

Atatürk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi
Atatürk University Journal of Faculty of Letters
Sayı / Number 66, Haziran/ June 2021, 221-241

**A PSYCHOANALYTIC CRITICISM OF J.J. ROUSSEAU: A NEGATIVE
ASPECT OF THE PUER AETERNUS ARCHETYPE**

**J.J. Rousseau Üzerine Psikanalitik Bir Eleştiri: Puer Aeternus Arketipinin
Olumsuz Bir Veçhesi**

(Makale Geliş Tarihi: 15.08.2020 / Kabul Tarihi: 09.04.2021)

Canberk ŞEREF*

Abstract

Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), either historically or personally, is an original and a highly controversial figure. He has been the precursor of the Romantic Movement and has been a great influencer for the environment of the French Revolution and the Declaration of Human Rights which follows it. Rousseau's theories are focused on the idea that man has been corrupted by civilization and "has been chained everywhere he goes". It is stated in this paper that these ideas of Rousseau are driven by a certain psychological bias: a possession by the archetype of "puer aeternus" or "eternal child". In order to open up this psychology, we took into consideration both Rousseau as a historical figure and an individual (along with his own experiences). It has been argued that personal psychology and philosophy of Rousseau -in relationship with his time period- is thus interlinked. Our approach has taken Jungian psychoanalysis as its method and revolved around it.

Keywords: J. J. Rousseau, Jungian Psychoanalysis, C. G. Jung, M. L. von Franz, Archetypes, Puer Aeternus, Romanticism, Individuation.

Öz

Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), tarihi veya şahsi olarak özgün ve son derece tartışmalı bir figürdür. Romantik Akım'ın öncüsü olmuş ve Fransız

* Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Fransız Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Ankara / TÜRKİYE.
Hacettepe University, Faculty of Letters, Department of French Language and Literature, Ankara /TURKEY. E-mail: can.seref@hotmail.com / ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4135-3198>

Devrimi ortamı ile beraber İnsan Hakları Bildirgesi için büyük etkiye bulunmuştur. Rousseau'nun kuramı, insanın uygarlık tarafından yozlaştırıldığı ve "gittiği her yerde zincire vurulduğu" fikri üzerine eğilmektedir. Bu çalışmada da, Rousseau'nun bu düşüncelerinin bilinçdışı bir önyargı tarafından, yani "puer aeternus" veya "ebedi çocuk" arketipin tarafından hakimiyet altına alındığı ya da yönlendirildiği savunulmuştur. Bu psikolojiyi serimlemek için, çalışmamızda, Rousseau hem tarihi bir figür hem de birey olarak (şahsi tecrübeleriyle birlikte) ele alınmıştır. Dolayısıyla Rousseau'nun şahsi psikolojisi ve felsefesinin -çağı ile ilişkide olarak- doğrudan birbirine bağlı olduğu öne sürülmektedir. Yaklaşımımızda da Jungcu psikanaliz benimsenmiş ve onun etrafında ilerlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: J.J. Rousseau, Jungcu Psikanaliz, C. G. Jung, M. L. von Franz, Arketipler, Puer Aeternus, Romantizm, Bireyleşme.

"[...] then, by taking refuge in the common mother, I searched in her arms my exemption from the reach of her children [...]"

Reveries of the Solitary Walker

"[...] and until the end of his life, he will not stop being an old child."

Dialogues: Rousseau, Judge of Jean-Jacques

Introduction

Carl Jung's theory of archetypes is founded on his idea that the unconscious is separated as "personal unconscious" and "collective unconscious". As the names reveal enough, the personal unconscious is limited with the life of the individual after birth; and the collective unconscious is the pool of cultural psyche and its motifs, including hereditary and biological basis. Repeating themes, events and all kinds of motifs, thus, are explained (and made sense of) by Jung in this context. The archetypes, as Jung often states, cannot be completely limited by a definition. They are open and in change. They can only be "circumscribed" (Jung, 1969, p.156). Of course, they are not merely the motifs of the imagination but are the unconscious drives which lead the individual's psychic life.¹ It means that the relation of the person with the archetypes is linked directly with his or her personal unconscious.

