

Abyssal Nology and Psychoanalysis

in English by Ana Catrina Buchser

I will have to attempt a sketch, a parallel between the abyssal nology proposed by Blaga and the psychoanalysis of Freud, Adler, Jung and Lacan, to only cite a few of the most important thinkers in this field. It is curious, there are two fields that study the hidden part of our psyche, that started basically from the same trunk, from the Freudian concept on the unconscious, which had a different evolution (at least that's how Blaga tries to present it) and which have now reached the situation of being able to unite, each bringing an important part from a new and future theory of the unconscious.

Freud is shocked by the importance that sexuality represents among his patients, sexuality as accomplished pleasure or as desire. For this he will place the principle of pleasure as dominant in the human psyche. The greatest part of our psyche is unconscious, consciousness being only a small part of our control systems. This unknown part, the unconscious, is the one that determines our conscious acts.

Life's impetus is based on three primary instincts: *hunger* (conservation of the individual), *sex* (conservation of the species), and the instinct of *protection-aggression*. These instincts are inscribed in our genetic memory and have appeared in the phylogenetic social evolution. Instincts are the vegetative Ego. In the unconscious there exists another latent Ego, a social, phylogenetic Ego, which represents the archaic layer of our moral-social consciousness, it is also called the Super-Ego (*das Überich*). This latent, social, phylogenetic Ego is the memory of the social conveniences that are transmitted hereditarily and it is enriched during childhood. The vegetative Ego and the social phylogenetic Ego are the motor of life, being, on the one hand, in a continuous battle for the realization of pleasure,

the sexual instinct being dominant, and on the other hand, the Super-Ego, the rational Ego, the intellectual Ego, the social ontogenetic Ego, which we form starting in early childhood, until we become adults. The primitive Ego conducts itself according to the principle of pleasure, while the latent Ego, the Super-Ego, together with the rational Ego, introduce a censorship of this hedonistic principle, which forces all of the tendencies imposed by the Libido to retract into the unconscious. Pleasure is overturned, repressed and banished into the unconscious. The emotions overturned into the unconscious have a great intensity, a tension that will grow with time and will look for the chance to become an act, if not directly due to social conventions, then indirectly, masked, sublimated.

The strongest instinct is the sexual instinct, it is the bearer of a great latent energy, present in the child and which grows at puberty. This energy is the Libido. C.G. Jung will say that the Libido (*libido* in Latin means desire, want, lust, pleasure, caprice) is psychic energy, trying to desexualize it. Freud did not agree with this change, insisting on the importance of sexual energy.

Almost all human activities have in Freud a sexual origin. "...the emotional relations between parents and children (initially completely sexual), the feelings of friendship... are generated by the sexual inclination" and are considered *Sexual aspirations with inhibited finality*. In humans there are two categories of opposing impulses, which correspond to anabolism and catabolism. On the one hand, there is the impulse of death (*Todestrieb*), which prepares the human being, from birth, for death, it is an impulse of aggression, of destruction, and on the other hand there is the impulse of life (*Lebenstrieb*), the impulse of the sexual libido (*libidenosen Sexualtriebe*) or Eros. These instincts can lead to the victory of Eros through procreation or the victory of death through destructive impulses (Sigmund Freud, *Psychoanalysis and Sexuality*, Ed. Științifică, București, 1994, p.26).

We must admit that the psychoanalytical theory constructed by Freud is consistent, is convincing. First, for the human, sexuality is a completely different thing than it is for the animal. It is much richer, it does not limit to the period of estrus and it is not just a simple excitation of the sexual organs followed by ejaculation, even if it is also that. Sexual life and the emotion linked to it occupies, truly, almost everything man does. Even when he is no longer potent, man can be pushed into action by emotions with a strong sexual charge. Social life, social conventions have put a strong imprint on human sexuality. As Freud well noted, this can be seen not only in civilized humans, but also in humans who live in primitive conditions. The transformation of sexual impulses, their sublimation, their masking, takes place in any human community, we could say that it is a common factor of humanity.

Second, Freud, starting on a road still unexplored until him, shows that the libido does not appear from nothing at puberty. It is present in the child who sucks at her mother's breast. This presence of the sexual instinct from the earliest age, its evolution through diverse stages, the oral and anal eroticism, the oedipal complex, is the second great discovery of Freud.

Let's not confuse sexuality with procreation, with the simple sexual act. In humans, sexuality participates, as I was saying, in the entire emotional life of the individual, the libido marks him irrefutably. The libido also participates in the other instincts, that's why the child has an oral phase of sexuality, in which she associates alimentary pleasure with the one of sucking at her mother's or nanny's breast, just as the adult who eschews the pleasure of the sexual act, who lives a complex of castration, will transform the sexual act in the pleasure of eating and will gain weight. The libido, as omnipotent psychic energy, is a principle imposed by Freud. On this basis, Freudian psychoanalysis, developed by bright researchers such as Lacan, also gave solutions in the domain of the spirit, of creation. The

libido, the psychic energy, in certain conditions, depending on the terrain on which it is developing, can reach a total transformation of the egoism of pleasure into altruism. This way, the tendency toward antisocial manifestations changes into activities with social value. This upset is the sublimation of sexual energy. The young man will play sports, will dance, will flirt, and will court his female colleagues. Girls and women will dress up, will want to be in step with fashion, and both parties will fall in love.

There also are superior ways of sublimation. Artistic creation, the comic spirit, music, painting, science.

It is very difficult to eliminate this load, this sexual throb in human creation. With the help of Blega we will see, further, what else we can say in this domain of human creativity.

There are other opinions in psychoanalysis that do not agree with the Freudian pan-sexuality. Adler places instead of the principle of pleasure the principle of power. Sexual copulation would be, according to him, an expression of this instinct of domination. The psychic life motor would be the *will for power* with which a child is born, and not the libido, sexuality. The psychic conflict is between this will for power and powerlessness, lack of power. Actually, Adler does nothing else but to attribute more importance to the instinct of aggression, to the throb for death proposed by Freud, because the Eros is present in his work too. On the other hand, the will for power reminds one of Nietzsche.

If we were to follow the examples in politics or American movies, we should agree with Adler. The relationship between sexes sometimes becomes an aggressive relation, I could actually say that it always becomes aggressive, but that it depends on the type of aggression. Even the sexual act in itself is an aggression most times, even when both partners desire each other and want to copulate. As a matter of fact, ejaculation can only be achieved through aggression. Not to mention

that in the mass-media examples of families based more on the aggression instinct than on the love instinct abound. Man aggresses woman, he beats her, and the woman can hit the man who comes home helpless, drunk or physically weak. Parents aggress their children and not seldom these aggressions reach crime. Is the sexual instinct, the sexual throb, the strongest? or is it the aggression instinct, which manages to subjugate the sexual throb? Dostoyevsky's novels have permitted modern psychology to appear. Many times literature is a useful material for scientific research. In Nicolae Breban's novels appears a relationship between characters in which the one with power imposes it on the one able to obey, it is a relationship between master and servant. This time even realized sexual impulses are a sublimation of this relationship between master and servant. Something happens that from the Freudian point of view would be completely curious and unnatural. Really? Anyway, sexuality retains its important role. If I think better about animal sexuality, it is based on aggression. The strongest, the one that wins the fight, is the one that will copulate and procreate. It is the instinct of perpetuating the species, of maintaining the quality of individuals within the framework of the species, the avoidance of physical regression within the species. Is the instinct of individual existence stronger than the perpetuation of the species? It doesn't seem so. When animals mate they risk their lives.

If so, then aggression, the desire for power, the enforcement of power of which Konrad Lorenz also speaks, is an animal instinct we also inherit. Of course, we transfigure this battle for power among humans, we give it another face, almost unrecognizable for an ethologist, but it remains a battle for power. Is it maybe that the battle for power, the constraint through force have an important role in the prelude of human sexuality? Don't you think that a serenade or the duel between Lensky and Onedin are manifestations of the prelude of a conquest? Even the expression "to conquer", which can be applied to a fortress as well as to a woman,

directs our thoughts that way. Let's not forget that the most famous war, the Trojan War, was started for the conquest of a woman. Surely, aggression, like sexuality, is very different from animal to human. Which is stronger? which leads? which was first? I think that a hungry man, sleepless and harassed by enemies who want to kill him, will not be attracted even by the most beautiful woman. Aggression, like hunger, are primary instincts that guarantee our existence, and sexuality, as strong as it is, remains secondary. On the first two¹ depends, as I was saying, the physical being of an individual, that's why they are stronger instincts, while sexuality responds to the call of the species, the establishment of the species.

Let's go back to hunger. Don't you think that the kiss, the fact that we use the tongue in a kiss, we use it on the entire body of our sexual partner, we bite the breast or the neck of the woman or man with which we copulate, brings us rather close to the act of eating? Or is it an outbreak of oral sexuality? Aren't these accompanying acts of the sexual act transferred from the domain of the instinct of preservation of the individual through eating into the one of sexuality? Freud tells us that sucking, for the newborn, is at the same time food and sexuality. I wonder how is the sucking of girls justified as sexuality? through Diana's complex?

In any case, be it sexuality (libido) or aggression instinct, both, as transformed as they are in the human world, remain animal constants, inherited, transmitted to man. In our world, both aggression and sex do not estrange us too much from the animal. Human surpasses animals, we are wilder, crueller, more ruthless than animals, but humans have another thing, something for which they are human, something completely different from the animal world.

Maybe Adler's point of view in psychic analysis can be discussed a little more. Let's not forget that in the beginnings of human society, it seems, was the matriarchy. The woman was the one that aggressed, she determined when she was

¹ Aggression and hunger, (translator's note).

going to copulate with the man, when she was going to bear children and how she was going to raise them. Amazons exist in all mythologies, but they can be, socially speaking, contemporary. There is mention of these warrior tribes of women in travel books from Amazonia. They decided on a date on which they invited the men from surrounding tribes at a feast, they copulated with them, and then they chased them away. From the newborn babies they only kept the females. As warriors, they were dreaded.

How, I wonder, did sexuality develop in matriarchy, similar to the Amazons? What could be left in our unconscious from this experience? We don't know. Something from what we today call the upside-down Oedipal complex, Diana's complex. Young girls did not know their fathers and thus were not able to fall in love with a male model, nor did were they able to hate and want to kill their mother who had, actually did not have, relations with the father. How can a Freudian explain this? Sadism? The will for power can explain perfectly woman's fulfilled desire to dominate. The education girls received to dominate, to subjugate the male enemies can be understood. The Amazons' sex and hormones pushed them to be aggressive and not libidinous. Is aggression a sublimation of the libido? This could happen, but I don't know whether the study of the normal and the pathologic psyche would confirm this, because we must not forget, Freudism started from and it is based on clinical psychiatry.

Not even C.J. Jung is of the opinion that the entire psychic energy depends only on sexuality, and he talk about Libido as of a psychic energy separate from sexuality. He proposes a desexualisation of the libido. For this, Freud critiques him, opposing "Jung's speculation referring to the initial libido" (Sigmund Freud, *Psychoanalysis and Sexuality*, Ed. Științifică, București, 1994, p.26) and he forces him to give up calling himself a psychoanalyst. Jung complies and will talk of *analytical psychology*.

