



















[T]ouching the personal unconscious already changes you and touching the collective unconscious changes you all the more: you are a different being, and no longer like the people who have not touched it.

*Nietzsche's Zarathustra: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1934–1939, Vol. I* (15 May 1935), p. 483.

Indeed, the fate of the individual is largely dependent on unconscious factors.

“Conscious, Unconscious, and Individuation” (1939), CW 9i, § 504.

We know that the mask of the unconscious is not rigid—it reflects the face we turn towards it. Hostility lends it a threatening aspect, friendliness softens its features.

*Psychology and Alchemy* (1944), CW 12, § 29.

The role of the unconscious is to act compensatorily to the conscious contents of the moment. By this I do not mean that it sets up an opposition, for there are times when the tendency of the unconscious coincides with that of consciousness, namely, when the conscious attitude is approaching the optimum. The nearer it approaches the optimum, the more the autonomous activity of the unconscious is diminished, and the more its value sinks until, at the moment when the optimum is reached, it falls to zero. We can say, then, that so long as all goes well, so long as a person travels the road that is, for him, the individual as well as the social optimum, there is no talk of the unconscious. The very fact that we in our age come to speak of the unconscious at all is proof that everything is not in order.

“The Role of the Unconscious” (1918), CW 10, § 21.

The unconscious is not a demoniacal monster, but a natural entity which, as far as moral sense, aesthetic taste, and intellectual judgment go, is completely neutral. It only becomes dangerous when our conscious attitude is completely wrong. To the degree that we repress it, its danger increases. But the moment the patient begins

to assimilate contents that were previously unconscious, its danger diminishes.

“The Practical Use of Dream-Analysis” (1934), CW 16, § 329.

The unconscious on one side is nothing but nature, and on the other hand it is the overcoming of nature; it is yea and nay in itself, two things in one. So we shall never understand what the unconscious is, as we shall never understand what the world is, because it is and it is not.

*Visions: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1930–1934, Vol. I* (19 November 1930), p. 89.

For not knowing about the unconscious means that one has deviated, one is not in harmony with it, and therefore it works against one.

*Visions: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1930–1934, Vol. I* (10 June 1931), p. 405.

[W]e have to distinguish in the unconscious a layer which we may call the *personal unconscious*. The materials contained in this layer are of a personal nature in so far as they have the character partly of acquisitions derived from the individual’s life and partly of psychological factors which could just as well be conscious. It can readily be understood that incompatible psychological elements are liable to repression and therefore become unconscious. But on the other hand this implies the possibility of making and keeping the repressed contents conscious once they have been recognized. We recognize them as personal contents because their effects, or their partial manifestation, or their source can be discovered in our personal past.

*The Relations between the Ego and the Unconscious* (1916/1928), CW 7, § 218.

A more or less superficial layer of the unconscious is undoubtedly personal. I call it the *personal unconscious*. But this personal unconscious rests upon a deeper layer, which does not derive from

personal experience and is not a personal acquisition but is inborn. This deeper layer I call the *collective unconscious*. I have chosen the term “collective” because this part of the unconscious is not individual but universal; in contrast to the personal psyche, it has contents and modes of behaviour that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals. It is, in other words, identical in all men and thus constitutes a common psychic substrate of a supra-personal nature which is present in every one of us.

“Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious” (1934/1954),  
CW 9i, § 3.

Whereas the contents of the personal unconscious are acquired during the individual’s lifetime, the contents of the collective unconscious are invariably archetypes that were present from the beginning.

*Aion* (1951), CW 9ii, § 13.

This “personal unconscious” must always be dealt with first, that is, made conscious, otherwise the gateway to the collective unconscious cannot be opened.

*Psychology and Alchemy* (1944), CW 12, § 81.

I understand the unconscious rather as an *impersonal* psyche common to all men, even though it expresses itself through a personal unconscious. When anyone breathes, his breathing is not a phenomenon to be interpreted personally.

“The Psychological Aspects of the Kore” (1949), CW 9i, § 314.

The experience of the unconscious is a personal secret communicable only to very few, and that with difficulty.

*Psychology and Alchemy* (1944), CW 12, § 61.

