

20th Century Feminism: A Jungian Exploration of The Feminine Self

by

Christopher Alan Snellgrove

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
August 4, 2012

Keywords: Carl Jung, Virginia Woolf, Toni Morrison, Margaret Atwood, Archetypes

Copyright 2012 by Christopher Alan Snellgrove

Approved by

Jonathan Bolton, Chair, Associate Professor of English
Dan Latimer, Professor Emeritus of English
Susana Morris, Assistant Professor of English

Abstract

The following work uses the theories and methods provided by Carl Jung as a way of analyzing works by three women authors: Virginia Woolf's *Orlando*, Toni Morrison's *Beloved*, and Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*. The primary Jungian notion featured is that of self-actualization—the process by which a person has achieved a sense of wholeness uniting their body and mind to the greater world. Specifically, I examine how the protagonists and antagonists of these texts either complete their Jungian journey towards actualized wholeness. In order to do this, I focus greatly on Jung's notion of archetypes, and how they either help or hinder the journey that these women are on.

A large part of the analysis centers on how actualization might be defined in feminine terms, by women living in a world of patriarchal control. As such, this work continues the endeavors of other Post-Jungians to “rescue” Jung from his own patriarchal leanings, using his otherwise egalitarian theories as a way of critiquing patriarchy and envisioning sexual equality. Jung, then, becomes an interesting bridge between first, second, and third-wave feminism, as well as a bridge between modernism and post-modernism. By analyzing these disparate female authors (divided by time, nationality, and race), it is my hope to provide a framework by which future feminist fiction and scholarship can be better understood within the context of eternal feminine archetypes.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank all of those who helped make this work possible. This includes my beautiful wife Laura, my amazing son James, my supporting parents Jim and Susan, my caring sister Heather, and my fuzzy companions during late night work, Tulip and Lola. I would also like to thank my amazing dissertation committee: Jonathan Bolton, Dan Latimer, and Susana Morris. They have provided keen insight and amazing guidance, for which I will be eternally grateful.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1	12
Chapter 2	77
Chapter 3	136
Conclusion	190
References	200

Introduction

The use of Carl Jung's philosophy and texts to conduct feminist analysis may seem an odd choice to the charitable outside observer. To the less charitable observer, it may seem impossible: Jung is often considered outdated, and his compelling philosophy is often tinged with a patriarchal bias. Feministic critics such as Naomi Goldenberg have often said as much. In her brief "A Feminist Critique of Jung", Goldenberg focuses on how Jung's use of archetypes, which are intended to be part of a liberating mythology, arguably confine women instead: "It is true that Jung genuinely values woman for her remarkable and all too often overlooked Eros, but it is equally true that he confines her to this sphere. Once she moves into a Logos arena, she is not only at a great disadvantage but is behaving unnaturally as well." (p. 445). She further claims that Jung's focus on contrasexuality as part of a process of self-actualization (in which men are encouraged to embrace the feminine anima and women are encouraged to embrace the masculine animus) favored men over women—"The anima-animus model is clearly more beneficial to men than to women"—and that Jung's creation (and subsequent lack of development) of the animus is an indication of being clouded by his own masculine perception, because "Jung never developed the idea of the animus to the same extent as the anima; in my view he was forcing a mirror image where there was none." (p. 447).

However, the use of Jungian thought as a feminist tool is something that has been building in recent years. In the excellent *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, Susan Rowland essentially reclaims Jung for feminist analysis by clarifying and modifying the contentious Jungian claim regarding archetypes being inherited—a claim that, if true, would certainly lend credence to the criticism from Goldenberg and other critics regarding his confinement of gender (if access to archetypes is inherited, after all, then it becomes part of the material world in which women are

marginalized and, thus, inherit less than men)—by writing that “An archetype is an inborn potential for a certain sort of image. What the actual mental image will look like will not only depend upon the collective unconscious. Archetypal images also reflect the conscious experiences of the person as a subject in history, culture and time” (29). This serves as a very important bridge connecting Jung’s works to feminist theory, as it allows for writers to rather explicitly tackle how the historical and cultural marginalization of women by patriarchal force has psychologically affected the women and, indeed, evens the men clumsily wielding such power. Jung’s archetypes, then, take on special importance as a way of not only articulating such issues, but beginning to formulate a kind of solution that is peaceful, rather than destructive. Jungian scholar Irene Claremont de Castillejo (who honed her psychoanalytical and Jungian skills under Emma Jung in Zurich) touches on this in her 1973 book *Knowing Woman*, her exploration of divisions between masculinity and femininity within society. In this text, she writes that

the deeply buried feminine in us whose concern is the unbroken connection of all growing things is in passionate revolt against the stultifying, life-destroying, anonymous machine of the civilization we have built. She is consumed by an inner rage which is buried in a layer of the unconscious often too deep for us to recognize... With more consciousness, feminine anger could be harnessed to a creative end. (42)

In Castillejo’s view, Jungian philosophy serves as a vital tool for studying both individuals and collective groups. Patriarchal repression, then, can be understood as a kind of collective shadow of patriarchal society, one it refuses to acknowledge or accept. Jung’s notions of self-actualization—specifically, allowing someone to access their heretofore hidden unconscious—

can be utilized as a tool for expressing feminine (self)discovery on the individual level, and recovering feminism/feminist culture from the margins on the collective level.

One of the more interesting features of Jungian literary analysis (and arguably the feature which I find most compelling) is that it allows a critical connection of very disparate authors. Karen Elias alludes to this in her Jungian analysis of Grimm's "The Twelve Dancing Princesses," claiming that

In addition, the new feminist narratives encourage a woman-centered perspective. This point of view requires a redefinition of the feminine, one that, in Virginia Woolf's words, asks women to "think back through [their] mothers"... in order to discover in their collective survival a legacy of female strength. Construction of this new paradigm has the power to move women away from a 'home' that has become increasingly inadequate and detrimental, to a 'strange new country': a journey that can be compared to an evolutionary leap. (8)

It is with this in mind that I have focused my own Jungian analysis on three very disparate authors: Virginia Woolf and her novel *Orlando*, Toni Morrison and her novel *Beloved*, and Margaret Atwood and her novel *The Handmaid's Tale*. In Woolf's text, the gender-bending protagonist is able to successfully navigate the seemingly-paradoxical course laid out by Woolf in her seminal *A Room of One's Own*: the ability to become a man or woman at will helps Orlando (and, by extension, Woolf) to achieve the androgynous ideal that Woolf speaks of, while Orlando's final decision to embrace femininity and womanhood allows Woolf to think back through the lens of feminine thought, transforming a celebratory "biography" of Vita Sackville-West into a celebration of feminine assertion and self-actualization. Woolf understandably becomes an icon of early feminism, yet Toni Morrison's *Beloved* offers a blunt counterpoint,

offering a rather literal presentation of how “thinking back through...mothers” can be a haunting phenomenon: women are tied to both their children and their past through “thick blood” and haunting “rememories,” perhaps most explicitly illustrated through the titular *Beloved*, the specter of a murdered child that is resurrected into flesh and blood.

What, then, is the connection between Woolf and Morrison? While Orlando’s adventures serve as a fanciful metaphor for Jungian actualization, Morrison illustrates a world in which such actualization is nearly impossible for African-Americans due to the violent ravages of white patriarchy. Within this text, Morrison also works to reclaim femininity from more traditional/mainstream feminism—Paul D’s advice that she is her own “best thing” also functions as a kind of concession regarding their earlier argument, in which his accusation that her love is “too thick” is met with the acidic response that “thin love ain’t no love at all.” Sethe’s love seems to echo what Castillejo claimed: her killing her baby in order to “rescue” the child from a life of slavery and misery is certainly evocative of a “passionate revolt against the stultifying, life-destroying, anonymous machine of the civilization” around her. However, Morrison illustrates simple fact that neither Sethe nor other African Americans were able to exhibit agency within what was effectively a white, male civilization. Whereas Woolf implied that isolation and means alone would be enough to escape the shackles of patriarchal culture, Morrison illustrates how her characters faced the challenge of creating personal and social identity outside of the paradigm of white patriarchy; as such, Morrison showcases the struggles of Sethe and other characters to consciously create such an identity even as they attempt actualization, which involves union with the typically hidden world of the unconscious.

In many ways, Atwood brings the dialogue full-circle through *The Handmaid’s Tale*. While Atwood employed fantastic elements to emboss the realistic elements of her feminine

journey and Morrison used blunt reality and historical horror to augment a fantastic, supernatural story, Atwood (among these three women writers, she is the only one who characterizes herself as a Jungian) presents a dystopia that resembles the modern world enough that it cannot be dismissed. The handmaid Offred becomes a fascinating character for Jungian analysis because her attempts at psychological liberation from the oppressive world of Gilead serves as a kind of pantomime of Jungian actualization: she comments that her self has become something she must compose, yet the more she undertakes this kind of conscious composition, the further she is from the liberation of the unconscious world. This may evoke a natural question from the reader: if only one of these three protagonists is able to achieve actualization on Jungian terms, then why is Jungian analysis an ideal way of analyzing these texts?

The simplest answer to that question is that Jungian analysis allows us to explore function as well as dysfunction. That is, while the ultimate goal of Jung the doctor was helping his patients to achieve that sense of self-actualization, his writing focused quite a bit on instances where such actualization could not/would not occur, and why. This allows for a very postmodern reading of these texts as well: when values and actualization become both subjective and highly relative, each character represents an opportunity for deconstruction and analysis. *The Handmaid's Tale* illustrates this best, as the Jungian approach allows for not only an analysis of Offred, but of characters such as The Commander and minor characters such as Nick. Through them, we can explore a kind of spectrum of masculinity and femininity, and come to view Gilead as a kind of nightmare scenario in which the feminine as access to the unconsciousness and soul has been cut off entirely: rather, patriarchal forces insure that the values and appearance of women corresponds to male desires. Effectively, Gilead becomes a mirror by which man can better view himself; it is little wonder that cracks in this mirror appear through the aberrant

behavior of characters such as The Commander, who long for to access something within themselves that has been hidden by the reflection of masculinity that pervades the world of Gilead.

Atwood's aforementioned habit of grounding her text in reality (effectively tethering what might have been dismissed as a "what if" story to the bleak reality of "what has already happened") is in line with one of Jung's greatest strengths, one that helps highlight his utility to the cause of feminist analysis. Specifically, his insistence on universal symbols helps to place historical oppression within the context of modern oppression: he links the first witch hunts with a kind of sublimated sexuality that comes from the Church's insistence on reverence for Mary (a pure, motherly figure), something that seems especially relevant to a Handmaid's Tale. After all, Jung ascribed this historical brutality as an effect of man's inability to complete the cycle of his own erotic development. Gilead, in turn, has willingly halted its own erotic development through the use (in truth, forced prostitution and rape) of handmaids: widespread infertility has made procreation nearly the sole purpose of sex, meaning that the men of Gilead (assuming that The Commander is representative of most high-ranked men) oscillate between coldly formal relationships with their wives and stilted, business-like sex with their own handmaids. By halting their erotic development in this way, men help to reinforce their own repressive culture, creating in the so-called "Unwomen" a new kind of witch hunt, one which rather literally targets women who do not fit within the confines of male-defined femininity. Thus, the Jungian perspective allows us to view patriarchal repression as a kind of depressingly regenerating force: there seems to be no hope for Gilead because it becomes even more repressive over time (considering the lecture at the end reveals that the likely inspiration for The Commander is killed by more militant governmental forces later in Gilead's history) with each injustice and indignity opening the door

to further atrocities. As such, it also allows a fuller view of patriarchy as a form of psychological—Atwood portrays, as a logical extension of the patriarchal micro-aggressions against women, a society that has twisted into a dystopia of male control, and emphasizes the effects of such long-term trauma on the victims who have suffered from it.

Jungian philosophy also allows intriguing analysis on the intersection of race and feminism, an intersection that has formed one of the central divides between second- and third-wave feminism. Toni Morrison is a writer who has often eschewed many of the aspects of second-wave feminism: in a 1998 interview with Zia Jaffrey, Morrison mentioned the need she felt to “distance” herself from feminism. Specifically, she prefers ambiguity that is open to interpretation—“leaving the endings open for reinterpretation, revisitation, a little ambiguity”—to a more didactic “feminist tract,” boldly stating “I don’t subscribe to patriarchy, and I don’t think it should be substituted with matriarchy” (140). Implicit in Morrison’s words is the need for the contrasexuality that Jung placed so much focus on: patriarchy and matriarchy are both fundamentally unbalanced, favoring one sex (and its attendant sexual politics) over another. The ambiguity of texts such as *Beloved*, then,

Overall, Jungian analysis helps serve as a bridge between the worlds of modernism and postmodernism, allowing critical readers to see the importance of universal symbols and archetypes within literary texts while acknowledging that the use and interpretation of those symbols and archetypes will vary by individual. For modernist characters and their authors, Jung becomes part of the emphasis on psychology that propelled Freud to such heights of fame, providing for the modern world an intangible goal (mental wholeness and stability) with which they could replace the uncertainties widespread social instability and violent conflict. Arguably, the character of Orlando represents the actualization of such a goal for the troubled Virginia

Woolf, as Orlando finds within herself the creative nexus to transcend all boundaries, including time and gender. It is my contention that Jungian thought provided a better psychological alternative for Woolf (who famously clashed with Freud¹), especially considering that his emphasis on contrasexuality was more in line with the androgynous ideal that she puts forth in *A Room of One's Own*. For Atwood and Morrison, Jung fulfills arguably more of a postmodernist role: each author presents a bleak world (for Atwood, a dystopia of the present world—for Morrison, the full horrors of America's history concerning slavery), worlds in which objective truth seems gone. A large part of this is due to the multiple layers of instability encountered by the protagonists of these texts, forcing them to define truth according to their own terms. *Beloved's* Sethe is a great example of this: on one hand, the "thick love" she reveres clearly keeps her from living a happy and fulfilling life, tethering her to a seemingly inescapable past. However, it is impossible for readers to judge her for this love, as she has bravely thrust that love out into a world of fear and hate. It has become central to not only her character, but her sense of identity as a mother, without which the "thick love" would have very little relevance. In such a case, Jungian analysis helps the critical reader view Sethe through the lens of failed actualization, and to better understand the characters and world around her that kept her from achieving this actualization.

In fact, it is interesting to note how the social constructs that exist within Morrison's portrayal of slave-owning America are often a result of racist, patriarchal characters that have,

¹ Woolf dismissed texts focusing overly on empty psychoanalysis as "Freudian Fiction," and she fretted over the great costs Hogarth Press took to publish works that illustrated the "gull-like imbecility" of "these Germans" (Orr 5). While not specifically indicting Freud, it should be noted that the "madness and suicide of Septimus Smith in *Mrs. Dalloway*" help reveal her thoughts on doctors who make their patients feel "dominated and controlled," though she seems to develop a cautious respect for him in her journal after they are acquainted in 1939.

themselves, failed to actualize. In the horrifying scene in which Schoolteacher's nephews take Sethe's milk, it seems clear that their own erotic development has been stilted—they eroticize the maternal, while Schoolteacher seems to deny is entirely, equating Sethe and other slaves to the role of beasts. While these events are numbingly horrid on their own, Jungian analysis allows a tentative answer as to what fuels the potent blend of misogyny and racism: Jung viewed the anima as a representation of man's soul, which is one of the reasons it is such a varying archetype (it can be a young nymph to an old man, or a wise matriarch to a young man). Characters such as Schoolteacher and his nephews effectively deny themselves access to their souls and their unconscious mind through the practice of slavery. As such, there is little empathy for slaves—as with Atwood's chilling world of Gilead, patriarchal forces have suppressed the unconscious world to such an extent that the world around them becomes a representation of their own conscious personas of masculine power.

Put another way, it is not a coincidence that while Woolf's *Orlando* is centered on the eventual elevation and transcendent actualization of its titular protagonist, Atwood and Morrison focus on the victimization and psychological trauma of their own protagonists. In many ways, this signals the shift from modernism to postmodernism, as these texts concentrate more on the nature of the power dynamics within their unjust societies, and how those dynamics affect the protagonists (effects which are understandably negative). Jung, however, allows us to view what fuels these shifts in power dynamics—specifically, how characters often re-appropriate archetypes for their own agendas. This is perhaps most obvious in Atwood's Gilead, in which the authority of the Bible has been perverted in order to place God's stamp on the atrocities that are being committed. On a fundamental level, the architects of Gilead are using the collective need for wholeness and actualization to prop up their fascist dictatorship: they have manufactured the

instability of the country via a violent coup and continued warfare against other nations, so that the average people of Gilead look to sources of authority for a sense of stability. When the Bible is changed in order to mislead those who are not supposed to read, the powers that be in Gilead effectively present themselves as God. Jungian analysis, then, offers a fascinating view of archetypes as viewed by old lenses: high-ranking wives, for instance, dress like the Virgin Mary—an intended compliment to the wives that offers a fascinating glimpse into the psychology of Gilead, in which even those with all of the power are falsely composing themselves, as they force their victims to do. Jung, then, helps even the postmodernist better deconstruct such a text, helping to answer questions concerning identity and wholeness, even as it is made quite clear that the nature of such a world almost certainly precludes achieving that wholeness.

With that in mind, the following work will examine Woolf, Morrison, and Atwood in that order. It is my hope to use Jungian analysis and texts to better illustrate why it was possible for Orlando to achieve actualization, but not Sethe or Offred. In the chapters of the latter characters, I posit that such actualization is not impossible (despite the postmodern nature of each text, healing and wholeness are still theoretically attainable for these characters), but highly unlikely due to the worlds they are in. As such, the *Orlando* chapter predominately features analysis of Orlando herself, while the *Beloved* and *The Handmaid's Tale* chapters offer supporting discussions of other characters (such as Denver, Paul D, and Beloved for Morrison, and The Commander for Atwood) in order to more fully flesh out the failure of actualization in these texts, and what its implications are. Through the discussion of these three texts, I hope to not only highlight the utility and versatility of Jung for analyzing these authors, but to establish a more secure place for Jung among feminist scholarship as we move further into the 21st century.

Snellgrove 11

Chapter 1:

Woolf and Jung: A New Perspective for A New Feminism

Virginia Woolf and her writings are no strangers to psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic theory. Woolf paved the way herself through visits with none other than Sigmund Freud, visits which left her skeptical of both the man's approach to psychology and the benefits of his counseling. Nonetheless, the psychoanalytic approach to Woolf's writing over the years has been predominately Freudian...an approach that, by its very patriarchal and sex-focused nature, limits any conclusions that can be drawn. My proposal, instead, is to use the psychoanalytic theories of Carl Jung to better understand both Virginia Woolf and her texts...chiefly, the text of *Orlando*.² Orlando's trips through time, space, and sex represent a unique opportunity to explore the explication of Jung's ideas concerning the anima—the oft-repressed feminine side to a man. Woolf presents a story in which this side is given so much expression that Orlando transforms into a woman, seemingly becoming the androgynous ideal in the eyes of Woolf (in the sense of possessing both feminine and masculine characteristics, but able to produce eternal art that transcends sex). However well Woolf's text fits, however, the need (or case, as it were) for Jungian analysis of Woolf's text should be plainly laid out.

One of the obvious counterarguments to the enterprise of a Jungian analysis on the anima within Woolf's *Orlando* is that, in traditional Jungian theory, a woman—which *Orlando* most certainly becomes, albeit while taking an extraordinarily scenic route—do not have an anima, nor do they follow traditional anima development. Rather, women develop along a separate (yet

² One of the major conceits of this work is that while Jung himself was quite patriarchal, his thoughts and philosophies are easier to reconcile into a feminist framework than Freud's are. As such, I see myself extending the research already conducted by Susan Rowland (*Jung: A Feminist Revision*), Demaris Wehr (*Jung and Feminism: Liberating Archetypes*) and Jung's wife Emma Jung (*Animus and Anima*).

related) track, that of the animus, or serve as vessels for the projection of men—blank slates onto which such men project their own notions of women, as defined by their own unconscious. To such counterarguments, I offer the following rebuttals: the first, albeit simplest argument against these objections is that Orlando is not a traditional woman—she changes from man to woman and back again, and can therefore be interpreted as, in many ways, the self-projection of her own notions of anima. Put another way, the vast majority of the text can theoretically be read as a masculine Orlando transitioning into femininity and womanhood, and it is the responsibility of the reader to determine how much of these feminine displays is an expression of her own femininity, and how much is filtered through the lens of her previous masculine expectations, acting in accord with how the masculine Orlando would prefer women to act.

One argument in favor of Jungian analysis is that Woolf may very well have been playfully exploring her own analogous notion of the anima. In fact, Woolf claimed that

it is becoming daily more evident that Lady Macbeth, Cordelia, Ophelia, Clarissa, Dora, Diana, Helen and the rest are by no means what they pretend to be. Some are very plainly men in disguise; others represent what men would like to be, or are conscious of not being... To cast out and incorporate in a person of the opposite sex all that we miss in ourselves and desire in the universe and detest in humanity is a deep and universal instinct on the part of both men and women. But though it affords relief, it does not lead to understanding. Rochester is as great a travesty of the truth about men as Cordelia is of the truth about women. (Woolf, *Women and Writing* 65)

As Stephen Walker eloquently puts it, “in distinguishing between the ‘truth’ about the sexes and the ‘travesty of truth’ one finds in gender stereotypes... Woolf was expressing in ordinary

language what Jung as a psychologist was struggling to express in his descriptions of animus and anima” (Walker 49). *Orlando*, then, provides Woolf an opportunity to explore the idea of the anima and the animus through one character. Moreover, such an exploration allows her to explore (if only through fiction) the “understanding” that she claims is typically absent from such portrayals in fiction. Bibliographically, that makes *Orlando* important as a work of transition, one allowing Woolf to explore the waters of the unconscious before fully plunging into those murky depths for her subsequent novel, *The Waves*. Therefore, even as Woolf explored gender concepts in parallel with Jungian philosophy, we can use Jungian philosophy to better understand the Byzantine pathways that Woolf’s characters take through both body and mind within *Orlando*.

The third (and most sweeping) argument for a Jungian analysis of *Orlando*’s anima is that my work seeks to revitalize Jung for the 21st century as a tool for decoding and understanding feminist texts. As such, it is worth keeping in mind the writings of neo-Jungian scholars such as James Hillman, who in 1987 pointed out the relative absurdity of assuming that women cannot experience anima development themselves:

The roles which Jung assigns to the anima—relation with the mysteries, with the archaic past, enactment of the good fairy, witch, whore, saint, and animal ... all appear frequently and validly in the psychology of women...as the images are not restricted to men only, so anima emotion cannot be confined only to the male sex. (Hillman 57)

Jungian analysis has ample room to breathe when one expands the notion of anima to women: as Hillman continues, “we are freed from the masculine-feminine fantasy of anima, from the endless oscillations of compensation, and also from the epistemological deceit of explanations

through ‘projection’” (Hillman 59), and also helps to avoid the embedded sexism within the assumption that, in the Jungian schematic, women are asked to “neglect soul for the sake of spirit” (Hillman 61), and better equip the Jungian scholar to analyze a postmodern world in which gender performance has become more separate from sex than ever before. Hillman’s work is illuminating, but dated; it is one of my hopes with this work to expand upon his groundbreaking work concerning the anima, and to better adapt it as a tool for feminist analysis. This plays a major part in my own interpretation of Hillman: while the readers themselves may be freed from the “epistemological deceit” of projections, that does not mean that characters within a literary work cannot or do not project. Rather, it offers a way of circumventing the potentially endless cycle of determining how much of a psychoanalytic approach can be separated from its speaker, and whether Jung’s notions of projection are actually his own projections of projections, and so forth. Specifically, this helps distinguish this critique from earlier critiques that read so much of Woolf in *Orlando* that it becomes difficult (if not impossible) to distinguish the two.³

Jung, despite his own patriarchal leanings, has provided a theoretical framework that helps to unpack much of the complicated writing that Woolf engages in. Ellen Friedman highlights the need for such a framework by noting that “women anticanonical writers such as Richardson, Woolf, and Gertrude Stein do not locate their texts within patriarchal myths and traditions. ... Expression of the feminine requires a disengagement not only from the modes of traditional fiction...but also a stance of irreverence toward or distance from the central myths of the dominant culture.” She goes on to contrast the enterprise of male writers as one that focuses

³ Distinguishing between the author and her creation becomes doubly important when one considers that Woolf deliberately merged biography, autobiography, and fiction as a way of creating a literary escape from the emotional torpor of her relationship with Vita Sackville-West, as Woolf biographer Julia Biggs asserts.

on tradition in order to “arrive where we started” with that of female writers, who believe “it is their project to present what this tradition has resisted, to make ‘it’ *different* because they wish to arrive elsewhere” (Friedman 359). While Jung as a writer is undeniably rooted in certain aspects of tradition, the theory behind his writing is rooted in the idea of uncovering resisted tradition. Jung does this with expediency by pointing out how much of “tradition” is actually a product of the unconscious mind that individuals have had no way of understanding. In this sense, a large part of Jung’s own enterprise concerns deconstructing the “central myths of the dominant culture,” if only to prove that there are deeper myths and archetypes underneath the surface. In this sense, Jung provides a vital and dynamic new way of approaching scholarship concerning Virginia Woolf by inviting analysis of how she uses a variety of literary techniques (such as elongated time and a focus on how reality is shaped by the mind of the observer) in order to arrive somewhere truly new: the shores of the unconscious mind.

A blunter question regarding psychoanalysis of Woolf or her texts would be “why not Freud?” Considering Woolf’s own experience with the venerable legend of psychology, he would—at first glance—seem to provide the ideal lens through which to examine her works. However, upon further examination, this is not the case: Yael Feldman, analyzing Woolf’s earlier fiction, notes that “there is no substantial evidence that Freud’s writing had any effect on Woolf in the same years (the 1920s). Moreover, in her diary Woolf did not miss any opportunity to make fun of psychoanalysis and of what she named “Freudian fiction” (131). Feldman goes on to state that “Freud’s ideas must have upset her, as they totally contradicted the Bloomsbury understanding of the nature of civilization and personal freedom, and of the source of artistic inspiration (132)” and concludes that Woolf “performed a sleight of hand” concerning Freud’s

beliefs concerning aggression and instinct, by making the “culprit” masculine, and therefore something that needs to be transcended (134).⁴

Regarding the text of *Orlando* specifically, and its unavoidable topic of bisexuality, Karen Lawrence illustrates that “the polymorphous possibilities of bisexuality continue to circulate. They put into play a new kind of female narcissism/homoeroticism, which is freed from the shadow of Freudian judgment and is represented in a series of mirroring pairs of androgynous lovers.” Combined with what Lawrence sees as a “comic deflation of the horrors of the Freudian paradigm” of castration and the textual focus on what Freud had dubbed the “enigma of female sexuality,” and it seems clear that the Freudian approach is not an ideal approach with which to analyze *Orlando* (Lawrence 254). Why is Jung the ideal alternative? Jung is much less focused on sexual difference than Freud or the neo-Freudians who followed; as such, even relatively comic scenes, such as the unveiling of the transformed *Orlando*, can be read in terms of unconscious archetypes rather than conscious anxiety revolving around a penis (or lack thereof). And considering Woolf’s own obvious fascination with, as Lawrence puts it, “mirroring pairs of androgynous lovers,” Jungian analysis provides a similar model, as Jung’s own ideas of self-actualization concern opposing pairs of disparate psychological aspects (such as the repressed hyper-masculinity of the shadow archetype paired with the enigmatic femininity of the anima archetype), and how true actualization involves the individual reconciling these disparate aspects until they can be psychologically whole: neither wholly masculine or feminine,

⁴ This is quite Jungian, since Woolf noted male writers’ propensities for projecting negativity on female characters in her review of Leonie Villard’s *La Femme Anglaise au XIX^eeme Siecle et son Evolution d’apres le Roman Anglais Contemporain*. Self-actualization must necessarily involve liberation from both male-given labels and the need to negatively label men, which she asserts in *A Room of One’s Own*. Through *Orlando*, she introduces a character that can mediate both worlds, and ultimately transcend the need for any such projection.

for instance, but a kind of mental mixture. Viewed in this context, Jungian psychoanalysis is ideal for analyzing Woolf's *Orlando* because, for all intents and purposes, it already speaks the same language.

In many ways, both the text of *Orlando* and the titular character serves as explications for the feminist philosophy of writing that Woolf puts forth in *A Room of One's Own*. When thinking of Orlando in terms of the actualization of Woolf's ideas in *A Room of One's Own*, it is interesting to note the seeds of Jungian thought that permeate the latter. While it can be argued that she was being poetically tongue in cheek, Woolf reminds readers early on that "I is only a convenient term for somebody who has no real being" (Woolf, *A Room of One's Own* 4). When examined from the Jungian perspective, this is a very powerful statement, asserting that most individuals' sense of identity is not one born of any true substance. The natural question to such a statement is what, exactly, the "I"—the identity—most often consists of? The Jungian answer would be that individuals are very focused on their archetypal personas, placing masks over their real sense of self in order to facilitate interaction with the world. It is on this point that Woolf is frequent and harsh, noting that women often buy into the misogynistic mythology that men have framed them in. Perhaps most stinging are her notes regarding "Professor X" and that she has "given prominence to his statement that women are intellectually, morally and physically inferior to men" (Woolf, *A Room of One's Own* 110). Considering her blunt reminder that the vast majority of what would be considered quality English poetry came from those trained at a university, it presents a sobering reality in which the artistic world to which she encourages women to aspire is one that consistently rejects those women.

Of course, Woolf encourages women to take off those masks—to abandon the personas of subservience to dominant males which have historically kept them from being a part of the

artistic world. She mentions how both the consumption and production of writing has the power to transport a woman away from the artificial world that men have tried to keep her in and into the real world: “For the reading of these books seems to perform a curious couching operation on the senses; one sees more intensely afterwards; the world seems bared of its covering and given an intenser life” (Woolf, *A Room of One’s Own* 109). In fact, the world seeming bare of its coverings seems to echo the Jungian notion of self-actualization: an actualized person will no longer be covered by masks of persona, in which they consciously attempt to appear as something other than what they really are. Nor will such a person be unconsciously possessed by different archetypes that force them to present only one aspect of themselves at a time. Rather, the person will be able to embody all of the disparate parts of themselves into a single unified identity.

Woolf’s inspiring words towards the end of the text concerning Shakespeare’s sister also seem to echo Jungian thought, particularly concerning the notion of archetypes. Woolf writes that

She lies buried where the omnibuses now stop, opposite the Elephant and Castle. Now my belief is that this poet who never wrote a word and was buried at the cross-roads still lives. She lives in you and in me, and in many other women who are not here to-night, for they are washing up the dishes and putting the children to bed. But she lives; for great poets do not die; they are continuing presences; they need only the opportunity to walk among us in the flesh” (Woolf, *A Room of One’s Own* 48).

The idea of a kind of universal sense of womanhood is something that Woolf has made clear from the very beginning of this text, noting that she could be referred to as “Mary Beton, Mary

Seton, Mary Carmichael or by any name you please” (Woolf, *A Room of One’s Own* 5). She makes this claim shortly after her reminder that “I,” as a philosophical notion, often has very little substance behind it. In this context, the implication seems quite clear: just as she is Virginia Woolf, well-known scholar and writer, she is also connected to the world of women, present and past...something she returns to with the discussion of embodying Shakespeare’s sister, and bringing to life the creative potential that her early death had cut short. This is a fundamental idea to Jungian psychoanalysis: self-actualization involves accessing one’s unconscious mind, which most emphatically contains more than one’s own conscious, but the collective unconscious of those who have lived before. In this sense, self-actualization involves reaching a kind of accord with the past, reconciling one’s self to what has happened in the past in order to change the face of the future.

While mentioned only briefly, Woolf’s idea of feminine writers embracing reality is very similar to Jung’s notions of self-actualization. Woolf begins by rhetorically questioning the nature of reality, and then providing an answer: “What is reality?...whatever it touches, it fixes and makes permanent. That is what remains over when the skin of the day has been cast into the hedge; that is what is left of past time and of our loves and hates” (Woolf, *A Room of One’s Own* 108). It forms an interesting contrast: while “the skin of the day” is “cast into the hedge,” true reality is still comprised of events and emotions that have previously occurred: “past time and of our loves and hates.” Jung’s idea of the mandala most directly symbolized his notion of self-actualization, as he imagined paired opposites on either side of a centered self. Only when one could effectively unite those opposites—to embrace the disparate aspects and be all things at once—could one truly be actualized. In this case, Woolf writes of the revelation of reality (her equivalent of self-actualization) as a way of distilling the substance of a day from non-substance.

How else can one dismiss “the skin of the day” while embracing “what is left of past time?” Following Woolf’s metaphor directly, the individual must be willing to tear the skin off in order to see the substance within...substance that is comprised of contradictions, such as “loves and hates.” Once an individual can reconcile these contradictions, they can enter into a world of self-actualization.

This notion of paired opposites also lines up with Woolf’s philosophy of writing, as she expands upon in a variety of texts. Some of the paired opposites that Woolf tackles are as follows: masculinity and femininity (which she seeks to reconcile, at least in part, through the androgynous ideal she writes of in *A Room of One’s Own*, and explores through the shifting character of Orlando), Self versus persona (the dilemma of reconciling one’s true identity with one’s public mask, something that Virginia Woolf was no stranger to), and production versus consumption (in the case of producing art rather than consuming it, the reconciliation of which finally allows Orlando to rise above both critics Nicholas Green and famous writers such as Alexander Pope). In fact, Woolf’s own sense of developing a creative identity has provided much for psychoanalytic theory to process. Her views on this subject expressed more literally in *A Room of One’s Own* and more metaphorically in *Orlando* seem to mesh well with Jungian theory:

...some marriage of opposites has to be consummated. The whole of the mind must lie wide open if we are to get the sense that the writer is communicating his experience with perfect fullness. There must be freedom and there must be peace. Not a wheel must grate, not a light glimmer. The curtains must be close drawn.

(Woolf, *A Room of One’s Own* 102)

Such a vision is as tantalizing as it is puzzling—after all, the consummation in *A Room* is arguably symbolized by a union of male and female in a taxi, and yet feminist writing is characterized by an androgynous ideal that, nonetheless, retains a maternal lens. However, Jungian theory provides a way of untangling this particular difficulty using Jung’s own schematic of self-actualization, which he personally symbolized as a mandala. He envisioned the symbol as a circle squared, in which

the centre is represented by an innermost point, it is surrounded by a periphery containing everything that belongs to the self—the paired opposites that make up the total personality...the self, though on the one hand simple, is on the other hand an extremely composite thing, a “conglomerate soul,” to use the Indian expression. (Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 357).

On the most basic level, this seems to provide an answer to what Woolf has been calling for in the development of feminist identity. Jung, too, believes in the “consummation” of the paired opposites, such as the man and woman joining together in the taxi that Woolf speaks of.

However, the product of such a union is, on the psychic level, something else entirely: not entirely man and not entirely woman, it represents, as Jung puts it, a “composite” or “conglomerate soul” which theoretically allows for Woolf’s androgynous ideal while, at the same time, allowing such writers to think through their mothers: after all, having multiple lenses through which one is able to view the world does not lessen that view, or make it any less the writer’s own unique perspective.⁵

⁵ Another reason why *Orlando* provides such fascinating material for Jungian inquiry is the imagery at the end, in which reunion with Marmaduke seemingly creates this composite/conglomerate soul, physically and emotionally liberating Orlando from a static world that remains fixed in time and place while she roams, completely free.

The Jungian bent to Woolf's thinking extended to the world of poetry as well, though she didn't personally consider such a world as part of her own writing (an irony, perhaps, given the often poetic nature of her texts). In her *Letter to a Young Poet*, she described what she saw as the standard of modern poetry, in which writers are simply performing for readers:

They dress themselves up. They act their parts. One leads; the other follows. One is romantic, the other realist. One is advanced, the other out of date. There is no harm in it, so long as you take it as a joke, but once you believe in it, once you begin to take yourself seriously as a leader or as a follower, as a modern or as a conservative, then you become a self-conscious, biting, and scratching little animal whose work is not of the slightest value or importance to anybody.

(Woolf, *A Letter to a Young Poet*)

She sees the poetic world as divided into paired opposites that seemingly echo the Jungian notion of a mandala. Moreover, her description of self-conscious poets perfectly echoes the Jungian notion of the persona, in which one consciously shifts their identity as a way of accommodating the expectations of others. Specifically, it echoes the notion of masculine persona, which is very much a part of the world of modern writers that she sought to coexist with. It is interesting to note that when she continues by asking the young poets to take a different path—to be “a poet in whom live all the poets of the past, from whom all poets in time to come will spring” (Woolf, *A Letter to a Young Poet*)—she is subtly trying to steer them towards an approach more in line with her own understated gynocentric view. Specifically, she is asking them to consider their role as progenitors of the next generation of poetry, and in order to bring that about (to be the poets “from whom all poets in time to come will spring”), they must be able to link the disparate masculine and feminine aspects of their own minds. For these patriarchal poets, this was

tantamount to asking them to view feminine thought not as something simply Other from themselves, but as a path that they, too, can walk.

In many ways, Woolf's evocation of this mandala-type imagery seems to echo the Jungian notion of the collective unconscious, in the sense that the creative world (past, present, and future) is linked together by psychological archetypes that are universally stirring. Regarding self-actualization, Woolf points out that many modern poets put themselves into seclusion: that when it comes to their sense of self, "It is a self that sits alone in the room at night with the blinds drawn" (Woolf, *A Letter to a Young Poet*). The alternative, she says, is for the poets to engage with the world in a way that unites disparate elements (that is, the world of prose and the world of poetry): "Then let your rhythmical sense wind itself in and out among men and women, omnibuses, sparrows — whatever come along the street — until it has strung them together in one harmonious whole" (Woolf, *A Letter to a Young Poet*). In many ways, this echoes the Jungian notion of self-actualization, as it involves both putting aside the public persona and finding a way of (poetically speaking) incorporating all aspects into a "harmonious whole."

This idea of self-actualization is persistent in *Orlando* as well. Of course, obtaining this ideal of self-actualization is not always easy: Even towards the end of *Orlando*, the titular character is struggling to unlock her true self. Woolf writes that

the conscious self, which is the uppermost, and has the power to desire, wishes to be nothing but one self. This is what some people call the true self, and it is, they say, compact of all the selves we have it in us to be; commanded and locked up by the Captain self, the Key self, which amalgamates and controls them all. (Woolf, *Orlando* 310).

