

Copyright Notice

Staff and students of this University are reminded that copyright subsists in this extract and the work from which it was taken. This Digital Copy has been made under the terms of a CLA Licence which allows you to:

- Access and download a copy
- Print out a copy

This Digital Copy and any digital or printed copy supplied to or made by you under the terms of this Licence are for use in connection with this module or course of study. You may retain such copies after the end of the course, but strictly for your own personal use.

All copies (including electronic copies) shall include this Copyright Notice and shall be destroyed and/or deleted if and when required by the University.

Except as provided for by copyright law, no further copying, storage or distribution (including by e-mail) is permitted without the consent of the copyright holder.

The author (which term includes artists and other visual creators) has moral rights in the work and neither staff nor students may cause, or permit, the distortion, mutilation or other modification of the work, or any other derogatory treatment of it, which would be prejudicial to the honour or reputation of the author.

Title of extract: **The History and Psychology of a natural Symbol**

Name of Author: **Jung, C.G.**

Title/Author of book/edition (if applicable): **The Collected Works of C. G. Jung Vol 11 part 1 Psychology and Religion. Jung, C. G.**

Name of Visual Creator or other acknowledgement (if applicable):

Journal details –title/Vol/Year (if applicable):

Publisher: **Oxford University Press**

Pages scanned: **64 - 105**

Course of Study (Module name and number): **Psychological Perspectives
AHAN7005**

Name of Designated Person
authorising scanning:

Date authorised: 02.08.12

Moodle/Powerpoint

E.L. Hams

which are not only transmitted by tradition and migration but also by heredity. The latter hypothesis is indispensable, since even complicated archetypal images can be spontaneously reproduced without any possible direct tradition.

The theory of preconscious, primordial ideas is by no means my own invention, as the term "archetype," which belongs to the first centuries of our era, denotes.¹² With special reference to psychology we find this theory in the works of Adolf Bastian¹³ and then again in Nietzsche.¹⁴ In French literature Hubert, Mauss¹⁵ and Lévy-Bruhl¹⁶ mention similar ideas. I gave only an empirical foundation to the theory of what were called formerly primordial or elementary ideas, "catégories" or "habitudes directrices de la conscience," "représentations collectives," etc., by undertaking certain researches into detail.¹⁷

In the second of the dreams we discussed before, we met with an archetype that I have not yet taken into consideration. This is the peculiar arrangement of burning candles in four pyramid-like points. The arrangement emphasizes the symbolic importance of the number four, by putting it in place of the altar or the iconostasis, where one would expect to find the sacred images. Since the Temple is called the "house of self-collection," we may assume that this character is expressed by the image or symbol appearing in the place of worship. The tetraktys—to use the Pythagorean term—does indeed refer to "self-collection," as our patient's dream clearly demonstrates. The sym-

bol appears in other dreams, usually in the form of a circle divided by or containing four main parts. In other dreams of the same series it takes also the form of an undivided circle, a flower, a square place or room, a quadrangle, a globe, a clock, a symmetrical garden with a fountain in the center, four people in a boat, in an aeroplane or at a table, four chairs round a table, four colors, a wheel with eight spokes, an eight-rayed star or sun, a round hat divided into eight parts, a bear with four eyes, a square prison cell, the four seasons, a bowl containing four nuts, the world clock with a disk divided into $4 \times 8 = 32$ divisions, and so on.¹⁸

Those quaternity symbols occur not less than seventy-one times in a series of four hundred dreams. My case is no exception in this respect. I have observed many cases where the four occurred and it always had an unconscious origin, that is, the dreamer got it first from a dream and had no idea of its meaning nor had he ever heard of the symbolic importance of the four. It would of course be a different thing with the three, since the Trinity represents an acknowledged symbolic number accessible to everybody. But four with us, and particularly with a modern scientist, conveys no more than any other number. Number symbolism and its venerable history is a field of knowledge utterly beyond the interests of our dreamer's mind. If dreams, under such conditions, insist upon the importance of the four, we have every right to call its origin an unconscious one. The numi-

nous character of the quaternity is obvious in the second dream. From this fact we must conclude that it points to a meaning which we have to call "sacred." Since the dreamer is unable to trace this peculiar character to any conscious source, I apply a comparative method in order to elucidate the meaning of the symbolism. It is of course impossible to give a complete account of this comparative procedure within the frame of this book. I must, therefore, restrict myself to mere allusions.

Since many of the unconscious contents seem to be remnants of historical mental conditions, we need only go back a few hundred years in order to reach that conscious level which forms the parallel to our unconscious contents. In our case we step back not quite three hundred years and find ourselves among scientists and philosophers of nature who are seriously discussing the enigma of the quadratura circuli.¹⁹ This abstruse problem was in itself a psychological projection of much older and completely unconscious things. But they knew in those days that the circle meant the Deity: "Deus est figura intellectualis, cujus centrum est ubique, circumferentia vero nusquam," as one of these philosophers said, repeating St. Augustine. A man as introverted and introspective as Emerson could hardly fail to touch upon the same idea and likewise quote St. Augustine. The image of the circle—regarded as the most perfect form since Plato's *Timaeus*, the prime authority of Hermetic philosophy—was also given to the most perfect sub-

stance, to the gold, to the anima mundi or anima media natura, and to the first created light. And because the macrocosm, the Great World, was made by the creator "in forma rotunda et globosa,"²⁰ the smallest part of the whole, the point, also contains this perfect nature. As the philosopher says: "Omnium figurarum simplicissima et perfectissima primo est rotunda, quae in puncto requiescit."²¹ This image of the Deity, dormant and concealed in matter, was what the alchemists called the original chaos, or the earth of paradise, or the round fish in the sea,²² or merely the rotundum or the egg. That round thing was in possession of the key which unlocked the closed doors of matter. As it is said in *Timaeus*, only the demiurge, the perfect being, was capable of dissolving the tetraktys,²³ the embrace of the four elements, that is, the four constituents of the round world. One of the great authorities since the thirteenth century, the *Turba Philosophorum*, says that the rotundum can dissolve copper into four.²⁴ Thus the much-sought-for aurum philosophicum was round.²⁵ Opinions were divided as to the procedure by which one could procure the dormant demiurge. Some hoped to lay hold of him in the form of a prima materia containing a particular concentration or a specially apt kind of substance. Others made efforts to create the round substance by a sort of synthesis, called "conjunctio"; the Anonymus of the "Rosarium Philosophorum" says: "Make a round circle of man and woman, extract therefrom a quadrangle and from it a triangle.