Modern psychology knows that the personal unconscious is only the top layer, resting on a foundation of a wholly different nature which we call the collective unconscious. The reason for this design-

nation is the circumstance that, unlike the personal unconscious and its purely personal contents, the images in the deeper unconscious have a distinctly mythological character. That is to say, in form and content they coincide with those widespread primordial ideas which underlie the myths. They are no longer of a personal but of a purely supra-personal nature and are therefore common to all men. For this reason they are to be found in the myths and legends of all peoples and all times, as well as in individuals who have not the slightest knowledge of mythology.

“The Psychology of Eastern Meditation” (1943), CW 11, § 944.

[I]n the unconscious it is not so terribly important whether a man is alive or dead, that seems to make very little impression upon the unconscious. But your attitude to it matters, how you will take it, whether you believe in immortality or not, how you react to such and such an event, that matters to the unconscious.

*Visions: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1930–1934, Vol. II* (1 February 1933), p. 903.

The unconscious is the only available source of religious experience. This is certainly not to say that what we call the unconscious is identical with God or is set up in his place. It is simply the medium from which religious experience seems to flow. As to what the further cause of such experience might be, the answer to this lies beyond the range of human knowledge. Knowledge of God is a transcendental problem.

*The Undiscovered Self* (1957), CW 10, § 565.

I was being compelled to go through this process of the unconscious. I had to let myself be carried along by the current, without a notion of where it would lead me.

*Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (1962), p. 196.

People who are unconscious always create unconsciousness, and in this way they influence others; they can get them into an uncon-

scious condition so that they will behave exactly according to their intention. That is the real essence of witchcraft.

*Visions: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1930–1934, Vol. II* (31 January 1934), pp. 1272–73.

[T]he unconscious, as the totality of all archetypes, is the deposit of all human experience right back to its remotest beginnings. Not, indeed, a dead deposit, a sort of abandoned rubbish-heap, but a living system of reactions and aptitudes that determine the individual's life in invisible ways—all the more effective because invisible. It is not just a gigantic historical prejudice, so to speak, an *a priori* historical condition; it is also the source of the instincts, for the archetypes are simply the forms which the instincts assume. From the living fountain of instinct flows everything that is creative; hence the unconscious is not merely conditioned by history, but is the very source of the creative impulse. It is like Nature herself—prodigiously conservative, and yet transcending her own historical conditions in her acts of creation. No wonder, then, that it has always been a burning question for humanity how best to adapt to these invisible determinants. If consciousness had never split off from the unconscious—an eternally repeated event symbolized as the fall of the angels and the disobedience of the first parents—this problem would never have arisen, any more than would the question of environmental adaptation.

“The Structure of the Psyche” (1927/1931), CW 8, § 339.

[T]he archetype as an image of instinct is a spiritual goal toward which the whole nature of man strives; it is the sea to which all rivers wend their way, the prize which the hero wrests from the fight with the dragon.

“On the Nature of the Psyche” (1947/1954), CW 8, § 415.

A psychological reading of the dominant archetypal images reveals a continuous series of psychological transformations, depicting the

autonomous life of archetypes behind the scenes of consciousness. This hypothesis has been worked out to clarify and make comprehensible our religious history.

“Jung and Religious Belief” (1958), CW 18, § 1686.

[W]hat we mean by “archetype” is in itself irrepresentable, but has effects which make visualizations of it possible, namely, the archetypal images and ideas.

“On the Nature of the Psyche” (1947/1954), CW 8, § 417.

Nobody has ever seen an archetype, and nobody has ever seen an atom either.

Letter to H. Haberlandt, 23 April 1952, *Letters, Vol. II*, p. 54.

[A]rchetypes are not whimsical inventions but autonomous elements of the unconscious psyche which were there before any invention was thought of. They represent the unalterable structure of a psychic world whose “reality” is attested by the determining effects it has upon the conscious mind.

“The Phenomenology of the Spirit in Fairytales” (1945/1948), CW 9i, § 451.

The archetype is essentially an unconscious content that is altered by becoming conscious and by being perceived, and it takes its colour from the individual consciousness in which it happens to appear.

“Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious” (1934/1954), CW 9i, § 6.

An archetype—so far as we can establish it empirically—is an *image*. An image, as the very term denotes, is a picture of something. An archetypal image is like the portrait of an unknown man in a gallery. His name, his biography, his existence in general are unknown, but we assume nevertheless that the picture portrays a once living subject, a man who was real. We find numberless images of God, but we cannot produce the original. There is

no doubt in my mind that there is an original behind our images, but it is inaccessible.

