the cat goddess Bastet is already interwoven with Sechmet, the lion goddess, and with the goddess Tefnut who is also a lioness. In fact, even the famous Hathor, the heavenly cow, sometimes appears as a cat. Bastet and Sechmet are so close together that it is sometimes impossible to keep them apart.

Bastet is usually depicted with a human body and a cat’s head. Tefnut is the sister-wife of Shu. These last two were originally worshipped as a pair of lions. Like Tefnut, Bastet was the daughter of Atun, the original creator god who appears in the pyramid texts as the chthonic original deity. He is said to have impregnated himself and produced the first pair of gods – Shu and Tefnut – by spitting them out of his mouth. Dr. Jacobsohn mentioned this in a recent lecture and said there were other versions of how he produced them. As you know, Egyptian gods melt into each other and reappear in a confusing way, amazingly like the way our own figures of the unconscious behave. When I had the flu, I took notes that afterward gave me the impression of having gone deep into active imagination and the unconscious. There is nothing more like the unconscious as we experience it in dreams and active imagination than the Egyptian gods. We saw this in the lecture on active imagination and the world-weary man. Aten became Re- or Ra-Aten; that is, he became one with Ra, the sun god. In German he is spoken of as Re, but in Budge’s *Book of the Dead* he is Ra (Budge 1951). Tefnut and Bastet appear later as daughters of Ra. In this role they usually appear as his moon eye (the left eye) or more rarely as his sun eye (the right eye of the “feminine sun”) (Bonnet 1952, 81). In connection with Bastet, as the moon eye of the sun god, I should mention that, according to Plutarch, the cat was directly connected with the moon. It is true that all these goddesses are found more often as the moon than as the sun, although Bonnet assures us that the cat itself is more a sun than a moon animal in Egypt and points out that a great many cat images have a scarab, a sun symbol, on their head or breast.

The Cat: Maternal and False Nature 27

In the sun eye they are again contaminated with the serpent Uto and the culture goddess Mut. This is not surprising, as cat and serpent have some common qualities. They have the same power of casting a spell on their prey and the same (to us) extraordinarily unpredictable behavior. In later pictures of the sun god we find the bird who can also appear as a god. In such pictures the breast and head of a falcon usually grow out of the body of a cat, the reverse of the usual form of the cat head and the human body. This is but one example of the flux of Egyptian deities.

Angry Bast(et), Sechmet Ra, as Tomcat

Puss in Boots

Independent, shrewd, clever, self-reliant Female, maternal and false nature

Tefnut, as Ethiopian cat Cozy, related

aspect; lazy Sechmet’s

healing magic (Cinderella and witch)

Pleasant Bastet Mouser, hunter; fierce and cruel Sechmet as

sender of illness (witch, negative side)

Lazy,

repentant cat

Figure 1. Aspects of the Cat

IV

The Cat: Rage and Emotion

Sechmet is the raging goddess of war whose fiery breath is said to be the hot wind from the desert.¹ As Sechmet, our cat goddess Bastet is closely connected with sorcery, divination and the healing arts. The priests of Sechmet were said to be rich in magic (Bonnet 1952, 645). On the one side, Sechmet is a goddess and patron of healing – her magical priests were also doctors – but on the other, she is said to send out illnesses, particularly epidemics probably connected with the hot wind from the desert, which was a great breeder of illness. Our *Föhn* (the warm, dry and powerful southwesterly wind descending from the Alps) is also that desert wind, so we can call it the breath of Sechmet. The fiery and destructive wind of Sechmet we will look at in a bit more detail below.

On the one hand, Bastet was related to these fiery lion goddesses and was known for her own wild and fierce nature (in the pyramid texts she appears as an angry goddess). On the other hand Bastet, like the domestic cat, had her very pleasant and comfortable side. The goddess Hathor who was worshipped as a cow (the most placid of all animals), also appears as a cat. An inscription from Philae says that when angry, Hathor is Sechmet, but when cheerful and pleasant, she is Bastet. Herodotus's description of the ecstatic Dionysian festivals in Bubastis fits in here where there was wine, dancing, music and every kind of cheerful orgy. In Bubastis, expansive cat cemeteries were found with mummified cats and many bronze representations of cats. In the pyramid texts, quoted by Dr. Jacobsohn a few years ago, prayers or charms for healing are seen to have been made almost as often for cats as for human beings. They were practically household gods. Dr. von Franz's sister Mandy, who was recently in India, said that it was striking to first be there where cats were few and very wild, and then come to Egypt where there are great quantities of beautiful domestic cats. It was a grave sin in ancient Egypt to hit a cat, a sin even to hunt lions in Bastet's day, and it was terrible to kill one (but this is not confined to Egypt). The historian Diodorus of Sicily reports of the prompt lynching of a Roman legionnaire after the soldier slew a cat, despite the political ramifications for the individuals of the mob.² De Gubernatis, in *Zoological Mythology*, tells us that the cat is sacred to St. Martha in Sicily and is respected for her sake, and that anyone who kills a cat is unhappy for seven years (like our mirror superstition) (de Gubernatis 1872).

There is a well-known and very charming legend where Tefnut, as the Ethiopian cat, sits in her cat form on the forehead of the sun god Ra. Ra, the highest sun god, is very much connected with cats, for it is reported that Ra himself fought as a tomcat against the Apophis serpent (or Apep serpent) in Heliopolis (Budge 1951, 103). A vignette shows him as a tomcat cutting off the head of the serpent (Howey 1981). You probably know that the Apophis serpent is forever trying to destroy the sun boat of Ra when he is trying to pass through the underworld, that is, to destroy consciousness. Bonnet thinks the cat was only the assistant of Ra in this battle, but nevertheless, "Great Tom Cat" is one of the names by which Ra is addressed. According to Bonnet, this battle may have been one of the causes of the cat becoming sacred in Egypt. In our legend, however, Ra did not fight his own battles but induced Tefnut to do it for him. Apparently she got tired of being used for this purpose, for she suddenly went off to a considerable distance and settled down in Nubia or Ethiopia. Here she behaved as badly as she could, incited the people to war, and reduced a peaceful country to indescribable chaos and slaughter. When Ra heard this he decided to put an end to it. Moreover, he missed her exceedingly himself. So he sent Thoth, the monkey god, as envoy to fetch her back and insisted that she also mend her ways and behave herself as she formerly had done. In *La Religion des Egyptiens* by Adolphe Erman, there is a charming picture of Tefnut offering her paw to Thoth in amends and promising to improve her behavior.

As a striking example of the positive aspect of the cat's witchlike nature, I must mention the fact that in the Irish version of the Cinderella story, the fairy godmother is replaced by a cat called Moerin. The witch, using destructive magic, would be the opposite of Moerin. The two aspects are very good examples of black and white magic.

We shall only be able to interpret the main theme of our stories just to get an idea of how the luminosity of the cat can help us when it appears in our dreams. To save time, we must keep to the role of the cat as much as possible and leave aside other motifs such as the Apophis serpent and Ra in the tomcat story.

Beginning with Bastet in her wild and raging aspect – her Sechmet aspect – what do you think the image of such a cat might mean in a modern dream? It would be the raging emotional side, probably entailing neglected and repressed feminine feelings and emotions or, in a man, a neglected anima who was just raging all over the place in a state of possession. That kind of day when the boss at the office is in a bad mood and the whole staff tries not to provoke him further. Then the boss's anima is in her Sechmet aspect. Or when the cook is in a filthy temper and one tiptoes around him in the kitchen. Or when the mistress of the house wakes up in a bad mood and takes it out on the cook, who in turn vents it on the kitchen maid, who takes it out on the cat! Quite right, in a way, since the cat was at the bottom of it. Only it is awful to project it onto the actual cat.

An Englishman with a very pronounced cat anima used to go to bed feeling quite pleasant and then wake up in the night in such a Sechmet mood, after which everything went wrong. His state usually began by his being furious with someone; he then tormented himself with negative thoughts about every friend and everything in his life, the sort of mood in which one thinks of the atom bomb and nothing is of any use anyway. Once, when he went back to sleep after such a bad mood, he dreamed that he was an adolescent boy and was tying a tin can onto the tail of a cat. Evidently the trouble began with his provoking or even torturing his anima cat, and she responded with a Sechmet mood of an utterly negative and destructive character. It is a case of the chicken and the egg. It is a fact that cats are very often tortured, much more often than dogs. This is presumably due to their independent nature. They come in and eat, and then they go off. They do not make concessions as dogs do. The bother with the cat is that it usually wants the penny and the cake; it wants to eat our food, fulfill its needs, but does not want to make any concessions. If you analyze such a mood with a man or a woman, you will usually find this psychology. The anima often wants something very badly, but does not want to pay for it. It is the same with women when they get into these irrational angry moods. Such an angry mood can be symbolized by a fierce bull, but then it is more aggressive. It has a purpose. In such a mood, a man might shoot his mistress – here there is action – whereas the Bastet mood has not much action. In Sechmet moods the man or woman will become more infantile. The Sechmet mood very often starts with being jealous and offended. A man is apt to become sentimental and to complain needlessly. An angry cat mood can be sulky and resentful. There is no surrender in a cat, and this can be very provoking. Angry cat moods provoke everybody around. I believe that the theory of the "jealous cat" is mainly a projection; dogs are much more jealous. But jealousy is often the cause of a Bastet mood. A man with a cat anima or a woman with a catty nature like Bastet herself can be very cozy and comfortable when the cat nature feels that way. Such a man can purr around you and be quite delightful, but you never know when his claws are coming out.

As to torturing, there was an interesting story in the paper the other day. Professor Hediger, the Director of the Zurich Zoological Gardens, was trying an experiment with rhesus monkeys, which have a most extraordinary social order. There is a head monkey who has a big harem with first and second wives and so on down to the miserable no-class wives. Hediger put in a young monkey, thinking he was too young to provoke the head monkey, but the least important wife treated him so badly that he took to the water to get away from her. Hediger thought he would have to take him out when one of the head wives took him and made him delouse her and she deloused him, and then he was under her protection. The poor "bottom" wife had been so sat upon that as soon as this defenseless creature came, she could not resist the opportunity to torment him.

In a story of Sechmet we get a hint of how such emotions can be used. The Lord of Heaven in the legend sent Sechmet out to destroy sinful man. This is exceedingly painful from man's point of view, but very practical for the Lord of Heaven because he can use the wild emotional aspect for a definite purpose. In the case of epidemic illness among overpopulated regions, well, fiery Sechmet was employed. As brutal as it may seem, destruction is necessary at times from the point of view of nature to make room for new growth. But Sechmet did not always wait for higher orders. She also got possessed by her own fury and became the raging goddess of war. When enraged her fiery breath became the hot desert wind, as mentioned, and she brought pestilence and every kind of illness. Yet on the other side she was full of healing magic and her priests were said to be especially rich in divination and sorcery. Therefore Sechmet carries the opposites in her own person. She is the one who brings about the disease and the one who heals it. But the opposites are not yet reconciled in her; they work separately, one perpetually following the other.

Another point here is that the Lord of Heaven thus avoided becoming identical with his rage against mankind. The worst danger lies in allowing ourselves to be unconsciously possessed by destruction, caught by our fury instead of being objective and farsighted toward it.

In the Ra-as-tomcat story there is a much more positive and differentiated aspect. When Sechmet is sent out, she can do anything she likes. Ra deliberately uses Sechmet for a definite purpose. He did not kill the Apophis serpent in his usual form as a sun god because he had to descend into the darkness of the underworld where the sun has no place. But cats can see in the dark, so he made use of this instinct – the form of absolute knowledge expressed in the vehicle of the cat – to approach the serpent. A modern dream shows the two opposites, which fought like Ahriman and Ormazd.³ They were equal in strength for a long time, and the dreamer became afraid that the light figure would be defeated when a small wraithlike fragment detached itself from the dark figure and went over to the light, which then prevailed. There is the same motif in *Wuthering Heights*. The first Catherine was far too high; she did not take the mean cat qualities, which were left to Isabella. The second Catherine behaved in a far more catty manner and at last was able to prevail against the negative animus of Heathcliff.

As to one more common quality of cat and serpent, both strike with lightning speed and use surprise tactics in an unpredictable fashion. So both are worthy foes, and one sees why Ra chose to be a tomcat for this battle. Moreover, although the cat is a warmblooded animal, it has some of the coldness of the serpent. Both are witches' animals and both are used in magic, but that is a stigma that they share with a great many other small animals such as hares, birds and so on. The important points are the non-identification with the emotion, being able to differentiate it from the mood, and using it for a purpose. In a seminar here someone once remarked that, after all, there were occasions when it is not a good plan to be too cool, that sometimes a certain emotion is needed. Jung agreed, but added that one should never use emotion unless one can just as well not use it, for otherwise one is possessed by it. If you felt that you would not be able to get through to a person without getting angry, as long as you feel a longing to let the anger loose, then don't; but when at last you can detach yourself and not be identical with it and can say: "Ah, yes, that might be a way to get at that person," then you can. The one is an image of being possessed by emotion and the other of using it. There are situations where we cannot do anything with our consciousness. It is almost like the image of the Apophis serpent. If Ra had gone down as the sun, he would not have got anywhere near the serpent. To give an example: a girl I knew used to get on extremely badly with her mother and used to destroy herself by fighting, and the more she struggled, the more her rages and negative side got her. At last she thought she must find a way out, and then her hitherto useless anger became the incentive, and it stimulated her inventiveness until she actually found the solution. That is Ra fighting as a cat against the Apophis serpent in contradistinction to the person caught in furious cat emotion and just letting it rip, when, of course, it works destructively or at least extremely uncomfortably.

Remember that the Lord of Heaven sent out Sechmet to destroy mankind, and presumably Sechmet as the origin of illness belongs in the same connection. Here we enter the realm of witchcraft into which I do not want to go deeply. But there are many primitive stories about the witch doctor sending out the icicle or the bolt to hurt his enemies and afterward having to be very careful because the bolt always comes back. Jung mentions a shaman-witch doctor who hung his coat out in a field so that the angry bolt would return to it instead of to him. Once it arrived back, he "worried it" until it got tired and then put it back in his pocket for future use (Jung 1997, 367). The bad mood of the boss or the cook usually has no direction, so it works more like a bad smell making everyone miserable or at least uncomfortable, to say nothing of the frightful waste of energy. A purpose always implies a certain detachment, and this can be used positively, as in the story of Ra, or negatively as when Sechmet was sent out to destroy mankind. In nature, destruction and new growth are absolute opposites, but the one is necessary to make room for the other. If a tree did not become old and fall, there would be no place for the young tree. We enter here on a terribly difficult problem. You may all be angry with me when I say that sentimentality is partly responsible for the situation today. Before the First World War we were getting more and more sentimental. By helping to keep everything alive, we got too sentimental and destructive, and these dreadful wars broke out of us; when the one opposite is too much constellated, the other has to force its way through. Therefore we cannot avoid the fact that the destructive nature of the cat, which we cannot avoid, does show us that we have a hook for destruction in this instinct. Jung once said that it was no use to shut our eyes to the fact that if he is sitting in a chair, someone else cannot sit in it. To some extent we must push out other people to live, and we shall do it far better if we do it consciously and know what we are doing. Dr. von Franz in one of her lectures talks of the life of St. Niklaus von der Flüe. Previously she herself had no idea of the enormous amount of worldly wisdom shown in it. It is a fact that he was a saint who did not eat for long periods of time but was sustained over a period of nearly twenty years in some inexplicable way. In a court-like investigation, a bishop forced him to eat some bread contrary to Niklaus's wish. (He begged to refrain, claiming it would make him ill.) But he had to give in, and indeed became very ill. (In the end, the Church had to acknowledge that his fasting was a fact.) On being asked by a worldly troublemaker whether it was true that he did not eat, he was too clever to say "Yes." He merely replied, "God knows if it is true." Such an answer needed extraordinary detachment because one wants most dreadfully to justify oneself. Niklaus showed the same detachment in the famous example where he averted war between the political powers governing the cities in the central region of Switzerland and those governing the rural countryside. The negotiations had got so out of hand that just before an agreement was to be reached, tempers flared, the breach between the parties was rent open anew, and the opposing delegates drew their swords. The local priest, however, ran to Niklaus's hermitage in a panic, pleading that he must come at once as war would break out any moment. But Niklaus remained quietly in his cell and told the priest to go back to the parties and report that "Brother Klaus says that you should be reasonable and keep the peace." So deeply was Brother Klaus respected, and so complete was his emotional detachment even in these dire straits, that the warring hostilities were instantly dissolved.⁴ It was Niklaus's detachment from both sides that gave his message the impact that it had, resulting in the actual aversion of a war. He was not caught in his emotions but could master them. Nothing impresses other people quite like someone who is detached from the emotions that possess them.

In witchcraft every bolt returns to us. In a discussion on active imagination Dr. Jung said that magic was really only in its right place when used subjectively on oneself – to destroy the vermin in ourselves. In active imagination there is a place where you can use fantasy in a very dangerous way, or it uses you as intrigues and plots and negative criticisms and so forth. Or you can use it positively in order to come to terms with your own unconscious. One has to use it as Niklaus von der Flüe did, but we have to be dreadfully careful. One could say that the disease is the intrigue and the plot, and through accepting the fantasy one can do something about it. The unconscious can cause a neurosis and also heal it. Apollo could send the pest and could heal it, as could other gods, and Sechmet does the same. It is a complete paradox, but it accords with modern medical practice where the patient is inoculated with the disease itself. Who could know better how to heal than the originator? Quite obviously the one who

sends the disease is the one who can heal it par excellence. Thus we have the cat, for instance, as the witch's cat and as Cinderella's fairy godmother, and that is the negative and positive aspects, the spinner of plots and intrigues and the highly positive subjective use of catlike feeling and instinct.

In the story of Tefnut going off to Ethiopia we have the essence of what the image of the cat archetype can do both for us and against us. If we can be conscious of it, as Ra was when he had Tefnut on his forehead, or when he himself took the form of a cat to fight the Apophis serpent, then the cat can be very helpful for us, fighting our battles in every kind of way. But if we allow her to become autonomous, to go off on her own to the unconscious where we rapidly forget all about her, she can possess us without our knowledge and incite us not only to every kind of negative emotion but even to contention, belligerence and war. It was really the essence of short-sighted selfishness for Tefnut to leave the sun god in the lurch and go off into sheer destructiveness. In Ra, on the other hand, we see that the sun god stands for consciousness per se and in his tomcat aspect we see how helpful our inner cats can be if we relate to them and get them to work with us instead of autonomously.

V

The Cat: Coziness and Laziness

When we come to the lazy side of the cat, the negative aspect of the cozy and comfortable side, we find some good material in de Gubernatis' *Zoological Mythology* (de Gubernatis 1872, 42ff). In the *Pancatantram*, the old Indian epic comparable to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in Greece, there is a story of the cat "Butter Ears" or "White Ears" (the luminosity) who feigns repentance for all his crimes. Thus he is thought to be wonderful and he is made a judge. Actually, in our own idiom, he has decided to let his head save his heels. As the repentant cat, he is asked to judge in a dispute between a hare and a sparrow. He pretends to be deaf and asks them to come a little closer and confide their troubles in his ears, whereupon he eats them both. Reconciliation takes place in his stomach and not quite in the way they had hoped.

The cat here is very shrewd and extremely false, but the decisive element is laziness, since he gets his food without hunting for it. There are endless stories of the repentant cat, a proverbial quality found, for instance, in the *Book of Maus*, one of the oldest known Indian texts. If you choose to cheat, you must accept the consequences and the responsibility, but the worst of laziness is that it

The Cat: Coziness and Laziness 39

often leads to unconscious cheating, especially if paired with ambition, for it leads to borrowing here and there until eventually you don't take any trouble at all, just like the cat who does not bother to get its own food. Butter Ears had either to hunt his prey or to play some trick. If you know what you are doing, it is your own funeral, and at least the repentant cat knew what it was doing. But people often steal intellectually and quite unconsciously. Lazy people have to become "catty" to live at all. Intellectual laziness, in particular, practically forces you to dishonesty. People with a creative problem that they do not tackle are especially exposed to this temptation. I know many cases of people who really have a certain talent with active imagination. But active imagination requires a tremendous creative effort, and if people don't make it, they may fall into the plot like Butter Ears.

Schiller says that play stands at the beginning of all culture because it is of no practical use and so leads always from materialism to more spiritual values. You find it in the games, in the mysteries and in primitive rites, especially the Dionysian mysteries. It was at the celebrations at Bubastis, which had a clear Dionysian-like character, that the playful side of the cat was revered. The complete relaxation of the cat is also a very valuable aspect that should on no account be forgotten in these tense and hurried days. We will return to this theme at the conclusion of our discussion on the cat.

We should not forget that the cat is not all play. In contrast to the playful, pleasant side of Bastet, Agatha Christie tells such a good story about a highly serious mouser in *Come Tell Me Where You Live*. She relates how she and some acquaintances were taken to a house full of rats and mice, but the Arabs assured them that a "professional mouser" was coming. It arrived and took no notice of food or people, unless they disturbed it by a noise, and in three days there was not a mouse or rat.

On the cozy, relaxed side we need the luminosity of the cat instinct. Needless to say, the psychology of the person has to be taken into account, but the danger is not so great when the person is far too strung up, too devoted to duty and taking life too seriously. A cat is a model for taking life as it comes, keeping calm about it, and finding the coziest place to stretch out and rest. If a lazy person dreams of a sleeping cat, you may be pretty sure the dream will in some way end rather badly. This is a complete paradox, for relaxation is one of the most desirable things in life, but I think laziness leads straight to the devil. The meaning would be quite different if someone who was too tense had the same dream. You can generally see by the context which way it is meant.

VI

The Cat: Independence and Self-Reliance

We now come to the last of our four threads. Now, Now independence is both a positive and a negative aspect of the real cat. The cat has the most extraordinary independence and self-reliance. It can be ruthlessly shrewd, and even in domesticated environments – farms, for instance – the cat can be totally self-reliant with little interest in people. When we come to the independent side of the cat one can turn to Tefnut, the cat who cut her duties. One could say that she was the initiator of the strike. To leave her owner – the ruler of heaven and the sun god – and go off on her own as she did was really the climax of independence.

You might say that Tefnut, when she left Ra in the lurch, went off to reflect in Ethiopia, but we have no evidence that she spent much time thinking anything over. My garageman is very nervous and he got into a rage because he had done something stupid, and Tefnut just went off to Ethiopia. The garageman was left completely in his negative Sechmet aspect. For the moment you can only say that you have to go, and then, perhaps Tefnut comes back. Tefnut, as Ra's anima, sat on his forehead and spat at his enemies. One must make conscious use of one's cat nature.

There is a story of a woman who was always so efficient, and someone dreamed of her as a black cat that came into a room and took a bunch of yarn, which it mixed into a terrible muddle. The cat had just a marvelous time and finally walked off with its tail held neatly at a right angle. That is a picture of Tefnut of Ethiopia and her complete lack of responsibility. She mixes up the wool into chaos. And then everything depends on how nicely you hold your tail.

Lecture Three: May 10, 1954

In the last lecture we came to the fourth and last threads of the cat and finished with the more negative, irresponsible side as illustrated by Tefnut. Lack of responsibility is a leading characteristic of cats. A dog minds terribly if you are pleased with him or not, but the cat doesn't care a damn, although certain punishments have weight (for purely selfish reasons). But the cat who minds whether you are pleased or annoyed is very rare. Dogs react intensely against people with evil designs. I read yesterday of a temple where dogs are used and can be relied upon to bark furiously at or bite people with evil intentions, yet are kind and friendly to others. Police dogs also can, of course, be trained to know when people have evil designs, whereas the average cat would let its owner be killed and would settle down in the same house with the murderer, provided it was well treated. If a cat notices that you are in a bad mood, it just disappears, but not the dog, who is much more likely to enter into your mood.

The best example I know of this purely selfish and autoerotic attitude is in "Puss-in-Boots." A condensed and rather dry version of the story goes like this:

A miller dies leaving three sons; to the eldest he bequeaths the mill; to the second the donkey; and to the third, the cat. The youngest, annoyed at receiving something so valueless, is determined to have the cat killed and skinned and make a pair of gloves out of the fur. But the cat hears him and protests, saying he would only get a poor pair of gloves since his fur is not very good, and that instead the miller's son should buy him a pair of boots, and he will help him in return. On receiving the boots, the cat walks off on his two hind legs. Now the king of the land is extremely fond of partridges, but the hunters are no longer able to find any. The cat, seeing his opportunity, puts a little corn into a bag, takes it to the wood, and the partridges dart in. The cat seizes the bag and takes it to the court, where he says that his master, a great count, has sent the partridges. The king is delighted and gives him a lot of gold. This goes on for a long time, the cat getting a sack of gold daily, until he becomes the tame cat at the king's castle. Then one day he overhears that the king and his daughter are to go for a drive, so he tells his master to go and bathe in a stream, and, after hiding his clothes, goes bewailing to the king about his poor master who cannot come out of the water because his clothes have been stolen. So the king sends for some of his own clothes, and the "count" is able to appear at the court suitably dressed. The cat then frightens people into telling the king that some beautiful fields of grass and corn and a lovely woods belong to his master, the count, and he himself goes to visit the real owner, a wizard, whom he flatters into changing first into an elephant, then into a lion, and finally into a mouse, which he then promptly eats. Naturally he then takes the castle for his master, who marries the king's daughter and keeps the cat as his prime minister.

This story was first written down in about the early nineteenth century and appeared in Grimm's fairy tales, but it is a much older story and there are many earlier versions. There is no time to interpret the whole story, thus we must just briefly take the role of the cat, who shows himself to be wily, completely independent, and self-reliant. It is unusual for an animal to be so extremely independent, but he works for his master as well as for himself. In the end of this story the master keeps the good instinct as his adviser, but in many other versions the master gets rid of the cat and the story ends badly for him.

This story is a good example of an antithesis of the utterly selfish Tefnut going off for her own purposes and using the powers of the unconscious for personal aims (which then inevitably degenerate into discord, black magic and the incitement of hostilities). Puss-in-Boots acts altogether differently.¹ (It is true that his first aim was to save his own life, but he had every opportunity to disappear down to "Ethiopia" forever right after he got that pair of boots out of the miller's son. And this he did not. He related to his master in every way imaginable.)

One way of explaining all the exceptional things that Puss-in-Boots understood is through some form of absolute knowledge which, by the way, is particularly accessible to cats. How else could he, a simple miller's cat, understand the affairs of state at the king's court? Granted the possibility that he heard of the dearth of partridges through village gossip, how could he, with a cat's powerful instinct for hunting, have known how to catch partridges alive, and even more astounding, then resist the temptation of eating them himself? He was wise enough to use them for an ultimate aim that only some form of deeper absolute knowledge could have communicated to him. It must have been a similar source of knowledge that inspired him to concoct the scheme of getting his master a noble set of clothes with which a simple miller's son could appear as a count at the court of the king and princess. And above all, this source of knowledge must have been consulted in order to enter the mind of the powerful magician and trick him into a form that was easy for a cat to eliminate. (And then Puss-in-Boots actually assimilated the figure into himself.)

We must not forget the all-important fact that he asked his master for boots and wore them in all his subsequent adventures. Boots symbolize a firm standpoint and a separation from the earth, and we find the same archetypal image here in this story as in Egypt, where the cat goddesses are nearly always depicted with a human body and a cat's head. Puss-in-Boots is a cat with a human standpoint. By stepping into boots he has dis-identified himself with his blind cat instincts, rising above a *participation mystique* with all nature. Presumably it was this detachment that enabled him to resist eating the partridges, and yet with his cat's head he was far nearer to a source of absolute knowledge than modern human beings ever are.

This gives us a valuable hint concerning our attitude toward our cat nature; we cannot change it, and we do not want to, but we can give it boots. If one can aspire to detach oneself and seek an individual touch when confronted with emotional difficulties, then we have more possibilities of dealing with these situations.² Jung notes in his Visions Seminar that nothing is as infectious as collective emotion. When you are in an excited crowd you get excited too even if you do not understand the language. In an assembly where everyone laughs, you laugh too "like a silly idiot" even if you don't get the joke. When you have to cope with emotion in a person, you cannot help being infected by it (Jung 1997, 368).

So through the "cat's head" we can connect to its amazing ingenuity, which the cat has kept by maintaining a living relation to deeper levels of absolute knowledge. This ingenuity would enable us to enter the royal court of the Self where our ordinary consciousness could find no way, and to

enter the minds of our environment, symbolized here by the peasants and the wizard. The ingenuity of the cat here really comes far more directly from what Dr. Jung calls an absolute knowledge than from ordinary human consciousness. The cat knows how to catch the partridges that are baffling even skilled hunters, that is, we have an instinct somewhere in us that can enter the nature of the partridge and get the better of it. We have the same motif in the old nursery rhyme:

Pussy Cat, Pussy Cat, where have you been? I've been to London to visit the Queen. Pussy Cat, Pussy Cat, what did you there? I frightened a little mouse under [her] chair.

This is the same idea, namely that the cat instinct can enter anywhere, that human barriers do not exist for it; it can get to places where we cannot possibly find a way. This same instinct can also engage the water, that is, the unconscious, as its accomplice. The cat hid his master there while he played his clever trick on the king to get the "count" presentable attire. Puss-in-Boots could enter the mind of the wizard and play on his vanity until he had him where he wanted him and could thus finally dispose of him. Afterward the matter was simple, and his master had the good sense – when he had reached the king's throne – to keep his cat instinct as his prime minister and adviser. In other words, he kept the contact with the catlike absolute knowledge and therefore, although himself a simple peasant, he was able to rule. Through the extraordinary cleverness of the cat and his own shrewdness in keeping the animal, the master was able to make a good job of it.

In his amazing independence and self-reliance, Puss-in-Boots shows the very essence of the cat that walks by itself. A dog is quite different in this respect. Although in fairy tales dogs often lead their master to the solution, they do so in a far more related and cooperative way. They work with their master, not completely on their own. Although all animals remain true to their own nature, and thus are far more in harmony with the source of absolute knowledge than we are, it seems to me that the cat – of all domestic animals – is the one that we can understand as a symbol of fierce independence and self-reliance, an archetypal image that can help us most in regaining touch with this source. And it can teach us about emotional detachment, a virtue that Meister Eckhart prized above all others.

One is struck by the fact that in not eating the partridges, for example, the cat is acting against nature, showing extreme selfcontrol and demonstrating amazing shrewdness in hiding his ultimate aims. Brehm gives a good account of the way a female cat chooses its mate and then feigns complete indifference to it and even fights it furiously and is angry when pursued. The French have a saying descriptive of a woman capable of such action. They say: *Elle choisit celui qui devra la choisir* (she chooses whatever she will have to choose). If the woman showed her hand, the man would be in a position to make conditions, but by hiding her purpose and pretending reluctance, she keeps control. In the East, when each side plays the game of indifference, you can take from two to seven days to buy a carpet. We are inclined to think this human cleverness, but it really belongs in the instinctive realm. As far as I know, members of the cat family are the only animals that hunt in such an extraordinarily clever way, pretending, for instance, to be asleep so as to deceive their prey into thinking them harmless. Here they demonstrate control of hunger and greed.³ Elephants have a hard time protecting their young from a tiger, which always tries to eat the elephant calf in the first week; after a week or two it is too late. An elephant will stay with her mate until she realizes that she is pregnant; then she goes off with another female (dubbed "Auntie"). The two give their whole time to protecting the calf that is to be born and looking after it during the initial weeks after its birth. Oozies (Burmese elephant drivers) describe the way in which a tiger will employ cunning and deceit trying to trick the mother and her companion (Williams 1956, 68).

Yet we must also remain rationally alert. Jung has said that when we get to the point of trusting our instincts, we are apt to think that they can help us in everything, in all our daily life. But what does instinct – or even the Self – know about taxation? We can only allow the cat instinct to help us where we really cannot see our way.

As mentioned, the cat in "Puss-in-Boots" needs the boots to separate him from the earth, from the *participation mystique*. Here we see the super cat that combines extreme shrewdness and cleverness with a human standpoint. It has something of the spiritual in it. We really enter here into the ultraviolet end of the scale. We had indications before, but the boots bring us fully to that end. It is actually the same idea we met with in Egypt, where Bastet is represented with a human body and a cat's head. Presumably the partridges, for instance, could not have been resisted without something between the animal and the soil.⁴

It is the cat that is represented as the presiding deity on the Egyptian musical instrument known as the sistrum. The sistrum, a lyre-like string instrument, was associated to religious ritual and magic perhaps like no other musical instrument since (Howey 1981, 7). Howey says:

It has been suggested that the form of the Sistrum was derived from that of the Ankh, the well-known symbol of life carried by every Egyptian deity. Or, conversely, that the Ankh was based on the Sistrum. The fruitfulness of the cat accords with either theory. The erect oval is emblematic of the Female Principle of Nature regarded as the womb of Divine Manifestation, whilst the upright pillar of the handle symbolizes the corresponding Male principle. The cat is the presiding Deity blessing the mystic union with fecundity and abundance. (Howey 1981, 27f)

The cat is thus shown as presiding over a union of opposites, although, as we saw in the examples of Sechemet and Tefnut, the opposites were not yet reconciled but still working separately one after the other. But through the sistrum, a musical instrument very much associated with feeling, the cat deity goes farther and even unites the main opposites, male and female, as an archetypal image. This is closely connected with the *hierosgamos*, the "chymical wedding," that is, the archetypal form of the union of the opposites that lies at the very heart of alchemy and the life-work of Jung. In fact, he devoted the entirety of his last masterpiece, *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, to the *hierosgamos*.

Now, when we think of the cat's exceptional musical performance in the mating season – a musical vocalization that defies description – then it may not be so surprising that the cat is found atop the sistrum. We commonly dislike this caterwauling and even empty jugs of water on the cat if it takes place near our bedroom windows at night. But the cats themselves use it in the service of their love life, and the music that they produce when mating can be called the chthonic or lower instinctive foundation of all love and eros. Like it or not, it is undoubtedly earthy, and as music, pure and unmistakably cat.

The music of the sistrum was also connected with dancing, and this brings us to another aspect of the cat worship at Bubastis that is important for us. The celebrations were often much like well-oiled Dionysian festivals, or even orgies, full of everything that we have so lamentably lost in the Christian religion. Particularly in *Psychology and Alchemy* Jung speaks about the banishment of all traces of the carnival and of such play as *jeux de paume* from the Church. He ends this discussion pointing out that exuberance, play, pathos, joy, and intoxication, which were once celebrated in the well-structured context of religious practice and officiated by priests and priestesses, were all driven into the hands of the devil, so to speak.

The Dionysian element has to do with emotions and affects which have found no suitable religious outlet in the predominantly Apollonian cult and ethos of Christianity. The medieval carnivals and *jeux de paume* in the Church were abolished relatively early; consequently the carnival became secularized and with it divine intoxication vanished from the sacred precincts. Mourning, earnestness, severity, and well-tempered spiritual joy remained. But intoxication, that most direct and dangerous form of possession, turned away from the gods and enveloped the human world with its exuberance and pathos. The pagan religions met this danger by giving drunken ecstasy a place within their cult. Heraclitus doubtlessly saw what was at the back of it when he said, "But Hades is that same Dionysos in whose honor they go mad and keep the feast of the wine-vat." For this very reason orgies were granted religious license, so as to exorcize the danger that threatened from Hades. Our [Christian] solution, however, has served to throw the gates of hell wide open. (Jung 1968, par. 182)

Play is by no means purposeless, for it satisfies something very important. When the club was started nearly forty years ago, one of the first things Dr. Jung introduced was the Hallelujah game in which a knotted handkerchief was thrown across the room from person to person standing – or sitting – in a circle. A participant standing in the middle tried to catch the “ball.” It seems a silly and pointless game, but it was played for some years and often waxed fast and furious. It was very effective in banishing stiffness and formality and prevented the members from taking things too seriously, helping them to relate on a simple human level. On the other hand, it helped unite the members and prevent their fellowships with each other from falling apart in mere personal and transitory interests. And in this sense it served an aspect of the Self.

Jung was always very anxious that one should not forget to play in daily life. Playfulness is often at the beginning of creative work and is one of the best ways of starting active imagination. When people play with material and really enjoy doing it, then the thing is started in the right way. One can well understand Schiller’s statement that play stands at the beginning of all culture because it is of no practical use and so leads to more human, spiritual values. Play brings together children, or adults, or even mixed groups of people in a wonderful way. Such amusement is in part delegated to sport in the modern world. People flock to see other people playing, but too many individuals have lost the habit of playing themselves. As mentioned earlier, it was at Bubastis above all that the playful side of the cat was exalted and celebrated in joyous and even erotic ways. One can hardly overemphasize the importance of the playful element in the cat instinct.

The enormous respect, even worship, accorded to the cat in ancient Egypt speaks volumes for the importance of this largely forgotten archetypal image. When Dr. Jacobsohn read us some translations of the pyramid texts in one of his seminars at the Institute, at least as many of these texts referred to cats as human beings. As mentioned, the veneration of cats is touchingly expressed in the numerous bronze cat figures found in the expansive cemetery for cats at Bubastis, which already existed in the twenty-second dynasty.

In these days, when girls are determined to become, at any rate in appearance, more and more like boys, and the present generation of women seems largely to have lost touch with its own principle of eros, it is clear that we need the archetypal image of the cat more urgently than ever before. “Called or not called, it will be there,” either in its constructive or destructive characteristics, as the Delphic inscription goes. And it lies in our own choice whether we make the effort to become conscious of it or not. If we do not, it will inevitably go off like Tefnut into the unconscious and work its destructive black magic from there. One could even say that it is this cat image that is behind the disastrous feminine tendency to spin unconscious plots, which I have spoken of numerous times. I also tried to show the disastrous effect of an unconscious plot in the chapter on Mary Webb’s *Precious Bane* in my *Striving Towards Wholeness* (Hannah 1971, 72–104). That was a plot that succeeded (Prue got her weaver). But forty years of observing women’s plots has taught me that a plot that succeeds is far more destructive to the process of individuation than plots that fail.

The cat’s archetypal image is present in us all. It is clearer to women, for the cat – even the tomcat – is much more feminine in behavior than, for instance, the dog. Men have the cat also, but here it is more connected with the anima. Thus they do not escape the disastrous tendency of their anima cat to spin plots. She usually hooks on to ambition, power and money where temptations are great and men are not so terribly conscious. And then, of course, Tefnut entangles them in sexual affairs of all kinds and is delighted when they turn out disastrously. The anima is much farther away for men and therefore more difficult to make conscious. In fact, catching plots is the *conditio sine qua non* of men becoming conscious of their animas. This is the most difficult task of all for men, far more difficult than it is for woman to become conscious of her animus.

It is above all the task of women to become conscious of the archetypal image of the cat that can be so disastrous to her if allowed to remain unconscious. We have seen how much it can do for us if we work with it as Ra did in Egypt, or at least to become fully aware of it, putting our trust in it as the miller’s son did in “Puss-in-Boots.” Of course, as we know from Christ’s logion, all animals, even the fish of the sea, are those that lead us to the kingdom of heaven, or in our language, to the Self and to a connection with absolute knowledge. But perhaps the cat is especially important on account of her tendency to go off with Tefnut into the depths of the unconscious and to degenerate into all kinds of injurious or even fatal behavior. This degeneration is certainly very reminiscent of the days we live in, where plots are so readily spun in the unconscious and subconscious lives of women and men alike, not only in ourselves but even on a worldwide scale. All that each one of us can do is to work honestly on the archetypal image of the cat in our own souls. Perhaps we may each then add “an infinitesimal grain [on] the scales of humanity’s soul” (Jung 1966, par. 449).

We have much too briefly and, for my taste, too superficially worked out the four aspects of the luminosity of the cat instinct. We have looked at each from the positive and negative side. No doubt there are many other aspects. But perhaps eight are sufficient to give us an idea of the complexities and general lines that we require to interpret cats at all adequately in dreams or active imagination. I hope I have been able to give you an idea of how inadequate it is to dismiss the cat with a label such as “our feminine nature” or as the anima of men.

I really have not gone enough into how much the cat does represent the anima, and how much we have the cat in ourselves; that would have needed a great deal more time. At any rate, these aspects give us some idea of how our cat instinct can help us positively and how, when uncontrolled, it can endanger us on the negative side. Puss-in-Boots made a good relation to his master, who had given his last money for the boots. The wild hunter can help us as Ra, the tomcat, fighting the darkness and its vermin in our unconscious, or it can endanger us as Bastet, losing our energy in wild untamed emotions. It can bring us destruction if it is used as plots and black magic, or healing if the magic is tamed and used for a genuine, non-egotistical purpose. It can relax us and help heal our overstrained conscious attitude as the pleasant Bastet. Or make us lazy and false, like the repentant cat. It can lead us away from our human relationships into a desert of purely autoerotic isolation as the Ethiopian cat. Or it can give us access to the universal knowledge and make us truly self-reliant as Pussin-Boots. Nothing we can do for anyone is more helpful than selfreliance. It is an indispensable help to our environment if we can become responsible for ourselves and not always turn to someone else. Another time, when Jung was discussing the parable of the unjust steward (the connection with the cat and the unjust steward is very clear), the unjust steward was praised because he did not collapse. He did not behave very elegantly, this is true, but he was a going concern and by his cleverness kept his roots and kept his self-reliance. If we can do this, as Puss-in-Boots did, without losing relationship to others and even helping them, we really reach the summit of relating to the luminosity of the cat. VII

The Dog: Notes on the Biological Background

With the dog we have a totally different luminosity or instinct. The cat represents an independent, almost wild instinct that yet is very close to us. The dog is much more domesticated and is dependent on us in our society in every way. It is thus much easier to train or educate than the cat. It could therefore be called an instinct that we can, to a certain extent, integrate much more easily. It is also an instinct that would lend itself to development and even to a large degree to assimilation. Both Brehm and Lorenz agree that there were domesticated dogs long before there was agriculture or before cattle were domesticated, and ages before the first traces of domestic cats. Interestingly enough, I saw a paper by Professor Hediger about foxes in *Sie und Er* this week in which he says that people used to think that dogs were descended from foxes. But this is not so. You cannot cross dogs with foxes, whereas dogs will mate quite happily with jackals and wolves. I am not so sure that this is the case with American native dogs; in fact, I have seen jackal descent denied in an American magazine. With *lupus* canines, the dog attaches to the master as a leader, whereas with the *aureus* dogs, the attachment is to a substitute parent. This is certainly true of the little French poodle that belongs to Dr von Franz, whose attitude is purely that of a child to its parent. In either case, the dog is a social animal and loyal to its master. In the Christmas 1953 issue of the *Saturday Evening Post* there is an article by Sally Carrigher titled "The Dog that Trained Me" that describes her relationship with a Husky, which is very enlightening as regards *lupus* dogs.

Whatever their original descent, Brehm says that wild dogs were originally tamed in their own countries. Probably, unlike cats, dogs were originally indigenous to the soil. Of course, through breeding and moving about, they now come from all over the world and are very much uprooted.

Brehm divides mammals into sight and smell groups because those are their two strongest senses. A great many dogs hate certain noises, but smell governs a dog's life. If the scent nerve is severed, a dog loses all relationship, even to its master. However, dogs with the flat, squashed nose do not smell at all well. They follow by sight and not by smell, and their eyes are very much better than those of most dogs. People say how nice it would be if dogs could talk. But how awful it would be if they really did. Think of what their conversation would be! Who ate what for dinner, and the ins and outs of street-corner lampposts.

Brehm writes that it is very difficult to say anything about the original physic qualities of dogs because of the extreme degree of training. They are naturally cowardly and very seldom bite; they only do so if absolutely cornered, but they have been trained to be unusually brave and even fierce. He says that the innate quality at the bottom of their whole development with man is their docility and willingness to learn. Lorenz, in his book *So kam der Mensch auf den Hund*, says that it is a mistake to think that domesticated animals are stupider than their wild forefathers. It is true that their senses have become duller in some respects and that certain subtle instincts have degenerated, but the same is true of human beings, and it is not in spite of these losses but because of them that man has risen above the

56 *The Archetypal Symbolism of the Cat, Dog, and Horse*

animals. The breaking down of the rigid rails along which a great part of animal behavior is forced to run was the *sine qua non* for the development of a special human freedom.

Lorenz emphasizes that in training dogs one must never forget that they generally have no feeling of responsibility or sense of duty. The secret of training a dog is to teach it that it may do certain things as a privilege, but it must always be "may" and never "must." If you can manage to teach in this way, they take an enormous pleasure in learning. Thus, as we shall see, the secret of training actual dogs can be of use to us subjectively in dealing with our own dog instinct.

Dogs can be very maternal and, like cats, will take over the care of other small animals or even those of their "racial enemies," such as lion and tiger cubs. In the Zoological Gardens they are often successfully used for such purposes. But above all, the dog is a companion. Dogs love to work and fulfill their genetic dispositions; enthusiastically and wholeheartedly they can be trained to retrieve, hunt, protect, guard, search, lead the blind, perform all sorts of tricks, and so forth. In arctic countries they are used to draw sledges. There and in other European countries you often see them harnessed to small carts. The police and the army use dogs for many purposes, and the large Saint Bernard and the German shepherd are employed for searching for lost persons and objects.

Dogs will eat practically every kind of food that humans eat. Cats are much more fastidious. Dogs are by nature carnivorous and like their meat high (that is, beginning to decompose). They are therefore used in many countries as scavengers and even in some as corpse eaters. A traveler in Tibet in the twelfth or thirteenth century reports that human corpses were dismembered ritually by priests and exposed. If birds, vultures or eagles ate them, it was a sign that that person was going to heaven. But if the dogs or pigs ate them, then they would be reincarnated on earth. And last but not least, Brehm says that dogs very rarely sleep deeply. They certainly dream a lot. It would be interesting to know if cats dream. (An audience member remarked: "Yes, they do!")

I would like now to give the four headings of the main aspects of the crosshairs I propose using for our telescope of the dog, and that is the dog as:

1. a symbol of the loyal friend and its opposite, the betrayer,
2. a symbol of the guide and hunter,
3. a symbol of the watchdog and its opposite, the thief,
4. a symbol of the healer versus the dog as devourer of corpses.

VIII

The Dog: Friend and Betrayer

There is a vast amount of mythological material about the dog, an overabundant chaos that I have cut down recklessly. I intend to start with the first of our aspects, the loyal friend, which all dog lovers feel to be the most striking quality of the dog. It is interesting to find a widespread creation myth (particularly in Asia and Eastern Europe) that it was the dog that first delivered man into the hands of the devil. I'll give here an Asiatic Ugrian version. Now, according to this legend, God created the bodies of the first pair of human beings and then ascended to heaven to see about giving them a soul, leaving them as bodies on the earth and in the care of the dog. This dog had lived in heaven with God, who had told him to be particularly careful about the devil. Now the first man had a horny skin, like our nails, and the dog a bare skin with no hair. No sooner had God gone away to see about the man's soul than the devil came, but the dog barked furiously – as God had ordered – and attacked him fiercely. The devil, being very clever, began to talk to him and tried to bribe him with promises of a nice fur coat, telling him that he was all right now, for it was summer, but that later on when winter came it would be dreadful. The dog resisted at first, saying that God would beat him, but some versions say that after three days – although the time varies – he at last gave in and sold man to the devil.

Then the devil spat at the dog, and he immediately grew a thick fur coat with only the tip of his nose remaining bare. The devil then spat at the first human beings and their horny skin fell off, but his spittle gave out, so man was left with finger- and toenails.

On his return with the souls, God was furious and cursed the dog, condemning it to eat dung and be in servitude to man. In most versions, God gave man his soul, but in a Turkish version, the devil quickly blew his kind of soul into humans by the anus. In another version, this only happened to a woman and “therefore the soul of woman is very evil, but her understanding is sevenfold” because the devil had used a seven-stemmed pipe for this purpose. (This might also be interesting from the point of view of the psyche of the animus.)

We will take up the one point in this myth that is always the same in every version and belongs to our subject, namely the betrayal of man at the beginning of his history by his later most loyal friend, the dog. Myths, as you know, represent archetypal motifs in the collective psyche of man, so there must be a reason why this one portrays man's most loyal friend as the one who betrays him to the devil. We must remember that it was the beginning of the world, of consciousness, and therefore the instinct was bound to betray us or there would have been nowhere for consciousness to develop. We would have remained in the harmonious ignorance of Paradise. When I told this myth to Dr. von Franz, she remarked that it was really the reverse of the story of the Garden of Eden, where it was man who betrayed God. He was the troublemaker. Here, it is the instinct that disobeys God and thus betrays man.

In order that consciousness may develop, a Promethean sin of disobedience is necessary and can come from either the conscious or the unconscious. In Jung's *Answer to Job* and in Rivkah Schärf's *Satan* it is very clear that the devil is the other side of God, so who could know better about God's weaknesses?

We also find an interesting light on the actions of the dog in Lorenz's book. He says that all instinctive impulses of a wild animal are of a kind that will ultimately make it decide in favor of its own well-being or of its herd or pack. There is no conflict in the daily life of an animal between its natural urges and an “ought.” Every inner urge is “good.” Man has lost this paradisiacal harmony. He says that true morality, in the highest sense of the word, demands spiritual achievement of which no animal is capable (Lorenz 1951, 213ff). The chapter is called “The Animal with Conscience.” Lorenz goes on to deal with the undeniable fact that dogs do often show a bad conscience and asks how this is reconcilable with their lack of moral sense. He explains it by the following story of a young zoologist, an assistant, presumably, at the Zoological Gardens of Vienna. The man had charge of the young giant snakes and had to feed his pythons and boa constrictors with small animals the size of mice. He could either use fully grown mice or young rats. It is much easier to breed rats and therefore he knew he ought to give them the young rats, but he had a peculiar feeling against it and continued to give the mice until the supply ran out. He realized then that young rats have a peculiarly helpless look, almost like a human baby, and that look aroused a certain protective feeling in him. He managed, however, to kill six and was punished for a whole week by dreadful dreams about these little rats in which they appeared every night looking even more helpless and more human than they really are. They even talked with human voices and would not die. Then he learned that morality is not just traditional laws, but that it has also deep roots in deep instinctive layers of our psyche. He could not afford to ignore deep feelings no matter what his rational intellect might decide.

This deep instinctive, undeveloped root of morality also exists in dogs, and Lorenz tells two stories to illustrate it. He had a French bulldog of which he was very fond, but a second dog came along and proved to Lorenz that it belonged to him as well. “Bully” was very jealous, and at last the two dogs had a most awful fight in the living room of his home. Lorenz had to interfere, and Bully bit his hand by mistake. As soon as he saw the blood, Bully collapsed with a serious nervous shock that lasted for hours. He could not be persuaded to eat and he suffered apparent agonies from a bad conscience for weeks. The fact that it was a mistake or that Lorenz forgave him at once and took him in his arms played no role (Lorenz 1951, 214ff).

Another time Lorenz went to a friend's house and was parking his motorcycle when the English bulldog there attacked him from behind and bit him in his leg. As he was wearing leather motorcycle attire and had his back turned to the house, the English bulldog had failed to recognize him. This dog, not being his own, did not get quite so upset, but looked at Lorenz in a most pathetic way and held up his paw the whole evening. Days later, when Lorenz met him again casually on the street, the dog showed none of his usual enthusiasm but displayed all the cowering signs typical of regret (Lorenz 1951, 216ff). Lorenz asked himself why this was. Neither dog had bitten before, thus it was not fear of punishment, so how did they know it was such a sin? Lorenz came to the conclusion that it wounded the same kind of instinctive feeling as the assistant had wounded in himself when he killed the baby rats. This observation is of vital importance to us in understanding dogs and the dog instinct in ourselves. It is all a matter of which of these deep instinctive urges is the stronger.

To return to our myth, the dog there simply yielded to its stronger impulse, its longing for a warm coat. It seems like betrayal to us. For man it was betrayal, but the dog was true to its own nature. Evidently its feeling for God, its master, was not very developed, for the only objection it raised to the devil was that God would beat it. And eventually it decided that the fur coat was worth the beating. At my home, where the woods came up to the garden, we had two Skye terriers who were very much tempted to go off hunting. This was very dangerous and forbidden. We had lost one already in the traps, so the dogs were always beaten when they escaped, yet sometimes they would go off and stay away two days. They made up their minds that it was worth a beating. The female, who was very brave, would go straight to the man who would beat her, whereas the male dog hid in the rhubarb patch, but as he always hid in the same place, the man knew where to find him.

Dogs, which have a similar loyalty to the leading dog in the pack and will never stop fighting alongside him until he gives in, will only be loyal when they have a strong feeling tie to us. This is the decisive urge, and even then we must not forget that they ultimately decide in favor of their own well-being. They are loyal because the original elastic band to their home is attached to us; we are their center and most vital in their lives. This is a vitally important point to us because we need to realize it fully to be able to live our life with our instincts and emotions. We may be able to do a great deal for abstract morality; certain people live their whole lives on this pattern, but they dry up, they repress their whole emotions, and eventually these will break through either with a terrific explosion, or the barriers will hold and the person eventually dies – actually or psychically

– because they are quite cut off from the life stream. All of you know such people who look as though they had no blood left in them at all. If you say to such a person in analysis: “What do you want to do?,” it is amazing how some people will answer from what they think they *ought* to do. For many people, it is very difficult to get down to what one really wants and to one’s strong instinctive urge in a situation.

There is a Russian legend that when God made men he made the common people of clay, but that the clay gave out so he made the aristocrats of dough. The dog sniffed at them all but ate only those made of dough. When God found the aristocrats missing, he suspected the dog and beat him, or – in other versions – told his angel or St. Peter to get the dog by the tail and shake him, and each time this happened out dropped another aristocrat! In other versions, the Poles, Lithuanians, and so on take the role of the aristocrats. This is not only a betrayal story but has traces of the dog ancestor myths that we shall see are very common, that is, the motif of exceptional people who have been captive in a dog’s stomach (similar to Jonah and the whale). It also suggests the night sea journey in a very primitive form. But here the dog and not the hero takes all the action.

Freda Kretschmar, in *Hundesstammvater und Kerberos*, has collected an impressive amount of material in myths and legends where the dog is regarded as the first ancestor of a tribe or even of all mankind. (I do not want to emphasize this too much as it is a common motif in creation myths, and it is an honor that the dog shares with many other animals.) Kretschmar says it is impossible to separate the dog from the wolf, the jackal, and the American coyote in this field. In some primitive languages there are even no separate words for wolf and dog.

Most of these creation myths are wildly irrational. Human beings are already there, and one of them marries a dog – usually a woman and often a princess, although the sex is sometimes reversed – and then he is the first ancestor even of mankind. This dog is sometimes a bewitched prince or becomes human, but more often it is only the children that become human. Sometimes, if a girl has refused all human suitors, the father punishes her by marrying her to a dog, or sometimes she runs off with her father’s dog herself to escape the incest wish of her father. But, as I mentioned before, this is not a specific quality of the dog, so I only mention it to show what a deep respect some primitive people have for the dog. They consider themselves honored in having him as an ancestor and believe him to be a worthy husband for a legendary princess. (The paradox is also visible here, however, for sometimes a dog husband or wife is an honor, and sometimes a degradation or punishment.)

As an example of the loyal friend, I propose taking one aspect of the Nordic fairy tale “Prince Ring” where the dog, Snati-Snati, plays a particularly important role. I propose only taking a few points that bear directly on our theme and not the whole story. Those who are interested may like to know that it is analyzed at considerable length in Dr. von Franz’s book *The Interpretation of Fairy Tales* (von Franz 1996, 115–118). I will summarize the part that affects our theme.

A prince following a fleet hind with a golden ring round her horns gets into difficulties which land him on a strange island where a pair of giants pick him up. They treat him well and only forbid him to look into the kitchen. He tries to resist the temptation but at last does so, and a dog there calls out: “Choose me, Prince Ring.” When the giants are dying and he can have what he wishes, he chooses Snati-Snati, and when they are dead, the two leave together for the mainland. At Snati’s suggestion they go to the king’s court and ask for a small room. They are welcomed by the king but hated by the jealous minister, Rauder, who incites the king to set Prince Ring impossible tasks like cutting trees, killing wild bulls, recovering three precious objects – a golden suit of clothes, a golden chessboard, and shining gold itself – all of which had been stolen and are now in the possession of another family of giants. When he has accomplished these tasks, he can marry the princess.

By the extreme cunning and prowess of Snati-Snati all these tasks are performed, and then the dog, at the risk of his own life, saves his master’s life from Rauder and brings the latter to disgrace. Then, at the end of the story, he begs to be allowed to sleep at the bottom of the bridal bed and is changed into a prince.

Like Puss-in-Boots, Snati-Snati takes the lead in this story, but whereas the former plays a lone hand, Snati-Snati confides in the hero, very much in keeping with the related character of the dog in contrast to the independent nature of the cat.

The beginning of the acquaintance is very much like the beginning of a deep relationship between dog and man, particularly (as described by Lorenz) with dogs of wolf blood. It takes six months or a year for the *lupus* blood dog to give its loyalty entirely to one person, and thereafter it very seldom changes. The transition out of the introductory stage in this story would be when the decision is made to do something about the unconscious, give up one-sided consciousness, turn toward the unconscious and find out its terms: enter the kitchen, the place of transformation. The man takes the first step in this case, and the original price of the dog is the courage needed in breaking the taboo of the forbidden chamber; then the dog takes the fatal step that links their fates by saying: “Choose me.” This “choose me” is a frequent feature when one goes to buy a dog. My brother once gave me a Cairn puppy, but another of his dogs chose me, she always went with me, so, with great difficulty, I persuaded my brother to change. Then there is also the question as to whether the unconscious accepts us. We can do nothing in the process of individuation, or in taking up the problem of the inferior function, unless the unconscious is willing. If it is not, it will not send us any dreams and instinctive help. Here the dog accepts Prince Ring and begs him to choose him, so the development can begin. The third stage is the stage of fuller and sustained sacrifice. Payment has to be made again, and a bigger price than before. The ego will has to be subordinated to the will of the Self, and that is far heavier than the original price. Prince Ring remains true in choosing the dog when he is offered any possession of the dying giants. In the real dog, this represents the stage when we make sacrifices to fit him into our lives.

Lecture Four: May 17, 1954

We stopped in the last lecture just as we were discussing the beginning of Prince Ring and Snati-Snati’s acquaintance and comparing it to the beginning of our own relationship to a real dog and to the unconscious. We said that when Prince Ring went into the forbidden kitchen, this then would be equivalent to our decision to transgress against the one-sided traditional viewpoint of our age and open negotiations with the other side, the unconscious, which is here represented by the dog.

When the dog calls “Choose me” to Prince Ring, it is equivalent to the acceptance of us by the unconscious; that is, it shows whether it wishes what we wish or not. This is a stage in which we are more or less helpless and have to give the decision to the unconscious.

The third stage is where the ego has to make further and sustained sacrifices, giving up its rational will and accepted values and subordinating itself to the will of the Self. In *Psychology and Alchemy* Jung says: “To let the unconscious go its own way and to experience it as a reality is something beyond the courage and capacity of the average European” (Jung 1968, par. 60). Prince Ring shows this courage when he chooses Snati-Snati before any accepted value that the giants possessed.

It is interesting that in this story, as Dr. von Franz pointed out to me, obedience and humiliation increase. They go together side by side to the king’s court at Snati-Snati’s suggestion. But in the third trial, the fetching of the golden objects, Prince Ring can only get up the hill to the giant’s cave by holding onto the tail of the dog. This represents a place where consciousness would be powerless and where it can only accept the humiliation of being towed by the instinct. Now this task is the decisive one by which the anima is won; that is, it is the *sine qua non* for a union of opposites. Dr. Jung says that as we go on in the process of individuation, it becomes more and more difficult. While unconscious at the beginning, one can get away with a lot; but as we advance, the slightest deviation from our way is taboo. Consciousness is often just not sensitive enough to know when we do deviate, but our dog instinct knows the way unerringly and is a much more sensitive instrument in this respect. To go far in the process of individuation is a superhuman task. It can only be accomplished, as the alchemists say, *Deo concedente*, which means, roughly, with the consent of God. In *Psychology and Alchemy* Jung compares the Christian attitude of throwing all our sins on Christ in complete

unconsciousness with the alchemists' idea that man can only be redeemed by his own very hard work. But even the alchemists say that this can only come about if God is willing. Ring had to give total empowerment over to his dog. He had to give up the last of his ego and will in order to humiliate himself and stand to his

Selling man Prince Ring
 Licking wounds; eating grass
 Loyal Friend Betrayer Coyote legends
 Healer Devourer of corpses Guide
 Trickster
 Cerberus Watchdog
 Thief
 Guide to Heaven
 Guard of Heaven Stealing

Figure 2. Aspects of the Dog

own weakness. But he had learned by experience that the dog could be relied on. We have to experiment until we know which aspect of the unconscious, which feeling and which instinct we can rely on, and we have to be sure that it wants it also.

If Ring had trusted Rauder, who was also an aspect of the unconscious, namely a shadow figure, it would have led to complete disaster. But consciousness was needed too. If Ring had not given full conscious collaboration, Snati-Snati could hardly have prevailed against the three giants. Yet, interestingly enough, in the next event – in the midst of the story – Snati-Snati acted alone. He demanded a still greater humiliation from his master. That the dog should sleep in the master's bed and the prince take Snati's place on the floor was really going a little far. And Snati did not explain any more than Puss-in-Boots did to the miller's son. The reason, in this case, is that Rauder planned to murder Prince Ring and naturally went to the bed, but here Snati attacked him fiercely and bit off his hand. The next morning the hand was still grasping the sword so Prince Ring was able to convince the king that Rauder meant to murder him, and the minister was promptly hung.

Now, why did Snati set out on his own here? Something very cruel had to be done, and in such a case the instinct cannot rely on man. He is too likely to fall into sentimentality or to be too rational. The dog could not rely on the man here because it was practically a case of killing Rauder, and that goes beyond human limitations. Those of you who have read the 1824 classic *Confessions of a Justified Sinner* will remember that this was the place where Robert really lost his battle. He permitted Gil Martin to incite him to murder instead of staying within his own human limitations. Here Snati takes the deed over and commits it himself.

I remember a girl who had no parents; she had only a sick aunt who was a cripple and extremely difficult and had an awful power attitude. The girl, however, felt she must go and visit her since it would be too cruel not to do so. Finally one day her legs would not take her up the staircase; they just shook like jelly. Dr. Jung, who had previously taken the point of view that the visits would not hurt her, said that that settled it, one must accept it. It is well known that instinct works by itself in producing frigidity in a woman if she marries against her instinct, or likewise impotence in a man.

The dog and instinct can afford to be more ruthless than the conscious attitude. If the conscious acted in that way, it would be almost forced to make Jesuitical excuses: doing bad that good might come, and so forth. But if the instinct does it then it's a *fait accompli*, and there is nothing to be said about it. If Ring had known in advance, he could not have let Snati be so ruthless. Of course this is very dangerous because it is really an invitation to make plots. To leave things one cannot manage up to the unconscious is absolutely wrong. I am simply trying to explain that there are times when the instinct does act on its own. The dog wouldn't risk his master's life, and there he shows the summit of loyalty and willingness to give his life for his friend. Dogs, with the "elastic band" to the master, will also do this. According to Lorenz, this would be the strongest urge because their own well-being depends on their master's survival. The question is: can we say the same of our unconscious? Of an unconscious that is fixed on the process of individuation I think we could. It is my experience that as the center is approached, as the Self slowly takes over from the ego – and if the ego has really sacrificed its own way – sacrifices are also made by autonomous complexes such as the animus. In active imagination it is possible sometimes to influence an autonomous complex in this way, to say to it something like: "Look here, if you kill me, our whole project will go on the rocks; you need the human being in order that you may be incarnated on this side of reality." This works sometimes, for after all, our bodies are the vessel. The unconscious often acts on its own, just as Snati-Snati did, and can make us ill to save us from some folly. In active imagination it may act suddenly where we least expect it. For example, a woman was working in active imagination on the "country of eros" which for her was ruled by a tyrant. She had tried every way to eject him but unavailingly. And then, quite suddenly, when she least expected it, he retired voluntarily and restored the queen he had deposed and imprisoned years before.

After all, individuation, the bringing of the eternal Self into reality, requires the life of the human being as a *sine qua non*, so we could say that it is absolutely true that our unconscious does go as far as Snati. At the end of the story Snati-Snati asks to sleep at the bottom of the bed on the bridal night, and when his wish is granted, he turns into a human prince, also with the name Prince Ring. Evidently the fulfillment of eros is required to restore this dog prince to his rights. One could almost say that this piece of Ring's psychology had been lost and contaminated with three things: chthonic contents, the anima, and the lack of eros, three aspects of the psyche very much repressed in the field of Christian consciousness. He had also been human before, so it looks like something that had previously been in human consciousness. Dr. von Franz says it is a very old fairy tale written not so long after the conversion to Christianity of the Nordic lands, that is, somewhere between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries. She bases this on the fact that there is still no great tension between human consciousness and the instinctive world, as shown in the comparative ease with which Ring and Snati find each other and harmonize their points of view. In order to be redeemed, Ring must not only humiliate himself but also accept the anima. Then, suddenly, what he had regarded as a dog turns out to have a spiritual content. Here the dog moves from the infrared to the ultraviolet end of the spectrum and the instinct, represented by Snati, reveals its archetypal meaning. It would lead us too far from our theme to do more than mention this aspect. By transforming into a prince, Snati turns out to be an instinct that can, to a great extent, be assimilated. The dog is much nearer to us than the cat. Snati is a bewitched human prince, that is, not quite a real dog, which we could never wholly assimilate. He is something lost to consciousness that was previously human. In this case Snati can be fully integrated, whereas the total assimilation of the dog can never occur. There have been times in history when people lived much closer to their instincts than they do today, and therefore much of the instinct represented by the dog can be integrated. In creation myths (as briefly mentioned), the theme of the dog slowly becoming more human frequently occurs.

The Dog: Guide and Trickster

One of the best known aspects of the dog in mythology is the dog as the guide of souls who accompanies us to the other world. Sometimes he is known to guide us in this world as well. We will deal with the important aspect of the dog as guide, but, as with most other animals, it is better to begin with the more negative side. We find here the dog as a mis-leader or trickster. Lorenz writes that in the case of the actual dog, it simply obeys its inner urge. And to it every urge is “good.” So in this aspect in particular it is arbitrary to divide it into negative and positive, and I am fully aware that it can be argued that the dog as trickster brings about positive results just as much as the dog as guide. However, in the dog even more than in the cat, these aspects mix into each other, particularly on the negative sides.

As the Egyptian Anubis, and in many other places as well, the dog is very much connected with death. Therefore we should expect to find him also on the side of abundant life. Especially in America we find his cousin, the coyote, as an erotic animal who not only has every affair he can manage with the daughters of men but is also the one who taught man the secrets of sex and thus brought about procreation and the survival of the species.

The Salishan Native American tribes in British Columbia and in the American Northwest have a great many myths and legends regarding the coyote, whom some tribes even regard as the creator and cultural hero. But here, as elsewhere in North America, he is a highly tricky creator, always up to mischief and using his powers to a great extent for his own amusement. For instance, the Shuswap tribe (of the Salishan peoples) have a story that he once changed himself into a baby and was picked up by two sisters out of pity for the poor, motherless, deserted thing. In the night he secretly slept with each of them, and in the morning they were both pregnant. He is said not even to have respected his own daughter but to have got onto what he said was his deathbed and made her promise to give herself to the first man she met and, changing himself into a man, met her in a wood and claimed her promise to her “dying father” for himself.

Such stories of the coyote seem to be endless among the natives of North America, and we find the same erotic promiscuity attributed to the dog in the Old World. In North Borneo, for instance, a tribe believes that paradise is situated on the summit of a mountain. The portals are guarded by a fiery dog who throws himself on every virgin that arrives at the gate of paradise, whereas every woman who has slept with a man on earth passes unhindered since he considers her unworthy of his embrace.

The promiscuous nature of the dog is also very much emphasized in our common speech. To speak of a woman as a cat may mean that she is clever at playing tricks on other women or that she is clever with men, like the cat who chooses the tom and makes him believe he choose her. But often when women say so fiercely: “What a cat she is. . . .” you can detect a secret note of envy. But in my youth when a woman was called a bitch – which of course was used then as now also to denote a normal female dog – it was just meant derogatorily that she was promiscuous. Psychologically such a woman has fallen victim to a promiscuous animus and lost her connection with the eros principle, her only reliable guide in matters of relationship. Wild animals obey their mating laws whatever they are – some monogamous, other polygamous, and so on. Most herd animals are polygamous, there being wild battles among the males in which the law of the survival of the fittest generally prevails.

Why should we find the dog and his cousin the coyote in myth and legend as such an especially promiscuous beast that he, particularly she, became a byword for promiscuity? Dogs are most domesticated and, by living so near to man, have had their instincts more interfered with than any other animal. Their sexual pattern of behavior has become distorted – particularly in our eyes – and they have in fact come to copulate openly as the urge calls, any time and any place. The dog has thus taken on the image of an exaggerated and unnatural sexuality. The bull and the stallion, for instance, are kept for breeding and, although controlled by man, are given enough scope. But dogs are rarely kept for breeding and, unlike cats, they are not usually castrated. Thus, of all our domesticated animals, they have perhaps suffered most from civilization. Our own sexuality has suffered in a similar way.

I went to live in Paris for two years as an art student when I was about twenty-seven or twenty-eight and was struck by the effect of the *Quartier Latin* on young girls who came there from America and England, particularly if they had been strictly brought up. Some built the walls still higher and became even more straitlaced, while others in an extremely short time went right over to almost becoming prostitutes. This was just after the First World War. Women who have been strictly raised are inclined to fall into a promiscuous animus, which may be the psychological reason for the enormous number of myths and legends where a woman marries a dog. Men tend to fall into the hands of a highly possessive anima who keeps her power over the man by continually projecting herself into different women. In the dialogue between Hugh de St. Victor and his soul he asks what she loves best, and she says quite calmly that she has not quite made up her mind. She either loses the things that she likes through decay or she sees something she likes better and feels bound to change. Here she expresses exactly that quality which is constellated when promiscuity gets the upper hand.

The connection between dog and trickster – mainly as I have given it to you in the coyote – also needs explanation. It is a totally different trickiness to that of the cat. The dog who sold man for fur and who ate the people God made of dough, or the coyote in the examples just mentioned, take immediate pleasure, whereas the cat is like a master detective playing for bigger stakes with much more self-control. The dog trickster already contains an element of dawning consciousness. Such stories as that of the fiery dog or the affair of the coyote and the virgins either shock you or make you laugh, and then you are already not quite identical with the instinct. These animals show a kind of semihuman intelligence pointing to the hypothesis that with the dog, in contradistinction to the cat and horse, we are dealing with an instinct very close to man. (Kretschmar said that it is really not possible to keep the dog myths apart from those of the wolf, jackal, and coyote.) The dog has become so humanized, so to speak, that he is by no means a purely animal instinct. In my paper “The Problem of Contact with the Animus,”¹ I spoke of the woman with the animus figure she called “Archibald.” He was most useful, a regular Admiral Creighton. She told us many years ago about this animus and of how he helped her, and we remarked that you could not really trust a figure of the unconscious to such an extent, particularly in regard to things of the outside life where you must make your own decisions. However, she would not listen; she was so delighted and gave herself more and more into his hands and became completely possessed by him, so that what was originally very positive in the end became purely negative.

