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1.1 INTRODUCTION:

There are creative writers and critics who feel that to understand a work of art, the practice of a theory is essential. Without a theory or an approach, no proper analysis or interpretation of a text or a work of art can be done in a proper perspective. A theory can afford many profound clues toward solving a work’s thematic and symbolic texture. Though one theory or one approach can seldom account for the beautiful symmetry of a well-wrought poem or of a fictional masterpiece, the interpretive craftsman must often use other tools for a proper rendering of a work of art. Commenting on the significance of theory, Mary Evans observes, “. . . thus a practice without theory, therefore, headless chickens rushing in mindless circles before they finally collapse in death” (225). With this perspective at the back of mind, let us see archetypal theory or approach and how Robertson Davies made use of in his work of art or in his novels.

Robertson Davies had been an avid student of Freud. At Queen’s University, Kingston, he enrolled in several courses in psychology, taught by Professor George Humprey, who introduced him to Freud. In an interview, Davies lists Freudianism as one of his great enthusiasms before the age of forty. To quote Davies: “Freud was an enormous enthusiasm of
mine before I was forty; after forty I came to examine the works of his
great colleague Carl Gustav Jung, and I have been, over many years,
reading and reading and reading again the collected works of C. G. Jung”
(Cameron 77). His interview with Silver Donald Cameron (1971) reveals
two formative influences on Davies – the influence of Freud and C. G.
Jung.

For the first time in the history of psychology, Freud gave a three-
fold structure of the human mind and its working. The human mind,
according to him, has three regions: conscious, subconscious, and the
three functioning agents: Id, Ego and Superego. Of these three energy
levels, he gives prime importance to the Ego as the organizer and the
chief executive of the human personality.

The Ego derives its energy from the Id that is mainly formed of the
instincts and drives like hunger, sex, aggression, violence and so on. The
Id always works in the light of the pleasure-principle. By all means, it
wants to have pleasure. It behaves like a ‘kid’, that restlessly cries for
every wish fulfilment. The Id-motives, that motivate the human actions,
are many, and cannot always be satisfied in a socially approved way,
because society strictly forbids certain modes of behaviour. Therefore,
the Ego always seeks out the effective means of coping with the Id.
On the other hand, the Suprego that is formed as a result of the internalization of the socio-cultural values and their various aspects makes demands for their fulfilment. As some unwritten social laws, morals, and the ethical standards form the fabric of the Superego, it may neglect or delay the fulfilment of some basic human needs, and, sometimes, reach the extreme position exactly opposite to that of the Id.

In such circumstances, the Ego has to bring about a happy balance, a peaceful harmony between these warring psychic-energies. In fact, it is the Ego, as a wise man, that checks both the Id and the Superego, and governs the personality.

Sometimes, while doing this difficult task, Ego faces some traumatic anxieties. When it cannot successfully deal with them in a rational and realistic manner, it falls back upon the unrealistic ones, often denying, falsifying and destroying reality. These activities of the Ego are called ‘the Ego-defense-mechanisms.’ Repression, projection, reaction – formation, rationalization, displacement, fixation and regression are some of the defense mechanisms, which, of course, take place unconsciously and the person is unaware of them. In Freud’s view, most of the psychic-energy is invested in these defences, in modifying or adjusting with the other forces of mind. Therefore, man is the product of his intra-psychic conflicts, and the Ego plays a major role in overcoming these conflicts.
Moreover, in a properly developed person, his Ego is the monitor of all the psychic activities.

The concept of Ego and its working seems to be equivalent to the self-concept and its working, although Freud did not mention it.

Another Freudian personologist who put forth his ‘Psycho-social theory’ of the personality development, by extending and celebrating Freud’s four stages into eight subsequent stages, and embracing the whole life-span of man is Erik H. Erikson.

Unlike Freud, he is of the opinion that the human personality development, to a large extent, is a life-long process, and it gives many golden chances for the development of Ego. While trying to achieve a delicate balance between the Id-motives and the Superego, in Freud’s opinion, the Ego is always entrapped in the defense-mechanisms, whereas Erikson thinks that every stage of the psycho-social theory involves a conflict that gives Ego a chance to develop. He believes that the Ego thrives on the conflicts and crises, because it is capable of overcoming the conflicts positively, the result of which is the enrichment of personality.

Each stage, like a coin, offers two opposing psychological traits like, ‘basic trust versus basic mistrust’, in infancy ‘autonomy versus shame and doubt’ in the early childhood, ‘initiative versus guilt’ in the play age, ‘industry versus inferiority’ in the school age, ‘identity versus
identity confusion’ in the adolescence, intimacy versus isolation’, in the young adulthood, ‘generativity versus stagnation’, in the mature adulthood, and finally, ‘integrity versus despair and disgust’ in the old age.

Erikson’s theory gives much importance to the socio-cultural environment, and its agents, and the person’s interactions with them. It paints the strong Ego that is responsible for a healthy and happy life. Erikson, though layed much stress on the ‘identity crisis’ that a young man faces in his adolescence, like Freud, did not talk much of the human self.

There are a number of pioneering psychologists in the field of ‘individual psychology,’ who have focused on the human personality with its social relationships. Alfred Adler, Abraham H. Maslow, Gordon W. Allport, Carl Rogers are a few of more pioneering psychologists who have probed human self from different angles.

1.2.1 As Davies grew older, he became more and more dissatisfied with Freudian psychoanalysis because of its limited view on reality: “much of (Freud’s) thought is violently reductive – the tendency to feel that the sexual etiology of neurosis explains everything” (Cameron 77-78). Davies could no longer agree with the reductive assumption that a singular event in childhood could account for a persisting neurosis in later
life. Nor could he reconcile himself to the overtone of sex in Freud’s work, and to the popular transformations of the Swiss psychoanalyst’s model, which were concocted by the public at large and had been instigated by the Freudian school. But the greatest obstacle for him was the place that the artist got in Freudian theory:

Why is somebody a writer? A Freudian will say, ‘It is because he had never lost his dread of the pre-oedipal mother.’ Well baloney! That’s not why he’s a writer. He must be a writer for some better reason than because he was scared of his mother before he developed his oedipus complex. (Heatherington 120)

Following the scorn of many Freudians towards Jung, Davies began reading into the latter. He immediately found out that the Jungian train of thought was much more closely connected to his own than that of Freud. Apart from biographical similarities, Jung’s erudition and wide knowledge of literature appealed to Davies. Although Davies had let go of Freudian psychoanalysis, he had not abandoned the idea of the unconscious, which Jung takes as the basis of his theory. In contrast with Freud, however, Jung offered Davies an attractive perspective on religion, myth and the role of the artist. Davies could not cope with Freud’s idea that all creative thinking was the result of individual sexual neurosis, and that religion and myth were essentially the offspring of the individually perverted and repressed, and were consequently to be dismissed as mere illusions. Davies, as a writer, was unable to accept the Freudian view of
the artist as a sexually neurotic mind. Instead of the reductive attitude of Freud, Davies found Jung to be very constructive towards myth, legend, literature and religion. The Jungian definition of the task of the artist for humanity suited Davies’s position as a writer. In reply to the question of Gordon Roper, Davies says:

And what Jung seems to feel about art is that it is the job of the artist, without being a job in the sense that you can set to work and do it at will, is to dig into a deep kind of consciousness which is shared by a great number of people, and to find in it things which are of much more than personal importance, or individual importance, and to bring it out and make it live or make it vivid to other people. And this is really, what art is about. (Roper 54)

Jung offered Davies the solution in moving from the individual to the collective and from the sexual to something more inclusive.

