Divine Madness: Archetypes of Romantic Love

by John Ryan Haule

Copyright © 1990
All Rights Reserved
http://www.jrhaule.net/divine.html

Three

The Love Potion: Metaphors Of Depth

In the legend of Tristan and Isolde, the love potion symbolizes the depth, the inevitability, the transcendence and the eternality of their love. But it is not the only symbol which points in this direction. For example, God actively assists them despite what appears to be their sin, and the people are unanimously behind them despite their violation of the rules of the social order. Furthermore, when Tristan is wounded the first time and no medicine in Cornwall can save him, he sets to sea in a boat without oars; and the sea carries him directly to the shores of Ireland, to Isolde the maker of the poison which threatens him and the only person in the world who can cure him. Furthermore, after Tristan has been cured and he returns to Cornwall to sing of Isolde's beauty rather than pursue a relationship with her, a bird carries a strand of her golden hair across sea and land directly to King Mark who agrees to marry only the woman to whom it belongs; and Tristan is dispatched to find her. We may say, then, that the image of the love potion sums up all the forces which draw Tristan and Isolde together: God, the people, and all of nature.

Symbolic analogues of the love potion are therefore numerous. We have already considered Plato's myth of the round being divided into male and female halves which spend their days in search of one another. In Chinese legend, when the immortals ordained a union between a man and a woman, an invisible red thread which no force on earth could break was tied between their feet by the god of marriage (Time-Life: 18). Very commonly the literary device which serves the purpose of the potion-symbol is that of pre-vision. One of the earliest examples is again to be found in Plato. He tells the myth in *Phaedo* (72e-77a) that souls are granted, prior to their birth, a vision of the *eide*, the eternal, transcendent ideas or essences of things. We cannot know these *eide* by means of our sense organs, because the senses are limited to apprehending particulars. Consequently Plato argues, we "remember" them from our pre-birth vision (the concept of anamnesis). A contemporary example of this is to be found in Alban Berg's opera, *Lulu* (Act II), where the anti-heroine Lulu declares that she can tell in the dark if a man is "made for her" because she dreamed of him during an adolescent sickness. A Persian tale (Nizami 1959) tells of a pair of royal adolescents, one living in Arabia and the other in China, who refuse all the matches their parents make for them until the jinn collaborate to bring them together by providing them images of one another through their dreams. Similarly, in Mozart's *Magic Flute* Tamino is shown a picture of Tamina, the woman the gods have chosen for him, so that he will recognize her and be able to rescue her. He falls in love with the pictured maiden at once.

Hans Christian Andersen, too, in his version of the Turandot legend,[1] has the hero, Johannes, see her image in a dream long before he is ready to meet her. When he first hears of her, he learns only that she is a princess who beheads her suitors. He declares her "horrible":

> "She should be switched, that is what she deserves. If I were the old king, I would beat her till I drew blood".
>
> . . . [But] when Johannes saw her, his face became as red as blood dripping from a wound and he could not utter a word. The princess looked like the girl with a golden crown that he had dreamed about the night his father died. She was so beautiful, and he already loved her so much, that he could not believe that she was an evil witch who ordered men to be beheaded or hanged, because they could not guess the answers to the questions she asked them (49).

In this tale we see ambivalence for the first time. One part of Johannes very correctly perceives the princess as a demon-possessed, murderous, spoiled brat; for we later learn that she is inspired in her beheading by a blood-thirsty mountain spirit. His criticism, therefore, stems from a part of himself which is well adapted to the real world. Another part of himself, however, the part that has drunk the love potion, responds to an entirely different order of reality. She is, indeed, "meant" for him; he is the only man who can save her; and she is the only woman in the world who can complete him. Both parts of Johannes are right, but the reader does not experience the tension between them. Rather they must be deduced through the symbolism of the tale. In Richard Wagner's opera, *Lohengrin*, however, this inner conflict is portrayed directly through the drama and the music.