“Jung and Religious Belief” (1958), CW 18, § 1589.

The archetype—let us never forget this—is a psychic organ present in all of us.

“The Psychology of the Child Archetype” (1963), CW 9i, § 271.

[I]t seems to me probable that the real nature of the archetype is not capable of being made conscious, that it is transcendent, on which account I call it psychoid.

“On the Nature of the Psyche” (1947/1954), CW 8, § 417.

Archetypes are like riverbeds which dry up when the water deserts them, but which it can find again at any time. An archetype is like an old watercourse along which the water of life has flowed for centuries, digging a deep channel for itself. The longer it has flowed in this channel the more likely it is that sooner or later the water will return to its old bed.

“Wotan” (1936), CW 10, § 395.

Archetypes are, by definition, factors and motifs that arrange the psychic elements into certain images, characterized as archetypal, but in such a way that they can be recognized only from the effects they produce. They exist preconsciously, and presumably they form the structural dominants of the psyche in general. They may be compared to the invisible presence of the crystal lattice in a saturated solution. As *a priori* conditioning factors they represent a special, psychological instance of the biological “pattern of behaviour,” which gives all living organisms their specific qualities. Just as the manifestations of this biological ground plan may change in the course of development, so also can those of the archetype. Empirically considered, however, the archetype did not ever come into

existence as a phenomenon of organic life, but entered into the picture with life itself.

“A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity”

(1942/1948), CW 11, n. 2, § 222.

Do we ever understand what we think? We only understand that kind of thinking which is a mere equation, from which nothing comes out but what we have put in. That is the working of the intellect. But besides that there is a thinking in primordial images, in symbols which are older than the historical man, which are inborn in him from the earliest times, and, eternally living, outlasting all generations, still make up the groundwork of the human psyche. It is only possible to live the fullest life when we are in harmony with these symbols; wisdom is a return to them.

“The Stages of Life” (1930–31), CW 8, § 794.

[A]rchetypes probably represent typical situations in life.

“Psychological Factors Determining Human Behavior” (1937),

CW 8, § 254.

The archetypes are the numinous, structural elements of the psyche and possess a certain autonomy and specific energy which enables them to attract, out of the conscious mind, those contents which are best suited to themselves.

*Symbols of Transformation*, (1912/1952), CW 5, § 344.

[M]an must remain conscious of the world of the archetypes, because in it he is still a part of Nature and is connected with his own roots.

“Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype” (1938/1954),

CW 9i, § 174.

The archetypal is a powerful emotion brought into its original form. When someone is able to perform the art of touching on the

archetypal, he can play on the souls of people like on the strings of a piano.

*Children's Dreams: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1936–1940*,  
p. 150.

No archetype can be reduced to a simple formula. It is a vessel which we can never empty, and never fill. It has a potential existence only, and when it takes shape in matter it is no longer what it was. It persists throughout the ages and requires interpreting ever anew. The archetypes are imperishable elements of the unconscious, but they change their shape continually.

“The Psychology of the Child Archetype” (1940), CW 9i, § 301.

The archetype is, so to speak, an “eternal” presence, and it is only a question of whether it is perceived by the conscious mind or not.

*Psychology and Alchemy* (1944), CW 12, § 329.

Just as all archetypes have a positive, favourable, bright side that points upwards, so also they have one that points downwards, partly negative and unfavourable, partly chthonic, but for the rest merely neutral.

“The Phenomenology of the Spirit in Fairytales” (1945/1948), CW 9i,  
§ 413.

The impact of an archetype, whether it takes the form of immediate experience or is expressed through the spoken word, stirs us because it summons up a voice that is stronger than our own. Whoever speaks in primordial images speaks with a thousand voices; he enthral and overpowers, while at the same time he lifts the idea he is seeking to express out of the occasional and the transitory into the realm of the ever-enduring. He transmutes our personal destiny into the destiny of mankind, and evokes in us all those beneficent forces that ever and anon have enabled humanity to find a refuge from every peril and to outlive the longest night.

“On the Relation of Analytical Psychology to Poetry” (1922), CW 15,  
§ 129.

Only that which acts upon me do I recognize as real and actual. But that which has no effect upon me might as well not exist.

*Answer to Job* (1952), CW 11, § 757.