1.2.2 The credit of introducing the concept of self goes to Carl Gustav Jung whose analytical theory of personality is different from that of Freud. He believes the human being as an aspiring, goal directed person capable of striving for perfection or self-realization. His is also a three-fold structure of the human psyche: personal conscious, personal unconscious and collective unconscious. He traces the over dominance of the collective unconscious mind in the life-activities.
The libido, in his opinion, is a total psychic energy of which the sexual energy is but a part. And this psychic energy, that performs the personality functions, is always in a state of flux, displacable, transferable; and is conserved in one or the other system of personality.

According to him, the Ego is the centre of the personal conscious mind that is made of conscious perceptions, memories, thoughts and feelings. Again, it is only a part of the total personality and not the centre. In Jung’s opinion,

It is acquired . . . during the individual’s life-time. It seems to arise in the first place from the collision between the somatic factor and the environment, and once established as a subject, it goes on developing from the further collisions with the outer world and the inner. (*AION: Researches into the phenomenology of the self*)

The second system of the human mind – ‘the personal unconscious’ includes all the stored up impressions, with or without their original intensities, right from the childhood. And these impressions are made available, under certain circumstances, to influence the Ego-activities. Such impressions, which exert a mental tension, are called complexes. A complex, for Jung, is a network of thoughts or an organized group of feelings, thoughts, perceptions, memories and attitudes held together by a nuclear idea or a core disposition. The person, who suffers from a complex, has no control over it, because the centre of the complex
is the personal unconscious mind. Moreover, when a particular complex is active, it works, like a distinctive personality, rejecting the person’s Ego. For example, no matter what the conversation, the person with a ‘women complex’ finds a way of getting back to the subject of woman. The personal unconscious mind may have many complexes, which hinder the personality development.

The ‘Collective Unconscious’ is the third system of mind that is inherited from our ancestors, even from the pre-human periods. It is the psychic-residue of our ancestral past that has been carried by the countless generations and is continuously passed on to every new generation. And it is with us, with its tremendous pressure, from which there is no escape.

In other words, a person is born with some pre-dispositions for thinking, feeling, and perceiving. His deep knowledge of mythology and religion helped him to recognize that the collective unconscious consists of mythological motifs or primordial images to which Jung gave the name Archetypes. The archetypes work as the highly charged, autonomous energy centres of personality. Besides, having been associated with myths, rituals, dreams, visions and the works of art, they can easily penetrate into the personal-consciousness. The proper
expression and modification of these archetypes is essential for the proper perception of oneself and the external world.

1.2.3 In several interviews, he has admitted the influence of Freud and Jung. Freud was appealing to the youthful Davies because he suggested a definite cause for each act. If one only probed enough or know enough, each life choice could be explained by a number of crucial events early in the formative years. It is much easier to accept the possibility of certainty when one is young. Ultimately, however Freud seemed reductive, whereas Jung seemed inclusive. Davies’s interest in Jung has contributed significantly to the creation of his art. More than Freud, Jung has inspired the New Age movement with his interest in occultism, Eastern religions and mythology. In his essay on ‘Psychology and Literature’ (1939), Jung writes with conviction:

   The artist is not a person endowed with free will who seeks his own ends, but one who allows art to realize its purposes through him. As a human being, he may have moods and a will and personal aims, but as an artist, he is “man” in a higher sense – he is “collective man”, a vehicle and moulder of the unconscious psychic life of mankind. (185)

Davies proposed that the human psyche could be best understood not only through a study of dreams (as Freud had suggested) but through world religion, mythology, art, and philosophy. Religion and mythology could reveal a great deal about humans because, according to Jung,
human souls not only had a personal unconscious but a collective unconscious as well. The key component of the collective unconscious was the ‘archetypes’ – religious and spiritual emotions and experiences that were common to all societies, past and present. Examples of such archetypes would be the Wise Old Man, the great Mother, the Hero, the Trickster, the Eternal Youth, and other such figures that, according to Jung, recurred repeatedly in all mythologies and literatures. The persona, the shadow, the anima and the animus are some of the important archetypes from the cluster of many like birth, rebirth, death, power, unity, the hero, God, the demon, the wise old man and so on. With this perspective at the back of mind, let us see the concept ‘archetype’, the origin and meaning of archetype, the basic qualities of archetype, types of archetypes etc.

1.2.4 The concept of the archetype relies on the work of three men Carl Jung, Joseph Campbell and Northrop Frye. Jung, a pioneer in the field of psychology, focused on the psychoanalytic features of the archetype. Archetypes are patterns and behaviour; are primordial images, which are part of our psyche and social systems. When we dream, we form images unconsciously. These dream images correspond to the sacred images, stories and myths of primitive people. Thus, these remains from a primitive people are called primordial images or archetypes. The form of
the archetype endures in all people. Archetypes are similar to instincts and they reveal themselves to our consciousness by powerful symbolic images, Archetypes can bring people under their spell – they have a vitalizing force when people allow themselves to experience them. Archetypes are collective, they are held in common by a social group. Archetypes appear simple on the surface, but are complex. The identification of archetypes is a relatively modern phenomenon. They are both images and emotions and both have to be present to radiate. Archetypes are connected to the individual by the bridge of emotions.

Having seen the concept of archetype, let us see the origin and the meaning of the archetype.

