



# In Shadows and Darkness: Being Authentic In Céline And Hillman ("intimité des choses" and "pathologizing")

*Nas Sombras e na Escuridão: Ser Autêntico Em Céline E Hillman  
("intimidade das coisas" e "patologizando")*

Aleš Vrbata \*

Universidade Estadual de Feira de Santana,  
Feira de Santana, Bahia, Brasil

Claudio Novaes \*\*

Universidade Estadual de Feira de Santana,  
Feira de Santana, Bahia, Brasil

**Resumo:** Aim of this paper is to demonstrate a proximity or even complementarity between James Hillman's and Louis-Ferdinand Céline's vision of human soul and human condition. Even though their cultural and intellectual context differed significantly and they both used very different forms of expression, they repeatedly invoked intimate dimension of human existence as permeated by somehow pathological, peripheral or dark aspects of being. Nevertheless, both of them shared deep interest in bottom-line dimension of being which they called "soul" and which they linked with death, darkness, weakness and which they associated with socially disapproved ways of being. Even though Hillman could be labeled as reformist and Céline as nihilist, for both of them modern society and its programming cut modern man off his deeper sense of meaningfulness or as Céline puts it in from "*intimité des choses*". Questioning intellectual legacy of Enlightenment, both Céline and Hillman find soul of modern man as pathologized and threatened but at the same time as the very source of meaningfulness. Thus, Hillman and Céline can be viewed not just as cultural critics but as actively deconstructing and questioning modern project and modern subjectivity.

**Palavras-chave:** Céline. Hillman. Darkness. Soul.

**Abstract:** O objetivo deste artigo é demonstrar a proximidade e/ou complementaridade entre a visão da alma e da condição humana em James Hillman e Louis-Ferdinand Céline. Apesar dos contextos culturais e intelectuais deles serem diferentes e ambos usarem formas diferentes de expressão, repetidamente eles invocavam a dimensão íntima da existência humana como permeada por um aspecto patológico, periférico e escuro do ser. Mesmo que não compartilhem um interesse profundo pela dimensão fundamental do ser: a "alma" (associada com a morte, escuridão, fraqueza por eles ligada com as maneiras socialmente desaprovadas de ser), as perspectivas deles paradoxalmente se diferenciaram e se aproximam. Hillman poderia ser rotulado de reformista e Céline de nihilista. Mas para os dois a sociedade moderna separou o homem do sentido mais profundo da vida, ou como diz Céline

\* Pós-Doutorando em Estudos Literários/UEFS-CAPES/PNPD, PhD em história pela Universidade Carolina, Praga, Rep. Tcheca (2010), pós-doutorando (CAPES/PNPD) na UEFS/PROGEL, Feira de Santana, Bahia. *E-mail:* alesvrbata@hotmail.com.

\*\* Professor do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Estudos Literários/UEFS, Dr. em Ciências da Comunicação/ECA-USP; Mestre em Literatura/UFBA, com Pós-Doutorado em Comunicação/ECO-UFRJ.

da “*intimité des choses*”. Questionando a herança intelectual do Iluminismo, tanto Céline quanto Hillman encontram a “alma” do sujeito moderno como patologizada e ameaçada, mas ao mesmo tempo como fonte de novos sentidos. Nossa reflexão pretende mostrar como Hillman e Céline podem ser vistos não só como críticos culturais, mas como autores que ativamente desconstruíram e questionaram o projeto da modernidade e a subjetividade moderna.

**Keywords:** Céline. Hillman. Escuridão. Alma.

[...] becoming more and more oneself - the actual experience of it is a shrinking, in that very often it's a dehydration, a loss of inflations, a loss of illusions. [...] shedding is a beautiful thing. It's of course not what consumerism tells you, but shedding feels good. It's a lightening up. [...]. Or put it another way: Growth is always loss (HILLMAN-VENTURA, 2007, p. 8).

Je me souviens qu'avant de me lancer dans *Voyage au bout de la nuit* une idée m'est venue. Je me suis dit: il y a deux façon de traverser Paris [...] l'une en surface [...] puis il y l'autre qui consiste à prendre le metro – d'aller alors directement à son but par l'intimité même des choses [...]. Il faut s'enfoncer dans le système nerveux, dans l'émotion et y demeurer jusqu'à arrivée au but (CÉLINE, 2012, p. 53).