The deposit of man's whole ancestral experience—so rich in emotional imagery—of father, mother, child, husband and wife, of the magic personality, of dangers to body and soul, has exalted this group of archetypes into the supreme regulating principles of religious and even of political life, in unconscious recognition of their tremendous psychic power.

“The Structure of the Psyche” (1927/1931), CW 8, § 337.

[T]he unconscious functions according to the archetypes. When it functions correctly, it could lead to the discovery of the world or to the reinvention of world history. It is not we who have those images, but they are within us, and we are shaped by them. These are preordained modes of functioning. The way it happens in us is how it happens in nature in general. An insect does by itself what it has to do after hatching. It is not welcomed by benevolent parents or midwives, and all the same it spins its threads correctly. It flies to the plant where it finds its food, and so on. It just does the right thing. Similarly, the mental functioning of human beings is not something that each individual has to learn anew for him- or herself. We do what our ancestors have always done. It is not the school that brings this about. On the contrary, we have to be careful that the school does not destroy the natural functioning of the psyche.

*Children's Dreams: Notes from the Seminar Given in 1936–1940*,  
p. 133.

When I was working on the stone tablets, I became aware of the fateful links between me and my ancestors. I feel very strongly that I am under the influence of things or questions which were left incomplete and unanswered by my parents and grandparents and more distant ancestors. It often seems as if there were an impersonal karma within a family, which is passed on from parents to

children. It has always seemed to me that I had to answer questions which fate had posed to my forefathers, and which had not yet been answered, or as if I had to complete, or perhaps continue, things which previous ages had left unfinished. It is difficult to determine whether these questions are more of a personal or more of a general (collective) nature. It seems to me that the latter is the case. A collective problem, if not recognized as such, always appears as a personal problem, and in individual cases may give the impression that something is out of order in the realm of the personal psyche. The personal sphere is indeed disturbed, but such disturbances need not be primary; they may well be secondary, the consequence of an insupportable change in the social atmosphere. The cause of the disturbance is, therefore, not to be sought in the personal surroundings, but rather in the collective situation. Psychotherapy has hitherto taken this matter far too little into account.

*Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (1962), pp. 233–34.

[T]he indispensable condition is that you have an archetypal experience, and to have that means that you have surrendered to life. If your life has not three-dimensions, if you don't live in the body, if you live on the two-dimensional plane in the paper world that is flat and printed, as if you were only living your biography, then you are nowhere. You don't see the archetypal world, but live like a pressed flower in the pages of a book, a mere memory of yourself.

*Nietzsche's Zarathustra: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1934–1939*,  
Vol. II (3 June 1936), p. 972.

[I]t is not surprising that when an archetypal situation occurs we suddenly feel an extraordinary sense of release, as though transported, or caught up by an overwhelming power. At such moments we are no longer individuals, but the race; the voice of all mankind resounds in us.

“On the Relation of Analytical Psychology to Poetry” (1922), CW 15,  
§ 128.

Archetypes are forms of different aspects expressing the creative psychic background. They are and always have been numinous and therefore “divine.” In a very generalizing way we can therefore define them as attributes of the creator.

Letter to Herbert Read, 22 October 1960, *Letters*, Vol. II, p. 606.

The great lure of the archetypal situation is that you yourself suddenly cease to be. You cease to think and are acted upon as though carried by a great river with no end. You are suddenly eternal.

*Nietzsche's Zarathustra: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1934–1939*, Vol. I (14 November 1934), p. 240.

[A]nyone possessed by an archetype cannot help having all the symptoms of inflation. For the archetype is nothing human; no archetype is properly human. The archetype itself is an exaggeration and it reaches beyond the confines of humanity.

*Nietzsche's Zarathustra: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1934–1939*, Vol. II (19 October 1938), p. 1343.

Man's capacity for consciousness alone makes him man.

“On the Nature of the Psyche” (1947/1954), CW 8, § 412.

And yet the attainment of consciousness was the most precious fruit of the tree of knowledge, the magical weapon which gave man victory over the earth, and which we hope will give him a still greater victory over himself.

“The Meaning of Psychology for Modern Man” (1933/1934), CW 10, § 289.