In regard to the origin of the English word archetype, it is to be noted that the word is derived from a Greek word that is prominent in the writings of religious thinkers during the Hellenistic period. Archetype consists of two words, tupos and arche, both of which have double referents. Tupos refers both to a physical blow and to the concrete manifestation of its impact. Hence, the seal and its imprint are both tupoi. Further, the relation between any form and its derivative forms is indicated by this term. For example, the cast that moulds the statue and the statue itself are both tupoi, as is the mould that is placed around a fruit by a grower in order to shape it as it grows. Internal and invisible
moulding is also a kind of tupos as in biological generation: the child is the tupos of its parents. Finally, as in the English cognate, type, tupos comes to signify any character or nature that is shared by numerous, related phenomena with the result that they appear to have been cast from the same mould: for example, the eucalyptus is a type of tree.

The nominal prefix arche refers to what is first or original, both in a temporal and in an ontological sense. As such, it may indicate equally the heavenly powers that govern the cosmos, the ruler of a realm, or the vital organs that empower life in the body.

Together, these two Greek words make up to archetupon, or “the archetype,” a term that was not so commonly used as either of its components but that does appear with some frequency in the rather esoteric writings of certain Hellenistic religious philosophers. Philo Judaeus, the Jewish theologian, refers to the archetype as the image dei (‘god-image’) residing in and moulding humanity in the likeness of God. The next philosopher is Irenaeus who uses the term for a group of gnostic Christians who believed that the world was not created by God out of nothing, but rather it was the fabrication of a demiurge, who copied directly or indirectly an archetypal world that existed outside him. In this view, the Demiurge creates in the manner of a mechanic who builds a robot that simulates, but does not replicate, a living model. The third
philosopher is Plotinus who says that the phenomenological realm does not truly exist, but appears at the boundaries between true being, that is, the One, and the void external to it. Plotinus’s cosmogony thus presents a third use of the imagery associated with the term archetype.

For all three philosophers, the word archetupon is used to depict a cosmogonic principle. Common to all three belief systems is the conviction that the creation of the cosmos, including the creation of man, depends on the pre-existence of a transcendental reality.

During the twentieth century, the historian of religions like Mircea Eliade and the depth psychologist C. G. Jung has rehabilitated the word archetype. Eliade, in his study of the religions of humankind, uses the term to name the sacred paradigms that are expressed in myth and articulated in ritual. For Jung, the concept of the archetype can also be applied to the dynamic structures of the unconscious that determine individual patterns of experience and behaviour. Eliade and Jung were able to discuss and compare their ideas on archetypes. As a psychologist knowledgeable in the study of religion, Jung knew and accepted the concepts of Eliade – archetype as transcendent model, the nature of hierophany, and so forth – but, in addition, for Jung, the archetype was also active in determining the inner life of humans in both its spiritual and material dimensions.
The archetype is most concretely viewed as instinct. Jung states that the archetype:

is not meant to denote an inherited idea, but rather an inherited made of psychic functioning, corresponding to the inborn way in which the chick emerges from the egg, the bird builds its nest, a certain kind of wasp stings the motor ganglion of the caterpillar, and eels find their way to the Bermudas. In other words, it is a pattern of behaviour. This aspect of the archetype is the biological one. (*The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 43)

The instinctual life of the body is unconscious. It is felt indirectly through drives and compulsions as well as through images that arise spontaneously in dreams and fantasy. It is the imagination that serves to mediate the subjective experience of instinct to the ego. Instinct clothes itself in images taken from everyday experience. The archetypal nature of instinct appears in the numinous quality of many of these images, that is, they have the power to compel one absolutely. For Jung, the archetype is nothing but instinct. Jung suggests that instinct and spirit are simply two different names for the same reality. What looks like instinct to the outsider is experienced as spirit on the subjective level of inner life. The appearance of the archetypal pattern at different levels of human experience in varying forms is described as projection.
Projection is a psychological term. The term simply points to the mode of appearance and not to the ontological status of the archetype, that is, the archetype does not exist as a projection, but rather it appears in projection.

The existence of archetypes cannot be proved, but archetypes can be subjectively experienced. Jung often explained that, as a psychologist, he could not prove the existence of God. Nevertheless, in *Face to Face*, his interview with John Freeman for the BBC, he admits that he has no need of belief in God because he has knowledge based on experience. In *Ordeal by Labyrinth: Conversations with Claude-Henri Rocquet*, Eliade insists on the religious content of the archetype:

> If God does not exist, then everything is dust and ashes. If there is no absolute to give meaning and value to our existence, then that means existence has no meaning. I know there are philosophers who do think precisely that; but for me, that would be not just pure despair but also a kind of betrayal. Because it is not true and I know that it is not true.

(Eliade 67)

Though, the term archetype was used by a historian of religions and a psychologist, yet the ancient term archetype retained the religious significance that it had for three religious philosophers during the first century of the common era. Referring both to the sacred model and to its appearance within the world of phenomena, the archetype is meaningless
in any system of thought that denies the reality of a transcendent principle. The term ‘archetype’, though not coined by Jung, enjoys its present-widespread usage among the myth critics primarily because of his influence. Like Freud, Jung was a pioneer whose brilliant flashes of insight have helped to light our way in exploring the darker recesses of the human mind.

Having seen the origin and meaning of the archetype, let us see the basic features of archetype. Jung defined an archetype as “a universal and recurring image, pattern or motif representing a typical human experience” (Burrows 57). Archetypes are patterns and behaviours; are primordial images, which are part of our psyche and social systems. In his book *Contributions to Analytical Psychology*, Jung writes that there are three basic qualities that characterize archetypes:

i) Primordial  
ii) Universal  
iii) Recurrent

i) Primordial Characteristics: The most fundamental quality that characterizes archetypes is that they are primordial. We, as individuals, have these archetypal images ingrained in our understanding even before we are born. They are located within the human preconscious, that area of the mind from which information can be recalled, though it is not present in the conscious mind. They are innate images of experiences, which have been repeated so often that they have formed deep, lasting
impressions upon the human psyche. Jung viewed them as models or prototypes of universal behaviour. He named them archetypes.

ii) Universal Characteristics: The second fundamental quality of archetypes is that they are universal: they are unaffected by time or situation, community or culture. They are now as they were in the past; they are as significant to tribal people, so isolated in dense jungles or on remote islands that they think their few members are the only human beings in existence as they are to engineers striving to solve the complex problems of space travel. The ancient Greeks battling over Helen at the walls of Troy were as affected by archetypes as politicians today who are trying to calculate the interests and moods of the people so that successful election campaign may be waged. From this perspective, humans have changed little in the past 4,000 years of recorded history, a period, which is itself only an instant when compared with the backdrop of evolutionary time. The psychoneurological functions of the modern mind remain essentially unchanged from the minds of Neolithic people. As a result, we all share similar experiences, emotions, drives, needs, and archetypes with each other as well as with our ancient ancestors. Archetypes are, therefore, truly part of the human universal experience. These archetypes can be found all over the world and throughout history. The manifestation of the idea may be different, but the idea itself is the same.
iii) Recurrent Characteristic: The third fundamental quality of archetypes is that they are recurrent. Those who have conducted research in the fields of anthropology, comparative religion, and mythology have tended to confirm the similarities among people, while demonstrating that what differences do exist are attributable mostly to local adaptations. It makes little difference, for example, where people are on the earth or when they exist, all people have been concerned with their creation and the meaning of their existence. These concerns are universal, therefore, archetypal. The most fascinating aspects of any comparison, however, come with the realization that the explanations of human origin and worldly creation are strikingly similar.