Thus the dog instinct has an unerring flair, but we have to be very careful not to let it advance into outer things too far. We must trust it in the darkness of the unconscious, for there it sees far better than we do and its interests are usually identical with our own.

Coming to the dog as guide to the beyond, we find that the material is endless and comes from all over the world. I can only give you the merest fragment.

In Egypt there are two gods represented in old pictures as dogs: Anubis is represented as a dog lying down and Upuaut (in Greek, Ophois) is represented as a standing dog. Anubis is a god of the land of the dead and belongs more in the Cerberus aspect, but Upuaut is a guide par excellence. His very name, according to Bonnet, is already a proof of victorious advance in war and means the “opener of ways” (Bonnet 1952, 842). He is closely related to Anubis and is practically identical to Abydos, thus bringing us to the shores of Egypt. According to certain Greek writers, he becomes identical with Hermes or Mercurius, who also has a caduceus, that is, the thing that can open all ways. Hermes also has the Kynée, that is, a helmet or cap in likeness of a dog’s head, so that Hermes is connected with the dog directly and not only through his contamination

with Anubis. He is also directly connected with the poimen (Greek for shepherd) and in modern dreams very often with the dog. In fact, I have had dreams of the dog that Dr. Jung has taken directly as the archetype of the poimen.

The idea that the dog can get us everywhere, especially to the beyond, is widespread. For instance, the Samoyeds in northern Asia (who also have a version of the myth of the “dog betraying man to the devil for fur”) usually gave their god Ngaa (death) the form of a wolf. When someone is very ill, they send for a shaman who places an image of the wolf at the side of the tent and then sacrifices the dog of the sick man. (This sacrifice occurs after leading the dog around the tent counterclockwise and includes placing the dog’s heart on a pole.) Then he kills another dog and, as this one dies, he prays to the wolf Ngaa to accept the sacrifice in place of the life of the sick man. (They perform somewhat the same rite during a child’s birth.) If these rites are unsuccessful and Ngaa insists on the life of the human being, they kill yet another dog on the man’s grave and hang it so that the tail is pointing downward toward the corpse. The idea here is that when the soul is resurrected, the dead man will hang onto the dog’s tail and thus his soul will be safely conveyed to the land of the dead where he will find a second life. In certain areas of India they put the lead of the dog into the hands of the corpse, but the tail version seems to be the more usual. In the Zoroastrian religion in Persia this idea is still more developed.

In New Guinea there is a tribe that believes that pigs and dogs have immortal souls. There are two special dogs called Bigami and Vauri who are the leaders of souls and the messengers of death. They come on the earth to fetch the soul of a dying man. They are considered to be very dangerous, the belief being that while you are asleep your soul flutters freely around (thus no man of the tribe will sleep outdoors).

The dog as guide can find the way with his highly developed sense of smell when none of our senses are of any use, and he is so related to man through thousands of years of domestication that he will guide him, whereas other animals with this acute sense of smell will not. We must also remember that the dog in mythology is profoundly connected with death and the beyond and that the actual dog is also a sarcophagus for man in the many countries where corpses are exposed to him to eat. Thus as a dweller both here and in the beyond he is particularly well fitted to be a guide from one to the other and even a mediator, for both men and ghosts understand him, so to speak. Dogs are also very sensitive to ghosts, and there are many stories of their being the first to realize that ghosts are around. In some countries in Asia it is believed that the dog will always show if there is a bad demon about. A doctor I knew always took a dog with him, and if the patient could recover, the dog would go into the room, but if the patient was destined to die, it would run away or cower outside. When it comes to the spiritual world, all reason and rational means come to an end. Like Prince Ring, we have to trust our dog instinct completely. Ring, however, had already been told where the golden objects were. He only had to accept the humiliation of being towed, that is, acknowledging that his own strength was quite inadequate to the task. Here the dog as guide goes further; you have to venture into the completely unknown with only the dog instinct. In most of the myths it is death, and there is no help for it, but psychologically when you venture into such realms, you voluntarily have to face something so terrifying as death or there can be no rebirth. You can have analyzed for a very long time and done a lot of active imagination before you meet this supreme trial. It even seems as if you were losing all you gained. As one woman commented about a dream when faced with such a journey, “But if I go there, I lose all my psychological knowledge, everything I gained in analysis.”

We find the same thing with the alchemists, for although they lay such an enormous emphasis on study, suddenly it is said: “Go tear up the books that your hearts be not torn asunder,” and this even though they insist time and again on the vital importance of study and contend that all the books must be repeatedly read. Important as it is to the alchemist to know the right doctrine, he knows that on such a journey doctrine is only a hindrance. Here it really is a fact that only an animal with a loving heart, such as the dog, can guide us in these dark places. It is the point where you have to give up everything that you have learned and go, guided only by your instinct.

X

The Dog: Watchdog and Thief

In the very short time we have for these lectures we cannot possibly go into all eight aspects of the dog thoroughly. Thus I propose mentioning the motif of the dog as thief only briefly, since it is a well-known theme and we already touched on it in talking of the lazy aspect of the cat and Butter Ears, who cheated because he was too lazy to hunt.

So now, coming to the thief side of the dog, I would like to relate an amusing and widespread Christian legend found particularly in eastern Europe. I give here an ancient Baltic Lithuanian version which relates that God sent Adam to sleep after extracting the rib from his side and took a rest to smoke his pipe. (In most versions God went away to get clay to fill up the hole in Adam.) While God's attention was elsewhere, the dog stole the rib. God rushed after him but the dog saved himself by crossing a river where God could not follow. He did manage to catch the dog's tail, which came off in his hand, so God made Eve out of that.

Despite the partly humorous dig at women, this legend is quite meaningful as the dog here really takes the role of the devil per se, the one who interferes with God's plans. The fact that he goes over the river to the other bank – where God cannot follow – shows the duality in God that is so clear in those two texts I mentioned: Jung's *Answer to Job* and Schärff's *Satan*. The devil is like the other side of God, the one who is on the other side of the river. So the Dog-Satan tries to take woman in entirety, the whole rib designed to be Eve, but God just manages to stop this by getting the dog's tail, a piece of the other side. God has to change his plans and make Eve more doglike and less human than he had intended. Women are nearer to instinct and more capable of dealing with the chthonic side than men. At the beginning of the Second World War I had a dream that I was in Chichester Cathedral, where there used to be an unfinished chapel in which stones and so forth were kept. Here I met the devil and said to him: "What a mess you are making of the world with the war." He said: "Excuse me, this is not my fault, it is yours." I declined that responsibility, and he answered with something like: "Of course, I do not mean you personally, I mean women, because women can deal with the dark side and with evil and, since they don't, it gets into the hands of men who anyway can't deal with the darker sides of life. If the women won't try, then there are bound to be wars." It is very helpful, however, that women at least grew up on God's side of the river, which prevented the other opposite from being too strong.

Perhaps the most interesting of the many myths and legends concerning the watchdog of heaven is to be found in the Zoroastrian religion in Persia. We hear in the *Sad-dar*, for instance, that to give bread to a dog is a good work, that one must never wake a sleeping dog on the road, and that altogether one should be careful to treat dogs well in order to ensure their help on the Cinvat Bridge, which leads over the abyss to hell and to paradise. In the *Videvdāt* (XIX, 30) we hear that a beautiful virgin guards this bridge and restrains two dogs on a leash. They throw the unworthy down into hell and guide the souls of the righteous over the bridge to paradise. We find these two dogs confirmed in the *Bundahish* and the *Sad-dar* (both Pahlavi texts). In the *Bundahish*, however, the virgin and the two dogs seem to be one large ghost-dog. At all events, in all versions it seems to be certain that one or two dogs guard the Cinvat Bridge. A near parallel are the two dogs of the god Yama in Indian mythology, which also guard the way to heaven.

We meet the dog as watchdog and guard at the entrance to heaven in a yet more powerful position here. He practically occupies the place of Peter in Christian religion and seems to have a lot to say, if not the actual decision, as to who goes to heaven and who is thrown into hell. Now on earth the dog is more or less the possession of man, but here he practically decides man's fate after death. When it comes to the other side, we may be pretty sure that the decision of what is good and what is evil changes its standards. Traditional morality presumably gives way, as it were, to a deeper instinctive morality. One could say that what we call good, if it is against life, is rejected, and the same applies to what we call evil. I do not necessarily mean life on this side, which ends in death, but more a secret life manifestation of the psyche, which is the vital and decisive point. This morality is really the morality of the process of individuation that aims at *totality*. The dog knows this morality better than we do; it lives itself as a whole being much better than we. The dog on earth actually has a good nose for a criminal, that is, for someone who has deviated too far from his own pattern.

In conclusion I would like to give a short example. When I visited some friends of mine in Los Angeles, I had to pass a chow. I know and like chows, and as a rule this one was amiable and pleased to see me, but if he growled or showed displeasure I could bet that I had become inflated or that something was wrong. We say one must be wary of people whom children and dogs do not like, which shows the vital necessity of getting on good terms with one's instinct. You will remember that I quoted Dr. Jung at the beginning as saying that it was vitally important for the analyst to see if the instincts were with the emotions, for the latter were otherwise totally unreal. Yet this same dog can be a thief himself and even steal Adam's rib from God. This is the same paradox that we find everywhere. In the end it is a question of whether we are at one with our instincts, the paradoxical thing being in ourselves.

Lecture Five: May 24, 1954

The dog is not only the guard to paradise, as on the Cinvat Bridge, but also is perhaps best known to all of us as the dog of the underworld. Cerberus was originally the devouring god of the land of the dead and only later became the watchdog of Pluto. He is a real god – in dog form – of the underworld and cannot stand the light of day. As you know, the twelfth labor of Hercules was to carry the dog Cerberus to the upper world. Dr. von Franz relates an amusing mythological anecdote, namely that Hercules carried Cerberus up to the outer world – he had never seen the sun – and when the first sunbeam hit his nose he sneezed, and where he sneezed foxgloves grew. Digitalis is a poison and also a heart remedy, so here already we have a hint of the healing aspect. But Cerberus could not stand the light and Eurystheus – divine ruler of Greece – could not stand Cerberus, so Hercules sent him down to Hades.

Homer mentions this dog but without giving him a name. Hesiod first introduces him as Cerberus, attributing fifty heads to the monster. Later authors and artists confine themselves to a three-headed Cerberus that resembles Hecate, that dark chthonic goddess who prevailed over magic arts and spells. She herself is very much connected with dogs and was usually represented with them, often associating with the dogs of the Styx and the crowds of the dead. Black dogs were considered her favorite sacrifice. It was said that she was approaching when the distant howling of dogs was heard, and apparently people fled or threw themselves to the ground so as not to see or be seen by them. Hecate's dogs were connected with the Furies, who are supposed to bring madness.

We must remember that before the discovery that rabies was the result of a virus and could be developed in any warm-blooded animal (sheep, and so forth), it was thought that the dog was the personification of rabies. This conjecture offers one explanation for the dog's frequent connection with death and why we so often find it associated with the beyond.

Hecate is much connected with Artemis, that is, with Diana, the huntress goddess who is usually depicted with dogs. According to Hesychius, Hecate was sometimes even regarded as a dog herself. In later Christian days both the three-headed Hecate and the three-headed Cerberus became a kind of dark chthonic underworld compensation or mirror image of the heavenly Trinity. Cerberus, very much in contradistinction to the dogs of the Cinvat Bridge, is well known to have accepted bribes. Hercules, Theseus and others got past him by offering him honey cakes.

Kretschmar points out that although it is clear that Cerberus was more than a mere watchdog at the door of Hades, there is no mention in

literature that he ate the dead, a curious omission since the dog is so widely known as a corpse eater. She also says that almost all the human figures connected with Hades have certain dog characteristics. Charon, the ferryman to the underworld, for instance, has fiery eyes and tousled clothes and growls suddenly so that he is even called the "human-shaped successor" of Cerberus. As already mentioned, Anubis in Egypt – represented in the hieroglyph as the dog lying down – is also connected with the dead and is, in fact, a god of the dead par excellence. Kretschmar brings countless other examples from all over the world.

We have already considered the dog in his aspect of guide to the other world, the one who can smell out the way in the beyond. We must now consider him as being quite at home in the beyond and also in his aspect as the disreputable watchdog of the underworld, an extremely fierce guardian of the gate who is yet pliable with bribes. This aspect of the dog Cerberus has to do with the instinct of anger. If we repress the instincts, if we neglect to give them their meat, then they become a very angry watchdog between us and the unconscious and we cannot get in. You know that people who are on very bad terms with their unconscious often have dreams of angry animals or inferior men. That is the Cerberus aspect, the aspect of something neglected that then bars our way into the unconscious, and there is really no chance of getting through until the anger instinct is appeased with the honey cake. As honey is a spiritual food and is connected with poetic inspiration, it would mean, to some extent, that the way we get through is by using our creative side. You see people with a real emotional or psychological block because they have neglected something. Very often people have to work on anything they can in order to give something of themselves. Honey is a natural food, but the honey cake is something made by the human being and therefore, at bottom, is a substitute for the human sacrifice. You have to give a bit of yourself in some way to this anger instinct before you can go or you will be kept out of the unconscious forever. If the instinct has been badly repressed and badly treated, it is really hell, and we must reckon with Cerberus each time we try to approach. Jung often says that when our problems are darkest we cannot decide consciously. It is always the instinct that has to decide (unless we prefer an arbitrary, one-sided solution that is not really a solution at all but merely a repression of one side or the other). If hostile, the dog instinct must be appeased, and often, even when he has not been badly repressed, we have to act *contra naturam*, and then we have to "bribe" our instinct a little to let us do it. Such an undertaking as entering hell to fetch up Persephone is dead against nature, for it means entering the realm of the dead while still alive. Our instinct will tear us to pieces, like Cerberus at the gate, unless we remember its point of view and sacrifice something to it. Honey cake might also symbolize in its sweetness a kind of warm, feeling attitude to an instinct that we have repressed or are forced to hurt by acting *contra naturam*.

In *The Phenomenology of the Spirit in Fairy Tales* Dr. Jung gives a marvelous fairy tale where he shows very clearly the difference between the witch (an attitude that is just trying to make use of the unconscious for its own purpose) and a real attitude of trying to get to one's unconscious and wholeness (Jung 1977a, pars. 384–455). In this story the hero sacrifices the lambs, but the witch sacrifices nothing and therefore loses one of the legs of her horse.

XI

The Dog: Healer and Corpse Eater

We find the healing aspect of the dog also in many times and places. The most famous example is undoubtedly the cult of Asclepius. Jung pointed out to me that it is very important that the wolf is the animal of Asclepius's father, Apollo.¹ As Apollo is regarded as such a shining and positive figure, it gives us quite a shock to find him connected with a wild and dangerous wolf, showing again the dual nature of the gods with which we are always confronted. But his own son, Asclepius – educated by the famous centaur, Chiron – is the legendary god of medicine, and with him his father's fierce wolf becomes the healing dog.

Although it is difficult to find any details, it is well known that dogs played a role in Asclepian temples. Kretschmar lets us down here. She tells us only of the saga that Asclepius was suckled by a dog mother. (These legends of human children being suckled by animals are very common. One thinks instantly, for instance, of Romulus and Remus, who were nourished by a wolf.) There is no time to go into this aspect, although it belongs in the healing category, for the dog does save children's lives. (I refer you to Jung's discussion of the "divine child" in his essay on the psychology of the child archetype (Jung 1977a, pars. 259–305).) In the *Revue Archeologique* for 1884 there are two interesting articles. In the first of these, by a man called Reinach and titled "Les Chiens dans le Culte d'Esculape," we learn that the word for dog appears on the pillars of a Phoenician sanctuary in Citium, showing that the dogs were on the temple inventory. Reinach then goes on to speak of two inscriptions on the Asclepian temple in Epidaurus. The first concerns a blind child named Thyson D'Hermione, and says: "This child was looked after by one of the temple dogs and left cured." The second is even more interesting and reads: "One of the sacred dogs took care with its tongue of a child who had a tumor on its head." These inscriptions really prove beyond doubt that the role of the dogs in the cult of Asclepius goes far beyond the watchdog and that dogs, like the serpent, actually played a part in the healing ceremonies and were, so to speak, the living vehicle for the healing power of the god.

In the other article, "A propos des chiens d'Eidaure" by H. Gaidoz, the author says that Reinach has proved that these two cures at all events were brought about by the sacred dogs. He brings a great many parallels in other places showing the widespread belief that the dog has a healing quality in its tongue.

Certain illiterate Indians believe that the English kill dogs for their tongues, which contain a healing ambrosia, and they themselves allow dogs to lick their wounds for the same reason. What the Indians call "ambrosia" is referred to by the Venetians as "balsam." Gaidoz mentioned the same kind of belief in other countries, for instance, Portugal, Scotland, France, Jamaica, Bohemia, and so forth. A well-known French proverb says: "The tongue of a dog can be used as medicine," and a Breton proverb runs: "The tongue of a dog is healing, the tongue of a cat is venomous." Gaidoz also mentions the dogs licking the sores of Lazarus, which is, I think, the only positive reference to dogs in the Bible.

Another reason why the dog is connected with healing is the fact that he cures himself by eating grass and in many places is credited with considerable knowledge of herbs, as he is said to know the right grasses to eat. This last aspect of healing brings us into a rather different realm and perhaps the most positive one of all in this incredibly helpful animal, since it seems to lie in an innate healing quality in the tongue.² Now, in response to your question about what I think about the healing in our instincts that is represented by the dog, I would say that this healing aspect may also be connected with the faithful and loving aspect of our canine friend. If everything goes wrong and we are completely out of tune with ourselves, something in us may express warm concern for our well-being. Instead of trying to satisfy our dependent needs from the outside, it is as though the power to do this lies within ourselves.

Yes, there is a source of healing in ourselves if we can trust it. People often dream of doctors and very often – if not always – such dreams can be interpreted on the subjective level as something in the patient that knows how to heal. Such an "inner doctor" in ourselves would usually not be one learned in our modern clinical methods but would more likely be on the lines of a primitive medicine man. Through his healing quality, a dog in a dream could also appear in such a role. But it is clear that if healing is represented by a dog, it would mean that we must look for a cure in a humble place, as if we actually submitted ourselves to being licked by a dog.

The articles quoted above state that dogs disappeared in the cult of Asclepius long before the serpent, which was always a source of healing in the Asclepian cult. Gaidoz thinks that their disappearance is due to the fact that dogs were so despised in Greece. In Asclepian temples the serpent is also spoken of as licking its patients. The serpent would reach down to a far deeper level than the dog. One other fact that we should not overlook is that it is just in licking that this healing "balsam" or "ambrosia" lies. As you know, Jung usually takes spittle as "soul substance," a psychic substance, or essence. Therefore, we might say that the dog really massages us with the essence of its soul when it licks us.

I would now like to summarize and conclude our study of the dog. We have passed far too quickly and superficially through eight aspects of the meaning of the dog as he appears in myth and legend. These aspects – even if we had time to go into them properly – by no means exhaust the manifold possibilities or meanings of the dog in dreams or active imagination, but I hope that they may have proved how irresponsible it would be to hang a ticket around the animal's neck and say a dog means this or that. We saw him first as the betrayer of man to the devil for his own advantage and saw right away that we cannot afford to project our human standards of right and wrong onto a dog or our dog instinct. To prevent our dog instinct from betraying us, we must learn its language here, so to speak, as it was learned in dreams of baby rats fed to pythons.

Then we turned to the more positive side of this aspect, in which the dog Snati-Snati helped Prince Ring accomplish tasks that would have been far beyond human consciousness. We saw the summit of loyalty in Snati when he risked his life for his master and realized that our own unconscious is capable of a similar loyalty if we have a cooperative attitude toward it, as Ring had to Snati.

Afterward we returned to the promiscuous and trickster element in the dog and saw how civilization has somewhat warped both our dogs' and our own sexuality and that the trickster element, although it is a kind of embryonic consciousness, bids us beware of too blind a confidence in our dog instinct. To let it lead us consciously is a totally different thing from allowing it to possess us. The latter is always the result of a confidence that is blind.

We then met the dog as the guide of souls to the beyond and saw his suitability for this task owing to his being at home on both sides. In psychological situations, such as those symbolized by the night sea journey, we go into the unknown as completely as when we die and then – as illustrated in religions and myths all over the world – the dog is widely regarded as the one who knows how to guide us through the darkness of our own way.

We also dwelt briefly on the dog as thief in the Christian legend where he steals Adam's bone, and we saw him as the watchdog at the entrance to paradise as illustrated in the Zoroastrian belief of the Cinvat Bridge. We find the dog here almost in the role of St. Peter and saw that it knows more of the morality of the process of individuation and wholeness than we do. Therefore we might expect him to know who has fulfilled the pattern of his life and who has neglected it. Then we saw the dog as Cerberus, the guard at the portals of Hades, and that a neglected and repressed instinct may well prove to be like a Cerberus that prevents us from reaching our unconscious. Moreover, we saw that even when we are forced to act *contra naturam*, we must never forget our dog instinct and neglect to give it some honey cake so that it will allow us to accomplish our purpose.

Finally, we came to dogs in the healing realm, particularly in the cult of Asclepius, and saw that there is a healing power in ourselves, but that it often needs great humility to reach this, just as it would to submit to being licked by a dog. I admit that I have skipped a discussion of the dog as an

eater of corpses, a practice that is widespread enough throughout history to need no particular mention. Moreover, the horror of this image – most vividly illustrated for us perhaps by the devouring practices of wolves – speaks well enough for itself. It is quite a paradoxical and powerful contrast to the healing aspect of the dog. With this final point I would like to draw our discussion of the symbolism of the dog to a close. I would suggest we proceed here directly with our study of the horse.

XII

The Horse: Notes on the Biological Background

With the horse we enter a different field again, one that is much different from our two foregoing animals and even more different than the dog was to the cat. Other than the horse being a domestic animal, it shares little in common with the one or the other.

Brehm divides the equine family into zebras, asses, and horses, of which only the last concern us here. Unlike dogs, who seem to have developed from jackals and wolves, the horse, per se, is found in very remote ages long prior to human history.

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* informs us that wild horses were abundant in the Neolithic period. Quantities of horse bones have been found near human remains of that period, pointing to the probability that they formed one of man's more important food supplies. The same reference asserts that these horses were domesticated by inhabitants of Europe before the dawn of history. But Brehm is more conservative in this respect. In any case, opinions seem to differ considerably. It seems probable that horses were domesticated much later than dogs, and probably a good deal earlier than cats. For the most part, our horses descend from European wild horses, although these were crossed with Eastern breeds (in England probably from the Crusades onward). There is no authentic account of Eastern horses being brought into England until the reign of James I, when they were first entered in the *Stud Book*. The Muslim invasion of Spain also brought a lot of Eastern blood to European horses. Brehm asserts, however, that the so-called English thoroughbred has only a thoroughbred father.

Although horses were indigenous to the American continents, they died out early and were imported by Europeans after the discovery of the New World. Brehm points out that the herds of wild horses in South America are horses that were originally domesticated and have again gone wild. Such horses soon take on the habits of their wild ancestors. South American wild horses have exactly the same habits as the wild horses of Asia and Europe that have never been tamed. Usually they are in very large herds, but within these there are much smaller groups consisting of a varying number of mares under the leadership of an older stallion. Both small groups and large herds are very shy and evasive, galloping away from danger, and their sense of smell and hearing seems to be very much more acute than that of the domestic horse. Brehm emphasizes again and again that the horse gallops off if anything frightens it, or if anything is uncanny, or if there is anything it does not understand.

The book *Tschiffely's Ride* is an account of a man who rode from Buenos Aires to New York. He took two American ponies that had gone wild in Patagonia. He describes them as immensely intelligent. For example, one slipped down a precipice and by sheer luck caught on a tree, and he was able to go down and take off the saddle packs. The horse remained perfectly still – despite every reason to panic – allowing itself to be dragged up onto the path.

Brehm points out that – like the dog – the horse is one of the animals whose strongest sense is smell. Its hearing is also extremely acute, while its sight is rather curious. Although its eyes are so much larger than ours, they do not see stationary objects nearly as clearly as we do, or nearly as far, but they have an extraordinary sensitivity to anything that moves; a moving paper or a flying bird will make a horse shy, hence the use of blinders. Brehm mentions also *Der kluge Hans* (the horse who was supposed to answer questions) and believes that the rider's smallest involuntary movement would be perceived by the horse. If the rider had not known the answer, it is questionable whether the horse would.

As mentioned, Brehm emphasizes that the horse's natural reaction is always instantaneous flight. That the horse has so largely overcome this natural tendency to panic and flee speaks for a certain psychic ability to transform and adapt; one need only think, for instance, of the battlefield and the amazing courage of the cavalry horses. Brehm believes, like a good many other people, that the horse is not very intelligent – in the human sense of the word – and says that in its skull the space for the brain is very small in comparison to its long face. The intelligence of horses is a controversial point. They certainly have most remarkable extrasensory perception, as evidenced by their ability to find their way and get over difficult country. They are also highly sensitive to anything uncanny or to haunted places. Even the gifts of clairvoyance and prophecy have been freely attributed to them in many ages and places, but evidence of any reasoning power is rather rare. Of course, their extraordinary extrasensory perception and obedience to instinct often seems like reasoning, but if you analyze it – in my experience, at any rate – the cases that seem to be reasoning are very much less rare with the cat and dog than with the horse.

Brehm divides horses into "cold- and warm-blooded" and "phlegmatic and fiery" breeds. Even within breeds, of course, dispositions of individual horses vary enormously. The more their wills are broken, and the more we treat them like robots, the less independence and intelligence they show, but that is actually because we cut them off from their instinct and they form the habit of blind obedience that replaces the inner guidance just as the white man replaces the inner guidance of the primitive. It is a fact that primitive tribes are inclined to lose their dependence on their chiefs and medicine men when their government is taken over by a European country. Jung tells the story of how, when he asked an African chief about his dreams, he received the answer that they no longer dreamed anymore because the district commissioner knew everything.

Both the outer and the mythological material on the horse is simply enormous. Even in a far longer course I should be obliged to leave out many famous examples. In the Bible the cat is not mentioned at all, the dog has only a third of a column in Cruden's *Concordance*, but the horse, horses, and horsemen nearly two columns. One remembers, for instance, the important role played by the different colored horses in Revelation, but this is too long and too complicated to touch on here. An interesting book is *The Horse in Magic and Myth* by M. Oldfield Howey, but I have learned not to quote it as a reference unless I am able to confirm the material elsewhere. (It is not my wish, by the way, to cite numerous books addressing the symbolic context of the horse [or any animal], but to limit ourselves in these lectures to those few good sources that give a representative, in-depth and concise review of that animal's symbolism.)

We cannot deny that the horse is to a great extent a symbol for energy and libido (the power of engines being reckoned in horsepower) but it would be much too cheap to leave it at that. A much more general symbol for energy is money, for that can be converted into almost anything, whereas the energy symbolized by the horse is much more specific; perhaps we might call the horse's energy temperamental disposition.

In any case, to find the crosshairs for the horse was most difficult, for they overlap even more than in the case of the cat and the dog, but the aspects of the horse that I propose are the horse as:

1. a symbol of the obedient and hard worker versus wild unruly spirit (which includes the extreme ease with which the horse, so easily domesticated, returns to the wild),
2. a symbol of the helper as well as the victim (of man),
3. a symbol instilling vitality as well as destruction,
4. a symbol of extrasensory perception versus a tendency to panic.

The Horse: Obedient Worker and Unruly Spirit

For the obedient worker aspect of the horse, nothing needs to be said other than that no animal has ever worked quite like the horse. We take pride in comparing ourselves to horses with expressions such as “he works like a horse” or “she is a workhorse.” The elephant is also an excellent example of a hardworking animal and with its trunk and tusks can perform skilled labor. Similar to the horse that draws plough, wagon or carriage, it drags huge logs through the teak forests of the Far East. But despite its impressive skills and strength, it is a far distant second to the breeds of work, draft, and calvary horses that have served mankind across the continents of the world during past millennia. I would, however, like to bring one beautiful and widespread mythological image that portrays the magnificent team of horses drawing the sun god across the cupola of the heavens in the daily course of the sun. Here the draft horse brings to us even our daily sun. The number of horses varies considerably, although perhaps four is the more usual. There is an interesting Siberian version that says that the sun is drawn by white horses, but that when it comes to the west, it is drawn under the earth by black horses and changes again in the east in the morning. Whereas the sun horses are usually white, Pluto’s horses are coal black. On the rare occasions when he left his gloomy underworld and visited the surface of the earth, his chariot was said to be drawn by four of these black steeds.

There is also the well-known parable in Plato’s *Phaedrus* of the soul as a charioteer driving two horses. The horses and drivers of the gods, Socrates says, are all good in themselves and of good extraction, but the character and breed of all other horse-and-driver teams is mixed. Man has a pair of horses of which one is “generous and of generous breed” and the other of “opposite descent and opposite character.” Later the description is more complete:

In the beginning of this tale I divided each soul into three parts, two of which had the form of horses, the third that of a charioteer.... Now of the horses we say one is good and the other bad; but we did not define what the goodness of the one and the badness of the other was. That we must do now. The horse that stands at the right hand is upright and has clean limbs; he carries his neck high, has an aquiline nose, is white in color, and has dark eyes; he is a friend of honor joined with temperance and modesty, and a follower of true glory; he needs no whip, but is guided only by the word of command and by reason. The other, however, is short and thick, his nose flat, his color dark, his eyes grey and bloodshot; he is the friend of insolence and pride, is shaggy-eared and deaf, hardly obedient to whip and spurs. (Fowler 1982)

He goes on to explain how the white horse is obedient and the other completely unruly, always yielding to earthly passion, whereas the white horse would take us to a place where we could see the land of the gods, but – being tractable in contradistinction to the other – always turns to the lower thing if the charioteer turns him that way. Most of you probably know *Phaedrus*, and

The Horse: Obedient Worker and Unruly Spirit 97

the point is made here that the obedient docile worker and the wild, unruly spirit are taken by Plato as a marvelous image of the opposites in our soul that lead to our greatest difficulties. These are mentioned in the Visions Seminar several times. I will just give you a few brief references.

In the Visions Seminar Jung relates an interesting story of black and white magicians where the anima first appears as a black horse, which would be of great interest to our theme if we had time for it. He also notes an interesting aspect of Plato’s black horse and how it parallels the animus of women (Jung 1997, 114f).

We also find a good reference in the Zarathustra Seminar which I will quote:

...to handle the good is no art but to handle evil is difficult. Plato expresses this in his parable of the man in a chariot driving two horses; one is good-tempered and white, the other black and evil-tempered, and the charioteer has all the trouble in the world to manage it. That is the good man who does not know how to handle evil; good people are singularly incapable of handling evil. So if God is only good, he is of course ignorant in reference to evil. There he could not put up any show. (Jung 1998, 846).

So really, at bottom, according to this parable, the art of life consists in being able to handle this peculiar, unruly horse though, as a matter of fact, the completely obedient one also entails a lot of responsibility such as knowing where you are going and what orders you have to give the horse.

On the one side, the parable of the charioteer and two horses is a wonderful and exact image of the whole difficulty of man with his instincts. I do not know if it is personal, but I nevertheless have a somewhat dissatisfied feeling, perhaps owing to the fact that there is but a triad of figures and thus this parable strikes me as a bit intellectual and optimistic. The optimism really consists in the fact that the charioteer himself is *one*. This is typical of Plato, as in his day there was no distinction between ego and Self, and he often puts the ego where we would be quite sure that the ego was inadequate and that only the Self could function. However, it is such a marvelous image that I could not bear to omit it, but I also feel the need to point out that the image is misleadingly simple in that ego, shadow and Self are all contained in the figure of the charioteer.

XIV

The Horse: Helper and Victim

Passing on to the second aspect, I must remark that although the negative aspect came quite naturally first with the cat, this approach gave me a little trouble with the dog. With the horse, however, I feel forced to take the positive side first, that is, the horse as helper. It takes little reflection to grasp that, throughout the world, no animal like the horse has worked so hard nor stood by, helped, and even fought at the side of man. I would like to bring here as an illustration of the helper motive the passage in the *Iliad* where the horse Xanthus warns Achilles of his approaching death. It may not be the most obvious or down-to-earth example, but it is a beautiful literary portrayal of the powerful relation typifying horse and man.

Xanthus and Balius, Achilles' marvelous horses at the siege of Troy, were celebrated for their fleetness, having been born by the harpy Podarge impregnated by Zephyrus, the generative wind. Achilles lent these horses to his friend Patroclus to fight against the Trojans, but after killing many Trojans Patroclus dismounted from his chariot and was killed himself by Hector with Apollo's help. I quote from Howey:

Xanthus and Balius were deeply grieved over the loss of their driver. They kept apart from the battle after his death, weeping, since first they were aware that their charioteer was fallen in the dust beneath the hands of the man-slaying Hector. They stood abasing their heads unto the earth. Hot tears flowed from their eyes unto the ground as they mourned in sorrow for their charioteer and their rich manes were soiled as they drooped from the yoke cushion on both sides beneath the yoke. (Howey 1958, 159)

In closure today I would like to actually quote a horse. We note that the next time when Achilles used Xanthus and Balius he reproached them for having left Patroclus slain upon the field. This unjust reproach unsealed Xanthus's lips or, as we hear in Homer's *Iliad*, caused Juno to endow him with speech, and he said:

Yes, great Achilles, we this day again

Will bear thee safely, but thy hour of doom is nigh at hand; nor shall we cause thy death, But Heav'n's high will, and Fate's imperious power. By no fault of ours, nor lack of speed,

The Trojans stripp'd Patroclus of his arms: The mighty god, fair-hair'd Latona's son, Achiev'd his death, and Hector's victory gained. Our speed of foot may vie with Zephyr's breeze, Deem'd swiftest of the winds; but thou art doom'd To die, by force combin'd of God and man.

(Howey 1958, 159)

Lecture Six: June 1, 1954

I would like to begin here by repeating to you that although it is not a label, the horse is usually connected with energy, or rather a kind of temperamental disposition, and that we can learn to domesticate and ride or drive the instinct somewhat as we can a real horse. We cannot assimilate this energy – as we shall see – or only to a very limited extent, but we can get an attitude or relation to it similar to that which can be established to real horses.

We were speaking of the horse Xanthus in the *Iliad* last time, and I pointed out that he dis-identified himself from fate, God and man and said that it would be by no fault of the horse that Achilles would shortly meet his death, but rather a result of a "force combined of God and man."

The horse Xanthus, the personified equine instinct, teaches us here that it can carry us swiftly and faithfully, but that it, like us, is beholden to fate and God, or, in psychological language, to the Self. We can realize our energy personified as the horse and it can do a lot for us, but only if we live under the deeper law of our being; beyond that, it can only warn us, *not* save us, for it is also subjected to the pattern of fate, as Xanthus tells Achilles. It must not be overlooked that Xanthus ends his prophecy of Achilles' death with the words "God and man" for, very much in contradistinction to the cat, the horse symbolizes an instinct that, to some extent at all events, lies within the power of human consciousness. Like all our instincts, it is not only ultimately in the power of God or the Self. The libido expressed by the horse can to a considerable degree be domesticated, so it is altogether unfair when Achilles rebukes his horses for Patroclus's death. Yet this is something that we also do when we trust in our instinct blindly. Horse and man are required to give this instinct its meaning.

Now, as for the second aspect, the horse as sacrificial victim, the mythology stems from the prevalence of the horse as an actual sacrificial animal. Bulls and rams, for instance, were sacrificed in numerous places over the past millennia. As one of mankind's most valuable possessions, horses were perhaps sacrificed in certain places and during certain periods of world history more than any other animal. Horses were regarded as an especially acceptable offering to the sun, sea and water gods, a custom prevalent in many countries. For instance, we find a widespread custom of offering sacrifices to the gods before the crossing of a dangerous stream. Herodotus tells us that when Xerxes led the Persian host in the fifth century bc and they came to a dangerous river, the river Strymon in Thrace, white horses were sacrificed before entering the water (Herodotus VII, 113). The Patagonian Indians also sacrifice a horse when about to cross a dangerous ford.

Just as we saw that many tribes sacrifice dogs to lead their dead to the beyond, so it was the custom in many places to sacrifice a man's charger when he died. The remnants of this belief are still to be found in the British Isles. There is a story of an old Irish woman who, on the death of her husband, had his horse killed and, when remonstrated, replied: "Do you think I would let my man go on foot in the next world?" In England it is still usual at a military funeral for the horse to be led behind the coffin with the deceased's boots hung reversed on either side of the saddle. This is a custom of great antiquity and probably a remnant of the days when the horse was thus led to the grave to be slaughtered for the use of the rider in the beyond. As an example I quote the *London Daily Mail* of June 22, 1922, in which there is a picture of the charger of Field Marshal Sir Henry Wilson being led in this way in procession to St. Paul's Cathedral. Also in *Tschiffely's Ride*, which I quoted last time, it is told how Mancho and Gato are led behind the hearse of their owner's great friend, Cunningham Grahame, in 1936. (I can, in the case of a dog, quote my own experience on the death of my little Cairn. Out of purely hygienic reasons I decided to burn the basket and blankets she had had during her last illness, and afterward I found myself half-consciously thinking: "Well, now she will be comfortable in the world beyond; she will have her basket.")

To relate an anecdote, I recently read about a dog in Tokyo who had been accustomed to meeting his master at a tram stop at twelve o'clock every day. The master was killed in an accident and the body was taken immediately to the mortuary, so the dog did not know of his death, and for eleven years he went every day to meet the tram. On his death, a monument was erected in his

Plato's White Horse Plato's

Black Horse

The Magic Horse (Turkestan) Worker

Bolter Xanthus Ballus

EPS Helper Panic Victim Kubin The Other Side Imparter of Vitality

and Destruction Sacrifice in

Bridhadaranyaka Upanishad

Pegasus Nightmare

Figure 3. Aspects of the Horse

honor. In such a case, a dog might sometimes be really grateful for the revival of this primitive idea of animal sacrifice. Horses undoubtedly accustom themselves to other owners more easily than dogs.

Coming back to the mythological side of the horse as victim, we will take the impressive beginning of the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* as our

example:

Verily the dawn is the head of the horse which is fit for sacrifice, the sun its eye, the wind its breath, the mouth the Vais. vanara fire, the year the body of the sacrificial horse. Heaven is the back, the sky the belly, the earth the chest, the quarters the two sides, the intermediate quarters the ribs, the members the seasons, the joints the months and half-months, the feet days and nights, the bones the stars, the flesh the clouds. The half-digested food is the sand, the rivers the bowels, the liver and the lungs the mountains, the hairs the herbs and trees. As the sun rises, it is the forepart, as it sets, the hindpart of the horse. When the horse shakes itself, then it lightens; when it kicks, it thunders; when it makes water, it rains; voice is its voice.

Verily Day arose after the horse as the (golden) vessel, called Mahiman (greatness), which (at the sacrifice) is placed before the horse. Its place is in the Eastern sea. The Night arose after the horse as the (silver) vessel, called Mahiman, which (at the sacrifice) is placed behind the horse. Its place is in the Western sea. Verily, these two vessels (or greatnesses) arose to be on each side of the horse.

As a racer he carried the Devas, as a stallion the Gandharvas, as a runner the Asuras, as a horse men. The sea is its kin, the sea is its birthplace. (Müller 1926, 73f)

In *Symbols of Transformation* Jung notes that we find the horse here not only as a symbol not only of time but also of the whole world. Later he adds that in the *Upanishad*:

[The] horse symbol contains the whole world, his kinsman and cradle is the sea, the mother, equal to the world soul. Just as Aion represents the libido in the “embrace” or state of death and rebirth, so here the cradle of the horse, i.e., the libido is in the “mother,” dying and rising again in the unconscious. (Jung 1967, par. 426)

Later he returns to this theme again and says:

As Deussen remarks, the horse-sacrifice signifies a renunciation of the world. When the horse is sacrificed the world is sacrificed and destroyed – a train of thought that also suggested itself to Schopenhauer. The horse stands between two sacrificial vessels, passing from one to the other, just as the sun passes from morning to evening. Since the horse is man’s steed and works for him, and energy is even measured in terms of “horse power,” the horse signifies a quantum of energy that stands at man’s disposal. It therefore represents the libido which has passed into the world. We saw earlier on that the “mother-libido” must be sacrificed in order to create the world; here the world is destroyed by renewed sacrifice of the same libido, which once belonged to the mother and then passed into the world. The horse, therefore, may reasonably be substituted as a symbol for this libido because, as we saw, it has numerous connections with the mother. The sacrifice of the horse can only produce another phase of introversion similar to that which prevailed before the creation of the world. The position of the horse between two vessels, which represent the birth-giving and the devouring mother, hints at the idea of life enclosed in the ovum; consequently the vessels are destined to “surround” the horse. That this is in fact so can be seen from the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* 3,3.

Jung continues with this passage, but time forces me to condense unwarrantably, thus I can only give you one more sentence of his interpretation where he says: “...the offerers of the horsesacrifice go to that narrowest of gaps between the shells of the world-egg, the point where they are at once united and divided” (Jung 1967, par. 658).

The sacrifice of the libido in the mother usually takes place unconsciously as a young man’s libido passes out into the world as he grows up. Therefore, we could say that the sacrifice of the outer libido in the world, symbolized here as the horse, is the first conscious sacrifice of libido for the sake of introversion.

Dr. Jacobsohn takes the Ka in his lectures on the Egyptian religion as the aspect of the Self that is effective in the world, whereas the Ba is the aspect of the Self that withdraws into introversion (Jacobsohn 1992).¹ The sacrifice of the horse is the moment of turning from the outer to the inner. Although I want to take the nightmare aspect later, I must just mention here that it also represents such a turning inward of the libido but happening to us unconsciously and involuntarily in sleep. (I will return to this theme later.)

I would like to give here a piece of modern material that exactly fits the situation. It is the first dream of a French woman living in the American West when she initially came into analysis. This woman was about forty-two. She had had a fairly successful business life but a difficult marriage. She was exceedingly extroverted but came from a very religious background so that something in her life was considerably in revolt against the empty life she was leading. She dreamed that:

...animals are being sacrificed. A horse is on the altar. She sees that it is not dead. She is very upset and signals to the sacrificer, a man, and he approaches with a large syringe to give the horse the *coup de grace*. But the horse raises its head and stares straight into the man’s eyes, and the dream ends while they are motionless, looking at each other.

We find an interesting parallel to man and horse looking into each other’s eyes in the medieval epic chronicles *Chansons de Geste*, a group of which centers around Charlemagne (ca. 742–814). Bayard was the famous demon horse of Aymon of Dordogne, who managed to give Charlemagne a peck of trouble owing to the horse’s magic powers. On his death, Aymon left Bayard to his youngest son, Renaud, whom Bayard served faithfully, but later the four sons, finding themselves at the mercy of the emperor, purchased his forgiveness by handing over the demon horse to be put to death. The emperor, considering that all the trouble had come through the horse, weighted his hooves with lead and drove him into the Seine to drown. Twice Bayard rose to the surface and met his master’s eyes in a look of agonizing appeal. But as he rose for the third time, his stricken master Renaud (his heart breaking) had fallen in anguish to the ground and – missing his master’s eyes – the horse sank for the last time. Renaud, maddened by the torture of his faithful friend, tore up the pardon of the emperor and threw it at his feet. Tradition asserts that he gave up the world, went on a crusade and then became a hermit known for his holy life.

This story is quite interesting to us, as it illustrates very vividly in medieval legend exactly the process that Jung attributes to the sacrifice of the horse, marking a complete change from an extroverted worldly life to the inner life of a hermit. Those of you who have gone to Dr. von Franz’s lectures on Niklaus von der Flüe will remember the role that the horse played in a vision of the Swiss saint before he also left the world and settled in the “Ranft” (his hermitage located in the central region of Switzerland).

To return to our modern dreamer, we must consider what the unconscious might be trying to tell her. She was just past the middle of life, so presumably it was time for her to withdraw her libido from the world, although not in the sense of becoming a hermit. She is called upon to sacrifice something. As you know, we possess nothing really unless we have sacrificed it, an idea difficult to understand unless one has had the experience. (I refer you to what Jung says about that aspect of sacrifice in his lecture on the Mass (Jung 1977b, par. 307).) The dreamer was, in a way, “staring at” – or “fixated on” – the things she wanted. Now if you consciously fixate and “stare at” things (your “stare” essentially keeping things at a distance) they never come into reality. I remember the case of a girl who had been brought up by her mother to marry, so she “stared at” that possibility in the case of every eligible man who came near her. She got on all right with men as long as they were not marriageable. It was only when she was over forty, and in analysis, that she faced the possibility of never marrying. Later she married a man who said he had wanted a relationship with her for a long time but for some reason had found her unapproachable.

The dreamer evidently shuns pain, but the horse knows that the pain is necessary and exposes the man to looking into the eyes of the animal, that is, the animus who does first what she must do later. In regard to the eyes of an animal, Jung discusses a vision of a woman with whom he was

working:

This is the first vision where she is quite positively stung; she has been more or less sightseeing, but here it gets under her skin. She made a picture of the face: it is that of an animal, a dark hairy face with the melancholy eye of a beast. What really happened was they not only traveled back to ancient Greece but went even farther, the animals led her back into the animal age. You remember that the purpose of the Dionysian mysteries was to bring people back to the animal; not to what we commonly understand by that word, but to the animal within. She looks directly into the eyes of an animal, and they are full of woe and beauty because they contain the truth of life, an equal sum of pain and pleasure, the capacity for joy and the capacity for suffering. The eyes of very primitive and unconscious men have the same strange expression of a mental state before consciousness which is neither pain nor pleasure; one doesn't know exactly what it is. It is most bewildering, but undoubtedly here she sees into the very soul of the animal, and that is the experience she should have. Otherwise she is disconnected from nature. (Jung 1997, 154)

Our dreamer also has to look into the truth of life, into truth and beauty, into the experience of which her superficial life is robbing her. "Looking into the eyes" would be establishing psychic contact, which the dream says can only be achieved through sacrifice. From other dreams it was evident that she had been living completely at the infrared end of the scale, and here she is offered the opportunity of apprehending, that is "seeing" the meaning and thus moving toward the ultraviolet end, where she can learn something of the archetypal image of the instinct she had just blindly lived.

The nightmare is closely related to the sacrificial aspect. Howey quotes some modern instances of nightmares from the contemporary press and gives the following extract from the *Daily Express* of February 5, 1920:

Death during nightmare, the problem raised at the inquest on a convict who died in his sleep, was much discussed in medical circles yesterday. "There is nothing improbable in the suggestion of death caused by nightmare," said Dr. Welby Fisher of Harley Street, and formerly a member of the staff of St. George's Hospital, to a *Daily Express* representative. "Victims of these unpleasant sensations always experience difficulty in breathing. With persons suffering from angina pectoris, the struggle for breath during nightmare would cause death. A normally healthy person would not be likely to die of these nocturnal terrors, but one who is physically weak would lack the power to withstand the terrible strain. Nightmare is more common with children than with adults, but I have never known a child to die in these circumstances. Grown-up people who are subject to a recurrence of these distressing symptoms should exercise the greatest care... as neglect of the simple rules of health may bring the nightmare of death. (Howey 1958, 45)

The *Express* further comments on this in a leading article:

The dictionary interpretation of a nightmare is an incubus or evil spirit that oppresses people during sleep.... Whatever the cause, there is no question that the effects of a nightmare leave their mark on the human brain for a lifetime. The question is now raised whether such visions may not be the cause of many sudden deaths which occur during sleep. Leading medical authorities agree that this is a very frequent explanation in the case of persons suffering from extreme physical exhaustion. (Howey 1958, 45f)

In *Symbols of Transformation* Jung traces the Indo-European root of the word *mare* to *mers* and *mor*, which means "to die," so it is interesting to find a discussion in a modern newspaper seriously considering that the nightmare can even be a cause of death. Jung says that "lamias" typically appear in nightmares – and are even considered nightmares – and abundant evidence points to their feminine character. We hear everywhere that they ride their victims (Jung 1967, par. 371). Their counterpart is the ghostly horse that carries away its riders at a mad gallop. Howey has collected a lot of legends where the rider is never heard of again.

We do not have the time here to go into the subject more deeply, as Jung does. He connects the nightmare in particular with regaining the energy back from the mother and later from the world. In the footnotes to this page he refers to other literature on the same subject. The point I want to make is that if nothing is done to free this libido it becomes regressive and sits on one's chest like a nightmare. Or it carries one away from the world like the ghostly horse. This is a wonderful picture of being possessed by the animus and isolated by him far from human contact – that is, of course, in the psychology of women.

From its connection with the lamia, the nightmare also represents the anima in her most possessive form. I must remind you of the origin of the word *lamia*. The Queen of Libya, Lamia, had a love affair with Zeus, and the jealous Hera managed to prevent Lamia from ever bringing a living child into the world. This made her dreadfully bitter and she became the bloodthirsty destroyer of every child she could reach. Thus the lamia were believed to be malignant female spirits who wandered about at night, usually in the guise of old hags, sucking the blood and devouring the flesh of human beings, and especially of young children (Howey 1930, 328). They also took the form of beautiful women who deceived and enticed men into their embrace, and then tore them in pieces and gorged on their young blood. (Lamias were also thought to assume the form of serpents.) She also represents a particularly cold-blooded form of the anima enticing young men into her embrace so that she might feed on their life and young blood. I would also remind you of Keats's "Lamia." Who can say how much this demon anima had to do with his death in his twenty-sixth year? Again, there is his haunting ballad titled "La Belle Dame Sans Merci," one of the most terrible anima poems in the English language. The anima appears here in her deathly aspect without her compensating activity of entangling a man in the world. Keats is a phenomenon himself that we cannot go into here, and if we did it would really belong more in the Pegasus aspect.

At bottom one might perhaps say that the horse in its nightmare aspect is intimately connected with the problem of the anima for men and the animus for women, and this is perhaps the simplest way of expressing the necessity of sacrificing one's horse libido. For without this sacrifice, one will remain possessed by these figures in their most negative and possessive aspect. They will literally suffocate one or gallop away with one, and that leaves one's whole individual pattern unresolved.

The Horse: Imparter of Vitality and Destruction

The way out of the deadlock of the nightmare is obviously connected with creative processes and is again symbolized by a horse, the famous Pegasus. This winged horse of Greek fable is said to have sprung from the trunk of the gorgon Medusa when Perseus cut off her head, a most clear symbol of what is produced by the sacrifice of the mother in her petrifying nightmare aspect.

The sea god Poseidon, a god very much connected with horses, was said to be the father of Pegasus. Most unfortunately, we shall have to leave out this aspect due to the lack of time. Bellerophon was said to be the first mortal who rode Pegasus. According to some accounts, he was also a son of Poseidon, and if so, this would make him the brother of his own horse. On Poseidon, Bellerophon slew Chimera. Dr. von Franz tells me that Chimera was originally a monster whose forepart was a lion, the hindpart a dragon and the middle part a woman. We must resist this fascinating symbolism and only point out that the name of this monster, Chimera, has become the common word for both mere wild fancies with no foundation and for delusions. The motif of Bellerophon slaying Chimera while riding on the horse that had sprung from the destroyed gorgon Medusa is another marvelous symbol not only of the necessity for slaying the mother but also for the fantastic plans and unrealities connected with her. In other words, we could say that the wrong kind of active imagination must be slain before Pegasus can come into his own as the real creative libido.

Bellerophon himself came to a bad end through his ambitious attempt to ascend to the heavens on Pegasus. The angry Zeus sent a gadfly to sting the horse so that Pegasus shied and threw Bellerophon to the earth, where, lamed and blinded, he became a wanderer separated from Pegasus for the rest of his life. Again, we see a typical danger of creative libido: it tries to rise too high and thus lames itself fatally. We will return to this aspect later.

Many of you will remember that Pegasus was mentioned in a very interesting way in Jung's Visions Seminar not only as the inspiration of the poet but as a new ruling astrological principle. He says that the interesting thing is that

...Pegasus is entirely symbolic, it is no longer a human principle, it is not a hero, nor is it a female principle, it is quite decidedly the animal principle. We would say that the horse was a libido symbol, representing the animal part of man, and by pulling himself up upon, by riding it, it thus becomes winged and divine; it is not only an ordinary animal, it is a divine animal. So it would mean a time in which man discovers that the real guiding principle is the living libido, and that would be represented by a square. How the people of that time could ever imagine that Pegasus should be represented by a square is a miracle to me, but they actually did. (Jung 1997, 731)

In this age, in other words, the three has been superseded by the four, symbolized by the square of Pegasus. It is really interesting that this winged horse (which, like Bellerophon, is

114 *The Archetypal Symbolism of the Cat, Dog, and Horse*

connected with human ambition and can lead to inflation) should be just the one to supply the missing fourth. Pegasus is himself a symbol that united the opposites, a chthonic animal absolutely of the earth and yet with wings belonging to the spiritual realm. He is a symbol similar to the famous winged serpent in the Aztec religion. He unites the chthonic and spiritual, therefore he leads toward wholeness, the quaternity and the square. Thus, if we are to ride Pegasus at all, we need to do so with the *utmost* humility. Ambition, plans and high flights are taboo and would lead to the fate of a Bellerophon.

Personally I should also say that Pegasus, regarded as true creative inspiration in spite of his high flights, is just the one to bring us down to earth, for if we have to *produce* something, we are soon checked in our high flights. Anyone who has tried to reduce a vision, for instance, to paint, prose or poesie knows the utter despair that rises in one when confronted with the hopeless task of producing anything satisfactory. The creative libido of Pegasus is only dangerous if we allow it to divorce us from reality. If we succeed in combining it with work, it brakes itself, for, as we have seen, the square of Pegasus is connected with the aspiration of achieving a state of completion or totality, the hardest job there is, whether attempted by the creative artist or in realizing the process of individuation.

In bad cases of inflation, one often meets the symbol of the eagle. In Hogg's *Confessions of a Justified Sinner*, Robert says that he felt as if he were an eagle flying above the world and looking down on groveling mankind, and promptly thereafter fell into the hands of Gil Martin. With Pegasus, we are not dealing with a bird but a horse with all a horse's qualities, which cannot be ignored just because he also has wings. The Bellerophon myth is really an excellent picture of creative libido. After the first battle with the Chimera is won and you are able to use your libido creatively, a second battle has to be fought against over-ambition, which is particularly dangerous when combined with laziness. There comes the temptation to ignore one's earthly limits, to let the monster Chimera revive and indulge in high flights of unreal fantasy, joining the gods, as Bellerophon tried to do, which will lead to a fatal fall and to a lame or blind existence. But if you remember that your horse is flesh and blood and humbly keep to your own limitations and, above all, to the hard work that is a main characteristic of the horse, the catastrophe of Bellerophon can be avoided.

XVI

The Horse: Panic and ESP

Panic, naturally, is very much connected with the nightmare. One of the greatest dangers of nightmares is that it will result in panic, for everything depends on how the content is taken. If it can be accepted with some degree of self-control, a nightmare may even turn out to be a blessing in disguise. Jung once said to me in regard to a dream I had had that there was really only one danger in the unconscious, and that was the danger of panic. If that could be avoided, then it was difficult but possible to find one's way through every other difficulty that confronted one. The great danger is that you get infected with the panic of the horse.

The horse is particularly exposed to this danger for, as Brehm points out, this natural reaction in the wild state is instantaneous flight. Not that this is necessarily and always panic; it can be a wise retreat, a sort of "he who fights and runs away lives to fight another day." But as its contact with man has so largely robbed it of its natural setting and natural reaction, it has become repressed (like so many of our own human instincts), and when it breaks through, it is really a terrifying thing. A badly frightened horse that takes the bit between its mouth and bolts was the only thing in my riding days that frankly scared me stiff. It is difficult to say where panic ends and madness begins, but they are very close. When in the grip of a wild panic, one might almost say that the sanest person is temporarily mad.

A literary example of such a state, often mentioned by Jung, is in a book written by the German author Alfred Kubin shortly before or during World War I, titled *The Other Side*.¹ Unfortunately there is no English translation. The book leaves a nasty taste in your mouth, and Jung says of it that it is a description of the collective unconscious in which the man Kubin is almost caught and that he only just escaped a psychosis. I should mention that Kubin was really an artist. He illustrates this fantastic novel himself.

The hero of the fantasy, also an artist, is tempted by a large sum of money to join an old school friend who has established a so-called "dream state" a day or two's journey beyond Samarkand (north of Afghanistan in Central Russian Asia). Alternatively jubilant and terribly depressed, he and his wife accomplish the long journey, passing by Constantinople and the Caspian Sea and finally reaching Samarkand. But from there on they leave "outer conditions" and enter the "other side," a dream state where the sun never shines and there is little or no change in the seasons. At once they realize that something is badly wrong, but for two years they have no idea what. Then, driven by the nervous agonies of his wife, the hero goes to investigate the noises that are driving her mad and finds that they are due to an almost starved and maddened white horse that is galloping around in wild panic imprisoned in the underground network of catacombs beneath the town. Jung describes this horse as a thing "never finding its way out – a life that got lost in the tombs of the collective unconscious and went mad." Here the horse is the personification of panic, a riderless horse being a piece of libido that should be ridden by man but is lost here in the underground catacombs (Jung 1997, 1176f).

Naturally, this is an extreme case, but it illustrates very vividly the great danger of not being in connection with our horse instinct. If we can domesticate our horse power, our temperamental disposition, if we can ride or drive it, then it is our fruitful helper, even in our most difficult situations. But if we starve or repress it, as Kubin evidently had done, we shall only meet it in the form of a wild panic when it can endanger our life and, worse still, our reason.

It is not by chance that Kubin was an artist, for this danger is particularly acute where there is a creative problem. If we fail to meet the demands of the creative spirit within us, if we do not use our Pegasus to the utmost of our ability – whether in active imagination or outer creative work (no matter in how humble a form he may present himself) – if we repress him, then sooner or later he inevitably becomes this white horse imprisoned in subliminal catacombs. At first he may be perceived only as curious ghostly noises coming from one knows not where, vague terrors, or perhaps only malaise. But if we ignore these comparatively mild warnings, the danger will inevitably become more and more acute and then – although perhaps in a less dramatic form – we shall sooner or later be confronted with a situation akin to the one depicted in this book.

Turning now to the aspect of extrasensory perception, one could dedicate a whole seminar to this attribute of the horse alone. We already touched on it in the *Iliad* where Xanthus foretells Achilles' death, and we must just mention Wotan's eightlegged Sleipnir – half-human and half-horse – and legends that attribute properties to the horse that psychologically belong to the unconscious of man. There are clairvoyant and clairaudient horses, path-finding horses who show the way when the wanderer is lost, and horses with mantic powers. In the *Iliad* (XIX) the horse prophesies evil. Horses are believed to hear the words the corpse utters on its way to the grave, words that no human can hear. Caesar was told by his human-footed horse that he would conquer the world (Jung 1976, 421). The extra sensory and divinatory aspect is the direct opposite of panic. Such communications can only be heard if we are quiet, for they tend to be "a quiet small voice" that is only too easily drowned.

Dr. von Franz drew my attention to one of the best horse fairy tales that I ever read. It is called "The Magic Horse" and is found in a Turkestan volume of fairy tales (Jungbauer 1923, 126ff). Unfortunately, there is only time to take the last image (which makes an excellent conclusion to our theme) and to give you the barest outline of the story.

In the story there is a king with a beautiful daughter whom he does not want to lose, so he feeds up a flea until it becomes as big as an elephant, which he then skins. Thereafter suitors for the hand of the princess are set the riddle that they should guess what the skin is. No one can guess, but a djinn who lives in a lake hears a servant say that it was a pity that no one knows that it is the skin of a flea. The king does not want to give his daughter to the djinn, who has now been able to give him the answer, but the latter has magic powers and makes such dreadful weather that the king has to give in. The princess is very unhappy about this state of affairs, complains bitterly, but the king has to submit, and she has to choose a dowry. When she goes into the stable, a little magic horse says: "Choose me." Then it names four magic objects that they should take with them, namely a mirror, a comb, salt, and a carnation. It is the djinn's intention to run off with the girl and eat her, but the little horse makes her throw away the magic objects one at a time, each of which makes a different obstacle that the djinn has to get past. So each time the two gain a little more time. The last object, the mirror, makes a river, and the princess tells the djinn that the only way to cross it is by putting stones around one's neck. And so the djinn sinks to the bottom of the river and is drowned. The princess and the little horse then arrive in another country and the king there falls in love with her for her beauty and marries her. They are happy until the king goes hunting. Then the djinn – now revived – manages to get hold of a letter that is being sent to the king to say that the queen has given birth to beautiful twin boys. The djinn changes the sense of the letter and states that she has given birth to a cat and a dog, but the king replies that they are all to be taken care of until he arrives. The djinn also changes this letter into one that says that she is to be driven out with her children into the wilderness. This is done. The djinn goes with her, and when they are by a river he says he is now going to eat her children. She knows that if she throws the hairs of the horse into a fire, the horse will appear, and she therefore persuades the djinn to light a fire to cook the children. He does so, she throws in the hairs, the horse appears and fights with the djinn and eventually overcomes him. The horse then commands the princess to kill it and put its head on one side, its legs in the four directions of the compass, and throw away its entrails. She is then to sit with her children under the ribs. After she has mustered the courage and carried out the task, the legs then turn into beautiful golden poplars with emerald leaves, the entrails become villages and fields, the ribs a beautiful golden castle, and the head a silvery stream of pure water. After a long time, the king finds her and they live together in this mandala kingdom that originally was the horse.

Here the extrasensory perception, in a particularly subtle and positive form, is used to free the girl from the danger of possession by the

negative animus and, in addition, the horse reveals the *goal* of ESP in general, that is, the mandala, the totality, the Self. Already an indication of this is to be found in the square of Pegasus, but here it goes much further: the horse itself becomes a particularly differentiated form of mandala.

What in the beginning seems to be physical, namely the horse instinct at the infrared end of the scale, reveals here the ultraviolet aspect far more completely than we have seen it before. This then is the quintessential meaning of the archetypal image that occurs in the process of individuation itself. From this image we can even postulate that if we live the natural flow of our life completely, including the sacrifice, we arrive naturally at the goal that is hidden in the horse.

It is particularly interesting that the horse itself insists on the sacrifice here, suggesting psychologically that the libido itself contains its own spiritual counterpart, that it sublimates itself, so to speak (in contradistinction to the Freudian idea of our having to sublimate our instincts). The horse here sacrifices itself if we have the courage to accept the intense suffering involved in the sacrifice, as the princess eventually does in this story.

We see very closely here the feminine quality of the horse, for although it is the guide, on account of its unusual extrasensory perception, it carries us and even contains us, a psychological truth made clear in this story and in the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad*. The horse – in contrast to the cat or dog – reveals itself here not only as libido and its goal, but also as the vessel in which the whole process takes place.

XVII

Conclusion of the Cat, Dog, and Horse

We have raced through a fragment of the rich symbolism with which the archetypal images of our three animals have related to us and seen something of the many facets of their meaning.

I should like to conclude with a few words on the qualities of the instincts that all these animals have in common and those that are specific to each. All three are represented by domesticated animals; therefore we have been dealing with instincts that are near to us, instincts with which we can establish a connection. (I need not remind you of the many birds, insects, reptiles and so on that represent the more distant or deeper layers of instincts that are also connected with our psyche.)

Animals in general seem to represent the lower instinctive forces in man that often know the way when our conscious is entirely at sea. This has turned out to be true of our three animals. Of all of them we can say that “if we follow the way of nature, it will lead us to our own law.” Or we can apply Christ’s logion to them all and say that they are among those that “lead us to the kingdom of heaven.” In other words, we could say that all instincts serve the process of individuation in some form or other, that this goal is common to them all, and that their negative aspects are only constellated when we are not serving this goal ourselves. For instance, the cat instinct only degenerates into cattiness when we are being untrue to the process of individuation; and so it is with other aspects and animals.

Common to all is also the fact that we cannot project human notions of right and wrong onto any of them. Yet it is just the animal that confronts us with the greatest moral problems, for everything depends on our right or wrong attitude to it. Here it is useful to remember Lorenz’s dream of the baby rats and to search for a deep instinctive feeling of what we can or cannot do in order to understand any of these three. They all belong to human nature, to the luminosities that surround our ego, and all three can help us when our consciousness is entirely at fault.

Of all our three animals, the horse comes the nearest to being the representative of what the instincts in general can do for us. The horse is a far wider and more embracing symbol than the cat or dog, but, on the other hand, the latter two are much more specific and have a narrower and more definite meaning.

I know of no example in fairy tales or mythology where the cat or the dog becomes the mandala representing the vessel in which the whole process takes place. (There may be exceptions but I do not know one, nor does Dr. von Franz. At all events they are relatively rare.) The cat and the dog represent helpful instincts that guide us in the individuation process or help us find our way back when we have gone astray.

The cat is the least related of our three animals. It walks by itself and must be allowed to do so in order that this instinct can work in us in its most positive form. We shall never really domesticate this instinct but must rather regard it as something that remains wild in us, that can yet work for the good of the whole if we can find the right attitude toward it.

Moreover, the cat is the smallest and most harmless of the three. It can do us very little harm in comparison with a fierce

124 *The Archetypal Symbolism of the Cat, Dog, and Horse*

dog or an unruly horse and this, of course, also has a bearing on the right attitude toward it. As we saw, cats are often treated with the utmost cruelty, and naturally, if we fall into this error, we have no chance whatsoever of enlisting the assistance of the cat instinct.

The dog is the most related of all our animals and, as against the cat and the horse, very rarely reverts willingly to the wild state. We are for the most part the home center to which its elastic band is attached, and this makes an enormous difference to our connection with the dog instinct. The many myths and fairy tales worldwide where dogs become human (the motif is found with other animals but is most common with the dog) show us how close this instinct is to us and how much of it we can assimilate. But above all, it is a matter of *relating* to the dog, and if we can achieve this, he will be our guide to the beyond and in the unconscious, and we shall be able to deal with him as the watchdog of heaven (as on the Cinvat Bridge) or as Cerberus guarding the portals of hell. He also has the greatest healing power of any of the three, as seen in the role he played in the cult of Asclepius.

Our relationship to our horse instinct needs to lie somewhere between that which is appropriate to the cat and dog instincts. The horse is not so completely independent as the cat, nor so dependent on our relationship as the dog. In contrast to the two others, it is much stronger than we are, and as we have seen, it can carry and even contain us. We must domesticate it, learn to ride and drive it, and yet we must let it follow its own law, for Pegasus is associated with the square, the totality, and the horse is the symbol par excellence for the libido that is leading us through sacrifice to the mandala, that is, to the Self.

In conclusion, I hope it has been clear to you throughout these lectures that the whole functional meaning of all three animals depends on our attitude toward them. As domestic animals they are all three factors for which we carry the responsibility. If we meet a starving lion in a dream, for instance, we are not responsible for the fact that it has had no food. But if we meet any of our animals in the similar condition, we can be sure that we are responsible and that the dream is drawing our attention to some neglect on the part of consciousness. It is just the instincts, therefore, as represented by domestic animals, that are especially important, and the myths that deal with them make an appeal, as it were, to our understanding and sense of responsibility toward these animal instincts. In our time, when the problem of the instincts has become so red hot, it is necessary to start at the end of the spectrum where we are able to do something about it. Thus the right interpretation of our animals – when they appear in dreams or active imagination – may well be more important today than ever before.

The Archetypal Symbolism of the Serpent

Barbara Hannah's lecture series on the archetypal symbolism of the serpent was given at the C.G. Jung Institute, Zurich, Switzerland. The first lecture occurred on October 28, 1957 and the final lecture on December 8, 1957.

XVIII

Introduction to the Symbolism of the Serpent

Lecture One: October 28, 1957

It is now over three years since I gave my seminar on the symbolism of the cat, dog, and horse. This winter I propose to take entirely different animals, namely the serpent, the lion, and the bull and the cow, animals that lie further from our consciousness than was the case with our three domesticated friends of man. It is true that the bull and cow are also domesticated animals, but they are not so individually close to our everyday lives

– unless one happens to be a farmer – and therefore they already seem to be further away in a bit more remote part of the collective unconscious.

Now, of course the mythology of the cat, dog, and horse also belongs to the archetypal world, to the realm of the collective unconscious. In this respect there is little difference. But with the domestic animals we are dealing with instincts that can be domesticated and which, to a great extent, can be tamed and even used for our own purposes. As far as the horse is concerned, we even reckon in horsepower, so it represents par excellence the libido which we can domesticate and use for conscious purposes. But when it comes to such creatures as the serpent, all efforts at domestication come to an end. A serpent can never be made to serve our purposes, and this may be one of the reasons why it figures so universally in symbolizing what is foreign, strange, and far removed from man. I would like to take serpent symbolism first and to delve deeply into detail because of its universal character and enormous importance in Jung's work.

It is a platitude to say that animals usually symbolize instincts when we encounter them in dreams and active imagination. The term "instinct" itself is complex and difficult; and it is by no means found solely in the singular, nor is it a unified term. As we discuss our separate animals, particularly their mythology, we shall see how many-sided each animal is and that its meaning necessarily depends on its context in a dream and, of course above all, on the conscious situation of the dreamer. It is very much a matter of consciously and carefully differentiating the various aspects of instincts.

I have never regretted a moment of the time I spent three years ago in preparing for my lectures on the cat, dog, and horse, for I have often met them since in dreams and feel less baffled than before. I purposely say "less baffled," because the symbolism of every animal goes beyond the dominion of reason and always leads into depths where one's competence comes to an end. It is better to admit this regrettable fact from the start.

While parts of the introduction below will be a repetition of the first of the cat, dog, and horse lectures, this preface on the serpent will hopefully serve to elaborate and more clearly formulate some of my ideas on animal symbolism from that time. As I usually do before beginning with the material of my seminars, I would like to start with a short introduction to the general theme while quoting largely from Jung's books and seminars. This will give you some idea of his attitude on the subject and thus, in turn, more precisely define my own standpoint.¹

I would like to begin with a repetition of that passage in *Aion* which I referred to in the cat, dog, and horse lectures and then delve into more detail on the serpent. First, theriomorphic (that is, animal) symbols are:

...very common in dreams and other manifestations of the unconscious. They express the psychic level of the content in question; that is to say, such contents are at a stage of unconsciousness that is as far from human consciousness as the psyche of an animal. Warm-blooded or cold-blooded vertebrates of all kinds, or even invertebrates, thus indicate the degree of unconsciousness. It is important for [psychotherapists] to know this, because these contents can produce, at all levels, symptoms that are localized to the corresponding organic or physiological functions. For instance, the symptoms may be distinctly correlated with the cerebrospinal and the sympathetic nervous system. (Jung 1969, par. 291)

Not only for this reason is it vitally important for anyone who is dealing with the products of the unconscious to study the symbolism of animals. Theriomorphic symbolism arises out of the dark, chthonic aspect of nature – that deep source in the unconscious that was reduced to an aberration by Christianity yet set at the center of a process of redemption by the alchemists. Jung remarks here that:

Dark and unfathomable as the earth is, its theriomorphic symbols do not have only a reductive meaning, but one that is prospective and spiritual. They are paradoxical, pointing upwards and downwards at the same time. If contents like these are integrated..., it means that... consciousness is widened in both directions. (Jung 1970a, par. 427)

He adds that this integration benefits the regeneration of consciousness by supplying it with what was previously lacking. We will see that this prospective, spiritual and higher aspect of animal symbolism is particularly central to our study of the serpent as well as the lion.