The Story of Lohengrin

> Elsa is accused of murdering her brother in order to grab the throne of the Duchy of Brabant. Telramund, the man who accuses her, is next in ducal succession and, therefore, has a vested interest in getting rid of her. The dispute is brought before the king of Germany who can afford neither to alienate the people of Brabant by deciding against Elsa, nor to lose Telramund's army by deciding against him. So he orders God to make the decision. He calls for a *Gottesgericht*, a "judgment of God," to be obtained by having Telramund fight a duel with whatever knight will champion Elsa's cause.
>
> When the call for a champion goes out and none responds, Elsa prays God to send her the glorious knight she has seen in her dreams. The knight actually appears on a barge drawn by a swan and wins the duel for Elsa. They will be married, but Elsa is never to ask his name or origin.
>
> Before the wedding can take place, however, Ortrud, the wife of the defeated Telramund, begins to insinuate doubts into Elsa's mind. Ortrud is a magician who prays to the *entweihte Goetter*, the desacralized or profaned gods of paganism. At first Elsa is full of confidence:
>
>> You poor thing, you'll never know
>> How free from doubt my heart loves!
>> You've never had this good fortune
>> Which comes from faith, alone!
>>
>> Follow me and let me teach you
>> How sweet the bliss of purest trust!
>> Be yourself converted to the faith:
>> There's no good fortune without rue!
>> (Act II, scene 2, my translation).
>
> Ortrud is enraged at this sweet arrogance and accuses Lohengrin, the unnamed hero, of relying on

> the trickery of magic rather than divine aid. If she is right, the "divine judgment" of the duel is also a trick and Elsa's great love is a foolish adolescent crush.
>
> Although the wedding takes place as planned, Ortrud's insinuations have effect; and as soon as they are alone in their bridal chamber, Elsa begins to question Lohengrin. She notes how sweet her own name sounds from his lips; should she not be allowed to pronounce his? Can he not make her proud through his trust in her and thereby prevent her perishing in worthlessness? In answer, Lohengrin appeals to the wonders which attended his appearance and his intimate knowledge of her dreams. These are insufficient, and Elsa finally demands to know his name, title, and land.
>
> Lohengrin reveals before Elsa, King Heinrich, and all the people of Brabant that he is the son of Parsifal, the Grail King, sent to work righteousness upon the earth. If Elsa had only been able to tolerate his anonymity for a period of two years, they would have lived happily ever after. But now he must return to the Kingdom of the Grail. His swan is transformed into Elsa's long-lost brother who ascends the throne of Brabant; Lohengrin departs; and Elsa, in her brother's arms, sinks slowly to earth, *entseelt* -- "dis-en-souled." These are Wagner's stage directions and seem to imply that Elsa's soul has departed with Lohengrin to reign with him forever in the Kingdom of the Grail.

Two themes in this story illuminate the symbol of the love potion and metaphor of love's depth: (a) the fact that Elsa was able to conjure her animus into bodily existence and (b) the subsequent doubts about Lohengrin's value -- deep, central and divine or shallow, peripheral and magical.

The first of these themes may sound wholly fantastic to those who have not had much exposure to what Jung calls the "synchronistic" events which so frequently attend archetypal experiences. As an analyst I have heard quite a few such stories. In particular, I think of one man who reported that he had conjured his "anima" into existence one semester in graduate school when he had written several passionate papers on the female beloved in American literature. When in the stacks of the library she appeared in the flesh, he recognized only that she was important. In a few weeks he knew she was central, but it was several months before he realized that she was the one he had been writing about. They had a tumultuous relationship over a period of two years. The "naked sword" took several forms and then appeared finally in the guise of the woman's fear of the emotional intensity they shared: she fled into a marriage with another man. Twenty years later, as a college professor, he began to deal with the issue in analysis. Eventually, he was inspired to put together a college course on certain aspects of romantic love in literature, explicitly with the object of coming to understand what had happened to him in his youth. No sooner had he put the final touches on it than he received a phone call from a woman of his own age, a graduate student from another college who wished to consult with him on completing her master's degree thesis. This time he knew at once that a new chapter was beginning in his own thesis. She proved to be another perfect embodiment of his anima -- even better, on account of the years of maturation they had both gone through.

Jung himself appears to have had experiences of this type, at least with his patients, Sabina Spielrein and Antonia Wolff. Although we have no testimony from Jung on the question, something of his attitude can be glimpsed from certain passages in Spielrein's diary where she is reflecting on how strange the world looks now that she has drunk the potion with Jung. One entry, from September 8, 1910, was written after she had spent a disappointing afternoon with some of her fellow medical students talking of men, women, and love:

> So that is supposed to be youth, the strength and blossom of humanity? Is it possible I shall never escape to a different milieu, with people who love life as I do, who know how to find beauty in everything . . . My guardian spirit was right in his promise that everything I wanted would be fulfilled, if by wanting one means that for which one's nature unwaveringly longs (Carotenuto, 9).