C.J. Jung finds in the unconscious content whose generic name will be *archetype*. It is very interesting to see how he reaches this knowledge, because herein lays one of the great keys to the understanding of our psychic activity, of our thinking. In *Pattern of Behavior and Archetype*, Jung narrates how he left the psychiatric clinic where he observed in his patients: “The chaotic assortment of images that at first confronted me reduced itself in the course of the work to certain well-defined themes and formal elements, which repeated themselves in identical or analogous form with the most varied individuals. ... These facts show in an unmistakable manner how fantasies guided by unconscious regulators coincide with the records of man’s mental activity as known to us from tradition and ethnological research. ... My most fundamental views and ideas derive from these experiences. ...And so it is with the hand that guides the crayon or brush, the dance that executes the dance-step, with the eye and the ear, with the word and the thought: a dark impulse is the ultimate arbiter of the pattern, an unconscious *a priori* precipitates itself into plastic form, and one has no inkling that another person’s consciousness is being guided by the same principles... there seems to reign a dim foreknowledge not only of the pattern but of its meaning. ...the pattern needs no interpretation: it portrays its own meaning. ...These experiences and reflections lead me to believe that there are certain collective unconscious conditions which act as regulators and stimulators of creative fantasy-activity and call forth corresponding formations... The existence of these unconscious regulators—I sometimes refer to them as “dominants”... seemed to me so important that I based upon it my hypothesis of an impersonal collective unconscious. ...the archetypes intervene in the shaping of conscious contents... they act like instincts. ...In spite or perhaps because of its affinity with instinct, the archetype represents the authentic element of spirit, but a spirit which is not to be identified with the human intellect, since it is the latter’s *spiritus rector*. The

essential content of all mythologies and all religions and all isms is archetypal. The archetype is spirit or pseudo-spirit: what it ultimately proves to be depends on the attitude of the human mind. Archetype and instinct are the most polar opposites imaginable, as can easily be seen when one compares a man who is ruled by his instinctual drives with a man who is seized by the spirit. ... Opposites are extreme qualities in any state, by virtue of which that state is perceived to be real, for they form a potential. The psyche is made up of processes whose energy springs from the equilibration of all kinds of opposites. The spirit / instinct antithesis is only one of the commonest formulations, but it has the advantage of reducing the greatest number of the most important and most complex psychic processes to a common denominator. So regarded, psychic processes seem to be balances of energy flowing between spirit and instinct, though the question of whether a process is to be described as spiritual or as instinctual remains shrouded in darkness. ...depends entirely upon the standpoint or state of the conscious mind. A poorly developed consciousness... will naturally see in the instinctual drives the source of all reality. It remains blissfully unaware of the spirituality of such a philosophical surmise, ...a consciousness that finds itself in opposition to the instincts can, in consequence of the enormous influence then exerted by the archetypes, ...subordinate instinct to spirit... Psychic processes... behave like a scale along which consciousness “slides”. At one moment it finds itself in the vicinity of instinct and falls under its influence; at another, it slides along to the other end where spirit predominates and even assimilates the instinctual processes most opposed to it. (Carl Gustav Jung, *Collected Works Vol. 8: The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, tr. R.F.C. Hull, paragraphs. 401-408).

I apologize to the reader for the rather long quote. But we are witnesses, in these final writings of Jung, to his laboratory of creation. We are witnesses to the steps he took and how he was forced by the clinic to reach a transcendent notion,

as he himself recognizes, the one or archetype. Instincts are also archetypes. The nature of the psyche is, of course, in general, unknown. So much more are the archetypes that have great resistance to being made conscious. They constantly send signals in our conscious activity, but cannot be brought into this bright side of psyche.

The clinical psychologist that was Jung shuddered when he found even in his practical activity, in the individual “objects” of the human psyche research, in thoughts and fantasies, an invariable for such different people. He found a “psychoid” factor, which influences our psychic life.

For us the question is to what extent the stylistic matrix and the archetypes are the same, similar, or different?

They are both transcendent, a priori, we have them without being able to say with a certain assurance from where we have them. All we know about them we obtain indirectly, because the possibility to know them directly, to study them, does not exist. Both influence our knowledge, being a transcendent censorship.

With all these similarities, I will propose to consider them different as function. The *stylistic matrix* is a sort of modulator of our perceptions, it modifies them, it gives them another appearance in rapport to its form, and to the way it built itself in our mind.

Archetypes are a profound unconscious content, which send signals that we must take into consideration in our control systems. They don't seem to modify the aspect of our thoughts and perceptions, eventually the archetypes can give our thoughts and perceptions another value through the simple conjoining of the symbols they carry. Through this they also participate in the transcendent censorship, but in a different way than the stylistic matrix.

What would have happened if Jung found out about Blaga's philosophy? I cannot know. What I am sure of is that both psychology and philosophy would have had to gain.

For all these reasons I will prefer to consider the stylistic matrix and the archetypes as two equal partners, but different in function. Together, they participate in the structure of our psyche, in its knowledge and censorship.

It is true that Jung did not notice the image of a possible censorship produced by archetypes. They enrich our thoughts without modifying them too much. As Jung said, if we have a thought close to an instinct it remains the same in the company of the archetype, even if it gains some symbolic valences. If we look at the figures from Bosch's paintings, we have a rather large registry of states, of instinctual feelings. Look at the staging of a cockfight or a boxing match. The figures on the screen lower our instincts on the table. In both this situation and Bosch's figures, one can read alongside the pleasure of aggression, of violence, of physical or sexual hunger, the human component of these feelings, contribution of the archetypes.

It is very difficult to convince, through education, that a man has transcendence in his soul. It is easier to make him understand that his feeling, much like his thinking are censored by his own cognitive structures. All we perceive is filtered by our stylistic matrix, by the unconscious' categories, and influenced by archetypes.

Jung is of the opinion that our psychic energy comes from the opposite pairs in our psyche, from two opposite poles that exist under tension, under the tension of sensations, of feelings. So are the conscience and the unconscious, instincts and archetypes, they are all like water and fire, like sky and earth, also like what is bad and what is good, what is true and what is false, like black and white. These

opposing couples are also the source of our complexes, our psychic traumas, and our illnesses.

I don't see what could be opposed in this point of view. The more the difference of potential between two poles of the psyche grows, the more a greater, stronger energy is possible. As Blaga says, "the psyche takes the energy it needs from anywhere..." Why must this difference in potential always shock us? Why can't we light a bulb with this energy? light a house? why must we always burn our fingers?

Here we are not only talking about energy, but also about where the accent falls, the preponderance of the conscious and the unconscious. Jung, like Freud, considers the preponderance of the unconscious to be equal to the preponderance of instinctual archetypes, the preponderance of disorder over psychic order, of complexes over a balanced conscience, an opening to pathology. It is true that Jung, unlike Freud, sees man's salvation through a conscious stimulation of certain archetypes by religion, faith, by the transcendent. This because social life leads to the upending of the collective unconscious, which can only be saved by bringing into the conscious some spiritual preoccupation. Religion corresponds to certain contents of the archetypes. "So long as the communal consciousness presided over by the Church is objectively present, the psyche... continues to enjoy certain equilibrium. At all events, it constitutes a sufficiently effective defense against inflation of the ego (Carl Gustav Jung, *Collected Works Vol. 8: The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, tr. R.F.C. Hull, paragraph 426).

We have, probably, an archetype of the benevolent and kind *father*, who can do everything, does everything for his child, in other words he has absolute powers. I remember this father who does nothing wrong, who does not break his promise in front of his son, when I was 4 years old. It was when we still spent summers in Balcic where *tătuța*, my grandfather, had a villa. In the evening, in

Bucuresti, sometimes, my father would take me to the grocery shop across the street, *Gălăţescu's*, from where he bought all kinds of dainties; Manchurian caviar, Prague ham thinly sliced with a special machine, sometimes even black caviar, when it wasn't pressed. Dad only bought fresh black caviar. I don't know why. There was a reason; one evening when we went together, a dispute was unleashed between dad and Mr. Gălăţescu: it seemed that a certain sausage did not smell the way my father wanted it to, and the owner was as cross as two sticks because the sausage was fresh. He screamed at my dad, dad raised his voice also. They fought. For the moment I didn't understand anything. At home I started to recuperate. How could somebody scream at my dad? How? isn't dad the largest and fairest man? can somebody really doubt my dad's words? I couldn't believe it. Dad was for me everything, in my child's universe he was the absolute. My father remained my father, but I had lost the absolute. I cried, I cried to my mother, who tried to comfort me.

We probably have an archetype of the absolute and of the omnipotent father. When we grow up, we can project these archetypes into faith, religion, just as Jung claims.

Maybe this way we can be a little more merciful with Blaga. I think this is how we must understand him when he postulates an absolute he calls the Great Anonymous. Of course Blaga was religious like any of us, but he wanted to build a metaphysical system in which he didn't need God. That's why he postulates the Great Anonymous, who is not God, to satisfy his own archetype of the omnipotent father, of the absolute. It is notable that the transcendent censorship does not suffer an alteration as idea, it remains a filter of our perceptions and thoughts, an a priori, an absolute, but this absolute that could have remained undefined is personified by the Great Anonymous. The fact that the Great Anonymous places in us the a priori forms of sensibility, just as the stylistic matrix, or even the categories of

knowledge, remains a fairytale, just as the Great Anonymous' wish to avoid the danger of human knowledge remains a fairytale. It is true that this last fairytale we meet again in Plato, and in many mythologies. Is it possible that the danger of a too advanced human knowledge be real?

We went over it too quickly, that's why we return to the content of the unconscious. Freud is convinced that from the unconscious come all of our fantasies. I think he is right as a physician who observed his patients, but he makes a mistake when he extends the notion to humans. Jung hesitates, the unconscious also has a luminous part, with an elevated archetypal content, but which can only be made valuable through conscious activity. Still, he believes that nothing good can exist if the unconscious dominates the conscious. Only the conscious, with its luminous part, can assure the use of elevated archetypes. If we abandon ourselves to the unconscious we will be dominated, in the end, by instincts, which also have an archetypal structure, but which are our *shadow*, what is dark in the human psyche.

In Blaga, everything changes 180 degrees. It is true that we are in the possession of certain instincts that guarantee our individual existence together with the perpetuation of the species, but the unconscious has a spiritual activity. Through the unconscious we can fertilize the creative activities of our conscience, the patterns of the stylistic matrix, which are a censor of perceived reality, they are also a stimulus for the most important human activity, for creativity. It is true that the Great Anonymous permits us creativity in the patterns of the stylistic matrix, but it permits our creativity.

In order for the structure of our unconscious to be more clearly represented, let's say that alongside *shadow*, the unconscious also has a part that contains archetypes of the good part, of the luminous part, and let's call it a name borrowed from Greek, *eumeros*.

