



## The Essence of Archetypes

Jon Mills

To cite this article: Jon Mills (2018) The Essence of Archetypes, International Journal of Jungian Studies, 10:3, 199-220, DOI: [10.1080/19409052.2018.1503808](https://doi.org/10.1080/19409052.2018.1503808)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19409052.2018.1503808>



Published online: 31 Jul 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 28



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



## The Essence of Archetypes

Jon Mills

Department of Psychology, Adler Graduate Professional School, Toronto, Canada

### ABSTRACT

Jung's notion of the archetype remains an equivocal concept, so much so that Jungians and post-Jungians have failed to agree on its essential nature. In this essay, I wish to argue that an archetype may be understood as an unconscious schema that is self-constitutive and emerges into consciousness from its own a priori ground, hence an autonomous self-determinative act derived from archaic ontology. After offering an analysis of the archetype debate, I set out to philosophically investigate the essence of an archetype by examining its origins and dialectical reflections as a process system arising from its own autochthonous parameters. I offer a descriptive explication of the inner constitution and birth of an archetype based on internal rupture and the desire to project its universality, form, and patternings into psychic reality as self-instantiating replicators. Archetypal content is the appearance of essence as the products of self-manifestation, for an archetype must appear in order to be made actual. Here we must seriously question that, in the beginning, if an archetype is self-constituted and self-generative, the notion and validity of a collective unconscious becomes rather dubious, if not superfluous. I conclude by sketching out an archetypal theory of alterity based on dialectical logic.

### KEYWORDS

Archetypes; analytical psychology; collective unconscious; archaic ontology; origins of mind; unconscious schemata; metaphysics of difference; dialectics

What constitutes the essence of an archetype? In other words, what makes it what it truly is, *exactly*, without which it would not be? Jung failed to make this clear. And post-Jungian schools including contemporary Jungian movements have still not answered this most elemental question. As a result, there is no clarity or consensus among the profession. The term 'archetype' is thrown about and employed, I suggest, without proper understanding or analysis of its essential features. This essay aims to provide a possible corrective to such theoretical ambiguities and *aporias* in order to rehabilitate the definition, clarity, and value this term properly conveys. Here any exposition of an archetype must stand in relation to the question of origins.

Archetypal theory must contend with the inner parameters of what constitutes an archetype's essence, scope, and ground for appearance. As such, I will offer a dialectical account of the inner constitution of an archetype with an emphasis on the ontology of difference as a pivotal feature. I propose that the internal configuration of an archetype entails its own dialectical relations and tensions to otherness *within* its own constitution,

which becomes the template for external differentiation, projection, and self-manifestation revealed through alterity. What I have in mind is exploring to what degree otherness is not only ontologically necessary for identity, but is also the instantiation of internal division that becomes unfamiliar and alienated from the internal fabric of an archetype itself, hence giving rise to modified forms as the differentiation of its original essence. What this means is that all instantiations of archetypal process originally arise from their own internal division as a dialectical mediation to otherness that becomes externalized through specific forms and particularities. In what follows, I hope to articulate the metaphysical factors and internal operations of the activities of an archetype that enrich a theoretic justification for postulating an original ground and grounding for archaic ontology to manifest and reinscribe itself through archetypal phenomena. Put laconically, I will attempt to elucidate a new theory of archetypes based on the dynamics of internal rupture, division, and exteriorization manifesting as unconscious schemata.

### The archetype debate

The field of Jungian studies cannot agree upon what constitutes Jung's most original contributions to psychological theory, namely, the doctrine of archetypes. Nowhere, that is, in no other psychoanalytic tradition, I suggest, do we witness such a debate where the most fundamental aspect of a community's theoretical framework is challenged. The *most basic theoretical tenet* of the founding father of the movement is repeatedly drawn into question within post-classical, reformed, and contemporary perspectives to the degree that there is no unified consensus on what defines or constitutes an archetype. This opens up the field to criticism – to being labeled an esoteric scholarly specialty, insular self-interest group, or Gnostic guild, even a mystic cult, unfairly I might add. Jungianism needs to rehabilitate its image, arguably to modernize its appeal to other academic and clinical disciplines and make it attractive to the masses. Here, I concur with many others, its allure and success is in addressing the question of the spiritual (Mills, 2017), a shortcoming of traditional psychoanalysis. But the ontology of the archetype, although repeatedly denied by Jung's followers and apologists as making no metaphysical claims whatsoever, lies at the very heart of this conundrum. What is missing is a proper *philosophical* expatiation and analysis of the essence of archetypes, a theoretical scaffolding I hope to remediate in what follows.

Let us briefly begin with Jung, who had referred to the archetypes in so many varied, convoluted, and contradictory ways, that his conjectural legacy was bound to be taken up by post-Jungian and contemporary scholars in an effort to expound, de-convolute, and clean up the theoretical mess. Jung referred to archetypes as inborn ideas, forms, collective images, instincts, affective organizations, fantasies, emotions, behavioral patterns, and qualitative intensities such as numinosity (CW, 8, pp. 133, 195, 201, 205–206, 436; Jung, 1957, p. xliv; 1964, p. 96). In other places in the *Collected Works*, he calls them psychic energies, entities, and independent forces and agencies that are autonomously organized and can seize or impose themselves on a person against their own volition (CW, 8, p. 231; Jung, 1961, p. 347). Furthermore, he attributes mind-independence to archetypes, which have a transcendental character, and that they exist outside of naturalized accounts of space and time due to their supernatural structure and presence (CW, 14, pp. 505, 536–538, 551–552; also averred in his interview with Freeman, 1959). But Jung also referred to archetypes as concepts, hypotheses, heuristic models, and metaphors (CW, 9, p. 160) when he was

backtracking from his earlier philosophic commitments under the banner of science. And he was very clear to announce that he was conducting empirical psychology, not speculative philosophy, and went to great lengths to claim that his theories had nothing to do with metaphysics (CW, 11, p. 16) despite the fact that he was engaging ontology. This is not a convincing, let alone coherent or sustainable, argument. So where does this leave us?

May I suggest that the controversy over the fate of the archetype concept has traditionally been framed in the following binary categories, if not false dichotomies: (1) *The Rationalism vs. Empiricism debate*, which engages the general questions of a priorism versus experience; (2) *The Biology vs. Culture debate*, which engages the more specific questions of innateness, evolution, and genetic transmission versus the role of the environment, attachment, developmental psychology, language, and social dynamics; and (3) *The Naturalism vs. Supernaturalism debate*, which engages and intersects the previous categories with many micro-debates that situate nuanced arguments within naturalized embodied paradigms within complex social structures versus transpersonal, transsubjective, suprapersonal, transcendent entities, agencies, and energies that have supernatural foundations, organizations, and mystical properties, which evoke greater metaphysical questions such as emanationism, supervenience, and the God posit.

The question of a priorism or innateness can be approached from both rationalist philosophical traditions as well as empirical ones, whether that be from speculative metaphysics with an emphasis on first principles, to propositional logic, and the grounding and function of our epistemological processes including logical positivism, to the role of biology, evolution, genetics, cognition, neuroscience, epigenetics, attachment theory, developmental and social psychology, and the nature of universals. Developmentalists quarrel with evolutionary biologists, and environmentalists or sociologists abhor any reductive paradigms that boil an archetype down to its substantive (materially) deterministic nature, even if it is an a priori ontological condition for subsequent human development. And both naturalists and culturalists object to the theosophic implications of importing onto-theology into any discussion of the constitution of an archetype. Please forgive me if I am being too simplistic here, but there seems to be four predominant groups that overlap and debate: (1) evolutionists, (2) developmentalists, (3) culturalists, and (4) transpersonalists, followed by a series of supple disputes within each camp that may annex other perspectives, such as developmental emergentism, and hence highlights the complexity of archetype theory.