Last decades of the 20th century have revealed an extraordinary process of intertwining of different research areas at work. Since then historiography, literary critique, psychology, science of religion, film studies and other disciplines find much easier to merge with each other and create new fields of inter-disciplinary studies. This paper deals with a perhaps surprisingly close views and attitudes of writer/novelist Louis-Ferdinand Céline and psychologist/therapist/philosopher James Hillman regarding the Western culture, its myths and collective psychology. Even though coming from different countries, historical background and experience, their thoughts revolve around very similar themes. Some of them could be termed “individual” and others “collective” but there is always significant emphasis on the true and authentic dimension of human life in spite of western “cultural programming”. The most important aspects of their cultural criticism draw from imagery of periphery, darkness, exclusion, oblivion, loneliness and social pathology in general.

Topic in itself is too vast to be dealt with in a limited extent of this article. However, it can serve as an introduction to both author's thinking and their respective overlap. Céline's and Hillman's works are abundant in mythological imagery and critical thoughts regarding western modernity. These aspects of their works are the focus of this article. For this reason I am going to use not just Hillman's and Céline's own works but also texts produced within literary studies, recently published Hillman's biography by Dick Russell, Céline's correspondence with Milton Hindus, and, of course, references from the area of archetypal studies because “from an archetypal perspective, a human existence is a ‘mythic’ existence” (ADAMS, 2010, p. 47). This paper can serve as an introduction to such imagery, to its theoretical context and serve as a suggestion of its further ramifications as well.

In the first chapter I introduce both authors in terms of their social and cultural criticism and in terms of “homecoming” vision in particular. In the second chapter I pay attention their vision of “homecoming” as a turn to archetypal realm or, if you will, to

innerness. In the third chapter I turn my attention to Céline's affinity with Hillman. Their perspective is far from being identical, but they both reject perspective of the cultural center, academy, medias, mainstream, i.e. culturally conditioned views they consider non-authentic. On the contrary, they opt for peripheral, inner, soul-perspective or night-perspective. In the last, fourth, chapter, I deal with the question of image phenomenon in both authors. Whereas Céline created his own universe with his own images and mythology without ever transcending them, Hillman's ambition is to go through and beyond images because only this way one can understand the workings of psyche or soul. That is probably the most significant difference between the both.

## 1 THEORETICAL NOTES: CÉLINE AND HILLMAN ABOUT MODERNITY

I think I said somewhere that the real revolution in our society begins with the person who can stand with his own depression. Because then you say no to the whole manic situation of modern society: overconsumption, overactivity, travel (HILLMAN, 1983, p.12)

Erika Ostrovsky in her work *Céline and His Vison* reminds us that "*laurels rest uneasily on a head such as his [Céline's]*" (OSTROVSKY, 1967, p. v) that Céline's "*position in French literature [...] has been subject to quite varied interpretation*" and that "*it is not easy to fix or to pin down Céline's situation in contemporary literature*" (OSTROVSKY, 1967, p. 14). There is no help if one argues that Céline is renowned and recognized author worldwide.

In a sense, similar appraisal is linked with recently deceased American Jungian therapist and writer James Hillman whose disciple David Tacey commented that he had been a man who "*destroys the Jungian ghetto that other Jungians want to cherish*" and that there is a "*contempt for the man who has constructed himself as the enfant terrible of the post-Jungian world*" (TACEY, 2005, p. 218). And again, as in Céline's case, in spite of forementioned reserves, Hillman is today particularly appreciated and respectable representative of post-Jungian thought and founding figure of "archetypal psychology".

These paradoxical appraisals can constitute a good point of departure of this paper because they turn our attention to authors whose works never really found their true "*famille d'esprit*", who wandered off the beaten path and were appreciated rather abroad than in their homelands. However, such seclusion and rejection led both of them to sharpening pervasiveness of their vision and made them thinkers dedicated to human innerness. Ostrovsky describes such turn to innerness in Céline as "*blackening*" / "*noircissement*". As far as Hillman is concerned, in late 1960s he calls it "*soul-making*" or "*pathologizing*" just to deny himself in his later work *We've Had a Hundred Years of Psychotherapy – And the World's Getting Worse* (1993).

---

<sup>1</sup> Céline's artistic genealogy describes Ostrovsky. In her view Céline belongs to the lineage that distances itself from Illumination, its philosophical heritage, modernity and literary existencialism. Parallely, Hillman refers to romanticists and renaissance thinkers, neoplatonics and presocratics as his precursors whereas at the same time rejects contemporary academic psychology.

As we are going to see further, this turn to innerness can be easily linked to group of what I would call “underworld archetypes” constituted by symbolism of black colour, night, or archetype of cosmic fall. All these great symbols and archetypes can be amplified and provide us with extensive symbolism of darkness. The fact that such aspect of both authors have been increasingly studied proves that that they still have particular spiritual or religious repercussion in the contemporary West.

