

Eros in Language, Myth, and Dream

RUSSELL A. LOCKHART

The essential character of Eros is the divine (i.e., creative) shaft which leaps across the guarded frontier of the subject in order to reach the object. The creative shaft is the impregnating phallus, the impressive, fertilizing image, the creative word, the idea which gets home, the divine leap by which the individual subject is able to transcend his own subjectivity and take an effective part in the work of creation. This is Eros, the god which bringeth twain together in the service of life.

—H. G. Baynes, *Mythology of the Soul*

HIDDEN AWAY in the *Sacellum Volupiae*, the Roman Sanctuary of Pleasure, is a statue of *Angerona*. Her mouth is bound and sealed. An uplifted finger touching her lips points to her silence and her suffering. This quiet *Angerona* is goddess of silent suffering and the suffering of silence. I invoke her image as counterpoint to the clamor of voices speaking out on modern problems and crises in love and relationship. Floods of words are pouring over us—words of analysis, advice, direction, pleading—all telling how to relate in love, sex, marriage and all the myriad configurations of connection and disconnection between us. The more one listens to all this outer shouting, the more difficult it becomes to hear the quiet inner voices. As powerful collective images claim our allegiance and tell us how to be, the more difficult it becomes to hear the claims of soul. And here I add voice to all the others. I am guilty too! Yet, when everyone is talking about relationship, when we hear about it everywhere, when we meet it at every turn, when we cannot be silent, we must assume something of importance is stirring the psyche to speak. We shall see that all this talk, all this shouting, *belongs* to the phenomenology of relationship.

Our time is a time when collective containers are strained, cracked, breaking and generally failing to hold. This is true for containers and forms of relationship. When containers crack, leak, and finally fall into pieces, *Chaos* rules. Each fragment of the old container aspires to make of itself the new container. Each piece lays claim to the whole. That's what we experience all around us today, each piece proclaiming: relate

• RUSSELL A. LOCKHART, Ph. D. is a Jungian analyst in Santa Barbara, CA, and an Associate Research Psychologist in the Department of Psychiatry at the UCLA School of Medicine. He directs the research program at the C. G. Jung Institute in Los Angeles and a doctoral program in Jungian Studies at International College.

this way, heal that way, develop this way, dream that way, move this way, go that way over there. Each little piece is, in fact, large enough to carry ego a short distance, but not Self. That is why all these little pieces in panacean disguise are fine for a moment, seem nirvana for a time, but fail after all. So, we are in a time of Chaos, when much is in pieces, when disorder, disarray, disconnection, despair fill the air.

In the realm of human relationship Chaos abounds. One hears more loudly than ever a plaintive cry for deep, connected, committed relationship; yet rarely has it seemed so elusive, so difficult to find, so hard to know, such demanding and painful work. The collective consciousness of the past few years has provided potent images which offer themselves as vehicles for creating, changing, and dissolving relationships. We seem ever freer to seek, to test, to leave. Open relationships, deep relationships, casual relationships, all manner of relationships—all these lie before us. It is as if ego had at last achieved its fantasy of ultimate freedom, its fantasy of unbounded flight, its fantasy of being a god. No longer restrained by old values, free of imposed limitations, we seem able now to challenge and break through any barrier at will. We no longer fear flying.

Yet, in spite of all this openness, freedom, and movements of liberation, something seems wrong, something is missing, the arrows of this new thrust seem deflected from the center mark. Women increasingly complain of inability to find deeply satisfying relationship—particularly those women who tell of being most liberated in other realms. And men seem ever more frightened at the possibility of relationship—particularly when relationship demands commitment and faithful connection. Revolutions in relationship abound and they bring Chaos with them. And as these revolutions reach into the deeper regions of relationship it seems important to ask: Is Eros in them? The words and imagery of these revolutions revolve around power, control, assertion. This is not the language of Eros. Where is Eros in all this Chaos?

In reflecting on this question, I was struck by the mythic image of Chaos giving birth to Eros.¹ I want to approach this image—to take up a relationship with it—not so much by trying to define Chaos and Eros empirically, logically, or even psychologically, but to enter these images *imaginally*. Imaginal contact with the psychic substance of these images is critically important for the life of soul. In fact, an imaginal relationship with one's own psyche may be the very essence of eros. An eros relationship with one's psyche may be essential for an eros relation to others. But that is jumping ahead to my conclusion and there is much to tell before such a leap can be taken.

If Chaos is womb to Eros, it must be necessary to stay with Chaos, in Chaos, to nurture it, stand it, give it time, energy. It must be necessary to give disconnection and unrelatedness its place, its space, to carry Chaos, to know and feel the body of Chaos, to accept that it belongs, and to realize that suffering all of this is for the purpose of giving Eros birth.

We speak of a woman "having" a baby. But in important ways, the baby "has" the woman. She must direct her energies to it, carry the burden of it, birth it, nurture it, raise it, let go of it. It is a burden, this birth. Likewise, Eros is a burden. It is easy to think of Eros as little Cupid striking hearts of lovers, inflaming them to joyous, ecstatic, erotic union. But there is another aspect of Eros, an aspect that carries one into darker realms of hurt, pain, suffering, and the burdens of relationship. True, we have relationships. It is also true: relationships have us.

No one abandons relationship because of love, joy, ecstasy, or the pleasures of companionship, communication, and communion with another person. These high-points of human experience are eagerly sought, warmly embraced, and savored as long as possible. Between these peaks, relationship is often experienced as incomplete, unfulfilled, and painful. In this atmosphere, fantasies of "something better" find ready audience. Difficulties engender doubts. Present pain stretches endlessly into the future. When love goes unanswered, when suffering exceeds endurance, when the resonance of interaction becomes more torturous than joyous, when we are hurt to the core, at these moments we find ourselves falling out of the container of relationship and falling into the depths of Chaos. It is at these moments we seek an end, a termination, a way to abandon relationship.

Chaos is not joyous, ecstatic, erotic. Rarely do we embrace Chaos. We do not greet it with open arms. More often, we flee from its approach, hurry away from its embrace, struggle to free ourselves from its grip. We avoid those places of disconnection, scurry from their darkness, run from the suffering of relationship. In following these ready and easy paths we abort the birth of Eros. It is the burden of Eros *in* Chaos that we have trouble carrying full term. The abortion of Eros is at the root of many problems and difficulties in relationship. It may not be accidental that the themes of abortion and liberation are so closely entwined.

Whether one seeks panacea in liberation, openness, freedom, or falls into isolation, separation and withdrawal, each of these "solutions" bring its own form of Chaos. The suffering of Chaos cannot be avoided.

What is the purpose and meaning of all this suffering in relationship? We know that for relationship to go deeply it goes to the depth with suffering. Suffering is the way to relationship. Suffering and relationship go together. Even the *words* belong together. *Relate* comes from the Latin² word *refero* while *suffer* comes from the Latin *suffero*. Both words share an extremely productive root, *fero*, which among other things means 'to bear,' 'to carry,' 'to take up,' 'to endure,' 'to put up with.' It is the root of our English words *bear*, *birth*, and *burden*. It is also found in *Lucifer*, the bearer of light. *Lucifer* too belongs to the imagery of relationship. To *suffer* (L. *suffero*) means 'to bear below,' 'to submit to,' 'to undergo,' 'to endure.' Notice that these meanings carry images of going *below* or

under. Psychologically, this means that suffering as 'undergoing' is a going under, a going to the underground of things, that is, to the depths. Little wonder that "suffering is hell." To *relate* (L. *refero*) means 'to bear back,' 'to bring back,' 'to return,' that is to bear or carry something *again*.

Thus, in relationship and in suffering, something is a burden, the burden is carried, again and again, until something is born. So, as with Chaos and Eros, we meet in these words the fantasy of burden, bearing, and birth. I believe this represents an archetypal reality of relationship mirrored in myth and word.

Examination of the pre-eminent myth of relationship, that of Eros and Psyche, reveals themes of suffering, burdens, confrontations with impossible tasks, all ending and pointing toward the birth of Voluptas, the child called Pleasure. Before this birth, Eros and Psyche are wounded, tormented, and undergo considerable suffering. The purpose of all this suffering may be seen as bringing Psyche into full feminine development and freeing Eros from the prison of his incestual relation with Aphrodite (his mother), making possible a more complete masculine development. Put simply, the myth says that the union of more fully developed masculine and feminine principles produces pleasure. More personally, to the extent that these principles are not developed in us, to that extent we will fail to experience the full pleasure of relationship. When these principles are undeveloped, blocked, or otherwise hindered, relationship is characterized by needy desire and transitory impulse and, most particularly, by failure in the capacity for consciously accepted suffering. The Eros and Psyche myth emphasizes the vital necessity of separate and distinct development of masculine and feminine principles. Attempts to make one principle superior to the other (e. g., the misogynic fantasy), or to blur or otherwise diminish their critical differences (e. g., the unisex fantasy), produces distortions in relationship. This myth is a guide to the meaning and purpose of relationship.

