

Iridescent Infinity

Participatory Theory and Archetypal Cosmology

Becca Tarnas

A kind of fluid interpenetration belongs to the very nature of all archetypes. They can only be roughly circumscribed at best. Their living meaning comes out more from their presentation as a whole than from a single formulation. Every attempt to focus them more sharply is immediately punished by the intangible core of meaning losing its luminosity. No archetype can be reduced to a simple formula. It is a vessel which we can never empty, and never fill. It has a potential existence only, and when it takes shape in matter it is no longer what it was. It persists throughout the ages and requires interpreting ever anew. The archetypes are the imperishable elements of the unconscious, but they change their shape continually.

C. G. Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*¹

The creative magnificence of the universe is so irreducibly complex that no human framework will ever capture the full extent of its dynamic and indefinable nature. Yet human beings need an orientation in the cosmos to allow the meanings of existence to unfold. The spiritual and intellectual quest of humanity has impelled generation after generation to engage with the divine mystery out of which everything arises, in part to come to a fuller understanding of what our role is within the majesty of the cosmos. This quest has produced a plurality of religious and spiritual traditions that diversely engage and enact spiritual truths through their practices, texts, rituals, celebrations, experiments, and customs.

Transpersonal theory emerged in the second half of the twentieth century as a discipline to understand the psychospiritual development of human beings

as they are nurtured by a variety of religious forms. Early transpersonalism, as exemplified at different stages by Abraham Maslow, Stanislav Grof, and Ken Wilber, among others, primarily sought to perceive a unifying core at the center of all traditions. The work of Jorge Ferrer, in his book *Revisoning Transpersonal Theory*, offers a revision of the transpersonal perspective that encompasses the creative diversity continuously emerging in the co-creative participation between humanity and the divine—a participatory spirituality.

Arising parallel and in relationship to the development of transpersonal theory was the discipline of archetypal cosmology, cultivated most notably in Richard Tarnas's work with astrology, depth psychology, and cultural history. I would like to propose archetypal cosmology as a complementary vision of participatory spirituality that is simultaneously a psychological cartography, a spiritual discipline, a mode of spiritual knowing, and a world view. However, as illustrated in the above quotation from C. G. Jung, it is the very nature of the archetypes not to be fully definable and describable, without misrepresenting and dulling their divine luminosity. In recognition of this, I offer this essay as my personal struggle to come to understand the role the archetypes play in the unfolding relationship of the human and the divine in the cosmos.

The Archetypal Perspective

In his work with Stanislav Grof, Tarnas came to affirm “a highly significant—indeed a pervasive—correspondence between planetary movements and human affairs.”² This correspondence—perceptible in the position of the planets at one's birth, as well as in the transiting movement of the planets in relation to the birth chart throughout one's life, and the ever-changing dynamics of the planets' relational positions to each other—is of an archetypal character. Archetypal astrology is a continuously ongoing, universally visible form of synchronicity, what Jung describes as a meaningful coincidence between an inner and outer event.³ The planetary archetypes, Tarnas came to understand, are functionally similar to the archetypes as understood by the depth psychological tradition, yet are also comparable to the spectrum of gods and goddesses central to ancient cultures.⁴ As Tarnas writes: “Archetypes can be seen as the great organizing principles of psyche and cosmos—whether as mythic deities, Platonic Ideas, Aristotelian universals, [or] Jungian archetypes.”⁵ The planetary bodies in our solar system each correlate with a different archetype.⁶ Astrology, as a discipline, could be called the spiritual practice of archetypal cosmology.

As Gerry Goddard writes: “The planetary dynamics are themselves informed by the same archetypal ground as the biological and the mental.”⁷ The archetypes are not thought to be imposed structures projected upon the physical spheres, but rather, “cosmic perspectives in which the soul participates.” As James Hillman writes:

They are the lords of [the soul’s] realms of being, the patterns for its mimesis. The soul cannot be, except in one of their patterns. All psychic reality is governed by one or another archetypal fantasy, given sanction by a God. I cannot but be in them.⁸

From the archetypal cosmological perspective, the cosmos is structured and ordered according to these primordial principles, which permeate every level of being, from the depths of the psychic interior to the interrelational dynamics of worldly and cosmic events. Tarnas describes archetypes as “autonomous patterns and essences of meaning that cannot be localized in a particular dimension of being.”⁹ The infinite multivalence of archetypal expression, their “iridescent variation of aspect”¹⁰ as John Findlay describes, demonstrates that this understanding of astrology is not concretely or deterministically predictive, but rather archetypally predictive.¹¹ Tarnas writes, “Archetypes are indeterminate because they themselves are intrinsically and dynamically multivalent and multidimensional.”¹² The indeterminate nature of archetypes echoes the indeterminate nature of the divine mystery that Ferrer describes.