There is naturally a tendency to want to classify animals so that one can look them up in a dictionary whenever one meets one in one's own or other people's material. As I mentioned in the cat, dog and horse lecture series, it is really too cheap to hang a ticket round the neck of each animal – although I admit it is a great temptation to do so. But each animal has many shades of meaning that appear in its various actual characteristics and still more in its mythology. One needs to know something at least about all this before one can be sure what an animal is likely to represent in individual dreams and fantasies. Not only is each and every animal unique, but at bottom there is something intensely mysterious that lies far beyond our powers of comprehension. By considering the mythology as well as the behavior of animals as we know them, we can attempt to get some idea of the quality and meaning of each specific mystery.

As a general rule, there is, to me at all events, something relaxing or reassuring about dreaming of an animal (although of course this again depends on its context, for it can be exactly the reverse). When meeting an animal in a dream or active imagination, one often gets a feeling of returning to nature and thus being reunited with something whole and healing. To go back to nature to solely mimic the primitive would be a mere regression. But to strive onward and reach nature again through a psychological development is something quite different. For then we are again living instinctively as the primitive does, but this time we are doing so consciously, whereas before we were doing so unconsciously.

Therefore, it is obvious that if we follow our animals back into nature, we must on no account lose our consciousness which we struggle so hard to gain. If we can achieve this, however, we shall find it restful, for we shall, so to speak, be flowing with the stream instead of forever paddling against it. Dr. Jung once told me a story that made a great impression on me. Long ago, when he was in full practice, a colleague sent him a girl who could not sleep. She was to come for only one hour. After talking to her about her symptoms, Dr. Jung suddenly felt drawn to go to the window. It was a beautiful day for sailing and he pointed out the boats on the lake to her and said how wonderful it was to sail with the wind. Six months later at a congress he met the doctor who had sent the girl to him. The doctor said he had been longing to see him to ask what on earth he had done to the girl, for there had been no more trouble over her sleeplessness ever since. She had not remembered anything in particular that Dr. Jung had said except that he had talked about sailing. Something in Dr. Jung's unconscious had apparently led him to talk about sailing, and she had got the point, namely to sail with the wind instead of against it. For she had been making arduous efforts against the wind which, however, would bring her quietly along if she only accepted it.

Except in very rational and sophisticated situations, we are able to do very little without the help of our instincts, and one of the most threatening symptoms of the present day is the extent to which we are divorced from them. In fact we might say without exaggeration that the *conditio sine qua non* for the continuation of our civilization is our being more consciously in touch with both our instincts and our inner natures.

I mentioned in the introduction to the cat, dog, and horse lectures the story of the African messenger who, impressed and motivated by the task

of carrying a message between two great chiefs, ran ten hours to deliver a letter to the far-distant post. In a way, something similar happened to me this morning when my instinct drew me to the old lecture room in the Psychological Club instead of to our new institute lecture room. Ms. Ammann came and had to give me a cigarette and tell me how nice the new quarters were to get me going! As far as our superior functions are concerned, the efforts of many generations have detached a certain sum of energy that is under the control of our will. But there is a primitive in us all who lies beyond the reach of our will, and there we are entirely dependent upon our instincts. Moreover, we experience the same phenomenon the moment we touch our inferior function, whereupon an indolence, exactly like the primitive's, possesses us immediately.

One point about which we must be as clear as possible from the beginning is the difference between instinct and archetype. They could also be called two aspects of one and the same thing, as they naturally have a secret connection that can be very confusing. For the sake of clarity, therefore, I will read you Jung's definition that he gave in a lecture titled "Instinct and the Unconscious" at Bedford College, London University in 1919.

Instincts are typical modes of action, and wherever we meet with uniform and regularly recurring modes of action and reaction we are dealing with instinct, no matter whether it is associated with a conscious motive or not.

Archetypes are typical modes of apprehension, and wherever we meet with uniform and regularly recurring modes of apprehension we are dealing with an archetype, no matter whether its mythological character is recognized or not. (Jung 1970b, pars. 273, 280)

I mentioned in the cat, dog, and horse lectures the renowned story of Socrates, whose daemon whispered to him to turn to the left, by which he escaped being trampled down by a great herd of swine. We can call this archetypal, for if Socrates had heard nothing and just turned impulsively into the other street with no idea as to why he was doing it, it would have been instinct. Pure blind instinct. Or, as we could also express it, the instinct is an automatic way of outer behavior and the archetype is a disposition for apprehending its inner meaning. We shall return to this subject later.

In his Visions Seminar, Jung says that animals represent the lower instinctive forces in man and that one can turn to them, must turn to them when one's conscious is completely lost (Jung 1997, 133). This has happened to me personally more than once when I got lost on the Downs. There one path looks like another, so when I was lost I used to let my reins drop onto the horse's neck, knowing that he would lead me to the nearest road where I could take over again. Later, in the same seminar, Jung gave the practical example (which I also mentioned earlier) of the woman patient who had a very bad depression and was distracted – even rescued – from suicidal tendencies when she came upon a pair of shoes on the *Bahnhofstrasse* in Zurich (Jung 1997, 132f). It is similar to the motif of the helpful animal in fairy tales and myths where the hero is saved by an animal that shows him something self-evident and near at hand which he just has not seen. Sometimes the animal does even more and brings the whole solution. There is a fairy tale of a shoemaker and a tailor in which the former momentarily blinds the tailor and leaves him to die. When the tailor's sight is restored, he finds himself terribly hungry and desperate to kill an animal to eat. Yet he passes up one animal after the next because they all beg him to spare them. And then the shoemaker, who is with the tailor at the King's Court, sees to it that the tailor is set impossible tasks such as finding the old crown at the bottom of the lake. But the duck, which he had not killed, goes down and fishes it up, and in turn each animal performs the impossible task for him. That is a very common motif in fairy tales, and if we treat our instincts well, they will always help us when our ordinary rational means come to an end.

In all natural situations, Jung says, the instincts are a far better protection than all the intellectual wisdom in the world, although in most civilized situations we also require the mind, as instinct all too often would lead us astray. It is always a case of Scylla and Charybdis, for if we stay too long with our instincts we might indulge in them and lose our consciousness entirely, and if we live entirely in the mind, we are lost in the natural situations of which our lives largely consist.

Jung often speaks of the piety of animals and of how much nearer they live to God's will and to their true nature than we do. The only thing that is still more pious than even an animal, he says, is the plant that just has to stand and accept the weather and whatever nature brings to it. He often quotes the logion from the apocryphal sayings of Christ, a text that originally came from the same source as the Bible but for one reason or another was excluded from biblical canon. In this logion, Christ's disciples ask him who would lift them up to the Kingdom of Heaven since it is so far above the sky, and Christ answers:

"The fowls of the heaven, and of the beasts whatever is beneath the earth or upon the earth, and the fishes of the sea, these are they that will draw you: and the kingdom of heaven is within you: and whosoever knoweth himself shall find it: and having found it ye shall know yourselves that ye... are in God and God in you." (James 1924, 26)

Note here that the "beasts beneath the earth," that is, the serpent, is mentioned first.

Jung says: "That means the instincts, one could almost say the blind instincts; the way of nature will bring you quite naturally where you have to go" (Jung 1997, 402f). Jung adds later that if you follow the way of nature, of the birds in the air, the fishes in the sea and the animals on the earth, you will quite naturally come to your own law. Then one comes to the question:

...what is the law of man? According to preconceived ideas, man is all wrong, sinful, little better than an earthworm. But that is an absolutely wrong idea. Who created the religions of the world? Who produced Christ? Who produced the Buddha? All that is the natural growth of man. If left to himself, he can bring about his own salvation quite naturally; he has always produced symbols that redeemed him. So if we follow the laws that are in our own nature, they will lead us to the right end. (Jung 1997, 403)

Jung goes on to point out that this is just what active imagination can do for us. Our fantasies do not lead us straight to hell (unless we indulge in them and use active imagination in the wrong way), but if we learn to trust our own inner as well as outer experience, this will – according to our inner natural law – lead us to a state of completeness... but not perfection.

Again here, however, I must emphasize that it is not a case of just blindly following the instinct alone. The matter here is of trusting instinct consciously and seeking its meaning. Certainly neither Christ nor Buddha remained automatically in the instincts, uniformly and regularly repeating the same thing, for they would have just remained in tradition. On the contrary, they apprehended a new meaning in the laws of their own nature and thus were led naturally to the right end. Two years later, in the context of a discussion on alchemy, Jung said:

So the original unconscious primitive condition of man is a sort of rock that contains gold, and if you put that body through such a chemical – or in this case psychological

– treatment, the rock will yield gold; that is an analogy for the so-called transformation of instincts. You simply separate certain instincts that were contained in the original unconscious, you lift them up into consciousness, and so you naturally change the original condition of the primitive man – he becomes conscious; consciousness is the gold that has been contained in the unconscious, but so distributed that it was invisible.

There is a lot of gold in the unconscious of primitive man; his unconscious is different from ours, and it shows far more signs of vitality. Our unconscious still occasionally behaves in the same way, but only when we are unconscious as primitive man remains continuously. Through the process of civilization you slowly bring out all the gold and other precious metals that were contained in the original unconsciousness; the philosopher's stone, the diamond, the gold, the *elixir vitae*, the fluid that makes you immortal, etc., all these are symbols for the various substances extracted from that rock of original unconsciousness. Through that process things surely change, but if you make a solution of the gold and pour it

into the heap of ashes, in time it will form a stone as before. So if you allow the ego to become conscious, you will create again the original unconsciousness, because everything is there. In this respect we have not transformed the instincts, we have only taken out of them something which they contained. For instinct is the unconscious mental functioning of man, in which there are the possibilities of extracting the gold of consciousness. (Jung 1997, 1065)

Extracting the gold of consciousness by lifting the instincts out of their unconscious state perhaps needs an example. When the disciples draw Christ's attention to the man working in the field and ask him whether he should be doing this on the Sabbath, Christ answers: "If thou knowest what thou art doing, thou art blessed: but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed and a breaker of the law" (Jung 1997, 1226). Now naturally his instincts would prompt this man to save the crop. During the holidays I was in a house where there was a big acorn tree in the garden and you could watch the animals bringing in their supplies for the winter; first the squirrels and other little animals, and then the jays, which are destructive and waste about two for every three acorns they take. Obviously the normal instinct is to store food. But according to the fourth commandment, biblical law forbids any work being done on the Sabbath. The man in the Bible is caught between conflicting duties, for instinct tells him to save his crops, but the law tells him that he should let them be destroyed since the seventh day must be a day of rest. Rebecca was also caught in a conflict, although rather unconsciously. When the unborn twins struggled together within her, the Lord told her that the elder should serve the younger. She was caught between two conflicting duties when she tricked old Isaac and Esau. On the one hand she was really very fond of her husband and hated to trick him, but if she wanted the thing to come through into reality, she had to behave as she did. Although what she did came out well, from a moral point of view her conduct was exceedingly questionable. The gold "being blest," in Christ's language, comes from standing the conflict and taking the suffering involved. To act unthinkingly would mean that the gold remained buried. In a discussion at the Psychological Club in Zurich, Dr. Jung and a Catholic Benedictine priest compared notes regarding the way in which people avoid the really painful things. The priest said that people would confess all sorts of sins, get upset about them, and work themselves into an awfully emotional state, and yet one would feel that they were hiding something else. Jung said that the same thing happened in analysis, for people would come with some exaggerated or unconvincing emotion with the objective of deflecting other more serious emotions that were actually getting too hot. But sometimes one has to accept this, for one cannot always hold people to their suffering. It is important to know where the emotion is and whether it is with the instinct or in conflict with it.

This leads us over to another aspect of the instincts, and that is the fact that they are very much mixed up with emotion. In discussing instinct and emotions in the context of the symbolic appearance of the buffalo, Jung says:

You see, in practical psychology, there is always the great and important question for the analyst whether a series of emotions is really correct, whether it is in accordance with the instincts, that is. If it is against the instincts it is all morbid waste, but if the instincts are with it, you know it is all right. Whatever it is, it is along the line, those emotions belong, they are the right food, the correct magic procedure. And instinct is represented usually by an animal – a dog, a horse, an elephant for instance. In this case, a buffalo is there as a sort of exponent indicating that it is correct, the emotion is backed up by the instinct. (Jung 1997, 1059)

Now, in extracting the gold from the emotions that are with the instincts, the first thing to do is to make a difference between yourself and your emotion. If you can say: "Yes, I am in an awful rage," then you are no longer identical with your emotion; you see your own rage with a certain objectivity. But if you cannot do this, then you are its prey; you become a wild animal divorced from consciousness. You are simply dissolved in unconsciousness. (Just as the field-worker in the logion would have been cursed instead of blessed if he had been the victim of unconsciousness.) But when you are no longer identical, you begin to extract the gold from the heart of your instinct. In terms of the chakras, you leave Manipura and enter Anahata, where you catch your first glimpse of the Purusha, the first man, the Adam of the *Upanishads*. The Eastern point of view is more rooted in the instincts than ours, for we have a complete hybrid on this subject. We always think we can command our instincts and can be on top of them, whereas we really can do nothing of the kind. We can merely learn to accept them, to dis-identify with them and thus extract some of the gold of their archetypal meaning. We will return to this subject of dis-identifying with the emotions when we study the mythology of the serpent and the lion, where the issue appears particularly clearly.

A very important point that will come up frequently in our material should be mentioned in the introduction, and that is the fact that in many religions animals are regarded as gods. For instance, primitive dancers in Africa wear animal masks when representing the divine souls of their ancestors. You find much the same thing in Australia. You still find the cow regarded as a sacred animal in India and the buffalo, snake, and eagle among the native peoples of North America. In parts of India the cow is allowed to go wherever she wishes and behave as she likes. We find animal-headed gods not only in the more primitive religions but in the highly developed and differentiated religions of Egypt. In Greece as well, the gods have animal attributes, such as the owl of Pallas Athene and the cow-eyed Hera, and Zeus had the habit of transforming himself into an animal when he wished to pursue a love affair under the watchful eyes of the jealous Hera. The Christian symbolism, I need hardly remind you, is no exception in this respect: there is the dove of the Holy Ghost, the animals associated with certain apostles and Christ as a lamb, or a fish, and even as a serpent, but we shall return to this later.

Before we take our actual animals, I should like to make an attempt to see how such images fit into our psyche and how we are to regard them psychologically. Jung says:

As we know from direct experience, the light of consciousness has many degrees of brightness, and the egocomplex many gradations of emphasis. On the animal and primitive level there is a mere "luminosity," differing hardly at all from the glancing fragments of a dissociated ego. Here, as on the infantile level, consciousness is not a unity, being as yet uncentered by a firmly-knit ego-complex, and just flickering into life here and there wherever outer or inner events, instincts, and affects happen to call it awake. At this stage it is still like a chain of islands or an archipelago. Nor is it a fully integrated whole even at the higher and highest stages; rather, it is capable of indefinite expansion. Gleaming islands, indeed whole continents can still add themselves to our modern consciousness – a phenomenon that has become the daily experience of the psychotherapist. Therefore we would do well to think of ego-consciousness as being surrounded by a multitude of little luminosities. (Jung 1970b, par. 387)

Here I would like to remind you of the passage from *Aion* (which I referred to at the beginning of the cat lectures) where Jung says that theriomorphic symbols in dreams and other manifestations of the unconscious express the most varied levels of instincts. Each animal, so to speak, is one of these luminosities in the vicinity of the ego, and we can measure its distance from consciousness by whether the animal is warm- or cold-blooded, vertebrate or non-vertebrate, and so on. Animals in general represent these dim luminosities, and they are able to guide us in places where our ego-consciousness would be powerless.

In many mythologies (for instance the Babylonian, Sumerian, and Chinese), stars are animals and vice versa, and it is a fact that the zodiac has many more animal than human signs. It is probably because of the connection between animals and luminosities in the human psyche that you find stars and constellations of stars represented by animals in so many civilizations. Such ideas are a projection of unconscious psychic facts. Jung speaks of the way in which Paracelsus and other alchemists regarded these luminosities, that is, the alchemical *lumen naturae*. I would like to briefly mention again that characteristic alchemical vision of sparks scintillating in the blackness of the arcane substance. For Paracelsus, these scintillating sparks:

...change into the spectacle of the “interior firmament” and its stars. He beholds the darknesses of the sky as a star-strewn night sky, whose planets and fixed constellations represent the archetypes in all their luminosity and numinosity. The starry vault of heaven is in truth the open book of cosmic projection, in which are reflected the mythologems, i.e., the archetypes. In this vision astrology and alchemy, the two classical functionaries of the psychology of the collective unconscious, join hands. (Jung 1970b, par. 392)

The world soul represented a natural force that was held responsible for all the phenomena of life and the psyche. In a later paper on synchronicity, Jung speaks of an “absolute knowledge” that is really a later formulation of this same phenomenon, which was far more generally known in the Middle Ages than it is in the rational one-sided consciousness of modern man.

I should particularly like to emphasize Paracelsus’s idea of the dark psyche as an inner firmament lit up by the stars, for as I mentioned before, one could actually regard the archetypal images of every animal as stars in such an inner firmament. Such an idea, on account of its plastic quality, really conveys something of what we shall attempt to achieve in this course. If we think of each animal – or rather its archetypal image – as a star or constellation in this inner firmament, we shall try, as it were, to look at them through a telescope and never forget that the crosshairs we are using are human means to apprehend something that is essentially beyond human knowledge at its present stage.

I do not want to take too long on an introduction, but I do recommend to all of you who are not already familiar with the articles to read the chapter on “Patterns of Behavior and Archetypes,” as it throws a lot of light on our theme (Jung 1970b, pars. 397–420). But there is still one passage I would like to remind you of, as it will help us distinguish between animals on the one hand as instincts (that is, as largely automatic patterns of behavior), and animals as archetypal images (that is, their meaning) on the other. Jung writes:

Psychic process... behaves like a scale along which consciousness “slides.” At one moment it finds itself in the vicinity of instinct, and falls under its influence; at another, it slides along to the other end where spirit predominates and even assimilates the instinctual process most opposed to it. These counter-positions, so fruitful of illusion, are by no means symptoms of the abnormal; on the contrary, they form the twin poles of that psychic one-sidedness which is typical of the normal man of today. Naturally this does not manifest itself only in the spirit/instinct antithesis; it assumes many other forms, as I have shown in my *Psychological Types*. This “sliding consciousness” is thoroughly characteristic of modern man. But the one-sidedness it causes can be removed by what I have called the “realization of the shadow.” (Jung 1970b, pars. 408f)

Now, the realization of the shadow is a subject beyond the scope of this lecture. But shadow, instinct and instinctive levels of consciousness are themes very much pertinent to the symbolism of the serpent. I would like to repeat Jung’s reflections on the nature of this scale of consciousness:

By means of “active imagination” we are put in a position of advantage, for we can then make the discovery of the archetype without sinking back into the instinctual sphere, which would only lead to blank unconsciousness or, worse still, to some kind of intellectual substitute for instinct. This means – to employ once more the simile of the spectrum

– that the instinctual image is to be located not at the red end but at the violet end of the color band. The dynamism of instinct is lodged as it were in the infrared part of the spectrum, whereas the instinctual image lies in the ultraviolet part. (Jung 1970b, par. 414)

Instinct – Infrared Archetype – ultraviolet (dynamic instinct) (image of dynamic instinct)

Consciousness can move anywhere along the scale between the infrared and the ultraviolet. Later Jung adds:

The realization and assimilation of instinct never take place at the red end, i.e., by absorption into the instinctual sphere, but only through integration of the image which signifies and at the same time evokes the instinct, although in a form quite different from the one we meet on the biological level. (Jung 1970b, par. 414)

There is an excellent example of this given in the *ETH Notes* about a Don Juan type of man. Speaking first of the two ends of the scale, Jung says:

The use of most of the instincts is obvious, sex, hunger, etc., but the purpose is not the meaning, that is something quite different. The Yucca moth comes to maturity just as the Yucca bud opens. Its father and mother are dead long before it comes out of the egg, yet it knows exactly what to do. It collects pollen, rolls it into a ball, puts it on its thorax and pushes it down so that the fruit of the Yucca plant is fertilized. Then it lays fifty eggs. If there were more, the plant would be destroyed, and then their means of subsistence would be gone. Now who told the moth how many eggs to lay? The moth is born with pictures, prepared in its system; the sun goes down and it knows that now it is the time to do this, or that. The instinct holds two aspects, the first is dynamic, pushing into action, but if there were only just action then eggs could be laid in any plant. But it must be just the Yucca, so the moth has an image of that in itself in order to know what it should do. These images are equal in importance to the action itself.

This system of images is also born in human beings, it is the archetypes, the potential force in man, but it only comes to the surface when the moment for it is ripe, then the archetype functions as an urge, like an instinct. In the collective unconscious the archetypes and instincts are one and the same thing. The English biologist Rivers refers to this as the “all or none reaction,” it goes right through or it does not start. The archetypal or image side seldom comes to the surface in young people, they take instinct for granted, and never stop to think what the meaning of it is, it just functions naturally. But when the instinct becomes questionable, as always happens when you get older, you begin to wonder what it all means; the split has already appeared and the images are liberated. The active side of the instinct has become less demanding so the side of the images is dominating, it is as if the moth stopped to wonder: “Why do I do this,” as if it would like to free itself from blindly following its instinct and look at the pictures instead.... Hesitation only comes when the instinct begins to weaken. The same instinct that moved you at the age of fifteen may be moving you again when much older and yet there is something showing that the whole process which is happening in the unconscious is different, the images are becoming liberated from the active instinct. When this process has a great deal of intensity, but remains in the unconscious, then these ideas get a strong hold in the unconscious which dynamically influences the consciousness, and a conflict ensues with neurotic complications. Sexual perversions, for instance, often arise from this source, and this explains sudden abnormalities which appear in quite normal people. They are not as a rule put into action but result in a perversion in phantasy. How often do we hear of a respectable, elderly gentleman who suddenly develops a penchant for the kitchen staff. In such cases it is necessary to find the split in the instinct and to make it conscious, as it were to make the Yucca moth conscious of what it has done, and we must keep in mind that the possible explanation is that the moth did not act from biological, but from mythological reasons. Experience with the primitives teaches us this. (Jung 1935, 130f)

Then he continues with the example of the man with a Don Juan type of psychology:

I will give you an example. It concerns a man of fifty who found himself in the unpleasant situation of having to be a Don Juan. He had to run after women, who in turn ran after him, and he had to envy every young couple he saw in the street, thinking that they had what he was seeking. I asked him why on earth he had to do this and he replied: “They have a secret and I must discover it.” It turned out that he had a negative mother complex. She was a remarkable woman, too strong for his father, and so of course she had phantasies of other men, which she repressed, and because of this repression the interest naturally went over on to the only son. She constantly told him how he should feel and treated him as if his feelings were hers. Men whose mothers have done this to them get sentimental ideas, they never think that a man is just moved by the sexual instinct, but that he is moved by a noble motive, the girl might be hungry, or have some secret sorrow. He made several girls very unhappy, and then they were really sad for his sadism had made them so, but he went on believing in his good intentions. He was continually seeking something and became like Bernard Shaw’s figure in *Man and Superman*. His mother had poisoned his feelings with her criticism and constant guidance. (Jung 1935, 131f)

Jung gave the following diagram:

Dynamic natural flow

Instinct

Pictures, archetypes, meaning

He then continued:

If you follow the second path, the way of the pictures, you arrive at the meaning. This man, through a lack of understanding, was trying to move on the first path. The investigation of his case revealed a mother complex which, through his own disposition, had led to the condition he was in. He said that the secret was what attracted him; he thought every woman possessed this secret. I could have gone on with him on the cold path of speculation but it would have led nowhere, so I chose the way of following up his dreams which clearly pointed to the mother. They were exceedingly bad dreams, the mother appeared very negatively, as a bloodthirsty demon, as a being half male and half female, he had to fight with her, and even once to cut off her hands. He was an intelligent man so he soon saw that this did not refer to his real mother, there was something of a totally different nature in this mother image, something which was inhuman and inapplicable to a real woman; besides which his own mother was long since dead. I explained to him that contents which belonged to the second path were entering the first, that a mythological picture of a bloodthirsty goddess, an autonomous being, was mixing itself with the old reality situation. His life had been much disturbed by the existence of this image, it was the secret for which he was searching and he was completely fascinated by it. The fascination is not to be wondered at when we realize that in other ages people found their gods in these images.

When the idea of the image became clear to him it had also a practical effect. One day he came beaming to me and said: "A loving couple passed me in the street, and instead of envying them I thought: Thank God, they have it, they must look after it, not I!" And he had found another occupation: to study the pictures which would lead him to the realization of his anima. (Jung 1935, 132f)

Jung also points out that young people, especially those with artistic tendencies, may use such pictures as a pretext to avoid a relationship with real women. No woman is quite good enough; there is always something wrong with the soup. Such convictions may well go on until the man is thirty or thirty-five and he has laid well the foundations of bachelorhood. Or, if the man marries, he soon finds a few good reasons that convince him that he has married the wrong woman, for she simply does not quite resemble that goddess of the image. If people in the second half of life do not become aware of these pictures and yet find themselves unable to move freely along the first path pursuing the fulfillment, for example, of the sexual instinct, then the repression of the instinct may lead to all kinds of sexual anomalies (Jung 1935, 133). The second path, on the other hand, leads to initiation. Jung concludes here with a quote from Faust:

*Yet now at last the God is surely sinking But the new gift impels to flight.
Onward I speed, eternal radiance drinking Before me day, and far behind me night.*
(Jung 1935, 133)

It is the drive of the instincts that makes life worth living; without it, life is merely momentary and fragmentary. It is this drive that gives life form and meaning. But unless we understand this form and meaning in a deep sense, the spiritual instincts just worry at us; we try to explain them in the wrong way and can see no use in them. It is necessary to have some understanding in order to feel in harmony with life, and this is the reason why initiation rituals were conceived and established. When those doubtful blessings, missionaries, stop the initiation ceremonies of a tribe, it always decays. When you take these rites from the people they lose their sense of life, and then they just go from one cigarette to the next, one drink to the next. They take to alcoholism and become diseased and gradually the whole tribe goes to pieces;

...they are even asked to wear clothes to prevent the missionaries having indecent phantasies. On a certain island, the English with good common sense – they have more common sense than other nations – will [reprimand] the natives when they wear clothes. That is how it should be, only white men are indecent naked. (Jung 1935, 134)

Jung continues, noting that the second path goes the symbolic way of the initiation process, for the natural drive cannot be controlled by the will. Mankind noticed that initiation gave protection, and therefore it seemed reasonable to give this protection early on. As civilization advanced, these ceremonies were administered at an increasingly younger age to the point where baptism in our Church is practiced on babies. This makes no sense at all, for no experience is possible. The magic part along with the spirit of this ceremony has been lost. Secret societies exist, however, where living remnants of the magic are still to be found (Jung 1935, 134).

The examples above give a practical idea of the two ends of the scale. But please do not take me too literally when I suggest that we shall meet the real animal at the infrared end of the scale and its archetypal image at the ultraviolet. With young people in particular, animals in dreams are often concerned with outer situations. They are like the helpful animal in fairy tales showing the way, a path that oftentimes happens to be just too simple and obvious to be seen. Here, in such real-life situations, the animals are in the infrared, so to speak. In other cases, on the other hand, the animal is concerned with the ultraviolet, that is, the meaning that has not been apprehended. Indeed, we can see the "ultraviolet – infrared opposites" acted out before our very eyes if we have the eyes to see, although unfortunately we are very blind in this respect. I will give you the case of a young woman as an example.

Before the publication of *Psychology and Alchemy*, when the symbolism of the unicorn was very little known in Jungian circles and not at all to the young woman in question, this woman met the symbol of the unicorn in some research work she was doing. Needless to say, she failed entirely to understand it. She just had not a clue. Then quite suddenly she found herself becoming unusually irritable, particularly with her best friends. She would become literally possessed with an irrational fury, particularly if anyone tried to discuss the unicorn with her.

Now, as you know, the unicorn – like the stag and the rhinoceros – is a symbol for the dark, chthonic, emotional side of God, for the uncontrolled emotions that one sees at work, for instance, in Yahweh's dealings with Job. In *Psychology and Alchemy* you will find pictures and quotations where the wild uncontrolled unicorn is being tamed in the lap of a pure virgin, as the God of the Old Testament was tamed in the womb of the Virgin Mary and transformed into the God of love in the New Testament (Jung 1970b, see figs. 241, 242, & 248).

Now, as I said, this young woman knew nothing of the unicorn, but when she failed to find the right interpretation for it, it possessed her and she found herself acting out its irritable, emotional nature in outer reality. She had, as it were, failed to apprehend its meaning in the ultraviolet and it thus forced her to act it out in the infrared. As they say in German, "after the performance one knows the play," and once *Psychology and Alchemy* was published it was quite clear what had happened. But while one is caught in such a drama, one is only too inclined to act it out blindly, expressing at best one's regrets then with remarks such as: "I must have been possessed to do that..." and so on. But this is a realm where we can find out a great deal about ourselves if we are able to detach a bit from such situations. When you feel possessed, you do have a chance to make a little objective distance between yourself and the thing that is possessing you.

XIX

The Serpent: Notes on the Biological Background

Lecture Two: November 4, 1957

The serpent appears probably more than any other animal in mythology, fairy tales, and primitive religions as well as in the most differentiated faiths. We find it, for instance, on the staff of Moses or on the staff of Asclepius. In Christianity it represents the two greatest opposites, for both Christ and the Devil are represented by a snake. Due to its widespread and profound significance, I will discuss it before the lion, bull and cow. I also propose to take it in much more detail, whereas the latter three animals we will study more briefly. One of my main reasons for doing this is that the snake, above all animals, shows most clearly how impossible it is to hang a label around its neck and do anything like justice to an animal symbol in dreams and active imagination. As Jung remarked once in a seminar, the serpent may have seven thousand meanings (Jung 1984, 251), and we need to know a great deal about it before we can attempt to interpret it in a dream or deal with it when we meet it in our own active imaginations. I have met it twice since beginning these lectures, and both times I have had the greatest difficulty.

I read a good deal in preparing lectures on this subject – although only an infinitesimal fraction of what could and really should be read on the theme – and I freely admit that I felt completely drowned in material before I even began to consider how to deal with it in this course. I have even caught myself considering ways and means by which to avoid having to give these lectures. It is very likely that I shall pass on some of this “drowned-in-material” feeling to you, but I am inclined to think that, intensely disagreeable as it is, it is probably better than having the illusion that one can in any way master the symbolism of the serpent. I will also spare you a fanfare of source literature and concentrate instead on a few good texts that will give us the feeling that we are, at least now and then, hitting the nail on the head. Nevertheless, the snake will always slither through our fingers because there is probably no other animal that is so difficult.

The first time I began to feel that perhaps, after all, I would not run away from my task was when I was doing some active imagination and caught a glimpse, a whiff, so to speak, of something divine. For a moment I thought I had it and was thrilled, and then it was gone, leaving only a memory of something glimpsed and lost. Then I thought: “Now, that is why a serpent so often represents the divine: it stirs in the dry leaves at one’s feet and glides instantaneously out of sight.” As Jung points out, snakes are oftentimes symbols for psychic happenings or experiences that suddenly dart out of the unconscious and have a frightening or redeeming effect (Jung 1969, par. 291). One wants to keep it, to see it properly, and yet one is scared to death with a primordial fear, a well-justified fear indeed, for if it is a venomous snake and happens to be annoyed, it might well be one’s end. In this fear we find a parallel of sorts between the serpent and divinity, for as the Lord says in the Bible, “... You cannot see my face; for no man shall see Me and live” (Exodus 33:20).¹ A glimpse of either stirs one right down into the depths of one’s soul, which makes it easy to realize why the serpent is so often chosen to represent the “totally other.”

When I speak of the divine as the “totally other,” I mean that, from the standpoint of ordinary life, it seems to be the “totally other.” Our own souls, however, seem just as strange to us as the divine, and in the introduction to *Psychology and Alchemy* Jung points out that the human soul contains a faculty of relationship to God, that is, a correspondence with the archetype of God. In a footnote he even says:

It is therefore psychologically quite unthinkable for God to be simply the “wholly other,” for a “wholly other” could never be one of the soul’s deepest and closest intimacies

– which is precisely what God is. The only statements that have psychological validity concerning the God-image are either paradoxes or antinomies. (Jung 1968, par. 11n)

We shall find this paradox continually in the serpent and find it symbolizing both God and the human soul.

A frequent mythological motif, particularly in Greece, is a child playing with a snake (Eros, for instance, and Erechtheus). The child would represent the close, intimate aspect and the serpent the strange and faraway aspect. It is this cold-blooded vertebrate very far removed from the human being that we are now going to consider from the outer point of view.

We will begin (as we did with the cat, dog, and horse) by considering the serpent as a living animal, dwelling shortly on a few of the characteristics that are particularly important to our theme. I took twelve points from Brehm that seem to me to be the chief hooks based in the real serpent upon which projections are hung.

As I am sure you all know, one does not project voluntarily. This observation is something that apparently one cannot repeat enough, for one continually meets people who know quite a lot of Jungian psychology and yet still do not understand that we do not project voluntarily; in fact, we do nothing of the kind. We simply do not see something that is nevertheless a part of our own psyche. Since at first it is completely foreign to us, we meet it for the first time in someone else as a projection, and then slowly we become aware of its existence also in ourselves.

The serpent, like all animals in the reptile class, is definitely cold-blooded. It both absorbs and stores heat, thus Brehm classifies it as a *wechselwarmes Wirbeltier* (a vertebrate with a variable temperature). It is indeed only found in fairly warm countries, and, broadly speaking, the hotter the climate the more snakes there are likely to be. Only at night and during the winter does its blood temperature go down to that of the surrounding atmosphere. Its activity is increased by heat yet decreased even to nil by cold. As you may know, if you find a hibernating snake in the winter, it is absolutely stiff, and it is almost impossible to know whether it is dead or alive. In a way, therefore, one can call it a creature that, although definitely cold itself, is dependent on its own opposite for the storage and absorption of heat; to some extent the serpent unites the opposites of heat and cold.

Brehm tells us that the reptile’s brain is far below that of mammals and birds although more developed than that of the fish. The spine and nerves are very bulky in comparison with the meager size of the brain, which apparently has very little influence on the action of the nerves. It is totally different from ourselves in this respect. Instead of having the differentiated but narrow discrimination of our brain, its reactions are on a much broader and consequently more creative basis. One sees here what a marvelous symbol it is for a more adaptable creative attitude freed of the much greater discrimination that our brains produce. Not that I want in any way to undervalue the latter. I only want to emphasize that, in developing this quality almost to excess, we have lost direct touch with our sympathetic nervous system and thus lost the ability to see the way in certain situations where a serpent would know exactly how to react. When a serpent appears in a dream, it is often reminding us that a seemingly hopeless situation might be solved could we descend into – and be guided by – the sympathetic nervous system, which can replace all functions and where the serpent knows the way we have lost. It is not only that the brain of the serpent wields little influence, but also that the snake altogether relies on different senses from those which we employ. With the exception of certain day varieties, Brehm maintains that snakes do not see very well and that they use sight much less than we think. He also maintains that they hear very little and, with his nineteenth-century rationalism, denies on this account that it is possible to charm them by music. He does not take into account the fact that music may be apprehended by them in ways that are strange to us and that it may have an effect on their sympathetic nervous system that just may not depend on sound entering by the ear. Being totally unmusical myself and yet able to appreciate music, I can, to some extent, bear witness to such a possibility.

According to Brehm, the serpent’s tongue is its chief organ of orientation. Contrary to certain popular beliefs, a serpent’s tongue is not

memorous, but – as those of you who have ever watched them know – the tongue is constantly in the move. Brehm seems to regard a serpent's tongue almost as a sort of antenna with which it tests everything. It has been proven that the tongue perceives a centimeter beyond its actual reach – that is, when the tongue is a centimeter away from an object, the snake reacts as if it had already touched it – and it is possible that the snake can apprehend with its tongue at a much greater distance. At all events, snakes' tongues seem to be totally different from ours and to have a completely different use. The only sound they can generally make is their well-known hiss and then for some species the rattle. All this begins to explain why the serpent symbolizes to the human being the "totally other," be it God, the Devil, the spirits of the dead or the uroboros of cyclic life.

One more point that is very interesting here is that certain varieties of snake and lizard have the rudimentary physical remains of a third eye in the forehead. Those of you who have read Lobsang Rampa's *The Third Eye* will know that in Tibet they still perform some kind of operation on certain lamas to reopen this eye. It seems to be something very rare, for even the much revered Dalai Lama, "The Precious One," had no third eye and relied at times on Lobsang Rampa for the things he could see. The latter was on more than one occasion asked to be present at important interviews and report what impression he got through his third eye, that purportedly made visible certain qualities and auras surrounding people. One could say roughly, and in lay language, that this third eye opens a more direct connection with the absolute knowledge of the unconscious that Jung discusses in his article on synchronicity. It is most interesting to find physical reference to it in the serpent, which in several other ways seems strangely connected with this type of absolute knowledge.

A snake is exceedingly adaptable. It does not actually change color like a chameleon, but its color almost always corresponds to its usual environment. For instance, desert snakes are usually sand-colored, and those that live on trees tend to be green. Fresh-water snakes are mostly of a dull, muddy, greenish color while sea snakes are much brighter in hue, in harmony with the waters they inhabit. Particularly in the Indian Ocean, where they are most often found, they tend to be bright yellow and dark blue, which considerably reduces their visibility in the ever-moving, multicolored waves.

Jung tells a story of an Englishman in Nairobi who told him that he had been hunting butterflies and looking for orchids in a dense jungle gorge and was just going to sit down on a rotting tree trunk when his little terrier began to bark up a storm. The supposed tree trunk then slowly moved away and turned out to be a huge boa. Jung pointed out that snakes are as perfectly camouflaged as any military object in war (Jung 1997, 1222). Moreover, a serpent's gliding movement along the ground makes it very difficult to be seen, so that it can be said to have altogether a certain invisibility.

The snake, according to Brehm, has only three distinguishable anatomical parts: head, body, and tail. The head is never large – curiously enough, it resembles the head of a bird in structure – and it usually merges almost imperceptibly into the body. Then the body, which constitutes most of the snake, extends almost uninterruptedly into the tail. The simplicity and evenness of its outer form is conditioned by the structure of its bones; in most snakes these only consist of a skull, a vertebrate backbone and ribs. In some kinds of snakes, however, there are rudimentary traces of a pelvis and of legs and even, in a very few, of shoulder blades and arm arteries. These remnants, according to Brehm, teach us that in primeval times snakes may have evolved from fowl-legged, lizardlike forefathers. The snake has a great number of vertebrae which vary greatly in different species, but Brehm thinks there are rarely less than two hundred. When one considers this impressive length and the smoothness in symmetry uninterrupted by any extremities, we get an extraordinary unbroken line. This peculiar simplicity in form again gives one an idea of why the snake is so often chosen to symbolize the deity, for alchemy speaks of its highest treasure as the "simple thing" (*res simplex*). As Jung often says, it really would be awfully easy to understand the Self and to get to the center if only simple things were not the most difficult. We also know that in art. Some of those absolutely simple line drawings, say of Rembrandt, that look so easy, can only be drawn by a master with a lifetime of experience. The same is also true of one's understanding and perception of the psyche.

The snake differs most from all other living beings – including its nearest cousins, the lizards – in a peculiar mobility of the bones of the face that enables it to open its mouth to a phenomenal extent and to swallow prey far larger than the actual size of the mouth would allow. It is therefore well qualified to represent the unconscious in its devouring aspect, a motif we also see in the whale of Jonah.

Like worms, snakes are difficult to injure because they can grow a substitute for what they lose. One of their best-known attributes is their ability to shed their skins, thus it is only to be expected that they have come to symbolize renewal. Moreover, they are actually very long-lived; indeed, it was once thought that they only shed their skin and never die. This belief has no doubt played a role in their becoming a symbol associated with eternity.

The eye of the snake has no eyelids, the place of the latter being taken by a transparent skin similar to a watch-glass. It is probably the fact that its eyes are always open that gives us the impression that it relies so much on sight, an impression that Brehm energetically denies. But the fact that there are no eyelids gives the eyes a peculiarly staring, glassy appearance, which is presumably one of the physical causes for the well-known bewitching quality attributed to the serpent's eye.

Brehm points out that snakes have little or no fear even of their worst enemy – man – frequently living in the closest proximity to him and even inhabiting the same house. They can certainly be startled or surprised, for they glide quickly away with every appearance of shock if one steps too close to them. But experiment shows that they can even be put in a box with their worst enemies and will display no reaction until they come quite close to them. Brehm – who in accordance with his contemporaries very much disliked the idea of any kind of intelligence that does not proceed from the brain – says that this just shows how stupid they are. I would rather say it shows how "totally other" their intelligence is to ours (or perhaps I should say wisdom). Jung often speaks of their complete strangeness in his seminar on Dream Analysis. I will give you one example. He writes:

Hagenbeck, the famous connoisseur of animals, said that you can establish a psychical rapport with practically all animals until one comes to snakes, alligators and such creatures, and there it comes to an end. He told about a man who brought up a python, a perfectly harmless and inoffensive animal, apparently, that he used to feed by hand when it was quite big, and everybody assumed that it had some knowledge of him and knew that he was its nurse; but once, suddenly, that animal wound itself like lightning round the body of the man and almost killed him. Another man had to cut it to pieces with a hatchet in order to save the man's life. That is a typical example of the untrustworthiness of these creatures. Warm-blooded animals have an idea of man; they are either friendly, or they avoid him and his habitations because they dislike or are afraid of him. But snakes are absolutely heedless. So we must assume that cold-blooded animals have an entirely different kind of psychology – one could say none, but that is a little arbitrary. These coldblooded relics are in a way uncanny powers, because they symbolize the fundamental factors of our instinctive life.... (Jung 1984, 645)

Snakes are so remote that they often appear to be unaware of man or of their specific surroundings. They live, as it were, in a different world, seemingly oblivious to us and so invisible that we are often unaware of them. One sees why they have also come to represent the ghosts of the dead. They can dwell with us rather in the same way as ghosts are often thought to do. (Perhaps some of you will remember Thornton Wilder's *Our Town*, in which the young girl who dies is allowed to live another day of her life and goes back to her parents' house but simply cannot draw their attention to her.)

Each of the serpent's vertebrae has a rib and very strong muscles attached to it, and these muscles are used as levers to propel the animal

forward. The skeletal and muscular construction is such that they can move in every direction except backward, swift silent motion being characteristic of the snake. It appears suddenly and unexpectedly, which corresponds to our own experience of things in the unconscious and to the appearance of serpents in visions, and so on.

Although there are many quite harmless snakes, one cannot leave out their venomous quality when enumerating chief outer characteristics. The venomous varieties store the poison

– produced by special glands – in hollow teeth. (The teeth of the serpent seem very complicated but need not concern us.) We connect this poison so much with snakes that the most harmless kind is apt to create a shiver down one's spine. The hook here is too real to need comment.

As a rule, snakes seem rather solitary creatures, going about alone or, at certain seasons, in pairs. Of the two thousand seven hundred species or so there are one or two that may be a bit more "social," but I think the point is clear: they are a bit skimpy on gregarious warmth. Nevertheless, serpents are known to form large, even very large groups prior to the mating season, even very large, and people who have seen such a snakes' ball – as they are often called – say they are a very awe-inspiring sight. The solitary snake and the large group may also form a hook for the projection of the unique and collective Self, but it shares this with other animals.

I will give now the twelve actual physical characteristics that seem to me the twelve main outer reasons for the almost universal occurrence of the serpent symbol in mythology and religion:

1. changing temperature of its proverbially cold blood,
2. orientation by sympathetic nervous system,
3. relative invisibility,
4. simplicity of form,
5. facility in swallowing,
6. self-renewal,
7. staring, hypnotic eyes,
8. remoteness from specific surroundings,
9. extraordinary mobility – can move in any direction except backward,
10. long life,
11. venomous quality,
12. solitary, but have snake balls before mating.

These physical qualities represent the hooks, so to speak, that attract the projection of deep psychic elements, and these, like everything else in the unconscious, can only be first discovered by mankind in their projected state.

Before we go on to our material from mythology and religion, I would like to reflect on two passages in Jung's seminars on snakes (which, by the way, are mentioned in his seminars and books more frequently than any other animal). In speaking of the reason why snakes express a particularly primitive libido, Jung says:

Yes [they are cold-blooded], and they have [practically] no brain, they have only a tremendous spinal cord. They are utterly strange to man and therefore they always represent that part of life that is inhumanely cold, where there is no warm blood. There is something of the snake in everybody. That is why extraordinary people – like heroes – are supposed to be descendants of snakes, or to transform into snakes after death. Cecrops, the founder of the Acropolis in Athens, was supposed to be transformed into a snake that lived under the Acropolis. And in a Northern saga, it is said that the hero has snake's eyes, which means that he has the cold eyes of the snake. This simply expresses the fact that the remarkable individual is chiefly remarkable for a certain strangeness and inhumanity, which impresses people like the inhumanity of a snake. Also the fact that they can live under conditions where other people cannot live, that they receive their nourishment, or their warmth of life, from sources where other men cannot get it, like the snakes that live out of the sun. (Jung 1997, 268)

The end of the quotation refers to the way in which snakes can absorb and store heat from solar radiation. This draws attention to how needs can be satisfied by the serpent in ways generally unknown to us.

Jung tells us later that where we now put signs saying *Verbot* ("no trespassing") in antiquity they put up a snake (Jung 1997, 269)! They would have put up a snake instead of the various signs we have to persuade the motorist, for instance, to be careful. The very fact that a representation of a snake was used for such purposes instead of our abstract signs gives us a hint about how civilization seems to move progressively further away from its own vital roots, for as Jung said, "there is something of the snake in everybody" (Jung 1997, 268), and we all have a sympathetic nervous system, however much we chose to ignore that fact.

There is just one more place in the seminars on dream analysis that speaks of reptiles and this I would like to read to you here, as it belongs to a general view of the subject. I will try to bring a few more specific quotations later where they especially fit our material. In this place Jung actually is speaking of a crocodile, but what he says here also applies to a serpent or to any kind of reptile:

You remember I said that when a crocodile or any saurian turns up, one may expect something quite unusual to happen.... As I explained at that time, the crocodile, as well as the tortoise and any other cold-blooded animal, represents extremely archaic psychology of the cold-blooded thing in us. Schopenhauer said: "the fat of our brother is good enough to smear our boots." That is the thing we never can understand – that somewhere we are terribly cold-blooded. There are people who, under certain circumstances, would be capable of things which they simply could not admit. It is frightening, we are shocked out of our wits and cannot accept it. I gave you examples of the natural mind of woman; there you see the cold-blooded animal. And naturally the same thing is in the cold-blooded man; they will confess it to each other, but never to a woman, because it is too shocking. It is like an awful danger very far away. It used to be in the Balkans, but now it is much farther away – in the moon. It would be a moral catastrophe, but since we are so far away we can laugh about it. But when it touches us, we don't laugh; it drives people almost crazy. Once we were quite certainly cold-blooded animals, and we have a trace of it in our anatomy, in the structure of the nervous system. The saurian still functions in us and one only needs to take away enough brain to bring it to the daylight. Let a man be wounded very badly in the brain, or have a disease that destroys it, and he becomes a vegetative and utterly cold-blooded thing, exactly like a lizard or a crocodile or a tortoise. (Jung 1984, 644)

(I am sure you have all had the experience when talking to someone in a normal way that suddenly there is a snakelike look that can occur when the animus or anima or some inhuman influence from the unconscious has caught the person.) Later Jung notes that:

These cold-blooded relics are in a way uncanny powers because they symbolize the fundamental factors of our instinctive life, dating from paleozoic times. If constellated by circumstances, the saurian appears. For instance, a terrible fear or an organic threat of disease is often expressed in dreams by a snake. Therefore people who understand nothing of dream interpretation will yet tell you that whenever they dream of snakes, they know they are going to be ill. (Jung 1984, 645)

During World War I, when Jung was in charge of British internees of war, he became acquainted with the wife of one of the officers, a peculiarly clairvoyant person, and she told him that whenever she dreamed of snakes it meant disease. While he was there she dreamed of an enormous serpent that killed many people and she said: "You will see that that means some catastrophe." A few days later the second of those big epidemics

of the "Spanish flu" broke out and killed any number of people, and she herself almost died. Jung notes that the snake comes up in such cases because there is an organic threat that calls forth all one's instinctive reactions.

So whenever life means business, when things are getting serious, you are likely to find a saurian on the way. Or when vital contents are to appear from the unconscious, vital thoughts or impulses, you will dream of such animals. It may be the hindrance that comes up, and it will block your way although you think it is perfectly simple. Up comes an invisible hindrance and you don't know what it really is because you can't see it, or even symbolize it, and yet it can hold you. There is something hidden. Perhaps your libido drops, it appears usually in that well-known form; one loses interest suddenly, and the dream expresses it as a dragon or a monster or threatening animal that appears on your way and simply blocks the path for you. Then, in other cases, such a [beast] is a help: the tremendous force of organized instinct comes up and pushes you over an obstacle which you would not believe possible to climb over by will power or conscious decision. There the animal proves to be helpful. (Jung 1984, 645f)

I remember the time at a seminar party when Mrs. Carol Baumann made the observation that a saurian or reptile was a signal from the unconscious to change trains. There is a lot to say for this remark, for when these depths are touched, only a pretty basic change of attitude is likely to help.

The serpent – cold-blooded par excellence, yet only stirring into activity from its ability to absorb and store heat – is from its most basic qualities so much connected with the opposites that it is terribly difficult to bring it into any kind of classification. One class will always overlap the next, and many examples could be fitted into all or most of the classes. Brehm complains about this ambiguity in describing the physical characteristics of the reptiles, and it is infinitely worse on the symbolic side. For instance, one can fit an example into the dark earthy side only to find that it fits just as well on the light and spiritual.

Nevertheless, it is absolutely necessary to bring some kind of order into our vast and unwieldy material, so – although this is just a method of apprehending – we have attempted a classification under four main headings:

1. serpents as demons of earth, darkness and evil,
2. serpents as spirits of light, wisdom and creativity,
3. serpents as symbols of renewal and the uroboros of natural cyclic life,
4. serpents as representing the union of the opposites and as a means of communicating with the divine.

The examples that come under the heading of the serpent as a demon of the earth, darkness and evil are practically inexhaustible. We can start for instance in India and Persia, where we find the bird on the side of the gods and the serpent on that of the demons (de Gubernatis 1872, 412). (In India the serpent is not only demonic but also positive, but in Persia it is mainly negative.) Gubernatis also points out that the omniform demon makes any god or hero who falls into his power assume the most diverse zoological forms, but he almost always reserves the form of the serpent for himself as his most favorite and privileged shape. We have seen in our short, incomplete consideration of its physical qualities the many advantages the snake has to offer, so it is really very interesting that demons (and also witches) reserve this metamorphosis for themselves! Gubernatis goes on with his often quoted passage:

The devil, says the popular proverb, is known by his tail, and to show that women know more than the devil, it adds that they also know where the devil secretes his tail, or where he keeps his poison, for his poison and power to harm are in his tail. A devil without a tail would not be a real devil; it is his tail which betrays him, and its tail is the serpent's tail. In the forty-fifth story of the fifth book of *Afanassieff*, the devil-serpent comes every night to visit the young widow in the form of her deceased husband.... [He] eats with her and sleeps with her till the morning; she grows thinner every night, like a candle before the fire; but her mother counsels her to let a spoon drop when she is sitting at table so that in lifting it she may scrutinize the guest's feet; instead of his feet, she only sees his tail. Then the widow goes to the church to be purified. (de Gubernatis 1872, 389)

The belief that women know more about the serpent than men might be based on woman's moon nature and the fact that women are more connected with the earth and men with the spirit. But in the olden days, women just lived life without too much reflection. Nowadays they have discovered man's world and with it new difficulties, for we have discovered another side. Women's natural mind functioned as it should while women just lived it. Women's difficulties came with the necessary development of the mind and of the spiritual side, and it is now really hard for them to get back to their instinctive nature. Women have to try, as much as possible, to remember that God and the Devil are man-made abstractions. They may be the crosshairs in our telescope, but they are not inherent in the natural world.

I would like to conclude today's lecture relating an interesting thing that happened to me not long ago. A woman brought me a lecture to read that was a dull effort. She had been told to study the signs of the zodiac but had not done it, and then later she was asked to give a lecture on the study she had made. What she produced was dreadfully colorless because she had written it without putting herself into it. She had just forced herself to write something. Then she had a dream in which her dog lay down on colored carpets cast in sunlight and shade and the carpets were bearing the signs of the zodiac. The dog just took to these rich woolly mats and loved them, lying sometimes in the sun, other times in the shade. The dreamer had a fixed idea of good and evil, of the negative and positive, and could not bear her shadow side. The dream intimated that, in order to understand the signs of the zodiac, she should rather learn to think more as a dog who accepts sunshine and shade in summer and winter, but does not think of the sun as being in a higher category than the shade. It accepts the variations naturally, simply, according to its need and concurring with the season. We need a lot of that kind of attitude in order to be able to understand the serpent material to which we are coming.

XX

The Serpent as Demon of the Earth, Darkness, and Evil

Lecture Three: November 11, 1957

We began to talk of the serpent in the last lecture but confined ourselves to a few outer points. Today I propose to delve more deeply into the first of the four classes of symbolism by which we are trying to bring some order into our chaotic and endless material. This class entails the serpent as demon of the earth, darkness and evil. We will begin with the motif of the earth demon.

The most remarkable example I know of the serpent as earth demon is the python of Delphi. Now, I may be here personally influenced by the fact that when we were in Greece last spring, Delphi made a greater impression on me than any other place we visited. This snake at Delphi belongs to both the first and second classes of symbolism, because the original shrine with its python at Delphi was dedicated to Gaia (Gaea or Ge), the Greek goddess of the earth. And the serpent continued there in a new form long after the python was officially slain, so to speak, neither as the god nor as the old earth goddess, but being taken up in the form of Apollo. The python at Delphi retained this second form for many years (in accordance with serpents as spirits of light, spirituality, and wisdom). I propose considering what little we know about the original earth form in the first class of symbolism and the Apollo phase in the second.

The old stone that is left from the original worship of Gaia is possibly the most impressive thing we saw while in Greece. I spent the whole morning beside it and felt as if I had actually picked up a bit of the underlying atmosphere. The ruins of the Apollo temple are far larger and, in a way, psychologically on a higher level, but the mana and the message to the lost sympathetic nervous system flowed out of that stone and did something to one that cannot be put into words. The serpent as earth demon had to be overcome; that was a historical and psychological necessity, but one cannot possibly overcome a thing until one has it, and that morning taught me more of what it is that we have lost than anything I ever experienced.

Pausanias tells us that in the most ancient times the Delphic oracle was an oracle of the Earth. Plutarch also mentions the temple of the earth goddess Gaia. In his text *The Encircled Serpent*, M. Oldfield Howey sums up the evidence by saying:

The original Python, then, was apparently the guardian serpent of the shrine of Ge [Gaia]. The pythia, priestess of the earth goddess, obtained her inspiration from subterranean sources, and received through a cleft of the earth the gassy vapor which threw her into a trance. The place whence this vapor was exhaled was a deep cavern with a narrow orifice on the southern side of Mount Parnassus at no great distance from the seaports of Crissa and Cirrha. We are told that it was first introduced to public notice by a goatherd whose goats, browsing on its brink, were thrown into violent convulsions as they came within its influence. Their guardian thereupon went to the same spot and endeavored to look into the chasm, but himself was frantically agitated. When these happenings became known, they were at once attributed to a deity residing in the place, and it was said to be the oracle of the goddess Ge. From all around the people flocked to it to obtain information of the future by inhaling the mysterious vapor. Whatever they uttered in the ensuing intoxication was regarded as inspired by the goddess. But prophecy under such conditions was attended by considerable risk, and many of the prophets, made giddy by the gas, fell into the chasm and were lost. A consultation of the inhabitants of the neighborhood was called, and they decided that only one person, appointed by public authority, should be allowed to receive the inspiration and render the responses of the goddess, and that the security of this prophet should be provided for by a frame placed over the chasm through which the maddening vapor might be inhaled with safety. The importance of the oracle was of course greatly increased by this public recognition, and further measures became necessary. A rude temple was erected over the cavern, priests were appointed, ceremonies prescribed, and sacrifices offered. A revenue became a necessity. Therefore all who would consult the goddess must bring an offering to her shrine, and sometimes this was of great value. The reputation of the oracle now no longer rested merely on the superstition of the people. With the priesthood, a vested interest had been created for its guardianship, and Delphi, prospering through its oracle, became an important town. (Howey 1930, 139f)

(I should warn you here that although Howey's book is excellent, I have had to check everything he says.)

Howey then goes on with the transition in Delphi from Gaia to Apollo, who became the presiding deity of the shrine, a point we will consider later. We will turn now to what Erich Küster has to say about Gaia in *The Serpent in Greek Art and Religion*. I have made the following rough translation:

The image of the serpent – or of a monstrous mixed being with the body of a snake – was used very early in the fantasy of the Greek people to represent those powerful spirits and demons which dwell in the depths of the earth and only occasionally break through to the surface, for instance in a volcanic eruption or hot steaming springs. Sometimes such beings brought good to man and sometimes evil. (Küster 1913, 85f)

I would like to draw your attention to a modern painting produced by a young woman during an analysis. She had always had a peculiar dread of worms – which did not outwardly extend to snakes – yet the worm's movement of creeping on the earth, shared by both, was filled with a terrifying mana. I show the picture here on account of the interesting fact that quite unconsciously (for she knew nothing of the role of the serpent in early Greece at the time) she has brought the snake and the volcano together.¹ The volcano here seems to even be part of the snake, showing that this archetype, which was expressed in early Greece by the image of a snake and associated with volcanos and volcanic eruptions, still calls up the same images in the unconscious of a modern woman.

It is also favorable that in this picture there are double wheel mandalas that bring in the idea of the totality, a motif (as we shall see) poignantly symbolized by the snake as well. The twoness of the mandalas indicates that there is something still below the threshold of consciousness now rising toward the surface. This, of course, was terribly uncomfortable for the young woman, as things of that kind always are when they should come up out of the unconscious. Küster continues:

Primeval man never took a step beyond the peace of his hut without meeting something which made him think fearfully of a higher being, of a god. Therefore he noticed and feared the destructive forces that broke forth from the earth in fiery or liquid form and came down as lightning from heaven before he was able to revere the blessings and fertility which were also present. (Küster 1913, 86)

That is very interesting as a historical observation – whether or not it is true – because this is actually what happens in psychology. Generally we experience the destructive and negative side of an archetype before any of its positive side emerges. In fact, one of the old alchemists, Michael Maier, says:

There is in our chemistry a certain noble substance, in the beginning whereof is wretchedness with vinegar, but in its ending joy with gladness. Therefore I have supposed that the same will happen to me, namely that I shall suffer difficulty, grief and weariness at first, but in the end shall come to glimpse more pleasant and easier things. (Jung 1968, par. 387)

Till Eulenspiegel also laughed when going uphill and cried when going down, for he knew that he would have to climb up again. Jung always says that there is a great deal of psychological wisdom in the enantiodromia inherent in that idea. Küster continues:

This is the reason why the oldest Greek mythology portrayed the being of the earth with terrible, dark and destructive qualities. As the snake – which from time immemorial had been endowed with sinister and superhuman qualities

– also regarded as the “child of the earth,” it was natural enough that the serpent seemed to them to be the incarnation of the terrible forces sleeping in the earth. (Küster 1913, 86)

The earth goddess Gaia is thus regarded as the mother of all serpentlike demons and monsters.

I had never fully realized what an earthquake could do until we went to the Island of Rhodes and out to Lindos. Much in this island has been rebuilt by the Templar Knights, but in places there are still the old antique temples, many of which have been made into fortifications. The guide showed us what it had been like about 200 bc, when it had been a great town down by the sea, but through the earthquake it had been made quite narrow with huge arms of the sea on both sides. One has to see this to realize why the Greeks were so much impressed by the goddesses and deities who lived in the earth and produced such things.

We find a figure very like Gaia in the Babylonian Tiamat, who was also a primeval mother goddess with snake attributes. She was revered mainly out of fear for her destructive qualities and, as you know, was later overcome by Marduk. The examples could be multiplied indefinitely, but we will stick as much as possible to Gaia and Delphi as a good example.

We should perhaps stop and consider why the earth goddess Gaia was regarded as the mother of all serpentlike demons and monsters, and why she herself indeed is often regarded as a serpent. The hooks for such a projection might be in the fact that the serpent slithers across the earth with its whole length and is nowhere lifted up on even the smallest feet; many species live in the earth; and most of all, it has that phenomenal facility of swallowing which suggests the devouring mother. Jung tells a story of how he first learned that you must never interfere with earth things but allow them to take their course. He was very much pleased once when a hedgehog in his garden produced a family, but, fearing that his dog might interfere, he put a wire netting round them only to find the next morning that the mother had eaten the lot! She had apparently thought there was something wrong and therefore swallowed them.

Nature itself is like that. It creates with a lavish hand and then devours again. As long as a woman is unconscious of her close connection with nature, she is bound to function that way, for only if you know – and really know – a thing, only then is there any hope of detaching from it. It is nature that makes women like that. Men are more detached from nature; in fact, if they cling to their children it is usually through an unrealized anima. It is a feminine quality, whether it appears in man or woman. In Greece, vegetation is absolutely beautiful, but then suddenly an earthquake destroys everything. This is even better illustrated in Italy near Vesuvius, which erupts time and again taking all vegetation with it; yet people always return.

Küster’s remark that the earth goddess Gaia is regarded as the mother of all serpentlike demons and monsters brings us to the work of Ms. Mills, who was doing research all last summer on snake-tailed men (Küster 1913, 86). This brought her naturally to Gaia’s children, who are the Titans and the snake-tailed giants. So I have asked her to present a short paper summing up her investigations. This Ms. Mills will now read to us.

Presentation by Ms. S. Mills

This paper is intended as a tentative suggestion that the creation of the half-human monsters, for example the Titans and the Giants in Greek mythology, is an attempt on the part of the deity to incarnate his dark or shadow side. I should perhaps say that the significance of including it here is that the giants are half serpents, that is, they are snake-tailed from the waist down.

We have perhaps a parallel in Marc Connelly’s *Green Pastures*, where God is represented as a Negro preacher. Probably everyone here will know that *Green Pastures* is a play in the form of a fable depicting the Negro’s idea of heaven and the Old Testament story. God is depicted as despairing of His creation – mankind

– because of man’s sinfulness. His efforts at improving His creation have included a flood and thunderbolts (since He styles Himself the God of wrath and vengeance) yet the results have been negligible. He knows that mankind must be all right at the core, or else, as He says: “Why did I ever bother with him in the first place?” In fact, God has reached an impasse. Neither the flood nor the thunderbolts have succeeded, and so He decides to arrange the Exodus from Egypt to the Promised Land in order to finally get man to function properly. But again He is disappointed, this time by the corruption of the High Priest, so He decides to put them in bondage again and to renounce them. There is a loud clap of thunder! Some time later He finds that man no longer worships the God of wrath and vengeance, but the Lord God of Hosea, and that He is a God of Mercy. Man tells Him that Hosea would never have found what mercy was unless there was a little of it in God too. So God learns from mankind that the only way to find mercy is through suffering, and at the end of the play we know by inference that He has decided to incarnate and to learn to suffer as a man.

The Titans and Giants have much in common. They are both potencies belonging to an early, pre-Olympian stage of Greek mythology. According to Hastings’ *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, the discrepancy between the two tends to be confused by late authors, but originally they are distinct.

The Titans are gods and as such immortal, whereas the Giants

– born of the gods – are strictly mortal. “Titan Gods” is a fixed formula in Hesiod’s *Theogony*. They are sky potencies as contrasted with the Giants, who are earthborn. According to Hesiod, Titans and Giants alike are the offspring of Earth and Heaven, but the Titans tend skyward, the Giants, with the snake tails, earthward. Jane Harrison notes that the Giants of the Greeks are in no way “gigantic” in size. Although prone to stupendous fits of rage, fury, jealousy, and ranting emotionality, they are actually of normal human stature. Born of the earth, and looking very much indeed like men, only one characteristic mark separates them from the mortals: they are the actual children of Gaia, the Earth herself, and are often snake-tailed. In their fury they wield weapons indigenous to the earth such as tree trunks, boulders and the like. Describing a giant in her book *Themis*, Harrison says: “He is the typical ‘Giant,’ earthborn, seed of Echion.” She adds: “the Titans, unlike the Giants, seem early to have left their earth-nature behind them and climbed one step up the ladder to heaven” (Harrison 1927, 452).

Both Titans and Giants are the children of Uranus (Air) and Gaia, who was the Great Earth Mother. The myth states that after Uranus had thrown his rebellious sons, the Cyclopes, into Tartarus, Gaia incited the Titans to attack their father in revenge. Led by Cronos, the youngest of the seven, whom Gaia armed with a flint sickle, they overcame Uranus as he slept and Cronos castrated him. The Titans then released the Cyclopes from Tartarus and awarded the sovereignty of the earth to Cronos. No sooner did Cronos find himself in this position than he confined the Cyclopes to Tartarus again and married Rhea, his sister. But, as it had been foretold that he would suffer the same fate as Uranus, each year as Rhea bore him a child he swallowed it. The myth records that when Rhea had given birth to Zeus, she concealed him and gave to Cronos a stone wrapped in swaddling clothes, which he swallowed instead of the child. When grown up, Zeus returned and forced Cronos to disgorge both the stone and his brothers and sisters. It is stated that they all sprang out unhurt. Thus was Cronos dethroned, and Zeus waged war against him and his brother Titans.

In *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* we find that Earth, in her indignation at the overthrow of the Titans, gave birth to the Giants fathered by Uranus. The giants are described thus:

They were of huge bulk, of irresistible strength and of frightful aspect, their hair and beards were long and thick and they had scaly serpent coils in place of legs. They hurled rocks and blazing trees against Heaven. It was prophesied by Hera that the Giants could never be killed by any god but only by a lion-skinned mortal. And that even he could do nothing unless the enemy were anticipated in their search for a certain herb of invulnerability which grew in a secret place on earth. It was added that in order to kill them they must be dragged away from their own territory.

(Hastings 1955)

One might ask here why the Giants are snake-tailed, that is, cold-blooded and primitive from the waist down and identified with reptiles that live in the earth, symbolizing the instinctual side of the unconscious as Jung notes. I think Ms. Hannah gave us a clue here in her lecture last week. She spoke of the snake's ability to shed its skin and its symbolism of everlasting renewal. There is also the fact that the snake has no fear until in close proximity with its enemy, and also the difficulty in injuring a snake. These traits contribute to the feeling of invincibility in these snake-tailed monsters. Fearlessness and invincibility as well as renewal and rebirth lie in the serpentine nature of their lower extremities.

Another aspect of the giant was described by Dr. von Franz in the second lecture of her seminar on "The Problem of the Shadow in Fairy Tales" when she discussed and amplified the character of the shoemaker in the fairy tale. She spoke of the stupidity of the giants, saying that they caused earthquakes or emotional upheavals. The fact that they throw tree trunks and rocks at their enemies shows the crudeness of their passions and the brute force employed in their action. It is little wonder that their activation causes such a sense of catastrophe and violation within the psyche. But it is the upper half that throws the blazing tree trunks while underneath this red-hot anger there is the cold flick of the serpent's tail.

The myth says that they could never be killed by any god but by a single, lion-skinned mortal who was Hercules. Hercules, amongst other things, symbolizes strength, tenacity and great courage. It was Hercules who killed the Nemean lion as his first labor. In order to acquire the lion's skin, one must first have the strength and courage to slay the lion. And the lion symbolizes the emotions, the fiery and passionate emotions; therefore it is feasible that the powerful and destructive giants may only be dispatched by one who has himself overcome his fiery nature to such an extent that he can assume the strength and invulnerability of the lion for the greater and more impersonal task. Jung describes one of the main characteristics of the lion in *Psychology and Alchemy*: "It is a 'fiery' animal, an emblem of the devil, and stands for the danger of being swallowed by the unconscious" (Jung 1968, par. 277). Therefore the lion must first be overcome and his skin used for armor.

The myth continues that he could only destroy them finally when they had been dragged away from their own territory. To drag them away from their own territory is to cut them off from their roots, as they cannot be annihilated while still in contact with their own soil. It is as if their serpent tails were truly part of the earth and they must be severed. Surely there is a parallel here. The giant animus must not only be dealt his death blow by the one who has come to terms with her more fiery emotions, but he must first be isolated. In other words, before one can come to terms or deal effectively with moods or anger or fiery emotions, one must first be able to isolate the affect from the cause.

We also find the belief that it is these monsters who bring insanity and also know how to cure it. This may be associated with the double nature of the inherent snake symbolism. As Hastings notes, these monsters seem to be the personification of the forces of storm and earthquake. An earthquake strikes at the very foundation of things. It comes from the center and disturbs the foundations of buildings so that they totter and reel into a state of collapse and ruin. This is a dramatic representation of what it feels like to be in the grip of a psychotic-like state or, to a lesser degree, in the hands of the negative animus; he can whip up the fury of the psychic elements until one's hard-won structure of consciousness may seem to be in danger of foundering, much like the effect of an earthquake.

But it is not only the power of destruction that exists in the serpent's tail. Within it also is the chance of redemption. Professor Jung says: "...the snake symbolism certainly points to the problem of evil which, although outside the Trinity, is yet somehow connected with the work of redemption" (Jung 1966, par. 533). So we see it is no good denying the snake's tail, that is, the evil roots that exist underneath, but there is some means of redemption within this same tail. We have many allusions to this healing aspect of the serpent in Professor Jung's works. He says that the serpent, like the unicorn, is an alexipharmic and the principle that brings all things to maturity and perfection. And in his seminar on dream analysis he says:

The serpent was the original form of the physician's god. There was an enormous serpent in the temple Asclepius and in the third century, the huge beast was brought to Rome to combat the spirit of pestilence. For centuries, there was a serpent in the sanctuary. It was snake worship. A staff with a snake wrapped round it was the doctors' symbol, the caduceus. It was also the symbol of Hermes the sorcerer. There was originally an idea that Asclepius himself was a serpent, so [the staff] conveyed the idea of healing, as Christ was the healing one. Savior and serpent are used interchangeably. (Jung 1984, 434f)

Also in *Psychology and Alchemy* we find: "The idea of transformation and renewal by means of a serpent is a well-substantiated archetype" (Jung 1968, par. 184).