The word *relationship* comes into English in 1744, seemingly first used by Alexander Pope, the famous eighteenth century poet. This means that Shakespeare before him wrote all his dramas of relationship without once using the word. Nor is it to be found in the King James Bible. Today, however, we can't talk without using it. Of course, it comes from an earlier word, *relation*, which came into English in 1390 meaning, 'to tell.' This is an important meaning.

The *re* part of *relate* is worthy of reflection. *Re* means 'again,' and 'back' (as in turning back). These meanings reveal something important about relationship: repetition and returning are integral aspects of the cyclical phenomenology of relationship; that is, always returning to the same place, the same argument, the same words, the same feelings, the same mistakes. People complain of following the same pattern over and over again. This repeating, this "again-ness" of relationship is unavoidable

—one of its necessary qualities. Many of the words we use in relationship have this *re* characteristic: re-concile, re-form, re-gret, re-ject, re-lease, re-sent, re-sist, re-spect, re-pond, re-treat, re-tract, re-turn, re-veal and scores of others.

Why are we brought *back* to the same place in relationship? Perhaps it means we have never truly left—something remains there *in just that place* for us to *go through*. We find ourselves in such repetitive patterns because we have not gone through relationship, only round and round in the circle of relationship. When we fail to go through relationship we are compelled to an ever recurrent cycle of repetition: the same phenomena, the same problems, the same misery, the same failures of relationship. Even the boredom, flatness, and emptiness—the aloneness in relationship—is a result of going around in circles rather than going through. It is as if one always looked at the same reflection in the mirror. But going into and through the mirror is a different story—as Alice discovered when she stepped through. This "going through" is the imaginal dimension of relationship.

I believe going through relationship entails going consciously into and through the depths (places beneath the surface); darkness (places without light); and despair (places without hope) of relationship. Too often we go or are dragged unconsciously into and through these places of trial and turmoil. Then one suffers unconsciously and neurotically; a suffering that never humanizes, but serves only to victimize the sufferer and the suffered. The suffering cannot be avoided—indeed must not. But we can, as Jung pointed out, enter the suffering consciously, go into it, take on the burden of it. In that way the suffering of relationship will humanize. One's hubric aspirations, secret pretensions, hopes and wishes, one's dreams of immortality and paradise are nowhere more quickly exposed than when one falls into or develops a deep-going relationship. One central purpose of suffering, as myth so clearly reveals, is to reduce ego to its proper human proportions. Certainly we lose something of our human potential whenever we turn too quickly from the pains and hurts of relationship and seek to avoid suffering. To be sure, suffering must be overcome, but as Jung says, "the only way to overcome it is to endure it."³ Moreover, problems of relationship, like psychological and bodily symptoms, point beyond the merely human. Jung used to say that there were gods hidden in our diseases, our ills, our symptoms. To this let's add that gods and goddesses are hidden in our problems of relating to one another. As with symptoms, we must go in search of the divinities hidden in the pains and pleasures of relationship. But not simply to name them! To say, "Well! I'm caught in a Zeus-Hera interaction with this woman," is not enough. Such naming is a way of avoiding the gods, a way to be rid of them. What is at issue is a *seeking* after what the gods want of us in our relationships. What *they* want; not just what *we* want.

Mythology tells us that gods and goddesses always were involving themselves in the affairs of mortals. This is one of the deepest insights preserved for us in these old stories. We may have lost a living connection to the old stories, mythology may be dead to us, but the gods are alive and well in our relationships. Trying to see these gods at work in our everyday life is of tremendous value. It is in the day-to-day turmoil of relationship that our consciousness of the gods is most veiled, most hidden, most unreflected. And this is true of all relationships we are in, or out of, or going through.

By 'gods,' of course, I mean those potencies or numinosities having a peculiar and powerful pull on our psyche and soul and mediated within our experience by images, affects, behavior, and which reveal themselves in those inner figures we call anima, animus, wise-old-person, Self; or in those outer figures we call fathers, mothers, lovers, friends, enemies, and others. Gods come in many forms.

There are many gods and goddesses working their will and way in our experience of relationship. Here I wish to focus on one god in particular, a strange and mysterious aspect of divinity, that god of relationship called Eros. This god of love, this little Cupid, hides a great mystery. Of Eros, Jung wrote: "Love 'bears all things' and 'endures all things.' These words say all there is to be said; nothing can be added to them."⁴ Jung echoes an ancient wisdom: *love suffers all, all else is silence*. So, you see why Angerona should be with us. Reason and prudence dictate that I should stop with this simple but important lesson, let this wisdom speak, and let silence do the rest.

Yet, there is something in the nature of Eros that forces speaking, urges speech, even if one cannot find the "language which might adequately express the incalculable paradoxes of love."⁵ There is something about Eros that impels speaking, telling, relating. It is said of Eros that he "relaxes the limbs, and in the breasts of all gods and all men subdues their reason and prudent counsel."⁶ That I continue shows that my reason and prudent counsel are long since subdued and as I begin to explore this uncertain territory of Eros, silence too is subdued as I give voice to what this god has stirred in me.

The epithet of Eros as *limb-relaxer* is shared by other gods, most importantly by Hypnos, Lord of Sleep and Dreams, and Thanatos, Lord of the Dead, personification of Death. What is meant by this "limb-relaxing" effect of Eros, Hypnos, Thanatos? In death, of course, the limbs lose all tension. In sleep, particularly in dreaming sleep, the entire musculature is loose and limp. In love? Well, we know how the limbs can go all soft and unmanageable in the falls, faints and swoons of love.

The Greek word for this limb-relaxing means that the bodily muscles are set free of their restraints. In early Greek thinking this was a precondition enabling the soul to be set free from the constraints of the body. In

sleep, the soul is set free, has adventures, relationships, and experiences quite beyond the limited experience of the person in his waking life. We call the memory of these soul experiences, *dreams*. In death, man has always and everywhere imagined his soul set free of body and transported to, transfigured by, or transmuted in other realms. In love? Well, of course, there is the popular idea of "free love" which carries the image of love unbounded by constrictions, restrictions, or limitations of any kind. Eros' realm *is* boundless. Love recognizes no borders, no walls, no boundaries. Love cannot be imprisoned. That is why we love the most impossible things, why our love goes in ways which often make no sense to us. Most important for us is the image and fantasy of soul set free by love, in love, for love, through love.

Thus, hidden away in this epithet of Eros is the image of the soul set free in death, in dreams, in love. These "limb-relaxing," "soul-releasing" gods are connected with realms other than consciousness. Hypnos, Thanatos, Eros take us into the unconscious and bring unconsciousness to us. These realms and their lords are not of our making, our willing, our conscious doing. In love problems, the will is paralyzed, relaxed beyond use, and faced with impossible situations—not unlike the impossible tasks Aphrodite gives Psyche. Psyche gave herself up to those tasks, actively accepting her fate, not passively suffering it, before help arrived. One must face the utter loss of will before the will of other psychic beings is constellated.

There is a similarity between exercising will power and use of the so-called "voluntary" muscles. Voluntary muscles are those we can use willfully; they are under our conscious control. In fact, the word *voluntary* and the word *will* come from the same root: *vol*, meaning 'wish' or 'desire.' In fantasies of death, in the drama of dreams, and in conflicts of love our will is relaxed, paralyzed. We cannot do what we want, we lose control, we come face to face with being controlled by something beyond our doing. In death, dreams, and love, we are bent to the will of gods at work in those realms. In dreams we are tossed about, gripped, shaken, and put through impossible tasks and often face horrible and frightening things. In death, fantasy and myth tell us that our soul is pained and tortured before release. In love, in relationship, we find the same. Our soul is hurt, pained, driven crazy. We are exercised in all these ways so that our soul will know itself.