At first glance, it might seem that Woolf's idea of "the Captain self" is the one more in line with Jungian theory: after all, it is "the key self" that "amalgamates...them all," which seems to be in line with the Jungian sense of self-actualization, in which the paired opposites of one's personality are finally united, and one can be the entirety of themselves at once. However, Lokke points out the importance of the wording in this passage: "The phrase 'they say' and the negative connotations of the words 'commanded' and 'locked up' suggest that this Captain self does not in fact represent Woolf's ideal of free and creative selfhood." Lokke sees this as quite distinct from the "real self in the novel's conclusion," which "can hardly be described as a commanding or controlling Captain" (Lokke 245). It seems likely that Woolf was being more literal during this section, describing an aspect of herself/her identity that is the key to unlocking "the true self." In doing so, she uses sublime paradox to describe the very problems that Jungian analysis is designed to uncover: the very thing which is able to unlock the doors into the deeper layers of one's unconscious mind is the unconscious itself, which also serves as a gate barring entry into those depths. In Woolf's schematic of feminine theory, this Captain self seems to be masculine, both in the sense that the reader makes an immediate connection with Marmaduke and in the sense that it is a controlling and even oppressive force, one that seeks "control" over the "compact of all selves we have it in us to be." In the case of Orlando, this "compact" is represented by her feminine identity, which she is only able to explore and create by utilizing her own knowledge of the masculine world: using the key to unlock her interior self. This also elegantly expounds upon her idea of androgyny as well: while the "compact of all selves" for her is feminine, it is only via the mental and physical freedoms granted by her performance of masculinity that allows her to open this compact, and explore her true identity.

This, too, seems an actualization of the theories that Woolf puts forth in *A Room of One's Own*. She describes the writer after such a consummation has taken place: "The writer, I thought, once his experience is over, must lie back and let his mind celebrate its nuptials in darkness." Jung's schematic of self-actualization has its own sublime paradox as well: self-actualization is a method for achieving a harmonic unity from the chaotic multiplicity of one's psychic selves. Woolf describes as much in the brief passage above: it is a consummation that echoes romantic pairings, but at the same time involves utter solitude, a lone mind celebrating in darkness. This would seem to fit with both Jungian psychoanalytic theory as well as Woolf's feminist theory: the latter sees feminine life as one that is subject to male intrusion at almost any moment, and at nearly every level. As the text of *Orlando* illustrates so well, male intrusion is often thought necessary as a way of defining femininity: Orlando's debating whether or not it is more pleasurable to yield to men or not may seem empowering at first glance, but such a view overlooks the blunt reality of this binary choice...that one either takes the pittance that men offer, or must choose to provide for themselves in a patriarchal world. Through *A Room and Orlando's* conclusion, Woolf seems to be putting forth a third option: acquiring independence, both economically and emotionally, and using this relative isolation as a way of exploring what being a woman means to the woman herself, as opposed to what it means to men. Only through such an action can one effectively be freed from the persona—the mask one wears in response to the needs and expectations of the surrounding world.⁶

⁶ The persona, of course, corresponds to the notion of performance, as in the performance of masculinity and the performance of femininity. Orlando finds initial freedom in the performance of femininity, but her final self-actualization comes later, with the realization that she need not perform/conform to an outsider's view of ideal femininity.

It would be helpful to follow the transformation(s) of Orlando (ultimately culminating in her becoming a woman, in the sense that she is literally and metaphorically comfortable with the gender identity of her body) along the lines of Jung's so-called four stages of erotic development. This development traces different aspects of the anima development until it is fully realized in an individual—a rare case, because various cultural and unconscious forces often keep individuals from reaching the fourth and final stage. Jung's four stages are as follows: Eve, Helen, Mary, and Sophia. Eve represents fertility and motherhood—a kind of primal mother figure presiding over the consciousness of mankind. The second stage, Helen—named after Helen of Troy—who represents sexual power, potential, and energy. The third stage is that of the Virgin Mary, in which the sexual energies and urges of the Helen stage are sublimated into pursuit of a kind of ideal purity. Finally, the Sophia stage represents an idealized and eternal feminine nature whose knowledge surpasses everyone and everything. How, then, do these stages apply to Orlando?

One of the more important things to understand regarding the Eve stage of development is that it is not limited to literal fertility, nor literal motherhood. Rather, as Hiromi Yashida notes, the Eve stage of erotic development represents “the primal life force and the universal womb of consciousness, the Great Goddess who idolizes the maternal anima corresponds, also, to the great cosmic beginning,” and is something that must ultimately “be affirmed in order to galvanize the individuation process” (35). The importance of the maternal aspect has played an important role in previous criticism of the text in many of Woolf's narratives: as Beth Schwartz notes, “In invoking maternal figures as her muses, Woolf rewrites the erotic, heterosexual plot of the poet-muse relationship, replacing it with a homoerotic script. Furthermore, by thinking back through her mothers, Woolf aims to establish the mother as a repository of memory and as the source of

poetic inspiration for women writers by locating her at the core of the creative impulse” (Schwartz 721). Schwartz postulates that a maternal Shakespeare comes to serve as a kind of muse for Orlando in her quest to produce her own narratives. From the standpoint of a Jungian analysis, then, this places the anima development of Orlando into an even more important context: as Orlando seeks to become less tethered to the world of masculinity and its trapping, one of the chief goals is to escape the male influence of earlier writers. Just as she is eventually freed from the importance of Green’s criticism (whether for good or ill), she must free herself from Shakespeare and other male writers that serve as focal points in the literary world. In this sense, the first stage of anima development allows Orlando to take the first, tentative steps into becoming her own maternal influence, and becoming her own maternal lens through which she can view the world.

Woolf writes that “very soon after Orlando escapes with the gypsies,” they note that she has “fallen into the clutches of the vilest and cruelest among all the Gods, which is Nature.” Not content to simply view the natural vistas before her, the ever-creative Orlando “likened the hills to ramparts, to the breasts of doves, and the flanks of kine. She compared the flowers to enamel and the turf to Turkey rugs worn thin. Trees were withered hags, and sheep were grey boulders.” As seems natural enough for a writer, she wished to commit such observations to writing, and by creating ink from berries and scrawling in her precious copy of “The Oak Tree” she was able to “to describe the scenery in a long, blank version poem, and to carry on a dialogue with herself about this Beauty and Truth concisely enough” (Woolf, *Orlando* 145).

Orlando, newly transformed, is seeking to become the kind of creative and generative force that does not passively receive the beauty of the natural world as an onlooker, but seeks to create it as well. While it may be argued that this is not necessarily a new development for

Orlando—after all, her writing material is the very nature-oriented poem she has hauled around for so far and for so long—it is important to note how this deviates from her previous behavior. Her precious poem had been previously described as “his boyish dream and very short” (Woolf, *Orlando* 96-97) when Orlando was a man; while the use of the word “boyish” certainly helps underscore the relative immaturity of the poem, it is impossible to overlook the gendered implications. It was, for all intents and purposes, a boy’s dream...something that could only be properly understood by readers in the context of the generative power of Orlando’s feminine transformation. In short: one did not realize how much of the old dream was “boyish” until it was joined by the feminine counterpoint of the transformed Orlando. The poem as a metaphor for Orlando herself is quite illuminating, then: due to necessity, she is unable to write on any other paper, and is forced to write upon her copy of “The Oak Tree.” As such, the feminine artistic ability—the fully realized power of feminine creation—is something that expands upon the incomplete template created by man. As Hiromi Yashida puts it, “the birth of woman from man illustrates the idea of spiritual, conceptual, or artistic creation that corresponds to the emergence of the anima from the male psyche” (35). The newly transformed Orlando is able to access this creative energy in ways that she previously could not as a male.

In the context of this anima development, it is interesting to note that Orlando returns to England. As Karen Lawrence puts it, she had only recently been freed from “the patriarchal shackles” of her position; why return? Lawrence’s answer is relatively straightforward: “Unlimited freedom of movement has a negative side; Orlando discovers that the lack of attachment is inimical both to poetry and to intimacy of the kind explored in the novel’s androgynous pairings” (272) In terms of self-actualization, then, nomadic life among the gypsies actually takes Orlando further and further away from her centered self because, in many ways,

that self belongs in England. Therefore, being away from England not only stifles the creative impulse of her Eve stage of development, but also removes the objects of her affection. She was a creator running away from what she perceived as the literary nexus of creation, and a nurturer with nothing to nurture: even the very words by which she expresses love for nature around her are limited among the gypsies, and her need to use such words to describe beauty results in the schism between her and her saviors.

The second stage of erotic development, Helen, is an interesting figure in Jung's paradigm. While Eve is the beginning of anima development and Sophia is the desired endpoint, Helen represents a very transitional phase—an important stage of sexual development, certainly, but one that risks (appropriately enough for the namesake) an obsession with physical gratification and pleasure. In short: in the Jungian paradigm, an individual should not be obsessed solely with matters of the flesh any more than they should be obsessed with matters of the spirit, but must find a way to balance these disparate aspects. Of the Helen stage, Jung has claimed that “she personifies a romantic and aesthetic level that is...still characterized by sexual elements” (Franz, “The Process of Individuation” 195). In the brief romances with Captain Nicholas and the Archduke (as well as the frank fascination with prostitutes), Orlando illustrates this aspect quite well, as her own aesthetic sense turns away from matters of nature and more to sexual matters. This transition is duly noted by the text itself, which informs readers that “It is a strange fact, but a true one, that up to this moment she had scarcely given her sex a thought” but becomes obsessed with whether it feels better to “refuse” or to “yield,” seemingly identifying the inherent power in this choice as one that is decidedly feminine in nature. In fact, Orlando's musings on the subject mirror the varying interpretations of Helen's character—specifically, whether she was unwillingly abducted or coerced into leaving her home, or whether she

willingly fled after being seduced by Paris. Interpretations are similarly divided on Helen's role in the Greek invasion of Troy... whether she helped lead the men inside, or tortured them from within their wooden horse.

One of the reasons for such varying interpretations of both Helen and Orlando has to do with the fact that the collective unconscious does not produce unified interpretations—differing degrees of consciousness can result in both positive and negative interpretations of certain aspects. For instance, the figure of a grandmother can be both wonderful and frightening to a child; as someone who exercises power and authority over the child's parents (who are otherwise the most powerful figures in his world), the grandmother figure is often either glorified through fairytales and stories as figures such as fairy godmothers or Glinda the Good Witch, or demonized as child-eating crones or the Wicked Witch of the West. In these inner dialogues, Orlando seems to embody both possibilities, as she wonders whether it is better to see the captain frown by declining his offer of putting fat onto her plate, or whether it is better to see him smiling by yielding. This binary thinking continues when Orlando ponders returning to England itself:

landing there meant comfort, meant opulence, meant consequence and state
(for she would doubtless pick up some noble Prince and reign, his consort,
over half Yorkshire), still...it meant conventionality, meant slavery, meant
deceit, meant denying her love, fettering her limbs, pursing her lips, and
restraining her tongue. (Woolf, *Orlando* 163)

What is very intriguing about this passage is that it reveals Orlando as both subject and object of her transformation and subsequent erotic development—that is, even as the transformation begins to affect changes both great and small to her own psyche, she is able to perceive the

different interpretations of being a woman. I contend that part of her ability to embody both subject and object is the fact that she is still transitioning from man to woman. This is illustrated by her later changes in gender, which come before the legal pronouncement (that she apparently agrees with) that her sex was “pronounced indisputably, and beyond the shadow of a doubt...female” (Woolf, *Orlando* 255). How does this interact with the Jungian interpretation? While it may seem obvious, at times Orlando’s development as a woman runs along male ideas of femininity, while at other times it is more organic (compare her choices to dress modestly and interact with high society with her later “marriage” to nature that leads to the appearance of Marmaduke).

The third stage of erotic development is that of the Virgin Mary. Perhaps more so than any other stages, this stage invites skepticism on the part of the critical reader. After all, neither Woolf nor Orlando seem like ready figures to associate with traditional notions of the Virgin Mary (such as chastity and religious devotion). However, Jung himself notes that the modern interpretation of Mary as being completely devoid of bodily aspects is, in fact, a reaction to modern man’s dependence on science and technology. Specifically, Jung questions how the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, confirmed as Catholic dogma in 1950, can be reconciled with the animal nature of man: “what has become of the characteristic relation of the mother-image to the earth, darkness, the abysmal side of the bodily man with his animal passions and instinctual nature, and to ‘matter’ in general” (Jung, *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious* 107)? In attempting to answer this provocative question, Jung comments that the collective focus of the world on science and technology has given rise to weapons (such as the hydrogen bomb) capable of mass annihilation, and the result is that “the Mother of God was divested of all the essential qualities of materiality.” Humanity, then, requires Mary to become the antithesis of the material

world in order to embody deliverance from the material world entirely. Jung, however, sees it differently, and posits that Mary's body being taken "into heaven, the realm of the spirit...indicates a union of earth and heaven, or of matter and spirit." Rather than reconciling these aspects, Jung claims "the Assumption is the absolute opposite of materialism" and "it is a counterstroke that does nothing to diminish the tension between the opposites, but drives it to extremes" (Jung, *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious* 108-109). Part of the significance of this is that for Jung, the Virgin Mary stage of erotic development is not intended to be the final stage—it represents someone who is overly fixated on matters of a spiritual nature, rather than matters of the material world, and only at the final stage, Sophia, can these aspects be united.⁷

Where, then, does Orlando fit into such analysis? She seems to deify the abstract notion of intellect, going so far as to link (albeit playfully) the presence of God with the presence of intellect, as when Lady R.'s reception room is described as a

place where men and women met to swing censers and chant hymns to the bust of genius in a niche in the wall. Sometimes the God himself vouchsafed his presence for a moment. Intellect alone admitted the suppliant, and nothing (so the report ran) was said inside that was not witty. (Woolf, *Orlando* 198)

Following Jung's notion of the Virgin Mary archetype being used to "redeem" that of the Helen archetype, Orlando has replaced the frivolous men who formerly comprised the lovers vying for her attention with the intellectual "great men" that would be more worthy of her attention and devotion. The archetype of the Virgin Mary is significant for its ability to refine the notion of

⁷ The final aspect is what makes notions of this so-called "erotic development" friendly to feminist analysis. The first three stages are very concerned with patriarchal perceptions of women, as flawed creators and tempters (Eve) to fallen seductresses (Helen) to redeeming mothers (Mary). However, Sophia involves the woman embodying wisdom by unifying these opposing aspects of being—being everything at once, much like Orlando at the end of the text.

love: as Jung puts it, it is “a figure who raises love (*eros*) to the heights of spiritual devotion” (Jung, *Man and His Symbols* 195). Though Woolf was obviously writing before the Assumption of Mary became dogma, Orlando’s actions seem to align quite well with the hope that a spiritualized force can embody deliverance from failed flesh; this seems to be symbolized by her relationship with Alexander Pope, who she sees as a representation of true wit, unlike those who simply think themselves to be witty. The dichotomy seems clear from the very beginning, as he represents a towering intellect housed within physically unappealing body. While she soon becomes disillusioned with Pope as well, it is Woolf’s intriguing description of a kind of archetypal poet figure that perhaps best exemplifies the Jungian archetype of the Virgin Mary:

A poet is Atlantic and lion in one. While one drowns us the other gnaws us. If we survive the teeth, we succumb to the waves. A man who can destroy illusions is both beast and flood. Illusions are to the soul what atmosphere is to the earth.
...By the truth we are undone. Life is a dream. 'Tis waking that kills us. (Woolf, *Orlando* 203)

Interestingly, this corresponds quite well to Jung’s own notion of the Virgin Mary’s place within the schematic of erotic development: as Thomas Lawson puts it, “Jung finds the Christian Trinity, itself, of two incompatible figures: the Virgin Mary and the devil...as the intercessor between the sinner and Christ” (166). The Catholic Church, rather understandably, “excluded evil from the make-up of the Trinity, holding that God could contain no element of evil, for its presence in him would stand in contradiction to his holiness. Yet the immitigable presence of moral evil in the world found expression nevertheless through the imposing figure of Satan” (Lawson 166). Orlando slowly realizes that poets (Pope chief among them) represent this kind of innate paradox: they represent intellectual deliverance from the material world, and yet their

bodies and their works inhabit the material world. The ride home with Pope hints rather strongly at the need for a final stage of erotic development beyond this one—one in which Orlando would not need to rely upon external forces for intellectual salvation, just as she would no longer view the material world as something that she must escape.

However, while still embodying the Virgin Mary phase, Orlando's ride home with Pope provides interesting insight that revolves around the intriguing interplay of lightness and darkness on their carriage ride. She alternates thinking of herself as honored and blessed to be riding with such a venerable poet, and that they are insignificant cosmic specks in the mosaic of history. This binary eventually shifts to the character of Pope himself: he is alternately a "noble" man with "a weight of genius" in his brow, and a "wretched man" who is "plain" and "ignoble" and "despicable," a "deformed and weakly" man to "pity" and "despise." She seems unable to reconcile the salvation of his intellect with the weakness of his flesh, and interestingly returns to religious imagery in an attempt to discover both answers and, indeed, new questions:

But it is I that am a wretch,...for base as you may be, am I not still baser?...If I want to worship, have you not provided me with an image of yourself and set it in the sky? Are not evidences of your care everywhere? How humble, how grateful, how docile, should I not be, therefore? Let it be all my joy to serve, honour, and obey you. (Woolf, *Orlando* 206)

Herein, Orlando seems to return to the notion of an archetypal poet. While it is not literally Alexander Pope whose images are ever-present, he serves as an imperfect shade of her Platonic ideal of a poet's divinity. All the while, however, Pope seems to be serving his function as both redeeming force and antagonistic one: his intellect and its products represent the vessels through which Orlando intends to purify and humble herself, yet the material reality of Pope (and, by

extension, all poets, including herself) is that which newly-purified Orlando feels that she must confront. To put it another way: she would be unable to appreciate what she described as beams of genius that “may flash six or seven beams in quick succession (as Mr. Pope did that night) and then lapse into darkness for a year or for ever” (Woolf, *Orlando* 208-209) if she did not also confront the ignoble and despicable Pope in the darkness, absent the illumination from his brilliant beams of light.

It is worth mentioning one obvious element that would seem to derail this Jungian interpretation: why, in the midst of the Virgin Mary archetype, does Orlando display interest in a prostitute in Leicester Square? There are multiple answers to this query: the first is that Orlando, still adjusting physically and mentally to womanhood and femininity, sometimes still “lapsed,” so to speak, into masculinity. Woolf notes this by pointing out Orlando’s initial feelings towards the girl: “to feel her hanging lightly yet like a suppliant on her arm, roused in Orlando all the feelings which become a man” (Woolf, *Orlando* 216-217). Her feminine development seems to resume almost immediately, however, as Orlando notes the various things that the woman does that are “all put on to gratify her [Orlando’s] masculinity.” Considering that part of the transition from the Helen archetype to the Virgin Mary archetype is the purification of physical desires, it is interesting to note that Orlando’s love for Nell (and soon Prue, Kitty, and Rose) seemed less focused on physical aspects of beauty: despite the fact that Woolf describes Orlando’s initial interest in Prue as being caused by “the charm of ease and the seduction of beauty,” it is soon made clear that what fascinates her most about these women is not their bodies, but their words: it was, after all, the “poor girl’s talk, larded though it was with the commonest expressions of the street corners, tasted like wine after the fine phrases she had been used to” (Woolf, *Orlando* 219). In fact, in viewing these sequences as part of the aforementioned transition into the

archetype of the Virgin Mary, it is quite natural that Orlando transitions away from the witty-yet-emotionally-empty world of male writers to the more emotionally earnest “society of her own sex,” setting the latter up as (despite the physical reality of their profession) a desexualized gathering—especially in comparison to the back-to-back visits by the male wits, in which they bore more than a passing resemblance to a panoply of suitors, pursuing her as if she was a modern incarnation of Penelope. This also provides yet another hint that a final stage of erotic development will be coming for her character: spiritualized intelligence seems to provide less insight than the bawdy, bodily talk of these women, further hinting that she will need to find a way to fuse the material and the spiritual world if she is to achieve any kind of self-actualization.

Of equal note to this analysis is the fact that in this chapter, Orlando begins using her ability to switch genders as a way of gaining agency. While the primary emphasis is placed on her ability to do things typically associated with men (from gardening, sitting in on court and even prowling the streets and looking for adventure), the desexualized nature of the female Orlando’s interaction with men is of special note: she can absorb the wisdom of visiting “suppliants” with the same ease that she spies on coffeehouse wits, free to slip away into a new identity at any time. This same freedom allows her to casually entertain (and casually decline) “a proposal of marriage from some great nobleman” (Woolf, *Orlando* 221). The process of being able to absorb the wit and wisdom of others seems to reach its zenith when she spies upon Samuel Johnson and his cohorts—as with her spying upon those within the coffee shop, Orlando is content with her own interpretation of the communication that she is witnessing, as opposed to hearing the actual words first hand. This kind of synthesis provides insight into her development along the lines of the Virgin Mary archetype: her own interpretations of what it means to be witty as well as beautiful help segue her to later revisions on her poem.

The Sophia archetype is, perhaps, the most confusing stage of Jung's anima development. Of Sophia, Jung has claimed that it represents "the stage where the earthly quality completely disappears; therefore the personal or human character vanishes" (Jung, *Visions*, 480). Sophia also represents "heavenly divinity, the dove or the Holy Ghost" and the "leader of souls" (Jung, *Visions*, 491) as well as "the eternal feminine" (Jung, *Visions*, 481). Despite the Greek etymology and the various Gnostic connections that Jung draws upon, he also has very specific Christian connections in mind when he speaks of Sophia—for instance, that the Virgin Mary serves as a kind of physical "allegory" for the Holy Ghost—the true mother of God and the force that Sophia is the personification of (Jung, *Nietzsche's Zarathustra*, 1075). In the schematic of erotic development, he considers her "the highest form of anima," a pure force who possesses "the highest qualities of virtue and knowledge (Jung, *Nietzsche's Zarathustra*, 1167)." The importance of this stage of erotic development in Orlando's life cannot be overstated: Leeming and Page put it quite well when they point out that "the Jungian Anima becomes the Goddess who must be searched for in the dark and danger-filled world of the unconscious, the womb-tomb of death and rebirth," that only through a "union" with "Sophia-Anima" can one experience "wholeness...individuation, or self-realization" (171).

It is important to remember that prior to this, Orlando's gender was not fixed—she still transformed into a young man to enter into a variety of misadventures, and not until the later legal proclamation (read before Marmaduke) does she consider the issue settled. As has been previously mentioned, following the development of the anima—specifically, the oft-hidden female aspect of the male psyche—is, within the bounds of the text, a way of following Orlando rather literally coming to grips with femininity, ultimately embracing it entirely in lieu of remaining male. What is intriguing about the Sophia figure, then, is that its advent with regards

to the figure of Orlando can be read meta-textually as Woolf's own search for herself, as she is the feminized goddess that has been hidden by the collective psyche of male "wit," and that by seeking out the society of other women during the lapses (so to speak) of her Virgin Mary phase of erotic development, Orlando was creating fallow ground for her fully-realized feminine psyche to grow and bloom.

At first glance, the notion of resolving Orlando's final phase—that of the Sophia archetype—with the reality of her adventures would seem somewhat problematic. After all, it seems difficult to reconcile the pure and spiritual Jungian ideal of Sophia with the earthy and romantic Orlando that falls in love with Marmaduke. However, what should be pointed out is that the union with Marmaduke does not represent her attaining the Sophia archetype: rather, I contend that Orlando's final time shift into Virginia Woolf's present time (and metaphorical possession of the wild goose that she had so constantly longed for) represents this moment of self-attainment, elaborated on further in this work. In fact, it is my contention that, to some degree, Marmaduke was preventing Orlando from individuation. As its name suggests, individuation is a very individual and private process—an actualization of the self, and not of others. Thus, the relationship with Marmaduke, while vital to Orlando's development (as with the Virgin Mary archetype, the transition to this development takes time, trials, and occasional errors) ultimately obscures Orlando's realization that she can be a vital person outside the schematic of societal demands. Marmaduke serves as a stand-in for nature, who Orlando wishes to wed, and her desire stems from notions of Victorian convention. The ironic necessity of Marmaduke's absence seems signified by his employment as a professional mariner who must often travel; even Orlando's son—someone who would theoretically be a rather large impediment in terms of a private journey of self-individuation—seems to disappear entirely after

her final shift in time, leaving her free to complete this journey alone. Further complicating matters is Woolf's stream-of-consciousness writing style towards the end, which makes the mysterious reappearance of Marmaduke seem unreal...he may as well be sprouting from the ground, as a fully-bloomed representation of nature and substitute for the poem that Orlando was finally willing to lay down.

However, the simple absence of others does not mean that they did not play a substantial role in the individuation of Orlando. What role, for instance, did pregnancy play for Orlando as she transitioned from the archetype of the Virgin Mary to that of Sophia? In this case, the metaphorical nature of the archetype allegories is more explicit than usual: the archetypal Virgin Mary is, in the Jungian schematic, a purified mother figure, in contrast to the earthy figure cast by the Eve archetype. It is more than understandable that Orlando, in her attempts to achieve the Sophia archetype, would lapse into the figure of the Virgin Mary. In fact, part of what made her transference from the worship of Alexander Pope and his ilk possible was that her time among the society of women (comprised of Nell and her associates) allowed an emphasis on beauty and emotion over the much drier aesthetics of wit. When Orlando finds herself in the Victorian era, emphasis on beauty and emotion has been culturally discouraged by a society that more openly than ever wishes to define women in relation to men...hence, Orlando's "need" to get married, as well as the assumption that having a child is a necessary function of womanhood.

While I will soon elaborate more on the importance of her pregnancy and the birth of her child to Orlando's achieving the Sophia archetype (as well as self-actualization itself), it is important to focus on the importance of Marmaduke to these proceedings. After her time shift into the Victorian era, Orlando becomes despondent because she feels that everyone else has found a mate, and yet she has not. She is soon (and perhaps ironically) reconciled to the notion of

being mated to nature, almost immediately before she meets Marmaduke. There are a number of interesting aspects of this decision: while her decision that she must be married is clearly a result of the Victorian culture she then inhabited, the decision to be the bride of nature seems to illustrate continued possession by the Virgin Mary archetype. Therefore, her romance with Marmaduke (who, as mentioned earlier, serves as a kind of physical stand-in for nature) is purified into a kind of relationship between a mortal and a higher being. On one hand, this is nothing new to Orlando, who had previously romanticized poetic wits as higher powers; on the other hand, however, this gives us a valuable glimpse of her later embracing the Sophia archetype, as it is characterized (and often symbolized) as a spiritual aspect that one can only access when they are separated from the world. As the following will soon illustrate, her decision to become nature's bride signifies the beginning of this separation.

What is of great interest to a Jungian interpretation of this text is the exact moment in which she reconciles herself to nature:

she saw, gleaming on the hill-side, a silver pool, mysterious as the lake into which Sir Bedivere flung the sword of Arthur. A single feather quivered in the air and fell into the middle of it. Then, some strange ecstasy came over her. Some wild notion she had of following the birds to the rim of the world and flinging herself on the spongy turf and there drinking forgetfulness, while the rooks' hoarse laughter sounded over her. She quickened her pace; she ran; she tripped; the tough heather roots flung her to the ground. Her ankle was broken. She could not rise. But there she lay content. The scent of the bog myrtle and the meadow-sweet was in her nostrils. The rooks' hoarse laughter was in her ears. 'I have found my mate,' she murmured. 'It is the moor. I am nature's bride,' she whispered, giving herself

in rapture to the cold embraces of the grass as she lay folded in her cloak in the hollow by the pool. (Woolf, *Orlando* 248)

Some critics have read this scene (and the subsequent introduction of Marmaduke) as mostly satirical, such as Jane de Gay, who points out that it serves as a kind of pastiche of Romantic and Victorian literature, intended to help Woolf further deconstruct the institution of marriage (Gay 154). However, my contention is that despite the obvious playfulness of the scene, this scene represents an important milestone in the psychological development of Orlando, hinting at the possibility of her self-actualization by employing the symbols and tropes of Romanticism that called for a union of man and the natural world. One of the symbols she uses quite well in this regard is water: according to Jung, “Water is the commonest symbol for the unconscious. The lake in the valley is unconscious, which lies, as it were, underneath conscience” (Jung, *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious* 18). This is important because this scene represents Orlando willingly accessing her unconscious self—something that, perhaps, explains the sudden experience of Marmaduke, a character who is seemingly willed into being by Orlando herself. Though she has previously experienced increased agency and exhibited the ability to change her gender at will, she has still been at the mercy of her unconscious and its desires, whether it wills her to cavort with Russian beauties, make fast friends with prostitutes, or even to straddle the worlds of masculinity and femininity in her exploration of these very diverse worlds. However, by willingly accessing her unconscious, she begins the process which will ultimately help free her from material concerns altogether, allowing her to focus on the wisdom symbolized by the Sophia archetype.

While she has obviously shifted gender previously, these acts previously came as surprises to her, before she was able to control it and indulge in the best of both gendered worlds.

In these previous cases, the male Orlando becoming female is Jung's notion of anima possession in a quite literal state, as the unconscious urges had taken Orlando over and transformed her. Accessing the unconscious willingly through her experience by the pool, then, represents Orlando's understanding (and perhaps one of Woolf's more didactic lessons) regarding the foolishness of high/low spiritual/body distinctions. As Jung writes, many people associate spiritual acts with heights and flights, actions that soar above the crude and mundane world of the flesh: he points out that for many, there exists "the conscious mind, which knows 'spirit' only as something that can be found in the heights" and the separate idea of "'Spirit'" that "always seems to come from above, while from below comes everything that is sordid and worthless." For some, this dichotomy presents no issue: "For people who think in this way, spirit means highest freedom, a soaring over the depths, deliverance from the prison of the chthonic world, and hence a refuge for all those timorous souls who do not want to become anything different." However, many come to realize exactly what Orlando realizes in this passage: "But water is earthy and tangible, it is also the fluid of the instinct-driven body, blood and the flowing of blood, the odor of the beast, carnality heavy with passion" (Jung, *The Archetypes and collective unconscious* 19).

It is no accident, then, that this moment is set off by the feather falling into the lake, effectively symbolizing the world of the spirit (the soaring birds that can fly anywhere upon "the rim of the world") joining with the world of the flesh—a world that Orlando seemingly joins by instinct, then subsequently revels in the sensory details around her, such as the bog's scent and that of the meadowsweet. The notion of these watery depths representing "carnality heavy with passion" is soon realized, as Orlando tries to determine what the incoming sound is, thinking it first to be "some hammer on an anvil, or was it a heart beating" from "deep within." Soon, she

realizes it a horse that Marmaduke is riding, and Woolf (who had referenced mythology earlier in this section, likening the truths within the water to Excalibur, thrown by the reluctant Bedivere) creates her own kind of unconscious mythology in this section, where thought, feeling, and creation become one within Orlando: the beating of her heart is like a hammer on an anvil, forging an answer to her unconscious desire for fulfillment that, on the conscious level, she processed as the need for a mate.

At first blush, such an act may seem contrary not only to a Jungian reading, but to the character of Orlando herself, who had so recently declared nature to be her husband before the arrival of Marmaduke. However, it is important to keep a kind of cause and effect in mind: having attempted to fully access her unconscious and effectively transform it into her conscious life, Orlando subsequently creates a new unconscious. As Jung puts it,

If anyone should set out to replace his conscious outlook by the dictates of the unconscious...he would only succeed in repressing the former, and it would reappear as an unconscious compensation. The unconscious would have changed its face and completely reversed its position. It would have become timidly reasonable, in striking contrast to its former tone” (Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* 18).

Marmaduke, then, can be viewed as the manifestation of repressed desires on the part of Orlando. As many critics have noted, their relationship is very evocative on a kind of meta-textual level as well, representing the passionate-yet-subsequently-repressed relationship that existed between Virginia Woolf and Vita Sackville-West. Victoria Smith, exploring some of the potential hidden meaning in Marmaduke’s quote that “if you see a ship in full sail coming with

the sun on it proudly sweeping across the Mediterranean from the South Seas, one says at once, 'Orlando,'" noted that

In this interchange, there is a movement from the actual—Virginia looking at Vita—to the imaginary—Virginia images her to be like a magnificent ship—to the fictional—Orlando as a fictional representation of Vita—to a moment that foregrounds a dynamic space between the real and representation, a gap if you will. For in Shelmerdine's admiration of Orlando and metaphorization of her as a ship, we are brought back to Vita, and, ineluctably, Woolf. (Smith, 57-58)

On this meta-textual level, Marmaduke becomes a symbol of freedom and adventure for the frequently bedridden Woolf. In this scenario, the timing of this sequence makes much more sense, as the fictional Orlando, after freeing herself from notions of adhering to social convention (symbolized by her declaration that she will now be the bride of nature, and channeling the fierce feminism of Virginia Woolf), is free to follow the dictates of her heart rather than the dictates of others...unlike the real Woolf and Sackville-West, who were driven apart by the unfortunate need to conform to mainstream society.

It would be overly pithy to claim that Marmaduke, within the context of the novel, functions primarily as Orlando's animus, if one's knowledge and understanding of the anima/animus was limited to it simply being a representation of repressed feminine/masculine qualities. However, Singer offers a unique way of viewing the animus: "The animus of the woman is not so much the repressed Masculine as it is the repressed Other, the unconscious Other that she has been prevented from living out...There is a mystery about the unknown, and the unknown is often the unconscious Other within (Singer, as quoted by Miller). Again, this interpretation of the text provides key understanding on both the textual and meta-textual level,

furthering the direct metaphor regarding the loss of Sackville-West (quite literally, an Othered relationship that Virginia Woolf was prevented from living out) as well as illuminating more of Marmaduke's character and, indeed, very existence: the manifestation of repression. In this sense, the changing names of his character (at least, in the eyes of Orlando) represent repressed aspects of Orlando herself, and his character is changing in order to accommodate them. When she is in a "dreamy, amorous, acquiescent mood," she refers to him as "Mar," the Spanish word for "sea." In these moments, she is presumably closest to her unconscious, and identifies Marmaduke as the living manifestation of her unconscious desires.

"Mar," of course, is just one of the nicknames that she bestows upon him, and the names consistently serve as a reference to the emotional state of Orlando. This includes the use of the formal middle name "Bonthrop" in order to signify Orlando's need for quiet solitude, and the affectionate "Shel" that evokes the snail shells that so fascinate Marmaduke. What is of interest to a Jungian interpretation of the text is that, during the hypnotic ending in which the character of Orlando feels herself finally settling into the then-present time period of 1928 as part of her own attempts at self-actualization, she attempts to summon Marmaduke to her by calling out his full name: "Marmaduke Bonthrop Shelmerdine." In this way, she is verbally uniting her perception of Marmaduke in the same way that she hopes to unite the disparate aspects of her own identity—the dreamy aspects meet the social aspects, which in turn coexist with her need for solitude. In this way, Marmaduke finally stops being a reflection of Orlando's own mask (that is, a representation of her repressed aspects) and is "now grown a fine sea captain, hale, fresh-coloured, and alert." This moment initially is one that seems shocking, as Orlando's time-jumping escapades have placed her beyond the reach of Marmaduke. However, the goose flying over this "fine sea captain"—the one that Orlando declares to be the "wild goose" (Woolf,

Orlando 13) the same one that she has chased across the continents—provides a powerful clue regarding the ending of the text.

Orlando herself seemed to unite her own identity with Marmaduke's, to the point that she feels her own attempt at self-actualization requires his presence—the text describes her attempt to unite with the natural world, as she is “baring her breast to the moon (which now showed bright) so that her pearls glowed--like the eggs of some vast moon-spider,” only to be rudely interrupted when “the aeroplane rushed out of the clouds and stood over her head. It hovered above her. Her pearls burnt like a phosphorescent flare in the darkness” (Woolf, *Orlando* 329). The technology and nature dichotomy cannot be ignored in this passage, with technology intruding upon soulful introspection, even as Orlando's natural glow is enough to drive back the darkness of the modern world. Even to the very end, Orlando seems obsessed with capturing the wild goose that has led her on so many adventures, yet she seems unaware of the fact that she has always been able to wield the goose's nature through the simple, symbolic goose-quill pen. Earlier, it seemed to fail her and was a symbol of rote and bland writing when Orlando (then a he), “with the half-conscious air of one doing what they do every day of their lives at this hour,” began writing with “an old stained goose quill” (Woolf, *Orlando* 16). Later, this image is contrasted by the character of “our Lady of Purity; whose brows are bound with fillets of the whitest lamb's wool; whose hair is as an avalanche of the driven snow; and in whose hand reposes the white quill of a virgin goose” (Woolf, *Orlando* 134). She dramatically explains that “I am the guardian of the sleeping fawn; the snow is dear to me; and the moon rising; and the silver sea,” but is driven off (along with her two sisters) so that the newly-transformed Orlando can better appreciate “The Truth and nothing but the Truth” (Woolf, *Orlando* 136).

The paradoxical challenge seems quite clear: Orlando feels that her true calling is to purify and perfect her writing, something that she has tried to do across centuries and across genders. She dreams of wielding the “wild goose”—that which is truly alive, a generative force in stark contrast to the “old stained goose quill” capable of only rote, passionless text. Compared to her own inner development and innate talent, Marmaduke is, as her affectionate nickname suggested, simply a shell—something she used as both fort and anchor in her own constantly-changing world. However, the paradox comes into play when one realizes that Orlando, too, seeks to wield the same “white quill of a virgin goose” as the Lady of Purity does, but in service of the Truth, rather than the decorative speckles that Purity spreads over the grimy reality of the earth. This can only come once Orlando herself has actualized—achieved in reality that which she attempted to do with Marmaduke by speaking his full name, and joining her own different qualities together. What, exactly, would such truth entail—what would a composition of “the Truth and nothing but the Truth” actually look like? Woolf does not explicitly say, but it may, perhaps, be inferred: upon visiting her ancient home towards the end of the text, the narrator informs us that “we cannot conceal the fact that she was now a very indifferent witness to the truth of what was before her and might easily have mistaken a sheep for a cow, or an old man called Smith for one who was called Jones and was no relation of his whatever” (Woolf, *Orlando*). This ties into her decision to bury her poem: ultimately, truth is relative—like the actualized Orlando at the end of the text, truth is spontaneous, ever-present, and can exist only in the moment of its creation. The poem can never be a record of any kind of eternal truth and stays behind, simply an artifact of her struggle to understand the power to fashion her own truths that she has had the capacity for all along.