From Experientialism to Participatory Events

The archetypal perspective seems to be a deeply complementary vision reflective of Ferrer’s participatory turn in transpersonal theory and religious studies. Ferrer’s primary argument with the early frameworks of transpersonalism is that they are essentially confined to experientialist and perennialist perspectives, the latter of which I look into later in this essay.¹³ Experientialism can be defined as the reduction of all transpersonal phenomena to the realm of human interior subjective experience.¹⁴ While relegating all spiritual events to the realm of personal experience can be problematic, interestingly it was through Grof’s and Tarnas’s research into individuals’ subjective experience that led to the discovery of the correlations with planetary movements. Keiron Le Grice writes, “In the exploration of the human psyche in transpersonal research, what begins as an

interior quest, a great inward journey into the realm of the unconscious, leads, paradoxically, outwards to the cosmos.”¹⁵ Archetypal phenomena cannot be reduced to the interior alone, although they can certainly be encountered or experienced as such. Rather, following the work of both Ferrer and Tarnas, they seem to radiate throughout all dimensions of the cosmos: from the most personal emotional and psychological moments, to world events, to the physical rhythms of the planets.

Instead of referring to transpersonal phenomena as subjective experiences, Ferrer calls them participatory events, indicating their co-created, multilocal, and multidimensional nature.¹⁶ By viewing such events as participatory, human creativity and freedom is allowed to flourish in relationship to the divine. However, as Ferrer and Jacob Sherman write, “Such human participation need not reduce religious and spiritual phenomena to mere products of a culturally or biologically shaped human subjectivity.”¹⁷ Ferrer gives several examples of how transpersonal events occur not only at a personal level, but also at collective levels of identity, including events of an archetypal nature.¹⁸ The inherent astrological synchronicity of the planetary positions to human events is a strongly suggestive indication that transpersonal phenomena are not created merely in the human realm of internal experience but rather occur simultaneously in multiple dimensions.¹⁹

The multivalence and multidimensionality of archetypal expression—what Tarnas further describes as “their formal coherence and consistency that could give rise to a plurality of meaning and possible manifestation,”²⁰—is a result of their radically participatory nature that requires the agency of human co-creation. Tarnas depicts such participation, with reference to Ferrer’s description of the divine mystery:

Human beings complexly participate in, and are participated in *by*, an archetypal dimension that is pervaded, informed, and impelled by “*an indeterminate and dynamic spiritual power of inexhaustible creativity*” (Ferrer). This power both manifests in and through the human person, and simultaneously pervades, informs, and is expressive of the cosmos itself.²¹

The archetypal principles can be seen as informing all transpersonal events, and the multiplicity of spiritual domains and religious traditions reflect the imaginative creativity of human participation.

Archetypal Astrology as a Way of Spiritual Knowing

Astrology, as the study of how archetypal dynamics unfold between humanity and the multiplicitous expressions of divinity, is a form of *participatory knowing*, and could also be seen as a spiritual discipline and practice. Ferrer defines participatory knowing as:

A multidimensional access to reality that includes not only the intellectual knowing of the mind, but also the emotional and empathic knowing of the heart, the sensual and somatic knowing of the body, the visionary and intuitive knowing of the soul, as well as any other way of knowing available to human beings.²²

Astrology is first grounded in understanding astronomical data, and the changing geometrical relationships between the planets. However, the practice of archetypal astrology championed by Tarnas elevates it to a form of participatory spiritual knowing, which in turn leads to the development of what Hillman calls an “archetypal eye,” or the capacity to perceive the multifaceted expressions of the archetypes in the many domains of human experience and events.²³ Human participation in the archetypal realm, as Tarnas observes, “is as relevant to *the act of astrological cognition*, the capacity to discern archetypal correlations between planetary positions and human experience, as it is to the archetypal manifestations themselves.”²⁴

Archetypal manifestations can be observed, as previously mentioned, to be simultaneously occurring in multiple realms of experience in individual human beings and world events, irrespective of whether individuals are aware of the archetypes’ participation in their lives. From this perspective, one could say that every moment is a participatory event co-created with the archetypes. It also follows that if astrology is approached as a co-creative practice, or even as a spiritual discipline, one’s engagement with the archetypes can shape, to some extent, the archetypal manifestations in one’s life, or even the expressions of archetypes themselves. With greater awareness of the planetary movements and archetypal combinations, the individual human participant can co-create a more emancipated reality through their own conscious participation. It is important to emphasize that such participation is a *co*-creation, and is neither exclusively subject to the independent free will of the human nor solely to the fundamental principles of the planetary archetypes, but rather a constantly shifting relationship between these agential entities. It implies both a level of

responsibility on the part of the human being, and a trust in the ultimate, dynamic creativity of divinity.