Make the circle round and thou shalt have the Philosopher's Stone."²⁶

This marvelous stone was symbolized as a perfect living being of hermaphroditic nature corresponding to the Empedoclean σφαῖρος, the εὐδαιμονέστατος θεός and the all-round bisexual man of Plato.²⁷ As early as the beginning of the fourteenth century, the lapis was compared by Petrus Bonus to Christ as representing an allegoria Christi.²⁸ But in the *Aurea Hora*, a Pseudo-Thomasian tract of the thirteenth century, the mystery of the stone is paramount to the mysteries of the Christian religion.²⁹ I mention these facts merely to show that the circle or globe containing the four meant the Deity to not a few of our learned forefathers.

From the Latin tracts it is also evident that the latent demiurge, dormant and concealed in matter, is identical with the so-called homo philosophicus, the second Adam.³⁰ The latter is the superior, spiritual man, the Adam Kadmon, often identified with Christ. While the original Adam was mortal, because he consisted of the corruptible four elements, the second Adam is immortal, because he consists of one pure and incorruptible essence. Thus Pseudo-Thomas says: "Secundus Adam de puris elementis in aeternitatem transivit. Ideo quia ex simplici et pura essentia constat, in aeternum manet."³¹ An early Latinized Arabic author called Senior, a famous authority throughout the Middle Ages, is quoted as saying about the lapis: "There is one substance which never dies, be-

cause it perseveres in constant increase." This substance is the second Adam.³²

It is evident from these quotations that the round substance searched for by the philosophers was a projection of a nature very similar to our dream symbolism. We have historical documents which prove that often dreams, visions, even hallucinations, were mixed with the great philosophic opus.³³ Our forefathers, being of a more naïve mental constitution, projected their unconscious contents directly into matter. Matter, however, could easily accept such projections, because at that time it was a practically unknown and incomprehensible entity. And whenever man encounters something totally mysterious he projects his assumptions into it without the slightest self-criticism. But since chemical matter nowadays is something we know fairly well, we can no longer project as freely as our ancestors were able to do. We have, at last, to admit that the tetraktys is something psychical; and we do not know yet whether, in a more or less remote future, this may not also be proved to be a projection. For the time being we are satisfied with the fact that an idea of God, utterly absent from the conscious mind of modern man, returns in a form known consciously three hundred or four hundred years ago.

I do not need to emphasize the fact that this piece of history was completely unknown to my dreamer. One could say, quoting a classical poet:

"Naturam expellas furca tamen usque recurret."

The idea of those old philosophers was that God manifested himself first in the creation of the four elements. They were symbolized by the four partitions of the circle. Thus we read in a Coptic Gnostic tract of the *Codex Brucianus*³⁴ about the Only-Begotten (Monogenes or Anthropos): "This same is he who dwelleth in the Monad, which is in the Setheus (creator), and which came from the place of which none can say where it is. . . . From him it is the Monad came, in the manner of a ship, laden with all good things, and in the manner of a field, filled or planted with every kind of tree, and in the manner of a city, filled with all races of mankind . . . to its veil which surroundeth it in the manner of a defense, there are twelve Gates . . . this same is the Mother-City (μητρόπολις) of the Only-Begotten." In another place the Anthropos himself is the city and his members are the four gates. The Monad is but a spark of light (σπινθήρ), an atom of the Deity. The Monogenes is thought of as standing upon a τετράπεζα, a platform supported by four pillars corresponding to the Christian quaternarium of the Evangiles, or to the Tetramorphus, the symbolic riding animal of the church, consisting of the symbols of the four evangelists, the angel, eagle, ox or calf, and lion. The analogy of this text with the New Jerusalem of the Revelations is obvious.

The division into four, the synthesis of the four, the miraculous apparition of the four colors and the four stages of the work: the nigredo, the dealbatio,

rubefactio and citrinitas, are constant preoccupations of the old philosophers.³⁵ The four symbolizes the parts, qualities and aspects of the One. But why should my patient repeat those old speculations?

I do not know why he should. I know only that this is not an isolated case; many other cases under my observation or under that of my colleagues have spontaneously produced the same symbolism. I do not really think that they get it from three hundred or four hundred years ago. That age was rather another time when this same archetypal idea was very much in the foreground. As a matter of fact, it is much older than the Middle Ages, as *Timaeus* proves. Nor is it a classical or an Egyptian inheritance, since it is to be found practically everywhere and in all ages. One has only to remember, for instance, how great an importance is attributed to the quaternity by the red Indians.

Although the four is an age-old, presumably prehistoric symbol,³⁶ always associated with the idea of a world-creating deity, it is, however—curiously enough—rarely understood as such by those modern people to whom it occurs. I have always been particularly interested to see how people, if left to their own devices and not informed about the history of the symbol, would interpret it to themselves. I was careful, therefore, not to disturb them with my own opinions and as a rule I discovered that people took it to symbolize themselves or rather something in themselves. They felt it as belonging intimately to them-

selves as a sort of creative background, a life-producing sun in the depths of the unconscious mind. Though it was easy to see that it was often almost a replica of Ezekiel's vision, it was very rare that people recognized the analogy, even when they knew the vision—which knowledge, by the way, is pretty rare nowadays. What one could almost call a systematic blindness is simply the effect of the prejudice that the deity is *outside* man. Although this prejudice is not solely Christian, there are certain religions which do not share it at all. On the contrary they insist, as do certain Christian mystics, upon the essential identity of God and man, either in the form of an a priori identity, or of a goal to be attained by certain practices or initiations, as we know them, for instance, from the metamorphoses of Apuleius, not to speak of certain yoga methods.

The application of the comparative method indubitably shows the quaternity as being a more or less direct representation of the God manifested in his creation. We might, therefore, conclude that the symbol, spontaneously produced in the dreams of modern people, means the same thing—*the God within*. Although the majority of cases do not recognize this analogy, the interpretation might nevertheless be true. If we take into consideration the fact that the idea of God is an "unscientific" hypothesis, we can easily explain why people have forgotten to think along such lines. And even if they cherish a certain belief in God they would be deterred from the idea of

God within by their religious education, which always depreciated this idea as "mystical." Yet it is precisely this "mystical" idea which is enforced by the natural tendencies of the unconscious mind. I myself, as well as my colleagues, have seen so many cases developing the same kind of symbolism that we cannot doubt its existence any longer. My observations, moreover, date back as far as 1914 and I waited fourteen years before I alluded publicly to them.