That capacity is, of course, tied to self-actualization. Of the self, Jung writes that “the ‘self’” represents “a psychic totality” that is “at the same time a centre...it is, in a sense, non-spatial and non-temporal” (Jung, *Four Archetypes*, 90). Considering Orlando’s many time-jumping adventures, it is of special note that she seems to be in at least partial control of this final jump, which is indicated by the aforementioned passage in which she bares her breast to the moon and shines her pearls into the night like burning stars, effectively reclaiming the power and connection of the moon from the Lady of Purity, just as she had reclaimed the transformative power of water to serve her own unconscious demands. In fact, shortly before the final bell tolls for Orlando, she seems to exert power over her perception (if not reality itself), as the jarring image of the plane emerging from the clouds is replaced by the wild goose, which she possesses at last.

A major part of understanding the Jungian sense of self-actualization and individuation is understanding that it is largely a matter of reconciling opposing forces—instead of being overtaken by different archetypes at different times (such as being possessed by the dark urges of a shadow archetype, or the mysterious power of the anima), one can instead be all things at all times—the mask of one’s archetypal persona falls away, revealing a kind of harmonic symphony of psychic traits. Towards the end of the text, Orlando seems to realize that this is exactly what she needs:

And it was at this moment, when she had ceased to call 'Orlando' and was deep in thoughts of something else, that the Orlando whom she had called came of its own accord; as was proved by the change that now came over her...The whole of her darkened and settled, as when some foil whose addition makes the round and solidity of a surface is added to it, and the

shallow becomes deep and the near distant; and all is contained as water is contained by the sides of a well. So she was now darkened, stilled, and become, with the addition of this Orlando, what is called, rightly or wrongly, a single self, a real self. And she fell silent. For it is probable that when people talk aloud, the selves (of which there may be more than two thousand) are conscious of dis severment, and are trying to communicate, but when communication is established they fall silent. (Woolf, *Orlando* 314)

While this section carries the cheekiness of Woolf's usual playfulness, it is difficult to ignore the specifics of her language...the multiple "selves" that comprise an individual are conscious that they have been separated, and long to communicate with one another. This describes the Jungian notion of becoming aware of one's unconscious life, as well as the relative impotence an individual feels when they are unable to access that unconscious world. Of equal import is the notion that Orlando has become "darkened" and "stilled"—curious language, for what is meant to be a triumphant union of the many aspects of self. However, they indicate her transformation into (psychologically speaking) a three-dimensional being. She is "darkened" by her shadow aspect, just as her turbulent life and mind are "stilled" enough for actualization. This is what makes Jung's connection between water and the unconscious world so apt, as the manic highs and lows of Orlando's life had previously kept her from the stillness necessary to explore her true self.

From a Jungian standpoint, then, it is quite rewarding to see how this section differs from earlier ones within the text. By Woolf's own admission, many of Orlando's subsequent actions are quite mundane...yet, as she puts it, "when the shrivelled skin of the ordinary is stuffed out with meaning it satisfies the senses amazingly. This was true indeed of every

movement and action now, usual though they were” (Woolf, *Orlando* 315). This, too, is in line with a Jungian reading of the text, as it fits well within the non-temporal schematic of individuation...though the trappings of Orlando’s actions are modern (driving an automobile, for instance),the substance of them is rooted in the past, as when she wanders the house and recalls the fond memories it has helped provide her. She is no longer leading a purely linear existence, but her thoughts and feelings seem to exist across time.

This notion of an integrated self even extends to the emotional qualities that she perceives in her own home: “She fancied, too, that, hundreds and thousands of times as she had seen them, they never looked the same twice, as if so long a life as theirs had stored in them a myriad moods which changed with winter and summer, bright weather and dark, and her own fortunes and the people's characters who visited them.” Like Orlando herself, the rooms had accumulated enough experience that they could afford to appear different upon each visit, and were no longer limited by the seasons. The identification with her rooms continues as she ponders the secrets that only she knows about: “she knew what age each part of them was and its little secrets--a hidden drawer, a concealed cupboard, or some deficiency perhaps, such as a part made up, or added later” (Woolf, *Orlando* 316-317). In many ways, the description of these rooms matches Jung’s ideal of an individuated self, as no part of them is concealed to Orlando’s gaze...they can, for all intents and purposes, represent the totality of their being at any moment. Similar to this idea of totality is the image of Orlando wandering through the house with a glass of Spanish wine in her hand, consuming glasses as she surveys her ancestral home.

Within a Jungian framework, this wine takes on its own very special significance... speaking on the topic of the cult of the Virgin Mary’s development in the thirteenth century, Jung noted the development of the so-called Loretanian Litany, the “invocation to the mother”

in which “she is called the *vas in signe devotionis*, the excellent vessel of devotion.” Jung claims that the *vas*, or vessel, “is analogous to the life-giving chalice in the legend of the Holy Grail,” and is also tied to other ancient cults as representations of fertility and other aspects of the Great Mother (Jung, *Visions*, 328). Therefore, the notion of Orlando wielding such a force after her individuation may seem, at first, contradictory...if she has truly attained the Sophia archetype, and become an individuated self, then why does she seem to be embodying the fertile symbols of the Eve and Mary archetypes? Jung himself provides clarification on this matter; as mentioned earlier, “Sophia as wisdom is the personification of the Holy Ghost...in the first and second century there were numbers of Christians who believed that Mary the mother of God was really a sort of allegory and Sophia was the real mother, the Holy Ghost” (Jung, *Nietzsche’s Zarathustra*, 1075). After her individuation, Orlando’s character is able to harness the generative force of this maternal archetype without being consumed by the Eve-esque bodily aspects of it, nor the spiritual aspects signified by the Virgin Mary archetype. In fact, through the sheer force of her own intellect, Orlando has become her own maternal force: even as she laments that no new ambassadors will grace her home and ponders the absence of Queen Elizabeth in a bittersweet way, she sits in the Queen’s chair, placing herself in the position of regal authority that Elizabeth had once occupied. This is a necessary transition, for when the clock strikes four, all of these remnants of her former life seemingly disappear.

Orlando is not phased by the disappearance; rather, riding the stream-of-consciousness wave that comes over her, she seems energized:

Her mind began to toss like the sea. Yes, she thought, heaving a deep sigh of relief, as she turned from the carpenter's shop to climb the hill, I can begin to live again. I am by the Serpentine, she thought, the little boat is climbing

through the white arch of a thousand deaths. I am about to understand.

(Woolf, *Orlando* 322).

Here, at the cusp of understanding that comes with self-actualization, Orlando seems to embody what James Hillman describes as the contrary emotional aspects that comprise the anima:

“...the contrary emotions that anima phenomena constellate: the fascination plus danger, the awe plus desire, the submission to her as fate plus suspicion, the intense awareness that this way lie both my life and my death..Its [the anima’s] primary attachment is to the state of nature, to all things that simply are—life, fate, death—and which can only be reflected but never separated from their impenetrable opacity” (Hillman 23-25). Orlando’s blunt assessment of the world around her certainly seems to represent such a constellation, as she begins to innately understand that death, understanding, and life itself are interconnected ideas. Understanding, then, becomes not a matter of piercing this opaque veil—of discovering what lies beyond “the white arch of a thousand deaths”—but realizing that everything is connected...to take her metaphor to heart, at that very moment it makes no difference whether she is physically climbing a hill or traveling by boat across the Serpentine lake...one does not pierce the opaque veil upon individuation, but rather realizes they have been part of that veil all along.

It is important to note her location during this moment of transition, turning from the carpenter’s shop and embracing her opportunity “to live again.” It is no coincidence that shortly after she turns her back on the carpenter’s shop—a symbol of creative force—she lays down her creative opus “The Oak Tree” by its physical inspiration. This is a far cry from the newly-transformed Orlando who, as mentioned previously, embraced creativity among the gypsies as a way of asserting the earthy creative energy that surrounds the Eve archetype. However, Orlando’s Sophia stage—the fourth and final stage of erotic development—is quite distinct from

the Eve stage. Ultimately, Sophia represents integration—she represents the point at which an individual is fully actualized, and can therefore represent her multitude of selves, rather than displaying only one “self” at a time (similar to a person changing from mask to mask). As such, she no longer needs to outwardly exercise the generative energy of her poetry. Rather, the generative energy is within her now. The change in generative energy is signified by her use of it as well—while her previous writing was often composed with earthly ends in mind (ranging from proving her work could stand beside the greats of yesteryear to impressing literary critics and, through them, the world), the generative force within her now seems focused on intellectual understanding. From a Jungian perspective, this is hardly surprising: Sophia represents the intellect, tethered neither by spirit nor body. Woolf uses deliberate parallelism in order to represent this shift, by bringing back the feather imagery in association with the character of Marmaduke. Previously, the feather represented her instinctually accessing her unconscious, joining earth and spirit together—a union that seemingly manifested Marmaduke from nothingness. Now, however, Orlando is very much in control:

Marmaduke Bonthrop Shelmerdine!" she cried, standing by the oak tree... The beautiful, glittering name fell out of the sky like a steel-blue feather. She watched it fall, turning and twisting like a slow-falling arrow that cleaves the deep air beautifully. (Woolf, *Orlando* 327-328)

As when she first meets Marmaduke, there is the implication that he appears of her accord rather than his own. The fact that she is standing by the oak tree when this occurs is quite significant: as written above, she is now able to access the generative powers within herself in order to summon Marmaduke. The name—her words, and her evocative associations with the fullness of his name—become the feather. No longer is the feather’s course an accident: rather, since it is her

own words, it is implied that she is in control as the feather “cleaves the deep air beautifully.” The metaphor seems quite clear: Orlando is no longer someone who is transitioning from one state or another, either physically or mentally. Rather, her agency allows her the creative force to shape the world around her: the feather “cleaves” the air until Marmaduke appears, making it seem as if she shaped him from nothingness.

The obvious question for a Jungian interpretation would be what role Marmaduke plays in this conclusion...put bluntly, why is his presence necessary at all? After all, if Orlando has fully individuated—a journey of self that was, ultimately, completed alone—then why would she need Marmaduke? The answers to these questions lie, at least partially, in the simple fact that the ultimate goal of individuation is not solitude. In many ways, it is exactly the opposite: a non-individuated mind is one that must put on different masks in order to deal with different situations and people. This, in and of itself, can be quite isolating: the cost of socializing with others is, paradoxically, to be unable to truly be one’s self. Upon individuation, the need for masks of persona falls away, as the individuated self can now be all things to all people.

In that context, the presence of Marmaduke makes much more sense. Depending on her mood, the relationship with Marmaduke was one that threatened Orlando’s sense of her own independence and growth as a person. This is something symbolized during their marriage ceremony, in which “one word” could just as easily be something as frightening as “the jaws of death” as it is something simple and pedestrian, such as “obey.” The Orlando that married Marmaduke was someone who feared the paralyzing effects of a marriage (the jaws connoted immobility as much as they did the possibility of death), and in the often stream-of-consciousness text, the frequent absences of Marmaduke can be interpreted in the same way as the persistent absence of their son is...as an indication that Orlando feared such anchors to the

world would ultimately be the death of her interiority, as she'd be forced to trade the world of intellect and spirit for the world of flesh. However, the Orlando at the end of the text has changed significantly: as someone who is willing to risk death a thousand times over in the name of understanding, she seems to intuitively realize that such emotional anchors do not necessarily stop her journey of understanding. Furthermore, she identifies (as mentioned earlier) Marmaduke with the so-called "wild goose" that she has been chasing for her entire life; rather than representing an end to her various adventures, it comes to symbolize a kind of stable life, one she can more fully appreciate now that her own identity is individuated. As mentioned earlier, invoking Marmaduke through his full name signifies that she is willing to accept him fully, rather than as incomplete reflections of her own fractured identity. In short: he represents a kind of social wholeness to which she feels she can finally embrace, having achieved an emotional and mental wholeness through the process of individuation. This is part of a larger synthesis of opposing forces that occur at the end of the text, as Louise Poresky points out that

as the clock sounds the twelfth stroke of midnight, the point where night and day, dark and light, and, therefore, feminine and masculine meet, the wild goose springs up into the sky. Opposites unite, and out of this union soars all that the goose symbolizes—"life," "truth," the Self. (Poresky 182).

While Poresky's notion of the Self is not explicitly Jungian, it is interesting to note the similarity with Jungian thought: actualization comes from the union of opposing forces. Therefore, reunion with Marmaduke does not negate this actualization as a feminine triumph—rather, union with Marmaduke allows Orlando to symbolically embody both anima and animus, becoming fully whole at last.

Jungian analysis of *Orlando* as both character and text does pose an interesting question: what, exactly, is the archetypal shadow of Orlando? Jung characterized such a force in one's unconscious as a kind of repression of negative qualities: "Everyone carries a shadow, and the less it is embodied in the individual's conscious life, the blacker and denser it is... 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" (Jung, *Psychology and Religion* 93). However, it is worth noting that the shadow archetype is not solely negative—ultimately, individuation would involve reconciliation with this archetype, just as it would with others. This is because

this darkness is not just the simple converse of the conscious ego. Just as the ego contains unfavorable and destructive attitudes, so the shadow has good qualities—normal instincts and creative impulses. Ego and shadow, indeed, although separate, are inextricably linked in much the same way that thought and feeling are related to each other" (Franz, "The Process of Individuation" 110).

However, just as individuals' thoughts and feelings are often in conflict with each other (the classical struggle of the mental sphere in conflict with the emotional sphere), the ego and the shadow wrestle each other—a struggle that can be metaphorically understood as the individual mind trying to assert their consciousness over their unconscious, which was signified in early stories as man struggling with fantastic monsters, such as dragons (Franz, "The Process of Individuation" 111). This is one of the reasons the masculine hero's journey is relatively uniform in such heroic fantasies. However, *Orlando* is a story that often frustrates such masculine interpretations, starting with the simple fact that Orlando transitions away from a kind of ultra-

masculine character who slashes at the heads of state enemies to something less masculine, and ultimately to something completely feminine.

So who or what functions as the shadow of Orlando? The only possible answer is the character of Sasha...while she is a flesh and blood person before becoming a kind of haunting mental presence, the relationship with Sasha illustrates Orlando using her as a kind of shadow foil for himself (and, later, herself). As Jung puts it, “whoever looks into the mirror of the water will see first of all his own face. Whoever goes to himself risks a confrontation with himself. The mirror does not flatter, it faithfully shows whatever looks into it...the mirror lies behind the mask and shows the true face” (Jung, *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious* 20). In this sense, the changing ways in which Orlando views Sasha can be interpreted as another way in which Orlando discovers the truth about himself (and later, herself); in the beginning, a large part of the fascination with Sasha as a character is her differences from Orlando, differences that are at first tempting, but later serve as the foundation for much of the negative projection that Orlando has for Sasha as a character.

In fact, it is not much of a stretch to claim that one of the qualities that Orlando initially finds so fascinating about Sasha is that she is the opposite of him in so many ways: just as he is focusing so much of his energy on becoming a kind of courtier supreme, he falls in love with someone who often “would stamp her foot and cry, 'Take me away. I detest your English mob,' by which she meant the English Court itself. She could stand it no longer” (Woolf, *Orlando* 43). This helps to illustrate what makes Orlando such a fascinating character for this type of analysis: Sasha as the shadow (and therefore, the representation of repressed negative qualities) actually changes as Orlando does: it is one of the reasons why Sasha represents repressed desires for the male Orlando—the desire to abandon the “English mob” and meditate in solitude—that she later

makes into reality as a woman. To the Jungian scholar, this is perhaps less surprising, as Sasha—at this moment in time—serves as both archetypal shadow and an anima form that prefigures the mysterious and alluring femininity that Orlando will eventually embrace. As Jung writes, “To the men of antiquity the anima appeared as a goddess or a witch, while for medieval man the goddess was replaced by the Queen of Heaven and Mother Church” (Jung, *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious* 29). Anima figures can be as inspirational as they can be terrifying: “Since the beginning of time man...has been engaged in combat with his soul and its daemonism. If the soul were uniformly dark it would be a simple matter. Unfortunately this is not so, for the anima can appear also as an angel of light, a psychopomp who points the way to the highest meaning” (Jung, *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious* 29). While the relationship with Sasha serves as a kind of trial for Orlando on a variety of levels, there is—at the risk of sounding trite—meaning in the trial itself. As such, this shadow/anima figure is very important—as Jung quite eloquently puts it, “[Anima] is the serpent in the paradise of the harmless man with good resolutions and still better intentions...because the anima wants life, she wants both good and bad” (Jung, *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious* 28). To carry that metaphor through to its obvious conclusion, while Sasha may tempt Orlando to a greater knowledge of both good and evil, Orlando comes to revere knowledge in and of itself, making Sasha a very valuable individual in the self-actualization of Orlando. As with most aspects of the text, this love of knowledge is something that changes as Orlando does: at first, he deals with his grief over Sasha by turning to such riveting texts as “the works of Sir Thomas Browne and proceeded to investigate the delicate articulation of one of the doctor's longest and most marvellously contorted cogitations” (Woolf, *Orlando*). It is not the text itself that is significant,

but Orlando's return to knowledge as a form of escape from the material world, something that the narrator tells us was a habit leftover from childhood:

It was the fatal nature of this disease to substitute a phantom for reality, so that Orlando, to whom fortune had given every gift--plate, linen, houses, men-servants, carpets, beds in profusion--had only to open a book for the whole vast accumulation to turn to mist...So it was, and Orlando would sit by himself, reading, a naked man. (Woolf, *Orlando*).

In some ways, the vacillations of this pre-transformation Orlando help to anticipate the later stages of erotic development, as he essentially rebounds from the passionate archetype of Helen to that of Mary—knowledge as salvation from the cruelties of the material world. Just as the actualized mind cannot remain with the Virgin Mary phase, though, Orlando must later find a way to embody Sophia, and fully join the material world and the world of knowledge. Of course, this anticipation of later erotic development on Orlando's part via Sasha is no surprise, since Sasha functions as both early anima and shadow for Orlando.

How, then—despite the passionate origin of their relationship—does Sasha function as an archetypal shadow for Orlando? At the time of their first meetings, Orlando is very much a male, and as such, the thoughts and fantasies of Sasha represent typical male fears. This is primarily manifested in the fear that Sasha is withholding information, the fear of which is enough to drive Orlando to terrible rages: “The agony would seize him suddenly. Then he would blaze out in such wrath that she did not know how to quiet him. Perhaps she did not want to quiet him; perhaps his rages pleased her and she provoked them purposely” (Woolf, *Orlando* 49). While it is ambiguous whether the latter speculation was editorializing on the part of the author or speculation on Orlando's part, it reveals a kind of projection of Orlando's fear of loss,

projected onto Sasha. Even this fear of loss is something that is ultimately made out to be more about Orlando than it is about Sasha—the text informs us that “time went by, and Orlando, wrapped in his own dreams, thought only of the pleasures of life; of his jewel; of her rarity; of means for making her irrevocably and indissolubly his own” (Woolf, *Orlando* 50). As such, his fears regarding losing Sasha could easily be interpreted as fears regarding losing his own standing that he had fought so hard for—while Orlando was captivated by the anima aspect of Sasha to the point of romanticizing her lower station (or, more accurately, romanticizing himself and the gallant action of lowering himself to such a station), Sasha as shadow archetype reveals their relationship as a projection of Orlando’s own fear of loss: she was valuable to him as an object that he considered rare, and the merest thought of her cavorting with another man diluted her rarity in his eyes. If nothing else, her “rarity” would be lessened, and therefore the value of possessing her as “his own” would be lessened as well.

However, the encounter with Sasha is actually necessary to the eventual individuation of Orlando. As Jung puts it,

But if we are able to see our own shadow and can bear knowing about it, then a small part of the problem has already been solved: we have at least brought up the personal unconscious. The shadow is a living part of the personality and therefore wants to live with it in some form. It cannot be argued out of existence or rationalized into harmlessness” (Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 20).

Therefore, as mentioned above, the encounter with Sasha represents a kind of identity struggle that is necessary for the development of the unconscious to begin. In fact, as minor as this scene may seem, it plays an interesting role within the Jungian schematic: the aforementioned

ego/unconscious struggle historically manifested itself as man's fight with fantastic monsters, such as knights battling dragons. However, this is merely the first step—a rather blunt way for the masses to imagine themselves as asserting a kind of power or dominance over their unconscious. However, literature is ripe with examples of characters who realize that understanding their unconscious is not a matter of overpowering an external force, but finding a way to a kind of inner exploration, which recurs repeatedly throughout mythology as a descent into the underworld. This minor scene arguably represents such a journey for Orlando, and Woolf—ever ready to explore unexpected psychic consequences within her text—illustrates how Orlando's ultimate reaction to what he sees differs from his initial reaction.

Initially, the scene aboard the ship serves to highlight the external explication of Orlando's internal fears: as Woolf writes, "seized instantly with those dark forebodings which shadowed even his most confident thoughts of her, he plunged the way he had seen them go into the hold of the ship." Initially, Orlando seems to desire a confrontation with the sailor—the old paradigm, in which conquering an external force would equate mastery over the unconscious. However, "Sasha threw herself between them," after which "a deadly sickness came over Orlando" and Orlando, when recovered, "came to doubt what he had seen. Had not the candle guttered; had not the shadows moved?" (Woolf, *Orlando* 51). In this, Orlando's descent into the underworld (such as it is) mirrors that of Odysseus: on one hand, he obtains part of the knowledge he descended for (a possible validation of his fears concerning Sasha). On the other hand, he is filled with doubts about himself—just as Odysseus has his notion of glory challenged by the shade of Achilles, Orlando begins to doubt his own assumptions, starting with the aforementioned suspicions of Sasha and ending with his estimation of Sasha herself, who he only now fears may be "rank...coarse flavoured...peasant born," fears which then extend to the Sasha

of the future: “he fancied her at forty grown unwieldy though she was now slim as a reed, and lethargic though she was now blithe as a lark” (Woolf, *Orlando* 52-53). My contention is that this descent into Orlando’s unconscious underworld represents Orlando catching a passing glimpse of Sasha as a shadow of Orlando himself—a crystallization of fears concerning losing beauty, grace, and station. This is an important moment in the Jungian analysis of the text, as it anticipates the obese Sasha of the future, meaning that Orlando has had an important glimpse of the substance behind the shadow projection of Sasha. This glimpse becomes something more soon after, as signified by the flood-related events that occur after Sasha’s departure—as mentioned above, water is one of the primary links to the subconscious in Jungian theory.

In fact, the prominence of water in the first chapter provides much material for a Jungian interpretation of the text. With the premise of the water representing one’s unconscious mind in place (a premise that seems greatly validated by the later scene that occurs immediately before the introduction of Marmaduke), it is very significant that the river is, for most of the chapter, completely frozen over. In many ways, this can be interpreted as Orlando being cut off from his true unconscious, something that he realizes (on an equally unconscious level) as being hidden from him. Even the first sexual union with Sasha signifies this: they make love upon the ice, but Orlando is unable to penetrate the mind of Sasha with the same ease that he penetrates her body. This forms the root of the trust issues within their relationship, perhaps most greatly signified by the ambiguity surrounding Sasha’s actions onboard the Russian ship (itself an explication of Orlando’s attempt to descend beneath the frozen consciousness and understand the darkness within).

Once again, there is the idea that Sasha is able to access the unconscious mind in a way that Orlando cannot—Sasha descends into the depths of the ship alone, and only Sasha knows

what (if anything) happened between herself and the brutish man within the ship, while Orlando is left with only speculation and doubt. Indeed, that same brutish man could be considered part of the shadow projection that surrounds the character of Sasha—he is, in many ways, a brutish mirror of Orlando’s masculine aspects. The man is quick to anger, potentially very intimate even when passionate (it is worth noting that the act that Orlando seemingly catches the two in involves the relatively benign action of his hand resting upon her knees), and is ultimately dismissed as a “hairy sea brute” (Woolf, *Orlando* 52). Such a man could be a representation of Orlando himself, were he stripped of titles and privileges. While brief, this scene could be considered a key event in the ego’s struggle with the shadow, as Orlando tries to impose his will on the ever inscrutable Sasha. Within the ship, this effort is obviously a failure: once the ice melts, the failure becomes that much more spectacular.

If the frozen waters represent a frozen unconscious, then the obvious question remains...what is the significance, in Jungian terms, of the ice melting, and the subsequent misadventures that it causes? The incident seems to be immediately precipitated by Orlando and Sasha taking in a performance of *Othello*, during which Orlando is shocked to find that he empathizes with the act of killing a lover to such a degree that Othello’s rage seems to be his own. Possibly to avoid acting on such hasty passions, Orlando attempts to run away from his old life with Sasha in tow...something that she ultimately refuses. With the aforementioned motif in mind of ego versus shadow—or the mind versus emotion—such a rage as Orlando felt towards Sasha may very well indicate that the ego was beginning to lose the struggle. Rather than triumphing over the emotional aspect of the unconscious realms, Orlando’s very sanity was nearly dragged into that same abyss. Therefore, if the ice represented a completely static unconscious that could not be easily penetrated or accessed, the flooding waters may very well

represent the unconsciousness unchanged... a dynamic flood of thoughts, emotions, and fears that Orlando is unable (or unwilling) to process.

While it is hardly subtle, it is worth noting the character of Othello as a projection of Orlando's shadow. This in itself is not overly surprising—the literal dark character of Othello serving as a shadowy projection of white fears has arguably been built into the play since its inception—but the specific comparison of Orlando and Othello reveals much within the context of a Jungian analysis. For example, whereas Iago is presented as a clear manipulative force who helps bring about the senseless murder of Desdemona, Orlando identifies Sasha herself as the manipulator. This, perhaps, is what alarms him so much about his own reaction: rather than responding with horror to a scene of senseless murder, he instead sees it as a vicarious fulfillment of his own desire for violence... a desire, perversely enough, that is considered as a kind of justice, since it would be the ultimate demonstration of Orlando's ego-power over Sasha. The cultured and well-bred Orlando is at something of a standstill, as he is unable to determine a better way of asserting his ego, yet the alternative is to become the murderous Othello—or, perhaps, to become the hairy sea brute who knows nothing of culture and art, yet is nonetheless able to understand Sasha in a way that Orlando never will.

Subsequently, signifying to Sasha that it was time for them to run away together serves as a final attempt for the ego to assert its will: while the attempt to make their lives resemble a kind of fairytale spectacle (waiting for the right time and the right appearance of the sky in order to run away from their old lives in order to begin anew) may seem more emotional to outside observers, it is Orlando's attempt to use such a fantasy to reorder their relationship that is significant in illustrating this as an act of ego-driven will. In place of his own emotional outburst, he seeks to reassert the comfort of the old fantasy... ultimately, an act of ego intended to set up

an ego-approved proxy fantasy (one that Orlando, of course, was fully in control of) in place of the emotional chaos that was raging through him (that, of course, Orlando had no real control of). In short: finding himself on the emotional precipice of murderous violence, Orlando forcibly pulls himself back to the world of intellect...one where, even in an act of fantasy fulfillment, he is in complete control. However, Sasha's refusal to appear seems to trigger a breakdown of the walls between Orlando and the unconscious.

It is important to note that when the river thaws (signifying that Orlando's unconscious can now be accessed), it does not mean that Orlando is psychologically ready to deliberately access this unconscious realm. This is what makes Orlando's later desire for marriage and the subsequent appearance of Marmaduke so profound, as it represented a deliberate attempt to access her unconscious desires and to bridge the two worlds of conscious and unconscious. This early encounter with Sasha's departure, however, represents an involuntary method of accessing the unconscious world, due to the apparent triumph of the shadow archetype through the departure of Sasha. As long as the two of them remained together, the battle of wills could continue—the ego world of Orlando grappling with the emotional world of Sasha, seeking purchase and, eventually, victory. However, the departure of Sasha represents her triumph: the shadow has won, leaving Orlando (for the moment) in darkness and despair. This seems to be signified by the end of the second chapter, in which an impotent Orlando realizes he has no power over Sasha:

Flinging himself from his horse, he made, in his rage, as if he would breast the flood. Standing knee-deep in water he hurled at the faithless woman all the insults that have ever been the lot of her sex. Faithless, mutable, fickle, he called her;

devil, adulteress, deceiver; and the swirling waters took his words, and tossed at his feet a broken pot and a little straw. (Woolf, *Orlando* 64)

Sasha's identity as Orlando's shadow is never as clear as it is in this moment, in which Orlando hurls a variety of insults that, in time, will almost all apply to Orlando himself after his feminine transformation...as ever, his vision of Sasha is a projection of his own repressed desires, something that he is unable to give full voice to until he is half-submerged⁸ into the waters of the unconscious. It is intriguing that, as the text notes, those "swirling waters" offered Orlando "a broken pot and a little straw" in exchange for his cruel words. These seem to be totems of his fractured unconscious at the time...the broken pot, something that could possibly contain the roiling waters of his unconscious, is now broken and useless. Similarly, the straw seems to be a subtle indicator that his image of Sasha is ultimately artificial; however, there is still the potential to take the raw materials of that straw and build something anew.

Obviously, the image of Sasha recurs throughout the text, and the notion of her as Orlando's archetypal shadow helps to illustrate the significance of her changing role throughout these appearances. When her name is next mentioned in the text, it is used to reinforce that Orlando had developed similarly powerful borderline hypnotic abilities regarding those who adored him: "The power is a mysterious one compounded of beauty, birth, and some rarer gift, which we may call glamour and have done with it. 'A million candles', as Sasha had said, burnt in him without his being at the trouble of lighting a single one" (Woolf, *Orlando* 124). There is a kind of dark irony at place through the use of this imagery: whereas before it served as a visual reminder of the psychological distinctions between himself and Sasha (his incandescent

⁸ Symbolically, the fact that he was half-submerged is quite critical, as it indicates only partial immersion into the fluid genders of the unconscious world. Here, Orlando's masculine conscious struggles again such immersion, fearful of losing its sense of identity.

brilliance represented the ego, in deliberate contrast to her mysterious and shadowy nature), the invocation of Sasha's description at this point in the text seems to indicate that Orlando has actually become such a shadow character himself. This is visually signified by the text as well, which notes "thus he would stand, gazing at the city beneath him, apparently entranced. At this hour the mist would lie so thick that the domes of Santa Sofia and the rest would seem to be afloat" (Woolf, *Orlando* 120). Orlando as inscrutable shadow also explicitly hides from those around him: "And sometimes, it is said, he would pass out of his own gates late at night so disguised that the sentries did not know him" (Woolf, *Orlando* 123). Indeed, Orlando as shadow is meta-textually accurate as well, as the playful conceit of this section of the text is that very little is known of this period of Orlando's life: what is known has been gathered from others, and their own knowledge of Orlando seems to be limited to their own projections, whether he is thought of as a capricious drunk, a secret lover, or a master diplomat.

While it can only be addressed briefly within this section dedicated to Sasha, one obvious question is where Orlando's transformation falls within this ego/shadow model. At this point in the text, Orlando seems to have become little more than a shadow, cast by the substance of something larger than himself. Hence, it is difficult for individuals to have a clear idea of who Orlando really is: he is the personification of their own repressed urges, which may indicate why even the great and glorious moments (such as obtaining the Dukedom) are sullied by scandals. So what prompts the infamous transformation? If the testimony of one old woman is to be believed, the event was precipitated by Orlando's romantic tryst with a woman "apparently of the peasant class" (Woolf, *Orlando* 131). While the character of Orlando is difficult to understand through the lens of other characters, such a union can be viewed as a very different culmination of the ego/shadow struggle...whereas the relationship with Sasha represented this

conflict as a constant struggle due to Sasha's unwillingness to truly allow Orlando into her life, Orlando in this scenario has now married Rosina-Pepita in an attempt to unite both his ego and emotion. This represents an act of mediating his ego through his emotional connection to someone who would be viewed as a commoner. Specifically, marriage to a peasant allows him to retain the incandescent brilliance of his life and his mind while simultaneously tempering his station in life via a "low" union. Why is this so important? It indicates the urge for actualization that brings about his transformation into a woman—the urge to experience a world which is so very different from the world he is accustomed to, a world in which his high class and his masculinity have previously been inextricably combined. His later time as a woman involves navigating a struggle between embodying substance at times and shadow at others, something that is perfectly prefigured by marriage to a common woman, something that allows him to be substantial in Rosina's eyes and but a shadow to the viewpoint of others.

In this span of time, Orlando has made a kind of archetypal transformation that mirrors the gender transformation he will soon undergo. Previously, he been possessed by his shadowy archetype, but even more than that...in Jungian terms, he had become little more than a projection of others, a kind of cipher into which other people could read only their own unconscious thoughts. However, obtaining the Dukedom represented a way of reasserting his will over the more emotional aspects of himself. While the later Orlando would come to disregard this title as well as others, all of the aspects of the ceremony help to illustrate Orlando once again becoming substance rather than shadow, and taking up the mantle of the intellectual ego who must struggle against the more monstrous aspects of the emotional world. In fact, the attempt to unite the different parts of his own identity seemed symbolized by the very act of the coronation, in which Orlando had the orderly and controlled soldiers of England on one side and

the restless natives of Turkey on the other side—it seemed to echo Freud’s idea of the ego, id, and superego, with Orlando as the final element that could mediate the desires of both sides. However, just as Jung separated himself from Freud’s notions because the idea of nearly everything being driven by a sex-hungry id was very limiting to analysis of the psyche, the text of *Orlando* soon illustrates the folly of trying to mediate these forces, with the natives offering the first frightening glimpse of chaos and anarchy taking over.⁹

In the absence of Sasha, the faceless natives actually take on the important role of shadowy, antagonistic force. The fact that they take up this shadowy mantle just as Orlando abandons it for a new one (literally, in the form of the coronet) is signified during the coronation: Orlando, as outlined previously, has existed as a projection of the unconscious desires of those around him. While it is by nature speculative, the text theorizes that Orlando not living up to the high-mythical expectations placed upon him may have been a contributing factor to the civil unrest in the area: “Either the people had expected a miracle--some say a shower of gold was prophesied to fall from the skies--which did not happen, or this was the signal chosen for the attack to begin; nobody seems to know; but as the coronet settled on Orlando's brows a great uproar rose” (Woolf, *Orlando* 130). In short: the moment that Orlando comes to represent the forces of ego again, he is opposed by the faceless mass of native unrest. Thus, the classical Jungian paradigm is reasserted as the Freudian paradigm fails.

Orlando’s brief relationship with Rosina may seem, at first, different from this typical Jungian paradigm. His relationship with Sasha was a constant struggle to bring her into his world, and on his terms: she attended his court in his land, and when he tired of that, she was

⁹ This may be intentional on Woolf’s part, in the sense that Orlando must formulate his own solutions when faced with the failure of Freudian theory. With this mind, his eventual transformation may be viewed as the ultimate liberation from the sexual constraints of Freud.

expected to run away with him, at his appointed time and to his appointed place. With the unseen Rosina-Pepita, there is cursory evidence that he attempted a very different approach: through marriage, he sought to bring them to an equal footing...a gesture made more generous by the bleak reality of her station. How, then, does this unite with the Jungian framework established thus far? Karen Lawrence views the union with Rosina as a way of symbolizing Orlando's initial break with the expectations of masculine patriarchal culture:

Orlando finds himself attracted to the ethos of the other rather than disposed to regulate it...The signs of the relaxation of military male purpose are Orlando's slumming in disguise among the "natives" and are confirmed in his marriage to Rosina Pepita ...This match, witnessed by a washerwoman, suggests illegitimacy, a departure from the aristocratic, patriarchal Englishness of Orlando's upbringing.
(265)

In this sense, it should be clear that the typical Jungian framework is very much present: despite the egalitarian appearance of a nobleman marrying a common woman, Rosina serves as the kind of vessel for male ego. Specifically, she represents a means by which Orlando can reestablish psychological dominance by reimagining himself and his role. Rather than serving as the projection of others, he seeks to redefine himself as departing from that patriarchal tradition. The irony, of course, is that even as Orlando seeks to depart from a world of patriarchal tradition, he is inextricably linked to it: using an apparently throwaway marriage to a commoner as a way of reimagining himself is a gross act of wealthy masculine privilege. Woolf portrays Orlando as someone who must reach the very edge of masculinity before they can penetrate the barrier into the mysterious world of the feminine. Ultimately, this is what makes Orlando's self-actualization at the end of the text so powerful: she has extended beyond not only the boundaries of the

masculine world, but the boundaries of the feminine one as well. Put more accurately, she has discovered that such boundaries do not exist, save for the boundaries that she places on sex. As such, she is fully—and finally—in control of herself.¹⁰

Obviously, this analysis represents a small sampling of the potential Jungian analysis of Woolf's texts. Which returns us to the original question, in many ways: why focus such an analysis on this particular text of Woolf's? One of the more compelling reasons is that, through the character of Orlando, Woolf is able to portray a self-actualization that may have eluded her in her own life. According to Julia Briggs' biography, "freeing Orlando from the tick of time's clock" was a way of releasing "herself, the self that felt old beside Vita, traveled so much more slowly." Woolf, she asserts, "longed to follow Orlando into the realm of imagination, to retreat into the weightlessness of words and thoughts." Perhaps most interestingly, Biggs claims that the ending of the text represents

a mystic marriage of opposites that would be consummated in darkness in the final chapter of her next book, a marriage Shakespearean in its optimism, its unions of irreconcilables—not just the marriage of Orlando and Shel, of male and female, but of homo- and hetero-sexual love, biography and autobiography, of literary history and quantum physics, of the body and the universe, of eternity and time... (Biggs 210).

The next novel was, of course, *The Waves*, a novel which arguably begins within the world of the unconscious, in which the narrative is formed from six distinct monologues that allow Woolf to

¹⁰ This correlates closely to Susana Rowland and her research into Jung; she posited that Jung's unconscious was "fluidly gendered" (Rowland 148) despite the patriarchal limits his conscious mind placed on his writing. In fully accessing her femininity, Orlando, too, extends beyond the gendered limits of the conscious mind, and has become her own union of male and female.

further explore notions of consciousness and actualization. *Orlando*, then, becomes that much more important in the spectrum of Jungian analysis because it represents the author herself in a kind of transition, as she both articulates the limits of the conscious mind and then uses imagination as a means to transcend those limits entirely, doing so through a synthesis of opposing forces—that “mystic marriage of opposites”—that perfectly evokes Jungian self-actualization.

