

Trans-Cultural Anima, Animus, Shadow and Self : Carl Jung as Structuralist-Poststructuralist Continuum

Nipun Chaudhary

Abstract: Concepts are language at its most divorced from what Jung regarded as the innate creativity of the unconscious at the heart of being. So, conceptual language is, on the one hand, necessary because rationality is a necessary part of subjectivity and an important cultural activity. On the other hand, Jung's concepts are to be regarded as provisional constructs. They do not provide fixed rules about the way the psyche behaves. For, there is an important sense in which Jung should be regarded as both a structuralism and a poststructuralist. Perhaps more accurately we see that he has been read both ways by literary criticism, so producing these critical alternatives. Hybridization, like authenticity, is incomprehensibly without a notion of cultural purity. Whether it is authenticity or Creolization, both attribute the significance of cultural elements to national derivation: where a thing has an existence from its actual meaning. So consider Jung, with his psyche polarized between centralizing archetypal dynamism and centrifugal manifestations of archetypal images as they are contingent upon cultural difference. Could it be that Jung provides something similar to the psyche posited by such theories of discourse? By a re-evaluation of a thinker devoted to healing modernity, Jungian literary theory offers the creative imagination as the source of new critical approaches, a new treatment of texts. Tradition has an ontological existence, not in the past but in the present, where it affects people's images and their behavior towards their own self. It shows the relation between the concepts and categories in a subject area or domain. While analyzing Hybridization an important research gap of lack of visibly precise and homogenized variables and a necessity of instructive analysis which is based on an appropriate hypothesis with huge amount of cumulative sets of data can be acknowledged. Another important factor which is analyzed through this article is the importance of new media practices especially in the light of changes in Arabic and African countries where institutional and social changes are taking place.

Index Terms: Carl Jung, Archetypes, Ontology, Hybridization, Creolization

I. INTRODUCTION

The absence of the concept of natural communication makes the process of language learning complicated as compare to language acquisition in mother tongue. 'Direct instruction in the rules of language' to students is the last nail on the tomb. Producing the correct linguistic response to a stimulus (a thing that arouses activity or energy in someone or something) requires efforts. If the learner is not called upon to make this effort there is no learning. Structuralists believe in the pattern of practice. Cognitivists believe that when child is ready to learn then he can be taught.

Revised Manuscript Received on December 22, 2018

Nipun Chaudhary, Assistant Professor, Dept. of English, Lovely Professional University, Punjab, nipun085@gmail.com

Jung followed through the implications of this founding principle in his own work: it thereby generates the other core characteristics of Jungian literary theory. If the function of the unconscious is to challenge and subvert forms of knowing, then his own psychology is also subject to it. So he admits that his own theory, that he named analytical psychology to distinguish it from Freudian psychoanalysis, is a provisional, contingent and historically located entity. In fact, forms of psychology are fatally liable to be conditioned by the personality of their founder: Jungian psychology is, at least in part, a derivative of Jung's own psychology. Consequently there is a third principle germane to Jungian literary theory after the radical effects of the unknown unconscious and the personal quality of theorizing. It is that the psyche is inescapably a cultural organ, contingent on its history and cultural context. Whether or not, psyche has innate structuring principles, is one of the provisional arguments that Jung makes, subject like all else to the unknowable effects of the unconscious. However it is undeniable that an individual psyche exists in time and space and is saturated with history. It follows that a work of art for Jung is a kind of condensed material moment in which a culture is thinking consciously and unconsciously, together.

The framework described so far has consequences for attitudes to language, with two further principles for Jungian literary theory. Although Jungian psychology is known by its concepts, such as the collective unconscious, archetypes, individuation, shadow, anima, animus, Jung is insistent that all conceptual language is profoundly inauthentic. Concepts, with their bright clarity and certainty, are the kind of language made by the ego when it is basing its existence upon reason. It is therefore language and thinking most subject to subversion by the unknowable effects of the unconscious. Concepts are language at its most divorced from what Jung regarded as the innate creativity of the unconscious at the heart of being. So, conceptual language is, on one hand, necessary because rationality is a necessary part of subjectivity and an important cultural activity. On the other hand, Jung's concepts are to be regarded as provisional constructs. They do not provide fixed rules about the way the psyche behaves.