Without consciousness there would, practically speaking, be no world, for the world exists for us only in so far as it is consciously reflected by a psyche. *Consciousness is a precondition of being.* Thus the psyche is endowed with the dignity of a cosmic principle, which philosophically and in fact gives it a position co-equal with the principle of physical being. The carrier of this consciousness is the individual, who does not produce the psyche of his own voli-

tion but is, on the contrary, preformed by it and nourished by the gradual awakening of consciousness during childhood. If therefore the psyche is of overriding empirical importance, so also is the individual, who is the only immediate manifestation of the psyche.

*The Undiscovered Self* (1957), CW 10, § 528.

Consciousness, no matter how extensive it may be, must always remain the smaller circle within the greater circle of the unconscious, an island surrounded by the sea; and, like the sea itself, the unconscious yields an endless and self-replenishing abundance of living creatures, a wealth beyond our fathoming. We may long have known the meaning, effects, and characteristics of unconscious contents without ever having fathomed their depths and potentialities, for they are capable of infinite variation and can never be depotentiated. The only way to get at them in practice is to try to attain a conscious attitude which allows the unconscious to co-operate instead of being driven into opposition.

*The Psychology of the Transference* (1946), CW 16, § 366.

[W]e come to the paradoxical conclusion that there is no conscious content which is not in some other respect unconscious.

“On the Nature of the Psyche” (1947/1954), CW 8, § 385.

The greatest blessing in this world is the greatest curse in the unconscious.

*The Psychology of Kundalini Yoga: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1932* (26 October, 1932), p. 51.

[N]o matter what your conscious attitude may be, the unconscious has an absolutely free hand and can do what it pleases.

*Visions: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1930–1934, Vol. I* (22 October 1930), p. 27.

The longing for light is the longing for consciousness.

*Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (1962), p. 269.

Conflict engenders fire, the fire of affects and emotions, and like every other fire it has two aspects, that of combustion and that of creating light. On the one hand, emotion is the alchemical fire whose warmth brings everything into existence and whose heat burns all superfluities to ashes. But on the other hand, emotion is the moment when steel meets flint and a spark is struck forth, for emotion is the chief source of consciousness. There is no change from darkness to light or from inertia to movement without emotion.

“Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype” (1938/1954),  
CW 9i, § 179.

If there were no consciousness, there would be no world; the whole world, as far as it enters into our consideration, depends upon that little flame of consciousness, that is surely the decisive factor. In the unconscious one cannot judge because of the great darkness there, but in the conscious there is light, and so there are differences; there is a criterion in consciousness which gives one a measure by which to judge.

*Visions: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1930–1934, Vol. II* (1 February 1933), p. 898.

[C]onsciousness can take up no position which will not call up, somewhere in the dark corners of the psyche, a negation or a compensatory effect, approval or resentment. This process of coming to terms with the Other in us is well worth while, because in this way we get to know aspects of our nature which we would not allow anybody else to show us and which we ourselves would never have admitted.

*Mysterium Coniunctionis* (1955–56), CW 14, § 706.

The secret participation of the unconscious is everywhere present without our having to search for it, but as it remains unconscious we never really know what is going on or what to expect. What we are searching for is a way to make conscious those contents which

are about to influence our actions, so that the secret interference of the unconscious and its unpleasant consequences can be avoided.

“The Transcendent Function” ([1916]/1958),<sup>2</sup> CW 8, § 158.

Anything conscious can be corrected. But anything that slips away into the unconscious is beyond the reach of correction and, its rank growth undisturbed, is subject to increasing degeneration. Happily, nature sees to it that the unconscious contents will irrupt into consciousness sooner or later and create the necessary confusion.

*Mysterium Coniunctionis* (1955–56), CW 14, § 672.

[M]an’s greatest triumph was that God himself incarnated in man in order to illumine the world; that was a tremendous increase of consciousness. But every increase of consciousness means a further separation from the original animal-like condition, and I don’t know where it will end: it is really a tragic problem. We have to discover more consciousness, to extend consciousness, and the more it is extended the more we get away from the original condition.

*Nietzsche’s Zarathustra: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1934–1939, Vol. II* (3 June 1936), p. 967.

[W]e cannot apply our notion of time to the unconscious. Our consciousness can conceive of things only in temporal succession, our time is, therefore, essentially linked to the chronological sequence. In the unconscious this is different, because there everything lies together, so to speak. To some extent, in the unconscious we all still live in the past; in a way we are still very little children, and often only very little is needed for the “child” to come to the surface. At the same time, we are standing in the shadow cast by a future, of which we still know nothing, but which is already somehow anticipated by the unconscious.