In the next chapter I am going to point out one of the most important themes of contemporary Jungian studies and that is a “homecoming”. In both Céline and Hillman it seems that if a modern man is to set out on his/her way to archetypal home, he/she must encounter the depth of his/her own soul (Hillman) or of his/her own dark starless night (Céline). Edward Edinger is convinced that the contemporary West lacks living cultural myth (EDINGER, 1977, p. 23-38). Did Céline and Hillman touch in their works this sensitive point? Are Céline and Hillman harbingers of civilizational archetypal “homecoming” understood as authentic human innerness? These are questions I am going to contribute to in this article.

## 2 HOMECOMING AND ARCHETYPAL UNDERWORLD IN CÉLINE

On ne peut pas se retrouver pendant qu'on est dans la vie. Y a trop de couleurs qui vous distraient et trop de gens qui bougent autour. On ne se retrouve qu'au silence, quand il est trop tard, comme les morts (CÉLINE, 1934, p.445).

As David Tacey puts it, Jung and Jungian tradition

[...] imagines modern man and woman on a journey of exile and homecoming. At present we are more aware of our exile and rootlessness, but there is the expectations of a future homecoming. [...] Our exile is away from the external forms that nurtured our ancestors, and our homecoming is toward the mystical depths that give spirit and life to us, and that gave spirit and life to the traditions. [...] modernity could be enacting the myth of the Prodigal Son [...] (TACEY, 2007, p. 1).

In many respects Céline’s first novel *Voyage au bout de la nuit* (1932) constitutes a sequence of images that refer to archetypal imagery of exile and rootlessness. In this sense this novel can be viewed as an enactment of the condition of modern man. Its two heroes and author’s doubles, Ferdinand Bardamu and Léon Robinson, constitute images of western modern subjectivity. As Denise Aebersold notes, particularly in his first novel “*Céline situe son oeuvre ‘de l’autre côté de la vie’ dans le sens d’un trajet vers Thanatos*” (AEBERSOLD, 2008, p. 37) and doing it he makes use of three great metaphors :

1. La chute
2. Le pacte avec la nuit et la confrontation de l’écrivain avec son ombre, par doubles interposés
3. Enfin, les exorcismes mis en place par Céline, plus voyuer de la nuit qu’acteur, du moins pour les risques  
(AEBERSOLD, 2008, p. 37).

Does Céline mean to describe the state of modern man subjectivity? Do all these chthonic images reflect what some consider Céline's nihilism? Imagery of archetypal fall, night, exile and powerlessness will substantiate his later novels as well.

To add another dimension to this primary archetypal perspective, let's look at the symbolism of the night sky Céline is mentioning at the very beginning of his novel. As already Mircea Eliade noted, sky is apparently the most appropriate archetypal image of transcendence:

The sky shows itself as it really is: infinite, transcendent. The value of heaven is, more than anything else, "something quite apart" from the tiny thing that is man and his span of life. The symbolism of its transcendence derives from the simple realization of its infinite height (RENNIE, 1996, p. 12).

And as Rennie puts it: *The sky is there before man, but the sky is not just there. The sky is high, transcendent, infinite, immovable for no other reason than that the sky is* (RENNIE, 1996, p. 12)

Again, sky is a primordial archaic screen for the human unconscious projections:

even before any religious values have been set upon it the sky reveals its transcendence. The sky "symbolizes" transcendence, power and changelessness simply by being there. It exists because it is high, infinite, immovable, powerful (RENNIE, 1996, p.12)

But what we can see in Céline is the archetypal chthonic night sky, that one which Denise Aebersold terms "*Ciel d'En Bas*" whose origin attributes to Céline's own dark religiosity (according to which Céline is classified as "*religieux refoulé*"), which conceives his novels as encounters with a great archetypal Night (AEBERSOLD, 2008, p. 7-8). But for Céline, the starless night is probably the space where the world is laid bare, where all the things are dismantled and one touches "*intimité des choses*". But sacral dimension of such a vision manifests itself first of all from the perspective of starless night.

Voyage sera une plongée dans une nuit substantielle qui n'est plus une nuit phénoménale, profane, mais une nuit d'une noirceur magique, sacrée [...] (AEBERSOLD, 2008, p. 29).

The things are got rid of their profane character, their worldliness. What rests is their chthonic dimension, e. g. their Thanatos blackness as it was depicted by Céline in *Voyage au bout de la nuit*: "*Dans le Ciel nocturne célinien 'rien ne luit'. Si l'on s'en tient aux astres, l'éclairage émane presque toujours de réverbères*" (AEBERSOLD, 2008, p. 29). For Céline archetypal Night (subsequently written with capital N) is the symbol of Hades or archetypal Terrible Mother (Neumann), the place where all the externalities of this world are taken away and what rests is a Thanatos darkness:

La vérité, c'est une agonie qui n'en finit pas. La vérité de ce monde c'est la mort. Il faut choisir, mourir ou mentir (CÉLINE, 1934, p. 256).