Jungian literary theory, then, draws on principles foundational to Jung. To recap, these are: the absence of a unifying principle for disciplines with the challenging exception of the founding presence/absence of the unknowable unconscious,

the provisional personal quality of theorizing (so grand narratives can never be absolute), the culturally situated psyche, and the inauthenticity of conceptual language against

the imaginative qualities of myth. Such an approach to Jung now needs to be set in a wider context to account for the different trajectories of Jungian literary theory and traditional Jungian criticism. For, there is an important sense in which Jung should be regarded as both a structuralist and a poststructuralist. Perhaps more accurately we see that he has been read both ways by literary criticism, so producing these critical alternatives. Jungian literary theory reads Jung as a poststructuralist by taking the principles hitherto described as the parameters of his thinking. As a poststructuralist, Jung uses concepts and structures pragmatically, as adaptable tools for practice rather than as a means to universal truths about culture. Structuring concepts are conceived playfully as provisional constructs that can give (as in the play of a rope), so the emphasis shifts to responding to specific situations and histories.

Traditional Jungian criticism reads Jung as a structuralist and tends to prioritize his description of concepts over the radical nature of his founding unconscious. For example, in the key concept of the 'collective unconscious', Jung suggested a common biological inheritance of structuring potentials for images and meaning called 'archetypes'. He further posited that the collective unconscious functioned as compensatory to the personal and cultural biases of the ego in a lifelong development narrative that he called 'individuation'. Although the Freudian Oedipus complex plays a role in the Jungian psyche, the underlying direction is prospective in a teleological orientation towards the future. The role of psychic compensation is important for gender identity as a man's conscious masculinity is compensated by a feminine archetypal anima, with the masculine animus playing a similar part for a woman. Two further archetypal energies contribute to the deconstructive process of individuation. The shadow is the destructive psychic opposite to ego bias and the self is the centering principle of meaning, the goal of individuation.

Jungian concepts offer a structuralist map of the mind that finds a home in Jungian criticism as the search for anima, animus, shadow and self as mythical figures in literature, films and art. While this can be a valuable form of opening up critical reading, the structuralist approach has attendant dangers. If it ignores the poststructuralist framework deeply imbued in Jung's writing, it may elevate the universal and generic aspects of art at the expense of the individuality and cultural specificity of the work. Where the concepts are too rigidly applied, structuralist Jungian criticism degenerates into a rigid template, measuring art by Jung's own cultural prejudices.

Having outlined the principles and context of Jungian literary theory, it is now time to look at it as a practice. In fact, as hinted above, Jungian literary theory will not be abandoning entirely the so-called structuralist conceptual route to criticism. Rather, it will hold Jung's concepts of psyche and

ideas about art as merely one tool to consider the mystery of the other that is the art object. As a materialization of culture rooted in the unknowable effects of the unconscious, a work of art for Jungian literary theory should be enabled to participate in the making of consciousness. In practice, the theory provides a frame what is not yet known in the text.

First of all we need to look at Jung's four key ideas on art for their ability to offer a focus for criticism. In the 1922 lecture Jung set out a distinction between signs and symbols that again illustrates his double position on the structuralist-poststructuralist continuum. Where signs point to what is known and conscious in a culture, symbols denote the largely unknown domain of the creative unconscious, pregnant with the future. Hence a second notion of two broad categories of art: psychological works are mainly formed by signs and reflect a cultural collective consciousness, (Jung's name for conventional norms). Conversely visionary art is largely made up of symbols pointing to what is not yet known and perhaps can never be fully known in an individual and his culture. Visionary art is the child of the collective unconscious[1].