It would be a regrettable mistake if anybody should understand my observations to be a kind of proof of the existence of God. They prove only the existence of an archetypal image of the Deity, which to my mind is the most we can assert psychologically about God. But as it is a very important and influential archetype, its relatively frequent occurrence seems to be a noteworthy fact for any *theologia naturalis*. Since the experience of it has the quality of numinosity, often to a high degree, it ranks among religious experiences.

I cannot omit calling attention to the interesting fact that whereas the central Christian symbolism is a Trinity, the formula of the unconscious mind is a quaternity. As a matter of fact even the orthodox Christian formula is not quite complete, because the dogmatic aspect of the evil principle is absent from the Trinity, the former leading a more or less awkward existence as devil. Since a God identical with man is a heretical assumption,³⁷ the "God within" is also dogmatically difficult. But the quaternity as un-

derstood by the modern mind directly suggests not only the God within, but also the identity of God and man. Contrary to the dogma there are not three, but four aspects. It could easily be inferred that the fourth represents the devil. Though we have the logion: "I myself and the Father are one. Who seeth me seeth the Father," it would be considered as blasphemy or as madness to stress Christ's dogmatic humanity to such a degree that man could identify himself with Christ and his homoousia. But this is precisely the inference. From an orthodox standpoint, therefore, the natural quaternity could be declared to be "*diabolica fraus*" and the capital piece of evidence would be the assimilation of the fourth aspect which represents the reprehensible part of the Christian cosmos. The church, I assume, has to invalidate any attempt at taking such results seriously. She must even condemn any approach to these experiences, since she cannot admit that nature unites what she has separated. The voice of nature is clearly audible in all the events that are connected with the quaternity, and this arouses all the old suspicions against anything connected with the unconscious mind. Scientific exploration of dreams is old oneiromancy and as objectionable as alchemy. Close parallels to the psychology of dreams are to be found among Latin alchemical tracts and are, like these, full of heresy.³⁸ There, it seems, was once reason enough for secrecy and protective metaphors.³⁹ The symbolic statements of old alchemy issue from the same unconscious mind

as modern dreams and are just as much the voice of nature.

If we were still living in a medieval setting where there was not much doubt about the ultimate things and where every history of the world began with Genesis, we could easily brush aside dreams and the like. Unfortunately we live in a modern setting, where the ultimate things are doubtful, where there is a pre-history of enormous extension, and where people are fully aware of the fact that if there is any numinous experience at all, it is the experience of the psyche. We can no longer imagine an empyrean world revolving round the throne of God, and we would not dream of seeking for Him somewhere behind the galactic systems. But the human soul seems to harbor mysteries, since to an empiricist all religious experience boils down to a peculiar condition of the mind. If we want to know anything of what religious experience means to those who have it, we have every chance nowadays of studying every imaginable form of it. And if it means anything, it means everything to those who have it. This is at least the inevitable conclusion one reaches by a careful study of the evidence. One could even define religious experience as that kind of experience which is characterized by the highest appreciation, no matter what its contents are. Modern mentality, in as much as it is formulated by the verdict "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*," will turn to the soul as to a last hope. Where else could one obtain experience? The answer will be more or less of the

kind which I have described. The voice of nature will answer and all those concerned with the spiritual problem of man will be confronted with new baffling problems. Through the spiritual need of my patients I have been forced to make a serious attempt at least to understand some of the extraordinary implications of the symbolism produced by the unconscious mind. As it would lead much too far to go into a discussion of the intellectual as well as the ethical consequences, I have to content myself with a mere allusion.

The main symbolic figures of a religion are always expressive of the particular moral and mental attitude involved. I mention, for instance, the cross and its various religious meanings. Another main symbol is the Trinity. It is of an exclusively masculine character. The unconscious mind, however, transforms it into a quaternity, being a unity at the same time, just as the three persons of the Trinity are one and the same God. The old philosophers of nature represented the Trinity, in as much as it was "imaginata in natura," as the three *ἀσώματα* or "spiritus," or "volatilia," viz., water, air and fire. The fourth constituent on the other hand was *τὸ σῶμα*, the earth or the body. They symbolized the latter by the Virgin.⁴⁰ In this way they added the feminine element to their physical Trinity, producing thereby the quaternity or the *circulus quadratus*, the symbol of which was the hermaphroditic *Rebis*, the *filius sapientiae*. The medieval philosophers of nature undoubtedly meant earth and woman by the fourth element. The princi-

ple of evil was not openly mentioned, but it appears in the poisonous quality of the *prima materia* and in other allusions. The quaternity in modern dreams is a product of the unconscious. As I explained in the first chapter, the unconscious is often personified by the *anima*, a female figure. Apparently the symbol of the quaternity issues from her. She would be the matrix of the quaternity, a *θεοτόκος* or *Mater Dei*, just as the earth was understood to be the Mother of God. But since the woman, as well as evil, is excluded from the Deity in the dogma of the Trinity, the element of evil would also form a part of the religious symbol, if the latter should be a quaternity. It needs no particular effort of imagination to guess the far-reaching spiritual consequence of such a development.

III

THE HISTORY AND PSYCHOLOGY OF A NATURAL SYMBOL

ALTHOUGH I do not want to discourage philosophical curiosity, I prefer not to lose myself in a discussion of the ethical and intellectual aspects of the problem raised by the quaternity symbol. Its psychological effects are certainly far-reaching and meaningful enough. They play a considerable role in practical treatment. While we are not concerned here with psychotherapy, but with the religious aspect of psychical phenomena, I have been forced through my studies in psychopathology to dig out these historical symbols and figures from the dust of their graves.¹ When I was a young alienist I should never have suspected myself of doing such a thing. I shall not mind, therefore, if this long discussion on the quaternity symbol, the *circulus quadratus* and the heretical attempts to improve on the dogma of the Trinity seem to be somewhat far fetched and overemphasized. But in point of fact my whole discourse about the quaternity is no more than a regrettably short and inadequate introduction to the final and crowning piece of my paradigmatic case.

Already at the very beginning of our dream series the circle appears. It takes the form, for instance, of a serpent, which describes a circle² round the dreamer.

