

1

Senex and Puer: An Aspect of the Historical and Psychological Present

“But it is rather time,” saith she, “to apply remedies, than to make complaintes.”

– Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy*

We are living in what the Greeks called the *kairos* – the right moment – for a “metamorphosis of the gods,” of the fundamental principles and symbols. This peculiarity of our time, which is certainly not of our conscious choosing, is the expression of the unconscious man within us who is changing. Coming generations will have to take account of this momentous transformation if humanity is not to destroy itself through the might of its own technology and science.

– C.G. Jung, *The Undiscovered Self*

Our special problem today is just this: we are essentially primitive creatures struggling desperately to adjust ourselves to a way of life that is alien to almost the whole past history of our species ... the transition from primitive to sophisticated technology must be made swiftly – the resource problem demands that this be so. Today we are living at a unique moment, neither in the long primitive era nor in the better adjusted prosperous future. It is our century, our millennium, that must perforce take the maximum strain, for it is our fate to live during the transitional phase. And because we live in this special phase we find social difficulties, pressures, situations that defy even the simplest logical processes. We find ourselves in no real contact with the forces that are shaping the future.

– Fred Hoyle, *Of Men and Galaxies*

To have “no real contact with the forces that are shaping the future” (Hoyle) **[1]** would be to fail the *kairos* of transition. **[2]** To come to terms with this *kairos* would mean discovering a connection between past and future. For us, individuals, makeweights **[3]** that may tip the scales of history, our task is to discover the psychic connection between past and future, otherwise the unconscious figures within us who are as well the archaic past will shape the historical future perhaps disastrously. Thus the *kairos*, this unique moment of transition in world history, becomes a transition within the microcosm, within us each individually, as we struggle with the psychological connections between past and future, old and new, expressed archetypally as the polarity of senex and puer.

Psychology and History. A polar division between senex and puer is all about us outside in the historical field. We find good example of this in demography which has reached back to an archaic system: peoples are again divided along lines of age and youth. The principle categories of social structure – race, region, religion, class, occupation, economics, sex – are insufficient. Modern urban society emphasizes again the division according to age-levels. There are communities in the United States – new communities, not just the derelict hamlets from which youth has always fled where only “oldsters” live, entire cities of the retired, the “home for the aged” now extended over square miles. There are new suburbs in France where the average age of population is less than twenty-one. In Sweden, in Britain, in the United States, there are communities the size of towns where only young married couples live; and settlements, apartment houses, resorts for only the young or only the old. Two new fields of psychotherapy have been invented – geriatrics and juvenile delinquency – and we have specialists for the psyche of the old and of the adolescent. In this crowded world of our future, the division is between age and youth: on one side the established nations with slower, controlled birth-rates and aging population; on the other, the so-called newer, younger, and needy nations with high birth-rates and the proliferation of children reflected in a low median age.

The division is in the family as the conflict of generations, sometimes no longer a conflict of misunderstandings, but a silence. There is a division of communication systems between

age and youth: the latter learns today not through traditional forms and printed words but from altogether other media in our urban collective. Youth forms a social class, self-enclosed and uninitiated by its elders, and thus largely without communication outside of itself.

The division is in the political world with its aging leaders and systems attempting to maintain “law and order,” and the rebellions of youth in the name of “rights and freedom.” As one legal philosopher has put it: never in the history of the United States have we had so many laws, so much science of law and its enforcement, and never have we had so much disorder and violence.

The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed ...
The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.
Surely some revelation is at hand;
Surely the Second Coming is at hand, [4]

said William Butler Yeats in his poem, “The Second Coming.”

And theology, also riven by the senex-puer problem, having found God dead, both Father and Son, awaits some revelation. For when it is announced: “The King is dead,” immediately follows: “Long live the King.” At the same moment, the King dies and the Prince becomes King. If God is dead, what princely power is succeeding? Why the silence, and where the succession?

The polar division between senex and puer, falcon split from falconer, that is all about us is of course our historical concern. But it is not only historical and for the historian only. The psyche is not isolated from history, and psychology takes place not only in a small room between two people in two chairs walled off from the historical scene. History is in the room. And just as the psyche is situated in an historical present that trails behind it the roots of a thousand ancestral trees, so too does history have psychological existence. Mircea Eliade has shown that historical events, those accumulations of irreversible time, are not the primary facts of existence. [5] Historical facts are secondary; they are incomplete and imperfect actions calling for a before and after, historical consequences built on historical antecedents, and are, as such, only accumulations of sins and sufferings that are senseless unless they point inward to central meanings. The historical “facts” may be but fantasies attached to and sprouting from central archetypal cores. Below the tangled pattern of events are experiences, psychological realities of passionate importance, a mythological substrate that gives the soul a feeling of destiny, an eschatological sense that *what happens matters*. And it matters to someone, to a person. Without the person, without the individual’s sense of personal soul (that makeweight in the scales) we are simply pre-historic revenants with only collective destiny. Without the sense of soul, we have no sense of history. We never enter it. This core of soul that weaves events together into the meaningful patterns of tales and stories recounted by reminiscing creates history. History is story first and fact later.

The fantasy we call “current events,” that which is taking place outside in the historical field, is a reflection of an eternal mythological experience. An historical analysis of these events – old Mao and the Red Guard, the hippie flower youth, the sociology of ageing – will not lead to their meaning. We can no more grasp the soul of the times through the TV news than we can understand the soul of a person only through the events of his case history. (Twenty-two volumes of a Warren Report can never settle or explain the living ferment of a myth.) Nothing can be revealed by a newspaper, by the world’s *chronique scandaleuse*, unless the essence is grasped from within through an archetypal pattern. The archetype provides the basis for uniting those incommensurables, fact and meaning. Outer historical facts are archetypally colored, so as to disclose essential psychological meanings.

Historical facts disclose the eternally recurring mythemes of history and of our individual souls. History is but the stage on which we enact the mythemes of the soul.

The experiencing that makes history possible and is its *a priori* has been called Clio. And Clio, as first daughter, has a special relation to the mother of muses, Remembering. Clio's name signifies *gloria*, honor, celebration, and she remembers best the actions of heroes. Her interest is hardly in the daily news of the world's case history, or what Mircea Eliade calls "profane time." Rather her interest lies in those unique nuclear moments, the heroic moments through which the archetype at the soul's core is revealed, redeeming events from the blindness of mere fact. As we individuals are fastened to the facts of our personal case histories by what we remember of our personal lives, so is our culture addicted to the history of profane time. An addiction demands more and more, faster and faster. Much of our inventiveness serves merely making, gathering, and reproducing events. As the time of the millennium runs out, events speed up. We need more "information," we have less time to wait. We have even achieved "instant history," which Arthur Schlesinger defends by calling, "Contemporary History," where everything that happens to everyone on the public scene must be recorded and what is recorded must be published – and fast. [6] The profane *chroniques scandaleuse* – the profanities – of the heroes replace the *gloria* of Clio.

In analytical practice we have learned that an archetypal understanding of events can cure the compulsive fascination with one's case history. *The facts do not change, but their order is given another dimension through another myth.* They are experienced differently; they gain another meaning because they are told through another tale. So redemption from the addiction to profane history might come in the same way. This way would show another archetypal organization of the events from which we suffer. But this reorganization first requires a change in memory itself, so that one asks each day not "what happened?" but "what happened to the soul?" For this way of remembering events, memory needs to return again to its reminiscence of primordial ideas, to its original association with the root metaphors of human experience. Memory thus transformed would register first the experiences of the soul and only secondarily the accidents of events. Or rather, it could take up the events psychologically, ritually, no longer only their victim. [7]

This archetypal understanding could regenerate history in the sense of reversing it or cleansing it. Such work is immensely difficult, demanding that heroic intensity that Clio celebrates. For this reason analytical work on the collective levels of the soul is so "heroic." Psychological changes – changes of attitude, changes of personality, those fundamental illustrations of the soul – are also regenerations of history. Transforming my family's attitudes by uncovering patterns in the entwined ancestral roots is not merely a personal analytical problem. It is an historical step towards freeing a generation from a collective pattern. By changing that collective, there is a change in history itself. And each one, anyone, who makes a clearing in his bit of the forest of the past is the hero who redeems time and is the scapegoat who by taking on the sins undoes time. Thus are we makeweights in the historical transition and what we do with our psychological life is of historical import, not merely on the inner plane of salvation of the individual soul from history. More, it is the way in which history, as that which goes on collectively outside us, itself may be washed and healed.

Our polarities – senex and puer – provide the archetype for the psychological foundation of the problem of history. First, in the conventional sense, puer and senex are history as sequence and transition, as a process through time from beginning to end. And second, history as a problem in which I am caught, for which I suffer and from which I long to be redeemed, is given by the same pair as Father Time and Eternal Youth, temporality and eternity, and the puzzling paradoxes of their connection. To be involved with these figures is to be drawn into history. To be identified with either is to be dominated by an archetypal attitude towards history: the puer who transcends history and leaps out of time, and is as such

a-historical, or anti-historical in protest and revolt; or the senex who is an image of history itself and of the permanent truth revealed through history.

Our concern with the archetype of senex-*puer* is determined by the transition of millennia and it indicates the late stage of our culture. Curtius has amassed evidence enough from classical Latin literature to support his statements that the term “*puer senilis* or *puer senex* is a coinage of late pagan antiquity” and that where early cultures may extol youth and honor age, “late periods develop a human ideal in which the polarity youth-age works towards a balance.”^[8] Thus our concern is itself a reflection of the archetype now manifested symbolically in the culture around us and in the complexes of our inner world. And the constellation of this polarity *as a split* demonstrates the gravity of our historical crisis. Therefore our engagement with this archetype may restore a balance and have an effect on the historical lysis.