We do not make death. Death makes us. We do not make dreams, but as Jung discovered, dreams make us. In an important sense, we do not make love. Love makes us. We are the metal, the soul-stuff on the anvils of these "limb-relaxing," "soul-releasing" gods. Dreams, death and love are meant to teach us this perspective, a perspective of reversal in which subject and object shift ground. It is important how we see and relate to dreams, death and love; but important too, and critically so, is how dreams, death, and love see and relate to us. That is the perspective brought to us by Hypnos, Thanatos, and Eros.

The Greek word for 'soul' is *psyche*. That makes psychology a "logos" of the soul. If we restrict our understanding of logos to its meaning as logic, reason, and science, we miss a vital image embedded in this word. For in earlier time it meant 'word' and 'speech' and heard this way, psychology becomes speech of the soul, the soul speaking, telling, relating. Psyche as image and logos as speech go together to make psychology, to make "soul words."

The word *psyche* also means 'butterfly.' And like the butterfly, patterned, colorful, and wondrous images flit through the mind, difficult to fix, difficult to grasp, making soul difficult to study scientifically. Speech too is a winged creature. Words fly. A little bird told me. So psyche and word belong together. Psyche wishes to express itself not only in images but in words as well. And is it not in just those realms of Hypnos, Thanatos, and Eros that we are most concerned and affected by the logos of psyche, psyche's speech, the words and visions of psyche. The story of our soul is being told in those realms.

Often we are unaware of the psyche's activity in words. We are unconscious of the images hidden and buried in our words, in our language. Yet, in language we come close to one of the deepest archetypal dimensions of our being: *the transformation of psyche into words*. In the Gospel of John (i. 1 - 2), we hear "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (RSV). This means that the word was the living carrier, the living expression of the spirit. In the Greek text of this Gospel, "word" appears as *logos*. An old meaning of *logos* is 'the speech by which the inner thought is expressed.' Thus, behind and before the literal word is the thought as image. The archetype expresses itself in images and images express themselves in words, in logos. Jung declared: "What an archetypal content is always expressing is first and foremost a figure of speech."⁷ Language may be seen as an impressionable substance upon which the psyche works its images into words.

Just as psyche is hidden in the images of dreams, it is hidden as well in the images of words. Just as the ego may cut off its connection, its relationship to its unconscious sources and roots, it cuts off as well its relationship to the images imbedded in words. There is psyche in words and for this reason there is need of an eros relationship to words, to rescue the psyche that sleeps in words. *An Eros of words*. I belabor this point because words have fallen on bad times in psychology where touch, feel and display are in the ascendancy. I once had a dream in which I was asked: "Do you not know that words are eggs, that words carry life, that words give birth?" I didn't. In our present context this dream means to me that we are in need once again, as was known in the days of living myth, of finding psychic life in our words. Hesiod knew this when he said: "Speech is man's best treasure."⁸

Words come into our awareness and go out in speech without reflection. We are unaware of what we say. We do not know there is psyche

in our speech, that something of our psyche goes out to others when we talk. It is not accidental that Freud's observations of "slips of the tongue" and Jung's "word association" were central to the discovery of the depth of psyche. Nor was it accidental that psychoanalysis became a therapy with words. Psyche was carried and revealed in the word. Even before Freud and Jung, Herman Paul had this intuition. He wrote: "The old word meanings have an after effect, chiefly imperceptible, within the dark chamber of the unconscious of the soul."⁹

Jung was aware of this dark chamber and his writing is rich partly because he drew out of words the images locked in them. Jung had an eros relation with words and for this reason was able to extract the psychic substance, the imaginal essence, hidden in them. Some experience Jung's emphasis on etymology as pedantic and boring and skip over it. That is like leaving Psyche on the dark mountain, or in her Stygian sleep. For Jung, etymology carried great significance because it revealed to him the parentage, the lineage, the family tree of psyche. It became for him one of the ways to come closer to the truths of the objective psyche, the collective unconscious. This becomes even more meaningful when we realize that *etymos* means 'truth.' Thus, the logos of *etymos*, etymology, is 'truth speaking.'

We call Latin a dead language, no longer alive and therefore of no use to us. When we do not consciously understand something, we say, "It's Greek to me." What is dead and buried, what is unclear and not understood, is rather of immense psychological interest because these images point to something beyond consciousness. It is not unlike dreams. One of my favorite expressions comes from the great French philosopher Gaston Bachelard, when he says, "Truly, words dream."¹⁰ Another, when a poet reveals: "At the bottom of each word, I'm a spectator at my birth."¹¹

Alchemy was dead, forgotten relic of the past. But for Jung, alchemy came alive as a voice of the unconscious speaking to him. Alchemy was the soul seeing itself in the operations and ovens of the alchemical laboratory. As the alchemist peered into his vessel and fires, his imagination was fired with living images. These images spoke to the alchemists, and the alchemists spoke to them. They put all of this into words. The *oratorium* was as important as the *laboratorium*. The alchemists emphasized the necessity of relationship to their work and Eros and Chaos were prominent images in their experience.

What is the relationship of alchemy to our theme? Perhaps it would be to emphasize an *alchemy of relationship*. Why not relate to Chaos in relationship as the *massa confusa*, the primal substance, to be ordered and transformed, and from which the highest value, Eros as *lapis*, is to be born? Relationship might be envisioned through images of calcination, coagulation, sublimation, solution, dissolution, mortification and all the other operations belonging to relationship as an alchemical process. If we remember how tenuous and difficult was the alchemical art, we might gain

some needed perspective on relationship as a difficult art. Most importantly, alchemy was an *imaginal* art, and relationship too could become an imaginal art. This would be a new dimension to our relationships. Instead of always talking in circles about our relationships, our talks and places of relationship could become imaginal arenas if we could take relationship problems as alchemical substances to be worked on imaginally.

There is, as well, an alchemy of words. By peering into words, by letting the images there uncovered fire our imagination, letting our fantasy on the word's images free, we will learn something of psyche. This fantasy on word images is important I think because, as Jung said, "fantasy is not a sickness but a natural and vital activity which helps the seeds of psychic development to grow."¹² There are seeds of psychic life in words, as I was told in my dream.

There are many myths concerning the birth of Eros. Let us see this as a statement that Eros may be born in many ways, that he comes into being out of different and differing wombs. Late Greek myth speaks of Eros as son of the Goddess of Love, Aphrodite, and fathered by Ares, the deification of the spirit of War and Battle. Son, like father, would bring something of the spirit of war into the realm of love. From lovers' quarrels to the battle of the sexes, to the extreme hatred and cruelty that characterizes love at war, it is Ares' and Aphrodite's son, Eros, who brings these passions of conflict and conflicts of passion. The root of this may be found, I imagine, in the much emphasized fact that Eros is Aphrodite's son, her attendant, her servant. In this respect, Eros fits the mytheme of the son-lover and points to a background of mother-son incest. In the Eros-Psyche myth, Aphrodite works to keep Eros and Psyche apart. She is the spirit who would destroy Psyche and she imprisons her son to keep him by her side. For Eros to break out of this role of mother-servant, he must be hurt, injured, revealed and burned by Psyche, by soul, by a consciousness different from Aphrodite. It is Eros *burned* and *seen* that breaks away from Aphrodite's control. Eros shifts from mother-son incest to soul-relatedness to Psyche. Eros unharmed, Eros hidden from view, remains rooted in Aphrodite's realm, masculinity remains undeveloped and in service to the erotic mother. This quality characterizes those relationships where a man seeks a mother as a lover and serves her.

Myth tells that Eros is born also of *Penia*. *Penia* means 'need,' 'want,' 'hunger,' and 'poverty' and points to those relationships where need, want, and hunger for relatedness, affection, and attention govern. In such relationships, need for relationship is stronger than relationship itself, the relationship never fills the need, never satisfies the hunger, never fully answers the want. Such relationship is in continual poverty. One always seeks more; nothing is ever enough. Need often connects with the wrong thing, because we focus so much on filling the need that we don't let something come from the need itself. That is, in falling so quickly into satisfying

need, be it for food, sex, or relationship, we abort the birth of Eros from need. We abort that special "something" that would connect us to the deeper aim of need.