Jane Harrison says that it is noteworthy that Zeus – king and father of all the other Olympians – should be the last to shed his elemental nature. She notes that although he is always boasting that he is father and counselor, he remains to the end a spontaneously explosive thunderstorm. The split between the light and the dark is again expressed when she alludes to the Olympian's shame of his earth origin and his effort to repudiate his snake tail; clearly there is still difficulty in accepting the shadowy side.

The Giants are often depicted in art with wings as well as snake tails, and here we have an attempt at the union of the opposites at a pre-conscious level: the chthonic body, with its relationship to the depths, and the wings, which suggest their contact with the wind and spirit. These vases show very clearly their parentage of Heaven and Earth and an early attempt to unite them.² In talking about the two symbols of the cross and crescent, Professor Jung says: "Energy can only exist where the opposites are at work. When there is an equal warmth everywhere, as if all the world were reduced to a plane, then nothing happens at all" (Jung 1984, 415). He later notes: "The world cannot move without conflict. This throws light on the theory of complexes. Benevolent people assume that analysis has been invented, divinely ordained, to rid people of their complexes. But I maintain that without complexes there can be no energy" (Jung 1984, 416). Here we can see the true value and the redeeming feature of the snake tail.

The Titans and Giants might therefore be described as an attempt to unite the spiritual and animal natures of man. In as much as the Creator begot man in his own image, the Titans and Giants may be described as a halfway step toward the creation of man, or one step away from the purely earth nature of the giants. This step could be seen as an attempt on the part of the deity to incarnate embodying both the spiritual and the satanic sides.

I would like to conclude with the following Orphic myth of Dionysus, which goes roughly like this: Zeus had a son named Dionysus or Zagreus (with Persephone, the queen of the lower world). He intended the child to have dominion over the world, but the Titans lured it to them with toys, fell upon it, tore it to pieces and devoured its limbs. Nevertheless, Athena was able to save the heart and brought it to Zeus, who ate it. And out of this was afterward born a new Dionysus, the son of Semele. Zeus avenged the atrocity by striking the Titans with lightning, which burned them to ashes. From the ashes man was formed and he thus contains within himself something of the divine – coming from Zeus-Dionysus – and something of the opposite – coming from his enemies, the Titans.

So man embraces both the divine and the destructive qualities within. But he does not possess the heart of the divine principle. The heart is swallowed by Zeus in order to renew and resurrect the new god, for the drama was to be re-enacted each year with the birth, dismemberment and renewal of the god and the burning of his enemy into ashes.

□

I would like to express my gratitude to Ms. Mills for her detailed presentation. I am also grateful for her most informative work. At this point I would like to return to Küster and look at the mantic (that is, divinatory) significance that was given to the snake. He writes: "The belief

that earth deities and spirits had an unusual amount of the gift of prophecy probably goes back to a more general idea that a prophetic power itself dwelt in the earth" (Küster 1913, 122). The old Greeks, he states, not only believed that it was the earth deities and spirits who had an unusual amount to do with prophecy, but also "believed very early that figures in dreams and even the dreams themselves came from the depths of the earth and thus arrived at the idea of an incubation oracle" (Küster 1913, 122).

In Epidaurus there are still cubicles that look almost like ship cabins. If you lie down in them you feel as if you were right down in the earth. There people sought diagnostic dreams from the serpent god Asclepius. Küster notes:

Delphi is probably the oldest example of this preApollonian earth oracle whose priestess was a snake. There is a great deal of evidence – in fact we may take it as proven

– that the Delphic earth oracle originally belonged to Gaia who was connected with the sea god Poseidon. (Gaia later abdicated in favor of her daughter Themis who was, however, completely identical with her.) She was conquered later by the immigrant Apollo who then took possession of the old earth serpent. (Küster 1913, 122)

The idea that prophetic quality dwelt in the earth seems to me to want more consideration, as it is not self-evident. You remember that the tongues of fire that enabled the disciples to talk in all languages came from above. At modern seances I believe that the earth is not stressed. Küster says that the earth is usually regarded as the feminine principle, so it is quite possible that although it is more usual to regard the god of heaven as Gaia's husband who fertilizes her by sun and rain, undoubtedly the chthonic spirits and gods were concerned with her fertilization as well. So apparently the serpent was also regarded as taking the male role and in its phallic form being – as it were – the husband of Gaia (Küster 1913, 138). He further notes that:

Apart from any association with religious cites and oracles, the serpent frequently appears in Greek mythology as an independent symbol of divination per se, as a divine being which possesses the power to foretell the future and who even prefers to choose men to impart the gift of prophecy. It cannot, however, be denied that this independent divinatory significance arises first in connection with the oracular divinities themselves. (Küster 1913, 124)

And adds that:

Apollo retained the serpent in order to emphasize its prophetic side and it appears very frequently in Greek art and coins in this connection. Sometimes the serpent is curled round the tripod, sometimes round the Delphic Omphalos, sometimes round other sacred objects and symbols which belong to the cult of Apollo. (Küster 1913, 123f)

A representation of the Omphalos mentioned here can be seen in the museum at Delphi. It is a symbol of the navel of the world, of Gaia, the old earth goddess.

One sees at once in this one example of Gaia – who is herself the serpent, the mother of all serpents, and the wife of the serpent – how impossible it is to keep up any logic or rational thinking when talking of these reptiles. They have indeed their own logic, the logic of the waxing and waning moon (sometimes here and sometimes not), they have an omnipresence and are full of apparent contradictions that yet resolve themselves if one can comprehend the mythical logic of the moon.

Howey says that the original Pythia, the priestess of the earth goddess Gaia (who received her inspiration from the cleft long since closed), was undoubtedly represented very early by a woman called the Pythoness. Pythons were actually kept and mantic information was presumably derived from their behavior. Although less regularly, similar information was divinated from the flight of birds.³

I would like to point out here that the first and second classes of symbolism, despite the fact that they are more or less each other's opposites, are mixed up here. In Delphi there is a rather clear sequence: first the earth mother Gaia, totally in the first class; then Apollo in the role of dragon and snake killer; and then Apollo himself. But the oracle, the serpent in communication with the divine, takes us also into the fourth class.

There is a very interesting Scandinavian creation myth found in the *Edda* that leads over to the serpent as wholly evil. According to Howey it is an almost unique example of the serpent as the destroyer of the tree of life. The myth relates how Odin created an enormous ash tree which he named Yggdrasil, the Tree of the Universe, or the Tree of Life. This tree filled all the world and took root not only in the deepest depths of Niflheim (the home of mist and darkness, whence arose the spring Hvergelmir) but also in Midgard near Mimir's well (the ocean), and in Asgard near the Urdar foundation.

A horrible dragon or serpent named Nidhog had his dwelling in Hvergelmir, and he continually gnawed at the roots of Yggdrasil. He was aided in his work of destruction by numerous worms. Their aim was to kill the tree, and their success, if accomplished, meant the downfall of the gods.

Running up and down the branches of Yggdrasil was a squirrel named Ratatosk, or the Branch-borer, employed in repeating to the dragon below what had been said by the eagle who lived in the topmost bough.

The myth goes on to relate how the spirits of those who had led evil lives upon earth were first banished to Naströnd, the strand of corpses where they waded in icy streams of venom through a cave made of intertwined serpents whose threatening heads were ever turned toward them. After untold sufferings in this horrid place they were washed down into the bubbling cauldron Hvergelmir, and the serpent Nidhog would pause for a moment from gnawing the roots of Yggdrasil so that he might devour their bones. Howey cites from Saemund's version of the *Edda*:

A hall standing far from the sun in Naströnd; Its doors are northward turned.

Venom-drops fall in through its apertures; Entwined is that hall with serpents' backs. There Nidhog sucks the corpses of the dead.

(Howey 1930, 112f)

When the chthonic power has become obstinately one-sided, then it becomes destructive and gnaws at the roots of the tree of life. We get this in the last line of Hexagram Two ("The Receptive") of the *I Ching*, which says:

In the top place the dark element should yield to the light. If it attempts to maintain a position to which it is not entitled and to rule instead of serving, it draws down upon itself the anger of the strong. A struggle ensues in which it is overthrown, with injury, however, to both sides. The dragon, symbol of heaven, comes to fight the false dragon that symbolized the inflation of the earth principle. Midnight blue is the color of heaven; yellow is the color of earth. Therefore, when black and yellow blood flow, it is a sign that in this unnatural contest both primal powers suffer injury. (Wilhelm 1970, 14f)⁴

When asked if he thought that the atom bomb would be deployed, Dr. Jung said that he thought it depended on the number of individuals who could stand the clash of the opposites in themselves. If there were enough it might hold, but if the atom bomb were dropped, then our civilization would go down as so many others have done in the past. One cannot do anything definite about the situation. But – on the principle of the story of the rainmaker – the feeling that one is producing something, even if only a grain, gives one purpose and meaning when struggling to hold through the tensions of the opposites within.

Whereas in China the true dragon comes from above and the false from below, in the West the dragon is practically always the earth and the dark principle. The hexagram can be seen as a noteworthy parallel to our myth. When either element tries to rule, it becomes the enemy of the life process. The two have to work together. Like Mercurius, the squirrel in the myth is the messenger, but in this case a negative one, for it reports gossip and makes enmity worse and worse.

In closing, I would also like to note that in Persia we find Ahriman as a serpent seducing the first parents from Ormazd, the God of Light, for the *Bundahishch* has a very similar version of the fall to that in Genesis. Ahriman is known as “the old serpent with two feet.”⁵
Lecture Four: November 18, 1957

I was asked last time how the serpent was used at Delphi and replied that I supposed its behavior was observed and conclusions drawn, for I know that this was the case with the serpent of Asclepius at Epidaurus.

I have made enquiries but cannot add anything to my inferences last time as regards the Delphic python. I have, however, remembered a little more regarding snake worship in the Island of Crete, which was much older than the Apollonian rites at Delphi. It was more or less contemporary with the presumable beginning of the original Delphic python. There are a great many similarities between the mother goddess of Crete and Delphi, and if either is older, it is almost certainly the former. Indeed, it is possible that the mainland religion was originally derived from Crete.

In the museum at Heraklion in Candia, the capital of Crete, there are a great many ancient bowls that were used for feeding the snakes used in the religious practices at Knossos and there is, at all events, one statue of a goddess or priestess holding two serpents in her hands. Thus it looks as if the idea here was essentially the same as in the Hopi ritual serpent dance where snakes are carried in the hands or in the mouth. If it does not bite you, the god is favorable to you, and if you are bitten, it is against you.

In order to illustrate how this archetypal idea is still alive and thriving today, I will briefly present two modern examples where the serpent is still the representative of the divine. The first example occurred in India, the second in the United States.

In the periodical *Atlantis*, Ella Maillart reports of religious practices with serpents currently occurring in India (Maillart 1956, 511–518). I would like to show you a photograph of a group of so-called “snake stones” in which the image of the god can be seen to be surrounded by two snakes.⁶ Maillart, who wrote the article and took the photographs, frequently saw such snake stones at the foot of sacred trees.

In an advertisement that appeared several times in the newspaper *Hindu* she discovered that there were still active practices with snakes in India. For example, she learned that it was widely believed that if one killed a snake one would get leprosy or remain childless in a future incarnation. On the other hand, if a childless pair wanted children, they had to offer a snake stone to the god of Nagas to be erected after the birth.⁷ This stone image had to be put in a fountain or spring for six months to fill it with *prana*, and the woman had to circumambulate a special tree with the stone one hundred and eight times in forty-five days.

Maillart’s interest was aroused by the fact that she was living at the time in a southern town called Trivandrum whose name meant “the place of the sacred serpents.” Further investigation led her to discover that there was a dense wood in the neighborhood reserved for the worship of snakes. All that she could discover was that a little ceremony was given there where an oil lamp was lit every evening and there was a sacrificial gift of milk once a month. Moreover, in the autumn there were special reconciliation ceremonies for the local snakes. The snake itself was regarded as a noble animal because, as aspired to by ascetics, it can purportedly support life on nothing but air for months. Its eyes are said to be hypnotic, it is endowed both with mysterious strength and the ability to fleetly appear and disappear, and since it sheds its skin, it is supposed to remain eternally youthful. As an earth dweller, it is savvy to the secrets of the subterranean world and is regarded as the guardian of the earth. And it is said to only bite people with bad intentions who, moreover, can only be saved if they acknowledge their faults. Also a story was told of a healer who was called in to cure a peasant succumbing to snakebite. The healer performed ceremonies exorcizing the snake until it appeared; it apparently returned to its victim. At this point, the healer sucked out the poison from the wound. The serpent then died, whereas the peasant slowly recovered.

Ms. Maillart then heard of a temple consecrated since olden days to the serpent Vasuki, located at Manarsala in the north of the State of Travancore. A woman high priestess presides there who gives up her Brahman husband and becomes the Nagaraja’s wife. (The Nagaraja is the great and holy serpent of this temple that is consulted for divinatory purposes.) Her eldest daughter leads a normal life until the day when she too inherits the role of the priestess.

It was extremely difficult to obtain permission to visit this temple, but Ms. Maillart was at last allowed to go accompanied by a well-educated interpreter. The temple is situated in the midst of flat plains covered with scrub, and there is one huge tree standing in the sand. When Ms. Maillart arrived it was evident that a service was in progress. She was led silently through two courtyards to the house belonging to the priestess. Here the woman’s husband resided, honored with the title of Sri Vasuki, named after the first ruler of Malabar. He was an elderly man, overweight, going gray and badly shaven but with the alert and intelligent look of a doctor or a lawyer who knows people well. They were given food that had been blessed on the altar of the chapel and consisted of rice, lotus leaves, earth nuts, and a yellow curcuma paste. In the chapel there are three stone blocks with pyramid-shaped tops on which the serpents can lie, rest and play; it serves as a refuge for them in rain and flood. I am not certain whether the Nagaraja ever comes up itself, but all the snakes of the surrounding country can take refuge there. The temple itself, Ms. Maillart says, was “as old as the world.”

It is said that a childless woman had prayed for children and then had given birth to twins, a boy and a snake. The snake-child promised its mother that the Nagaraja would give the female members of the family special strength, but said that the eldest girl must always be the priestess and then take a vow of chastity. The snake child also promised to remain forever in the cellar to protect the family.

Eventually Ms. Maillart was taken from the husband’s house to the women’s quarters and was allowed to see the priestess. There were young girls around, but these retired and the grandmother-priestess came forward. She then stopped and stood in dignified and impressive silence. She wore a halo-like hat fixed to her head by a band and her complexion was without blemish. It was not possible to win her over with smiles and, as there was no interpreter present, it took some courage on Ms. Maillart’s part to ask her to come down a step so that a photograph could be taken. She was a most noble-looking lady. Ms. Maillart then returned to the men’s quarters and was taken to a kind of foreroom with two doors, one leading to the treasury and the other to the subterranean area where the snake protector lives and where only the priestess may go. Every day a service is held in this fore-room. The house has been rebuilt, but the serpent’s cavern is never touched. (Three months later, just as Ms. Maillart was writing her article for *Atlantis*, she heard from her interpreter that Sri Vasuki had died on a pilgrimage to Benares and that the serpent had been sighing in its cave for eight days.) Ms. Maillart describes visits to other serpent worshippers, but the one I have quoted is the most interesting.

Here we have a living example of the archaic patterns under consideration. We see here the serpent as a sort of protecting spirit of a clan with a hereditary bond – made with a common ancestress – where both sides have obligations toward and receive favors from the other.

I will say no more about the living religion described in this article now, for we shall find its elements cropping up in all four of our classes of symbolism. However, there are two things to which I would like to draw your attention. One is that it had been observed that the serpent had sighed for eight days before Sri Vasuki died, thereby foretelling some kind of pending misfortune. Here is an example of the behavior of snakes being studied for divinatory purpose. The other point to which I want to draw your attention is the rather striking fact that the great serpent is kept in a subterranean vault that has never been disturbed, whereas the outer buildings have occasionally been renovated, repaired, or even rebuilt. We find the same idea, not quite so clearly expressed, in a great many other places where the serpent is worshipped. In the Palace of Knossos in Epidaurus the chief serpent is kept below the cleft, and the python was supposed to have been kept right down under the cleft in Delphi. It seems to me that the image of the serpent’s cellar kept beneath all the other buildings is an amazing picture of the eternal versus the transitory insignificant nature of the ego. Here we cannot help seeing the image of an underlying eternal life beneath our visible lives with which we cannot interfere or

even touch. We are rarely aware of it, as it is a place where the ego entirely loses its central place in our consciousness and ceases to matter.

The fact that the python was kept down the cleft at Delphi, in cellars at Knossos, and in a deep maze at Epidaurus shows that the same idea was represented in the most ancient forms of snake worship. Here an image of the timeless and the timebound comes to mind. You can analyze it in terms of energy or of the creative power, as has been suggested by members of the class. Jung noted once in a seminar that in every deep analysis a time comes, although it may be of short duration, when the importance of the ego simply does not matter any more and there is an experience of an eternal foundation. If you can experience this, then you feel more rooted and safe. If you really do experience this feeling of the eternal just for a moment, then it does not matter what happens to the outer ego, which is transient and always changing.

The religion we have just described is as highly developed as a great many ancient mysteries, but a much more primitive ceremony is given in a report of a living serpent cult. I owe this to Ms. Todd, who saw the article in the *Saturday Evening Post* (September 28, 1957). "The Holiness Branch of the Church of God" is evidently a Caucasian sect of the hysterical, revivalist type in the Appalachian mountains of West Virginia, Kentucky and Tennessee. The sect seems to be composed of people rather cut off from civilization and to consist mainly of miners' families living in very modest or impoverished conditions. The individual handles a snake in the presence of a crowd, the latter being indispensable as mass suggestion plays a central role in this practice. After working up a hysterical atmosphere, they pick up snakes such as rattlesnakes and copperheads and many people handle them without being bitten.

Their creed is based on the Gospel of St. Mark 16:18: "They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them" and Isaiah 43:2: "When thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned." They take these texts quite concretely – although poison and fire are used more rarely than snakes. (They are reported to even drink strychnine.) The members of the inner circle call themselves "the saints" and, if bitten, accept no medical aid. State and federal authorities are powerless to stop their religious practices, and in the forty-eight years of the sect, at least twenty-five "saints" have died in agony. Everyone who shuns snakes is regarded as an outsider and sinner even though he may belong to the "Holiness Branch."

The idea here is more or less the same: namely, one must subject oneself to a ritualistic ordeal to show whether God is for or against one. But dying of snakebite does not necessarily mean a fall from grace. The practioneers believe there must be martyrs occasionally to prove to doubters that there is no hanky-panky with these reptiles. And a good many recover in spite of the bite.

Although these "saints" remind one of revivalist meetings and of evangelists such as Billy Graham, there is one significant difference. The latter setup is much more sentimental and based on the light side of the gospels. It is the upper spirit that is invoked and, although there are very real psychic dangers, these are by no means evident and usually remain unrealized by the congregation. In the Appalachian variety, however, they deal with the chthonic side and the danger is concrete and evident to everyone. They at least have the merit of risking their lives for their convictions.

Hagenbeck, as we have already mentioned, contends that you can establish contact with any animal except a snake. Therefore I think the archetypal idea underlying this handling of serpents is that by trying to create affinity with the snake, they are trying to establish a rapport beyond normal human dimensions. Such a connection is of a quasi hypnotic, transcendent nature and shares features with the establishment of a rapport with God that also requires more than rational human resources. One can call it the primordial power, but I would prefer to say that the snake represents an image of the deity and of the very great difficulty of establishing contact. If one reflects on the sacrifices in almost all of the many religions of the world made in order to attract the power and the influence of the deity – and one reflects on the cardinal emphasis put on power in almost all religions – one sees the tremendous basic human difficulty entailed in establishing contact with the divine. This seems to me to be very beautifully symbolized by the terrific effort made to establish contact with an animal that is beyond human rapport. Presumably the priestess – referring to the first class of symbolism – has attained the real power of being able to go down to the basic earthly root beyond the ego. She has trained herself, I would say. The very fact that when her mother dies she has to give up her husband and child and take a vow of chastity means a tremendous renunciation of the ego and a sacrifice of the things that dangerously influence the ego. For it is just the ego that prevents us from going near the everlasting and unchangeable; we are afraid we shall lose our identity, or lose our ego, or be killed. And with a snake you do run this risk every time. I presume the priestess has been trained from early youth not to place too much importance on the ego. She represents the rapport between the ego and the Self. Here she goes down as a pythoness. And at Delphi she goes down and finds out what the serpent is doing. To discover its will, as it were, she watches and serves as the mediator between the serpent and the assembly. To sum up, I would say that the underlying idea here – as in most serpent worship – is an attempt to establish rapport with a living and dangerous cold-blooded animal that, as a rule, is entirely beyond the reach of any form of normal, rational human consciousness.

XXI

The Serpent in Christianity

We will now return to the material of the first class of symbolism in order to consider the role of the serpent in Christianity. Here the serpent is for the most part placed on the dark and evil side. The main exceptions are practically all Gnostic, for the Gnostics even represented Christ Himself as the serpent and, in particular, as a serpent on the cross.

The serpent in Eden is so well known that it need only be mentioned briefly. But when one comes to think of it, it is interesting that in the Judeo-Christian tradition this universal symbol already appears in the opening chapters of Genesis. In other words, the snake emerges at the very beginning of human history. We hear in the third chapter that the serpent was more subtle than any other beast of the field that the Lord God had made. The chapter then proceeds with the story of the fall with a markedly moral nuance wherein the serpent is definitely banished to evil and punished by the Lord. But it manages nevertheless to remain a “subtle” figure, particularly when we consider Christ’s injunction to be “wise as serpents and harmless as doves.” In basic Old Testament and New Testament theology, as in almost every other religion, the paradoxical nature of the serpent is fully recognized. Its banishment to the evil side I should say was the result of the one-sided development of the Church of which the doctrine of the *privatio boni* was the most striking fruit. If one cannot think paradoxically it is indeed difficult to digest the symbolism of the snake. You are probably all familiar with Tertullian’s statement: “And the Son of God is dead, which is worthy of belief because it is absurd. And when buried He rose again which is certain because it is impossible” (Jung 1968, par. 18). As Jung points out in *Psychology and Alchemy*, few people have the spiritual strength to endure the suffering of antinomies such as those of a Tertullian, who could not only endure a paradox but to whom it spelled the highest grade of religious certainty (Jung 1968, par. 24). This is as true today as it was two thousand years ago. Therefore, the serpent, like many other symbols in Christianity, was only seen from one side and slowly became more and more identified with the devil himself.

There is just one other point with regard to the third chapter in Genesis that only struck me when I read it again for this seminar, namely that the Lord says in Genesis 3:15 that the descendants of woman shall bruise the serpent’s head and the serpent mankind’s heel. I have always taken that to mean – naively projecting my own head onto the serpent – that man would be less hurt than the serpent! But when one remembers that the brain of the serpent is undeveloped and insignificant compared with its massive spinal column and that the serpent does not use its brain to orientate itself but has quite other resources, the matter becomes much more even, a sort of fifty-fifty business.

The main Christian legends about the serpent – if not all of them – come under the heading of the serpent or dragon killer and therefore form a bridge between the first and second class, for, although we have lost our connection with the serpent now, in the days before Christianity and in all primitive conditions, the very thing which is a desideratum for us had to be overcome for any progress to be made. Those of you who have heard the lecture of Dr. von Franz on Apuleius will remember the vivid picture that he gives of the pagan world just after the birth of Christianity. It was just a mass of magic and dark unconsciousness, and it was a historical and psychological necessity that the light principle should for a time be exalted above the dark.

The prototype for these Christian legends is to be found in Chapter Twelve in Revelation just after the interesting story of the pregnant woman who was clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and a crown of twelve stars on her head. The great red dragon with seven crowned heads and ten horns pursued her into the wilderness where her son, as soon as it was born, was snatched up to heaven and was given a place prepared by God. This part of the story is dealt with in a more interesting way in the *Answer to Job*. Its immediate effect in the next three verses is our concern here.

And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought [against] the dragon; and the dragon and his angels fought and prevailed not; neither was their place found in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him. (Revelation 12:7–9)

The archangel Michael, because he overcame the dragon here, became the prototype par excellence for the dragon killer in its Christian form. The story is depicted in many ways and places of which I only mention a few. First, the old English coin called the Angel was named from the image on its face of St. Michael piercing the dragon.¹ Second, the remains of the great serpent temple at Carnac in Brittany was consecrated by the Christian Church to the archangel Michael, known as the serpent killer. Third, the great pestilence in Italy in the days of Gregory the Great was identified with the serpent or dragon and was said to have brought Michael to earth to slay him. And finally, there is still a bronze image of the Archangel on the mole of Hadrian that watches over Rome, the city of the seven hills.

St. George, the patron saint of England, is perhaps the best known of the legends of a Christian hero who slew a great serpentlike dragon. There are many versions of this story, usually connected with a princess who was to be sacrificed to the dragon thus reflecting the pre-Christian theme of Perseus and Andromeda. St. George slays – or first tames and then slays – the dragon after converting the whole kingdom to Christianity.

One might define the slayer and the dragon by saying that the hero represents the spirit of clarity and truthfulness fighting against “woolly-mindedness” and confusion, a condition where the unconscious has taken over consciousness. Reginald Scot, in his 1584 treatise titled *The Discoverie of Witchcraft*, has a beautiful description of such woolly-mindedness and speaks of the old women witches in whose drowsy minds the devil enjoys a luxury seat.

Howey gives an interesting French version of this legend that shows the essential identity between the slayer and the slain. It relates that there lived:

...in the castle of Vaugrenans a lady whose great beauty had proved a snare to herself and others and who was changed into a basilisk [lizard] for her misdeeds. She terrorized the country in that form. Her own son George, unlike his mother, was very pious, and as brave and handsome as he was good. He was now faced with conflicting duties but decided that he must free his country from the depredations of the monstrous reptile which preyed upon it. He therefore did battle with the dragon [his own mother] and slew it, and his horse trampled its remains beneath its hoofs. But in spite of his victory George was sad at heart and uneasy in conscience, so he asked St. Michael, himself a dragon slayer and a witness of the combat, what was the punishment due to him who had slain his own mother. St. Michael uncompromisingly and sternly replied that he ought to be burnt and his ashes scattered to the winds, and George accepted the verdict and underwent the punishment. But his ashes fell in one heap instead of scattering, and a young girl who was passing gathered them up. Not far away she saw an apple of Paradise which she ate. In due course she gave birth to a son, and when her child was baptized, it cried in a loud voice: “I am called George, and I have been born on this earth for the second time.” (Howey 1930, 182f)

This story relates a clear example of the identity of the mother with the dragon that has to be overcome. In *Symbols of Transformation* Jung says: “Snake and water are mother attributes. The snake coils protectingly round the maternal rock, lives in the cave, twines itself round the mother-tree, and guards the precious hoard, the secret treasure” (Jung 1967, par. 541). In other passages, the identity of the mother and the dragon are still more emphasized, which brings us back to Marduk and Tiamat, the pre-Christian prototypes of this problem. But before we leave the Christian legends, I should like to mention St. Patrick of Ireland, one among many Christian dragon killers. It is interesting that the Irish harp, now represented as a beautiful woman with celestial wings, seems originally to have been a dragon with extended foray pinions and a semi-fish- or lizard-like

extremity. St. Patrick, the apostle of Ireland who landed there about 432 ad, seems to have encountered a serpent-worshipping population. He is known to have been much concerned with the serpent and is supposed to have destroyed it, presumably in this case by converting the Irish to Christianity.

It may interest you to know that there are also women who subdue serpents in Christian legend, possibly led by the Virgin Mary, for she is sometimes represented as trampling down the serpent or dragon. Of actual women Howey says:

Perhaps the most famous of lady dragon-slayers is St. Margaret of Antioch whose memory the Roman Church celebrates on July 20.... This woman had been long celebrated for her piety, and it is written of her in the breviary of Salisbury that on a certain time she begged that she might have an opportunity of engaging with the devil face to face because she had formerly had many secret struggles with him. Her request was granted and the devil appeared to her under the form of a most hideous dragon who immediately swallowed her up. Here was the moment of trial; she recollected that she was a Christian, and though in the belly of the dragon, she marked upon herself the sign of the cross, and the monster's body burst asunder so that the virgin came out unhurt. [Truly a commendable example of courage and presence of mind.] This lady is said to have had no less than three encounters with a dragon. These possibly may be an allegory of her prolonged sufferings and martyrdom at Antioch. In allusion to her delivery from the dragon, she is the patron saint against the pains of childbirth. She has enjoyed great popularity from an early period, and in Great Britain two hundred and thirty-eight churches have been dedicated to her honor. (Howey 1930, 189)

This story confirms what Jung has often said, namely that the man overcomes by becoming active, as here illustrated by the stabbing and killing of the dragon, and the woman by accepting suffering.² She did not go out and attack it but prayed for the suffering of seeing it face to face. We see the same thing illustrated in this modern painting, now about two years old, in which the serpent is attacking the woman.³ It looks very much as though it would swallow her, for her hands are bound and she can only wait to be swallowed. She is even more helpless than St. Margaret because she cannot even make the sign of the cross but will have to accept her suffering. The young woman who painted this picture was not brought up in the Church. So, like most people who have slipped out of the Church, she has no longer the possibility of taking refuge behind the thought that Christ will bear her suffering. She will have to bear it herself. Here we have an absolute example of what Jung says of the difference between the way in which women suffer and men overcome. We may be necessarily Christian in our bones, but we have now taken over the alchemist's belief, namely that we have to rescue the god imprisoned in matter. The alchemists believed that man must be active and help the god. In the case of the woman it means passive suffering. It is not that the eternal truth of the cross fails to remain true, but it is now our cross, not just an image of someone else suffering.

The sister of Lazarus, St. Martha, is also reputed in the legend to have subdued a dragon who fed on human flesh in France. In the story of Martha and Mary, Martha gets a rough deal, thus I felt it would only be just to give her a bit of recognition. St. Hilda is supposed to have changed serpents into stones by her prayers, and there is a like tradition of a Welsh Princess Keyna.

Coming now to the original source of these Christian legends, I refer you to *Symbols of Transformation*, where you will find several examples identifying the dragon serpent with the devouring mother. I particularly recommend Jung's analysis of the story of the Babylonian creation myth of Tiamat, given in considerable detail. I will only give a brief fragment. The nocturnal serpent Tiamat, the mother and the origin of the gods, would not allow her descendants any freedom of will and they were forced to rebel against her. Jung notes that: "Against the fearful hosts of Tiamat the gods finally put up Marduk, the god of spring, who represents the victorious sun. Marduk prepares himself for battle and forges his invincible weapons" (Jung 1967, par. 376):

*He created the evil wind, Imhullu, the sou'wester, the hurricane,
The fourfold wind, the sevenfold wind, the whirlwind, and the harmful wind.
Then he let loose the winds he had brought forth, all seven of them:
To stir up confusion in Tiamat's vitals,
they followed behind him.
Then the Lord raised up the cyclone,
his mighty weapon.
For his chariot he mounted the storm-wind, matchless and terrible.*

His chief weapons, Jung notes, are the wind and a net with which he hopes to catch Tiamat. Marduk then approaches Tiamat and challenges her to single combat:

*Then Tiamat and Marduk, the wise one among the gods, joined issue,
Girding their loins for the fight, drawing near for battle.
Then the Lord spread out his net and caught her;
Imhullu, which followed behind, he let loose in her face,
When Tiamat opened her mouth, as wide as she could, to consume him,
He let Imhullu rush in and her lips could not close.
With the raging wind he filled her belly,
Her inward parts were seized and she opened wide her mouth.
He smote her with the spear, he hewed her in pieces,
He cut up her bowels and made mincemeat of her heart,
Vanquished her and put an end to her life,
Threw down her carcass and trampled upon it. (Jung 1967, pars. 376f)*

Then Marduk creates the world out of her dead body.

This text strikes me as a particularly beautiful myth of a serpent slayer because instead of throwing away the other principle – as in Christian myths – he makes a creative use of her body and she becomes the world in the orbit of the sun – consciousness – instead of an autonomous destructive force. I always find it upsetting that in exorcism there is seldom any interest taken in what becomes of the exorcized spirit, which probably will only cause worse mischief elsewhere.

There are, of course, many other myths such as that of Perseus and the Gorgon and later the monster who was to devour Andromeda, whom Perseus turned to stone by means of the Gorgon's head. Horus's fight against Set in Egypt is an even earlier example. (In the Greek legend Typhon, that is, Set, is a dragon.) Apollo also reckons as a subduer of dragons. As mentioned, he overcame the old earth mother Gaia at Delphi. In fact, according to Küster, Typhon, who was overcome by Horus, was a terrible son of Gaia (Küster 1913, 87). Apollo is also connected with the destruction of Typhon as well as of his mother, Gaia. Both Apollo and Horus are sun gods.

The Serpent as Spirit of Light and Wisdom

This brings us over to our second class of serpent symbolism, for the python of Delphi in the Apollonian cult was definitely more a spirit of light and wisdom than a dark, earthy demon. This characteristic is reflected in the relationship between Gaia and Apollo and the difference in the interpretation by the priests. Even in the time of Apollo there was naturally much less of a split between the two than afterward became the case. Good and evil had not yet been sharply separated as we have seen in the Christian legends.

While I was in Greece, the museum at Olympia was one of the places that made the greatest impression on me. It is much older than the Sabine Museum. There we found the motif of the centaurs attempting to take away the women and Apollo appearing among them and crying: "Enough!" In this group of statuary the face of Apollo is most striking.¹ He appears as someone superior to the conflict and therefore able to control it, for he is not identified with it. This group is fascinating and shows on a higher level exactly what happened in the subduing of the serpent. Apollo here represents control, discrimination, a higher point of view, and that old Greek wisdom: "Do not exaggerate anything. All good lies in the right measure." Yet Jung comments: "But what an abyss still separates us from reason" (Jung 1968, par. 37). Here this dragon may no longer even have to be killed. One does not really have the feeling that Apollo has any intention of killing the centaurs; everything can live together in the right measure.

As we have already mentioned, Gaia was the original goddess at Delphi, and Apollo, coming more or less as a newcomer, overcame her in the same way as Marduk overcame Tiamat. But although he came from afar, he already had a great reputation, both in the surrounding islands and in Asia Minor as well. But when he became the god of Delphi he had little reputation on the mainland of Greece. On traveling down to Rhodes in a steamer one realizes why the religions of Asia Minor and Greece so intensely influenced each other. One can see the coast of Asia Minor the whole way down to Rhodes, as it lies very near these islands.

One more rational account relates that not Apollo but his worshippers came from Knossos on Crete and – so it is said – were led by a dolphin to the port of Crissa, where they landed with the apparent purpose of ousting the old deity and establishing Apollo in her stead. The whole question of Crete and the Mycenaean culture is difficult to make out, but at any rate we saw much more of the remains of an earth goddess in Crete than of Apollo. Dr. von Franz, who was speaking to us about the psychological side of the civilizations we encountered, developed a theory that struck me as interesting in regard to the fact that while the outer visible culture was extraordinarily developed, the inner had remained on the earth goddess level. The palace of Knossos, for instance, had a drainage system as good as ours. Von Franz's idea was that perhaps as this culture was so far developed on the one side, they retained a very primitive religion of an old earth goddess as compensation on the other. This would be similar to the sect in the Appalachians that uses the serpent as a test. Perhaps it is more striking in the United States that in order to reach back into the divine foundation you still have to go the way of an earth goddess. One sees it more clearly in the cult of "Mom," so amusingly depicted in Philip Wylie's book *Generation of Vipers*.

In some of these islands, however, Apollo was certainly worshipped very early. He and his sister Diana were supposed to have been born on the island of Delos. Zeus had an affair with Leto, which infuriated Hera. As she was the goddess of the earth, she was able to prevent Leto from settling anywhere to have her child. In pity for her, Poseidon, the sea god, gave her the island of Delos, where her two children were born. A fairly early cult of Apollo was practiced on that island.

Küster tells us an interesting story of the fight of the mighty Olympian gods with the old oracle Gaia and says that Apollo, who slew this demon, was obliged to do penance for his crime against Gaia. This theme played a central role in the Pythian games (Küster 1913, 123). The Delphic games, although less famous than the Olympic, also played a considerable role in this culture. But whereas in Olympia it was the physical sport that counted, the artistic and poetic sides were emphasized at Delphi. Here, at the temple of Apollo, there is a most wonderful and very well-preserved stadium, much better preserved than the one at Olympia, even though the latter is the most famous for the games. Still, the games played a very considerable role at Delphi.

According to Küster, one sees Apollo's fight with Gaia depicted on old coins (Küster 1913, 123). Some show him as a youth slaying the serpent, while on others he is depicted as a child who springs out of the arms of the escaping Leto down onto the monster.

In closure for today I would like to note that Apollo, although he overthrew Gaia, retained the python, thus emphasizing his prophetic side. The oracle of Delphi reached its zenith of fame during the Apollonian period. Delphi remained the navel of the oracular world, and the oracle became by far the most famous we know. The date of the change from Gaia to Apollo is unknown, but it seems to have been perhaps centuries before the days of Homer. (The traditions of his dates vary between 1050 and 850 bc, which is the date given by Herodotus.)

The temple of the deity was a magnificent building in stone. But the oracle was little changed. Howey hopes (but later unconsciously contradicts himself) that the vapors were given up! But even he admits that it was only in outward appearance that Gaia was conquered and her religion, like the python, slain. For their influence was far from dead and remained active as long as that of Apollo himself at Delphi. The skin of the slain python was said to cover the tripod on which the Pythia sat. According to Howey, the tripod itself was formed of a serpent of bronze, coiled and spiraling upward in the form of a cone and terminating in three heads (really the old mother goddess herself). But he adds: "As the cone, or pyramid, was a symbol of the sun's rays, this typified the union of the worship of Apollo, the Sun-god, with that of the Serpent, the Python or earth deity" (Howey 1930, 143). The temple at Delphi did not decline until about the fourth century ad, when it was officially closed by a Christian emperor. We were told that within a century after the oracle was terminated there was a terrific earthquake. And the old cleft from which the prophecies issued was sealed.

Lecture Five: November 25, 1957

Last week we began to speak about our second class of serpent symbolism with the topic of the serpent as a spirit of light and wisdom. There we spoke about the later phase of the python of Delphi which followed the demise of the original mother goddess, Gaia, who was more or less identical with the serpent. She was overcome by Apollo, who retained the python for its prophetic qualities. Prophecies were now actually done by a woman, called the Pythoness, of whom Howey says:

The pythoness was chosen from among mountain cottagers, the most unacquainted with mankind that could be discovered, and it was always required that she should be a virgin and, originally, that she should be young. Once appointed she was never to leave the temple. But one of these maidens made her escape. A young Thessalian, who fell in love with her extraordinary beauty, succeeded in an attempt to carry her off. After this it was decreed that no pythoness should be appointed under fifty years of age, though she was still to be as simple and childlike as possible and to wear the dress of a girl.

At first there was only one pythoness, but later the oracle was so sought after that three were appointed who alternately took their seats on the tripod. The office of pythoness appears to have been anything but desirable. The vapors from the chasm threw her into real convulsions. The priests often employed force to lead her to the sacred tripod, and held her upon it till her frenzy rose to what they considered was the desirable pitch. It was easy for them to protect themselves because the noxious vapors were so much heavier than air that they did not rise above a certain height. But some of the pythonesses died almost immediately after leaving the tripod and others whilst actually upon it. (Howey 1930, 143f)

The pythoness was evidently what we would call in modern language a medium. Dr. Jung, in the course of an investigation, discovered that mediums were very much inclined to lose their power as soon as they started using it as a means of making money. Presumably the priests realized something of the kind and therefore made the secular world so extremely disagreeable for their pythonesses that they in turn did nothing for themselves. Howey goes on with an interesting description of the Delphic oracle taken from *The Travels of Anacharsis the Younger in Greece during the Middle of the Fourth Century bc.*² Anacharsis was very indignant about the torments of these women and, being exceedingly rational, condemns the priest and the credulity of mankind. The behavior of the pythoness, however, mirrors a primitive mentality that is closely connected with the cult of the serpent and physiologically connected with the sympathetic nervous system. The whole atmosphere is one of an ecstatic contact with the deeper levels of the unconscious (as we see in the Appalachian example). The pythoness' consciousness was completely blotted out. She could not even produce a sentence. She could only groan and eventually utter a few disconnected words which the priests eagerly collected. One could say that the priests were the brain and what the pythoness uttered was just not cerebral.

The oracle at Delphi, in contrast to that at Epidaurus, which we will consider in our fourth class of symbolism, was consulted chiefly for questions concerning nations or large groups of people. (At Epidaurus, as we shall see, it was the individual who usually came for help.) Very prominent individuals such as kings would ask the Delphic oracle more personal questions. Of course there is the famous example of the father of Oedipus for it was the Delphic oracle that he consulted. But as a rule, the pythoness was consulted on political matters such as whether to begin a war or who should rule over a state and so on. The answers were apparently remarkably helpful, because Delphi acquired a tremendous reputation not just in Greece but also in the surrounding countries. Nearly two thousand years later in England, women who felt they preferred mediumistic powers proudly titled themselves "pythoness"; Scot dedicates several short chapters in his study on witchcraft to such pythonesses.

Before we leave the subject of Delphi, I must just point out that the most important thing concerning the Delphic snake is that after it was slain as Gaia it was still retained in the worship of Apollo. But by Apollo it functioned not as an earth-goddess demon but as its opposite, a harbinger of wisdom, light and order. This is a very important point in the practical interpretation of dreams. (We will speak of it in connection with an actual dream in a few minutes.)

The serpent of the zodiac is also a very good example of this second class of serpent symbolism, that is, the serpent of light. In the summer sessions of his Visions Seminar in 1933, Jung spoke of the *durée créatrice* of Bergson's philosophy and quoted the old Neoplatonist Proclus, who said: "Wherever there is creation there is time." He pointed out that the old creative god of the Stoics was called Cronos – time – and that the serpent was connected with the path of the sun through the signs of the zodiac (Jung 1997, 1042). Jung then went on to speak of Christ as the zodiacal serpent, but there is a longer piece about this in his autumn seminars of that year that I should like to quote:

...Christ is likened to the zodiacal serpent. The sun's course is represented as a big snake weaving its way through the zodiac, and Christ is compared to that celestial serpent; the twelve zodiacal constellations form the pattern on its back and they also express the apostles, his twelve disciples; they are the zodiacal signs, and he is the serpent that connects them all. Another parallel is Christ's saying: "I am the vine and ye are the grapes." As the grapes are held together and live the life of the vine, so Christ as the zodiacal serpent carries the apostles. There are other hints in the Christian iconology of the fact that the disciples were understood to be stars or constellations; they are sometimes represented with a star above the head, for instance, indicating that they are connected with the cosmos, and therefore Christ was understood to be the cosmic serpent.

That idea is not to be found in the text of the New Testament but it is substantiated by Gnostic tradition, the Marcionite tradition, for example. The Marcionites were a somewhat later development of the so-called Ophites, a sect, probably of pre-Christian origin, that worshipped the redeemer in the form of a serpent and celebrated the communion with a real serpent. The original pagan Ophites represented the snake as the king cobra with the inflated neck, but later on it lost that terrible poisonous aspect.

....Then when the Ophites became Christian they still celebrated their communion with the snake; it was in a basket on the communion table, and it symbolized the Messiah. That is, according to the old tradition, the creator of the world, the Demiurgos, was a blind demon who thought he had made human beings as unconscious as possible in order that they should not see the imperfection. But the god of the spiritual world was quite different, he never made material creations because that was beneath his dignity, only demons could work with dirt; and he saw the misery of those blind human beings, and sent his son in the form of the serpent in paradise to tell them they ought to change, they ought to eat the forbidden fruit in order to become conscious and see the difference between good and bad – knowing good and evil, as the text says. So the son of God made his first appearance on earth in the form of the snake in paradise, giving good advice to the first parents. (Jung 1997, 1222f)

This last reference, again referring to Eden, definitely belongs on the light side, for the serpent is actually reckoned as Christ and as a positive messenger from God bringing illumination to man. This belief contrasts the conviction that the devil brought about the fall, which is how the Church always regards it. We see here again how the Gnostics were able to preserve a far wider and more basic Christianity than the Church was able to do. Of course that was quite inevitable because most people cannot think in paradoxes, but still the Gnostics did preserve more of the paradoxical truth that Christ brought himself, a truth that now makes far more sense for us today. In that the serpent on earth and in most mythologies is very much a chthonic creature, it is very interesting that we also find it in the zodiac among the light givers – the stars – and as the vine holding Christ and his disciples together.

The fact that the Gnostic Ophites continued to celebrate their communion with a snake after they became Christians reminds us vividly of the way Apollo kept the python at Delphi. If only the Church Fathers could had kept a little more of the serpent, we would today not be so divorced from our lower instincts and sympathetic nervous system and might not have got ourselves into the present impasse.

This brings us to a specially interesting passage in Jung's seminar on children's dreams of 1939–1940 where he speaks of a dream reported to him by von Franz when she was a student. It is that of a ten-year-old girl:

A serpent with glittering, diamond eyes is chasing me in a wood or in my bedroom. The dream is so terrifying that I dare not move in my bed and even when I wake I see all over the room the glittering eyes of the snake that wants to bite me. (Jung 1987, 254)

It is, of course, very important to consider the type of serpent in a dream. One cannot possibly see its meaning until one has decided the role that the explicit serpent in the specific dream would play. The snake, because of the glittering diamond eyes, would obviously be a herald of light or of enlightenment as well as a harbinger of something of value because of the diamondshaped form of its eyes. A dark, chaotic snake would probably represent an earth demon or some form of darkness. The important thing in such a dream is to see exactly what the snake looks like, for even if it has a little yellow cross or a few yellow spots it would be interpreted quite differently from a dark snake. Impressive childhood dreams often bring the prognosis of a whole life, and naturally one would not tell the child everything, but this is an archetypal dream. I had a somewhat similar dream in my childhood which I mentioned in an earlier seminar, but the point I wish to make about our dreamer is that there is evidently a very bad split owing to the fact that she had been brought up so terribly correctly. Metaphorically, the thing to do would be to let such a child play in the gutter. Jung says that the prognosis in this case is definitely good because the unconscious wants to come to the child. One can say that there is a strong attraction here because although she is frightened and runs away, she sees the diamond eyes everywhere and is attracted by them. She is one of those who already at the age of ten has to come to an *auseinandersetzung* with the unconscious. The Malabar legend was of the childless woman who prayed to the god of the Nagas and who later gave birth to twins: one a child and the other a serpent who remained as a protecting spirit to the

female members of the family. This dream reminds me of that legend. One could also wonder if there is a deeper potential in the dreamer could be “twin-like” with the snake.

Before I present a bit of Jung’s amplifications and comments on this dream, I would like to read another snake dream that has certain parallels. It is the dream of a twenty-seven-year-old English girl who, as a child, had lived in Zurich for a few years when her mother was analyzing with Dr. Jung. She dreamed:

I am walking along the street where I once lived in Zurich. Suddenly I see a green and golden snake. I wanted to pick it up, but as I approached it, it coiled up and then I got frightened and turned and ran. The snake streaked along behind me, chasing me all the way to the house where I lived. Then suddenly I was looking at the snake ring which my mother wears and which was once given to her by Dr. Jung.

The mother of this young woman actually has a snake ring. But it was not given to her by Dr. Jung other than perhaps in a metaphorical sense in that Dr. Jung taught her about the Kundalini serpent, which awoke her interest in the symbolic snake and led her to buy a snake ring.

This seems to be a very favorable dream. The snake is evidently a harbinger of light and not a chthonic demon. Gold would represent the highest value, and green is the color of nature and even of the Holy Ghost. Gold obviously also has to do with illumination so that this snake really contains earth and spirit. But should it have been picked up in the street? Or was it right that it chased her to her house? (One gets hung up to some extent with such dreams because one cannot give enough personal material. I remember that a lecturer here gave a course about a man who had died many years before, thinking that nobody present would know the case, yet there happened to be a woman in the class who had known the man over fifteen years before!) In this case it would have been fatal for the dreamer to pick up the snake in the street. If she had accepted it there, she would have done so for worldly profit as so many people do. It had coiled, perhaps for striking, and it would have been most dangerous for her there. She could only run home and meet it on her own ground where it changed and was not a threat. The dream had enough mana to stop her from making a mistake in outer life. The ring would be the symbol of integration and union and shows that she will eventually get to the right place. It also has a certain mana, since in the dream she thinks it had been given to her mother by her mother’s psychotherapist, Dr. Jung. Metaphorically speaking, at that time in life one still has to live out in the street, but there are qualities in this dreamer that show that the really important time of her life will occur in the second half. For some people, the first half of life is the important part – learning a profession, marrying and having children – whereas others who have not outwardly succeeded in the first half can somehow find the possibility of making more of a success of the second.

I have translated a little of Jung’s amplifications as to the nature of the snake in the first dream. Both Jung and von Franz point out that the impressive thing is the glittering eyes. Onto them the child’s fascinated terror is focused. This shows that the snake has a consciousness in itself; it is a light bringer, a savior snake. Jung roughly says that we can certainly conclude that this snake is a kind of a harbinger of light or at least brings the diamond, the most shining stone. He compares it with the fact that the philosopher’s stone is also found sometimes as a brain stone. So it seems here that a light is hidden in the brain of the serpent

– the undeveloped part of the serpent – which announces the ability of a wider consciousness that is not yet present. That such a possibility exists is shown by the savior quality of the snake. Were the snake the representative of the earth demon, of evil, it would not lead directly to a redeeming effect, for it would represent pure instinct which in itself contains no promise of redemption. You will remember the quote in *On the Nature of the Psyche* (Jung 1970b, pars. 414ff) where Jung said you could experience instinct at the infrared end and you could experience the archetypal meaning at the ultraviolet end, but that at the infrared end it was simply living the instincts more or less blindly and that redemption had to take place at the ultraviolet end.

The savior snake has a pronounced spiritual meaning here in reference to the mediaeval representations of Christ as a serpent on the cross (which we find principally among the Gnostics). As you know from *Psychology and Alchemy*, the serpent as Christ on the cross is not only Gnostic (Jung 1968, par. 481, fig. 217). It is depicted, for instance, in Abraham Eleazar’s *Uraltes Chymisches Werk*, first published in 1735 (Eleazar 1982, 139 fig. 2 and Glossary fig. 10).³

The serpent here is the symbol of secret wisdom and promises the revelation of concealed things and insight. It is the term – as it were – for *gnosis*, knowledge of an irrational nature where something suddenly reveals itself. This sudden and unexpected cognition, this satori-like grasping of knowledge is quite different from the everyday knowledge of worldly things. It is a spiritual activity that suddenly springs from a quite peculiar spiritual situation. If you study the Gnostics you will find a similar idea. They announce serpent wisdom, namely that wisdom which comes from Nature herself. Although it happens everywhere and at all times, it is hardly possible to trace the source of this knowledge. And it can scarcely be explained rationally. You can get a hint of this if you study the origin of the dogma and read Jung’s article on the Trinity.

Jung writes:

...Gnosis... [is] a knowledge that pours forth from inner experience.... It is knowledge of an irrational nature that is distinctly different from arbitrary thought. It is a “happening,” an inner revelation, a mental experience that springs forth from one’s own individual spirit.... [Now] if we look at it psychologically we see that there is another kind of cognition that is simultaneously knowledge and life process. These things are strange to us but we can understand them better if we inform ourselves about the psyche of eastern man. Intellectual ways of thinking are not important in the East, for instance the whole philosophy of the *Upanishads* and classic Chinese philosophy sprang from processes of life whose nature is also a process of cognition. This is a thinking from the guts, from the viscera, from the depths, as opposed to an academic intellectualism which is often empty and does not always agree with us. For women, especially, it has something destructive, because women are not fundamentally intellectual. What women mean is far more gnostic. This explains why women so often find academic study so disappointing, particularly modern philosophy which is intellectual in contrast to ancient days when it was still a life process. Back then it was gnosis, an instinct, a natural fact, an inner need, like water quenching the thirst of parched earth. Gnosis is a knowledge that comes from the blood. Therefore the alchemists say of the stone: It is found in veins full of blood. Or the philosopher’s stone or lapis is found in the arteries pulsing with blood. They also spoke of it as blood red, the carbuncle, or ruby. (Jung 1987, 272f)⁴

Jung had previously pointed out the parallel between this girl’s dream and Ignatius’s vision of the many-eyed serpent, the sight of which filled Ignatius with the greatest delight. The more frequently he saw it the “greater was the comfort with which he saw it and when it disappeared from before his eyes he was sad” (Jung 1939b, 20).⁵ Later, however, he decided that it was an evil spirit and drove it away with a stick: the original light bringer is dogmatically repressed and becomes the devil. This explains quite a lot about the spiritual experience of St. Ignatius, the founder of the Jesuits.

Directly after the alchemical passage about the connection between blood and the stone, Jung points out that this gnostic kind of knowledge is also in Ignatius’s vision, which appeared as he was struggling to know God. Here it is as if the serpent wanted to say: “I am he with one hundred eyes that sees and knows everything” (Jung 1987, 273). These many eyes represent as many possibilities of consciousness corresponding to the decentralized functions of consciousness. The objects of Gnosis are at the same time luminous and reveal themselves in their own light. That is why this process is often described as a revelation, as an invasion by which man is overwhelmed. It is a process that rests in itself. This is the meaning of the serpent when one experiences it from within (Jung 1987, 273).

Perhaps one requires an example to make the Gnosis knowledge a little clearer. I think Jung has published – or at least told fairly widely – that

just as he had completed the lecture on the Mass a snake was found to have swallowed a large fish. It had been too big, and the snake could do nothing with it. It had got stuck in his throat and both fish and serpent died. Such synchronistic experiences show one that the thoughts one has been dealing with have substance and are not just thought in the air. I remember very early in my career here I had to correct the English of Dr. Jung's *Psychology and Religion* and was awfully scared of the task. While I was sitting down by the lake a snake came and settled down on the sunny stone beside me and stayed there practically all the morning. I thought it was quite amazing and rather enjoyed its presence. And when I told Dr. Jung he said: "Ah, now I am glad, that means that the way you are working has substance, you are not just doing it from your mind." Jung's attitude to such things is that when there are such occurrences one is probably thinking in accordance with the processes of life. He does not trust thoughts that just shoot into one's mind, for they might be artificial. Dreams, of course, are another source of unadulterated information in accordance with nature.

In this second class of serpent symbolism we should also mention the brazen serpent of Moses. In the wilderness the children of Israel turned against God and Moses, for after the fleshpots of Egypt they got tired of eating only manna. They said: "Our soul loatheth this light bread." (They also had become discouraged by their long journey through the wilderness.) Here we read:

And the Lord sent fiery serpents among the people, and they bit the people; and much people of Israel died. Therefore the people came to Moses, and said: "We have sinned, for we have spoken against the Lord, and against thee; pray unto the Lord that He take away the serpents from us." And Moses prayed for the people. And the Lord said unto Moses: "Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole, and it shall come to pass that every one who is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live." So Moses made a serpent of brass and put it upon a pole, and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived. (Numbers 21:6–9)

Here we have the two opposites, one after the other. On the one hand we have the destructive fiery serpents whose bite was deadly. (Yahweh, in one of his all too frequent fits of rage against his people. You will remember that Ms. Mills mentioned *Green Pastures*, the play in which God fell into such frightful passions and was always sending thunderbolts.) And on the other hand, Yahweh instructing Moses to create the healing serpent in brass. After Moses' intercession, the serpent of brass on a pole healed what Yahweh's other side had harmed. Like the savior snake of the dream, this healing serpent is definitely positive and is a sort of parallel to the snakes of Asclepius, which we shall come to in our fourth class of symbolism.

The Children of Israel, as we know from the golden calf, had absorbed a lot of the theriomorphic gods of the Egyptian religion, and this serpent was later worshipped in and for itself. In II Kings we read that King Hezekiah, who "did what was right in the sight of the Lord," broke into pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made, for the Children of Israel still burned incense to it (II Kings 18:3).

In the conversation with Nicodemus, Christ likens Himself to this brazen serpent. He says: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the son of man be lifted up." In the Visions Seminar, Jung points out that in the Greek translation the passage runs: "As Moses has lifted up the serpent to the pole, so the son of man shall be exalted to the pole," a quote that contains the idea of Christ being impaled on the cross (Jung 1997, 1223). Jung points out that the same thing would happen to Christ because he was also the healing serpent producing the medicine of immortality. Furthermore, he points out that as serpents always renew themselves by shedding their old skins, they were the symbol for death, resurrection and renewal. The many fiery serpents mentioned would represent an emotional dissociation, a dissolving into many elements of the collective unconscious, the extreme form of which would be a psychosis. The one serpent, on the other hand, would imply coming together again into a oneness or totality with its healing effect. Like the savior snake of the dream, the healing serpent is definitely positive and is a sort of parallel to the snakes of Asclepius. But it is not only the oneness that heals; it is also the pole or, in the case of Christ, the cross.

I would like to read you an extract from the Visions Seminar that I came on by chance when I was looking for something else, for it addresses the idea of the many fiery serpents in the wilderness and the one serpent lifted upon a pole which heals the emotional disturbance and dissociation. Jung had been talking of lycanthropy – not only the transformation into werewolves and cats in witchcraft but, broadly speaking, the transformation of people into different kinds of animal behavior such as barking, howling, galloping and neighing like a stallion, and so forth – and said it was simply a psychological statement about a condition where people were unaware of the Self. He then asked the question: "Why does the consciousness of the Self protect against dismemberment through the onslaught of unconscious powers? How do you explain it?" He answers:

...as soon as you are conscious of your Self as separate from the mood, the Self helps you to protect yourself against dismemberment by the following fact: you are confronted with two things, the mood or the emotion or whatever it is on the one side, and the Self on the other. You must be conscious of two things, of what you are, and what that mood is. You can say: "This mood is myself, it belongs to me," and then you lose sight of the Self, you are identical with the mood and you are gone, you are away, and quite unprotected. Or you can say: "Yes, this mood belongs to me, it is part of myself, but I am also conscious of the Self," and then you are protected. So it is a subtle mental operation in that you are conscious of two things. One is always inclined to be conscious of one thing only, just the thing which is actually there. Now it is of course very important to be able to realize what is there, to be able to put yourself whole-heartedly into a situation and fill it with your whole being; yet you must never forget your Self, you must always keep yourself in mind. And that seems to be a superior condition. (Jung 1997, 1299f)

The Israelites were at first completely demoralized. Then they lost themselves in emotion and despair, fear of death overtook them, and this in turn led to a panic about the serpents. When they were able to be aware of the "One" raised on the pole (a pre-projected form of the Self), they were no longer identical with or dismembered by their fear because they had a relationship to the Oneness of God that they could turn to and hold on to. According to the text, even if they had been bitten by the serpents, they were healed if they looked at the brazen serpent on the pole. That is a very early primitive example of the beginning of a detachment of consciousness.

Jung continues: "Why is it a superior condition to think of two things at once?" At the seminar Mrs. Baumann got the right answer; she said: "It means being detached for one thing, one cannot be in both at the same time" (Jung 1997, 1300). (I would like to recommend to you to read Meister Eckhart's "Sermon on Detachment." You will find it in Evans' translation). Of course there is always the danger that you give yourself to a situation so totally that everything else recedes into nothingness. But usually you are aware that you are not only that one thing. There are, of course, times when your attention is given fully to one situation but even then this is different from one's attention being possessed. With phobias, for example, people go along normally until something triggers the fear, and then they are taken, swept away. With the fear of cancer, for example, the doctor may well be able to talk a person back into their senses, but as soon as the doctor is no longer there, the danger looms. In Jungian circles, people get so possessed that they forget that there is anything like individuation. One learns to get a foot outside these obsessions only with experience. This is, however, different from giving yourself to something or someone.

If you give yourself to a thing then you have yourself to give. Jung says in his article on the Mass that when you give yourself away it is really a loss, yet you have yourself, and most people do not have even that (Jung 1977b, pars. 390 & 397f). You are aware of yourself if you can give yourself completely. That is a different thing from being possessed by a thing, as we see in the fear of the serpents by the Children of Israel. Detachment can easily be misused and go too far, as Mr. Allemann pointed out in the Visions Seminar: "If one detached entirely, it would be Nirvana, no more life." Dr. Jung added:

Yes, because there you simply come to an end. Those people who strive after *nirvana* get into a sort of quietism where they simply vanish; so nothing comes of it. The life of a Buddhist saint is exceedingly sterile. Obviously that is not the point of life; the point of life is that you are the fool of

life, that you play the role, that you make all sorts of attempts, that you suffer. But you play that role in a most unsatisfactory way, you create a lot of nuisance or suffering or even catastrophes, if you identify with it. Therefore you must divide yourself and think of the Self. (Jung 1997, 1300)

There is an old Eastern saying that every human being should play the role that is assigned to him, the king should play the king, the beggar the beggar, and the criminal the criminal – but always remembering the gods. That would mean that one should take one's role in life as a sort of mask, not identifying with it, yet recognizing it as one's task, and always reminding oneself of the divine being that cannot possibly be identical with the more or less incidental role. (Jung 1997, 127)

Even if you acknowledge that you are a thief, remember that it is a role you are playing – we are called upon to do strange things in this existence. Or even if you are a king, you must reserve a sphere of freedom, something beyond, where you are detached, where you disagree; you are as little the king as the actor [of the passion play] is Christ. The gods of course are only appearances of the Self – but in Eastern philosophy Atman or Brahman is the Self, the very breath of all the gods. (Jung 1997, 1300)

I would like to conclude the lecture today on a memory of what Jung once shared with us. He said: "It is as if I spend my nights down in the bottom of the river absolutely at one, and then every morning I have to come up through the river and put on the role of Professor Jung and play it as well as I can, to then return in the evening to a state of unity with the Self."

Lecture Six: December 2, 1957

We began to consider the brazen serpent of Moses last time and spoke of the many fiery serpents and above all of the danger of dissociation or possession from identifying with the emotions. We also spoke of the "one serpent" as the reunification again in oneness and of the healing effect of this form of inner unity. I read you an extract from Jung's Visions Seminar that emphasized the fact that awareness of the Self was the protection par excellence against the danger of being swept away and possessed by moods and emotions. We went on to point out that when one is aware of the Self as well as of the mood or emotion, one has a certain detachment that amounts to a superior condition.

I would like to return to our story of Moses and the brazen serpent in the wilderness. This is not the first time that we meet this motif of the serpent and the rod or pole. You will remember that Moses held the brazen serpent up on the pole and all the Israelites who had been bitten and who looked at it were then healed. After the incident of the burning bush (Exodus 3:2), God told Moses to cast down his rod, whereupon it became a serpent and Moses fled away from it but was forced to pick it up again by the tail, whereupon it once again became a rod:

And [the Lord] said unto him: "What is that in thine hand?" And [Moses] said: "A rod." And He said: "Cast it on the ground." And he cast it on the ground and it became a serpent; and Moses fled from before it. And the Lord said unto Moses, "Put forth thine hand, and take it by the tail." And he put forth his hand, and caught it, and it became a rod in his hand.... (Exodus 4:3)

The same thing happened with Aaron's rod before Pharaoh: "When Pharaoh shall speak unto you, saying, 'Show a miracle for you': then thou shalt say unto Aaron, 'Take thy rod, and cast it before Pharaoh, and it shall become a serpent' " (Exodus 7:9).

The difference between the serpent and the rod or the pole could be said to be in the fact that the serpent is pure nature while the pole or rod – the straight line – would represent having a goal and going straight toward it, that is, consciousness and direction. They complement or complete each other, they unite the vacillation and sinuosity of nature with the clarity of consciousness. This is beautifully represented in the caduceus and the staff of Asclepius, which we will address later.

We have spoken of Aaron's rod and Moses's pole, which have more or less the same meaning. (It was Aaron's rod that afterward produced the plagues and divided the Red Sea.) But when the Son of Man was exalted, the pole became the cross. So we should differentiate a little more here. The cross would represent a differentiation through consciousness. It contains the basic fourness of the whole quaternity. One can think also of the four cardinal directions, the four functions, and so forth. The cross was put together by man in that shape. That was the aim of the alchemists. In the first part of their work they have the four elements and put them together again as the "one" at the end of the process. The pole represents more the act of taking a definite conscious line, of going straight toward a goal. It is only by the cooperation of the two, consciousness and unconscious (the serpent on the pole or cross), that the serpent fully becomes a savior, for it is no use going into the unconscious to become irresolute and undecided. The serpent alone can enlighten or destroy, but when he is lifted up on the pole or cross he becomes a real savior, for he is combined with his own opposite. His own double nature is united.

There are still a great many examples that could be placed in the second class of symbolism: for instance, the feathered serpents of Mexico and the many examples of winged snakes particularly common among the legends of the Incas. The solar serpent is to be found both in North America and Mexico. Howey tells us of:

...an Indian priest of the solar serpent worship in the country northwest of Louisiana. Both sun and serpent are tattooed upon his breast, and in his hand he holds a kind of instrument shaped like a tadpole. Upon its rounded head is figured the sun, and this is penetrated by the head of a serpent – the tail of which forms the waving handle of the instrument. (Howey 1930, 282)

It is notable that this example of sun and serpent which we last met at Delphi – for Apollo is a sun god – should occur again spontaneously as far away as America. But it is an archetype that occurs in many places and I need not multiply the examples.

The Aztecs came originally from the north and were migratory for a long time. But in the beginnings of the fourteenth century they halted on the southwestern borders of their principal lake, where they are said to have had a vision of an eagle:

...perched upon the stem of a prickly pear which grew from the crevice of a rock washed by the waves.... [It was] a royal eagle of enormous size and great beauty, with a serpent in his talons, and his broad wings open to the rising sun. They hailed the auspicious omen announced by the oracle as indicating where they were to build their future city, and here on piles sunk into the marshes they erected their huts of reeds and rushes, living on the fish of the lake and such vegetables as they could raise in their floating gardens. They called the place Tenochtitlan, i.e., "a cactus on a stone," to commemorate its miraculous origin, though it was only known to Europeans by its other name of Mexico, derived from their war god Mexitli. The eagle and the cactus form the arms of the modern Mexican Republic, but the serpent does not take the prominent part we should expect from the position it occupied in the omen, and the high veneration in which it was held. This is the more remarkable because the Aztec sculptures and paintings and other relics of the aboriginal inhabitants of Mexico prove that almost every one of their deities was symbolized by either a serpent or a dragon; and these Mexican paintings, like the Egyptian and Persian hieroglyphs, describe the sacred symbol of the uræon in almost all its variations. It seems that in Mexico, as in Egypt and Persia, the serpent was a symbol of divinity as such, rather than a representative of any particular deity, or his attributes. (Howey 1930, 298f)

In more modern times in Mexico the serpent has tended to disappear parallel to the way it disappeared, or became the devil, in orthodox Christianity. Just as the Gnostics kept it alive as a symbol, so we find it everywhere where religion has not yet become one-sided; the serpent simply does not lend itself to rational, one-sided thinking.

Later, Howey quotes the following passage from the Mexican creation myth:

Everything was without life, calm and silent; all was motionless and quiet. Void was the immensity of the heavens, the face of the earth did not manifest itself yet: only the tranquil sea was and the space of the heavens. All was immobility and silence in the darkness of the night; only the Creator, the Maker, the Dominator, the Serpent covered with feathers, they who engender, they who create, were on the waters an ever-increasing

light. They are surrounded by green and blue. But although the Supreme [Being] was thus personified in his creative energy by a serpent, he is also represented as at war with a serpent. And this warfare Humboldt explains by saying: "The serpent crushed by the great spirit Teotl when he takes the form of one of the subaltern deities is the genius of evil." (Howey 1930, 300)

(This, I would like to note, is the true Mexican feathered serpent.) We see the universality of this theme of the worship of the serpent as well as that of the serpent killer (to mention only two examples) in Delphi and Mexico.

This widespread archetype shows all the ambiguities that are evident when man separates himself from his animal nature. It was the serpent, that is, man's animal instinctiveness, that taught him all his knowledge. And it was just this same instinct that led him to the heroic attempt to overcome his own instinctive wisdom and to strive for a clearer and more definite knowledge and attitude, an attempt that is personified in the serpent killer. In one way the serpent wisdom led to its own demise. Then, as it were, the serpent instinct resented its own step and became the enemy of the light hero. This last, however, is only true to a certain extent because (as we saw in Delphi) the light hero can still make his peace with the serpent if he does not stress his onesided light-nature too much. When he succeeds in making peace with his defeated foe, the serpent, we get that rare and extremely positive creative situation where conscious and unconscious cooperate and neither represses the other. It is precisely this rare creative situation that we are trying to restore now through our own efforts in psychology.

Before we leave our second class of symbolism we must speak a little more about the serpent as the symbol of creativity. We had the serpent as a sexual symbol in the first class of symbolism seen in the motif of creativity at the infrared end of the scale. This is instinct per se. As a symbol of wisdom we must speak of it at the ultraviolet end. An example would be that of a man and a woman carried away in the ecstasy of sex and the mystic carried away in the union with God – the *unio mystica* – for they are really moved by one and the same instinct, one at the infrared and the other at the ultraviolet end. We have spoken of the utterly different ways in which a serpent orients itself, of its negligible brain in comparison with ours, of its use of its tongue and sympathetic nervous system, and of the extraordinary nature of its knowledge of a solution when we are totally at a loss. And we have mentioned a Mexican legend where the feathered serpent was actually the creator of the world, a motif found in many places. Therefore, at the ultraviolet end, so to speak, when a serpent appears in a dream or active imagination, he often represents the utterly unexpected solution, something we could never think of consciously in a thousand years.

When we read the history of science and of great human inventions, we are repeatedly struck by the way in which the average man always tends to grope his way along certain banal, collective rails of thought. The ingenious and creative thinker, on the other hand, risks quitting these well-trodden paths and seeks a completely new and unexpected point of view. Such a creative solution amazes one by its utter unexpectedness and newness. But after the coup one has mixed feelings. On the one hand, it clicks at once and one feels: "I could have thought of that myself." But on the other, one can hardly recover from astonishment at its bold newness. It is such new solutions and thoughts that practically manifest what we could call serpent creativity. On a minor scale every really good interpretation of a dream or myth conveys this feeling of "it clicks." "It clicks, or it does not click"; that is our final criterion, as Jung once said in a seminar. The only way one can get any certainty in life is that feeling of "it clicks," for then you know you are right; but unfortunately one more often gets the feeling that it does not click. This is why medicine men all over the world have snakes among their symbols because – in their profession – it is just this creative instinctiveness that is needed. XXIII

The Serpent as the Uroboros of Cyclic Life

It may surprise you that the uroboros is not in the fourth and final class of symbolism, for it is a well-known symbol of the totality. It represents the first original condition of the totality, the cycle of life in nature, the original state. It is highly positive in that it is total and complete. As the alchemists say, it has everything it needs in itself. But it is, as things are in nature, an eternal circle that goes on forever without change. To quote (Pseudo) Demokritos: “Nature rejoices in nature, nature subdues nature, nature rules over nature” (Jung 1977a, par. 234). You will find this famous sentence, which was quoted throughout alchemy, commented on in detail by Jung in the so called “E.T.H. Notes,” notes of lectures given at the federal technical university in Switzerland (Jung 1940, 44f). It is like the treasure Jung so often quotes that rises to the surface after nine years, nine months and nine days; it rises and recedes to take another nine years, nine months and nine days before it emerges once again. One could almost say that the uroboros calls for man to break the constant cycle and bring the uroboric circle eternally eating its own tail up into consciousness.