In fact, the archetypal *Fall* Aebersold is describing is the fall to the Night. Is Céline the one who, similar to Hermes-Psychopompos, guides us down to the Night/Hades? On such *Journey* make externalities like human feelings, ideals, confidence, love and even soul itself to fall apart, disappear or they are proven to be totally needless:

Faire confiance aux hommes c'est déjà se faire tuer un peu (CÉLINE, 1934, p. 227).

L'amour c'est comme l'alcool, plus on est impuissant et soûl et plus on se croit fort et malin, et sûr de ses droits. (CÉLINE, 1934, p. 101).

What in fact is shining and radiating in Céline's *oeuvre* is the darkness, the chthonic dimension of the universe, deep and truthful essence of all the being. In *Voyage* Céline explicitly announces his main characters (who are his own doubles<sup>2</sup>) as true homecomers. As we will see, this "homecoming" can have more meanings. For now we can infallibly state that Céline's vision turns downwards

On ne peut pas se retrouver pendant qu'on est dans la vie y a trop de couleurs qui vous distraient et trop de gens qui bougent autour. On ne se retrouve qu'au silence, quand il est trop tard, comme les morts (CÉLINE, 1934, p. 445).

and backwards...where ancient Dionysian art rests:

[...] c'est le retour à la poésie du sauvage. Le sauvage ne s'exprime pas sans poésie, il ne peut pas. Le civilisé, académisé, s'exprime en ingénieur, en architecte, en mécanisé, [pas] plus en homme sensible [...]. J'aurais voulu qu'on retrouve dans les mots le chant de l'âme (CÉLINE, 2012, p. 53).

Leaving civilized, culturally programmed and patterned world, Céline's vision turns back ad down. Absorbing chthonic Thanatos blackness Céline enters archetypal layers of collective unconscious and archetypal Home beyond life and death. We got transferred to *l'autre côté de la vie*, experiencing *intimité des choses*, seeing "*Ciel d'En Bas*" and its Thanatos blackness whose archetypal nature is similarly universal:

Night and fear and death and also romance and love – all the things that are related to night – are transcultural. Something about the night does something to humans, makes us afraid, makes us imagine. That is another kind of black than the racial black. There will be thanatic black figures in the dreams of people from all kinds of different races (ADAMS, 1992, p. 25).

But what kind of "home" corresponds with Céline's starless night, the chthonic realm? First of all, let me remind that Céline's imagery is a primordial imagery referring not to profane but to the archetypal. An archetype is an *a priori* factor in human unconscious, sort of Kantian *Ding an sich* whose essence is still unknown to us, but that expresses itself through archetypal imagery. As Jung says:

<sup>2</sup> Ferdinand Bardamu and Léon Robinson in Céline's first novel *Voyage au bout de la nuit* (1932).

[the archetypes] exist preconsciously, and presumably they form the structural dominants of the psyche in general' (JUNG, 1958, p. 148). And Neumann adds: "[...] the 'archetype and sich' is a nuclear phenomenon transcending consciousness, and its 'eternal presence' is nondivisible. But not only does it act as a magnetic field, directing the unconscious behaviour of the personality through the pattern of behavior set up by instincts; it also operates as a pattern of vision in the consciousness, ordering the psychic material into symbolic images (NEUMANN, 1963, p. 6).

As Neumann points out in *The Great Mother*, archetypal imagery of Mother extends back to prehistorical times when the psychic life of the first hominids was mainly unconscious. It was through mythology and arts that the experience with unconscious became exteriorized and thus made conscious, e.g. divided in its "positive" and "negative" mode:

The dark half of the black-and-white cosmic egg representing the archetypal feminine engenders terrible figures that manifest the black, abysmal side of life and the human psyche. Just as world, life, nature and soul have been experienced as a generative and nourishing, protecting and warming femininity, so their opposites are also perceived in the image of the feminine; death and destruction, danger and distress, hunger and nakedness, appear as helplessness in the presence of the dark and Terrible Mother.

Thus the womb of the earth becomes the deadly devouring maw of the underworld, and beside the fecundated womb and the protecting cave of earth and mountain gapes the abyss of hell, the dark hole of the depths, the devouring womb of the grave and of death, of darkness without light, of nothingness (NEUMANN, 1963, p. 148-149).