The mission of "bringing the unconscious to consciousness" in psychoanalysis, is defined in Jung's theory as "individuation". According to this, as the more one's conscious and unconscious mind becomes familiar with each other, the more

¹ In this manner, the archetypes are essential elements of Jungian psychoanalysis.

the person is a complete individual – or to be precise, a more “integrated” individual. The suppression or neglect of the unconscious mind cannot be ignored in this ultimate inevitability. Rather, as the depth of the suppressed increases, the danger of inflation or becoming “possessed” by the archetype increases too: “The rejection of unconscious usually has unfortunate results; if the instinctive forces of the unconscious are kept to be neglected, they rise in opposition [...] The more negative is the attitude of the conscious through the unconscious, the more the unconscious becomes dangerous” (Jung, 2015, p. 31). In this situation, the person can identify him or herself with the archetype or can be so allured by the search of an archetype that they gets under the control of this archetype which will eventually “possess” the person. For example, this can be revealed as a search for the equal of the feminine archetype (anima) in men’s psyche, and the masculine archetype (animus) in women’s psyche (hence, leading to mother or father complex). The problem is that, since the archetype is an image of ideal, an equivalence is a priori unattainable in the world of phenomena. As a result, this leads to an endless dissatisfaction which constitutes a neurosis.

When we think of the archetypes, -except some, when they are in a position which is in direct relation with norms- they do not contain negative aspects in themselves but only in an indirect relation with the person and his or her psychology which defines one’s attitude through the world. So, a mother complex can be interpreted as an anima problem, but the anima as a figure, is not intrinsically problematic. In the example of the *puer aeternus* (or “the eternal child”) which is the subject of this paper, this archetype represents eternal youth with its both positive and negative aspects in it. As this youth and its source of energy are linked with the instinctual world -i.e. Nature-, the other world that is constructed by civilization as an artificial construct often contradicts its desires. This world of instinctual source, as Peterson (2002) has tackled thoroughly -by taking Jungian psychology as an important basis- within the terms of “unknown” or “chaos”, is interlinked with the psychological symbolism of the womb and the unconscious state. While in this case also “mother figure symbolizes the unconscious” (Jung, 2015, p. 35), a child’s or man’s unwillingness for adapting to the conscious reality which is partly detached from motherly unconscious state grows and accumulates itself. When this turns into a feedback -which reveals its essential negative aspect-, “fear of life and people causes more regression and ultimately this results with *infantilism* and ‘return to mother’ ” (Jung, 201, p. 34).² It is a fact that “for many people, what ends the childhood dreams cruelly are the needs of life” (Jung, 2015, p. 42). However, in common sense, for children to be like a child is normally expected from them; yet, when we see a man who carries childlike psychology, it often shows us a neurosis that causes not only an anomaly but also an internal conflict in individual’s psychic life.

² Emphasis belongs to us.

The positive aspect of the puer aeternus archetype is a genius and creativity, or a bringing of wholeness that leads to *Self*. And its negative aspect is this childish psychology in a grown man³ which is defined by certain traits such as irresponsibility, tendency to overvalue the dream -or ideal- world, spontaneity, dependence on mother, and so on. Jung states that “the ‘eternal child’ in man is an indescribable experience, an incongruity, a handicap, and a divine prerogative; an imponderable that determines the ultimate worth or worthlessness of a personality” (Jung, 1969, p. 179). According to this, depending on the point of view, we can observe this archetype in its two-sided aspects. It is the manifestation of the experience which resides out of the conscious mind, and thus, which can threaten it. In the same time, because it is on the outside of the enlightened conscious territory, it can bring the novelty, development, destruction and creation (-concerning bringing of novelty and growth by the hero- see Peterson, 2002); and therefore the wholeness in the manner of awakening the one-sidedness of the conscious: “It is a personification of vital forces quite outside the limited range of our conscious mind; of ways and possibilities of which our one-sided conscious mind knows nothing; a wholeness which embraces the very depths of Nature” (Jung, 1969, p. 170).