If you will allow a lame comparison, you will all remember the wonderful feeling of wholeness one sometimes had as a child, or if you look at a natural child, or a small animal, or a primitive person, you recapture that feeling of being all of a piece. You could call it “being contained in the mother,” but it is something a little different from that because you see it in a primitive man after he has broken away from the mother yet not broken away from his tribe. But the feeling of wholeness is inevitably and necessarily broken up through education and in life, just as the alchemists broke up their original One into the four elements in the stage of the *separatio*. That early unconscious wholeness can be likened to the uroboros, the untouched, unaware wholeness of nature. The alchemists call their stone the beginning and the end, and the uroboros symbolizes the beginning, the original prima materia. The psychological Self is also there from the beginning but only – as Jung has often pointed out – as a kind of framework of the crystal in the solution, and it depends on ourselves whether we are able to make it conscious or not. Neumann has enlarged this idea as a pre-conscious oneness in children and discusses at length what he calls the uroboric state (Neumann 1954).

The uroboros itself is a very ancient symbol. We found it, for instance, in the bas relief in the Temple at Abydos which we visited when we were in Egypt. It is a temple of the mysteries of Osiris and in it we saw the uroboros in the bas reliefs of the temple walls. There may be others that are earlier. Those were probably about 2000 to 1500 bc. The uroboros appears in the *Codex Marcianus* with the inscription “One is the whole.” Here it is portrayed as dark behind and speckled in front to indicate that it has a secret double nature and is a *complexio oppositorum*. It is not always depicted as one serpent, although that is the most basic form. It is also represented in alchemy as a double dragon, one winged and one wingless, each catching the tail of the other and forming a ring. It is also sometimes two other animals, such as dog and wolf or male and female lion. Certainly a lot more could be said on this profound theme, but I believe we are all well enough acquainted with this aspect of the serpent that fur

The Serpent as the Uroboros of Cyclic Life 2 2 9

ther details would be redundant. Although the serpent as the uroboros is purely an unconscious and deeply archetypal affair, it is in a way out of reverence and awe of the serpent’s nature that it drew upon itself the projection of the primordial, cyclic nature of life on earth that we see here in its role as the symbol of the eternal cycle of Oneness.

XXIV

The Serpent as a Symbol of Ghosts and Renewal

Serpents and birds are probably the most widespread symbols for the ghosts of the dead. Gubernatis quotes examples of snakes in graves that were worshipped as the representatives of the dead hero. He relates that the serpent is supposed to protect and preserve the lost riches and to guard the soul of the dead hero, hence serpents, like crows, are revered in India as embodied souls of the dead. According to the popular legend in Germany, whoever eats of the white serpent or is licked by it in the ears receives the gift of universal knowledge and the understanding of the language of birds. The serpent here is also associated with whiteness and winter. In the midst of snow, or on the night of Christmas, those who are predestined to see marvels can comprehend the language of the cattle in the stables and the birds in the woods. According to the legend, in the night of Christmas, Charles le Gros (Charlemagne) saw the portals of heaven and hell open and was able to recognize his forefathers (de Gubernatis 1872, 407). The serpent imparting the gift of understanding the language of birds, for instance, can be also found much earlier in Greek fairy tales (Küster 1913, 124f).

We see here that the serpent is not only supposed to represent the souls of the dead, but that, according to the legend, it enabled Charles le Gros to recognize his ancestors. This reminds one of the contemporary Indian serpent religion where the same serpent is supposed to have lived in the cellar under the family since the original birth of the serpent with its human twin. Naturally, it would know all generations and be able to introduce Charles le Gros to his forefathers. Gubernatis reports a similar, more widespread legend where it is fabled that a child is sometimes born with a serpent entwined round its neck, and that it and the child are thenceforth inseparable (de Gubernatis 1872, 408). Here the serpent is presumably as longlived as the child, unless it lives on as its immortal spirit.

Jung repeatedly notes that the heroes in Northern sagas are depicted with snakes' eyes and generally speaks of the horrible, fascinating, cold stare in a human being, a monstrous look where one sees that one's father was a snake, or has a snake's soul. He notes that the birth of many heroes is foretold in their mothers' dream as being conceived in intercourse with a great snake (for instance, the mother of Augustus). He also says that:

The souls of the old Greek heroes were supposed to have been transformed into snakes after death.... The idea was that as the dead were buried in the ground, they were still living underground like snakes, so shafts were made into the graves over the head, and libations were poured down to the body that was supposed to be in the snake's form. You see it was a sort of exchange, the snake becomes man and man becomes snake, as if that were an attribute of the god, the revealed god being loving and spiritual, and then changing into another form and becoming monstrous, horrible. (Jung 1997, 850f)

Later in his Visions Seminar Jung again speaks of the dead as snakes:

Snakes figure largely in folklore in all countries, and they usually represent the souls of the dead.... In Africa it is understood that the medicine man has demon snakes that know everything and tell him secrets, and they also defend his life, he is always followed by them; they live round his hut and everybody is afraid of them. That is like the soul serpent of Asclepius, the great doctor. If you see a snake upon the grave of a dead man, you know it is his soul. The old Greek heroes were supposed to have snake souls. There was a snake cellar under the Erechtheum on the Acropolis at Athens, of which one can still see traces, and it was said that Erechtheus, that hero of old, lived down there in the form of a snake. Also Cecrops, the founder of the Acropolis, was supposed to live in the form of a serpent in the rock; he took on the metaphysical form of a serpent. (Jung 1997, 1374f)

The idea that the souls of the dead were snakes by no means began in Greece. It is a very widespread idea from the earliest times and very much alive still today, not only among primitive peoples but also in our own unconscious. You will remember that a great many examples are given in Jung's paper on synchronicity of birds that announce death. It actually happened to us. We had a very old landlady, a Frau Tobler, who had the kind of heart trouble that might have allowed her to live on for years. She told her hairdresser that she had seen many crows settling on her own roof and thus she knew that she would soon die, and she did indeed die a few days later. That the bird should represent the disembodied spirit is an idea that clicks easily with pretty much everyone except hard-boiled rationalists. But snakes being comparatively rare with us, I had trouble grasping the idea until I heard Jung's suggestion "that as the dead were buried in the ground, they were therefore living underground like snakes."

Then we have the example of the Persians who expose their dead to be eaten by vultures, jackals and the like. They maintain that if the bird eats the corpse it shows that the deceased was a spiritually minded person and if the beasts of the earth devour it, then he was a worldly, undeveloped, if not evil person. But Persia has the idea of two gods, Ormazd, the light and positive god, and Ahriman, the dark and negative god, corresponding more or less to our Christ and Satan. So that to think of the dead as birds or snakes in the same way is already a projection of our own dual point of view.

A little later Jung discuss cases of schizophrenia in which patients describe a snakelike ectoplasmic mass issuing from or traveling in their bodies and notes the curious appearances of such forms in parapsychology where one sees:

...such snakelike forms coming out of people's bodies. Ectoplasm is exactly like whitish worms; when photographed it looks like that, most gruesome, and it has the touch of a reptile. Quite independently of each other, people have described the strange feeling it gave them; they said one could only compare it to the touch of a reptile's skin, soft and yet tight, no bones in it, like rubber. Flournoy once described to me a hand he had touched; it was not exactly like a hand, there were only three fingers, like hard sausages, and it was not a human touch, there were no bones in it, yet it was hard and elastic. He took hold of it and it gradually melted in his grasp; that impressed him the most, the fact that it actually melted, changed its quality, becoming thinner and thinner until finally there was nothing left. These are strange phenomena which we cannot explain. (Jung 1997, 1376f)¹

The ectoplasm at seances can take so many forms, as one knows from photographs, so I don't want to belabor this point, but I would like to confirm from my own experience the fact that the touch of anything of the kind is like touching a reptile. My mother's people were Scots and the Scots revel in haunted houses. Half the houses are haunted there, and as a child I stayed in such a house. I never saw anything, but more than once it happened to me that something brushed against me that felt exactly like the touch of a reptile. Once after I began I withstood such a thing for the first time without getting into a panic. I had a couple of rooms in what used to be the Pension Rittershaus. They were high above the ground and went right down to the *Tobel*, that is, the gorge. I thought there was a cat on my bed and was not surprised, but yet thought it was odd as the door was shut and locked. I began to wonder whether it could be a cat and then I felt it; it was just about the weight of a cat but my hand went through it and it was gone. That taught me by experience that there is such a thing. A friend of mine, an English doctor, was very much interested in such things and took part in seances. He said that once he witnessed a medium who was weighed during the session on a highly precise scale. It was observed that she lost half a pound during the seance but regained it at the end less a minuscule amount expended in the effort.

It is quite clear that, due to the fact that it changes its skin, the snake was bound to become a symbol of renewal. Gubernatis tells us, for instance that:

The body of the old rishis Carabhangas also gives us the idea of a serpent's body. Carabhangas desires to deliver himself from it, as a serpent

casts off its old skin. He then enters the fire; the fire burns him; Carabhangas, arising from the conflagration, comes forth young, splendid, and as brilliant as fire. (de Gubernatis 1872, 404)

In the seminar on Zarathustra, where there is a great deal about the serpent on account of the sleeping shepherd into whose mouth the snake crawled, Jung says:

The snake [often] means resurrection on account of the shedding of its skin. According to an African myth, there was no death on earth originally, death came in by mistake. People could shed their skins every year and so they were always new, rejuvenated, until once an old woman, in a distracted condition and feeble-minded, put on old skin again and then she died. That is the way in which death came into the world. It is again the idea that human beings were like snakes originally, they did not die. It was a snake that brought the idea of death to Adam and Eve in Paradise. The snake was always associated with death, but death out of which new life was born. (Jung 1998, 1286)

This all may help, at least partially, to explain the universality of the idea that the dead survive in the form of snakes. It also fits in with the idea of cyclic life. We begin as a worm, so to speak (here a form of endearment for a child is “little worm”), our “life is one long worm” if we take time as an extension, and our corpses survive as snakes in some subterranean capacity after death, transmigrating into spirits and ghosts. In this cycle of life and death we come again to the uroboros, so to speak, that eternal recurring cycle of nature. This, of course, also brings us to the whole idea of rebirth and a most infinite amount of material. We will, however, only consider what shedding the skin means psychologically because it symbolizes a quite special kind of renewal. Actually, skin is only shed when a new skin has grown underneath. We can observe the same in dreams. New contents or attitudes are mirrored in dreams ages before they appear in ourselves. There one sees a sign that new skin is growing underneath even though you go on wearing the old one. Old neurotic symptoms, bad habits, age-old failures, and so forth persist to our despair. Of course we must try to get rid of them, but we shall only succeed when the new attitude is ready. Sometimes one is amazed by the fact that people can suddenly make a decision that they have long been loath to make, or make a great sacrifice, take on severe loss, or face with dignity a devastatingly critical observation about themselves mediated maybe through a dream or just simply said to their face. But one can assume that the new skin – long in the making – was ready for the change. XXV

The Serpent as Union of the Opposites and Communication with the Divine

As mentioned at the beginning of these lectures, the four classes of serpent symbolism cannot in any way be segregated but necessarily overlap and are enmeshed with each other. So, in the Oracle of Delphi for instance, we have already seen something of the serpent as a symbol for communication with the divine, and we have constantly spoken of it as containing both opposites which belong indeed to its most basic nature. But, like the uroboros, this has for the most part belonged to the unseparated opposites in nature, to the first class of symbolism. In this fourth and last class I propose speaking of the serpent as the symbol of a union of opposites, opposites that have already been separated – either by fate or human agency – and which are then reunited more or less consciously as opposed to the unconscious union of the beginning. We shall see this attempt at uniting the opposites enacted in the mystery rites in so far as we can piece these together from the fragments that have been preserved. We can assume this attempt was made intentionally. The fourth is always the most difficult. Maria Prophetissa's axiom on this subject was a leading theme throughout the history of alchemy: "One becomes two, two becomes three, and out of the third comes the one as the fourth" (Jung 1968, par. 26).

To pass from our theme of the opposites lying together unconsciously to the motif of them consciously reunited, I would like to speak of a legend concerning the origin of the famous caduceus, that wand of Hermes or Mercury entwined by two serpents which "knows all ways." We have already seen this symbol as a marvelous union of the serpent's sinuosity with the straight line or pole, ultimately indicating a *coniunctio* of consciousness and unconsciousness. This legend explains the presence of the serpents on the rod. On his travels, the god Mercury is said to have seen two snakes in a deadly fight and to have placed his staff between them to end the fight. The magic wand pacified their anger; they embraced each other and wound themselves around the staff. And thus the serpents taught Mercury to know that his rod was a peacemaker.

This image, of course, is a purely projected union of the opposites. It is a legend that tells us one way in which man first glimpsed the possibility of uniting a pair of warring opposites by means of the projection onto a god who had a magic wand. It is a sort of development or a doubling of the idea of the uroboros here consisting of two snakes (instead of one) each biting and eating the other's tail. But a doubling of the uroboros symbolism entails the danger of the two snakes devouring each other, whereas in the caduceus legend this duality is creative and constructive. For here the snakes make peace with each other, adding their wisdom to that of the original wand. Thus Mercury is taught that he can make peace between enemies. (As you know, the staff of Asclepius with double entwined serpents is still the sign for healing for pharmacists and doctors in general.) The alchemists emphasize that the way to their goal is never a straight but a serpentine way and refer to it as the mercurial serpent. As Jung says in the introduction to *Psychology and Alchemy*, the serpentine way to individuation ("the process by which a person becomes a psychological 'in-dividual,' that is, a separate, indivisible unity or 'whole'" [Jung 1977a, par. 490]) consists of detours, humiliating errors and wrong turnings.

It is a *longissima via*, not straight but snakelike, a path that unites opposites in the manner of the guiding caduceus, a path whose labyrinthine twists and turns are not lacking in terrors. It is on this *longissima via* that we meet with those experiences which are said to be "inaccessible." This inaccessibility really consists in the fact that they cost us an enormous amount of effort: they demand the very thing we most fear, namely the "wholeness" which we talk about so glibly and which lends itself to endless theorizing though in actual life we give it the widest possible berth. (Jung 1968, par. 6)

There is no straight or easy way to individuation.

Jung once told the anecdote of the little liver cell that somehow got lost in the body and went around the body trying to find the right place. It got up into the brain and thought there was a lot to be learned there, but all the brain cells threw him out. Then he got to the lungs and said the air was so wonderful there, it was just like being in a mountain resort, but he got thrown out of there too. Then, by mistake, he came to the liver where all the cells caught him. He said that that was not the right place for him, it was the most disgusting place he had ever been in, and Jung said that was individuation.

As you will note in the legend of Mercury and the caduceus, it required a third – the wand – to make peace between the warring opposites. The same holds true of the opposites in psychology. Our human intellect suffices to discriminate between the opposites, to tear them apart from their original oneness, to make conscious the fact that they are two and not one. But it is easier to pull down than to build up, it is simpler to pull apart than to put together, and although we can discover our conflicts more or less by human means, it requires more to find a synthesis and creative solution. Whereas the Christian relies on Christ to do everything, the alchemists always emphasize the fact that the work must be done by man. But at the point we are discussing they add: *Deo concedente*. The opposites cannot be united without a *tertium quod non datur*, without the appearance of the "third." It requires the effort of consciousness and the cooperation of the unconscious. And the third that arises could be compared to the creative, utterly unexpected solution of which we have spoken, and this third is sometimes revealed in a dream by a snake.

The serpent played a major role in the mysteries of Sabazios, a Greek Orphic mystery religion that practiced, among other things, a cult of renewal. Sabazios was a god belonging to late antiquity and its syncretism of religions. The mysteries played a considerable role in the late Roman Empire, but this god came originally from Asia Minor and, like all the divinities of this late period, was a mixture of several gods. (One sees this syncretism particularly well in Apuleius's hymn to Isis in the *Golden Ass*: "Thou art called Venus in Paphos, Demeter in Eleusis, Cybele in Asia, Hecate by many people, but it is the Egyptians who call thee by thy right name Isis.") Sabazios is frequently identified with Dionysus, sometimes with Zeus or Jupiter, and his worship was closely connected with that of Cybele and Attis. This synthesis, with all its drawbacks, has a very positive aspect, for the incomprehensible breadth of the archetype is no longer pinned down into one aspect.

In *Symbols of Transformation* Jung speaks of the large role that the snake played in these mysteries under the strange title of the "god through the lap." The passage is as follows:

Clement says that the symbol of the Sabazios mysteries was "the god through the lap: and that is a snake which is dragged through the laps of the initiates." From Arnobius we learn: "A golden snake is let down into the lap of the initiates and is drawn out again from below." In the fiftysecond Orphic hymn, Bacchus is invoked by the name of ὑποκοῦλτιε (lying in the lap) which suggests that the god entered his devotees as if through the female genitals. (Jung 1967, par. 530)

Jung goes into more detail in the Zarathustra Seminar. He has been speaking of the snake as the lower part of man's mental functions which Nietzsche refused and which thus entered into the shepherd's mouth as a serpent. As you remember, that was always Nietzsche's great trouble. The rope dancer at the beginning showed his probable fate. He refused the ugliest man (who was represented as a snake) and he bit off the head, not really accepting it even then. Jung says:

Peculiarly enough, the snake is at the same time a religious symbol in the mysteries of Sabazios. The initiation consisted in the swallowing of the snake – of course not literally; they perhaps patted it or kissed it. The Christian Ophites celebrated their communion with a real snake on the altar, but in the mysteries of Sabazios they had a golden serpent that was pushed in under the chin – instead of into the mouth – and passed down under the vestments and taken out below again; it was then assumed that the god had entered the initiate and impregnated him with the divine

germ, and they called him *entheos*. (Jung 1998, 1061f)

The serpent symbolizes the god that enters man in order to fill him with the god, to make him the mother of God. And the pulling out from below refers of course to the birth. That was like the antique rite of adoption: the mother who wished to adopt a son or a daughter had to hide the child (even if a grown up person) under her skirts, and then he was pulled out from under them. She also had to give her breast to the adopted child to denote that it was her suckling: then after such ceremonies they were nourished with milk and so on, similar to the rebirth mysteries in antiquity. (Jung 1998, 1062)

The snake here represents the god himself and implants the divine germ. The idea behind many of their rites in the antique mysteries was to do things that interested the gods so that the gods themselves would take part in the ceremonies. This is perhaps clearest of all in the idea of the sacrifices where they tried to attract the gods by concrete gifts. It is an age-old and universal idea that the gods need men in order to receive sacrifices and that, if the right kind are offered, the gods will dwell among men.

In the Sabazios mysteries the matter is also very concrete but it is less well known, partly because of man's eternal prudery when it comes to anything that even rhymes with sex. We know, of course, that sexuality in general played a great role in the ancient mysteries, as Linda Fierz, for instance, showed in her excellent lecture titled "The Villa of Mysteries at Pompeii." It was often quite concrete in the Dionysian orgies, for example, and it was the old custom of the aristocratic ladies of Athens to offer themselves on the steps of the temple one night in the year and to accept any man who took them as the representative of the god. One can imagine the tremendous humiliation and what real fervor must have been at the root of such a custom; these women simply lay on the temple steps and had to accept anyone – beggar or whatever – who was "seized by the gods."

But in this description of the mysteries of Sabazios the rite has already become symbolic – we can guess that religious practices with actual snakes and arousing sexuality thrived long before this form of symbolic transformation – for the god went through the actual lap of the novice symbolized by the golden serpent. We can assume that it was through sexual excitement brought about by this ceremony that the ancients expected to arouse the interest of the god. That idea has become strange to us, but it is very widespread and makes a lot of sense. Freud took hold of this age-old idea when he produced an exclusively sexual psychology. I am not sure if Jung ever published his impression that Freud's religious and mystical side was projected wholly onto sex, but I have often heard him say so both privately and in seminars. The nineteenth century's materialism prevented Freud from ever seeing this religious aspect except in a very slight degree in certain modifications of his own theory at the end. It still tends to prevent his school from any such realization today, undoubtedly playing an invisible role now as then.

In Schreber's book *Memories of My Nervous Illness*, which has just been translated into English, one sees the idea of sexual excitement attracting the gods. The book gives one of the most interesting accounts of mental illness I ever read. It was quite a revelation to me when I read it in English, but, as I believe is also the case in the original German, a sentence, a piece, or even a chapter is omitted as unfit for publication. Schreber, of course, had a most appalling inflation, but if one reads the book from a scientific point of view, it is immensely interesting and one can learn a great deal from it. Sometimes it is the schizophrenic who can best hit on the hidden things that interest the gods. Schizophrenics produce the most amazing things, and that is just why the psychologist must accompany them in the most irrational flights and, above all, never do or say anything to deny the religiosity of their experiences and convictions. But of course they are usually very loosely knit together and all too easily dissolve into the many fiery serpents of the Children of Israel in the wilderness. Moreover, the ecstasy they sometimes meet undoubtedly often prevents them from wanting to be cured as they often prefer this ecstasy to the banalities and drabness of daily life.

In conclusion I would like to emphasize that it is absolutely necessary to do the things that interest the god – one of the very hardest things in the process of individuation – and it is just here that the snake is our best hope, for it represents that instinct which "knows" the gods' interests and compels us to fulfill them. One hears of primitive people who say that children speak of "the little snake that told me" just as we say "a little bird told me." Consciousness would never be able to guess these interests, these deeper impulses and needs – not in a thousand years – and the more the ego tries, well, the worse it goes astray. But if we can listen to the snake and hear its small voice, it very well may whisper this secret to us, and that is really why it is universally recognized as a divinity, or at all events as a mediator between the divine and man. One of the best examples is found in the case of the demonized nun Jeanne Féry, where Mary Magdalene made the Archbishop take the possessed woman out of her convent and provide for her in his house. The whole Diocese was scandalized, and although the Archbishop sent her back to the convent, she at once got worse and he had always to take her back again. That is a good illustration of the appalling things that are sometimes demanded of the priest or the doctor in order that any real healing may take place. At the end, Jeanne Féry gets rid of the demon and the Archbishop is let off any further obligations to her. Consciousness alone would never know how to act. Yet we have to try, because if we do not try at all then nothing will happen in the unconscious. It is only from the great effort of consciousness that the serpent solution will be constellated.

Lecture Seven: December 8, 1957

We reached our fourth class of symbolism last time and will finish the serpent this morning. (After Christmas I propose beginning with the lion as a symbol of the fiery opposite of the snake which, by the way, is symbolically intertwined with the cat, as both animals belong to the same family and are entwined with each other. In Egypt, for instance, the goddess Sechmet is even both a lion and a cat.)

I would like now to show you a painting composed by a woman, which I should really have spoken of when we were discussing the Naassenian Ophites, those Gnostics who celebrated their communion with a live snake on the altar.¹ (In this practice they were not unlike the Greeks worshipping, for instance, Cecrops² as a serpent, since both theologies integrate the original paradoxical idea of the serpent as the god, neither good nor evil, neither and both.) The practices of the Ophites particularly offended the conventional Church because of the honor they paid to the serpent, who was already regarded as the enemy of the Highest God, as evil incarnate against the good, so to speak. The Ophite Trinity consisted of:

1. the universal God, the first man,
2. his conception, the second man, and
3. a female Holy Spirit.

From the female Holy Spirit, the third man was begotten by the first and second. Christ flew upward with his mother and a spark fell on the waters, and this was Sophia. This contact led to the Demiurgos, who created from the dregs of matter the *Nous* (who appeared in serpent form).

Nous (or *pneuma*) is known to you all in the myth where he bends down deeply to admire his own reflection and is seized by the loving embrace of the feminine Physis, depicted by the Justinian Gnosis as a virgin above, serpent below (Jung 1968, par. 410). She then imprisons him far down in matter. Along the tortuous path of alchemy it is she who eventually becomes "the divine soul imprisoned in the elements" whom the alchemists aspire to redeem (Jung 1968, par. 413).

We see these old ideas reproduced in this picture by an artist who was totally unaware of their existence. She apparently encountered this serpent in a vision where it appeared powerfully vivid and dignified on the altar, although he then quickly slithered over it and descended into an inky blackness below. She described the man here as entirely within or completely grown inside of this dark inverted cone which was slowly melted by the venom dropping from the serpent's tongue. She painted the man more visibly than he really was in the vision in anticipation of the fact that he would soon appear, the cone obviously beginning to be melted from the top down by the powerful venom. This strikes me as one of the most

interesting pictures from the unconscious that I have ever seen, for the way it sums up our whole subject, for the serpent is the mediator here between our highly spiritual religion and the lower man of god who is lacking in Christianity. But, as the snake comes from behind the altar where it has been imprisoned, it is naturally extremely venomous and is, in a way, the evil serpent of the Christian religion. The serpent that comes from the earth is much more positive, for it comes with the healing of nature.

But the most interesting thing to me is that it is precisely the concentrated venom that liberates the imprisoned deity. Here we have the whole idea of accepting the shadow in Jungian psychology. The evil gossip and projections of our shadow on our neighbors, which is the venom of our lives, can be a savior if we take them back and see them in ourselves.

In this picture there are two cones, both black and evil, but below them is the sea of the unconscious, where we find pure nature. We arrive here only if we fulfill the task of accepting the darkness and venom in ourselves.

Jung goes into great depths about the serpent in *Aion*, particularly in regard to the doctrine of Perate Gnosticism, where it is the symbol par excellence of Christ. (Through allegory and parables, the Peratic branch of Gnosticism attempted to illuminate and render more comprehensible the metaphysical role of the Savior, employing symbols such as Christ as the serpent, the fish, the lion and the peacock. They aspired to assimilate into a Oneness the “gods of destruction and the god of salvation,” the antithetic polarities of the cross, and so forth.)³ There are several chapters on the symbolism of the fish in *Aion*, as you know, and in connection with the Peratic doctrine of the serpent Jung says:

The serpent is an equivalent of the fish. The consensus of opinion interpreted the Redeemer equally as a fish and a serpent; he is a fish because he rose from the unknown depths, and a serpent because he came mysteriously out of the darkness. Fishes and snakes are favorite symbols for describing psychic happenings or experiences that suddenly dart out of the unconscious and have a frightening or redeeming effect. That is why they are so often expressed by the motif of helpful animals. The comparison of Christ with the serpent is more authentic than that with the fish, but, for all that, it was not so popular in primitive Christianity. The Gnostics favored it because it was an old-established symbol for the “good” *genius loci*, the Agathodaimon, and also for their beloved Nous. Both symbols are of inestimable value when it comes to the natural, instinctive interpretation of the Christ-figure. (Jung 1969, par. 291)

In the Peratic doctrine itself the words serpent and Christ are used interchangeably, as the serpent is he who brings the signs of the Father down from above, awakens those on earth, and carries them back up again, which they see as an explanation of Christ’s saying, “I am the door.” The doctrine sets forth that the perfect race of men, made in the image of the Father and from the same substance, “is drawn from the world by the Serpent even as it was sent down by him...” (Jung 1969, par. 290).

Although from childhood we have been familiar with theriomorphic symbols in our churches – eagle, lamb, and so on – I, at any rate, never realized them at all as such. Before I was six years old we had a person who whistled when reading the lessons and I was convinced that it was the eagle and was disappointed when a new parson came who did not whistle. From then on, I saw the theriomorphic symbols like things, like the pulpit and the altar, and they meant just nothing to me. I first realized that there could be such a thing as “a natural, instinctive interpretation of Christ’s figure” through Jungian psychology. Even now I think it is very difficult to realize it in connection with Christ, for somehow through our familiarity with them these symbols have lost their mana and they seem worn out to us. That is the point of the rather blasphemous and witty rhymes such as:

There was a young man of Dijon, who had no love for religion:

“The fault is by me,

I don’t love the three,

the Father, the Son and the pigeon.”⁴

It is just the shock of hearing the Holy Ghost spoken of as a pigeon that wakes one up and makes one realize that such a symbol is still alive and meaningful. Otherwise one would not be shocked. As mentioned in the introduction to these lectures, theriomorphic symbols are very frequent in dreams and other manifestations of the unconscious. They express the level on which the content they represent is to be found, namely a level of the unconscious that is as far removed from human consciousness as the psyche of that particular animal. Varying grades of unconsciousness are shown by the kind of animal: warm-blooded or cold-blooded, vertebrate or non-vertebrate. It is important to repeat this here – and recall it time and again – because the psychotherapist must comprehend that such contents can produce symptoms on all levels, which correspond to the functions that characterize those animals. Therefore there are definite cerebrospinal and sympathetic forms of symptoms.

The Sethian Gnostics may have guessed something of the kind, for Hippolytus mentions in connection with the snake that they compared the “Father” with the cerebrum and the “Son” with the cerebellum and spinal cord. The snake actually symbolizes cold-blooded, inhuman contents and tendencies of both a spiritual abstractness and animal concreteness: in a word, the so-called “non-human” or extra-human quality in man (Jung 1969, par. 291).⁵

The eighth chapter in *Aion*, to which I have alluded, began with the idea of the attraction between magnet and iron in the Gnostic symbolism. In previous chapters Jung dealt with this idea in reference to the Echeneis or Remora fish, which, in spite of its tiny size, could hold back great vessels like a magnet and was thus an alchemistic symbol for the greatest value (in psychological terms: the Self). As far as Jung knew, this idea of the magnet appears three times in the Elenchos of Hippolytus, first in the teaching of the Naassenes and again in the teaching of the Perates, where the agent is a serpent. Jung says of this:

The agent is an inanimate, autonomous being, the serpent. It appears spontaneously or comes as a surprise; it fascinates; its glance is staring, fixed, unrelated; its blood cold, and it is a stranger to man: it crawls over the sleeper, he finds it in a shoe or in his pocket. It expresses his fear of everything inhuman and his awe of the sublime, of what is beyond human ken. It is the lowest (devil) and the highest (son of God, Logos, Nous, Agathodaimon). The snake’s presence is frightening, one finds it in unexpected places at unexpected moments. Like the fish, it represents and personifies the dark and unfathomable, the watery deep, the forest, the night, the cave. When a primitive says “snake,” he means an experience of something extra-human. The snake is not an allegory or metaphor, for its own peculiar form is symbolic in itself, and it is essential to note that the “Son” has the form of a snake and not the other way round: the snake does not mean the “Son.” (Jung 1969, par. 293)

It must be emphasized that this symbol of the serpent was by no means a metaphysical image for the Perates. It did not symbolize Christ as the Son of God in heaven, but as man on earth. The serpent comes up as a symbol when the burning problem is the incarnation of the deity and when earthly man urgently requires a contact with the divine. When such problems are acute, the serpent becomes the leading symbol of the Anthropos.

In his article “The Structure and Dynamics of the Self,” Jung address this problem in regard to the Gnostic quaternion. It would lead us too far astray to go into these issues, so it must suffice to say that in the double diagram of the anthropos-shadow quaternion we find man portrayed in the middle of the upper and a lower system, and, in the lower equivalent to the higher, the snake takes the place of Adam (Jung 1969, pars. 364ff). Jung says: “The lower senarius reaches its nadir not in the ‘lower Adam,’ but in his dark, theriomorphic prefiguration – the *serpent* – who was created before man, or the Gnostic Naas” (Jung 1969, par. 365). Perhaps this requires some explanation. The higher Adam is the obvious symbol of the Self in its aspect of being above and beyond man. He represents, so to speak, the ideal pattern toward which we strive, whereas the snake represents the aspect of the Self that manifests, for instance, as an involuntary urge that disturbs all our plans and ideas, and that usually seems all wrong or, at least, the most terrible nuisance to us. But, in spite of this, the higher Adam and the snake are two realities or aspects of one and the

same thing. This is why we very often discover symbols of the Self behind the most perverse and abnormal urges that we are tempted to disown or immediately repress. But if we do, we shall throw out the Self. I remember once a woman got into a terrible state after a dream of having had sexual relations with a stag. But Dr. Jung explained that if you could accept the animal, then you could accept the god.

Therefore one can say that the serpent in Eden, which brought about the fall of man, is also Adam, his other side, which would explain why his anima, Eve, was forced to obey it. In the next paragraph Jung says:

The serpentine form of the *Nous* and the *Agathodaimon* does not mean that the serpent has only a good aspect. Just as the *Apophis*-serpent was the traditional enemy of the Egyptian sun-god, so the devil, "that ancient serpent," is the enemy of Christ, the [new sun]. The good, perfect, spiritual God was opposed by an imperfect, vain, ignorant, and incompetent demiurge. There were archontic Powers that gave to mankind a corrupt "chirographum" (handwriting) from which Christ had to redeem them. (Jung 1969, par. 366)

You probably know the old Gnostic idea that as the soul descended through the firmament to be incarnated on earth it received a quality from each of the Archons, the so-called *Heimarmene*. These qualities had to be lived so that man could be redeemed, or redeem himself. Jung explains this idea quoting St. Paul (Colossians 2:14): "...having wiped out the handwriting of requirements that was against us, which was contrary to us. And He has taken it out of the way, having nailed it to the cross." The handwriting is imprinted on the body. Priscillian is said to have thought that the soul in its descent through the spheres to be born is caught by the powers of evil and pushed into various bodies according to the will of the victor. The parts of the soul received a divine handwriting, but the parts of the body are inscribed with the signs of the zodiac (Jung 1969, par. 366n).

Psychologically, in everyday analysis, this would correspond to the inherited components and familiar complexes (such as the father or mother complex) that put their seal on each individual's life and can only be redeemed when we discriminate them and make them conscious, that is, nail them to the cross. It is not a man's guilt that he has a mother complex, or a woman's that she has a father complex. The only guilt of any validity results from not knowing it. It is simply something that has to be redeemed. A man with a mother complex just cannot help getting into a deadly panic when a serious situation arises with a woman. It is his *Heimarmene*, and the panic is the snake, that opposite of the higher Adam. No one wants to be born with a really nasty disposition; that is a misfortune and not our fault. And people know they should not lose their tempers, but they just can't seem to stop themselves. Again the snake. The Self creates these symptoms but also cures them.

Before going further I must just refer back to the story of the *Apophis* serpent and *Ra* (the sun god) mentioned in the lectures on the cat. It would really have belonged in our first class of serpent symbolism, but I omitted it because I had already discussed it previously at some length. There the barque of the sun was constantly threatened by this *Apophis* snake as it passed through the dark underworld below the horizon. *Ra* had to descend every night into the underworld as a tomcat and cut off the head of the *Apophis* serpent so that the rising of the sun was protected. Here is the danger, so to speak, of our conscious reflection being swallowed as the serpent power raises its head within us.

To return to *Aion*, Jung continues:

With the dawn of the second millennium the accent shifted more and more toward the dark side. The demiurge became the devil who had created the world, and a little later, alchemy began to develop its conception of *Mercurius* as the partly material, partly immaterial spirit that penetrates and sustains all things, from stones and metals to the highest living organisms. In the form of a snake he dwells inside the earth, has a body, soul and spirit, was believed to have a human shape as the *homonuculus* or *homo altus*, and was regarded as the "earthly God." From this we can see clearly that the serpent was either a forerunner of man or a distant copy of the *Anthropos*, and how justified is the equation *Naas* = *Nous* = *Logos* = *Christ* = Higher Adam. (Jung 1969, par. 367)

This idea of the alchemist's mercurial snake as a partly material and partly immaterial spirit that penetrates and sustains all things is paramount for understanding the idea of the serpent in our own psyche. It is here practically equivalent to the *deus absconditus*, the part of God imprisoned in matter (or concealed in darkness) which it was the task of the alchemists to redeem (Jung 1998, par. 1295). I remind you here of Christ's saying (John 10:34): "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?" And Psalm 82:6: "I have said, Ye are gods, and all of you are children of the most High." I would like to point out that – at least in my own experience – when we look for the divine part of our nature above, in the light and spiritual, we are very unlikely to get even a whiff of what this difficult logion means. But if we look below, down in the so-called lowest and deepest part of our own psyche or our body, we have much more chance of hearing a rustle that reminds us of a snake slipping noiselessly through the grass. And it is here that we may experience the mercurial and divine serpent in our psyche.

Returning to *Aion*, Jung goes on to say:

We have seen above that, as the higher Adam corresponds to the lower, so the lower Adam corresponds to the serpent. For the mentality of the Middle Ages and of late Antiquity, the first of the two double pyramids, the *Anthropos Quaternio*, represents the world of the spirit or metaphysics, while the second, the *Shadow Quaternio*, depicts the sublunary nature and in particular man's instinctual disposition, the "flesh" – to use the Gnostic-Christian term – which has its roots in the animal kingdom, or to be more precise, in the realm of the warm-blooded animals. The nadir of this system is the cold-blooded vertebrate, the snake, for with the snake the psychic rapport which can be established with practically all warm-blooded animals comes to an end. That the snake, contrary to expectation, should be a counterpart of the *Anthropos* is corroborated by the fact – of special significance for the Middle Ages – that it is on the one hand a well-known allegory of Christ, and on the other hand appears to be equipped with the gift of wisdom and of supreme spirituality. [It was said to be the most spiritual animal.] As Hippolytus says, the Gnostics identified the serpent with the spinal cord and the medulla. These are synonymous with the reflex functions. (Jung 1969, par. 369)

Jung points out that the second quaternio represents the negative of the first, that is, its shadow, and then continues:

By "shadow" I mean the inferior personality, the lowest levels of which are indistinguishable from the instinctuality of the animal. This is a view that can be found at a very early date, in the idea of the... "exrescent soul" [grown-on soul] of Isidorus.⁶ We also meet it in Origen, who speaks of the animals contained in man. Since the shadow, in itself, is unconscious for most people, the snake would correspond to what is totally unconscious and incapable of becoming conscious, but which, as the collective unconscious and as instinct, seems to possess a peculiar wisdom of its own and a knowledge that is often felt to be supernatural. This is the treasure which the snake (or dragon) guards, and also the reason why the snake signifies evil and darkness on the one hand and wisdom on the other. Its unrelatedness, coldness and dangerousness express the instinctuality that with ruthless cruelty rides roughshod over all moral and any other human wishes and considerations and is therefore just as terrifying and fascinating in its effect as the sudden glance of a poisonous snake. (Jung 1969, par. 370)

This strikes me as specially clear and gives a vivid picture of the snake in man, the utterly cold, inhuman destructiveness we meet in ourselves and others and which shocks us to death. This inhuman aspect is then set vis-à-vis the divine wisdom which brings us the creative solution in a positive way where our mere human faculties would be entirely lost. I used to think one could always rely on people's love, but as Jung was known once to say: "If someone does something that shows they love me today, they will be sure to do something that shows me that they hate me tomorrow." My sister, on whom I thought I could rely in all cases, knew that I was particularly fond of someone who said that I danced well. Her comment was that I was heavy as lead and stiff as a poker and if one called that dancing, then she supposed I did dance well! I reckon that remark brought me to psychology!

Continuing with his line of thought, Jung notes:

alchemy the snake is the symbol of *Mercurius non vulgi*, which was bracketed with the god of revelation, Hermes. Both have a pneumatic nature. The *serpens Mercurii* is a chthonic spirit who dwells in matter, more especially in the bit of original chaos hidden in creation, the *massa confusa* or *globosa*. The snake symbol in alchemy points back to historically earlier images. Since the *opus* was understood by the alchemists as a recapitulation or imitation of the creation of the world, the serpent of Mercurius, that crafty and deceitful god, reminded them of the serpent in the Garden of Eden, and therefore of the devil, the tempter, who on their own admission played all sorts of tricks on them during their work. Mephistopheles, whose “aunt is the snake,” is Goethe’s version of the alchemical familiar, Mercurius. Like the dragon, Mercurius is the slippery, evasive, poisonous, dangerous forerunner of the hermaphrodite, and for that reason he has to be overcome. (Jung 1969, par. 371)

Here we see the motif of the serpent as a deceitful, diabolical being, and also the fact that below does not only mean the flesh – and indeed its most despised physical parts – but also evil, our most despised and terrifying psychic qualities. For the bit of original chaos hidden in creation I refer you to Jung’s chapter on the “Increatum” where the whole thing is brought together with active imagination in a most interesting way (Jung 1968, pars. 430–432). Jung continues:

The serpent in *Genesis* is an illustration of the personified tree-numen; hence it is traditionally represented in or coiled round the tree. It is the tree’s voice, which persuades Eve

– in Luther’s version – that “it would be good to eat of the tree, and pleasant to behold that it is a lusty tree.” In the fairy tale of *The Spirit in the Bottle*, Mercurius can likewise be interpreted as a tree-numen. In the Ripley Scroll, Mercurius appears as a snake in the shape of a Melusina descending from the top of the Philosophical Tree (“tree of knowledge”). The tree stands for the development and phases of the transformation process, and its fruits or flowers signify the consummation of the work. In the fairy tale Mercurius is hidden in the roots of a great oak tree, i.e., in the earth. For it is in the interior of the earth that the Mercurial serpent dwells. (Jung 1969, par. 372)

An entire chapter in Howey’s *The Encircled Serpent* is dedicated to the tree and the snake, a combination found all over the world (Howey 1930, 108–125). He regards the serpent as a phallic and the tree as a female symbol representing the active and passive aspects of the deity. Sometimes the serpent is the tree’s guardian, sometimes its destroyer. One of the many examples of the former is the garden of the Hesperides, where the golden apple of Hera is guarded by nymphs with the help of a dragon or serpent (Howey 1930, 232). Another Greek version of the motif is found in the Erechtheus, who are legendary figures – half serpent, half man. When Pallas Athene created the olive tree in order to win the competition with Poseidon for the honor of naming the city of Athens, she planted it on the Acropolis and placed it under the guardianship of Erechtheus with his lower serpentine extremities. As an example of the snake as a destroyer we already mentioned the serpent Nidhog continually gnawing at the roots of Yggdrasil, the tree of the universe. Many primitives believe that the gods and man were outwitted by serpents who secured for themselves the immortality intended for man. (In the Gilgamesh Epic, the plant that was to give Gilgamesh immortal life was stolen by the serpent while he slept.) Here it is usually the herb of immortality, but it also occurs as a branch of a sacred tree. We could multiply these examples of the conflict between snake and tree indefinitely.

Before we leave these references to the serpent in *Aion* I would like to mention one more example where Jung again speaks of the snake as the equivalent of the lower Adam. Here he points out that:

The choice of this symbol is justified firstly by the wellknown association of Adam with the snake: it is his chthonic daemon, his familiar spirit. Secondly, the snake is the commonest symbol of the dark, chthonic world of the instinct. It may – as frequently happens – be replaced by an equivalent, cold-blooded animal such as a dragon, crocodile or fish. But the snake is not just a nefarious, chthonic being; it is also... a symbol of wisdom and hence of the light, good and healing. Even in the New Testament it is simultaneously an allegory of Christ and of the devil, just as we have seen that the fish was. Similarly the dragon, which for us has only a negative meaning, has a positive significance in China, and sometimes in Western alchemy too. The inner polarity of the snake symbol far exceeds that of man. It is overt, whereas man’s is partly latent or potential. The serpent surpassed Adam in cleverness and knowledge and can outwit him. She is older than he, and is evidently equipped by God with a superhuman intelligence, like that son of God who took over the role of the Satan.

Just as man culminates above in the idea of a “light” and good God, so he rests below on a dark and evil principle, traditionally described as the devil or as the serpent that personifies Adam’s disobedience. And just as we symmetrized man by the serpent, so the serpent has its complement in the second Naassene quaternion, or Paradise Quaternio. Paradise takes us into the world of plants and animals. It is, in fact, a plantation or garden enlivened by animals, the epitome of all the growing things that sprout out of the earth. As *serpents mercurialis*, the snake is not only related to the god of revelation, Hermes, but, as a vegetation numen, calls forth the “blessed greenness,” all the budding and blossoming of plant life. Indeed, this serpent dwells even in the interior of the earth and is the pneuma that lies concealed in the *stone*.

The symmetrical complement of the serpent, then, is the *stone* as representative of the earth. Here we enter a later developmental stage of the symbolism, the alchemical stage, whose central idea is the *lapis*. Just as the serpent forms the lower opposite of man, so the *lapis* complements the serpent. It corresponds, on the other hand, to man, for it is not only represented in human form but even has “body, soul and spirit,” is an homunculus and, as the text shows, a symbol of the self. It is, however, not a human ego but a collective entity, a collective soul, like the Indian *hiranyagarbhe*, “golden seed.” The stone is the “fathermother” of the metals, an hermaphrodite. Though it is an ultimate unity, it is not an elementary but a composite unity that has evolved. For the stone we could substitute all those “thousand names” which the alchemists devised for their central symbol, but nothing different or more fitting would have been said. (Jung 1969, pars. 385–387)

As we have seen, the serpent is a symbol for the deity all over the world, thus this comparison with the lapis will not surprise us. After all, the stone is even more unlike us than the serpent, for the latter has a backbone and life in common with us whereas the stone has only matter.

Before going on to the Asclepian mysteries, I should just mention the Egyptian Uraeus. This image of the serpent was worn by the Pharaohs as a kind of diadem on their foreheads. It was beneficent to the Pharaoh himself and represented a sort of mana soul that burned up the Pharaoh’s enemies with its fierce serpent eyes.

Perhaps the very best example of the serpent as a means of communication with the Divine is provided by what little we know of the serpent in the temples of Asclepius, of which I will especially take the temple of Epidaurus. (I refer you here to Dr. Meier’s book on antique incubation (Meier 1985).) Although the premises are very badly ruined, it has still the most tremendous mana, and you get a real feeling of what it must be. I lay down in one of those cells and could imagine what it would be like to be in one alone at night. There is a labyrinth in the middle and at its center they kept snakes. The labyrinth at that time was covered by a roof and patients had to feel their way through the maze in the dark, the goal being these terrifying serpents. (I believe there were no poisonous ones.) The diagnosis depended on the snakes’ behavior.

We have already considered the healing quality in Moses’ brazen serpent, and Howey tells us that a great many ancient myths and stories relate that it is just the snake that knows about healing or life-restoring plants. He quotes Apollodorus (III, 3, 1) who reports that Glaucus, the son of Minos, was raised from the dead:

...by the seer Polydus who had learned the secret from a serpent, and we know from Pliny that a similar story was told by Xanthus, an early historian of Lydia, of the Lydian hero, Tylon.... According to the tale Tylon was walking one day along the banks of the Hermus when a serpent stung [sic] and killed him. His sister, Moire, in great distress at his cruel fate, persuaded a giant named Damasene, to slay the serpent. This he did,

but the serpent's mate gathered a herb called "the flower of Zeus" which grew in the woods, and brought it in her mouth to the lips of the dead serpent who immediately revived. Moire, who had been watching the serpent's actions, took the same herb to her brother, Tylon, and renewed his life by touching him with it.

Bearing these instances in mind, we shall have no difficulty in realizing why Asclepius, the reputed son of Apollo, the Sun-god, was worshipped all over Greece as the god of medicine, and like his sire was symbolized by the serpent. (Howey 1930, 89)

As mentioned in our discussion of the symbolism of the dog, Asclepius was said to be the son of Apollo born by the nymph Coronis, and to have been educated by the centaur Chiron, who taught him the arts of healing and hunting. Although the chief healing animal of Asclepius was a serpent, dogs also played a central role in his temples. (We recall that Apollo's animal was the fierce wolf, whereas his son Asclepius, the legendary god of medicine, was affiliated more with the domesticated dog.)

In Howey's opinion (and here he is probably correct, as the cultures of Egypt, Greece, and Asia Minor greatly influenced each other), Asclepius represents a newer personification of the healing power represented by the Egyptian sun serpent Cneph and the Babylonian Hea. He bases his opinion on etymological relations between the names of these gods, noting that the word Asclepius means "the man-instructing serpent" while Babylonian Hea (the serpent god) is called "the teacher of mankind," "the Lord of Understanding," and so on. He notes that both Hea and Asclepius are called "The Life-Giver" (Howey 1930, 89f).

The chief and original seat of the worship of Asclepius was in his legendary birthplace at Epidaurus, but there were centers also at Cos, Cnidos, Rhodes and other places. Howey remarks:

A splendid temple was erected to the honor of Æsculapius at Epidaurus. It contained a gold and ivory statue of the god... half the size of the statue of Olympian Jupiter at Athens. He was represented sitting, one hand holding a staff, the other resting on a serpent's head, whilst a dog, as an emblem of watchfulness, crouched at his feet. On the coinage of ancient Greece he is usually pictured with a long beard, holding in his hand a staff around which a serpent is twined. Often he is accompanied by a cock, and sometimes by an owl. At Epidaurus there was a peculiar breed of yellowish-brown snakes, large in size, harmless and easily tamed, which lived in the temple and were fed by servants who, because of religious awe, were fearful of approaching the sacred reptiles since they were believed to be the form in which the god manifested himself. (Howey 1930, 90)

As with his father Apollo and the much earlier and more primitive Gaia, the serpent is not "the divinatory animal of Asclepius," but rather the god himself is the serpent. The fame of Epidaurus was by no means local but, similar to Delphi, spread far and wide. Even the Romans were convinced of the identity of Asclepius and the serpent (as briefly mentioned by Ms. Mills). Howey notes the following story which accounts for the introduction of the worship of Asclepius to Rome (about 291 bc) where a temple was built to him. Here he was honored in the form of an enormous serpent. A pestilence broke out in Rome so:

...the oracle at Delphi was consulted as to the best means of combating it. The advice given was that the Romans should send an embassy to Epidaurus to fetch Æsculapius from his temple. Ambassadors were duly sent, and, having arrived in the temple, were gazing with awe on the magnificent statue of the god when a venerable serpent glided forth from his lurking place beneath and, proceeding to the ship which had brought the Romans, he went on board and there coiled himself up in the berth of Ogulnius, the principal ambassador. The ambassadors instantly recognized that it was the deity who had assumed this form and conveyed it homewards. On reaching an island in the Tiber [in Rome], the serpent slipped ashore and disappeared. The Romans erected a temple on this spot and the plague was stayed "with wonderful celerity." A few inscriptions relating cures and the means employed have been found in this island. (Howey 1930, 90)

This is certainly an interesting legend, for it contains the idea of the very essence of those synchronistic events that show whether one's ideas have substance or are thoughts in the air. The serpent itself decides and embarks on the boat on its own volition. It knew what to do at a time when man was entirely helpless and at the mercy of a pestilence, and man had enough naivety and naturalness in those days to cooperate with such an omen, a naturalness we try to recapture in our attitude to the unconscious today.

Howey – as rationalistic as his time – but briefly mentions that the god was said to personally prescribe treatments for patients by sending them dreams and visions. For us, of course, this is the most interesting point in the legends of Asclepius. The very fact that this serpent god was said to send these dreams himself is very characteristic of the attitude to dreams not only in antiquity, but in the beliefs of more primitive cultures as well. When a Roman senator's daughter had a dream that the temple of Juno should be restored, renovations were soon undertaken by the Senate, as such dreams were granted validity. Knud Rasmussen relates the story of how a medicine man of a tribe (whose food supplies were rapidly diminishing in a time of great scarcity of food) dreamed of an abundance of whales, seals, and the like and convinced his tribe to risk crossing the ice packs from Baffin's Bay in Greenland to North America. Halfway over, certain old men began to doubt, as they always do, so half of the tribe turned back. And perished. The others who followed the medicine man and his dream arrived safely on the Canadian shore (Jung 1984, 6).

As Jung notes, this well describes what the shepherd or medicine man must rely on under primitive circumstances. His is an intuitive mind influenced by a vision or farsightedness. In such circumstances this is the only function by which the life of a tribe can be safely led. There are no other possibilities or sources of guidance. It cannot be done by thinking, because thinking is not differentiated, so he must rely on intuitive farsightedness in order to let the people know where the flocks are, where food is, when there will be war, and so forth.

A similar attitude prevailed at Epidaurus and the other Asclepian sanctuaries. The sick or troubled individual came seeking guidance, and the priests or doctors did not make the mistake, so common today, of allowing themselves any rational opinions about symptoms or the cure or even whether the patient was meant to be healed. They left all that to Asclepius, to a dream or vision in the cells, or to how the animals, particularly the serpent, behaved.

The same principles apply very largely in psychology today. We rarely know what is wrong or have a solution to a problem. But the unconscious does. And we can only say: "Well, something in you knows, and we may be able to better understand it as the old Asclepius once did." And as much as experience helps and we may have a fair idea of what needs to be done, we must always be prepared to modify our conscious opinion if the dreams or visions instruct us to do so.

The whole attitude of these old Asclepians toward the problem of communicating with the divine is "full of meat," so to speak, and is potentially very helpful to the psychologist of today.

We should now consider the serpent in the Asclepian mysteries from the psychological point of view. As a healing factor in the case of psychic or physical illness, it involves a surrender of the ego. The serpent represents a layer of the unconscious that we can at best propitiate but never directly influence. It stands for that aspect of a psychological cure which is not concerned with making moral efforts or struggling to comprehend. This aspect is, of course, also very important, although there it was attended to by the priests. But when we come to the serpent today we touch the region of the miraculous part of a cure that is the manifestation of the archetypal world and cannot be produced by any conscious effort if it is to take place at all. It can, however, be rendered more likely to happen by giving it regular attention, that is, by feeding the serpents, by modesty, by surrender on the part of the ego, and by trust – symbolized in the Asclepian mysteries by sleeping alone in a cell in the dark with snakes about.

Asclepius was not only concerned with the sick but with the question of birth as well (Howey 1930, 92). As you know, the ancients believed that

many of their heroes were semi-divine, usually thought to be the son of a mortal mother and immortal father. Thus Asclepius was greatly sought after by women who wanted to have children. They were said sometimes to go to his temple and sleep in the cells (where the sick got their diagnoses from dreams), and there they were sometimes so greatly favored as to be visited by the god himself in serpent form. Pausanias tells us that "the famous Aratus of Sicyon was believed by his country-men to be a son of Asclepius and begotten by him when in serpent form" (Howey 1930, 92).

Frazer reportedly says of this hero's mother:

"Probably she slept either in the shrine of Asclepius at Sicyon where a figurine of her was shown seated on a serpent, or perhaps in the more secluded sanctuary of the god at Titane, not many miles off, where the sacred serpents crawled among ancient cypresses on the hill-top which overlooks the narrow green valley of the Asopus with the white turbid river rushing in its depths. There, under the shadow of the cypresses, with the murmur of the Asopus in her ears, the mother of Aratus may have conceived, or fancied she conceived, the future deliverer of his country." (Howey 1930, 92)

The ancients would see nothing improbable in such an idea. The Emperor Augustus was said to have been begotten by a snake in the temple of Apollo and hence was said to be a son of that god, and many other instances might be given of celebrated men who claimed sacred serpents as their fathers. That the serpent is also so nearly concerned with birth is really only to be expected.

I would now like to draw our seven lectures on the serpent to a close. We have looked at the serpent from several standpoints, divided into four classes of symbolism. We began with it as the demon of earth, darkness and evil, and went on in the second class to consider it as the representative of light, spirit and wisdom. In the third class of symbolism we saw it as the uroboros of cyclic life and the symbol of renewal as well as the ghosts of the dead, and finally, in the fourth, we spoke of the serpent as the uniter of opposites and the means of communication with the divine.

I would like to reiterate that all four classes of serpent symbolism are enmeshed with each other; the earth demon is also a healer just as Lucifer, the bitter enemy of light, is a harbinger of light. Perhaps the most general characteristic in the material we have considered is that of communication with the Divine, for the serpent is very close to the absolute knowledge postulated in Jung's paper on synchronicity. But it is a specific kind of communication with the Divine. It is not the kind of revelation to which we are accustomed in Christianity; it is not inspiration by the Holy Ghost, nor has it anything to do with any form of tradition. One could rather call it a communication with the deity by means of direct individual experience beyond normal, human warm-bloodedness deep within the realm of nature. The serpent symbolizes the miraculous, numinous "Other" as experienced by the individual, and that is why this symbol appears especially in the dreams and experiences of those who are once more seeking the immediate inner healing power within themselves.

The Archetypal Symbolism of the Lion

Barbara Hannah's lecture series on the archetypal symbolism of the lion followed her lectures on the serpent and was given at the C.G. Jung Institute, Zurich, Switzerland. The first lecture occurred on January 20, 1958, after the break for the Christmas holidays in 1957, and the final lecture was given on February 17, 1958.

XXVI

Introduction to the Lion

Lecture Eight: January 20, 1958

Last time we concluded our study of the serpent . I would now like to look at its polar opposite, the lion. In particular, the lion can be seen as the polar opposite of our first two classes of serpent symbolism, the serpent as earth demon and as bringer of light. In our latter two last classes, the serpent more or less represents a union of opposites: unconscious in the case of the uroboros (the eternally recurring cycles of nature), and more conscious in the fourth and last class where the serpent represents a union of opposites that have been separated and brought together again by the efforts of man. A similar development in the third and fourth class of symbolism is to be observed in the lion on a different level, although this occurs less widely than with the serpent.

When the opposites are represented by serpent and lion, the serpent is relatively one-sided, the cold, chthonic, and moist, over against the lion as warm-blooded heat and fire. Sometimes, as in the symbol for Aion (the eternal being), they are found

268 The Archetypal Symbolism of the Lion

more or less peacefully together, appearing as a lion-headed god encoiled by the serpent. Or they are depicted on each side of the Mithraic amphora (a kind of cauldron) with the flame arising from it. There both serpent and lion are trying to get at the fire in opposition to each other, although one – the lion – is more or less of the same nature as fire, whereas the serpent is its logical opposite. Presumably the lion wants to assimilate and the serpent to extinguish it.

In another representation of the Mithraic amphora, the lion is in the air above the vessel as if in the act of precipitating himself into the flaming cauldron. As the latter is a feminine symbol, the lion is evidently aiming at rebirth, but we shall come to this aspect later.

The Mithraic cult was in part a nature cult. (We will discuss it in more detail in the lecture on the bull.) In Jung's Visions Seminar there is a passage describing this amphora and addressing the Mithraic lion that I should like to read here. Jung describes the amphora as follows:

The lion is usually represented there [in the Mithraic cult] in connection with the amphora. Out of the amphora rises a flame, and a lion is depicted on the one side, and a snake on the other, and both are trying to get into the amphora. What that meant in Mithraism is completely dark, but the amphora is a vessel of a certain form, and a chaotic condition is like a shapeless liquid; the liquid held into the amphora form might therefore symbolize the desire of man for definite orientation – it might mean the specific reaction of man's attitude against chaos. Now the spirit does not come in through the chaos [and] the lion alone does not make spirit. The spirit must be postulated as a principle reacting against the dynamism of man, the mere dynamism of man is always bringing out a spiritual reaction. But without this lion condition there would be no experience of the spirit; as long as things are rolling on rails it is impossible to experience it. So the spirit can be defined as an immediate reaction against

Introduction to the Lion 269

the fire of the animal condition; without that tremendous conflagration one can have no idea of what it is. For the phenomenon of the spirit is only generated in the moment of almost complete destruction. (Jung 1997, 1044)

Quite in general then, before we come to the four classes into which I shall try to divide the lion, we should realize that the fiery lion represents a condition without which there would be no experience of the spirit. But the lion alone does not make spirit, it is rather a stage we must go through and overcome for, like the serpent in its original nature demon form, it must be conquered and assimilated.

There are lion killers exactly as there are serpent killers. The most well-known example is the killing of the Nemean lion, the first labor of Hercules, who had to kill it with his bare hands. Ms. Mills pointed out in her paper on serpents that, during all his later labors, Hercules donned the skin of the Nemean lion as a trophy to show that by overcoming the lion he had assimilated its strength. We shall come to other examples.

XXVII

The Lion: Notes on the Biological Background

The lion belongs in the class of beasts of prey, which comprises an enormous variety of animals ranging from the weasel to the lion with all sorts of little detours like the hyena and the bear. In this very large class, most of the animals are doglike or catlike in character. There are many similarities such as the structure of the teeth, the pads and claws, and, most important, the whiskers on the lips as well as the great strength of the ribs whether the animal is lightly or heavily built. (As an anecdote here... when I was a child we had a fox terrier that was run over by a heavy car with iron studs on the wheels, the marks of which could be seen on the dog afterward, yet he was quite all right. The vet said there was nothing the matter with him. There is a certain place where they have such strong ribs that they are not hurt. Curiously enough, just the other day I heard of something similar when another dog was run over and not hurt at all, so one sees what an immense strength the ribcage must have.) All animals of this class have highly developed senses, usually two of which are especially acute. All of course are carnivorous, although some are known to eat vegetables, nuts, and fruits as well. Another anecdote that I would like to relate regards the fact that many beasts of prey live monogamously, although not necessarily for the whole period of their lives. Lorenz tells a very good story in *King Solomon's Ring* about his wife, who had a chow while he had an Alsatian wolfhound. They wanted to keep the breeds pure even though the two dogs were brought up together. The chow female, however, refused to mate with any dog except the wolfhound. The owners were determined that this should not happen, but it was no use. The Alsatian finally got to her and that started the famous breed of Alsatian-chow, a breed arrived at by pure monogamous instinct. I believe, however, that this propensity does not last the whole life. (After this dog had had her puppies, she was quite ready to mate with other chows.) In regard to their similarities, one additional point that strikes me personally as interesting is that no beast of prey has hair on the tip of its nose. Only this fact is mentioned by Brehm and no reason given, but presumably this is because the animal is thus enabled to smell more efficiently.

The members of the cat family are graceful animals, delicately yet formidably built. They have round heads, thick strong necks and, with the exception of the Manx, long tails. Their fur is thick and soft, camouflaging them well in their environment. Their special weapons are their formidable teeth and powerful retractable claws with paws so shaped that the claws are not worn by walking.

All cats stalk silently, most are swift runners and can leap several times their length, most climb trees, while many are good swimmers if the occasion arises – or compels them to it. Their best sense is that of hearing, for they are capable of hearing great distances, and their sight is keen even though they are probably nearsighted. They also have especially sensitive fur on the back of the forelegs and possibly also in the ears; their whiskers over the lips and eyes are real organs of touch. The whole body is in fact particularly sensitive. Their sense of smell is less accentuated, reacting primarily to strong smells. They are obviously intelligent animals. Brehm describes them as having a mixture of coolheadedness, endurance, cunning, greed, and reckless courage. He thinks that all the cat family can be tamed. However, a family in Norfolk in England had a number of lions which they believed to be tamed; yet one morning one of the sons was killed for no particular reason. And even Brehm, who claims to have kept wild animals – letting them grow up with his children – admits that there are moments when their wild nature breaks through, although he believes comparatively harmlessly.

The cat family is to be found wild all over the world except in Australia, Madagascar, and the West Indies. Most species prefer to live in forest and wood, but they are to be found in mountainous terrain (even in snow-covered, or rugged or barren landscapes), in various types of jungles, on the savanna, in fact adapted to an exceptionally wide variety of environments. The hunting methods of the domestic cat are typical of the entire cat family. Very young kittens have to be protected from the male parent, who sometimes eats them when they are very small and cannot yet see, so initially the mother has to be solely responsible for the family. But once this danger is past, they have a cheerful and playful youth with their fathers around.

Anatomically, lions are indistinguishable from tigers, whereas mythologically there is a great difference. The lion, with rare exceptions, is usually the symbol of the light, male qualities and the tiger of the female. Of course the two look very different, but this is to a large extent due to their coloring.

Lions and tigers can be mated (which always shows a close genetic relationship). Leopards can be mated with jaguars and pumas but not with lions and tigers. The lion, the culmination of the true cat, so to speak, is usually regarded as the king of the beasts. He is unicolored and smooth-haired with a magnificent mane and a tuft of hair at the end of the tail. The lion was once found in Eastern Europe – Herodotus and Aristotle speak of it in the Northern Balkans – and in the Bible there is mention of lions in Palestine. But in these regions they have long been extinct.

The habits of lions vary according to whether the country in which they live is rich or poor in game. They generally hunt and live alone except at mating season. But where game is abundant, several will unite for the hunt. As a rule they hunt silently or with low growls, but according to Brehm they have a bit of the skills of a ventriloquist, as the growl does not seem to come from the place where the lion actually lurks. They only roar in what we might call triumph. However, in Africa before attacking domestic animals in the kraal, they may roar to produce panic, which gives them a much better chance than if they just kept on growling. (Now, this gives us a clue as to the way we lose our instincts when we go into civilization, for the wild animals, which perhaps know danger better than domestic animals, will tend to keep their instincts, not panic, and put up the best fight they can.) Certainly the lion's roar has an extraordinary effect and undoubtedly forms a part of the reason why it is regarded as the king of the beasts. I once had a flat not far from Regent's Park and used to hear the lions roaring early in the morning before the traffic began and, although I knew they were safely behind bars, it certainly was a bloodcurdling sound.

Male lions seem to us to be notoriously lazy and appear to be all too glad to let the females do the hunting for them... along with all of the rest of the work. The lion in his natural habitat pretty much fails to fulfill our grand projection of the royal king of beasts. When more closely observed, his behavior is in fact anything but royal. He actually appears a coward and doesn't play the king-of-beasts game at all. It is true that he is terribly strong, and he can finish off large prey swiftly with stunning brutality, but he could be a lot more royal in his behavior. I am sure if we asked him he could not care less about our expectations, arguing that he enjoys life marvelously doing very much of nothing while the lady pretty much takes care of the food, the children, and everything else at home. This is, after all, pretty much the wish of every "king" at home in his castle, and many of them are a lot less royal than even a lazy lion. Nevertheless, royal he is because we must go by the qualities that people have projected on the lion in all times and cultures.

This is an important point in analyzing the lion in dreams and active imagination. Unless the dreamer happens to have been connected a lot with real lions, which is rarely the case, the lion must be taken generally as the king of the beasts and as a symbol for heat, passion, strength, power, possession by power, and – when sublimated and overcome – as mana personified.

We now come to our four classes of symbolism. As mentioned earlier, we have to have these classes – or some kind of classification – just as you need crosshairs in a telescope. Of course that does not affect the starry sky; it is simply a way by which you see it better, and it is exactly the same with these four classes. I am just attempting to set some intelligible order in the symbolism of this animal. Our four classes here, then, are the lion as:

1. a solar symbol,
2. a symbol of power,
3. a symbol of urge, desire, and passion,
4. a symbol of resurrection and spiritual mana. XXXVIII

The Lion as a Solar Symbol

Leo is the well-known zodiacal sign for the days from July 24 to August 23, the hottest time of the year. We should bear in mind that these symbols arose in a hotter climate than ours, where the heat from July to August is formidable. The zodiac probably came into being in Mesopotamia, where the thermometer climbs to over 105°F in the shade every day during these months. In *Symbols of Transformation* Jung writes that: “The lion, the zodiacal sign for the torrid heat of summer, is the symbol of *concupiscentia effrenata*, ‘frenzied desire’ ” (Jung 1967, par. 425). “Therefore the lion was killed by Samson who afterward harvested honey from the carcass. Summer’s end is autumn’s plenty” (Jung 1967, par. 425n). There are several other mentions of the lion as a zodiacal sign in the works of Jung, but as a rule only this fact is mentioned.

Dr. von Franz drew my attention to a fascinating book by Constant de Wit about the lion in Egypt, titled *Le rôle et le sens du Lion dans l’Egypte Ancienne*. We shall have occasion in most of the classes of symbolism to refer to his work. De Wit reports that Plutarch reproduces a verse from the *Phenomena* of Aratos, according to whom the Nile inundates when the sun enters the sign of Leo. He says in his *Quaestiones Convivales* “The waters flow from the sources by the mouths in the form of lions, because the Nile takes water to the fields of Egyptians while the sun passes through Leo.” Pliny notes that: “...the Nile begins to grow in the new moon that follows the summer solstice. Its growth is gradual and moderate while the sun traverses Cancer and becomes very abundant when it traverses the Lion.” Horapollon reports on the same subject: “Wanting to represent the rising of the Nile – that they called ‘Noun’ in Egyptian, which translated means ‘the new’ – they sometimes draw a lion, sometimes three great vases of water, sometimes the sky and the earth producing water” (de Wit 1951, 398f).

It is well known that Egypt depends entirely on the inundation of the Nile, so the connection of the Nile with the mana of lion is psychologically poignant. When you go by train from Cairo to Aswan you see the most extraordinary fertility along the Nile. It is more abundant than anything we know. Yet sometimes only a few hundred yards from the Nile you have the desert as if you were in the Sahara. What fascinated me intensely was this stark contrast on that morning when we crossed the Nile and then drove from the fertile land beside its banks out into the desert, where we came upon the grossly arid valley that surrounds the Tombs of the Kings.

The fiery lion has so much to do symbolically with the emotions. And without emotions, nothing is fruitful. We learn a lot in psychology that remains in the cold intellectual realm, for nothing really counts psychologically until the emotions are involved. Even negative emotions, I should say, are preferable to none. Emotions can be called the fertile ground of our psyche, which is why it is so important to cultivate them. When Jung was lecturing at the E.T.H., he spoke of a Tibetan text, the *Shri-ChakraSambhara Tantra*, and when he came to the passage where the Yogi speaks to his anima figure, he commented that the man was doing a cultural work on his inner figures and emotions (Jung 1939a). (In these notes there are illustrations and Indian pictures of the Yogi sitting there with all these figures round him.) And then Jung spontaneously said: “And that is a culture we know nothing of in the West, nothing whatsoever.” In essence he had said something that was of absolutely vital importance. If one can only get at one’s emotions, negative or positive, as the Yogi does, then one can do something with them. One always has a hundred lousy excuses not to because it means coming right up against a difficult inner reality, but from my experience I can say that anything one does with active imagination that affects the emotional region of our psyche is done on most fertile ground. And here we are capable of affecting as great a difference as that afforded by the desert and the land fertilized by the waters of the Nile. We cannot afford to be possessed by our emotions, but we need them. When we simply open the door to destructive emotions such as rage and jealousy, no fertile ground is cultivated. It is as though the Egyptians were never to plant any seed or make any use of the waters. Even these holidays I experienced that no matter how cheerfully one wakes up in the morning, the animus can be there right away with the most depressing thoughts about things that have happened and insinuations that you are no good.¹ If you can catch him before he gets hold of you, if you can do something without letting him inundate you, then you manage him, so to speak, as the Egyptians do the Nile. This is immensely effective. Even Kitchener’s Island in Aswan (which he cultivated even in the lifetime of most of the older people among us) has a beautiful garden where the most extraordinary plants flourish, watered solely by the Nile. The drawback of the Nile is that its waters are full of microbes; great for the plants but less fortunate for the digestion of human beings.