Goodwyn (2010) reconsiders the question of innateness and the argument from inheritance, which he juxtaposes to current trends that view archetypes as a confluence of developmental and constructivist processes that become dynamic emergent systems and properties (Hogenson, 2001; Saunders & Skar, 2001), such as image schemas (Knox, 2003). The locus of this nuanced deliberation is on how much do we inherit from evolutionary pressures and genetic conditioning versus how developmental-psychosocial processes emerge within a socio-symbolic order that conditions the content of our psychic productions, which are not originally inherited. Stevens (2002) champions the classical biological approach, which more or less subsumes the cognitive and neurosciences, including the notion of brain-specific algorithms that are pre-programed, pre-existent, and pre-specified, while developmentalists argue that anything symbolically meaningful cannot be inherited but only emerge from attachments and socialization processes within a cultural milieu. A priorists and evolutionists – from Kant to Darwin, are generically in

agreement that basic constitutional predispositions condition all experience, while emergent theorists or dynamic systems models would emphasize the organizing power of experience over reductive causal forces, even if they were to concede that they still emerge from a corporeal a priori ground and become dynamically organized through complex interactions between genes, epigeneticity, and the environment, whether that be biologically embodied, socio-culturally mediated, or both. Of course, any discussion that privileges one side over the other, e.g. genetics versus culture, must contend with the thorny issues of causal determinism, personal freedom, choice, and agency, a debate we do not need to entertain here (see Mills, 2013b for a review).

Stevens (2002) goes so far to proclaim that, 'When I define archetype as "innate neuropsychic potential", I am talking about the *archetype-as-such*' (p. 284, italics in original). Here he is referring to the *Ding an sich*, which is reduced to its ontological biological substrate. Following Jung's (and Freud's) Kantian affinities that the thing-in-itself cannot be directly known, only its derivatives, that is, we may only have epistemological access to the forms in which they appear, the paradigmatic example being *imago*, this type of dogmatic reductionism poses severe philosophical challenges. Boiling down archetypes to the brain is a crass biological realism that Jones (2000) has referred to as a 'myth of modernity' (p. 600). To say that the 'real' archetype is a neurological correlate and property of the brain that causes emergence *as such* is to displace the rich discourse on the variegated modes of appearance and the phenomenology of lived experience that may be overdetermined and derived from multiple competing strands of causation and their subsequent meta-organizations and functions. Biology is a necessary condition of all psychological phenomena, but it is hardly a sufficient condition to explain the complexifications of mind and society. We can observe brain states in a fMRI or a CAT scan, for example, but these observations are not witnessing or recording consciousness. Consciousness is not colorful images on a computer screen. This is a mereological error, as well as the fallacy of simple location as misplaced concreteness. Consciousness cannot be collapsed into any physicalist paradigm without suffering the loss of soul. Psyche is much more than what these reductive models can proclaim, even if scientifically savvy and politically in vogue.

Back to the cultural wars, Roesler (2012), like Knox (2003), thinks that archetypes are transmitted more through social processes than biology, for complex symbolic patterns cannot be genetically encoded or inherited and should be conceived as originating from socialization. Hybrid determinist positions have also focused on the essence of archetypes from within the psyche and society, some solely from the standpoint of imagination (Hillman, 2013), as symbolic forms (Pietikainen, 1998), action patterns (Hogenson, 2009), as well as phenomenologically emergent from embodied human engagement and action in their social and physical environments within their linguistic world (Colman, 2016); while evolutionary proponents wish to argue for how biology is the basis for developmental, social, and cultural achievement despite being ontologically intertwined. Following those who have constructed empirical studies to provide so-called scientific 'proof' for the existence of archetypes (see Maloney, 1999), Goodwyn (2013) argues that recurrent motifs in all societies function as 'resonant attractors' that can be empirically studied in the narrative field and offers evidence for the existence of innate archetypes, although attractor positions could just as easily be explained through psychodynamic motivations based in unconscious desire, defense, and identification, so the micro-tensions between evolutionary psychology, developmental emergence, and sociological-cultural influence

become a matter of emphasis, if not a moot point, not to mention the perils of proving epistemological validity.

Jung's introduction of the archetype as a transpersonal reality with transcendental properties that infiltrate and occupy the psyche of all people in all cultures but is unknowable in itself is often interpreted by those unsympathetic to this view as a magical construct from a supernatural provenance (see Jung, *CW*, 7, p. 187; *CW*, 8, p. 183, 209; *CW*, 9, p. 33). How could an archetype be floating about in space (yet is outside of spacetime but supervenes on the spatiotemporal mind) as an independent entity and agency that impregnates the psyche of all people, acts autonomously, seizes mental functioning, compels a person or social forces to act against their will, and claim that it is anchored in an archaic unconscious participatory process that is equated with and/or originates from God (see Jung, *CW*, 11, pp. 468–470)? Jung goes so far as to make an archetype a 'living subject' (*CW*, 11, p. 469), a divine 'arranger of psychic forms inside and outside the psyche' (see *Letters II*, p. 22).

It goes without saying that the naturalists would dismiss any supernatural claims as being unscientific, unverifiable, unfalsifiable, and bogus illusions, while the transpersonalists would question the epistemological arrogance of science, separate the categories of subjectivity, intersubjectivity, and objectivity as distinct modes of experience, being, and knowledge, reframe the realism versus idealism debate, expand the notion of what constitutes the parameters of naturalism, and favor a phenomenological and hermeneutic discourse over the empirical method. The objections to naturalism are often motivated by the need to preserve the notions of spirituality, theology, transcendence, and phenomenological or mystical experience, when naturalists and logical positivists oppose such phenomena based on ideological differences and metaphysical and linguistic disputes about the 'true' nature of reality. In the end we have an irreconcilable clash of values that colors the frame, context, and logical confines of the debate.

To add to the controversy, there are those who argue that Jung never really had a theory of archetypes at all (see Hogenson, 2004, p. 33), 'is a redundant explanation for the origin and transmission of symbols' (Colman, 2015, p. 525), no longer find the term 'archetype' necessary, let alone useful (Merchant, 2009), and question if archetypes *really exist*. This is the heart of the matter. Are we merely conjuring up fictions, using language games to define something into existence, or do these processes and presences have an ontological basis? In other words, is the term archetype merely a theoretic fabrication, a social construction, a semiotic – not a reality, hence a signifier rather than a concrete entity in its own right? Even if they are 'immaterial entities,' as Segal (2014) prefers to call them, we are still left with the task of defining their ontological constraints. These are the philosophical questions I wish to explore in our investigation that follows.

What becomes important to delineate is the *ground* from which an archetype emerges. It can't just pop-up *ex nihilo* without importing some supernatural edifice that is philosophically encumbered unless we rethink the notion of a priori universalism. Emergence cannot happen independently of our embodiment, either materially within our biology or within our concrete social milieus, for psyche is enmattered and resides within place. In other words, archetypes cannot logically or categorically pop into existence from some ephemeral vapor or magical realm. They must be explained as deriving from an organic developmental process that is compatible with reason and science, even if we are engaging the humanities, namely, the human sciences.

## The appearance of archaic ontology

When we posit archaic ontology, we evoke the notion of initiation, of *arché* (ἀρχή), hence origins. Psychic and cultural phenomena must have a prehistory, preconditions that stand in relation to their original instantiations. Following the principle of sufficient reason, every mental event must stand in relation to an archaic object that is derived from its original ground. In other words, all psychic experience must stand in relation to its origins. This is the prototype of the unconscious. If an archetype is an original exemplary model or participatory template in which human experience correlates to in some manner, if not emanates from, then we are invoking the question, ground, and scope of original ontology. Here the meaning of the archetypal must contend with what I call the ‘genesis problem’ (Mills, 2002a) in order to explain how mental activity participates of earlier derivatives and repetitions of original being that may be said to have derived from archaic societies laid down within a collective transpersonal process (even if genetically, developmentally, and culturally transmitted) that conditions how we come to perceive and experience our contemporary world.

Setting aside for the moment the issue of a collective unconscious that informs the psychic development of the human race, which is presumably the womb of archetypal process – Plato’s *chora*, here I am mainly interested in pursuing a narrow scope of inquiry into defining and articulating the *essence* of an archetype. In other words, how is it structurally constituted? What are its internal configurations, blueprints, and functional dynamics? Why should we presuppose it in the first place? Does it prove itself? Does it demonstrate its existence? Does it have a source or point of origination? These are not easy questions to answer, because it requires us to speculate about pre-appearances. Whence do archetypes appear? What precedes manifestation? From where do they originate? In order for something to be truly archetypal, would it not have to stand in relation to its pre-manifestation from a primal ontic ground? That which manifests simply does not happen *ex nihilo*, but rather must issue forth from an a priori state of being. That which affirms the recapitulation of the archaic must also implicitly disclose its essence through the reiteration of appearance, hence the replication of original presence.