It appears in later dreams as a clock, a circle with a central point, a round target for shooting practice, a clock that is a *perpetuum mobile*, a ball, a globe, a round table, a basin, and so on. The square appears also, about the same time, in the form of a town square or garden with a fountain in the center. Somewhat later the square appears connected with a circular movement:³ people who walk around in a square, a magic ceremony (the transformation of animals into human beings) which takes place in a square room, in the corners of which are four snakes, and people are again circulating round the four corners; the dreamer driving round a square in a taxi; a square prison cell, an empty square which is itself rotating, and so on. In other dreams the circle is represented by rotation, four children, for instance, carry a "dark ring" and walk in a circle. The circle appears also combined with the quaternity, as a silver bowl with four nuts at the four cardinal points; or as a table with four chairs. The center seems to be particularly emphasized. It is symbolized by an egg in the middle of a ring; by a star consisting of a body of soldiers; by a rotating star in a circle, the cardinal points of which represent the four seasons; by the pole; or by a precious stone, and so on.

All those dreams lead up to one picture which came to the patient in the form of a sudden visual impression. He had already had such glimpses or visualizations on different occasions, but this time it was a most impressive experience. As he himself says: "It

was an impression of the most sublime harmony." In such a case it does not matter at all what *our* impression is or what *we* think about it. It only matters how the patient feels about it. It is *his* experience, and if it has a deeply transforming influence upon his condition there will be no use arguing against it. The psychologist can only take note of the fact and, if he feels equal to the task, he might also make an attempt to understand why such a vision had such an effect upon such a person. The vision was a turning point in the patient's psychological development. It was what one would call—in the language of religion—a conversion.

This is the literal text of the vision:

"There are a vertical and a horizontal circle with a center common to both. This is the world clock. It is carried by the black bird. [The patient refers here to a preceding vision, where a black eagle had carried away a golden ring.] The vertical circle is a blue disk with a white rim, divided into $4 \times 8 = 32$ partitions. A hand is rotating upon it. The horizontal circle consists of four colors. Four little men are standing upon the circle carrying pendula and the golden ring [of the former vision] is laid around it.

"The world clock has three rhythms or pulses:

"1. The small pulse: the hand of the blue vertical disk moves on one thirty-second ($1/32$) at a time.

"2. The middle pulse is one complete rotation of the hand. At the same time the horizontal circle moves on by one thirty-second.

"3. The great pulse: thirty-two middle pulses are equal to one complete rotation of the golden ring."

The vision sums up all the allusions in the previous dreams. It seems to be an attempt to make a meaningful whole from the formerly fragmentary symbols, then characterized as circle, globe, square, rotation, clock, star, cross, quaternity, time, and so on.

It is of course difficult to understand why a feeling of "most sublime harmony" should be produced by this abstract structure. But if we think of the two circles in Plato's *Timaeus*, and of the harmonious all-roundness of his *anima mundi*, we might find an avenue leading to an understanding. Again, the term "world clock" suggests the antique conception of the musical harmony of the spheres. It would be a sort of cosmological system. If it were a vision of the firmament and its silent rotation, or of the steady movement of the solar system, we would readily understand and appreciate the perfect harmony of the picture. We might also assume that the platonic vision of the cosmos was faintly glimmering through the mist of a semiconscious mental condition. But there is something in the vision that does not quite agree with the harmonious perfection of the platonic picture. The two circles are different in nature. Not only is their movement different, but their color, too. The vertical circle is blue and the horizontal one containing four colors is golden. The blue circle might easily symbolize the blue hemisphere of the sky, while the horizontal circle would represent the horizon with the

four cardinal points, personified by the four little men and characterized by the four colors. (In a former dream, the four points were represented once by four children and again by the four seasons.) This picture reminds one immediately of medieval representations of the world in the form of a circle or of the *rex gloriae* with the four evangelists or of the *melothesiaie*, where the horizon is formed by the zodiac. The representation of the triumphant Christ seems to be derived from similar pictures of Horus and his four sons.⁴ There are also Eastern analogies: the Buddhistic mandalas or circles, usually of Tibetan origin. They consist as a rule of a circular padma or lotus which contains a square sacred building with four gates, indicating the four cardinal points and the seasons. The center contains a Buddha or more often the conjunction of Shiva and his Shakti or an equivalent dorje (thunderbolt) symbol.⁵ They are yantras or instruments of ritual for the purpose of contemplation, concentration and the final transformation of the yogin's consciousness into the divine all-consciousness.⁶

No matter how striking these analogies are, they are not satisfactory, because they all emphasize the center to such an extent that they seem to have been made in order to express the importance of the central figure. In our case, however, the center is empty. It consists only of a mathematical point. The parallels mentioned depict the world-creating or world-ruling deity, or else man in his dependence upon the ce-

lestial constellations. Our symbol is a clock, symbolizing time. The only analogy to such a symbol that I can think of is the design of the horoscope. It also has four cardinal points and an empty center. There is, moreover, another peculiar coincidence: rotation is often mentioned in the previous dreams and this is usually reported as moving to the left. The horoscope has twelve houses that progress to the left, that is, anticlockwise.

But the horoscope consists of one circle only and moreover contains no contrast between two obviously different systems. Thus the horoscope is also an unsatisfactory analogy, though it sheds some light upon the time aspect of our symbol. We should be forced to give up our endeavor to find psychological parallels if it were not for the treasure house of medieval symbolism. By good chance I became acquainted with a little-known medieval author of the early fourteenth century, Guillaume de Digulleville, the prior of a monastery at Châlis, a Norman poet, who wrote three "pèlerinages" between 1330 and 1355.⁷ They are called *Le Pèlerinage de la Vie Humaine, de l'Âme et de Jésus Christ*. In the last *Chant du Pèlerinage de l'Âme* we find a vision of paradise.

Paradise consists of forty-nine rotating spheres. They are called "siècles," centuries, being the prototypes or archetypes of the earthly centuries. But, as the angel who serves as a guide to Guillaume explains, the ecclesiastical expression "in saecula saeculorum" means eternity and not ordinary time. A

golden heaven surrounds all the spheres. When Guillaume looked up to the golden heaven he suddenly became aware of a small circle, only three feet wide and of the color of sapphire. He says of this circle: "Il sortait du ciel d'or en un point et y rentrait d'autre part et il en faisait tout le tour." Obviously the blue circle was rolling like a disk upon a great circle which dissected the golden sphere of heaven.