Archetypal Astrology as a Spiritual Discipline

Ferrer notes that the primary aim of most contemplative spiritual traditions is not to have mystical experiences of the divine, but rather to be liberated by greater spiritual knowledge through participatory states of discernment—though mystical experiences can certainly lead to such knowledge and liberation.²⁵ The practice of archetypal astrology, as described here, does not aspire toward a particular fixed goal either, unless it is to come to greater conscious awareness of oneself as an archetypally informed being, engaging in a dialogue of reciprocity with the archetypal dimension. Ferrer sees “the overcoming of self-centeredness”²⁶ as a central tenet of most spiritual traditions, an aim which can be aided by the practice of archetypal astrology. As Tarnas writes, “Understanding and owning projections through awareness of what archetypal influences are at work, or awareness of personal or collective shadow, radically increases the potential for autonomous co-creative participation.”²⁷ Moreover, in observing the correlation between one’s own experiences and the movement of the planets, one can recognize that one’s life is not encapsulated within the self but is embedded in, and participating with, the larger experience of the cosmos.

Astrology is pertinent not only to personal psychology but also to relationships between individuals, as well as community dynamics, world events, and even natural events not directly connected to humanity.²⁸ World transits, and the multiplicity of archetypal events that manifest in correlation with them, are an example of the multilocality of transpersonal events. Personal transits, or the relationship between the world transits and one’s personal natal chart, are an additional layer of co-creation taking place between the multiple, dynamic layers of the cosmos. By recognizing the manifestations of the archetypes in realms beyond the human, one can recognize that spiritual meaning pervades the cosmos, and is not exclusive to the connection between humanity and the divine alone. Rather, the cosmos itself seems to be alive, aware, and participating with and between the human and the divine mystery.

Although the sole aim of practicing astrology, like other spiritual disciplines, may not be to have a mystical experience of the divine, such experiences can provide a deeper and more profound understanding of the

archetypes in their multivalent complexity. Le Grice intimates the great power of such an encounter:

In deep psychological exploration, or in heightened moments of openness, receptivity, and inspiration, one can have a direct encounter with the archetypal realm in all its unbridled power and intensity, an experience that is distinguished by a sense of the numinous—of mystery and awe, of tremendous power rising through the body, of intense religious affect, of emotional arousal, of tingling nerves, of soaring moral uplift, of demonic strength or even evil, or of overwhelming beauty and a sense of rightness or truth. In such moments, it seems that one has truly stepped into the realm of the gods.²⁹

Beyond even the magnificence and power of what one has encountered, to recognize the astrological correlations between such a direct experience of the archetypes and the significant positioning of the planets at that time can deepen the profundity of such revelations.

The apt naming of the planets and luminaries—from the Sun and Moon, to Mercury out through Saturn—by the peoples of numerous ancient cultures indicates that they perceived a clear connection between the archetypes as planets and the archetypes as gods, although the names of the gods and planets together varied from culture to culture. In a discussion of archetypes and gods, Hillman alludes suggestively to their cosmic status in the very metaphor he chooses to describe them:

By setting up a universe which tends to hold everything we do, see, and say in the sway of its cosmos, an archetype is best comparable with a God. And Gods, religions sometimes say, are less accessible to the senses and to the intellect than they are to the imaginative vision and emotion of the soul.³⁰

From ancient gods to psychological complexes, the archetypes seem to have pervaded human consciousness in their multivalent expressions since the dawn of our species. From this perspective, archetypal astrology can be seen as a spiritual path, discipline, or tradition: one of many religions participating in the great mystery of divinity.