Pliny says that the Nile begins to rise at the new moon after the summer solstice just at the end of Gemini, the twins. It would be highly speculative, but one is tempted to wonder whether the two (that is, the “twins”) initiate a polarization that brings about a rise of energy which then gradually proceeds under the retrograde influence of Cancer, a sort of *reculer pour mieux sauter*, and then in the sign of the Lion the whole valley is inundated, bringing fertility and rebirth. The presence of the new moon at the start beautifully introduces the feminine principle. And as we leave the zodiac, we must just mention the fact that the heavenly assumption of the Virgin is celebrated by Catholics in the middle of August just as the sun passes out of Leo.

We should now turn to Gubernatis to see what he has to say about the lion as a solar symbol. In his second volume we read:

We have already mentioned the Vedic monster lion of the West, in which we recognize the expiring sun. The strong Indras, killer of the monster, Vritras, is also represented as a lion. In the same way as the Jewish Samson is found in connection with the lion, and this lion with honey, and as the strength of the lion and that of Samson is said to be centered in the hair (the sun, when he loses his rays or mane, loses all his strength), so in the parallel myth of Indras we find analogous circumstances. Tvashtar, the Hindoo celestial blacksmith – who makes weapons now for the gods and now for the demons (the reddish sky of morning and of evening is likened to a burning forge; the solar hero or the sun in this forge is a blacksmith) – is also represented in a Vedic hymn as a lion... [and when] turned toward the west, heaven and earth rejoice, although (on account of the din made by him when coming into the world) they are, before all, terrified. The form of a lion is one of the favorite shapes created by the mythical and legendary blacksmith. (de Gubernatis 1872, 154)

Among the Indian gods, Tvashtar is the “hand-worker” who forged the thunderbolt of Indra as well as the chalice for ambrosia. He corresponds to the Egyptian Ptah and the Greek Hephaestus. As to the blacksmith, one should mention that the earlier form of the medicine man in many countries is the smith, because the discovery of metal ores and the forging of metal into household implements, horseshoes, weapons and so forth was a tremendous step forward for a tribe. Just think of the power that metal implements imparted to one people over another possessing only stone, bone or horn implements. Any tribe that had bronze or iron was immensely stronger and increased in power while those with only the old weapons decreased. Naturally the power was projected onto the blacksmiths, and they were regarded as a type of medicine man.

It is similar in a way today with the atom bomb, if you think of it. For example, the only people exalted by the Russians are the physicists and people who produce these frightful weapons. They are accorded the same respect as were the blacksmiths in the old tribes. They are one of the few people who can do pretty much as they like, for they are producing something that is regarded as exceptionally important. So we today are in this way on a level comparable to a primitive tribe.

Beyond power, the blacksmith also shows what can actually be done with the fire when used creatively, for his is a creative work forging in fire with his very hands. The man who makes weapons, horseshoes and the like is also an apt symbol for what can be done with the fiery emotions if one uses them for creative purposes instead of letting oneself be possessed by them.

I have often quoted Emma Jung, who told me something that I found very helpful after I had been here a year or two. She had a great belief in

negative emotions and thought a lot could be made out of them if you just found a way to have them express themselves instead of giving in to them or fighting them back. The woman's individual battle against the animus when he tries to get hold of our emotions would be an instance of the blacksmith forging the fire of the lion on the anvil. The idea she gave me was one of the most helpful I got in analysis.

Gubernatis says further:

Empedocles, however, considered the transformation into a lion as the best of all human metamorphoses. When the sun enters into the sign of the lion, he arrives at his greatest height of power; and the golden crown which the Florentines placed upon their lion in the public square, on the day of St. John, was a symbol of the approach of the season which they call by one word alone, *sollione* [sol – sun, *lione* – lion]. This lion is enraged, and makes, as it said, plants and animals rage. The pagan legend says of Prometheus:

Insani leonis

Vim stomacho apposuisse nostro.

[Literally translated: "He has the strength of a raging lion and applied it to our stomach," or freely translated: "He has got the strength of a raging lion and thus it has got into our system."] But the mythical lion, the sun, does not inspire the man with rage alone, but with strength also. (de Gubernatis 1872, 159)²

It is interesting that this legend attributes to Prometheus the victory over the raging lion and accuses him of thus implanting all this rage in our system. He stole the divine fire from the gods and so took over the responsibility. Dr. Helmuth Jacobsohn in "The World-Weary Man" speaks of the negative confession that the Egyptians made before the gods where they mentioned all of their sins, claiming that they themselves had not committed them in their lifetime (Jacobsohn 1968, 18). Jacobsohn explained that the entire responsibility for these sins was then in the hands of the gods, who would have regarded it as an insult if man had had the hubris to say that he had broken the laws without returning the responsibility to them. The discovery of the atom bomb by the physicists can, in a way, be compared with the theft of the divine fire by Prometheus, for through the physicists we now have weapons that no one had before. But we are really like children in a gunpowder shop and in great danger of being destroyed. Psychologically considered, when Prometheus stole the fire, he stole the emotions, warmth and heat from the gods, but he also forced us to take over responsibility and so "got into our stomachs." As the text says, this "did us a bad turn," for if we cannot deal with our emotions we are in great danger of being possessed by them. Either we have to find a creative way to integrate what comes up from the unconscious or we shall be possessed and bring about our own destruction. I might refer you to an interesting but truly dreadful book by C.S. Lewis called *The Hideous Strength*.

Before leaving the lion as a solar animal, Gubernatis mentions the fable of the lion in the book titled *Tuti-Name*. The *Tuti-Name* is a translation and, in part, a paraphrase, both in Persian and Turkish, of the Hindu *Cuka-Saptatī*, meaning the seventy stories of the parrots. Gubernatis says:

In the *Tuti-Name* we have the fable of the lion (instead of the wolf) that accuses the lamb, and the lion who is afraid of the ass, of the bull... and of the lynx. The Western lion-sun is now monstrous, now aged, now ill, now has a thorn in his foot, is now blind, and now foolish. The monstrous lion, who guards the monster's dwelling, the infernal abode, is found in a great number of popular stories. (de Gubernatis 1872, 157)

So, in conclusion for today, we note that the lion does not only symbolize the sun in its zenith (Leo in the zodiac) but the old lion can also be the sun whose power is waning and setting in the West. We must speak here briefly of a symbol that really belongs in our fourth class, the Egyptian Lion of Aker. At midnight he is the double lion, the sun on his back, and he represents yesterday and tomorrow, the two horizons, East and West, and therefore the very moment of transformation.

XXIX

The Lion as a Symbol of Power

Lecture Nine: January 27, 1958

Last week we spoke very briefly about the biological background of the lion and then of the lion as a solar symbol, the first of our four classes of symbolism. In this first class the lion appears as a symbol of the sun and of the fiery lion of our emotions. We also mentioned the fertility of Egypt thanks to the inundations of the Nile coupled with the heat of the sun. So we come now to our second class, the lion as a symbol of power. Here we encounter the chief quality that has always been projected onto the lion: power and strength as the king of the beasts. For example, we find the lion as a symbol of the power of kingship in many primitive tribes, in the kings of Babylon and Assyria, in the myth of Hercules, the story of Samson, as the insignia of the Roman Imperium, on the shields of knights in the Middle Ages, on the shield of nations, states, and cantons, right down to the present where lions appear on the insignias of cars, movie companies, household products, and the like.

One of the best known and earliest examples of the lion as a symbol of power is the lion of Judah, a prophecy or pre-form, as it were, of Christ. We hear about the powerful man Judah as a lion first in Chapter Forty-nine of Genesis where Jacob blesses his sons just before his death and warns them of their probable future. The first three sons he heavily criticizes, then comes Judah, who is the first to be praised:

Judah, thou art he whom your brethren shall praise: thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee. Judah is a lion's whelp:

from the prey, my son, thou art gone up:

he stooped down, he couched as a lion,

and as an old lion; who shall rouse him up? The sceptre shall not depart from Judah,

nor a lawgiver from between his feet,

Until Shiloh come;

and unto him shall the gathering of the people be. Binding his foal unto the vine,

and his ass's colt unto the choice vine;

he washed his garments in wine,

and his clothes in the blood of grapes:

His eyes shall be red with wine,

and his teeth white with milk.

(Genesis 49:8–12)

I read this lengthier passage because I wanted to bring in the part about the milk. I will explain this later.

In *Symbols of Transformation* Jung says:

The onslaught of instinct then becomes an experience of divinity, provided that man does not succumb to it and follow it blindly, but defends his humanity against the animal nature of the divine power. It is a "fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God," and "whoso is near unto me, is near unto the fire, and whoso is far from me, is far from the kingdom;" for "the Lord is a consuming fire," [and] the Messiah is "the Lion of the tribe of Judah." (Jung 1967, par. 524)

The devil, too, "as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour" (Jung 1967, par. 525). Numerous examples show that the lion as a symbol of power is an analogy very much at home in early Judeo-Christian teachings.

We see the lion here as the terrible side of God following the idea of the greatest heat in the zodiac. Jung compares the lion of Judah to the passages about actual fire, and indeed these are the passages he often quotes to show that facing an encounter with the Self needs downright heroism.

In the days when Dr. Jung was in the full swing of his practice one could see how people dealt with the transference, one of the most difficult tasks of individuation. During the approximately thirty years I have spent here I have seen the fates of more than a generation of analysands and observed that those who stood the transference are those who, at least to some extent, have gone on. While those who were afraid and prematurely bailed out were those who perhaps abandoned the whole thing. Standing the fire of the emotions is the one thing that gets one near to the fire of the psychological Self. Some people, of course, have a strong moral sense and then the fire means accepting the shadow.

As Jung has often pointed out, there are two main urges in mankind: sexuality (which Freud took up and made the one and only) and power (which Adler proved equally convincingly and one-sidedly). In this class I would like, as much as possible, to keep to the power aspect, although we see in the other classes that the lion is just as much a symbol of sexual desire. (To limit it to sex is perhaps narrowing it a little too much. We could also, for instance, include the various forms of greed.) In speaking of these two urges, Jung pointed out that one was as difficult as the other. He said that people with a feeling of inferiority were usually possessed by power, whereas those possessed by sex had rather the attitude of: "Oh, I can afford it," and would allow themselves something outrageous. He pointed out that sufferers from these two forms of possession misjudge each other appallingly, for the power people are convinced that the others are trying to get them down and are only moved by prestige, whereas those possessed by sex tend to assume that others are moved by motives similar to their own.

These urges or possessions are not connected indissolubly with any kind of psychological type, nor do they ever occur uncontaminated by their opposite. Usually the shadow is reversed here in relation to the conscious personality, and the more pronounced the conscious urge, the more autonomous will the shadow be. (I mean here that someone who is always seeking power and prestige will have a shadow in the opposite urge without knowing it at all, but to pursue this theme would lead us far from our lion into the whole subject of plots.)

I would like to turn again to de Wit where he cites a victorious hymn of Tut Moses III. We read: "I have arranged that they see your Majesty like a lion (with his terrible glance) that transforms his enemies into corpses in their valleys" (de Wit 151, 20). A few pages later we read: "The beautiful golden ring, with the seal of Horemheb, has on one of its facets a passing lion with the motto 'master of his valiance' (literally, master of the sword or strong arm)" (de Wit 151, 23). In a papyrus of "Anastasi I" there is mention of a letter sent to the court to appease or rejoice in the lion, the king. Here king and lion are identical and he is further spoken of as the lion that is against Syria and as the terrifying lion pursuing his enemies. Again it is stated: "His Majesty is like an enraged lion tearing those who oppose him in pieces with his hands." That would be a parallel to Hercules, who tore the Nemean lion to pieces bare-handed (de Wit 151, 27).

What do you think these complete identifications of the lion with Pharaoh mean psychologically? We have here the deification of the lion or the king as the Self, not of the ego. Whereas Hitler tried to become the lion of Germany (which was the most awful inflation of the ego), the deification of the king (or the king's powers) in the original primitive tribe was absolutely essential to ensure survival. The Pharaoh was really the representative of the divine on earth and had the whole hierarchy behind him. On the other hand, Hitler's regime vanished into smoke, for it was a governing body rooted in an intensely neurotic system in which power went pathological, or even psychopathic, and eventually blew itself out.

In a previous lecture I mentioned the dream of a woman in which she had sexual relations with a stag and how Jung took the opportunity to point

out that, through neglect, her sexuality had become animal-like. But he also said that it should not be forgotten that if anyone could go so far beyond the human as to be able to meet the animal, that they were also capable of going above the human and meeting the god. We met that idea of the god and the animal in Egypt, where nearly all the gods in the papyri and on the walls of the graves of the kings have animal heads. I would again like to refer to Hugh de St. Victor where he says that man stands between the animal and the god and needs to be aware of both as far as this is possible.

In his Visions Seminar Jung speaks of apotropaic symbols for warding off evil influences, mentioning how in the East or in Africa (particularly in the old Arabic houses) they put a stuffed crocodile over the door for this purpose. He points out that our modern, rational version is a sign such as "Beware of the Dog" or "Hausieren verboten" ("No peddlers"). But on the temple gates in China one finds the lion motif, for there it is the lion spirits that terrify all evildoers who may approach the temple and its treasures (Jung 1997, 497).

Gubernatis notes:

The tiger and the lion have in India the same dignity and are both supreme symbols of royal strength and majesty. The tiger of men and the lion of men are two expressions equivalent to the prince, as the prince is supposed to be the best man.... [The strength of the tiger and lion] is strength that gives victory and superiority in natural relations; therefore the tiger and the lion, called king of the beasts, represent the king in civic social relations among men. The narasimhas of India was called, in the Middle Ages, the king par excellence; thus in Greece the king was also called leôn. (de Gubernatis 1872, 153f)

The myth of the lion and the tiger is essentially an Asiatic one, notwithstanding that a great part of it was developed in Greece, where lions and tigers were at one time well known, and, as in India, must have inspired something similar to that religious terror caused by oriental kings.

I must say that this is one of the few places where I have seen the tiger and the lion linked side by side, for as a general rule the lion represents the sun and heat, whereas the tiger represents the dark and the feminine. But it is interesting here to see the two together.

Gubernatis's *Zoological Mythology* was published in 1872. Since Schliemann only began his excavations at Mycenae in 1871 and Evans in Crete first in 1901, the book was written without the knowledge discovered by these two. And so Gubernatis, presumably, was not aware that the influence of Asia on Greece probably really went via Crete. At all events, a great many ideas and much of the Greek culture is now proven to have come from Crete. Similar to the motif of the lion on the temple gates of China terrifying intruders we find the famous lion gate at Mycenae, where it is written: "I have the king of beasts. I am the king. Tremble and submit."

Mycenae was the town and castle of Agamemnon, just as Sparta was of Menelaus, and it strikes me as very interesting that the lion should guard the fatal portals of Menelaus's city. Most of you have probably read John Erskine's *The Private Life of Helen of Troy* and will remember how Agamemnon took over the role of the lion and went to Troy to avenge his brother Menelaus (whose wife had been carried off by Paris). It cost him his anima, and then it cost him his very life, for he had been forced to sacrifice his daughter, Iphigenia, to appease Artemis, who was so enraged about him shooting a stag in one of her groves that she delayed his fleet. Thus, to live the lion in his power aspect, he had had to sacrifice his individual anima. However, my idea may be far-fetched, for the Lion Gate of Mycenae could well be of a more recent date than Agamemnon.

We find the same theme in *Faust*. As Jung has pointed out, Faust's failure with Gretchen in Part I led him into power in Part II, and even when he does touch with Helen of Troy, the outcome is disastrous because Euphorion is incapable of meeting life. Both stories prove the incompatibility of love and power. It is not significant to us whether the story of Agamemnon is historically true or not, for here we are interested in its psychological ramifications.

De Wit also writes:

The first Egyptologists, Champollion at their head, thought that the sphinx was a unique representation of the solar god. Mariette was the first to recognize that it was an image of the king. At the beginning, the sphinx may only have been a lion in charge of the temple gates. If a head (which was invariably that of the king) is added to the body of a lion, then it is the king himself who guards the temple he has founded: his strength is symbolized by the body of the lion, and his intelligence by the human head on the animal body. (de Wit 1951, 39f)

This formulation is really of an admirable simplicity. We may not think in that simple, direct way, but if you think of the Sphinx, this description is appropriate.

In his conclusion de Wit says:

The sphinx is not only a lion provided with the head of the king, but a lion through whose animal nature the anthropomorphic divinity manifests. The incarnation of the divine shows in the human face, the accent being on the divine. The "lion with a human head" is a being that disposes of eternity. But we cannot follow Kristensen who goes too far in our opinion when he declares that the lion with the human face is originally a symbol of the sun-god and that the royal sphinx is nothing but a simplification of the double sphinx of Aker.... In Egypt the lions and sphinx placed before the doors of the temples follow the evolutions, that make the temple the image of heaven on earth and make the temple gates the door to the other world.

The double lion assimilates himself to these gates and becomes by that very fact the guardian of the other world under diverse names: Aker, Shou/Tefenet, Routi, Yesterday and Tomorrow, the mountains of Manou and Bakhou, and so forth. If you take the general meaning of the [hieroglyphic] sign and [the lion as] guardian of the doors of the horizon where the daily resurrection of the sun-god takes place, the double lion (at first but the simple deposit of the secrets of the Beyond) is slowly assimilated to the sun-god himself. (de Wit 1951, 464)

One should add here something of what de Wit notes, namely that the Egyptians express with one word the horizons east and west, the other world, the temple, and the darkness of the night (de Wit 1951, 71). Thus when the royal sphinx guards the entrance, it does not only guard the Temple but the whole mystic world where there is no sun, in other words, the unconscious.

In the first part of these lectures on the serpent and the lion we often found the serpent representing the deity per se. That the lion – as indeed many other animals – should do so in Egypt is well known. Shou is a lion god and Sechmet and Tefnut are lion goddesses and, in common with other animals, are deified in Egypt. But the lion at the gate of eternity strikes me as rather surprising.

What do you think could be the psychological reason for regarding the lion on the gate of the temple as the entrance to the unconscious?

Unless we can accept emotion and instinct, we cannot be open to transformation. That is why purely intellectual people are sometimes so infantile. We have to come to terms with the lion – the instinct – for after all one cannot take any big step in life such as marriage, death, or a very difficult examination unless one's instinct and emotionality helps one – examinations excepted, perhaps. But I once heard Dr. Jung give an examination here and I can assure you that no intellect would have got you through that exam! It is interesting to think of the Temple, or the Church, as not only the entrance to eternity but also to the big steps in life such as christening, confirmation, marriage, and burial – although these no longer always take place in the Church today.

When we come to our third class of symbolism we shall refer to a passage in the *Mysterium Coniunctionis* where Jung says that the fiery lion – a passionate emotion – is a preliminary stage to the realization of unconscious contents. So it is absolutely necessary to brave the lion, that is, to overcome one's emotions before one can enter the unconscious, or eternity. So the lion gates guarding the portals to eternity make enormous sense. I also propose bringing long extracts from the same book in the fourth class of symbolism, as *Mysterium Coniunctionis* will not be

translated into English for some time since there are a number of other volumes that will be translated first.¹

Naturally, overcoming the lion requires unusual courage and I would like very briefly to sketch Grimm's fairy tale of *The King's Son Who Knew No Fear*, where a lion guards a gate and where the hero behaves somewhat differently than Hercules did to the lion he conquered. The story goes something like this:

There was once a king's son who got so bored at home that he went out to seek adventure in the world. In the course of time he came to a giant's castle, where he sat down and rested. In the giant's yard were some enormous bowling balls and skittles as big as a man, and having nothing much else to do, he began to amuse himself with them. The giant, hearing the racket outside, looked out and behold, there was a normal-sized man. Astonished, he asked the man where he got his strength, and the king's son told him that he was in fact so strong that he could do anything he wanted. The giant was amazed and impressed, in particular because he immediately saw the solution to his own dilemma. He asked the prince if he would fetch an apple from the Tree of Life standing in the middle of a magnificent garden which his bride had asked for. He himself had no idea where the tree was to be found, as he had searched for the garden in vain. The king's son was convinced he could tackle the task, but the giant said it would not be so easy, for the garden was surrounded by an iron fence, and wild animals stood before the gate posting guard. They would not let anyone in, and if one managed to get into the garden, and even if one could see the apple hanging on the tree, one could not just pick it. No, one had to put one's hand through a ring suspended on the tree, and that was a feat no one had ever managed. But the king's son was certain he could complete the task.

So off he trekked through field and wood, across mountain and valley, and at last came to the grounds of the castle surrounding the magic garden entrusted to the guard of those formidable animals. But to his great fortune all of the animals just happened to be asleep, so he gingerly stepped over them, scaled the fence, and in the middle of the garden came upon the Tree of Life with red apples glowing with light. And there too was the ring. He climbed the tree, put his hand right through the ring, and nimbly plucked the apple. The ring fastened tightly round his arm and he felt a mighty strength surge through his body.

Preferring a direct exit to climbing back over the fence, he took hold of the gate, shook it powerfully until it burst open, and marched on through. The lion who had been sleeping in front of the gate woke up and sprang toward him, not – of all things – in rage, but actually as an animal to his master.

So the lion joined the king's son, who brought the apple to the giant saying that it had cost him no trouble at all. More than delighted, the giant hurried to give the apple to his bride, a beautiful and clever girl. But as there was no ring on his arm, she simply could not believe he had fetched the apple himself.

The giant then mumbled that, much to his dismay, he had forgotten the ring while plucking the apple and that he would just slip back to the garden and fetch that ring with no further ado. He reckoned that if that little man did not give it to him willingly, he could always take it by force. The giant went to the prince, tried to pull the man's heartstrings

– after all the apple and the ring would always want to remain together – but the king's son would have nothing of it and refused to yield. So in his frustration – and with no other ideas anyway in his head – the giant attacked the prince straight out, and the two wrestled a long time. In fact, much to the giant's surprise, a surprisingly long time. Now, due to the magic strength of the king's son, the giant could not overcome him, so the giant had to turn to a trick. Requesting a break in the wrestling match, the giant suggested that they bathe in the river near by and cool themselves off. The king's son, naive as the day is long, suspected no harm, went right over to the river, took off his clothes along with the ring and plunged in for a swim. The giant seized the opportunity and the ring, and in no time was off with it under his arm. But the lion was watching the event and pursued him, caught up to him swiftly, wrenched the ring from his clutches and brought it back to his master. The giant, furious and desperate, took shelter behind a tree, and as the king's son was putting on his clothes, he sprang forth and put out the prince's eyes.

The prince, now blinded, did not know what to do. Not only was the prince naive, but he did not seem to learn much from experience, because the giant came and the king's son allowed himself to be taken by the hand and kindly led to safety. But the giant brought him a couple of steps from the edge of a high cliff, quietly released his hand, and departed, convinced that the fatal step was close at hand and the prince would plunge to his death. The faithful lion – true to his master – rushed to the scene and pulled his master back from the final step. When the giant returned to rob the dead man, he saw his trick had failed. Gigantically angry, he led the blind man to the edge of the precipice once more, only to have the lion rescue him again. The third time, however, when the prince and the giant approached the edge and the giant released the blind man, the lion pounced on him and pushed him over the edge, where he plunged to his demise.

The faithful animal then led his master to a tree beside a clear stream. The blind man sat down and the lion, with his paws, sprinkled his face with a few drops of the water. Scarcely had the water touched his face than the prince could see a bit of light and shadow, and he could just make out a bird flying by which – distracted by the scene below – accidentally crashed into the trunk of a tree. Now blinded as well, the bird stumbled over to the stream, bathed itself in the waters, and flew away through the trees, its sight restored. The king's son took note of the revelation given to him by God, went to the stream and bathed his own face. And soon his eyes could see clearly once again.

Then the prince expressed his thanks to God, and he and the lion went on their way together. Soon they came to an enchanted castle, and, naturally, at the entrance stood a beautiful girl. But a spell had been put upon her and her skin was as if cast in gloomy shadow. She pleaded with the king's son to deliver her from her curse. The prince was eager to please but learned that he would have to spend three nights in the grand hall of the fortress, remaining fearless if tormented. Only if he withstood the torture, uttering not even the slightest cry, would she be redeemed. She also promised that he would not be killed.

The king's son entered the grand hall just after dark. At midnight demons came out of all corners and a terrible ruckus ensued. They behaved as though they didn't see him, made a fire in the middle of the room, sat about it, dealt out cards, and started to play their wild games. Whenever one of them didn't win, he argued that there was someone present who did not belong to them. The noise grew to a tumult, but the king's son sat quietly. At last the demons saw him, sprang on him, punched and pulled him to the ground, and hit and tormented him. There were so many of them that it was hopeless, so he did not attempt to defend himself but sat still and never uttered a sound. Toward morning they left him beaten and so exhausted that he could scarcely move. The girl came to him bringing a small bottle containing a magical revitalizing water with which she washed him, and soon his aches and pains left him and he felt strength again stream through his veins. The girl said he had stood one night but that he would have to go through two more. Then she departed. But he noticed that her feet had been freed of the shadow of sheer darkness and had taken on their normal hue.

The next night the demons returned to their beastly games, attacking the king's son more brutally than before. They now began to inflict his body with gaping wounds. But he withstood it all, and with the dawn the girl returned and healed him with the water. As she left he saw to his joy that the color of her body had returned up to her fingertips.

The third night was the worst. When the devils came and saw that he was still there they said that they would torment him until he couldn't breathe. They tossed him about the room like a rag doll and went after him trying to tear him to pieces. But he bore it all without a sound. At last they gave up and departed, leaving him lying senseless in the hall. He could not even open his eyes to look at the girl when she came in to bathe him

with that magical water. But with the washing of his wounds, the pain soon receded and he felt fresh and healthy as though he had woken from a deep sleep. And when he opened his eyes and saw the girl standing beside him, she was as beautiful and light as the day. She told him to stand up and swing his sword three times over the steps, which then delivered the castle from the curse. The girl was a rich princess. (How could it be otherwise?) Then the servants came and said that the table was laid in the grand hall and food prepared. So they sat down and ate and drank together and, no sooner said than done, their marriage was celebrated with great rejoicing that very evening. (This fairy tale has many details but I only propose to deal with the part taken by the lion in this story.)

In the many hundreds of years since the myth of Hercules, the idea of the hero overcoming the lion has undergone a change. The lion defeated is no longer killed but becomes the preserver and protector, and here the two become faithful friends. But we must not think that the theme of conquering the lion is now today outdated. It is as pertinent as ever. However, more advanced individuals have to go further with the task and not just subjugate and overcome the lion, that is, the emotions, but join and cooperate with them.

I would like to ask you what it means psychologically that the giant is the first person whom the hero meets when he leaves the court. It is not just a question of a contest of strength, for the prince evidences more than enough physical prowess right from the beginning as he bowls with "king-size" skittles in the giant's garden. Now, as we know, giants are above all notably limited in their intelligence. They are, as it were, stuck in denseness, bulk and blind emotionality and do not go through the process of individuation. One could say that the giant in our story is stuck halfway, he is of human form but short on insight and foresight, so he is a kind of miscarriage lacking those human qualities which would enable him to find the apple himself. Furthermore, the giant's bride in the story is an aspect of the anima that has to be separated off, for she is fully unsatisfied with him. As for the lion, there is no wickedness. He simply follows the laws of nature in contradistinction to the human, who has lost the obedience of the animal and is so often wayward in his manner.

I would compare the giant with the "isms," something that has stuck halfway and lacks intelligence. In his discussion of Wotan in *Contemporary Events*, Jung says that the individuation process got lost in Germany (Jung 1978, pars. 371–399 & 412f). It got projected onto the whole country and thus, engulfed in collectivity, it came to a negative end. Dr. von Franz recently said to me that here the lion could be said to represent purely instinctive emotion while the giant would represent the emotions contaminated by a neurotic system such as communism, Nazism or terrorism. You meet the same thing in a paranoid with a persecution complex. Many people work out a whole system of the way in which they consider that they are being persecuted. Nations can even go so far as to think that people of other nationalities, cultures or creeds are determined to undermine and destroy them. This neurotic conviction was prevalent in Nazi propaganda. Such a paranoid system of ideas removes the possibility of a real individuation.

Jung once made some investigations of a family where there was a certain amount of inherited psychosis and showed that the greater the psychosis, the nearer that person was, in a way, to the process of individuation. For if those people had just been able to stand the impact of the emotions and the unconscious, they could have held through. If the morass is not too much and can be drained, those are just the people who can find their way through because they are so much nearer the unconscious. In my youth, the peasants in Ireland were often furious because the squire was so wealthy and had so many more chances in life than they. They even at times hid themselves behind a hedge or whatever and tried to shoot him. That was in a way decent and fair, as it entailed honest and personal engagement and a fair target. I remember meeting two Irish people in the Riviera and they said how exciting Ireland was now becoming, for you could go to a teashop and see some terrorist act where somebody got killed, whereas on the continent one went to a teashop and got nothing but cakes! It is all right that the individual resents the lion. But if it falls into a system, an "ism" like communism or terrorism, resentment of the rich becomes evil, for it has neither the innocence of the lion nor the humanity of the individual.

Now, instead of the animals being on guard at the garden gate, they are all resting when the king's son arrives; thus we can assume that he is instinctually well in tune with the unconscious. It does seem to be on his side, as he appears just at the right time and can pick his way without problems through and over the animals. There is the same idea when we see how the ring (which has prevented everybody else from picking the apple) just closes round his arm and gives him added strength. He is the right person, for he is more innocent, courageous, conscious, determined and humane than the giant.

In climbing over the fence at the garden the prince goes around the complex that I should say was represented by the fence railings. The lion as the doorkeeper might have been awake, and it would have been very different if the prince had come as an intruder attempting to directly enter the castle gardens. Very often the complex cannot be attacked straight on, for that would be too frightening and upsetting. A detour has to be made to get behind it and see what is there before you can overcome it. Some years ago I had an analysand who had a most terrible racial problem. She lived in Africa and simply disdained the blacks, which was simply nothing other than the projection of her own shadow. If I had attacked the problem frontally it would have got us nowhere, so we had to leave it to the side and slowly pick apart her shadow. Only with experience of her own shadow could I suggest that the dark things in herself of which she was learning and disliked so much might be the basis of her projections onto the blacks whom she uncontrollably belittled. She wasn't too pleased about the idea, but she did get it, although the projection was not so quickly overcome. I could also give you an example of a situation where I could not go straight at the problem. When I was a painter I could not face doing anything with my paintings. I was introverted, and a visit to a dealer meant a sleepless night. One winter in Paris I made up my mind that because I was so afraid I just had to force myself to go and see a dealer once a week. But all I accomplished was to increase my feelings of inferiority by my continued failure to see them. It is really important at times not to try to enter through the front door! Jung made just one attempt when somebody in Bern offered me an exhibition, but then he saw that I got into such a panic that it was impossible and that the problem could not be attacked straight on. Now, today I could do it without difficulty. If I have to go and see an editor, that does not upset me. But then I was only interested in the paintings, and having to discuss them with unsympathetic and dishonest dealers was too much. In a similar manner, if the man had gone straight up to the lion he might not have succeeded.

One must remember that these fairy tales do not show actual processes of individuation, for there is no real individual in these stories. The stories portray a prototype of the ego and a prototype of the way the individual has to go. The initial detour around the lion shows us the importance of skirting an emotion that is too powerful.

In conclusion for the day, I would like to speak for a moment about the significance approaching the lion from the inside instead of from the outside as previous invaders had attempted. Having gained the apple and the ring, the prince can now walk out of the front door from within. One could compare the lion to a fierce watchdog employed to keep out intruders. Behind this violent emotional complex is a great treasure, and the apple and the ring are aspects of the Self that you need in order to be able to face the complex. For when you possess them, the lion becomes like a tame dog. It then leads, as dogs do the blind, but this can only happen where the Self is needed to overcome the animus or anima or the emotions – or any complex – and the ego is too weak to do it alone. The king's son has something of the Self about him instead of the ego; he has the apple and the ring from the Tree of Life. Therefore the lion welcomes him instead of killing him and will be faithful to him as long as he retains his right relationship to the anima and is faithful to her.

Lecture Ten: February 3, 1958

Last week we spoke of the lion as a symbol of power and I gave various quotations from Jung, Gubernatis and de Wit. We spoke of the lion of Judah, the lion as a symbol of the Pharaoh in Egypt, the lion identical with the king and as the Sphinx, and finally the lion as the guardian of the gate. We found the lion not only stationed at the portals of earthly bastions in Egypt or Mycenae, or for instance at the temple entrance in China, but also posted as the guardian of the Beyond, at the Gates of Eternity or, as we would say, the unconscious.

In illustration of this latter point we took Grimm's fairy tale *The King's Son Who Knew No Fear*, where the lion was the guardian at the gate of the garden where the Tree of Life stood. We got to the place where the hero comes from the center and goes out by the door and is thus welcomed by the lion in humble admiration instead of being torn to pieces as would probably have been the case if he had come from outside as an intruder. The two then join together to encounter the giant.

Someone in the class posed the question as to how the king's son could be a hero if he knew no fear. This made me realize that it has not yet been fully grasped that fairy tales do not represent personal individuals but, in the form of individual experiences, show collective archetypal patterns and prototypes of various qualities and possibilities. There is usually a prototype of the ego. But here you cannot really say that the hero is a prototype of the ego, but rather a prototype of the hero that the ego can strive toward. The king's son here represents the archetype of "the hero without fear," an attitude that one must achieve if one is to face the unconscious. As Jung has said, getting into a panic when meeting the unconscious is the one great danger; the panic is the danger and not the unconscious content. To some extent we must get to the attitude of having no fear, and this fearlessness is what the king's son in our story represents. Undoubtedly the individual has to go through fear, but the king's son does not represent an individual. In the human individual, courage won from fear perhaps represents a higher achievement than the bravery of the man who has little imagination. But in our story the king's son represents a quality absolutely necessary for overcoming the giant and the lion.

The ring has been the obstacle to gaining the apple for most people, but to the king's son it gave great strength. It wielded a magical power so great that the giant – enormously powerful

– could not defeat the prince in direct battle. On the other hand, neither could the king's son overcome him. Why do you think that the king's son was willing to give the apple to the giant but refused to give the ring? I would say that the apple represents more the physical and the sexual side, whereas the ring is a symbol of relationship and of union. It unites the hero with the strength of the lion. If he had given the ring to the giant, there would have been a premature union between the giant (emotions) and the anima without going through the suffering and forging of his emotions which takes place at the end of the story. By holding onto the ring, the hero reserves the *coniunctio* with the anima for himself in a full and proper way at the end of the story. The giant is a psychological part of the man that is quite incapable of dealing properly with eros, so the hero refuses to offer the ring – *coniunctio* – up to him.

In our next incident in the story the giant tries a trick, suggesting that they refresh themselves by bathing in the river. When the king's son has taken off his clothes, the giant steals the ring. Hitherto the innocence of the hero has stood him in good stead, enabling him to do the things that he would not have dared to undertake had he been more aware. But that he is ignorant of such trickery is dangerous. Knowing nothing of deceit or cunning, he takes off the ring before plunging into the river and so falls into the giant's trap. But the lion, who up till now has been but friendly like a dog, now takes over the active role and retrieves the ring. The giant who lured the king's son into the water can be said to have a one-sided attitude, while the lion here is a symbol representing both sides. The important thing is the good relationship between the lion and the hero, who is now led by instinct instead of naivete or neurosis.

When the king's son bathes in the water, that is, takes the first real step in the story to enter unclothed into the unconscious, the ego is not enough. It is too one-sided; it knows nothing of the dark, so the prince can no longer just control the lion but has to submit to its spiritual guidance. In fairy tales we often have the motif of the rescuing helpful animal, and here the lion has become the divine guide. If the lion had not been actually in the hero's life, he would have been overcome by it. Hercules after overcoming the Nemean lion wore the skin to show that he had the lion's strength. But the king's son who strives toward true eros, that is, genuine relationship, goes a step further. To make friends with one's instinct and lion-like emotionality, and to tame it and integrate it into one's life, this is something more than merely overcoming it. Having decided to take on the task of keeping the ring and now entering a real encounter with the unconscious, the hero can no longer control the lion but is forced to follow him as his spiritual guide.

If the king's son had remained on the dry land they might have just gone on with the fight, and with the strength of the ring he might perhaps have overcome the giant. But because he enters the unconscious, he has to go beyond human reasoning and be led by the instinctive or spiritual animal guide. Whereupon the giant promptly puts out his eyes.

Those who have read the notes of Dr. Jung's seminar in 1925 will remember his description of the active imagination in which he had to kill Siegfried, the hero (Jung 1925, 70f). He describes it as destroying his heroic ideal of efficiency, that is, his superior function. One cannot go on in the unconscious with the superior function alone, so when the giant blinds the hero, it is this superiority and efficiency that he attacks. We took the giant as representing a neurotic system of ideas such as Communism or any of the other "isms," and if the giant puts out his eyes, then that would be similar to the collective "isms" that blind the individual. This is the actual symbol that substantiates what we said rather theoretically at the beginning about the giant being such an "ism." Here the giant imparts himself (his own stupidity) to the hero and literally blinds him – just as the "isms" blind us, for we see nothing when caught in a system.

I once worked in analysis with a woman who was a communist. It was all but impossible to reach her at all as an individual personality, for she was completely identified with her convictions. She had a dream of a squadron of airplanes approaching from Russia which flew over her with hostile intent, each displaying a red light. I said that Jungian psychology and Communism were probably incompatible. And if you took the Jungian approach seriously and dreamed that such a squadron of airplanes came over from a Communist country with destructive intent, then you would have to admit that this squadron was a part of you that was destructive and that you had to do something about. But, as she said, she had "settled the animus problem," "had only to work on the shadow now," and if there was to be nothing but a repetition of the same old stuff... well then she would not go on! As long as she was identical with the mental system, talking was to no avail. If she could have separated herself just a little from the collective convictions that ruled within her, it would have been different. But a book she had written was then accepted for publication, paying her well, so she stayed with the communists. So let's go back to our story.

After the giant has blinded the hero he tries to kill him, but the lion gets hold of his master's clothes and pulls him back, as a dog (trained to lead the blind) would do. But the second time the lion directly attacks the giant and pushes him over the precipice; thus the giant, instead of the hero, meets his death. Here the healthy instinct overcomes the neurotic system. Nature cures her own diseases if we let her. We see that the healthy instinct of the lion overcomes the unhealthy, swollen-up attitude of the giant. After the third rescue attempt, the hero recognizes the evil in the giant and the beneficence of the lion, so here instinct is able to triumph. You can see this phenomenon often in analysis. If a person will not get too upset but concentrate on understanding what is happening and not meddle too much, then healthy forces in the unconscious overcome the neurosis, similar to the process in physical disease. What the doctor really does is put himself on the side of the healthy forces in the body, and then together they complete the cure. I remember talking to an old doctor who was well over seventy and who had been brought up in the South of the United States. His parents had not been very much concerned with him. The person who had taken a real interest in him as a youth had been an old Negro

who had previously lived on the plantations and who passed on to him the most extraordinary instinctive wisdom. The doctor was actually far more an exceptionally good "medicine man" and not a "normal" doctor. When he came to me he was very much upset because younger men had set up practice in his town with all modern equipment which he knew nothing about. He began to slip increasingly into feelings of inferiority, began to lose the healing capacities he really had, and eventually, feeling a bit defeated, left his town for a while. When he came back, it was quite extraordinary how some of the colleagues – who had previously told him he knew nothing and should retire – came to him admitting that while he had been away they had realized something was missing in their approach. They grasped how little they knew about the whole human being and how they had only been looking at the disease. And now they turned back to him to learn. He had acquired from the Negroes the wisdom of how to let nature cure. Afterward the medical practitioners of the town found a decent *modus vivendi* with each other.

I want to emphasize that I hold the achievements of modern medicine and science in esteem, because there is no doubt of their effectiveness in treating certain illnesses, extending life expectancy, and so forth. But, nevertheless, they are inclined to look only at the disease and not at the human. And it is not medicine alone, but something within the individual, that determines whether we heal or not.

Another point I would like to mention is that the hero has been obliged for the first time to realize that the giant is deceitful and a thief. The two were to resume the fight again after the swim, but the prince was so naive that it did not occur to him that anything else could happen. The realization of the giant's evil brought about a consciousness that made it possible for the lion to overcome the giant. Jung says in his paper on synchronicity that there seems to be an absolute knowledge in the unconscious with which the animal in particular can get in touch. Occasionally one can even do it oneself. Once I went for a walk on the Dorsetshire Downs with two people who wanted to see a ghost. We were looking for ghosts out in the darkness on these Downs because they are supposed to be haunted, but we found nothing and got nowhere except completely lost! The man in the party pointed out the North Star, but as we did not know whether we had to go east or west that wasn't much help. And the girl who should have known the way because it was her own country was equally disoriented. So after awhile there was nothing left to do but for me to turn inward to the image of the horse who can always find its way home. I went down into myself in search of that animal instinct and was able to find the way straight home. That is an apt illustration of a connection via the "inner animal" to a deeper source of instinctual knowledge within us.

When the king's son is blinded, the lion leads his master to a tree beside a clear stream and, with his paw, sprinkles the blind man's eyes with a few drops of the water. This enables the hero to see sufficiently well to observe a bird who is momentarily blinded by flying into a tree. The bird then goes and dips in the water and afterward flies away cured, so the prince bathes his face and eyes and thus his sight is restored. But how did the lion know about the healing water?

The lion was the guardian of the door to that paradisiacal garden and therefore not a stranger to the secrets of the Beyond. Thus his access to water, which vivifies, renews and heals. Of course it is also a further illustration of nature healing herself. With the waters of nature the damage done by the giant is healed. Here the lion has become even more the spiritual guide. We will pursue the lion as a symbol of healing and resurrection in our third and fourth classes of symbolism and will limit ourselves here to saying that the animal urge – sexual desire or the lust for power or greed – can be transformed into an equally strong urge for consciousness. The greed to understand is far more constructive than the greed for something that but partially satisfies or even disappoints when one finally has it. Only when actually blinded was the hero able to realize his plight. Hitherto he had been a bit overconfident, but now he has to depend on the lion and humbly follow his instinct. His sight is evidently quite different when given back to him by the sagacity of the lion, for from now on we hear nothing special about the lion; hereafter he essentially returns to his role of the accompanying animal. We are told that once the hero regains his sight, he and his lion journey onwards and come to the princess's enchanted castle.

When the prince arrives at the palace he is again the right man in the right place at the right time. You will remember that this anima figure is cast in darkness, and in order to redeem her the hero has to spend three nights in the hall of the castle. To free the princess he has to sit there without crying out or showing that he is afraid despite the fact that he sits in terror. The demons come out, play cards, and when they see him, they attack him in every possible way. Each night he is endlessly tortured by that horde of demons who cannot actually kill him. Each morning the princess finds him mauled and exhausted. She greets him with the revitalizing "water of life." And here he is revived just as he was when the lion fetched the water that cured his blindness. He endures with a wonderful quality of courage. In the beginning of the story his bravery is more or less unconscious. But he begins to learn real courage, tenacity, and the endurance of suffering when he must hold out those three nights of terror.

Three different aspects of the anima can be seen in the figures of the giant's bride, the lion and the princess. The lion first killed the giant – freeing not only the prince but in a sense also the ogre's bride – and then applied the water to the prince's eyes. Now the subsequent repetition of the water motif, this time dispensed by the princess, shows that she has taken over the lion's role. Bride-lion-princess are three different levels of the same thing, and when the hero joins together with the lion instinct, the anima can begin to move to a higher level and become positive. When we dream of an animal it means that we are unconscious of it. The lion here is more on the unconscious level of the emotions and represents the fiery relationship. Both lion and princess are instinctive, irrational and warm; neither is coldly intellectual. The princess is the higher level of development, thus it is not surprising that when the princess appears the lion symbol retires. But both revive the hero with the water of life, both serve life in its fullest sense (that is, intellectual and emotional), and both are purveyors of spiritual development. (The anima is that part of the man that entangles him in life. His intellect and logos suffice for his work.)

Dr. Jung has described logos and eros by taking as illustration a building containing a number of offices. In the first is an astronomer who observes the sky all the time, in the second a professor who examines lice, and in the third a scientist examining feces (which is also interesting if that happens to be your cup of tea). Then, as representing eros, Dr. Jung takes the charwoman who cleans all the offices and talks of the tenants. The astronomer, she says, is not a nice man; he has no relations, he is cold, ignores her, and never gives her a tip. The professor who is concerned with lice is a kind man; he has a wife and family and occasionally gives her a little gift. And the scientist in that lab, well, she doesn't quite understand what he is getting paid for, but it is a shame that he is so alone because he seems to be a decent, hardworking man. That is how eros looks at life. It looks at people and asks if they are connected with others, or if they are cold and cut off like the astronomer. People get upset by their emotions, which forces them to attend their relationships and feelings, and that is represented here by the lion. And of course the anima is the principle of life and relationship.

A member of the course has asked me to explain in more detail the torment of the king's son in the hall of the castle and how his suffering would connect with the lion. I would say here that the lion and instinct, which worked so hard for the hero at the beginning, evolve into a higher level of the anima at the end. At the beginning the hero's courage is that of an unimaginative man. He left home out of boredom. Most fairy tales start with some kind of a quest, but this hero goes out for no other reason than to leave the monotony of his existence. He was so strong and courageous that he had long dealt with everything he could at his homestead, so fate then brings him to the first quest of getting the apple from the Tree of Life. He manages this through his instinct and inborn natural courage; he is, after all, a prince and a hero. But the final task in the grand hall of the castle is very much more difficult, for here the demons cannot be directly overcome. We are told that the multitude of demons is too great for him to be able to fight. Thus – at this point in his struggle – a tough fighting spirit, so essential at the beginning, fails to suffice. Dr. Jung has said that, broadly speaking, the man's way is to overcome by force, that is, by killing the dragon, while the woman's way is to overcome by enduring suffering. When

the demons assault our hero from all sides he will lose everything if he resists in the masculine way. He is obliged to produce the other side of courage, the feminine side. The first couple of times the prince was victorious more in the usual style of the hero (albeit the lion, not the hero, disposed of the giant). But now he not only finds the anima – herself cast in darkness presumably on account of his innocence to guile, plot and ruse – but he has to redeem her by taking over her role, by encountering for her an intense suffering that now must be withstood in a passive, persevering and undaunted way. He had to stay in the hall for three nights, undergo torment and pain, and never shout out or show fear. Herein is complete acceptance and the “feminine way” of dealing with suffering. In respect to emotional and spiritual development, this story goes much further than many.

Going back to the nature of the lion, I turn again to Gubernatis, who quotes an extract from the *Ramayana*, an Indian epic relating to Rama. He says:

[The lion's] royal nature is also shown in the *Râmâyanam* in which King Daçarathas says that his son Râmas, the lion of men, after his exile, will disdain to occupy the kingdom previously enjoyed by Bharatas, in the same way as the lion disdains to feed upon flesh which has been licked by other animals. It is perhaps for this reason that, in the fable, the lion's [share] means all of the prey. The proud one becomes the violent one, the tyrant, and hence the monster. (de Gubernatis 1872, 156)

The phrase “the lion's [share] means all the prey” alludes to the well-known fable where the lion hunts with three other animals. When a division of the quarry is to be made after the kill, the lion divides it into four parts saying: “The first part is mine because it is my part, the second is mine because I am the lion, the third is mine because I am the king of the beasts, and whichever of you three touches the fourth I shall kill immediately.” Whereas in the fairy tale we have seen him in his positive role, here we have him in his original nature. You can also witness here the fatally easy step from a powerful king to a tyrant. The most difficult thing in the world to handle is power. *Macht ist machen*: power is achievement and efficiency; power is making things happen. We can achieve and do something, but if power overcomes and possesses us, then the step is only too easy to be like the lion who wants all four shares. Power creeps up on one unawares. It is terribly tempting. And the other most difficult thing is perhaps sex, to which it is equally hard to have the right attitude.

I want to end the discussion of the second class of symbolism on the above note, because a lot of the lion is symbolically anything but positive. But the positive side of the lion symbol in these first two classes anticipates later symbolism. Our third class of symbolism then deals with the lion as a symbol of urge, desire, and possession.

XXX

The Lion as a Symbol of Urge, Desire, and Possession

The third class of symbolism is very difficult to separate from the second and fourth. In this class of motifs I am thinking primarily of the passionate sexual drive that the lion so often symbolizes. But one can just as well be possessed and driven by power as by sexuality. It is actually not possible to separate the examples neatly into power and sex. Moreover, this class necessarily overlaps with the fourth, because in the examples where the lion is overcome and its strength assimilated (as symbolized by Hercules wearing the Nemean lion's skin) the lion sometimes becomes spiritual mana rising to the highest level belonging to the fourth class.

In the legend of St. Marcellus, Gubernatis relates the story of a vision of the saint in which a lion kills a serpent (de Gubernatis 1872, 159). (This appearance was considered to presage good fortune for the enterprise of the Emperor Leo in Africa.) I would just like to point out the connection between serpent and lion here, for it brings out the fact that the lion as an animal instinct is on a higher level. The victory of the lion, who is warm-blooded and therefore nearer the human than the serpent, St. Marcellus regards as heralding good fortune. No doubt the name plays a role here: the Emperor Leo will overcome his enemies in Africa as his namesake overcomes the serpent. But Gubernatis continues:

Sometimes, on the other hand, hero and heroine become lion and lioness by the vengeance of deities or monsters. Atalanta defies the [suitors for] her hand to outstrip her in running, [yet] kills those who lose. Hippomenes, by the favor of the goddess of love, having received three apples from the garden of the Hesperides, provokes Atalanta to the race; on the way, he throws the apples down; Atalanta cannot resist the impulse to gather them up, and Hippomenes overtakes her and unites himself with her in the wood sacred to the mother of the gods; the offended goddess transforms the young couple into a lion and a lioness. (de Gubernatis 1872, 159f)

This story takes an interesting turn. What would you say was the reason, psychologically, for the earth goddess, the mother of the gods, turning this young couple into lions?

Here the ego has usurped that which belonged to the Self. This is a very common theme in fairy tales. The witch who represents the negative side of the goddess transforms any young person who annoys her into an animal (as we saw in the fairy tale of Prince Ring). It is such a common theme that again it is a bit ambivalent. The goddess objected to instinct overcoming them when they were in the holy precincts of love, so they were punished by being made identical with beasts of prey. They gave way to the purely animal urge in a sacred grove; thus they had to pay the consequences.

You remember the dream in Mrs. Jung's paper on the animus of the girl who had to take a bowl of blood to her ghostly lover every month until at last, through this sacrifice, the ghostly lover was himself transformed into the sacrificial bowl (E. Jung 1978, 33).³ But the Mother Goddess, similar to the witch, is always inclined to lycanthropy (that is, transforming herself into other forms, particularly into wolves), so it may have been only an excuse on her part.

We find the lion directly connected with sex in the following examples in Gubernatis:

Tvashtar, the creator, now of divine, now of monstrous forms, Tvashtar the lion, must necessarily create leonine forms. In a Tuscan story, the blacksmith makes a lion by means of which Argentofo penetrates by night into the room of a young princess with whom he unites himself. In the third story of the fourth book of the *Pentamerone*, the three prince brothers, when the fairy's curse is over, return home with their brides, drawn by six lions. This lion-seducer reminds us of Indras who was also a lion and a seducer of women. (de Gubernatis 1872, 155f)

Here the lion is entirely engaged in love affairs. He is either the disguise in which Argentofo seduces the princess or he represents the energy by which the bridegrooms take their brides home. Or Indras turns himself into a lion in his role of seducer of women.

An amusing dream was brought to me by a young man who was a very small person in every way. This young man actually thought of himself as quite a lion, a sort of Don Juan and Hercules rolled into one. Of course then nothing really worked. He had previously suffered from complete impotence but in the meantime had recovered to a certain extent. He had a wonderful dream where he thought that for once he would strip his bed and turn the mattress, and there under the mattress he found a lion. Now, since this man was not exactly a lion in any known way, we are inclined to reflect on the dream as a beautiful illustration of a *Salon-Löwe* (literally, "a living-room lion," a lady's man, a carpet knight). Things began to work more effectively when he modified his impressions of himself and accepted the simple man within. But the "lion under the bed" poignantly illustrated the attitude underneath his convictions regarding his sexual prowess. And here the whole thing had been put on the wrong basis.

My main example for the third and fourth classes comes from alchemy, where the lion plays a considerable role. For instance, we find the motif of its paws being cut off, a motif it shares with the mother, whose hands are cut off for a similar purpose. The image of the lion incestuously being swallowed by the mother is another motif we will pursue.

Although the connection between mother and lion will become clearer in the latter part of this lecture series, I should like here to give you a dream that, curiously enough, was sent to me just as I was preparing this part of the lectures. It is the dream of an older professional English woman who has a negative mother complex. (She is not, by the way, in the habit of sending me dreams.) She did very well professionally, but when she retired she felt she was too much on the surface of life, so she decided to seek more meaning in her concluding years. (Of late, she has done most meritorious active imagination on the animus.) She dreamed:

I open the door and enter the hall of a house where I used to live as a girl. A big lion comes rushing toward me. Mother is at the back of the hall and by alternately attracting the lion's attention we manage, first mother and then I, to get into a room and close the door. Grandmother also lives with us. For the first time I feel sympathy for her and go to warn her about the lion. This touches her and she wants to give me a picture from her wall which I am also moved by. But I say: "I cannot take that, you love it and will miss it." But I see that the picture depicts nothing but heavy clouds and mists. She answers: "I have passed through the mists and no longer need it." Then I look out into the hall and see people passing who do not appear to be afraid of the lion. In amazement I look at the lion. He has grown much smaller and now he seems little more than a playful, overgrown cub.

She included the following associations to the dream:

- "The lion is in striking contrast to my last animal symbol, which was a timid faun. Apparently his dangerous strength compensates in the unconscious for the weakness of the faun. Perhaps this is why the faun had to die."
- "By tricking the lion we manage to escape, but the lion is left in possession of the field and I am locked in a room with my mother, along with my old grandmother."
- "Years before she died, my grandmother gave up any attempt at outer adaptation and lived in an isolated miasma of moods, dreams, and complaints that roused opposition from the rest of the family."
- "Mother was 'father's daughter' and hated to be told that she in any way resembled her mother."
- "The picture of mists and clouds I think would represent the things that shut grandmother off from reality."

To this last association I would note that the dreamer seems to be afraid that the grandmother wants to pass on this dark inheritance.

In conclusion for today I would like to note that the way we approach the motif of the mists and clouds is very important. It also affords a striking

difference in the fairy tale we have just discussed for, instead of friends with the lion, it becomes a cub. We will take up this theme next week.

Lecture Eleven: February 10, 1958

Let's begin today where we stopped last week in our third class of symbolism. I gave you a dream as an illustration of the connection between the lion and the mother. Now, what would the great lion rushing at the dreamer in her girlhood house represent?

Evidently, this lion is something that got left behind in the childhood home and is likely to be connected not only with her mother and grandmother but with either sex or power or both as well. The mother died when the dreamer was young. The real grandmother was a sort of "negligible quantity" in the house. She had not much to say in any way, but there she was with her disagreeable presence and disturbing conduct as indicated in the dreamer's active imagination. Through the bad personal relations between the three women, the contact with the "great" mother is blocked and disturbed.

For the past three or four years, both in dialogues and in visual imagination, the dreamer has done unusually hard work on her animus, and in connection to this work the dream comes up in an instinctual form. The dream is quite an event in her work on herself. She is a woman inclined to live a bit below her level. As a feeling type, she hates disturbances and prefers to be friendly and nice on the surface. So she has locked up her most disturbing mother complex and thus meets it here in an alarming form. Previously she has had a rather good and pleasant relationship to women, but now the other side is coming up with a rush. Violent emotion – as symbolized by the lion – is evidently needed to constellate this content of the unconscious. Up till now there has never been a feminine figure of much strength in her active imagination. There she has usually had a very weak little shadow sometimes carried off by the animus.

The dreamer has adopted a negative attitude toward the grandmother, which one sees particularly in her association to the picture, although in the dream the grandmother is not at all negative. The dreamer herself has evidently lived on the masculine bright side with feminine eros mostly in the mist and clouds, leaving little in the feminine that she can get a hold of. Naturally she feels lost in the mist and would be inclined to interpret the clouds and mist of the picture as the way in which the feminine aspect seems to her. She herself likes very clear opinions; thus the grandmother's miasma of moods put her off. Yet strangely enough it seems from the dream as if there might be an unseen meaning even for the personal grandmother. But I doubt if the grandmother is to be taken very personally here. The dream figure seems to be more the "great" mother – the real "grand" mother, so to speak. As a rule in dreams, the mother more or less represents the personal individual mother, whereas the grandmother is inclined to represent the archetype of the great mother. But as the grandmother lived with the family we cannot ignore the actual woman.

One could even connect the mist with the spirit which "broodeth over the face of the waters." I wonder whether this dream does not give one information about things that one really has not been able to understand. Many people seem to live on into old age for years, lingering on, yet it seems that something does evolve in them. The dream gives me the feeling that perhaps there is far more meaning than we imagine in those apparently useless years of waiting for death. In some cases one wonders why life should continue. Two or three years ago I observed a long enduring illness and then realized that the ego had to give up entirely before the person could die. Here we have indications in this dream that the grandmother did accomplish something, for apparently something happened in the miasma that overtook her.

All the things that the parents should have done and all the problems that they should have resolved revert to the child, and the dreamer now has to deal with something that neither her grandmother nor mother dealt with at all. When I said that perhaps something happened to the grandmother, I was speaking speculatively, for ultimately the granddaughter has the problem. Again conjecturing, one might think that the work of the individual also helps the ancestors. We do not have to look beyond the problems of ourselves to see how things change in oneself in particular, since we do not know enough about the other side. There are plenty of dreams, however, that indicate that it is our task to work on and redeem unresolved issues of our fathers and mothers, our grand- and great-grandparents, and so forth. The question of reincarnation could be raised here – there is certainly enough evidence pointing to some form of returning to life – but from the images in this dream one cannot assert anything about this subject.

The lion in the dream at first indicates the emotion and energy locked up within the mother and grandmother. As has already been pointed out, the development of the lion is definitely favorable, for the dangerous beast becomes a playful cub. It takes many years of analysis and work to find appropriate means of accepting and expressing such locked-up emotions.

But I would like to compare the motifs in the dream with those of the fairy tale of the king's son. Presumably because the dreamer is a woman, the lion, instead of being a docile and helpful animal as in the fairy tale, assumes here the form of a cub, a form that she can mother as a development of her maternal function. When the grandmother gives her the picture of the mists and clouds, she inherits the mother's symbol. The dreamer has actually a very good relation to animals (here she functions adequately), for her relations with animals go right down to the bottom of her being. Thus the lion as playful cub would fit. Moreover, its playfulness is just what she needs. In our masculine age women tend to live by logos. The acceptance of the much less definite feminine side is a very common problem of women today, for so many have lived so much in the animus, as pseudo men, that they feel as though they were in a complete mist when they get to the feminine side. We see here that a woman's dangerous emotions, previously lost in a mother complex, can actually become manageable lion cubs if worked on. And this should be an incentive for women.

But in the fairy tale, which presumably is a mirroring image of a masculine psyche, it was a terrible sacrifice for the fearless prince to surrender and accept the guidance of the instinct of the lion. But only by this sacrifice were he and the anima rescued. In our present case, our feminine dreamer is only too keen to accept such guidance. There is a strong tendency in women to wish to rely on the man and throw all responsibility onto him. But here she has to take the responsibility of her emotional life on herself. The prototype of the masculine ego, however, has to have his eyes put out before he can humiliate himself sufficiently to accept the guidance of the instinct. Many women find it terribly hard to accept the responsibility for their own lives, particularly when the animus begins to collapse, and therefore the dream appeals to her maternal instincts to accept the responsibility for the cub. The maternal instincts, which have been lost in the mists, are now required to care for the cub left behind in the child's home. One could argue that it is a regression into childishness, but I see it as a return to tap the emotion and energy that, as a child, seemed to her to be destructive and roaring like a lion. Through the acceptance of the clouds and mist, and the grandmother and mother, the playful cub can become a responsibility which she needs to mother and educate.

The lion here would also represent the creative side, since no woman really creates until she uses her feminine side as well as the masculine. The symbol is just a picture presumably meaning a creative image; the creative aspect is found with the mother and the grandmother: it is only through accepting the feminine principle that the lion becomes manageable.

With the emphasis on science and one-sidedness in our masculine age, trying to accept the feminine principle, as the dreamer has to do here (even in the negative form of the memories of her grandmother), is like accepting a mist. Jung says that as you get older you have the choice of remaining in prestige psychology, holding yourself tensely in an upper sphere, or you can go right down into the mists and the darkness of the valley, and then your consciousness will necessarily be much less clear but also wider and more satisfying.

A student just remarked that this lion is here both Yang and Yin; it is the masculine side and also contains the feminine. Yes, this is true, although here one has to be careful to avoid confusion. A psychological statement is never quite true unless you can turn it round and look at it the other way.

On the whole, one has to stick to the lion symbolizing the Yang principle. Nevertheless, in alchemy we will see feminine symbolism associated with the lion. In both the fairy tale and the dream a transformation of the lion is made without cutting off the paws. But in alchemical symbolism we find the paws of the lion and the hands of the mother cut off, which then puts the lion on the feminine side. I have often quoted Jung's statement that men overcome by killing the dragon and women by accepting their suffering, but in a full process of individuation – for either a man or a woman – both have to be done. In so far as one can channel the lion into creative work, the influence becomes creative instead of destructive. It is quite correct to add that the creativeness also has to be used on the relationships around one. Only then would the lion be more as we find him in the fairy tale where the lion behaves like a dog.

Yes, as this student here has just said, the lion – if representing the creative work – would be associated with the anthropomorphic. But we must not forget that the whole emotion in the dream is something of which the dreamer is quite unconscious.

In the pause one of the members of the class pointed out that the four chief functions are represented in the dream. There are indeed four main figures: the dreamer, the mother, the grandmother, and the lion. One could say that the lion represents the inferior function, which is still quite unconscious, whereas the others have at least human form and are people whom she knew.

For our third and fourth classes of symbolism I propose taking an alchemistic text and would like to quote the lion's role in the famous *Cantilena* of the English alchemist Sir George Ripley (1415–90) (Jung 1968, pars. 490–501). You will know it briefly from *Psychology and Alchemy* in the Lapis-Christus chapter, but Jung goes into much more detail in *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, where the role of the green lion is worked out in more detail (Jung 1970a, pars. 368ff). Therefore I propose translating certain passages, as there is not likely to be an English translation for some time. I will first give you a short summary of the *Cantilena*.¹

This text deals with the story of a king who is sterile and childless and who concludes that he has a *defectus originalis*, although he is considered to be nurtured under the wings of the sun without natural bodily defects. But he knows that he will never beget if he does not get help at once. He decides to return to his mother's womb and dissolve himself in the prima materia. The queen-mother reincarnates her king-son in herself and during her pregnancy eats peacock's flesh and drinks the blood of the green lion, which Mercurius hands her with the *telium passionis* (Cupid's arrow) in a golden Babylonian cup (Jung 1970a, par. 414).

I would like to digress a moment to point out that Cupid's arrow characterizes here the lion who represents the passion of love, and that the Babylonian cup refers to the cup in the hand of the woman in *Revelation*. That woman was described as:

...sitting on a scarlet beast which was full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. The woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet, and adorned with gold and precious stones and pearls, having in her hand a golden cup full of abominations and the filthiness of her fornication. And on her forehead a name was written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND OF THE ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. (Revelation 17:3–6)

The great harlot of Babylon's cup suggests that the king's mother, that is, the Queen Mother, is not only wounded by Cupid's arrow (which can also represent the love of a high order) but that the lion's blood in this Babylonian cup also represents passion in its most misbegotten and extreme forms. In fact, this second birth of the king goes into a much deeper and darker level than the first.

But the lion here is not associated solely with the Babylonian fornication motif, because the lion, in connection with the queen, brings up the whole problem of power in love. Whenever the passionate roaring of the lion is directly involved, love is mixed up with the secret wish to dominate. Whenever jealousy comes directly into play (for possessive love is always jealous), it is very difficult to know if it is really a matter of love or whether there is only a lionlike urge to eat the so-called love object and possess it. Jealousy is always possessive, for the essence of love is to give credit and freedom. As soon as there is a wish to dominate and to be the one and only, love becomes a phenomenon on the boundary of power – if not entirely over its border.

Not only passion, but motherly love has the same temptation. Mothers generally have no easy time giving their children true freedom. It is specially difficult for them not to regard children as their property to rule... or to eat. Fathers are by no means immune from this primitivity. You remember the story in the seminar of the primitive man who complains: "There goes my son with my body and yet he does not do what I say." That is the epitome of this kind of possessive love. Fathers can let their anima hurt their daughters just as women let their animus hurt their sons.

XXXI

The Lion: Sublimation and Transformation

Let's return now to the story of the *Cantilena*. The Queen Mother, thus nourished, brings forth her reborn and resplendent son. We hear of the lion again when God gives this reborn king "the glorious glittering armory of the four elements" with the redeemer virgin in their midst (Jung 1968, par. 491). She has the green lion lying on her lap whose nourishment is delivered by an eagle. The blood which the virgin drank out of the hand of Mercurius flowed from the side of the lion. This virgin produced a marvelous milk or a type of balsam from her breasts and gave it to the lion, whose face she washed with a sponge remoistened afresh with her own milk (Jung 1970a, par. 453). She was crowned with a diadem and set as a star in the highest heaven. The king became a triumphant victor, a healer and redeemer.

We will put our spotlight now entirely on the role of the lion in this alchemical text, and I will translate some of what Jung says adding my own comments. It will seem at first quite difficult, so I ask you to bear with me. I assure you that you will later see why it is so worthwhile. We can always discuss any questions you may have as we go along. Now, in this text, the blood that the queen mother drinks is said to be the blood of the green lion (Jung 1970a, par. 401). This "royal" animal:

...is a synonym of Mercurius, or to be more accurate, for a stage in his transformation. [The lion] is the warm-blooded form of the devouring, predatory monster who first appears as the dragon. Usually the lion-form succeeds the dragon's death and eventual dismemberment. This in turn is followed by the eagle. (Jung 1970a, par. 404)

I would like now to comment on the stages, which Jung mentions, of the transformation of Mercurius. We have already met the beginning of this transition in the legend of St. Marcellus, where the lion-killing serpent was regarded as a good omen. The first stage is represented by the dragon, alias the serpent, of whom we spoke in the first part of this lecture series. The second is represented by the lion itself. And the third stage is seen in the eagle (which I feel would someday also belong to this course).

The sequence is a process of natural sublimation beginning with the serpent (who creeps along right down on the earth and has a psychical or sympathetic nervous reaction to everything). The second, the lion, is already raised on its legs above the ground and, moreover, has tremendous emotions that are a step between the cold serpent and the human being. The third, the eagle, can fly over the earth and look down at it from above. Psychologically, it flies up into the realm of intuitions and ideas.

Jung goes on to say that Christian Rosencreutz's *Chymical Wedding* gives a good idea of the transformations and symbols of Mercurius. I will only take the illustration of a furious battle between a wingless lion (red sulphur) and a winged lioness (white sulphur). This lion and lioness are a pre-stage of the human royal pair and are therefore crowned. He continues:

Evidently at this stage there is still a good deal of bickering between them, and this is precisely what the fiery lion is intended to express – the passionate emotionality that precedes the recognition of unconscious contents. The quarreling couple also represents the uroboros again. The lion thus signifies the arcane substance, described as *terra*, the body or unclean body. Further synonyms are "desert place," "poison, because it [this earth] is deadly," "tree, because it bears fruit," or "hidden matter [hyle], because it is the foundation of all nature and the substance... of all elements." (Jung 1970a, par. 404)

Here in our third class of symbolism we meet again the uroboros and the union of the opposites. I would like to once again repeat that maxim of Pseudo Demokritos: "Nature delights in nature, nature conquers nature, and nature rules nature" (Jung 1977a, par. 234). The battle of the lions contains the same idea of the eternal cycle of nature (represented by the uroboros but now on a more human level). The lion is warm-blooded; thus we can surmise that the matter is getting warmer. But the essential point here is that the fiery lion represents a preliminary step in the realization of unconscious contents. It brings one down to fiery emotion, which, by the way, is quite necessary before we can really meet the contents of the unconscious at all. It is only when we get passionate about things and are gripped by the unconscious that we really see the terrific reality of the psyche. For some people it can remain a theory for a very long time. One sees that people have to have their backs against the wall and be really driven to active imagination before they will take it on. Once prior to giving a lecture on active imagination I spoke to Jung about this form of resistance and he said that one could dedicate a whole lecture on the lousy excuses people make when you ask them to actively attempt an encounter with the unconscious.

A little later in his discussion on this alchemical motif, Jung says: "It is, however, psychologically correct to say that emotion unites us as much as it divides.... The *Gloria Mundi* calls the green lion the mineral stone that 'consumes a great quantity of its own spirit,' meaning self-impregnation by one's own soul..." (Jung 1970a, par. 404).

To make the above clearer we will take another alchemical text titled *Marchos' Lion Hunt* (Jung 1970a, pars. 409f). In this text the lion takes the place of the king. Marchos prepares a trap for the lion and entices it with the good smell of a stone that particularly serves to charm the eyes. So the lion falls into the trap. This pit, covered by a glass roof, forms an enclosed space that is defined here as the bridal chamber. The lion thus falls into the bridal bed as bridegroom where the stone is lying on a bed of coals. The stone is good for the eyes and is a woman. ("And this stone, which the lion loves, is a woman" [Jung 1970a, par. 409].) This stone, or woman, swallows the lion so that he disappears entirely.

Most of you know the text of the *Visio Arislei* where, in the sterile land, the philosophers take the two children conceived out of the King's head (the only productive place in this country) and put them into a terrible glass house under the sea where Gabricus, the son, is dissolved in Beya, the daughter. Jung comments:

In the "lion hunt" the incest, though veiled, is clear enough. The love-affair is projected on the lion, the animal nature or "accrescent soul" of the king; in other words, it is enacted in his unconscious or in a dream. Because of his ambiguous character the lion is well suited to take over the role of this indecorous lover. (Jung 1970a, par. 410)

Here I would like to say a word about the love affair being projected onto the lion. The content represented by an animal is still in the unconscious, and the kind of animal shows how far away the content is. In a dream, if an animal represented something like incest, this would show that the dreamer was unconscious of this point. As mentioned, a serpent would represent something much further away than a lion, and a lion further away than a domestic animal, and so on. The lion often represents the content that has been kept unconscious by the fiery emotion around it. So it is a very apt symbol here.