Here then we have two different systems, the one golden, the other blue, and the one cutting through the other. What is the blue circle? The angel again explains to the wondering Guillaume:

"Ce cercle que tu vois est le calendrier,
Qui en faisant son tour entier,
Montre des Saints les journées
Quand elles doivent être fêtées.
Chacun en fait le cercle un tour,
Chacune étoile y est pour jour,
Chacun soleil pour l'espace
De jours trente ou zodiaque."

The blue circle is the ecclesiastical calendar. Thus we have here another parallel—the element of time. It will be remembered that time, in our vision, is characterized or measured by three pulses. Guillaume's calendar circle is three feet in diameter. Moreover, while Guillaume is gazing at the blue circle, three spirits clad in purple suddenly appear. The angel explains that this is the moment of the feast of those three saints, and he goes on discoursing about the

whole zodiac. When he comes to the fishes he mentions the feast of the twelve fishermen, which precedes the Holy Trinity. Here Guillaume breaks in and tells the angel that he has never quite understood the symbol of the Trinity. He asks him to be good enough to explain this mystery. Whereupon the angel answers: "Or, il y a trois couleurs principales: le vert, le rouge et l'or." One can see them united in the peacock's tail. And he adds: "Le roi de toute puissance qui met trois couleurs en unité, ne peut-il faire aussi qu'une substance soit trois?" The golden color, he says, belongs to the Father, the red to the Son and the green to the Holy Ghost. Then the angel warns the poet not to ask any more questions and disappears.

We know, happily enough, from the angel's teaching, that the three has to do with the Trinity. And thus we know also that our former digression into the field of mystical speculation about the Trinity has not been far off the mark. At the same time we meet the motive of the colors, but unfortunately our patient has four, while Guillaume, or rather the angel, speaks of three only, gold, red and green. We might quote the first words of *Timaeus* here: "There are three, where has the fourth remained?" Or we may quote the very same words from Goethe's *Faust*, from the famous scene of the Kabires in Part II, where they bring up the vision of that mysterious "streng Gebilde," perhaps to be rendered by "severe image," from the sea.

The four little men of our vision are dwarfs or

Kabires. They represent the four cardinal points and the four seasons, as well as the four colors. In *Timaeus* as also in *Faust* and in the *Pèlerinage*, the number four is missing. The absent color is obviously blue. It is the one that belongs in the series of yellow, red and green. Why is blue missing? What is wrong with the calendar? or with time? or with the blue color?

Poor old Guillaume has surely stumbled over the same problem: There are three, but where is the fourth? He was indeed eager to hear something about the Trinity which, as he says, he had never quite understood. And it is somewhat suspicious that the angel is in a hurry to get away before Guillaume asks some more awkward questions.

Well, I suppose Guillaume was unconscious when he went to heaven, otherwise he surely would have drawn certain conclusions from what he saw. Now what did he actually see? First he saw the spheres or "siècles" inhabited by those who had attained eternal bliss. Then he beheld the heaven of gold, the "ciel d'or" and there was the King of Heaven, sitting upon a golden throne and, beside him, the Queen of Heaven, sitting upon a round throne of brown crystal. This latter detail refers to the fact that Maria is assumed to have been taken to heaven with her body, as the only mortal being permitted to unite with the body before the resurrection of the dead. In such representations the king is usually the triumphant Christ in conjunction with the church as his bride. But the all-important thing is that the king, being Christ, is

at the same time the Trinity, and that the number four is his queen. Blue is the color of Maria's celestial cloak; she is the earth covered by the blue tent of the sky.⁸ But why should the Mother of God not be mentioned? According to the dogma she is only beata, and not divine. Moreover, she represents the earth, which is also the body and its darkness. That is the reason why she, the all merciful, is the attorney pleading for all sinners.

From this precious piece of medieval psychology we gain some insight into the merits of our patient's mandala. It unites the four and they function together harmoniously. My patient had been brought up a Catholic and thus, unwittingly, he was confronted with the same problem which caused not a little worry to old Guillaume. It was a great problem indeed to the Middle Ages, that problem of the Trinity and the exclusion, or the very conditioned recognition, of the female element, the earth and the body, which were yet, in the form of Maria's womb, the sacred abode of the Deity and the indispensable link in the chain of the divine work of redemption. My patient's vision is a symbolic answer to the question of the centuries. That is probably the deeper reason why the image of the world clock produced the impression of "most sublime harmony." It was the first intimation of a possible solution of the devastating conflict between matter and spirit, between the desires of the flesh and the love of God. The miserable and ineffectual compromise of the church dream is

completely overcome by this mandala vision, in which all contrasts are reconciled. If we are allowed to adduce here the old Pythagorean idea that the soul is a square,⁹ the mandala would express the Deity through the threefold rhythm and the soul through the static quaternity, that is, the circle divided into four colors. And thus its innermost meaning would simply be the union of the soul with God.

In as much as the world clock also represents the *quadratura circuli* and the *perpetuum mobile*, those two preoccupations of the medieval mind find their adequate expression in our mandala. The golden ring and its contents represent the quaternity in the form of the four Kabires and the four colors, the blue circle the Trinity and the movement of time, according to Guillaume. In our case, the hand of the blue circle has the fastest movement, while the golden circle moves slowly. Whereas the blue circle seems to be somewhat incongruous in Guillaume's golden heaven, the circles in our case are harmoniously combined. The Trinity is now the life, the "pulse" of the whole system, with a threefold rhythm, based, however, on thirty-two, a multiple of four. Thus circle and quaternity on the one side and the threefold rhythm on the other side interpenetrate each other so that the one is also contained in the other. In Guillaume's version, the Trinity is obvious, but the quaternity is concealed in the duality of the King and Queen of Heaven. And moreover the blue color does not adhere to the queen, but to the calendar which represents

time, characterized by Trinitarian attributes. This seems to be matter of an interpenetration similar to our case.

