

Psychology of the 12th Century Renaissance in Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival**

Tatsuhiko Nakajima, Ph. D.**

Abstract: Is theoretical construction of Carl Jung's psychology an extension of Aristotle's natural philosophy and Hermeticism? Aristotle's natural philosophy was transferred to the 12th century Europe, via Arabic and Persian astrology, with Hermeticism and Neoplatonism. Transmission of *Corpus Hermeticum* to Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival* was an example. It is possible to identify the psychology of Aristotle in these texts. Aristotle's natural philosophy was displaced by the philosophy of mind after Descartes, and Jung analyzed this paradigm shift as the depsychologization of projected psychology. With his archetypal theory, Jung compensated for what was missing in modern psychology due to a radical break between the Cartesian mind and the Aristotelian soul. By applying the methodology of the continuity thesis of the history of science, Jung's psychology is elucidated as a renewal of natural philosophy through transformation. Jung transformed Aristotle's epistemological distinction between reason (*logos*) and intellect (*nous*) into the differentiation of the ego and the self.

Key words: gnosticism and the grail legend; 12th century Renaissance; epistemology of Aristotle and Jung

*Manuscript received: 11th November, 2017. Accepted: 15th July, 2018.

**Santa Bárbara, USA. IAJS, livtung365@gmail.com.

'Writing is a sea. Its reeds are a shore. Hasten therein, little one, little one!'
The Ancient Egyptian Book of Thoth.

1. Introduction

James Hillman (1983b) once asked, 'Why does the psyche need to present experience dressed in the costumes of the past, as if it were history? Why does the psyche historicize? What does historicizing do for the soul?' (p. 43). Hillman regarded these moves into history as a means of detachment of the psyche rather than defensive maneuver by the ego to escape from the present reality by placing events in the past. The psyche spontaneously historicizes to gain a particular kind of distance as a means of separating act from actuality to have a look at it in another light. Hillman explained:

The psyche puts an event into another time so it can be treated in another style, such as we would use to treat any historical event, with a certain quality of respect, bemused curiosity, and dispassionate inquiry—and above all by gathering its cultural context. Historicizing is less a sign of psychological defensiveness than of the psyche getting out from under the ego's domination.

Historicizing, moreover, puts events into another genre. Neither here and now, nor once upon a time, but halfway between. Yet this between has a precise locus in history and event placed there may require treatment in the style of that historical time.

Not all psychological complexes appearing as dream figures and symptoms are up to date, asking for a today kind of therapy. (...) The historical fictions that the psyche uses to tell us where we are also tell the kind of therapy called for. (...) Symptoms are a way of entering history: other times, other complaints. History is a way of entering symptoms (p. 44).

By identifying Aristotle's natural philosophy and Hermeticism in Carl Jung's recollection and deconstruction of antique psychology, I attempt to place Jung's psychology in the history of science. The aim of this paper is to reevaluate Jung's psychology as medicine of the modern soul which is now ruled by science and technology. To locate Jung's psychology in the history of science provides a scientific ground for a practice of Jungian and post-Jungian psychotherapy.

Mathew Mather (2014) described research on the grail legend by Emma Jung and the importance of this for Carl Jung:

[Carl] Jung wrote very little about Merlin and the grail legend, as this was his wife Emma's major project. However, although Emma was often asked to give lectures on the subject, she never managed to condense the enormous amount of material into book form (Hanna 1976: 259). Hanna writes that a reason for this is that she had not yet worked out 'the thorny problem of Merlin' (ibid.). After Emma's death, Jung asked Marie-Louise von Franz to finish the task. He was apparently 'exceedingly pleased with the result' (ibid.) (p. 107).

In fact, had it not been for Jung's unwillingness to intrude upon his wife's field, Jung would have included more materials relating to the quest for the Grail and the fisher king in his alchemical studies while he was working on the fish symbol of Christianity in *Aion* (1968a). Marie-Louise von Franz (1980) explained her scope of the editorial work she performed in completing Emma Jung's legacy:

Mrs. Jung had been engaged on the Grail legend for thirty years and was planning an extensive publication on the subject. Her labours were cut short by her death in 1955 when, in response to Professor Jung's wish, I undertook to bring her work to a conclusion. In order that the completed work might be as homogeneous as possible, I have continued the interpretation from the point at which it was interrupted, and I have based my work, in the first instance, on the material collected and sifted by Mrs. Jung (p. 7).

Franz added a footnote to that to say, 'Under the circumstances it has not been possible to include all of the newer literature' (1980, p. 8). She preferred Chrétien's interpretation for its translation value, while she acknowledged Eschenbach's version as being more important and referred to it frequently. Franz included the research of Eschenbach's *Parzival* undertaken by Henry Kahane and Renée Kahane (1965) after Emma Jung's death, only as supplementary information. If the significant texts written after Emma Jung's death had been more incorporated, it could have been a different text. In a sense, the research on the grail legend was incomplete for Franz and needs to be developed from recent findings in the field of the intellectual history of science and ideas. In my research, I examine Eschenbach's *Parzival* with the texts probed deeply into alchemy and gnosticism in *Parzival* as a historical continuity.[1]

It is well-known that Greco-Arabic science entered Western Europe in the 12th century. It was a dramatic break with the past and a new beginning with the enrichment of a Latin science (Grant, 1996). Logic, science, and natural philosophy were henceforth institutionalized. The translation of Aristotle's natural philosophy as well as the related Greco-Arabic sciences, such as astrology and medicine, was the core of manuscript reproduction and dissemination, and was deeply rooted in the medieval universities. As Charles Homer Haskins (1927) pointed out, 'In the Middle Ages, as in ancient Greece, philosophy and science were closely allied, if not inseparable; indeed in most medieval classifications of knowledge science was only a branch of philosophy' (p. 341). The paradigm shift was going on in the psyche of the 12th century Europe. David Fideler (1991) explained the emergence of the Grail legend out of the new paradigm of the history:

There has been much talk of the Renaissance of the twelfth century, but while renaissance literally means rebirth, and refers in the case of the Italian Renaissance to the rediscovery of classical learning, I do not feel that the term can properly be applied to this movement of the twelfth century. That is because in the twelfth century we do not witness the rebirth of something which previously existed, but the emergence of a totally new phenomenon: not only do we see the emergence of romantic love, a concept which is unique to the West, but we also witness the emergence of what we now take for granted as the fundamental psychic and social dominants of European civilization. With the development of romantic love we also encounter an increased emphasis on the role of the individual: the quest for the Grail is an individual quest (p. 196).

The earliest version of the Grail quest appeared in *Perceval, li contes del graal (The Story of the Grail)* by Chrétien de Troyes, who claimed that his source was from the book given by his patron, Count Philip of Flanders. The poem was dated sometime between 1180 and 1191; however, it was incomplete due to his death. Chrétien's version reads like a fairytale and retained its original form of a legend orally transmitted from Celtic mythology. The Grail referred to the Celtic dish of plenty, a mythic vessel which provides an unlimited source of sustenance. Chrétien did not use a capital letter for the Grail but referred it as a common noun 'a grail' (*un graal*). The explicit Christianization of the Grail began with Robert de Boron in his *Joseph d'Armathie* where he stated that the Grail was the chalice used at the Last Supper and then brought to Glastonbury, England by Joseph of Arimathea. Also, the bleeding lance was associated with the lance of Longinus which pierced the side of Christ.