Enacting the Archetypal Dimension

Archetypal, participatory phenomena could be considered what Ferrer calls, after Varela, Maturana, and Thompson, an *enaction*, or bringing forth, of spiritual or archetypal worlds or domains of distinction.³¹ These domains are, as Tarnas mentions, “co-created and co-determined by *all* the different elements in any event,” including “the *individual* human;” the conscious and unconscious “*collective* factors” (such as “class, race, gender, subculture, culture, epoch, species” and so forth); “*circumstantial* elements;” and “*unconscious transpersonal* factors such as karmic, ancestral, historical, phylogenetic, evolutionary”—all in complex participatory interaction with the archetypal dimension, intrinsically informed by the dynamic, creative, indeterminate spiritual mystery.³²

In Ferrer and Sherman’s participatory, pluralistic vision of spirituality, “the radical openness, interrelatedness, and creativity of the mystery and/or cosmos allows for the participatory enaction of an indefinite number of possible self-disclosures of reality and corresponding metaphysical or religious worlds.”³³ Yet, in reference to the variety of established spiritual worlds in which one can participate, Ferrer also suggests that when a spiritual domain is enacted it becomes more accessible to others upon the spiritual quest.³⁴ He offers the metaphor of a dense forest in which certain paths have been cleared: because the paths are more accessible they are more easily followed. While following clear paths is one possibility, it is also possible for new routes to be found among the trees by those seeking such spiritual exploration.³⁵ Such a metaphor could be applied to the concept of archetypes: they are enacted structures that evolve and transform in diverse ways as generation after generation of human beings participates with them in the unfolding of cosmic events.

While this concept of archetypes as fluid enacted mediaries between the human being and the divine mystery is certainly valid, the archetypes have particular qualities that suggest that they transcend the solely human realm. Tarnas describes archetypes as “universal essences or forms at once intrinsic to and independent of the human mind, that not only endure as timeless universals but are also co-creatively enacted and recursively affected through human participation.”³⁶ Tarnas affirms the enactive, participatory nature of the archetypes, but here also suggests that an eternal, universal principle underlies the archetypes as well: something that may indeed be inherent to the very nature of the mystery. The outcome is a view of archetypes that is at one level timeless and transcendent like the Platonic Forms, while at another level immanent and dynamic like Aristotelian universals or Sheldrakean morphogenetic fields. While

they can be understood as transcendent, they are also affected in their expression and accessibility by previous enactments.³⁷

A Universal Spiritual Core

Perennial philosophy carries the assumption that at the core of all religious traditions is a single, unitive spiritual ultimate with pre-given characteristics, accessed and interpreted at different levels of truth by the various religions.³⁸ Archetypal cosmology could be conflated with aspects of the perennialism that are deconstructed by Ferrer in *Revisioning Transpersonal Theory*. Archetypes do seem to have pre-given, universal qualities; however, as we have seen, archetypes are also dynamic, creative, enactive, and participatory. Furthermore, we cannot know the ultimate nature of each archetype because we encounter them through their particular manifestations, which are not lesser versions of the whole archetype, but rather holographic representations expressing in their particularity facets of that indeterminate, inexhaustible archetypal wholeness. I use the term “holographic” here to indicate when the parts of the whole contain the whole in miniature within themselves, such as in a hologram.

In agreement with perennialism, Grof writes: “Genuine religion is universal, all-inclusive, and all-encompassing. It has to transcend specific culture-bound archetypal images and focus on the ultimate source of all forms.”³⁹ I would argue that instead of the need to transcend the cultural archetypal images of the divine, one could discern the archetypal nature of the divine as expressed genuinely through religious traditions. The multiplicity of religious expressions of the divine, even in their full diversity, is still reflective of the archetypes, whether it is the Neptunian nonduality of Advaita Vedanta, or the Saturnian/Uranian-Promethean personal God of the Judaeo-Christian traditions. An understanding of these expressions of the divine as archetypal does not undermine the reality of the representation. It may be that the specific archetypal expressions present in any given religious tradition are essential to that tradition’s character and disclosure of the mystery. Archetypal expressions are holographic: they are simultaneously complete wholes in and of themselves, and are also part of the greater whole of the indefinable mystery. As Tarnas writes: “Here the holographic relation can be recognized in terms of the *whole* as a single concrete phenomenon, event, or person, while the *parts* are the multiple archetypes involved, cohering into and forming an integrated entity or whole in the specific phenomenon.”⁴⁰

All major religions seem to agree that there is a correspondence between humanity, the universe, and divinity, a correspondence that archetypal cosmology clearly reflects.⁴¹ The diversity of spiritual worlds accessed by the world's religions, as discussed above, arises from human participation in the generative spiritual power.⁴² Ferrer makes an important distinction between what qualities of these spiritual worlds are co-created by human enaction and what are inherent qualities of the divine itself: "Roughly, I believe that we can discriminate between (a) primordial qualities or archetypes existing previously to the emergence of human life and consciousness, and (b) historically enacted spiritual forms (e.g., the various spiritual worlds and cosmologies, spiritual states, and so forth) through human co-creation with the mystery and/or its primordial archetypes."⁴³ In this statement Ferrer describes the archetypes as inherent characteristics of the mystery, which are then expressed through enaction by the various religious traditions.