An early Orphic conception of Eros' birth tells that first of all was Nyx or dark night. Nyx was black-winged and she laid what is described as a "wind-egg." From this wind-egg, Eros was born. This "egg-nature" of Eros is shown in the following dream: *I see two cards. On one is a plus sign. On the other a minus sign. Laying above and connecting these two cards is a third card with the number 2. Off to the side is a hand holding an egg. There is some connection between the egg and the 2.* The plus and minus certainly carry the imagery of opposites. What bridges them is the number 2, which in this dream is connected with the egg. Taking the egg as a potential birthplace of Eros, we see, that then, it will be Eros who unites the opposites, Eros will bring together the plus and the minus. In this sense, the imagery of Eros in statuary and painting is relevant because often he unites the opposites of sexuality, appearing as androgynous, and the opposites of man and beast, appearing with animal head, feet, and with snakes wrapped about him. (It should be noted that this union of opposites is precisely the meaning of *symbol*. We could well imagine that symbol formation is an activity of Eros; the power that brings opposites together and binds images in *coniunctio*.)

There is another birth tale central to our theme. In Hesiod's ancient genealogy of the gods, Chaos came first into being. What is this fantasy of Chaos and how shall we regard it? The word's meaning ranges from 'the first state of the universe,' through 'infinite darkness and unformed matter,' to its most primitive meaning, 'any vast gulf or chasm.' Chaos is related to an older word which means to 'yawn or gape,' 'to open the mouth wide,' to 'speak with the mouth wide open,' to 'utter.' So, Chaos is a great, gaping chasm of dark unformed blackness and from this Eros was born. Approaching this imaginally, we might say it is from the mouth of Chaos that Eros is born, or better, *Eros comes into being as the first utterance of creation.*

The birth of Eros from Chaos is an important image. Frequently, our lives become Chaos, a relationship enters or re-enters the Chaos stage, our experience descends into darkness with nothing to hang onto, where all things become black and disconnected. Relationship frequently brings Chaos, or throws us into the gaping chasm of Chaos. About Chaos, Jung says: "One must not underestimate the devastating effect of getting lost in Chaos, even if we know that it is the *sine qua non* of any regeneration of spirit and personality."¹³ We can get lost and devastated in the Chaos of relationship. Yet, if myth be right, if myth carries an archetypal truth, then Chaos carries a seed, which, if nurtured and allowed time to come to birth, becomes Eros in us. Chaos is for the purpose of bringing in, giving birth to a new connection to life, to give birth to the very principle of

creative connection, to give birth to Eros. If Jung is correct, then Eros too is essential to any regeneration of the spirit and the personality.

If we abort this birth, if we flee from the tension of Chaos, this refreshed relation to life is denied us. Chaos must be borne; it is the burden, the unwanted thing. Chaos must be borne to give Eros birth. The mythology of Eros tells us that this god embodies the spirit of relatedness. In early Orphic stories, Eros is the oldest god, the very first god, because without the principle of connecting one element to another there could be no life, only disconnection between lifeless elements. Bringing elements into connection was the beginning of life. *Eros orders Chaos and brings life.* Eros is the connecting principle, not so much in the sense of going from place to place, realm to realm (as does Hermes), but in the sense of bringing together in union at any level realms that otherwise are apart, separate, disconnected, and unrelated.

Eros then is the god of relationship. To relate means to bring elements, particularly humans, into some form of connection. A moment's reflection reveals as well that relate means 'to tell.' So this word *relate* has a dual meaning referring both to the principle of connection as well as to the principle of telling. I think there is something important for us in this simple observation concerning the nature of Eros. I can put it very simply by saying that *Eros means telling.* Eros as telling follows from the image of Eros as the first utterance of creation. Eros as telling is not far from the early Greek imagination. Words were pictured as having wings which enabled them to fly from the speaker's mouth. There are pictorial representations of winged *Erotes* emerging from the mouth of a god or hero and flying to the waiting ear as destination—even images of butterflies flying from the mouth. Words carry from the interior our feelings, thoughts, emotions; all inner things that can be formed into words and put into flight, toward our own inner ear as well as the ears of those around us.

Let's follow this image of Eros as telling a bit further. Myth teaches us primarily through the vehicle of images captured in words. In earliest times, myth, saga, epic, tale, fairy story, and storytelling, as well as song, were all carried by the word, by the spoken and remembered word, and only much later by the written word. The point I wish to tell, a telling point so to speak, is that the word is also a realm of Eros. The word connects us to ourselves and to each other, to all inner and outer things. Do not forget that words too have relationship—masculine and feminine gender. Words carry masculine and feminine divinity. Masculine sky, feminine earth. There is myth in word. We should remember too that the word *myth* itself means 'anything delivered by word of mouth, that is spoken.' Myth is more frequently now taken to mean "false" than as something deeply true. Words, too, have suffered the same fate. We no longer trust what we say, what we hear. However, we can rescue words if we become what Bachelard describes as "word dreamers."¹⁴

One of the most common complaints in relationship centers on talking and telling: "We must talk about our relationship," "Why can't he talk to me?" "Why can't I tell her?" "Tell me you love me," "Say anything, but please talk to me, don't shut me out," "I just love the way you tell me," "I don't like the way you said that," "What do you mean by that?" "Why don't you say something?" Think back on your most recent conversation which centered on relationship. More than likely it centered on words and telling. Words pierce, get under the skin. Words penetrate as Eros' arrows penetrate. Why else do we say such awful and horrible things to one another? We wound one another very deeply in the things we say. To say we should not do this, not wound with words, would be to miss the point. The fact is that relationship compels it, it is an inevitable phenomenon of relationship. Nor is the answer in apologies or in saying one is sorry. The answer is in following the wounding barb, the hurting word, all the way to its core, to where it is aimed. "Love means not having to say you are sorry," has, after all, a deep truth. Better to follow those hurting words as arrows of connection than to avoid by saying sorry. That is part of the imaginal work of relationship we usually fail to do. Bachelard says: "What is the source of our first suffering? It lies in the fact that we hesitated to speak . . . it was born in the moment when we accumulated silent things within us."¹⁵

We know that Eros shoots arrows and when they strike, they go deep. Where Eros is, we experience the pain and suffering of his never failing aim. We are familiar with the myth of the wounded healer and how essential it is for the healer, be he physician, priest, or analyst to be wounded. We should never forget that Eros wounds, and in the Eros-Psyche myth, wounds even himself with his own arrow. It is not without some meaning that his name reversed means "sore." We are often sore in love, sore from the wounds of love. To love, as to heal, carries with it the necessity of wounding, wounding in relationship and the suffering of those wounds. The wounds of love and relationship must be suffered.

In Renaissance fantasy, not before, Eros is pictured as blinded or blind-folded. We say love is blind. But this does not mean that love is random, reckless, or rash. It simply means that Eros shoots with a vision beyond normal seeing, from a realm that sees more deeply, and sees to it that things are brought into connection, in relation, together, whether this be in the realms of death, or dreams, or love. For Eros' realm extends, as Jung says, from the "endless space of heavens to the dark abyss of hell."¹⁶ This means that the connections Eros brings will also bring something of the characteristics of boundless heavens and the pits of hell. Relationship brought by Eros will include the agonies of hell, the never ending pushing of the Sisyphean rock up the mountain, the never healing wounds, to the bliss and ecstasy of union with the divine. Moments and eternities of *each*. Unless the ego is willing to go through all this, to submit to the pain as well as the pleasure then true relationship will not be possible. The ego,

in trying to avoid pain by avoiding or aborting suffering of the burdens of relationship, will become empty, unrelated, always hungry, always unfilled, always in search, but never finding.

An Eros relationship means that one is able to tell the other person the *reality* of one's experience over its full range, and to tell it in a *personal* way. It is not telling mediated by collective images or values, nor the "shoulds" or "oughts" of parental or authoritarian injunction. It is the telling of personal things. It is telling the truth of one's thoughts, feelings, emotions, sensations, intuitions. It is keeping nothing back behind facades. It is not bargaining. "I'll tell if you'll tell," is not Eros. One tells all at great risk, one exposes one's true reality, reveals it to the other in all its horror and delight, the full range. No barriers, no walls, no hidden prisons for secrets. It is holding nothing back; it is nakedness to another. If one can do that in relationship, Eros will be there. We often hesitate to tell for fear we will hurt the other person, or that the other can't take it, or will take it wrong, or will run away. That is when we *wrongfully* wound another person; that is cruelty. We try to manage what we tell, to censor, to play games. *The most cruel thing is to withhold our reality from one another.* Telling our reality will hurt; it hurts us and it hurts the other. But such hurt is proper to relationship, it belongs. The cruelty of not telling each other our reality destroys the possibility of relationship and reduces human interaction to form and sham; it is a perversion of Psyche and a shutting out of Eros. When we can truly tell one another, when we can speak so deeply, Eros, as Jung says, becomes "not transference . . . no ordinary friendship or sympathy. It is more primitive, more primeval, and more spiritual than anything we can describe. . . . There is no distance, but immediate presence."¹⁷

We need *rituals* of telling. Certainly, psychotherapy and analysis are such rituals. Others are "women talking to women" and "men talking to men." Women can tell women in ways they cannot tell men and vice versa. These are vital telling rituals. But we need more than this. We need rituals of telling in all our relationships. What sort of rituals can we find in which we can tell and in which we will be heard and will hear the other tell? In most every relationship there is something not yet told. To that extent, there is a block, a barrier, a difficulty in the relationship. A psychic seed not allowed to grow. One meaning of going "deep" in relationship means to tell all, everything.