Interpenetrations of qualities and contents are typical of symbols. We find this, also, in the Christian Trinity, where the Father is contained in the Son, the Son in the Father and the Holy Ghost contained in Father and Son or penetrating both. The progression from Father to Son represents a time element, while the spatial element would be personified by the *Mater Dei*. (The mother quality was originally attributed to the Holy Ghost and the latter was then called *Sophia-Sapientia* by certain early Christians.¹⁰ This female quality could not be completely uprooted, it still adheres, at least, to the symbol of the Holy Ghost, the *columba spiritus sancti*.) But the quaternity is entirely absent from the dogma, though it appears early in ecclesiastical symbolism. I refer to the cross of equal branches included in the circle, the triumphant Christ with the four evangelists, the *Tetramorphus*, and so on. In later church symbolism the *rosa mystica*, the *vas devotionis*, the *fons signatus* and the *hortus conclusus* appear as attributes of the *Mater Dei* and of the spiritualized earth.¹¹

Our mandala is an abstract, almost mathematical representation of some of the main problems abundantly discussed in medieval Christian philosophy. The abstraction goes so far, indeed, that if it had not been for the help of Guillaume's vision we might have

overlooked its widespread, historical system of roots. The patient does not possess any real knowledge of such historical materials. He knows only what anybody who received some slight instruction about religion in early childhood would know. He himself saw no connection between his world clock and any religious symbolism. One can readily understand this, since the vision contains nothing that would remind anyone of religion at first sight. Yet the vision itself came shortly after the dream of the "house of self-collection." And that dream again was the answer to the problem of three and four, represented in a still earlier dream. It was a matter there of a rectangular space, on the four sides of which were four goblets filled with colored water. One was yellow, another red, the third green and the fourth was without color. The blue is obviously lacking, yet it had been connected with the three other colors in a previous vision, where a bear appeared in the depth of a cavern. The bear had four eyes emitting red, yellow, green and blue light. Astonishingly enough, in the later dream the blue color had disappeared. At the same time the usual square was transformed into a rectangle, which had never appeared before. The cause of this manifest disturbance was a resistance against the female element represented by the anima. In the dream of the "house of self-collection" the voice confirms this fact. It says: "What thou art doing is dangerous. Religion is not the tax that thou payest in order

to get rid of the woman's image, for this image is indispensable." The "woman's image" is exactly what one would call "anima."¹²

It is normal for a man to resist his anima because she represents, as I said before, the unconscious with all those tendencies and contents hitherto excluded from conscious life. They were excluded for a number of real and apparent reasons. Some are suppressed and some are repressed. As a rule those tendencies that represent the amount of antisocial elements in man's psychical structure—what I call the "statistical criminal" in everybody—are suppressed, that is, consciously and deliberately disposed of. But tendencies that are merely repressed are usually only doubtful in character. They are not indubitably antisocial, but are rather unconventional and socially awkward. The reason why one represses them is equally doubtful. Some people repress them from sheer cowardice, others from a merely conventional morality, and others again from the motive of respectability. Repression is a sort of half-conscious and half-hearted letting go of things, a dropping of hot cakes or a reviling of grapes which hang too high, or a looking the other way in order not to become conscious of one's desires. Freud has discovered repression as one of the main mechanisms in the making of a neurosis. Suppression amounts to a conscious moral choice, but repression is a rather immoral "penchant" for getting rid of disagreeable decisions.

Suppression may cause worry, conflict and suffering, but never causes a neurosis of one of the usual patterns. Neurosis is a substitute for legitimate suffering.

If one excludes the "statistical criminal," there remains the vast domain of inferior qualities and of primitive tendencies which belong to the psychical structure of a man who is less ideal and more primitive than we should like to be.¹³ We have certain ideas as to how a civilized or educated or moral being should live and we occasionally do our best to fulfil these ambitious expectations. But as nature has not bestowed the same blessings upon each of her children, some are more, and others less, gifted. Thus there are people who can just afford to live properly and respectably, that is, no manifest flaw is discoverable. They either commit minor sins, if they sin at all, or their sins are concealed even to their consciousness. One is rather lenient with sinners unconscious of their sins. Although the law occasionally punishes unconsciousness, the practice of confession in the church is concerned only with deeds which you yourself connect with a feeling of sinfulness. But nature is not at all lenient with unconscious sinners. She punishes them just as severely as if they had committed a conscious offense. Thus we find, as the pious old Drummond once observed, that it is highly moral people, unaware of their other side, who develop peculiar irritability and hellish moods which make them insupportable to their relatives. The fame of saintliness may be far reaching, but to live with a saint might cause an in-

feriority complex or even a wild outburst of immorality in individuals less morally gifted. Morality seems to be a gift like intelligence. You cannot pump it into a system where it is not indigenous, though you may spoil it.

Unfortunately there is no doubt about the fact that man is, as a whole, less good than he imagines himself or wants to be. Everyone carries a shadow, and the less it is embodied in the individual's conscious life, the blacker and denser it is.¹⁴ If an inferiority is conscious, one always has a chance to correct it. Furthermore, it is constantly in contact with other interests, so that it is steadily subjected to modifications. But if it is repressed and isolated from consciousness, it never gets corrected. It is, moreover, liable to burst forth in a moment of unawareness. At all events, it forms an unconscious snag, blocking the most well-meant attempts.

We carry our past with us, to wit, the primitive and inferior man with his desires and emotions, and it is only by a considerable effort that we can detach ourselves from this burden. If it comes to a neurosis, we have invariably to deal with a considerably intensified shadow. And if such a case wants to be cured it is necessary to find a way in which man's conscious personality and his shadow can live together.

This is a very serious problem for all those who are either themselves in such a predicament, or who have to help other people to live. A mere suppression of the shadow is just as little of a remedy as is behead-

ing against headache. To destroy a man's morality does not help either, because it would kill his better self, without which even the shadow makes no sense. The reconciliation of these opposites is a major problem, and even in antiquity it bothered certain minds. Thus we know of an otherwise legendary personality of the second century, Karpokrates, a Gnostic,¹⁵ that he interpreted Matthew 5.25, which reads, "Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him," to mean: The adversary is the somatic man. As the living body is an indispensable part of the personality, the text, therefore, should be read: "Agree with thyself quickly, whilst thou art in the way with thyself." It is natural that the more robust mentality of the Fathers could not appreciate the delicacy and the merit of this subtle and, from a modern point of view, immensely practical argument. It was also dangerous, and it is still the most vital and yet the most ticklish problem of a civilization that has forgotten why man's life should be sacrificial, that is, offered up to an idea greater than man. Man can live amazing things if they make sense to him. But the difficulty is to create that sense. It must be a conviction naturally; but you find that the most convincing things man can invent are cheap and ready made, and never able to convince him against his personal desires and fears.