Archaic imagery of the uroboric mother is not linked only to Mother Earth but has its cosmic analogy in the form of nocturnal ocean or dark, starless sky as well:

Night sky, earth, underworld, and Primordial Ocean are correlated with this feminine principle, which originally appears as dark and darkly embracing. The uroboric goddess of the beginning is the great goddess of the Night, although she is seldom worshiped directly as such (NEUMANN, 1963, p. 211-212).

Is the Céline's homecoming a regressive fantasy about moving back to the Mother Night's devouring maw? Was Céline a man suffering from tremendous mother complex? Ostrovsky is convinced that Céline's imagery served as a sullied mirror of the 20<sup>th</sup>-century West. In this respect Céline became one of contemporary de-mythologizers of cultural and civilizational modernity myth. Céline's sullied mirror leads to distorted and darkened perspective

In this impassioned and painful journey, Céline becomes the Virgil of a Dantesque exploration which never emerges toward Purgatory or Paradise, but leaves the traveler stranded on the shores of day, in the cold and indifferent light of morning.

In this hellish domain, it is not Satan but man who is gigantically evil. What Céline terms "vacherie" (vileness) in argotique and deceptively off-handed fashion is really Evil of epic proportions. The cataloguing of all its possible manifestations, the dwelling upon its endless forms, is a vast undertaking. Céline devotes himself to this task with something resembling cold passion. Not a single aspect of man's hiddenness is neglected, no corner of his black

recesses is left unilluminated, Nothing and no one is spared. Ignominy covers the unborn child and the aged cancer patient.. Neither poverty nor health, learning nor ignorance, health nor disease, voluptuousness nor abstinence, cowardice nor bravery, victory nor submission, life nor death, confer any dignity or worth upon man (OSTROVSKY, 1967, p. 41-42).

### 3 CÉLINE AND HILLMAN AGAINST MODERNITY

There are many aspects in James Hillman's work that can be easily identifiable as parallel to Céline's assumptions. Let me name just some of them: 1) stress on human innerness, subjectivity or soul, 2) remarkable importance attributed to the connection of the soul with the death, darkness and depth and the necessity of the depth for the "growth" of the soul, 3) arts and fantasy as the primary medium of psyche, 4) emphasis on what is socially pathological, unacceptable, misplaced because it is exactly what is creative (Hillman prefers word "inventive") and what opens the door to the future, to the healthy life. The common denominator of all these points could be the search for authenticity by means of or in shadowy parts of life, in mythopoetic quality of the soul, in questioning of modernity myth. Simply, both authors assumed "underworld" or "shadowy" perspective when looking at the world and especially modern society.

Hillman's biographer Dick Russell quite appropriately calls him "underground man", label that could be readily used for Céline as well: "Hillman is not easy to interpret or classify. [...] Disdaining spiritual paths that focus on salvation or liberation, he can't be called New Age. Because he didn't fit readily into any category, within the United States, Hillman has remained a kind of 'underground man'" (RUSSELL, 2013, p. xxi). Criticism of both Céline and Hillman goes against academic or "high" culture:

I [Hillman] hate college campus atmosphere: coffee shops [...], fake Gothic, studied poses, despair. I shall go mad if I don't write. My madness here is falling into dull collective adaptive bourgeois jewish man (RUSSELL, 2013, p. 620).

Philosopher n'est qu'une autre façon d'avoir peur et ne porte guère qu'aux lâches simulacres (CÉLINE, 1934, p. 263).

Both of them were highly critical towards their own field and its prominent figures. For Hillman academic psychology betrays the very soul that should be its prominent preoccupation:

When psychology becomes a specialism and the psyche is set forth in an academic textbook, the soul disappears. When the soul is taken over by the university in the secular spirit of enlightenment, it loses all actuality, all substance, and all relevance for life. Thus academic psychology has been a psychology without soul from the beginning (HILLMAN, 1997, p. 130).

But beyond such criticism of academic psychology there is a criticism of modern western society in general. Russell summarizes this Hillman's position in the following way:

[...] the psychology is misguided precisely because it has failed to consider the negative influence of the culture in which the field is embedded, and the cluster of problematic ideas which it unknowingly (unconsciously) serves, such as individualism, rationalism, and materialism, to mention only a few (RUSSELL, 2013, p. xviii).

Céline scorned the prominent and popular writers of his time who perhaps shared at least some aspirations with him:

En verité Sartre, Camus, Miller etc. – sont bien furieux de me savoir encore en vie. Ils ne sont pas *donés* ces morveux – Ils manquent de Songe interne – Ils sont voués au plagiat d'où chez eux cette rage de l'extravagant <et> du saugrenu qu'ils veulent faire passer pour du fantastique, et la crudité pour du caractère. Ce n'est pas si facile ! ... Ils trichent. Je ne le dis qu'à vous (CÉLINE, 2012, p.134-135).