Archetypes fall into two major categories: Characters, Situations/symbolic. Before diving deep into these categories, let us see, what Jung has to say about the archetypes. Jung outlined five main archetypes:

1) The Persona
2) The Self
3) The Shadow
4) The Anima
5) The Animus

These five archetypes have the most frequent and most disturbing influence on the ego. The persona represents your public image. The word is, obviously, related to the word person and personality, and comes from a Latin word for mask. So the persona is the mask you put on before
you show yourself to the outside world. Although it begins as an archetype, by the time we are finished realizing it, it is the part of us most distant from the collective unconscious. At its best, it is just the “good impression” we all wish to present as we fill the roles society requires of us. But, of course, it can also be the “false impression” we use to manipulate people’s opinions and behaviours. And, at its worst, it can be mistaken, even by ourselves, for our true nature: sometimes we believe we really are what we pretend to be.

A person must know his archetypes, his social role, his weakness, the anima or the animus and accept them as a part of his or her personality. A lot of psychic-energy is consumed, blocking the healthy personality development if these archetypes are not properly recognized, understood and expressed in a socially approved way.

Unlike Freud, Jung strongly believes both in the healthy personality development and in the process of the psychological maturity – individuation. He says, “By it, I mean the psychological process that makes a human being an ‘individual’ a unique individuated unit or ‘whole man’” (The Integration of Personality 3).

The emergence of the self is the output of the individuation. The self, according to him, stands for the psychic totality: “a union of conscious and unconscious” (268). He comments on the nature of the self
as follows: “This (self) would be the point of a new equilibrium, a new centring of the total personality, a vital centre which, on account of its focal position between the conscious and conconscious insures for personality a new and more solid foundation” (219).

Once the self is evolved, the ego becomes its satellite. The self, thus, serves as unifying force that has a transcendent function – which provides stability and balance to the various aspects of personality. In other words, the person knows more about his unconscious aspects of the psychic life and about their respective roles. This awareness lands him on a new ground of understanding where he overcomes the conflicts, and begins to live harmoniously within himself and with others.

The self-realization, the realization of the fullness of our being, according to him, is an unattainable ideal; however, every person must strive for it. Jung believes that the self generally emerges very late, almost during the middle age of a person.

The persona, the shadow and the anima are structural components of the psyche that human beings have inherited, just as the chicken has inherited his built-in response to the hawk. We encounter the symbolic projections of these archetypes throughout the myths and the literatures of humankind. In melodrama, such as the traditional television or film western or cop story, the persona, the anima, and the shadow are
projected, respectively in the characters of the hero, the heroine, and the villain. By shadow, Jung means the sum of all those unpleasant qualities we like to hide or the negative side of our personality. It need not be wholly bad; it may just be somewhat inferior, unadopted and primitive. It may sometimes contain childish, undeveloped, or immature qualities which make life exciting but which convention forbids in an adult.

The shadow is a moral problem that challenges the whole ego or personality. When a person becomes conscious of it, he is forced to recognize the dark aspects of his personality as present and real. This is a kind of pre-requisite for any kind of knowledge and usually it meets with a lot of resistance from the individual. It is this refusal to acknowledge the evil or dark aspects of one’s self that makes the Whites project the shadow archetype on the Black men. The widespread fear of the Black men as rapists of white women was perhaps such an attempt to deny any evil sexual lurking in the white self.

The shadow is the darker side of our unconscious self, the inferior and less pleasing aspects of the personality, which we wish to suppress. Commenting on its deepest sense, Jung writes in his book *Psychological Reflections* (1961): “Taking it in its deepest sense, the shadow is the invisible saurian (reptilian) tail that man still drags behind him” (217). The most common variant of this archetype, when projected, is the Devil,
who, in Jung’s words, represents the “dangerous aspect of the unrecognized dark half of the personality” (94). In literature, we see symbolic representations of this archetype in such figures as Shakespeare’s Iago, Milton’s Satan, Goethe’s Mephistopheles, and Conrad’s Kurtz.

The anima is perhaps the most complex of Jung’s archetypes.

A part of our persona is the role of male or female we must play. For most people that role is determined by their physical gender. But Jung, like Freud and Adler and others, felt that we are all really bisexual in nature. When we begin our lives as foetuses, we have undifferentiated sex organs that only gradually, under the influence of hormones, become male or female. Likewise, when we begin our social lives as infants, we are neither male nor female in the social sense. Almost immediately – as soon as those pink or blue booties go on – we come under the influence of society, which gradually moulds us into men and women.

In all societies, the expectations placed on men and women differ, usually based on our different roles in reproduction, but often involving many details that are purely traditional. In our society today, we still have many remnants of these traditional expectations. Women are still expected to be more nurturing and less aggressive; men are still expected
to be strong and to ignore the emotional side of life. But Jung felt these expectations meant that we had developed only half of our potential.

The anima is the female aspect present in the collective unconscious of men, and the animus is the male aspect present in the collective unconscious of women. Together, they are referred to as Syzygy. The anima may be personified as a young girl, very spontaneous and intuitive, or as a witch, or as the earth mother. It is likely to be associated with deep emotionality and the force of life itself. The animus may be personified as a wise old man, a sorcerer, or often a number of males, and tends to be logical, often rationalistic, and even argumentative. The anima or animus is the archetype through which you communicate with the collective unconscious generally, and it is important to get into touch with it. It is also the archetype that is responsible for much of our love life: We are, as an ancient Greek myth suggests, always looking for our other half, the half that the Gods took from us, in members of the opposite sex. When we fall in love at first sight, we have found someone that “fills” our anima or animus archetype particularly well.

In literature, Jung considers such figures as Helen of Troy, Dante’s Beatrice, Milton’s Eve, and H. Rider Haggard’s. They are personified as anima. Following his theory, we might say that any female figure, who is invested with unusual significance or power, is likely to be a symbol of
Another function of the anima is noteworthy here. The anima is a kind of mediator between the ego (the conscious will or thinking self) and the unconscious or inner world of the male individual.