In his epic *Parzival*, Wolfram von Eschenbach reworked Chrétien's incomplete poem, and revised the text greatly to comprise an esoteric quest for readers. What is so unique about the reworking is that Eschenbach consciously avoided the explicit Christianization of the Grail by rendering it not as a dish or chalice, but as the Philosopher's Stone of alchemy. In Eschenbach's text, *lapsit exillis* is an anagram of *lapis elixir* meaning "medicinal stone" or *lapis exilis* which the alchemist Arnaldus de Villanova called "stone of no worth" (Franz & Jung, 1980; Jung, 1968d). By adding the diversity of Aristotelian natural philosophy and Hermeticism to Christian allegory, Eschenbach succeeded in creating a product of imaginal psychology of the 12th century.[2] The imaginal psychology is a psychology of *mundus imaginalis*, the imaginal realm which I will explain later in terms of Islamic philosophy.

Eschenbach was a German knight and Minnesinger who wrote and performed Minnesang, the courtly lyric and secular monophony popular in Germany from the 12th century to the 14th century. Minnesinger was similar to the Provençal troubadour tradition, though it had

independent features. Eschenbach referred to Kyot as a Provençal troubadour, calling him *laschantiure*, construed as *l'enchanteur* (jongleur) or *le chanteur* (singer) who saw the original story of *Parzival* in the 'heathenish tongue,' which was probably Arabic. Kahane and Kahane identified Kyot as William of Tudela, the author of the first part of the *Chanson de la croisade albigeoise*. By the 12th century in Western Europe, many scientific and philosophical works, including a large amount of astrological texts, were being translated from the Arabic, which reached Toledo in 1085 and Zaragoza in 1118 (Haskins, 1927). Tudela was located close to Zaragoza, and belonged to the bishopric of Tarazona, one of the great centers of the translation of Arabic astrology (Haskins, 1927; Kahane & Kahane, 1965). Hugh of Santalla as being one of the most distinguished translators of the Aragonese-Navarrese group, his most important translation *Book of Causes* ends with the famous alchemical text known as the *Tabula Smaragdina (Emerald Tablet)* (Kahane & Kahane, 1965). In addition to this, Hugh translated three other works related to Hermetism. Based on several more findings, Kahane and Kahane (1965) described the source of Eschenbach's esoteric knowledge as follows:

Kyot is a man of the twelfth-century Renaissance. He represents the culture of the Catalan-Provençal Raum [area]. His training must have taken place in the atmosphere of the Arabic-Jewish-Spanish cultural symbiosis which marked the group of translators and geomancers in Tarazona. His life in an Albigensian milieu brought him in contact with the doctrines of this sect (...). This background enabled him to transmit to Wolfram vital source material for the Parzival. First of all, he provided (...) some form of the Corpus hermeticum in an Arabic version (p. 154).

Kahane and Kahane uncovered many common features between gnostic texts Corpus Hermeticum known as Hermetica and Parzival.[3] They found that Eschenbach made the most extensive use of the fourth treatise 'A Discourse of Hermes to Tat: The Krater, or the Monad' (Ἑρμοῦ πρὸς τὰτ ὁ κρατήρ [ἡ μονάς]), and pointed out that Hermetica's use of the word 'krater' (κρατήρ) is identical with Eschenbach's use of the word 'grail' (grâl). For example, in *Parzival* it is described as 'the famous Master Kyot found the prime version of this tale in heathenish script lying all neglected in a corner of Toledo [Tudela]' (p. 232). Eschenbach (trans. 1980) wrote about the astrological origin of the grail:

*Flegetanis der heiden sach,
dâ von er blûclîche sprach,
in dem gestirne mit sînen ougen
verholnbaeriu tougen.
er jach, ez hieze ein dinc der grâl:
des namen las er sunder twâl
in dem gestirne, wie der hiez.
'ein schar in ûf der erden liez:
diu vuor ûf über die sterne hôch.'*

[With his own eyes the heathen Flegetanis saw—and he spoke of it reverentially—hidden secrets in the constellations. He declared there was a thing called the Gral, whose name he read in the stars without more ado. 'A troop left it on earth then rose high above the stars' (p. 232)].

Flegetanis is depicted as a Hermetic astrologer descended from Solomon.

Jung (1963) said, 'Grounded in the natural philosophy of the Middle Ages, alchemy formed the bridge on the one hand into the past, to Gnosticism, and on the other into the future, to the modern psychology of the unconscious' (p. 201). In this formula of Jung's, the grail legend

is placed at the midpoint between gnosticism and alchemy, as a vessel in which ancient gnosticism transformed into early modern alchemy. As Jung recognized that gnosticism was a psychology of the ancient, Eschenbach incorporated the text of Corpus Hermeticum in his epic as an imaginal psychology of the 12th century. The question is 'What was that psychology?' Is there any continuity from the ancient psychology of Hermetica via Parzival to modern psychology? In what way?

2. Continuity Thesis

Scientific Revolution of the 17th century, followed by the institutionalization and professionalization of scientists in the 19th century, flourished as technological revolution in the 20th century. According to Edward Grant (1996, 2007), he explained the continuity thesis that there was no radical discontinuity between the intellectual development before and after Scientific Revolution. The process of the developments in the late Middle Ages to the early modern period resulted in Scientific Revolution. The idea of this continuity began with Pierre Duhem, the French physicist and philosopher of science, followed by George Sarton. Grant referred to the European Renaissance of the 12th century as a sign of the continuity of Greco-Arabic-Latin science and natural philosophy. Grant (2007) articulates his point of contention regarding the continuity thesis of the history of science:

Andrew Cunningham and Perry Williams have claimed that natural philosophy and science were two wholly different enterprises that never coexisted: natural philosophy appeared first in the ancient world and continued to exist for many centuries until it was wholly replaced by science, or modern science, in the nineteenth century. Similarly, Floris Cohen has argued that 'the emancipation of science from an overarching entity called 'natural philosophy' is one defining characteristic of the Scientific Revolution.' I shall argue (...) that these are serious misunderstandings of the history of science. The virtual opposite of these claims is the more accurate description. The Scientific Revolution occurred because, after coexisting independently for many centuries, the exact sciences of optics, mechanics, and especially astronomy merged with natural philosophy in the seventeenth century. This momentous occurrence broadened the previously all-too narrow scope of the ancient and medieval exact sciences (...), which now, by virtue of natural philosophy, would seek physical causes for all sorts of natural phenomena, rather than being confined to mere calculation and quantification. Thus were the seeds planted for the flowering of the modern version of the exact physical sciences, and the many other sciences that emerged during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. As the 'Great Mother of the Sciences,' natural philosophy nourished within itself a multiplicity of specialized sciences, such as physics, chemistry, biology, and their numerous subdivisions. By the end of the nineteenth century, many of these sciences had reached sufficient maturity and development to depart natural philosophy and become independent entities (p. 303).