Extending Eliade’s (1949) notion of the repetition of the ‘mythical instant of the beginning’ (p. 35), What would constitute an archetype *ab origine*? Not only would psychic experience stand in relation to its fundamental prototype, namely, *original form*, the manifestation of experience itself would by necessity participate of a *prior* organizing principle. Whether this organizing principle derives from a supraordinate systemic process is another matter, a question we may bracket for the moment. Furthermore, if we presume an archetype – if it exists – reflects an original form, would it not also come from conditions that allowed it to arise in the first place, its pre-beginnings, so to speak, that which are *pre-formed*?

This would imply that original form derives from earlier ontic constituencies. But for the time being we do not know what those conditions would be other than what our speculations have to offer abductively based on what presents itself as evidential. While Jung postulated the collective unconscious, in the end, this may be superfluous, if not simply begging the question. Yet the metaphysics of origins demands a careful analysis of what *appears* in the collective life of humankind – across societies, geography, and

time; and that is arguably more substantive and experientially realized through phenomena we attribute to archetypal process.

Regardless if we can adequately answer to the question of genesis, if we stay focused on the nature of the archetypal, how would the process or mechanism of manifestation work? We must first start with what appears and via abduction attempt to provide a viable or plausible account of how appearance arises from its historicity, viz. original essence. In fact, we must first insist on a first principle, namely, that something comes from something. If we do not, then there is no metaphysical connection to the past. I find this thesis untenable, because the archaic primacy of the past is the ontic precursor that conditions the present. The archaic is a priori ground for which nothing could manifest without it.

What becomes important, I suggest, is to differentiate (at least categorically) the phenomenon of archetypal process from its point of origination; for what appears or manifests to the psyche must be a derivative of an earlier unconscious instantiation that distributes its essence through the modifications in which content, forms, and patterns appear to the subjective mind – whether that be as imago, percept, affect, behavioral impetus, the numinous, the mythic, the symbolic, and so forth. Here we must distinguish the (a) *dispersal* of its essence into differentiated and modified modes from the (b) *appearance* of archetypal morphology. Yet we must ask, What transpires *before* the archetype appears? We have postulated that the archetype never appears as such, only its derivatives, so this may be a premature proposition. But what I am getting at is the question of original ground. To tarry with this question further, What are the structures or processes that bring about appearance? In other words, what constitutes the formal parameters of an archetype in the beginning? Here appearance and essence may not be ontologically separated, for essence conditions appearance,<sup>1</sup> although archetypal manifestation may be considered to be a modification of original form.

Let us start from the standpoint of speculative metaphysics. Assume for the moment that an archetype is self-constitutive, that it is a process system or psychic ‘entity,’ as Jung calls it,<sup>2</sup> with its own internal pulsions and dynamics in its own right. What if archetypes were autochthonous, what we may say is indigenous to the psyche and derived from its own primordial source? What if archetypes are ‘parthenogenically born ... as self-revelations of the psyche’ (Mogenson, 1999, pp. 129–130)? What if archetypes were begotten from themselves, that is, each archetype is a generative *replicator* that exudes its essence into concrete manifestations of appearance – the image, for example? What if archetypes are ‘autonomous,’ as Jung says (*CW*, 9, p. 40; *CW*, 11, p. 469),<sup>3</sup> behaving ‘autocratically’ as ‘involuntary manifestations of unconscious processes’ (*CW*, 9, pp. 154, 153, § 260) that spontaneously arise as self-creative acts, and can generate their own productions in our consciousness, engendered from an unconscious ground no less? If this is possible, then the concept of the collective unconscious is not required as the generator of archetypes, for archetypes would be propagative and self-producing. In other words, the collective unconscious would be gratuitous, hence not needed to explain the phenomena of archetypes. This would imply that archetypes ground their own ground, emanating from a primordial *Ungrund*, so to speak, as ground without a ground.

But here we encounter the problem of agency. We furthermore have to account for causation, unless we are willing to grant the archetype its own spontaneous productions as self-determinative activity, which would further answer to the question of agency, for



self-spontaneous generation is an agentic act. But if we cannot justify this metaphysical leap to agency, then the most we can attribute to the archetype is the character of an artifact – as re-production, a repetitive object or datum for consciousness, despite the fact that it carries its own meaning and message, which must be deciphered, unless meaning is relegated to the interpretation and projection of the subject. But when we import the language of hermeneutics, we have already entered into the domain of a dynamic complexity that has a certain degree of teleology, indeed, a particular *intent* no less, for purpose and meaning are conveyed in the very act of production itself. So when Jung proclaims that archetypes may possess a mythic character or are symbolically infused motifs as *représentations collectives* (*CW*, 5; *CW*, 8, p. 122; pp. 152, 155; *CW*, 9, p. 41), we have already entered the domain of language and communicative action, for all meaning structures convey a conceptual scheme, a message, purposefully I might add, as informational exchange.

When archetypes achieve the complexity of the symbolic, even if dominated by sense perceptions, emotionality, and desire, they convey a meaning that is semiotically charged, for all symbols are linguistically mediated and convey advanced telic properties that are part and parcel of their signification, especially when signification is overdetermined. This means that human language pervades an archetype if it possesses symbolic meaning. If it is not symbolic, it would by definition correspond to less organized and unarticulated emergent properties. And when human language is involved, even when positing archaic humanity, this would imply a collective or cultural process that is agentially informed. Here, once again, enters the question of a collective unconscious, or perhaps merely an archetypal process that is unconsciously organized, self-produced, and dispersed into psychic reality as the coming to presence of earlier forms and potencies. But regardless of the depth or stratification we attribute to unconscious process (individual or collective), it belongs to the universal features of the human psyche, hence a general and unanimous aspect of all people worldwide regardless of gender, race, culture, geography, and time. Because of the presumed universality of the archetype, regardless of the endless modes in which it appears, we may expect to find even more basic configurations that form its structure and meaning networks by closely analyzing its systemic components, that is, the mechanisms involved in the generation of appearances.

### **On the inner constitution of an archetype**

When positing the notion of original ground, what can we discern from closely examining the inner constitution of an archetype? We would expect to find some discernable configuration if the concept of an archetype has any internal consistency; and we would most certainly expect to find empirical evidence for its appearance. But what about internal consistency? Before we can answer to this question, we must first define what we mean by interiority.

Unlike Giegerich (1998) who views the soul as pure thought (logical life) grounded in ‘absolute interiority or internal infinity’ (p. 18),<sup>4</sup> here I wish to show how internality emerges from itself and conditions all psychic productions. Interiority means anything that belongs to the inner constitution and experiential life of a complex organization or entity, whether organic or not. It possesses its own internal structures and dynamic relations, is in constant flux and movement, and as such is a temporal–spatial systemic

process of becoming. As becoming, psyche finds itself as internal relata through an ensuing series of spacings within its unconscious abyss (Mills, 2002b, 2010). What is at stake here is a speculative metaphysics of postulating the internal workings of a complex system that is self-constitutive, self-organized, and oriented toward communicative exchange, namely, the tendency to disperse its presence and essential contents into other psychic mediums. Here I am mainly thinking of internal unconscious organizations of quasi-autonomous units of experience as variegated schemata within the individual minds of human subjects within a collective society.

### **On universality**

If we proceed from the premise that archetypes are ‘universal’ (Jung, 1951, p. 585), and that they originate from archaic humanity, what has historically been referred to pejoratively as ‘primitive man,’ then we must conclude that they are endemic to human nature, even if they appear in pluralistic (even incompatible or antagonistic) varieties. Here, archetypes are simply rife. We encounter them every day as part of our perfunctory rituals interpassively submersed in unconscious cultural conditioning. But what can we say about generalities? On the face of things, we must first appeal to universal features. What is an archetype in our most common understanding? Starting with Jung (1957, p. xliv), we import content into any definition, e.g. the archetypal image. But what precedes content? What a priori structures condition the appearance of content?

If an archetype presages and signifies form, then what do we make of a generic form that is formless? Here we have no discernable content other than the content of amorphous form, a redundant generic category grafted onto a theoretical principle of explaining phenomena. If this is the case, then we are left with analyzing *formless form*. Then what is the ground – the essence – of an archetype if it is merely featureless form? Although we know it as appearance in all its multidimensional and subtle manifestations, we must conclude that formless form constitutes its basic ontological structure. Whether this is an empty formalism is another matter. On the one hand, archetypal form by definition is populated with content, for its own form serves as the foundation of its content, but with stipulations. On the other hand, its generic (universal) structure conforms to *essential factors* that allow for content to manifest. In other words, it must have certain conditions *necessarily*, without which it could not exist. What are such formal parameters? Let us first begin with its universality.