We are not concerned with the case history of our times and its anarchy, with the psychology of aging, of revolt and tradition, of youth, of fathers and sons, of stages of life, and such “timely topics.” These are diversions. The soul is neither young nor old – or it is both. Our contemporary obsession with age and youth reflects the fall of the soul into the time and measurement system of historical materialism. Behind it all is an archetypal split. Therefore our concern must be with archetypal therapy or therapy of an archetype. And our approach must be radical if we would put history back into the psyche. Thus we take historical problems as psychological symptoms in order to contain the speeding and spreading of these events. We shall try to hold them as psychological problems, regarding the splits in which we are caught as manifestations of an archetypal split within our individual souls.

Furthermore, because of its special relation with time as process, *this specific archetype will be involved with the process character of any complex*, with the youth and age, the temporality and eternity conundrums of any psychological attitude or part of personality. Senex and *puer* are bound up with the very nature of development. Any attitude as it comes into being can take on the wings of the *puer* and streak skyward; any attitude as it passes its ripeness can lose touch with revelation, cling to its power, and be out of Tao. Lao Tzu says: “After things reach their prime, they begin to grow old, which means being contrary to Tao ...”^[9] Our *puer* attitudes are not bound to youth, nor are our senex qualities reserved for age. The complete coincidence of psychological development and the biological course of life is yet to be established. The psyche seems to have its own course, its own timing. The senex as well as the *puer* may appear at many phases and may influence any complex. So we cannot fit psychological life into the historical conditions or the narrowly biological frames of a “first-half/second-half.” To do so would be an early indication that we have ourselves too easily succumbed to the faulted thinking of the split archetype.

If we look about us we see too well that the first-half/second-half scheme simply does not fit. Can the generation that is now to make the transition of the millennium put off until “some time later” the issues of meaning, of religion, of selfhood, meanwhile adapting to sociological and biological norms that have been handed them by another age and have lost their inherent value? A young person today is pressed to take up the problems of the second-half in the first-half. He has been born into a second-half, into the end of an age (as those of us who are older are forced to live a first-half of the wholly new spirit of the next age which is now beginning). We have not only our own problems; we have by historical necessity the collective problem of individuation loaded onto us. We carry a pack of history on our backs and are expected to meet the requirements of an old culture. Thus we start out as a *puer senilis*, both older than our age and struggling heroically against our oldness.

The “*puer* problem” of today is not only a collective neurosis; it is a psychic expression of an historical claim, and as such is a call. If psychic energy is not able to flow through the

usual external channels of tradition, it falls inward and activates the unconscious. The unconscious as “mother” makes it then appear as if all a young person’s questioning and mal-adaptation were his own personal mother-complex. But it is a reflection of the transition and, as Jung says, “not of our conscious choosing.” It reflects “the unconscious man within us who is changing.” Can this unconscious man be put off until the second-half?

The second-half is with us from the beginning, as is Saturn in our birth charts, just as the little boy and his question “why,” the child Eros, and the winged angel are with us to the last. The puer inspires the blossoming of things; the senex presides over the harvest. But flowering and harvest go on intermittently throughout life. And do we know finally who takes charge at death – greybeard with his scythe or the young angel?

Polarities in Analytical Psychology. Since it will be in the form of a polar split that we shall encounter the archetype puer-senex, we need first to regard polarities, in general, in analytical psychology. Analytical psychology as a structured field depends for this structure upon polar descriptions. Jung’s life and thought makes more use of polarities than does any other major psychological vision. [\[10\]](#) The polar model is basic in all his major psychological ideas. [\[11\]](#)

In all of this, the primary poles are conscious and unconscious, whether conceived as topological areas, as modalities of being, or as adjectival descriptions of mental contents and behavior. For psychology, all polarities are subjected to this primary division. This primary polarity, however, is given only as a potential within the archetype, which theoretically is not divided into poles. The archetype per se is ambivalent and paradoxical, embracing both spirit and nature, psyche and matter, consciousness and unconsciousness; in it the yea and nay are one. There is neither day nor night, but rather a continual dawning. The inherent opposition within the archetype splits into poles when it enters ego-consciousness. Day breaks with the ego; night is left behind. Our usual daily consciousness grasps only one part and makes it into a pole. *For psychology, the ontological basis of polarity is ego-consciousness.*

For every bit of light that we grasp out of archetypal ambivalence, illumining with the candle of our ego a bright circle of awareness, we also darken the remainder of the room. At the same moment that we light the candle we create “outer darkness,” as if the light were a theft from the penumbra of dawn and twilight, of paradoxical archetypal light. Consciousness and the unconscious are created into a polarity at the same moment out of original twilight states; and they are continually being created at the same moment. The process of making conscious thereby also makes unconscious, or as Jung put this awkward truth: “So we come to the paradoxical conclusion that there is no conscious content which is not in some other respect unconscious. Maybe, too, there is no unconscious psychism which is not at the same time conscious.” [\[12\]](#) We may not speak therefore of an evolutionary process of light emerging from darkness, an extension of light at the expense of darkness. The light is not stolen from the dark where there is privation of light; rather the ego concentrates into one pole the divine primordial half-light, thereby also darkening the divine. Snuff the candle and the twilight dawns again at the outer edges of the room which just before were impenetrable recesses of shadow. In other words, for psychology the phenomenon of polarity is not archetypally primary, but is a consequent of the ego’s affinity for light, just as the term *polarity* entered Western language with the Cartesian ego and the Enlightenment. [\[13\]](#)

As long as we remain within metaphors of light and vision, it does not matter which comes first or which is best. The metaphors of vision, of intuition, require neither logic nor value. Clarity is enough. Both poles of the archetype are necessary and equal. On this plane of vision, of intuition, one is beyond the opposites, beyond good and evil. But consciousness and unconsciousness require other metaphors, especially those of value. So we find that the basic yea and nay as positive and negative values in all their modes interfere and complicate a simple co-existing polarity. The Bible’s God, in the first value judgment of the universe,

declares light to be good, and by calling it Day and by separating it from the darkness of Night implies that the latter is not good. Thus are plus and minus signs attached to the primary poles of conscious and unconscious. Thus does the human world begin when feeling values add complexity to perception, and we *feel* the polarities and recognize moral choice.

So when we speak of consciousness we still tend to say good or bad consciousness, attributing at the same time the opposite sign to the unconscious. This tendency works for every pair of opposites. The view and value we have of one pair of a polarity is taken from within the standpoint of the other. Owing to the nature of consciousness as a polarity with the unconscious, we can never be wholly outside our own unconsciousness. Thus, too, the so-called objective standpoint of the conscious observer is actually from within the same archetype but from the opposite pole of it. Does not the most penetrating revelation of the negative senex come from his own son? Is not the most objective critic of the negative puer his own father?

Puer and senex are therefore each both positive and negative. Because these figures are in special relation forming, if you will, a two-headed archetype, or a *Janus-Gestalt*, we shall find it impossible to say good of one without saying bad of the other as long as the two remain in polar opposition, as long as the ego wears only one face.

Nevertheless, though polarities may split into contradictories and even strive against each other as in all the classic puer-senex struggles, they may also be re-approximated. This rapprochement in order to heal a fundamental split is the main work of psychoanalysis. *Our attempt at rapprochement shall go by way of returning to the original condition of the archetype before it has been broken apart and turned against itself.*

May I insist here that we cannot over-estimate the importance of this rapprochement. It is worth every attempt, not for the success or cure that it might bring, but because each attempt makes us aware of the split and thereby begins healing. The division into mutually indifferent or repugnant polarities is tearing the soul apart. The soul itself stands amidst all sorts of opposites as the “third factor.” It has always existed half-way between Heaven and Hell, spirit and flesh, inner and outer, individual and collective – or, these opposites have been held together within its unfathomed reaches. From the lyre of Heraclitus to the spectrum of Jung, the soul holds polarities in harmony. It is the psychic connection. But now the ego, having replaced the soul as the center of the conscious personality, cannot hold the tension. With its disjunctive rationalism it makes divisions where the soul gives feeling connections and mythic unities. So the soul has come unstrung; its suffering and illness reflect the torn condition of the split archetype.

As an early sign of this reunion we may expect a new experience of ambivalence. Psychology usually gives to ambivalence a major pejorative judgment. It is associated with schizophrenia. Like the term “twilight state,” “ambivalence” tends to be reserved only for a faulty ego. But *ambivalence is natural*, as the necessary concomitant to the ambiguity of psychic wholeness whose light is in a twilight state. Neither ambivalence nor twilight consciousness is per se a pathological condition even though, as with anything psychological, they may present pathological forms. Living in ambivalence is living where yea and nay, light and darkness, right action and wrong, are held closely together and are difficult to distinguish. Psychology usually attempts to meet this condition through reaffirming consciousness by decision and differentiation: solidify and strengthen the ego; turn against the mixture of feelings and the indistinct soft light of the first-half or of old age. But ambivalence, rather than being overcome in this manner, may be developed within its own principle. It is a way in itself.