The *shadow* and *eumeros* are the two complementary parts of the unconscious. The *shadow* has more of an instinctual content, of the animal life inheritance, while *eumeros* possesses the spiritual contents that characterize humanity. Between them there is a great complementarity, just as Jung speaks of the complementarity between conscious and unconscious. Between *shadow* and *eumeros* there is a tension even in our unconscious. The tension Jung speaks of between conscience and unconscious is, first of all, encountered even in the unconscious. It is a tension that remains latent as long as it doesn't have stimuli in the conscience. These will come once a child enters the world, after birth, and will be accented at certain stages of childhood or adulthood. At age 3, age 7, puberty, between 18-25 years old, at 40, and 60 years old. These ages correspond to the ages at which psychologists noticed that a human being is at a critical, or at least important point, or zone. Of course the first activations, in the first few days of life, and also around ages 3 and 7, are the most important. The shaping of our personal unconscious starts then, the archetypes are much more obvious, they will produce clear signals in the conscience, and they will help in the subsequent molding of human personality.

The latency of the tension between *shadow* and *eumeros* ruptures in the first days after birth and it can also change into a slow, constant variant, when the evolution of the child and young adult does not suffer traumas. Unfortunately, traumas appear rather easily, sometimes a word, an attitude, can unleash a revolution in a child's unconscious. That's why it is thought that the most important years for the forming of a child are *the 7 years from home*², and pedagogues state that the most competent teachers should be assigned to the first few years of school. For the same reason, Romania's experience with teachers

² In Romania, it used to be common for children to go to school only when they turn 7. The 7 years from home are considered the education you receive from your parents before school. Nowadays, the common first grader is usually 6 years old (translator's note).

between the two world wars, teachers linked to their pupils and location, when entire generations of intellectuals rose from the rural communities, from simple families, but with a second family at school, with their teacher, must not be forgotten.

Let's see what the unconscious means for psychoanalysis in comparison to the unconscious proposed by Blaga.

For psychoanalysis, the unconscious is a domain of human psyche, which is instinctually connected to the libido, to sexuality (Freud, Lacan). In the unconscious are deposited our unfulfilled wishes under a disguised form, as having a mask which is, sometimes, difficult to reveal. For this, the practice of a different psychoanalysis was proposed, a psychoanalysis that can, also sometimes, resolve the conflicts that can appear between the lived reality and the suppressed wishes. For psychoanalysis it seemed that the unconscious is, actually, a conscious, a conscious that is conflictual and a little forgotten. C.G. Jung says the same thing in *Instinct and volition*, "This discovery... led to the interpretation of the unconscious as a phenomenon of repression which could be understood in personalistic terms. Its contents were lost elements that had once been conscious. Freud later acknowledged the continued existence of archaic vestiges in the form of primitive modes of functioning, though even these were explained personalistically. On this view the unconscious psyche appears as a subliminal appendix to the conscious mind." (Carl Gustav Jung, *Collected Works Vol. 8: The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, tr. R.F.C. Hull, paragraph 373). Freud will introduce around 1923 the notion of Super Ego, which is very close to Jung's archetypes, being an *unconscious spirit* inherited and enriched through social imperatives. Vasile Dem. Zamfirescu underlines the fact that "...as early as 1915, Freud talks about the non-individual contents of the unconscious." To say nothing of the fact that for Freud "The unconscious is a different world through the laws that govern, laws different

from those of the conscience” (Vasile Dem. Zamfirescu, *Between the logic off the heart and the logic of the mind*, Ed. Trei, 1977, p.120).

In Blaga, the unconscious is an independent domain, with its own laws, its own resources, but a domain in which the spirit is present, which can judge, which, as we have seen, has a priori forms of sensibility, has categories. It is, even if Blaga doesn't say it, Kant's understanding knowledge. That's why I think we can agree with Blaga that the unconscious is a domain completely different from the conscious one, same as for Kant, reason (*Vernunft*) is a domain completely different from understanding (*Verstand*).

We saw that for Freud and also for Jung, the unconscious is a different domain than consciousness. This world is, for them, a darker world, dominated by instincts, even if they evolved and they became of the human world.

Between the unconscious proposed by psychoanalysis, even the one proposed by Jung, and the one developed by Blaga, there is a great difference in the understanding of its beneficial function, it is an unknown and rather dark domain. The unconscious is populated with instincts, even with archetypes that can enter in combinations with the *shadow*, with what is negative, populated with suppressions, with complexes. Blaga does not negate the value of all these notions, but he contests their supremacy. He is of the opinion that what we now propose to call *eumeros* is a very important part of the unconscious, which can, and not seldom, assume, “underline” the instincts' negative energy, transform it in factor that stimulate creativity.

Let's go back in time. Psychic analysis and self-analysis are methods utilized in all the world's religions. Us, Christians, confess in order to periodically clean the interior of our soul, or at least we are supposed to. Yoga followers and Buddhists practice psychic self-analysis on a regular basis, even daily. All these methods of renewal of the unconscious are very important, if they are done by a

gifted person. It is also important for our health, not only for our spiritual, emotional, psychic health, but also for the health of our body, that our unconscious functions normally. Through personance³ we can have an intimate leader, a sort of Pinocchio's cricket, that whispers to us, if we can hear it, what we should do, and how exactly we can save everything that is most precious to us, our personality, our soul, and our body.

If what I said above approaches the truth at all remains to be seen. I will repeat, Blaga tells us that it is important to realize that the unconscious is not only the rather dark part we have already met by reading psychoanalysis books. He believes that psychoanalysis, as I was saying, does not separate too much from the conscience. The contents of the unconscious are seemingly a second conscience, they still have a conscious nature. The development stages of the unconscious, oral, anal, and the Oedipal complex, are not personal structures of the unconscious, they are very connected to the phylogenetic manifestations of conscience, of our consciousness, because they are stages in the child's evolution to maturity. Moreover, some psychiatrists don't even accept the existence of the unconscious, they speak of something that would be more similar to different stages of the conscience. I am convinced that somewhere Blaga was right, the unconscious is only another conscience for psychoanalysis, a decayed conscience, even if it can have inherited contents, even if for today's human it is an a priori. Freud, Jung, Lacan, like the other physicians who introduced and developed psychoanalysis had, first of all, a medical interest, from this devolved a philosophic, secondary interest. Their interest was about the parts of the unconscious upon which one can take action in order to treat psychiatric patients. The metaphysics of the unconscious, its value for the human being, was not first in their attention. They

³ A Blagian term, from the Italian *personare*, "something is ringing, something is constantly ringing from the unconscious toward the conscious state" (Blaga). Personance is the mode of communication between the unconscious and the conscious. (see chapter "Personance-Understanding" in this book.

don't need to be blamed for this. A psychoanalytic theory of the spiritual creation was described, which used what they found in their clinic, the libido and sublimation. Blaga sketches a pertinent critique of this theory.

“There exists a psychoanalytic theory about <spiritual creation>. This theory is an essential part of psychoanalytic learning... The terms psychoanalysis resorts to for the elucidation of the spiritual creation's <mechanism> are those of the <sexual libido> and <sublimation>. Psychoanalysts alter the *first manifestation* of an individual, belonging to a certain <vital-spiritual> type, into the permanent <motor> of the spiritual life of this individual... there is an incredible confusion between <accident> and <substance>... the first infantile behaviors have at the most the significance of certain primal manifestations or outlines of a bio-psychological type... and not the prestige and the efficiency of certain <decisive determinations>, on which the <type> itself would depend, as psychoanalysts believe. ...About ...the god Libido's river, <the omnipotent>, many tales were put in circulation... But unfortunately, about the hidden system, with its transformers, due to which one effectively reaches a spiritual creation, psychoanalysis never disclosed us anything... the spirit takes its energies, which he needs, from anywhere there stand and its disposal... we recognize psychoanalysis' merit to have put in light the mechanism of repression. The psychic process of repression exists; and it is one of the most permanent of spiritual life... Advocates of a somehow fixed thinking, they put an exaggerated accent on the mechanic causality of repressed contents... repression exists, but the statement that these repressed contents *determine*, like a deus ex machina, the form and structure of personality, is a jump, upon which psychoanalysts decide without any real support... the relation between facts is exactly inverse: the form and structure of the psychic personality determines the manner and nature of repressions, or the manner in

which an individual solves from case to case the problem of repressions...” (Lucian Blaga, Op. cit. p. 31-35).

I would like to ask you, as regards Blaga's statements, if you don't find the opinion that the unsatisfied, deviant libido is the only energy that is being offered to the spirit in order to create, a little forced and with a great degree of risk? Is it really that overflowing and more or less satisfied sexuality is the only impulse, the only source of power that is being offered to an artist when she creates, to a genius man of science, to an important thinker? Let's go back a little to Oedipus's myth. Do you really think that the achievement of this myth was determined by unconscious impulses of the eventual creator/creators, to kills his father in order to have children with his own mother? Do you think that the main message of this myth is simply this? I am of the opinion of those who see in Oedipus's myth the sanction of man's great achievement to pass the threshold that still kept him close to the animal world. As Blaga tells us, *man has a creative destiny*, destiny that was released through an *ontological mutation*. It is very good that in philosophy we can also talk about a <mutation> the same way we talk about <mutation> in biology. Maybe this ontological mutation of the human is not determined by a modification of genes, maybe it is only the rendering valuable of certain genetic functions not used until then, or a simple enrichment of the genetic material. The primitive human had the same destiny as animals, to <exist in the world> and nothing more. The art of people who lived in caves comes to our help to understand this. The caves' walls, the different stones, have drawn on them all sorts of animals and even people. You can't really find deities, idols, but it remains an artistic creation, the start of an escape form the world of simple existence. Those people who lived, who existed only to live, just started to feel the need to create, to draw on a stone, to believe in a transcendent who could help them hunt. There came a moment when man realized he lived differently, that he lives in a world of mysteries.

Maybe among the first mysteries he felt the need to know are the ones connected to hunting, to the representation of animals, to a “force” that helps them hunt. All these became as many signs inscribed in stone. Then man started to become a creator, even if he didn’t realize it. I think we can only approximate when man started to become man, to feel that he lives in a world of mysteries that he will try to unveil. When he started to understand that “*he lives for mystery and for revelation.*” Man exists unconsciously in this ideated space of mysteries and his destiny became that of a creator, even if he doesn’t realize it, as I was saying, because only through the act of creation could he attempt the unveiling of the mysteries. This new destiny, for human existence, is the ontological mutation.

What is Oedipus’s living? He found out, through *Pitia*, about the god’s curse that follows him and tried to oppose it. How? By creating, alone, the defense of fulfilling it. He leaves his parents, without knowing they were only adoptive parents, and that leaving will only bring him closer to the implacable fulfillment of his destiny. The destiny is fulfilled! He kills his father, without knowing it is his father, and answering the three questions of the Sphinx, he also becomes the husband of his mother, with which he will have children. In this myth appears a mystery that we still don’t really understand today. Oedipus says truthfully that man is stronger than gods, because the Sphinx will die, and she will only die if she receives a true answer. Only this answer, which determines the Sphinx’s death, leads exactly to the fulfillment of the curse. The Sphinx dies laughing (in Enescu’s version). What is the truth? Is man really stronger than gods? It doesn’t seem so. But, at his death, Oedipus shouts: <We defeated the gods! My will was never in my actions>. Shall we believe Oedipus, who never wanted to kill his father and have progeny with his mother? Man, through his ontological mutation, through his creative destiny, became a danger for gods, for God. Picasso believed himself to be God, it is true that through his creations, through his art, he created a wonderful

world. Any creator, any artist, has the sensation that they create a world with their hands and heads. Maybe those who created the atomic bomb had the feeling that they were almost gods. Maybe even a saint, a hermit, discovering God within himself, might have had the feeling that he is becoming one with Him. Only gods protected themselves from something like this, they introduced in us the a priori forms of sensibility, the categories and the archetypes. All these are as many possibilities of censorship. Blaga calls it *transcendent censorship*, in order to underline the fact that it is imposed on us from another world, from the world of the Great Anonymous. This Great Anonymous is a sort of world of Ideas, maybe better an intelligible world which, even if we have it within us, is perennial. It is the notions, the categories and archetypes of the intelligible world, it is God, who we have within us.