There are at least six classifications we may attribute to the definition of *universal*: (1) totality, entirety; complete; whole; (2) an ontological assertion of absolute inclusion; (3) a general category of participation; (4) a unification principle; (5) infinity or eternal presence; and (6), undifferentiation or an undivided unity. It is mainly within this last class of universality I wish to situate my argument of interiority as the coming into being of internal experience from immediate autochthony as undifferentiated unity to the dispersal of differentiated internality into psychic presence and the particularity of appearance. Therefore, an archetype emerges from its own initial, distinctionless universality. As such, it is its own essence that grounds its own ground.<sup>5</sup> What this means is that an archetype is a freely determinative process system: it not only is its own ground and is grounded, but it gives itself form, substance, and content.<sup>6</sup>

We have argued that an archetype derives from original form, that is, the primordial instantiation of archaic ontology. As the reiteration of archaic form, archetypes condition the individual and cultural productions that populate psyche and society. This would make archetypes a universal phenomenon, and not merely relegated to particularized, personal idiosyncrasies or cultural relativity, for they must be common to all human beings. In fact, it becomes important to underscore the point that in order for there to be any common universality, there must be an essential structure to make anything what it is – without which it would not be. Hence the doctrine of essence is the most rudimentary theoretic that structurally and ontologically fortifies the conditions of being and becoming.<sup>7</sup> What this means is that the universal conditions the particular.

### ***On form and appearance***

What is particularly universal is not its content, which varies widely throughout human civilization, but rather the form of an archetype as such, which we have hitherto said is featureless or formless in its generic composition. This gives rise to a special type of universality, namely, a *formless pervasiveness* as a *featureless absolute*. As a universal, it is both pervasive and absolute, for anything short of an all-encompassing ubiquity and totality would annul its universal character. But how can form be formless when by definition it displays organization as well as a mode or type of configuration? Here formlessness merely signifies its lack of a specific or defining content; yet this does not mean it lacks defining properties, even if the question of content is suspended for the time being.

Perhaps this featureless form is not so empty after all, insofar as something elementary must exist in order for there to be essence, without which it cannot be nor appear. What we can reasonably conclude at this point, as nebulous as it remains so far in our investigation, following from its a priori constitution, an archetype *must* appear. In fact, an archetype is the appearance of archaic ontology, for nothing can exist unless it is made actual. In Hegel's (1812) language, '*Essence must appear ... Existence; it is a being that has come forth from negativity and inwardness ... whatever is, exists.*' (pp. 479, 481, italics in original). What the archetype manifests as, however, is content: it is never revealed in its bare formalism. We may only discern this form logically. But the more audacious claim is that archetypal appearance is actually the thing-in-itself – what appears is real or actual as the unveiling and instantiation of essence in its modes of manifestation. Here the Kantian *noumena* or Fichtean *Anstoss* – the limit, boundary, or rigid check – is superseded by the mere fact that we can posit it. In fact, there is nothing we can know more certain than the essence of the real, for in order to conceive of it or think it at all presupposes that we already know it by virtue of the fact that we posit it.<sup>8</sup>

If we adopt the notion that every manifestation (content) must stand in ontic relation to its original ground (essential form), then an archetype transcends the phenomenal, for it predates appearance as such, hence standing for an *ultimate reality* or *source* from which phenomena manifest, namely, that which conditions all experience. Although appearance and ground are equiprimordial, we can never *experience* the archetype in-itself, as if we could slip into its empty form or encounter the ground from which it emerges, even though we may claim to know it exists. In this respect, it is merely a Platonic Ideal or Hegelian Absolute – simply an idealized abstraction of thought. In other words, we may claim to know it but we do not experience it directly in its original form. So there has to be a

process where appearance stems from ground, which would by logical extension echo back to its archaic organization, as the reverberation of unconscious ontology, which informs the conditions for appearance as such. This transcendental character to the archetype makes the metaphysics of experience interdependent upon an archaic past that conditions the present, although we may argue that it does not necessarily make an archetype deterministic, only determinative.

### **On essence**

Let us now return to the notion of essence. What would constitute a formal organization of archaic form that precedes appearance? In other words, what types of configurations, associations, orders, properties, and functions would an archetype possess, necessarily so, to the degree that it is essential to its nature, without which it would not and could not exist? The question of ontological necessity is so indispensably important that an archetype would never be able to become or reveal itself as the modification or expression of its original instance or act of initial being. In other words, there would be no phenomenology without ontology. You cannot have appearance without some original archaic ground or systemic order (as unconscious process) conditioning the process of becoming. Everything is process, but it must come from prior organizations that are historically constituted as encroachments from the real, the traumatic realization that there are objective facts and events that fracture and intrude on our lived (psychological and material) realities.

We have determined that an archetype possesses the attribute of universality, which is pervasive and absolute, yet it is simultaneously singularly constituted, for each archetype has its own unique character when it discloses itself (i.e. as image, emotion, motif, etc.). This would seem to suggest that each archetype begins as a self-enclosed, self-contained original unit. While at first glance this may sound rather circular, monadic, and solipsistic, because archetypes presumably participate of each other's formal essence, viz., that which makes them what they are, without which they would not be, their appearances are only the appearance of singularity and difference – 'partly as diversity, partly as *opposition*' (Hegel, 1812, p. 449, italics in original). Jung (1951) presumably echoes this thesis when he says: 'If the archetype, which is universal, i.e. identical with itself always and anywhere, is properly dealt with in one place only, it is influenced as a whole, i.e. simultaneously and everywhere' (p. 585). In order for this to be the case, *all archetypes must participate of a common essence*.

Formal essence must start with a shared commonality to all archetypes that exist before division and modification succeed its breach into distinction, particularity, and multiplicity as the coming into being of lived psychic presence. This would make shared essence an ontological feature of all archetypes regardless of how they appear as singular occurrences, hence derivative forms of original form.

Despite their singularity and dispersal of multiplicity, if archetypes share a common essence, they would have the same formal parameters regardless of how they individually appear to the psyche. Archetypal appearance to the psyche – as imago, numinosity, and so forth – signals its *modification* from original form, that is, appearance is *alteration* from its original makeup as such. This would at the very least entail a basic division in its internal constitution: division fractures its original unity. Appearance is the coming to presence of a

new form where the archetype is no longer simple and undivided. Manifestation is the particularization of content as *event*, whether this be as impulse, affect, percept, and so forth.

This leads us to analyze the form of form. What is the nature or innermost essence of this form? If an archetype is a (1) self-constituted formal unit that is (2) universal in its unconscious a priorism, only to undergo internal modification and manifest as (3) content, we must therefore explain its movement from (a) internal unity to (b) disruption to (c) manifestation. Here I suggest an archetype must have a basic structure that is dialectically constituted as self-relation, and moreover as self-in-relation, to identity and difference. At first an archetype has a simply unity which must undergo division, modification, and dispersal into psychic reality: it is destined to disclose itself, to shine forth, to reveal its hidden presence as content in consciousness. The dialectic of identity and difference is therefore inherent to the structure of an archetype, without which it could not appear as particularization. Because archetypal processes do not appear in the same way, but are derived from primordial or archaic forms, they participate of a common ground or essence that lends order to their appearances. In fact, such internal dynamic structures are the very ontic (relational) conditions for archetypes to manifest.

It may be more helpful to view the internal constitution of an archetype as a *process system* rather than a static object, as a presubjective impersonal formalism that generates the multitude and penumbras of experience. It makes no sense to refer to archetypes as 'living subjects' as Jung did (*CW*, 11, p. 469), which anthropomorphizes the concept and is simply bad philosophy. To make an archetype a reified subject is to make it a personal agent rather than simply highlighting the teleonomy and teleology that operates within the process system itself. In other words, by stating that archetypes 'are not mere objects of the mind, but are also autonomous factors' (*Ibid*), Jung embarrassingly confounds a mental object (concept) with the *function* of how an internal process may *appear* as an exogenous agency, a living subject no less, like homunculi populating the psyche. We can easily become confused about source, ground, and appearance in our internal experiences to the point that we can imagine they emanate from an external mind-independent provenance. This is merely a fantasy fueled by unconscious desire, defense, and conflict. Archetypes are certainly not inner dwarfs pulling the gear-strings of the mind. The appearance of autonomy or alienation of psychic schemata or internal contents should not be equated with personal entities, let alone deified presences, floating about in the psyche and casting a spell on the individual like a voodoo incantation. In viewing an archetype as a presubjective impersonal formalism that is at once both essence and ground, we are highlighting the ontological a priori foundations in which more subjective experiences of the psyche are conditioned, which furthermore transpire within an objective sociological landscape – the minds of collectives.