As there is a way of decision, there is also a way of ambivalence; and this way can comprehend the archetype in its wholeness, leading one down even to the psychoid [14] level. Ambivalence rather than corrected may be encouraged towards encompassing ever more

profound paradoxes and symbols, which always release ambivalent feelings that hinder clarity and decisiveness. Paradox and symbol express the co-existence of polarity, the fundamental two-headed duality that is both logically absurd and symbolically true. *Ambivalence is the adequate reaction of the whole psyche* to these whole truths. To cure away ambivalence removes the eye with which we can perceive the paradox, whereas bearing ambivalence places us within symbolic reality where we perceive both faces at once, even exist as two realities at once. That which is not split does not have to be rejoined; thus going by way of ambivalence circumvents *coniunctio* efforts of the ego, because by bearing ambivalence one is in the *coniunctio* itself as the tension of opposites. This way works at wholeness not in halves but through wholeness from the start. The way is slower, action is hindered, and one fumbles foolishly in the half-light and the symbolic. The way finds echo in many familiar phrases from Lao Tzu, but especially: “Soften the light, become one with the dusty world.” [15]

The Senex. Let us begin with a prayer to Saturn, an Arabic one from the *Picatrix* of the tenth century, which circulated widely in the late Middle Ages of Western Europe:

O Master of sublime name and great power, supreme Master; O Master Saturn: Thou, the Cold, the Sterile, the Mournful, the Pernicious; Thou, whose life is sincere and whose word sure; Thou, the Sage and Solitary, the Impenetrable; Thou, whose promises are kept; Thou who art weak and weary; Thou who hast cares greater than any other, who knowest neither pleasure nor joy; Thou, the old and cunning, master of all artifice, deceitful, wise, and judicious; Thou who bringest prosperity or ruin and makest men to be happy or unhappy! I conjure Thee, O Supreme Father, by Thy great benevolence and Thy generous bounty, to do for me what I ask ... [16]

Appropriately, our starting point is duplex. Kronos-Saturn is on one hand:

... a benevolent God of agriculture ... the ruler of the Golden Age when men had abundance of all things ... the lord of the Islands of the Blessed ... and the building of cities ... On the other hand he was the gloomy, dethroned, and solitary god conceived as “dwelling at the uttermost end of land and sea,” “exiled ... ruler of the nether gods” ... prisoner or bondsman in ... Tartarus ... the god of death and the dead. On the one hand he was the father of gods and men, on the other hand the devourer of children, eater of raw flesh, the consumer of all, who “swallowed up all the gods” ... [17]

According to the Warburg Institute’s authoritative study of Saturn, in no Greek god-figure is the dual aspect so real, so fundamental, as in the figure of Kronos, so that even with the later additions of the Roman Saturn who “was originally not ambivalent but definitely good,” the compounded image remains at core bi-polar. Saturn is at once archetypal image for wise old man, solitary sage, the *lapis* as rock of ages with all its positive moral and intellectual virtues, and for the Old King, [18] that castrating castrated ogre. He is the world as builder of cities and the not-world of exile. At the same time that he is father of all he consumes all; by living on and from his fatherhood he feeds himself insatiably from the bounty of his own paternalism. *Saturn is image for both positive and negative senex.*

We turned to the *Picatrix*, [19] a popular astro-magical text for a first description of the senex because astrology provides the best descriptions of character qualities. More than any other field, astrology gives background for the psychology of personality when personality is conceived as a collection of stable traits. This fixed characterological view, personality conceived through heredity, disposition, virtues and vices, is less to be found in personality theory and psychopathology today. Personality theory and psychopathology tend to favor psycho-dynamics, learning theory, conditioning and behaviorism, and at times so extremely that even endogenic and structural disorders have been considered not as inherent traits but as reaction formations. [20] The astrological view of personality is saturnine, and Saturn is the “ruler” of astrology. The psycho-dynamic view is mercurial: nothing is given and everything can be transformed; all limits may be overcome and conditions may be altered through re-learning, behavior therapy, drive reinforcement, and psycho-dynamics. The impetus behind therapy itself owes more to mercurial optimism and less to the saturnine attitude of fateful

limits set by character traits where psychic disposition is congenital. Congenital means synchronous with birth, that is, astrological.

But the pessimism of Saturn has deeper implications. Although the virtues and vices of character may be modified, they do not disappear through cure because they belong to one's nature as the original gift of sin. Congenital structure is karma; character is fate. Thus personality descriptions of the senex given by astrology will be statements of the senex by the senex. It is a description from the inside, a self-description of the bound and fettered condition of human nature set within the privation of its characterological limits and whose wisdom comes through suffering these limits.

From astrology, then, from the medicine of the humors, from lore and iconography, from the collections of the mythographers, we can piece together the major characteristics of Kronos-Saturn as archetypal image of the senex. [21] His duality we have already mentioned. In astrology this duality was traditionally handled by the examination of Saturn's place in the birth-chart. In this way, the good and bad poles inherent to his nature could be kept distinct. His temperament is *cold*. Coldness can be expressed also as *distance*; the lonely wanderer set apart, out-cast. Coldness is also cold reality, things just as they are; and yet Saturn is at the far-out edge of reality. As lord of the nethermost, he views the world from the outside, from such depths of distance that he sees it, so to speak, all upside down, yet structurally and abstractly. The concern with structure and abstraction makes him the principle of *order*, whether through time, or hierarchy, or exact science and system, or limits and borders, or power, or inwardness and reflection, or earth and the forms it gives. The cold is also *slow*, heavy, leaden, and dry or rheumy moist, but always the *coagulator* through denseness, slowness, and weight expressed by the mood of sadness, depression, or melancholia. Thus he is black, winter, and the night, yet heralds through his day, Saturday, the return of the holy Sunday light. His relation to *sexuality* is again dual: on the one hand he is patron of eunuchs and celibates, being dry and impotent; on the other hand he is represented by the dog and the lecherous goat, and is a fertility god as inventor of agriculture, a god of earth and peasant, the harvest and Saturnalia, a ruler of fruit and seed. But the harvest is a *hoard*; the ripened end-product and in-gathering again can be dual. Under the aegis of Saturn it can show qualities of greed and tyranny, where in-gathering means holding and the purse of miserliness, making things last through all time. (Saturn governs coins, minting, and wealth.) Here we find the characteristics of avarice, gluttony, and such rapaciousness that Saturn is *bhoga* (Hindu), "eating the world," and identified with Moloch [22] – which again on its positive side demands the extreme *sacrifice* and can be understood as Abraham and Moses, the patriarchal mentor who demands the extreme.

His relationship to the *feminine* has been put in a few words: those born under Saturn "do not like to walk with women and pass the time." "They are never in favor with woman or wife." So Saturn is in association with widowhood, childlessness, orphanhood, child-exposure, and he attends childbirth so as to be able to eat the newborn, as everything new coming to life can become food to the senex. Old attitudes and habits assimilate each new content; everlastingly changeless, it eats its own possibilities of change.

His *moral aspects* are two-sided. He presides over honesty in speech – and deceit; over secrets, silence – and loquaciousness and slander; over loyalty and friendship – and selfishness, cruelty, cunning, thievery and murder. He makes both honest reckoning and fraud. He is god of manure, privies, dirty linen, bad wind, and is also cleanser of souls. His *intellectual qualities* include the inspired genius of the brooding melancholic, creativity through contemplation, deliberation in the exact sciences and mathematics, as well as the highest occult secrets such as angelology, theology, and prophetic furor. He is the aged Indian on the elephant, [23] the wise old man and "creator of wise men," as Augustine ironically called him in his anti-pagan polemic, which used Saturn for whipping-boy. [24]

This amplification may give a phenomenological description of an archetype, but it is not psychology. Psychology may be based on archetypal themata, but psychology proper begins only when these dominants, experienced as emotional realities through and within our complexes, are felt to pull and shape our lives. The senex is at the core of *any complex* or governs *any attitude* when these psychological processes pass to end-phase. We expect it to correspond to biological senescence, just as many of its images: dryness, night, coldness, winter, harvest, are taken from the processes of time and of nature. To speak accurately, however, the senex archetype transcends mere biological senescence and is given from the beginning as a potential of order, meaning, and teleological fulfillment – and death – within all the psyche and all its parts. So the death that the senex brings is not only bio-physical. It is the death that comes through perfection and order. It is the death of accomplishment and fulfillment, a death which grows in power within any complex or attitude as that psychological process matures through consciousness into order, becoming habitual and dominant – and therefore unconscious again. Paradoxically, we are least conscious where we are most conscious. Where we are in our ego-efficiency, habitual, feeling most certain, ruling from within that which we know best, we are the least reflectively aware. Close to the light our sight is shortest. Our destructivity is felt in the closest neighborhood and is the result of the shadow that issues from the very ego-center of our light. Out of its own light, the ego makes shadow; the ego is its own shadow; perhaps the ego is shadow. So the senex represents just this force of death that is carried by the glittering hardness of our own ego-certainty, the ego-concentricity that can say “I know” – for it does know, and this knowledge is power. It is also dry and cold, and its boundaries are set as if by its own precision instruments.

The hardening process of consciousness has been represented by the symbol of the Old King. [25] The Old King with his sickness is an alchemical image for the negative *lapis*, the *lapis* as petrification. This end-phase has also been formulated mainly as a consequent of the absent feminine, resulting in dryness and coldness. Consciousness is out of touch with life. The elixir does not flow and the negative tincture stains the surrounding with blight. The main blame for this condition of the senex has been laid upon the ego, which often gets a moralistic-pedagogical rap over the knuckles for “wrong attitudes.” It is the ego’s fault that consciousness is ingathered to itself. It is the power-greed of the ego that makes its point of view tyrannical and its consciousness deaf. It is the one-sidedness or the over-rationality of the ego that cuts it off from the living.