Psychology was one of those *genes* of the Great Mother of the sciences. The gene traces back to Aristotle's natural philosophy.

3. Egyptian Hermes

A collection of 17 Greek treatises supplemented by one preserved in Latin translation, as a corpus, were put together between the sixth and 11th centuries and ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus. These Greco-Egyptian wisdom texts were already in existence from the second and third centuries CE in Egypt. The treatises, several of which were written in the form of dialogues between the spirit guide Hermes Trismegistus (thrice-greatest Hermes) and his

disciples, are characterized as 'the pagan branch of gnosticism' (Kahane & Kahane, 1965, p. 6). They consist of the religious and philosophical syncretism of Platonism, Stoicism, and Judaism, as well as a gnostic strain which includes the Egyptian cults of Thoth, Isis, and Re (Festugière & Nock, 1983; Fowden, 1986; Jasnow & Zauzich, 2005; Scott, 1993).

Hermes Trismegistus of *Hermetica* was an Egyptianized Hermes, not the traditional Greek Hermes clad in chlamys and winged hat and sandals. Garth Fowden (1986) describes the cultural synthesis and absorption of Greco-Roman Egypt as Hermes was Egyptianized by translating, either literally or metaphorically, the attributes of Egyptian God Thoth.

In Egypt, Thoth was a moon-god, and hence the ruler of Time and the regulator of individual destinies. The peculiarity of Thoth's position among the ancient gods was that Thoth did not stand in the groupings of gods in any family relationship to the gods of Heliopolis and Osirian legend (Boylan, 1922). Thoth was self-created, god 'One' (Budge, 1904). However, his lunar character was derived from the lips of Re in Hathor legend. Re said to Thoth, 'I will cause thee to embrace the two heavens with thy beauty, and thy rays. Thereupon sprang into being the moon of Thoth' (Boylan, pp. 79-80). In mythology, Re and Thoth intertwined as the right eye of the sun and the left eye of the moon respectively. Thoth's connection with Re was indicated by the *utchat*, the sun-eye of Re that departed from Re and was lost. It was Thoth who sought and found it (Bleeker, 1973). It was also Thoth who played a prominent role in the battle of Re and Set. Set used his evil power to cast clouds over the sun-eye of Re, which Thoth swept away (Budge). In the *Book of the Dead*, the idea that the dead became Thoth, or the moon, was often expressed by saying, 'Re that shines in night' (Boylan, p. 63). The dead Pharaoh became one with the sun-god Re by day, and one with the moon-god Thoth by night. In the daytime Thoth journeyed with Re in the solar barque: in the nighttime he travelled alone in the lunar barque. Not only the right sun-eye in the myth of Re but also the left moon-eye in the famous battle of Horus and Set proved Thoth as the deity of the *visionary experience*. Thoth is, therefore, 'He who makes whole the Eye' (Boylan, p. 34). Fowden (1986) summarized the Thoth mythology:

Thoth came to be regarded as the origin of cosmic order and of religious and civil institutions. He presided over almost every aspect of the temple cults, law and the civil year, and in particular over the sacred rituals, texts and formulae, and the magic arts that were so closely related. To him, as divine scribe, inventor of writing and lord of wisdom, the priesthood attributed much of its sacred literature, including, for example, parts of the Book of the dead. And of the occult powers latent in all these aspects of the cult of the gods, Thoth was the acknowledged source. By extension he came to be regarded as the lord of knowledge, language, and all science—even as Understanding or Reason personified. (...) He was called 'the Mysterious,' 'the Unknown' (pp. 22-23).

4. Arabic Hermes

It was said that a damaged manuscript of the *Corpus* was rediscovered and came into the hands of Michael Psellus in Byzantium of the 11th century. Eschenbach might know the *Corpus* as a whole through Psellus. The collection as a whole existed as early as the 12th century. However, the Islamic lore of Hermes as found in *Parzival* cannot be explained by Byzantine mediation. 'How was it possible that a Greek text written in the second or third century in Egypt had come to the knowledge of Wolfram in the 12th century?' asked Kahane and Kahane (1965, p. 113).

The Greek *Hermetica* came to the attention of scholars in the Latin tradition of Western Europe in 1460, when a monk named Leonardo brought a manuscript of Greek Hermetic texts from Macedonia to Cosimo de' Medici and Marsilio Ficino in Florence. However, other translations of other traffics had existed even before Ficino's *Hermetica*. According to Kevin van Bladel's (2009) extensive research, besides Coptic translation of Greek *Hermetica* discovered in the *Nag Hammadi Codices* (Robinson, ed., 1990), Arabic scholars' understanding of Hermes had its earliest roots in the Sasanian reception of *Hermetica* in Middle Persian translation, and these translations were astrological. Al-Kindi testified that an Arabic translation did exist by the mid-ninth century. Translations of Arabic *Hermetica* were found in Latin, Persian, Hebrew, and other languages.

From the Middle Eastern centers, the Arabic *Hermetica* might have reached Spain after the Moorish conquest of the Visigoth kingdom in 711 CE followed by the establishment of the Umayyad dynasty in 756 CE (Zoller, 2004). Abu Ma'sar's astrological texts (trans. 1994) were widely translated in the 12th century and became an important means by which Aristotelian natural philosophy entered 12th century Europe (Grant, 1996, 2007). In the 12th century, Hermeticism captivated minds of the scholars of the Cathedral School of Chartres, William of Conches, and Hugh of St. Victor (Zoller, 2004).

Alchemy and astrology became an experimental and theoretical practice of natural philosophy based on more technical, exact science. Hermeticism was a vehicle and a carrier of a cultural continuity, dissemination, and circulation of Aristotelian natural philosophy. Between natural philosophy and modern science lay alchemy and astrology, acting as a bridge. This juncture produced many kinds of scientific tools and apparatus leading to the scientific revolution. The technical side of Hermeticism had a role in transforming natural philosophy into modern science. Thus Hermeticism is important in the history of science; however, the importance of Hermeticism has much more than just a technical side. This is clear in psychological interpretation of Hermeticism by Jung. In a sense, Jung discovered psychology in the application of natural philosophy in Hermeticism.

5. Aristotle's Active Intellect and Jung's Knowledge of the Self

Probably, Eschenbach had known the fourth treatise of *Corpus Hermeticum* through contacting someone or some source which Eschenbach called *kyot* that provided Thabit ibn Qurrah's Arabic translation of Syrian *Hermetica* (Kahane & Kahane, 1965; Franz & Jung, 1980). There was a carrier, a vehicle who transmitted natural philosophy written in the fourth treatise of *Corpus Hermeticum*. That philosophy was primarily Aristotle.