The primary ritual, of course, is telling oneself. Repression and forgetting are ways of not telling ourself our own reality. The ritual of reflection is one of telling, remembering, saying our reality to ourself. As we tell, other voices of the psyche begin to speak to us. Active imagination is psychic images speaking, telling, relating to us as well as our relating, telling, speaking to them. Active imagination works when there is real telling because Eros is in it.

There can, of course, be words without telling, without revealing—just as there can be telling without words. The body speaks a language in its actions, glances, looks, moves, gestures. One can "say it with flowers." But when words in truth do tell, they tell a truth. It is well to emphasize again that the word *mythos*, which gives birth to our word *myth*, means speech, in short, to tell. Not telling, is like not mything—telling is a way to mythmaking in our life—it is telling our myth. One's myth must be told. Not telling is poison and makes us sick. Telling our secrets, telling our reality is the medicine of relationship. *Secret* and *secrete* come from the same root. We must secrete our secrets, let them, force them out into relationship. Telling is often a secretion of what is secret.

When we speak, we reveal ourselves. If one lets the words out freely, without constraint, as in Freud's free association, one's dark background is at once revealed. This "freedom to tell" constellates the complexes of the psyche because they wish to speak and are drawn Eros-like into the vortex created by the telling. In Jung's word association, the complex speaks when one lets the first image come to mind and gives it voice in response to the stimulus word.

Complexes also speak in dreams. Complexes tell their tales, their stories, in our dreams. That is why the dream and drama are so close. The drama, as the dream, has an emotional and erotic connection because we see on the stage before us something of the psyche speaking and envisioning itself. In this sense, I believe we can regard the dream as an arrow of Eros. It comes to us, punctures and penetrates our consciousness. It is the unconscious trying to relate to the conscious world. It wants to tell; it wants to speak. It wants, seeks, desires. It wants relationship for itself, not just to be used and abused by the ego as a means to better relation to the world. When relationship with the unconscious is cut off, when the dream arrows of Eros are denied, then the un-lived relation with the unconscious will be lived in the outer world unconsciously and infecting there what it should not. How a person relates to his dreams, and how his dreams relate to him, form a picture of that person's relation to Eros.

Thinking of the dream as an arrow of Eros, puts the dream in the masculine realm. Indeed, Eros is most often pictured as a masculine god. From this point of view I find the following insight of Bachelard most compelling: "Roughly speaking—and I shall try to suggest this to the willing reader—the dream is masculine; reverie is feminine. Then by using the division of the psyche into animus and anima, as this division has been established by the psychology of the depths, we shall show that reverie is, as much in man as in woman, a manifestation of the anima. But first, through a reverie on the words themselves, we must prepare the intimate convictions which assure the permanence of femininity in every human psyche."¹⁸ At another point, he says: "When I was fortunate enough to have a dictionary, I would let myself be enchanted for hours on end by the feminine of words."¹⁹ That is, Bachelard discovered that reverie as

imagination is feminine. He finds relationship in the masculine and feminine gender of words and dreams on from them. We could put Bachelard's approach, his conception of Eros and Psyche in language, against the modern trend to de-sex, to emasculate and misogynate words and language. To me, that is putting Psyche to sleep and putting Eros behind bars to keep them from relating in the words we speak.

When Psyche and Eros are in darkness they are "in love" but "in the dark." That is, they are in unconscious love, unreflected love, love in paradise. The myth tells us that Psyche yearns to *see* her lover—something the god had forbidden. Eros must be seen by Psyche. What induced this yearning was the poisonous suspicion of Psyche's sisters. The sisters play a role analogous to the serpent in Eden. God had forbidden knowledge of good and evil, that is, consciousness. Eros had forbidden Psyche to see him, to become conscious of who he truly was. As the snake seduced Eve, so the sisters induce Psyche to question her lover: is he the monster who will devour her that is pictured by the sisters? With the first thrust of being in love we are indeed blind to everything else, everything becomes unconscious. But the sisters, those aspects of unfulfilled and un-lived life (for that is what those sisters were) in their raging jealousy plant suspicion and distrust and doubt in Psyche's blind love. Psyche must now see if it is true; she must find the truth in love. The masculine is concerned about the truth of things, of ideas, of the ways of the world. But the feminine is more concerned about the truth in love. So it is Psyche who brings the lamp to the god and in seeing him burns him. In wounding him, in becoming conscious of him, she loses him, and loses too her unconscious love. She is left with the truth of her love, but loses her lover. This is a frequent experience for a woman; when the man is revealed, he often flees, leaving the woman with the truth but without the man.

When we love in the dark we are unconscious of whom we are loving—perhaps even of who we are. That means there will be a wide field for our unconsciousness to operate. As we become conscious of our love and who we are loving we often experience shock and disappointment—even the loss of love. What we experience is the loss of being contained *in* love. At this moment we fall out of love, out of the container of unconscious love.

We frequently suspect our lover of "monstrous" things; do we not often play "monster" to one another in relationship—almost as if it is somehow essential to relationship? Is not all the phenomenology of love and relationship regarding suspicion, jealousy, unfulfilled and demanding need, clutch, and so on, just this—the essential stimulus for sending Psyche on her way, out of unconscious love, into her mission which is the peak of feminine development, the mission of conscious love?

In Psyche's marriage of death to Eros, the winged dragon, she attempted to stab her heart with a knife, she inflicted pain on Eros, and

she was ever close to death, her sleep of death. All these pains and hurts, thoughts and fantasy of murder, suicide and death, all these pains of love belong to it. We are truest to Psyche's mission when we accept their *belongingness*. If we try to avoid all this, try to escape, try to undo, we become disloyal to Psyche and the process leaves us cold, embittered, unloved, distrusting of love altogether. One must go into and through—all the way through—the suffering of relationship.

A woman is suspicious her lover is having an affair. She sneaks about in numerous ways trying to verify her feeling and intuition. She dreams of throwing grease on him and he bolts out of the house. At bottom, this is an Eros-Psyche dream. The suspicions serve to disturb the paradise of unconscious relationship. The *third* element like the sisters, the other woman, or other man, or mother-in-law, or job, or sex, or money, or children, or headache—all these things are the third thing, that third element that comes between, in the between-space, and inevitably so. It is the dynamic forcing depth. Otherwise the relationship remains essentially surface, superficial, lived only on the surface of life. The soul, Psyche, yearns for the depth of things, the bottom. If this "third thing" is only taken literally, just concretely, this will lead to destruction of the relationship. If seen through, these so-called "problems" of relationship become an initiatory experience into the mythology of conscious love. Unconscious love must undergo experiences of rejection, abandonment, hurt, pain, suffering, offering oneself up to fate, in order to forge a conscious love.

Who keeps Eros and Psyche in the dark? That is, who works to keep love unconscious? We must learn that unconscious love is truly most monstrous. Eros tries to keep the secret of his love for Psyche from his mother Aphrodite. This binds love in secret service to Aphrodite. Conscious love requires telling, it must be told; it cannot be kept secret. How often love must be undertaken in secret—from the secret communications between lovers to the secrecy of affairs. All of this is to keep something *apart* for that is the meaning of secret. The Eros-Psyche myth tells us that Eros is quite happy in his secret love; but Psyche brings something different. The secret will out. Something in Psyche yearns for conscious love, love in the open, unhidden, not kept from view. You can be sure that love hidden is unconscious love. But the secret will be revealed. Unconscious love from this perspective is a result of the mother-son incest between Eros and Aphrodite. Eros breaks away—disobeys his mother—but keeps it secret, and urges Psyche to keep it secret too. I would say from this that true love, genuine love, deep love, will be able to withstand anything that is told. I find that one of the most frequent problems of relationship can be traced to something not told, something kept secret. That keeps love unconscious. Then we are afraid to tell because we will lose love.