Having outlined five main archetypes, namely, the Persona, the Self, the Shadow, the Anima and the Animus, Jung mentions four more universal archetypes. These are – Mother, Rebirth, Spirit, and Trickster (or Devil).

Like any other archetype, the mother archetype appears under an almost infinite variety of aspects – the personal mother and grandmother, stepmother and mother-in-law, nurse, surrogate mother and governess. It also includes the goddess. The mother archetype has both positive and negative representations. The mother archetype is also known as the loving and terrible mother. The mother archetype “is often associated with things and places standing for fertility and fruitfulness: the cornucopia, a ploughed field, a garden” (Jung, *Four Archetypes*, 15). Jung further adds:

It (the archetype) can be attached to a rock, a cave, a tree, a spring, a deep well, or to various vessels such as the baptismal font, or to vessel-shaped flowers like the rose or the lotus. . . . Hollow objects such as ovens and cooking vessels are associated with the mother archetype. . . . Added to this list there are many animals, such as the cow, hare, and helpful animals in general. (15)
The mother archetype has three forms: the good, the terrible, and the good-bad mother. The positive qualities of the mother Archetype are: maternal solicitation and sympathy, life giving, magic, authority, wisdom and spiritual. The good mother is associated with birth, warmth, nourishment, protection, fertility, growth and abundance.

The negative qualities of the mother Archetype are: the witch, sorceress, siren, whore, lamia, femme fatale – associated with sensuality, sexual orgies, fear, danger, darkness, dismemberment, emasculation, death; the unconscious in its terrifying aspects.

These positive and negative qualities of the Good Mother and the Terrible Mother differ from the qualities of The Soul Mate. The positive aspects of The Soul Mate are: the Sophia figure, Holy Mother, the princess or “beautiful lady” – incarnation of inspiration and spiritual fulfilment.

The Mother Archetype is associated with the following symbols:

i) Represents the goal of longing for redemption and the symbols are heaven, earth, woods, sea, still water and moon.

ii) Often associated with things and places standing for fertility such as cornucopia, a plowed field, tree, vessel shaped flowers like a rose or lotus, and hollow objects.

iii) Implies protection and is represented by the magic circle or mandala.
iv) Animals associated with the archetype are the cow, hare and helpful animals.

v) There are also evil symbols associated with the mother archetype such as the witch, dragon or devouring and entwining animals such as a large fish or snake, death, the grave, sarcophagus, deep water and nightmares. In addition to the Good Mother, The Terrible Mother, and The Soul Mate, there are still other archetypal women such as stepmothers in fairy tales (Cinderella, fairy godmothers, Mother Goose, Little Red Riding Hood, Briar Rose, Pocahontas, Wicked witch from the Wizard of Oz); Persephone, Demeter, Hercate, Gorgon, Medusa from mythology; Gladriel from Lord of the Rings, Dorothy from the Wizard of Oz, Dante’s Beatrice; the temptress women such as Delilah, Helen of Troy, Circe and Cleopatra.

The second archetype is the concept of rebirth. It is felt that the rebirth concept can only be understood by examining history, since rebirth itself is a purely psychic reality transmitted only indirectly through personal statements. The affirmation of the concept of rebirth among many different people is taken as support for its archetypal quality. According to Jung, there are five different forms of rebirth. First, Metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls is described as life extended in time by passing through different bodily existences, an eternal life
interrupted by different reincarnations. This concept does not require a continuity of personality, even in Buddhism where it is of particular importance, but only continuity of Karma. Second, in reincarnation, human personality is regarded as continuous; previous existences are at least potentially available to awareness, since the same ego is presumed to exist throughout the various lives. These lives are generally thought to be exclusively human. The third form of rebirth, resurrection, is defined as a reestablishment of human existence after death, with the implication of some change or transformation of the being. A different place or body may be involved in transformation; the change of body can be either in the carnal or the nonmaterial sense. Rebirth in its fourth form (renovatio) is described as rebirth within the span of individual life; this rebirth may either consist of some healing or strengthening of a part of the physical or psychological being without essential change of the whole, or of a profound basic change in the essential nature of the individual, called transmutation, for example, the assumption of the body of the Mother of God into heaven after her death. The fifth form of rebirth is seen as an indirect one in which the individual witnesses or takes part in some rite of transformation and thereby shares a divine grace. It is exemplified by the witnessing of transubstantiation in the Mass, or the confession of the initiate in the Eleusinian mysteries.
In the next phase, Jung discusses the psychic importance of the concept of rebirth and two main types of transformation experiences. Within the scope of a dissertation, one cannot make a comprehensive study of various psychological aspects of the rebirth. Jung, in his concluding part, notes some typical set of symbols illustrating the process of transformation. An example of the symbolism of transformation is found in the Khidr myth of Islamic mysticism, which appears in the Eighteenth Sura of the Koran. The cave, which appears in this text, is seen as a symbol of the unconscious; the entry into the cave is the beginning of a process of psychic transformation which may result in a substantial personality change. Moral observations, which follow the legend, are considered as counsel to those who will not achieve transformation and who must substitute adherence to the law for true rebirth. Jung takes another example of Moses and his servant to explain the process of transformation. The catch and subsequent loss of the fish by Moses symbolises an incomplete contact with the nourishing influence of the unconscious. The appearance of Khidr in the legend is felt to represent the greater self, which can guide the ego consciousness toward increased wisdom.

The child motif as an archetypal image is noted to manifest itself as unity or plurality. When a number of children appear with no individual
characteristics, a dissociation of the personality as such is found in schizophrenia; while the appearance of the child as a unity is felt to represent a potential synthesis of the personality. The appearance of the child may be in the form of a god or hero, with the miraculous birth and early adversities common to both. The child god is seen as a symbol of the unintegrated unconscious; the child hero, combining human and supernatural qualities, is considered a symbol of the potential for individuation. The typical fates of the child figures are interpreted as symbols of psychic events, which occur during the entelechy (genesis) of the self as the psyche struggles toward wholeness.

