

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

On the Theoretical Intuition of Jungian Archetypes and its Logical Extensions

Isaac Penzance *

Posted Date: 24 July 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints2024071869.v1

Keywords: psychic symbolism; archetypes; psychology; intuition; personality



Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Article

On the Theoretical Intuition of Jungian Archetypes and Its Logical Extensions

Isaac Penzance

Independent Researcher; penzanceisaac@gmail.com

Abstract: This article considers the status of psychoanalytical archetypes as attitudinal bodies. It possesses the initiative to consider the prerogative that they are situated on, and to develop that into discussing the conditions for an archetype-like body that is derived from Jungian pretenses. As this article operates within the boundaries of the conjecture, it serves instead to cover the potentiality for developments outside of the simple basis of the archetype, which therefore means that it covers a form of guidance instead of specific results. Unlike Jung's study, which serves in a multitude of sections and draws upon evidential factors of, however generally expressed, ancient civilisations, this article seeks to apply that logic to the purpose of explicating the meaning and potential extensions of the "archetypal dogma".

Keywords: psychic symbolism; archetypes; psychology; intuition; personality

1. Introduction

Of all proclivities that have been present in psychoanalysis thus far, what has received little attention is the attitude for the construction of archetypes [1] and the parochial state that they have been conceived in. The study has been dominated by a normative exercise that conceives some semblance of a *natural* social proclivity towards these archetypes. The issue present with respect to a limited number of archetypes is that, while they are suggestive of a world (or environment) that they are causal from, they do not suffice for a description of their own, whole, theoretical character. This therefore creates the first prerogative of this text: that the *theoretical character* in which archetypes are manifested is not limited exclusively to the world that they are initiated into.

Jung details the archetypes as related to the psychic symbolism (manifest in the collective unconsciousness) – to suggest that the world that they are placed in provides a very clear set of "archetypal dogmas". It is assumed that the contingency placed on the *world* from which they are derived allows for a different manifestation of "archetypal dogmas" to become apparent – and that therefore the *archetype* itself is not absolute, and instead focus must be paid for a separate intuition. That *intuition* extends beyond the scope of this article, but this helps to form the basis for what the *pure* personality does intend to be and why it must be so – for the archetypal dogma is established by a qualitative world akin, in nature, to *our own* which is able to pertain to different experiences according to whom it should be rendered for; with a single set of psychic existence comes a plurality of theoretical manifestations of those *psychic existences*.

Still, this normative exercise is not believed to yield a false or incorrect set of archetypes – those falsities (whereby the archetypes should fail to describe minds divergent from themselves) cannot exist in a set of archetypes so long as they are conceived correctly. The mistake that is made by the idea of the archetypes is the disparity between how they do restrict deviation within their own form, and that they are limited by the subconscious prerogative that controls them.

As an office of interpretation for the nature of the archetypes, the *pure* personality – one that is defined as, like the archetypes, to mark itself as distinct from, as our current assumption stands, the monadic idea of the psyche, yet functions in the context of a different environment that is divergent from where the current archetypes are manifest from. Importantly, the necessity for divergent archetypes is two-fold: that mental processes cannot be limited to traditionalist statures, therefore

that this “divergence” is a necessary quality, and that any such divergence which is to be used must be absolute rather than within the bounds of negligible changes.

As it will be re-stated further, the allocation of the “pure” distinction as the divergent archetype is no accident, for all other ordinations of the most carnal objects of the mind: emotion, is still qualitatively equivalent if it cannot be produced in its own singular (“pure”) manner, although other modes of deriving “impossible” constructions have not been explored, they are not denied.

This article has been composed with an explanation of the Intuition in Section 1.2 and a further consideration.

Normative Attitudes towards Archetypes

In forming our current set of psychological archetypes (of which, while it is believed that all are constructed of the same quality by this idea of *normative attitudes*, there exist a great multitude of like archetypal dogmas) [2] which is Jung’s original sixteen, it is assumed that their presence as a result of our *archetypal dogma* is made through the collective unconsciousness, and can be explicated into the *deeper consciousness* [3]. It has been observed previously that the entire collective consciousness is the *world* in which the psyche should be exposed to – effectively one among the many which are available.

As a conclusion to this section, the aforementioned *pure* state (although yet introduced with the intention to explicate), has been used for the particular purpose of discussing a case whereby the difference

2. On the Pure State

The *pure state* is manifested, for the sake of its argument, in a *pure* environment that is divergent from the same, universal social state that the traditionally Jungian archetypes are predicated upon. To the objects of *our own* environments – minds of people – the *pure* environment is entirely a theoretical body, but its perception can be suggested. Its existence makes it a contingency upon constructing the pure mind.