A marvelous foundation for the history of psychology was laid by Aristotle. In *De Anima* Aristotle (trans. 1986) included a seed that would later grow into psychopathology, cognitive-behavioral psychology, as well as depth psychology. Aristotle defined soul by three features: the production of movement, perception, and incorporeality. By the term *movement*, Aristotle meant four types of movement which were not necessarily physical phenomenon but included psychological and natural phenomena; namely, locomotion, alteration, decay, and growth. While discussing pre-Platonic philosophers and introducing their views on the soul as a material substance like one of four elements, Aristotle referred to Heraclitus who held a view

that everything emanates from soul as the first principle. Hillman (1979) commented on this reference of Aristotle to Heraclitus: 'Aristotle said that Heraclitus took soul as his *archon*, his first principle, which makes him [Heraclitus] the first depth psychologist in our tradition' (p. 25).

Aristotle regarded the incorporeality of soul in a different way than Plato did. Unlike Plato, who thought soul is partly immortal, Aristotle thought that soul is substance as the form of a natural body and therefore mortal. Aristotle (trans. 1986) told: "It is not that the body is the actuality of the soul but that the soul is the actuality of some body (...). The soul is neither without body nor a kind of body (...). It is not a body but belongs to a body" (II.2.414a).

Aristotelian mortal soul sounds like early materialism; however, it is not very clear what Aristotle exactly meant in saying 'substance as the form of a natural body' (trans. 1986, II.1.412a). It has been discussed throughout millennia, but Hillman's interpretation is the most persuasive as well as deconstructive. Hillman (1975b) explained:

It is crucial to see through the Aristotelian 'organic fallacy' about the psyche. Otherwise the soul remains held within the perspectives of life. Then care of soul means only reverence toward life and respect for individual human beings where soul is embodied. Just here Aristotelianism neglects what the Platonists remember: psyche is indeed the essence of living bodies, but living bodies are also dying bodies. The Platonist's insistence on immortality of soul was an insistence on the soul's dissociation from life and a priori relation with death. From this viewpoint Aristotle's definition of soul can be more psychologically restated: soul is the primary actuality of each body that bears death within it. Soul refers to that fantasy of death going on, in countless ways, in the midst of the organic and natural standpoint (pp. 206-207).

As soul belongs to a body, soul is a complex of faculties holding capacities for cognitively grasping objects. Sight grasps colors, smell odors, hearing sounds, taste flavor, touch a wide range of objects. Imagination is a movement coming about from the activity of sense-perception. The images are like sense-data but without matter; Soul cannot think without images. Aristotle regarded 'the imagination as a kind of thinking' (trans. 1986, III.10.433a). Hillman (1962) interpreted Aristotle's analysis of imagination as relevant to the concept of the unconscious of depth psychology. It may be also possible to say that Aristotle's imagination equates with the unconscious complex. Hillman (1983a) stated 'archetypal psychology is complex at the beginning, since the image is a self-limiting, multiple relationship of meanings, moods, historical events, qualitative details, and expressive possibilities' (p. 18). Jung (1968c) identified the image with the psyche, which is a maxim that archetypal psychology adopted as the soul constituted of images; the soul is primarily an imagining activity (Hillman, 1983a). By differentiating from spiritual discipline which aims for detachment and transcendence, Hillman (1962) clarified that 'concern with soul immerses us in immanence: God in the soul or the soul in God, the soul in the body, the soul in the world, souls in each other or in the world-soul' (p. 27).

The thinking faculty of soul has always been the most controversial part of Aristotle's philosophy because Aristotle maintained that intellect is the part of the soul most likely to survive the death of the body. But, how can soul be immortal when it belongs to a mortal body? Aristotle thought that the immortal intellect has no personal memory or anything specific to an individual's life. The possibility of separate survival of the soul was discussed in detail by Alexander of Aphrodisias, Themistius, Al-Farabi, Avicenna, Averroes, Thomas Aquinas, and many other Medieval and Renaissance philosophers. They queried the

plausibility of the immortal intellect being an aspect of the human soul or an entity existing independently of man, and the debate is still ongoing as a subject matter of the history of philosophy. Whether the intellect is capable of separate existence could only be answered by a division of the concept of intellect in two parts, namely the active intellect and the passive intellect. That was also to explain 'how the human intellect passes from its original state, in which it does not think, to a subsequent state, in which it does' (Davidson, 1992, p. 3).

Aristotle applied his theory of potentiality and actuality to the distinction between different parts of the intellect. He said, 'There is an intellect characterized by the capacity to become all things, and an intellect characterized by that to bring all things about' (trans. 1986, III.5.430a). He meant the former as the passive intellect which receives the intelligible forms of things, whereas the latter is the active intellect which transforms potential knowledge into actual knowledge. The passive intellect is perishable and thinks nothing without the active intellect. Aristotle used the analogy of light making potential colors into actual colors to explain this concept. Davidson (1992) commented on this process from potentiality to actuality with imagination as medium:

The active intellect leads the human intellect to actuality by (...) illuminating (...) what is intelligible in images presented by the imaginative faculty to the human intellect; and the potential intellect becomes actual by (...) viewing the illumined intelligible thoughts (pp. 19-20).

Aristotle also distinguished intellect (*nous*) from reason (*logos*) as a distinction between intuition and logical processing. Intellect is the faculty for setting definitions, whereas reason is the faculty which uses them. Aristotle divided the soul into two parts; one which has reason and one which does not. The part which has reason is further divided into the lower part which has the reason into the reasoning (*logistikos*) and the higher knowing part (*epistēmonikos*) which contemplates general first principles (*archai*). Intellect as intuition is the source of the first principles. Aristotle (trans. 2004) said,

Scientific knowledge consists in forming judgments about things that are universal and necessary; and demonstrable truths, and every kind of scientific knowledge (because this involves reasoning), depend upon first principles. It follows that the first principles of scientific truth cannot be grasped either by science or by art or by prudence (...). The state of mind that apprehends first principles is intuition [intellect, nous] (VI.1140b-1141a).

Descartes (1996) omitted this Aristotelian epistemology of intellect and reason. Instead, he established mechanical philosophy of mind based on a dualism between mind and matter. The Cartesian concept of mind is a wider general abode for the entire content of experience of a thinking being as a subject. This difference between Cartesian mind and Aristotelian soul makes a crucial difference when I examine Jung's theoretical construction of modern psychology later.