The Jungian approach, at its heart, concerns reaching beyond sex in order to penetrate the mysteries of the interior mind and, like Woolf, seems to represent a paradox at first glance. After all, it involves embracing the worst part of ourselves in order to transform into the best part; it involves a belief that the cultural archetypes of the past are a way of discovering the future. Woolf’s paradoxes have always been rather prevalent: one must be independent of others yet dependent on money... female writers must concentrate on writing that extends beyond femininity, yet still “think” through the mother of the writer. However, the intricacy of such paradoxes represents, on a very real level, the enormity of the mysteries these authors attempt to solve. The paradox persists because, as Woolf so ardently insists concerning the need for androgynous writing, one must be transcendent while, in a way, being still: one must transcend who they are without losing sight of who they have become...to be the movement of the river, and the stillness of the riverbed. Jung offers a way of reconciling such a paradox, and through his use of archetypes, effectively offers a way of creating and analyzing a continuum of femininity. That is, Jung’s psychoanalytic methods offer a way of uniting the ever-evolving world of modern feminist discourse with the icons and touchstones of feminism that have come before, illustrating what binds such discourses together even as we celebrate the disparate views within. It is through

such archetypal links that the white and privileged world of Virginia Woolf's texts can be linked with the blunt and often horrifying world of Toni Morrison's body of work.

Chapter 2:

Morrison and Jung: The Impossibility of Actualization

As with Virginia Woolf, one of the more direct questions regarding a Jungian analysis of Morrison's *Beloved* is "why?" One answer is that Morrison's psychological tale invites such analysis, one that is capable of analyzing how Sethe, Denver, and Paul function as discrete psychological entities as well as the collective familial unit that they attempt to form. *Beloved*, as the one who frustrates this attempt at unity, requires the bulk of this Jungian analysis, as she serves as an explication of negative psychological projection. If Orlando serves as a positive example of literally embodying one's anima, *Beloved* serves as an example of negative projections of anima and shadow—rather than enabling Sethe to actualize, she serves as an impediment to actualization... a perpetual reminder of Sethe's decision to kill her child in order to protect her from the forces of white patriarchy. As such, my intention with this chapter is to appropriate Jung (who is notably a white patriarch himself) as a tool for exploring not only the psychological colonization of African-Americans by white patriarchal forces within the text, but the attempts at decolonization undertaken by Sethe.

To this end, my analysis is more in line with Post-Jungian thought: specifically, the conceit that Jung's reliance on subjective experience and relative truth not only lends itself to a variety of characters and circumstances, but also allows a critical approach that is not impeded by Jung's own behavior. That same subjectivity makes Jung very versatile for postmodern as well as modern approaches, allowing us to view the actualized state as less of a monolithic entity to which all seek entrance, but rather as a personally-defined sense of psychological well-being. With this being said, this text focuses much on the fact that Sethe is unable to actualize during

the events of the novel. Accordingly, I explore the various psychological archetypes that she and other characters use as part of their daily ritual, and attempt to make a case that Sethe's re-memories—her intense connection to the past—keeps her from actualization. She is unable to live in the eternal present because for her, the past is a constant presence.

While there is little critical argument over the fact that Morrison crafted an explicitly psychological tale (one that both invites psychoanalysis, and benefits from its speculative lens), critics are actually quite divided over which lens is, in fact, best-suited for such analysis. Ashraf Rushdy, for instance, recalls Freud's idea of primal scenes in childhood memory, claiming that this provides an ideal lens through which to view "the pain and necessity of remembering primal scenes" within the text (139-140). Doreen Fowler, in turn, feels that Morrison was intentionally rewriting a Freudian/Lacanian paradigm in order to be more in line with the writings of Kristeva, claiming that "the paternal function in *Beloved* models a liminal boundary space between self and other that enables social exchange while still marking a difference....someone must 'get in' the lives of mother and child so that a child can locate a self apart from and related to others" (16). Unfortunately, these critical lenses prove to be too limiting for thorough analysis. Both Rushdy and Fowler are focusing on what amount to patriarchal readings of a profoundly feminist text; put bluntly, focusing overly much on the paternal function of *Beloved* risks overlooking the importance of the maternal function, and how Morrison explores and subverts traditional notions of motherhood. Similarly, Fowler's Freudian focus, while serving as an intriguing exploration of the notion of "rememory," risks being limited by both Freud's focus on sexual energy (a patriarchal focus that is complicated by a novel in which sex is both commoditized and weaponized by male characters) and Lacan's focus on male authority, which also deemphasizes

the importance of Sethe and her struggle to put forth a unique, feminine authority into the patriarchal world around her.

Of the different critical perspectives on *Beloved*, there is limited support within existing criticism of the text for the lens of Jungian theory, with Gail Sobat pointing out that Morrison's text seems much more Jungian than it does Freudian:

[*Beloved* does] not support Freud's conception of such apparitions as symptoms of madness, paranoia, or hysteria, seeming closer to Carl Gustav Jung's psychological explanation of supernatural occurrences. Jung asserts that a person experiencing paranormal phenomena is, in effect, manifesting some link between conscious and unconscious, especially if memories of pain or trauma have been repressed and particularly if the subject is an adolescent and a female in "an acutely disturbed state" ... Jung further suggests that creating the apparition or poltergeist is an attempt by the psyche to ease its burden through a process of memory, of bringing to the light of consciousness the unpleasant past. (169).

Sobat's work, while intriguing, focuses on Jung's notion of synchronicity, claiming that *Beloved* is primarily a manifestation of Denver's need for selfhood. Ultimately, Sobat views the novel as a story of Denver confronting the dark aspect of her psyche (*Beloved*) and becoming a completed person.

As such, her analysis is limited, with Denver's willingness to enter into the world in order to save her mother, and her joining with the community intent on saving Sethe being put forth as the sole evidence of her "rebirth" into "a healthy psyche" (Sobat 173). From a psychoanalytic perspective, it seems much more rewarding to view the novel in terms of Sethe's psychological journey, and her failed attempts at self-actualization. It also seems more in line with Morrison's

own thoughts: she explicitly compares the mental and emotional states of Sethe and Beloved, rhetorically asking

whose hunger for disrupted love, whose lack of love, abandoned love, matches the ferocity of mother love... This all-consuming love, which is an exaggeration of course of parental love, involved loving in a fierce, unhealthy, distorted way under circumstances that made such a love logical. (Morrison, “Things We Find in Language” 172)

Therefore, in terms of viewing *Beloved* as a kind of dark mirror for the psychological needs of a character, she seems to be much more organically an expansion of Sethe's needs, rather than Denver's. Of course, the three women are inextricably linked, which is why this analysis will focus much attention on the notion of Jungian archetypes, and the projections of those archetypes on others, allowing these three women (as well as other characters) to see aspects of themselves in other people. This is one of the primary reasons that she also functions as a kind of trickster within the text, a topic which will be explored further in this analysis of the text, and what it means for Sethe to self-actualize.

Morrison offers readers a glimpse of what that self-actualization may entail (one that seems quite in line with Jungian thought) when Paul D recalls the wisdom of Sixo, who explains his attraction to the Thirty Mile Woman by claiming “she is a friend of my mind. She gather me, man. The pieces I am, she gather them and give them back to me in all the right order” (Morrison, *Beloved* 321). As this chapter will delve into in more detail, Jung's idea of self-actualization corresponds to the idea of wholeness as representing the entirety of one's psychological being. Therefore, an individual does not become whole by simply burying their darker impulses, but by integrating those unconscious elements into their conscious life, so they

can finally become complete and whole, having gathered all of their disparate pieces together. Sixo's wording, then, proves to be quite important to this reading of the text, as the clear implication of receiving the "pieces" of one's mind in the *wrong* order is that one will not be "gathered"—one will not be whole. This quote hints at the notion of actualization as a process: one projects archetypes, for instance, as a way of interacting with their own oft-hidden unconscious life; only by completing this interaction and integrating this aspect into their conscious existence can they be one step closer to an actualized self that has neither the need nor the desire to hide or repress its different elements.

Despite this glimpse of what individuated wholeness looks like, Morrison's somber text seems to reiterate the impossibility of wholeness and the ubiquity of chaotic emotional states, leaving readers questioning exactly how Sethe manages to hold herself together. This serves as a rather literal metaphor, considering that at the end of the text, she wonders if, when Paul D bathes her in sections, her parts "will hold" (Morrison, *Beloved* 321). But more than the physical body, what is the center that Sethe would ideally reach, should she actualize? In Jungian terms, it would be the aforementioned actualized self. Morrison seems concerned with the idea of self-actualization in many of her texts: during one interview, she likened the thematic elements of *Jazz* to those of *Beloved*, claiming that the novel was concerned with "how to own your own body and love somebody else. Under historical duress, where one fights for agency, the problem is how to be an individual, how to exert individual agency under this huge umbrella of determined historical life. (Morrison, "An Interview With Toni Morrison" 56). In many ways, the story of *Beloved* can be read as Sethe's struggle for (and, ultimately, her failure to obtain) that same agency. Incidentally, the importance of the "individual" aspect of this cannot be overstated: while Sobat and others view the community banding together to drive out *Beloved* as

one of the positive aspects of the novel—an unsubtle metaphor for Sethe’s reintegration into the community that she shunned, and was shunned by—these critics often seem to overlook that by driving out Beloved, the community did not restore Sethe to any kind of wholeness. Rather, she is left tattered and broken, with the spirit of Beloved becoming a roaming loneliness that she can no longer use to reconcile herself to the past. This, perhaps, is one of the chief distinctions between my reading of the text and that of other critics, for I see the haunting figure of Beloved as a manifestation of Sethe’s need for wholeness. Unfortunately, she is unable to reconcile herself to her past, and is ultimately left just as adrift as the ghost of her dead daughter.

Meanwhile, the community’s move to “save” Sethe can be viewed more in terms of the pursuit of their own self-actualization, as they attempt to reincorporate someone whom they had previously cast out for her “otherness” in relation to their collective view of their own femininity. While it can never be fully known if Sethe would have managed to self-actualize if Beloved had continued to inhabit the house, her banishment at that precise moment underscored Sethe’s failed self-actualization: she and Beloved were locked into a vicious cycle of projecting expectations onto the other, rather than looking inward for the fulfillment they desired. Cut off from Beloved, Sethe no longer has the mirror of psychological projection by which to measure her sense of self, and is left feeling completely isolated, despite the ostensible support of the rest of her community.

In another interview, Morrison gives a tantalizing glimpse of what such individuation would likely look like for women such as Sethe, and perhaps for most women: “Women transfer the best part of themselves into the beloved—the children, the husband. . . . The point is reclamation. The point is not enough that it is there; the point is to reclaim it” (Morrison, “Interview with Toni Morrison” 30). Sethe, then, is someone who is unable to reclaim what she

has lost in *Beloved*, and unable to embrace Paul D's hard truth that she may be her own best thing. This is in line with Jungian thought, as well as that of other psychoanalysts: Sethe is mentally and spiritually unbalanced, having put so much of herself into someone who is now dead at her hands. In Morrison's terms, she is tasked with reclaiming the aspects of herself that she gave to *Beloved*—the best part of herself—but she is ultimately consumed by the need to be forgiven by her dead daughter. Instead of reclaiming what she has lost, she ends up pouring even more of herself into her child. Obviously, such reclamation is not an easy task: she cannot simply push the negative memories of *Beloved* away in order to pursue herself, because they are integral to her identity as a mother. She must find a way to balance her love for *Beloved* and Denver with a love for herself, but this is ultimately something that Sethe is unable to do. Of course, a major part of doing that concerns surrendering her notion of motherly identity being her sole identity. According to Morrison, Sethe is at odds with the more mainstream, feminist notions of self-actualization:

So I thought it was interesting to write...about how one woman felt, that she was only free and complete when she asserted herself as a mother as opposed to those feminist notions of not having to be forced into motherhood as a way of completing, fulfilling the self and expressing one's freedom. (Morrison, "'Things We Find in Language'" 172-173).

All of this fits rather neatly within the paradigm of Jungian analysis: Sethe, as Morrison writes, cannot actualize as an individual by completely turning away from her role and responsibilities as a mother—by pursuing her own interests above all else, as part of reclaiming her feminine identity. If she were unable to access these emotions at all, then she would never be able to think of herself as “free and complete.”

At the same time, however, the love that she bears for Beloved is the kind of love that Morrison describes as “unhealthy” and “all-consuming,” a love that leaves no room for any distinct identity on Sethe’s part. She must find a way to love herself as well as her children; she must find a way to forgive herself for what she did to her infant child, yet to not forget it. She must find a way to integrate into her community, while remaining an independent woman and not being caught in the communal notion of female passivity, one given to them by their patriarchal world. In short, there are a number of extreme poles that Sethe must navigate between, and by finding the center of them all—a point in which she can fully embrace all aspects of her personality—Sethe would at last be able to achieve self-actualization on Jungian terms.

The notion of that center, and “circling” within the narrative, is a subject of interest to Valerie Smith, who noted that the text, like Sethe evading Paul D’s pointed questions, “circles” rather than addressing things directly:

These points in the novel display a striking self-reflexivity, calling attention as they do to the inexpressibility of what the narrative can only ‘circle’...Unable to resolve the paradox of narrating the body, uttering the unutterable, it’s as if the novel replicates that paradox. For it sets up and explodes an array of dichotomies: those between life and afterlife, living and dead, oral and written, self and other, and so on” (Smith 350).

This, too, provides another avenue for Jungian exploration of Morrison’s text: Smith notes the presence of these “dichotomies”—life and death, life and afterlife, spoken and scribed, self and other—and sees them as part of a deliberately unsolvable puzzle...a postmodern signifier than the audience will never be able to decipher Sethe’s code and understand what she understands.

While I agree with Smith that the notion of psychic wholeness remains evasive for Sethe, Jung's notion of the mandala as part of an individual's process of individuation provides a symbolic way to both uncover and explore Sethe's "code" that she has built around herself. Specifically, Jung imagined the mandala as a way of expression the idea of self-actualization—a circle squared, a symbol of psychic wholeness. As visual metaphors go, it is quite elegant, embodying the circle as the classic symbol of wholeness that connects the square of disparate elements. This, then, is Jungian wholeness, in which an individual does not have to choose from those disparate elements like an actor choosing to put on a different mask. Rather, they can embrace and embody all aspects of their psyche at once. However, in order to measure whether a character has achieved individuation in this sense, it is important to have a metric by which to judge their journey to wholeness.

Morrison provides no definitive characters that embody actualization. Part of this lack of actualized characters comes from the fact that, unlike Virginia Woolf's *Orlando* (which arguably builds towards an ideal of feminine independence by the end of the text) Morrison has crafted a stark story that reinforces the fragmented lives of slaves and former slaves. The actualized self in Jungian terms is a matter of wholeness...a kind of integration of disparate elements into a unified whole. By comparison, the tale of *Beloved* begins with loneliness and isolation, and ends in the same way: "THERE IS a loneliness that can be rocked. Arms crossed, knees drawn up; holding, holding on, this motion, unlike a ship's, smooths and contains the rocker. It's an inside kind--wrapped tight like skin. Then there is a loneliness that roams. No rocking can hold it down" (Morrison, *Beloved* 323). This, then, represents the hint that Morrison offers: an idealized self would integrate with its own loneliness, rocking it (uniting the disparate selves of child and adult, indicated by the self-contained rocking...it is both the nurturer and the nurtured) until it is

smoothed over and capable of engulfing the rocker itself. Such a description is in line with the Jungian idea of self-actualization, in which one is capable of putting aside the masks of persona and embracing the different aspects of their mind at once: in short, they are able to paradoxically contain the entirety of themselves. For Sethe, this may well have represented Jungian self-actualization, had she been fully able to integrate the loneliness and guilt of the past with her present life. However, even the advent of Beloved in physical form (complete with a predatory sense of what love means) ends up being another opportunity on Sethe's part to turn her back on the past, and try to substitute present-day forgiveness from Beloved for her stark "rememories" of the past. This is actually her largest hurdle in the quest for wholeness, because she can never escape the memory of what she has done. The forgiveness that she seeks cannot come from her reincarnated child, or her family, or her community. Rather, such forgiveness needs to come from within herself, which ultimately means it will never come at all. As befitting her ever-circling narrative, Sethe is caught in another kind of paradox regarding her interactions with these individuals. Integrating with her community is necessary for actualization not because of any external validation they may offer, but because it would end the self-imposed stubborn exile that comprises a large part of her persona. This, too, is a mask, and she must move past it before she can discover what she has hidden from herself, even as she hid herself from the world.

Sethe's desire for a kind of unified self, and her frustration that she has been unable to achieve such actualization, is present quite early in the text: she tells Paul D that "I got a tree on my back and a haint in my house, and nothing in between but the daughter I am holding in my arms" (Morrison, *Beloved* 18). She is longing for what she perceives as an escape from the continuum of pain that comprises her past, present, and future. Rather than being able to embrace the notion that Paul D later explicates (that she is self-contained and self-reliant—her own best

thing), she worries that the tree, a symbol of white patriarchal violence, has colonized her body and serves as a reminder of the identity she feels has been taken from her. Sethe is at a crossroads in a number of ways: in a literal way, her past is the primary feature of her life, effectively outweighing the present, as Denver is not more substantial, physically or psychically, than the physical reminders of past tortures, or the spectral reminder of Sethe's own cruelty to her child. Put another way, the curse of her powerful memories lends them a haunting, vivid quality with which present reality cannot compete, to the point that Denver later becomes the neglected shade while Beloved (a memory made flesh) becomes the entirety of Sethe's world. Paul D represents the tantalizing possibility of helping to counterbalance Sethe's life: he and Denver can help Sethe form a proper family, the dream of which serves as a dream of the future that might potentially help her to transcend her past, freeing her from being perpetually tethered to it. Beloved's arrival effectively not only destroys this vision of the future, but replaces it entirely: regarding her and Paul D's walk home with Denver, she first notes that "They were not holding hands, but their shadows were. Sethe looked to her left and all three of them were gliding over the dust holding hands. Maybe he was right. A life" (Morrison, *Beloved* 56). Later in the novel, however, she revises the memory, claiming that "Obviously the hand-holding shadows she had seen on the road were not Paul D, Denver and herself, but 'us three'" (Morrison, *Beloved* 214). By returning to the shadow-image of wholeness and placing Beloved in place of Paul D, Morrison provides a glimpse for readers into how and why Beloved as a character proves to be problematic for any psychoanalytic reading of the text. This is largely due to Beloved functioning as a physical extension of Sethe's guilt. Rather than free her from being tethered to the past, Beloved functions much like the "tree" on Sethe's back: she is born of

violence and bonded with Sethe, and her expansion means that Sethe's chances for self-actualization are further buried in the unconscious world of Sethe's past.

Despite the harm that she facilitates regarding Sethe, many critics view Beloved as vessel through which other characters are able to actualize. Valerie Smith, for instance, claims that "As a ghost made flesh, she is literally the story of the past embodied" (Smith 350), and Beloved has a somewhat positive effect on other characters. After all, "the act of intercourse with Beloved restores Paul D to himself, restores his heart to him" (Smith 346), and the revelation of Beloved's identity prompts Sethe to "[give] herself over fully to the past" (Smith 350) when she was previously unable to face that aspect of herself. While Beloved is certainly an embodiment of the past, the invitation for these individuals to give themselves fully over to the past can be damaging in the pursuit of individuation. After all, Sethe effectively becomes lost in the past in her relationship with Beloved, becoming so focused on providing everything that she could never provide to Beloved as an infant that she nearly gives up living in the present. From the Jungian perspective, it would be more accurate to say that Sethe would ideally be able to mediate both the past and the present: to be aware of both worlds, but to not be confined to either one.

Kevin Quashie, meanwhile, regards Beloved as more of a force of nature, which by definition cannot truly possess agency or blame: "She is, as a text, ultimately unmarkable, for, though she sometimes imitates singularity and self-containedness, her constitution and character are inflected by the other bodies she interacts with and/or inhabits" (Quashie 102). Moreover, Quashie views Beloved as the embodiment of the collective black female body, and its attendant collective memory:

it impairs and is susceptible to impairment. Is past and present and even future.

Dead and alive and ailing. Material, partial, and immaterial. Elusive and allusive.

Is stable and collapses; hard to trust and impossible to ignore. Fully alive but not always engaged and hence can be, or appear, deadened. Improvisational.

Essential. (105)

A large part of why Sethe fails to achieve individuation within the text is due to the fact that she focuses so much on reconciling Beloved's own paradoxical nature. She sees someone who is, as Quashie puts it, "susceptible to impairment," yet does not realize that Beloved impairs Sethe herself. As Morrison put it, she has returned to putting the best of herself into her child, and Beloved's status as the collective black female body helps to explicate the difficulty Sethe faces when trying to reclaim the part of herself that she put into her child. This is due to that same paradoxical nature of Beloved herself, as Sethe must navigate the "material, partial, and immaterial" nature of this collective body in order to arrive at her own sense of wholeness. Smith and Quashie's views on Beloved illustrate part of the critical issues surrounding the text:

Beloved cannot be both an agent for healing and a destructive agent for Sethe, nor can she be viewed as a collective embodiment of black memory when viewed through the lens of Sethe's own perceptions and attempts at individuation, as the focus on uniting herself with collective identity threatens to further fragment her psyche. However, Jungian analysis does present a way of reconciling some (though not all) of these key differences between differing critical perspectives.

Jung allows us to unpack the paradox of Quashie, for instance: how can Beloved be both "alive" and "deadened?" Both "stable" and something that "collapses?" The most elegant explanation is that Beloved functions within this text as a projection of both Sethe's shadow and inner anima—in an ideal Jungian framework, such projections serve as a way for an individual to confront disparate aspects of their unconscious mind as part of the journey to self-actualization.

Upon actualization, such projections become stable parts of the actualized self, a self that is now able to embody its many diverse elements simultaneously. However, negative projection can end up serving the opposite purpose, as Sethe illustrates when the arrival of Beloved moves Sethe away from actualization and further into the unconscious depths of her past life. This is, of course, in line with Valerie Smith's notion of Beloved as the embodiment of the past, as Sethe's unhealthy relationship with Beloved characterizes her unhealthy relationship with the past—present reality sublimating itself to the memories of yesterday. The relationship becomes part of the “circles” of “self-reflexivity” that Smith notes as well, as rather than approaching the relationship as a Jungian mandala of actualization (the “circle squared” in which an individual finds their own center amidst opposing aspects of self), Sethe is unable to resolve the paradox of life and death that Beloved represents, just as readers are unable to resolve the paradoxes that Smith mentions.

With this in mind, the framework of Rushdy's Freudian analysis is still in place, as it links the “necessity of remembering primal scenes” with Smith's argument concerning the novel's sometimes frustrating unwillingness to move its characters beyond the pain of such scenes. And while my own analysis primarily focuses on Sethe and her sense of Self, the Jungian analysis of Beloved incorporates elements of Kristeva's approach: while I do not personally subscribe to the notion that a “paternal function” *per se* is necessary for actualization in the text, the fact that the completely incomplete character of Beloved so stridently pushes Paul D. away highlights the sadness of a “child” that is unable to “locate a self apart from and related to others.” Beloved is practically lost in the murk of the Jungian unconscious, and her fanatic need to be with Sethe plays a large part in keeping the latter from actualization. Finally, this Jungian approach dovetails Sobat's own Jungian reading, with one important distinction: while Sobat

views *Beloved* as a kind of “poltergeist” meant to “ease” Sethe’s memories of the past, I contend that she serves as a constant reminder of the past, rendering Sethe unable to move past it.

Before the physical death of *Beloved*, the character of Baby Suggs represents a kind of Jungian idealization of self-actualization, one in which other characters can be measured against. This is illustrated quite vividly by the description of her sermons in the clearing, to which she arrived “uncalled, unrobed” (Morrison, *Beloved* 102). This is important because, among other things, it illustrates that Baby Suggs had no need to hide herself behind titles or masks or ceremonial clothing, all of which can symbolically represent the Jungian idea of a persona that individuals wear in order to hide their true self from others. This is, of course, in stark contrast to her final days, in which she literally hides within the house and metaphorically hides behind the veil of colors. The latter day Baby Suggs is a character broken by despair, hoping for some sort of external influence to ease both her heart and mind, while the earlier Suggs is a generative force—as mentioned above, an early ideal of actualization, and the only character presented as such in the text.

The actualization that she offers to other people is that which she has already experienced: put simply, she did not experience the call to service from either God or men, but called herself, and this self-reliance and independence is something that she offers to others; despite her role as a facilitator of individuation, the individuation she offers can only be fully achieved from within. Those seeking it cannot rely on those who are called, robed, and anointed, because such totems of authority serve as reminders of the perversion of authority and justice within their world. While it may seem obvious, most of the responsibilities given in the text are tainted by white patriarchy: even the eminent status that Sethe and Paul D. are given by their kindly former master is tainted by the specter of complicity with the evils of slavery, and the

mixed feelings that this causes are signaled by the divisive memories both Sethe and Paul D. experience when remembering Sweet Home. Furthermore, the text makes special note of masks that individuals such as School Teacher (his very name serves as a mask of persona, a noble title meant to obscure the horror of the individual) use in order to claim they know what is best for other people.

Those totems of authority can be considered part of the mental colonization that the institution of slavery helped engender; the notion of “rememory” is an explication of this process of colonization, as it highlights how the mental horrors of the past pervasively inhabit the present life of Sethe and others affected by slavery. Quashie points out how the notion of rememory can have a debilitating effect on those involved: “That memory sometimes works against itself is one of the ways that it can colonize a subject, can interfere with a subject’s process of selfhood” (Quashie 108). According to this perspective, when a mind is continuously colonized by haunting memories from the past, then the attainment of selfhood can be imagined as a matter of decolonization:

The work of self-decolonization, which is also the work to articulate and define a relationship with memory, necessarily involves retelling and inventing stories to counter the oppressor but also presupposes a more intimate relationship to memory, one that acknowledges a communal agenda but remains entangled in memory as a selfful enterprise of one’s subjectivity. (Quashie 109-110)

Baby Suggs ritual provides a way of doing so for the members of her community. The choice of venue for her sermons is very important to this process—the text describes it as “a wide-open place cut deep in the woods nobody knew for what at the end of a path known only to deer and whoever cleared the land in the first place” (Morrison, *Beloved* 102). It is a place that is not

tainted by the harsh memories/rememories of anyone present, and it also visually reinforces a kind of return to nature, away from the corrupt “civilization” of the colonizing force. Suggs’ ritual also reinforces a kind of return to primal nature, as she calls children to “let your mothers hear you laugh,” for men to “let your wives and children see you dance,” and for women to “cry...for the living and the dead. Just cry” (Morrison, *Beloved* 103). This is a kind of decolonization that works on many different levels, as it involves a kind of reconciliation with rememory (in the sense that the heavy substance of their past is joined with the lightness of the clearing) as well as the blurring of identity that helps lead to a Jungian wholeness. For this particular community (one that would later exile Sethe because their belief in her excessive pride) Baby Suggs’ ritual was especially important. This ritual allowed them to return to a kind of primal nature untouched by the colonizing hands of the patriarchal world, allowing for a blurring of patriarchy-influenced sex-based expectations that helps them to find freedom from the constraints of those expectations.

As mentioned earlier, individuation in the Jungian sense does not mean that the past is forgotten, or simply replaced with something else. That is why the process of psychic decolonization involves retelling as well as invention: this allows an individual to unite the past with their own changing perceptions, to essentially re-colonize the colonized mind, as opposed to tearing down all of the structures of colonization to begin with. The rest of Suggs’ ritual seems to emphasize this as well:

It started that way: laughing children, dancing men, crying women and then it got mixed up. Women stopped crying and danced; men sat down and cried; children danced, women laughed, children cried until, exhausted and riven, all and each lay about the Clearing damp and gasping for breath. In the silence that followed,

Baby Suggs, holy, offered up to them her great big heart... She did not tell them to clean up their lives or to go and sin no more. She did not tell them they were the blessed of the earth, its inheriting meek or its glorybound pure. She told them that the only grace they could have was the grace they could imagine. That if they could not see it, they would not have it. (Morrison, *Beloved* 103)

The importance of the individual to the process of their own individuation is stressed here, with Baby Suggs actively telling her flock that they must “imagine” their own grace; logically, the absence of grace can be interpreted as a lack of the necessary imagination and agency to create it. This ties into the notion of decolonization, in which imagination is necessary for the invention that it takes to combat traumatic memories. The explicitly Jungian notion of individuation seems to be highlighted by the fact that the boundaries separating different groups inevitably break down, until they all feel free to embrace different roles. In the narrative of Baby Suggs’ sermons, one could interpret her initial calling as a pantomime of societal expectation, in which individuals are grouped by the function they are expected to perform: children are to laugh, men are to dance, and women are to cry.

However, within the white patriarchy of America, those social roles echo the ones given by white authoritarians such as Schoolteacher; as such, even otherwise free individuals who subscribe to these socially-imposed limitations are still, for all intents and purposes, bound by white society. Normally, when these masks of persona are not fully in place, it brings the judgment of the community. Paul D wears such a mask, for he feels that in order to “dance”—that is, to serve as a happy and productive counterweight to the gloomy suffocation of Sethe’s household—he must keep the pain and suffering of his soul within the tin covering of his heart, allowing him to be the embodiment of masculinity that he has always taken pride in...the

understandably ambiguous pride of being a “Sweet Home” man. When sex with Beloved makes him feel like the painful contents of his heart have been exposed, he exiles himself from Sethe’s home, rather than allow her to see him as emotional and vulnerable.

Denver, too, undergoes a kind of self-exile: children are expected to laugh, and yet Denver’s acute awareness that she could not bear to hear the truth regarding her mother killing a child brought on deafness that exiled her from the happy world of Lady Jones and the other children. Interestingly, her self-exile from the world represents her own attempt to stay a part of that world, as that deafness keeps her from hearing the horrific information that would introduce her to the adult world...a double-exile, then, as it keeps her from being part of either world. And, of course, if women are expected to cry, a large part of the communal resentment towards Sethe centers on the idea that she is unapologetic for what she did to Beloved. If women are expected to cry for the living and the dead, Sethe feels unable to do so, because the ghost of Beloved lives somewhere in-between those extremes. Sethe’s exile, then, represents an exile from her own community. It is interesting to note that she is symbolically welcomed in by the revelation that she not only does not consider herself elevated above her neighbors, but in fact suffers more heinously than they do: Ella, previously furious over the death of Beloved, is surprisingly empathetic towards the ghosts of the past taking over Sethe’s life, and seems to consider helping Sethe exorcise this demon as a way of breaking down the barrier of her own hostile persona, as well as that of Sethe’s.

In Jungian terms, Sethe’s persona is often the means by which she sabotages herself, both in terms of personal relationships and self-actualization. Regarding such masks of persona, Jung once commented that

the persona is a very treacherous thing. The persona can make one believe that it is the true and only thing, and such a prejudice makes people imagine they are nothing but the role they play...very conscious people are particularly inclined to identify themselves with their consciousness, losing sight of what they are unconsciously” (Jung, *Visions* 414).

This provides an interesting frame for analyzing Sethe’s failure to actualize: she seems to consider her voluntary isolation from the social world as a rebellion against the community that turned against her; just as they shunned her, she has chosen to shun them. However, in Jungian terms, Sethe has merely swapped one mask for another; her refusal to play the grieving woman that the community wishes to see enables her need for revenge against the community, but also masks her own need to bury the past: she is unwilling to confront the past until, through Beloved, the past confronts her. Jung notes the important distinction between the two ideas:

Individualism means deliberately stressing and giving prominence to some supposed peculiarity rather than to collective considerations and obligations. But individuation means precisely the better and more complete fulfillment of the collective qualities of the human being...a process by which a man becomes the definite, unique being he in fact is. (Jung, *Two Essays* 173-174)

Much of Sethe’s failure to fully attain selfhood within the text can be traced back to this desire to separate herself from the community, freeing herself from “collective considerations and obligations.” However, when it comes to individuation, she essentially has no basis for understanding or comparison: she has shunned the support of her present community, and her memories of the past, particularly of Sweet Home, are still colonized by the oppression that she went through.

Like Paul D, she seems struck by the mingled horror and beauty of Sweet Home, which hampers her ability to decolonize, or rather recolonize, her own mind. Such recolonization would involve both confronting the past and remaking it in her own image, but she is unable or unwilling to do so. In many ways, Sethe is left with the worst of both worlds, unable to be part of the community's network of support, yet unable to achieve individuation through stubborn individualism. In its own minor way, her interaction (and subsequent lack thereof) with her community provides an ideal mirror for recolonization as the reconciliation between beauty and horror: her community has been effectively colonized by patriarchal thought, yet it still serves as a physical explication of the wholeness that she is seeking. Therefore, the need for recolonization: just as she struggles to mediate the happy memories of Sweet Home with the horrific ones—effectively recolonizing her own consciousness—the ideal reconciliation with her community would involve reconciliation of anima and animus. In short, it would involve communal actualization that would allow individuals to no longer be defined by the gender roles and expectations put upon them by male society. However, Sethe is unable to achieve her own self-actualization, a microcosm that mirrors her community's inability to achieve any actualization at all. By the time they retrieve and reclaim Sethe, she is a shadow of her former self.

Sethe's failure to achieve individuation, then, can be understood in the context of Baby Suggs and her sermons in the clearing. According to Baby Suggs, "the prize" for loving their hearts was symbolized by a dance that represented unity: "Saying no more, she stood up then and danced with her twisted hip the rest of what her heart had to say while the others opened their mouths and gave her the music. Long notes held until the four-part harmony was perfect enough for their deeply loved flesh" (Morrison, *Beloved* 104). Within this ritual is an echo of Jung's

mandala, or the “circle squared,” as the harmony is comprised of four different parts represented by the very disparate group of individuals that joined Baby Suggs in the clearing. They become united only when Baby Suggs offers them her heart, which allows the community to realize that the divisions between them and among them were largely given by white patriarchy (something that comes from this community’s animus, a topic which will be explored in further detail within this text). Once they learn to love their hearts more than anything else, they are able to begin reclaiming love, as Morrison has described it. In turn, after Sethe kills Beloved, Baby Suggs “dismissed her great heart” (Morrison, *Beloved* 104) which gave the community no opportunity to further reconcile themselves to each other. The square no longer had its circle, and there was no more harmony. As such, everyone—Baby Suggs, Sethe, Denver, and the rest of the community—are unable to recolonize their minds, and the colonies of division and hatred that were first instilled by white patriarchy are left to thrive, unopposed.

The failure to recolonize the mind is represented by the figure of Beloved in a number of ways. For one, she serves as a representation of the collective black feminine body, simultaneously able to embody the living while her status as a resurrected victim allows her to embody the dead victims of slavery that Morrison mentions in her foreword. Beloved necessarily bears scars, both physical and psychological, that remind the world of the atrocities of slavery. However, for Sethe, the memories of the past are so powerful and pervasive that they undermine any attempts to recolonize her mind, and the scars of Beloved serve as a persistent reminder that Sethe herself is responsible for the death of her daughter. This is why the most intriguing—and troubling—aspect of Jungian analysis for this text is Beloved herself, and the functions that she performs within the novel. Is she a violent, haunting specter, or an opportunity for psychological healing? Is she manifested by the needs of Denver, Sethe, or possibly both at

the same time? One potential answer is to view Beloved in part as an archetypal shadow of Sethe's mind. Jungian psychoanalysis views the shadow archetype as (appropriately enough) the embodiment of repressed emotions. Considering Sethe's repression of what she did to Beloved as an infant, and the idea that Beloved is the embodiment of memory itself, then her physical reappearance (along with her vengeful behavior as a ghost) can be viewed in the context of confrontation necessary for Sethe's individuation. Jung claims that the product of such a confrontation—integration, rather than separation, with what many would consider “evil”—is actually quite necessary: the

[integration of the shadow] makes the highest demands on an individual's morality, for the 'acceptance of evil' means nothing less than that his whole moral existence is put in question...[actualization] will be satisfactory only if it expresses the whole of the psyche. This is not possible unless the conscious mind takes account of the unconscious, unless desire is confronted with its possible consequences, and unless action is subjected to moral criticism' (Jung, *The Symbolic Life* 619).

Sethe's obsession with seeking forgiveness for what she did to Beloved keeps her from any such confrontation with what she has done. In fact, the appearance of Beloved as a young adult gives Sethe an opportunity to act as if the past never happened by attempting to create the idyllic family life that was previously denied to her.

In many ways, Beloved functions as a trickster figure within the text. This, too, fits within the Jungian paradigm. According to Jung, “this collective figure gradually breaks up under the impact of civilization...But the main part of [the trickster] gets personalized and is

made an object of personal responsibility” (Jung, *Four Archetypes* 168). Such seems to be implied by the very end of *Beloved*, which discusses the fate of the spirit:

everybody knew what she was called, but nobody anywhere knew her name. Disremembered and unaccounted for, she cannot be lost because no one is looking for her, and even if they were, how can they call her if they don't know her name? Although she has claim, she is not claimed.

(Morrison, *Beloved* 323).

In many ways, it is civilization which disrupts the spirit of *Beloved*: the community banding together drives her from Sethe's home, and through communal effort, she is forgotten, “like an unpleasant dream during a troubling sleep.” However, some part of her endures, as “down by the stream in back of 124 her footprints come and go, come and go. They are so familiar.”

Furthermore, “Should a child, an adult place his feet in them, they will fit. Take them out and they disappear again as though nobody ever walked there” (Morrison, *Beloved* 324). One interpretation of this is that such a spirit can only be animated when a living person willingly walks the same path as the spirit, effectively joining the two together.

The resurrected *Beloved* also seems to hint at a connection to one of the African trickster archetypes Henry Louise Gates writes about in *Signifying Monkey*. He writes of Esu, a “guardian of the crossroads” and “god of generation and fecundity.” This trickster is described as a mediating figure, literally keeping a single foot “anchored in the realm of the gods while the other rests in this, our human world.” Furthermore, this trickster god is possessed of a multitude of qualities, including “parody...magic...ambiguity, sexuality, chance, uncertainty, disruption and reconciliation” (6). It is the latter quality that is of particular interest to this Jungian analysis, as I contend that *Beloved* certainly has the potential to be a mediating figure, allowing Sethe to

transcend the past she is anchored to and to embrace a world of self-actualization. However, Beloved is disruptive, and Sethe never entirely moves beyond that disruption. She pushes Paul D and his offer of effectively restarting a family in order to embrace the trickster Beloved (Esu, as phallic god, also echoes Lacanian notions of authority, causing Sethe to doubt the motivations and methods of Paul as the self-styled head of the house). Morrison blurs some of these lines as well, considering that the particular crossroads that Beloved guards might be characterized as more of a frightened netherworld, or perhaps purgatory. Nonetheless, she has certainly maintained a foothold in the world through her haunting, a haunting that seems to embody a parody of the spirituality that Baby Suggs embodied in her years of ministering to the community. In her groundbreaking *Toni Morrison and the Idea of Africa*, La Vinia Delois Jennings uses Gates' text as a springboard for highlighting Morrison's frequent use of trickster characters within her texts; while Jennings does not focus on Beloved as such a figure, it is my hope to further illustrate how this character fits within Morrison's existing pantheon of trickster characters.