*Children’s Dreams: Notes from the Seminar Given in 1936–1940*, p. 360.

<sup>2</sup> A date in square brackets is the date when the work was composed; other dates refer to the year the work was published.

Projection is a terrific force. You are moved by it and you do not know why. The impact of the projection comes at you like a billiard ball. Through projection terrible things can be brought about. If you do not know of the hook in yourself or of the open door, then the devil creeps in (the projection) and has a tremendous effect. You cannot be indifferent to a projection.

*Dream Analysis: Notes of a Seminar Given in 1928–1930* (13 March 1929), p. 165.

Practical analysis has shown that unconscious contents are invariably projected at first upon concrete persons and situations. Many projections can ultimately be integrated back into the individual once he has recognized their subjective origin; others resist integration, and although they may be detached from their original objects, they thereupon transfer themselves to the doctor.

*The Psychology of the Transference* (1946), CW 16, § 357.

Projection is one of the commonest psychic phenomena. It is the same as *participation mystique*, which Lévy-Bruhl, to his great credit, emphasized as being an especially characteristic feature of primitive man. We merely give it another name, and as a rule deny that we are guilty of it. Everything that is unconscious in ourselves we discover in our neighbour, and we treat him accordingly.

“Archaic Man” (1931), CW 10, § 131.

[T]here is always an attraction between conscious mind and projected content. Generally it takes the form of a fascination.

*Psychology and Alchemy* (1944), CW 12, § 436.

[S]o long as a content remains in the projected state it is inaccessible.

*Psychology and Alchemy* (1944), CW 12, § 555.

Projections change the world into the replica of one’s unknown face.

*Aion* (1951), CW 9ii, § 17.

Everything that works from the unconscious appears projected on others. Not that these others are wholly without blame, for even the worst projection is at least hung on a hook, perhaps a very small one, but still a hook offered by the other person.

“On Psychic Energy” (1928), CW 8, § 99.

True, whoever looks into the mirror of the water will see first of all his own face. Whoever goes to himself risks a confrontation with himself. The mirror does not flatter, it faithfully shows whatever looks into it; namely, the face we never show to the world because we cover it with the *persona*, the mask of the actor. But the mirror lies behind the mask and shows the true face.

“Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious” (1934/1954), CW 9i, § 43.

The tendencies of the conscious and the unconscious are the two factors that together make up the transcendent function. It is called “transcendent” because it makes the transition from one attitude to another organically possible, without loss of the unconscious.

“The Transcendent Function” ([1916]/1958), CW 8, § 145.

The process of coming to terms with the unconscious is a true labour, a work which involves both action and suffering. It has been named the “transcendent function” because it represents a function based on real and “imaginary,” or rational and irrational, data, thus bridging the yawning gulf between conscious and unconscious.

*On the Psychology of the Unconscious* (1917/1926), CW 7, § 121.

[Y]ou find no trace of the transcendent function in the psychology of a man with definite religious convictions. What the term “transcendent function” designates is really the transition from one condition to another. When a man is caught by a religious concept, he does not leave it; he stays with his religious conviction, and, furthermore, that is what he should do. If any conflict appears, it is immediately repressed or resolved by a definite religious idea. That is why the transcendent function can be observed only in people

who no longer have their original religious conviction, or never had any, and who, in consequence, find themselves directly faced with their unconscious. This was the case with Christ. He was a religious innovator who opposed the traditional religion of his time and his people. Thus he was *extra ecclesiam* [outside the church]<sup>3</sup> and in a state of *nulla salus* [no salvation]. That is why he experienced the transcendent function, whereas a Christian saint could never experience it, since for him no fundamental and total change of attitude would be involved.

Letter to M. Zarine, 3 May 1939, *Letters*, Vol. I, p. 268.

How the harmonizing of conscious and unconscious data is to be undertaken cannot be indicated in the form of a recipe. It is an irrational life-process which expresses itself in definite symbols. It may be the task of the analyst to stand by this process with all the help he can give. In this case, knowledge of the symbols is indispensable, for it is in them that the union of conscious and unconscious contents is consummated. Out of this union emerge new situations and new conscious attitudes. I have therefore called the union of opposites the “transcendent function.” This rounding out of the personality into a whole may well be the goal of any psychotherapy that claims to be more than a mere cure of symptoms.