6. The Fourth Treatise of Corpus Hermeticum

It is possible to decipher 'A Discourse of Hermes to Tat: The Krater, or the Monad' in terms of Aristotelian psychology. Based on Plato's *Timaeus*, the fourth treatise describes the Krater as the world soul (*anima mundi*) filled with intellect (*nous*). However, unlike Plato's optimistic idea that 'this world came to be in very truth, through god's providence, a living being with soul and intelligence' (trans. 1977, 30), the fourth treatise proclaimed such a world vision is possible

only for winners who obtained the Cup. The Cup was sent down by God, which means that intellect emanated from the monad which is the unmoved mover. Aristotle thought that the unmoved mover is a cause of all the celestial movement without being affected to be moved by any cause, and equated it with the active intellect. Jung (1969) shared the same idea with gnosticism regarding *anima mundi*:

This flight from the darkness of nature's depths culminates in trinitarian thinking, which moves in a Platonic, 'supracelestial' realm. But the question of the fourth, rightly or wrongly, remained. It stayed down 'below,' and from there threw up the heretical notion of the quaternity and the speculations of Hermetic philosophy (p. 176 [CW 11, para. 261])

There was no other way for the Cup to be acknowledged as the world soul than falling down from the sky to the hearts of those who would seek it. Jung (1963) regarded the krater of *Hermetica* as the vessel of spiritual transformation which later developed into the actual *vas* of alchemy. As the *anima mundi*, the krater is a feminine principle of androgynous Mercury (Jung, 1970). The masculine half is the sword of the Knights of the Round Table. In *Hermetica* (IV.4), the dialogue between Hermes Trismegistus and Tat refers to the 'Krater':

He [God] filled a great Krater with intellect [nous], and sent it down to earth; and he appointed a herald, and bade him make proclamation to hearts of men: 'Dip yourself in this Krater, you who are able; you who believe that you will ascend to Him who sent this Krater down; you who know for what purpose you have been born.' Now they who gave heed to the proclamation and were baptized in intellect, those men got a share of gnosis, and they became perfect men because they received intellect. But those who failed to heed the proclamation, those are they who possess the gift of communication and reasoning [rationalist, logikoi], to be sure, but not more, since they have not received intellect and know not for what purpose they have been made, nor by whom they have been made (Kahane & Kahane, 1965, p. 165).

The passage of the fourth treatise, following Aristotle's differentiation of intellect and reason, emphasized superiority of intellect over reason using the Greek word *logikoi*, meaning the rationalist's way of communication and reasoning. The difference between the fourth treatise and Aristotle is that the term Aristotle used for knowledge was scientific knowledge (*epistēmē*), which the knowing part of reason contemplates general first principles. In *Hermetica*, that is spiritual knowledge of soul (*gnōsis*), which Jung identified as ancient psychology.

The fourth treatise closes with the following passage (trans. 1999, IV.11); sounding like a herald for the coming knights of the quest for the Holy Grail:

This is the image of God, O Tat, that has been drawn for you, as far as it can be. If you observe it clearly and reflect upon it with the eyes of the heart, believe me, my son, you will find the way to higher things. In fact the image itself will guide you. For sight of the image has a special quality of its own. It dwells in those who have already seen it and draws them upward, just as they say a magnet draws up iron.

The final passage of the fourth treatise can be interpreted as the soul's return to *anima mundi* or monad through works of imagination, which later developed as the grail legend.[4] The Greek word used for 'image' for this passage was *eikon* (εἰκών) which is the etymology of the word 'icon.' *Phantasia* (φαντασία) was used by Aristotle for the word 'imagination,' and is the etymological origin of 'fantasy.' The transition from religious *icon* to poetic *fantasy* seems to be

a transformation of the imaginal psychology from ancient gnosticism to the Medieval grail legend.

7. Emanation and Individuation in Parzival

The structure of *Parzival* has three realms corresponding to the layers of the spirit, soul, and matter. Tripartition is an idea found in Aristotelian revival of the Medieval Age, in Avicenna for example (Hasse, 2000). Fideler (1991) explained:

The three levels are, in a sense, symbolized by three separate locales: the Round Table, or Arthurian society; the Castle of Wonders; and the Castle of the Grail. These levels in turn are typified by certain characters and levels of human experience (...). Parzival is initiated into each successively higher realm by a particular teacher: Gurnemanz initiates Parzival into the realm of Arthurian society; Condwiramurs, the 'guide to love,' initiates Parzival into the mysteries of love which abide in the realm of the soul; while Trevrizent initiates Parzival into the mysteries of the Grail, the realm of the spirit (p. 209).

The interesting thing is that the structure of *Parzival* corresponds to the order of Jungian archetypes. The first level corresponds to the ego, shadow, and persona; the second to the anima and animus; the third to the self. The emergence of the hallucinatory Grail Castle in Parzival's visionary experience was a moment of the discovery of the unconscious in the 12th century. However, in those days there was not a modern concept as the unconscious, so they called it the castle of Munsalvæsche and distinguished it from the Arthurian court, as if the distinction between the conscious and the unconscious was necessary. As I pointed out earlier, Hillman (1962) interpreted Aristotle's imagination as relevant to the concept of the unconscious of depth psychology, and in terms of imaginal psychology, the castle of Munsalvæsche is *mudus imaginalis*. Fideler (1991) gave insight into the interrelational aspect of each level, which makes sense from the point of view of archetypal psychology:

Three levels are linked together through the principle of continuity: there is an interpenetration of levels and characters. The Castle of the Grail may be hidden, but its messengers and envoys secretly ride forth into the realm of everyday affairs. In fact, one of the most remarkable things about Wolfram's epic is its lack of dualism between the 'worldly' and the 'spiritual' (p. 209).

Likewise, in Jung's psychology, the self is 'hidden,' but at the same time, it relates to the other archetypes of the collective unconscious as a balancing and integrating mechanism[5]. Also, it is a characteristic of Neoplatonism in which the worldly and the spiritual was not separate but connected by theurgy which employed astrological oracles and Hermetic rituals for the divine to descend to the body and soul. Parzival's visionary experience at Grail Castle can be interpreted as a dramatizing scene of theurgy. Following the Kahanes's studies, Fideler (1991) analyzed the symbolic meaning of the scene of the Grail procession of *Parzival* in the way it represents the Aristotelian model of cosmology:

Before the appearance of the Grail a series of maidens appear: first a group of four maidens, then a group of eight maidens, then a group of twelve maidens, and finally Repanse de Schoye appears alone bearing the Grail (...). The first four maidens, dressed in brown wool, represent the four elements of earth, water, air and fire. The eight maidens, dressed in green samite, represent the seven planetary spheres and the sphere of fixed stars. The twelve maidens dressed in silk interwoven with gold, and pfellel-silk from Nineveh, represent the twelve zodiacal signs, while Repanse de Schoye, glowing like the sun in Arabian silk, represents and bears the

Grail, the divine Monad. The procession, therefore, relates to the soul's ascent through the cosmic spheres—the soul's movement up the celestial hierarchy towards the One, its divine source and goal—a central doctrine of the Hermetic writings. Moreover, the old French repense means 'knowledge,' and the Kahanes suggest that Repanse de Schoye means 'knowledge of joy,' the knowledge of the Monad. Both 'the geography of the celestial ascent' and the nature of the Grail bearer are in full accord with the Hermetic tradition (pp. 216-217).