Let us return to the equiprimordial oscillation of identity and difference that operates dialectically within the unconscious as tarrying moments of negative relata in search of mediation, synthesis, and unification of opposition as a 'transcendent function.' The notion of a grand synthesis is a logical fallacy and a fantasy the psyche manufactures in its pursuit of wholeness. But we can't give up on it because it is a *psychic need* to achieve ideality. We never achieve wholeness. What would that be like? It would mean the end of process, the death of the dialectic of desire. The most we can do is *conceive* of wholeness as a logical culmination of imagination. In Hegel's (1830) apt conclusion, 'fantasy is reason' (§ 131).

The dialectic of identity and difference as mutual moments and ontic relations is an indispensable unconscious movement that grounds the ontological makeup of an archetype. From each side, both are immediate and mediate, implicit and explicit, undifferentiated and differentiated in the antediluvian process of seeking a third movement in sublating themselves, hence raising the process to a new complexity, itself a new immediacy. This makes the basic configuration of an archetype more of a *bi-unity* with a *dual-aspect* to its internal relations and functions. In fact, simple divisions of identity and difference, subject and object, self and otherness are not rigid polarities or binaries, but rather they are *dynamic relations* that are always in movement and flux, hence accounting for the multiplicity of contents that populate consciousness emanating from a vast underworld of unconscious pulsions, parallel processes, reciprocal encounters, and negotiations in their acts of materialization. Such dynamic relational exchanges are therefore defined and articulated through their dialectical engagements, not as a bicameral structure, but rather as a mutually communicative exchange of opposing forces that are necessarily interdependent, ontically indivisible, communally implicative, and reciprocally conjoined. I argue this is a fundamental tenet of all psychoanalytic schools.

### Archetypes as unconscious schemata

In *Origins: On the Genesis of Psychic Reality*, I offer a formal psychoanalytic metaphysics articulating the birth of psychic agency. Unconscious mind is a *series of spacings* that first instantiate themselves as a multitude of *schemata*, which are the building blocks of psychic reality. A schema is a desirous-apperceptive-ideational unit of self-experience that is teleologically oriented and dialectically constituted. Schemata may be viewed as microagents with semi-autonomous powers of telic expression that operate as self-states as they create spacings within the unconscious mind. Schemata may take various forms, from the archaic to the refined, and materialize as somatic, sensuous, affective, perceptual, and conceptual (symbolic) orders within the psyche, each having their own intrinsic pressures, valences, intensities, intentional and defensive strategies, and unconscious qualia.

The microdynamics of schematic expression can be highly individualistic in their bid for freedom, creativity, complexity, and agentic intent, and are tantamount to the instinctual, desirous, and defensive processes we are accustomed to attribute to unconscious mentation in general. The difference here is that schemata are inherently both free and determined, or perhaps more appropriately, freely determined, that is, they are self-constituted and determinate within the natural parameters in which they find themselves and operate. This means that schematic expression is highly contextual and contingent; yet schemata exist in a multiplicity of process systems that commune, interact, and participate in a society of events that mutually influence the unique constitution of each schematic structure within the sea of the mind. This overdetermination of psychic processes ensures that unconscious agency ultimately underlies the constitution of all mental functioning.

I wish to apply this conceptual scheme to the nature of an archetype. In my language, an archetype would be tantamount to an unconscious schema. There are two general theoretical frameworks we can adopt. One is that we merely assume archetypes are forms and fantasies with desirous-affective-image properties that are generated by the

mind derived from unconscious genesis. This view could conceivably be compatible with both Freudian and Jungian conceptions of the unconscious. The second option is that we adopt another speculative framework that attributes the powers of self-generation to the archetype itself. If an archetype is 'autonomous' and self-constituted, as Jung contends, are we not justified in attributing a modicum of agency to its inner constitution? While I would not want to attribute selfhood to the constitution of an archetype, as if it were a self, subject, or personality in its own right, strictly speaking, this would not rule out the possibility of agency with the capacity for determinate expression. In fact, there is a certain degree of teleology inherent to an archetype, because it is oriented to express itself, to reveal itself in consciousness, to disclose itself from concealment in its quest to become manifest. Although an archetype is not a proper agent, it nevertheless exudes and executes agency by the mere fact that it appears in the psyche and in all societies. An archetype is therefore a paradigmatic prototype or exemplary model oriented to repeat itself as archaic form in psychic productions.

There is a certain independence in an archetype's capacity toward self-assertion – to impose its presence on psychic reality. In other words, even if archetypes are self-states or quasi-microagents that cluster into their own autonomous organizations in the mind, they have their own internal relations and telic modes of expression. By applying the notion of unconscious schemata as a telic experiential process of self-manifestation, we may potentially explain how archetypes manifest from their primordial ontology. Let us first start with origins, from pre-beginning, the unconscious cosmogonic act of creation.

Because archetypes cannot just appear or blink into existence *ex nihilo*, as we have argued, they must emerge from a primal dynamic ground of self-experience. At the very least we can say is that archetypes must derive from an unconscious organizing principle that is internally impelled to materialize, that is, to become, and is hence subject to being apprehended in consciousness, or otherwise archetypes would never appear. Because of its innate autonomy to manifest, this means that an archetype by necessity would have an agentic character with a particular telos, which accounts for its multiplicity of forms or patterns as well as its specific contents, themes, qualities, valences, intensities, and so forth. We may further speculate that because of its autonomous character, it is self-derived and self-activating, for without which, it would not be released from its unconscious slumber or primal hiddenness. In other words, without such an agentic disposition or proclivity to project or externalize itself into psychic reality, it would not appear. The point here is that in order for an archetype to properly exist, it must make itself actual through determinative action as the *coming into being of internal presence*.

An archetype is construed to be an internal presence, first and foremost as a summoning of the interior, but we do not know exactly *why* it radiates its essence, if there is a prior supraordinate force, field, or system directing the process, and/or what its essence really signifies, only that its *source* is from within. Those claiming, as Jung did, that archetypes are transpersonal, cosmic external occurrences or organizations superimposed on our interior have a messy epistemological burden to reckon with. Tacking on a collective unconscious agent/creator or transsubjective entity only anthropomorphizes the construct and further problematizes the question of origins by conjuring up a supernatural macroanthropos (Mills, 2013a). It may prove more fruitful to stay focused on how emergence may transpire from internality as this is all we can directly know epistemically as phenomenal-near inner

experience. Here we only need to adopt the theoretic standpoint of internally derived activity to show its logical coherence, for appearance descends and springs from its prior dialectical movements. Before appearance, before archetypal manifestation, we must posit primordial ground as the a priori condition for the unfolding of unconscious phenomenology. Rather than solicit a collective supernatural process where archetypes are said to stem, we may more modestly begin with a naturalized account of psychic phenomena derived from unconscious organizing principles governing internal psychological dynamics. Rather than import the philosophical implications of emanationism or supervenience (see Mills, 2014a), what is more plausible is that internal phenomena condition our metaphysical postulates. While Jung would most certainly agree with this, his incongruities on the nature of the collective unconscious cloud a proper appreciation of the exact nature and essence of what constitutes an archetype. Proceeding from the proposition that archetypes are in essence internal presences, this is much less problematic than asserting their mind independent existence under the rubric of metaphysical realism.

If we succeed in attributing a modicum of agency to the inner constitution of an archetype, then an archetype must have a motive – a telos, as aim – to reveal itself, to express or externalize itself, to make its presence felt and known. In this regard, it is no different than the unconscious desire to fulfill a wish; and it does so by objectifying itself, that is, by making itself an object for consciousness.