Blaga considers the unconscious *the other realm*. “The existential mutation, once declared in man, he has promoted on an irrevocable line, where all his attempts could rival the Great Anonymous, if they weren’t stopped by permanent breaks <from beyond>. These are the coordinates and terms of the creative destiny and of the human chances; <the existence for mystery and reveling>, <transcendent brakes>. (L. Blaga, Op. cit. p. 491)

We are in a moment in which we can say that the transcendent meets the Kantian transcendental in us. It seems like for Blaga mysteries are the transcendent domain, although “mystery” is what humans don’t understand from this world, from what surrounds us, from what we live. Man has something in him that he doesn’t know what it is. Couldn’t it be something else? Who guarantees us that our world doesn’t interpenetrate with other worlds? Heraclites thought so, that our world is full of beings we cannot see. Didn’t gods climb down on Earth and mingle

in humans' lives? Greeks knew that every man has his Daimon⁴, but only Socrates knew how to use this presence. We, some of us, feel God within us. Man is a God bearer, but how many of us know this, how many can recognize that something like this is possible?

For all these reasons I think it is not wrong to say that mystery, being something that exceeds our understanding, could have in it something from the world beyond, from the transcendent. We cannot prove this, but it seems harder to invalidate such a statement. Moreover, if the unconscious is the other realm, as Blaga says, it has in it transcendent. Is it a matter of the unconscious' categories? Maybe only a part of them?

What a difficult question! We can suspect the existence of the unconscious' categories, we can even be sure of their existence, but, unfortunately, we can't prove anything. We can't answer sure of ourselves what happens in the domain of the categories of the unconscious, which we have only presumed. Our knowledge of the unconscious is indirect, the unconscious is, for us, what its name says, an unknown, a mystery.

If God is within us, it is true that the transcendent is also within us. For Blaga, the transcendent can come within us, can descend in our soul, can unite with it in our unconscious. He said that we Easterners, as opposed to Westerners, for whom the transcendent ascends with the cathedrals' "arrow", we have the feeling of a transcendent that descends, that comes into us, just like the sun rays descend in the Saint Sophia Church in Constantinople through the circular windows in the vault.

I will ask you again. Do you think that the one/ those who created the myth of Oedipus, that the myth of Oedipus, the way it was born, is only the simple

⁴ The Greek Daimon means 'divine power', 'fate', or 'god'. To the Greeks Daimons were intermediary spirits between human beings and the gods, acting as spiritual advisors.

sexual impulse repressed into the unconscious, a transposition through sublimation, of the boy's desire to sleep with his mother, reason for which he had to remove his father? Don't you think, rather, that this unconscious tendency, if it was possible (and why not, because humanity carries with it everything that is most beautiful and most horrible), lead the myth's creators to the choice of this horrible incest, in order to create a relief, a strong dramatic structure that opposes the moral legality of the era, in order to communicate what was important: that man has received unimagined powers through his creativity, and with his creative willpower he managed to measure himself with the gods, even if unsuccessfully? The man Oedipus acted unnaturally, but he lived beautifully. In his life he constantly opposed what he eventually did, that's why his willpower was never in his actions, he wanted something else than what he achieved. Maybe there's one more thing to say and I owe this to a younger friend who agreed with me, that the myth of Oedipus can be more than what was said until now, if we try to change the event a little.

Man's power can live most beautifully only in the living out of his destiny. If Laius wouldn't have thrown out his child to fulfill his destiny, Oedipus, even in the condition of implacably fulfilling this destiny, he could have rejoiced in living his childhood and youth next to him, next to their son. This way, they lived the trauma of puericide. In this case, the myth could be a social commandment that forbids the killing of children, as a matter of fact it is something like that also, or a simple stimulus to live a dignified life, even if you are destined a tragic end.

Here there is a lot of truth. In this limited situation, he can appear forced. As a matter of fact, we all know that this world will end someday, nobody knows when. Maybe tomorrow, the day after tomorrow. Those who live in California know that one day an earthquake will break off this part of land and few will escape. Even so, we continue to live, to have children, to be, if we can, happy, and

Californians don't seem to care a lot what will happen to them, they are happy that they live on a beautiful part of Terra. The "Titanic" was sinking fulfilling a horrible destiny, but some still played their instruments for those who, like them, could no longer save themselves from death. I always admired them, exactly because I was never able to break away from worrying about the future, those who know how to be happy with what they have, with what life puts at their disposal.

We can defeat time, or better, unfavorable times, because nobody can defeat time. We lived, with my wife and our daughter, through the horrible years of Ceaușescu's communism. Maybe the most tormenting for us was the corruption of the children's souls in this epoch of glory. They lived a double life at school, where they had to be obedient to false ideas, and at home, where we secretly celebrated Christmas with carols and Easter with red eggs. In our house came friends with which we had endless literary or philosophical discussions. It was as if we didn't live in an epoch in which we were forced to live. That's why we came out of this era more prepared for what followed than others. Of course other illnesses threaten our society that tends toward freedom, illnesses that bring back lies and impose a great deficiency in communication, but nobody imposes on our children anymore ugliness and falsity as law. Now we can choose beauty or ugliness, falsity or cleanliness.

Man is stronger than gods if he *wants* to be, and he can be creative even subjugated to the most horrible situations. We don't need to replace the psychoanalytical explanation of the Oedipus myth, but this myth can also communicate something much more beautiful, grander, just as Enescu thought. Therefore, we would like to show that something else can also exist, profoundly inscribed in our unconscious, that can explain a behavior differently, even if our life is strongly dominated by the sexual instinct and by pleasure. Instincts are not the only possible explanation. I don't think that the existence of an omnipotent

instinct can unveil the entire truth about the unconscious. Man can, has the power to conquer any obstacle, even a dominating destiny, a terrible destiny. For old Greeks, this force was the willpower that leads conscious thinking. In the end I think they were right. The unconscious in the Jung-Blaga version can help us, but consciousness is still the specific human part and it dominates as importance over the conscience, even if the levels of unconscious are quantitatively more important. We, people, are conscious willpower. Our feelings can be dominated by the unconscious, they are even lead unconsciously. But there is always also a conscious component that has its value in any feeling and the application of our willpower doesn't always imply a fight with an instinct, it doesn't always lead to sexual complexes, but to the victory of what we think, of what we want.

I will try to give another literary example. The writings of great creators, be they even anonymous, have been an inexhaustible source for science. The Bible, the Vedas, the Epic of Gilgamesh are as many monuments of universal culture. Let's not forget that the fourth book from Plato's *Republic* was able to inspire Freud in his psychoanalytic thinking, just like Dostoyevsky's novels opened the road to psychological research. I will stop at Dmitri Merejkowsky, personality in the literary critique world. Talking about Turgenev, Merejkowsky unveils the particular aspect of love in this author shadowed by colossi such as Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky. For Turgenev, love is etherized, it has a virginal aspect, as if flesh, muscle, veins and bones did not exist. For Turgenev, love is not violence, screams, birth, carnal ecstasy. Everything happens in a register that would have been useless to Freud. "...we are not talking about a castration, on the contrary, it is a flaming allegiance to sex, a burning purity, an infatuated virginity... Turgenev's women and girls are icons among human figures, among those who live... All of Turgenev's women and girls hear Vasily's call, but it is not Vasily, it is somebody

else... Vasily is Christ in person..." (Dmitri Merejkowsky, Compagnons Eternels, Ed. Bossard, Paris, 1922, p.296-300).

I don't know if the sublimation of the sexual instinct can explain everything. I don't think it can be the basis of everything that happens in human creativity. To accept this, as Freud and his followers did, is definitely a point of view that is unilateral and a little forced. Let's not forget that Freud used in his theory experimental data after one experiment, even self-experiments—as was the case with cocaine or with his own sexual experiences—generalizing a little too soon. It is, definitely, a method used by researchers and that can give good results, but it also opens up the possibility of many mistakes. Love is also something else, it has the right to something else, even if it doesn't find itself in front of characters who are not castrated. Similarly, our unconscious can also be populated by feelings that approach the spirit not only with sadomasochistic fantasies. Moreover, I think that we can, if we want and with great effort, translate, convert, change our sexual urges that dominate us, especially at a certain age, that populate are dreams or even makes us daydream, to convert them into artistic creations, literary, musical, into creations, in other words to sublimate them. Who wasn't a poet when he was in love? Who doesn't hum or remember with pleasure a piece of music related to an amorous encounter, to a love? Eminescu, Baudelaire, Blaga wrote masterpieces when they loved, Picasso, Dali, Wagner were stimulated by their great loves. I think each one of us did something beautiful when they were in love, something they always remember with pleasure.

Allow me to make another digression that may prove useful. Kant, in *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals*, talks about happiness, about pleasure, as motor of what man covets, as impulse of his tendencies, his volition. It is known that Immanuel Kant refuses Epicureanism, eudaemonism. For Kant there exists an inferior pleasure that belongs to the world of senses and a superior pleasure in

which the reason is the faculty of coveting. For him, "...creatures without reason only feel sensitive impulses" (Immanuel Kant, *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals* and *Critique of Practical Reason*, Ed. Stiintifica, Bucuresti, 1972, p.79). He prefers to occupy himself with the search for beauty and of pleasure through reason. But Freud realizes, even if we don't completely agree with him, an interesting synthesis, showing us approximately what the impulses of aggression and sexuality look like in humans, the rational beings. How these instincts can be masked and transformed in the domain of reason. Not accepting Freud completely, we cannot accept the success of his revolution.

Let's go back to Kant. It is true that the intelligible world is different from the world of Ideas. For Plato, the world of Ideas is transcendence, it surpasses the poor man, while the intelligible world is for Kant within us, humans, even if it surpasses the individual man. It is a sort of human transcendence, it is the transcendental. What is valid for all humans surpasses the individual. Immanuel Kant is in search of immutable structures, of thinking "skeletons". He is not interested, like Plato, in Ideas and their content. That's why the intelligible world is something else than the world of ideas. That's where only the a priori forms are, space, time, and the categories of our understanding. These a priori forms gain content from the world of senses, making possible the a priori synthetic judgments with which we know the world.

