

C. G. Jung

"On the Relation of Analytical Psychology to Poetry"

- Art as "a psychological activity" only in its creation:
 - not interested in artist's pathology, but in special conditions of artistic creation
 - problem with Freud:
 - a) symbol* (represents) VS symptom (disease)
 - *the original subconscious language; no word for it, but we recognize the meaning instinctively
 - b) reduces all artists to people with sexual fantasies, but doesn't explain their work
 - c) artistic impulse is similar to neurosis, but not all artists are neurotics, and vice-versa
 - d) art is not a living "person," but separate from its creator
 - e) art is inherently determined (not by the artist's childhood or external factors)

- Two types of artwork/ artist:

intentional	inspired
personal stamp	imposed by work
deliberately crafted	comes perfectly formed
sentimental	naïve
introverted	extraverted
conscious of his creative function, masks symbols due to limits of own awareness/ talent	unaware, delivers symbols in "pure," difficult-to-grasp form, untranslatable language
E.g.: Mayakovski's marxist poetry	E.g. Coleridge's "Kubla Khan"

--there are traces of the other in each case:

a) will, alien voice, muse

b) artist says more than s/he intended

c) compulsion to finish or stop work--no control over inspiration

• Art as "autonomous creative complex":

--a capricious creative urge in the

unconscious moves the artist-->must be

expressed regardless of the "vehicle's" will

--"a split-off portion of the psyche," either weak
(only bothers) or strong (harnesses ego)

--a "parasite" on conscious functions-->artists
apathetic, infantile, irritable, eccentric

--VS autonomous complex (neurosis), because it
is based on primordial image* from the
collective unconscious

--*archetypal image drawn is emotionally
charged with racial/species recognition

--art=elaborated re-activation of an archetype,
translated and enriched to fit present era,
and fill its conceptual blanks