Let us reconsider the relation between the ego and the senex. We have just seen from our amplification that it is the senex that in-gathers and hoards. It is the senex that *a priori* is the archetypal principle of coldness, hardness, and exile from life. As principle of coagulation and of geometrical order, it dries and orders, “builds cities” and “mints money,” makes solid and square and profitable, overcoming the dissolving wetness of soulful emotionality. It is the senex as certainty principle that directs the ego away from the uncertainty principle, the doubts and provisional confusions of dawn and twilight. No, it is not the ego that gives the senex its authority and ultimate tyranny, but the brief authority in which the ego is dressed depends upon its relation with the senex archetype. Even the ego’s notion of itself as authoritative dominant of consciousness results from the archetypal senex. The Old Wise Man and the Old King are there from the beginning, before the ego is born, governing the mysterious ordering aspect of ego-formation by meaningfully structuring contents into knowledge and extending the area of the will’s control. As Jung pointed out in discussing the “Stages of Life,” knowledge is the hallmark of consciousness and is at the beginning of ego-formation in the child. [26] This knowing precedes the ego that says “I know.” The cognitive capacity precedes cognition, which, in turn, precedes ego-subjectivity. The ego does not come *ex nihilo* onto the scene, cognizing the world into existence by turning its attention like a spotlight upon its surround. Rather, the ego is gradually formed “like a chain of islands or

an archipelago,” from pre-existent fragments of cognitive consciousness. [27] Something prior to the ego cognizes, gives meaning, and patterns into order this fragmentary twilight consciousness. This “something” has been called the Self, which is another name for the archetype of meaning, [28] or the Old Wise Man.

Thus we conclude *that the senex is there at the beginning as an archetypal root of ego-formation*. It makes consolidation of the ego possible, giving its rule as an identity within fixed borders, its tendency to omnivorous rapacious aggrandizement (“swallowing all the gods” and their ambivalent natural light) through the principle of association with consciousness, and its perpetuation through habit, memory, repetition, and time. These qualities – identity of borders, association with consciousness, continuity – we use to describe the ego, and these qualities are each properties of Kronos-Saturn, the senex. The senex as *spiritus rector* bestows the certainty of the spirit, so that one is led to state that ego-development is a phenomenon of the senex spirit that works at ordering and hardening within the ego with such compulsion that it must be – as well as the Promethean thrust of the Hero – an instinctual source of ego energy. Here we approach Freud’s notion of Thanatos.

Because the negative senex is not an ego fault it cannot be altered by the ego. The negative senex problem is not merely a matter of moral attitude (as if the ego should do better, be more modest or humble or “conscious”). Nor is it a problem of outdated ideas (as if the ego should keep up with the times), nor of biological vitality (as if the ego should keep fit and active), nor even of the absent feminine. *These ego problems are consequents rather than causes; they reflect a prior disorder in the archetypal ground of the ego*. This ground is *senex-et-puer*, briefly conceived as its order on the one hand, its impetus on the other. Together they give the ego what has been called its *Gestaltungskraft* or intentionality, or meaningfulness of the spirit. When the duality of this ground is split into polarity, then we have not only the alternating plus and minus valences given to one half or the other, but we have a more fundamental negativity, that of the split archetype, and its corollary: ego-consciousness split from archetypal reality, the gods.

We must further conclude that the negative senex is the senex split from its own puer aspect. He has lost his “child.” The archetypal core of the complex, now split, loses its inherent tension, its ambivalence, and is just dead in the midst of its brightness, which is its own eclipse, as a negative *Sol Niger*. Without the enthusiasm and eros of the son, authority loses its idealism. It aspires to nothing but its own perpetuation, leading but to tyranny and cynicism; *for meaning cannot be sustained by structure and order alone*. Such spirit is one-sided, and one-sidedness is crippling. Being is static, a pleroma that cannot become. Time – called euphemistically “experience” but more often just the crusted accretions of profane history – becomes a moral virtue and even witness of truth, “*veritas filia temporis* (truth is the daughter of time).” The old is always preferred to the new. Sexuality without young eros becomes goaty; weakness becomes complaints; creative isolation, only paranoid loneliness. Because the complex is unable to catch on and sow seed, it feeds on the growth of other complexes or of other people, as for instance the growth of one’s own children, or the developmental process going on in one’s analysands. Cut off from its own child and fool, the complex no longer has anything to tell us. [29] Folly and immaturity are projected onto others. Without folly it has no wisdom, only knowledge – serious, depressing, hoarded in an academic vault or used as power. The feminine may be kept imprisoned in secret, or may be Dame Melancholy, a moody consort, as an atmosphere emanating from the moribund complex, giving it the stench of Saturn. The integration of personality becomes the subjugation of personality, a unification through dominance, and integrity only a selfsame repetition of firm principle. Or, to reawaken the puer side again there may be a complex-compelled falling-in-love. (Venus is born from imaginal froth – i.e. the repressed fantasies – of dissociated sexuality cut off through Saturn.)

To sum up then with the senex: It is there from the beginning as are all archetypal dominants and is found in the small child who knows and says “I know” and “mine” with the full intensity of its being, the small child who is the last to pity and first to tyrannize, destroys what it has built, and in its weakness lives in oral omnipotence fantasies, defending its borders and testing the limits set by others. But although the senex is there in the child, the senex spirit nevertheless appears most evidently when any function we use, attitude we have, or complex of the psyche begins to coagulate past its prime. It is the Saturn within the complex that makes it hard to shed, dense and slow and maddeningly depressing – the madness of lead-poison – that feeling of the everlasting indestructibility of the complex. It cuts off the complex from life and the feminine, inhibiting it and introverting it into an isolation. Thus it stands behind the fastness of our habits and the ability we have of making a virtue of any vice by merely keeping it in order or attributing it to fate.

The senex as complex appears in dreams long before a person has himself put on his *toga senilis* (*aet.* 60 in Rome). It manifests as the dream father, mentor, old wise man, to which the dreamer’s consciousness is pupil. When accentuated it seems to have drawn all power to itself, paralyzing elsewhere, and a person is unable to make a decision without first taking counsel with the unconscious to await an advising voice from an oracle or vision. Though this counsel may come from a dream or revelation, it may be as collective as that which comes from the standard canons of the culture. For statements of sagacity and meaning, even spiritual truths, can be bad advice. These representations – father, elders, mentors, and old wise men – provide an authority and wisdom that is beyond the experience of the dreamer. Therefore it tends to have him rather than he it, so that he is driven by an unconscious certainty, making him wise beyond his years, ambitious for recognition by his seniors and intolerant of his own youthfulness.

The senex spirit also affects any attitude or complex when the creative contemplation of its ultimate meaning, its relation to fate, its deepest “why,” become constellated. Then the husk of any habitual attitude deprived of all outward power shrinks to a grain, but imprisoned in the little limits of this seed is all the *vis* of the original complex. Turned thus in on itself almost to the point of disappearing altogether, leaving only a melancholy mood of *mortificatio* or *putrefactio*, in the black cold night of deprivation it holds a sort of lonely communion in itself with the future; and then with the prophetic genius of the senex spirit reveals that which is beyond the edge of its own destructive harvesting scythe, that which will sprout green from the grain it has itself slain.

This duality within the senex itself that is imaged by the positive-negative Kronos-Saturn figure gives each of us those intensely difficult problems in our lives. How does the Old King in my attitudes change? How can my knowledge become wisdom? How do I admit uncertainty, disorder, and nonsense within my borders? How we work out these issues affects the historical transition since we are each a makeweight in the scales.

We might easily believe that the difference between the negative and positive senex is mainly a matter of the difference between the Old King of power and extraversion as a profane end-stage of the Puer-Hero, and the Old Wise One of knowledge and introversion as the sacred end-stage of the Puer-Messiah. But this simplification will not hold because we are involved with an archetypal structure that is not only dual as is the image of Kronos-Saturn, reflected by the universal duality of the senex dominants Chief and Medicine Man. (These figures stand for the inner polarity of the senex, the two ways of order and meaning, neither of which is positive or negative *per se*.) The simplification will not hold because *the duality of the senex rests upon an even more basic archetypal polarity: the senex-puer archetype.*

Thus the crucial psychological problem expressed by the terms “negative senex” and “positive senex,” ogre and wisdom, which concerns our individual lives and “how to be,” and which is determining the symptoms of the ageing millennium, arises from a fundamental split

between senex and puer within the same archetype. Negative senex attitudes and behavior result from this split archetype, while positive senex attitudes and behavior reflect its unity; so that the term “positive senex” or “old wise man” refers merely to a transformed continuation of the puer. Here the first part of our thesis reaches its issue: *the difference between the negative and positive senex qualities reflects the split or connection within the senex-puer archetype.*

The Puer. Unlike the term senex, analytical psychology uses the concept of *puer eternus* widely and freely. It appears early in Jung’s work (1912) [30] and has been elaborated in various aspects by him and by many since then. [31] We are especially indebted to Marie-Louise von Franz for her work on this figure and the problem. [32] The single archetype tends to merge in one: the Hero, the Divine Child, the figures of Eros, the King’s Son, the Son of the Great Mother, the Psychopompos, Mercurius-Hermes, [33] Trickster, and the Messiah. In him we see a mercurial range of these “personalities”: narcissistic, inspired, effeminate, phallic, inquisitive, inventive, pensive, passive, fiery, and capricious. Furthermore, a description of the puer will be complicated because archetypal background and neurotic foreground, positive and negative, are not clearly distinguished. Let us nevertheless sketch some main lines of a psychological phenomenology.