One of the common features of both authors is their attack on the imagery of progress in the modern West. In fact, Hillman is convinced that the collectively shared fantasy of ever-expanding progress is acting out our fundamental misunderstanding of the world and the psyche that contains also the opposite of what we believe in.

The fantasy of growth, the fantasy of the ever-expanding, ever-developing person—which is a very strong fantasy out there right now, especially among the educated, and among all those buyers of self-help books—doesn't take changelessness into account at all, doesn't set up a dialectic between change and changelessness (HILLMAN-VENTURA, 2007, p. 10).

In Céline loss is almost permanent topic:

Loss is a constant theme in the works of Céline. In *Voyage au bout de la nuit* the entire architecture of the novel is based upon a series of explorations, each of which results in a loss: the abandonment of Molly and the return from 'the other world'; the death of Bébert; the passing of Robinson. But there are other losses as well: of youth, adventure, joy and pain, tenderness, finally of all that is alive. Memory fails, youth passes, one's companions are abandoned or disappear (OSTROVSKY, 1967, p.134).

According to Hillman modern obsession with growth permeated psychology as well and made us believe in permanent consumerist approach to the world and people. But the true growth requires its exact opposite:

[...] becoming more and more oneself - the actual experience of it is a shrinking, in that very often it's a dehydration, a loss of inflations, a loss of illusions. [...] shedding is a beautiful thing. It's of course not what consumerism tells you, but shedding feels good. It's a lightening up. [...] Or put it another way: Growth is always loss (HILLMAN-VENTURA, 2007, p. 8).

Céline attacks the progress and French Enlightenment in a long passage of his novel *Voyage au bout de la nuit*. The same critique of exaggerated belief in lawful everlasting growth is perceptible:

Les Philosophes, ce sont eux, notez-le encore pendant que nous y sommes, qui ont commencé par raconter des histoires au bon peuple ...Lui qui ne connaissait que le catéchisme ! Ils se sont mis, proclamèrent-ils, à l'éduquer ...Ah ! ils en avaient des vérités à lui révéler ! a des belles ! Et des pas fatiguées ! Qui brillaient ! Qu'on en restait tout ébloui ! C'est ça ! qu'il a commencé par dire, le bon peuple, c'est bien ça ! C'est tout à fait ça ! Mourons tous pour ça ! Il ne demande jamais qu'à mourir le peuple ! Il est ainsi. "Vive Diderot !" qu'ils ont gueulé et puis "Bravo Voltaire" En voilà au moins des philosophes ! Et vive aussi Carnot qui organise si bien les victoires ! Et vive tout le monde ! Voilà au moins des gars qui ne le laissent pas crever dans l'ignorance et le fétichisme le bon peuple ! Ils lui montrent eux les routes de la Liberté ! Ils l'émancipent ! Ça n'a pas traîné ! Que tout le monde d'abord sache lire les journaux ! [...] Rien que des soldats citoyens ! Qui votent ! Qui lisent ! Et qui se battent ! Et qui marchent ! (CÉLINE, 1934, p. 89)

#### 4 BEYOND IMAGERY, INTO THE DEEPER MEANING

Céline's turn to primordial imagery of darkness, Hades-like heroes and his mythology of blackness finds its counterpart in what Hillman calls (1) "soul-making", (2) in Hillman's inspiration by ancient philosophy, religion and mythology, (3) in "pathologization" and (4) imaginal products of soul that are, according to Hillman, the very essence of being and can be grasped just by art and artistic imagery. Range of all these topic is too large to be dealt with here, but some of these questions are too close to what has been already mentioned. Repeating old Jungian principle that "psyche is the image", Hillman affirms that soul and its imagery are being constantly projected and this is why conscious life can be compared to sort of dreaming. Human being is mythopoetic being, a man is a myth-creating being:

The unconscious is always present, just as the past is always present [...] so we never cease projecting. We are dreaming all the time. The dream is there; we can never leave it. Part of the soul is continually remembering in mythopoetic speech, continually seeing, feeling and hearing ...Experience reverberates with memories, and it echoes reminiscences that we may never actually have lived. Thereby our lives seem at one and the same moment to be uniquely our own and altogether new, yet to carry an ancestral aura, a quality of *déjà vu* (HILLMAN, 1970, p. 177).

And more than this, creativity is inherent in all psychic events:

The fact that a psychic event is a creative event doesn't mean "creative, isn't that beautiful!" or "creative is romantic" and all that crap; no, not only positive, because creative also means destructive; and this comes from Jung, too, who says, "Creative means both destructive and constructive", so it doesn't have a positive happy evaluation only, that word "creative" (HILLMAN, 1983, p. 61).