Rousseau’s philosophy, on its basis, argues that the development of civilization gradually corrupts the nature of man (for some precise statements, see for example Rousseau, 2008, p. 52 and 2018, p. 5). The unconscious state of *homme sauvage* (savage man or primitive man), compared to this, is depicted as “moral” and more natural with closeness to all the fruits of the Nature. Therefore, Rousseau’s description for the state of nature can be seen as an unconscious symbolization of pre-paradise-lost-times. Besides of clear projection of puer psychology in his theories which we shall examine, Rousseau’s psychological individuality also shows his puer character in an evident manner, and this is linked to his ideas as well: firstly his mother complex and his constant tendency to idealize women, and then his radical “chain-negating” attitude which likewise reveals itself with his marginality in the society.

As a historical figure, Rousseau is considered to be both a romantic and an enlightenment philosopher (despite their contrast in their essential ideas). In his romantic thought, Rousseau is strongly original – which makes him the precursor of romanticism. Rousseau’s clear and unhesitant statements can be related to this originality. Thus, he was the discoverer of this particular way of thinking. His bold motivation of speaking the truth seems to be the attitude that opens his mind more clearly to his psychoanalytic readings based on his commentaries. It can be seen as an impudent or a too easy choice to make assumptions on a philosopher from history: related to this, before starting, we must accept that everything should not be seen as a complex, but instead, some great things are caused *by* and *thanks to* psychological

³ *Puella aeternus* is the feminine name of the archetype but since we will focus on Rousseau, we shall limit ourselves with man’s puer psychology.

irregularities. Which means that if Rousseau was driven by his puer psychology we are obligated to accept the fact that in most cases we would not be able to treat his complex without destroying his philosophy in totality either. Therefore, one could not demand a philosopher to be “normal”, if we were to look from a perspective concerning the value of his philosophy. He is what he is – nonexcludable from his whole psyche.⁴

Eventually, we link Rousseau’s ideas to his psychology and observe his psychology in comparison with the structure of his time’s ideological background.⁵ In this period of the eighteenth century, the Age of Enlightenment (and industrial developments) rapidly improves the individual consciousness of the society. Its main motive is a trust to reason’s potential to enhance the state of man in his social life. In the face of this radical acceleration, another parallelly radical oppositional (a cultural enantiadromia⁶) intellectual movement arises: the romanticism. Rousseau, in his part as a historical figure, represents the emblematic way of thinking and character of romanticism.

Noting these so far, the argument of this paper revolves around the connection of the archetype of “puer aeternus”⁷ and Rousseau’s psychology -with unconscious drives that lead him to his philosophical deductions- in the frame that is revealed in his philosophical and autobiographical texts which contain a therapeutic expression of the unconscious psyche as in their “confession” in a written form. The famous and dominant theme of “returning to nature” in Rousseau’s theories is examined in this context with the perspective of Jungian psychoanalysis along with the theories of Carl Jung himself and Jungian psychologist Marie-Louise von Franz. The main claim that Rousseau makes for justifying the natural state is thus considered as a complex-biased characteristic caused by “possession by an archetype”. Therefore, it is argued that Rousseau’s texts and his philosophy in general contain an observable puer psychology in their both personal and the *zeitgeist* context.

Jung and the Puer Aeternus or “the Child God”

The “puer aeternus” archetype is essentially defined by Jung in his book *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious*. He describes certain characteristics of this

⁴ Von Franz gives an example for this sensitive subject: treating analysands but with what cost? (von Franz, 2000, p. 20).

⁵ With this, for the moment we ignore some problematics of literary criticism concerning the relationship of the author and his or her text.

⁶ A Jungian term for an extreme equalization of an extreme attitude.