The concept *puer eternus* refers to that archetypal dominant, which personifies or is in special relation with transcendent spiritual powers. Puer figures can be regarded as avatars of the psyche’s spiritual aspect, and puer impulses as messages from the spirit or as calls to the spirit. When the collective unconscious in an individual life is represented mainly by parental figures, then puer attitudes and impulses will show personal taints of the mother’s boy or *filis du papa*, the perennial adolescence of the provisional life. Then the neurotic foreground obscures the archetypal background. One assumes that the negative and irksome adolescence, the lack of progress and reality, is all a puer problem, whereas it is the personal and parental in the neurotic foreground that is distorting the necessary connection to the spirit. Then the transcendent call is lived within the family complex, distorted into a transcendent function of the family problem, as an attempt to redeem the parents or be their Messiah. The true call does not come through, or is possible only through technical breakthroughs: drugs or death-defying adventure.

The parental complex, however, is not solely responsible for the crippling, laming, or castration of the archetypal puer figures. This laming refers to the especial weakness and helplessness at the beginning of any enterprise. Inherent in the one-sided vertical direction is the Ikaros-Ganymede propensity of flying and falling. [34] It must be weak on earth, because it is not at home on earth. The beginnings of things are *Einfälle*; they fall in on one from above as gifts of the puer, or sprout up out of the ground as daktyls, as flowers. But there is difficulty at the beginning; the child is in danger, easily gives up. The horizontal world, the space-time continuum, which we call “reality,” is not its world. So the new dies easily because it is not born in the *Diesseits*, and this death confirms it in eternity. Death does not matter because the puer gives the feeling that it can come again another time, make another start. Mortality points to immortality; danger only heightens the unreality of “reality” and intensifies the vertical connection.

Because of this vertical *direct* access to the spirit, this immediacy where vision of goal and goal itself are one, winged speed, haste – even the short cut – are imperative. The puer cannot do with indirection, with timing and patience. It knows little of the seasons and of waiting. And when it must rest or withdraw from the scene, then it seems to be stuck in a timeless state, innocent of the passing years, out of tune with time. Its wandering is as the spirit wanders, without attachment and not as an odyssey of experience. It wanders to spend or to capture, and to ignite, to try its luck, but not with the aim of going home. No wife waits; it

has no son in Ithaca. Like the senex, it cannot hear, does not learn. The puer therefore understands little of what is gained by repetition and consistency, that is, by work, or of the moving back and forth, left and right, in and out, which makes for subtlety in proceeding step by step through the labyrinthine complexity of the horizontal world. These teachings but cripple its winged heels, for there, from below and behind, it is particularly vulnerable. It is anyway not meant to walk, but to fly.

The direct connection to the spirit can be misdirected through or by the Great Mother. [35] Puer figures often have a special relationship with the Great Mother, who is in love with them as carriers of the spirit; incest with them inspires her – and them – to ecstatic excess and destruction. She feeds their fire with animal desire and fans their flame with promise of scope and conquest over the horizontal world, her world of matter. Whether as her hero-lover or hero-slayer, the puer impulse is re-inforced by this entanglement with the Great Mother archetype, leading to those spiritual exaggerations we call neurotic. Primary among these exaggerations is the labile mood and the dependency of the spirit upon moods. Again, they are described in vertical language (heights and depths, glory and despair) and we hear echoes of the festivals for Attis called *tristia* and *hilaria*. [36]

The eternal spirit is sufficient unto itself and contains all possibilities. As the senex is perfected through time, the puer is primordially perfect. Therefore there is no development; development means devolution, a loss and fall and restriction of possibilities. So for all its changeability the puer, like the senex, at core resists development. This self-perfection, this aura of knowing all and needing nothing, is the true background of the self-containment and isolation of any complex, reflected for instance in the ego's narcissistic attitudes, that angelic hermaphroditic quality where masculine and feminine are so perfectly joined that nothing else is needed. There is therefore no need for relationship or woman, unless it be some magical puella or some mother-figure who can admiringly reflect and not disturb this exclusive hermaphroditic unity of oneself with one's archetypal essence. The feeling of distance and coldness, of impermanence, of Don Juan's ithyphallic sexuality, of homosexuality, can all be seen as derivatives of this privileged archetypal connection with the spirit, which may burn with a blue and ideal fire, but in a human relationship it may show the icy penis and chilling seed of a satanic incubus.

Because eternity is changeless, that which is governed only by the puer does not age. So, too, it has no maturing organic face that shows the bite of time. Its face is universal, given by the archetype, and so it cannot be faced, confronted in personal confrontation. It has a pose – phallic cavalier, pensive poet, messenger – but not a persona of adaptation. The revelations of the spirit have no personal locus in personality; they are eternally valid statements, good forever.

Yet in this faceless form it captures psyche. [37] It is to the puer that psyche succumbs, and just because it is psyche's opposite; the puer spirit is the least psychological, has the least soul. Its "sensitive soulfulness" is rather pseudopsychological, and a derivative of the hermaphroditic effeminacy. It can search and risk; it has insight, aesthetic intuition, spiritual ambition – all but not psychology, for psychology requires time, femininity of soul, and the entanglement of relationships. Instead of psychology, the puer attitude displays an aesthetic point of view: the world as beautiful images or as vast scenario. Life becomes literature, an adventure of intellect or science, or of religion or action, but always unreflected and unrelated and therefore unpsychological. It is the puer in a complex that "unrelates" it, that volatilizes it out of the vessel – that would act it out, call it off and away from the psychological – and thus is the principle that uncoagulates and disintegrates. What is unreflected tends to become compulsive, or greedy. The puer in any complex gives it drive and drivenness, makes it move too fast, want too much, go too far, not only because of the oral hunger and omnipotence fantasies of the childish, but archetypally because the world can never satisfy the demands of

the spirit or match its ideal beauty. Hungering for eternal experience makes one a consumer of profane events. When the puer spirit falls into the public arena, it hurries history along.

And finally, as Henry Corbin has often pointed out, the puer eternus figure is the vision of our own first nature, our primordial golden shadow, our affinity to beauty, our angelic essence as messenger of the divine, as divine message. [38] From the puer we are given our sense of destiny and mission, of having a message and being meant as eternal cup-bearer to the divine, that our sap and overflow, our enthusiastic wetness of soul, is in service to the Gods, bringing eternal refreshment to the archetypal background of the universe.

So the puer personifies that moist spark within any complex or attitude that is the original dynamic seed of spirit. It is the call of a thing to the perfection of itself, the call of a person to his or her daimon, to be true to itself. The puer offers direct connection with spirit. Break this vertical connection and it falls with broken wings. When it falls we lose the urgent burning purpose and instead commence the long processional march through the halls of power towards the heart-hardened sick old king who is often cloaked and indistinguishable from the sick wise old man or woman.

The spark extinguished by this “heroic overcoming” leaves behind sad regrets, bitterness and cynicism, the very emotions of the negative senex. By conquering the parental complexes in the neurotic foreground, we smother the archetypal background. The puer suffers an enantiodromia into senex; he switches Janus faces. Thus are we led to realize *that there is no basic difference between the negative puer and negative senex*, except for their difference in biological age. The critical time in this process that is represented by the midpoint of biological life is as well the midpoint of any attitude or psychological function that ages but does not change. The eros and idealism of the beginning succumb to success and power, to be re-found, as we have seen from our examination of the senex, only at the end when power and success fail, when Saturn is in exile from the world – then eros as loyalty and friendship, and idealism as prophetic insight and contemplation of truth return.

In all this, the greatest damage is done to meaning, distorted from idealism into cynicism. As the spirit becomes meaning through senex order, so the puer is meaning’s other face. As archetypal structure, the puer is the inspiration of meaning and brings meaning as vision wherever he appears. A beginning is always meaningful and filled with the excitement of eros. Meaning expresses the invisible coincidence of the positive puer with the positive senex. The puer aspect of meaning is in the *search*, as the dynamus of the child’s eternal “why?”; the quest, or questioning, seeking, adventuring, which grips personality from behind and compels it forward. All things are uncertain, provisional, subject to question, thereby opening the way and leading the soul toward further questioning.

However, if persuaded into the temporal world by the negative senex, the puer loses connection with its own aspect of meaning and becomes the negative puer. Then it goes dead, and there is passivity, withdrawal, even physical death. These pueri are only flower-people like Hyacinthus, Narcissus, Crocus, whose tears are but wind-flowers, anemones of the goddess, and whose blood gives only Adonis-roses and Attis-violets of regret. They are flower-people who are unable to carry their own meaning through to the end, and as flowers they must fade before fruit and seed. Eternal Becoming never realized in Being; possibility and promise only. Or the negative puer may become hyperactive and we find all the traits accentuated and materialized, but without inherent meaning. When the falcon cannot hear the falconer, wingedness becomes mere haste and fanaticism, an unguided missile. A person is caught in the puer activities of social rebellion, intellectual technology, or physical adventure with redoubled energy and loss of goal. Everything new is worshipped because it gives promise of the original, while the historical is discarded because it is of the senex who is now enemy. Personal revelation is preferred to objective knowledge so that minor epiphanies weigh more than the classics of culture. Eventually meaning declines into a philosophy of the

absurd, action into the *acte gratuite* or violence, or intoxication, or flight into the future; and the chaos returns, which the puer as archetype is itself called to oppose. By refusing history, by pushing it all down into the unconscious in order to fly above it, one is forced to repeat history unconsciously. In the unconscious the senex position builds up with a compulsive vengeance until with all the force of historical necessity it takes over in its turn, reducing new truths to old clichés again, switching the only-puer into an only-senex, split from the next generation.