Jung continues:

As the king is represented by his animal and his mother by a magic stone, the royal incest can take place as it were happening somewhere "outside," in quite another sphere than the personal world of the king and his mother. Indeed, the marriage does not only seem to be "unnatural" but is actually intended to be so. (Jung 1970a, par. 410)

Dr. von Franz has rather freely translated the word *artificium* as "a conscious achievement." This may seem to contradict my comment just now where I spoke of animals in dreams as representing an unconscious content. But King Marchos's lion hunt is not a dream. No doubt it comes partly from the unconscious, but like the rather similar *Visio Arislei* it is also a conscious attempt to describe something in the form of a simile or illustration which the alchemists only partially knew and understood. Jung goes on to say:

The tabooed incest imposed as a task and, as the wealth of allegories shows, it is always in form and never concrete. One has the impression that this "sacral" act, of whose incestuous nature the alchemists were by no means unconscious, was not so much banished by them into the *cucurbita* or glass-house but was taking place in it all the time. (Jung 1970a, par. 410)

This shows the peculiar state of something being "consciously yet not-conscious" that well typifies the alchemists. If they do not repress or banish the incest to the retort, but rather discover it there, then we are dealing with a piece of themselves they do not know. For this is the essence of projections: we do not make them. Instead, we find them. But Jung notes here that incest was by no means unconscious to the alchemists. So how can this be? Today we come across this same ambiguity in our own dreams and fantasies. We know, for instance, that we have, say, a father complex, just as the alchemists were aware that, to be effective, this union of opposites required incestuous libido. (They often speak of the brother-sister, mother-son pair). But they do not really understand this strange mystery any more than we understand the father complex, and they find it in their retorts just as we slowly get to know more about our complexes from the images in dreams. For instance, I cannot tell you how often Jung and I discussed the details of the problematical and negative nature of my father complex before I heard within me one day the sudden and utterly surprising remark: "But I still love Father best." That was unconscious to me, for although I knew I disliked my father, I did not know that I loved him. In much the same way, the alchemists knew that they were dealing with incest but did not really know what it was, because it is a mystery and something more than one can understand with one's mind. Jung writes:

Whoever wished to commit this act in its true sense would therefore have to get outside himself as if into an external glass house, a round *cucurbita* which represented the microcosmic space of the psyche. A little reason would teach us that we do not need to get "outside ourselves," but merely a little deeper *into* ourselves to experience the reality of incest and much else besides, since in each of us slumbers the "beastlike" primitive who may be roused by the doves of Diana. This would account for the widespread suspicion that nothing good can come out of the psyche. (Jung 1970a, par. 410)

I would like to conclude today's lecture on a short reflection regarding the prejudice that presently exists against psychology. People say that it is a purely egotistical occupation. I remember getting a letter from a friend of mine who I was very fond of, saying that she would never go to a place like Zurich and let people poke about inside her. Encountering the unconscious is real work and the most valuable that can be done in the exploration of the psyche. The value of this work, and the sublimation of the lion, for instance, is something not understood by most people unless they have gone quite a way in tackling their own psychology.

Lecture Twelve: February 17, 1958

In the last lecture we took a look at the alchemical text of the *Cantilena Riplaei*, which Jung writes about in *Mysterium Coniunctionis*. I spoke shortly on the lion hunt of King Marchos, where the male lover is the lion and the mother a magical stone, a projection of the incest between the king and his mother. We read Jung's comment in which he spoke of the tabooed incest being made a task. Jung continued:

Undoubtedly the hierosgamos of the substances is a projection of unconscious contents. These contents, it is usually concluded, therefore belong to the psyche and, like the psyche itself, are "inside" man.... As against this the fact remains that only a very few people are or ever were conscious of possessing any incestuous fantasies worth mentioning. If such fantasies are present at all they are *not yet* conscious, like the collective unconscious in general. An analysis of dreams and products of the unconscious is needed to make such these visible. To that end considerable resistances have to be overcome, as though one were entering a strange territory, a region of the psyche to which one feels no longer related, let alone identical with it; and whoever has strayed into that territory, either out of negligence or by mistake, feels outside himself, and a stranger in his own home. I think one should take cognizance of these facts and not attribute to our personal psyche everything that appears as a psychic content. After all, we would not do this with a bird that happened to fly through our field of vision. (Jung 1970a, par. 410)

When people first begin to notice synchronistic events they are inclined always to connect them with themselves, an idea that can become appallingly exaggerated. For instance, I remember the case of a woman who was taking driving lessons. Her instructor had to go into military service, where he was killed in an explosion. She made up her mind that, since she was taking lessons from him, she was to blame. You can imagine how much difficulty I had in freeing her of this idea. The conviction that one can be the cause of such an event has an obvious pathological quality that goes altogether too far. When you have no more relation to the person than she had, then there is no reason to connect the event with your psyche. Jung tries here to establish the fact that there is an objective psyche that does not belong to one's own personal sphere. He says:

It may well be a prejudice to restrict the psyche to being "inside" the body. In so far as the psyche has a non-spatial aspect, there may be a psychic "outside the body," a region so utterly different from "my" psychic space that one has to get outside oneself or make use of some auxiliary technique in order to get there. If this view is at all correct, the alchemical consummation of the royal marriage in the *cucurbita* [retort] could be understood as a synthetic process in the psyche "outside" the ego. (Jung 1970a, par. 410)¹

I would recommend that you read the section in *Psychology and Alchemy* on "Soul and Body" (Jung 1970b, pars. 397–420).

The question of the ego and the non-ego is very difficult. Perhaps the problem of incest (as symbolized in this marriage between the lion and the woman/stone) is one of the places where one sees the idea best. Most people who have undergone a deep analysis have touched on this burning problem, and naturally it arouses the strongest resistances. One meets it first, as a rule, in the father or mother complex, and it is usually extremely acute between mothers and sons. Long before I began to work as an analyst an older woman confided in me that she felt her eldest son just had to be a virgin when he married. She did not know why, but she used to go to him every night, put her hands softly on his shoulders and say: "Is it all right?" She was over eighty years old when she died, and both of her sons outlived her but a very short time. Jung said that they had never become "individual trees"; they were just suckers getting their sustenance from the trunk. Their deaths were uncanny: one was ill at the time of her demise, but not the other.

It is very natural that we should have a strong resistance to incest, which is one of the earliest taboos in primitive societies. It is horribly painful to have to admit that a parent or child or a brother or sister ever aroused such a desire. Moreover, it is Freud's enduring merit to have ventured to rediscover such a painful, shameful, and yet terribly important urge. Yet he formulated it so personally that we have again been driven into opposition. But Freud never went beyond the actual personal side and entirely ignored the psyche "outside the body," that is, the collective psyche. Because this realm is unknown to us, we naturally project it into our personal realm, and we will never discover the union of the opposites unless we accept it where we first find it. And it usually occurs as a most awkward attraction to a near relation!

Although this attraction – once we have ventured to see it at all – may be overwhelmingly strong, it is checked (or at least restrained) by an equally strong opposing taboo. This repression can in turn be negative and even lead to perversions of the sexual instinct. A girl, for instance, who has lived at home in an unconscious fantasy incest with her father too long will be so used to the unconscious curbing of the urge that it may become impossible for her to give herself to a man.

Most of you have read *The Psychology of the Transference* (Jung 1966, pars. 353–539) and will remember the second chapter on endogamous and exogamous libido – two equally strong urges – of which the former pretty much succumbed to the latter in our outer civilization. But the conquered endogamy is still there, as Freud's psychology makes abundantly clear, seen here in a projected form in our lion and stone/mother marriage.

Although, as mentioned, it is impossible to reach this buried endogamous urge at all without accepting it in the painful and awkward personal realm, it comes as a welcome release when one realizes that it is also “outside the body,” a process in the psychic non-ego, that is, in the collective unconscious affecting a far larger field than one’s personal ego. It is similar to the idea of the personal and impersonal Atman in the East, or to the unique and collective quality of the psychological Self. (A book titled *Thomasina* by Paul Gallico gives a rather amusing although very intellectual description of how it feels to be an ordinary cat and the Egyptian goddess at the same time.)

This primitive, endogamous libido has, of course, by no means disappeared but now carries the process of individuation. So that this powerful urge in the human being at bottom serves that purpose. The same is true of urges of sex and power, which the ego finds it hard to curb and which it can really only succeed in doing by calling in the stronger power of the Self. There is this same idea in *The Lion Hunt of Marchos*, for the stone, as you know, is the *lapis philosophorum* and the lion is dissolved in the stone. In other words, the lion symbol of the fiery urges of sex and power is submitted to the alchemical symbol of the Self, which alone is equal to the task.

We spoke of the green lion of the *Gloria Mundi* that “consumes a great quantity of its own spirit,” meaning a self-impregnation by one’s own soul (Jung 1970a, par. 404). Returning now to Jung’s comments on the blood of the green lion in Ripley’s *Cantilena*, he notes that:

Besides the green lion there was also, in the later Middle Ages, a red lion. Both were Mercurius. [In a footnote we hear that presumably from the time of Paracelsus, the red lion is probably a later equivalent of sulphur rubrum and that the alchemist Johann Mylius equates the two lions with red and white sulphur.] The fact that Artefius mentions a magic use of the lion (and of the snake) throws considerable light on our symbol: he is “good” for battle, and here we may recall the fighting lions and the fact that the king in the “Allegoria Merlini” began drinking the water just when he was venturing forth to war. We shall probably not be wrong if we assume that the “king of beasts,” known even in Hellenistic times as a transformation stage of Helios, represents the old king, the Antiquus dierum of the *Cantilena*, at a certain stage of renewal, and that perhaps in this way he acquired the singular title of “Leo antiquus.” At the same time he represents the king in his theriomorphic form, that is, as he appears in his unconscious state. (Jung 1970a, pr. 405)

The animal form expresses the fact that the king is, as it were, overwhelmed by the animal, or consumed by it, and that therefore his whole life-expression only consists of animal-like reactions, which are simply emotions. Emotionalism – in the sense of uncontrolled affects – is an essentially animal affair. Therefore such people, or when they are in such a condition, can only be approached suitably by the rules of bush manners (tact, foresight, and politeness) or by the methods of the circus dompteur (Jung 1970a, pars. 405 & 405n 162). (I used to have a very sensitive and charming little Cairn whom I used to take with me to my analysis with Dr. Jung, and usually he was on excellent terms with her. But one day he offended her and she would not speak to him for about three weeks until at last he said: “Well really, you might forgive me, even though I know that on one occasion I did forget my Bush manners.”)

To continue with our extract: “According to the statements of the alchemists the king changes into his animal attribute, that is to say he returns to his animal nature, the psychic source of renewal” (Jung 1970a, par. 406). Here we come very near to the marrow of the bone of this course. Whenever animals appear in dreams there is yet the idea of a return to the source of renewal. For nothing has been repressed by Christianity worse than the animal. We must, however, never forget that each animal in each dream is different. The naturalness of the animal is that which is required, but not possession by the animal. To be possessed by the lion implies a bad regression, but to be as natural as the lion is a major advance.

I remember once a parson’s daughter (who had the greatest difficulty in getting back to her instincts) repeatedly dreamed that she was looking for a lavatory. (I wonder if there is any parson’s daughter who has not dreamed of lavatories.) But she could not find one in a satisfactory condition. The first time in her dreams that things finally went right was when she dreamed that she entered a cowshed, which would mean getting back to nature almost to the level of the cow.

Jung says later:

But in so far as the lion and lioness are forerunners of the (incestuous) coniunctio, they come into the category of those theriomorphic pairs who spend their time fighting and copulating, e.g., cock and hen, the two serpents of the caduceus, the two dragons, etc. The lion has among other things an unmistakable erotic aspect. Thus the *Introitus Apertus* says: “Learn what the doves of Diana are, who conquer the lion with caresses; the green lion, I say, who in truth is the Babylonish dragon, who kills all with his venom.” (Jung 1970a, par. 408)

Jung then comments that: “The reference to the ‘Babylonish’ dragon here is not altogether accidental, since in ecclesiastical language ‘Babylon’ is thoroughly ambiguous” (Jung 1970a, par. 408). We have already met the Babylonian cup in Ripley’s text, and the quotation from the *Introitus Apertus* shows that it is by no means unique in the *Cantilena*. Thus we can presume that the Babylonian whore is really meant to lead into dubious and dark regions. But the issue at hand is full of meat. First the green lion is equated with the Babylonian dragon which kills everything with its poison. Yet this lion is conquered by the tenderness of Diana’s doves. We find the same idea in the changing of the vengeful God of the Old Testament to the God of love by incarnation in the Virgin’s womb. This motif also occurs when the unicorn is tamed in the Virgin’s lap (Jung 1970b, see figs. 241, 242, 245, & 248).

The fact that the lion is conquered by Diana’s doves shows that relatedness with feeling is the bridge to getting the lion into more human shape. The two temptations are either to repress sexuality or to let ourselves be possessed by it. And here, as we know, is where many sexual affairs lack the culture of relatedness or eros. Now this problem is really constellated in our age, and here I must say that I think women are much more to blame than men, for eros is their principle. I refer you to Jung’s article “Woman in Europe” (Jung 1978, pars. 236–275). Many people have forgotten the earlier books such as *Contributions to Analytical Psychology*, a very important book especially for women.² Those who have read *Psychology of the Transference* will have seen that the lack of love and real relationship is the central problem of our age (Jung 1966, pars. 353–539). But once we really face relationship, we are obliged to take up the problem of the animus and anima, for until we have done so we shall always deceive ourselves. The animus will always slip into an opinion instead of real relatedness and real feeling. And the anima will always be apt to put in a sentimental comment or a nasty little jab so that one can say, as Jung does in *Psychology of the Transference*, that here lies the greatest problem of our age. The central issue, however, is our lack of knowing our own animus or anima.

A few pages later in *Mysterium Coniunctionis* Jung points out that evidently:

...on account of its close relationship with Venus, the green lion has, surprisingly enough, rose-colored blood, as mentioned by Dorn and by his contemporary Khunrath. The latter also ascribes rose-colored blood to the *filii macrocosmi* as well [another designation of the central symbol of alchemy, the lapis]. This peculiarity of the green lion’s blood establishes its connection not only with the filius, a wellknown Christ parallel, but above all with the rose, whose symbolism produced not only the popular title “Rosarium” (rose garden) but also the Rosencreuz (Rosy Cross). The white and red rose garden are synonyms for the *albedo* and *rubedo*.... The rose-garden is a “garden enclosed” and, like the rose, a soubriquet of Mary, the parallel of the “locked” prima materia. (Jung 1970a, par. 419)

Here the parallel between the lion’s blood and symbols of love goes even further, although these are only reached after the lion is overcome. Thus they actually belong in our fourth class of symbolism. This process of sublimation further explains the earlier passage where the fiery lion represented a preliminary step of the realization of unconscious contents: when the wild emotions of the lion are overcome, even the most precious

contents of the unconscious, the fruits of genuine love, become visible.

But the realization of unconscious contents, which drinking the blood of the green lion opens up, goes further. Jung's notes:

In the *Cantilena*, the mythologem of the uroboros is unexpectedly, and most unusually, translated into feminine form: it is not the father and son who merge into one another, but the mother who merges with her own substance, "eating her own tail" and "impregnating herself," as the king in the Allegoria Merlini drank his "own" water. [The play of words is not quite forbidden as the urine of the boy is a synonym of the *aqua permanens*.] The queen is in a condition of psychic pregnancy: the anima has become activated and sends her contents into consciousness. These correspond to the peacock's flesh and lion's blood. If the products of the anima (dreams, fantasies, visions, symptoms, chance ideas, etc.) are assimilated, digested, and integrated, this has a beneficial effect on the growth and development ("nourishment") of the psyche. At the same time the *cibatio* [feeling] and *imbitio* [giving drink] of the anima-mother indicate the integration and completion of the entire personality. The anima becomes creative when the old king renews himself in her. Psychologically, the king stands first of all for Sol, whom we have interpreted as consciousness. (Jung 1970a, par. 424)

In our first class of symbolism the lion was also a solar symbol, so it is definitely not only its blood that contributes to the renewal of the king. The lion himself is transformed and becomes, so to speak, the new sun instead of the old.

But this renewal is not brought about, as mentioned before, by harmless and recognized methods. Jung emphasizes this again, saying:

These considerations make it more comprehensible that it was a cleric who wrote the *Cantilena*. It is indeed something of a descent to the underworld when he makes Mercurius, "bearing the dart of passion," the emblem of Cupid, hand the queen the blood-potion in a "golden cup of Babylon." This, as we have seen, is the golden cup "full of abominations and filthiness of fornication," and it is quite obvious that she is being ruthlessly regaled with her own psychic substances. These are animal substances she has to integrate, the "acrescent soul" – peacock and lion with their positive and negative qualities; and the draught is given to her in the cup of fornication, which emphasizes still more the erotic nature of the lion, his lust and greed. Such an integration amounts to a widening of consciousness through profound insight. (Jung 1970a, par. 426)

Put into simple everyday psychological language, this process entails conscious differentiation and the integration of the shadow. It is quite correct to say that active imagination is the most effective way of working on this, but I do not believe in being fanatical. Many people never touch active imagination yet do the same work. It is also achieved through the interpretation of dreams as well as in ordinary daily life by realizing what one really is through common sense and extraordinary honesty. Active imagination is not the only way. Although I advocate it strongly, I do not think it an exaggeration to say that half of the people who work with me never touch it, although Jung has said more than once that it is the way in which you can learn to deal with yourself without the help of an analyst. He has also said that he thought it was the test of whether people really wanted to become themselves and independent, or whether they would prefer to put their problems over on your side of the fence and remain dependent in some way or another. Active imagination is a very wide term, and many people who do not practice it put it into practical application in their daily life by watching where the shadow is and the effect they have on others.

The queen has eaten the peacock's flesh and drunk the blood of the lion, and she is therefore, to put it simply, integrating the body. I think what Jung is getting at here is that we must eat and assimilate such contents; that is, we must fully admit to ourselves the things we desire and not just repress them or skirt the responsibility by saying: "It is not for me." After admitting the desire, the question arises as to whether or not it must be sacrificed or every effort made to get it. You have to face that problem, for just to sacrifice the desire in every case would be quite inadequate. Once when I had a dream that there was an undesirable thief around, Jung said that he thought most people would take me for a pretty honest woman, and the fact that I had discovered that I was also a thief widened me a lot. That is the choice as you grow older; you either go down and your consciousness becomes much less bright and much less one-sided. Or else you get stuck in prestige psychology, where you are always trying not to drop into the abyss. But the older you get, the more you feel that it is better to be low down. This brings us back to Jung's statement on theriomorphic symbolism that I mentioned in the beginning of these lectures, which I give here in its alchemical context:

But why should such an unpalatable diet be prescribed for the queen? Obviously because the old king lacked something, on which account he grew senile: the dark chthonic aspect of nature. And not only this but the sense that all creation was in the image of God, the antique feeling for nature, which in the Middle Ages was considered a false track and an aberration. Dark and unfathomable as the earth is, its theriomorphic symbols do not have only a reductive meaning, but one that is prospective and spiritual. They are paradoxical, pointing upwards and downwards at the same time. If contents like these are integrated in the queen, it means that her consciousness is widened in both directions. This diet will naturally benefit the regeneration of the king by supplying what was lacking before. Contrary to appearances, this is not *only* the darkness of the animal sphere, but rather a spiritual nature or a natural spirit which even has its analogies with the mystery of faith, as the alchemists were never tired of emphasizing. (Jung 1970a, par. 427)

Here again we are close to the very marrow of the course.

Jung refers here to the Eucharist, where the faithful eat Christ's body and drink his blood. But obviously when the Queen Mother eats the peacock's flesh and drinks the lion's blood, it goes much deeper. The virgin birth, as Jung points out in *Answer to Job*, was such a careful process of disinfection that the animal body was left out as much as possible. The Queen Mother, on the other hand, goes right into the animal realm to renew her weakened and aging son. She descends even down into the dregs of what man has done in repressing the clean natural instincts; that is, she sinks down as far as all the fornications and abominations of Babylon. Jung writes:

During her pregnancy, therefore, the queen undergoes something akin to a psychotherapeutic treatment whereby her consciousness is enriched by a knowledge of the collective unconscious, and we may assume, by her inner participation in the conflict between her spiritual and chthonic nature. Often the law governing the progressive widening of consciousness makes the evaluation of the heights and depths into a moral task transcending the limits of convention. Failure to know what one is doing acts like guilt and must be paid for as dearly. (Jung 1970a, par. 428)

No one takes any notice at all of whether we know that we are committing a sin or whether we just sin unconsciously, and that is really, to my way of thinking, the big difference between the ethics of Jungian psychology and ordinary traditional morality. I used to fight my sister, who would say that our father could not be blamed because he did not realize what he was doing. I used to respond with, "But why not?" A father or mother will often say that they would never have hurt the child if only they had known how deeply it would affect the child. Of course in a way this is true, but the results for the child are the same. Probably if the parent was conscious, he or she would not sin as badly. What is done unconsciously hurts the son or daughter just as much; the price they pay is exactly the same. From our point of view, the greater sin is a lack of knowing. Jung continues:

The conflict may even turn out to be an advantage since, without it, there could be no reconciliation and no birth of a supraordinate third thing. The king could then be neither renewed nor reborn. The conflict is manifested in the long sickness of the queen. (Jung 1970a, par. 428)

The eighteenth verse of the *Cantilena* relates how the Queen was ill for nine months and shed many tears while the green lion suckled her. The uroboros relationship between the lion-king and the mother-queen becomes clear here: she drinks his blood and he her milk. This image may seem revolting to us, but this peculiar idea explains the identification of the Queen with the Mother of God who, as personification of mankind, took God into her womb and suckled him at her breast. The lion, as an allegory of Christ, gives the counter gift of his blood to mankind. (In fact, the wound in the lion's side is, of course, the wound in the side given by Longinus to Christ on the cross.) This interpretation is confirmed in later verses. A

similar image is also used by Angelus Silesius in his epigram on the incarnated God: "God drank the Virgin's milk, left us his wine; How human things have humanized divine" (Jung 1970a, par. 429).

Angelus Silesius was occupied with the problem of the ego and the non-ego that we briefly touched on. As mentioned, Jung observed that not everything is located in the body and that there is a real "beyond-the-body" which the alchemists in their symbols tried to approach. As you know, Silesius was originally a mystic and a Protestant, and in his introversion he discovered the extremely mysterious relationship between man and God. He wrote a great deal expressing the idea that if man is destroyed, then God is destroyed as well. But Silesius found his confrontation with this theme so difficult that he could not keep it up, and when people began to call him heretical he became a Catholic, retreating from his early mystical knowledge. He spent his later years in writing against Protestantism. He might be called the classic example of someone who touched the reality of the psyche and, finding it too hot to handle, turned back because he could not stand it. He purportedly ended in misery.

XXXII

The Lion as Resurrection and Spiritual Mana

Following the discussion on the sublimation and transformation of the lion, we are now ready to discuss our fourth and final class of symbolism, where we find the king of beasts as a symbol of resurrection and spiritual mana. I would like to interrupt the *Cantilena* for a moment here and read, without comment, just a few quotations regarding the role and meaning of the lion in ancient Egypt. I do this to show that it is not unusual that the lion appears as a symbol of resurrection in the *Cantilena*, for it was regarded as such in Egypt as well. In a description of funerary beds, de Wit writes in *Le rôle et le sens du Lion dans l'Egypte Ancienne*:

In the ancient Empire the [image of the] lion was often [carved into] the beds, or rather two lions side by side. The bed is formed of the body and the ends ornamented by its head and tail, and the legs of the bed are its paws. (de Wit, 1951, 161)

The idea always was the rebirth or resurrection of the dead. This form of double lion was used for centuries for funeral beds on which the dead or the gods repose. These lions are not artistic supports but symbolize the very form of the resurrection. We hear that lions also supported tables used for embalming and that the idea always was the rebirth of the dead (de Wit, 1951, 161). Shou and Tefnut, the pair of lions, are the gods who created the primordial gods and are involved in the process of spiritualization at death (de Wit, 1951, 178). De Wit notes that in the *Book of the Dead* we hear: "O Atoum, I have become a glorious (transfigured) spirit in the presence of the double lion, the great god; he has opened for me the portals of Geb." And again: "The double lion guides the shape of the dead toward the place where the deceased can find rest for his Ka" (de Wit, 1951, 179).

I would now like to turn back to the thirty-second and thirtythird verse of the *Cantilena*, where the green lion lay in the lap of the queen-mother-virgin and was fed by the eagle. From the side of the lion flowed the blood that the virgin drank from the hand of Mercurius. A wondrous milk flowed from her breasts and she gave it to the lion, whose face she cleaned with a sponge moistened with her own milk (Jung 1970a, par. 453). The next two verses continue with the glorification of the Virgin. Jung then comments:

Here the apotheosis of the Queen is described in a way that instantly reminds us of its prototype, the coronation of the Virgin Mary. The picture is complicated by the images of the Pietà on the one hand and the mother, giving the child her breast, on the other. As is normally the case only in dreams, several images of the Mother of God have contaminated one another, as have also the allegories of Christ as child and lion, the latter representing the body of the Crucified with the blood flowing from his side. As in dreams, the symbolism with its grotesque condensations and overlappings of contradictory contents shows no regard for our aesthetic and religious feelings; it is as though trinkets made of different metals were being melted in a crucible

342 *The Archetypal Symbolism of the Lion*

and their contours flowed into one another. The images have lost their pristine force, their clarity and meaning. In dreams it often happens – to our horror – that our most cherished convictions and values are subjected to just this iconoclastic mutilation (Jung 1970a, par. 454).

As this tangled knot of contaminations is for the most part composed of known symbols disentangled by Jung in his comment, it gives us a very good idea of the difficulty of unraveling the elements in a dream where a large percentage of the symbols are unknown to us. The great difficulty in getting to the bottom of a dream was one of the reasons that brought Jung to active imagination. Dreams frequently contain images of the future, which nobody can possibly foresee. And, as a rule, there is little of what we understand as our concept of time in the unconscious.

The image of the virgin wetting the lion's face with her milk, presumably to wash it, is indeed strange. In doing this the queen accepts the animal completely and also nurses the god-figure. A major difference between the alchemistic and the Christian point of view is that the former believes that God needs our help, whereas Christians are inclined to think that man is weak and helpless and can do nothing without God's intervention. Of course both theories are true. The lion with the wound in its side represents the suffering god. The Queen Mother here is showing compassion with the divine image; she pities and nurses it. You remember that Jung says that the unconscious mirrors the face we turn toward it: if we are hostile, it becomes threatening and savage like the lion's emotional angry stage, whereas after washing its face with the milk, it really becomes the peaceful cat in her lap.

In concluding our discussion of the symbolism of the lion, we see here that the lion has now entirely entered the fourth class, for it is becoming more and more divine. With its angry, roaring, fiery and passionate nature it is a wonderful symbol for the God of the Old Testament who has to be transformed by the doves of Diana. And when we come to our emotions, and our passions awaken more and more, we suffer what the deity suffers because he himself is so passionate. Job also suffered in this way.

And in completion of our study we must consider the interesting fact that the lion is still present in the final picture. The renewed king is the triumphant victor, the healer and the redeemer on earth. The Virgin is crowned with a diadem and set as a star in the sky. But the green lion is still held on her lap. Psychologically, this would mean that the emotions, although transformed, are still in the realm of the anima or of the great mother and the eternal feminine. The chthonic soul is being looked after by the anima or the Great Mother. It also can be said to represent a union of the opposites, the light and the chthonic sides of the anima.

Just as the Virgin Mary has Christ on her knee (as a child and in the Pietà), so the alchemical anima has the shadow of Christ – the lion – on her knee. Some of you will remember that Dr. Jung spoke of the problem of what we can do with the chthonic soul and said we ourselves could never know. Only the "true man" or the *homo quadratio* knows, and we can only wait for the next hint in a dream. This image of the lion is such a hint. The lion is given here into the charge of its own opposite, the celestial anima, for the Virgin Mother is removed here to the sky.

The Archetypal Symbolism of the Bull and the Cow

Editorial Foreword

The following text on the symbolism of the bull and the cow is included in the main body of this text despite a few reservations. First, Barbara Hannah's discussion of these two animals is more abbreviated than the study on the serpent and lion, or even the cat, dog, and horse. Due to the brevity of her presentation, the bull and cow seem to be imbalanced in relation to the other animals discussed in this volume. Second, the text below is based on handwritten notes and not on a transcription. Barbara Hannah apparently presented many of her amplifications spontaneously and from memory, for in certain places her notes only mention the sketchiest references to the religious or mythological examples she discusses. Just the beginning and end of several quotes are given; thus she either directly read from the book at the lecture or recited the quotations by heart. Furthermore, she discusses the interpretation of the details of a fairy tale in such a way that the audience must have been presented with a version of the story. One can assume that she narrated the story by heart. In any case, her version of the story is missing. A short résumé of the fairy tale has been added to help the reader follow her line of reasoning.

Rather than attempting to "fill in the holes" or extend her notes, the text below aspires to remain true to the material available. Notes so sketchy that they would have required additional research have been left "as is" and included in a footnote. On a few occasions, the notes were simply too cursory to be deciphered. And finally, a synthesis and summary of the material on the bull and cow must have been given ad hoc. The exact dates and location of the lectures are also uncertain, but it is presumed that Barbara Hannah gave these lectures at the Jung Institute in Zurich directly after the lecture series on the serpent and the lion in 1958.

Despite these considerations, there is no question as to the insight and the depth of the symbolic material on the bull and the cow that Barbara Hannah discusses. Due to the value of this work, the following study is included in the main body of the present publication.

XXXIII

The Bull and Cow: Notes on the Biological Background

As we begin to approach the symbolism of the bull and cow, the first thing we need to note is that the different sexual genders of these two animals play a decisive role in their mythology. As far as I know, all other animals have a mythology that roughly includes both sexes, although, of course, there are certain myths and fairy tales concerning a particular male or female of a species, such as a mare or a stallion. Puss-in-Boots is definitely a tomcat, and Moerin, in an Irish version of Cinderella, is a she-cat, and so on. Now, occasionally we do find the symbolism of the bull and cow overlapping, both representing one and the same thing. Yet never before have either the mythologies or fairy tales about animals given me any incentive to use gender as a crosshair or to specifically discriminate between the two.

With the bull and the cow, however, this discrimination is preordained. Their mythologies are so individual that they require an entirely different treatment because fundamentally these two actually represent a pair of opposites. It was the sharp division between the bull and cow that made me alter the order given in the program on the symbolism of these seven animals and put them at the end. They contain the possibility of a *coniunctio* much more plainly than any of the other animals that we have dealt with so far.

True, we also find a clearer division between the sexes in some animals that we have not yet spoken of, such as the stag and the deer, but it is not as marked as in our bovine pair, where the bull at once calls forth an image of masculine virility and the cow of the docile, yielding nature of the feminine. Thus, I will present them separately, discussing first the bull and then the cow.

We will begin, as usual, with the outer animal, relying on Brehm's *Tierleben*. Brehm points out that since earliest times the bull, the cow and the ox represent the very foundations upon which the cultures on the continents of Europe, Asia and Africa were built. The domestication of cattle made agriculture possible and opened up a thoroughly different mode of life for humanity in every respect. The domestication of cattle, in fact, represents an enormous gain for mankind. Herein probably lies the outer reason why the cow and the bull figure so profoundly in mythology.

According to Brehm, cattle belong to the species of doublehooved animals. They have cloven hooves both on their fore and hind legs. Brehm devotes eight sections to hoof-animals, and cattle belong in his seventh section, titled *Der Paarhufer*. They also chew the cud, which a lot of hoof-animals do not. (Their habit of chewing the cud is also an important point for us, as it gives a psychological hook for rumination and thus for meditation in its widest sense.)

Cattle were domesticated already in prehistoric times, and since then they have undergone an extraordinary development. They are cultivated wherever possible and are still one of the most crucial items in our food supply, not only for meat but also for the broad palette of dairy products provided by the cow.

Generally, both sexes have horns, the right with a clockwise curve and the left curving counterclockwise. The skull is broad above and tapers toward the nose. Their eyes are set widely apart

The Bull and Cow: Notes on the Biological Background 3 4 9

and are positioned on the side of the skull. On the whole, their hair is generally short, occurring long and mane-like only in a few places. There are exceptions to this rule. Highland cattle in Scotland, for example, are shaggy, and some are almost long-haired.

The original home of cattle is very widespread. They were found in the whole of Europe, Africa, Central and South Asia. According to Brehm, North America can be regarded as their original homeland although now, of course, they have been imported all over the world wherever the climate makes it possible to raise them. They are without exception a herd animal in their natural habitat yet are able to live alone in domestication.

Although cattle seem rather clumsy and slow, they can move very quickly in an emergency situation. They climb and swim extremely well, and their endurance is remarkable. Their olfactory sense is best developed, yet they also hear extraordinarily well. Their sight, on the contrary, is not particularly good. Brehm thinks that their intelligence has greatly decreased in captivity.

On the whole, bovines are gentle and trustworthy. Brehm notes that all kinds of cattle permit themselves to be domesticated and comply with being used in countless ways. They can be very affectionate with each other, especially cows to their calves. But bulls, as well as oxen and cows, can be wild and fierce under certain circumstances, and cows are known to defend their young with reckless courage. They have not only attacked people on occasion, but will fend off fierce beasts of prey using their formidable horns so cleverly that they often come off the victor. They only fight among themselves when it is a question of mating.

Mating is important to almost every kind of animal, but of all our domestic animals, it seems most important to the bull and the cow. Mares, for instance, often refuse to mate, and we spoke of how adversely we have affected the sexuality of dogs. But the bull and cow seem unaffected. Perhaps this plays a role in why the bull has become a prototype of male generative power and the cow of female acceptance, docility and passivity.

We can now begin to take a look at our outer crosshairs, first with the bull and then the cow. I am greatly limiting the discussion of these symbolic aspects, on the one hand because the knowledge is generally well known, and on the other because we would otherwise never get through our material. The four mythological aspects for the bull are as follows:

1. a symbol of generative power, strength, and fertility,
2. a symbol of impetus and a quality of piercing (via the horns),
3. a symbol of the constant victim,
4. a symbol of spiritual regeneration and rumination.

The fourth aspect in mythology is not really founded on an outer biological aspect, as it is purely spiritual, but chewing the cud with its ruminative nature suggests meditation, which in human beings is the generation of the spiritual side.

XXXIV

The Bull as Generative Power, Strength, and Fertility

Mythological symbolism based on the strength, fertility, and generative power of the bull is extensive and widespread. Generative power and strength, which we will also find in the second class, are the most common themes found in mythology. In fact, the bull can pretty much be considered the very prototype of these characteristics. Naturally, we find these features in common speech. A virile man is said to be bull-like, strong as a bull, or powerful as a bull. A man impossibly stubborn in his thoughts is bullheaded, and here are all the associations to bulls as rigorous, rugged, hard, or even fierce fighters. (Swiss wrestling champions in the various cantons receive a young bull as their prize.) Then there are the few exceptional bulls that are portrayed as gentle, impossible to rile, who like to smell flowers and such, but they are literary creations, because anyone who stands in the vicinity of a bull experiences the incredible power and sheer size of these beasts. Here in Switzerland there are farmers killed every year by their bulls. And anyone who has to work with bulls knows how dangerous they at times can be. There is really no need to go into further amplifications on this subject.

Maybe not exactly renowned, but certainly for our purposes the most important examples of this class are found in Egypt, where as you know the bull, ox and cow play an extraordinary role. It is particularly the motif of the Ka-Mutef, the “bull of his mother,” that belongs in our present category. The best known bull gods concerned are Apis (possibly the earliest of these gods), Buchis (the holy “white bull”), and Min, although Min is usually represented in ithyphallic human form with the bull as his attribute (Bonnet 1952, 364). But he, too, is called “the bull of his mother.” Amun, who is an ithyphallic god as well, also figures as KaMutef, and in divine coitus fills the body of his mother and queen with his light and majesty (Jacobssohn 1992, 89).

“The bull of his mother” is a theme portraying the bull as the impregnator of his mother. And thus the god has no origin but himself. Bonnet tells us that in later texts the Ka-Mutef is also the begetter of his own father (Bonnet 1952, 364). The goddess mother, so venerated, is often Hathor of Dendera, of whom we shall hear a great deal when we speak about the cow. But all the goddesses merged progressively into Isis, which led to Min and Horus being mixed with each other. The “bull of his mother” is an exceedingly important aspect of Egyptian mythology which we find well underscored by Helmuth Jacobsohn (Jacobsohn 1992, 83ff).

The Ka-Mutef idea was carried out, so to speak, by the Pharaohs, who – as you know – were regarded as divine in Egypt. When the Pharaoh visited his queen in order to beget their eldest son, he did so in the role of the Ka-Mutef – the bull of his mother. In that moment he was actually identical with the divine generative power. Thus the Ka-Mutef, that is, this divine power, was subsequently conceived of as something similar to the Holy Ghost. Namely, the Pharaoh as the son-god was identical with his son through the mediation of the Ka-Mutef.

I would like to remind you of the statement in the Nicene Creed concerning Jesus being of one substance with the Father. This idea is extended even further in the “Creed of St. Athanasius,” which is still recited in the English Church on Christmas, Easter, *The Bull as Generative Power, Strength, and Fertility* 3 5 3

and other festive holidays in place of the usual Apostles’ Creed. This Athanasian Creed much more fully expounds the idea of the three persons being of one substance, and we find it in the *English Prayer Book* under the title of “St. Morning Prayer” directly after Evensong. It is startling how closely the context of this creed parallels the Egyptian idea of the Ka-Mutef.

As Jacobsohn points out, in Christianity the Holy Ghost is conceived of as something purely spiritual, whereas the KaMutef meant not only the spirit, but also strength, fertility and generative power on all levels (Jacobsohn 1992, 83).

What burning psychological problem does the Ka-Mutef remind us of today? One issue above all is the transpersonal aspect of sexuality, an aspect of sexuality so little realized in the West. By this I mean that sexuality belongs to the gods and is therefore (particularly in the second half of life) a religious problem. This archetypal image is behind all the apparent nonsense and even perversion of the modern problem of incest with which Freud was so tremendously impressed. But this problem is only distasteful if, like Freud, we do not see its religious significance. As you know, incestuous ties often persist even when great conscious efforts have been made to dissolve them. Although the mother-son archetype, for example, appears very often (I need only remind you of Attis), it seems to me that there is an aspect in this idea of the Ka-Mutef that throws a special light on the problem. I refer here to the fact that, according to Bonnet, the God must have no other origin than himself, a feature then symbolized by the generative power and fertility of the bull (Bonnet 1952, 364).

Have you any idea about the nature of this symbolism? Obviously it is, among other things, a matter of the Self, which is the one that has no other origin than itself. It is also a matter of the endogamous per se: “our family above all others,” and so on. Mothers are terribly inclined to think no girls are good enough for their sons, and some sons compare all women to their mothers – much, I must say, to the son’s disadvantage. And the same holds true, of course, with fathers and daughters.

There is also a genuine and important hook for this idea, and that is the fact that man is both human and divine – which, as mentioned earlier, we find in Psalms, in John 10:34, in the English theologian and alchemist John Pordage, or Silesius and Meister Eckhart (Jung 1966, par. 517). This psychic fact is possibly the most difficult to realize, and when it is not realized, it projects itself usually in the most absurd places, such as identifications with Christ (or other famous figures) as well as in numerous inflated forms. It also gets projected into the incest situation: somewhere the mother regards herself as the goddess and her son as the god. Outwardly she may be fighting in every way she can to free the son, but the son is secretly “the bull of the mother” and she cannot let him go. Or the son may be doing his outer best to get out into life, but inwardly the goddess, the anima, is persuading him – nay, commanding him

– that he is the bull of his mother and eternally bound to her. It is only when we realize the magnetic and very real force of such archetypal images that we have any chance of freeing them from of their projected and oftentimes very damaging form.

But even when we realize the force of such images, it is very difficult to see what they have to do with us in everyday life. Here it is quite impossible to generalize, for it is always a question of which archetype is constellated, and here there are no general rules. Dreams usually give us the most help, and they are usually the best bridges between our conscious lives and the archetypes, for we dream of synchronistic events, and through the dream we can try to grasp that we are both ourselves and at the same time the archetype. If we can manage to register the little synchronistic events of the day, these can give us valuable hints. I remind you of the prevalence of fish in Jung’s day while he was writing about the fish and how that archetype was constellated.¹

Primitives observe such things much better than we, and they also watch their dreams carefully in order to find out what “archetype” is constellated. When they know the invisible forces that are around, they can do something about it in their daily lives. It is therefore critically important to know something of the archetypes that are constellated.

The Bull as a Symbol of Impetus and Piercing

The strength of the bull is also strongly underscored in Egypt. Bonnet tells us that the word bull is sometimes used figuratively for a strong ruler, and we today find the same usage elsewhere (Bonnet 1952, 364). The president or mayor of a little community in Switzerland is known as the *Gemeindemuni*, that is, the “community bull.” (The “community bull” in Switzerland was also an actual individual bull which was kept by a cooperative of farmers who, unable to provide privately for a bull, joined together to secure the insemination of their cows. Here then is the association of the *Gemeindemuni* not only with strength and virility but with impetus and piercing argumentative skills.)

I would like, however, to take India as our chief example in this section, where we find the supreme Vedic god Indras frequently represented as a bull. We hear a great deal about him in this form in the *Rig-Vedas*, which were, as you probably know, the work of about one hundred poets stretching over several centuries.

Gubernatis points out the tremendous importance of cattle to the ancient Aryan and says it is thus natural that the virile bull and beneficent cow are the rulers of their heaven (de Gubernatis 1872, 3). We see the piercing quality, for instance, in the way Indras is said to be able to dispel the clouds. He is, of course, a sun god as well and is addressed as the “bull of bulls,” the invincible son of the cow that bellows like the Marutas. The Marutas are the wind gods that howl in the tempest and are said both to be as swift as lightning and to surround themselves with lightning (de Gubernatis 1872, 7). We find them also represented as bulls. In order to become a bull and develop the strength necessary to kill the serpent, Indras must fortify himself; thus he drinks the “somas” (an ambrosia associated with the moon) and the milk of the celestial cow from which he derives the swiftness of a horse. The gods are said to have given him three hundred oxen to eat and three lakes of ambrosial liquor to drink in order to develop his phenomenal strength, for he is the killer of the monstrous serpent (de Gubernatis 1872, 8).

Indras’s great weapons are his horns, which, according to Gubernatis, are his thunderbolts, and he is said to sharpen these thunderbolts as a bull sharpens his horns. They are reputed to have one thousand points, and Indras as the bull is called “the bull with one thousand horns that rises from the sea.” Sometimes his beloved cows sharpen his horns so that he may deliver them from the “monster of darkness” that constantly envelops them. (His thunderbolts are at times themselves called bulls (de Gubernatis 1872, 9).)

The monstrous enemy is always stealing the cows and imprisoning them in such places as woods or caverns, and as the bull Indras fights the monster with his horns in order to liberate his cows. In a hymn to Indras the gods come with their axes, destroy the woods, and put an end to the monsters that are holding back the milk from the udders of the cows (de Gubernatis 1872, 10ff).

In their negative aspect, the Maruta bulls are said to cause landslides and, in dispelling the darkness and the clouds, do as much damage as they do good. But these things are always paradoxical; it belongs to their very nature. Indras is also destructive, although he is represented as the one who destroys evil.

The Bull as a Symbol of Impetus and Piercing 3 5 7

In one Vedic hymn in particular Indras vividly appears as a bull who destroys a Vedic witch, a sort of Amazon or Medea, who had treacherously plunged her husband into a fiery furnace (de Gubernatis 1872, 33).¹

Interestingly enough, the Sanskrit word for bull – in the sense of the one who pours out – is also used to denote the best, or the first, or the prince, which again reminds us of the *Gemeindemuni*. Gubernatis points out that the bull in India is a most sacred symbol of royalty (de Gubernatis 1872, 3). (The cow is yet more honored, but we shall come to that later.)

Perhaps this is enough to give some idea of the bull Indras in the *Rig-Vedas* and the extraordinary honor that was paid to his impetus, strength and piercing quality.²

What would you say psychologically of the bull in this aspect? How is he different from the lion, which is also a symbol for strength and power?

The lion is still dangerous; it can actually eat you. The bull is nearer to consciousness in that it can be domesticated. It is of course even used for agricultural purposes, to draw ploughs and the like. So if one dreamed of a bull, it would be strength and impetus that could be, to a large extent, tamed, harnessed, and used by consciousness. A lion, on the other hand, is always wild and has to be treated quite differently. In the fairy tale of the prince and the lion, the lion was extremely helpful. But it was of his own volition; consciousness could have in no way obliged him to be helpful.

XXXVI

The Bull as the Constant Victim

The motif of the sacrifice of the bull is a widespread motif that we find practically throughout the world. It survives to the present day in the bullfights in Spain, which, although admittedly not a religious ceremony, still retain an enormous mana. The bull is still the constant victim in Spain. Whereas the men who fight him may lose their lives, he is never allowed to live. In the Provence he does at least have a chance and still occasionally comes off the victor. In the antique bullfight he may have also had a chance. We know very little about antique bullfights, although, as evidenced by this picture that I would like to show you, they were complex and elaborate events entailing a type of dance performed with the bull, an event that we assume must have been dangerous for the human performers.¹

One of the forms of the sea god, Poseidon, was a bull, and certainly he was associated with the sacrifice of bulls on the mainland of Greece and probably in Crete as well, although the main deity of the latter seems to have been an archaic mother earth goddess.

We hear from Jane Harrison in her book *Themis* that in Greece a bull was dedicated to Zeus at the time when seed was sown (Harrison 1927: 150). The bull was led in a solemn, festive procession and thereafter ritually fed until he was finally sacrificed in the month of Artemis (about April 6). It was thought that the willingness of the bull to be thus treated played a considerable role. At all events, we find that on the island of Kos the choice of the actual bull to be sacrificed was determined by the bull himself, which bowed his head in acquiescence. It was not only sacrificed to the gods, but subsequently eaten communally in order to obtain its mana.

In a sanctuary of Poseidon the injunctions of the god were inscribed on a columnlike pillar or obelisk. (These injunctions seem to have constituted the law of the country and were accompanied by a curse for the disobedient.) The bull was first set free in this sanctuary and then led to the column where it was slaughtered so that its blood flowed directly onto the inscription. According to Harrison – and she brings coins to prove her point

– the bull was hung on the pillar and killed in such a way that brought his blood into direct contact with the laws inscribed so as to endow them with new mana (Harrison 1927, 163f).

As Poseidon was represented as a bull, the idea of infusing mana in his laws by sacrificing the god above them strikes me as interesting, particularly if Harrison is correct in her premise that the bull had to consent to its own death. It is a conjunction of law and instinct from which we could learn a great deal.

Can you think of a psychological parallel? I would say that we see here the difference between traditional morality and ethos that is so clearly brought out in Jung's recent paper on human ethics and conscience.² The former – that is, traditional morality – is little more than just following a trodden path. But the latter, ethos, requires that you sacrifice your blood over the law, taking on the dreaded conflict of duties and suffering through hell before you know what to do.

The most famous and best known example of the bull as the constant victim is in the Mithraic religion. Here one suffers from an excess of material in contradistinction to the mysteries entailing the bull of Crete and the Mycenaean culture (lately realized to be intimately connected). The Mithraic religion survived into the Christian era, whereas the final catastrophe in Crete was probably about 1500 bc. Franz Cumont, who is a great authority on Mithras, dates the origin of the god Mithras very early and points out that there was a Vedic Mithras as well as the betterknown Iranian version. At all events, the name Mithras for a god is very old. Mithraism was an early rival of Christianity and – as a very learned old friend of mine was always telling me in my early youth – it very nearly became the leading religion of the world instead of Christianity. He used to love to speculate on how different our culture would have been! Cumont gives a very interesting account of the whole religion in his book *The Mysteries of Mithra*, but I shall confine myself strictly to the role of the bull.

Cumont recounts the legend of Mithras and the bull and points out that the naive nature of this fable could only have originated in a people of herders and hunters. Cattle are the source of all their worldly wealth, and the capture of a wild bull is the heroic undertaking of a god. In this legend, Mithras seized the horns while it was grazing on a mountainside. The bull, infuriated, bolted, struggling in vain to free itself of the rider. Mithras lost his position but hung on for dear life until the bull, exhausted, was forced to surrender. He then dragged the bull backward into a cave, which Mithras made into his home. (I give here a lengthier version of the legend because the role of Mithra's dog as the guide of souls is classic.)

This painful Journey... of Mithra became the symbol of human sufferings. But the bull [previously captured]... succeeded in making its escape from its prison, and roamed again at large over the mountain pastures. The sun then sent the raven, his messenger, to carry to his ally [Mithra] the command to slay the fugitive. Mithra received this cruel mission much against his will, but submitting to the decree of Heaven he pursued the truant beast with his agile dog, succeeded in overtaking it just at the moment when it was taking refuge in the cave which it had quitted, and seizing it by the nostrils with one hand, with the other he plunged deep into its flank his hunting knife.

Then came an extraordinary prodigy to pass. From the body of the moribund victim sprang all the useful herbs and plants that cover the earth with their verdure. From the spinal cord of the animal sprang wheat that gives us our bread, and from the blood the vine that produces the sacred drink of the Mysteries. In vain did the Evil Spirit launch forth his unclean demons against the anguish-wrung animal, in order to poison in it the very sources of life; the scorpion, the ant, the serpent, strove in vain to consume the genital parts and to drink the blood of the prolific quadruped; but they were powerless to impede the miracle that was enacting. The seed of the bull, gathered and purified by the Moon, produced the different species of useful animals, and [the bull's] soul, under the protection of the dog, the faithful companion of Mithra, ascended into the celestial spheres above, where, receiving the honors of divinity, [the bull's soul] became... the guardian of herds. Thus, through the sacrifice which he had so resignedly undertaken, the tauroctonous hero became the creator of all beneficent beings on earth; and from the death which he had caused, was born a new life, more rich and more fecund than the old. (Cumont 1956, 135ff)

This legend is one of the origins of the bull sacrifice in Mithras, and in this aspect it was a fertility rite.³ But in the Mithraic mysteries the main idea was that the novices should receive divinity as individuals from the blood of the gods; they were literally showered with the bull's blood beneath a grate over which the bull was sacrificed). The idea also was to overcome the power of the blind instinctive force portrayed here by the sacrifice of the bull.

The Mithraic material belongs also in our fourth category, for sacrificing the animal instinct is a form of spiritualization. But in this legend of Mithras, the springing of vegetation from the sacrificed bull connotes the laying of the foundation of culture that can only arise with a people that have already domesticated animals and have an agricultural tradition.

I would like to draw your attention to the point Jung makes in *Symbols of Transformation* where he refers to the sentimentality and brutality that is to be seen in the representations of Mithras (Jung 1967, par. 668). We met this also in Jacobsohn's four-thousand-year-old Egyptian text of the world-weary man in which the man's Ba soul criticizes the sentimentality of the man's complaints and points out that the man is quite wrong in thinking he is not brutal when he considers laying violent hands on himself (Jacobsohn 1968).

Why do you think sentimentality and brutality are so often found together? In part this is because these feelings are inferior. There is an artificial

character to sentimentality: it is little more than putting a disguise over brutality. When you directly stand to your own selfishness or lack of feeling for others, the coldness becomes less brutal, but the more you pretend to feelings you haven't got, the more brutal you become. So these two feelings are eternal begetters of each other.

In the chapter on the unicorn in *Psychology and Alchemy* we learn that the bull is closely related to the unicorn. Tertullian, for instance, alludes to Christ, saying that: "His glory is that of the bull, his horn is that of the unicorn" (Jung 1968, par. 520). And when Moses blessed the children of Israel before his death he said of Joseph: "His glory is like a firstborn bull, and his horns like the horns of a wild ox; together with them he shall push the peoples to the ends of the earth" (Deuteronomy 33:17). Tertullian also says: "Christ was named the bull on account of two qualities: the one hard as a judge (*ferus*, 'wild, untamed'), and the other gentle as a savior (*mansuetus*, 'tame')" (Jung 1968, par. 521). A lot of the unicorn material also belongs to the bull, particularly the idea of the wrathful and avenging God of the Old Testament being soothed in the lap of the Virgin after being made captive by love (Jung 1968, par. 522).

XXXVII

The Bull as Spiritual Regeneration

As has been the case with our other animals, particularly with the horse, the serpent and the lion, we find the first three classes of the symbolism of the bull raised to a higher level in the fourth.

It is true that in our second class of symbolism I have not found many signs of Indras being transformed. The material given by Gubernatis is undeveloped, so it is possible that it really fails to reach the fourth class. But if I had the time to study the *Rig-Vedas* themselves, I think we would find that Gubernatis lacked either interest in or awareness of this fourth aspect and thus did not uncover the necessary material in the *Rig-Vedas*. Brute strength, impetus and a piercing quality are, of course, very much in need of transformation, and indeed we find this evolution in many other materials. The impetus to develop and evolve these qualities requires a new and more differentiated direction, and, as I pointed out, these qualities are very evident in the Egyptian material: they are all present in the theme of the Ka-Mutef. The Ka-Mutef is constantly undergoing transformation for the idea here is that the king is simultaneously identical with the son yet he begets him, and thus he renews and regenerates himself.

All of you have probably read *Psychology and Alchemy*. Now, the entire section on the unicorn belongs in our theme. Jung chose this example to show how the symbolism of the alchemical Mercurius “was intermingled with the traditions of pagan Gnosticism and of the Church” (Jung 1968, par. 518). As the Church became more one-sided, many of its vibrant origins flowed into alchemy and thrived there. We could say that our bull was one of the main elements that suffered this fate, for Yahweh was a very bull-like god in the Old Testament

– both hard, or even fierce, and gentle, merciful, and often kind. However, as the ideas of the *summum bonum* and the *privatio boni* gained ground, there was no more room for the hard, irritable and fierce side of the bull; thus it was regarded more and more as a Mithraic symbol that had nothing to do with Christianity. Yet, as we know, the bull-like part of our nature by no means disappeared on account of the Christian attempt to transform him or get rid of him, and this problem is shown by such expressions as “a bull in a china shop” used for a person whose original nature breaks through because he can no longer bear all the fragile objects with which our culture has surrounded us.

Jung follows the unicorn first in alchemy, then in ecclesiastical allegory, then in Gnosticism, then as the one-horned scarabaeus in Egypt, in the Vedas, in Persia, in Jewish tradition, and in China (Jung 1968, pars. 435–549). He concludes with a discussion on the “unicorn cup,” which is directly connected with the “Eucharistic Chalice” and is also the vessel used in divination. I mention all these sources in order to show how deeply and universally the horn is associated with fierce, hardened and penetrating qualities, and would add here that the horn of the unicorn and the horn of the bull are imprinted as such deeply in the human psyche. The unicorn and bull – particularly in the nature of their personalities – are in many central characteristics interchangeable.

The main idea, as I mentioned before, is the *spiritualization* of this wild instinct that lends itself to domestication and can be transformed in us in a way we could never achieve with our still wilder instincts such as the lion. The latter can at best be related to, its emotionality forged and transformed. But the bull can be spiritualized. In the unicorn and the bull, instinctive indulgence in bull-like passions and moods is not only forged, but it is taken a step further and transformed into deepest spiritual love.

Let us return to our example of the legend of Mithras. If we recall, the sun god, by means of his messenger, the raven, commands Mithras to kill the bull. Although Mithras loved the animal and would have preferred to tame it, he was unsuccessful in his efforts. Only through the sacrifice of the bull could a real spiritualization take place. The curative and restorative plants and trees springing forth from the blood of the bull have a different nature and rhythm of life and are the symbols par excellence of a very different order of spirit in contradistinction to animal existence. When the Mithraic bull is sacrificed, a whole new world comes into being.

What would be the meaning of killing such a bull in ourselves? And what would be the transformation? Well, for one thing it would be a sacrifice of our bad moods with the same determination as the sacrificer who smites the bull. If we do not master an evil temper such as sexual or material lust, it possesses us and kills our spiritual side as certainly as the bull would kill a clumsy toreador who is delayed in his reaction. Only a radical determination to give up a bullheaded mood or a stubborn habit or obsession helps here. The bull must be sacrificed, and only then can be transformed.

Marie-Louise von Franz gave me a fairy tale that depicts the sacrifice of a bull for a completely new attitude in the clear and naive form characteristic of fairy tales. The story, titled “Kari Wooden-Frock,” is about a king's daughter, reflecting the motif of a girl persecuted by a belligerent and degrading stepmother. Here she is helped by a blue bull and in the end meets her prince much like Cinderella.

A king, whose wife and queen has passed away, marries an evil woman who favors her own contemptible little daughter over Kari, the king's lovely child. Kari finds no refuge from the tirades of her stepmother until, as she looks after the royal herd of cattle, she discovers a certain solace in the shelter of the king's magnificent blue bull. He is no ordinary beast but blessed with magical powers, for out of his ear she is allowed to take a small tablecloth which then decks itself with all of her wishes and needs. The diabolical stepmother, who has grand plans for her own daughter to become the royal princess, is displeased that the king's daughter survives so well. So one day she seeks to discover why this Kari is not dwindling away. So she spies on the king's daughter and stumbles upon the wonderful secret. At first infuriated, but then quickly calm and composed, she returns to the castle to suddenly collapse from dire illness. As the king comes to the bedside of his languishing wife, she pleads, nay demands that the bull be sacrificed at once for its blood, for a heavenly voice has whispered to her that the bull's blood – and its blood only – can possibly save her from horrible death.

Kari and the bull get wind of the plot and bolt from the palace, journeying onward through many foreign and unknown lands until they arrive at a wondrous forest where all the trees are decked with copper foliage. Kari is warned that she must not remove a single leaf of a tree, for if she does, the Lord of the Forest, a three-headed troll, will certainly come to kill them. But the poor maiden is too dazzled to resist the wondrous beauty of the copper leaves, so she plucks one for herself... and thus the blue bull must combat the troll. The battle is a furious life-or-death struggle, no telling who will win. In the end the bull is victorious although he pays a heavy price; severe wounds are inflicted all over his body and he lingers, hovering near death. As if protected by a guardian angel, Kari finds a special ointment made by the old troll himself and is able to heal the bull.

Naturally, they travel onward. And the challenges and temptations increase. The next forest is one of marvelous silver trees in the dominion of a six-headed troll. Again Kari succumbs to temptation, snatches a silver leaf, and a terrific battle ensues. The bull, again victorious, travels with Kari onward to a forest of pure gold in the domination of a particularly nasty troll, and this one has nine heads. Kari has learned her lesson and resists the allurements of gold, but fate will have it that by fluke she plucks a golden apple. More battles, more wounds and suffering, and once again the defeat of a belligerent troll.

Thereafter the bull leads Kari up into the mountains, past a cliff face at the base of a towering rock wall, and then beyond to a castle fortress. He commands her to enter the sow pen, don a wooden frock, and offer herself as handmaiden to the prince of the palace. Before she goes he demands that she take a little knife and cut off his head – for Kari an abhorrent deed – and then she is told to remove his pelt, clean it, take the copper and silver leaves as well as the golden apple and roll them up in the hide. All this she then must stash at the foot of that mountain cliff. The bull further instructs her that outside the face of this mountain there lies a heavy hawthorn staff, and she is to knock with that staff on the stone wall

when her need becomes dire. With a heavy heart she executes her tasks and then goes to serve as a lowly handmaiden at the castle. She requests the honor of bringing the prince a bowl of water with which to wash himself, but as she ascends the stairs her wooden frock makes such a racket that the prince storms into the stairwell, barks about all the clamor, and empties the water bowl on her head. She is sent briskly away. Carefully performing her work with the pigs, Kari – never complaining – lives frugally in the pigsty, showering her love and care on the sows and piglets. And how they flourish and multiply. But one of the things that she so very much misses is going to church on Sunday. Now, with her present attire there is no hope in the world. So one day she returns to the mountain, picks up the hawthorn staff, knocks on the wall, and asks the unknown man who mysteriously appears out of the stone to grant her a dress that she can wear, especially one that she could wear to church at the next Christian holiday. She receives a dress that is as marvelous and shiny as the copper forest, and even more to her surprise, she is given a horse. At church the prince is stunned by her beauty and after the service approaches her, hoping to find out what royalty she may be and to ask her her name, but she flees, leaving a glove behind. She escapes his hot pursuit in that she calls out: “Light in front of me, darkness behind, where I am riding the prince will not find.”

She thus outwits the prince and returns to her pigsty. On the following two Sundays the episode repeats. Each time Kari escapes yet gives the prince first her handkerchief and then her comb. Finally, in her golden gown, Kari once again outwits the prince, but he manages to retain a shoe and now the search is on throughout the kingdom for the beautiful foot that fits.

Kari’s stepsister feels herself called to the honor and prepares herself to be whisked up into the prince’s arms as the up-and-coming ruler of the kingdom. Maybe he just hasn’t noticed her until now. So she mutilates her pudgy foot and jams it into the shoe. But a bird betrays her, singing: “A glob off the heel and a chunk off the toe, it’s Wooden-Frock’s shoe that’s bloodied, ho! ho!”

The prince recognizes Kari’s name and calls her forth from the sow stall. Up she comes, her wooden frock thundering louder than a regiment of dragoons. He is at once captivated by her beauty, fascinated by her courage and determination, and charmed by her modesty. What’s more, she is bedazzling, so he entreats her to become his wife. So in blue-blooded pomp and noble festivities she becomes his bride, and they discover and share the depths and joy of their love as the marriage is consummated that very night. (von Beit, 734f)¹

In terms of a woman’s psychology, what would you say is the first big transformation that takes place here? We go from the bull to a positive animus that enables her to change her whole attitude from that of a persecuted girl to that of a woman able to obtain a king’s love.

And the second transformation? She passes from the drudgery of a daughter to a queen; that is, from an ego in possession of the shadow and the anguish and travail of having a negative mother to a configuration of the Self. This strikes me as definitely a feminine story. Similarities to the fairy tale of *The Magic Horse* are apparent. Although they both deal with female psychology, there are a few significant variations. One of the main differences is found at the beginning, which starts with an evil stepmother instead of a father who wants to keep his daughter for himself.

Remembering that fairy tales are not individual psychology but more images of the collective psychology of the time, one could say that the king, representing the ruling principle, is slowly giving himself over to a more negative eros principal. As we see in the stepmother of the present story, it is has gone completely evil. The girl would represent here a new, more positive form of anima.

Taking it as an image of feminine psychology, however, what do you think would be the chief practical difference of a girl suffering under a belligerent stepmother and one who the father wants to keep for himself as in *The Magic Horse*? The answer, I believe, is that in the latter her eros would be weak. She would not necessarily be possessed by a demonic shadow of the father (djinn), but she would lack earth and eros. Therefore, a “*marriageconiunctio*” is the end goal here, for eros is disturbed.

The food is given by the bull. What would that mean? As the stepmother gives nothing, it is replaced by a bull animus. He is at least a positive male spirit, and that is the only way such a girl can get around. Her weak femininity must be nourished by the right spirit; such women have to do something with their minds before they can become women. If it goes wrong, the bull turns negative and blots out their femininity; then they turn into animus hounds. The horse is more the flow of libido that led the girl to the mandala, that is, to individuation. The bull is the spirit that nourishes her and makes her capable of life at least in this way. We see this in the Brontë sisters and the fact that it was such “bull animi” that helped them through with no mother (Hannah 1971).

Then in our story the stepmother wants to kill the bull that feeds the girl, and the bull proposes flight. Here she makes the interesting remark: “It is bad to leave my father, but it is worse to stay with my stepmother,” and thus she consents to go.

Now, what do you think of this? The bull has produced a certain maturity in the girl. She makes an adult choice and doesn’t ask for the penny and the cake. She sacrifices being with the father – something that is painful for her – and shows much more independence than the girl in the fairy tale *The Magic Horse*. In his paper “Woman in Europe,” Jung writes: “Masculinity means knowing what one wants and doing what is necessary to achieve it” (Jung 1978, par. 260). This is the advantage of a bull animus.²

What about the leaves? What do they mean? They are egotistic hooks that bring out the infernal aspect of the animus. Then comes the experience of sacrifice: after she has overcome her pain and done as the bull requested, she has to become a kitchen maid. What does this mean? After the negative animi are overcome, the girl can no longer be carried by the bull animus, however positive he may be. So she must sacrifice him and become a woman, which occurs first naturally on an elementary level.

Then the first transformation takes place. The bull becomes human and is then a positive animus, able to change her whole attitude and give her beautiful clothes instead of her wooden frock. And what does the second transformation mean? The girl rises out of the drudgery, that is out of the demoralized and humiliated shadow of femininity in which her stepmother had driven her, to then become a queen. In other words, she transcends from an ego in the possession of a negative stepmother to a feminine configuration of the Self.

Why would you say it is just the hide of the bull and horned head that have to be set at the foot of the mountain cliff? I would say that the toughness of the bull’s hide and the penetrating, puncturing and aggressive power of the horns are just the things that make him a bull. All the other organs he shares with animals in general, but this special combination comprises his individual traits. These powers are wrapped up together and put aside, yet they can be retrieved again when needed. By means of this sacrifice Kari gains the positive animus and completes the transformation. In the end she is able to stand symbolically to the individual traits of the bull, to express and live that which makes her feminine as a woman and to realize that which constitutes her special individual character.

XXXVIII

The Cow as Mother

We have already considered the outer biological characteristics of the cow when we studied the bull and need not repeat them here. Now, the main biological difference between the two of them is but one of gender. The very large udders and plentiful milk supply of the cow contrast with the sizable phallus and great virility of the bull. The appearance is also different in that the cow is more lightly built with graceful horns, whereas the bull is heavily built and his horns are thicker, stronger and often shorter. The two are also of course very different in character, the cow being as a rule much more docile and tame than the bull, although there are exceptions among them (as with ourselves): gentle bulls and fierce, dangerous cows. Usually cows are only dangerous – as is the case with most female animals – when they are defending their calves, but this is not always the case; cows are known to be quite fierce at other times as well. (Festivals centering on cowfights are an old annual tradition in the Alps, and among the pomp and festivities, the cows rigorously duel in the ring with great vitality and consequence.)

The cow is the maternal animal par excellence. Just as we speak of a particularly virile man as bull-like, so we talk of the kind of mother that is particularly excellent with small children as cow-like, and both are meant in a positive sense. So as our four crosshairs we will take the cow as:

1. a symbol of the mother,
2. a symbol of the nurturer and provider,
3. a symbol of docility,
4. a symbol of the feminine par excellence.

We find the cow as mother in many mythologies. Even Hera, the legitimate wife of Zeus, is spoken of as “the cow-eyed Hera,” and the main goddesses of Egypt are all connected in some way with Hathor, the cow goddess, whose chief sanctuary was in Dendera on the Nile in Upper Egypt. Hathor is definitely the cow goddess, but she is also represented in human shape with the cow as her attribute, or she is depicted as a cow with a human face, or fully human with cow horns. We already met Hathor, this placid cow goddess, when we spoke of the cat where, if you remember, she also appeared in the form of Sechmet (the lioness) when she is angry, and Bastet (the cat goddess) when she is cheerful and pleasant (Bonnet 1952, 282).

The name Hathor is usually taken to mean “the house of Horus,” and there are many connections between Hathor’s sanctuary at Dendera and Horus’s temple in neighboring Edfu. Bonnet tells us that Horus had his own suite at Dendera, and Hathor visited him at Edfu every year for a fortnight. The day of her arrival was celebrated as the “day of the beautiful embrace,” which was definitely meant as a *coniunctio* between the two (Bonnet 1952, 278). But whereas Hathor is really the cow, Horus can at best but indirectly be considered to be a bull. Hathor slowly merged into Isis and thereby became the mother of Horus, who was thus, like Apis and Min, “the bull of his mother.” (I should have liked to end this course with the *coniunctio* between bull and cow, but, despite my continual search, I have found very

374 *The Archetypal Symbolism of the Bull and the Cow*

little material on this theme.) With all the changing shapes of the Egyptian deities, one would not feel justified in regarding the falcon-headed Horus as a bull in this *coniunctio* either at Dendera or Edfu. Moreover, when Hathor took journeys abroad, she flew back to Dendera not as a cow but as a falcon hen. (Here again the flux of forms of the Egyptian gods and goddesses as they transform and merge in and out of one another.)

The name Hathor also means “my house in the sky,” and she was definitely regarded as the goddess of heaven. Plutarch combines the two and speaks of “Horus’s cosmic house.” (The house was also the image for the womb in Egypt.) Hathor may have originally been regarded as the mother of Horus, but, if so, she was certainly later deposed by Isis and still later merged more or less into a single identity with her. In her aspect as goddess of heaven she is very intimately connected with Nut, and we will consider this aspect in our fourth section on symbolism. In summing up the character of Hathor, Bonnet notes that she developed in two directions, of which only the first concerns us here. She was definitely the feminine par excellence, particularly in the aspect of the maternal. Herself a mother, she bestows the gift of children onto women, and she is also a great helper in childbirth. Moreover, she was very fond of dancing, games, and exuberant parties that included marvelous and very real orgies such as “The Mistress of Dendera’s Festival of Drunkenness” in which, among other things, the Pharaoh danced with the wine amphora of the goddess. Bonnet says that these feminine motherly qualities were indigenous to the original goddess herself (Bonnet 1952, 282).

One need not go into much detail about the maternal aspect of the psychology of the cow, since this quality is sufficiently well known. This quality of nature strives to mother and protect everything weak and growing; it is more interested in the helpless than the strong, and it is, one could say, more occupied with the future than the past, for it is the young growing child or calf that it protects so passionately. Many women are far more attracted by helplessness or infirmity in a man than by strength. They can love men better when they are ill or in trouble than they can when they are strong and successful.

However, it struck me at first as strange that Bonnet designated gaiety, drunkenness and orgies as belonging to the motherly and feminine, for when one thinks of intoxicated orgies, it is the god Dionysus who comes to mind. Yet when one comes to think of it, Dionysus is mythologically regarded as a mother’s son, so that the orgies probably belong to his anima, that is, to his feminine side; after all, it was the Maeneads, the mad women of Thebes, and very young men who celebrated them so wildly. The fact that the Egyptologist Bonnet should regard Hathor’s orgies as completely characteristic of her femininity is actually psychologically correct; this aspect belongs to women, femininity and the anima of men.

XXXIX

The Cow as Nurturer and Provider

The material in this second class of symbolism is also inexhaustible and found everywhere, for the products of the cow belong to the most invaluable treasures of man. It is not surprising to find their producer, the cow, highly venerated wherever cattle are domesticated, and, as Brehm pointed out, their origin is very widespread.

In India, the cardinal principal of life for the ancient Aryan was the increase of the number of his cows, and it was his goal to render them prolific in calves and fruitful of milk. Here the cow, as Gubernatis says, is the ready, loving, faithful, fruitful providence of the cowherd, so it is natural that this experience was projected onto the heavens and that the beneficent, fruitful power there should be called the cow (de Gubernatis 1872, 3).

India suffers heavily from droughts, and rain is the great desideratum. So when it rained or moisture came, they thought that their heavenly provider and nurturer was lavishing her milk upon them. Water being in such short supply, milk was often the only natural drinkable fluid and thus a partially sacred gift; the heavenly cow was believed to give her milk to them through the

The Cow as Nurturer and Provider 377

udders of her earthly representatives. The bull indeed was the one who impregnated the cow, enabling her to give calves and milk. But, on the other hand, the great hero god Indras needed the milk of the cow to strengthen himself, and spotted cows are said to drop their milk from the sky upon him.

You will remember that the Sanskrit word for bull also denotes “best” and “prince,” so the bull becomes a most sacred symbol of royalty; yet Gubernatis tells us on the same page that the cow is yet more honored (de Gubernatis 1872, 44). The sacred cows in India still go where they will in the streets of many towns, and it has long been a crime to kill a cow.