The *pure state* is therefore reliant on its *pure* environment for its realisation, but that, like the Jungian archetypes, its characteristics are not a simulacrum of the environment (in the form of the collective subconsciousness, for that necessitates still its environment) it is founded upon. The following explanation explicitly covers the *emotion* in which the environment is manifested from – in a vacuum bounded only by the psychical symbolism, respect paid towards emotion should appear to be unnecessary, but, with relevance paid to the symbolism discussed by Jung (most particularly, as is considered in §27, §37 [4], the latter of which induces suggestive elements of water as representative of the unconsciousness), it becomes *foundational* to establishing the symbols and that an altered character of the emotion will therefore alter the presentation of the symbols. However, importantly, one must note that the emotional change itself is exclusively considered instead of the prerogative of the psychic symbolism.

The *pure* environment is defined as such: emotions, which do contribute most specifically to psychic, and of which to our understanding can be maximised or minimised, are taken as void with respect to their scalar quantity. For an example, if we should take *anger* as one such emotion, it is observed that it can be quantitatively altered as it conforms to the archetypes that it exists in or it can act void of any such archetype and be a simple, expressive anger. Importantly, we assume the emotion to be directly invoked by the environment such that its qualitative understanding can be flexible and changing as such. The qualitative change in any emotion when it is present in a *pure environment*, although *anger* is used for its tangibility, is entirely transcendental, and, for the sake of a descriptive argument (although this understanding will not be explicated), it is enacted to the quality of being *formless* (whereby it is without a properly connective reciprocals like other minds) and akin to such examples as mathematical singularities.

In this respect, and if a conjecture should be made on an already highly conjectural approach, the *pure* personality is suggestive of a hierarchy that the Jungian archetypes are not acceded to – that the status of the Monarch, with respect to morality and otherwise, is absolutist about the subjects [5].

One can suggest further that a determined change in the archetypal dogma is reflective of a hierarchical existence and the relative unknown of an entirely different course of life with an equally different environment.

Therefore, we do understand that for the manner of the qualitative production of an emotion (explicitly, where it should not be causal to a change in the emotion itself), it firstly cannot be comparable to the quantitative scale, and it must also cover all divergent emotions, not exclusively the utilised "anger".

Results: on the pure state and the archetypes

In this specific archetypal dogma, a direct comparison is made between the archetypes and this such *pure* state. The first is the apparent disjunction between the environments (both Pure and otherwise) – that neither can exist in the other. With the collective (although it is understood that an implicit, strictly individual basis of the collective is being used) subconsciousness, it is now altered by its distinct feelings, for it does not operate on a plane of higher, apprehensive qualities.

As demonstrating instances of *another archetype*, the pure state fails conceptually because we lack the intuition to define its individual archetypes in an equal manner to the current observation. Therefore, the entire frame of both the traditional manifestation and the pure environment are required to be considered as single entities for consequential distinctions to be present. There exists no continuity between the pure and traditional states, however, the potentiality (although unexplored in this article) is present for other manifestations of divergent states. This is causal to the pure personality (a term used with respect to the archetypal dogma yielding a plurality of such personalities) being representative of an alien being, but that it most definitively constructs the necessary collective subconsciousness.

The *pure state* exists alone, and for as much as it has been described previously, it is impossible to construct an ideal of a parallel system of conducive system of symbolism because of the already theoretically stringent position that our current spirituality occupies; one would therefore invent a baseless and unguided (and its equality with the current would be questioned as well) mode of symbolism.

3. Conclusions and Significance

This article attempts to qualify the nature of archetypes and the collective subconsciousness as being subject to a misplacement of the sentiment of the archetype in an attitude that confers only to the real world. Jung's ideals are not challenged, however, the attitude that they are placed in is shown to misrepresent the potentiality of such a construction.

The greatest object of its significance is two-fold: it realises the theoretical placement of the archetypes as a factor of their intuition. It uses the expected equivalence of the archetypal dogma among divergent collectives of archetypes to instead illustrate the theoretical *intuition* of the "archetypal dogma".

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

1. Cherry, K. (s.d.). What Are Jung's 4 Major Archetypes? Tratto il giorno 7 22, 2024 da <http://psychology.about.com/od/personalitydevelopment/tp/archetypes.htm>
2. Arruda, Roberto (2019). Moral Archetypes - Ethics in Prehistory. Terra à Vista - ISBN-10: 1698168292 ISBN-13: 978-1698168296.
3. Jung, C. G. (ed.) (1959). The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious. Routledge.
4. Jung, 1959
5. Kilcullen, J., & Robinson, J. (2006). Medieval Political Philosophy. Tratto il giorno 7 22, 2024 da <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/medieval-political>

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.