The puer gives us connection to the spirit and is always concerned with the eternal aspect of ourselves and the world. However, *when this concern becomes only puer, exclusive and negative, the world is itself in danger of dissolution into the otherworldly*. This danger is especially present in the psyche and history of this fraction of our era. [39] Therefore it is of immense importance that the puer be recognized and valued, for it carries our future – positive or negative – not necessarily as the next step in time, but as the futurity within every complex, its prospective meaning, its way out and way forward, as a possibility of renewal through eros and as a call to meaning built on the eternities of spirit. Therefore it is of immense importance that we attempt the healing of the archetypal split, which divides puer from senex, turning them into a negative antithesis, hardening the heart against one's own puer imagination, thereby demonizing one's angel so that the new, which comes into being through the puer, is demonic. When the archetype is split, the dynamus works independently of the patterns of order. Then we have a too-familiar pattern: action that does not know and knowledge that does not act, fanatic versus cynic, commonly formulated as youth and age. This negative turn happens not only in young people or in the first half of life or in new movements.

We must therefore deny again the usual separation into first and second halves of life, as presented for example by Jacobi, Fordham, and Dunn. [40] It dangerously divides puer and senex. Always the puer is described from within the senex-puer duality and therefore comes out negatively, which also implies a positive senex view of itself.

Let us look at the usual recommendations for the “first-half” of life, or “how to cure a puer”: analyze the unconscious, reduce the fantasies, dry the hysterics, confront the intuitions, bring down to earth and reality, turn the poetry into prose. The will is to direct sexuality into relationship; the crippling is to be overcome through the exercise of work; practicality, sacrifice, limits, hardening. The face is to be set, positions defended, the provisional overcome through the panacea of commitment. Concentration, responsibility, roots, historical continuity and identity: in a word, ego-strengthening. Note well: all these images are Saturnian.

Commitment as duty clips the wings and binds the feet, as Saturn is chained through his commitments. Ego-strengthening fosters a revolutionary unattached shadow that would smash all fetters, for the strong ego has the strong shadow, the brilliance makes its own blackness. This path of worldly commitment aims to sever the puer from its own vertical axis; it reflects a senex personality, which has not itself separated the parental from the archetypal and is thus threatened by its own child, its own phallus, and its own poetry.

However we conceive the tasks of youth, or of the beginning of things, they cannot be accomplished without the meaning given by the spiritual connection. Initiation into reality is not to take away the initiate's relation with the primordial origins but only to separate these origins from the confusions of the personal and parental. Initiation is not a demythologizing into “hard” reality, but an affirmation of the mythical meaning within all reality. Initiation “softens” reality by filling in its background with layers of mythological perspective, providing the fantasy, which makes the “hardness” of reality meaningful and tolerable, and at the same time truly indestructible. The puer figure – Baldur, Tammuz, Jesus, Krishna – brings myth into reality, presents in himself the reality of myth that transcends history. His

message is mythical, stating that he, the myth – so easily wounded, easily slain, yet always re-born – is the seminal sub-structure of all enterprise. Traditional initiation of the puer by the positive senex confirms this relation to the archetype. Some substitutes for initiation – and analysis can be one – may instead sever this relation.

Relation with any archetype involves the danger of possession, usually marked by inflation. This is particularly true of the puer because of its high-flights and mythical behavior. Of course, possession through the senex brings an equally dangerous set of moods and actions: depression, pessimism, and hardness of heart. Even a minimum of psychological awareness – that I am just what I am as I am – can spare complete archetypal possession. This awareness is made possible through the reflective, echoing function of the psyche. This function is the human psyche's contribution to spirit and to meaning, which noble as they may be can also be, without psyche, runaway destructive possessions. So the main puer problem is not lack of worldly reality but *lack of psychic reality*. Rather than commitment to the order of the world the puer needs to be wedded to psyche, to which the puer is anyway naturally drawn. Rather than historical continuity and roots in the horizontal, he needs devotion to the anima. First psyche, then world; or through the psyche to the world. The anima has the thread and knows the step-by-step dance that can lead through the labyrinth, and can teach the puer the subtleties of left-hand/right-hand, opening and closing, accustoming and refining vision to the half-light of ambivalence.

Let us not mistakenly take this as *Lebensphilosophie* or a psychological prescription for “cure” – i.e., only involvement with a real woman leads a man out of his mother-bound adolescent compulsions. We are discussing rather an archetypal structure, not “how to be.” Each “hot idea,” at whatever time of life in whomever, wherever, requires psychization. It needs first to be contained within the relationship to psyche, given the soul connection. Each complex needs realization and connection within the psyche, taming the puer's hot compulsions with the common salt of the soul. This salt makes things last and brings out their true flavor. The young and burning sulphur needs union with the elusive quicksilver of psychic reality before it becomes fixed and weighty.

This turning to the soul means *taking in our complexes out of the world*, out of the realm of senex power and system. Only this can slow the speed of history and technology and the acceleration of particle-men into bits of information without souls. It means that the search and questing be a psychological search and questing, a psychological adventure. It means that the messianic and revolutionary impulse connect first with the soul and be concerned first with its redemption. This alone makes human the puer's message, at the same time reddening the soul into life. [41] It is in this realm of the soul that the gifts of the puer are first needed.

The Union of Sames. With the phenomenology of the senex and the puer behind us, we now see that we have actually been describing a secret identity of two halves – two halves not of life, but of a single archetype. This secret identity should not astonish us, since a corresponding feminine union of sames (the Mother-Daughter mysteries) has been placed at the center of feminine personality. Archetypal representations of this single figure with double aspects are: Tages, the Etruscan God who was a grey-haired boy appearing out of the furrows of a plowed field; the Islamic Chidr, a beauteous youth with a white beard; and Lao Tzu, whose name means senex-puer, i.e., “Lao” = “old” and “Tzu” = both “master” and “child.” (Other literary and hagiographic descriptions of the puer-senex polarity in the same figure are given in detail by Curtius. [42]) Through Jung's work we also know of this union of sames: a) first, on a dangerous and primitive level in the figure of Wotan, both youthful and Kronos, [43] b) in the figures of Mercurius, [44] Dionysus, [45] and Christ, each as *senex-et-puer*, c) in Asklepios, *senex-et-puer* who heals, and d) in the alchemical King and King's Son as two faces of the same dominant. These mythological figures, representing the union of

sames which energize (Wotan), which transform (Mercurius, Dionysus), which heal (Asklepios), which renew (King-cum-King's Son), and which redeem (Christ), each state the psychological axiom that the archetype is timeless. It seems utterly unconcerned with aging, with historical accumulations; there is no conflict of generations since it is all generations at any moment. Ego-consciousness as the self-divisive instrument of the Self, its "father" or its "son" and thus its "enemy," instigates the factions and the differences. Thus does the ego act as the shadow of the Self.

We are also used to finding a secret identity in those we call in our offhand psychological jargon "typically puer" or "typically senex": the same self-willed petulance and resistance to change, the same ego-centricity and coldness of feeling, the same destructive effect on the middleground values of life, regarding them with scurrility, bitterness, and contempt. "Typically puer" or "typically senex" therefore means a possession through one face only. Again, because of the secret identity, it does not matter by which face one is possessed since they are the same. "Typical" therefore means "only," and the typical puer is identical with the typical senex; each is only puer or senex, not *puer-et-senex*. They are the same in a negative identification because they have lost the ambivalent consciousness of the union of sames. That tragedy of changelessness, of being "stuck," of being "unmoved" (expressed symbolically in "deafness," "heart disease," and "feet troubles"), is also accounted for by this negative identification. If the senex will not change and the puer cannot change (change requires listening, feeling, and going step-by-step), it is because the alpha-omega polarity has been negatively identified and thus obliterated. Without this polarity, which is at the essence of the archetype and holds its meaning together, there is perfection but no process, no movement from here to there, from past to future. A tension of ambivalent opposites is the structural pre-condition for change.

The critical age of change in an individual life is, as Jung noted, around its midpoint in the fourth decade. Then the archetype of the process of life – and life for the psyche is a symbol – can break into two halves, sometimes killing the physical life of the individual who is broken by this symbolic crisis. That critical midpoint, when the puer impulse so often "dies" or becomes converted to senex values, is less a biological fact than a psychic symbol. As such it is governed less by the physiology of life processes than by the archetype of the process of life. This archetype of puer and senex is therefore particularly constellated at the midpoint, when the two faces are so close to each other and yet seem to look in opposite directions. It can be of utmost therapeutic value for the individual to realize (not that one is "getting old" but) that one is in the midst of a symbolic situation characterized by ambivalence of feeling and attitude, and that fears and confusions are appropriate. This realization that one's psyche is now being governed mainly by a union of sames may save one from an only ego view of necessary oppositions and choices. The therapeutic key to the midpoint would lie in the secret identity of the two faces of the same archetype. By continuing true to one's past puer spirit and consciously affirming it, one has already assumed the senex virtue of responsibility and order.