A woman dreams of a large fishbowl. These fish are copulating. As she looks more closely she sees the fish are not fish at all but herself and

her secret lover with whom she is having an affair. People begin to gather around. She attempts to keep them from seeing the fish. The woman was being torn apart by the burden of her secret affair but she refused to tell her husband about it. But the psyche pushes for revelation. To be "found out" is quite different from telling. The Eros connections we find ourselves in—often without our control—must be revealed.

Being able to tell, to risk telling, without knowing its effect is a true test of connection and commitment in relationship. Because *connection* and *commitment* are such important words in the language of relationship, let's look at their hidden images.

Connection derives from two roots: *Com*, meaning 'together' and *necto*, meaning 'to bind.' Thus, connection means 'to bind together.' The root which gives rise to *necto* is *nec* which also yields *nexus*, meaning 'a tying up,' 'binding together,' 'fastening,' 'joining,' 'interlacing,' 'entwining,' 'clasping together'; and *necessus*, meaning 'unavoidable,' 'inevitable,' 'necessary,' 'fate,' 'destiny,' 'necessity,' 'need.' A whole nest of relationship images is here revealed. Eros, as the principle of connection, is that which *binds together*. More deeply, connection refers to both the necessity of such binding, and the binding of necessity, fate, and destiny. Jung stressed how important it was to affirm one's destiny and how necessary it was to be conscious and to accept the binding to things that fate brings us. Sophocles put it most dramatically: "Ye must bear what heaven bears to you."²⁰ That is Eros at work, binding us to our fate.

Such affirmation requires *commitment*. We use the word *commit* in peculiar ways. We speak of 'committing' a crime. We speak of 'committing' someone to a mental hospital. And we speak of wanting a 'commitment' in relationship. The Latin word *committere* is a very interesting word. It of course means 'to bring together,' 'into union,' 'in combination,' 'to connect.' But it also means 'to bring together in fight,' 'to carry on a fight.' The root word, *mitto*, means 'to send away,' 'to cause to let go,' 'to release,' 'dispatch,' 'dismiss,' 'send off,' 'cast off.' Now, my fantasy about this paradoxical word goes something like this. A genuine commitment to one another in relationship requires 'letting go' of one another. Relationship becomes a shackle when we attempt to bind another person to us. Relationship is possible only when I bind myself to another while letting the other go; thus, to let go, let loose, release. Then I am committed, bound, tied to the relationship. I allow the other freedom from my binding grip while I bind myself to the relationship. What is the effect of such conscious binding? First of all, it is not dependency. Dependency is motivated by unfulfilled, unconscious needs. Nor is it done to balance or for accounting approaches to relationship, e. g., "I'll bind myself to the relationship if you will." No. One must let go of the other; the other must be free of our grip.

Now all of this imagery of ties and binding, connection and commitment, can be enacted on many levels. We could view the so-called sado-masochistic rituals of tying and binding as a literalization and concretization of these facts of relationship—brought out by tying real skin with real rope instead of working on the psychic substance in need of binding. We speak of the "ties of matrimony," the "bonds of marriage," even in another context, "tied to mother's apron strings." I think where many of us make a mistake in relationship is to focus on tying the other person down and not to focus sufficiently on our own voluntary binding, tying to the other. All manner of human cruelty can be worked in relation to the chains of relationship when we attempt to bind another to us. Then we are doing what is only for Eros to do. Eros is the binder of others to us; we are not. If the ego will allow itself to be bound, to bind itself, to relationship while letting the other loose from all bonds, then relationship will find its true form.

We are, of course, fearful of "letting go" of the other because he will leave us. Yet, it is easier to flee when one is trying to tie you down, easier to struggle against, easier to justify the leaving. It is more difficult to flee if one experiences the other person who is tied to the values of the relationship as carrying and extending freedom at the same time. This will often strike a deeper cord in the partner and will often call forth something of his own deeper nature.

This is not to argue that all relationships can be worked to such depth, whether we speak of friendships, love relationships, casual affairs, or genuine marriage. Going deep in relationship requires connection and commitment to one person—not a succession of persons. Breadth alone is not depth. Nor is time together a measure of depth. Duration alone is not depth. And going deep does not mean identification with archetypal figures or processes. Being carried away is not depth. Avoiding relationship and relating only to the inner world is no solution. Separation from life is not depth.

Near the end of his long and devoted explorations of the mysteries and depths of the psyche, Jung came at last to reflect upon the mystery of love. He begins the last of his "late thoughts" in his autobiography this way: "At this point the fact forces itself on my attention that beside the field of reflection there is another equally broad if not broader area in which rational modes of presentation find scarcely anything they are able to grasp. This is the realm of Eros."²¹

Jung marks out two realms: a realm belonging to ungraspable Eros and reflection's realm. What does Jung mean by a realm of reflection? Curiously, the most direct answer is found in a footnote in his deeply moving paper, "A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity." It says: "Reflection should be understood not simply as an act of thought,

but rather as an attitude. It is a privilege born of human freedom in contradistinction to the compulsion of natural law. As the word itself testifies ("reflection" means literally a "bending back"), reflection is a spiritual act that runs counter to the natural process; an act whereby we stop, call something to mind, form a picture, and take up a relation to and come to terms with what we have seen. It should be understood as an act of *becoming conscious*.²²

Two realms then: consciousness and love, reflection and Eros. Jung wrote little on love and Eros in comparison with his work on consciousness and reflection. By his own account, it was the spirit Hermes who animated and guided his work and life, the spirit which is the communicating principle between upper and lower, of consciousness and unconsciousness, the guide of souls to the underworld. Jung went underneath, underground, down, deep. He explored not just the bottom, but the "double bottom" of everything in his experience. Consciousness, for Jung, was the death of unconsciousness, the bringing of darkness into light, the depths to the surface, the surface to the depths, reflecting to God, God's own shadow. Jung would agree with Kazantzakis: "It is not God who will save us—it is we who will save God."²³ That was the purpose of consciousness, the reason for going against nature. For Jung, death meant depth. Death was born in Paradise when Eve ate the fruit of consciousness, the fruit of knowledge, the gnosis of good and evil. Consciousness too was born in Paradise. But consciousness is not love, not Eros. Eros was born in Chaos.

In his late thoughts, Freud also spoke of two realms: Eros and Thanatos, love and death, the principle of life and the principle of destruction. Though Freud agreed with Schopenhauer that "death is the goal of life,"²⁴ and with Novalis, that "life is for the sake of death,"²⁵ Freud spent little time on Thanatos, certainly much less than Jung's consideration of death. Freud spent most of his time and energies exploring the realm of Eros as the life principle particularly in its sexual aspect and appearances.

Viewing their work metaphorically, we may put it this way: Eros guided Freud in his entry to the unconscious, while Hermes was Jung's guide to these depths. Different gods as guides make a difference. Within this perspective we might understand the archetypal background of the common and mutual criticism of Freudians and Jungians. Jung neglects love and life and reality—so say the Freudians; Freud neglects depth and spirit and cosmos—so say the Jungians. If we see this as an inevitable constellation of opposites belonging to one another, we come to the conclusion that we must always speak of both love and depth, love and death, always *liebestod*. Love goes deep, love brings death. A poet says: "The beginning of the way of love proceeds from death, because whoever lives for love, first dies to everything else."²⁶ Plato, and the Neoplatonic tradition reborn in the Renaissance, argued passionately, even erotically, that love was the

key to understanding the meaning and purpose of death. A Renaissance painting by Lorenzo Lotto pictures Cupid crowning Death painted as a skull. Figures of Eros cover Renaissance sarcophagi and tombs. In Orphic mysticism, both in its antique form and in its periodic reflowerings, love is equated with death. This is the meaning of Sappho's favorite word—*bittersweet*.

Not infrequently do we hear such phrases as: "I'll die if he leaves me," "This relationship is killing me," "I can't stand the pain, I'll kill myself," "She threatened to kill me." This connection between love and death, of the soul's relation to Eros and to Thanatos is a theme clearly pictured in the Eros-Psyche myth. Eros rescues Psyche from the sleep of death, Persephone's sleep.