All art is, of course, collective, in the first place because the artist's and audience's psyche is culturally contingent. Additionally, art is collective because Jung posited that the human psyche is repository of a common inheritance of structuring archetypes. These will perform a dialogue with consciousness and culture to manifest culturally colored archetypal images. Art is collective to cultural consciousness or cultural unconsciousness or, more likely, is a tapestry of both. So, a third key idea of art is cultural compensation. Compensation occurs when visionary art is made up of archetypal images: this act as symbols denoting what is unrealized in the surface conventions of an age.

A fourth notion concerns visionary art, that its mystery may contain something of the future direction of the collective culture. So visionary art is teleological, pointing to what could be best termed future history. However, it is suggestive that Jung acknowledges that what may baffle the comprehension of one age in a visionary work may be more easily accommodated in another era. So a work may be visionary to one period and psychological to another, with mixing of categories also possible. No psychological work can completely exclude the creative energies of the collective unconscious because it is always present in subjectivity. No visionary text can abandon the language of signs representing the known world because the ego is conditioned by convention and history.

These four key ideas offer tenets or starting points for Jungian literary theory as a practice. They are the psychological and visionary categories, the notion of cultural compensation as a way of understanding the unknown in art (which is a form of historical reading), and likewise the notion of the unknown in art signifying potential cultural change. Such a starting position for Jungian literary theory is, in fact, a blend of the structuralist traditional Jungian criticism and of the poststructuralist re-thinking of Jung. The Jungian literary theorist will, however, proceed differently from the traditional approach by emphasizing the as-yet-unknown dimension of art, and by working with Jung's expression of the provisional

nature of his notions of structure and concepts. One way of doing this is to take the treatment of Jung's literary categories a stage further. Given Jung's own descriptions of the radical effect of the changing historical

context, we might want to shift his rather static model of two structuring categories. Perhaps psychological and visionary could become ways of reading, not alternative definitions. So instead of a criticism worrying about conceptual parameters, which to Jungian literary theory are provisional anyway, we would take psychological and visionary criteria as a framework to be applied to any text. Psychological and visionary would become tools by which to make visible art's participation in the collective in terms of the typical, the stereotypical and the archetypical. A work would be tested against its ability to reveal the contemporary mindset as well as its subversion; its creative re-ordering of history and its harboring of the future. Although Jung does not explicitly license such a critical practice, he does model it, in his essay *Ulysses: A Monologue* (1932)[2].

Jung's essay on James Joyce's novel is about art and the body. Such is his profoundly visceral response to the text that it confounds his psychological and visionary division. In despair at the draining away of meaning, Jung enacts criticism as comedy. His essay traces a great wheel of psychic disintegration in the process of reading. In turn, the trauma of reading leads to a redemptive, yet overtly tentative critical narrative that is imbued with historical analysis. Jung experiences *Ulysses* as an assault on the senses. The novel sends him to sleep twice and seems to have the meaning proper only to intestines and worms. It is a tapeworm epic! So the problem is diagnosed as a bodily exploration working to re-align the relationships between the body and the psyche. Here Jung demonstrates the creative possibilities of Jungian literary theory by tracking the slow re-assembling of meaning and cultural resonance in the reader's psyche. It is, of course, a view of reading literature as a form of individuation, as the transformation of consciousness by contact with the unconscious. Jung is explicit that evolving a critical narrative out of this visceral psyche is the necessary structuring of a pathway through mental chaos, not some kind of identification of a fixed truth. So this backside art could be read as a scatology offering a dark modern eschatology. It marks the absence of spirit and indicts the void at the heart of western modernity.

So the novel is both psychological and visionary to a degree that deconstructs Jung's over-simple categories. *Ulysses* is so steeped in the consciousness of modernity (i.e. psychological) that it is simultaneously a revelation of what is unconscious in western cultural identity (i.e. visionary). The novel's experimentation critically compensates the sentimentality of a materialist culture and, in its shock to the senses, is itself an organ of a transformation of consciousness. Such a transformation is urgently necessary, believes Jung, if modernity is to have a future.

Had Jung analyzed his own radical act of criticism, then Jungian literary theory would find direct expression in his

works. I am now going to give another brief example of practice in some brief remarks about the final scene of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. In a play in which a prince hesitates over killing a father-figure, in part because of confused reactions to his mother, an Oedipal explanation appears inevitable. However, Jungian literary theory offers a number of possibilities for exploring the political psyche of the play[3].