The idea that the sequence of emanations closes upon itself in a circle and returns to God can be found in Sohrawardi and Avicenna. This idea is quite consistent with the general structure of Neoplatonic metaphysics in which the return (*epistrophè*) is the necessary counterpart of procession (*proodos*) (Genequand, 2001). The structure of the Grail quest of Parzival can be read by this Neoplatonic and gnostic metaphysics of emanation and return. Parzival's journey is not only a heroic journey to master the ego but also a hermeneutic and symbolic process to understand God, the self, the creation and the archetypes by relating meaning to its beginnings. In that way, in *Parzival*, emanation and individuation relate to each other. In Islamic philosophy, this symbolic hermeneutics is called *ta'wil*, which Henry Corbin translated as *epistrophè* and introduced to Hillman; Hillman rendered the idea as a basis of his method of archetypal psychology and called it archetypal reversion. The meaning of Parzival's task of questioning concerning the grail and the bleeding lance can be found in this symbolic hermeneutics of archetypal reversion. That is what Hillman (1975a) meant by saying, 'Deepening of events into experiences' (p. x).

In the context of Aristotelian psychology, *Parzival* is a dramatization of the passage from not knowing to knowing, the soul's movement from the passive intellect, without asking any question at all, to the active intellect through imagination. It was soon after *Parzival* was written that *principium individuationis* became a subject matter of medieval philosophy of Duns Scotus. Already in *Parzival*, an increased emphasis on the role of the individual can be found (Blamires, 1966).

Parzival was a product of the problem of universals, an argument between realism and nominalism regarding the relation between the universals and the particulars. Parzival is a case of Aristotelian realism that universals are real entities as the Grail and its emanation, but their existence is dependent on Parzival's individuation as the particular who exemplifies it. Initially, Parzival does not know his own name until meeting a maiden on the way from the first visionary experience of the Grail castle. 'Personifying is a way of soul-making' (Hillman, 1975b, p. 3). Concerning naming of the archetypes, Jung (1968b) explained why he chose names like Shadow, Old Wise Man, Great Mother, Anima and Animus, names that appear in fantasy novels as persons: 'The fact that the unconscious spontaneously personifies (...) is the reason why I have taken over these personifications in my terminology and formulated them as names' (p. 285 [CW 9, Pt. 1, para. 514]). Parzival is an archetype of the soul of the imaginal psychology of the 12th century. Franz and Jung (1980) interpreted Parzival more as a symbol than a semiotic name:

The story of Perceval's development cannot be understood only as an example of the coming to consciousness of one individual but also as a symbolic representation of a collective evolution, conditioned by the age. Seen in this light the figure of Perceval himself becomes a symbol and represents an archetypal content (p. 109).

Franz and Jung explained a connection between name and soul:

The Old Aryan words for 'name,' such as the Irish ainm, Old Welsh anu, Old Bulgarian imen, Sanscrit nâman, Latin nomen and Greek onoma, are remarkably like the Irish and Welsh words for 'soul.' For instance, in Irish ainm is 'name' and anim is 'soul, anima.' (...) A similar connection is hinted at when Perceval learns his own name at the same time that he becomes acquainted with the anima (p. 185).

In terms of Aristotelian psychology, Parzival is an active movement of the imagination with which soul thinks. He is a particular individual while at the same time he is a product of imagination, an archetypal fantasy where soul moves toward actuality of the universal, which is a fantasy of individuation. Hillman (1975b) pointed out that individuation is a creative imagination that emanates from the archetype:

Where existentialists neglect process, Jungians literalize it. Because the process of individuation is an archetypal fantasy, it is of course ubiquitous and can be 'demonstrated' in texts and cases, just as any archetypal fantasy has its manifestation in historical events. But this process is not the axiomatic law of the psyche, the one purpose or goal of ensouled beings. To assert this even as a hypothesis or to establish it with instances is to desert psychologizing for metaphysics. It is to literalize and systematize one psychological idea, forgetting that individuation is a perspective. It is an ideational tool: we do not see individuation, but by means of it (p. 147).

In Neoplatonism and gnosticism, individuation is a process of the soul's emanation from the monad down to a series of the celestial spheres to the earth and then its return to the source. It is, in other words the emanation of the *archetypal images* or the *imaginal realm* from the archetype-in-itself. Jung thought that there is a primary cause that integrates principles of the psyche and matter as a unitary worldview called *unus mundus*. In *Parzival*, the Grail as the alchemical philosopher's stone, is *unus mundus*. The concept of *'âlam al-mithâl*, the *imaginal realm* or the creative imagination, an idea which Corbin developed from Persian Sufism, became a source of archetypal psychology for Hillman.

Succeeding the studies of Kahane and Kahane, Corbin (1971, 1977) pointed out that the Hermeticism of the Persian Sufi Sohrawardî in the 12th century brought forward a contribution to the motif of Hermeticism of Eschenbach. In *Book of the Temple of Light*, Sohrawardî revealed the secret of the Hermetic notion of the 'perfect Nature' as a personal Angel (Corbin, 1998). Like Jung's Philemon, perfect Nature is a kind of a guide spirit, an initiator and a tutor, or as the object and secret of all philosophy, a daimon of the sage's personal religion. Corbin (1994) stressed that:

Perfect Nature can only reveal itself 'in person' to one whose nature is perfect, that is, to the man of light; their relation is this unus-ambo [biunity] in which each of the two simultaneously assumes the position of the I and the self—image and mirror (p. 19).

In other words, the relation between the ego and the self, or image and mirror in terms of Corbin can be metaphysically understood as the Neoplatonic and gnostic idea of emanation of the creative imagination from the monad.

In *Parzival*, Trevrizent teaches Parzival that the Stone burns the Phoenix to ashes in which he is reborn. Corbin (1971) pointed out that the same motif can be found in *Book of Elucidations* of Sohrawardi in which Hermes ascends to the Light in ecstasy. The Phoenix metaphor in

Parzival can be interpreted as the emanation and individuation of the active intellect. The Arabic Aristotelians from al-Farabi onward frequently described the Active Intellect (*al-'aql al-fa'āl*), conceived to be a result of the emanations from the One that gave rise to the celestial spheres, by the visual metaphor of light (Bladel, 2009).

Whether it is Hermes or Christ, the Grail is thus a self-image, *Imago Dei* on one hand, and on the other hand it is an image of the transcendent function:

By this term [transcendent function] Jung understands the psychic synthesis of consciousness and the unconscious, through which it becomes possible for the psychic totality, the Self, to come into consciousness. This function is therefore also responsible for the continual maturation and transformation of the God-image, the Self, and for this reason can very well appear symbolically as the vessel in which the 'soul substance' of the god is preserved.