Archetypes arise in psyche, for *us*; but *how* do they arise? In other words, what is the mechanism or process that precedes their appearance in consciousness? If archetypes are self-activating, then they must emerge from their own ground. In the beginning, I suggest, an archetype is a self-enclosed unity that must undergo internal division via splitting by its own hands in order to externalize itself from its unconscious void of indeterminateness. This would require an initial act of self-posit or self-assertion where it would rouse or stir itself from indeterminateness to determinate being, that is, from unconscious parallax to conscious presence, from inarticulate implicitness to articulated explicitness in the psyche.

In its initial awakening as self-arousal, an archetype must first take itself as its own content, which is at first its own simple unity, its original form. In taking its original form as its initial content, it performs its own self-mediation as a dialectical enactment of instituting differentiation into its form, which becomes the initial movement from a self-enclosed universality to a differentiated identity as the dispersal of particularity, the instantiation of its essence into psychic reality. This initial act of differentiation and modification becomes the logical model for further patterns and dialectical relations to transpire as archetypes are released and begin to populate mental life.

### **Birth of an archetype**

Archetypes first must manifest as internal presence before they make their transition or trajectory to external presence, namely, as concrete universals that take many forms, such as collective or anthropological motifs, myths, material productions, art and aesthetic expressions, social institutions, cultural organizations, civilizations' ideals, religious beliefs, customs, rituals, and so on. These examples are the *derivatives* of archetypes. Archetypes first manifest as unconscious subjectivity only to become more rich and robust in content, schemata, and *patternings* when breaching into consciousness and objectified in



individual personality and the semiotic-socio-symbolic structures that define and govern any culture.

If an archetype is, at its most basic configuration, a patterning of a universal process, then such patterning cannot contain an empty formalism without jeopardizing the integrity of the theory. Rather, I argue, the patterning of an archetype arises from its own internal divisions and splitting maneuvers that naturally introduce mediation between oppositions. Such mediations are two-way internal relations that properly belong to the dialectical form of an archetype that bears a basic structural content as the bi-functionality of identity and difference.

When an archetype arouses itself through rupture from its self-enclosed slumber to the self-certainty of its own pre-reflective being, from implicitness to explicitness, it apprehends itself as unconscious apperception, the coming to presence of its inchoate simple form. In this initial act of apperception, an archetype performs a presubjective determination of instituting differentiation from its previous unmodified shape via reflection into itself, which raises itself to a determinate being-for-self as mediated self-certainty. Here, the apperceptive act of arousal simultaneously is the conferral of its own discrete identity that it sets over itself in relation to all particularities of difference. Opposition becomes the internal dynamic in which dialectical mediation takes place, which is ontically conjoined as an interplay between identity and difference. As an archetype intuitively apprehends itself as an apperceptive being, it gives itself identity that stands in relation to otherness, an otherness that is necessary in order to concretize the act of self-definition as the awaking of its essence as an internal impetus to manifest. Here we may say that an archetype originally becomes aware of itself as a pre-reflective burgeoning subjectivity, what we may call an *unconscious self-consciousness*, the simple self-apperceptive immediacy of its being.

Why does an archetype have such an internal impetus to manifest? Because it lacks. Because it desires. Here the desire to wake, to apprehend itself, to manifest, is the expression of its own felt-being in relation to lack. This is the prototype of the human psyche. Desire as being-in-relation-to-lack is the initial essential configuration of an archetype, for it wants to *be*, to experience, to become other than its mere self-enclosed unity. This breach into experience as desire to rectify its lack of being is the first expressive act of self-posit, which elevates the archetype to a living process it feels compelled to externalize as the coming into being of its own actual existence. Here archetypal process is summarized as the need to experience as being-toward-life. Just as an archetype stirs the psyche through emotional seizure, it first experiences its own internal stirring as self-seizure to awaken and externalize its essence as a living process through self-rupture. We may further suggest that this initial act of self-posit is imbued with existential value and carries an emotional tone as it apprehends itself in its awakened self-immediacy.

The organic sequence of such self-instantiation may further be viewed through the lens of a developmental monistic ontology: moving from the upheaval of its own disquieted desire to self-apperception constitutes the birth of an archetype, for which our own consciousness may in turn apprehend as a psychic entity or presence populating mental life. Just as an archetype is seized to self-awaken, so too is the human mind jarred to feel its internal presence. Of course we could be speaking generically about raw affect or emotions in general, but the phenomenal experience is qualitatively different. Archetypes feel like they are connected to something outside of or independent from the self despite the fact that they arise from and are encountered within. In this way, we may further say

that an archetype is the epitome of otherness, for its experiential announcement and imposition on consciousness is registered as an unfettered event. The epistemology of this seemingly autonomous process is what adds a further layer of uncanniness and numinosity to the experience – if not alienation from its origins, even if we are mistaken or deluded in interpreting the agency of their internal recurrence. When the psyche comes to notice the myriad patterns in which archetypes manifest, a recurrent theme of repetition cannot escape the discerning self-reflective cogito.

### **The metaphysics of difference: Toward an archetypal theory of alterity**

An archetype is originally an Other to itself, the primordial form of otherness, as alienation from its essence or internal nature, only to discover itself in its own process of becoming as a procreant developmental act. Its initial otherness is ontically entwined in the formal structure of opposition it must mediate and dialectically engage through intermediate dynamic relations of participation in differentiating, reconciling, and synthesizing (reuniting) its various schemata or self-states through informational exchange and reflection into itself. The archetype's breach into self-relation via discerning otherness – hence *non-identity* outside of its original, formal solipsistic unity – is the first dialectical movement toward discovering and defining self-identity that is mediated through conferring difference as non-identicalness. In short, the coming to presence of an archetype within psychic reality is initiated by the breaking up of or split in unity. This initial deed of self-assertion, of pure utter announcement, is the procreative act of mind that draws on the original motif of all cosmogonies: what is archetypal is first, the coming into being of Being. To reiterate my point, it bears repeating, archetypes represent and stand in relation to psychic origins.

Although archetypes are everywhere in psyche and culture, we must not lose sight of their fundamental significance: they are replications of original form. We may further say they are self-generating replicators or we would not encounter their ubiquity without the antediluvian drive of spontaneous repetition. Civilization is compelled to reproduce them in our psychosocial arrangements that govern human exchange based on the simple fact that we remember and rewrite history in our preoccupation with the past. This sociological observance highlights the primacy of looking back at, revisiting, acknowledging, and even savoring history as an idealized need for nostalgia, not as immediate presence, but as recapitulation, eternal recurrence. This is why the imaginary has such a stronghold over consciousness, for archetypes repeat themselves through images and associative fantasies that are more or less timeless. This notion (or fantasy) of eternal recurrence is the psychom mythology the mind generates and gravitates toward in order to confer meaning and ground its being. In this way, following Eliade, archetypes are the foundation and fulfillment of archaic ontology: every reproduction, every repetition stands *in illo tempore* as attempts at duplication and regeneration.

What is the most basic form of regeneration? May I suggest the search for sameness or familiarity within difference, the restoration of the universal, the reiteration of the eternal. To be more accurate, it is the dialectic of desire and difference we reencounter within the process of the need to return, even though this return is prefaced on the pining for novelty in its attempt at renewal. The basic act of cleavage rests on the institution or insertion of difference in mediatory relations. Therefore, the discernment or interjection of difference

introduces a bifurcation within original universality that inaugurates the split as a new bi-unity. Looking for sameness or similarity is to look for universality within difference. This ensures that all acts of judgment identify difference in conferring identity, and that differentiation stands in relation to the universal. Differentiation implies otherness, diversity, and opposition, the supersession of unity, the break from oneness, lost origin. The need to return to familiarity is both a self-grounding act of identity and a regenerative function of recapitulating essence. Just as an archetype discovers itself in its otherness, the Other is its externalization from sameness and lost unity. In its otherness, it wants to return to itself, its lost immediacy, yet at the same time seeks the universal in its differentiation. In other words, difference, variety, and plurality signifies the Other, the archetype's initial self-instantiation as becoming other to itself. The breaking up of initial unity is tantamount to the cosmogonic act of dispersing its essence into the world. Difference, particularization, and plurality always stand in relation to original form from which it originated; yet in its modification, it still remains ontically interrelated and interdependent upon its original ground or inception.

What is truly archaic or original has an ontic dialectical relation to otherness or difference that is logically and structurally constituted as unconscious process mediated through alterity. Psychic activity rests on a fulcrum of difference and negation to the degree that without an identifiable and discernable Other, any notion of the archaic would be tantamount to simplicity and solipsism, an untenable proposition in our pluralistic world of particularity and contextual difference.

