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Appendix 1

Glossary of Jungian Terms

**Anima** represents, for Jung (CW 7, § 328), the *unconscious* feminine aspects of the male psyche. An *archetype* of the feminine mediating between consciousness and the unconscious. Anima images are constellated into female characters representing extremes from the inspirational (such as “My Lady Soul”, CW 9ii, § 25), all the way to unappealing personal qualities (like “irrational moods”, CW 91, § 35) and are typically projected onto actual women.

With Hillman (1985) and other post-Jungians I consider anima/animus (as archetypes) to be not gender specific. Anima is thus the unconscious feminine counterpart to the Western collective psychic orientation which is so thoroughly inculcated with androcentric thinking.

**Animus** represents the compensatory, *unconscious* masculine aspects of the female psyche (CW 9ii, § 27), an *archetype* encapsulating the Logos qualities (intellect, rationality, discriminating consciousness, strength). Jung claimed animus can manifest negatively as “irrational opinions” (CW 9ii, § 35), or even as a “collection of condemnatory judges” (CW 7, § 332).

Again I use the term to represent an archetype which is not gender specific. Animus refers to aspects of the masculine lost (unconscious), not only to the feminine psyche, but especially unfamiliar to the masculine psyche which has been progressively smothered by increasingly constricting logocentric ideals.

* see following entries.
**Archetypes** are abstract, ideal forms (akin to Platonic Forms) which exist independently of material reality. They are “primordial types” (*CW* 9i, § 5) or “primordial images” (*CW* 9i, § 118) representing the inherited patterns and potentialities which provide the foundations for categorisations, understandings and meanings; they shape “unconscious aptitudes” (*CW* 7, § 300). But as active entities, archetypes also sway, influence, even possess individuals and groups through their effects on the *collective unconscious*. Although abstract and unknowable in themselves they are identified through manifestations or instantiated images which are larger than life, compelling or fateful, images which appear in dreams, fantasies, myths and stories and as projections onto other people. Archetypal forms which have most direct influence on the individual’s psychology are the Persona, Shadow, *Animal/Animus* and *Self*.

**Collective Consciousness** consists of “reasonable generalities” (*CW* 8, § 424), that is, of social and cultural beliefs, habits of thinking and understanding.

I argue that in Western culture the patrifocal and logocentric tendencies have resulted in a collective preference for the ideal of individualism (a restrictive preoccupation with abstraction, rationality, autonomy and isolation to the detriment of feeling, sociality and physicality).

**Collective Unconscious** is the shared “universal and impersonal” (*CW* 9i, § 90) unconscious; “the residues of ancestral life” (*CW* 7, § 118). Although by definition both the unconscious and archetypes are unknowable, both are evidenced in the recurring imagery of dreams, symbols, art work, stories etc.
**Complex(es)**, constellations of largely *unconscious* factors which contradict and disrupt the conscious orientation, result in preoccupations and fixations (e.g. mother complex or sexual complex). For Jung (*CW* 8, § 202) evidence of a complex in the individual’s psyche provides confirmation of unconscious activity. Complexes typically appear as slips of the tongue, dream images, compulsions, and tend to be associated with strong emotions - they are “feeling-toned” (*CW* 8, § 201). Complexes are the personal or individual manifestations of archetypal influences.

**Individuation**, the “coming to selfhood” (*CW* 7, § 266), is a process of conscious differentiation and integration. Previously unconscious aspects of *psyche* are recognised and explored. There is acceptance of the conflict between conscious and *unconscious* processes, but with an attempt to unite rather than suppress either (*CW* 8, § 522). Individuation implies a genuine individuality, one which is discovered, not imposed.

**Logos**, as used by Jung (*CW* 5, § 272), refers to spirit, mind, intellect, especially in a rational mode. Jung also used Logos as a short-hand term for the masculine principle (*CW* 9ii, § 29).

I argue that the term has been applied with an increasingly narrow focus to represent only independent, rational thought, thus coming close to my definition of individualism. It remains an appropriate term for the masculine principle, also seriously diminished by the ideals of individualism. However it is worth re-claiming more inclusive definitions for the masculine and for Logos.
**Personal Unconscious** refers to forgotten or repressed perceptions, ideas and memories. "It corresponds to the figure of the shadow so frequently met with in dreams." *(CW 7, § 103).*

**Psyche** is the integrated totality of psychological processes (*conscious* and *unconscious*). A term roughly analogous to mind, but in Jungian theory it resumes as well some of its original meaning as life force or soul, thus stressing its essential vitality.

**Psychodynamic** is used to refer to psychological theories emphasising a dynamic, changing interplay between conscious and *unconscious* processes. It is introduced to prevent the confusion which can arise when "psychoanalytic" is used in this generic sense, while also referring specifically to Freudian and neo-Freudian theories.

**Self** is the archetype of *individuation*. It is the "archetype of wholeness" *(CW 9ii, § 351)* and "the total personality" *(CW 9ii, § 9)*. It is represented by symbols of wholeness and unity (circle, square) and especially symbols of a union of opposites (szygy, sacred wedding). Jung chose Christ as a symbol of Self appropriate to the Western tradition. As archetype and *unconscious*, Self is more extensive and inclusive than ego-consciousness and represents an ideal to which people are drawn.

My concern is that Self as ideal is easily confused with social ideals and so can be turned into a prescriptive psychological requirement.

**Unconscious** refers to aspects of psyche outside conscious awareness.

See *Personal Unconscious* and *Collective Unconscious*. 
Appendix 2

Poem: Sunday Morning in Sydney 2.

The harbour breeze is November warm.
An early jacaranda stands fragile anchor
stops the haze-blue sky
from blowing away.
The breeze buffets me instead
with dreams
some mine
some new to me and
surprised, I try to send them away -
but they wrap about me
determined and demanding
as the belled Siamese cat
twining bare legs with purrs
and tail.

I reach to embrace them all -
heart bared to soft fur
to sail-boats
to voyeur-spiced dreams -
but that is the moment they choose
to stalk away.
I am too easy now.

Dreams behave better,
if you hold them under the surface
for a while,
just till the struggling
stops.

(Sunday Morning in Sydney 2. Bradley, 1989, p.31)