What is remarkable for this intelligible world is the fact that we are not conscious of it. We have the space, time, and the categories of understanding, without feeling that we have them and without knowing where we have them from. It is the same with gravity, with Earth's revolution. They are, but we don't feel them. Kant doesn't even seem interested in the origin of forms or categories, we just have them and with them we can understand and know nature, the surrounding reality. From Kant to us data was collected that makes us accept the fact that space,

time, and the categories with which we understand the world would form through experience, through learning. It is still difficult to try to prove that everything comes only through learning, we have something before we are able to learn, an a priori that makes learning possible. This re-launches Kant's point of view, because we have an a priori that helps us know, mature, become people. Lucian Blaga comes to show that our unconscious contains a priori forms, it contains a spatial, temporal structure, categories of the unconscious, stylistic categories which also help with the modeling of our notions, which we use more or less consciously, about space, time, and categories.

Kant, in *The Metaphysics of Morals*, makes a remarkable parallel between pure and practical reason. "...to my volition affected by sensitive covetings is being added also the Idea of the same pure practical volition..., but belonging to the intelligible world...: almost the same way that to the sensible world's intuitions are being added concepts of the intellect, which through themselves only mean the logical form in general and which thus make possible a priori synthetic judgments, on which any knowledge of nature is based." (Immanuel Kant, *Op. crit.*, p.73). In order to succeed in happiness, in pleasure, in good, in freedom, we need the intelligible world's domain, which offers us a categorical imperative. We belong, as phenomenon, to the sensible world, and as reason to the intelligible one. Even if within us these two worlds unite, we are beings determined by the laws of nature, so deprived of freedom, but free through our own volition. It is a distinction that would separate beings without reason, animals, which are determined by natural laws, by instincts, from rational beings, who can be free through volition. This means that man can be viewed from two different points of view; as belonging to instincts, being dominated by them, but free from this determination through his willpower, through the fact that he is man and not animal. It is true that, in its turn, man's volition to be free, happy, to have pleasure in life, to sign up for good

actions, is also dependent, dominated by the categories of the unconscious, the conscious, archetypes, by the intelligible world. These notions and categories determine us as rational beings, but they make us free as individual volition.

I would like to go a little deeper. According to what Kant said, the *a priori* notions and categories are only a scheme, a structure that fills with data offered by our sensitivity. Even the notions proposed by Błaga are the same, a structure that through personance brings modifications in the forms and categories of our understanding. We know that we have certain notions, Jean Piaget even showed it experimentally, which start functioning with the maturation of our nervous system. Mathematical notions, like other abstract notions, are only formed in our mind at a certain age. We have the notions of truth, beauty, and good very early and they develop in parallel with the instincts of defense, aggression, and also the first signs of the sexual instinct. Let's remember the wolf children found in India, which had developed only aggression, defense, and hunger instincts. With all the efforts made by those who cared for them, they weren't able to activate in them either speaking or any notion of communication through signs or feelings. Before they died they sketched, nevertheless, a human smile, a sketch of pleasure and good notions. The neuronal paths these children had, the sketch of the notions they had, were not able to function any more once they were definitively closed through the absence of adequate stimuli in the first childhood period. It would seem that we have certain notions of good, of beauty, of truth, approximately how Plato saw his world of ideas. Only these notions do not exist in a transcendent world of Ideas, they are within us, we have them in the intelligible world, we have them as an *a priori* of our being. They are very close to how Jung saw archetypes. I don't know if such notions, such Ideas, are not included in archetypes.

I would like to be a bit more explicit, to be able to be understood, to say what I want as simple as possible.

The human animal has inherited instincts, like any animal; it also has, still like any animal, certain inherited notions and categories, like a sort of sketch, of scaffolding, that becomes construction throughout life. This animal has succeeded, no one knows how, to also possess thinking, reasoning. Due to reason, the baggage each man inherits is richer, has become richer. We started having more elaborate categories and, next to the a priori forms of sensibility, *space* and *time*, we have, from birth, the sketch of abstract notions. Beauty, love, good, truth number among them, together with the archetype of the absolute, of the father, of water, of life-giving water, and many others. Everything we have as belonging to the human species could belong to any rational being. As Immanuel Kant thought, there is an *a priori* for every individual being, for every one of us, an a priori with which we are born, with which we grow up, on which we build our being as individuals, an a priori which fixes us as individuals in the species of rational animals.

This entire a priori is unconscious for us and for the adult man it can be brought into conscious with a command of the volition, so of the conscious reason. Instincts are a presence in any activity we perform. We eat daily, we dress, we shelter from rain and blizzard, we love and have sexual relationships. Instincts are the characteristic of animality, that why they are present in us at every step, but we have reason. Rationality, even when very developed, is not a necessarily dominant characteristic in all people, but this possibility cannot be excluded.

We said that we, as people, have an unconscious populated with richly structured notions and categories. They are an a priori. If a moral law can exist in such a way that what we want at a certain moment, what we want to fulfill, can always be a principle of a universal law, this can only depend on the intelligible world, on what we have a priori. This unconscious *a priori*, enriched by every one of us, is our stylistic matrix, together with the archetypes.

For the ancient man, physical, emotional, as well as spiritual values were together and they were similar. The man beautiful on the outside also had a beautiful inside. This is what the well known Oscar Wilde novel *The Portrait of Dorian Gray* is based on. Socrates had an ugly face, but a beautiful body; in his youth he fought sword in hand for Athena. Plato, in *Lysis*, proposes another such proximity until fusion between beauty of the body and that of the spirit.

What is a sporting achievement in our world today? What is sport? An ancient inheritance. Physical education and sport polish us, when they are not exaggerated, they model our instinctual urges of aggressiveness, they sublimate them into the desire to win a competition, to be victorious. With the occasion of this action certain archetypes can be stimulated, which sustain the moral values that are so needed in any sporting competition if we don't want them transformed into a slaughter. Such actions of sublimation of instincts can be achieved in any domain of human activity, but a constant support of the *eumeros* archetypes is required. Otherwise, any economic competition would be transformed in robbery, any army would be a gang of vagabonds, and men of science would take care of how to pull the rug from under each other's feet.

It is what Jung calls "conjunction oppositorum", when two poles, apparently opposed, without excluding each other, will collaborate, will be inscribed in the same Universe of discourse. Just as we need water and fire to boil water, the same happens with bad and good. An action can be good for me and bad for my neighbor. The action *in itself* is neither good nor bad. It has a Universe of discourse of the action, while the value appraisals are a different Universe of discourse. Good and bad are relative for me, or for the neighbor, but they are part of the Universe of discourse of value appraisals. When the subject is man, his personality, his will, the rule is relativity, a relativity in the field of an action and the field of certain value appraisals that can intersect. To say nothing of the fact that each man has his

contradictions, his indecisiveness, these being able to influence any action. We cannot color the personality of a man, even if he is an exceptional man, full of lively, bright colors. We need shadows also, chiaroscuro. Each of us has more or fewer shadows.

The embrace of contraries, their neighborliness, should be the rule in the domain of the psyche, especially of spirituality, as it manifests, actually, every day and in everything man does. If we transpose the complementarity from physics into the psychic domain, it should mean an impossibility to have exact data about an individual, about an individuality, only about a “population” of individuals. Individuality remains not understood in its depth, but we know that we have a priori forms of sensibility, categories of knowledge, stylistic categories, instincts—*the shadow*, archetypes—*eumeros*. Another aspect of the psychism’s complementarity is the *transcendental censorship*.

The same structures, the same contents, with which we can know what is in the surrounding world, the same ones limit this knowledge. It is even the theme of the observer who influences the development of the experiment in physics. The light we are forced to send in order to see what happens in the atom will chase away the electrons from the orbit. The light with which we want to see modifies the atom. That’s why we can’t see anything, we are able to know what happens with atoms because we can measure the energy level of a “population” of atoms, the modification through measurement being negligible. That’s why it was difficult for Jung to see find the archetypes inside his patients’ mind. But he understood, finding a certain type of psychic invariants that he can use an artifice and search for archetypes in humanity’s myths. We have in our mind without knowing that we have them and where we have them from, a series of invariants that appear as symbols in a story. *Fairies* carry our good thoughts and help us fight against evil magic, *dragons* unfold instincts, the same with the *Greatest Dragon* and the *Shrew*.

Prince Charming and *Ileana Cosanzeana* are our hopes for what is beautiful, good, for love. The *Horse* that eats embers takes Prince Charming on the wings of thought. *Life-giving water*, dripped by a bird in Prince Charming's mouth when he fights the Greatest Dragon, gives the former his lost force, his power, in order to fight until he wins. Pinocchio needs a cricket, which is a sort of personal *daimon*. How many other symbols don't you find in stories? Maybe it would be good to think more, when we will search for archetypes, as even Jung says, about symbols. The name, the word, is itself a limitation from this point of view, even if otherwise it is a huge opening. The symbol, maybe even the thought, is more comprehensive, more *true*, if by truth we understand here the archetype's truth, than the word. *Mercurius*, the *philosopher's stone*, the *grass of life*, the *life-giving water* can be written down under the same archetype, even if we call them differently.

Let's return. Blaga does not speak anywhere about the intelligible world, nor does he speak about the world of Ideas, but the Stylistic Matrix is a structure of the unconscious which we partially have a priori, and we partially enrich through experience, and the characteristic of humanity, the motivation of man's existence, is the necessity, therefore a categorical imperative, to be a creator, to be conscious of living in a world of mysteries which man wants to reveal, to uncover through the creative act.

Reason can be a characteristic of man because you cannot be a creator without thinking, without being rational. But not only. Through reason we can also bring what is not desired, in other words we can have reason that can support evil, what is ugly, falsity, dirt. Here the participation of the unconscious, of the domain of our understanding, is very important. In order to understand the world, we use the a priori forms that we have, our stylistic matrix, more, and thinking as reason less. We think very well, when we understand the world, with only the aid of the

baggage of stylistic matrix and archetypes. If we want something, if we want to act, then reason comes into play. Kant made a very good delineation between *understanding* and *reason* (*Verstand* and *Vernunft*). I ask your permission to also point out the distinction made by K. Jaspers between *understanding* and *explanation* (*Erklärung*). The understanding through the stylistic matrix cannot lie to us, cannot lie. It always shows us to our face the truth compared to the notions and categories of the stylistic matrix, to archetypes. Reason, our will, we are free through it, it helps us achieve the greatest wonders and the most horrible actions. It helps us carry out what is beautiful, good, clean, charming, as well as what is bad, ugly, false. The great social experiments, a tragedy of humanity, were possible due to the deformed use of reason. Why deformed? As a matter of fact, beautiful and good is what I like. This is exactly the deformation typically used by reason, because *beautiful* and *good* should correspond to certain *archetypes* and not to our good liking determined by will.

We saw that along our stylistic matrix we have the categories of understanding and some very general abstract notions. Truth, beauty, good. These notions dominate us from early babyhood and we cannot escape from under their tutelage. They correspond to the species, they are under a universal law that can become, for us, a simple volitive, rational choice. Even what is beautiful can differ from one continent to the other, the same with what is true, or good, we all have these notions and they are filtered by the stylistic matrix, they are filled with a content that can be regional, but it behaves as if it was universal. Every one of us wants something, desire something, have pleasure for something, but the stylistic matrix and the archetypes are the determination under which we stand and we cannot escape them. It is something we don't know, but we feel. We feel the conflict that can be unleashed between what we want, our rational freedom, and the unconscious determination.