If the repressed tendencies, the shadow as I call them, were decidedly evil, there would be no problem whatever. But the shadow is merely somewhat infe-

rior, primitive, unadapted, and awkward; not wholly bad. It even contains inferior, childish or primitive qualities which would in a way vitalize and embellish human existence, but "it is not done." The educated public, the flower of our actual civilization, has lifted itself up from its roots and is about to lose its connection with the earth. There is no civilized country nowadays where the lower strata of the population are not in a state of unrest and dissent. In a number of European nations such a condition is overtaking the upper strata, too. This state of affairs is the demonstration of our psychological problem on a gigantic scale. In as much as collectivities are mere accumulations of individuals, their problems are also accumulations of individual problems. One set of people identifies itself with the superior man and cannot descend, and the other set identifies itself with the inferior man and wants to reach the surface.

Such problems are never solved by legislation or tricks. They are only solved by a general change of attitude. And the change does not begin with propaganda and mass meetings, or with violence. It begins with a change in individuals. It will continue as a transformation of their personal likes and dislikes, of their outlook on life and of their values, and only the accumulation of such individual changes will produce a collective solution.

The educated man tries to repress the inferior one in himself, without realizing that by this he forces the latter to become revolutionary. It is characteristic of

my patient that he once dreamt of a military detachment which intended "to strangle the left wing completely." Somebody remarks that the left wing is already weak, but the military detachment answers that that is the reason why the left wing should be completely strangled. The dream shows how my patient dealt with his own inferior man. This is clearly not the right method. The dream of the "house of self-collection," on the contrary, shows a religious attitude as the correct answer to his question. The mandala seems to be an amplification of this particular point. Historically, as we have seen, the mandala served as a symbol in order to clarify the nature of the deity philosophically, or to demonstrate the same thing in a visible form for the purpose of adoration, or, as in the East, as a yantra for yoga practices. The wholeness of the celestial circle and the squareness of the earth, uniting the four principles or elements or psychical qualities,¹⁶ express completeness and union. Thus the mandala has the dignity of a "reconciling symbol."¹⁷ As the reconciliation of God and man is expressed in the symbol of Christ or of the cross, we could expect the patient's world clock to have some similar reconciling significance. Being prejudiced by historical analogies, we should expect a deity to occupy the center of the mandala. The center is, however, empty. The seat of the deity is unoccupied, in spite of the fact that, if we analyze the mandala according to historical models, we arrive at the god symbolized by the circle and the goddess

symbolized by the square. Instead of "goddess" we could also say "earth" or "soul." Against the historical prejudice, however, the fact must be insisted upon that (as in the "house of self-collection," where the place of the divine image was occupied by the quaternity) we find no trace of a deity in the mandala. It is, on the contrary, a mechanism. I do not believe that we have any right to disregard such an important fact in favor of a preconceived idea. A dream or a vision is just what it ought to be. It is not a disguise for something else. It is a natural product, which is precisely a thing without ulterior motive. I have seen many hundreds of mandalas, of patients who were quite uninfluenced, and I have found the same fact in an overwhelming majority of cases: there was never a deity occupying the center. The center is emphasized as a rule. But what we find there is a symbol of a very different meaning. It is a star, a sun, a flower, a cross of equal branches, a precious stone, a bowl filled with water or wine, a serpent coiled up, or a human being, but never a god.

When we find a triumphant Christ in the rose window of a medieval church, we assume rightly that this must be a central symbol of the Christian cult. At the same time we also assume that any religion which is rooted in the history of a people is as much an expression of their psychology as the form of political government, for instance, that the people have developed. If we apply the same method to the modern mandalas that people have seen in dreams or vi-

sions, or have developed through "active imagination," we reach the conclusion that the mandalas are expressions of a certain attitude which we cannot avoid calling "religious." Religion is a relationship to the highest or strongest value, be it positive or negative. The relationship is voluntary as well as involuntary, that is, you can accept, consciously, the value by which you are possessed unconsciously. That psychological fact which is the greatest power in your system is the god, since it is always the overwhelming psychic factor which is called god. As soon as a god ceases to be an overwhelming factor, he becomes a mere name. His essence is dead and his power is gone. Why have the antique gods lost their prestige and their effect upon human souls? It was because the Olympic gods had served their time and a new mystery began: God became man.

If we allow ourselves to draw conclusions from modern mandalas we should ask people, first, whether they worship stars, suns, flowers or snakes. They will deny it and at the same time they will assert that the globes, stars, crosses and the like are symbols for a center in themselves. And if asked what they mean by that center, they will begin to stammer and to refer to this or that experience which may be something very similar to the confession of my patient who found that the vision of his world clock had left him with a wonderful feeling of perfect harmony. Others will confess that a similar vision came to them in a moment of supreme pain and distress. To others

again it is a remembrance of a sublime dream or of a moment when long and fruitless worries came to an end and a reign of peace began. If you sum up what people tell you about their experience, you can formulate it about in this way: They came to themselves, they could accept themselves, they were able to become reconciled to themselves and by this they were also reconciled to adverse circumstances and events. This is much like what was formerly expressed by saying: He has made his peace with God, he has sacrificed his own will, he has submitted himself to the will of God.

A modern mandala is an involuntary confession of a peculiar mental condition. There is no deity in the mandala, and there is also no submission or reconciliation to a deity. The place of the deity seems to be taken by the wholeness of man.¹⁸

When one speaks of man, everybody means his own ego personality—that is, his personality in as much as he is aware of it—and when one speaks of others one assumes that they have a very similar personality. But since modern research has acquainted us with the fact that an individual consciousness is based upon and surrounded by an indefinitely extended unconscious psyche, we needs must revise our somewhat old-fashioned prejudice that man is his consciousness. This rather naïve assumption must be confronted at once by the critical question: Whose consciousness? Is it his consciousness or the consciousness of other people about him? The fact is that it would be a diffi-

cult task to reconcile the picture I have of myself to the one which other people make of me. Who is right? And who is the real individual? When we go further and take into account the fact that man is also what neither he himself nor other people know of him—an unknown something which can yet be proved to exist—the problem of identity becomes more difficult still. As a matter of fact it is quite impossible to define the extension and the ultimate character of psychic existence. When we now speak of man we mean the indefinable whole of him, an ineffable totality, which can only be formulated symbolically. I have chosen the term “self” to designate the totality of man, the sum total of conscious and unconscious existence.¹⁹ I have chosen this term in accordance with Eastern philosophy,²⁰ which for centuries has occupied itself with those problems that arise when even the gods cease to become human. The philosophy of the Upanishads corresponds to a psychology that long ago recognized the relativity of the gods.²¹ This is not to be confounded with such a stupid error as atheism. The world is as it ever has been, but our consciousness undergoes peculiar changes. First, in remote times (which can, however, still be observed with living primitives), the main body of psychical life was apparently in human and in nonhuman objects: it was projected, as we should say now.²² Consciousness can hardly exist in a state of complete projection. At most it would be nothing but a heap of emotions. Through the withdrawal of projections, conscious