Our English word love comes from the Latin words *lubere* and *libere*, which have the literal meaning, 'to please.' From this also derive such words as *libido* meaning 'desire,' 'passion,' 'lust'; *libere* meaning 'free,' 'unrestrained,' 'unshackled'; *libertas* meaning 'freedom,' 'liberty.' *Liber* is also the Latin name for Father Liber, the wine god, with connections to Bacchus and Dionysus. *Libera* is the Latin goddess, whose name in Greek is Persephone, the Queen of the Underworld. There is also *Liber-tina*, the Latin goddess of corpses. We meet here again the connection between love and images of death, coming of course from the underlying idea that the soul is liberated, set free in death. There is also the important word *liberation* about which we have heard so much in recent times. It was over the concept of libido as psychic energy that Jung and Freud broke their relationship. Freud wanted to imprison love in just its sexual form, while Jung wanted libido to range over much greater territory. It was in their discussions of death that Freud was most shaken. It would be interesting to look at their relationship in terms of the archetypal connections between love and death.

Let's see where the rest of Jung's late thoughts about Eros' realm took him: "In classical times, when such things were properly understood, Eros was considered a God whose divinity transcended our human limits, and who therefore could neither be comprehended nor represented in any way. I might, as many others before me have attempted to do, venture an approach to this daimon, whose range of activity extends from endless space of the heavens to the dark abysses of hell; but I falter before the task of finding the language which might adequately express the incalculable paradoxes of love."²⁷

It was not often that Jung faltered in finding a language to express the deepest paradoxes of the human soul. He indicated that love is the vehicle of paradox, not the mind.²⁸ But before this altar of love, which he once described as a "monster of a mountain,"²⁹ he was left speechless. Now being speechless before the god of love is not an uncommon experience. Love can take our breath away and speech with it. Isn't this why we

don't know what love is, or why we cannot say what it is, or whether it's real or not. We can never quite grasp it, never quite get a hand or handle on it. It always slips through. There are no words for love; yet, this very speechlessness compels speaking. We write love songs, whisper sweet nothings, tell our love of our love, tell it in passionate speech and soaring sonnets of love, or just in grunts and groans. And, we have just seen the importance of words and telling to Eros. The word is important to love, yet "no language is adequate to the task." Whatever one says, no words express the whole. We cannot grasp it precisely because *it grasps us*. We cannot understand Eros precisely because *Eros does not stand under anything at all*. Eros shoots *through* everything and will not be brought under any one head, under any one principle of understanding, and least of all under the principle of reflection. Reflection is seeing oneself in the mirror, seeing our reversal, our other side, perhaps who we more fully are. But Eros shoots through the mirror, into and through it, just as Alice did when she went through the looking glass. That was Eros' work. And it brought her into an imaginal relation with her psyche.

Before coming to the end of Jung's late thought on Eros, his ultimate conclusion, it is important to know his earlier views. In Jung's early formulations Eros was equated with the feminine principle in contrast to the masculine principle of Logos. He says, "It is probably Logos and Eros, impersonal and personal, which are most fundamental differences between man and woman."³⁰ This places Eros in the female realm, which is doubly emphasized by Jung's statement: "The 'anima' of a woman might suitably be designated 'Eros.'"³¹ Let your imagination play with that!

Jung relates Eros to the attitude types in the following way: "With an introvert—on account of his inferior Eros—it weighs more and seems to be more important. But the extravert should teach him to look a bit more away from it."³² And again, "If . . . the function of relationship (Eros) is not sufficiently attended to . . . something that needs to be put outside oneself is left inside."³³ Here Jung pictures Eros as a principle that leads us to bring to the outside, that is to others, what is inside. It is an extraversion of libido that connects us to things in the world. It is a picture of what I earlier meant when I said that Eros means telling.

Then Jung says to the introverted type: "Don't rely too much on your inferior Eros, and keep even smarting relations. You learn a lot from them."³⁴ Jung here counsels us to keep relationships even when they hurt because we learn from them. What Jung means by learn is "consciousness." Thus, keep painful relationships alive for the sake of consciousness. Eros in service of reflection. Because of the preponderance of introverts among Jungians, we can take his words as a cue to reflect on our relative lack of Eros, our difficulty with bringing to the outside those things that are inside, the effects of our inferior Eros not only among ourselves but in our relationship to the world.

Some feel that Jung equates Eros with feeling. They are mistaken. Feeling is the expression of values and as such has no more claim to the principle of connection and relationship than any other conscious function. Certainly it is possible to *think* with Eros, to *feel* with Eros, to *sense* with Eros, even to *intuit* with Eros. Eros plays through all these functions. Eros connects thoughts together in ways logic cannot; Eros brings feeling together in ways that feeling alone cannot engender; Eros brings sensation together in a way that sensation cannot; Eros brings intuitions into connection in ways not otherwise possible. Moreover, Eros connects all the functions together. A person has Eros when he is connected, when he is together, and when he has the effect of connecting us to ourselves. This is quite beyond mere feeling. Jung says on this point:

Love is a feeling, yet the principle of Eros is not necessarily loving, it can be hating too. Eros is the principle of relationship, and that is surely the main element in woman's psychology, as Logos is the main element in man's psychology. But the Logos naturally is in relation to feeling as well as to thinking, one can have sensation and intuition more under the influence of Logos or more under the influence of Eros. The functions are interrelated as well as permeated by the two basic principles. . . . [The feeling function] has nothing to do with loving. A feeling type can be as cold as ice if there is not Eros. He can maintain a feeling of hatred through death and the devil, he can die with hatred all over him, or he may have a feeling of indifference and hold out against anything. . . . There are women who are feeling types, who are entirely cold and without sex. The feeling type is never particularly warm, because the differentiated function is often lacking in human qualities. You must never mix up feeling with love. That is due to a miserable shortcoming of language. . . . The feeling function has to do with the feeling of values, and that has nothing necessarily to do with love. Love is relatedness. One can feel without having relationship. When admiring a beautiful woman, one does not necessarily have a relationship with her or love her. Love has to do with Eros. If love had only to do with feeling, a thinking type couldn't love. We have to use these intuitive concepts but there are two principles which are beyond the functions. . . . Perhaps we could leave it for the time being with the statement that the functions are vehicles for the forces, or influences, or activities, which emanate from those two principles, these two gods, Logos and Eros. . . . Don't mix up the word feeling with love as relationship.³⁵

What is the relation of Eros to anima and animus? Jung says: "The symbolic form of love (animus-anima) shrinks from nothing, least of all from sexual union. There is a "real" partner only if you make him real. Reality is an anthropomorphism."³⁶ This is an important statement and requires some thought. What Jung is saying is that anima-animus relationships are a symbolic form of love concretized and literalized in reality. What should be carried *symbolically* is carried on in outer reality. Therefore he says that reality is an anthropomorphism of the symbolic relationship. This is a reversal of the usual notion that the symbolic is an anthropomorphism of reality. Instead of seeing the inner woman as goddess, we see the goddess in an outer woman. Instead of seeing the inner man as a god, we see a god in an outer man. The anima-animus divinities

then relate in an outer reality almost always to the detriment of the real people involved.

How do we know when a relationship is anima-animus? Can we avoid its literalization, its anthropomorphism? Should we avoid relationship because of the possibility of concretizing an anima-animus symbolic love? I do not think it can be avoided. Whether with one other person, or a succession of persons, relationship will continually involve us in anima-animus constellations. It is a recurring task, part of the "againness" of relationship, to separate what is man-woman from what is anima-animus in relationship. Part of what is meant by going *through* a relationship is going into and through the anima-animus invasions. Going through requires developing a relationship to the inner process—not just living and suffering its consequences in outer form. If one begins to take up a deep relationship with the inner realm, with its endless diversity and possibility, this will have a major impact on one's outer relationships. As we individually take up a relationship to the unconscious, unconsciousness no longer becomes the basis for our relationship to others. Taking up a relationship with the unconscious in a real way creates something like a magnetic field attracting to oneself something quite different than what one actively sought before. One might say: to the extent to which we seek relationship to the inner world, so we will also find it in the outer world. For, as Jung said, "individuation does not shut one out from the world, but gathers the world to oneself."³⁷

This "making real" out of what needs to be taken as an *inner* reality and a call for *inner* relationship means that we find life and erotic connection only in the outer realm. This leaves the inner realm impoverished, abandoned in pursuit of literal reality. To fall victim to the literalization, the concretization, the anthropomorphism of symbolic reality, not only degrades the reality of psyche and soul, but brings into the human realm of relationship a symbolic reality, a cosmogonic spirit that cannot be carried. Gods and goddesses, then, get mixed up in our human relationships and human affairs. Human relation becomes infected and infested with something not human.