Clearly Elsa longed for Lohengrin unwaveringly with all of her nature. Right from the start we know that there is something right about the earnestness of her faithfulness to the image of her animus. The college professor, however, did not know he was conjuring up his anima. Of him, we would have to say that his nature longed unwaveringly but unconsciously for the woman who carried the image of his soul. He has longed more in the style of Johannes in the Andersen tale. There is something boyish about it, somewhat like the experience of the twelve-year-old Jung who, for several days, fought a inner image of God defecating on the Basel cathedral . When he finally allowed himself to experience it, he found it wholly changed his relationship with religion. Whereas his father, a minister, got into a crisis of faith by trying to conform his mind to the philosophy of Kant and traditional interpretations of the bible, Jung learned that the Holy Spirit speaks directly to one's soul. Jung writes: With the experience of God and the cathedral I at last had something tangible that was part of the great secret -- as if I had always talked of stones falling from heaven and now had one in my pocket (1961: 41).

Clearly Elsa and the college professor are both carrying very important "stones" about with them in their pockets. She had talked of a knight no one believed existed. Even her devoted people feared she was mad and a dreamer (Act I). The professor had written and spoken about the beloved he had not yet met in what he believed was a theoretical manner, but the woman's appearance -- twice, and with a twenty year interval -- was as solidly real as a stone in his pocket.

For Elsa to have conjured Lohengrin into existence, she had to have longed unwaveringly with her whole nature. It was a longing which proceeded from her "center," her Self. The dramatic conflict, however, revolves about her doubt: Do I love him from my center or from my periphery; is he sent from God or a magician? She's inclined to believe she and Lohengrin are connected from their centers. The complex within her which doubts this is personified by Ortrud, who in fact is a magician. In this play, a magician is a worshipper of the old gods of paganism, now transformed into demons by the influence of the Christian church. Ortrud is able to use their power to work her own will. Hers is an ego-centered longing. She conjurs from the conscious "periphery" of her psyche rather than from its unconscious center. Elsa wants to know if Lohengrin is a figment of Ortrud's imagination or a stone in her pocket. In Wuthering Heights Catherine Earnshaw knew very well with which level of her psyche she loved. Indeed, she had a lover for each of them. She tells Nelly, the narrator:

> My love for Linton is like the foliage in the woods: time will change it, I'm well aware, as winter changes the trees. My love for Heathcliff resembles the eternal rocks beneath -- a source of little visible delight, but necessary. Nelly, I am Heathcliff! He's always, always in my mind -- not as a pleasure, any more than I am always a pleasure to myself, but as my own being (84).

This passage tells us the nature of Cathy's tragic mistake in *Wuthering Heights*. She loves Heathcliff from the eternal rocklike depths of her psyche. But, knowing their love is timeless, she takes it for granted and marries Linton because he can supply the smooth

aristocratic style she longs for. She wants both loves and believes they can hardly conflict with one another, since they are so different. Her love for Linton is shallow, because she cannot connect with him through her Self. She uses him to insure her social standing, respectability, and wealth. This may be a "good enough" reason for marriage, insofar as that institution is a social, legal, and financial sort of companionship. It is the kind of marriage that was "arranged" in former times and which may be sought by pragmatic individuals who have never known the divine madness of love~or who *have* known it and decided it was too painful. But Cathy is not someone like that. She knows love’s depths and has no intention of losing Heathcliff. If Elsa had had a more trivial love (like Cathy’s Linton), she would have known by the contrast that her connection with Lohengrin belonged unmistakably to her center, to the "eternal rocks" of her psyche.

When we speak of "levels" or degrees of "depth" in the psyche~between seasonal trees and eternal rocks, what is central and what is peripheral, and so on~we refer to the theoretical division Jung began to articulate in the second decade of this century. He distinguished "personal" and "collective" levels. The personal psyche includes ego consciousness and the "personal unconscious." The latter is comprised of forgotten, overlooked, and repressed material that has accumulated over the course of our own personal biography. It is characterized by personal idiosyncrasies and knows something of time~insofar as, say, a dream image can be identified as belonging to one’s sixth or sixteenth year and is saturated with the joys and traumas of that period of life. There is an ordinary, "everyday" character to it, whereas the "collective psyche" is characterized by a kind of impersonality, transpersonality, and timelessness~very frequently with extraordinarily impressive, even uncanny, feeling tone. The collective psyche includes those dimensions of our psychic life that all of us as human beings have in common, regardless of our biographical differences. It is the realm of what Jung calls the archetypes. Jung’s language can be somewhat confusing on the nature of the archetypes; one reviewed (Hobson, 1980) counted more than thirty meanings of *archetype* in one volume of the *Collected Works*. I find it useful to distinguish three levels within the collective unconscious: the level of myth images, the Self level, and the level of the instincts or "inborn releasing mechanisms’[2]:

Personal Psyche	ego consciousness personal unconscious
Collective Psyche	mythic images Self instincts (inborn releasing mechanisms)

Lovers who have drunk the love potion relate to one another from the level of Self. This means that each feels complete and united within; they feel united with one another; and they feel one with the whole world. Thus Bedier says of Tristan and Isolde when they are living together in the forest that they were lords of the woods (73) and that Tristan could call the birds so that they would fly into their hut and sing for them (72). Tristan and Isolde could speak to one another in birdsong (97) just as Layla and Majnun were kept in touch during their separation by birds. Rumi, too, describes this condition:

> Lord, the air smells good today,
> straight from the mysteries within the inner courts of God.

> . . . Face to face with a lion, I grow leonine.
> Walking out of the Treasury Building, I feel generous.
> Anyone still sober in this weather must be afraid
> of people, afraid what they'll say.
> Enough talking. If we eat too much greenery,
> we're going to smell like vegetables
> (Rumi, 29).

Such unity, such *participation mystique* (to use Jung's expression, borrowed from anthropologist Levy-Bruhl[3]) not infrequently is attended by so-called "psi" phenomena. Lovers read one another's minds quite commonly when they are joined at the level of Self. In Anna Karenina Tolstoy has the lovers, Kitty and Levin communicating at a chalk board by writing only the initial letters of words. Thus, the letters iycfafwh would be immediately understood to mean, "If you could forget and forgive what happened" (423). It works as a literary device because we know it is plausible -- or nearly so. Things of this type are exceptional, but they really happen. For Jung, they do not imply anything supranormal. They are part of nature, although not usually apparent:

> I therefore think it would be advisable to consider Psi-phenomena in the first place as *sua sponte* facts and not as supranormal perceptions. . . . Most of the cases of Psi-perception are due to the presence of a constellated archetype, which produces an *abaissement du niveau* mental (numinosity, emotion) (1975ii: 542f).

Specifically, mentality is lowered to the level of the Self, too primitive a level for the reflective activity of imagery, much less words. It may be experienced as a paradisal state of egoless unity or a prison of non-identity. In the former case, we speak of the delights of the love potion and in the latter of a need for the sword of separation. Inwardly, we find ourselves whole and complete. Outwardly, we are united with our beloved and the whole universe as well.

Such phenomena are not limited to the experience of lovers. By passing into an ecstatic trance, the shaman accesses this same state of unity with nature and with the patient. In Eliade's words, "The shaman is the great specialist in the human soul; he alone 'sees' it, for he knows its 'form' and its destiny" (8). The shaman's calling, talents, and training provide access to virtually all human souls, while the lover has access primarily only to the soul of the beloved. In both cases the access is the same, i.e., through the Self-level of the psyche. The shaman has learned to gain this access, this "lowering of the mental level," deliberately and on conscious demand, whereas the lover does so passively as a result of the experience of falling deeply in love. For it is not all lovers who have this access, only those whose love has attained such depth that we can truly say of them that they have drunk the potion.

The shaman sees the condition of the patient's soul to diagnose illness and particularly perceives its absence in truly life-threatening diseases, often of psychological origin. For example, Marjorie Shostak tells the story of the shamanic healing of a young !Kung woman near death in her struggle with malaria. The dangerous element in her condition appeared to be psychological, namely the recent death of her father. The shaman went into trance, and his soul made an exploratory journey to the world of the dead, where he found the spirit of the sick woman tenderly enfolded in the arms of her father who was rocking her and singing to her. The shaman addressed the father, asking why the daughter was in the land of the dead

instead of with the living, where she belonged. The father said he had been desolate without her, whereupon the shaman argued passionately for her return to the obligations of life, saying that she would rejoin her father after she had experienced what life had to offer and had grown old. Finally the dead man's soul agreed to these terms. The shaman brought back the woman's soul, and she recovered (291f).