“Conscious, Unconscious, and Individuation” (1939), CW 9i, § 524.

If the mediatory product remains intact, it forms the raw material for a process not of dissolution but of construction, in which thesis and antithesis both play their part. In this way it becomes a new content that governs the whole attitude, putting an end to the division and forcing the energy of the opposites into a common channel. The standstill is overcome and life can flow on with renewed power towards new goals.

*Psychological Types* (1921), CW 6, § 827.

<sup>3</sup> Square brackets within quotations always enclose the editor’s translation or insertion.

The psychology of an individual can never be exhaustively explained from himself alone: a clear recognition is needed of the way it is also conditioned by historical and environmental circumstances. His individual psychology is not merely a physiological, biological, or moral problem, it is also a contemporary problem. Again, no psychological fact can ever be exhaustively explained in terms of causality alone; as a living phenomenon, it is always indissolubly bound up with the continuity of the vital process, so that it is not only something evolved but also continually evolving and creative.

Anything psychic is Janus-faced—it looks both backwards and forwards. Because it is so evolving, it is also preparing the future. Were this not so, intentions, aims, plans, calculations, predictions, and premonitions would be psychological impossibilities.

*Psychological Types* (1921), CW 6, § 717–18.

Meaningful coincidences—which are to be distinguished from meaningless chance groupings—therefore seem to rest on an archetypal foundation.

“Synchronicity: An Acausal Connecting Principle” (1952), CW 8, § 846.

Where an archetype prevails, we can expect synchronistic phenomena, i.e., *acausal correspondences*, which consist in a parallel arrangement of facts in time. The arrangement is not the effect of a cause. It just happens, being a consequence of the fact that causality is a statistical truth.

Letter to John Raymond Smythies, 29 February 1952, *Letters, Vol. II*, p. 46.

My researches into the psychology of unconscious processes long ago compelled me to look around for another principle of explanation, since the causality principle seemed to me insufficient to explain certain remarkable manifestations of the unconscious. I found that there are psychic parallelisms which simply cannot be

related to each other causally, but must be connected by another kind of principle altogether. This connection seemed to lie essentially in the relative simultaneity of the events, hence the term “synchronistic.”

“Richard Wilhelm: In Memoriam” (1930), CW 15, § 81.

Viewed from the psychological standpoint, extra-sensory perception appears as a manifestation of the *collective unconscious*. This particular psyche behaves as if it were *one* and not as if it were split up into many individuals. It is *non-personal*. (I call it the “objective psyche.”) It is the same everywhere and at all times. (If it were not so, comparative psychology would be impossible.) As it is not limited to the person, it is also not limited to the body. It manifests itself therefore not only in human beings but also at the same time in animals and even in physical circumstances. (Cf. the oracle technique of the *I Ching* and character horoscopes.) I call these latter phenomena the synchronicity of archetypal events. For instance, I walk with a woman patient in a wood. She tells me about the first dream in her life that had made an everlasting impression upon her. She had seen a spectral fox coming down the stairs in her parental home. At this moment a real fox comes out of the trees not 40 yards away and walks quietly on the path ahead of us for several minutes. The animal behaves as if it were a partner in the human situation. (One fact is no fact, but when you have seen many, you begin to sit up.)

Answers to Rhine’s Questions, November 1945, *Letters, Vol. I*, p. 395.

The concept of synchronicity says that a connection exists which is not of a causal nature. The connection consists firstly in the fact of coincidence and secondly in the fact of parallel meaning. It is a question of meaningful coincidences.

Letter to Karl Schmid, 11 June 1958, *Letters, Vol. II*, pp. 446–47.

[S]ynchronistic phenomena manifest themselves as pure chance. The essential thing about these phenomena is that an objective

event coincides meaningfully with a psychic process; that is to say, a physical event and an endopsychic one have a common meaning. This presupposes not only an all-pervading, latent meaning which can be recognized by consciousness, but, during that preconscious time, a psychoid process with which a physical event meaningfully coincides. Here the meaning cannot be recognized because there is as yet no consciousness. It is through the archetype that we come closest to this early, “irrepresentable,” psychoid stage of conscious development; indeed, the archetype itself gives us direct intimations of it. Unconscious synchronicities are, as we know from experience, altogether possible, since in many cases we are unconscious of their happening, or have to have our attention drawn to the coincidence by an outsider.