Consider the final moments of the drama in which a male royal dynasty has spectacularly imploded. As Fortinbras brings his army on stage to secure his succession, Horatio cradles the dying prince in his arms. Shakespeare produced his *Hamlet* in the final years of the reign of Elizabeth I whose deliberate embrace of Virgin Queen status was an important ingredient of her authority. Reading the end of the play psychologically, for signs, the signs are not good for the imminent male dynasty of the Stuarts. And if the play psychologically reflects anxiety about the return of fathers and sons to the throne, then there is also a complex critical compensation for Elizabeth's Virgin magic, which ultimately harks back to the myth of the great goddess.

The various frameworks of psychological, visionary, compensatory and teleological provide an overlapping multi-layered portrait of the play as an active intervention into political consciousness. For if Elizabeth's self-conscious sacred matriarchy is met by the play's compensatory masculine dynasty, then it also functions symbolically to suggest the archaic nature of sacred kingship as well. In the haunting presence of the past in the form of the Ghost, and the corruption of archaic ritual in the stage-managed final contest (where a ritual duel degenerates into a vehicle for murder), sacred monarchy loses its political potency at the end of the drama[4].

In fact, of course, drama is the end of the divine right of kings because Claudius corrupts ritual, and *Hamlet* replaces it with play-acting in politics. What are finally left on stage are two visions of the future, shortly to be en-acted in the seventeenth-century Civil War: power-through-military-force in Fortinbras explicitly arriving with his army and the politics-of-brotherly-love (Civil War political experiments in fraternal equality) dying in Horatio's embrace.

Also, the tableau of *Hamlet* and Horatio would be recognized by earlier audiences as a male version of an iconic Christian image of the Virgin cradling her dying son; it is an image with ancient roots as the goddess clasping her dying son-lover. *Hamlet* is ominous for masculine-feminine relations, since the only named embrace between man and woman is of a dead, rather than dying body, when *Hamlet* leaps into Ophelia's grave. It is relations between men, and between men and power, that will undergo the next revolution in consciousness [5].

Prince *Hamlet*'s true erotic connection to the unconscious has always been with death. First is was an archaic connection, signified by the Ghost. Then in his embrace of Yorick and dead Ophelia he rehearses his own transition from play-acting clown and lover to something that cannot be fully articulated in his age. Where Freud might be content to name the death drive and stop there, Jungian

literary theory would see something more complex, more culturally embedded and more numinous in the turn to death as the undiscovered country, the repository of the unknown future for this literary

work. Death at the end of the play is symbolic in the Jungian sense. It marks change from a religious culture of government to a secular one, and it is part of the play's mechanism for transforming the consciousness of its audience. Jungian literary theory sees art as an active intervention in the evolution of the collective consciousness of the era.

The discussion of culture in postcolonial critical theories revolves around the twin poles of the two very famous terms which are known as authenticity and hybridization. Hybridization comprises the blending of country specific and culture specific authoritarian and political campaigning techniques. There are various styles of doing it. The term 'Hybrid' was originally obtained from biology. There it stands for the process of combining varieties of living being to create better specie. Later this term is transferred to the field of political messages when a hybrid election campaign starts. All of these campaigns are target oriented and are fought with a killer instinct. One main characteristic related to this perception is the prominence to a global relative standpoint. The term hybridization, in Theory of Globalization, reflects a constant amalgamation of different cultures, lifestyles and ideologies. The communication which happens in political campaign similarly shows a kind of communication suggesting blending of political cultures and common methods used by them. Calling for a return to pre-colonial legitimacy could be considered as an appreciative response to the understanding of the term colonialism and its associated criticism of struggling cultural identities. The authenticity which will be achieved thereafter contrasts with the acceptance by other writers who believes in the purity of race. The supporters of Creolization may denounce colonialism but even then they consider it as an irreversible reality. Creolization is a process of making world new with the help of creating Creole cultures from indigenous breeds of human beings. There is a common concept that it will leave the former colonized without a culture which is fundamentally incorrect. They have a hybrid or Creole culture which is emerged and borrowed from the metropolitan culture and in the process subverted and indigenized it. A final note about Jungian literary theory should emphasize its capacity to enter a dialogue with other figures in cultural theory. For example, Jung anticipates some of the thinking of Jacques Derrida on deconstruction in his notion of individuation. Where Derrida takes language as the starting position and shows the fiction of a stable self by the slippery quality of signs, Jung begins from the psyche as a continual re-formation of meaning-making that places the unstable slippery unconscious at the heart of being[6].