Archetypes as Deep Structures

The archetypal principles can be seen as deep universal structures informing human spirituality, but unlike the forms of neoperennialism that Ferrer deconstructs, the archetypal structures do not progress in a hierarchical manner.⁴⁴ Rather, they can be understood as simultaneously whole spiritual universes in themselves that also inform the greater whole of the indefinable mystery that Ferrer describes. Each archetype can manifest in an indefinite variety of ways while still reflecting its core principle. Goddard supports this supposition by saying:

The postulation of archetypal structuration does not constrain diversity one iota anymore than the rules of chess constrain the diversity of chess games which exist at all levels of skill and elegance obeying the same rules (deep structure) at all levels.⁴⁵

Because each individual archetype can manifest in a spectrum from noble to shadow qualities, one can spiritually evolve toward the fullest potential of one's life by striving toward the most noble qualities of the archetypal complexes. No hierarchical sequence exists between one archetype and the next—for example there is no privileging of the Neptunian archetype over the Saturnian or

Uranian—as they are all equally relevant and intrinsic to human and cosmic nature. Goddard notes that “from a transpersonal perspective, the evolution of humanity is taking place not only on the earthly plane but between lives and within the collective unconscious.”⁴⁶ Through human participation, the archetypes themselves can be seen as evolving, as new creative manifestations are enacted over the course of history. Like enacted spiritual worlds, or Sheldrake’s “morphic fields,” newly enacted archetypal expressions become more accessible for future generations participating in the archetypal domain.⁴⁷

From much of what has been said up until this point, astrology could be construed as an inclusivist practice, and archetypal cosmology as a universalist framework. However, unlike inclusivist religions which see their discipline as ultimately in possession of greater truth than others, archetypal astrology acts as a complement to all religions, affirming their religious truths as genuine archetypal expressions of the divine. Indeed, astrology can help one better understand a religious leader or the *zeitgeist* of a religious flourishing by disclosing the archetypal qualities involved.

As for the issue of the apparent universalism of archetypal cosmology, this can best be understood by recognizing archetypal cosmology as a novel paradigm that recontextualizes but does not negate the meaning of the multitude of spiritual traditions. Tarnas describes the nature of a paradigm shift in *The Passion of the Western Mind*:

Each paradigm is a stage in an unfolding evolutionary sequence, and when that paradigm has fulfilled its purpose, when it has been developed and exploited to its fullest extent, then it loses its numinosity . . . it becomes felt as oppressive, limiting, opaque, something to be overcome—while the new paradigm that is emerging is felt as a liberating birth into a new, luminously intelligible universe.⁴⁸

Archetypal cosmology, as well as the participatory turn, can both be seen as paradigms that are co-created, like spiritual worlds, between the human collective and the divine mystery, paradigms which are also reflective of the archetypal spirit of the times. Thus the seeming universalism of the paradigm is itself a co-creative enactment. Yet Tarnas also says:

The idea of archetypes may well be the only concept that is sufficiently flexible, profound, and multivalent so as to make intelligible the multiple dimensions and varieties of human experience—physical,

psychological, perceptual, cognitive, emotional, poetic, spiritual, cultural, historical, temporal, eternal, intrapersonal, interpersonal, impersonal, individual, collective, and so forth.⁴⁹

The Iridescent Cosmos

Archetypal manifestations seem to have been enacted prior even to the presence of humanity in the cosmos, for when we look back at the evolution of the universe, the archetypal dynamics are clearly present: in the Plutonic violence of colliding galaxies, nuclear explosions forming stars, or the subduction of tectonic plates on the molten Earth; in the Saturnian structures of matter, and the natural organizing principles of complexifying life; the Jupiterian exponentially increasing expansion of the universe from the first flaring forth⁵⁰ until the present moment; or the Venusian beauty and harmony present in the intricate balance of the cosmos, from the elliptical orbits of our own planets to the minutest spring blossom opening in the warm sunshine of a lush meadow.