Letter to Erich Neumann, 10 March 1959, *Letters, Vol. II*, p. 495.

[J]ung said to me [Pierre Courthion, the interviewer], “Take the tendency to commit suicide—right from the beginning. What happens? You don’t pay attention on the street. One day you fall down stairs. Then there is a little automobile accident. It doesn’t look like anything. Yet these are the preliminaries. Chance? Primitive people never mention chance. That is why I say, ‘Be careful when you are not at one with yourself, in your moments of dissociation.’”

“A Wartime Interview” (1942), *C. G. Jung Speaking*, p. 144.

Everyone knows nowadays that people “have complexes.” What is not so well known, though far more important theoretically, is that complexes can *have us*. The existence of complexes throws serious doubt on the naïve assumption of the unity of consciousness, which is equated with “psyche,” and on the supremacy of the will. Every constellation of a complex postulates a disturbed state of consciousness. The unity of consciousness is disrupted and the intentions of the will are impeded or made impossible. Even memory is often noticeably affected, as we have seen. The complex must therefore be a psychic factor which, in terms of energy, possesses a

value that sometimes exceeds that of our conscious intentions, otherwise such disruptions of the conscious order would not be possible at all.

“A Review of the Complex Theory” (1934), CW 8, § 200.

Complexes are in truth the living units of the unconscious psyche, and it is only through them that we are able to deduce its existence and its constitution. The unconscious would in fact be—as it is in Wundt’s psychology—nothing but a vestige of dim or “obscure” representations, or a “fringe of consciousness,” as William James calls it, were it not for the existence of complexes. That is why Freud became the real discoverer of the unconscious in psychology, because he examined those dark places and did not simply dismiss them, with a disparaging euphemism, as “parapraxes.” The *via regia* to the unconscious, however, is not the dream, as he thought, but the complex, which is the architect of dreams and of symptoms. Nor is this *via* so very “royal,” either, since the way pointed out by the complex is more like a rough and uncommonly devious footpath that often loses itself in the undergrowth and generally leads not into the heart of the unconscious but past it.

“A Review of the Complex Theory” (1934), CW 8, § 210.

[C]omplexes are focal or nodal points of psychic life which we would not wish to do without; indeed, they should not be missing, for otherwise psychic activity would come to a fatal standstill.

*Psychological Types* (1921), CW 6, § 925.

What then, scientifically speaking, is a “feeling-toned complex?” It is the *image* of a certain psychic situation which is strongly accentuated emotionally and is, moreover, incompatible with the habitual attitude of consciousness. This image has a powerful inner coherence, it has its own wholeness and, in addition, a relatively high degree of autonomy, so that it is subject to the control of the conscious mind to only a limited extent, and therefore behaves like an

animated foreign body in the sphere of consciousness. The complex can usually be suppressed with an effort of will, but not argued out of existence, and at the first suitable opportunity it reappears in all its original strength.

“A Review of the Complex Theory” (1934), CW 8, § 201.

A complex can be really overcome only if it is lived out to the full. In other words, if we are to develop further we have to draw to us and drink down to the very dregs what, because of our complexes, we have held at a distance.

“Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype” (1938/1954),  
CW 9i, § 184.

Where the realm of the complexes begins the freedom of the ego comes to an end, for complexes are psychic agencies whose deepest nature is still unfathomed.

“A Review of the Complex Theory” (1934), CW 8, § 216.

Since the stars have fallen from heaven and our highest symbols have paled, a secret life holds sway in the unconscious. That is why we have a psychology today, and why we speak of the unconscious. All this would be quite superfluous in an age or culture that possessed symbols. Symbols are spirit from above, and under those conditions the spirit is above too. Therefore it would be a foolish and senseless undertaking for such people to wish to experience or investigate an unconscious that contains nothing but the silent, undisturbed sway of nature. Our unconscious, on the other hand, hides living water, spirit that has become nature, and that is why it is disturbed. Heaven has become for us the cosmic space of the physicists, and the divine empyrean a fair memory of things that once were. But “the heart glows,” and a secret unrest gnaws at the roots of our being.

“Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious” (1934/1954), CW 9i,  
§ 50.