*Although (...) the vessel and its contents are really identical, there is yet a subtle difference in the choice of images. As Jung has shown, the stone in alchemy signifies the inner spiritual man. Its divine attributes distinguish it as a particle of God concealed in nature, an analogy to the God who, in Christ, came down to earth in a human body, subject to suffering. On the other hand, the 'cheapness' of the stone (*lapis exilis, vilis*) alludes to the fact that every human being is its potential bearer, even its begetter. In this way the alchemical symbol of the lapis compensates for the overly exalted and remote spirituality of the ecclesiastical image of Christ, which is too far removed from the natural earthly man (Franz & Jung, 1980, pp. 156-157).*

Parzival's psychological development takes place in a fantasy world; however, these images are universal and archetypal as the creative imagination or the imaginal realm emanating from the archetypes. Archetype has power to create emotional drama, and naïve Parzival grows up to understand emotional subtlety and its origin from the experience of the power of archetypal images. It is as if the visible emanates from the invisible, a metaphor of the light and color in Aristotle; the images appear in the imaginal realm from the archetypes. In this way, it is not reason but intellect that promotes emotional intelligence.

Emanation of the name of Parzival takes place soon after his first visionary experience of the monad. Parzival gains knowledge of the ego, the *quis*, which means 'who Parzival is.' Parzival's return journey to the second visionary experience is to gain knowledge of the self, the *quid*, which means 'what made Parzival.' The whole sequence of movement is the individuation of Parzival. Structuralists would agree that there is a universal order that determines Parzival as Parzival, but structuralism is also an archetypal fantasy. Is there anything like an archetype of individuation? Jung (1968e) said, 'Mercurius is an archetype of the self on one hand, and of the individuation process on the other, and also of the collective unconscious' (p. 237 [CW 13, para 284]). Jung (1968a) explained the differentiation of knowledge of the ego and of the self:

The objective knowledge of the self is what the author [Dorn] means when he says: 'No one can know himself unless he knows what, and not who, he is, on what he depends, or whose he is [or: to whom or what he belongs] and for what end he was made.' The distinction between 'quis' and 'quid' is crucial: whereas 'quis' has an unmistakably personal aspect and refers to the ego, 'quid' is neuter, predicating nothing except an object which is not endowed even with personality. Not the subjective ego-consciousness of the psyche is meant, but the psyche itself as the unknown, unprejudiced object that still has to be investigated. The difference between knowledge of the ego and knowledge of the self could hardly be formulated more technically than in this distinction between 'quis' and 'quid' (p. 164 [CW 9, Pt. 2, para. 252]).

Is Jung's differentiation of knowledge an extension of Aristotle's epistemology of reason and intellect? In order to answer that question, first I have to explore how natural philosophy of Aristotle and Hermeticism transformed into modern science.

8. Transformation of Natural Philosophy

It has been pointed out that 'something important occurred between approximately 1200 and 1600 that proved conducive for the emergence of the Scientific Revolution' (Grant, 2007, p. 329). Eschenbach was prophesying this paradigm shift symbolically, through the wounded King in *Parzival*. In mythology and especially in alchemy, to heal the sick King does not mean restoration of the old order but instead signifies renewal of the old world through transformation. Jung (1970) analyzed the symbolic representation of the King in medieval alchemy:

The fact that the king played a large role in medieval alchemy for several hundred years proves that, from about the thirteenth century onwards, the traces of the king's renewal surviving from Egyptian and Hellenistic times began to gain in importance because they had acquired a new meaning. For as the West started to investigate nature, till then completely unknown, the doctrine of the lumen naturae began to germinate too. Ecclesiastical doctrine and scholastic philosophy had both proved incapable of shedding any light on the nature of the physical world. The conjecture thereupon arose that just as the mind revealed its nature in the light of divine revelation, so nature herself must possess a 'certain luminosity' which could become a source of enlightenment (pp. 308-309 [CW 14, para 425]).

Jung (1971) understood alchemy and astrology in terms of psychological projection and called them 'projected psychology' (p. 10 [CW 6, para 12]). The birth of modern chemistry and astronomy was a process of withdrawal of projection, which Jung called the 'de-psychologizing work of objective science' (p. 10 [CW 6, para 12]). Alchemists and astrologers were projecting natural philosophy of Aristotle and Hermeticism onto chemical substances and celestial movements. The analysis of the projected contents of the collective unconscious as a historical representation of the individuation process of science was a work of analytical psychology. Jung explained:

The collective attitude hinders the recognition and evaluation of a psychology different from the subject's, because the mind that is collectively oriented is quite incapable of thinking and feeling in any other way than by projection. What we understand by the concept 'individual' is a relatively recent acquisition in the history of the human mind and human culture. It is no wonder, therefore, that the earlier all-powerful collective attitude prevented almost completely an objective psychological evaluation of individual differences, or any scientific objectification of individual psychological processes. It was owing to this very lack of psychological thinking that knowledge became 'psychologized,' i.e., filled with projected psychology. We find striking examples of this in man's first attempts at a philosophical explanation of the cosmos. The development of individuality, with the consequent psychological differentiation of man, goes hand in hand with the de-psychologizing work of objective science (p. 10 [CW 6, para 12]).

An evolution of science from natural philosophy was, from Jung's point of view, a depsychologization of projected psychology. With his 'objective' psychology, Jung served to compensate for what was lacking in its process of purging soul out of logic of modern science. Jung's work was not just a simple reconstruction of Aristotle. Through intensive research on

alchemy, astrology, and medieval medicine, and by working with still very active images in those classic arts, Jung transformed archaic psychology into modern psychology. In that deconstruction of archaic psychology and transition into modern psychology, Aristotle's concept of actuality and potentiality transformed into the psychoanalytic concept of the conscious and the unconscious, entelechy to individuation, four elements of nature to four psychological functions of human nature, form and number to archetype, imagination to complex, unmoved mover to the archetype of the self, monad to principle of synchronicity and the psychoid unconscious. Aristotle's *psuchē* or *anima* was refined and differentiated into the concept of anima/animus archetype as a personification of the unconscious (Jung, 1968a), but at the same time it became more complicated and enigmatic. Hillman (1985) explained anima as archetype of psyche, but psyche cannot be equated with the anima archetype at times, for the psyche means psychic process in general in a broader usage. Aristotle's dyad of intellect and reason became Jung's dyad of knowledge of the self and knowledge of the ego. As discussed earlier, the Cartesian mind was a general abode for the entire content of thinking and omitted Aristotle's distinction of reason and intellect. Through differentiation of the ego and the self, Jung's psychology compensated for what was omitted in the Cartesian mind. Is Jung's psychology an extension of the argument concerning Aristotelian intellect? Jung's psychology is neither a direct continuation of Aristotelian natural philosophy nor is it a reconstruction, but it is possible to say that at the very least Jung's psychology was a renewal through transformation of natural philosophy.

9. Conclusion

I focused on the 12th century as a historical turning point of Aristotle's natural philosophy. Philosophers after Descartes attempted to circumvent the whole problem of the pre-modern psychological discussion, and modern attempts to reconstruct Renaissance debates remain so tentative, fragmentary, and incomplete (Kessler & Park, 1988). Clarification of these omissions made by modern philosophers and psychologists is needed. Since Allen G. Debus published *The Chemical Philosophy* in 1977, a close examination of transformation of natural philosophy at a particular epoch and location has been recognized as methodology of the continuity thesis of the history of science. Jung was aware of particularity of transformation of natural philosophy.