Regarding Beloved as ghost-made-flesh, the novel is cyclical, in its way: while both the spectral ghost and the fleshly apparition of Beloved have been driven from the house, the spirit still lingers, waiting to be acknowledged by someone and, therefore, given life. This cycle is intriguing from the Jungian perspective because it seems to further Beloved's connection to the trickster archetype. Jung claims that modern individuals often find themselves "at the mercy of annoying 'accidents' which thwart his will and his actions with apparently malicious intent" get dismissed as "'hoodoos' and 'jinxes.'" The reality, in fact, is that "the trickster is represented by counter-tendencies in the unconscious, and in certain cases by a sort of second personality, of a puerile and inferior character," something he considers as causing "all those ineffably childish

phenomena so typical of poltergeists” (Jung, *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious* 262). Therefore, while the body and ghost of Beloved have been driven from Sethe’s home, it lives on through Sethe and her broken will to live. Paul D notes that Sethe seems to be emulating the behavior of Baby Suggs on her deathbed, just as she had previously been emulating the role of a willful child, one who would die without the intervention of Denver. However, these emulations—these second personalities “of a puerile and inferior character”—are a manifestation of Beloved. Since she has buried her child within the recesses of her own mind, enacting a personality where she has no real agency and relies on the care of others is a way of keeping the spirit of Beloved alive. She is no longer in a position to self-actualize; rather, her conscious life itself seems to have taken on the trickster elements of Beloved in an attempt to ensure that her child is not lost once again.

In many ways, the appearance of Beloved forces Sethe to experience all of those aspects that Jung addresses, though her refusal to embrace the shadow of her mind means that she actively avoids necessary confrontation, and subsequently attempts to avoid moral criticism for her actions. Perhaps most obviously, she must face the consequences of her violence towards her own child, facing someone anew each day someone who refuses to forgive what she has done, someone unwilling or unable to reconcile Sethe’s desire to preserve her child’s innocence with the bloodshed that she used to ensure it. And, of course, part of facing moral criticism involves facing one’s moral accusers: Sethe’s exile from her community was partially of her own design, both in the sense that her action causes the exile, and her stubborn refusal to reach out to those she feels have turned their backs on her. In order to become a fully actualized self, Sethe would need to be able to integrate her actions, motivations, and criticism into a united self...however, by the end of the novel, she is left feeling torn, as if the best and most vital part of her is now

gone even as she experiences the tentative possibility of reintegration into both her community and, through Paul D, reintegration into a romantic relationship.

Confronting the shadow is an important part of the process of Jungian actualization, although as earlier critics have pointed out, women often experience multiple forms of the archetypal shadow. Jungian feminist scholar Susan Rowland points out, in her *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, how the Jungian notion of the shadow can also be utilized as a tool for understanding gothic texts: “individuation and the role of the shadow in supplying horrifying challenges to the ego that are finally incorporated into a greater attachment into the other” (153). In this sense, the multiple critical and textual perceptions of the character of Beloved can be of great use in exploring what it means for her to be Sethe’s shadow: Rowland claims that

women are subjected to three forms of the shadow: one of nation, of personal psyche and of ‘being a woman’ in a male-oriented society. Individuation seems to grant a woman her personal authority by bringing to consciousness the shadow that society has foisted upon her gender. (59)

In a very real way, the presence and actions of Beloved embodies all three aspects of this shadow. Regarding Beloved as a “national” shadow, she embodies this in two interconnected ways: her original physical life and death serve as a reminder for Sethe of the patriarchal power that America is capable of exerting over her at any time.

This serves as a reminder that others would do harm to her children in the name of God or the law or some other construct of authority, whereas Sethe would only do such harm in the name of love. Also, Sethe’s act of killing, to the white patriarchy that is unable and unwilling to consider the act within any kind of context, reinforces their negative stereotypes of African-Americans as brutally cruel. Therefore, Beloved is a kind of double national shadow, in that she

represents the shadow of the nation to Sethe (the shadow of violence that the nation perpetuates and engenders among black communities), and could be interpreted by the white patriarchy as the embodiment of their own mixed feelings towards young black women. If, as Quashie claims, Beloved represents the collective body of black women, it is notable that her various personas, from lusty young woman to overbearing matriarch, all correspond to narratives that white, patriarchal America has attempted to impose upon black women. Therefore, if the shadow figure is truly a mirror, the negative aspects of Beloved serve as a cruel echo for Sethe of the white world that she tried to keep from absorbing her baby.

The idea of Beloved as a shadow figure for Sethe's personal psyche seems relatively straightforward, at first: she embodies both guilt and malevolence, tormenting Sethe by denying her forgiveness...the need for which Sethe had buried so deep that it became a kind of foundation for her unconscious. Confronting this embodiment of repressed emotions, then, serves as an opportunity for Sethe to access her unconscious, and to further her journey towards self-actualization. However, the physical manifestation of Beloved goes well beyond being simply an inner demon for Sethe: given her interactions with Denver and Paul, as well as the conflicting visions among those in the community that have seen her, it seems that Beloved serves as a kind of trickster figure within the text. Jung briefly summarized the trickster figure as "the reflection of an earlier, rudimentary stage of consciousness." Moreover, such a figure is actually a "collective personification" that "is the product of an aggregate of individuals and is welcomed by each individual as something known to him, which would not be the case if it were just an individual outgrowth" (Jung, *Four Archetypes* 167). At first glance, this would seem to make Jungian analysis problematic, as Sethe's obviously personal relationship and history with

Beloved would seem to denote “an individual outgrowth” of her mind, as opposed to a solely communal one. However, the concepts are not mutually exclusive: as Jung points out,

the trickster is a collective shadow figure, a summation of all the inferior traits of character in individuals. And since the individual shadow is never absent as a component of personality, the collective figure can construct itself out of it continually. (Jung, *Four Archetypes* 177)

This helps provide a glimpse into Sethe’s troubled relationships with Denver, Paul, and the surrounding community: Beloved is Sethe’s own shadow, but she also becomes the collective shadow of the community, and their impression of her is constructed out of their impression of Sethe. Hence, Denver views Beloved in terms of Sethe’s past violence—she wishes to provide the adult manifestation of Beloved with the kind of protection that she wished she herself had possessed when growing up, a protection that would have soothed the fears that she had.

Protecting Beloved from Sethe serves as a way of protecting herself from Sethe, and illustrates the adversarial relationship that Denver seems to have with the world. Similarly, Paul D views Beloved in terms of his position within Sethe’s home; he sees her as the wedge between himself and the family that he hoped to join, and also resents her for exposing the “red heart” that he kept constrained within himself for fear of frightening Sethe: “He would not pry it loose now in front of this sweet sturdy woman, for if she got a whiff of the contents it would shame him. And it would hurt her to know that there was no red heart bright as Mister's comb beating in him” (Morrison, *Beloved* 86). In this sense, Beloved embodies Paul’s own fears about himself. Specifically, she forces him to question whether he fits the near-mythologized notion of masculinity that he held dear, and whether or not he could still be a proud Sweet Home man when a rooster possessed more agency than he did.

The larger community views Beloved as a manifestation of Sethe's sins, something that needs to be exorcised from the house, as Ella thinks: "Sethe's crime was staggering and her pride outstripped even that; but she could not countenance the possibility of sin moving on in the house, unleashed and sassy" (Morrison, *Beloved* 302). This latter perspective is tied to Rowland's third woman-centric shadow archetype: the shadow of being a woman in a patriarchal world. The brief glimpse that Sethe's community has of Beloved, they see a "devil-child...And beautiful. It had taken the shape of a pregnant woman, naked and smiling in the heat of the afternoon sun. Thunderblack and glistening, she stood on long straight legs, her belly big and tight. Vines of hair twisted all over her head" (Morrison, *Beloved* 308). In many ways, their brief glimpse of Beloved is defined by her femininity, as she is obviously tied to fertility and generative nature (hence, the vines in her hair and the appearance of pregnancy). As Morrison's writing indicates, the sight is both beautiful and terrifying, as Beloved represents something literally unnatural—a kind of force subverting the act of pregnancy and motherhood. It is as Ella feared, for the ghost from the past has not only put its claim on the present, but her pregnant status signifies that it may be extending itself into the future as well.

By the end of the novel, Beloved has become a kind of parody of womanhood, someone that could potentially force Sethe to confront the fact that her own ideas concerning fertility and femininity were twisted and perverted by Schoolteacher and his boys. This stems from her status as a projection of Sethe's shadow: in the best of all possible worlds, the advent of the resurrected Beloved would provide an opportunity for Sethe to confront the past and make peace with it. Instead, Beloved represents the life Sethe could have led, one marked by fertility and femininity rather than pain, loss, and victimization. Rather than allowing Sethe to move on, she becomes

transfixed by the opportunity to start over with Beloved; this opportunity is bittersweet, for as Denver notes, Beloved has no intention of offering the forgiveness that Sethe so ardently seeks.

Beloved's embodiment of femininity and motherhood seems to hint towards Morrison's idea of a woman reclaiming her femininity, and it works on multiple levels. One aspect of this is that Sethe is reclaiming her notion of motherhood—ideally, she would realize that with both Denver and the reincarnated Beloved, there are times when one must simply let go. The second aspect of this confrontation is that Beloved offers a glimpse of someone who cannot stop feeding on her mother's love; she is a monster that has been created by Sethe's reckless love, and only by transforming this reckless love into a positive self-love would it be possible for Sethe to achieve self-actualization. However, Beloved is successfully driven off before such a confrontation can occur, leaving Sethe full of the same reckless love, but without any kind of outlet for it. It is interesting to note that, within the context of Sethe not achieving an individuated self within the text, the communal intervention that dissipates the spirit of Beloved may, in fact, do more harm than good.

In many ways, events towards the end of the text can be viewed in positive terms of healing: after all, Sethe is offered reincorporation into a community that had previously shunned her, and reunited with Paul D at the same time that she is freed from a malignant spirit. At the same time, Denver has literally and metaphorically taken her first steps into the wider world, becoming an independent adult rather than a timid child. However, this does nothing to change the fact that Sethe feels broken, as if a part of her had been taken away. When Paul D tries to cajole her by claiming that “we got more yesterday than anybody...we need some kind of tomorrow” and to console her by claiming that “you your best thing,” a bewildered Sethe can only ask “me? Me” (Morrison, *Beloved* 322). Why, when the malignant spirit is removed from

her life, is Sethe still unable to individuate and self-actualize? The primary reason for this can be traced to the simple fact that she has failed to fully confront her shadow. The ghost is driven out, but not fully driven off, and it has presumably resumed its place within the dark recesses of Sethe's mind: rather than being part of a story to pass on, the ghost and the events of its death and rebirth have been repressed by Sethe and the community. As the epilogue reminds readers, there remains "a loneliness that can be rocked" and "a loneliness that roams. No rocking can hold it down" (Morrison, *Beloved* 323). This serves as a sobering reminder that she continues to lurk in the netherworld of unconsciousness, and Sethe's refusal to dive into that world paradoxically keeps her from escaping the specter (rather literally, in *Beloved's* case) of the past.

Jung claims that when consciousness is "itself trickster-like," confrontation with past behaviors and identities is impossible. In fact, such confrontation is "possible only when the attainment of a newer and higher level of consciousness" enables someone to "look back on a lower and inferior state" (Jung, *Four Archetypes* 168). Towards the beginning of the novel, Sethe was at a point where she was capable of doing this: the arrival of Paul gave her a chance to feel marginally less burdened, and to realize that the past held small bits of joy that were buried beneath the horrors. In fact, she feels relieved "that the responsibility for her breasts, at last, was in somebody else's hands." As the text unfolds, the significance of this claim becomes more apparent. Her feelings of responsibility towards her breasts signified both the lingering responsibilities that she felt for her children, as well as the sense of guilt, pain, and violation that she felt over being abused by Schoolteacher's boys. Morrison's notion of Sethe reclaiming her femininity, then, is that much more difficult for Sethe, as she associates femininity with her breasts, and her breasts with the horrors of rape. The arrival of Paul gives her an opportunity to share the physical and emotional burdens that she carries with another person, to confront the

past and potentially emerge stronger than before. It is no coincidence that Beloved physically manifests so shortly after Paul D's arrival, as this arrival gave Sethe an opportunity to differentiate her consciousness.

As Jung writes, the trickster figure is “obviously a ‘psychologem,’ an archetypal psychic structure of extreme antiquity,” and when fully manifested, it “is a faithful reflection of an absolutely undifferentiated human consciousness, corresponding to a psyche that has hardly left the animal level” (Jung, *Four Archetypes* 165). The physical manifestation of Beloved is a figure of dual antiquity, as she embodies the ancient history of Sethe's own life while, as Quashie claims, Beloved is also an embodiment of the collective black female body, one that is not constrained by any fixed point in time. However, Beloved is not a positive embodiment: rather, she is a figure of endless need, an unleashed id that confronts Sethe's ego. Jung classifies the trickster as a being that “has hardly left the animal level,” and Beloved—in many ways still the infant that she once was—seems to correspond to such a level. Ideally, Sethe would be able to confront such a being, this manifestation of her own internal shadow, and emerge stronger, full and whole. However, the kindhearted intervention from her community keeps this from happening, as their appearance and intervention seem to dissipate Beloved into nothingness.

If Sethe, then, brought Beloved back, this brings up a number of questions concerning how and why she did that, as well as how this affects her attempts at self-actualization. Jung writes in-depth about the archetypal child, a ghostly figure much like Beloved. However, with the conceit that Sethe has manifested Beloved, as opposed to becoming haunted by an external force, why would she manifest this force? According to Jung,

If we cannot deny the archetypes or otherwise neutralize them, we are confronted, at every new stage in the differentiation of consciousness to which civilization

attains, with the task of finding a new *interpretation* appropriate to this stage, in order to connect the life of the past that still exists in us with the life of the present, which threatens to slip away from it. (Jung, *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious* 157).

Therefore, the manifestation of a spectral child is a direct result of her inability to otherwise achieve an individuated self. As mentioned previously, Sethe is unable to reconcile her past with her present, whether that means giving Denver the care and attention that she deserves or volunteering the truth to Paul D of her own volition. There is a natural concern that the physical reality of Beloved's physical body will continue to fade away (just as the dark color of the baby's blood has faded into a pink memory of her headstone), and so Sethe manifests the ghost of her dead daughter. It is interesting to note that the doubled symbolism of Beloved—that of a shadowy trickster that represents repressed aspects of one's mind as well as a child symbolizing one's greatest goal—complement, rather than contradict each other. In fact, Jung characterizes the trickster as a figure with an “approximation to the savior” because it serves as a validation of “the mythological truth that the wounded wounder is agent of healing, and that the sufferer takes away suffering” (Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 256).

Historically, the child motif (sometimes referred to by Jung as the child god) is an image that is essentially variable— “a special instance of ‘the treasure hard to attain’ motif,” which may symbolize anything from Jesus Christ to “the golden egg,” so long as it represents the individuation that the individual seeks” (Jung, *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious* 158-160). Therefore, Beloved serves as the as the embodiment of Sethe's desire for her murderous actions to be both forgiven and understood; symbolically, she also serves as an embodiment of Jung's trickster, the “wounded wounder” and the “sufferer that takes away suffering.” This helps

to further illuminate the troubled relationship that Sethe has with her reincarnated child, as she sees actualization as a matter of being redeemed—having her wounds cleansed—by one who continues to wound her. In truth, her actualization would come from confronting such a spirit and integrating her violent past with her present life, as opposed to using the present day ghost to negate the horrors of the past. The ghost of the epilogue seems to hint at the impossibility of true reconciliation and/or actualization—it represents “a loneliness that can be rocked” and “a loneliness that roams. No rocking can hold it down,” (Morrison, *Beloved* 323) meaning that it can never inhabit the stillness of Sethe’s life in the way that she desires. And, of course, it would seem impossible that one could rock that loneliness without absorbing the loneliness: Sethe can never really self-actualize because she is constantly seeking actualization from a reconciliation of the past, which seems to doom her (perhaps cyclically) to reanimating the tragedies of her past rather than creating a new future.

Ultimately, the notion of this archetype as the embodiment of a goal helps to reaffirm the tragedy of the end of the novel: whereas the community believes that they have saved both Sethe and Denver by exorcising a satanic spirit, they have effectively driven it from the house before Sethe can confront the spirit as a way to individuate herself. How, exactly, would *Beloved* have helped Sethe in such a way? Jung writes that

In the psychology of the individual there is always, at such moments, an agonizing situation of conflict from which there seems to be no way out—at least for the conscious mind...But out of this collision of opposites the unconscious psyche always creates a third thing of irrational nature, which the conscious mind neither expects nor understands...Since, however, the solution of the conflict through the union of opposites is of vital importance, and is moreover the very

thing that the conscious mind is longing for, some inkling of the creative act, and of the significance of it, nevertheless gets through. From this comes the numinous character of the “child.” (Jung, *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious* 168).

Beloved’s function as a ghost, then, echoes (appropriately enough) the moment of her physical death. The horrible choice Sethe is forced to make lines up well with Jung’s schematic: she was placed into a position from which there was no easy escape. Morrison herself acknowledges the impossibility of the decision, saying that “I can’t think of anything worse than to kill one’s children. On the other hand, I can’t think of anything worse than to turn them over to living death. It was that question which destroyed Baby Suggs” (Morrison, “A Bench By the Road” 46). Forced to choose between infanticide and condemning her child to “living death,” Sethe unconsciously attempts to create an irrational third solution. The idea of this as an unconscious solution is supported by the novel, in which Sethe is described by Schoolteacher as “wild,” her eyes appearing blind because “the whites in them had disappeared,” the pupils blending in because “they were as black as her skin” (Morrison, *Beloved* 177). When she reluctantly tells the story to Paul D, she does not focus on murder as the conscious act, but rather the goal of that murder: “‘I stopped him,’ she said, staring at the place where the fence used to be. ‘I took and put my babies where they’d be safe’” (Morrison, *Beloved* 193).

Unconsciously, she is receiving what Jung describes as “an inkling of the creative act,” focusing not on what she is destroying—the life of her child—but what she is creating: a safe place. It is significant, of course, that Sethe focuses on “where the fence used to be” during this exchange, as it signifies her unconscious attempt at eliminating the barriers of her conscious mind (barriers comprised of the impossible decisions that she was asked to make), as well as the idea that she had placed Beloved in a place that was beyond any fences, and beyond the earth

itself. However, the dark irony of this is that Beloved is placed somewhere all too safe: within the depths of Sethe's unconscious mind, deep within a place that Sethe is afraid to access. Beloved only appears in a physical form when, after enough time, Sethe is interested (at least partially due to the arrival of Paul D) in actualization, and a kind of reconciliation with the past. At that time, Beloved manifested, giving Sethe a literal opportunity to confront her past. However, Sethe is ultimately incapable of embracing her shadow—her inner demons and her past—and tries to further repress them, keeping her from attaining actualization.

Therefore, the elimination of Beloved's physical body was a way in which the spectral body was created, a spectral body that hints at Sethe's longing for actualization. How, though, was such a haunting figure a symbolic representation of Sethe's need for actualization? According to Jung, "'Child' means something evolving towards independence. This it cannot do without detaching itself from its origins... its redemptive effect passes over into consciousness and brings about that separation from the conflict-situation which the conscious mind by itself was unable to achieve" (Jung, *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious* 168). The ghostly form of Beloved had a two-fold purpose: it allowed Sethe an alternative to her horrific dilemma, allowing her to believe her child was safer in the afterlife than she would ever be in life. Over time, however, Sethe is ideally meant to reconcile herself to the reality of her actions while the aforementioned confrontation with the shadow, as Morrison says, represents an attempt to reclaim some of the excessive love she had given Beloved during both life and death. This period would also give her a chance to reform the "unhealthy" and zealous "mother love" she has into a love for herself. Unfortunately, she is unable to bridge the past and the present, remaining stuck in the horrific re-memories of her previous life. Jung describes the consequences for an individual unable to properly link past with present:

If this link-up does not take place, a kind of rootless consciousness comes into being no longer oriented to the past...With the loss of the past, now become 'insignificant,' devalued, and incapable of revaluation, the savior is lost too, for the savior is either the insignificant thing itself or else arises out of it. (Jung, *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious* 157).

The key word, in this case, is "insignificant." Beloved has not been fully driven away, both in the sense that she lives on in the memory of Sethe and in the fact that her spirit apparently still wanders the area. However, through well-intentioned community intervention, Beloved has been driven out of Sethe's home, denying her the chance to make peace with it. Beloved, as a vengeful spirit, is most certainly not "the savior" in a traditional sense. From appearances, she seemed perfectly content to, as Denver intuited, punish Sethe for killing Beloved as a baby. However, psychologically, there is the possibility that Sethe's "savior"—namely, the self-forgiveness that she needs in order to individuate herself—may "arise" from Beloved, in the sense that she is forced to confront the reality of her actions. On the most basic level, her encounter with the physical reincarnation of her child provides an opportunity for her to realize that she can never receive forgiveness from the dead. This is a large part of what makes Paul D's words so haunting and powerful: "you your own best thing" is a way of reminding her that only she can forgive herself for what she has done. Part of that forgiveness is accepting the reality of her actions, but as her conversation with Paul D indicates—the emphasis on the fact that she kept her child safe, instead of the blunt truth that she killed her child—she is not willing to accept that reality, and uses the reincarnation of Beloved as a way to further bury the truth.

It should be noted that Sethe running to the memory of Baby Suggs after the latter's death follows Sethe's pattern of seeking forgiveness, rather than facing reality. She naturally feels guilt

over the death of Baby Suggs: “There was nothing to be done other than what she had done, but Sethe blamed herself for Baby Suggs' collapse. However many times Baby denied it, Sethe knew the grief at 124 started when she jumped down off the wagon, her newborn tied to her chest in the underwear of a whitegirl looking for Boston” (Morrison, *Beloved* 105). However, even embedded in that guilt is the refusal to acknowledge any agency that she had regarding the death of Beloved, because “there was nothing to be done other than what she had done.” Sethe is unable to fully face the memory of Beloved's death, so she instead tries to run to the memory of Beloved. This is something made explicit when she visits the Clearing, hoping to be counseled by the wisdom of Baby Suggs' own ghost:

Baby Suggs' long distance love was equal to any skin-close love she had known. The desire, let alone the gesture, to meet her needs was good enough to lift her spirits to the place where she could take the next step: ask for some clarifying word; some advice about how to keep on with a brain greedy for news nobody could live with in a world happy to provide it. (Morrison, *Beloved* 112)

Sethe is unable to turn to herself for actualization; unable, in essence, to begin meeting her own needs. Therefore, she tries to find actualization through Baby Suggs, unable to face her own archetypal shadow—the vengeful ghost of her dead child—until it tries to kill her. The idea that Sethe is running away from her shadow is one that is made clear even by her motivation, which is the question of satiating “a brain greedy for news nobody could live with in a world happy to provide it.” It seems that Sethe hungered for misery, and yet the prime, primal source of misery in her life—the killing of her child—was by her very own hands. She cannot confront that memory, and effectively does not confront that memory, until Beloved (first as a ghost, then in

physical form) forces her to do so. In this sense, the “clarifying word” that she seeks from Baby Suggs is another layer of abstraction meant to insulate her from this necessary confrontation.

One of the primary elements to Jungian thought is that of the anima and animus, and this provides us with one of the key lenses through which to view *Sethe*, *Beloved*, and *Denver*.

Andrew Samuels provides a context necessary for understanding this aspect of Jung’s psychology:

...anima and animus promote images which represent an innate aspect of men and women—that aspect of them which is somehow different to how they function consciously; something *other*, strange, perhaps mysterious, but certainly full of possibilities and potentials. But why the ‘contrasexual’ emphasis? This is because a man will, quite naturally, image what is ‘other’ to him in the symbolic form of a woman—a being with an-other anatomy. A woman will symbolize what is foreign or mysterious to her in terms of the kind of body she does not herself have. The contrasexuality is truly something ‘contrapsychological’; sexuality is a metaphor for this. (Samuels 172)

With this in mind, the male characters within the text take on a special dimension. The primary male character, and the one imagined as the Other by Sethe, would be the character of Paul D. Special attention is paid to the essentially timeless nature of his appearance...how “except for a heap more hair and some waiting in his eyes, he looked the way he had in Kentucky.” This presents a deliberate contrast to the mental and physical character of Sethe herself, which she feels has been irrevocably changed by her time during and after Sweet Home, changes that her memories ensure that she is unable to forget. In Jungian terms, Sethe is actually projecting her animus onto Paul—a kind of fantasy of strength and stability that represents what she herself has

been longing for. Between memory, rememory, and an actual ghost haunting her home, Sethe's life seems to be a kind of vaguely-controlled chaos, which makes the imagined stability of Paul part of the Otherness that she finds attractive. Sethe's longing for stability is characterized by one of the earliest descriptions of Paul, in which Morrison writes that,

for a man with an immobile face it was amazing how ready it was to smile, or blaze or be sorry with you. As though all you had to do was get his attention and right away he produced the feeling you were feeling. With less than a blink, his face seemed to change—underneath it lay the activity” (Morrison, *Beloved* 9).

In this case, the activity that Sethe perceives underneath Paul's face represents her own buried unconsciousness, something that she longs to access. This longing is represented by the emotional mimicry that Sethe perceives: what is attractive about Paul is not the dynamic and unique feelings that he possesses as an individual, but the fact that he creates a kind of emotional reciprocity with Sethe.

This reciprocity is important because it seems that Sethe often has her emotions buried deep within herself, which prevents access to those emotions by anyone, herself included. The integration of Paul may, in fact, represent a chance for her to attain her actualized self. As Samuels explains, this is because

Projection of what is contrasexual is a projection of unconscious potential: ‘soul-image.’ Thus the woman may first see or experience in the man parts of herself of which she is not yet conscious and yet which she needs. The man draws her soul (willingly) out of her...[Jung] speaks of the soul as an ‘inner personality,’ the true centre of the individual. (Samuels 173).

Therefore, the projection of one's animus may best be viewed as a kind of persona projected onto others; just as the typical persona represents a mask that allows individuals to project a certain appearance to the public, the projection of the animus allows them to view a variety of their own unique qualities within other individuals, giving them this individual perception of themselves that they would not otherwise be able to have. It is interesting to note the role that animus and anima play within the context of self-actualization: Jung readily notes that one can be possessed by this archetype as with any other (for instance, an elderly professional who abandons his own successful life to pursue an affair with a much younger woman represents someone becoming so captivated with the Otherness of the individual—her youth and beauty—that he loses sight of his own identity), yet integration of the Otherness that it represents is necessary for actualization. Paul D, then—or, more accurately, Sethe's animus projected onto Paul D—is someone that is able to bring forth the soul/self that Sethe has suppressed within her unconscious.

The scene between Sethe and Paul D at her stove illustrates this relationship quite well: Paul is someone that many women have been able to make emotional confessions to—"Women saw him and wanted to weep--to tell him that their chest hurt and their knees did too. Strong women and wise saw him and told him things they only told each other." Sethe, for her part, sees their blossoming relationship as an opportunity to be relieved of some of the great burden that she carries. After all, she feels a profound relief "that the responsibility for her breasts, at last, was in somebody else's hands" (Morrison, *Beloved* 21). This shifting of responsibility represents, for Sethe, her ability to access the unconscious world; Samuels points out that this, too, is quite necessary, because such a figure plays "a vital role in analysis in connecting the person as he or she is (ego) with what he or she may become (self)" (Samuels 172). This focus on mediating ego

and self is quite important, because it is not a union with Paul D (whether sexual or emotional) that, in and of itself, will provide Sethe with actualization. Rather, she projects her animus onto Paul, and interaction with him allows her to finally access an aspect of herself that would otherwise continue to be suppressed.

The mediation between ego and self relies on integration with one's animus, a mediation that mirrors necessary confrontation with one's community, which is something that Sethe is all too familiar with. Samuels elaborates on how the Otherness of the animus sometimes conflicts with community values: "Animus and anima are ways of communicating otherness, difference, that which is momentarily unavailable because of unconsciousness. Animus and anima speak, then, of the unexpected, of that which is 'out of order,' which offends the prevailing order" (Samuels 173). This highlights the confusing nature of Sethe's own conflict with her community: typically, as Jeffery Miller explains, "an individual's persona" functions as a "public mask aimed at conforming with the collective," and is itself "counterbalanced by the anima or animus which demands interaction with the unconsciousness" (Miller 66). Obviously, Sethe is an interesting case because the mask that she wears is not intended to help her conform with the collective.

This lack of conformity is made quite clear via Ella's reaction to Sethe after she is released from prison: "When [Sethe] got out of jail and made no gesture toward anybody, and lived as though she were alone, Ella junked her and wouldn't give her the time of day" (Morrison, *Beloved* 302). This seems to be the chief charge that the community has leveled against Sethe: the abundance of the feast thrown by Baby Suggs fosters jealousy, and brings about the question of how and why Sethe and Baby Suggs were so (relatively) privileged compared to the rest of the community. Sethe's independence after being released from prison served to cement that notion—that Sethe was somehow too proud to stoop down to the level of

someone else. The question remains, though: why would her persona be something that she uses to refuse conformity, rather than to embrace it? Murray Stein presents a possible explanation for this:

in order for society to be able to influence one's attitude and behavior, one must want to belong to society. The ego must be motivated to accept the persona features and the roles that society requires and offers, or else they will simply be avoided. There will be no identification at all. An agreement must be struck between the individual and society in order for a persona formation to take hold.
(Stein 115)

As addressed earlier, this does not mean that Sethe is somehow free of the masks of persona: rather, the spirit of rebellion that comprises her public identity has effectively become the mask that she wears. This seems to be symbolized by the early scene with Paul D at the stove, in which she intuitively understands what his affection means, but the abused flesh of her back has been unable to feel anything for years. That flesh, then, serves as a barrier—partly symbolic, partly literal—that serves two separate, yet related, functions: it separates Sethe from contact with the outer world, allowing her to resist integration or conformity with the community. While this seems desirable to Sethe on the surface, there is also the fact that this barrier to integration keeps her from actualization, because it keeps her in a constant state of emotional and psychological isolation.

Of course, not all aspects of the animus are positive, just as not all male figures within the context of *Beloved* are, themselves, very positive. Steven Walker provides illumination on the complex role that the animus plays in the psychological life of women: “animus issues provide a psychological focus to the problem of women's oppression by men and by patriarchal norms;

they may be said to constitute the internal psychological dimension of an external and social problem” (Walker 55). What Walker describes is the depressingly common element of patriarchal reality: within the confines of a patriarchy, many norms effectively become masculine in nature, so women who do wish to conform to collective society are conforming to a de facto masculine society. Walker sees the more conventional aspect of this issue displayed in novels such as *Wuthering Heights*, in which Catherine has projected her animus onto Heathcliff, yet chooses the unhappy marriage to Linton as a way of gaining both entry into and approval from the patriarchal world of high society. Therefore, she remains possessed by her animus (having no way to integrate her projection of it into herself), a possession that nearly drives her insane. In many ways, Sethe faces almost the exact opposite of this problem: when it comes to the community that she rejects, their idea of collective conformity hinges on integration into a patriarchal society. One interpretation of this is that the community itself is possessed by their own animus, one that hews much closer to Jung’s original, patriarchal vision of the animus: as Tessa Adams points out, “Jung characterizes ‘animus possession’ to the detriment of women” (97), and sees the anima/animus relation in terms of binaries. Adams claims, “these oppositions include...rationality/intuition, discrimination/connectedness...spirit/soul, and so on” (98). On the surface, such oppositions do not seem to favor one sex over the other, which is one of the reasons Adams and other feminists are interested in reclaiming Jungian thought in order to promote feminist philosophy.

In practice, Jung often seemed enveloped in the patriarchy himself: a man possessed by his anima is often viewed either with positivity (such as a stoic intellectual who decides to finally embrace instinct and intuition) or understanding pity (as with the hypothetical case of the elderly professor who leaves his life behind in order to live with a woman barely out of her teenage

years). By contrast, Jung often viewed women possessed by their animus in more negative terms: they are moving away from instinct and intuition rather than towards it, and as such, women possessed by their animus become overly analytical and overly intellectual; in one anecdote from a party, Jung recalls a woman who seemed to be simply repeating information from memory without adding anything new. When Jung politely prompts her for her own opinion on the matter she has been discussing, she (without irony) says that she needs to think about it. She is, to Jung, the epitome of animus possession, so caught up in the world of parroting intellectual discussion that she has effectively removed herself from the intuitive heart that exists at the core of all intellect.

However, the heart of Jung's own philosophy is something that can be revisited, revised, and reclaimed for feminist thought, and this is something that Morrison seems to be doing in connection with Sethe and her conflicts with the surrounding community. Adams points out that "the positive dynamic of animus and anima is that of mediation out of which our relationship with our hidden 'otherness' is forged" (99). Complete possession by the anima or animus is the exception, rather than the rule, when it comes to the psychological archetypes; ideally, they represent yet another chance for the kind of union necessary for self-actualization to occur—as with the Apollonian and Dionysian elements, an actualized self is one that is able to balance the abstract intellect of the masculine world and the instinctual, intuitive aspect of the feminine world, a balancing act that seems destined to fail in the world of *Beloved*. But why, exactly, is this?

Because (as touched on previously) it is the community itself that is caught in the patriarchal world, and seems to reject Sethe because she is a threat to that order. Adams points out that Jung, despite being part of the patriarchal order, anticipated this problem through his

writing. "...for women Logos is seen to operate primarily through the screen of the father and cultural representations of the male," which supports the implication "that the social convention of women's passivity is psychologically perpetuated" through the lens of male thought (99). Therefore, the community projects a kind of shadow/animus hybrid onto Sethe, viewing her as someone possessed of stereotypical male qualities (independence, strength, agency) that is considered as the Other to their closed community. This provides one intriguing interpretation of their perception of Beloved herself, with some members of the community vocalizing that Sethe may deserve to be haunted due to the actions she had taken against the infant body of Beloved. Though Sethe (and through Sethe, the reader) is aware that her murderous actions were motivated purely by instinct (something Jung would associate more closely with the anima, rather than the animus), the community seems to view it as an essentially unfeminine action: the mother murders her own child. However, infanticide was not only a commonplace practice during slavery, but not unheard of within their community, as Ella (perhaps the most vocal of Sethe's detractors) seems to derive an almost stubborn pride from the fact that she refused to nurse her children previously fathered by her white masters.

If simple hypocrisy is ruled out, then there are two possible explanations for Ella's particular vehemence to Sethe's actions. One concerns the nature of the infant: Ella's refusal to nurse the children of white masters could be considered an extreme act of resistance against slavery, highlighting that while she may be helpless against the abuse (sexual and otherwise) that occurs, she will not be seen as complicit in the immoral institution in any way, even if it means letting an infant die. The other possibility is more direct, and also likelier: that Ella has drawn a distinction between sins of omission and sins of commission. This is why, despite her own part in letting children die, she tells Stamp Paid "I ain't got no friends take a handsaw to their own

children” (Morrison, *Beloved* 221). Setting Ella’s particulars aside, though, infanticide (often with a sharp metal object) was a historical reality for many slaves, and their motivations were quite similar to Sethe’s, as they did not wish for their infants to experience abuse during their growth and development, culminating with being sold to a nameless white master. The question remains, then: why condemn Sethe for an action that, albeit horrifying, was far from unheard of? Why did her detractors include Ella, a veteran of infanticide? The Jungian answer is that much of the community actively desires to view her as a projection of their own shadow. In blunter terms, she can be the scapegoat for a variety of sins: the fortune and bounty of Baby Suggs’ party is dismissed as excessive pride and vanity, and Sethe’s subsequent coldness to the community after her return is characterized as an extension of that haughtiness and pride. Perhaps most notably, the killing of her own child is given as the reason for this treatment, despite this not being consistent with historical reality or the world of the text. This, then, is a negative projection: rather than allowing the community to put their own lives and actions into a kind of perspective, they instead view some of their own negative qualities and actions in Sethe. By marking her as some kind of communal Other, they attempt to exorcise themselves of their own demons. It is little surprise, then, that they do not band together in her defense until *Beloved* (characterized as a demon child) is discovered. There now exists for them a more proper Other (as *Beloved* literally comes from another world, according to her comments to Denver), as Sethe is welcomed back by Ella and others as victim, rather than victimizer.

Considering that *Beloved*’s ghost had long haunted Sethe and her family, one obvious question exists: why did Ella and others find the presence of the ghost tolerable, but the presence of the resurrected *Beloved* intolerable? If *Beloved* is the collective female body, then she would serve to function as a kind of embodiment of the collective anima as well...Sethe’s detractors

may very well feel that Beloved, in ghostly form, is something Sethe “deserves,” a lost feminine spirit that attempts to force itself onto the seemingly-masculine Sethe. It is interesting to note Ella’s highly specific thoughts concerning Beloved as a ghost versus Beloved as a flesh-and-blood person: “As long as the ghost showed out from its ghostly place--shaking stuff, crying, smashing and such—Ella respected it. But if it took flesh and came in her world, well, the shoe was on the other foot. She didn't mind a little communication between the two worlds, but this was an invasion” (Morrison, *Beloved* 302). Why would Ella (and by extension, other members of the community) respect a vengeful spirit, but disdain that spirit when it is turned to flesh? And why would the latter be considered “an invasion,” whereas the other was not? Once Beloved is made into flesh again, no possibility remains of Sethe integrating the feminine spirit of her child into herself. In point of fact, the fleshly Beloved still seems interested in such an integration, so she seems intent on slowly killing Sethe, drawing the life from her in an attempt to reduce Sethe to the same spectral status that Beloved once had. Even though the community has notions concerning actualization that do not coincide with Sethe’s—specifically, they wish to reincorporate her into a patriarchal framework, whereas Sethe is trying to establish an actualized self that is dependent from patriarchy as well as the undue influence of any others—they seemed to intuitively understand the importance of this flesh-and-blood Beloved. More accurately, they intuit that she *is* important without understanding why. They see her as a kind of animus figure that has now overstepped its boundaries in its relationship with Sethe, despite initially supporting the haunting nature of the spirit because it completes the cycle of suffering that Sethe initiated when she killed her own child.

The cyclical nature of this suffering—the idea that the child is inflicting pain on the murderous mother that the latter may well deserve—is something else that Ella is very critical of.