Unlike most of the cultures Eliade reviews in his classic book on shamanism, the !Kung do not reserve shamanic powers to a small elite of practitioners. They believe -- and it is evidently the case -- that every man and woman possesses and has access to the shamanic healing force they call *n/um*. Some, of course, are more skilled than others in using it. *N/um* is usually dormant and must be activated by a deliberate "lowering of the mental level" through music, and especially though a strenuous trance dance which may go on for hours. This is their way of reaching the psychic level of Self which lovers attain through their erotic participation mystique.

This connection, which the !Kung point to with the notion of *n/um* and I describe with the psychological metaphor of Self-level, Jung (1952/55) sometimes calls "unconscious a prioi knowledge" and "absolute knowledge." The shaman somehow "knows" the nature of the patient's illness and what to do about it, but it is not very much like the knowledge we attain with thought. We might say he "knows with his body," the expression Carlos Castaneda attributes to the Yaqui Indian shaman he calls don Juan Matus (1972, 1987). The lover "knows" the beloved in much the same way. Thus Tolstoy says of Kitty and Levin, "Through her love she knew his whole soul" (433). It is not a knowledge which can be reduced to words or images. Indeed, it might as well be called a "being" as a "knowing." That is why Cathy Earnshaw says, "I am Heathcliff" and Majnun calls himself the veil underneath which is the face of Layla (Nizami 1966: 125). Very likely it is similar to what the evangelist meant when he has Jesus say, "I and the Father are one" (John 10:30).

The shamanic and love-potion connection between people can also be expressed by the metaphor of seeing. Lovers say they "see" into one another's hearts or souls. The shaman "looks for" the patient's soul when it is "lost"; he "sees" the condition of the soul's strength and health. In similar manner, I like to speak of the anima and animus serving as a "lens" whereby the lover brings into focus the soul or Self of the beloved, as well as his or her own. This "seeing" bears as little resemblance to sight as *n/um* "knowing" to a bachelor's degree. For Castaneda, "seeing" is the primary metaphor for shamanic activity; and as one reads through the eight autobiographical volumes chronicling his apprenticeship, one finds the connotations of the word seeing gradually but steadily reduced and simplified. As Castaneda begins to experience for himself what don Juan has been trying to describe for him, he starts to drop his expectations and presumptions. The activity of "seeing" transcendent, non-bodily realities becomes less a fancied, radiant goal and more a tool of everyday living.

The metaphor of "seeing" is particularly compelling because images are so closely related to an interpersonal connection at the level of Self. The !Kung shaman, for example, actually enters a kind of dreamscape when he goes in search of the woman's lost soul. It is not a private dream of exclusively personal significance for the shaman. Rather it has an "objective" quality about it. It is a dream about the Self-level connectedness of shaman and patient. He obtains a true (because effective) insight into the psychological condition of the woman. She no longer wants to go on living; she would rather be with her father in the land

of the dead. But she does not experience this as an attitude of her own. For her, it is the "pull" her absent father exerts which draws her out of life and dissolves her interest in the affairs of the living.

Upon activating his *n/um*, the shaman first experiences these facts in an direct, imageless intuition. This is connection at the psychic level of Self. At this point he has a non-specific grasp of the seriousness of the woman's condition, which he expresses by saying that her soul is "lost." He does not know quite "where" it is or what is "detaining" it. In order to describe her condition more specifically, he needs imagery and therefore sends his own soul on a "journey" into dreamscape. Having lowered his mental level to that of the Self in order to obtain an effective participation mystique with his patient, he now needs to rise to the level of mythic image where those deep, unarticulated interpersonal facts can be represented in a useful manner. The shaman's role in primitive societies is precisely this, to be able to control the level of his or her psyche's functioning so as to: (a) access the soul/Self of the patient and (b) articulate the condition of that soul in imagery which is redolent of transcendent cultural meanings and social consensus. Thus Levi-Strauss (1967: 193) says of another shamanic cure, "The shaman provides the sick woman with a language by means of which unexpressed and otherwise inexpressible psychic states can be immediately expressed."