We know that there are multiple levels of memory. A superficial level of the immediate memory where new perception are stocked for relatively short periods of time. Here all perception, including the subliminal ones, are seemingly stocked helter-skelter, without rules to follow. They are probably stocked according to their arrival. This level has a great volume in which loads of information can be stored, but in which they cannot be saved for very long. When the superficial memory level is full appears fatigue. More levels follow, more and more profound, in which this information is arranged. The arrangement must be done according to a principle of economy of space and to guarantee the maximum speed in finding stocked information. As a matter of fact, this is probably why there is need for multiple levels of memory. This way, the information from the same family can be memorized grouped around a notion, for example. Finding an older piece of information can be done with great rapidity.

The memory levels are similar to onion layers, these different memory levels communicate with each other, but they each also have a relative independence, which can assure the safe keeping of a very large volume of information on each level. Let's not forget that we also remember the perceptions we are conscious of. Our brain was built to stock as much information as possible, with the option of reaching it quickly. Probably a necessity we don't yet understand, but this way the speed of communication between levels, between multiple levels, can be very high, and the stock volume increases greatly. For the time being I will say that this search is done both in depth, between levels, and on the same level, shortening the trip because the search is always performed in a family of notions, and not by checking all the deposits, the search follows a certain kinship, by color, by sound, by shape, by word. This trip of depositing-search has the aspect of a tree with many branches, a simple mathematical lattice aspect.

It seems like our memory can work with great speed and safety, if the depositing structure as well as the search structure are done similarly to a linguistic thesaurus. I don't know if our mind only remembers by verbalizing, I don't think so. Animals have a more imaginative memory. We remember images, but also words, entire passages from a book, poems. Let's not forget that the Vedas were spoken in verse, and that entire generations memorized them in their entirety. Even music helps in remembering verse. The Iliad was recited and sung the same as the minstrel stories in the Middle Ages. It is known that some people have a preponderantly imaginative memory, while others a preponderantly verbal one. When I try to remember a word, the first thing that comes to my mind is the first letter of the word. Why? Because I imagine it drawn. The memorization "notional" system brings around a notion, same as around a letter, countless nouns-objects, attributes-qualities, verbs-actions, and also copulas-links, words, but also images. Thus, around the notion of "house" gather all the houses I have seen with their diverse shapes, or houses I heard talk about, all the possible colors of a house, window panes, doors, windows, everything that can be in a house, along with all the feelings that linked me to a certain house, to certain houses. What a complex memory, but what a simple solution for depositing and finding data once perceived!

I think that our psychic problems, our psychic irregularities, our psychic conflicts appear due to non-synchronizations, if I may express myself this way, in the stocking and recalling of this information. Maybe here we can find the key to knowledge and to solving many psychic problems. Let me explain. Every second, we register perceptions through which our brain is connected to the outside environment. The registering is done in the most superficial level of memory. When this memory starts to be full with all sorts of information, we feel tired and we become sleepy. We sleep. Do our forces restore in our sleep? I don't think this

is where the secret of sleep lies. During sleep, we are in a way torn from the outside world, our perceptions are poor and they are reduced to interoceptions, to the information that comes from the body's interior, from our organs. It is the propitious moment for all the information perceived during the previous day's wakefulness, the period of immediately anterior consciousness, to be processed and deposited somewhere more profound. It is the moment when we can liberate our immediate memory from this information. Only then do we probably wake up rested and we are ready to start a new day full of new perceptions that also need to be memorized, deposited. When does the processing occur? In the REM sleep, during dreams. Dreaming. Sometimes we remember what we dreamt.—partially, probably—but most times we forget everything, because it is actually a sort of game, of trying to match new perceptions with older ones in order to find their deposit “little house”, the notional cloud in which they fit, as well as the memory level where they can be kept. It is possible that these data processes happen in several stages and they may even repeat, in order to ascertain their appointment, their long term memorization. Why is a good, correct appointment of the memorization location important? For the simple reason that it is easier to find something placed in a certain location, so for a better, more rapid use of this memorized information.

What do we do with those who don't sleep? It is very simple. It is not absolutely necessary to sleep in order for these processes, these memorizations, to take place. It is just necessary that the good functioning of memorization is not disturbed by consciousness, for nothing else to be perceived, or almost nothing. Somebody who rests in an armchair, quiet and without thinking about anything, can dream with open eyes, not figuratively but literally. During dreams, the processing of information, the depositing into memory can be done with images and sounds, with images and words, the words being written, seen, or heard.

During dreams, it's as if a translation of thinking into images takes place, we think with images. Psychoanalysts use these images that we remember to decipher certain psychic traumas, some complexes. Jung looks for the symbols of archetypes. But the interpretation of dreams has been done from antiquity and not seldom we grant a dream, like the antics, a premonitory value. How is it possible? I don't know. But I do know that in homeopathic medicine we use some dreams that repeat to find the remedy that can save a man. In general, in medicine we can use the information given to us by dreams, in standard medicine, not psychiatry. In a patient with insomnia, the therapeutic control, if the remedy is the one that will have an effect in time, is done by watching for the return of sleep, a sleep as normal as possible, that can assure a good processing of what we memorize.

It is important, in order to understand the point of view I am trying to communicate, to imagine how the deposit of our perceptions into memory takes place. First, the first level, that of the immediate memory, must clear of the quantity of perceptions accumulated. An image or a word recalls from the profound memory the family of images or words, of images and words that it corresponds to. This resemblance is checked and the package thus formed, from what is new together with what is old, is sent to a more profound layer of memory, memory which is, as I was saying, like the layers of an onion. There the contact continues in order to recheck the resemblance of the new package with even older data, kept even deeper in the memory. This continues until all new perceptions are resolved and the data is deposited the most profound possible, in the best place. What happens if there is no congruence, if the object, sentiment, word, the new one, does not quite resemble the one from its family, the one that was recalled to the surface? This mismatch can appear in actions, feelings, those seen or heard when an axiological value is associated with them. When something can be true, false, good, bad, beautiful, ugly. If what we registered does not resemble what is

deposited profoundly in our memory, or sometimes the archetypal symbol from our profound memory, then the memorization is blocked in an intermediary level. It can remain there or it can gush to the surface. I don't know if this is a method of repression of a sentiment, of an action, it seems something like that, but I suspect it takes place due to a defective resemblance, to a lack of resemblance, if not even an opposition. I think of something bad with a certain direction, on a certain Universe of discourse. This thought can be rejected by a previously achieved construction between the hinted situation, the man, and an archetype of good thoughts, of the good action. It is more difficult to wish bad and good to the same person, in the same period of time. This disagreement, difference, requires new processing, reason for which it is sent back into voluntary consciousness. This way we can rethink a decision, a previous thought. I can modify my thought by changing what I had decided, or I can strengthen it, give it more intensity. In this case, it can replace the previously formed pattern. The same way it is possible for them not to be resolved very quickly, the intensity of the two contrary sentiments being approximately equal, neither will be able to take the other's place. The conflict can return many times during wakefulness or sleep, when a new solution is being attempted. It can ruin our sleep, it can ruin our humor. The man becomes sad and insomniac. From here to real psychic suffering, to psychic illness, there is only one step, even if many years can pass until that moment. What is important is that, without a solution to this conflict, probably an axiological solution, and one that regards the intensity of sentiments, nothing is solved. It is true that a feeling that is too intense, love, hate, a feeling that does not easily find its place in the individual's unconscious, maybe due to its intensity, maybe because the individual wasn't used to it, to something new, thrilling, can also have the same effect. That's why conversations with a friend, confession and psychoanalysis are important. This is the domain of psychoanalysis, or at least of psychic analysis. It is always

good to find a little corner in our unconscious psyche to house such a feeling, to try to break it up into pieces, to see it up close, to find possible partial comparisons or to distance, if possible, those that can induce psychic trauma.

When chemical substances are used that modify, block the transmission, such as certain neurotransmitters, chemical mediators of inter-neuronal transmission, the circulation of information between memory levels can be stopped. The blocking of the meeting between certain older pieces of information and similar new ones can be reached. Remembering doesn't function well anymore. This way a new conflict can be avoided, a conflict that can traumatize the psyche, because the axiological conflict is postponed, temporized.

The chemical blocking of free information circulation between the different levels of memory can be useful for psychotic patients with severe (incurable) afflictions. But what is good for few is not, in this case, good for most who use them because they are anxious, insomniacs, traumatized by an axiological conflict that they are postponing chemically, but that will return with greater force at a certain moment, and they won't be rid of it until they find a solution, a deposit location after a previous analysis. Psychic analysis, psychoanalysis, I think are the only method to be used in such situations. Self-analysis can also be used, but it is better if it is assisted.

Freudian psychoanalysis knew a novel development with Lacan. A very appreciated psychiatrist who, like Freud and Jung, knew to be a fine observer of his patient's symptoms. The symptoms, in psychiatry, are the words. He looked to extract the truth of this communication between the one analyzed and the analyst. Lacan notices that we find ourselves in front of the unconscious as in front of somebody else. Just as we look into a mirror and we discover many unknowns of our face, the same way, the man who has a complex that he is hiding, involuntarily, carefully, starts to realize that he finds himself in front of *another* with whom he

would like to communicate. The analyst is the one who will help him, who will “verbalize, will translate into a story” what the man has so well hidden in his unconscious. The patient’s imaginary must acquire conscious existence through word. The analyst’s skill is very important as “the unconscious is that part of the concrete discourse... that is absent from the subject’s disposition...” The analyst will have to discover what is missing from the patient’s discourse such that the story is whole, is *true*. “The problem is the one of the rapport inside the subject between word and speech.” The inexpressible speech can be imagination, symbol, it has to reach the word in order to be expressed consciously, even if it reaches it as metaphor or metonymy. The analyst must catch the *other*’s discourse unawares, must make the unconscious speak. “The work of the dream is done through *condensations* (Verdichtung), or metaphor after metaphor, and through *displacements* (Verschiebung), or metonymy after metonymy, always the “missing” part from the WHOLE.” (Dr. Adolfo Fernandez-Zoïla, *Freud and Psychoanalyses*, Humanitas, 1996, p.340-356, tr. by the chapter’s translator). It is true that through metaphor we try to communicate something for which we don’t find a more direct way of expression, of course, when the metaphor is not used poetically, and the metonymy, which is a usual form of expression and is used in the most common situations, replaces a word with another maintaining the idea.

Because I had difficulties in understanding metonymy, I feel obliged to give a few explanations. We are talking about replacing a word with another in an expression without changing its meaning, keeping the idea. The word that replaces being in a logical, understandable relationship, or in a different connection determined by use. Thus we can use: what a good *hand*, while talking about a painter or a writer; a *cockerel*, a *napoleon*, for a gold coin; a *Xerox*, for a copier; a glass of *Tohani*, for the same wine; a *Goya* or *Pătrașcu* for a painting. I can give

may other examples because it is a very common figure of speech, very often used in usual conversation.