⁷ Which can be interpreted in Lacanian psychoanalysis even as a problematic “mirror stage” or a problematic adaptation process of “symbolic” (as in, *les non-dupes errent*) or an unacceptance of “lack” that results with a need for returning to the existence in totality inside the mother’s womb. But we deliberately put this work into the context of Jungian psychoanalysis to distinguish what is behind the attitude of “refusing to grow up” -that we encounter in man-child- both personally and culturally.

archetype, but by offering the future psychologists to expand it, he remarks that it is still a relatively “virgin territory” (Jung, 1969).

Jung defines the puer aeternus with its certain manifestations: link with the original condition which is not differentiated by consciousness or uprooted by it; a symbol which unites the opposites, a mediator, bringer of healing, that is, one who makes whole, thus himself is a hermaphrodite; a force to embrace the very depths of Nature and her drive to self-realization; a creative nature; a personification of vital forces; inseparable unity of the beginning and the end, and so on (Jung, 1969, pp. 162-178). In its most metaphorical sense, it is the bringer of wholeness. For the person, this archetype leads to the synthesis of the conscious and the unconscious – to the destination of which Jung calls “Self”. Therefore, it is one of the revelations of the Self’s figures.

Given these traits of puer aeternus, we can accept that it has essentially positive aspects for a person. However, we must take into consideration that the individuation process of Jung, which concludes with the unity of consciousness with the unconscious psyche, is the ultimate purpose of his psychoanalysis. Therefore, puer aeternus as a provider of unity, leads to the final destination of the process (for this example Jung gives Jesus who says “except ye become as little children” and speaks about other religious motifs [Jung, 1969, p. 169]).

Von Franz’s Examination of Puer Aeternus

One of Jung’s students and co-coworkers, Jungian psychologist Marie-Louise von Franz will make a thorough practical examination of this archetype with her twelve lessons which take place between 1959 and 1960 in Jung Institute in Switzerland and which, afterwards, have been collected into a book. She starts her lessons with a baseline characterization of the archetype and its reflections on the individual:

“*Puer aeternus*⁸ is the name of a god of antiquity. The words themselves come from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and are there applied to the child-god in the Eleusinian mysteries. Ovid speaks of the child-god Iacchus, addressing him as *puer aeternus* [...]”⁹. In later times, the child-god was identified with Dionysus and the god Eros. [...]. He is a god of vegetation and resurrection, the god of divine youth, corresponding to such oriental gods as Tammuz, Attis and Adonis. The title *puer aeternus* therefore means eternal youth, but we also use it sometimes to indicate a certain type of young man who has an outstanding mother complex and who therefore behaves in certain typical ways” (von Franz, 2000, p. 7).

It is important to distinguish that each of these gods are mythologically symbolized as “Nature” itself or an agent of it (except Eros). Tammuz, Attis and Adonis are the same gods treated or manifested differently in various cultures (Tammuz in

⁸ The Latin words are translated as “eternal child”.

⁹ Book IV, 18.

Akkadians and Semitic people, Attis in Phrygians and Adonis in Greeks). Dionysus is likewise an agent of the nature. And Eros is the unifier of sexes. Nature in itself is the unconscious or impulse-driven state, in which all living creatures act according to their instincts and emotions. Additionally, one should show regard to the symbolization of the nature as the unconsumable life.

With its positive aspect, there also exists a negative aspect of the puer aeternus which von Franz will make the examination of; hence the translation of the book's title is called *The Problems of Puer Aeternus*.¹⁰ Jung puts the puer in the mythological territory while von Franz brings it to more daily and individual life with her explications. Her inquiries are founded on those of Jung's, however, they focus more on individual traits. The first six lessons of the book are on *The Little Prince* of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry. According to von Franz, as the character "little prince" is a figure of puer aeternus, the author himself is also an individual with a deep puer psychology.

"A puer aeternus psychologically refers to an older man whose emotional life has remained at an adolescent level, usually coupled with too great a dependence on the mother" (Sharp, 1991, p. 107). Puer is generally known for his problem of commitment to things or people. He usually has a weak ego and a strong spiritual insight. With an idealist attitude to career, "toying with a thousand possibilities of life and cannot choose just one" (von Franz, 2000, p. 91), puer is often unwilling to commit to a thing or choice.