Such creative aspect of the soul reveals not just the *daimon* who is the true calling to individuation but also the depth of the soul. This is the aspect of Hillman's thought that links him with the archaic imagery surrounding idea of psyche/soul, which, according to Hillman, is supposed to be a leading force of depth psychology:

Heraclitus lies near the roots of this ancestral tree of thought [...], since he was the earliest to take psyche as his archetypal first principle, to imagine soul in terms of flux and to speak of its depth without measure. Depth psychology [...] is itself no modern term. [...] All depth psychology has already been summed up by this fragment of Heraclitus: “you could not discover the limits of the soul (*psyche*), even if you travelled every road to do so; such is the depth (*bathun*) of its meaning (*logos*)” (HILLMAN, 1975, p. xi).

To Hillman darkness and the soul seems to be somehow connected. The death is another component peculiar to soul. Together with Heraclitean deepening and imaginative capacity form the essence of the soul. All that could be understood as Hillman’s striving to get beyond phenomenal our imaginal quality of the soul and psychic life:

First, “soul” refers to the deepening of events into experiences, second, the significance soul makes possible, whether in love or in religious concern, derives from its special relation with death. And third, by “soul” I mean the imaginative possibility in our natures, the experiencing through reflective speculation, dream, image, and fantasy – that mode which recognizes all realities as primary symbolic or metaphorical (HILLMAN, 1975, p. XI).

Whereas Céline remains in his dark imaginative mythology (uroboric night of human soul), Hillman aspires to get deeper beyond images and see the psyche in its permanent mythopoetic and spontaneous creation. But as in the case of Céline, Hillman views our innerness as weak and inferior because the modern West is dominated by Logos and rationality. Whereas Logos and consciousness of modern people constitute the daylight world, our innerness is linked with hardly accessible nightlight dimension frequently hiding what daylight consciousness repressed:

The soul is experienced as something inferior. There is a necessary inferiority when you’re in psychic reality. [...] Logos, when working beautifully, leaves the soul out – if you bring soul in, you start to stutter or you’ll go around in circles or you’ll be unable to elocute it in way that does justice to it – you will be in half-darkness. My point is that soul means inferiority – something sensitive, something ...well ...pathologized. Soul makes the ego feel uncomfortable, uncertain, lost. And that lostness is a sign of soul. You couldn’t have soul or be a soul if you couldn’t feel that you have lost it. The person in the strong ego as it’s called, doesn’t feel he’s lost anything. That’s one reason I question the psychiatric procedure of developing a strong ego. [...] Violence or power or sadism or domination keep us from sensing soul [...]. (HILLMAN, 1983, p.16-17).

To me, imagery of both authors leads almost always to the image of private inner space, *temenos*, i.e. holy space within oneself, to the need of deep connection to ones soul, readiness to go again and again through death and regeneration, necessity to view one’s body as an extension of an inner being, rather belief in deeper instinctual truth than in external phenomenal and material externalities. Céline’s above mentioned “*retour à la poésie du sauvage*” and “*le chant de l’âme*” as well as his radical rejection of culturally programmed “*haute culture*” will certainly find its ally in Hillman whose texts are almost always making western academic-scientific culture co-responsible for what he calls “pathologizing”.

L'âme, c'est la vanité et le plaisir du corps tant qu'il est bien portant, mais c'est aussi l'envie d'en sortir du corps dès qu'il est malade ou que les choses tournent mal. On prend des deux poses celle qui vous sert le plus agréablement dans le moment et voilà tout ! Tant qu'on peut choisir entre les deux, ça va. Mais moi, je ne pouvais plus choisir, mon jeu était fait ! (CÉLINE, 1934, p. 67-68).

For both Céline and Hillman search for soul or “soul-making” (because soul must be made according to Hillman) is the same as the fumble in the darkness and stripping all the externalities. That is why Céline scorns “*la sale âme héroïque*” (CÉLINE, 1934, p. 19) which he views as a product of cultural programming. Hillman’s “pathologizing” refers to the dark recesses of human soul, whose subtle and intimate processes are not just mysterious and almost invisible but from the perspective of the daylight world they seem to be pathological and malignant. And that is why they are generally tabooed. Briefly, Céline writes about imagery that C. G. Jung considered repressed, pathologized and yet present everywhere (HILLMAN, 1975, p. x) whereas Hillman is trying to get beyond such imaginal phenomenology. Following the same path, Hillman and Céline seem to be intimately connected with ancient arts and spirituality:

Perhaps Céline would best be placed in the bardic tradition: that of *aède*, or the illuminated tramps of Celtic origins, the Breton jugglers, or those old men of North Africa and the Balcan countries who still practice the art of the oral epic – all the tellers of tales, the creators and perpetrators of legends and of myths. The figure of bard has many affinities with that of Céline (OSTROVSKY, 1967, p. 190).