Elsa's dream of Lohengrin is a manifestation of this same mythic level of the psyche, as was the initial dream of an analysand of mine in which an angelic man bathed in a golden light protected her and gave her the task of raising a baby which was herself. She dreamt it the night before first meeting with me and told me that she knew I was the analyst she should work with because the man in the dream was me. This phenomenon manifested itself somewhat differently, however, in the case of the college professor who twice seemed to conjure his anima into bodily existence. He did not have a dream image of the woman. Instead he pasted together, as it were, a montage of his anima, culled from literary sources. The mythic image-level of his psyche expressed itself implicitly in the academic work which he believed was wholly conscious.

Insofar as anima and animus images at the mythic level adequately reflect realities at the "deeper" level of Self, they are inherently true. They "feel" true, also, because they imaginatively represent central aspects of my psyche. Even when I have not yet made the acquaintance of these facets of my Self, they speak with the self-evident conviction of Plato's anamnesis, as though I am remembering essential matters from a pre-birth vision. As an image for the other half of the round being I originally was before time began, a vision of my anima presents me with a hitherto unknown part of my Self.

Such is surely the case with Elsa. Her vision of Lohengrin proceeds from her Self. It is true and in harmony with God's will. Lohengrin's defeat of Telramund in the *Gottesgericht* duel is merely secondary evidence for the centrality of Lohengrin in her psyche. Still she doubts, and it is important that she do so. She is a naive, dreamy young girl who can easily be led astray by peripheral concerns which only seem central. In fearing that Lohengrin may be a magician rather than an emissary of God (*Gott gesanter Mann*), Elsa entertains the possibility that the image of Lohengrin may have come from some shallower level of her psyche.

That would be the level characterized by personal imagery, by the memories and repressed material from her own life history. The level of personal imagery is above all the "space" in the psyche where "outer" and "inner" issues mingle. Here, mythic images emerging from below are "clothed," as it were, in personal associations and take on an appearance peculiarly suited to each individual’s past experience and future hopes. Here, too, we encounter imagery consciously and subliminally gathered from our environs. It is the reason fragments from televised beer commercials and science fiction movies find their way into our otherwise quite sober-seeming dreams.

Elsa’s doubt emerges from her awareness that she is lonely for companionship and understanding. She would love to have a knight-champion more angelically intimate and militarily powerful than any other. He would satisfy her deepest needs and justify her in the eyes of Brabant. Perhaps she has conjured him out of ego-centered desires. The magician works by precisely such means (cf. Gray, Bonewits, or Crowley): one determines the exact effects one wishes to bring about and then gathers intrapsychic emotional and image associations, amplifying them with mythic imagery and environmental effects. Having thus "mapped out one’s own being" (Crowley, 12), one lowers the mental level with a powerful and focused emotion and "fires it" at the goal (Bonewits, 159). In short, the magician exploits the readily available imagery and desires of the personal level of the psyche to imitate the action of the archetype.

All the several versions of the Turandot legend turn on this problem of center versus periphery or deep versus shallow. The hero Johannes in the Andersen version, cited above, has no doubts about himself or the princess once he has seen that she is the very woman he dreamed about. Nizami’s (1959) hero is a bit more complex. The beautiful Princess Turandot has mastered all the ordinary arts and sciences and the occult arts as well. She builds a castle of iron and steel atop a mountain and has magic swords guard the single path which connects her with the rest of the world. She paints her likeness, life-sized, on a silk banner and hangs it from the gate of her father’s city with the promise to marry any man who can disarm the swords, find his way into her castle with its hidden door, and answer a battery of riddles. The hero of this tale knows he has "lost his head" as soon as he sees Turandot’s likeness. Unlike the others who suffered physical decapitation, however, he does not proceed immediately to the challenge. He deliberately chooses the sword of separation. He spends several years studying with the world’s greatest gurus. This means that he familiarizes himself with his center. On this basis he succeeds.

Turandot, herself, suffers from the same problem. She does not dare choose a husband, because she cannot trust her feeling or intuition to distinguish the center from the periphery. In Nizami’s version of the tale, she has already fallen in love with the hero as soon as he enters her castle. But she does not show her emotion and coldly insists on the ordeal of the riddles. As I view the riddles, they are explicitly an attempt to test feelings -- to see if the feeling of being in love comes from the center or the periphery. Have they really drunk the love potion, or do they just wish they have?

The riddles proceed as follows. She breaks an earring in two and gives him its two identical pearls. In answer, he adds three pearls of the same weight and gives the five to her. She grinds them to power, mixes in sugar and returns it to him. He pours the powder into a glass of milk and gives it to her. She drinks the sweetened milk and recovers the exact

weight of pearl dust. She then sends him a ring. He puts it on his finger and sends her a "wonderful" pearl. She finds an identical one on her necklace, ties it to the first with a thread and returns it. He, unable to distinguish one from the other and not having a third, ties a glass marble to them. She puts the marble around her waist, hangs the pearls from her ears, and directs the wedding to be prepared.