Not only do world transits manifest in human events, but they also correlate with natural events, from earthquakes and droughts, to hurricanes and tsunamis, to name just a few of the more extreme examples. Furthermore, as seen in the evolution of the cosmos, it is plausible to conjecture that the archetypes preexisted the planets that carry their names in our solar system. Goddard seems to address this particular issue when he writes,

If astrology is a valid discipline and not simply a device or heuristic, the archetypal structure precedes even the development of the cosmos, a claim no more fantastic than . . . the anthropic principle. We have seen that modern cosmological physics expressed in the form of the anthropic principle . . . recognizes that the physical constants at the beginning of the universe must be almost precisely what they in fact were and are for there to be life at all.⁵¹

If this is the case, might the archetypes be the same in other planetary systems revolving around different suns? Or would the ultimate creativity of the divine mystery manifest in new archetypal forms, which still reflect the deep archetypal nature of the mystery itself? It seems that the archetypal structures, which manifest in both the cosmos and the human psyche, could be called “cosmocentric” rather than “anthropocentric.”

While Ferrer affirms that the divine mystery itself might be archetypally structured prior to the presence of the human being, he also says that “we may need to seriously contemplate the possibility that, after the emergence of human consciousness, even those essential features are not completely impervious to the formative powers of human consciousness.”⁵² He goes on, however, to affirm not only the co-creation of spiritual realities between the human and the divine, but also the role of the cosmos:

My sense is that all spiritual qualities and forms, at least as accessible to human consciousness . . . are “cosmotheandric” in that they emerge out of the creative interrelatedness among Being (theos), the Kosmos (cosmos), and human beings (anthropos).⁵³

Ferrer’s vision of participatory epistemology suggests an “intimate communion with the cosmos,”⁵⁴ which honors the essential complexities of the co-creative, enactive, indeterminate, and dynamically multivalent nature of psychocosmological reality.

Echoing these concepts in metaphorical terms, Goddard gives a beautiful description of the archetypal nature of the cosmos, which illustrates the sacred divinity saturating every dimension of the universe:

In their movements, the planets, each discovered to be associated with a particular protean archetypal mode, strike like hammers upon the archetypal strings of the Kosmic instrument, resonating up and down in terms of the archetypal channels which constitute not only the cosmos itself but the numberless entities constituting the biosphere and noosphere.⁵⁵

Each string of the instrument, or each archetype, is essentially a cosmos in its own sense, its own indeterminate mystery out of which arises an infinity of multivalent expressions. But perhaps it is when the strings of the instrument are understood to be in harmony with each other that the melodies of the ultimate mystery arise in unity.

Ferrer writes that “the *indeterminate nature of Spirit* cannot be adequately depicted through any positive attribute, such as nondual, dual, impersonal, personal, and so forth.”⁵⁶ However, in the spirit of the Platonic and Neoplatonic tradition, I would like to offer one positive attribute that may be diverse, flexible, and encompassing enough to still allow the mystery to flourish in all its

dynamic multivalence: *archetypal*. Through the archetypal lens the nature of spirit can still remain indeterminate, for as Jung writes, an archetype “has a potential existence only, and when it takes shape in matter it is no longer what it was.”⁵⁷ A profound paradox seems to be at play, for even the rejection of an archetypal perspective can be understood through an archetypal lens: Saturn correlates with negation and rejection and Neptune with archetypes, spirit, divinity, and the sacred. Indeed, the archetype of Neptune correlates with the experience of absolute unity and oneness, bringing forward the question of whether it is possible to have an experience beyond archetypal patterning, or if as Hillman says: “The soul cannot be, except in one of their patterns.” Such questions perhaps lie in the realm of soul, in coming to understand what a soul is—but these are deep inquiries to be explored at another time.

The presence of paradox seems to indicate the presence of the divine. When something is simultaneously one and many, manifest and unmanifest, and it cannot be reduced to one or the other, the very tension of this irresolvability reveals its sacredness. I would like to offer a metaphoric image to reflect the nature of the divine mystery and the “iridescent variation of aspect” displayed by its archetypal principles. Webster Dictionary defines *iridescence* as “a lustrous rainbowlike play of color caused by differential refraction of light waves that tends to change as the angle of view changes.” I believe this is true of the archetypal expression of the divine, which can be imagined as a white light, eternally refracting into the multiplicity of archetypal colors, in shades from light to shadow, ever shifting and interweaving with each other in a harmonious display of rainbows.

Notes

¹ Carl Gustav Jung, “The Psychology of the Child Archetype,” in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, 2nd ed., vol. 9, part 1, *The Collected Works of Carl Gustav Jung*, trans. R. F. C. Hull, ed. H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, and W. McGuire, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968), § 301, p. 179.

² Richard Tarnas, *Cosmos and Psyche: Intimations of a New World View* (New York: Viking, 2006), 68-69.