In the *Mahâbharâtam* (a collection of great, national Aryan epic poems) we hear of the wonderful products of the cow Kâdmadhenus: “Besides milk and ambrosia, she yields herbs and gems” (de Gubernatis 1872, 87). This cow is celebrated for her tail, udders, and horns. When an attempt was made to steal her, she bellowed, dropped fire from her tail and radiated armies from every part of her body that dispersed the would-be thieves. This particular producer of milk, ambrosia and gems can also produce very formidable weapons, and this leads us over to the fact that, although the cow is so much venerated in India, she is also endowed with monstrous and demonic qualities. And as far as my very limited knowledge goes, these qualities occur much more with her than with the bull. We find this idea already in the *Rig-Veda*, where the bull Indras has helpful cows who regard him as their friend and liberating hero. But the multi-form monster (his arch opponent) also has cows, and these cows regard Indras as their worst enemy. There are also cows that become monsters themselves. (Here such positive aspects of the cow – docility, passivity, maternalness and servility – take on their shadow opposites such as manipulation by means of weakness, infirmity and infertility, laziness, castrating and binding one’s children to oneself, and fawning subservience.)

The mythology entailing the wonderful and manifold products of the cow – sometimes themselves regarded as sacred – is very widespread, but we will confine ourselves to these few examples from India. The products of the cow would psychologically represent especially feminine creative products, products of the eros side of a woman in contradistinction to the masculine creativity of the spirit and of the mind. These products would lie especially in the realm of relationship and represent the gifts that a woman can give in this area. Relationship in its higher forms must be creative; it cannot run on recognized rails. It must be individually tailored to each particular relationship, and this adaptation requires a creative effort especially on the part of the woman, who is primarily responsible for eros just as the man is primarily responsible for the mind. A father forms or distorts his daughter’s (and his son’s) mind, and the mother forms or distorts her son’s (and her daughter’s) eros. The mother who really realizes her creative task in this aspect gives the home a totally different atmosphere than one where eros relationship is neglected. This creativity respects the identity and needs of each individual and recognizes the need to be oneself in husband and child alike. It raises itself out of the identity with the participation mystique of the original form and makes the home a springboard for life instead of just a warm nest with fledglings incapable of leaving it. And this creativity does not stop short at the doors of the home. It gives its products where they are needed, just as the cow does not insist on giving all her milk to her calf but allows herself to be milked by those who know enough to milk her properly.

The milk itself, which can be transformed into cream, butter, yogurt and innumerable kinds of cheese, also gives us a hint as to these feminine creative products and the development and transformation of which they are capable. Although the milk itself is highly perishable, when it has been processed (for instance, made into cheese), it can be preserved indefinitely and retains its rich nutrients. In the same way, a mother who has worked intensively on her eros produces a storehouse that she can pass on to her children. For instance, the daughters of such a mother, even long after her death, will find that they have reservoir of eros that does not fail them and that they in their turn can pass on to their children.

XL

The Docility of the Cow

We find the docile aspect of the cow beautifully described in Hexagram 30 of the *I Ching*, titled “The Clinging, Fire.” In “The Judgment” of the hexagram we read: “The Clinging. Perseverance furthers. It brings success. Care of the cow brings good fortune.” And at the end of the commentary to this judgement we read:

Human life on earth is conditioned and unfree, and when a man recognizes this limitation and makes himself dependent upon the harmonious and beneficent forces of the cosmos, he achieves success. The cow is the symbol of extreme docility. By cultivating in himself an attitude of compliance and voluntary dependence, man acquires clarity without sharpness and finds his place in the world. (Wilhelm 1970, 126f)

In a footnote on this section we read:

It is a noteworthy and curious coincidence that fire and care of the cow are connected here just as in the Parsee religion. [According to the Parsee belief the Divine Light, or Fire, was manifested in the mineral, vegetable, and animal worlds before it appeared in human form. Its animal incarnation was the cow, and Ahura-Mazda was nourished on her milk.] (Wilhelm 1970, 127)¹

In the second volume, that is, in “Part III – The Commentaries,” we find an interesting addition: “The yielding clings to the middle and to what is right, hence it has success. Therefore it is said. ‘Care of the cow brings good fortune’ ” (Wilhelm 1970, 179). And at the end of the commentary on the “Judgment” it speaks of the “strong but docile cow” (Wilhelm 1970, 180).

The cow here becomes the symbol of the attitude required to reach the middle, the quiet place in the center of the tension of the opposites, the path to the transcendent function and to individuation itself. Here we arrive at that type of docility marked by strength and integrity of character and a recognition of our own limitations. We find the “brightness” that “illuminates the four quarters of the world” (which is mentioned in “The Image” of this hexagram) (Wilhelm 1970, 127).

I do not know of anything more restful and centering when one feels on edge than to go into a cow stable after the cows have been milked and fed and just soak up the atmosphere of the place. Each cow seems completely content and at one with “the harmonious and beneficent forces of the cosmos” (as our text says), and together they radiate an uncomplicated serenity that pours balm on one’s soul. The horses, dogs and cats were all individual friends in my childhood, and I hardly ever knew one cow from another, although we only had five or six. But if I wanted to be reassured and comforted, I went to the cow stable, and it never failed me. They did not have the same effect in the fields, so I suppose it was the fact that they were fed, enclosed and resting that brought out this beneficent and centering aspect of docility which I found so infinitely reassuring as a child.²

It is not at all difficult for me to understand why the *I Ching* and the Parsee religion bring the cow together with fire or divine

The Docility of the Cow 381

light. The complete acceptance of the cow is in itself divine. She is what she is without restriction or reservation.

If one thinks for a moment about how we treat our domesticated cattle (quite apart from any unusual cruelty of their owners), one will see first that we take the calves from the cows far too early for their natural pattern; then we often kill them for veal; we then use the milk of the mother’s swollen udders for our own ends; of the calves which we do not eat we either castrate them and, as soon as they are grown, skin and eat them, sparing but a few to draw our plows and carts, or we keep the heifers for the next cycle of the production of butter, milk, yogurt, cheese or ice cream; and then we kill the cows at any moment that suits our convenience and make out of their bodies leather jackets, gloves, glue or what we will. Looking from this rather harsh vantage point, we get an idea of the complete acceptance of fate that the cow represents. With other domestic animals, bad treatment is actually passed down from generation to generation. It is almost impossible to establish a relationship with a kitten or puppy whose mother has gone wild or turned savage, so there certainly is an inherited pattern of behavior in domestic animals that is influenced even by the parents. Yet cattle remain docile for untold generations with an enviable and almost incredible trust in fate.

Just as the virile bull represents an image of brave and strong masculinity, so the docile cow represents an essential aspect of femininity that is all too rare in women today. Yet this voluntary docility is one of the strongest forces in the universe. It is like water that never resists yet is the strongest of all the elements, carving out stone and finding its way past all obstacles to the sea. So, according to this hexagram of the *I Ching*, it is this quality in the cow that is the symbol par excellence of the attitude that finds the precious middle way and in appropriate circumstances leads to the goal of individuation.

XLI

The Cow as the Feminine par Excellence

We already saw in our first class of symbolism that Hathor was regarded as a goddess of the sky. She is thus connected and sometimes identical with the heavenly goddess Nut, who was known to stand at the summit of the Egyptian gods as “She who bore the gods.” She was also the sun-mother who daily bears the sun. But later her son Ra deposed her from this summit, and she became one of the company of nine gods. She was compared by the Greeks to Rhea, the mother of Zeus, who also had trouble preventing her husband Cronos from eating her children.

The legend says that Nut and her brother Geb were the children of Schu and Tefnut, also a brother-sister pair who in turn were the children of the original God Atum. Originally Geb and Nut were locked together in an embrace on the earth, but as Nut had the unfortunate habit of devouring her own children (for which reason she is sometimes called a sow that devours its litter), she was raised by Schu to the heavens and thus separated from her husband Geb, who represents the earth.

Nut is found actually depicting or representing the vault of the heavens. Her head is in the West, and the sun is devoured by her mouth in the evening and reborn through her vagina at dawn. As the stars are invisible in the day, they also are regarded as being swallowed by her as the sun begins to rise, to be reborn as the sun sets again in the evening. According to Bonnet, Nut herself is always depicted in human form but often covered in stars when she is Hathor. The vault of heaven is represented in the same way but with the heavenly cow in the place of the human Nut (Bonnet 1952, 536f).

Both Nut and Hathor are goddesses of the dead, and the dead pray to them in much the same way as to Osiris (Hathor instead of Osiris). They pray to be swallowed by her like the sun and the stars in order to be reborn in the beyond. Nut is usually represented in the actual burial chamber in the innermost shrine of the graves of the kings, where she is depicted as overwhelmingly impressive and striking. The mummy is placed in the most convenient place for Nut to swallow him and bring him forth again in the beyond (Bonnet 1952, 538ff).

Nut and Hathor become here the very principle of the feminine itself. Outstanding in this mythology is that the feminine commands the heavens and the masculine the earth, for, as you know, in most mythologies and in alchemy this is reversed. Hathor, as a cow, would usually be regarded as belonging to the earth. We also find the celestial cow in India, however, and we heard from Gubernatis that she was even more highly honored than the bull. Not that either culture could be called matriarchal, for the male gods in both were at least as developed and important as the female.

If we take the legend literally, moreover, Nut was raised to this supreme place because of her notorious habit of eating her young. One may conjecture that this raising of Nut represents an unconscious attempt to free the feminine eros principle from the darkness and unconsciousness of earth and place it at a distance so that its divine character, its death and rebirth, may become visible and thus conscious. The logos

384 *The Archetypal Symbolism of the Bull and the Cow*

principle with us – due to the exclusively masculine character of our religion – is far more visible and conscious than the eros principle, which is still much too much connected with the sow that eats its litter (as we see, for instance, in many mother-son relationships). But in itself, the eros principle is the equal counterpart for the logos, and it seems to me we can learn a lot from this early image of the eternal feminine as the heavens with the devouring aspect that is simply part of the feminine redeemed by daily rebirth.

I would like to give a practical example. When a man has such a strong feeling for a woman that he has to deliver himself into her hands, she is obliged in a way to swallow him, that is, to accept the feeling he gives her. If she rejects him out of fear of devouring, both may lose a great opportunity for a love relationship. Accepting the bond, on the other hand, has a fertilizing effect on each side. But if she clings selfishly to the feeling, he will sooner or later feel robbed, whereas if she succeeds in letting it pass through her, like rebirth through Nut, both will gain invaluablely from the relationship. In other words, if she clings to him, sooner or later he will feel imprisoned and will either be obliged to leave her – probably with an awful row – or he will find himself put in her pocket whether he knows it or not.

One also sees this in analysis. The analyst does the analysand a great deal of harm if he or she refuses the transference. A time of considerable dependence is often altogether necessary. But if the analyst eats the transference – a thing that unfortunately happens – he or she undoes the whole meaning of it and not only prevents the analysand from getting out into life but also does him- or herself a great injustice.

The image of Nut is that of the sky devouring the sun and stars at night and regularly giving them new life at dawn. This is a wonderful image for both analysis and relationships. When Nut was raised to the sky, woman for the first time could see her eros principle objectively. For the man the anima was raised from within the unconscious to a position where he could see and consciously experience his emotional and spiritual life. Both the principle of eros and the anima are entities practically impossible to explain. But we find in the cow the principles of serene docility, gentle acceptance, and a renunciation of the bull-headedness typical of certain men, the animus, and the ego in general. If the *coniunctio* of the bull and the cow is not to be found in mythological literature, then it is a task calling to us today. This is a *coniunctio* of animus powers (tamed and transformed) with the power of eros (gentleness, kindness, relatedness and acceptance of others and ourselves). The essence of the feminine spirit is to “just quietly be”; somehow cows seem to manage this better than most other animals... and certainly better than adult men and women. When we allow the sun of our collective convictions and those of our egos to be swallowed every night and then to be regenerated anew the next morning in the embrace of the cow, of eros, love, and nurturing acceptance, then we are close to the very heart of feminine wisdom.

Notes

I

1. The introduction to the archetypal symbolism of the cat, dog and horse occurred in Barbara Hannah's first lecture in this series on April 26, 1954. The present introduction also includes several points that she clarified in the "Serpent and Lion Lectures" of 1957–58, given at the Jung Institute in Zurich, and the lecture titled "The Cat as an Archetypal Image" given at the Psychological Club, Zurich, on June 2, 1973. See Editor's Preface. [Ed.]

2. See also Jung 1928. Many of the essays in this earlier volume were published later in Jung 1970b. Other essays occur elsewhere, for instance, in the *Collected Works*, Vol. 10 & Vol. 17. [Ed.]

3. The text then adds that you would then be in God and God in you.

4. Marie-Louise von Franz was a close friend of Barbara Hannah for many years and the two resided together in their later years. Throughout these lectures Hannah refers to spontaneous personal conversations where their ideas and reflections were shared and discussed. [Ed.]

5. Guilielmus Partisiensis wrote in the first half of the thirteenth century.

6. Similar concepts and principles are found, for instance, in the Iroquois concept of "orenda"; in practices and beliefs among the Australian Aborigine cultures; in the Christian theology, for example that of Giordano Bruno; in the philosophy of Leibniz, and naturally in Chinese Taoism. [Ed.]

7. Translated in Jung, C.G. (1960) "On the Nature of the Psyche, Part 7: Patterns of Behavior and Archetypes," in Jung 1970b, pars. 397–420.

IV

1. Many details in this chapter on the cat as rage and emotion have been appended from Barbara Hannah's lecture on "The Cat as an Archetypal Image," given at the Psychological Club, Zurich, on June 2, 1973. [Ed.]

2. Jacobsohn, Helmuth (1992) *Gesammelte Schriften*. Jungraithmayr, Hermann, ed. Hildesheim-Zurich-New York: Georg Olms Verlag. The exact location of this reference was not found. In his *Collected Essays*, all five of Jacobsohn's articles cite the pyramid texts. There is no question regarding the veneration of cats in Egypt. The worship of sacred animals commenced in Egypt before the dawn of history and survived several thousand years interwoven with various creeds and religious practices. It occupied a prominent position in all the great religious centers. The worship of cats was widespread long before Sechmet or Bastet eclipsed them as human goddesses with animal heads. The story of Diodorus and numerous other anecdotes about cats in Egypt are reported by Howey in Howey 1981. See also Faulkner 1969 and Bonnet 1952, p. 81. [Ed.]

3. These ancient Persian divinities of darkness and light are discussed in more detail in the lectures on the serpent. [Ed.]

4. The "Stanserabkommnis" settling the dispute was signed on December 22, 1481. [Ed.]

VI

1. The discussion here of "Puss-in-Boots" was presented in Barbara Hannah's lecture on "The Cat as an Archetypal Image," given at the Psychological Club, Zurich, on June 2, 1973. She discussed this fairy tale at the Club at length. The discussion at the Psychological Club is integrated here with her first analysis of "Puss-in-Boots," which appeared in the original *Cat, Dog, and Horse Lectures*. [Ed.]

2. Barbara Hannah notes: "I remind you of the story of Niklaus von der Flüe when asked whether it was true that he did not eat for twenty years. His answer had the beautiful shrewdness of the cat and yet was completely human."

3. During the fifty or so years since these lectures were given there has been a plethora of observations documenting the behavior of animals in the wild. In the meantime, other animals have also been observed to employ clever, "playful" deception as a hunting strategy. Nevertheless, the observations on animal behavior that Hannah refers to in this work are still valid. It lies outside the scope of this book to cite more recent studies. [Ed.]

4. The conclusion of the discussion on the cat is taken from Barbara Hannah's lecture titled "The Cat as an Archetypal Image," given at the Psychological Club, Zurich, on June 2, 1973. [Ed.]

IX

1. A collection of Barbara Hannah's essays on the animus are being prepared for publication. [Ed.]

XI

1. Asclepius (or Aesculapius) is the son of Apollo and the nymph Coronis.

2. Dogs' saliva accelerates the clotting of blood and has antiseptic features, for instance, against *Escherichia coli* and *Streptococcus canis*. In Switzerland (as well as other places) there are farmers who encourage their dogs to lick human wounds. [Ed.]

XIV 1. In particular, see Jacobsohn 1968.

XVI

1. The first English translation appeared about a decade after these lectures. [Ed.]

XVIII

1. Barbara Hannah's general introduction at the beginning of the serpent lecture relies to a great extent on her introduction to the cat, dog and horse lectures. Although the introduction here on the serpent and lion repeats much of what occurs in the first chapter of this book, she now delves into several themes in a more extensive manner and adds new observations and quotes. In order to preserve the logical development of her discussion on the serpent and lion, the introduction is given here in an unabridged form. [Ed.]

XIX

1. All biblical references are cited from the New King James Version. [Ed.]

XX

1. The picture presented at the lecture is unavailable. [Ed.] 2. Pictures of the vases presented are unavailable. [Ed.]

3. Barbara Hannah writes: "Of course at Delphi they had the bird as well as the serpent oracles, and until I was in Delphi I never realized why the bird oracles were so important. It was extraordinary to see the hawks fly about in perpetually varying formations. One could imagine the people wondering why they made one formation one day and another the next. In the two or three days I was there I saw them about twenty times."

4. In a footnote on page 15, Wilhelm compares this line in the *I Ching* with the battle between the gods of Valhalla and the powers of darkness which ended in the Twilight of the Gods. [Ed.]

5. In ancient Persian mythology, Ormazd is the omniscient Lord, the creator of light, life and truth, of prayer and hope and all of the sublime and delightful creations of nature, roses, ruby-plumaged birds, and the like. Ahriman is the demon of darkness, death, lies, and agonized thought, and the creator of all negative forces on earth: doubt, debauchery, winter, noxious insects and plants, and so forth. The real world was thought to be the result of their personal struggle. [Ed.]

6. Snake stones are flat, bas-relief carvings averaging approximately 50 cm in height (with some as high as a meter). Intricately and beautifully carved, they usually entail two serpents entwined in a "double 8" form. At the top the snakes are positioned face to face. An image of the god is set within the upper loop. In Maillart's photograph in *Atlantis* one sees approximately fifty to one hundred of these carvings placed around the base of a large tree (Maillart 1956, 511). The photograph is unavailable for this edition. [Ed.]

7. In the mythology of India the Nagas are a fabulous race of powerful and dangerous snakes sometimes found in human-serpent form, sometimes as normal serpents. They often play fatal roles employing surprise and trickery, but can also be found, for instance, as the guardian protector of Vishnu's cosmic repose. [Ed.]

XXI

1. Coined initially in 1265 by Edward IV and last during the reign of Charles II, who died in 1431.

2. Neither Barbara Hannah nor C.G. Jung mean that men—per se— should challenge adversity in a solely active and assertive manner, women in a passive and receptive manner. Hannah is addressing here two different ways of coping with adversity—masculine and feminine / active and passive—neither of which is gender-specific and both of which are opened to men and women alike in accordance to the specific situation in which they are embroiled. She succinctly clarifies any possible misunderstanding on this point in her discussion on the symbolism of the lion. [Ed.]

3. The picture presented at the lecture is unavailable. [Ed.]

XXII

1. Here a photograph was shown to the class. [Ed.] 2. Abridged from the original work of the Abbé Barthelemy, 4th edition, London, 1810.

3. See also Jung 1968, figs. 217 & 238.

4. Author's translation.

5. See also Jung's discussion on the multiple levels of consciousness, "The Unconscious as a Multiple Consciousness," in Jung 1970b, pars. 388–396.

XXIV

1. Theodore Flournoy (1854–1920) was a French physician and experimental psychologist. His studies of Miss Frank Miller's active imaginations formed the basis of *Symbols of Transformation*. See Jung 1967.

XXV

1. This painting is unavailable. [Ed.]

2. The founder of the Acropolis.

3. See Jung 1970a, par. 258; Jung 1969, pars. 290f, and Jung 1977c, par. 1827.

4. Barbara Hannah herself writes: *Il était un jeune homme de Dijon, Qui n'aimait pas la religion. Il disait, "Ma foi, Je n'aime pas ces trois, Le père, le fils et le pigeon."*

5. See also Jung 1968, par. 580.

6. Excrescent or accrescent soul is a concept of Isidorus's meaning "grown-on" or "appended" souls. Isidorus uses the word excrescent to mean "outgrowth," in particular "outgrowths" that are animal souls, for example, those that are wolf-, monkey-, or lion-like. Valentinus similarly speaks here of soul "appendages," described as being spirits dwelling in man. Essentially, excrescent souls are psychic entities manifesting in animal imagery or animal forms of behavior. See Jung 1969, par. 370n 32 & 33. [Ed.]

XXVIII

1. Born in 1891, Barbara Hannah was sixty-six years old at the time of this lecture. [Ed.]

2. Barbara Hannah adds: Whenever I hear of Empedocles I recall Dr. Jung saying that Empedocles met his end by throwing himself into Vesuvius because of the many people who flocked around him wanting to hear about things of life. Transferences drove him there, said Dr. Jung, and added: "and if you are not careful, I shall land there too!"

XXIX

1. References from *Mysterium Coniunctionis* are cited from Jung 1970a. [Ed.]

XXX

1. An abridged version of this story appears in Jung 1968, par. 491. [Ed.]

XXXI

1. Cf. Jung, C.G., "Synchronicity: An Acausal Connecting Principle." In Jung 1970b, pars. 816–968.

2. Many of the essays in this earlier volume were published later in Jung 1970b. Other essays occur elsewhere, for instance, in the *Collected Works*, Vol. 10 & Vol. 17. [Ed.]

XXXIV

1. Barbara Hannah left abbreviated notes here referring to Jung and Pauli, to the "Interpretation of Nature and the Psyche," and to Jung's article "Synchronicity, an Acausal Connecting Principle." Further notes mention: "for instance, 1) 'Sp.' and fish for lunch. 2. April fish (fool) mentioned. 3. That morning note of Pisces. 4. Patient P.M. with impressive fish picture. 5. Embroidery (spontaneously) shown with fish. 6. Next morning patient brings dream of fish landing at her feet. (Working on fish symbol, but only one of the sex knew it.) 7. When writing this part of lecture, saw dead fish on wall, a foot long." All but the last item on this list of synchronistic events can be found in Jung 1970b, par. 826. The final item is apparently an event experienced by Hannah herself. [Ed.]

XXXV

1. In one version the victim is her husband, in another her brother.

2. An example of the piercing quality of the bull used against a dreamer for a good reason are found in Jung's ETH-Lectures. See Jung 1935, 83ff.

XXXVI

1. The picture mentioned here is not available. [Ed.]

2. It is assumed that Hannah is referring to Jung, C.G., "A Psychological View of Conscience." In Jung 1978, pars. 825–857. [Ed.] 3. Barbara Hannah noted here that this story is obviously a creation myth. **XXXVII**

1. Von Beit narrates an abridged version of the fairy tale. [Ed.]

2. Hannah's notes read: "DKM: Leave out: 'Trolls: The negative sides of the positive bull, he leads to them and is just able to overcome them, like the horse.'" **XL**

XL

1. Ahura-Mazda is the Persian god of gods, master of the heavens and the creator of all creators, the king of kings, master and ruler of all peoples. [Ed.]

2. Barbara Hannah notes here that this is an instance of "the water of life."

Sources

- Bonnet, Hans. 1952. *Reallexikon der Ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Boone, Allen. 1954. *Kinship with All Life*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brehm, Alfred. 1918. *Brehms Tierleben, Die Säugetiere*. Kleine Ausgabe, Band 4. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut AG.
- Budge, E.A. Wallis. 1951. *The Book of the Dead*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Cumont, Franz. 1956. *The Mysteries of Mithra*. New York: Dover Publications.
- de Gubernatis, Angelo. 1872. *Zoological Mythology*. London: Trübner & Co.
- de Wit, Constant. 1951. *Le rôle et le sens du Lion dans l'Egypte Ancienne*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Eleazar, Abraham. 1982. *Uraltes Chymisches Werk*. Stockholm: G. Mendelholm Verlag.
- Erman, Adolpf. 1937. *La Religion des Egyptiens*. Paris: Payot.
- Erschine, John. 1933. *The Private Life of Helen of Troy*. Hamburg: Albatross.
- Faulkner, R.O. 1969. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Fowler, Harold N., trans. 1982. *Plato: Euthyphro. Apology. Crito. Phaedo. Phaedrus*. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Gallico, Paul. 1981. *Thomasina*. London: Avon.
- Hannah, Barbara. 1951. "The Problem of Contact with the Animus." London: The Guild of Pastoral Psychology (Lecture Nr. 70).
- . 1971. *Striving Towards Wholeness*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- . 1992. *The Cat, Dog, and Horse Lectures*. Wilmette: Chiron Publications.
- Harrison, Jane Ellen. 1927. *Themis*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Hastings, James, ed. 1955. *The Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Hogg, James. 1992. *Confessions of a Justified Sinner*. London: Everyman's Library; David Campbell Publishers.
- Howey, M. Oldfield. Circa 1930. *The Encircled Serpent*. London: Rider and Co. (No publication date given; publication date is estimated at circa 1930.)
- . 1958. *The Horse in Magic and Myth*. New York: Castle Books.
- . 1981. *The Cat in the Mysteries of Religion and Magic*. Rutland and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Co.
- Jacobsohn, Helmuth. 1968. "The Dialogue of a World-Weary Man with his Ba." In Hillman, James [Ed.] *Timeless Documents of the Soul*. Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press.
- . 1992. *Gesammelte Schriften*. Jungraithmayr, Hermann, ed. Hildesheim-Zurich-New York: Georg Olms Verlag.
- James, Montague Rhodes. 1924. *The Apocryphal New Testament*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Jung, C.G. 1925. "Notes on the Seminar on Analytical Psychology." Notes on lectures given at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Zurich. March 23–July 6, 1925. Lecture VII. Unpublished multigraph. Küsnacht, M.-L. von Franz Library.
- . 1928. *Contributions to Analytical Psychology*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.
- . 1935. "Modern Psychology." Notes on lectures given at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Zurich. April 1934–July 1935. Unpublished multigraph by Barbara Hannah and Elizabeth Welsh. Küsnacht, M.-L. von Franz Library.
- . 1939a. "Modern Psychology: The Process of Individuation, Eastern Texts." Notes on lectures given at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Zurich. Lecture IX, January 20, 1939. Unpublished multigraph. Küsnacht, M.-L. von Franz Library.
- . 1939b. "The Process of Individuation: Exercitia spiritualia of St. Ignatius of Loyola." Notes on lectures given at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Zurich. Lecture X, June 30, 1939. Unpublished multigraph. Küsnacht, M.-L. von Franz Library.
- . 1940–1941. "The Process of Individuation: Alchemy I." Notes on lectures given at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Zurich. November 1950–February 1941. Unpublished multigraph. Küsnacht, M.-L. von Franz Library.
- . 1947. *Geist der Psychologie*. Sonderdruck Eranos Jahrbuch 1946, Band XIV. Zurich: Rheinverlag.
- . 1966. *The Practice of Psychotherapy. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 16. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- . 1967. *Symbols of Transformation. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 5. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- . 1968. *Psychology and Alchemy. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 12. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- . 1969. *Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 9ii. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- . 1970a. *Mysterium Coniunctionis. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 14. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- . 1970b. *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 8. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- . 1977a. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 9i. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- . 1977b. *Psychology and Religion: West and East. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 11. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- . 1977c. *The Symbolic Life: Miscellaneous Writings. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 18. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- . 1978. *Civilization in Transition. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol 10. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- . 1984. *Dream Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- . 1987. *Kinderträume*. Olten: Walter Verlag.
- . 1997. *Visions*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- . 1998. *Nietzsche's Zarathustra*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Jung, Emma. 1978. *Animus and Anima*. Zurich: Spring Publications.
- Jungbauer, Gustav, ed. 1923. *Märchen aus Turkestan und Tibet*, No. 9, "Das Zauberroß." Jena: Eugen Diederichs Verlag.
- Kretschmar, Frieda. 1938. *Hundesstammvater und Kerberos*. Stuttgart: Stecker & Schröder Verlag.
- Kubin, Alfred. 2000. *The Other Side*. Translated by Mike Mitchell. Hunting: Dedalus Ltd.
- Küster, Erich. 1913. *Die Schlange in der griechischen Kunst und Religion*. Giesen: Alfred Töpelmann Verlag.
- Lewis, C.S. 1946. *The Hideous Strength*. New York: Macmillan.
- Lorenz, Konrad. 1949. *So kam der Mensch auf den Hund*. Wien: Dr. G. Borotha-Schoeler Verlag.
- . 2002. *King Solomon's Ring*. London: Routledge.
- Maillart, Ella. 1956. "Der Schlangenkult in Indien." *Atlantis*. XXVIII^e Jahr, Heft 11, November 1956.
- Meier, C.A. 1985. *Der Traum als Medizin: Antike Inkubation und moderne Psychotherapie*. Zurich: Daimon Verlag.
- Müller, F. Max, ed. 1926. *The Upanishads* Part II. *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad*. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Neumann, Erich. 1954. *The Origins and History of Consciousness*. New York: Bollingen

Foundation. Rampa, Lobsang. 1956. *The Third Eye*. London: Secker & Warburg.

Schärf, Rivkah. 1967. *Satan in the Old Testament*. Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press.

Schreber, Daniel P. 1988. *Memories of My Nervous Illness*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.

Scot, Reginald. 1930. *The Discoverie of Witchcraft*. Bungay, Suffolk: John Rodker.

Tschiffely, Aime Felix. 2002. *Tschiffely's Ride*. London: Pallas Athene.

von Beit, Hedwig. 1986. *Symbolik des Märchens*, Band I, VII. Auflage. Berne: Francke Verlag.

von Franz, Marie-Louise. 1996. *The Interpretation of Fairy Tales*. Boston: Shambhala.

Wilhelm, Richard, trans. 1970. *The I Ching or Book of Changes*. Rendered into English by Cary F. Baynes. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Williams, J.H. 1956. *Elephant Bill*. London: Rubert Hart-Davis. Wylie, Phillip. 1955. *Generation of Vipers*. New York: Rinehart.

Index

Aaron, 221
absolute knowledge: as catlike, 46; human consciousness and, 45;
unconscious inherent with, 12–13 abstract morality, 62
accrescent soul, 392n6
Achilles, 99–101, 118
action, 6
active imagination, 15–16, 391n1; archetype discovered by, 143–44; autonomous complex influencing, 69;
consciousness and, 335–37; creative
effort for, 39; dreaming with, 314,
342; inner law guiding, 136; libido
and, 113
Adam: anima of, 249; the higher, 248–
49; the lower, 251–52; snake outwitting, 255–56
Adam's rib, 78, 80–81
adversity, 391n2
African courier, 5, 133
Agamemnon, 287–88
Ahriman, 33, 185, 233, 390, 390n5 alchemists, 199; beyond-the-body
approached by, 339; Christianity compared with, 342; conscious-yet-not-conscious typifying, 325–26; four elements for, 222; lion's role from, 321–
22; man doing work from, 239; man's
redemption for, 66–67, 131; mercurial snake of, 251; serpentine way
emphasized by, 237–38; snake symbol
for, 253; theriomorphic symbolism
with, 336–37; uroboros and, 228 ambrosia, 86
amphora, 268
Amum, 352
ancient mysteries, 241
 ancient symbol, 228–29
Andromeda, 200
angry cat mood, 31
anima, 385; Adam with, 249; aspects of,
 305; black horse representing, 97; cat representing, 52–53; “La Belle Dame Sans Merci” and, 110; man possessed by, 73; men conscious of, 51; relationships with, 333–34
 animal(s): absolute knowledge from, 46; attachments of, 18–19; behavior documented for, 388n3; cats maternal as, 22; characteristics of, 132; communicating with, 13; dreaming of,
125, 129–30, 149–50, 306, 331; Egypt's sacred, 388n2; as gods, 140; instincts represented by, 3, 122–23, 125, 129–30, 134–35; luminosities represented by, 141–42; mating laws
obeyed by, 73; motif for, 135, 245, 301; natural urges of, 60; paradise enlivened by, 256; people brought back to, 108; piety of, 7–8, 135–36; psychological meanings of, 20–21; renewal
from, 331; star connection with, 14; unconscious represented with, 324–25
 animal instinct: sacrificing, 361; seeking, 304
animal nature: king returning to, 331; man separating from, 224–25
animal symbolism: serpent elaborating on, 130; unconscious studied with, 4
animus: bull transforming, 369–70; death blow for, 178; depressing thoughts from, 277; Kari gaining positive, 371; negative, 120; possessed by, 110; relationships with, 333–34
402 *Lectures on Jung's Aion*
 Anthropos, 248
Anthropos quaternio, 251–52
anthropos-shadow quaternion, 248 Apollo, 181, 201, 202; Diana sister of,
 204–5; Gaia's relationship with, 202–
5; serpent retained by, 182, 207 Apophis serpent, 250
apotropaic symbols, 286–87
apple, 300
apprehension, 6, 134
archaic psychology, 163
archangel, 195
archetypal images, 354; cats with, 36–37,
52; inner firmament with, 142–43; ourselves understood through, 16 archetype: active imagination discovering, 143–44; instincts different from,
6, 134, 144; myths with, 59; negative side of, 172
aristocratic ladies, 241
Aristotle, 272
Aryans: cattle important to, 355–56; principle of life for, 376
Asclepian mysteries, 261
Asclepian temples: dogs role in, 85–86; healing sources from, 87; serpent in,
179, 257
Asclepius: birth concern of, 262; healing power represented by, 258; legends of, 260–61; worship of, 259
Atman, 220
Augustus, 262
autoerotic isolation, 53
autonomous complex, 69
Aztec religion, 114, 222–23
 Ba, 105
Babylon: abominations of, 337; creation myth of, 199; cup of, 319–20, 332; dragon of, 332
back to nature, 4–5
Balius, 100
bas-relief carvings, 228, 390n6
Bastet, 25–26, 28–29
Bayard (demon horse), 106
Baynes, H.G., 9
Bellerophon, 113–15
Bergson's philosophy, 207–8
birds, 232
blacksmiths, 279
blind obedience, 92–93
blood, 214–15
Boone, Allen, 13
boots, 44–45
bovines, 349, 350
Brahman, 220
Brihadaranyaka Upanishad, 103–4
Bubastis: celebrations at, 49; as center of worship, 25–26
buffalo, 139
“bull of his mother,” 352, 373
bulls: animus of, 369–70; Christ named, 362; cow and, 347–50; Indras represented by, 355; Kari leaves with, 366; Mithras sacrifice of, 361; mythological aspects of, 350; new mana from,

359; positive animus from, 369; as sacred symbol of royalty, 357; sacrifices of, 358; transformation of, 370–71; unification closely related to, 362, 364–65; write masculinity from, 348, 351, 353; Zeus dedicating, 358–59
 Butter Ears (cat), 38–39
 cat goddess: Bastet as, 25–26; cat head/ human body for, 44–45
 cat instinct: conscious use of, 42; human barriers nonexistent for, 46; luminosity of, 39–40, 52
 Catherine, 33
 cattle: Aryan importance of, 355–56; domestication of, 348–49; intelligence decreasing for, 349
 Cecrops, 162, 232
 centaur, 202–3
 Cerberus, 124; anger instinct of, 82–84; as Pluto's watchdog, 81
 chakras, 140
 Chansons de Geste, 106
 Charlemagne, 106
 childhood, 313–14
 children: Nut devouring, 382; parents experiences with, 315; unconscious hurting, 338
 Chimera, 112–13
 Christ: apocryphal sayings of, 135–36; brazen serpent and, 216–17; bull name for, 362; identifications with, 354; mankind receiving gift of, 338; metaphysical role of, 245; Perate Gnosticism and, 245–46; Sabbath day work from, 138–39; as serpent, 208–9, 213, 216–17, 245; shadow of, 343; sins thrown on, 66–67
 Christian legend: dog as thief in, 88–89; dog stealing rib in, 78–79; St. Patrick in, 197
 Christianity: alchemists compared with, 342; evil serpent in, 244; Gnostics preserving, 209; Holy Ghost in, 353; legends of, 195; natural process leading to, 8; opposites represented in, 152–53; serpents in, 193–95; St. George hero of, 196; symbolism of, 140; theriomorphic symbolism and, 131
 Christie, Agatha, 39
 chthonic soul, 343
 Chymical Wedding (Rosencreutz), 48, 322
 Cinvat Bridge, 79–81, 81, 88, 124
 Codex Marcianus, 228
 cognition, 214
 cold-blooded animals, 163
 collective emotions, 45
 Cronos, 176, 208, 382 cross, 221–22
 crosshairs, 17
 Cupid's arrow, 319 cyclic life, 235, 323 Cyclopes, 176
 caduceus, 237–38
Cantilena (Ripley), 318, 330–31, 332, 334, 340, 341
 carabhangas, 234
 cat(s): *See also* Puss-in-Boots;
 angry mood for, 31; anima represented by, 52–53; archetypal image of, 36–37, 52; aspects of, 27; categories of, 25; cruelty to, 124; as deity, 48; destructive nature of, 35–36; dream image of, 30–31; Egypt origins for, 21; family description of, 271–72; feminine nature of, 4, 51; as goddess, 25–26, 44–45; as highly maternal animal, 22; horse not related to, 17–18; human's inner, 37; hunting methods of, 272; independence of, 23, 41–42; individuation and, 123; ingenuity of, 45; lazy side of, 38–39; as least domesticated household animal, 18; life taken as it comes by, 40; musical performance of, 48–49; playful nature of, 50; psychological meaning of, 24; Ra fighting as, 34; as sacred, 29; witchlike nature of, 30; worship aspect of, 49–51, 388n2 cat deity, 48
 collective psyche, 329
 collective psychology, 369
 collective soul, 256
 collective unconscious; consciousness enriched by, 337; description of, 117; wisdom of, 252
Come Tell Me Where You Live
 (Christie), 39
 communications, 13
 communism, 296, 302
Confessions of a Justified Sinner (Hogg), 114
 Connelly, Marc, 174
 conscious achievement, 325
 consciousness: absolute knowledge and, 45; bull nearer to, 357; cross representative of, 221–22; desire for, 304–5; detachment of, 217–18; dog instincts and, 66; dreams bridging, 354; ego, 11, 141; instincts and, 69–70, 133; libido used for, 130; many eyes of, 214–15; Prince Ring collaborating with, 67; Promethean disobedience necessary for, 59; psychic process scale of, 15; regeneration of, 131–32; scale for, 15, 143–44; Self with, 217–18; serpent solution from, 243; shadow integration widening, 335–37; shadow's relations to, 285; sun god representing, 37; unconscious cooperating with, 224–25; unconscious gold in, 137–38
 corpses, 232–33
 cow(s): *See also* bulls; cattle
 aspects of, 373; bull and, 347–50; as docile, 372, 379–80; feminine spirit from, 385; Hathor goddess of, 28–29, 352; maternal aspect of, 374–75; number of, 376; products given by, 378; as sacred, 377; transcendent function symbolized by, 380
 coyotes: as dog's cousin, 71–72; Salishan Native American tribe legends about, 72
 creation myths: Babylon with, 199; dog theme in, 70; irrational nature of, 63; Mexican's with, 223–24; Scandinavian's with, 183
 creative spirit, 118
 creative work, 50
 creativity, 225
 dark psyche: as inner firmament, 14;
 Paracelsus's idea of, 142
 de Wit, Constant, 275
 death: animus and, 178; dogs connected
 with, 71–72; ego and, 315; mythology and, 76–77; nightmares with, 108–9
 deity: mankind suffering same as, 343; serpents representing, 289; snakes symbolizing, 158, 191; venom liberating, 244–45
 Delphi, 181, 390n3. *See also* python of Delphi
 Delphic games, 204
 demiurge, 250–51
 demon(s): Ahirman as, 390n5; attacking, 305, 307; Gaia mother of, 172–74
 destruction, 34–35
 devil, 294; demiurge becoming, 250–51; dog attacking, 58–59; God other side of, 79; as man-made abstraction, 167; serpent identified with, 194–95; tail on, 166
 Diana: Apollo brother of, 204; doves of, 332–33; Hecate connected with, 82
 Dionysian festivals, 49, 241
 Dionysian mysteries, 108
 Dionysus: as mother's son, 375; Zeus father of, 180
 The Discoverie of Witchcraft (Scott), 196
 dishonesty, 39
 divine, 223, 257, 263, 354
 Divine Manifestations, 48
 dog(s): Asclepian temples with, 85–86; aspects of, 57, 67; Christian legend about, 78–79, 88–89; creation myths with, 70; dark place guide by, 77; devil attacked by, 58–59; exceptional people captive in, 62–63; gods represented by, 75; healing aspect of, 85–86; hieroglyph's representing, 82; humans sacrificing for, 65; individuation and, 123; instincts connected to, 66, 124; as loyal friend, 58; luminosity of, 54–55; mankind and, 59, 74; master met by, 102–3; as master oriented, 18; morality in, 60–61; mythology and, 76; physical qualities of, 55–56; promiscuous nature of, 72–73; saliva of, 389n2; sexual behavior and, 73; soul message by, 87; souls guided by, 71–72, 88; as thief, 78–79; as tricksters, 74; work natural for, 56
 dog instincts: betrayal of, 88; consciousness and, 66; man's interests identical with, 74; purpose accomplished from, 89
 double lion, 289, 341
 doves, 332–33
 dragons, 196; as serpent, 199; slayer of, 197–98
 dreams: active imagination in, 314, 342; animals in, 125, 129–30, 149–50, 306, 331; associations in, 313; cats image in, 30–31; conscious life bridged by, 354; emotions in, 318; human

projections in, 23–24; lions represented in, 316; mother and, 147, 314–15; opposites in, 33; parson's daughter having, 332; renewal from, 331; reptiles in, 162–65; serpents in, 155–56; snakes in, 164, 211–13; theriomorphic symbols in, 3–4, 141; unadulterated information in, 215; unconscious in, 107, 131, 327; undesirable thief in, 336; values mutated in, 342
 Egypt: cats originating from, 21; gods of, 75; lion's meaning in, 340–41; sacred animals in, 388n2
 Egyptian gods transformations, 26–27
 Egyptian Lion of Aker, 281
 Egyptian Uraeus, 257–58
 emotions, 178, 331; See also moods; collective, 45; deflecting other, 139; dis-identifying with, 140; dreams with, 318; giants representing, 296; instincts in accordance with, 10, 139; lions symbolizing, 276–77, 306, 314, 316; non-identification with, 33–34; serpents healing, 217–18; swept away by, 220
 Empedocles, 392n2
 The Encircled Serpent (Howey), 169, 254
 energy, 179–80
 English bulldog, 61
 Epidauros, 259
 equine. See horse(s)
 Erechtheus, 254
 Erman, Adolpf, 30
 Eros, 378, 384, 385
 Eros principle, 72–73, 306
 Erskine, John, 287
 Esculapius, 258
 eternity, 158
 ethos, 359
 evil: apotropaic symbols warding off, 286–87; good man handling, 97; Indras destroying, 356–57; Naströnd with, 183–84; people oppressed by, 109; serpent as, 244
 excremental souls, 392n6
 extrasensory perception, 92, 118, 120
 eyes, 108
 earth: demons of, 168–69; goddess of, 169–70, 203–4; oracle of, 181
 Eastern philosophy, 140
 Echeneis, 247
 ectoplasm, 233–34
 Eden, 193–94, 249
 ego: consciousness of, 11, 141; death and, 315; fairy tales portraying, 298; masculine, 316–17; prototype of, 299; renunciation of, 191–92; sacrifices of, 66; Self distinguished from, 97–98; Self subordinated by, 66; Self transformed from, 369, 371; Self usurped by, 310; Self's rapport with, 192; transitory insignificant nature of, 189
 fairy tales, 317; collective archetypal patterns from, 299; ego portrayed by, 298; "The Magic Horse" as, 119–21
 fantasies: completeness from, 8–9; inner law guiding, 136; repression of, 146
 Faust, 148, 288
 Female Principle of Nature, 48
 feminine creative products, 378
 feminine nature, 307, 314
 cats with, 4, 51; horses with, 121; lion accepting, 317; principles of, 383–84; unconscious plots from, 51, 52 feminine principle, 278 feminine psychology, 369 Féry, Jeanne, 242–43
 fish, 245, 393n1
 Flournoy, Theodore, 391n1 folklore, 232
 Freud, Sigmund, 241
 friends, 58
 Greeks, 173
 green lion, 330–31, 341; Babylonian dragon equated with, 332; unconscious and, 334
 Green Pastures (Connelly), 174
 Grimm's fairy tales, 43, 290, 299
 Gros, Charles le (Charlemagne), 230, 231
 growth, 34–35
 Gaia, 181; Apollo's fight with, 203,
 204–5; Apollo's relationship with,
 202–3; as demon's mother, 172–74; Pythia priestess of, 182–83; python of Delphi following, 205–6; serpent wife of, 182; worship of, 169
 Genesis, 194, 254, 283
 genetic disposition, 56
 ghosts, 230–31
 giant(s), 292–93, 295; contaminated emotions represented by, 296; hero blinded by, 302–3; man's nature and,
 180; as mortals, 175–77; neurotic system represented by, 301
 Gnosis, 213–14, 215
 Gnostics, 193, 208; Christianity preserved by, 209; communion celebrated by, 243; quaternion, 248 God, 255; See also Christ; Christianity; deity; devil other side of, 79; lion symbol for,
 342–43; lion terrible side of, 284; mankind created by,
 58–59; mankind straying from,
 14; mankind's relationship to, 339; as man-made abstraction, 167; as Negro preacher, 174–75; prince thanking, 293; souls relationship with, 154; suffering/mercy for, 175; unicorn
 symbol for, 150; as wrathful/avenging, 362
 god(s): animals as, 140; dogs representing, 75; man helping, 199; Marutas as, 356; Mithras as, 360; sacrifices for,
 241; serpent dance for, 186; sexuality attracting, 242; Titans as, 175–77 goddess: earth, 169–70; Greeks
 impressed by, 173; Hathor as, 28–
 29, 352, 374, 383; mother, 310; Nut as, 382; Pythia as, 169–70; Sechmet as, 28–29
 Gorgon, 200
 grandmother, 314–15, 317
 Harrison, Jane, 358
 Hathor, 373; as cow goddess, 28–29, 352; as goddess of heaven, 374; as goddess of the dead, 383; orgies of, 375; Sechmet and, 373
 healer, 187
 healing power, 263; dogs and, 85–86; instincts with, 86–87; man containing, 89
 heaven: Hathor goddess of, 374; kingdom of, 136; lord of, 32–33, 34; watchdog to, 79–80
 Hecate, 81, 82
 Hediger, Heini, 18–19
 Helen of Troy, 288
 Hercules, 81–82, 177–78, 269, 282, 285
 Hermes, 75
 hero: demons assaulting, 307; giant blinding, 302–3; lions overcome by, 295; lions relationship with, 295, 300
 Herodotus, 102, 272
 hexagram, 185
 Hexagram Two, 184
 Hezekiah, King, 216
 hieroglyphs, 82
 hieroglyphs, 82
 hieroglyphs, 82
 hieroglyphs, 82
 hieroglyphs, 82
 the higher Adam, 248–49
 Hippolytus, 247
 Hippomenes, 310
 Hitler, Adolf, 285–86
 Hogg, James, 114
 The Holiness Branch of the Church of God, 190
 Holy Ghost, 246, 353

man, 364
 horse(s): Achilles warned by, 99–100; aspects of, 93–94, 103; Bayard demon, 106; cats not related to, 17–18; as energy/libido symbol, 93; European wild, 91; extrasensory perception revealed by, 120; family of, 90; feminine quality of, 121; flight natural reaction of, 92; helping aspect of, 99–100; humble hard work characteristic of, 115–16; instincts of, 101; instincts represented by, 123; libido signified by, 93, 104–5, 370; the magic, 119–21; mankind with, 96, 118; man's psychological attributes for, 118; Neolithic period with, 90–91; obedient worker aspect of, 95–96; panic personified by, 117; Plato's, 97; sacrificial aspect of, 101–2, 104; temperamental disposition of, 100–101; Tschiffely's Ride with, 91–92, 102; world symbolized by, 104
 horse instinct: domesticating, 117–18; infrared scale for, 120
 Horus, 373
 Howey, M. Oldfield, 169
 human barriers, 46
 human beings: See also mankind; assigned roles for, 219–20; consciousness/instincts of, 69–70; doctors not knowing, 303; dogs and, 65; intellectual, 290; lion transformation by, 279; projections of, 23–24; sacrifices made by, 65
Hundesstammvater and Kerberos (Kretschmar), 17
 inner firmament: archetypal images in, 142–43; dark psyche as, 14
 inner guidance, 92–93
 inner laws: animals obeying, 21; fantasies with, 136
 inner meaning, 134
 insanity, 178
 instinctive indulgence, 365
 instinctive morality, 80
 instinctive wisdom, 303
 instincts: as acting on its own, 68–69; animals representing, 3, 122–23, 125, 129–30, 134–35; archetype different from, 6, 134, 144; cats with, 39–40, 52; consciously in touch with, 133; decisions of, 83; dogs connected to, 74, 124; domestic animals representing, 125, 129–30; dynamism of, 16; Eastern point of view of, 140; emotions in accordance with, 10; emotions mixed with, 139; extending beyond consciousness, 11; good terms with, 80–81; healing with, 86–87; horses with, 101, 117–18, 120, 123; human consciousness and, 69–70, 133; individuation process served by, 122–23; intellectual wisdom compared to, 7; maternal, 317, 374; meaning sought for, 137; medicine men's wisdom using, 303; natural flow of, 147; people divorced from, 5; protection from, 135; sexual perversions and, 148; theriomorphic symbolism with, 141; transformation of, 9, 137; unconscious mental functioning of, 138; unconscious with, 177; use of, 144–46; woman's frigidity and, 68
 instinctual knowledge, 304
 intellectual laziness, 39
 intellectual wisdom, 7
 intelligence, 349
 introversion, 105
 inventions, 225–26
I Ching, 184, 379, 380
 Ignatius, 214
 immortality, 217
 incest, 325–26, 328–29, 354
 independence: cats having, 23, 41–42;
 dogs having less, 54–55
 India, 166, 391n7
 Indian god, 278–79
 Indian serpent religion, 213
 individuation process, 380; goal of, 381;
 instincts serving, 122–23; morality from, 89; process of, 66, 120; psychosis with, 296; unconscious and, 69
 Indras: bull representing, 355; evil destroyed by, 356–57; Vritras killed by, 278
 inferior function, 6
 initiation ceremonies, 149
 inner doctor, 87
 Jacobsohn, Helmuth, 280
 jealousy, 319
 Juan, Don, 144–48
 Judah, 283
 Jung, C.G., 3–19; *Marchos' Lion Hunt*, 324; *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, 290, 327, 333–34; *On the Nature of the Psyche*, 212–13; *The Phenomenology of the Spirit in Fairy Tales*, 83–84; Psychology and Alchemy, 49, 66, 150, 179, 213, 237–38, 328, 364; psychology of, 338; *Symbols of Transformation*, 104, 197, 239, 283–84, 362; Visions seminars by, 8, 10, 113, 134, 219, 231, 268
 Ka, 105
 Kâdmadhenus, 377
 Ka-Mutef, 352; Holy Ghost in, 353;
 transformation of, 363–64
 "Kari Wooden-Frock," 365–69
 king: animal nature returned to by, 331; evil woman married by, 366; lions identical to, 285; as sterile/childless, 318–19
 King Solomon's Ring (Lorenz), 271 Kingdom of Heaven, 136
Kinship with All Life (Boone), 13 Kretschmar, Freda, 17, 63
 Kubin, Alfred, 117
 Küster, Erich, 170–72, 181
 289, 341; dove's conquering, 333; dreams with, 316; emotions symbolized by, 276–77, 306, 314, 316; feminine nature accepted by, 317; God symbolized by, 342–43; as God's terrible side, 284; habits of, 273; heat/fire represented by, 267–68, 287; Hercules killing, 177–78; hero relationship with, 295, 300; Hitler as, 285–86; human transforming to, 279; king identical to, 285; mother connection with, 312; positive side of, 308; renewal of, 335; resurrection symbolized by, 340–41; sexual drive symbolized by, 309; as solar symbol, 278, 281; Sphinx as, 288–89; as spiritual guide, 304–5; as symbol of power, 282; tigers different from, 272; unconscious contents realized through, 290; unconscious guarded by, 299; Yang principle symbolized by, 317–18; as zodiac sign, 275 living serpent cult, 190
 logos, 306
longissima via, 238
 Lord of Heaven, 32–33
 Lorenz, Konrad, 61
 love, 334
 the lower Adam: serpent corresponding to, 251–52; snake as, 255
 lower instinctive forces, 7, 134–35 loyalty, 62
 luminosity: animals representing, 141–42; cat instinct with, 39–40, 52; dogs with, 54–55; ego-consciousness surrounded by, 11
 lycanthropy, 311
 "La Belle Dame Sans Merci," 110 *La Religion des Egyptiens* (Erman), 30 Iamia, 110
lapis, 256
 Lazarus, 199
 laziness, 40
Le rôle et le sens du Lion dans l'Egypte Ancienne (de Wt), 275
 Leto, 204
 libido, 101, 121; active imagination for,
 113; conscious purpose for, 130; exogamous, 329; horse signifying, 93, 104–5, 370; Pegasus's creative, 114–15; regressed, 110; sacrificing horse, 111; self found by, 124; snakes expressing primitive, 161–62; spiritual counterpart for, 120–21; union of opposites for, 326
 lion(s): alchemists view of, 321–22; amphora connected with, 268; approaching, 298; Babylonian cup and, 319–20, 332; as beast of prey, 270; blood of, 334, 337; classes of, 274; Cupid's arrow representing, 319; as divine guide, 301; double,

magic: cats associated with, 22; garden of, 291; healing power, 53; Hecate prevailing over, 81; internal vermin destroyed by, 36
 "The Magic Horse," 119–21
Mahābhārata, 377
 Malabar legend, 210–11
 mammals, 55
 mandala, 120, 123–24, 171
 mankind: anima possessing, 73; anima
 raised for, 384; animal nature lost in, 224–25; animal's impression on, 21; Christ's blood gift to, 338; moral process, 80
 morality: dogs having, 60–61; ethos
 deity suffering same as, 343; dog betraying, 59; dog instincts identical to, 74; dynamism of, 268–69; evil and, 97; God creating, 58–59; gods helped by, 199; God's relationship to, 339;
 God's will and, 14; healing powers of, 89; horses and, 96, 118; as human/divine, 354; inhuman destructiveness in, 253; instincts for, 9; mercy from suffering for, 175; naturalness
 recaptured by, 260; nature and, 8, 180; paradisiacal harmony lost for, 60; snakes changing into, 231; urges of, 284–85
 Marchos, King, 327
Marchos' Lion Hunt (Jung), 324
 Marcionites, 208
 Marduk, 199–200
 Marutas, 356
 masculinity, 370
 master, 55
 maternal instincts, 317, 374
 mating, 48–49, 73
 medicine men, 226; instinctive wisdom
 of, 303; intuitive mind of, 260–61; *Memories of My Nervous Illness* (Schreber), 242
 mental illness, 242
 Mercurius, 254, 322, 341
 Mercury, 237–39
 Mesopotamia, 275
 Messiah, 208
 Mexican creation myth, 223–24
 Mexico, 223
 Michael (archangel), 195
 military funeral, 102
 milk: sacred gift of, 376; transformation
 of, 378
 Mind of the Universe, 13
 Mithra, 360–61
 Mithraic amphora, 268
 Mithraic cult, 268
 Mithraic religion, 359
 Mithras, 360; bull sacrifice in, 361; legend of, 365
 modern man, 15
 Mberin, 30
 Moire, 258
 monsters: half-human, 174; insanity
 brought by, 178
 moods, 31, 218, 220, 365
 differing from, 359; individuation process with, 89; Jungian psychology compare to, 338; psyche's instinctive layers with, 60
 mortals, 175–77
 Moses, 215–16, 220–21
 mother, 317; bull of, 352, 373; dreams
 pointed to, 147, 314–15; Gaia demon, 172–74; as Goddess, 310; lions connection with, 312; nightmares with, 112; snakes with, attributes, 197; sons hurt by, 320; women compared
 to, 353
 Mother Goddess, 310
 motif: animals helpful for, 135, 245, 301; as "bull of his mother," 352, 373; as
 bull sacrifice, 358; as centaur, 202–3;
 as devouring aspect, 158; as diabolical serpent, 253–54; as earth demon,
 168–69; as mist/clouds, 313; as serpent/rod, 221; snakes in, 154
 museum, 202–3
 Mycenaean culture, 203–4, 287–88 *Mysterium Conjunctionis* (Jung), 290,
 327, 333–34
 mystic world, 289
 mythology: death and, 76–77; dogs and,
 76; serpent symbolized in, 161, 182 myths: archetypal motifs in, 59; watchdog of heaven in, 79–80
 Naassenes, 247
 Nagaraja, 187–88
 Nagas snakes, 391n7
 Naströnd, 183–84
 nature: dreams coming from, 215; man
 following own, 8; nature rules over, 227, 323; psychological development toward, 132; women's unconscious connected to, 173–74
 Nazi propaganda, 296
 negative mother complex, 146, 312 Negro preacher, 174–75
 Nemean lion, 177–78, 269, 285
 Neolithic period, 90–91
 Nettesheim, Agrippa von, 12
 neurosis: unconscious causing, 36;
 unconscious overcoming, 302–3 neurotic system, 301
 New Guinea, 76
 new moon, 278
 New testament, 150, 193
 Ngaa, 75
 Nicene Creed, 352
 Nidhog, 255; as horrible serpent, 183–
 84; Yggdrasil and, 184
 nightmares: mother sacrifice in, 112;
 panic from, 116; sacrificial aspects
 of, 108–9
 Nile, 276, 277
 nirvana, 219
 Nordic fairy tale, 63–64
 North American natives, 72
 Nous, 244
 Nut: feminine eros principle freed from,
 383–84; as heavenly goddess, 382
 objective psyche, 328

Oedipus, 207
 Old testament, 150, 174, 193, 362 Olympia, 202–3
On the Nature of the Psyche (Jung), 212–13
 Ophite Trinity, 243–44
 Ophites, 208, 209, 243
 opposites, 33, 152–53, 184–85, 237–39, 347–48; union of, 236–37, 323, 326 oracles: bird, 390n3; of Delphi, 204, 206–7, 236; importance of, 170; incubation, 181
 organic threat, 164
 Ormazd, 33, 233, 390n5
 Osiris, 383
The Other Side (Kubin), 117
 other world, 289
Our Town (Wilder), 160
 Persia, 166, 185
Phaedrus, 96
 Pharaoh, 221
The Phenomenology of the Spirit in Fairy Tales (Jung), 83–84
 Physis, 244
 piety, 7–8, 135–36
 Plato, 96, 97
 Pluto, 96
 Poseidon, 112, 204, 254, 359
 power, 308
 prejudice, 297–98
 prestige psychology, 317, 336
 prey, 22
 priestess, 191–92
 primitive ceremony, 190
 primitive man, 9, 137
 primitive tribe, 279, 282
 prince, 292, 295; garden entered by, 297; Kari outwitting, 368
 Prince Ring, 76, 88; conscious collaboration from, 67; dog calling to, 65–66; as Nordic fairy tale, 63–64
The Private Life of Helen (Erskine), 287 Prometheus, 59, 280
 psyche: See also dark psyche; collective, 329; emotions fertile ground of, 276–77; inner firmament of, 14; morality of, 60; non-spatial aspect of, 328; serpents in, 251
 psychic happenings, 245
 psychic non-ego, 330
 psychic process, 15, 143–44
 psychological development, 4–5, 132 psychological Self, 284
 psychology, 326–27
Psychology and Alchemy (Jung), 49, 66, 150, 179, 213, 237–38, 328, 364 psychosis, 296
 psychotherapists, 247
Purusha, 10
 Puss-in-Boots, 67; selfish attitude in, 42–47; self-reliance of, 53
 Pythia: as earth goddess priestess, 169–70; Gaia with, 182–83
 Pythian games, 204
 python, 205–6
 python of Delphi: as earth demon, 168–69, 185; Gaia's demise followed by, 205–6; as spirit of wisdom, 202 pythoness, 206–7
 pagan legends, 280
 pagan religions, 49
 panic, 116, 117
 Paracelsus, 11–12, 142
 paradise, 256
 parents, 315
 parson's daughter, 332
 participation mystique, 45, 47
 Patagonian Indians, 102
 Pegasus, 112, 124; spiritual world with, 114; as symbolic, 113
 Perate Gnosticism, 245, 246
 Perseus, 200
Quartier Latin, 73–74
 Queen Mother: lion's blood consumed by, 337; reborn son and, 321
 Ra, 36–37, 41–42, 250; as cat fighting, 34; Sechemet used by, 33; as sun god, 29–30
Ramayama, 307–8
 Rampa, Lobsang, 156
 Rauder (shadow figure), 67
 "realization of the shadow," 15, 143 redemption, 213
 relationships, 300; anima/animus in, 333–34; Apollo/Gaia, 202–3; God/ mankind, 339; God/soul, 154; hero/ lion, 295, 300; individually tailored for, 378; women avoiding, 148 religion, 213, 384; practices of, 185–86, 241; rituals of, 48
 Remora fish, 247
 Remus, 85
 Renaud, 106
 renewal: animals in dreams for, 331; lion transforming for, 335; snakes symbolizing, 234, 235
 repression, 333
 reptiles, 162–65
 responsibility, 41–42
 resurrection, 340–41
 Revelation, 195
 rhesus monkeys, 32
Rig-Vedas, 363
 ring, 300
 Romans, 259
 Romulus, 85
 Rosencreutz, Christian, 48, 322
 Rosencreutz (rosy cross), 333
 royal sphinx, 289
 Russian legend, 62–63
 St. George, 196
 St. Marcellus, 309–10

St. Margaret of Antioch, 197–98
 St. Martha, 199
 St. Niklaus von der Flüe, 35–36
 St. Patrick, 197
 St. Victor, Hugh de, 73
 Salishan Native American tribes, 72
 Samson, 282
 Scandinavian creation myth, 183
 schizophrenics, 242
 Schreber, Daniel P., 242
 Scot, Reginald, 196
 seances, 233–34
 Sechemet, 26, 243; Hathor appearing as, 373; mood of, 31; as raging goddess of war, 28–29; responsibility lacking for, 41–42; sinful man destroyed by, 32–33, 34
 secret societies, 149
 Self: aspects of, 105; conscious of, 217–18; ego distinguished from, 97–98; ego subordinating, 66; ego transformed to, 369, 371; ego usurping, 310; ego's rapport with, 192; giving of, 219; the higher Adam and, 248–49; libido leading us to, 124; psychological, 284; symptoms created by, 250; unity with, 220
 self-reliance, 53
 sentimentality, 362
 serenity, 380
serpens Mercurii, 253
 serpent(s), 136; See also snake(s); animal symbolism from, 130; Asclepian temples with, 179, 257; as autonomous being, 247; bewitching quality of, 159; Christ and, 208–9, 213, 216–17, 245; Christianity with, 193–95, 244; classifications for, 165–66; consciousness and, 243; construction of, 160; creativity symbolized by, 225; cult with, 190; deity represented by, 289; destructive power of, 178–79; devil identified with, 194–95; divinity symbolized by, 223, 257; as dragon, 199; dreams with, 155–56; as earth demon, 168–69; Eden with, 193–94, 249; emotional disturbance healed by, 217–18; eternal cycle of oneness symbolized by, 229; as snake(s): See also serpent(s); Adam outwitted by, 255–56; adaptability of, 157; affinity created with, 191; alchemist's symbol for, 253; Augustus begotten by, 262; basrelief carvings of, 390n6; child playing with, 154; deity symbolized by, 158, 191; divine germ implanted by, 240–41; as divine/man mediator, 242; dreams with, 164, 211–13; as extra-human, 248; The Holiness Branch of the Church of God with, 190; man changing into, 231; medicine symbolized by, 225–26; mother attributes in, 197; Nagas race of, 391n7; psychic happenings symbolized by, 153, 245; psychic rapport with, 252; no psychic rapport with, 159–60; ring, 211, 212; shepherd entered by, 234–35; as solitary creatures, 160–62; as symbol of renewal, 234, 235; uroboros symbolism with, 237; worship of, 185–86, 189–90
 Snati-Snati, 67, 88
 acquaintances of, 65–66; cunning/prowess of, 63–64
 Socrates, 96
 solar symbol, 278, 281
 souls: accrescent/excrescent, 392n6; divine handwriting in, 249; dogs guiding, 71, 88; God's relationship with, 154
 Sphinx, 288–89
 spiritual counterpart, 120–21
 spiritual guide, 304–5
 spiritual world, 114
 Sri Vasuki, 189
 stone, 214–15
 sun god, 37
 superior function, 5–6
 sustrum, 48
 symbolism, 183
Symbols of Transformation (Jung), 104, 197, 239, 283–84, 362
 sympathetic nervous system: loosing touch with, 155–56; pythoness behavior connected with, 206–7
 synchronicity, 304, 354
 Sabazios (mysteries): as god through the lap, 239–40; golden serpent in, 240; as Greek Orphic mystery religion, 239; rite symbolic in, 241
 Sabbath day, 138–39
 sacrifices: bull for, 358; ego having, 66; horses in, 101–2, 104; humans making, 65; libido and, 105; Mithras with, 361; nightmares of, 108–9, 112; offerings for, 241
 sailing, 133
 evil, 244; as Gaia's husband, 182; gods with, 186; golden, 240; Indian religion with, 213; lions connected to, 309–10; the lower Adam and, 251–52; major role played by, 239; Mercury's rod and, 237; Michael killer of, 195; motif of, 221, 253–54; mythology with, 161, 182; organ of orientation for, 156; paradoxical nature of, 194; Perate Gnosticism and, 245, 246; Persia with, 166, 185; as phallic symbol, 254; as protecting spirit, 171, 188; psyche with, 251; rebirth of, 177; Scandinavian creation myth with, 183; significance of, 152–53; slayer of, 200; solar, 222; souls of the dead represented by, 231; types of, 210; unconsciousness layer represented by, 261–62; underground powers of, 172; as union of opposites, 236–37; variable temperature of, 155; women knowing, 166–67; worship of, 192; zodiac with, 207–8
The Serpent in Greek Art and Religion (Küster), 170–72
 serpent symbolism, 130, 143; classes of, 263; Moses' serpent for, 215–16; second class of, 207–8; as spirit of light, 205–6
 Sethian Gnostics, 247
 sexual behavior, 73
 sexual perversions, 145–46, 148
 sexual psychology, 241
 sexuality: ancient mysteries with, 241; animal-like, 286; apple representing, 300; gods attracted by, 242; lions symbolizing, 309; religious practices arousing, 241; repression of, 329, 333; transpersonal aspect of, 353
 shadow: accepting, 179; Christ with, 343; conscious personality relations to, 285; consciousness widened with, 335–37; cows and, 377; evil gossip and, 245; prejudice projected from, 297–98; Rauber figure of, 67; realization of, 15, 143
 Shadow quaternio, 251–52
 shepherd, 234–35
 Silesius, Angelus, 339
 sins, 32–34, 66–67
 Tefnut, 26, 36–37, 41–42, 341; legend of, 29–30; selfishness of, 44
 temperature, 155
 terrorism, 296
The King's Son Who Knew No Fear, 290–95, 299
 Themis (Harrison), 358
 theriomorphic pairs, 332
 theriomorphic symbolism: alchemical context for, 336–37; Christianity and, 131; churches with, 246; dreams with, 3–4, 141; instincts expressed in, 141; as unconscious manifestations, 131
 thief, 78–79, 336
The Third Eye (Rampa), 156–57
 Tiamat, 199, 200
 tigers: cunning/deceit from, 47; dark/ feminine represented by, 287; lion different from, 272; obeying inner laws for, 21; as supreme symbols, 286–87
 Titans: as gods, 175–77; man's nature and, 180
 torture, 32
 totality, 80

- rainings, 56
- transcendent function, 4–5
- transformation, 9, 137, 370–71
- tree, 254–55
- Tree of Life, 291, 298
- Tschiffely's Ride* (Tschiffely), 91–92, 102
- Tuti-Name*, 281
- Tvashtar, 278–79, 311
- Tylon, 258
- Typhon, 201
- overcome by, 302–3; serpents representing, 261–62; signal from, 165
- unicorn, 150, 362, 364–65
- union of opposites, 326; serpents as, 236–37; uroboros as, 323
- Upanishads*, 10, 214
- Uranus, 176
- uroboros: alchemists and, 228; mythologem of, 334; snakes devouring each other in, 237; as symbol of totality, 227–28; as union of opposites, 323 Wooden-Frock, Kari, 365–69, 371
- work: dog's genetic disposition toward, 56; horses obedient in, 95–96
- world, 104
- world soul: life's phenomena represented by, 142; natural force represented by, 12
- worms, 171
- worship, 25–26; cats and, 49–51; Gaia and, 169; snakes and, 185–86, 189–90
- Wuthering Heights*, 33
- Vedic hymn, 357
- virgin, 341–42
- Visions seminars, Jung, C.G. giving, 8, 10, 113, 134, 219, 231, 268
- volcanos, 171
- von der Flüe, Niklaus, 388n2
- von Franz, Marie-Louise, 387n4 Vritas, 278
 - unconscious: absolute knowledge inherent in, 12–13; acceptance by, 65–66; active encounter with, 323; animal content representation in, 324–25; animal symbolism studying, 4; children hurt by, 338; conscious cooperating with, 224–25; deeper levels contacted for, 207; dreams with, 107, 131, 327; green lion's blood and, 334; individuation process and, 69; instinctual side of, 138, 177; interesting pictures from, 244; leaving things up to, 68–69; lion stage and, 290; lions guarding, 299; man recapturing, 260; manifestations of, 246–47; nature connected to, 173–74; neurosis caused by, 36; neurosis
 - watchdog of heaven, 79–80
- Wilder, Thornton, 160
- wisdom, 7, 303
- witchcraft, 34
- wolves, 63
- women: dark side dealt with by, 79; Eros
 - principle connection lost for, 72–73; frigidity/instincts and, 68; mother compared to, 353; Plato's horse and, 97; relationships avoided with, 148; serpents known by, 166–67; suffering accepted by, 198; volcanos associated with, 171
- Xanthus, 100, 101, 118
 - Yang principle, 317–18 Yggdrasil, 183–84, 255 young girls, 73–74
- Zarathustra, 234
- Zeus, 113, 176; bull dedicated to, 358–59; Cronos attacked by, 176; Dionysus son of, 180; Leto affair with, 204; nature of, 179
- zodiac: lions of, 275; Mesopotamia origin of, 275; serpent of, 207–8
- Zoroastrian, 88

Other books by Barbara Hannah

C. G. Jung: His Life and Work (Chiron Publications)

Striving Towards Wholeness (Chiron Publications)

Encounters with the Soul: Active Imagination (Chiron Publications)

The Cat, Dog, and Horse Lectures (Chiron Publications)

The Inner Journey: Lectures and Essays on Jungian Psychology (Inner City Books)