Does an archetype perform a cognitive act? No – unless you consider it a psychological entity in its own right. Is it registered, felt, and perceived by the psyche? Yes. But is there really any difference between the two? In other words, Is an archetype independent of mind and culture? Not likely. But does it appear as if it is an autonomous force in the psyche? Epistemologically, categorically (hence logically), and phenomenologically, yes. But can we ever really know its metaphysical status? To make an archetype supersensible, as Jung does by invoking Plato's eternal forms, is misguided, I argue, because this gives them a supernatural significance we are in no way capable of verifying (Mills, 2014b). All we can know is naturalized experience, the coming into being of inner presence.

Perhaps it is sufficient to merely relegate the birth of an archetype as a self-mediated movement to an organic process much like we would attribute to self-regulatory teleonomic mechanisms that unfold and control the processes of life or living organisms. If we adopt this philosophy of organism, it would not be inconceivable to extrapolate this model in its application to inanimate systems, as the discipline of physics has certainly taken the liberty of doing, not to mention succeed in applying a speculative metaphysical paradigm under the rubric of scientific acceptability when conceiving of the cosmos as one big systemic exchange of information. If an archetype can be compared to a material atom or energetic particle, then we may rightly call it an 'entity' in its own right, as Jung does (*CW* 8, p. 231), or in Whitehead's (1929) terms, an 'actual occasion.' If we conceive of archetypes as occasions, as pure events, we can come to know them through their appearances as patterns of original form.<sup>9</sup>

Patternings become the logical prototype for archetypes to manifest, hence giving rise to alterations in content and contextual appearances. Although divisions of otherness, mutually implicative conflicts, and complexes exist within intrapsychic domains of individuals and societies wed to certain worldviews and values that intersubjectively oppose

others, alterity also becomes the social manifestation of splits in identity and difference that maintain certain antitheses in our lived experiences and perceptions of the world. This insures that otherness becomes a fulcrum in the construction of identity based upon differentiation and unfamiliarity, the internalization process, and the nature of recognition and relationality toward shared *and* negated identifications and values. Recognition of otherness is an immediate unconscious prehension that is internally registered, pre-reflectively evaluated and compared to self-identity, and hence dialectically mediated as a self-other relation. Here the *Alien archetype* is only one such appearance of otherness, much like the Shadow, which subsumes the destructive principle of humankind. But what is alien to us is none other than our own projective identification with our disavowed interiority that is perceived as foreign. Yet it is precisely this foreignness we come to recognize as our counterpart we identify with in our reacquaintance with lost universality in ourselves. Following Hegel, we come to know who we are by seeing ourselves in the Other's desire as reacquaintance with lack. We see ourselves in the other, our own lost alienated yearning as being-in-relation-to-lack, a return of original form. This is why we are internally divided and often have to confront many occasions of difference and conflict that seek their dialectical solutions through suspending, negating, binding, or unifying opposition. Here the transcendent function becomes a regathering of the original split in unity synthesized through our reflective acts of apprehending otherness. This ensures that alterity retains a definitive role in the structure and function of archetypes.

Archetypes always evoke the spectra and specter of the Other, for differentiation and difference permeate the penumbral background that informs experience. Original ontology, the metaphysics of beginnings, the historical consciousness of traditional societies – all experience presupposes referents to the Other, namely, archaic mentality of the collective ethos, the cultural symbolic that conditions the historicity of civilizations and race *in memoriam*. This symbolic other is always there, even when concealed, undisclosed, or non-manifest. It is equivalent to the Lacanian real, the residue of the symbolic that remains foreclosed, occluded, residing outside the chain of signification as a remainder of ineffable desire and lack.

The dialectic of the familiar and the foreign always interpenetrates our encounter with otherness. Whether in acceptance or confrontation, alterity stems from the a priori ground of the archaic and is part and parcel of the human condition. This archaic ground is in fact an abyss from which all emerges, the psychic underworld that springs forth into familiar unfamiliarity, an uncanny return to home. The Other is the supersession of original unity as particularized plurality only to participate within the One, the encompassing universality that pervades psyche and culture. As an archetype disperses its essence into multiplicity, it becomes other to itself, only to recover its original lost unity in such otherness as a return to itself. In the *arché* is *origo*, an opening, *another*, to arise.

## Notes

1. For Hegel (1807, 1817/1827/1830a), 'appearance is essence' (*PS* § 147); 'essence must appear' (*EL* § 131), for nothing can exist unless it is actual, hence it must manifest. Elsewhere I have shown how Hegel's philosophy of Spirit anticipates psychoanalysis (Mills, 2002b) and that the human psyche is derived from an unconscious abyss, whereby unconsciousness appears as consciousness, its modified and evolved form.

2. In discussing the *unus mundus*, Jung alludes to an archetype as a 'transcendental entity' (*CW*, 14, p. 536), what he earlier conceived of as 'psychic entities' (*CW*, 8, p. 231).
3. Throughout his *Collected Works*, Jung refers to archetypes acting as autonomous agents within the mind (see Mills, 2013a for a review). In fact, he states that 'they are experienced as spontaneous agencies' where their very 'nature' is derived from 'spirit' (*CW*, 8, p. 216).
4. Although I have read very little of Giegerich's works, what appears at face value is his annexation of Hegel's Logic into his discourse on soul. In *The Soul's Logical Life* (2001), he gives us a clue. In discussing the soul's 'complex dialectical logic,' he refers to Hegel's '*Science of Logic*, which might serve as a model for the kind of abstract thought required to do justice to the complexities of the plight of the modern soul. Psychology needs the 'labor of the Concept' (p. 26). Compare to Hegel (1812): 'The beginning is *logical* in that it is to be made the element of thought that is free and for itself, in *pure knowing*. It is *mediated* because pure knowing is the ultimate, absolute truth of *consciousness*' (p. 68, italics in original), hence the 'labor' of *Begriff*. As Hegel would say, logic is the 'absolute ground' (p. 67). Here Giegerich appears to take Hegel's *Logic* as the starting point of any discussion—from metaphysics to psychology, and then applies the logic of the dialectic to the notion of soul or what we would call the modern day subject or the living personality of each individual's psychological makeup. He appears to take the extreme stance of absolute interiority as inner infinity (as logical workings) that he privileges over all other aspects of mind—hence thought is preferred over image, affect, imagination, instinct, or action. This amounts to an extreme form of idealism that does not create a mediatory split between inner and outer, only that there is *no outside*. Where does the dialectic go from here? I assume a return to absolute interiorizing. This seems very solipsistic, if not untenable, and is not particularly faithful to Hegel's overall system, because this stance of radical interiority only highlights spirit in particular *moments*. One must question his notion of the absolute autonomy of the psyche, which he equates with absolute negative interiority, a rather omnipotent proposition at that. Here he seemingly takes Hegel's Logic as the coming into being of pure self-consciousness through dialectical relata and then applies it narrowly to the internal configurations of the psyche. In Hegel's (1817/1827/1830c) system, psychology is the sublation (*Aufhebung*) of the soul (*Seele*), which he articulates in his section on Theoretical Spirit in the *Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. The feeling soul is a general, affective unconscious condition of the psyche that dialectically unfolds and raises itself to the standpoint of cognition and psychological dynamism. But Logic conditions all of this, like the biblical *Genesis*. *Geist* is pure thought (kind of like God) that disperses its essence into the materiality of nature (creation) (see 1817/1827/1830b); and then the soul (outlined in the Anthropology section of the *Encyclopaedia*) is the germination of the human spirit that developmentally makes its way dialectically from its material embodiment (as an incipient mind—here more like an infant) to the ego of consciousness as subjectivity (consciousness); and then proceeds in the Phenomenology (1807, 1830) from subjective mind (the inner workings of each conscious being) to objective mind (society and worldhood), only to come full circle to culminate in Absolute unity in full self-consciousness as world spirit realized through the Idea or Concept of the process of its own becoming as pure knowing—hence pure thought thinking about itself and all its operations. And yet this is the return to itself as the culmination and fulfillment of its Logical nature as pure thought thinking itself into being and fulfilling its own development as a spiritual-mental force grounded in a rational process. Perhaps Absolute Spirit is something similar to the concept of the *anima mundi* within the *unus mundus*, but more impersonal.
5. In Hegel's (1812) *Wissenschaft der Logik*, he is very clear: '*Essence determines itself as ground*' (p. 444, italics in original).
6. Cf. Hegel (1812): 'Ground is first, *absolute ground*, in which essence is, in the first instance, a substrate for the ground relation; but it further determines itself as *form* and *matter* and gives itself a *content*' (p. 445, italics in original).
7. In Hegel's (1812) *Wesenslogik*, he states, 'The truth of *being is essence*' (p. 389, italics in original).
8. Cf. Hegel (1812): 'Appearance is that which the thing is in itself, or its truth' (p. 479).
9. We may perhaps, not inappropriately, follow a similar formula as the discipline of physics that claims to have discovered the Higgs field through inference and indirect evidence.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