James Hillman has taken Jung's insight and described it more forcefully. He says:

Others carry our souls and become our soul figures, to the final consequence that without these idols we fall into the despair of loneliness and turn to suicide. By our use of them to keep ourselves alive, other persons begin to assume the place of fetishes and totems, becoming keepers of our lives. Through this worship of the personal, personal relationships have become the place where the divine is to be found. . . . Of course these archetypally loaded relationships break down, of course they require constant propitiatory attention, of course we must turn to priests of this cult (therapists and counselors) for instruction concerning the right ritual for relation to persons. For persons are no longer just human beings; they have been dehumanized by being divinized. Our weekends of encounter, our group sessions and sensitivity workshops are religious

phenomena: they attest to where the divine persons now reside—in human beings. . . . We spoil our actual friendships, marriages, loves, and families by looking to people for redemption. We seek salvation in personal encounters, personal relations, personal solutions. Human persons are the contemporary shrines and statues where personifying is lodged. The neighbor's nod is the numen. Our cult worships or propitiates actual people—the family, the beloved, the circle of encounters—while ignoring the persons of the psyche who compose the soul and upon whom the soul depends. . . . The last stage of this process is shrinking soul to its single and narrowest space, the ego, and thereby swelling this "I" into the inflation called "ego psychology." For ego psychology is what our souls today are left with; whether body-ego, feeling-ego, or individuating-ego, psychology is engaged in ego-making and not soul-making.³⁸

The point is not to abandon either inner or outer realms. If the inner realm is abandoned then the gods via archetypal projection and complexes will be at work in the outer realm where a relationship, if it is to work, must be carried on the human level. In contrast, if the human level of outer relationship is abandoned, if everything is reduced to symbolic reality, then one is left only with the gods, without human connection, without relationship to ground one in reality. So, as is always true of the nature of the psyche, something of both must be allowed, both realms must be given place, and we must find our place in each realm. Our personal and ethical responsibility toward one another in relationship is to carry our own individual relationship to the archetypal reality, to the Self, to the gods. If we can do that, then we will not have to burden others and ask or force them to play gods for us. We can stop being gods and goddesses to one another. Perhaps we can become just human.

Even in those in-and-out-of relationships that can be so very exciting, so very intense, transporting—those relationships that carry one away—these too carry the ground of projection. In such cases it is not uncommon to be relating to an archetype, even finding oneself relating in an archetypal way. What follows is that the relationship enacts itself in an archetypal pattern in such a way as to crush the participants. That is why we hear such imagery as, "I was crushed by it," "He mangled me," "It killed me."

I quoted Hillman at length to illustrate an essential point, an essential insight that we need to hear and heed. In our modern relationships we are asking our mates, our lovers, our friends, even our enemies to carry too much of what properly belongs as relationship to the divine. This has the effect of humanizing the gods and de-humanizing ourselves. This reversal is the ultimate hubris. It is the root source of our modern problems and difficulties in relationship.

In ancient Greece, in a place called Pyraea, there was an annual festival. In a sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, the women would separate themselves from their men and enter a bridal chamber deep within the sanctuary. What was performed there was a marriage ceremony. Each

woman was married in a sacred service to the god Dionysus. Then men left their women alone and, in fact, had ceremonies of their own about which little is known. This type of sacred marriage to a god was widespread and was a central tenet of Orphic practice. I wonder if we would not profit from some version of such ceremonies today?

Jung's final insight on the nature of Eros is this: "Eros is a *kosmogonos*, a creator and father-mother of all higher consciousness."³⁹ For Jung, "lower" consciousness was consciousness of ego, of one's personal unconscious, and one's unconsciousness in relation to others. It was consciousness of oneself as limited, as shadow, as person in relation to other persons. For Jung, "higher" consciousness always meant relationship to what is beyond one's personal psychology. Higher consciousness meant a relationship to the collective unconscious, to the archetypal realm, to the Self, to the gods; where the ego would function to reflect the Self into the world, to realize the Self, as one might take a mirror and reflect the sun's light into the darkness. Ego as instrument to the gods. Jung here tells us that it is Eros who produces this connection, Eros is the father-mother, the creator of that connection, the bringer of higher consciousness.

In this late thought of Jung, we see Eros desexed, freed from the feminine realm where he had held it for so long, broadened into an androgynous principle of creativity, the principle that seeds higher consciousness and brings it to birth, brings it as a possibility to each one of us, male and female. In practice what this means is that individuation cannot be produced or induced or carried by reflection alone, by consciousness alone. Individuation requires Eros too.

And now a final word. Kazantzakis speaks these thoughts in his book, *The Saviors of the Gods*:

The ultimate stage of our spiritual exercise is called Silence. Not because its contents are the ultimate inexpressible despair or the ultimate inexpressible joy and hope. Nor because it is the ultimate knowledge which does not condescend to speak, or the ultimate ignorance which cannot.

Silence means: Every person, after completing his service in all labors, reaches finally the highest summit of endeavor, beyond every labor, where he no longer struggles or shouts, where he ripens fully in silence, indestructibly, eternally with the entire Universe.

There he merges with the Abyss and nestles within it like a seed of man in the womb of woman. The abyss is now his wife, he plows her and devours her vitals, he transmutes her blood, he laughs and weeps, he ascends and descends with her, and he never leaves her.⁴⁰

From empty Abyss to Abyss with seed. From Chaos to Eros. And, now, Angerona, it's your turn.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 Hesiod, *Theogony*, ll. 115-22.
- 2 Throughout this paper, linguistic material is taken from the following sources: Charlton T. Lewis, *A Latin Dictionary for Schools* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1889); George Liddell and Robert Scott, *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1889/1972); *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (Springfield: G. & C. Meriam Co., 1971); *The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).
- 3 In a conversation with Walther Uhsadel, Jung remarked: "But suffering has to be overcome, and the only way to overcome it is to endure it. We learn that only from him." And here he pointed to the Crucified." *C. G. Jung Letters* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), I, 236.
- 4 C. G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (New York: Vintage Books, 1963), p. 354.
- 5 *Ibid.*, p. 353.
- 6 Hesiod, *Theogony*, ll. 120-22.
- 7 Jung, "The Psychology of the Child," C. G. Jung and C. Kerényi, *Essays on a Science of Mythology* (New York: Pantheon, 1949), p. 105.
- 8 Hesiod, *Theogony*, ll. 90-95.
- 9 Hermann Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachwissenschaft* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1880), cited by Theodore Thass-Theinemann, *The Interpretation of Language* (New York: Aronson, 1968/1973), I, 81-82.
- 10 Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Reverie* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), p. 18.
- 11 Alain Bosquet, "Premier Poem," cited by Bachelard. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
- 12 C. G. Jung, *The Symbolic Life*, CW 18, par. 1249.
- 13 C. G. Jung, *Psychology and Alchemy*, CW 12, par. 96.
- 14 Bachelard, *The Poetics of Reverie*, p. 36.
- 15 *Ibid.*
- 16 Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, p. 353.
- 17 Jung, *Letters*, I, 298.
- 18 Bachelard, *The Poetics of Reverie*, pp. 29-30.
- 19 *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.
- 20 *Greek-English Lexicon*, "connection," p. 858.
- 21 Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, p. 353.
- 22 C. G. Jung, *Psychology and Religion: West and East*, CW 11, par. 235, n. 9.
- 23 Nikos Kazantzakis, *The Saviors of God* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960), p. 106.
- 24 Henri F. Ellengerger, *The Discovery of the Unconscious* (New York: Basic Books, 1970), p. 513.
- 25 *Ibid.*, P. 514.
- 26 Lorenzo de'Medici commenting on his love sonnets, cited by Edgar Wind, *Pagan Mysteries* (New York: Norton, 1958/1968), p. 157.
- 27 Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, p. 353.
- 28 Jung, *Letters*, I, 298.
- 29 *Ibid.*, 38.
- 30 *Ibid.*, 48.
- 31 *Ibid.*, 69.
- 32 *Ibid.*, 337.

33 Ibid., 274.

34 Ibid., 337.

35 C. G. Jung, *Dream Analysis* (Zurich: C. G. Jung Institute, 1958), II, 293-96. It is to be noted that this passage from *Dream Analysis* does not represent Jung's exact words; rather, it is printed from stenographic notes taken by a participant of the seminar.

36 Jung, *Letters*, I, 213-14.

37 C. G. Jung, *Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, CW 8, par. 432.

38 James Hillman, *Re-visioning Psychology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975), pp. 47-48.

39 Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, p. 353.

40 Kazantzakis, *The Saviors of God*, p. 129.