Céline’s words about “*retour à la poésie du sauvage*” seem to confirm all that. And Hillman draws his main inspiration from pre-Socratic philosophy, renaissance neo-Platonics (Marsilio Ficino, Pico della Mirandola), alchemists and romanticists just to reject mainstream cultural programming such as Cartesian rationalism, positivism and scientific-philosophical objectivism:

We have to have new thinking—or much older thinking than Lawrence, Blake, and Keats—to find roots for therapy’s deep interiorizing work. Soul-making must be reimagined. We have to go back before Romanticism, back to medieval alchemy and Renaissance Neoplatonism, back to Plato, back to Egypt, and also especially out of Western history to tribal animistic psychologies that are always mainly concerned, not with individualities, but with the soul of things. (HILLMAN – VENTURA, 2007, p. 50).

In spite of their rebellious and complicated characters, both Louis-Ferdinand Céline and James Hillman found their admirers and disciples. In Céline’s case it was mainly in the USA and in Hillman’s case not just because he is a founder of “archetypal psychology” but also a very popular writer. Innerness and depth contained in their works continues being attractive especially if we decide for new perspectives. If there is a small, nevertheless strongly present, school of Jungian literary theory, it is worth of studying Céline and his rich dark imagery. If there is a Hillmanian rendering of Jungian school, it is worth of developing it and introducing it to literary critique.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADAMS, M. V. Image, Active Imagination, and the Imaginal Level: A Quadrant Interview with Robert Bosnak, *Quadrant*, New York, v. 25, n. 2, p. 9-29.

ADAMS, M. V. *The Multicultural Imagination. "Race", Color and the Unconscious*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

ADAMS, M.V. *The Mythological Unconscious*. New York : Spring, 2010.

AEBERSOLD, D. *Goéthie de Céline*. Paris: Société d'études céliniennes, 2008.

CÉLINE, L.-F. – HINDUS, M. *Céline Letters à Milton Hindus, 1947-1949*. Paris: Gallimard, 2012.

CÉLINE, L.-F. *Cesta do blubin noci*. Praha: Fr. Borový, 1934.

CÉLINE, L.-F. *Mort à crédit*. Paris: Gallimard, 1952.

EDINGER, E. F. The New Myth of Meaning. *Quadrant*, New York, v. 10. n. 1, p. 23-38, 1977.

HILLMAN, J. *Inter Views. Conversations with Laura Pozzo on Psychotherapy, Biography, Love, Soul, Dreams, Work, Imagination, and the State of the Culture*. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1983.

HILLMAN, J. The Language of Psychology and the Speech of the Soul. In: *Eranos Jahrbuch*, Zürich: Rhein v. 37, n. 1, p. 299-356, 1970.

HILLMAN, J. *The Myth of Analysis*. New York: Northwestern University Press, 1997.

HILLMAN, J. *Re-Visioning Psychology*. New York: Harper & Row 1975.

HILLMAN, J. – VENTURA, M. *We've Had a Hundred Years of Psychotherapy – And the World's Getting Worse*. New York: Harper Collins, 2007.

JUNG, C.G. A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of Trinity. In: JUNG, C.G. *Psychology of Religion: West and East* (Collected Works, v. 11). New York and London: Routledge, 1958.

NEUMANN, E. *The Great Mother*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

OSTROVSKY, E. *Céline and His Vision*. New York: New York University Press, 1967.

RENNIE, B. S. *Reconstructing Eliade. Making Sense of Religion*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1996.

RUSSELL, D. *The Life and the Ideas of James Hillman. The Making of a Psychologist*, v. 1. New York: Helios Press, 2013.

TACEY, D. *After Tradition: Closer Encounters with the Sacred*. London: The Guild of Pastoral Psychology, 2007.

TACEY, D. *The Spirituality Revolution. The Emergence of Contemporary Spirituality*. New York: Brunner-Routledge, 2004.

TACEY, D. Twisting and Turning with James Hillman. From Anima to World Soul, from Academia to Pop. In: CASEMENT, A. (ed.) *Post-Jungians Today. Key papers in contemporary analytical psychology*. London and New York: Routledge 2005, p. 215-234.

**Recebido em: 28/03/2017**

**Aprovado em: 25/05/2017**

**Publicado em: 01/06/2017**