"The puer typically leads a provisional life, due to the fear of being caught in a situation from which it might not be possible to escape. His lot is seldom what he really wants and one day he will do something about it – but not just yet. Plans for the future slip away in fantasies of what will be, what could be, while no decisive action is taken to change. He covets independence and freedom, chafes at boundaries and limits, and tends to find any restriction intolerable" (Sharp, 1991, p. 107).

Dependence can signify a prison for the puer aeternus – that is, to be stuck in. "There is always a 'but' which prevents marriage or any kind of definite commitment [...] There is always the fear of being caught in a situation from which it may be impossible to slip out again" (von Franz, 2000, p. 8). This means that responsibility is not an attraction for him. Here we can cite an example that has been given by von Franz:

"They generally do not like sports which require patience and long training, for the *puer aeternus*, in the negative sense of the word, is usually very impatient by disposition, so that such sports do not appeal to them. I know a young man, a classical example of the *puer aeternus*, who did a tremendous amount of mountaineering but

¹⁰ German title is "Puer Aeternus - Eternal Youth and Creative Genius". Yet, the original lessons are given in English.

so much hated carrying a rucksack that he preferred to train himself even to sleep in the rain or snow and wrap himself up in a silk raincoat and, with a kind of Yoga breathing, was able to sleep out of doors. He also trained himself to go practically without food, simply in order not to have to carry any weight. He roamed about for years all over the mountains of Europe and other continents, sleeping under trees or in the snow. In a way he led a very heroic existence, just in order not to be bound to go to a hut or carry a rucksack. You might say that this was symbolic, for such a young man in real life does not want to be burdened with any kind of weight. The one thing he absolutely refuses is responsibility for anything, or to carry the weight of a situation” (von Franz, 2000, pp. 8 and 9).

The puer generally feels “unique” with a hidden hope to achieve something extraordinary. This can be a secret messiah or savior complex (von Franz, 2000). But he is full of life and energy – after all, child-god is the “eternal youth”, the endless circle of life. Consequently, the will to independence can be seen in its connection to the untamable character of the nature – thus, the person becomes able to keep himself vitally fresh and vivid. Inside the society, this should be a problem because work and social relations require certain devotion or commitment, and the routine of daily life does not always allow creativity or being free.

For von Franz, the real issue behind the psychology of the puer aeternus is related to mother complex. This is defined as being “mother-bound” in person. When it comes to the child-god, this can be interpreted as his closeness to mother Nature, or for the individual, closeness to unconsciousness.

After giving certain characteristics of puer aeternus, von Franz goes to the examination of *The Little Prince* and its author. According to von Franz, Saint-Exupéry is a puer aeternus with a mother complex caused partly by his mother’s character of “devouring mother”. The book starts with Saint-Exupéry’s autobiographic story: he wants to be a painter in his childhood but people discourage him – they wish him to lean on more “serious” subjects and they do not understand his painting or see-through its real sense (by that, what is mentioned is the well-known “snake in elephant” painting). As von Franz interprets, this part is especially a critique of his society and adult world: “Saint-Exupéry, in a slightly ironical manner, speaks mockingly of the grown-up world and grown-up people who take themselves so seriously and are really occupied with such trifles” (von Franz, 2000, p. 31). In the later sections of *The Little Prince*, there is a voyage of the prince among planets which continues to the critic of the “adult” mindset as well. There, in order, he sees “king”, “conceited man”, “tippler”, “businessman”, “lamplighter” and finally “geographer” (Saint-Exupéry, 2016). None of these men’s work is sensible to him. Each has ridiculous motives.