Her first gesture seems to say, "Our two souls are such a matched pair of jewels as these." She even believes this message, though it is tainted with her doubt. If he accepts it uncritically, she can throw handfuls of such pearls in his face and order his decapitation. The message is true but also a trick, as the pearls are anything but unique. She desperately wants to believe in love and the destiny of their two souls, but is afraid of falling for foolish romantic drivel. The first move in the game is to determine whether he is as soft-headed as she fears she is herself. None of this is lost on the prince, who keeps his wits, restrains his feelings, and shows he understands by adding three identical pearls of his own. In grinding the five pearls to powder, she reveals the aggressive desperation of her situation. She is nearly paralyzed by the fear of opening herself to a man who does not deserve her intimacy. She sugars the results of her violence. She is still testing whether he can discern the difference between sweet romance and hard reality.

From the prince's side the message is slightly different; for in crushing both her own contribution and his, she threatens the five, the "quintessence" of their relationship. Unlike nuggets of gold, pearls cannot be reconstituted from dust; they have their value from the irreplaceable beauty of the whole. The sugaring of the dust suggests the threat of "sweet unconsciousness" which would result if he were to allow her to crush his individuality. In dissolving the sugar in milk, he invites her to enjoy the sweetness of their love. This answer is typical of his centered, Self-level replies. He accepts what she gives him for precisely what it is (two matching, valuable, but not unique pearls; a mixture of pearl-dust and sugar; etc.); but he transforms the meaning of the contributions. She tenders them in a fierce spirit of cynical mistrust. His careful acceptance widens the horizons of her suspicious world.

Her next gesture, the ring -- by implication a wedding ring -- continues her obsessive self-distrusting queries: what will he do if I finally give myself to him? His answer, the truly "wonderful" pearl, symbolizes himself, the most valuable and unique gift he has. As she has one exactly like it, she repeats the opening gesture; but this time the pearls are really unique. The offer is genuine. It is typical of her self-deprecation that she disguise her offer of herself by first making several feints, as if to say, "Do you really value me; do you know what I'm giving you; are you ready to take me seriously?" She demands his total attention; she must be the center of his interests. She wants to remain eternally the darling princess and is terrified at the prospects of going on with her life, of becoming wife, queen, and mother. Her question also means, "Can you love me as I have never been able to love myself?"

His answer of the glass bead shows his recognition that she has finally admitted her love, her belief that their two souls are unique, matching pearls. The bead seems to say: Alongside these pearls which are ourselves, all else is trash; there is no third. But it says more than this, for in giving her a worthless bauble, he also tells her he has seen her mean, petty, self-doubting side and accepts it, too. Her final gesture, hanging the bead from her waist, amounts to an acceptance of that in herself, an identification with the lowly piece of glass. This sentiment is repeated in the image, at once sexual and violent, with which she

sums up the meaning of the riddles: "the falcon is enthroned on the breast of the pheasant."

Both Turandot and Elsa have "stones in their pockets," but neither can quite trust her miraculous good fortune. Each attempts to solve the dilemma by examining her incarnated animus image. In a certain sense Elsa is more admirable in this, as she takes the risk of loss on her own head in demanding that Lohengrin identify himself. Turandot is much more cunning, desperate, and dangerous, but she accomplishes more. The two heroines are alike in that they have determined the connection with their lovers proceeds from the depth of the Self. The difference is that Elsa has built no foundation for an earthly life. She has, as it were, granted reality exclusively to the realm of the archetypes. This explains the ending of the opera, her sinking dis-en-souled to the earth, presumably to live bodilessly in the airy Kingdom of the Grail. In contrast, Turandot is brought down from her eagle's nest and will spend her life with her prince on the earthly, temporal plane.

Elsa's solution, the denial of the personal and temporal in favor of the archetypal and eternal may be met with quite frequently in an analytic practice. It is the man or woman who avoids all personal involvement by living in a dream world with the ghostly image of an anima or animus. It is also the individual who sleeps with several different partners a week, frequently not even learning their names. These people use the physiology of sex to lower their mental level to a deep participation mystique and never integrate this experience with the personal level of the psyche.