³ Tarnas, *Cosmos and Psyche*, 61.

⁴ Tarnas, *Cosmos and Psyche*, 65.

- ⁵ Richard Tarnas, “Notes on Archetypal Dynamics and Complex Causality in Astrology, Part I,” *Death, Rebirth, Revolution: Archetypal Dynamics and Personal Experience. Archai: The Journal of Archetypal Cosmology* 4 (2012): 40.
- ⁶ Tarnas, *Cosmos and Psyche*, 86.
- ⁷ Gerry Goddard, “The Astro-Transpersonal Model and the Archetypal Cosmos,” in *Transpersonal Theory and the Astrological Mandala: An Evolutionary Model* (Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: Trafford Publishing, 2009), accessed April 26, 2012, <http://www.islandastrology.net/Chapter23.htm>.
- ⁸ James Hillman, *Re-Visioning Psychology* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1992), 169-70.
- ⁹ Tarnas, “Notes on Archetypal Dynamics, Part I,” 43.
- ¹⁰ John Findlay, “The Logical Peculiarities of Neoplatonism,” in *The Structure of Being: A Neoplatonic Approach*, ed. R. Baine Harris (Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1982), 1.
- ¹¹ Tarnas, *Cosmos and Psyche*, 67.
- ¹² Tarnas, “Notes on Archetypal Dynamics, Part I,” 49.
- ¹³ Jorge N. Ferrer, *Revisoning Transpersonal Theory: A Participatory Vision of Human Spirituality* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2002), 2-3.
- ¹⁴ Ferrer, *Revisoning Transpersonal Theory*, 2.
- ¹⁵ Keiron Le Grice, *The Archetypal Cosmos: Rediscovering the Gods in Myth, Science and Astrology* (Edinburgh, UK: Floris Books, 2010), 156.
- ¹⁶ Ferrer, *Revisoning Transpersonal Theory*, 116.
- ¹⁷ Jorge N. Ferrer and Jacob H. Sherman, eds. *The Participatory Turn: Spirituality, Mysticism, Religious Studies* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2008), 35.
- ¹⁸ Ferrer, *Revisoning Transpersonal Theory*, 120.
- ¹⁹ Tarnas, *Cosmos and Psyche*, 58.
- ²⁰ Tarnas, *Cosmos and Psyche*, 67.
- ²¹ Tarnas, “Notes on Archetypal Dynamics, Part I,” 57.
- ²² Ferrer, *Revisoning Transpersonal Theory*, 121.
- ²³ James Hillman, “Why ‘Archetypal’ Psychology?” in *Loose Ends* (Zurich, Switzerland: Spring Publication, 1975), 139.

- ²⁴ Tarnas, "Notes on Archetypal Dynamics, Part I," 53.
- ²⁵ Ferrer, *Revisioning Transpersonal Theory*, 127.
- ²⁶ Ferrer, *Revisioning Transpersonal Theory*, 144.
- ²⁷ Tarnas, "Notes on Archetypal Dynamics, Part I," 52.
- ²⁸ Le Grice, *The Archetypal Cosmos*, 159.
- ²⁹ Le Grice, *The Archetypal Cosmos*, 169.
- ³⁰ Hillman, *Re-Visioning Psychology*, xix-xx.
- ³¹ Ferrer, *Revisioning Transpersonal Theory*, 123.
- ³² Tarnas, "Notes on Archetypal Dynamics, Part I," 52-53.
- ³³ Ferrer and Sherman, *The Participatory Turn*, 32.
- ³⁴ Ferrer, *Revisioning Transpersonal Theory*, 150.
- ³⁵ Ferrer, *Revisioning Transpersonal Theory*, 151.
- ³⁶ Tarnas, *Cosmos and Psyche*, 86.
- ³⁷ Tarnas, "Notes on Archetypal Dynamics, Part I," 43-45.
- ³⁸ Ferrer, *Revisioning Transpersonal Theory*, 74-75.
- ³⁹ Stanislav Grof, *The Cosmic Game: Explorations of the Frontiers of Human Consciousness* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998), 24.
- ⁴⁰ Richard Tarnas, "Notes on Archetypal Dynamics and Complex Causality in Astrology, Part II," *Saturn and the Foundations of an Emerging Discipline. Archai: The Journal of Archetypal Cosmology* 5 (2016): 109-10.
- ⁴¹ Ferrer and Sherman, *The Participatory Turn*, 40.
- ⁴² Ferrer and Sherman, *The Participatory Turn*, 34.
- ⁴³ Jorge N. Ferrer, "Response to A. H. Almaas," Unpublished Manuscript (2010), 4.
- ⁴⁴ Ferrer, *Revisioning Transpersonal Theory*, 101.
- ⁴⁵ Gerry Goddard, "The Astro-Transpersonal Model & Jorge Ferrer's Critique of Perennialist Universalism," in *Transpersonal Theory and the Astrological Mandala: An Evolutionary Model* (Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: Trafford Publishing, 2009), accessed April 26, 2012, <http://www.islandastrology.net/Chapter22.htm>.
- ⁴⁶ Goddard, "The Astro-Transpersonal Model and the Archetypal Cosmos."