We are able to establish this identity of the two faces not only through psychological observations. It can be confirmed as well through mythographical amplification. A review of the main characteristics of each half shows parallels in symbolic forms with the other:

The Holy Old Man as Attik [46] is concealed and as Saturn has his head covered or cloaked; Harpocrates, the boy, is hooded, faceless or covered; so, too, are Attis [47] and Telesphoros. Saturn has a sparse beard; Mercurius wears his first downy beard or a small beard. Saturn is taciturn and guards secrets; Harpocrates has his fingers to his lips. As Mercurius is winged, so can Kronos-Saturn, as Aion, or on tombstones, be winged. Both are related to the dead, to time and eternity, and to the Golden Age. On a tomb in the Vatican "Saturn appears sadly reflecting, like Attis on other tombs." Both are concerned with truth –

and with deceit, craftiness, and thieving. Their animals are the same breed: Goat and Kid, and sometimes Dog. Both show abnormality of the feet: Saturn is lamed and crippled; the feet of Attis are bound, and Mercurius has winged foot-gear and Achilles the vulnerable heel of heroic illusion. One cannot walk, the other can only fly. The deformity points to their each being only half of a whole reality. As Jung says, “they are separated by deformity.” Both Attis and Saturn show the castration motif and cold, cut-off satanic sexuality. For some, Mercurius is the principle of reason, governing astrology, mathematics, geometry, writing, knowledge, wisdom; for others, all these areas belong to Saturn. Both can be cold and dry. Saturn is lord of melancholy, yet Mercurius gives depression and worry. Harpocrates wears a wolfskin, and Mercurius, patron of merchants, shows the greed for gain; yet Saturn is the greedy one, miserly at home and rapacious abroad. Both are wanderers, both outcasts, and Saturn, who governs “magic and revels” (which could as well be said of the puer), is also against the bourgeois canons of society. As the puer is suicidal, Saturn presides over self-destruction. Both show an absence of the feminine, and both may have the ithyphallic attribute. The remoteness of Saturn at the *imum coeli* is matched at the other pole by the ascending puer Ikaros-Ganymede. Yet Ganymede the cup-bearer is also Saturn as Aquarian Water-Carrier, the sign of our new age; and in reverse, the alchemical mercurial spirit is buried deep in the bowels of the earth, in exile and stench, in the lowest of low. The vertical axis, which connects them, gives them the spiritual point of view: both see the world *sub specie aeternitatis*. The one sees through it from below, as criminal or peasant, having suffered it with the privative vision given of melancholy. The other looks down upon it from above and from within as the divine seed-spark that knows the true *eidōs* of all things. [48]

We seek this merger in our own lives. We seek a transformation of the conflict of extremes into a union of sames. Our time and its longing to be healed asks that the two ends be held together, that our other half so near to us, so like us as the shadow we cast, enter the circle of our light. Our other half is not only of another sex. The union of opposites – male with female – is not the only union for which we long and is not the only union that redeems. There is also the union of sames, the re-union of the vertical axis, which would heal the split spirit. Adam must re-unite with Eve, but there still remains his re-union with God. Still remains the union of the first Adam at the beginning with the second Adam at the end of history. This division, experienced as the chasm between consciousness and the unconscious, is in us each at the unhealed heart of the process of individuation. No wonder that our theme is so charged, that we cannot take hold of the senex-puer problem anywhere without getting burnt; no wonder that it cannot be fully circumscribed and contained. It cannot become clarified, for we stand in the midst of its smoke. Its split is our pain.

This split of spirit is reflected in the senescence and renewal of God and of civilization. It is behind the fascination with *Lebensphilosophie* and the comforting aphorisms of stages of life, which by taking the polarity as its starting point can offer no healing. [49] This split gives us the aches of the father-son problem and the silent distance between generations, the search of the son for his father and the longing of the father for his son, which is the search and longing for one’s own meaning; and the theological riddles of the Father and the Son. It tells us that we are split from our own likeness and have turned our sameness with this likeness into difference. And the same split is in the feminine as the spirit is represented in her by the animus, its poles that divide her and cause her to divide others, leading her into the either/or clarifications of the animus that but further new divisions such as love versus loyalty, principle versus abandon, or find her mothering the inspired puer or being the inspired daughter of the senex. The same split gives the frustrations of homosexual eros, the search for angelic beauty, the fear of ageing, the longing for the union of sames. We find it too in the insoluble difficulties of the master-pupil transference, the senex-teacher who must have a disciple and the puer-pupil who must have his image of the old wise man carried for

him. [50] This is the traditional way the spirit is transferred. Yet just this outer constellation reflects the inner division within each. Owing to the split archetype, a negative polarity is inevitably constellated. [51] This leads to the curse between generations, the betrayals, to kings and powers not sages and wisdom, and the inability of the master to recognize his pupil and give him blessing. The pupil then “slays the Old King” in order to come into his own kingdom, only to become an Old King himself in the course of time.

What might this union of sames feel like? How would it be were the polarity healed? We have only hints: some in concepts, some in images.

A primary image of the union of sames is given in that “most widely cherished Renaissance maxim” *festina lente* (make haste slowly). Holding the opposites together in a balanced tension was represented in countless emblematic variations summarized by Wind. The puer-senex or *paedogeron* was one major example of *festina lente*. Maturity in this ideal was not a negation of the puer aspect since the puer was an essential face of “two-fold truth.” [52]

Festina lente, in other words, presents an ego-ideal based on the two-faced archetype. It is an ideal that may be achieved, however, only by remaining consequently true to the puer aspect. To be true to one’s puer nature means to admit one’s puer past – all its gambols and gestures and sun-struck aspirations. From this history we draw consequences. By standing for these consequences, we let history catch up with us and thus is our haste slowed. History is the senex shadow of the puer, giving him substance. Through our individual histories, puer merges with senex, the eternal comes back into time, the falcon returns to the falconer’s arm.

The dynamus of one combines with the order of the other. The bipolar spirit becomes ambivalent, logically incoherent but symbolically cohesive, as we see in the paradoxes of mysticism. There will be a curious intermingling of time and eternity, as in nature. Temporal continuity, that causal chain of history, the basis of order and the basis of ego, is broken up or broken through by the eternal. The world of Saturn is pierced through with Mercurius; the silver-quick flow coagulated into solid moments: quantum jumps, spontaneous events, forgetting and foolishness, uselessness in the world of power yet full knowledge, unpredictable – “discontinuity,” as Erich Neumann called it. [53] Yet this is not chaos nor random destruction. Rather these ordered happenings within limits are vividly meaningful, happenings having their own meaning, a sense or non-sense that is not dependent upon before or after from which it may be discrete, discontinuous, or only in the same “topological space.” So the sense is given wholly by the experience itself as a gift of soul. And one feels through such experiences that there is meaning, that one is in meaning, that one is personally, individually meant. Let us call it meaningful discontinuity or the order of chance governed by fate, or call it living from the principle which Jung circumscribed as synchronicity.

Another hint comes from the paradoxes of knowing and not-knowing, the archetypal mystery, which is behind the phenomenon of dialogue. For dialogue does not rest only on the people who are involved, nor does their involvement rest on some existential para-concept. Dialogue, the union-forming effect of dialectic, the press within us to enter into dialectic to find knowledge and to discover meaning, is already embedded within the archetype of senex-puer relationship – that question “why” and that answer “I know.” For meaning is as much in the questioning as in the knowing, or as Jung put it in his autobiography:

The meaning of my existence is that life has addressed a question to me. Or, conversely, I myself am a question which is addressed to the world, and I must communicate my answer ... I also think of the possibility that through the achievement of an individual a question enters the world, to which he must provide some kind of answer. [54]

In answering one’s own question one is *puer-et-senex*. In questioning one’s own answer one is *senex-et-puer*. The two faces turned towards each other in dialogue. This unending dialogue with oneself and between oneself and the world is that which holds one in meaning.

Alchemy gives a further hint in one of the paradoxes of the *lapis*. The stone is not only hard as the senex face might view it, not only a jade of longevity, a diamond body of immortality. The *lapis*, as Erwin Rousselle [55] and Henry Corbin [56] have carefully elaborated, is the *puer eternus*. The end of the *via longissima* is the child. But the child begins in the realm of Saturn, in lead or rock, ashes or blackness, and it is there the child is realized. It is warmed to life in a bath of cinders, for only when a problem is finally worn to nothing, wasted and dry, can it reveal a wholly unexpected essence. Out of the darkest, coldest, most remote burnt-out state of the complex the phoenix arises. *Petra genetrix*; out of the stone a child is born, laughing, tender, unable. The stone, says Sir George Ripley, is “of so tender and oily a substance that it is apt to dissolve in every moist place.” [57] So it must be kept as sugar in a dry place. The *ceratio* makes it soft to the touch; lead, Mercurius, and gold have a kindred softness. Because it is wax-like and malleable, it takes the “type” easily, impressions can be struck and then wiped out, forgotten, history leaving no marks. At the human touch, at body temperature, the stone relaxes its form. Oily and fat, it anoints that which it touches, spreads blessing: *Christos, Messias*, anointed; the oily nature which “walks on water” and heals wounds. This stone of changeless substance nevertheless has discontinuity of form and face, of defensive borders. It is easily persuaded into positions and dissuaded out of them again. Though receptive to any imprint, it is not committed to any *eidōs* but its own substance. So, *of purus actus*, it is also purely acted upon and is thus a spirit indistinguishable from matter. Highly impressionable yet leaving no trace, it may take on any shape for a little while yet through warmth be ready to dissolve again. The coagulation is always subject to renewed dissolution, the senex certainty always provisionally puer.

These are hints of our healing. To get there where the spirit is whole, where meaning holds together, we have begun on a way of mythical images. There is an advantage in going this way towards archetypal healing, for myth is the language of ambivalence; nothing is only this or that; the gods and dancers will not stand still. They allow no sharp pictures of themselves, only visions. Besides, as Kluckhohn has paraphrased Lévi-Strauss: “... mythical thought always works from awareness of binary oppositions toward their progressive mediation. That is, the contribution of mythology is that of providing a logical model capable of over-coming contradictions.” [58]

Do we truly have a choice of ways? The binary oppositions, the polar coordinates, cannot be healed through an effort of mind and will, since the willful mind is the splitting instrument. We are incapable, as Hoyle said, [59] of solving the problems of the day with even the simplest logical processes. Any solution originating from the usual mind would be one-sided; it would be a solution imposed by either the senex or puer components of the ego. Thus the ego must first undergo an archetypal therapy of its split root.