The third archetype is the phenomenology of the spirit in fairy tales. In this part, Jung proposes the definition of the word “Spirit.” To quote Jung: “Spirit . . . is the principle that stands in opposition to matter. By this we understand an immaterial substance or form of existence which on the highest and most universal level is called ‘God’” (Collected Works of C. G. Jung 102). Jung, later, presents the historical description and mythical characteristics of the spirit. The great number of different definitions of the term in use today is considered to make it difficult to delimit any one concept; however, these definitions in combination are considered to provide a vivid and concrete view of the phenomenon. In the psychological sense, spirit is defined as a fundamental complex which
was originally felt as an invisible but dynamic living presence; this concept is seen to precede the Christian view of the spirit as superior to nature. The contrasting materialistic view, developed under anti-Christian influence, is based on the premise that the spirit is in fact determined by nature, just as the psychic functions are considered to depend on neurochemical phenomena. It is contended that while spirit and matter may eventually be revealed as identical, at present the reality of psychic contents and processes in themselves cannot be denied. The spirit is conceived as originally external to man; now, although it has been internalised in the consciousness, it is still creative rather than created, binding him and influencing him just as the external physical world does. It is seen as autonomous and therefore capable of manifesting itself spontaneously in the conscious.

The spirit archetype, like all other archetypes, is seen to have a negative as well as a positive aspect, expressed in the actions or appearance of the wise old man figure. The manifestation of the good and evil aspects is often found combined in one fairy tale, indirectly alluding to an inner relationship between the two.

Descriptions, interpretations, and examples of the manifestation of the spirit archetype in the form of an animal are presented. In many fairytales helpful animals appear with knowledge superior to men, or
wicked ones with superior power. A detailed analysis of one fairytale demonstrates the functioning of the animal figure in terms of its relationships with other archetypal symbols such as wholeness and polarity, and the privileged number of the quaternity. The interpretation of symbols in the fairy tale is discovered to be extremely complex, involving the animas and shadows of certain characters being personified in others.

The fourth and the last archetype that Jung mentions in his book, *Four Archetypes: Mother, Rebirth, Spirit, Trickster*, is the Trickster-Figure. The Trickster has multiple meanings such as joker, jester, clown, fool, fraud, prankster, picaro (rogue), poltergeist, confidence man (“con man”), medicine man (shaman), magician (sleight-of-hand artist), “spirit mercurius” (shape-shifter), simia dei (“the ape of God”), and witch.

A definition and history of the trickster figure, as he appears in myth and in emotional disturbance, are illustrated by examples of it in American Indian myth, alchemy, the Bible, and parapsychology. In his clearest manifestations, the trickster figure is described as a faithful representation of the absolutely undifferentiated human psyche, which has hardly left the animal level. In psychopathology the trickster figure is manifested in the split personality, in which, as collective personification of traits, may be better or worse than the ego that becomes active in the
psyche. The trickster figure is represented in normal man by
countertendencies in the unconscious that appear whenever a man feels
himself at the mercy of apparently malicious accidents; this character
component is the shadow. The myth of the trickster is explained to have
been preserved and developed for its therapeutic effect: the earlier low
intellectual and moral level is held before the consciousness of the more
highly developed individual to remind him of the past. The trickster is
defined as a parallel to the individual shadow, and the same trend toward
meaning seen in the trickster figure is felt to exist for the shadow.
Although the shadow appears negative, sometimes traits and associations
arising from it can suggest a positive resolution to conflict.

The Trickster plays malicious jokes on people only to fall victim in
his turn to the vengeance of those whom he has injured. He is described
“as a soul in hell” (Jung 178). The trickster wanders through the world
with humour and carelessness rather than fear. Behind the trickster’s
laughter and jokes is wisdom of the world. The trickster goes through a
civilizing process where he no longer blindly adheres to evil and his
behaviour becomes sensible and useful. The trickster never quite loses the
ability to play malicious jokes.

The trickster appears to be the opposite of the wise old man
because of his close affinity with the shadow archetype; however, we
should mention that he has a positive side and may even serve a healing function through his transformative influence. Jung remarks that “He is a forerunner of the saviour, and like him, God, man and animal at once. He is both subhuman and superhuman, a bestial and divine thing” (263).

Philip Wheelwright’s definition is particularly instructive:

Image of the archetype of mischievousness, unexpectedness, disorder, amorality, the trickster is an archetypal shadow figure that represents a primordial, dawning consciousness. Compensating for rigid or overly righteous collective attitudes, it functions collectively as a cathartic safety value for pent-up social pressures, a reminder of humankind’s primitive origins and the fallibility of the institutions. (Metaphor and Reality 188-189)

Jeanne Rosier Smith points out that myths,

as they appear in literature, can be read as part of an effort for human and cultural survival. The trickster’s role as survivor and transformer, creating order from chaos, accounts for the figure’s universal appeal and its centrality to the mythology and folklore of so many cultures. (Wheelwright 189)

While the trickster archetype has appeared in cultures throughout the world from time immemorial, he is particularly notable in African American and American Indian cultures.

Having seen various archetypes noted by Jung – the Persona, the self, the shadow, the anima, the animus, the mother, the Rebirth, the spirit
and the trickster, let us see some examples of archetypes that we notice in world literature.

### 1.2.5 Some examples of archetypes:

It is to be noted that the myth has its relationship to archetypes and archetypal patterns. Although people have their own distinctive mythology that may be reflected in legends, folklores, etc., myth is, in the general sense, universal. Furthermore, similar motifs or themes may be found among many different mythologies, and certain images that recur in the myths of people widely separated in time and place tend to have a common meaning or, more accurately, tend to elicit comparable psychological responses and to serve similar cultural functions. Such motifs and images are called archetypes. Stated simply, archetypes are universal symbols. As Philip Wheelwright explains in *Metaphor and Reality*, such symbols are:

> those which carry the same or very similar meanings for a large portion, if not all, of mankind. It is a discoverable fact that certain symbols, such as the sky, father and earth mother, light, blood, up-down, the axis of a wheel, and others, recur again and again in cultures so remote from one mother in space and time that there is no likelihood of any historical influence and causal connection among them. 

(111)
The following archetypes and the symbolic meanings tend to be widely associated. It should be noted that these meanings may vary significantly from one context to another.

**A) Images:**

1) Water: the mystery of creation; birth-death – resurrection; purification and redemption; fertility and growth. According to Jung, water is also the commonest symbol for the unconscious.
   a) The Sea: the mother of all life; spiritual mystery and infinity; death and rebirth; timelessness and eternity; the unconscious.
   b) Rivers: death and rebirth (baptism) the flowing of time into eternity; transitional phases of the life cycle; incarnations of deities.

2) Sun (fire and sky are closely related): Creative energy; law in nature; consciousness (thinking, enlightenment, wisdom, spiritual vision); father principle (moon and earth tend to be associated with female or mother principle); passage of time and life.
   a) Rising sun: birth, creation, enlightenment
   b) Setting sun: death.