Lacan tries to tell us that the psyche's problems can be understood better if we refer to language, to the interior language as well as the expressed one. In this situation, Lacan, although he is a declared Freudian, is closer to Jung. The interior language, imagination, symbols, are symptoms also found by Jung. The symbolic content of the unconscious is a reality for Lacan, and a reality is also the *truth* of these contents. He doesn't say what he understands by truth. Is it patient X's truth? a human truth? or, maybe, a transcendental truth? An answer to one of these questions engages the human being differently.

Blaga saw the unconscious structured in concentric spheres, I prefer to say like onion layers, and he also saw the forming of a structure in the unconscious, a very complex structure that has axiological accents, orientations in space and time, directions of evolution. He saw a stylistic matrix, an individual characteristic of the unconscious, which is an *a priori* structure of forms and stylistic categories, a filter of perceptions, and that can associate with the unconscious archetypal content. Together, the *stylistic matrix* and the *archetypes* are a characteristic that bears in it the memory of the entire humanity, a structure that dominates our sensibility and can even influence consciousness, will, thought. With the instruments Blaga proposes a new access into the unconscious can be attempted. A new understanding of the unconscious can be reached. If all perceptions are passed through this filter of the subject before they can be processed and memorized, they are passed through the stylistic matrix and compared to the structures of archetypes, which means they become subjective, they become of the subject, we must admit that this subjectivity is a generality, if not even a universality. That's why the transcendent, which descended from the Great Anonymous (the Blaga

alternative) meets, unites, is one with the Kantian transcendental, with our cognitive forms, as well as the stylistic ones (Blaga).

I will return a bit. We have in front of us the myth of Oedipus, axis of construction for Freud's psychoanalysis, and artistic creation. Do you think Van Gogh painted because he was crazy? Or that the splendors he created consumed him physically and psychically to such an extent that he could no longer bear it, the flame of creation burnt him, consumed him, and he finished in madness? I adhere to this last point of view, which is Blaga's. Artistic creation can be devastating, it requires sacrifice. Any creation requires sacrifice. Do you remember *Rubliov*, Tarkovsky's film? Why do you think the film starts with the episode in which a muzhik takes off in a balloon made from animal skins from a church's steeple? It is an example of the sacrifice that any great creation requires. Why is his last film "*The Sacrifice*"? Why does Tarkovsky die so young? Of course, of a merciless illness. But, why does he reach it?

Why does old Dali set himself on fire? Because there is nobody left to feed his creative energy that he displayed his entire life, Gala had died, and it wasn't simply a sexual relationship, but a relationship of the soul, a lifetime relationship.

In the situations above, do you think that we can also search for an explanation linked to sexual complexes? Maybe. But what a pity would it be to simplify something so beautiful. Man's need to have another next to him, the need to have a woman, a man, next to you, sexual need as a symphony, as achievement. Trauma can appear, this time, when something breaks, when what was complete is lost. Didn't Plato say that the primordial Hermaphrodite was cut in two halves by the gods to take its power away, because man had become dangerous for the gods. The union between sexes can make man invincible and can give him incalculable energy. Man alone is destined for destruction. Sexuality is everything that is most beautiful, and beauty does not exclude pleasure.

There is a potential danger, to which I would like to draw attention, of the blocking of *personance* through rational intoxication, danger that can be produced when we voluntarily impose something that is contrary to our stylistic matrix, something that doesn't correspond to the archetypes we have. In this case, personance can no longer function well, communication between the conscious and the unconscious is critical. It is the situation of psychic ageing, when due to the lack of creative activity the unconscious is no longer solicited and man lets himself be dominated by rational rigidity. It is also the case of those who due to too much confidence in reason end up being limited, their activity becomes stereotypical, like in Eugene Ionescu's characters, creativity is missing, and the mental leads to premature ageing.

As far as the Oedipus myth is concerned, I asked you above to allow it to also be something else, something more, something that touches not only the depth of instincts, but also the airy parts of the spirit. He is the myth of man's creative power that comes out victorious in its fight against an implacable destiny. His victory is the freedom of the will for action. As I said before, Oedipus defeated the gods because his will to kill his father and have children with his own mother was never in his actions. We are tied to the species, to the nation, to the social group, to another, through our unconscious, through our stylistic matrix, through archetypes, but we are free through our creative thinking, through our will, through our conscious activity. We cannot escape our unconscious baggage, but we are humans through our conscious activity. It is true that conscious activity is influenced personally by the unconscious. It is true that our lifestyle is imposed by our stylistic matrix, that archetypes stake out our life, but as true is the presence of the freedom of action, of will, from conscious thinking.

Our unconscious living, our stylistic matrix, the archetypes, bring us baggage that is present in us whatever we do. It is intelligent to use it, to help

ourselves with its presence. Any battle against our stylistic matrix is losing one and can lead to illness, physical or psychic illness. We are whole beings only together with our unconscious. That's why it is not good to neglect it, on the contrary, it would be better to try to come close to it, to know it as much as we can, to make continuous efforts to know it and use it, to render its utility for life valuable. We can trust it completely, it won't lie to us, it cannot lie because lying would alter it and it was created to safe keep our being. This does not mean that we must forget that we are free through will and reason. But, attention: reason can be deceiving. If we teach it to lie, if we accustom reason to lie, if we think evil, if we lie conscious of what we are doing, reason moves away from what is clean, right, and beautiful. Reason, in this situation, deforms its function. It can become detrimental to us. There may appear conflicts, uncouplings, all sorts of dysfunctions, between reason and the unconscious. It is an open gate toward physical and mental illness. There may appear unsolvable insomnias, internal organ suffering, depressions, states of anxiety, sufferings that are difficult to control by using psychotropic medicine, soporifics, or drugs.

Lies, as well as evil-heavy thoughts, increase the risk of interior conflict in our psyche. The unconscious, the *eumeros*, will try to isolate what does not suit it, but the ethical conflict within us may aggravate.

You will tell me that it is not a situation we always encounter. Indeed, most times this is true, but there are also exceptions in those whom we call *amoral*, or with a deviated morality (it is the case of the main character in the film "Silence of the Lambs"), situations in which it seems that the unconscious forgot the vein of thousands of generations that formed it. There are people who only live *hic et nunc* (here and now) and cannot differentiate good from evil. Sometimes to kill or to torture can be a pleasure.

This is why wise men taught us not to lie, steal, do evil, because ugly thought and evil deeds, what is ugly and evil, all these come into conflict with the unconscious archetype that corresponds to good and beautiful deeds. All evil can return from where it came through disequilibrium or illness (which is also disequilibrium). We become slaves to our own badly used reason.

The spiritual revolution brought by Jesus Christ applies exactly here. The wise man rejoices in the return of the prodigal son, and Jesus came to us to expiate our sins. What does this mean? For the sinner He came to absolve him. If the sinner admits his mistakes, the idea of the psycho-spiritual analysis that every believer performs when confessing to a priest, if he admits lie, evil, done by his own will, then he can escape the boomerang or evil that turns against him to destroy him. Assisted self-knowledge, psychic self-analysis, supported by faith in the purity, the beauty of Him who came to save us, is the stretched out hand that can cure us. Maybe now we have the duty to make other efforts in our knowledge, in self-knowledge. It is good to know that we cannot escape the consequences of our actions, be they good or bad, and that we are being limited in knowledge, because we have within us the censorship of our own categories with which we know ourselves. The instrument with which we are able to know has limits even in its internal built, it has limits even through the fact that we are able to know.

I propose to return to Carl Gustav Jung's thought given to the complementarity of the psychic life. He allocated great importance to the complementarity observed in physics. After he consults with W. Pauli, he will write: "...the concepts 'conscious' and 'unconscious' seem to offer a pretty close analogy to the 'complementarity situation in physics. ...The application of statistical laws to processes of atomic magnitude in physics has a noteworthy correspondence in psychology... Investigation of these effects yields the singular fact that they proceed from an unconscious reality..." (Carl Gustav Jung, *Collected*

Works Vol. 8: The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, tr. R.F.C. Hull, paragraphs. 439).

It is not the only complementarity in our psyche. We showed that it is also one between *shadow* and *eumeros*. Our entire cognitive structure, as well as the stylistic one, through which all perceptions, all thoughts pass, in order to be integrated and counted as knowledge, all these structures are at the same time a censorship of the knowledge they make possible. This complementary structure of our psyche was introduced by Kant and developed by Blaga.

Our perceptions are, first of all, censored anatomically by the organs with which we perceive, by eyes, ears, mouth, nose, and skin, then these perceptions pass through the cognitive filter of space, time, and categories, and are annexed to our thoughts, feelings, which also depend on archetypes, on *shadow*, as well as on *eumeros*, in which both animal and human memories are deposited.

These elements of our psyche escape the knowledge possibilities. We can have only bits of knowledge that come into the conscious. Is this agnosticism? Yes. Just like Kant was agnostic, like Freud and Jung are agnostics. Only due to Kant we have a science of knowledge and due to Freud, Jung, and others, we are in possession of certain pieces of knowledge about what cannot be known, about the *unconscious*. Jung will even say: "...it is not only psychology that suffers from the misfortune of having to give its object, the unconscious, a ...negative name; the same thing happened in physics, since it could not avoid using the ancient term "atom" (meaning "indivisible")" (Carl Gustav Jung, *Collected Works Vol. 8: The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, tr. R.F.C. Hull, paragraphs. 417). Understanding the complementary function of the cognitive structures of the conscious and unconscious can be of help.

We could be more parsimonious with the lies and misdeeds, with the blamable deeds. From now on we should know that we have within us the help

given to maintain our soul and spiritual beauty, that God is within us. God means truth, beauty, love, goodness. We have them within us through our unconscious understanding. Whether we will hide from what we have within us depends only on our decision. Attention! Through personance everything will surface, but it will meet something opposed, even contradictory, it will meet lie, ugliness and evil, and that may produce a psychic conflict difficult to resolve. I admit that this vision of God that every man can find within themselves, is a bit idyllic as long as there are so many “loiterers”, and nobody really has heard of such a character having conflicts with himself. There’s nothing we can do! We are so different from each other! Only in the animal world can we find a certain uniformity, because it is a world that’s missing reason, it is lead by instincts and the sketch of an eumeros.

Let’s be optimistic! Look everywhere around you: you will find only splendid manifestations of man’s creative power, you will find them in today’s world, in the artistic world as well as the technical one, you will find it in everything archeologists dig up, everywhere we find proof of man’s creative power. Even the most modest man can create, at home, an environment only for himself in which he feels good. To say nothing of the creations in folkloric art. It is obvious with us, in Eastern Europe, but even of pre-Columbian America, that artistic beauty, artistic creation, is and was part of man’s daily necessity. Human creation is our natural environment in which we live even if we are not always too conscious of it.

There is a necessity of art. I don’t think there can be a man who could live without producing or consuming art. Music, architecture, theater, decorating, other fine arts, accompany us everywhere our entire lives. Moreover, we search for them everywhere, because we need them. I don’t know what a world without art would be, maybe the Gulag, severe confinement, when man is at the limit of existence, only in these kinds of situations might man live without art.