As she noted, “nothing could be counted on in a world where even when you were a solution you were a problem” (Morrison, *Beloved* 302). Rather than a general lamentation, this phrasing provides a key to understanding this text through the lens of Jungian thought: on the most basic level, there is the idea that Sethe sabotages all of her attempts at self-actualization. This can be seen numerous times, from her reinterpretation of the shadows on the road (claiming that it represented a family held together by Beloved’s presence, rather than Paul D’s presence) to her heartbreaking refusal to accept that she, rather than anything or anyone external to herself, could be her “best thing.” On a similarly basic level, this seems to illustrate Sethe’s refusal that actualization represents an interior act—while Paul D, Beloved, and others may serve as archetypal figures in her own life, or projections of her own thoughts and feelings, their presence in her life allows her to simply view things from a different perspective, and possibly to initiate changes within her own life. However, the gradual transformation of Beloved as she transitions from simply being dead to being a ghost to being a flesh-and-blood reincarnation serves to reinforce Sethe’s inability to complete self-actualization because she projects everything outward, rather than inward. Beloved, as the greatest of these projections, is effectively dissipated by the community before Sethe can reincorporate her into her mind, meaning that the self-actualization is now farther away than ever before.

Why, then, is it necessary for her to project her animus onto Paul D in the first place? She is unable to access her own unconsciousness due to the barriers within her body and mind, so she projects that which she desires onto the character of Paul D so that she may be able to access the parts of her which had previously been hidden. Her vision of Paul D as a possible key to her own wholeness returns to her at the end of the text as well: “She opens her eyes, knowing the danger of looking at him. She looks at him. The peachstone skin, the crease between his ready, waiting

eyes and sees it--the thing in him, the blessedness, that has made him the kind of man who can walk in a house and make the women cry” (Morrison, *Beloved* 321). The phrasing of this passage is especially curious, as Sethe connotes looking at Paul with “danger.” What, exactly, is this danger? The simplest explanation seems to be that he might force Sethe into a kind of confrontation with her emotions. Obviously, one element to Paul D’s return is the idea of a circular narrative: just as Sethe’s own narratives of her life are circular, this story regarding her life ends where it began, with Paul D representing a possible chance for the actualization of Sethe. More importantly, she continues to project her animus onto Paul: he still symbolizes aspects such as “blessedness” despite the horrors he has been subjected to, and shows Sethe that it is possible to move beyond the pain she has known for her entire life. As her Othered mirror, Paul also provides a model for the actualization that Sethe seeks; while he held great resentment towards Beloved for exposing the red heart that he had so carefully hidden from the world, he is ultimately able to reconcile the vulnerable state this leaves him in with his emotions towards Sethe—specifically, that she had seen him at his most vulnerable before, and taken pains not only to not mention it but to not acknowledge in any way the spiked collar around his neck. As such, Sethe becomes a kind of feminized ideal for Paul D: while Beloved is hungry to expose the red heart that Paul had hidden so deep within himself, it is only Sethe that is able to perceive male vulnerability while simultaneously acknowledging how important it is to his masculinity that she hides her perception of it.

The novel’s frequent shifts in perspective provide a valuable framework for understanding the distinctions between Paul as he is perceived by Sethe (who, in turn, is projecting her animus onto him) and the actual Paul, who seems to be projecting his anima onto Sethe. These perspectives often shift as Sethe’s moods shift, which is why Paul driving the

haunting ghost from the house is first perceived as an act of strength, and only later (when Sethe is fully under Beloved's spell) is it viewed as a kind of incursion—an alien intrusion into the life that Sethe, Denver, and Beloved had created. This directly correlates to Sethe's changing priorities: since it is the "animus which demands interaction with the unconscious" in opposition to the persona, which is "aimed at conforming with the collective", Paul's role will necessarily change as Sethe changes (Miller 66). Specifically, what changes is Sethe's requirement for accessing her unconscious life. Early on, the ghost serves a more explicit role in keeping Sethe from any such access, because it serves as a constant reminder of her actions. Unable to find forgiveness from Baby Suggs, Denver, the community, or even herself, Sethe dons the aforementioned persona that enables her to consciously embrace the role of rebel. The more consciously that she associates herself with rebellion, the further she gets from the unconscious world that she needs to access. Therefore, the animus she projects onto Paul encompasses not only the strength, stability, and wisdom that she longs to have—that she feels she can only access through others, rather than herself—it allows her to fantasize about having a stable family at last, comprised of herself, Denver, Paul D, and no ghost. This effectively serves as a fantasy of integration with her community, which is further symbolized by her willingness to accompany Paul on a fun trip to the carnival, what is described as "her first social outing in eighteen years" (Morrison, *Beloved* 56). Even the interplay of shadow and light point to this, as her perception of their shadows holding hands is simply a trick of the sunlight, something in stark opposition to the "pool of red and undulating light" that came from Beloved's ghost, and had been driven out by Paul. This, then, was Paul's role early in the text, allowing Sethe to access her unconscious need for integration, acceptance, wholeness, and stability.

The rejection of Paul D as a source of wholeness helps signify Sethe's growing dysfunctional relationship with Beloved; rejecting him similarly signifies a dysfunctional relationship with the concept of actualization itself. Once Sethe is fully under the reincarnated Beloved's spell, Paul is driven from the house. He perceives this event as allowing himself to be moved, something that provides a key to understanding Sethe's mindset: by helping to push Paul D away, Sethe is indicating that his role of facilitating her access to her own unconsciousness is no longer required. This is partially signified when Sethe inwardly comments on Paul D's outsider status: "They were a family somehow and he was not the head of it" (Morrison, *Beloved* 155). Later, during their confrontation, she points out that "Thin love ain't love at all" (Morrison, *Beloved* 194) While this is given as a defense for infanticide, it also reinforces the bond shared between Sethe, Denver, and the resurrected Beloved—their blood is thick, leaving no room for Paul D, who only now consciously perceives the gulf in emotion and experience between himself and Sethe. Pushing Paul away may well be part of her attempts at actualization as well, as Beloved now serves in the aforementioned shadow/anima hybrid role, which would theoretically allow Sethe to access her unconscious, just as Paul D helped before Beloved arrived. Their methods are different, however: Paul is the image of stability, allowing Sethe to imagine herself as part of a stable family, reintegrated into the community, and having someone with which to share her burdens: "Sethe looked to her left and all three of them were gliding over the dust holding hands. Maybe he was right. A life" (Morrison, *Beloved* 56). This external notion of dropping her mask and embracing previously hidden aspects of herself mirrors, of course, the journey to self-actualization. While it should go without saying that the relationship with Beloved failed to result in the actualization of Sethe, it is important to note that this was not a foregone conclusion: as with Paul D, Beloved's appearance offered an opportunity for

integration and actualization, because it represents another opportunity for Sethe to interact with her repressed aspects.

While Paul represented her ability to interact with the strength and stability that she had buried so deep within herself that even she was unaware of it, Beloved, as a kind of animus projection, allows Sethe to access other repressed aspects of herself. In this case, those aspects are feminine, and after her reappearance, Beloved seems to embody both the positive and negative aspects Jung associated with the anima, ranging from “evil succubus” to “beatific spiritual guide” to “idealized woman” (Jensen 14). She is all of this and more: her presence seems to facilitate the shared psychic union between herself, Sethe, and Denver, something which may represent the closest Sethe comes to actualization within the text. In this sense, she certainly functions as a spiritual guide, someone who has straddled multiple worlds and can serve as mediating force between them. Towards the end of the text, she is simultaneously the succubus and the idealized woman, with the gathered community members showing much surprise at the fact that she “had taken the shape of a pregnant woman, naked and smiling in the heat of the afternoon sun. Thunderblack and glistening, she stood on long straight legs, her belly big and tight. Vines of hair twisted all over her head. Jesus. Her smile was dazzling” (Morrison, *Beloved* 308) even as she was visibly sapping the life from Sethe.

The nature of Beloved as anima projection helps provide illumination for the miserable state that she is left in when Beloved is driven away: the ultimate purpose of projection, be it positive or negative, is to use that projection in order to become a fuller, more actualized self. Positive projections provide a means to interact with and understand one’s own hidden strengths, whereas negative projections are the exact opposite, allowing individuals to project their own negative traits onto others so that they do not have to confront those traits within themselves.

This is important because, as a projection of anima, Beloved is able to embody both positive and negative aspects. As Jung writes, “the anima is bipolar and can appear positive one moment and negative the next; now young, now old; now mother, now maiden; now a good fairy, now a witch; now a saint, now a whore” (Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 200).

Such ambivalence in regards to this archetype should not be surprising, considering that the function of one’s anima (and, as many modern Jungians assert, the animus as well) is to mediate between one’s ego and one’s self. The ego, as the collection of a person’s experiences that comprises their conscious life, becomes the largest obstacle to individuation, because their conscious life effectively obscures their unconscious life. How does this tie into the complicated relationship between Sethe and Beloved? The short answer is that it further complicates that relationship on a number of levels, and frustrates Sethe’s ability to individuate. As a negative projection of Sethe’s own femininity, Beloved serves as a constant reminder of Sethe’s murderous past; in turn, Sethe cannot fully accept her past and her decision to kill her child because the child is now alive, and condemning her. During these torments, Beloved is clearly a negative projection of Sethe’s anima, but what is interesting is that she is not constantly negative. There are moments, as when Sethe, Denver, and Beloved skate on the ice, that they form a picture of unification and wholeness: “Walking back through the woods, Sethe put an arm around each girl at her side. Both of them had an arm around her waist. Making their way over hard snow, they stumbled and had to hold on tight, but nobody saw them fall” (Morrison, *Beloved* 205). During such scenes, Beloved becomes a positive projection of Sethe’s repressed anima, one that allows Sethe to experience the mother/daughter moments that would otherwise be denied to her by her previous violent actions. As her happiness transforms to a kind of

nameless sorrow, it seems that Morrison is signifying Sethe as getting closer to accessing her own unconsciousness.

As with Virginia Woolf's *Orlando*, the presence of ice for such a scene holds a high level of symbolic value: in Jungian analysis, water often represents the relationship between consciousness and unconsciousness. The metaphor is quite straightforward, as self-actualization involves the individual diving into the depths of their unconscious mind, and by necessity disturbing the otherwise serene stillness of the water's surface, representing the conscious persona that they embody. That mask is destroyed when the individual can fully reach the depths of their unconsciousness, and yet the ice represents the barrier that keeps Sethe from fully plunging into those depths. This scene, then, takes on a kind of sinister dual-meaning that highlights the ambivalent nature of the anima: ideally, Sethe's happy moments with Beloved would give her a chance to become whole again, reunited with both a person (Beloved) and an emotional state (happy, maternal love) that she was previously separated from. However, this connection is limited at first to a purely conscious level, one meant to play upon the surface of Sethe's mind without delving any deeper. Supported by both Denver and Beloved, Sethe is unable to "fall"—that is, to descend any deeper into her unconscious in order to confront what is there.

Ultimately, Jungian analysis helps us to more appreciate the psychological turmoil that slavery, racism, and the influence of white patriarchy helped perpetuate during Sethe's lifetime. Even the events that border on magic (chiefly the resurrection of Beloved) are dragged back to reality, echoing Esu the trickster, with his one foot planted firmly in the material reality of the world. For Sethe, Beloved is that trickster, both in terms of psychological significance and psychological function—Beloved is a bridge to her own past. Unfortunately, her obsession with

the past and her own regrets keeps her from crossing that bridge, and therefore fully mediating past, present, and future. She remains out of balance, unable to embrace the truth of Paul D.'s simple words, words that echo the powerful promise of actualize: she is her own best thing. However, the world of slavery and white patriarchal corruption prevented her from escaping its grasp, as her desperate attempt to save the life of her infant child further tied her to the world of violence that surrounded her. In many ways, that event became her constrictive yard, and even as Denver finally learns to travel beyond the boundaries of her own world, readers see the glaring truth that Sethe has created her own boundaries, and may never be able to transcend them.

Chapter 3

Atwood and Jung: The Unconscious Enslaved

Of the three writers my own analysis focuses on (Woolf, Morrison, and Atwood), Atwood is arguably the most suited to Jungian analysis. After all, she is no stranger to Jungian thought: in *Payback: Debt and the Shadow Side of Wealth*, she offers a wonderfully succinct description of “the psychologists of the twentieth century,” and pointed out that “Jung was steeped in Germanic folk tales, but also in anima-dramas such as the ballets of Giselle and Swan Lake (100-101). She also finds the archetype of the anima quite useful for decoding literature, using it in her famous speech on the presentation of “evil” women in literature. In this speech, Atwood framed the issue in Jungian terms, claiming that “if you are a man, the bad female character in a novel may be—in Jungian terms—your anima; but if you're a woman, the bad female character is your shadow; and...she who loses her shadow also loses her soul” (Atwood, “Spotty-Handed,” par. 25). Additionally, while exploring mythology and speculative fiction in her 2011 text *In Other Worlds*, Margaret Atwood counts herself among “we Jungians” while offering a playfully brief Jungian analysis on Batman and other comic book characters (Atwood, *In Other Worlds*, 30).

Just as Atwood is no stranger to Jung, her work is well known and analyzed among the Jungian and post-Jungian communities. Susan Rowland wrote of Atwood’s *Alias Grace* that it “is an example of a literary work that exposes through fiction the historical nature of the phallic anima, while it simultaneously draws upon the Jungian unconscious to represent gender as never completely certain, never completely knowable or finished” (Rowland, “Jung’s Ghost Stories,” 48-49). In “Parodic Border Crossings,” Hilda Staels notes that Atwood’s “writing is informed by Jungian archetypal theory in her use of conventions from the Gothic, ancient myth, and fairy

tales,” though Bouson’s analysis focused chiefly on the Atwood texts featured within the title of the text (41). Elizabeth Baer, while researching Atwood’s *Surfacing*, made a similar connection between Atwood, Jung, and Germanic folklore, claiming that “attention to the role of the fetus/abortion in *Surfacing* brings us...to the significance of the egg and the key in “Fitcher’s Feathered Bird.”” She goes on to point out that, in Jungian psychology, “the egg is frequently a symbol of the self in dreams” (Baer 29). Dunja Mohr, whose critique of *The Handmaid’s Tale* was not explicitly Jungian, nonetheless focuses on some of the issues that are core to Jungian self-actualization, claiming that “[Offred] creates polyperspectives... Her subversive use of language as a liberating discourse moreover deconstructs the either/or patterns of thought; and as she becomes increasingly cognizant of Gilead’s patriarchal perspective, she balances it with her own and other’s contrary discourses” (Mohr 233). Finally, speaking directly to the issues I’d like to address within this chapter, Sharon Wilson (in *Margaret Atwood’s Fairy-Tale Sexual Politics*) notes that “although Atwood parodies sexist ‘truth’ and dramatizes the old, great stories in such ‘realistic’ settings...part of the unrecognized appeal of an Atwood text is that the images, characters, and structures are ‘magical:’ they have archetypal depth. “ Of *The Handmaid’s Tale*, she notes that “Offred finally experiences a fairy-tale transformation of sorts” because, along with the Atwood character Joan Foster, “they tell their own stories and, resembling *Surface*’s unnamed narrator, are able to begin again, unlimited in the space at the end of the novels” (Wilson 10-11).

From the Jungian perspective, the tantalizing question that Wilson raises is whether or not Offred represents an actualized character at the end of the text. While it is true that she is “unlimited in the space at the end” of *The Handmaid’s Tale*, she is also disembodied. Her fate is uncertain, and the cold consolation that the nation of Gilead eventually fails is obscured by the

horrific specifics of its creation and the ambiguous fate of the protagonist, as well as that both the horrors of Gilead and the personal nature of Offred's tale are downplayed by male academia, effectively giving patriarchy the final voice of the text. Offred, then, may not achieve self-actualization in traditionally Jungian terms, but Jungian analysis of her Tale provides critical depth and understanding of the characters and events of the text, allowing us to view the "archetypal depth" that Wilson mentions by taking a closer look at the archetypes themselves, with a focus on how they fit into Atwood's feminist framework

Such understanding may require, however, a re-contextualization of Offred's character: Shirley Neumann, writing on the larger feminist implications of *The Handmaid's Tale*, notes that

We must be wary, however, of the impulse to make an unmitigated heroine of the novel's Offred. Her desire to survive and to know comes with a necessary degree of complicity and a tendency to relapse. In her new self-awareness, Offred specifically accepts the element of complicitous choice in her situation. (863)

From the Jungian perspective, Offred embodies a kind of paradoxical situation. As Neumann has noted, she seeks the increased self-awareness (which runs parallel, for the most part, with the notion of self-actualization) that can only come from (re)discovering her true identity, as opposed to the identity that Aunt Lydia and others have tried to imprint upon her. However, she is unable to access the past without complicity with her present captors, something that ties into the broader feminist viewpoint that she longs to return to a time that women were still vulnerable to predation by men, and still unequal within society (as she ironically notes later, the world of Gilead has many of the trappings of her mother's ideal world—one in which the safety of women is paramount—yet the dream of her mother's world has been perverted by patriarchy). This struggle between memory and complicity (a struggle that Toni Morrison explores so vividly in

Beloved as well) is one of the more straightforward reasons why it is nearly impossible for Offred to self-actualize, as the process of her actualization is tied so closely with the outward persona that she presents to the world. She cannot remove that final mask and achieve mental and emotional wholeness without subjecting her physical body to great harm, as she operates under constant physical, emotional, and psychological duress. While more sympathetic towards Offred than Neumann, Lauren Rule makes a similar observation regarding complicity, claiming that

Although Offred continues to insist that she has sovereignty over her own body, that her body is “my own territory,” she reveals that she has mapped herself within the Gileadean landscape. The rhetoric that likens her to virgin territory has taken effect, and her body itself has become a treacherous and contested space. ... Indicating doubts about her ability to win any battle over her body—physical, psychic, or political— the narrator imagines that her place within this landscape allows no exits... (630)

This serves to further highlight the need that Offred has for the mental and emotional freedom of self-actualization: powerless to change whatever the patriarchal culture of Gilead chooses to do with her body (which has become thoroughly colonized through violations of ink and flesh), Offred’s only option in her quest to achieve self-actualization is to reshape the world around her, effectively creating a form of psychological escape in a world that physically offers “no exits” to the women it has subjugated. In effect, this is what she does through her narrative: while her “reconstructions” are ostensibly meant to provide added veracity for those listening to her tale, the lecture at the end of the text (itself a patriarchal counter-narrative to the feminist voice of Offred, according to Rule) indicates that many inventions on the part of Offred (inventions that

range from the potential pun of the title to the name of Serena Joy) represented Offred's sense of humor, and a way of imprinting her own feminine voice and narrative over the masculine voice and narrative of Gilead. Why is this important? While it arguably provides her with a kind of escape from the monolithic patriarchy of Gilead, it frames the entire text within the confines of another kind of persona. It is impossible to claim that Offred has actualized, and not simply because of her uncertain physical fate, but the uncertainty of the entire narrative, as well as the troubling idea that Offred has simply swapped one persona for another, and is now performing a kind of identity for her future audience, just as she did for The Commander and other inhabitants of Gilead. However, these shifting personas do give a vital glimpse into the anima and animus within the text, and how the highly ordered male/female roles are shaped (and shaped by) these psychological archetypes.

While a bit obvious, the strict divisions between male and female roles within Gilead society provides a gateway to analysis of the anima and animus functions through the eyes of Offred, The Commander, and others. In fact, Gileadan society is arguably left with only two of the four stages of erotic development, as their careful removal of women from key aspects of religious wisdom denies them the purifying mother image of the Virgin Mary, while the stigmatization of independent female thought would seem to quell the Sophia stage (though the Commander's interactions with Offred imply that he may see her as such a projection of himself, though quite limited in scope). The lack of a Virgin Mary stage of erotic development is, perhaps, ironic, considering the ostensibly religious foundation of Gilead. However, Jung's notion of the Virgin Mary is that of a purifying force, one that allows for the spiritual cleansing of men. Much of Gileadan thought, however, is rooted in the opposite of this, with men perceiving women as being somehow dirty and unclean—people that need to be purified by the

extreme measures taken by men who think they know what is best for the women. Overall, their projections of women are limited to the generative Eve/mother archetype, and the sensually physical Helen archetype. This limited erotic development, then, provides an ideal starting point for such analysis.

At a glance, the casual reader might wonder why the fiercely patriarchal society of Gilead would project anima archetypes at all; are these not threats to their masculinity? However, it is important to keep in mind that such projections are often unconscious; the more they cover their conscious lives with a codification of masculine thought, the more the unconscious mind will seek expression through feminine projection. To put it another way: the unconscious mind longs for the psychological balance of actualization, even when the conscious mind does not. Offred identifies this need early in the text, noting that “there's a rug on the floor, oval, of braided rags. This is the kind of touch they like: folk art, archaic, made by women, in their spare time, from things that have no further use. A return to traditional values” (Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* 7). Of course, Gilead society hand-picks what totems best represent their notion of “traditional values,” and choose to decorate using the “archaic” items women have repurposed “from things that have no further use.” This hand-picking is meant to sate those needs for feminine expression that linger beneath conscious awareness (effectively draping the masculine world with some of the trappings of femininity, which is necessary for the men who also, on some unconscious level, long to return to the way things used to be), yet the consciousness of the act betrays, as Offred notes, the societal pecking order they wish to reinforce. Just as the women have repurposed these decorations, male society has repurposed the women, turning even a subtle display of femininity into an unsubtle display of masculine dominance. It is little wonder that The Commander seeks to interact with Offred in a way that better represents tradition, rather than the masculine parody

of “traditional values,” as this is one of the only ways he can access his own repressed feminine aspect.

One of the major contentions of my text is that The Commander projects his own anima onto Offred. Why, then, would his unconscious mind do such a thing? The chief answer to this question is that the society of Gilead had so successfully reshaped the world into its own masculine image that everything feminine that remained was not truly feminine, but a masculine representation of femininity, like the archaic feminine decorations that emphasize power differentials rather than lauding something truly feminine. Serena Joy and the other wives of officials, too, seemingly validate the importance of retaining “traditional values,” yet the limitations placed on them by The Commander and those like him ensure that they simply reflect what masculine society wishes to see. Offred, upon seeing The Commander’s sitting room, focuses on two paintings of women that she speculates Serena Joy acquired “after it became obvious to her that she'd have to redirect her energies into something convincingly domestic.” These paintings, then, acquire a special significance, as they represent Selena’s masculine-approved, domestic idea of femininity. How, then, are the women in these paintings described? “In any case, there they hang, their backs and mouths stiff, their breasts constricted, their faces pinched, their caps starched, their skin grayish white, guarding the room with their narrowed eyes” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 80). For all intents and purposes, these women are portrayed as dead—constricted corpses on display for The Commander’s pleasure. They are devoid of any vitality, and to Offred’s eyes, serve as guardians against intrusion into the masculine world created by The Commander and his ilk. It is also notable that the only uniquely feminine aspect of the painting—the breasts of the women—have been “constricted.” On the surface level, this, too, reinforces male domination, and the repression of anything uniquely

feminine. However, more interesting to this Jungian interpretation is the deceptively simple fact that the women have been made to look more like men, hair presumably obscured beneath the starched caps and breasts constricted into their frames. This painting, then, is the rather literal portrait of acceptable femininity within the world of Gilead: that which reflects men. Offred's presence (as well as that of her predecessor) serves as an understandable treat for The Commander, as her vitality, combined with his intimate knowledge of her body, serves as a markedly pleasant contrast to the man-like, corpse-like representations of femininity that adorn his office.

Viewed through this lens, it is no surprise that The Commander would risk so much in his interactions with Offred: most women can no longer serve as reflections of a man's feminine nature because they (like the painting above) are forced to reflect masculinity, serving as another column supporting Gilead's "traditional values." Offred, then, represents someone onto whom he can project the truth of the past (as opposed to the propaganda of "traditional values" to which Gilead aspires to return to), because only through such a projection can he access his repressed feminine nature. It is interesting that The Commander serves as a prime example of a person for whom the conscious and unconscious mind may run on parallel paths, albeit with a different destination in mind. On a conscious level, The Commander longs for some of the courtship rituals of the pre-Gilead era: as illustrated by the visit to Jezebel's, he enjoys the reputation of being a powerful man able to charm a woman by his wit and his privileges, something that he cannot effectively do under Gilead's laws because (irony of ironies) he is more of an object to Offred than he is a three-dimensional human being. However, on an unconscious level, he intuits that such interaction between men and women requires equality (or a simulacrum of equality), an intuition that prompts him to take measures that ostensibly put the two on equal footing, albeit

in a limited space and for a limited period of time. Even the forbidden items in his sitting room were designed to create such temporary parity, primarily through the mutual, ritual use of forbidden activities, such as not only allowing Offred to read, but to read magazines and other items that were supposed to be purged as part of Gilead assuming power. This compulsion to reach out to Offred (simultaneously elevating her while further objectifying her) is all key to understanding the Commander's need to access his anima: In *Symbols and the Interpretation of Dreams*, Jung points out that Middle Ages thinkers such as Dominicus Gnosius understood that man "carries Eve, his wife, hidden in his body." He points out that this anima image "is kept carefully concealed from others as well as from oneself. A man's visible personality may seem quite normal, while his anima side is sometimes in a deplorable state" (189). This "deplorable state" describes the hyper-patriarchal culture of Gilead quite well: if women are necessary for a man to self-actualize (accessing the inner soul within himself by projecting onto a figure such as his wife), then The Commander has, from a psychological perspective, cut himself off from his own soul by forcing women to be reflections of men and masculinity. His wife might have allowed him access to this soul in pre-Gileadan society, but now she, like all women in the nation, is forced to be a reflection of conscious male desire, rather than unconscious need. The result is that she is much like the paintings she has picked: strikingly pretty, overly formal, and ultimately dead inside, her femininity reduced to token roles of domesticity that are approved by the patriarchy. Offred, then (as well as her unfortunate predecessor) provides an opportunity for The Commander to access his anima, but it is an extremely flawed opportunity, considering that Offred is highly aware that this is simply another performance that is required of her.

This requires a kind of double performance on Offred's part—and a kind of double Othering, as she must now perform as his ideal reflection of femininity (that is, the pre-Gilead

femininity that is required for him to relive his memories of fantasies of pre-Gilead courtship) during their private time together, while still serving as a reflection of masculinized femininity to Serena Joy and others within the house. From the Jungian perspective, this kind of intense performance-as-persona is made quite clear by Offred, who thinks to herself “I wait. I compose myself. My self is a thing I must now compose, as one composes a speech. What I must present is a made thing, not something born” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 66). Her attempted journey towards actualization, then, can be imagined as a journey back to the person that she was “born” as, as opposed to the “made thing” meant to satisfy The Commander and those like him— primarily by serving as their own anima reflections, albeit in a limited form. As previously mentioned, Gilead’s social stigmas ensured that women could only embody the Eve and (through forbidden avenues such as the club) Helen stages of erotic development, and so it is with Offred. Symbolically, this can be understood as a kind of unraveling: men are unable to conceive of women beyond those first two archetype stages of erotic development, and have arranged all of society in order to align with that limited view. Offred, like other women, can no longer be a composite woman whose identity has elements of both Eve and Mary, both Helen and Sophia; rather, she must compose (in truth, re-compose) herself in order to better accommodate the prejudices and stigmas of the society around her. Those social stigmas also ensured that indiscretions like those on The Commander’s part would be inevitable: as Jung points out, anima represents the “soul” of man, “that which lives of itself and causes life.” By way of example, he points to the figure of Eve, claiming that “she is full of snares and traps, in order that man should fall, should reach the earth, entangle himself there, and stay caught, so that life should be lived” (Jung, *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious* 26-27). It is worth pointing out that this is another instance in which the conscious and unconscious needs of The Commander are

effectively at odds with one another: consciously, he has placed Eve and other women within the generative archetype of Eve, projecting onto them an Old Testament-friendly concept of being vessels for God's edict to procreate. However, psychologically, Eve is also a subversive force, in the sense that she helps mediate man into the harshness of the real world, as opposed to fantasies of paradise and perfection. Offred, though intended to perform only the former function, certainly situates herself as a subversive element within the text, entangling The Commander into fantasies of how "life should be lived" as opposed to the sterile world of Gilead, which is presented as a kind of paradise from which no one should desire to escape.

Of course, this subversive role of Eve is contrary to the sermon given by The Commander in which he reminds his household of the principles of their society, including that "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression" (Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* 221). The result is relatively straightforward: from the Jungian perspective, most men have willingly removed themselves from access to their soul because they place blame on the symbolic figure of Eve for fulfilling her psychological function with regards to the male mind—that is, she (and, by extension, all women) are blamed for the perceived loss of paradise, rather than lauded for bringing men back down to earth. She is blamed for the "snares and traps" that Jung mentions because the patriarchal Gileadan society regards this as part of the larger "transgression" that can only be redeemed through giving birth to a child. This duality perfectly captures the bizarre duality that Yoshida speaks of regarding Eve, because she is "at once the object of sexual fantasy and the scapegoat of misogynistic anxiety" (38). It is noteworthy that Gilead society sees their cultural imperative for women to give birth as a way of resolving this otherwise intractable dilemma, because giving birth to a child will return the woman to the psychologically safe (and stifling) status of primal mother, rather than the temptress that invites

them to discover the tangible pleasures of the real world rather than the abstract pleasures of a theoretical one. The psychological binary in place—sexual fantasy versus scapegoat—also accounts for the Madonna/whore dichotomy in place throughout Gilead.

This is perhaps the chief reason why The Commander chooses to take Offred to the forbidden hotel-turned-brothel, Jezebel's. As Jung illustrates, "man's anima must fit the woman somewhere, or such a figure would never have originated." Therefore, while the anima often serves as a way for the masculine individual to self-actualize, the form of the anima (particularly in the case of the anima being projected onto others) shifts in relation to the woman that he is projecting upon. How does this apply to Jezebel's? In the society of Gilead, women are forced to present a composed self that conforms to masculine desire, so The Commander taking Offred to this underground club is a way for him to reverse Jung's imagined course, changing the woman he desires so that she better matches the anima he seeks to project on her. The demure scapegoat of Eve no longer works his purposes; rather, he longs for the temptations of the lustful Helen. This need for her lust is, of course, all artificial fantasy on the part of The Commander: he cannot impose any real psychological change on her, and is accordingly unable to catalyze any such change or actualization in himself. Put more simply, not all psychological projections lead to actualization, and The Commander's focus on his conscious needs concerning Offred (dressing her like a temptress as part of his fantasy that he actually tempts her) often overrides the potential such projections have for allowing him to access his unconscious, especially his repressed feminine aspect.

Jung provides additional illumination concerning what The Commander is trying to do by taking her to the brothel. Jung writes that in the Eve stage of development, a woman might see man as "nothing but a generating phallus," and that the following stage (that of Helen), "human

consideration appears” concerning men, yet they exist as “a more or less friendly or unfriendly presence; he is just a man that happens to be there” (Jung, *Visions* 491). This lack of true intimacy perhaps best describes The Commander and Offred’s initial “relationship” outside of the ritual sex: while he insists on a different kind of ritual when they play Scrabble, one in which he instructs her to kiss him “as if you meant it,” she intuits that “he was so sad” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 140). The Commander seems to realize, if only unconsciously, that forcing Offred’s mind and body cannot produce any true intimacy—despite whatever favor he shows her by allowing her access to forbidden games, drinks, and texts, he is ultimately “a man that happens to be there,” and his decision to be a “friendly or unfriendly presence” does not elevate his status in his mind, nor does it elevate their relationship.

What he longs for, then, is the next stage of erotic development, which Jung describes as that of “the lover” and later, the Virgin Mary. On the face of it, this may seem paradoxical—however, Mary functions symbolically as a kind of force which purifies everything, including the erotic love of the Helen archetype. This erotic love is not destroyed, but transferred into a different aspect of man’s spiritual development. Therefore, he is able to view himself as more than the phallus of the Eve stage, or the simple romantic dalliance of the Helen stage; rather, he has become a true lover, transcending from being “a man that happens to be there” to “the man” in the mind of the woman he cares for. Jung characterizes this stage as “very psychological, because there is a definite choice, exclusiveness.” This “exclusive choice...goes to the core of things, it goes to the soul of woman” (Jung, *Visions* 491). Choice is at the heart of the text in many ways: Aunt Lydia, helping to indoctrinate Offred, Moira, and other women, insisted that before Gilead, they “were a society dying...of too much choice” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 25). And it is choice that characterizes her dangerous relationship with Nick: she enjoys “the

ritual politeness of asking” if it is too late for her to come in and join him because it makes her “feel more in control, as if there is a choice, a decision that could be made one way or the other” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 269). However, in the darkness of their rented hotel room, it is clear to Offred that she doesn’t have a choice with regards to The Commander. She dismisses the possibility of rebuffing his advances, thinking to herself that “I can’t afford pride or aversion, there are all kinds of things that have to be discarded, under the circumstances” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 255). This paradox on the part of The Commander is made quite clear by the text, as someone who played a role (an integral role, if the lecture at the end of the text is to be believed) in eliminating nearly all aspects of choice from the lives of women longs to be chosen by someone.

Psychologically, this inability to access the archetype of Mary/the lover has much to do with the perceived spirituality of women; as Jung makes clear, Mary is meant to be a kind of intermediary stage in which man is able to glimpse the next stage (Sophia) in which “the god” that “already appears in the lover” becomes perceptible—echoing Augustine’s notion of the three heavens, this represents the shift in which a man is able to view spiritual/inner understanding directly, as opposed to viewing it through a physical medium, such as a person. As such, the importance of the Mary stage for the psychological development of men is that it represents the “soul of the woman,” both in terms of her ability to make her own choices and in the man’s ability to perceive women as something beyond the aforementioned Madonna/whore paradigm...as neither mother (here identified more closely with Eve than Mary in the schematic of Jungian development) nor whore (here represented by Helen, who serves as both an objectified and objectifying source of erotic desire), but someone with agency and voice. By

physically inhibiting the lives and development of women, men have psychologically hindered their own development, and so The Commander's longing for Offred to treat him as a lover rather than a master does not represent a conscious urge to destroy Gilead (if nothing else, he obviously benefits from the country in a number of ways), but an unconscious urge towards the actualization that the institution of Gilead has halted. This longing, then, serves as another grim irony, as the minds of men have become as infertile as their bodies, even as they continue to ostracize and castigate the only group—women—that might help them unite with their unconscious mind.

Obviously, the agency required for women to psychologically fulfill this role for men is something that goes against the interests of the patriarchal leadership of Gilead, and they have taken great care to change Biblical scripture and wisdom in order to reduce this agency to nothingness. One of the most telling additions to biblical wisdom is that “blessed are the silent,” an addition meant to transform the mandated lack of communication on the part of women to a promise of a better world in the future. This notion of placing a patriarchal stamp on religious information goes hand in hand with keeping the Bible out of reach of women as well: as Offred ironically notes, “It is an incendiary device: who knows what we'd make of it, if we ever got our hands on it? We can be read to from it, by him, but we cannot read” (Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* 87). Women within this society cannot be precursors to perceiving God-within-woman because God (symbolically functioning within the Jungian framework as more of the embodiment of unconscious understanding than as an actual deity) is kept from them. Developmentally, The Commander and his ilk are frozen between viewing women as a

biological means for reproduction, or as ornamental, sexualized beings (as when he takes Offred to their forbidden club).

Given the negative effect that this has on men in terms of both psychological development and emotional happiness, one obvious question would be whether this is intentional or not. A cursory glance at the social structure of Gilead shows a society designed to offer the wealthiest, elite men access to a variety of sexual partners, all while removing that pesky need for consent. However, The Commander, as our chief representative of patriarchal authority within the tale, is unhappy with the arrangement: after taking Offred to the club, he attempts to justify its existence, claiming that

you can't cheat Nature...Nature demands variety, for men. It stands to reason, it's part of the procreational strategy. It's Nature's plan... Women know that instinctively. Why did they buy so many different clothes, in the old days? To trick the men into thinking they were several different women. A new one each day. (Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* 237)

While The Commander speaks from an obvious misogynistic bias, he seems to instinctively understand the Jungian notion of persona with regards to women, and how it relates to the performance of societal expectation: the idea of women trying “to trick the men” seems to echo Offred’s belief that she must now compose herself...however, The Commander seems to believe that the need to compose one’s self into a different identity is an artifact of “the old days.” Offred, though her pre-Gilead memories are often scattered, disagrees with this assessment, considering that the need to compose/create a self is something new; she views Gilead as the entity that actively seeks to unravel the composite identity she formerly held, forcing her to

compose a new identity in order to accommodate Gilead and its denizens. Which perspective, though, is correct?

They are both correct in many ways. Before Gilead, different (and non-assigned) clothes obviously still existed as a means of creating a persona for women to attract men. However, this is one of the Jungian obstacles to self-actualization, because it involves the conscious performance of a false identity rather than embracing the unconscious truth of a self made fully whole, rather than fragmented into pieces. Put another way, women who honestly believed that they had to appear as a different person in order to sexually attract and maintain the attentions of men were sabotaging their own chance for self-actualization, representing only chosen slivers of their self at certain times, rather than embracing the full diversity of their being. However, in a post-Gilead world, the sense of self that this is built on is eradicated as thoroughly and repeatedly as the patriarchal government can manage, all in the perverted name of progress: the intent seems to be to eliminate that need for women to “trick men,” as the government sees it more as an issue of temptation and morality as opposed to the dubious claims of the “procreational strategy” that The Commander speaks of. The challenge for Offred, then, is that much more severe: before she can transcend her persona in order to discover her actualized self, she is forced to create a new sense of self, one that would ideally be wholly independent of any persona intended to curry favor with The Commander or anyone else. Tragically, the composed self that she creates is merely another persona intended for pleasing men (as with the romance with Nick, a romance that many feminists read quite negatively¹¹), leaving her further from a true, actualized self than ever.

¹¹ As this chapter will elaborate on in further detail, such feminists include J. Brooks Bouson, Juliet MacCannell, and Shirley Neuman, Juliet MacCannell

One of my contentions regarding this text is that this frustrating aspect of Gilead's foundation (one which keeps women and women alike from actualizing, as men deny women the very agency necessary for the erotic development of either sex, even as this denial inhibits their own development) is deliberate. Atwood is very concerned with portraying a society that could reasonably occur, and it seems that, in designing Gilead, she may have examined some of the psychological limitations of medieval Christianity. Jung claims that, regarding erotic development, medieval Christianity commenced "institutionalized worship of woman" (Yoshida 102), which was a measured response to man's focus on erotic love (corresponding most directly with the Helen archetype). The intent was that the psychological and emotional focus of men could be transferred away from the world of sex and fleshly desire, and onto an abstract, spiritual ideal: The Virgin Mary. Through such a figure, erotic love and erotic development could be purified from what religious leaders thought was the corrupting influence of erotic desire. In Jung's original conception of erotic development, the "institutionalized worship of woman" was actually problematic, as it kept individuals from completing their own erotic development. In fact, Jung proposed Sophia as a solution to this dilemma: as Yoshida succinctly puts it, "The individual male subject is asked to transfer desire from the Virgin Mary of third-stage eroticism to an actual individual woman who embodies the personalized anima-form, or the transcendent mythical wisdom of Sophia..." (102). In short: she can embody the physical reality of Helen with the abstract spirituality of Mary, allowing individuals unfettered access to the unconscious understanding that has previously been filtered through different psychological prisms, such as Mary.