3) Colours:
   a) Red: blood, sacrifice, violent passion; disorder.
b) Green: growth; sensation; hope; fertility; in negative context may be associated with death and decay.

c) Blue: usually highly positive, associated with truth, religious feeling, security, spiritual purity (the color of the Great Mother or Holy Mother)

d) Black (darkness): chaos, mystery; the unknown; death; primal wisdom; the unconscious; evil; melancholy.

e) White: highly multivalent, signifying, in its positive aspects, light, purity, innocence, and timelessness; in its negative aspects, death, terror, the supernatural, and the blinding truth of an inscrutable cosmic mystery.

4) Circle (sphere): wholeness, unity.

   a) Mandala: the desire for spiritual unity and psychic integration.
   b) Egg (oval): the mystery of life and the forces of generation.
   c) Yang-lin: a Chinese symbol representing the union of the opposite forces of the young and the yin (female principle, darkness, passivity, the unconscious).
   d) Ouroboros: the ancient symbol of the snake biting its own tail, signifying the external cycle of life, primordial unconsciousness, the unity of opposing forces.
5) Serpent (snake, worm): symbol of energy and pure force (libido); evil, corruption, sensuality; destruction; mystery; wisdom; the unconscious.

6) Numbers:
   a) Three: light, spiritual awareness and unity (the Holy Trinity); the male principle.
   b) Four: associated with the circle, life cycle, four seasons; female principle, earth, nature, four elements (earth, air, fire, water).
   c) Five: signifying integration, the four limbs and the hand that controls them; the four cardinal points plus the center.
   d) Seven: the most potent of all symbolic numbers – signifying the union of three and four, the completion of a cycle, perfect order.

7) The Demon Lover (the male counterpart of the Terrible Mother): the devil, Satan, Dracula (Blake’s “The Sick Rose” and the Jungian animus).

8) The Wise Old Man (Saviour, redeemer guru): personification of the spiritual principle, representing “knowledge, reflection, insight, wisdom, cleverness, and intuition on the one hand, and on the other, moral qualities such as goodwill and readiness to help, which make his ‘spiritual’ character sufficiently plain. . . . Apart from his cleverness, wisdom, and insight, the old man . . . is also notable for his moral qualities; what is more, he even tests the moral qualities of others and
makes gifts dependent on this test. . . the old man always appears when the hero is in a hopeless and desperate situation from which only profound reflection or a lucky idea . . . can extricate him. But since, for internal and external reasons, the hero cannot accomplish this himself, the knowledge needed to compensate the deficiency comes in the form of a personified thought, i.e. in the shape of this sagacious and helpful old man” (Jung, The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious, 217).

9) Garden: Paradise; innocence; unspoiled beauty (especially feminine); fertility.

10) Tree: A Dictionary of symbols defines tree, “In its most general sense, the symbolism of the tree denotes life of the cosmos: its consistence, growth, proliferation, generative and regenerative processes. It stands for inexhaustible life, and is therefore equivalent to a symbol of immortality” (Cirlot 328).

11) Desert: Spiritual aridity; death’ nihilism; hopelessness.

12) Mountain: aspiration and inspiration; meditation and spiritual elevation. “The mountain stands for the goal of the pilgrimage and assent; hence it often has the psychological meaning of the self’ (Jung, Archetypes, 219).
These examples are by no means exhaustive, but represent some of the more common archetypal images that the reader is likely to encounter in literature. The images we have listed do not necessarily function as archetypes every time they appear in a literary work.

B) Archetypal Motifs or Patterns:

Archetypes can be found in nearly all forms of literature, with their motifs being predominantly in folklore. The archetypes can be used for a sense of understanding as well as for a state of treatment. To quote Jung:

The archetype is a tendency to form such representations of a motif-representations that can vary a great deal in detail without losing their basic pattern . . . they are indeed an instinctive trend. The archetype of initiation is strongly activated to provide a meaningful transition . . . with a rite of passage from one stage of life to the next (518).

W. B. Yeats, in his book *A Vision*, mentions 28 archetypes. Tarot cards depict a system of archetypes used for divination of a persons’ fate or story. In the Noh plays of Japan, the characters are skilfully depicted with exaggerated expressions and elaborate costumes to clearly portray a system of archetypes. William Shakespeare is noted for popularizing several archetypal characters – Falstaff, the bawdy rotund comic knight; Romeo and Juliet, the ill-fated (“star-crossed”) lovers; Richard II, the hero who dies with honour; and many others. Although Shakespeare based many of his characters on existing archetypes from fables and
myths, Shakespeare’s characters stand out as original by their contrast against a complex, social literary landscape. Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* is often quoted in this regard.

1) Creation: perhaps the most fundamental of all archetypal motifs—virtually every mythology is built on some account of how the cosmos, nature and humankind were brought into existence by some supernatural Being or beings.

2) Immortality: another fundamental archetype, generally taking one of two basic narrative forms:

   a) Escape from time: ‘return to paradise,” the state of perfect, timeless bliss enjoyed by man and woman before their tragic Fall into corruption and mortality.

   b) Mystical submersion into cyclical time: the theme of endless death and regeneration – human beings achieve a kind of immortality by submitting to the vast, mysterious rhythm of Nature’s eternal cycle, particularly the cycle of the seasons.

3) Hero archetypes (archetypes of transformation and redemption):

   The archetypal hero appears in all religions, mythologies, and epics of the world. He is an expression of our personal and collective unconscious, as theorized by Carl Jung and Joseph Campbell. All archetypal heroes share certain characteristics. This fact has only come
into light in this century, after people like Joseph Campbell began comparing mythologies of the world.

Joseph Campbell in the “Hero With a Thousand Faces” defines a hero as follows:

a hero is any male or female who leaves the world of his or her everyday life to undergo a journey to a special world where challenges and fears are overcome in order to secure a quest, which is then shared with other members of the hero’s community. (94)

The development of the hero has changed with time. In its earliest form, heroes were associated with religion or god-directed. Later they were more secular or military as seen in Beowulf. Then with realism, they were realistic representations of their society. Today, many are antiheroes. There are subdivisions of the classic or epic hero such as epic hero, tragic hero, gothic hero, or romantic hero that developed over the period of time.

a) The Quest: here, the character(s) are searching for something, whether consciously or unconsciously. Their actions, thoughts, and feelings centre on the goal of completing this quest, for example, Christian’s quest for salvation in John Bunyan’s The Pilgrim’s Progress.

b) The Initiation: the hero undergoes a series of excruciating ordeals in passing from ignorance and immaturity to social and spiritual
adulthood, that is, in achieving maturity and becoming a full-fledged member of his or her social group. The initiation most commonly consists of three distinct phases: (1) Separation, (2) transformation, and (3) return. Like the quest, this is a variation of the death-and-rebirth archetype, for example: Ayla’s initiation both into the Clan and into adulthood in Jean Anel’s *The Clan of the Care Bear*.

c) The sacrificial scapegoat: the hero, with whom the welfare of the tribe or nation is identified, must die to atone for the people’s sins and restore the land to fruitfulness, for example, Snowball from George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*.