Let's not forget that we are creators, this is man's destiny, to be a creator, even when we consume art. I read a book, I listen to music, I admire a painting or a sunset, every time something from within me participates like a sort of recreation of what has already been created or is natural. We participate with our stylistic matrix, with our archetypes and willpower, bringing what is personal in us, when we admire an artistic product. When I listen to music, I hear something else every time, the sunset I admire is different every time, just as the flowers in my garden seem different every time, even if I see them every day. We, people, are all creators, larger or smaller, but creators. Our life is creation. The peasant in the field, as well as the man who hammers create too, the housewife who prepares food and the way she serves it is also a creation, every object coming from man's hand is a creation.

If man's destiny is creation, in diverse domains, let's see what psychoanalysts think about creators. Creation, especially the artistic kind, would be a sort of "treatment", man creates, trying to heal his complexes. Do complexes, sexual repressions, push him to be creative, does illness fertilize creation? This rather biological, medical point of view is poor and does not take into consideration the fact that all cultural creations are judged for their content, for their quality and less for their makers. "...cultural creation cannot in its essence be connected to anything else but man's creative destiny itself... All naturalistic attempts to derive creative attitude from need, for example the needs for equilibrium, compensation, spending of excessive energy, satisfying certain repressed wishes, etc., etc., fall next to the phenomenon or penetrate at the most to its periphery. None of the naturalistic attempts wants to take note of an occurrence, a fundamental one: cultural creations are dominated by a stylistic matrix, being structured on abyssal lasts... We do not view culture in a humanistic way, as means of attenuating animality ... or as reaction against animality as is. On the contrary,

we realize that both the creation of culture and certain phases or types of culture, even among the greatest, have their cruelty and barbarities almost incredible. Let's just think about the pharaonic method of creating culture, or to the cruelties inherent in medievalism, also originator of monumental culture. Creating culture sometimes requires unspeakable sacrifices: it kills and devastates. Creation has its fire. Master M Manole walled in his wife under stone and lime in order to erect the church. We catch gurgling in this legend the cruel echo of conscience or of the premonition that a creation passes over lives and often devastates the creator himself. <To create> does not mean for the creator to acquire a certain equilibrium, as a too naïve and plain interpretation claims... True creation happens, most often, only at high tensions, which the organs of execution not always withstand. Creation often crushes the creator. The creator of culture cannot even have the solace that he is attenuating the cruelties inherent to life. On the contrary, sometimes he aggravates them, or it adds new cruelties to it. The creator of culture can say with Jesus: "I did not come to bring peace on Earth, but sword!" (Lucian Blaga, *Op. crit.*, p. 471, 472, 485)

So, creator can be any man as healthy as he might be, and that's because health is pretty hard to catch and then shout: this is it! Moreover, physical health and mental health are not even mandatory. What is absolutely necessary is a stylistic matrix, associated with the archetypes, that corresponds to a creative pulse. As far as the opinion that a creative tendency is capable of healing psychic disequilibrium, I doubt it is possible. It is easy to make a mistake when we know that there exists an occupational therapy used by psychiatrists. That's something totally different, something totally different are paint exhibitions of schizophrenics. Really, you can track down in these paintings the psychic disequilibrium that dominates the patient because disequilibrium is, in this case, the rule. And if some

feel ameliorated after they paint, that's not artistic creation, it is only therapy through a pleasant activity.

And the great creators? Agamemnon sacrifices his daughter to be able to conquer Troy. Abraham was going to sacrifice his son to persuade God. Amerindians sacrificed some youth to the Sun god to have good crops and not die of hunger. Faust sacrifices his soul to have youth. Odin gave an eye in order to know. The Bible and all mythologies are full of the sacrifices people must make to be able to create something, to be creators. Simple people from the country are not happy if they have gain they did not work for, because they know that someday they will have to pay for it. The implacable law of Karma tells us the same thing: you will obtain nothing without paying for it. For each action, bad or good, there is payment.

The abyssal noology proposed by Lucian Blaga opens an unsuspected perspective for the understanding of the unconscious, of the understanding knowledge with its notions and abyssal categories. Psychoanalysis remains a medical domain whose importance should not exceed the clinical too much.

Before concluding, I don't think it is possible to pass over the valuable information offered by physician Gheorghe Brătescu in *Freud and Psychoanalysis in Romania*.

Valuable information because it was collected carefully and if placed head to head they permit us to form an image of ensemble. It is curious, after reading it, you have the impression that most medical doctors and thinkers in Romania have something in common, even when they have diverging points of view. Maybe the common denominator is communicated to us best by N. Steinhardt in *The Journal of Happiness*. Having a chat, in his cell in Jilava⁵, with Anatolie Hagit-Beca about the Romanian phenomenon, they stop at the novella *The Traveler is Best Suited*

⁵ A prison in Romania.

with the Road, by Brătescu-Voinești. They both agree that the novella is written rather schematically and is of a Caragialism⁶ that's lost all its acid and venom. Still, the novella has the gift of putting the Romanian soul on a tray. "The archetypal fond of the Romanian soul appears as it is: joyous, craving for friendship, wishing to see another's contentment (Hey Năiță, if you love me, take this little fat piece over here⁷), incapable of being happy on his own, burning with the impatience of sharing any luck with another. (...in our parts a party involves all dinner companions and general mirth.) ... The conscious disappears and—even if a psychoanalysis is not followed, the unconscious is unveiled. But what a surprise! If psychoanalysis teaches us that behind the apparently clear, dignified and clean conscious boils the somber, slushy, complexed, and abject unconscious, here is the Romanian soul and things sit upside down.

...The deeper layers of Brătescu-Voinești's novella reveal the depths of a lake of great clearness, just like the ballad *Miorița*...

...You see, Anatolie, *The Traveler is Best Suited with the Road* is a piece of great meaning for Romanian typology... it remains like a... X-ray of the character of a people. ...the deep layers of the Romanian soul are calm and clear, in the mioritic⁸ lake—modest in surface area, placed at the periphery of the great centers of civilization, at "the crossroads of the great empires"—is reflected a completely clean sky." (N. Steinhardt, *Jurnalul fericirii*, Ed. Dacia, 1991, p. 162-163)

N. Steinhardt was a thinker, but let's see what physician psychiatrist Corneliu Vlad has to say, one of the people who introduced psychoanalysis in our country and served it all his life? A supporter of Freudian psychoanalysis. He writes a book in 1928, *Love, hate, and fear*, triad to which he referred until the end of his days, recommending its reprint, so that the world can see how love conquers

⁶ From Ion Luca Caragiale, Romanian writer famous for his acidic comedy.

⁷ In Romanian cuisine, the piece of meat with the most fat on it is considered the best.

⁸ Referring to the ballad *Miorița* (The Ewe), it symbolizes the beautiful pastoral landscape in Romania

hate and fear. For C. Vlad: “The primary noble, constructive affect is love... All that is good in the world comes from love, all miseries from hate and fear...We could say that Vlad’s <dissidence> against classic Freudism manifests exactly on this point... here is unveiled the < specific Romanian nature>, affable, consoling, concessive, of the psychoanalysis promoted by C. Vlad...” (G. Brătescu, *Freud and Psychoanalysis in Romania*, Humanitas, 1994, p.295).

It seems that the world of our archetypes prefers light, beauty, friendship, sociability. Contrary to the stories of the Germanic world for whom the forest is full of demons, for the Romanian, the forest was always a friend, a good mother who protects and feeds him. Let’s not forget that the Roman legions preferred to stop, in conquering Dacia, at the gold mines in the Apuseni Mountains and they avoided entering the unwelcoming for them forests of Northern Transilvania, of the Country of Maramures, and that they paid the tribes of free Dacians in Moldova to protect them, as much as they were able to protect them, against the invasion from the East. The forest was for hundreds of years for the Romanian house, mother, and friend, favoring with all its darkness the safekeeping of bright archetypes.

Maybe that’s how the Blagian split from psychoanalysis should be viewed. He searched for what is bright in the unconscious, he searched for the spirit that lives in the unconscious, refusing to consider it only a domain where the complexes of the conscious life are kept.

I think that another proof that Blaga never denied psychoanalysis lies in his autobiographical novel, *The Boat of Caron*. The painter Alina has a complex, she cannot have sexual relations. She was sexually aggressed at age 12. An unfulfilled rape, but one that marked her entire sexual life. Married, she cannot sleep with her husband who divorces her after living together for 8 years. A happy event makes her regain her woman’s life, but only after 35 years. Through this small story,

Blaga shows us that between 1950-1960, the approximate date of writing the novel, he was still an adept of Freudism, of Freudism as medical practice. He was still opposed to a type of Freudism that was imposed as belief, to an outlook about the unconscious that could not correspond to what he had found through philosophy.

In the same novel he will have a discussion with his alter ego, the philosopher Leonte, about Marxism, the sole philosophy that was imposed in all domains. Leonte notices, reading the day's brochures, that in the absence of a pertinent Western critique, historical materialism is a concept that is based on elements to a high degree psychological, and not materialistic. "...historical materialism is the first systematic psychoanalysis vast in scope... Psychoanalysis was built around the sexual instinct. It told us about the domination of this instinct, and about the way it determines us, from the unconscious depths, our entire psychic life... but the psychoanalysis of sexuality is not the only psychoanalysis... <historical materialism> has built, decades before modern psychoanalysis, a system of psychoanalysis based on a different instinct: hunger, conservation... Historical materialism is the Psychoanalysis of hunger... it expresses clearly the way of social organization to satisfy the instinct of hunger... *Sublimation* appears as *Superstructure*... Production relations represent the form under which society organizes itself during the time of satisfying the fundamental instinct of *hunger*..."

This point of view leads us, as even Blaga says, to understand that

"Psychoanalysis is not one, it would be multiple. So many Psychoanalyses are possible as many fundamental instincts are at hand in life... human instincts never make history without the complicity of certain factors of spiritual nature." (Lucian Blaga, *The Boat of Caron*, Humanitas, 1990, p. 198-199).

In this text can be noticed that Blaga's adhesion to Psychoanalysis is, as I was saying, in this late period, with nothing diminished compared to the period

before 1930. It is true, compared to *Horizon and Style*, here he is closer to Adler than to Jung. Explicably, after he lived through a devastating war and the Russian occupation of Romania, when the will of the conqueror was law. This makes him understand that the instincts of existence, of defense, can be the place of repressions, sublimations, individual or social. What other were *vital space* for the Nazis or the need for *class fight*, for the *proletariat dictatorship* for Communists? Aren't they repressions induced by hunger, by misery and repressions through aggression? That's why socialist revolutions were possible in the geographical areas of misery, hunger, not as Marx thought, in developed capitalist countries.

I think there is also possible a social psychology induced by the dominant archetype of the *omnipotent father*. In this case complexes are also possible, so are repressions and regressions through aggression. Maybe that's why people of all times needed and need a boss, a tribe leader, an army chief, a lord, a prince, a king, a president, an emperor, a dictator. This archetype connected to man's need for spirituality lead to religion, to the need for a connection with an existence that transcends us, that is beyond us.

That's why we people are such complicated and hard to know beings.

Maybe it is about time that at the beginning of the XXI century we lean with interest over the effort made by Lucian Blaga in the philosophical approach to the unconscious and we complete, this way, what we know relatively truncated until now.