The personal level poses more of a challenge to the love-potion experience than the shallow distraction which Elsa and Turandot so desperately fear. It demands integration. This level of the psyche, which Jung calls the personal unconscious, is the bridge between ego consciousness and the deep unconscious. In our personal-image dreams and fantasies, a life-world is created. We imagine how our life might and might not be lived in the light of the mythic images arising from below and the environmental demands intruding from without. At this level mythic, generically human, issues are personalized, reduced to size, rendered in a form which we can recognize as our own. The myth becomes individualized and livable. Simultaneously, our personal perspective is broadened and rooted in the deep psychic matrix which has seen thousands of generations dealing with the same set of problems. Our life becomes connected with the divine images which inform it with transcendent meaning. Turandot's loss to the guru-apprentice prince turns out to be a two-fold gain. She learns to trust her feeling connection with the deep Self level of the psyche, and she lays the groundwork for integrating this with everyday life.

Giacomo Puccini recognized the necessity of integrating objective and personal levels in his operatic version of the Turandot legend. He has the prince demand a task of her, namely to discover his name. In contrast to Wagner's Lohengrin, who tries to hide behind the numinous aura of his animus origins, Puccini's Calaf asks Turandot herself to penetrate the glow of transcendence. In his directions to his librettist, he says:

> [The love duet in Act II, scene 1] must be a great duet. The two beings [Turandot and Calaf] who stand, as it were, outside the world, are transmuted into human beings through love, and this love must take possession of everything on the stage.

This integration is the master stroke in romantic love. It is no small matter to have a distinct vision of the anima or animus. It is genuinely marvelous when this angelic image can

be conjured into bodily existence and related to. One may not ever expect to have "stones in the pocket." But to build something with those stones, that is what truly transforms a person. It is also the only act of the drama in which consciousness plays a major role. To have the image and even to conjure it into bodily existence, is an "act of grace," an unmerited boon from God. But to make it one's own, to find a way to live it, requires deliberate choice, resolution, judgment, and will.

Integrating the levels of personal image, mythic image, and Self in an episode of romantic love is a metaphor closely related to three others which have already been discussed: withdrawing the projection, using anima as a lens, and becoming Layla. In withdrawing the projection, I relinquish my clinging to my external beloved and recognize her image within me. Through this inner image, as through a lens, I bring into a kind of pre-image focus of feeling or intuition or "body knowledge" the deeper Self whence the anima or animus image has emerged. And because I do not merely gaze at this image but integrate it into a way of life, I become the veil before the face of my true being -- my Layla.

---

1. Turandot is a fairy tale by Nizami (1959) and an opera by Puccini. Variations appear in many traditions, including "The Bewitched Princess" (Zaunert) and "The Traveling Companion" (Anderson).

2. This differentiation of the collective unconscious is inspired by the later writings of Pierre Janet, where he develops a model of the psyche with nine levels, three of which cover the ground Jung includes in the term *archetype*. A careful reading of Jung (cf. Haule, 1984) will reveal his indebtedness to Janet's psychology to be about equally as great as to Freud's. However, he appears not to have read beyond Janet (1903), where the doctrine of the mental levels is first introduced. It is my belief that developments in Janet's psychology between the late 1920's and the end of his life can contribute valuably to Jung's thought while remaining within the spirit and conceptual framework of Jung's writings. Consult Haule (1983) for an exposition of these categories in language closer to that of Janet and applied to Jungian clinical practice. There is not much available in English on the psychology of Janet, but Ellenberger (386-94) presents an extensive summary of the nine mental levels Janet describes in his writings after 1920. For the English-speaking reader not ready to tackle Janet's straight-forward declarative French, the two volumes of *Psychological Healing* (1919) are an excellent place to begin, although these were written before the "grand synthesis" of nine mental levels had been developed.

3. Lucien Levy-Bruhl (1857-1939) argued that "primitive mentality" was characterized by, among other things, a lack of individual autonomy. Egohood was diminished to the advantage of social cohesion. There was no urge to autonomy, as the member gained primary satisfaction from mystically participating in the group. Jung applies the term *participation mystique* to describe any occurrence of this ecstatic relinquishment of consciousness between individuals. It need by no means be a pleasurable experience, for any overwhelming emotion between two or more people is capable of becoming an instance of *participation mystique*. "Mob psychology" would be a particularly abhorrent example.