knowledge slowly developed. Science, curiously enough, practically began with the discovery of astronomical laws, which was a first stage in the despiritualization of the world. One step slowly followed another. Already in antiquity they removed the gods from mountains and rivers, from trees and animals. Our science has subtiliated its projections to an almost unrecognizable degree. But our ordinary psychological life is still swarming with projections. You can find them spread out in the newspapers, books, rumors and in ordinary social gossip. All gaps in actual knowledge are still filled with projections. We are still almost certain we know what other people think or what their true character is. We are convinced that certain people have all the bad qualities we do not know in ourselves or that they live all those vices which could, of course, never be our own. We must still be exceedingly careful in order not to project our own shadows too shamelessly; we are still swamped with projected illusions. If you imagine someone who is brave enough to withdraw these projections, all and sundry, then you get an individual conscious of a pretty thick shadow. Such a man has saddled himself with new problems and conflicts. He has become a serious problem to himself, as he is now unable to say that *they* do this or that, *they* are wrong and *they* must be fought against. He lives in the “house of self-collection.” Such a man knows that whatever is wrong in the world is in himself, and if he only learns to deal with his own shadow then he has done something real

for the world. He has succeeded in removing an infinitesimal part at least of the unsolved gigantic, social problems of our day. These problems are unwieldy and poisoned by mutual projections. How can anyone see straight when he does not even see himself and that darkness which he himself carries unconsciously into all his dealings?

Modern psychological development leads to a much better understanding as to what man really consists of. The gods first lived in superhuman power and beauty on the top of snow-clad mountains or in the darkness of caves, woods and seas. Later on they drew together into one god, and then that god became man. But the gods in our time assemble in the lap of the ordinary individual and are as powerful and as awe-inspiring as ever, in spite of their new disguise—the so-called psychical functions. Man thinks of himself as holding the psyche in the hollow of his hand. He dreams even of making a science of her. But in reality she is the mother and the maker, the psychical subject and even the possibility of consciousness itself. The psyche reaches so far beyond the boundary line of consciousness that the latter could be easily compared to an island in the ocean. While the island is small and narrow, the ocean is immensely wide and deep, so that if it is a question of space, it does not matter whether the gods are inside or outside. But if the historical process of the despiritualization of the world—the withdrawal of projections—is going on as hitherto, then everything of a divine or demonic

character must return to the soul, to the inside of the unknown man. At first the materialistic error seems to be inevitable. Since the throne of god could not be discovered among the galactic systems, the inference was that god had never existed. The second inevitable mistake is psychologism: if god is anything, he must be an illusion derived from certain motives, from fear, for instance, from will to power, or from repressed sexuality. These arguments are not new. Similar things have already been said by the Christian missionaries who overthrew the idols of the pagan gods. But whereas the early missionaries were conscious of serving a new God by combatting the old ones, modern iconoclasts are unconscious of the one in whose name they are destroying old values. Nietzsche was quite conscious and quite responsible in breaking the old tablets and yet he felt the peculiar need to back himself up by a revived Zarathustra as a kind of secondary personality, a sort of alter ego, with whom he often identifies himself in his great tragedy *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. Nietzsche was no atheist, but his God was dead. The result was that Nietzsche himself split and he felt himself forced to call the other self "Zarathustra" or, at other times, "Dionysos." In his fatal illness he signed his letters "Zagreus," the dismembered Dionysos of the Thracians. The tragedy of *Zarathustra* is that, because his God died, Nietzsche himself became a god; and this happened because he was no atheist. He was too positive a nature to content himself with a negative

creed. For such a man it seems to be dangerous to make the statement that God is dead. He becomes instantly a victim of "inflation."²³ Since the idea of God represents an important, even overwhelming, psychical intensity, it is, in a way, safer to believe that such an autonomous intensity is a nonego, perhaps an altogether different or superhuman entity, "totaliter-aliter." Confronted with such a belief man must needs feel small, just about his own size. But if he declares the "tremendum" to be dead, then he should find out at once where this considerable energy, which was once invested in an existence as great as God, has disappeared to. It might reappear under another name, it might call itself "Wotan" or "State" or something ending with -ism, even atheism, of which people believe, hope and expect just as much as they formerly did of God. If it does not appear under the disguise of a new name, then it will most certainly return in the mentality of the one from whom the death declaration has issued. Since it is a matter of a tremendous energy, the result will be an equally important psychological disturbance in the form of a dissociation of personality. The disruption can produce a dual or a multiple personality. It is as if one single person could not carry the total amount of energy, so that parts of the personality which were hitherto functional units instantly break asunder and assume the dignity and importance of autonomous personalities.

Happily enough for the rest of mankind, there are not many individuals as sensitive and as religious as

Nietzsche. If dull people lose the idea of God nothing happens—not immediately and personally at least. But socially the masses begin to breed mental epidemics, of which we have now a fair number.

The experience formulated by the mandala is typical of people who cannot project the divine image any longer. They are in actual danger of inflation and dissociation. The round or square inclosures, therefore, have the value of magic means to produce protective walls or a *vas hermeticum* to prevent an outburst and a disintegration. Thus the mandala denotes and supports an exclusive concentration upon oneself. This state is anything but egocentricity. It is on the contrary a much needed self-control with the purpose of avoiding inflation and dissociation.

The inclosure, as we have seen, has also the meaning of what is called in Greek a *τέμενος*, the precincts of a temple or any isolated sacred place. The circle, in this case, protects or isolates an inward process that should not become mixed with things outside. Thus the mandala repeats symbolically archaic ways and means which were formerly concrete realities. As I have already mentioned, the inhabitant of the *temenos* was the god. But the prisoner, or the well-protected dweller in the mandala, does not seem to be a god, in as much as the symbols used, stars, for instance, crosses, globes, and so on do not mean a god, but rather an apparently most important part of the human personality. One might almost say that man himself, or at least his innermost soul, was the prisoner