- ⁴⁷ Le Grice, *The Archetypal Cosmos*, 215.
- ⁴⁸ Richard Tarnas, *The Passion of the Western Mind: Understanding the Ideas That Have Shaped Our World View*, (New York: Random House, Harmony 1991, Ballantine, 1993), 439.
- ⁴⁹ Tarnas, “Notes on Archetypal Dynamics, Part I,” 43.
- ⁵⁰ Brian Swimme and Thomas Berry, *The Universe Story* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1994), 16.
- ⁵¹ Goddard, “The Astro-Transpersonal Model and the Archetypal Cosmos.”
- ⁵² Ferrer, “Response to A. H. Almaas,” 4.
- ⁵³ Ferrer, “Response to A. H. Almaas,” 4. Ferrer is using Raimon Panikkar’s term “cosmotheandric,” also sometimes written “cosmotheanthropic” for a gender-neutral variation, to refer to the *cosmos*, the divine (*theos*), and the human (*anthropos*).
- ⁵⁴ Ferrer, *Revisioning Transpersonal Theory*, 173.
- ⁵⁵ Goddard, “The Astro-Transpersonal Model and the Archetypal Cosmos.”
- ⁵⁶ Ferrer, *Revisioning Transpersonal Theory*, 190.
- ⁵⁷ Jung, “The Psychology of the Child Archetype,” § 301, p. 179.

Bibliography

- Ferrer, Jorge N. *Revisioning Transpersonal Theory: A Participatory Vision of Human Spirituality*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- . “Response to A. H. Almaas.” Unpublished manuscript, 2010.
- Ferrer, Jorge N. and Jacob H. Sherman, eds. *The Participatory Turn: Spirituality, Mysticism, Religious Studies*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2008.
- Findlay, John, “The Logical Peculiarities of Neoplatonism.” In *The Structure of Being: A Neoplatonic Approach*. Edited by R. Baine Harris, Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1982.

- Goddard, Gerry. *Transpersonal Theory and the Astrological Mandala: An Evolutionary Model*. Victoria, British Columbia: Trafford Publishing, 2009. Accessed April 26, 2012. <http://www.islandastrology.net/contents.htm>.
- Grof, Stanislav. *The Cosmic Game: Explorations of the Frontiers of Human Consciousness*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998.
- . *Psychology of the Future: Lessons from Modern Consciousness Research*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2000.
- Hillman, James. *Re-Visioning Psychology*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1992.
- . “Why ‘Archetypal’ Psychology?” In *Loose Ends*. Zurich, Switzerland: Spring Publication, 1975.
- Jung, Carl Gustav “The Psychology of the Child Archetype.” In *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. 2nd edition. Vol. 9, part 1 of *The Collected Works of Carl Gustav Jung*. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. Edited by H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, and W. McGuire. Bollingen Series XX. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Le Grice, Keiron. *The Archetypal Cosmos: Rediscovering the Gods in Myth, Science and Astrology*. Edinburgh, UK: Floris Books, 2010.
- Swimme, Brian and Thomas Berry. *The Universe Story*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1994.
- Tarnas, Richard. *Cosmos and Psyche: Intimations of a New World View*. New York: Viking, 2006.
- . “Notes on Archetypal Dynamics and Complex Causality in Astrology, Part I.” *Death, Rebirth, Revolution: Archetypal Dynamics and Personal Experience*. *Archai: The Journal of Archetypal Cosmology* 4 (2012): 39-60.
- . “Notes on Archetypal Dynamics and Complex Causality in Astrology, Part II.” *Saturn and the Foundations of an Emerging Discipline*. *Archai: The Journal of Archetypal Cosmology* 5 (2016): 105-24.
- . *The Passion of the Western Mind: Understanding the Ideas That Have Shaped Our World View*. New York: Random House, Harmony 1991, Ballantine, 1993.