Creolization exuberant the mutual contamination of styles which is prevalent characteristic of diasporic writers like Salman Rushdie and Wilson Harris. Advocates of Creolization often argue that authenticity is unrealistic and it exists in the Utopian world because world is changing since

its beginning and people are migrating from one place to another from the time of their origin. Trans-cultural or in common words cross-cultural exchange has always been an absolute fact of life in every corner of the world. Creolization is facing the same objection which the term authenticity also faces. It is a common saying that culture has always been characterized by fluidity and exchange among peers. If we accept both the terms as a peculiar postcolonial condition, Hybridization, like authenticity, is incomprehensibly without a notion of cultural purity. Whether it is authenticity or Creolization, both attribute the significance of cultural elements to national derivation: where a thing has an existence from its actual meaning.

If there are no anti-essentialist accounts of distinctiveness, reification of civilization, together with authenticity and creolization, are allegorical in purpose. It means that they influence collective secret code in order to be triumphant in sanction for political action. Even though purporting to depict what inhabitants are and what they do, genuineness and creolization in reality confront people to recognize by means of a firm representation of them and subsequently to agree to an assured individuality. These edifices are to signify a person or cluster in terms of reified or serve it as symbol of culture. They recognize the legitimacy of either authenticity or creolization as a portrayal of oneself to admit definite modes of dressing, verbal communication and inscription as belonging appropriately to oneself and to rebuff other styles as artificial. Such definitions of self construct a planet not only of members and nonmembers but in addition of loyalists and conspirators. Inherent in such a world is the conjecture that there are citizens who have misplaced their identity. Similarly, when M.M. Bakhtin describes the dialogic imagination, he does so from the perspective of discourse polarized between centralizing forces of power and dispersing energies of social practice. So consider Jung, with his psyche polarized between centralizing archetypal dynamism and centrifugal manifestations of archetypal images as they are contingent upon cultural difference. Could it be that Jung provides something similar to the psyche posited by such theories of discourse?

It can also be said that the importance of Hybridisation and Creolisation is consistently increasing with the increase of the financial condition of the middle class society. It can also be taken as a solution to some social problems like Honor Killing and financial backwardness. The society is becoming global from local, metropolitan from town day by day. So the tendency to protect regional values is decreasing eventually. Although this can also be the basis of criticism of this growing metropolitan culture but there is a speed of development which can never be controlled absolutely by the political forces. Every change has both positive and negative effects but it can never be stopped. Thus it can be said that Hybridization and Creolization are for the benefit of the society. In the same way, Jungian literary theory is about a creative and critical response to Jung. By a re-evaluation of a thinker devoted to healing modernity, Jungian literary theory offers the creative imagination as the source of new critical approaches, a new treatment of texts.

REFERENCES

1. Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2006), "The Politics of Identity", Daedalus, Vol.135, Issue 4, 2006.
2. Benhabib, Seyla (2002), The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
3. Bilgrami, Akeel (2006), "Notes Towards the Definition of Identity", Daedalus, Vol.135, Issue: 4.
4. Jung, Carl Gustav (1978), Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature, Princeton University Press, 4th Ed.
5. Knight, G. Wilson (2001), The Wheel of Fire: Interpretations of Shakespearean Tragedy. Routledge, 2nd Ed.
6. Parker, Richard D (2005), "Five Thesis on Identity Politics", Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, Vol.29, Issue 1.