The ego today is a “mind at the end of its tether.” All it can do is leave itself open to the possibility of grace and to a renewal which might then take place in its absence. In the *absence of ego* and into its emptiness an imaginal stream can flow, providing mythical solutions for the psychic connection or “progressive mediation” between the senex/puer contradictions. These mythical solutions will be unclear, ambivalent, foolish. Ego-absence will feel first like ego-weakness; the solutions will seem to regress rather than to advance the problem into new terrain. But at this moment of transition we cannot advance until we have first retreated enough inward and backward so that the unconscious figures within can catch up with us. We cannot bring healing to the split without their cooperation since it is from them that we are split. To elicit their cooperation we must go part of the way, into the penumbral world. [60]

First presented at Eranos and published in *Eranos Yearbook* 35 (1967). The paper was republished in *Art International* 15/1 (1971) and in *Puer Papers*, ed. J. Hillman (Dallas: Spring Publications, 1979). The first three paragraphs of the original paper may be found in Appendix A.

- 1** F. Hoyle, *Of Men and Galaxies* (London: Heinemann, 1965), 65.
- 2** See chapter 3 for a further exploration of *kairos*, especially in terms of opportunity and opening. – Ed.
- 3** “Makeweight” refers to Jung’s question: “Does the individual know that *he* is the makeweight that tips the scales?” Cf. CW 10:586. – Ed.
- 4** W.B. Yeats, “The Second Coming,” *Collected Poems* (London: Macmillan, 1952).
- 5** M. Eliade, *The Myth of the Eternal Return* (New York: Bollingen, 1954); *Images and Symbols* (London: Harvill, 1961); *Myth and Reality* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1964); *The Two and the One* (London: Harvill, 1965).
- 6** A. Schlesinger, “On the Writing of Contemporary History,” *Atlantic Monthly* 219 (1967), sec. 3.
- 7** For further discussion of this perspective see James Hillman’s *Healing Fiction* (Putnam, Conn.: Spring Publications, 2004). – Ed.
- 8** E.R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (New York: Pantheon, 1953), 98–101.
- 9** Wing-tsit Chan, *The Way of Lao Tzu (Tao-te ching)* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963), sec. 55.
- 10** Jung does, of course, use other explanatory models for psychic structure, such as: 1) *Schichtentheorie* and a hierarchical schema when describing levels of the psyche or when describing the process of individuation. 2) He uses a situational conditionalism – a major model of thought for the existentialists – when discussing therapeutics and interpretation. 3) He uses as well an organismic functional model when he accounts for the evolutionary, developmental, or transformative aspects of the psyche as a whole. 4) And, further, we find in Jung an atomist-molecular model when describing the associations and constellations of the psyche. These are each but one metaphor for seizing the ungraspable nature of psychic realities. The one which he favored most is that of polar opposites.
- 11** The main features of Jung’s polar model are as follows: 1) The psyche is primarily divided into conscious and unconscious, the relation between which is compensatory. 2) The energy of the psyche flows between two poles which can be variously qualified by opposites. 3) The attitudes of the psyche (introversion and extraversion) and the four psychological functions are described in polar pairs. 4) Instinctual pattern of behavior and archetypal image are polar ends of a spectrum-continuum. 5) There are recurrent themes of polarities such as: logos and eros, power and love, ego and shadow, spirit and nature, sexuality and religion, rational and irrational, individual and collective, container and contained, as well as the notions of two kinds of thinking, first-half and second-half, *les extrêmes se touchent*, etc. 6) Polarity is fundamental to Jung’s writings on practice as a dialectic and his writings about himself, e.g., personality number one and personality number two. 7) Finally, the major theme of his later years: the male-female polarity and union in its various alchemical forms. (*Eranos Yearbooks* 2:379–81; 3:248–53; 4:298–329; 20:408–10).
- 12** C.G. Jung, “The Spirit of Psychology,” in *Spirit and Nature: Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks*, ed. Joseph Campbell (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1982), 399.
- 13** O. Barfield, *History in English Words* (London: Faber, 1962).
- 14** Jung introduced the term “psychoïd” in 1946 (CW 8). It refers to that aspect of archetypal reality that suggests an overlap of psyche and matter.
- 15** *Tao-te ching*, 20, 55.
- 16** J. Seznec, *The Survival of the Pagan Gods* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961), 53.
- 17** R. Klibansky, E. Panofsky, and F. Saxl, *Saturn and Melancholy* (London: Warburg Institute/Nelson, 1964), 134.
- 18** P. Wolff-Windegg, *Die Gekrönten* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1958).

- 19** *Picatrix*, translated into German from the Arabic by H. Ritter and M. Plessner (London: Warburg Institute, 1962).
- 20** Recent bio-genetic determinism is returning to Saturnian physiological fatalism: e.g., we are our inheritance.
- 21** My condensation of traditional traits derives from: *Saturn and Melancholy*, especially 127–214; E. Panofsky, “Father Time,” in *Studies in Iconography* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965); *Picatrix*, 117, 209, 213ff., 333–35, 360.
- 22** *Saturn and Melancholy*, 135n and 208.
- 23** *Ibid.*, 204.
- 24** *Ibid.*, 161–64.
- 25** CW 14, sec. IV (Rex et Regina).
- 26** CW 8:754–55.
- 27** CW 8:387.
- 28** CW 9.1:66ff.
- 29** Cf. A. Guggenbühl-Craig, *The Old Fool and the Corruption of Myth* (Dallas: Spring Publications, 1991).
- 30** C.G. Jung, *Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido* (Leipzig/Vienna: Deuticke, 1912); CW 5:194, 392, 526; CW 9.2 (“Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype,” “The Psychology of the Child Archetype,” “On the Psychology of the Trickster Figure”); CW 16:336; CW 13 (“The Spirit Mercurius”); CW 11:742.
- 31** H. Baynes, “The Provisional Life,” in *Analytical Psychology and the English Mind* (London: Kegan Paul, 1950); M. van Leight Frank, “Adoration of the Complex,” in *The Archetype*, ed. A. Guggenbühl-Craig (Basel: Karger, 1964); H. Binswanger, *Vol de Nuit von A. de St.-Exupéry: Versuch einer Interpretation*, Diss., C.G. Jung Institut, n.d.; H.A. Murray “American Icarus,” in *Clinical Studies of Personality*, ed. A. Burton (New York: Harper, 1955).
- 32** M.-L. von Franz, *The Problem of the Puer Aeternus* (New York: Spring Publications, 1970); Commentary to *Das Reich ohne Raum* by B. Goetz (Zurich: Origo, 1962); “Über religiöse Hintergründe des Puer-Aeternus Problems,” in *The Archetype*, op. cit.
- 33** K. Kerényi, *Hermes der Seelenführer* (Zurich: Rhein, 1944).
- 34** For further discussion of this theme see Chapter 5. – Ed.
- 35** For more on this issue, see Chapter 4. – Ed.
- 36** M.J. Vermaseren, *The Legend of Attis in Greek and Roman Art* (Leiden: Brill, 1966).
- 37** E. Neumann, *Amor and Psyche* (New York: Bollingen, 1956).
- 38** Cf. H. Corbin in *Eranos Yearbooks* 17, 19, 25, 27.
- 39** This paper was written in the midst of the 1960s social revolution in Western societies. – Ed.
- 40** J. Jacobi, *Der Weg zur Individuation* (Zurich: Rascher, 1965); M. Fordham, “Individuation and Ego Development,” *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 3.2 (1958); I.J. Dunn, “Analysis of Patients Who Meet the Problems of the First Half of Life in the Second,” *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 6.1 (1961); also M.E. Harding, *The Parental Image* (New York: Putnam, 1965).
- 41** For a fuller treatment of this important motif see Chapter 2. – Ed.
- 42** Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, loc. cit.

- 43** CW 10:375, 393ff.
- 44** CW 13 (“The Spirit Mercurius”).
- 45** CW 5:184; K. Kerényi, *Dionysos: Archetypal Image of Indestructible Life*, trans. R. Manheim (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976); W.F. Otto, *Dionysos: Myth and Cult*, trans. R. Palmer (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1965).
- 46** G. Scholem, “Die mystische Gestalt der Gottheit in der Kabbala,” *Eranos Yearbook* 29 (1960), 175.
- 47** *The Legend of Attis in Greek and Roman Art*, 54n.
- 48** *Saturn and Melancholy*, 196–7; 213; 131–34; 157, 177–79; 203; 266n.; *The Survival of the Pagan Gods*, 294ff.
- 49** M. Eliade, “Dimensions religieuses du renouvellement cosmique,” *Eranos Yearbook* 28 (1959), 251.
- 50** Panofsky, “Father Time,” in *Studies in Iconography*, 75, 78.
- 51** CW 5:184.
- 52** E. Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* (Harmondsworth: Peregrine, 1967), 98ff.
- 53** E. Neumann, “Das Bild des Menschen in Krise und Erneuerung,” *Eranos Yearbook* 28 (1959), 42ff.
- 54** *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, 318.
- 55** E. Rousselle, “Seelische Führung im lebenden Taoismus,” *Eranos Yearbook* 1 (1933).
- 56** H. Corbin, *Temple and Contemplation* (London and New York: KPI and Islamic Publications, 1986), 169.
- 57** G. Ripley, “The Bosom Book” in *Collectanea Chemica* (London: Stuart, 1963), 141.
- 58** C. Kluckhohn, “Recurrent Themes in Myths and Mythmaking” in *Myth and Mythmaking*, ed. H. A. Murray (New York: Braziller, 1960), 58.
- 59** F. Hoyle, *Of Men and Galaxies*, 65.
- 60** The concluding sections of the 1967 Eranos lecture (“Of Milk ... and Monkeys”) can be found as the last chapter of Part Four of this volume. – Ed.