C) Archetypes as Genres:

In addition to appearing as images and motifs, archetypes may be found in even more complex combinations as genres or types of literature that conform with the major phases of the seasonal cycle. Northrop Frye, in his *Anatomy of Criticism*, indicates the correspondent genres for the four seasons as follows:

1) The mythos of Spring: Comedy
2) The mythos of Summer: romance
3) The mythos of fall: tragedy
4) The mythos of Winter: irony

Frye identifies myth with literature, asserting that myth is a “structural organizing principle of literary form” (341) and that an archetype is
essentially an element of one’s literary experience” (365). And in *The Stubborn Structure* he claims that “mythology as a whole provides a kind of diagram or blue print of what literature as a whole is all about, an imaginative survey of the human situation from the beginning to the end, from the height to the depth, of what is imaginatively conceivable” (Frye, *The Stubborn Structure*, 102).

1.2.6 Other Archetypes:

Jung said that there is no fixed number of archetypes, which we could simply list and memorize. They overlap and easily melt into each other as needed, and their logic is not the usual kind. But here are some, which he mentions:

Besides mother, there are other family archetypes. Obviously, there is father, who is often symbolized by a guide or an authority figure. There is also the archetype family, which represents the idea of blood relationship and ties that run deeper than those based on conscious reasons. There is also the child, represented in mythology and art by children, infants most especially, other small creatures. The Christ child celebrated at Christmas is a manifestation of the child archetype, and represents the future, becoming, rebirth, and salvation.

There are other archetypes that are a little more difficult to talk about. One is the original man, represented in Western religion by Adam.
Another is the God archetype, representing our need to comprehend the universe, to give a meaning to all that happens, to see it all as having some purpose and direction.

The hermaphrodite, both male and female, represents the union of opposites, an important idea in Jung’s theory. In some religious art, Jesus is presented as a rather feminine man.

The Temptress is the woman to whom the protagonist is physically attracted to and who ultimately brings about his downfall.

The outcast – He or she has been cast out of society or has left it on a voluntary basis. The outcast figure can be considered as a Christ figure.

The shrew – This is that nagging, bothersome wife always battering her husband with verbal abuse.

The task – A situation in which a character, or group of characters, is driven to complete some duty of monstrous proportion.

The loss of innocence – This is, as the name implies, a loss of innocence through sexual experience, violence, or any other means.

The King – (Emperor, Ruler, Leader, Chief) The King is an archetype of major proportions representing the height of temporal male power and authority. Both benevolence and cruelty in their extreme expressions are associated with this archetype.
Images such as “the fish” and its archetype were not adequately explained by Jung. The fish symbol is widely distributed throughout the mythologies and religions of ancient civilizations. Christ was born under the sign of the Fishes, with the sun in the sign of the Twins. The list of the archetypes is so long that it cannot be given for want of space. Jung developed a theory of archetypes, which combined, with that of the collective unconscious and attempts were made by him to use these associated theories to explain similarities in myths and archetypes found in widely varying cultures at different times.

1.2.7 Limitations of Jungian Theory:

The use of archetypes to illuminate personality and literature was advanced by Carl Jung early in the 20th century. Jung made use of a number of images, and these images express dreams and myths of human beings. However, the precise relationships between images such as, “the fish” and its archetype were not adequately explained by Jung. Many people have pointed out the difficulty of presenting a systematic analysis of C. G. Jung’s theory of archetypes. Davies realised that Jung could not offer the final answer in defining human personality and mankind. At the same time, Davies recognized the limits of Jungian archetypal theory and psychology. Davies and a number of critics pronounced to be a dull and conservative writer, using past forms of discourse and employing a preachy, authoritative voice. Jung has received less criticism than Freud
has; his theories are more positive, less reductive and mechanistic, not sexually based, and accord religion, art, and cultural expression a value in their own right. They also draw support from contemporary interest in alternative medicines, oriental religions, mysticism, and existentialism. Jung’s own writings are somewhat nebulous, however, and would probably evade scientific testing. As a therapeutic technique, Jungian analysis suffers from the drawbacks of Freudian, but has greater appeal to artists since it practices occupy familiar ground.

Despite his limitations, it is to be noted that it was Jung who opened the wide vistas of archetype.

The term archetype is brought into literary criticism from the psychology of Carl. G. Jung, who holds that behind each individual’s “unconscious” lies the “collective unconscious” of the human race. The contents of the collective unconscious are called archetypes. Jung also called them dominants, images, mythological or primordial images, and a few other names, but archetypes seem to have won out over these.

The archetypes have proved to be very useful in the analysis of myths, fairy tales, literature in general, artistic symbolism and religious exposition. They apparently capture some of the basic “units” of our self-expression. The archetypes actually refer to some structures of the human mind. After all, from the physiological perspective, we come into this
world with a certain structure: We see in a certain way, hear in a certain way, “process information” in a certain way, and behave in a certain way, because our neurons and glands and muscles are structured in a certain way.

1.3 SIGNIFICANCE:

The human psyche is forever striving towards greater individuation, seeking emotional and intellectual clarity in a world that seems to grow increasingly impersonal, contradictory and meaningless. The search for “self” fulfilment becomes all the more remarkable in the novels of the Canadian novelists because of their struggle for national identity and self-recognition.

In the present study, three trilogies are taken up for in-depth study—*The Salterton Trilogy*, *The Deptford Trilogy* and *The Cornish Trilogy*. In all these nine novels, Davies provides profound insight into the issues such as individuation, myth, knowledge, the collective unconscious and artistic creation. Few Canadian writers have been able to conceive of characters, possessing the whole, complex ambiguity of human beings as they do.

The study is significant in the sense that it goes into the very depth of the Canadian’s experience in Canada. The concept of self of the Canadians as emerging from the experience, dreams and achievements of
the characters as portrayed through myths, symbols and fantasies or simply the style and language of the narrative, reveals the collective unconscious. Thus, the effort to establish a new self-image from a psychological viewpoint adds to the diversity, richness and value of the thesis.

The study of the novels of Davies reveals the fact that Davies has been considerably influenced by the theories of Carl Jung. Themes such as mystical, magical and mythical are evident enough to show that Davies explored the passionate underlife of the Canadian people.

1.4 JUSTIFICATION:

The subsequent chapters analyse Robertson Davies’ three trilogies in the context of the theoretical perspective discussed so far.
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