10. Bibliography

- Aristotle, *De anima (On the soul)*, translation by H. Lawson-Tancred, London: Penguin, 1986.
Aristotle, *The Nicomachean ethics*, translation by J. A. K. Homson, London: Penguin, 2004.
Bladel, K. Van, *The Arabic Hermes: From pagan sage to prophet of science*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
Blamires, D., *Characterization and individuality in Wolfram's 'Parzival'*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
Bleeker, C. J., *Hathor and Thoth: Two key figures of the ancient Egyptian religion*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
Boylan, P., *Thoth: The Hermes of Egypt*, Chicago: Ares, 1922.
Budge, E. A. W., *The gods of the Egyptians: Studies in Egyptian mythology* (Vol. 1), New York: Dover, 1904.
Corbin, H., *En Islam Iranien: Aspects spirituels et philosophiques* (Vol. 2), Paris: Gallimard, 1971.
Corbin, H., *Spiritual body and celestial earth: From Mazdean Iran to Shi'ite Iran*, translation by N. Pearson, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.

- Corbin, H., *The man of light in Iranian Sufism*, translation by N. Pearson, New Lebanon, NY: Omega, 1994.
- Corbin, H., *The voyage and the messenger: Iran and philosophy*, translation by J. Rowe, Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books, 1998.
- Davidson, H., *Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Averroes, on intellect: Their cosmologies, theories of the active intellect, and theories of human intellect*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Debus, A. G., *The chemical philosophy: Paracelsian science and medicine in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*, Mineola, NY: Dover, 1977.
- Descartes, R., *Meditations on first philosophy*, translation by J. Cottingham, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Eschenbach, W. von, *Parzival*, translation by A. T. Hatto, London: Penguin, 1980.
- Festugière, A.-J., & Nock, A.-D., *Corpus Hermeticum*, Paris: Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres, 1983.
- Fideler, D. R. "The path toward the Grail: The Hermetic sources and structure of Wolfram von Eschenbach's Parzival", in *Alexandria*, 1, Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes, 1991, pp. 186-227.
- Fowden, G., *The Egyptian Hermes: A historical approach to the late pagan mind*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Franz, M.-L. von., & Jung, E., *The grail legend*, translation by A. Dykes, London: Coventure, 1980.
- Genequand, C., "Metaphysics", in *History of Islamic philosophy*, London: Routledge, 2001, pp. 783-801.
- Grant, E., *The foundations of modern science in the Middle Ages: Their religious, institutional, and intellectual contexts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Grant, E., *A history of natural philosophy: From the ancient world to the nineteenth century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Haskins, C. H., *The renaissance of the twelfth century*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Hasse, D. N., *Avicenna's De anima in the Latin West: The formation of a peripatetic philosophy of the soul 1160-1300*, London: The Warburg Institute, 2000.
- Hillman, J., *The myth of analysis: Three essays in archetypal psychology*, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1962.
- Hillman, J., *Loose ends: Primary papers in archetypal psychology*, Dallas: Spring, 1975a.
- Hillman, J., *Re-Visioning psychology*, New York: HarperCollins, 1975b.
- Hillman, J., *The dream and the underworld*, New York: Harper & Row, 1979.
- Hillman, J., *Archetypal psychology: A brief account*, Woodstock, CT: Spring, 1983a.
- Hillman, J., *Healing fiction*, Woodstock, CT: Spring, 1983b.
- Hillman, J., *Anima: An anatomy of a personified notion*. Dallas: Spring, 1985.
- Jasnów, R., & Zauzich, K.-T., *The ancient Egyptian book of Thoth: A demotic discourse on knowledge and pendant to the classical Hermetica*, Wiesbaden: Harrsowitz Verlag, 2005.
- Jung, C. G., *Memories, dreams, reflections*, translation by R. & C. Winston, New York: Vintage Books, 1963.
- Jung, C. G., "Aion: Researches into the phenomenology of the self", in *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 9, Pt. 2). Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968a.
- Jung, C. G., "Conscious, unconscious, and individuation", in *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 9, Pt. 1), Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968b, pp. 275-289
- Jung, C. G., "Commentary on 'The Secret of the Golden Flower'", in *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 13), Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968c, pp. 1-56.
- Jung, C. G., *Psychology and alchemy*, in *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 12), Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968d.
- Jung, C. G., "The spirit Mercurius", in *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 13), Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968e, pp. 191-250.
- Jung, C. G., "A psychological approach to the dogma of the trinity", in *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 11), London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969, pp. 107-200.
- Jung, C. G., *Mysterium coniunctionis*, in *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 14), London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Jung, C. G., "Psychological types" in *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 6), Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971, pp. 1-496.

Kahane, H., & Kahane, R., *The krater and the grail: Hermetic sources of the Parzival*, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1965.

Kessler, E., & Park, K., "Psychology: The concept of psychology", in *The Cambridge history of Renaissance philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 453-463.

Ma`šar, A., *The abbreviation of the introduction to astrology: Together with the Medieval Latin translation of Adelard of Bath*, translation by C. Burnett, K. Yamamoto, & M. Yano, in *Islamic philosophy theology and science: Texts and studies* (Vol. 15), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.

Mather, M., *The alchemical Mercurius: Esoteric symbol of Jung's life and works*, London: Routledge, 2014.

Plato, *Timaeus and Critias*, translation by D. Lee, London: Penguin, 1977.

Robinson, J. M. (Ed.), *The Nag Hammadi library in English*, New York: Harper San Francisco, 1990.

Salaman, C., Oyen, D. van., & Wharton, W. D., *The corpus hermeticum*. London: Gerald Duckworth, 1999.

Scott, W., *Hermetica: The Ancient Greek and Latin writings which contain religious or philosophic teachings ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus*, Boston: Shambhala, 1993.

Zoller, R., *The Hermetic tradition*. London: A New Library Publication, 2004.

Notes:

[1] Primary sources of Kahane's findings can be found in the reference list of their work as well as their detailed discussion in their text; however, the aim and scope of my research is not for reexamining their argument.

[2] The use of 'Hermetism' designates the Alexandrian Hermetic texts *Corpus Hermeticum* or *Hermetica* as well as the works in their wake until the present time, while 'Hermeticism' serves to designate much more generally a variety of Hermetic texts relating to esoteric knowledge of Egyptian, Arabic, and Latin Hermes.

[3] The use of *gnostic* or *gnosticism* with a lower-case *g* refers to an esoteric knowledge, or to certain traits or tendencies generally associated with Hermes Trismegistus or other known Gnostic religions with an upper-case *G*.

[4] Aristotle referred to Thales when he said, 'The soul is something productive of movement, if he [Thales] really said that the magnet has a soul because it produces movement in iron' (trans. 1986, I.2.405a).

[5] In other words, the self can be unconscious but that does not mean the self does not exist as a balancing fulcrum of the unconscious *dunamis*.