What significance does this hold for *The Handmaid's Tale*? While his actions only hints at it, The Commander unconsciously longs to complete his own erotic development: to project an

image of wholeness onto a woman, such as Offred, and to become whole and actualized himself. When it comes to Offred, she already serves to fulfill his need for the Eve archetype, fulfilling biological functions and ideally serving as a vessel for his future children. And it seems that the archetype of Helen does not satisfy him: while presumably able to use the women at the club (such as Moira) to sate his sexual needs, he longs for a relationship that is mental as well as physical. This longing is why it is notable that his relationship with Offred, beyond that of their regularly scheduled intercourse, begins with something as innocuous as Scrabble: he has perceived, if only unconsciously, that he will not be able to liberate/actualize himself without extending her at least a shadow of mental liberation. However, the lecture at the end of the text makes it clear that The Commander and his sympathies were something of an aberration: Piexoto speculates that The Commander's true identity was Waterford, a man who "We know, for instance, that he met his end, probably soon after the events our author describes, in one of the earliest purges" (Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* 309). Such a purge presumably targeted those who were not properly in line with Gileadan thought—threats to the new order that they were attempting to create from the ashes of the society that Gilead had effectively destroyed. With this in mind, it is my contention that keeping its Commanders and other authority figures from self-actualization was one of the intentions of Gilead's architects.

Religious leaders of the medieval world developed the so-called cult of Mary as a way of helping to purify the medieval mind: According to Philip Smith's classic *The History of the Christian Church*, Mary historically functioned "as a female mediator, replacing in the minds of men and women the lost goddesses of heathenism" (295). Smith draws special attention to St. Bernard, who urged his "hearers to venerate Mary with their inmost hearts and affections and prayers, because God 'has willed that we should have all things through Mary'" (298). While the

medieval world may have used a kind of cult worship of the Virgin Mary as a way to purify their minds, Gilead's design would obviously be undermined if the worship of a woman (even a symbolic and holy woman) was part of its foundation. Considering that the club (with its ready access to objects of sexual desire that allow men to project the Helen aspect onto women) is also forbidden, it seems the architects of Gilead deliberately wanted to deny the erotic development of men beyond the "Eve" stage, which was well aligned with both their religious philosophy (viewing all women as servants of men, intended to bear them children) and the blunt necessity of producing more children. It is an interesting notion: while much of the structure of Gilead is obviously intended to reduce the rights and responsibilities of women, this suggests that some of the architects and key designers of Gilead's structure were concerned with men developing empathy and/or sympathy for women. It is not difficult to imagine how this could happen: if women were more readily associated with Mary rather than Eve, women would be honored as vessels of divinity—shades of the woman who gave birth to Christ. Instead, the government fosters an association of women with the misogynistic portrayal of Eve as a temptress, one who costs mankind a life in paradise, and whose suffering is effectively prescribed by God as a fit punishment. Intentionally or not, such a move helps freeze actualization on the part of men in its tracks. Actualization would involve projection of the anima, and the anima would be projected onto women: in order for men to view themselves as whole and complete, they would need to be able to project that image of wholeness onto women, which was impossible. Therefore, men in Gilead must also be kept in separate, discrete roles, something that is symbolized by their identification: one man may be a member of "The Eyes" and another a member of "The Angels" and others still may be "Commanders." If they aspire to be more than the special role to which

they are assigned—to psychologically develop into a truly composite and actualized self—they threaten the entire system, and must be “purged” from the body of Gilead.

One object of critical debate concerning Offred’s own journey towards actualization is her affair with Nick. Shirley Neumann, for instance, succinctly describes the affair as something that “marks a relapse into willed ignorance” (864), and Bouson points out that “the novel’s invocation of the conventional romance plot may also appear to present a culturally conservative message: namely, that falling in love is the ‘central’ thing, that a woman reaches self-fulfillment only in the love relationship” (Bouson, *Brutal Choreographies* 153). While less critical of Offred, Juliet MacCannell notes that Nick fits “stereotypes of romantic, if hard-boiled, leading men... a private eye... A tough, but virile T-shirted bachelor, the loner who takes women as they come, without complications.” In short: she sees Nick as a relatively non-threatening “shadow” of a man, someone who is “partial enough” for Offred to find wholeness with, in opposition to those like the Commander who wish to override her feminine identity with the fullness of their masculinity (127). From the Jungian perspective, this is certainly a troubling thought, as the actualization of a feminine self should not require another person in order to gain access to the wholeness within. However, I contend that Offred is attempting to use Nick as a means of accessing part of her unconscious life that the rigid state has forced her to continually repress. One of Aunt Lydia’s more insidious lessons is that “Modesty is invisibility... Never forget it...to be seen is to be...penetrated. What you must be, girls, is impenetrable” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 28). “Penetration,” then, serves a symbolic function with the development and attempted actualization of Offred’s character, as she lives in a society that has attempted to make her impenetrable not only to others (discounting, of course, whatever Commander she is assigned to) but to herself as well. Lydia’s simplistic philosophy forms a kind of self-fulfilling

prophecy for formerly-independent girls such as Offred and Moira, because anything that expresses or publicly characterizes them as possessing a unique, chosen feminine identity is a form of being “seen,” as in being seen for who they really are, and thus penetrated by the gaze of others. Obviously, the women are not kept truly invisible in Gilead society: they must be seen by some men in various domestic capacities, such as shopping for food and other essential items. However, their feminine identity is effectively covered up by the clothing they are given, as those who view the red robes of a handmaid instantly know they “belong” to someone, reiterating that the Gileadan ideal of feminine expression is for women to serve as reflections of men and masculinity.

How does this play into the notion of penetration as the key to actualization? Broadly speaking, penetration may consist of any act by which someone penetrates the patriarchal veil of women such as Offred and views them on their own terms, rather than as an appendage to someone like The Commander. The romance with Nick is certainly stereotypically romantic, as other critics have noted. However, I contend that this relationship is something that Offred is using to access the unconscious life that she previously led, the one that has been so thoroughly suppressed (and oppressed) by Gilead. The message, then, is not “that a woman reaches self-fulfillment only in the love relationship,” but that she achieves an actualized self through knowledge and expression of the fullness of her unconscious life. Nick, to be frank, is a means to that end: for instance, critics of the romance with Nick note the intimacy of Offred’s act of giving Nick her real name. As she asserts earlier in the text, her name is “something hidden, some treasure I’ll come back to dig up, one day” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 84) and so it is understandable that such critics would read the act of Offred giving Nick her true name as the act of giving him a valuable “treasure.” However, within that same passage, Offred clearly

explicates that the significance of using her real name is not limited to its value to others, but in its value to her. She asserts that “I tell myself it doesn't matter, your name is like your telephone number, useful only to others; but what I tell myself is wrong, it does matter” (Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* 84).

Offred herself hints at the need for sharing her name to transcend romance later in the text when she remembers Luke: as she says, “I want Luke here so badly. I want to be held and told my name. I want to be valued, in ways that I am not; I want to be more than valuable. I repeat my former name, remind myself of what I once could do, how others saw me” (Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* 97). At first, this sad scene would seem to reinforce the notion of sharing her name to be a romantic act, as she fantasizes about her husband holding her and calling her by name. However, the feminist undercurrent to Offred's thoughts begins to burst through in this section, because while she wants “to be valued, in ways that I am not” (something that she initially links to memories of Luke, who viewed her as an individual woman and not an object representing subservience in all women), she immediately progresses to the desire “to be more than valuable” and implies a causal relationship between “what I once could do” and “how others saw me,” the latter being rather explicitly tied to being acknowledged by others beyond being viewed as the property of someone else. This is significant because Offred seems on the cusp of a major understanding in this passage: she wants to be “more than valuable.” While this line can be read simply as the desire to escape objectification (in the sense that she wants to be more than an object to be valued), I contend that this line hints at an actualized future. As mentioned earlier, Gilead society permanently affixes the mask of persona onto women, and through the lens of Offred's mother, we can clearly see that even in pre-Gilead society, such rituals occurred in which women felt they had to cater their appearance and personality in order

to appeal to men. Offred dreams of an opportunity to transcend both past and present: to be “more than valuable” by eliminating the need to be valued by others at all.

This, then, fuels the relationship with Nick: she does not need to be valued or validated by her relationship with him. Rather, it is a way for her to better know herself—an important step on a journey will end with full actualization. As she says, “I tell him my real name, and feel that therefore I am known” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 270). It is Offred and her actualization that are at the center of her relationship with Nick, rather than the “love story” that critics scoff at. Offred’s language makes this much clear when she describes Nick as an “idol” that she has created. He is not a man that she idolizes in the more modern sense of the word, but instead serves as an older kind of idol: Nick is a kind of totem through which she can access her own inner divinity. She acknowledges this in passing, describing him as “a cardboard cut out” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 270). He is there, then, to provide a literal face to that unconscious soul that Offred is trying to access: Nick, much more than The Commander, serves as the animus for Offred.

The animus, as mentioned earlier, can be a powerful method by which a woman is able to access her unconscious self. As detailed in previous chapters, this figure is often projected onto actual men, just as men tend to project their animas onto women. In describing a patient of his, Jung offers an intriguing way of viewing the animus phenomenon, and gives details that help us to link such a figure to Nick: Jung claims that reality is “the country of the normal mind,” something that is in opposition to the actualized self that only accessing the unconscious mind can provide:

Reality as it is, the reality from which she has been long away. That has nothing to do with the unconscious. If there were an animus his country would be the

collective unconscious, for the animus is normally a function; one could call it the semiconscious fringe of her mind by which she perceives the collective unconscious” (Jung, *Visions* 1208-1209).

This interesting juxtaposition describes Offred and her life quite well: she, too, pines for some kind of return to reality, whether that would constitute an outright return to the pre-Gilead life or simply taking solace in brief glimpses to the past, such as playing Scrabble with The Commander. For most of the novel, however, she seems unaware of the fact that the reality that she longs for will not provide her with the actualization and fulfillment she longs for. While it may have been less institutionally misogynistic, Offred’s pre-Gilead world was one that was still full of rape, murder, exploitation, and cultural oppression of women. Rather than mentally returning to those earlier times, she longs (on a nearly unconscious level) to escape the spectrum of oppression that both America and Gilead seemed to inhabit, albeit at different points in her own life.

Nick, then, helps to serve a vital purpose for this actualization: he meets the stereotypical qualities of an attractive male during the pre-Gilead culture, as McCannel has noted. This stereotypical masculinity, too, is in line with Jungian thought. Jung, when differentiating between the anima and animus images, claimed that “the animus is often represented by a moving figure—an aviator or traffic manager,” and goes on to speculate that women are psychologically “more stable” than men, and “there is more movement in the unconscious” of their lives than in those of men (Jung, *Analytical Psychology* 158). This unconscious movement is in opposition to the relatively still life of the masculine unconscious, one whose anima images are correspondingly still—archetypal and near-mythic characters, such as Eve, Helen, and Mary—rather than the active embodiments of animus imagined by women. This is an interesting

distinction, as Jung's claim sees validated, in part, through the character of The Commander. While much of his professional life is not viewed by Offred (and, therefore, not shared with readers), his rank within the Gilead government marks him as someone on the forefront of multiple chaotic battles, helping to lead armies of "angels" in their various skirmishes to (if the lecture at the end is to be believed) serving as an architect for much of the structure of Gilead's policies and practices. He embodies chaos in the oldest, most literal sense, in that he must help to undo the world around him, and helping to rebuild it in his image. In this way, The Commander and those like him are embodying both the serpent/chaos monster and the God of the biblical Genesis, linking destruction and creation into a single act. Psychologically, then, it is little surprise that the Commander projects his anima onto Offred: as Jung has indicated, the anima is more of an eternal image for men, which is why it is symbolized by archetypes representing eternal images of women—images of stability, meant to counteract the chaotic nature of their lives. For Offred, however, things are different: while the patriarchal forces of chaos have certainly reordered and redefined her life, her day-to-day existence is quite mundane, a world of codified (and forced) serenity.

It is no surprise, then, that Nick would serve as someone on whom she can project her animus: in this static, stale world he is the embodiment of Jung's "moving figure," both in terms of actual movement (he is most often characterized as washing the car or engaging in other physical tasks, seemingly juxtaposed against the sedentary world of the elite, such as the aging Commander and Serena Joy) and in the sense of social fluidity: while Nick serves in a subservient role, he does so with a jaunty demeanor that implies that his own identity hasn't been fully stamped out and replaced with one approved by Gilead. In this sense, I agree with McCannell, but do not find Offred's romance with Nick to be incompatible with feminist

ideology; rather, I see self-actualization as arguably the most important aspect (or even endpoint) of feminist philosophy, a way of mentally and emotionally liberating one's self from a world that may still be patriarchal and/or misogynistic, but is unable to contain and constrain a woman any longer. Such self-actualization can only occur when the unconscious and conscious are joined together, and as Jung points out, projecting one's animus onto a real person may well be critical. In dealing with the notion of animus projection, Jung writes of that same patient that the animus, projected onto a "real man," is something that "would carry the transcendent function...because the animus and the mind of a woman are those functions in which the data of the unconscious and of the conscious can be united" (Jung, *Visions* 1209). Romance with Nick is not an obstacle to feminist actualization. Quite the opposite: while The Commander partially embodies the chaos used to undo the country that Offred remembers, Nick serves as a nostalgic throwback to that time period, one whose apartment reminds Offred of one designed "for a student, a young single person with a job... A bachelor, a studio, those were the names for that kind of apartment. It pleases me to be able to remember this. Separate entrance, it would say in the ads, and that meant you could have sex, unobserved" (Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* 260). Nick is not simply a link, then, to pre-Gilead times, but serves as a reflection of Offred before she met Luke. He reminds her of freedom—"you could have sex, unobserved"—and serves as a vessel for her own attempt at transcendence.

On a kind of metatextual level, both Offred and her readers are frustrated in their attempts to find actualization within the psychological rubble of Gilead. Ideally, Jungian actualization would involve the elimination of psychological barriers entirely, freeing the self from its previous constraints and allowing it to embody its various aspects simultaneously. However, the fragmentation of Gilead (and the subsequent psychological fragmentation of women, such as

Offred) forms a powerful barrier to such actualization. Offred seeks to keep herself together through the blend of fiction and reality that comprises her text: As Dunja Mohr points out, Offred's rich internal life and the tale she weaves is something that is meant to keep her fragmented psyche whole.

Atwood suggests with Offred's narration that, although dualities may exist, they should not necessarily be considered as mutual exclusives, but can rather be united without leveling the differences... To allow the coexistence of more than one reality and perspective, perhaps even to view these as constituents, may not erase but bridge this mental split... multiple perspectives and various realities, and telling her story as well as other's stories thus saves her from psychological fragmentation. (Mohr 233)

While Mohr is not a Jungian, her analysis is certainly in line with the Jungian sense of actualization, as Offred's *Tale* is intended to allow a perception of "multiple perspectives and various realities," echoing the more cheerful transcendence of Walt Whitman, whose literal and figurative size allowed him to be "large" enough to "contain multitudes," rather than to be limited. However, Mohr's more optimistic analysis of Offred and her intentions seems rooted in the theoretical. While Jung's own theories often faced similar accusations, the ultimate goal of his depth analysis was the actualization (and thereby the mental health) of his patients. Put another way, being lost within one's carefully crafted fiction may constitute a kind of freedom from the harshness of reality, but comes to form its own kind of mental prison that might be as debilitating towards true actualization as the abuses of reality.

This means that certain troubling aspects of the text (such as the romance of and reliance upon Nick) take on a kind of mixed tenor. Tolan notes this in her own analysis: she points out

that Nick's value is primarily symbolic, a way of allowing Offred to "[imagine] the other, the person on the outside," Offred is trying to establish a "self that can step outside of its society and offer a critique of that society," hoping for a better tomorrow in defiance of the postmodern dictum that tomorrow will look much like today (172). However, at the same time, Tolan has noted some of the problems with the perception of "truth" within the novel, such as the fact that the fictional aspects of the tale, its retrospective nature, and the final word being given to a male lecturer all created borders (or boundaries) to that which is intended to transcend them:

In one sense, the "truth" of the tale is maintained—its narrator never acknowledges her own fictionality; the story that she relates seems to encapsulate a whole world, without exposing the borders of the page. At the same time, Offred's narrative is a concealed retrospective, and this device is only exposed by the epilogue, which acts as an equally concealed frame to the tale, dislocating the reader from the immediacy of Offred's "I" and refocusing on her as a contained text" (170).

On merely a surface level, then, the fictional nature of the tale (and possibly many of its events and assumptions) frustrates attempts at actualization by the creation of additional borders: Offred creates that freedom from reality by her belief in the possibility of another world, but creates additional boundaries between her mind and the "real" world around here, boundaries which readers then augment when they read her tale through their own lens. She is still fragmented, and her control over the degree of her psychological fragmentation should not be confused for wholeness and actualization. Jung describes the thin dividing line between these aspects as follows: while the transcendent function can be described as "a natural process, a manifestation of the energy that springs from the tension of opposites, and it consists in a series of fantasy-

occurrences which appear spontaneously in dreams and visions.” However, failure to actualize can be a result of “the fact that they lack the mental and spiritual equipment to master the events taking place in them” (Jung, *Two Essays* 80). It is clear that Offred makes earnest attempts to marshal the fantasies and narratives of her mind, but she is still clearly more influenced by the outer world than she is able to use her inner discoveries to affect change, either inward or outward. In many ways, the brief romance with Nick echoes this failure: while I contend that Offred used the relationship as a way of accessing her memories of Luke (another attempt at actualization, one in which she mentally supplants the horrors of the present with the pleasant aspects of the past. However, these attempts to remember the past seem to turn a deliberately blind eye to some of the negative aspects of the past, particularly regarding how women were treated.

Tolan delves into this with little mercy, claiming that “*The Handmaid’s Tale* comes to satirically depict a dystopian society that has unconsciously and paradoxically met certain feminist aims” (Tolan 145) and that in portraying the burning of pornographic texts, Atwood “subtly implicates Offred’s mother and her friends in the deeds of Gileadean society. The difference between the two acts of censorship, it is implied, is simply one of degree” (Tolan 151). Offred, while able to isolate some of the horrors of the past (in the time before Gilead), does not seem to fully make this connection between totalitarianism of the past and totalitarianism of the present; the danger, of course, is that when she creates a kind of utopian/anti-dystopian vision in her mind with which to better deal with the terror of the world around here (as Mohr asserts), she is retreating into the very foundation of the horrors around here. In Jung’s schematic of self-actualization, a large part of actualization comes from the ability to synthesize the world of opposing forces into something new. Speaking broadly, Jung

describes the consequences of actualization as follows: “out of this union emerges new situations and new conscious attitudes,” and can be imagined as a “rounding out of the personality into a whole” (Jung, *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious* 289). Offred is unable to produce “new situations and new conscious attitudes” because both her attempt at the situations and the attitude she presents are tainted by the past. She does not seek to round her personality out and into something new through the tension of these opposites: rather, she sees the new woman that has been created by Gilead as a perversion of her old self, and seeks to return to that self through any means possible.

Offred’s actualization, then, is doubly endangered. Like Atwood herself (though to a lesser degree), Offred is creating a kind of mythic structure, something that is evident from the creative naming which goes beyond simply protecting herself or others. Perhaps the most stinging is the name of Serena Joy, clearly meant to imply a juxtaposition between the serenity and joy that she preached as a conservative commentator and the sterile and joyless existence she leads now, trapped in the faux-utopia that she helped to create. Of more mythological interest is the character of Moira. The name is immediately evocative of the Greek Fates—specifically, the Homeric personification of the three fates into a single individual. From the mythological perspective, her character seems to reinforce the negative portrayal of Gilead, with the rapacious patriarchy transforming a symbol of independence (someone who, in ancient stories, even the gods could not control or coerce) into another victim that is dependent on the world of man. She seems to be an agent of fate within the mind of Offred, at the very least: thoughts of Moira help Offred to preserve her identity, as her imagined advice—“Don’t think that way...think that way

and you'll make it happen"—holds at bay the fear of fading like a mirage before the memories of her own mind. For a time, Offred and the others under Aunt Lydia's care revere Moira as someone who is an agent of her own fate:

Moira was out there somewhere. She was at large, or dead. What would she do?

The thought of what she would do expanded till it filled the room. At any moment there might be a shattering explosion, the glass of the windows would fall inward, the doors would swing open. Moira had power now, she'd been set loose, she'd set herself loose. She was now a loose woman. (Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* 133).

In order to understand the symbolic power of this “loose woman,” it is important to clarify the Jungian notion of the Moira. As with most Jungian symbols, she does not literally conform to her mythological role as someone who determines the life and death of an individual: rather, she embodies one of the aspects of Jung's mother archetype, a symbol of generative force. This embodiment, too, requires something of an explanation: a literal reading of the brash, lesbian Moira as a mother-figure seems absurd. However, in the context of Atwood's feminist text (one that vehemently criticizes the patriarchal importance placed on women as being simply vessels for the pleasurable reproduction of the human race), Moira is a generative force of a different nature, offering a brief glimpse to Offred of a different kind of feminism. Moira is obviously not the marching, burning first-wave kind of feminist that Offred's mother was. However, she seems abreast of current threats to women/feminine culture—as Offred drily notes, Moira's academic interest in date rape is “very trendy.” She is also able to slyly subvert the masculine/patriarchal requirements of women, financing her way through college by throwing “underwhore” parties that are intended to sell racy lingerie to women who fear their husbands' sexual attention may be flagging. In this way, Moira (who is obviously not beholden to the interests of men, sexual or

otherwise) is able to exploit the patriarchal world in order to cultivate (in the time before Gilead, of course) a new kind of feminine freedom for herself, one that does not focus on destroying the old, patriarchal world but using it to build a new one.

It is little surprise, then, that in the post-Gilead world that Offred inhabits, Moira is a symbol of both hope and fear for those in the RED center who ponder her escape. On one hand, she is freedom personified, a woman who is “loose” from the tyrannical grip of the Gileadan authority. On the other hand, as Offred notes, “Moira was like an elevator with open sides. She made us dizzy. Already we were losing the taste for freedom, already we were finding these walls secure. In the upper reaches of the atmosphere you'd come apart, you'd vaporize, there would be no pressure holding you together” (Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* 133). This description is consistent with Jung's mother archetype, in which “these symbols can have a positive, favourable meaning or a negative, evil meaning. An ambivalent aspect is seen in the goddesses of fate” (Jung, *Four Archetypes* 15). Jung notes that while this archetype may be viewed in positive terms, such as the Greek Moira, they may also be viewed as witches, dragons, “any devouring or entwining animal” and even “the grave” and “death.” He likens this to medieval allegories, in which The Virgin Mary is both “the Lord's mother” and also “his cross,” and claims that the archetypal mother has three chief qualities: a cherishing/nurturing aspect, an “orgiastic emotionality,” and “her Stygian depths” (Jung, *Four Archetypes* 16). Symbolically, Moira embodies all of these aspects to Offred specifically, and to the women in the RED center in general. She represents a kind of tantalizing hope (of escape, of agency, of simply controlling any aspect of one's fate) that is mixed with a kind of dread: the same perceived power that she holds as a generative force also holds the power to undo that which has been made. Just as Moira illustrates the potential for creating a new kind of self, she also reminds Offred and the other

women of the danger of having “no pressure holding you together,” and the threat of losing one’s feminine coherency in a world that has been designed by and for men.

The idea of the Moira serving as a generative force is rooted in ancient traditions. Jung, when describing the cosmology of Plato as described in *Timaeus*, explains:

Moira, the personification of inevitable fate--the mother--is in the center of Earth. The iron axis of the world, around which the whole cosmos is revolving, goes through her womb. In this dream sticking the staff into the fire also means an act of procreation. It is interesting that the iron staff as crozier is also the symbol of Osiris, as it is the attribute of the shepherd or of the male deity in general. So here the image of an animus figure is reduced to a simple symbol of the creative and procreative force, similar to what happened with the mother image" (Jung, *Children's Dreams* 95).

It is very interesting to note some of the symbolic parallels at work between this cosmology and that of Gilead, which rather literally revolves around the axis of masculinity and its insertion into the womb of femininity. Jung’s careful language is quite accurate for this comparison: this is, indeed, a reduction, an ancient way of reducing the generative power of women to a subordinate position, relative to men (similar reductions, of course, are present in other ancient texts, such as The Old Testament and its insistence that women come from men, rather than the other way around). Atwood seems intent on analyzing the nature of this subordination, using the dystopia of the fictional world she has created to explore the horrifying ramifications of this pattern of thought. Atwood’s Moira, then, takes on further significance, as the representation of exactly who the patriarchal powerbrokers of Gilead wish to destroy. In fact, Offred notes the resemblance in clothing and style between her memories of Moira and some of the Unwomen

that she is shown on film as part of her re-education. Pre-Gilead, Offred believes Moira to be a personification of isolationist feminist thought—someone who “thought she could create Utopia by shutting herself up in a women-only enclave” and, in Offred’s mind, “was sadly mistaken.” Moira’s rejoinder is spirited, and to the point: “That’s like saying you should go out and catch syphilis merely because it exists” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 172). In order to more fully explore Atwood’s argument, this argument between Offred and Moira must be satisfactorily resolved.

This, of course, is a difficult task, as Atwood’s text illustrates the folly of both positions. The positive relationship with Luke (and, arguably, with Nick) helps to underscore that being hidden in a “women-only enclave” will not be something that satisfies all women. However, Moira’s comment—in the horrific light of the abuses of patriarchy present in the story—seems to resonate as well: while Luke may not be “a social disease,” the implication that positive relationships with feminist allies such as Luke somehow justifies the pervasive oppression of men would seem to undercut much of the feminist ideology in Atwood’s work. However, Jungian psychology provides a way of mediating this debate, just as Atwood herself seems intent on mediating the forces of first- and second-wave feminism. Hints of it are given by the cruel invective of Offred’s mother as she criticizes Luke’s hobby of cooking: “Look at him, slicing up the carrots. Don’t you know how many women’s lives, how many women’s bodies, the tanks had to roll over just to get that far... Once upon a time you wouldn’t have been allowed to have such a hobby, they’d have called you queer.” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 121). On the surface level, Offred’s mother is simply noting the important role that she and earlier activists had on the perception of sex and the expectation of gender roles: Luke would not be able to engage in a hobby previously thought to be non-masculine if others had not fought to

challenge the nature of masculinity and the role it played (and continues to play) in sexual dynamics. However, with Luke being a precursor to the figure of Nick (or, less charitably, with Nick being a stand-in for Luke), it is important to note that he, too, served as an animus figure for Offred. His nature as an animus projection differs from Nick's, however, because it is effectively the projection of a different woman: the projection of Offred in the time before Gilead, rather than afterward.

Moira's role as a kind of embodiment of faith is subordinate to her larger psychological role within the novel—that of Offred's shadow. Despite the sound (and often, the unconscious appearance) of the shadow, it is important to remember that, as in previous chapters, the shadow is not a negative thing. At the outset of individuation, it serves two very important functions: the more common function is to serve as a kind of psychological overflow valve for an individual's emotional extremes. In this sense, behind every level-headed person are fantasies of chaos and loss of control, even though these individuals are often not conscious of them. However, for individuation to truly occur, an individual must not only be aware of their shadow, but to confront it. Similar to the projections of anima and animus, this confrontation is meant to bring one into contact of their unconscious world, which is of the utmost necessity for any kind of individuation to occur.

How, then, might Moira serve as the shadow of Offred? After all, she is a person of flesh and blood, as opposed to a kind of fantasy of the mind, or a figure in a dream. However, within the context of Offred's tale, she can be all of these things: the *Tale* is uniquely Offred's, to the point that she embellishes characters into caricature, applies narratives where there are none, and so on. For readers, then, the flesh-and-blood Moira becomes indistinguishable from the fantasy of rebellion and chaos that exists in Offred's mind. The very emphasis placed on Moira's

individualism and spirit implies Offred's desire for actualization: as Jung points out, "the shadow is a living part of the personality and therefore wants to live with it in some form. It cannot be argued out of existence or rationalized into harmlessness. This problem is exceedingly difficult," not just for the challenges it poses to Offred's idea of wholeness (forcing her into a recognition that, while she may think she can compose herself into a whole being, she remains fragmented and incomplete), but because it reminds her of her "helplessness and ineffectuality" (Jung, *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 20-21). On one hand, it would seem like such a revelation may not be of much concern to Offred, as she is already victim of a corrupt patriarchy that forces her into sexual slavery under threat of violent exile and/or death. However, acknowledging the shadow archetype means acknowledging that, to a large degree, even one's fantasies are limited, because conscious fantasies are obviously limited by one's conscious mind. Confronting Moira's role as chaotic shadow within her own mind necessitates Offred acknowledging that even within the context of her story (full as it is of revisions, amended narratives, and dark witticism), she is still limited, and still longs for additional freedom.

A surface-level reading of *The Handmaid's Tale* may result in the reader assuming that Moira is an idealized feminist character: while Offred certainly quibbles with her over the inability to truly exile one's self from the world of men, the fascist patriarchy of Gilead seems to validate many of Moira's claims. She is also possessed of undeniable energy and spirit, embodying rebellion and escape within flashbacks. Even when Offred is reunited with the flesh-and-blood Moira (separate from the fantasy Moira in her mind, though to readers who are filtering these events through the narrative of Offred may find the figures indistinguishable) who has been integrated into the patriarchy, she seems possessed of special knowledge concerning figures such as The Commander, knowledge that seemingly gives her more agency, limited as it

may be under the repressive patriarchy. With all of this in mind, the obvious question would be why Moira serves, then, as simply the shadow of Offred, considering that the shadow is often associated with “the dark half of the personality” (Jung, *Four Archetypes* 124)? One relatively simple explanation is that the darkness and danger associated with the shadow archetype are obviously very relative terms: Jung speaks of the shadow as a figure “whose dangerousness exceeds” the “wildest dreams” of the individual, and that “as soon as people get together in masses and submerge the individual, the shadow is mobilized, and, as history shows, may even be personified and incarnated” (Jung, *Four Archetypes* 147). Much of Jung’s psychological theories and philosophies are rooted in (then) contemporary culture; therefore, the shadow is associated with that which would make one an outlier in society: for instance, when the peaceful Thoreau imagines himself devouring a live woodchuck by the pond, he is embracing his shadow by embracing a chaotic wildness that has little place in the staid, civilized world of Concord. Through her use of dystopia, Atwood presents readers with a psychological conundrum that echoed many tenets of second wave feminism (including, through debate between Offred and her mother, clashes between second wave feminism and the movement that would solidify into third wave feminism¹²): within the oppressive patriarchy of Gilead, what, exactly, is danger?

In this case, Moira represents a kind of two-fold danger: one is obviously danger to Offred’s physical well-being. Offred clings to the hope that the “bastards” will not grind her down, hope that is connected to the previous Handmaid who, in turn, Offred connects to Moira due to its playful rebelliousness. At the same time, however, there is the specter of the previous

¹² The chief difference between these waves and their attendant ideologies are whether a woman is considered as object or subject: Offred’s mother clings to thoughts of male victimization and the isolation of women, whereas Offred and her husband present the notion that femininity and masculinity as selective concepts, freeing them from the binary paradigm of either/or.

Handmaid's unknown fate—she is very likely dead or exiled after having the same kind of dalliance with The Commander that Offred has. Therefore, to be more like Moira is to court death and destruction, because she represents a threat to the corrupt state itself. Jung points out that most people hold to the “erroneous belief that under normal circumstances the individual is in perfect order. He then looks to the state for salvation, and makes society pay for his inefficiency...in this way his code of ethics is replaced by a knowledge of what is permitted or forbidden or ordered” (Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 268). Jung's philosophy, often accused of its own patriarchal bias, perfectly describes Gilead, in which women are encouraged to look to the state for everything, even as they are made the subjects of male ire for what amounts to male shortcomings (as when women are forbidden from mentioning the likelihood of their Commander or other high-ranking men being infertile). However, Atwood uses this Jungian trope to explore what happens when males and females are separated to the extreme, effectively creating separate cultures along gender lines. Therefore, male culture and female culture within Gilead both view Moira as a kind of trickster figure, though they do so for very different reasons.

For men/masculine culture, Moira and the other women who must work at Jezebel's effectively serve as an explication of the otherwise implicit desire that the Commander has regarding his unofficial relationship with Offred: to both access and celebrate aspects of the pre-Gilead world that they helped to suppress. Jung writes that the trickster myth was “preserved and developed” because “it holds the earlier low intellectual and moral level before the eyes of the more highly developed individual, so that he shall not forget how things looked yesterday” (Jung, *Four Archetypes* 147). It is quickly apparent why male and female culture within Gilead view Moira very differently: for males, she functions as more of a traditional trickster figure

because they are proceeding with the assumption that Gilead is evidence of their moral and intellectual development. As such, Moira and the rest of the girls at Jezebel's are a way for them to safely "slum"—to briefly descend into this lower world as a way of reassuring themselves of their high place on the new hierarchy of morality that they have helped to create. Obviously, this is not correct...their very need for psychological reassurance (along with the Commander's desire to actualize beyond the limited fulfillment that Gilead has offered him, resulting in his anima projections onto Offred) signifies that they have not reached the ideal, actualized state that they have intended to create. In this sense, Moira is a false trickster figure to the men of this patriarchal world because, as Jung notes, the trickster figure is a specialized form of the shadow archetype, which in turn is most often associated with one's own gender (in opposition to the anima and animus, which are obviously represented by the opposite of one's gender).

Aside from sexual attraction, then, how does patriarchal Gilead view Moira? On the most basic level, she is a safe representation for the Helen stage of the phases of erotic development. In an ironic twist, Moira becomes part of a trinity of female figures that serve as a complement to the Holy Trinity that serves as part of Gilead's allegedly Christian foundation. Wives and handmaids, primarily reduced to a reproductive role, loosely represent the Eve archetype for these men, representing the hope for fertility as well as a straightforward desire for these women to be the vessels through which Gilead may return to the biblical edict to "be fruitful and multiply." Moira and other women assigned to Jezebel's allow men to safely project the Helen archetype onto other women. It should be noted that even this "safe" projection signifies the dysfunctional nature of Gilead: ideally, Jung's schematic for erotic development is intended to be an ongoing process by which an individual approaches actualization, with their perception of anima projections changing as their own minds change and mature. For obvious reasons, the

state of Gilead discourages such development, as it would serve as a de facto acknowledgement that the state they have so carefully crafted is, in fact, imperfect, and leaves its citizens psychologically fragmented, as evidenced by those like the Commander (and, by extension, all of the men visiting Jezebel's) who long for the past. Even as it discourages such development, however, Gilead effectively perverts the cycle of erotic development in order to suit the purposes of the state: men are encouraged to view women through distinctive lenses as part of an ongoing cycle. They do not truly progress in their erotic development, then, as regression into the rituals of Gilead (such as the monthly attempt to impregnate a handmaiden, which forces them back to the beginning of their erotic development through the Eve archetype) eliminates any progress they may have made. Jezebel's, then, is a safe outlet for the purely erotic desires of the men, as it gives them a steady supply of women to which they can apply the lust that would degrade their wives (in the sense that it would degrade the more spiritual union that seems to define marriage in the mostly sterile world of Gilead) and unfairly elevate handmaidens, allowing them to transcend being symbolic stand-ins for the wife and becoming their own distinct objects of lust. Obviously, this is not much of an elevation in the eyes of the reader, yet such lust comes dangerously close to affording a unique identity onto a group (the handmaids) that is designed to be ubiquitous and (as much as possibly) interchangeably anonymous.

The men's lust for women such as Moira, then, has the hint of danger that excites them, even as the very existence of the club is hidden from the public eye, insuring that such dalliances do not threaten the state-approved relationships between men and women. The apex of this female trinity, then, would be the Virgin Mary. Interestingly, the Virgin Mary is not directly referenced within the text, and yet her symbols permeate the book, as can be seen with the blue gowns of the wives. With the infertility of Gilead, sex has effectively left the marriage (insofar as

it represents sex between husband and wife), and so the wives have been elevated to be stand-ins for Mary. This approximation of Mary, along with the otherwise notable exclusion of her from the text, points to a very interesting phenomenon: as noted in previous chapters, Jung believes that the Catholic Church deliberately cultivated a kind of cult of Mary, perhaps evidenced most strongly by the Middle Ages and its emphasis on chivalric ideals which were based (in part) on the pity of Mary, which itself was emphasized by non-scriptural doctrines that arguably afforded her a kind of quasi-divinity.¹³ According to Jung, this so-called Mariolatry was dangerous for two reasons: the most simple was that it halted the erotic development of man, effectively freezing this development in a place of spiritual and religious devotion (obviously considered by The Church to be an improvement over the emphasis of worldly love that is evocative of Jung's Helen stage of development) and keeping him from reaching the final stage, Sophia, in which one accesses the wisdom of actualization that transcends spiritual and religious instruction (obviously a threat to a religion that considers itself the sole font of moral instruction and guidance for society).

The other consequence of this worship of Mary was more tangible and horrific: he believes that Mary become an object of collective worship in place of actual, individual women, which subsequently triggered some of the infantile aspects of their mind (since their erotic energy was now being channeled into a mother figure),

And since all unconscious contents, when activated by dissociated libido, are projected upon the external object, the devaluation of the real woman was

¹³ According to Philip Smith's *The History of the Christian Church*, Mary historically functioned "as a female mediator, replacing in the minds of men and women the lost goddesses of heathenism" (295). Smith draws special attention to St. Bernard, who urged his "hearers to venerate Mary with their inmost hearts and affections and prayers, because God 'has willed that we should have all things through Mary'" (298).

compensated by daemonic features. She no longer appeared as an object of love, but as a persecutor or witch. The consequence of increasing Mariolatry was the witch hunt, that indelible blot on the later Middle Ages. (Jung, *Psychological Types* 344)

This is perhaps the simplest explanation for why Jezebel's continues to exist within the world of Gilead: while men are publicly encouraged to maintain the chaste love of their sexless marriages, Jezebel's provides a way of channeling this dissociated erotic energy into something marginally less destructive than the witch hunts that Jung describes. However, as noted earlier, erotic development is meant to be a process, and by effectively ghettoizing each stage into a kind of worship of different women (handmaid/prostitute/wife), the therapeutic effects of erotic development are lessened. As such, while the outright witch hunts of the Middle Ages are not reproduced in Gilead, they are enacted in other ways.