## Notes on contributor

**Jon Mills**, PsyD, PhD, ABPP is a philosopher, psychoanalyst, and clinical psychologist. He is Professor of Psychology & Psychoanalysis at Adler Graduate Professional School in Toronto and runs a mental health corporation in Ontario, Canada. Recipient of numerous awards for his scholarship, he is the author and/or editor of twenty books in psychoanalysis, philosophy, psychology, and cultural studies including *Inventing God* (Routledge, 2017); *Underworlds* (Routledge, 2014); *Conundrums: A Critique of Contemporary Psychoanalysis* (Routledge, 2012); *Origins: On the Genesis of Psychic Reality* (McGill-Queens University Press, 2010); *Treating Attachment Pathology* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2005); *The Unconscious Abyss: Hegel's Anticipation of Psychoanalysis* (State University of New York Press, 2002); and *The Ontology of Prejudice* (Rodopi, 1997).

## References

- Colman, W. (2015). A revolution of the mind: Some implications of George Hogenson's 'The Baldwin effect: A neglected influence on C.G. Jung's evolutionary thinking' (2001). *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 60(4), 520–539.
- Colman, W. (2016). *Act and image: The emergence of symbolic imagination*. New Orleans: Spring Publications.
- Eliade, M. (1949). *The myth of the eternal return*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Freeman, J. (1959). *Face to Face* (Interview with C.G. Jung). Produced by the BBC.
- Giegerich, W. (1998). Is the soul "deep?": Entering and following the logical movement of Heraclitus' "fragment 45." *Spring*, 64, 1–32.
- Giegerich, W. (2001). *The soul's logical life* (3rd Revised ed.) Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Goodwyn, E. (2010). Approaching archetypes: Reconsidering innateness. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 55, 502–521.
- Goodwyn, E. (2013). Recurrent motifs as resonant attractor states in the narrative field: A testable model of the archetype. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 58, 387–408.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (1807). *Phenomenology of spirit*. (A.V. Miller, Trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (1812/1831). *Science of logic*. (A.V. Miller, Trans.). London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1969.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (1817/1827/1830a). *The encyclopaedia logic, Vol.1 of the encyclopaedia of the philosophical sciences*. (T. F. Geraets, W.A. Suchting & H.S. Harris, Trans.). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1991.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (1817/1827/1830b). *Encyclopaedia of the philosophical sciences. Vol. 2: Philosophy of nature*. (A.V. Miller, Trans.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (1817/1827/1830c). *Encyclopaedia of the philosophical sciences. Vol. 3: Philosophy of mind*. (William Wallace and A.V. Miller, Trans.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (1830). *Philosophy of spirit*. In *Hegel's philosophy of subjective spirit. Vol. 3: Phenomenology and psychology*. (Trans. and Ed. M.J. Petry). Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1978.
- Hillman, J. (2013). *Archetypal psychology* (4th ed.) Putnam, Conn: Spring Publications.
- Hogenson, G. B. (2001). The Baldwin effect: A neglected influence on C.G. Jung's evolutionary thinking. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 46(4), 591–611.
- Hogenson, G. B. (2004). Archetypes: Emergence and the psyche's deep structure. In J. Cambray & L. Carter (Eds.). *Analytical psychology: Contemporary perspectives in Jungian analysis* (pp. 32–55). New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.
- Hogenson, G. B. (2009). Archetypes as action patterns. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 54(3), 325–337.

- Jones, R. A. (2000). On the empirical proof of archetypes: Commentary on maloney (JAP 44, January 1999, 101-16). *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 45, 599–605.
- Jung, C. G. (1911–12). *Symbols of transformation*, CW, 5.
- Jung, C. G. (1916). *The relations between the ego and the unconscious*. CW, 7: pp. 121–241.
- Jung, C. G. (1919). Instinct and the unconscious. CW, 8, pp. 129–138.
- Jung, C. G. (1934/1954). Archetypes of the collective unconscious. CW, 9, pt.1:pp. 3–41.
- Jung, C. G. (1936/1942). Psychological factors determining human behaviour, CW, 8, pp. 114–125.
- Jung, C. G. (1937). *Psychology and religion*. CW, 11: pp. 3–200.
- Jung, C. G. (1940). The psychology of the child Archetype. CW, 9: pp. 151–181.
- Jung, C. G. (1947). On the nature of the psyche. CW, 8: pp. 159–234.
- Jung, C. G. (1951/1973–1975). *Letters of C.G. Jung. Vol. II: 1951–1961*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Jung, C. G. (1952a). Synchronicity: An a causal connecting principle. CW, 8: pp. 417–531.
- Jung, C. G. (1952b). Answer to job. CW, 11: pp. 355–470.
- Jung, C. G. (1953–1977). *Collected works of C.G. Jung*; Bollingen Series, 20 vols. (H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, Eds.; R.F.C. Hull, Trans.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; Princeton: Princeton University Press. (hereafter referred to CW by vol. no.)
- Jung, C. G. (1955). *Mysterium coniunctionis*. CW, 14.
- Jung, C. G. (1957). Psychological commentary. In W.Y. Evans-Wentz (Ed.), *The Tibetan book of the dead*, (pp. xxxv-xlii, 3rd ed.) (R.F.C. Hull, Trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jung, C.G. (1961). *Memories, dreams, reflections*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Jung, C. G. (Ed.) (1964). Approaching the unconscious. In *Man and his symbols* (pp. 18–103). New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Knox, J. M. (2003). *Archetype, attachment, analysis*. London: Brunner-Routledge.
- Maloney, A. (1999). Preference ratings of images representing archetypal themes: An empirical study of the concept of archetypes. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 44, 101–116.
- Merchant, J. (2009). A reappraisal of classical archetype theory and its implications for theory and practice. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 54(3), 339–358.
- Mills, J. (2002a). Deciphering the “genesis problem”: On the dialectical origins of psychic reality. *The Psychoanalytic Review*, 89(6), 763–809.
- Mills, J. (2002b). *The unconscious abyss: Hegel's anticipation of psychoanalysis*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mills, J. (2010). *Origins: On the genesis of psychic reality*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Mills, J. (2013a). Jung's metaphysics. *International Journal of Jungian Studies*, 5(1), 19–43.
- Mills, J. (2013b). Freedom and determinism. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 41(2), 101–118.
- Mills, J. (2014a). *Underworlds: Philosophies of the unconscious from psychoanalysis to metaphysics*. London: Routledge.
- Mills, J. (2014b). Jung as philosopher: Archetypes, the Psychoid factor, and the question of the supernatural. *International Journal of Jungian Studies*, 6(3), 227–242.
- Mills, J. (2017). *Inventing God: Psychology of belief and the rise of secular spirituality*. London: Routledge.
- Mogenson, G. (1999). Psyche's archetypes: A response to Pietikainen, Stevens, Hogenson and solomon. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 44(1), 125–133.
- Pietikainen, P. (1998). Archetypes as symbolic forms. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 43, 325-343.
- Roesler, C. (2012). Are archetypes transmitted more by culture than biology? Questions arising from conceptualizations of the archetype. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 57, 223-246.
- Saunders, P. & Skar, P. (2001). Archetypes, complexes and self-organization. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 46, 305-323.
- Segal, R. A. (2014). On Mills' 'Jung's metaphysics'. *International Journal of Jungian Studies*, 6 (3), 217-226.
- Stevens, A. (2002). *Archetype revisited: An updated natural history of the self*. London: Routledge.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *Process and reality*. (Corrected ed.). D. R. Griffin & D. W. Sherburne (Eds.). New York, NY: Free Press, 1978.