Perhaps the most obvious way that such persecution is enacted comes in the chilling phrase "unwomen." The novel does not delve into too many specifics regarding this term, often leaving the fate of these women to the grim speculation of other characters. For instance, when mentioning the common knowledge that Unwomen are exiled to "colonies," Cora adds that they ultimately "starve to death and Lord knows what all" (Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* 10). Slow starvation may very well be worse than Moira's speculation about women whose minds become too entrenched in the pre-Gilead past: she claims they will be denied even exile to the Colonies—rather, they will be shot inside the Chemistry Lab and left to "burn...with the garbage, like an Unwoman" (Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* 216). It seems that the only time that Offred and others are allowed direct study of these Unwomen is when they are watching edited documentaries in the RED center. In the documentaries that Lydia forces the women to

watch, Offred sees how Gilead views Unwomen: “Godless” women who were previously given “government money” and yet were guilty of “wasting time,” producing a few ideas that Gilead “would have to condone,” but not enough to redeem them from the charge of Godlessness. These videos omit “what the Unwomen are saying” and yet preserve “the screams and grunts and shrieks of what is supposed to be either extreme pain or extreme pleasure,” with this particular video being a recording of Offred’s mother and other protestors at a “take back the night” rally. (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 119). Finally—and most notable for this Jungian analysis—is that one of the rewards of successfully giving birth is that the handmaid will “never be sent to the Colonies, she’ll never be declared Unwoman. That is her reward” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 127).

This ties into Jung’s writings concerning Mary (and the negative effects of the so-called worship of Mary) in a number of interesting ways. On the surface level, it would seem that Gilead’s actions regarding these Unwomen mirrors the medieval witch hunts, beginning with the great pains that are taken to paint them as Other, right down to their title: it is difficult for a woman to foster feelings of sisterhood and solidarity with someone who is thoroughly described as their own antithesis—not a woman, but an Unwoman. Also similar to the development of medieval witch hunts was the bitter irony that the persecuted women are presented as persecutors: as with the edited documentaries that Offred views, these Unwomen are presented as an attack on the religious values of Gilead, to the extent that even their good ideas (or at least, ideas that even Gilead would “condone”) are, according to Aunt Lydia, perverted by their godlessness: “we would have to condone some of their ideas, even today. Only some, mind you, she said coyly, raising her index finger, wagging it at us. But they were Godless, and that can

make all the difference, don't you agree?"¹⁴ However, Atwood's description of Gilead does not follow this exact Jungian paradigm for a very simple reason: for all of its religious ferocity, the staggering anti-woman bias that forms the bedrock of Gilead keeps a true cult of Mary from forming, because any special emphasis on Mary herself would be dangerously close to elevating a woman (the mother of Jesus or no) above men. In Mary's place are the wives of high-ranking officials such as The Commander, draped in the blue robes that symbolically reinforce their status as stand-ins for Mary. The natural question, then, is why these women do not present the same symbolic threat to male authority that Mary does? The simplest answer to this is that, as a kind of collective object, they are less threatening to Gilead than a single figure: it is not the women themselves that are elevated within society, but the station of "wife." Therefore, although Offred describes the Wives as holding "positions of such power," they are married in "group weddings" (Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* 203) that are meant to enhance the public perception of these women as trophies for their future husbands, who have performed well enough for the state (usually through combat) to be considered worthy enough to marry. Additionally, while the text is predominately negative towards her, the presentation of Serena Joy gives an indication of how much "power" these wives actually wield: while able to bend rules more effectively than a Handmaid or a Martha, Serena must also obey or covertly circumvent the patriarchal conceits of Gilead, such as infertility always being the fault of the woman, rather than the man. And despite the media pressure she helped exert in her former life to make the world of Gilead a reality, her role in it is presented as rote and dull, a prison of domesticity (as evidenced by copious amounts

¹⁴ While neither Aunt Lydia nor Atwood explicate what these ideas are, it likely serves as a further indication that the extreme measures taken by some second-wave feminists (such as burning offensive materials) are a precursor to the male extremism of Gilead

of knitting) that even Offred later thinks may have resulted in making her “numb,” so that “possibly she feels nothing, like one formerly scalded” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 203).

Rather than the worship of Mary, then, Gilead has a worship of marriage, which has been transformed into a collective celebration of masculine valor—appropriately enough to this patriarchal world, the worship of marriage has been transformed into a kind of worship of men. Accordingly, women are judged (both figuratively and literally) in relation to how well they conform to this model of womanhood, in which any measure of social power can only come through subservience to the ideals of Gilead, and to one’s husband. Anyone that deviates from this model is declared an Unwoman, subject to exile or death. What is interesting about this model, though, is the paradox at the center of it: the symbolic Woman that serves as the counterpoint to this idea of the Unwoman is, at its heart, the symbol of motherhood. However, this symbol, like many others, has been perverted by the world of Gilead, as motherhood is defined strictly within the dynamic of marriage, with actual mothers—in many cases, the Handmaids—being offered the consolation prize of simply not being shipped to the colonies: Offred describes Janine’s (seemingly the mother of a healthy child) fate, claiming that “she’ll never be sent to the Colonies, she’ll never be declared Unwoman. That is her reward” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 127). This brief glimpse of biological motherhood seems to stand in deliberate juxtaposition to those who ultimately raise the children, such as Serena Joy. In fact, Offred remembers being disappointed when she first meets Serena, because Offred longs for “a motherly figure, someone who would understand and protect me” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 16). Serena obviously has little empathy for Offred outside of her reproductive use, as Offred sees her as part of the repressive system that has separated her from her daughter: upon looking at the long-hidden photographic evidence of her child’s survival, Offred is stung by the

realization that, to her daughter, Offred has become “a shadow of a shadow, as dead mothers become. You can see it in her eyes: I am not there” (Atwood, *The Handmaid’s Tale* 228).

While deliberately evoking the atmosphere of the witch-hunt in her development of Gilead, Atwood also manages to point out that by transforming a negative image (in this case, Serena and women like her) into an idealized image, Gilead essentially forces women to become monstrous in order to avoid enslavement, exile, and/or death at the hands of the violent patriarchy. In this way, Gilead continues to evolve its collective notion of the anima, which is a transition that Jung noted began in the Middle Ages: he writes that “to the men of antiquity the anima appeared as a goddess or a witch, while for medieval man the goddess was replaced by the Queen of Heaven and Mother Church,” something that he felt led to “a sharpening of the moral conflict” which led to the aforementioned witch hunts (Jung, *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious* 29).. Gilead now has replaced “Mother Church” with its own notion of Mother, with many disturbing parallels to Jung’s description of the age of antiquity versus the Middle Ages. Just as the (mostly) benign image of the goddess/witch anima was transformed into an object of persecution in favor of the Queen of Heaven, the Middle Ages collective anima of the Queen of Heaven has, within Gilead, been identified as a threat to their system of patriarchal control. This image is transformed, rather than destroyed entirely, which provides a unique variation on the “sharpening of the moral conflict” within the text, as morality been centered on the notion of opposition to their collective idea of the Unwoman, and society restructured accordingly. As detailed earlier, while actualization is difficult for women due to the absurd restrictions of Gilead’s patriarchal government, it is nearly impossible for men because they have transformed all of society into a reflection of their own psychology. They are denied the positive effects of projecting their anima and undergoing erotic development because they have already

arbitrarily assigned different women different roles within society. In short, the women are reflections of the men, and any attempt the men make to access their unconscious minds simply results in further delving into the carefully artificial conscious life they have made for themselves. Offred inadvertently touches on this subject when she notes that her self is now a thing that must be composed: what the patriarchy of Gilead wants is unnatural, and so women who are trying to integrate themselves into that society to varying degrees (or simply avoid exile and extermination) must artificially compose themselves into a proper mask to reflect male values, which jeopardizes the possibilities of actualization for all involved.

In many ways, the failure of Atwood's characters to self-actualize reflects the nature of the work itself. As with the debate between Moira and Offred concerning the role or necessity of men to the happiness/prosperity of women, providing a clear-cut example or a simple answer is not Atwood's intent. Rather, she points to the need for debate on the subject by creating debate on the subject, focusing on two equally competing, equally compelling views. In some ways, this shields her from the potential criticism of such an actualization: the critics who already condemn Offred's affair with Nick (for its heteronormative implication that happiness and fulfillment can only come through a woman's relationship with a man) would suddenly be validated if Atwood presented Offred as a woman made psychologically whole by her union with Nick (or, perhaps, a reunion with Luke). However, a large part of what the text is arguing concerns the impossibility of actualization in such a world. As much as readers identify and sympathize with Offred, the character's actualization would hurt the larger themes concerning the evils of patriarchy and repression of women by implying, with naïve hope and idealism, that any source (be it internal or external) could psychologically save characters from such systematic oppression. In fact, Atwood goes out of her way to detail the idea of psychological confinement, and the ambiguous

nature of the ending hints, if nothing else, at the idea that physical escape (or even simply the hope of physical escape) is not enough to save one from such systematic oppression. This psychological focus also allows her to underscore the patriarchy's inability to actualize due to their own oppression; that they have created a nation focused fanatically on the creation of life, and in doing so, have removed any higher meaning of life, arbitrarily categorizing themselves just as they have arbitrarily categorized women.

In Jungian terms, this obsession with hierarchy represents an obsession with consciously controlling nearly all aspects of human life. In addition to the troublingly fascist government they create, the focus on conscious action removes them further and further from the world of the unconscious. This removal has a variety of negative effects, as it keeps them from beginning their journey towards actualization, frustrating their enjoyment of the very world they have created (as with The Commander, who still finds the need for a pantomime of parity regarding women like Offred in order to enjoy his prominent position within Gilead). Both the notion of the Unwoman and their execution and exile are products of an incomplete erotic development, resulting in a more modern equivalent of the medieval witch hunt. As previously stated, this erotic development is further harmed by the fact that the patriarchy of Gilead essentially forces women to be a mirror of men in terms of values, expectations, and goals. Such mirroring serves as a further parody of Jungian actualization, in which the projection of one's anima is intended to be a way for a person

As with Toni Morrison's *Sula*, part of the raw, distressing power of Atwood's text is her portrayal of a world in which self-actualization is nearly impossible. In each text, a powerful cultural hegemony has created a violent, self-serving system that serves to entrap the mind as readily as it entraps the body. Therefore, even the possibility of the "happy" ending for Offred—

one where Nick has successfully smuggled her to freedom—leaves little room for actualization, as her story is not only told through a filter of performance (just as she willingly composes herself for The Commander, she artificially reconstructs large sections of her tale for those who find it), which later has a narrative imposed upon it by patriarchal academic forces. The cynical conclusion would be that her world is a continuum of patriarchal control, and that Moira was right, after all: men are a virus, and the only hope for happiness and prosperity is for women to quarantine themselves away. However, I do not believe that this is the message Atwood wished for her readers to take away from the text: rather, the cautionary nature of the text ensures that Offred's own fate must remain unknown. Put simply, her uncertain future mirrors the uncertain future of the world. However, Atwood leaves hope for her readers, as they still have a chance to prevent their world from falling prey to the extremist attitudes that allowed Gilead to gain such a foothold. Just as Offred incorporated the fiery independence of Moira into the feminist voices that showed her an alternative way of viewing the world, Atwood's readers can now incorporate Offred and Moira both, as they strive towards the ideal of Jungian actualization: being able to embody a multitude of voices and perspectives, rather than performing a single identity.

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, it is notable that Atwood considers herself a Jungian, and that she finds the Jungian approach so viable within the 21st-century. A large part of this notability comes from the fact that the feminist Atwood, obviously aware of the historic and potential evils of patriarchal government, nonetheless sees the patriarchal Jung as a valuable lens through which to analyze literature and culture. Fortunately for critics, Jung's voice and ideas are capable of transcending his limits as an individual, and have already been carried into the 21st-century in a number of intriguing ways. I believe this is primarily due to his focus on the symbolic significance of archetypes—while other psychologists burrowed deep into the world of

the unconscious, Jung focused on the kind of psychological torch lights we leave as a culture, lights intended to help guide those following them into a world of actualization. In *The Handmaid's Tale*, Atwood explores how one of the more insidious acts of brainwashing undertaken by Gilead is the perversion of such archetypal totems: the Bible, of course, is altered and edited, with Old Testament verses given as scriptural evidence for how the modern world should model itself. The implication is that the age of the inspirational text gives it wisdom and authority, an implication that Gilead perverts for its own purposes. Jung's focus on archetypes and projections, then, is invaluable for helping to illustrate how Gilead's culture is psychologically destructive for all involved. Obviously, the enslaved women are placed more regularly in both physical and psychological distress (it is nearly impossible to actualize and shed one's persona when the persona is literally forced upon the woman by the government) than men, but The Commander provides evidence that even the slavers have separated themselves from their unconscious world. Therefore, the same men who felt that sex and love had been cheapened by its commoditization in the pre-Gilead world effectively shaped a world of similar sexual economy. Commanders and Angels have more agency and station than Marthas and Handmaidens, but they, too, are permanently performing persona, and those who step outside the boundaries of that persona (be it The Commander or Nick) may be summarily executed. However, the Jungian notion of actualization also helps to model a more mediated world. After all, one should not have to choose between a world of violent victimization (as with the pre-Gilead world) or sterile slavery (as with the post-Gilead world); there are alternatives to how nations can (and perhaps should be) structured, just as there are alternatives to the structure of the mind. Offred may never have stopped performing, but she made the story her own, and was able to construct a self other than the one that Gilead intended to create. She may not have

modeled perfect actualization, but serves instead as a model for seeking the unconscious world.

By plumbing the depths of history, her prison, and even her own mind, she helps to illustrate that the future is not a monolithic entity created by external forces, but something dynamic that only the individual mind can generate from within.

Conclusion

While Jungian philosophy is certainly not the first thing one is likely to think of when they imagine critical tools for feminist analysis and deconstruction, it is my belief that Jungian and post-Jungian approaches offer a versatile way to approach woman writers while mediating many of the struggles surrounding modern feminism. His focus on the maternal aspects of human beings (males included) helps to provide a necessary counterpoint to the legacies of Freud and even of Lacan, offering universal archetypes while respecting the differences between men and women. And, perhaps ironically, Jung's own ideas have become one of the best tools with which to deconstruct the qualities within Jung that feminists have often taken offense at, including essentialism, misogyny, and racism. How so? According to Susan Rowland, "the deconstructive strand in Jung's work enables a feminist critique of its sexist essentialism and logocentric pronouncements" (107); she traces this to Jung's habit (frustrating to some) of often focusing on his own experiences, rather than on universal ones—what an archetype meant to Jung at an exact moment in time does not necessarily represent what it will look like to another person and a different moment in time. This opens the door for Jungian interpretation in many ways, as Jung's own aforementioned limitations can be ascribed to the limits of personal experience and interpretation; at the same time, the ability to focus on individual interpretation of archetypes and actualizations helps to further open Jung's works to the world of postmodern analysis and deconstruction, along with George Jensen.

One inspiration for post-Jungian approaches has been George Jensen's *Identities Across Texts*, a book in which he, too, seeks to reinvent and revise Jung for a 21st-century audience. I find Jensen's claims bold, but some cannot yet be proven—for instance, he claims that

If we view the anima and animus as a reaction to culture, that is, to culturally imposed gender roles, we find that they operate within that particular power structure. Contrary to Jung, I have argued that the anima and animus should not be viewed as archetypes, that is, as transcultural. They may appear to be archetypal only because patriarchy is so widespread. Once, however, we begin to look for the effects of culture and history, we find it. (Jensen 119)

To some extent, my own work echoes this: certainly the use (and abuse) of the anima and animus in Atwood's *Gilead* is in reaction to the imposition of gender roles, and the power dynamics in Morrison's *Beloved* are driven in large part by perceived gender roles, and the interactions (or lack thereof) with the anima/animus. However, as Jensen himself notes, patriarchy is pervasive and "widespread," and it is quite difficult to specify how, exactly, Jungian philosophy will differ in a less patriarchal world.

What I am more in agreement with Jensen about is Jung's viability for postmodern critics: Jensen claims that

Jung's model of the psyche . . . could be described as postmodern, a view of the self that recognizes diversity and difference rather than unity and coherence

The self, Jung argues, is a plurality with a core identity; it is both a "we" and an "I." But Jung's work is not often read in this way. (2)

Achieving actualization, then, becomes less a matter of achieving a kind of static wholeness, and more a matter of achieving a constantly dynamic state—of being able to be all aspects of one's self simultaneously. This mode of actualization has helped guide my research into the characters created by Woolf, Morrison, and Atwood.

As elaborated on in the intro and subsequent chapters, Jung himself was philosophically limited. While speaking of a quest for actualization that is universal, and while offering a focus on maternal aspects in the face of Freud's overwhelming patriarchy, the blunt truth is that Jung was racist, patriarchal, and likely misogynist. However, over half a century since his death in 1961, critics and academics have continued to expand upon his philosophies, breathing new life into them and discovering new ways of perceiving existing literature, with the aforementioned Rowland offering the means by which Jungian theory can help deconstruct Jung himself. In fact, Jung's philosophies (and the modifications to those philosophies made by later writers) has helped make Jung the ideal bridge between Modernist, contemporary, and postmodernist texts: while he serves well as a means of analyzing Modernist literature and its aforementioned search for greater meaning, the postmodern world—in which comprehensive systems of meaning have been rejected entirely—is an arena in which Jung shines, as the journey to self-actualization becomes a highly personal, highly subjective quest: one does not become complete according to an outside metric, but rather, as it is so wonderfully written by Morrison, realizing that we are all our own “best thing.” Put another way, Jungian philosophy allows enough subjective interpretation as part of its archetypes and actualization that the subjectivity and relativity at the heart of postmodernism benefits (rather than hinders) the enterprise of Jungian analysis.

How, though, can Jung help shape the future of feminism? To begin with, Jungian philosophy offers a way of mediating second and third-wave feminism. Through the understanding and analysis of archetypes, the oft-criticized notion of universal femininity/womanhood that is part of second-wave feminism takes on a new life: as mentioned above, while the archetypes are universal (including maternal archetypes, and archetypes highlighting man's relationship with woman), the effect they have on the individual (as well as

whether or not they are of any help with the actualization of the individual) is highly subjective to each person. Additionally, Jungian philosophy is in line with second-wave feminism concerning the equality of women: while patriarchal himself, Jung emphasized the danger of men losing touch with the feminine side of themselves, and valued access to that feminine aspect as a way of accessing the unconscious and, therefore, actualizing one's self. Third-wave feminism, with its attendant post-structuralism, also benefits from Jungian philosophy: while the refutation of binary constructions would seem antithetical to Jungian thought, an understanding of the larger world's reliance on such binary structures as a way of creating and reinforcing power can be invaluable for those seeking to undo that power. This interpretative versatility on the part of Jungian philosophy helps to underscore its utility as a means of understanding power as well, as even those who reject his notions of transcendent actualization have seen the value in understanding the totems of modern cultural mythology. Jung, then, treads a thin line for post-structuralist feminism: while Audre Lorde famously noted that "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house," Jung provides a way of not only better understanding the master's house (as detailed in my chapter on Atwood, Jungian analysis can be quite fruitful in understanding repressive patriarchal forces), but the subjective nature his philosophy has undertaken via modern critics and writers allows for a formation of newer tools to perform such dismantling.

On a broader level, Jungian philosophy offers a way for modern feminism to once more become a tool for vital social transformation. Jung's role as both interpreter and weaver of myths helps his philosophy serve in such a function, for while modern feminism often seems confined to the academy (arguably a side effect of the relative success of second-wave feminism—much of what they campaigned for has become ingrained into the public consciousness, to the point

that many mistakenly believe it is no longer an important issue), Jung's focus on the symbolic significance of archetypes helps his philosophy to extend beyond the academic world, as when Joseph Campbell's *Hero With a Thousand Faces* (very much inspired by Jungian thought) helped critics and lay audiences alike appreciate tales ranging from *The Odyssey* to *Star Wars*. Accordingly, a modern focus on the use and abuse of archetypes within patriarchal culture can help to not only dismantle that culture, but to begin the long road towards a kind of collective actualization. In many ways, the focus on individual transformation helps underscore Jungian philosophy's potential for social transformation, combining elements from different feminist philosophies while combining them into something new entirely. For instance, it acknowledges the biological and mental differences between men and women, which is one of the chief concerns raised by Audre Lorde. At the same time, Jung's philosophy emphasizes the necessity of cooperation between the masculine and feminine elements of society: power imbalances occur when individuals have neglected part of themselves. However, by focusing on individual transformation and each person's subjective journey towards self-actualization, Jungian philosophy offers modern feminism a foot in the door of almost all forms of social, cultural, and religious change. All of these aspects are fueled by modern/postmodern psychology, and by better understanding those psychological drives and urges, a better future for women and feminism can be both created and cultivated.

Regarding the three authors I have chosen to analyze in these chapters, I maintain that Jungian discourse offers a vital glimpse into aspects of the writers and their writing that has never before been seen. In some ways, the disparate nature of the writers helps to highlight the universality and potentiality of Jungian philosophy: his philosophies are just as useful in outlining the struggle for feminine equality amid the otherwise well-off and influential (as with

Virginia Woolf) as they are in mediating the role of race and patriarchy in the brutal world of Toni Morrison's *Beloved*. Finally, the nightmarish alternate world presented by Atwood highlights the potentially dire social consequences when individuals deny their unconscious life and seek to consciously create the world in their own image. Through Jung, we are able to better grasp the universal elements that tie these disparate authors together while respecting the distinct cultural and social reality that each character inhabits. It is, after all, no great surprise that Orlando is the only one of these characters to achieve self-actualization, being possessed of great wealth, status, and independence. Sethe and Offred, while facing a very different set of challenges, are unable to achieve that actualization due to the pervasive racism and/or patriarchy of the world around them, and each seeks what amounts to a temporary escape from this oppression (Sethe retreats into the past via memories, while Offred reshapes the past via her journal) rather than the lasting escape of actualization.

A casual observer might consider this a failure of Jungian philosophy: what is the use of psychological transcendence if it is unable to save these characters? However, the answer to this is quite simple. Simply put, Sethe and Offred are unwilling to fully embrace their unconscious life. Sethe is tethered to the blood and sadness of her past via her so-called "thick love" whereas Offred trades one persona for another...and while she arguably possesses more agency in the tale she composes rather than the reality she lived, it is still a conscious performance, rather than an unconscious truth. What, exactly, an actualized Sethe and/or Offred might have entailed is a subject more suited for speculation than serious discussion: presumably, Sethe would have emerged with the strength of Denver rather than a frail unwillingness to face reality, and Offred would be shown to have definitively escaped Gilead so that she could (re)discover who they are. However, I feel that both Morrison and Atwood were highlighting the tragedy of their respective

worlds—that there was a psychological toll as well as a physical one for those who have survived the pervasive trauma. Their lack of actualization does not negate the utility of Jungian analysis; rather, it highlights it, as differing interpretations of universal archetypes on the part of oppressor and oppressed alike can be more thoroughly explored.

As such, an actualized state can be viewed almost as a separate structure (hinted at with the emphasis in Atwood's text of the need to compose the self). Our role as critical Jungian readers, then, is to look at the shards that remain of shattered attempts at actualization and to better paint a picture of what that actualization looked like. This makes Jungian theory doubly interesting for such analysis because it involves both deconstruction and a kind of reconstruction, something that is explored in my chapter on Morrison's *Beloved*, as that text shows the need to not only de-colonize the minds of those affected by slavery, but to re-colonize them as a move towards an individually-defined sense of wholeness and actualization. That these characters did not achieve actualization is less important than determining why they failed—what it says about the characters and the cultures they inhabit. It is notable that each of my three chosen authors have created a world that echoes speculative fiction: Woolf's *Orlando*, of course, highlights Orlando's ability to jump through time and to change gender at will. Morrison's *Beloved*, while grounded in brutal reality (especially concerning an escaped slave killing her child to avoid his enslavement), nevertheless focuses heavily on supernatural elements, ranging from the malicious specter of *Beloved* to her reanimated body. Atwood's text is arguably the most "realistic" in the sense that nothing supernatural occurs, nor do any characters possess extraordinary abilities; however, the story itself is posed as a "what if" based on the state of patriarchal repression that exists throughout the world, meaning that while Atwood may possess the most "realistic" of these three texts, it is also the most speculative.

What is significant, then, regarding the status of their fiction as speculative? At bare minimum, speculative fiction often invites the Jungian analytical lens due to the highly personal use of symbols and archetypes within each text: it is impossible to look at, for instance, the supernatural haunting at the heart of the otherwise quite realistic *Beloved* and not wonder what it says about these characters and their community, as well as how such a haunting interacts with Morrison's notion of "re-memory." Jungian analysis allows us to not only analyze these characters and their quest for wholeness, but to look at the historic use of such archetypes (*Beloved* herself invites discussion concerning the ancient archetype of the Trickster), as well as the unique interpretation of the individual author. The speculative nature of these works allows for explications of certain archetypes (the anima coming to life, for instance, or even collective denial of the anima in the case of Gilead) that might not otherwise be possible. Such fiction also befits the more deconstructive, post-Jungian view, as actualized wholeness is largely defined by each character, often unconsciously. As critics reading these texts from a Jungian perspective, we are afforded a unique opportunity to compare these worlds to our own, and to draw conclusions regarding the author's purpose from how these worlds deviate from our own.

In many ways, Jung is alive and well in 2012, though sometimes in unexpected areas. The cinema, for instance, seems to be constantly featuring a bevy of superheroes, revisions of fairy tales, and movies featuring supernatural protagonists and antagonists. In each of these movies, archetypes feature quite heavily...which is not much of a surprise, as Jung himself noted the use of archetypes in classic fairytales, and later Jungians such as Atwood noted how such structures are part of the typical superhero tale as well. What is, perhaps, surprising is the sheer hunger that the public has for such movies: the readiness with which they embrace movies such as *The Dark Knight*, which uses heroes and villains as a means of exploring topics ranging from

America's Patriot Act to the symbolic opposition of order and chaos. As such characters become internalized as part of the world's collective consciousness, the discovery and analysis of archetypes becomes more important than ever before in the pursuit of one's self-actualization. The nature of the movies helps point towards that need as well: invariably, they are tales in which good triumphs over evil, peace replaces strife and conflict, and so on. Jungian analysis helps, as ever, to determine how such figures function as symbolic guides to the unconscious mind of a person—how the journey to fulfilling actualization actually begins with an exploration of what the individual feels they lack, qualities for which the protagonists of these movies often serves a compensating function (someone that feels powerless, for instance, is naturally drawn to Batman, who possesses both economic and physical strength).

Outside of the spheres of popular culture, Jungian feminism continues to thrive: recent research led by Jerry Aldridge has identified Jungian elements in 19th-century feminist figures such as Margaret Fuller; Ann Wan-lih Chang discovered that Jung's unique approach allowed for an exploration of a uniquely female quest for individuation in the Marilyn McLaughlin tale "Witchwoman;" Nora Stovel explores the Jungian influence of Jung's feminine archetypes in Carol Shields' *Unless*, noting the importance of Jung in the intersection between explicit feminism and intense postmodernism (51); Marek Oziewicz presented Jungian analysis of Ursula K. Le Guin's revolutionary writing; in Michelle Stephens' "What Is This *Black* in Black Diaspora?," she analyzes Frantz Fanon's *Black Skin, White Masks*, pointing out that the latter's use of Jung's collective unconscious illustrates that "blackness ... is an *intercultural* product of a New World modernity shared by blacks, whites, and others who find themselves interpellated within colonial racial structures (such as East Indians in Trinidad, for example, or South and East Asians in the United States)" (32).

What does this mean for the future of Jungian analysis? It remains a vital way to not only take the pulse of the public consciousness, but to offer an analysis of that consciousness as well. Jung has transitioned well from the world of modernism to the world of post-modernism, and will continue to thrive in the future as well. The archetypes he describes are not going anywhere, though each generation may re-imagine and re-interpret them in a new way. As such, Jung is the bridge connecting past, present, and even future worlds of literature, a bridge that must still be traveled if one wishes to unravel the secrets of the unconscious mind behind the symbols and archetypes that comprise every story and pervade every culture.

References

- Adams, Tessa. "Jung's Search for the Masculine in Women: The Signification of the Animus." *The Feminine Case: Jung, Aesthetics, and Creative Process*. Eds: Tessa Adams and Andrea Duncan. London: H. Karnac, 2003, 97-118.
- Aldridge, Jerry, Jennifer Kilgo, Melissa Werner and Lois Christensen. "Parallels in the Beliefs and Works of Margaret Fuller and Carl Jung Dreams, Literature, Spirituality, and Gender." Sage Journals. 24 Aug. 2011. Web. 02 May 2012. n. pag.
- Atwood, Margaret. *In Other Worlds: SF and the Human Imagination*. New York: Doubleday, 2011
- Atwood, Margaret. "Spotty-Handed Villainesses: Problems Of Female Bad Behaviour In The Creation Of Literature." Sweet Briar College. Web. 10 Jan. 2012. n. pag.
- Atwood, Margaret. *The Handmaid's Tale*. New York: Random House, 1998.
- Atwood, Margaret. *Payback: Debt and the Shadow Side of Wealth*. Berkeley: Publishers Group West, 2008.
- Baer, Elizabeth. *Margaret Atwood: Visions and Forms*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1988.
- Biggs, Julia. *Virginia Woolf: An Inner Life*. Orlando: Harcourt, 2005.
- Bouson, J. Brooks. *Brutal Choreographies: Oppositional Strategies and Narrative Design in the Novels of Margaret Atwood*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Pres, 1993.
- Chang, Ann Wan-lih. "The Witch and the Damsel: The Female Quest for Individuation in Marilyn McLaughlin's 'Witchwoman.'" *Journal of Irish Studies*. 24:1 (2009), 101-109.
- Claremont de Castillejo, Irene. *Knowing Woman: A Feminine Psychology*. Boston: Shambhala Publications, Inc., 1973.

- Elias, Karen. "Through (With) the Looking Glass: A Reflection." *Journal of Jungian Scholarly Studies*. 8:1(2006), 1-10.
- Feldman, Yael. "From Essentialism to Constructivism?: The Gender of Peace and War—Gilman, Woolf, Freud." *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas*. 2:1 (2004), pp. 113-145.
- Fowler, Doreen. "'Nobody Could Make It Alone': Fathers and Boundaries in Toni Morrison's *Beloved*." *MELUS: Multi-Ethnic Literature of the U.S.* 36:2 (2011), 13-33.
- Franz, M.L. "The Process of Individuation." *Man and His Symbols*. Ed. Carl Jung. London: Aldus Books, 1964.
- Friedman, Ellen. "'Utterly Other Discourse': The Anticanon of Experimental Writers from Dorothy Richardson to Christine Brook-Rose." *Modern Fiction Studies*. 34:3 (1988), pp. 353-370
- Gates, Henry Louise. *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African-American Literary Criticism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Goldenberg, Naomi. "A Feminist Critique of Jung." *Signs*. 2:2(1976), 443-449.
- Hillman, James. *Anima: Anatomy of a Personified Notion*. Dallas: Spring Publications, Inc., 1987.
- Jennings, La Vinia Delois Jennings. *Toni Morrison and the Idea of Africa*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Jensen, George. *Identities Across Texts*. New York: Hampton Press, Inc., 2002.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Eds. Herbert Read et al.. Trans. R.F.C. Hull, New York: Pantheon, 1959.
- Jung, Carl. *Analytical Psychology: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1925*. Trans. Cary F. de

- Angulo. Ed. William McGuire. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. *Children's Dreams: Notes from the Seminar Given in 1936-1940*. Eds. Lorenz Jung and Maria Meyer-Grass. Trans. Ernst Falzeder and Tony Woolfson. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Jung, Carl. *Four Archetypes*. Trans: R.F.C. Hull. New York: Bollingen Foundation, Inc., 2006.
- Jung, Carl. *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*. Trans. W.S. Dell. Abingdon: Routledge, 2005.
- Jung, Carl. *Nietzsche's "Zarathustra": notes of the seminar given in 1934-1939*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. *Psychological Types*. Trans. H.G. Baynes. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1971.
- Jung, Carl. *Psychology and Religion*. New York: The Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., 1966.
- Jung, Carl. *The Symbolic Life*. Trans: R.F.C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976
- Jung, Carl Gustav. *The Undiscovered Self with Symbols and the Interpretation of Dreams*. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. Ed. Gerhard Adler. London: Routledge, 1953.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. *Visions: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1930-1934*. Ed. Claire Douglas. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Lawrence, Karen. "Orlando's Voyage Out." *Modern Fiction Studies*. 38:1 (1992), pp. 253-277.
- Lokke, Kari Elise. "Orlando and Incandescence: Virginia Woolf's Comic Sublime." *Modern Fiction Studies*. 38:1 (1992), pp. 235-252
- Lorde, Audre. "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House." *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Berkeley: Crossing Press, 1984, 110-113.

- MacCannell, Juliet. *The Hysteric's Guide to the Future Female Subject*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2000.
- Miller, Jeffrey. *The Transcendent Function: Jung's Model of Psychological Growth Through Dialogue With the Unconscious*. Albany: State University of New York, 2004.
- Mohr, Dunja. *Worlds Apart: Dualism and Transgression in Contemporary Female Dystopias*. Jefferson: McFarland and Company, Inc., 2005.
- Morrison, Toni. "An Interview With Toni Morrison." By Salman Rushdie. *Toni Morrison: Conversations*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2008.
- Morrison, Toni. *Beloved*. New York: Vintage Books, 2004.
- Morrison, Toni. "Interview With Toni Morrison." By Eugene Redmond. *Toni Morrison: Conversations*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2008.
- Morrison, Toni. "'Things We Find in Language': A Conversation With Toni Morrison." By Michael Silverblatt. *Toni Morrison: Conversations*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2008.
- Morrison, Toni. Interview with Zia Jaffrey. *Toni Morrison: Conversations*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2008.
- Neumann, Shirley. "'Just a Backlash': Margaret Atwood, Feminism, and The Handmaid's Tale." *University of Toronto Quarterly*. 75:3 (2006), 857-868.
- Olson, Liesl M. "Virginia Woolf's 'cotton wool of daily life.'" *Journal of Modern Literature*. 26:2 (2003), pp. 42-65.
- Orr, Douglass. "Virginia Woolf and Freud." Clemson University. Web. 04 Apr. 2012.
- Oziewicz, Marek. *One Earth, One People: The Mythopoeic Fantasy Series of Ursula K. Le Guin, Lloyd Alexander, Madeleine L'Engle and Orson Scott Card*. Jefferson: McFarland, 2008.

- Poresky, Louise. *The Elusive Self: Psyche and Spirit in Virginia Woolf's Novels*. Lincoln: Associated University Presses, 1981.
- Quashi, Kevin. *Black Women, Identity, and Cultural Theory: (Un)Becoming the Subject*. Piscataway: Rutgers University Press, 2004.
- Rowland, Susan. *Jung: A Feminist Revision*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.
- Rowland, Susan. "Jung's Ghost Stories: Jung for Literary Theory in Feminism, Poststructuralism, and Postmodernism." *Post-Jungian Criticism: Theory and Practice*. Eds. James Baumlin, Tita Baumlin, George Jensen. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004, 31-54.
- Rule, Lauren. "Not Fading Into Another Landscape: Specters of American Empire in Margaret Atwood's Fiction." *Modern Fiction Studies* 54:4 (2008), 627-653.
- Rushdy, Alfred. "'Rememory': Primal Scenes and Constructions in Toni Morrison's novels." *Toni Morrison's Fiction: Contemporary Criticism*. Ed: David L. Middleton. New York: Garland Publishing, 2000.
- Samuels, Andrew. *Jung and the Post-Jungians*. New York: Routledge, 1985.
- Schwartz, Beth. "Thinking Back Through Our Mothers: Virginia Woolf Reads Shakespeare." *ELH*. 58:3 (1991), pp. 721-746
- Smith, Philip. *The History of the Christian Church During the Middle Ages With a Summary of the Reformation*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1885.
- Smith, Valerie. "'Circling the Subject': History and Narrative in Beloved." *Toni Morrison: Critical Perspectives Past and Present*. Ed: Henry Louise Gates, Jr. and K.A. Appiah. New York: Amistad, 340-354.
- Smith, Victoria. "'Ransacking the Language': Finding the Missing Goods in Virginia Woolf's

- Orlando*." *Journal of Modern Literature*. 29:4 (2006), pp. 57-75
- Sobat, Gail. "If the Ghost Be There, Then Am I Crazy?: An Examination of Ghosts in Virginia Hamilton's *Sweet Whispers*, *Brother Rush* and Toni Morrison's *Beloved*." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*. 20:4 (1995), 168-174.
- Staels, Hilda. "Parodic Border Crossings in *The Robber Bride*." *Margaret Atwood: The Robber Bride, the Blind Assassin, Oryx and Crake*. Ed. J. Brooks Bouson. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2010, 36-49.
- Stein, Murray. *Jung's Map of the Soul: An Introduction*. Peru: Carus Publishing Company, 1998.
- Stephens, Michelle. "What Is This *Black* in Black Diaspora?" *Small Axe*. 13:2 (2009), 26-38
- Stovel, Nora Foster. "Because she's a woman": Myth and Metafiction in Carol Shields's *Unless*." *English Studies in Canada*. 32:4 (2006), 51-73.
- Tolan, Fiona. *Margaret Atwood: Feminism and Fiction*. New York: Rodopi Publishing, 2007.
- Walker, Steven. *Jung and the Jungians On Myth: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Wilson, Sharon Rose. *Margaret Atwood's Fairy-Tale Sexual Politics*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1993.
- Woolf, Virginia. "A Letter to a Young Poet." *The Virginia Woolf Reader*. Ed. Mitchell A. Leaska. Orlando: Harcourt, 1984.
- Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. Orlando: Harcourt, 2005.
- Woolf, Virginia. *Women and Writing: Remarkable Pieces On the Writing Life of Women*. London: Women's Press, 1942.
- Woolf, Virginia. *Orlando*. Orlando: Harcourt, 1956.
- Yoshida, Hiromi. *Joyce and Jung: the "four stages of eroticism" in A Portrait of the Artist as a*

Young Man. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2007.