Presumably, the author gives up painting and becomes a pilot (Saint-Exupéry himself has been a pilot during WW2). Even this choice of career is deeply

connected to the unwillingness to dependence on daily reality. During the flight, one feels free from gravity so that no one can neither catch nor enchain the pilot. “He never quite commits himself to any mundane situation but just hovers over the earth, touching it from time to time” (von Franz, 2000, p. 11). Here we can remind Peter Pan who is also a perfect depiction of puer aeternus and also is “the eternal youth” (Killey, 1997): he can fly only by the help of fairy dust, he never gets old, he as well is a rather narcissistic character, he is almost always energetic -except when he is moody-, he is a wanderer and he always unconsciously seeks for a mother figure.¹¹

Rousseau’s Philosophy of “Returning to Nature” and Its Ground of Puer Aspect

Rousseau, in his part, is a romantic and an enlightenment philosopher at the same time. These two principally contradict each other. Because, while enlightenment ideas strongly value reason in its aid for evaluating human condition in society and the world, romanticism rejects the rationality of the enlightenment by replacing it with sentimentality, feelings, and the power of imagination. “The romantic movement”, e.g. with the words of Russell, “in its essence, aimed at liberating human personality from the fetters of social convention and social morality” (Russell, 1967, p. 683). Rousseau, based on both his ideas and characteristic themes of his texts, as it generally accepted, has become the founder of the romantic movement “by appealing to the already existing cult of sensibility, gave it a breadth and scope that it might not otherwise have possessed” (Russell, 1967, p. 676).

As a philosopher, the essential theory of Rousseau is founded on the theme of “returning to nature”. The thinking system which has been constructed over this basis starts with a certain assumption on the natural state of man. The first published text of Rousseau, *The Discourse on Arts and Sciences*, defends the idea that despite of the opposite supposition in their favor, arts and sciences have corrupted the morality and the nature of man.¹² The picture of *homme sauvage* (man before civilization) is not depicted here yet. Instead, Rousseau mainly takes into observation the ancient communities such as Athens, Sparta and Rome. Athens for Rousseau, with its rich art and sciences and developed culture, cannot be compared to pure and untouched virtues of Sparta. Therefore, according to Rousseau, Sparta is considered to

¹¹ For example, see the last chapter of *Peter Pan*. Peter Pan searches for a mother but he is not conscious of this. He is the captain of the legion of lost boys, none among whom knows what a mother is and Peter introduces Wendy to them as he has “brought them a mother”, they too ask her to be their mother (Barrie, 2017, pp. 70 and 79).

Dan Killey’s definition of Peter Pan Syndrome also covers the content of a puer psychology. And in this paper, related to Jung’s theory, we take his ideas into consideration also.

¹² For a more extensive evaluation of *The Discourse on Arts and Sciences*, see our work: Şeref, Canberk (2020). *Rousseaucu Logosantrizm ve Lakonofili: Sparta Bir Mitik Ütopya Mıdır Politik Ütopya Mı? FLSF Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (30), 195-222. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/flsf/issue/58166/750532>

be the ideal state. Rome was also a near-perfect political state in its republic period until it has been corrupted by the Athenian culture's influence (Rousseau, 2017: 12). Shortly, as Rousseau's idea is expressed by Russell, "by creating wants, arts and sciences are the sources of slavery; for how can the chains be imposed on those who go naked?" And surely his final deduction is that "everything that distinguishes civilized man from the untutored barbarian is evil" (Russell, 1967, p. 687).

Barbaric communities are approved by Rousseau by virtue of their untouched will to liberty (Rousseau, 2017a). Hence, both the historical development of mankind and the development of individual in the course of one's life are seen as a "losing" of the Nature by him. As he says on the first page of *Emile*: "Everything is good which comes from the hands of the creator of things: all degenerates in the hands of man" (Rousseau, 2018, p. 5). His second discourse named "*On the Origin and Basis of Equality Among Men*" investigates the state of man in the nature more thoroughly (this *homme sauvage* is also popularly called "noble savage" which is defined by an uncivilized and rather virtuous character). According to Rousseau's argument, man was moral in the natural state just because he was driven by his impulses or emotions. Despite that he could be self-centered or selfish, this attitude is always balanced by his feeling of sympathy in the way of "pity" or "mercy" (Rousseau, 2008). As Rousseau indicates: "lack of logic and reason that we see in him always gets him carelessly engaged by his first sentiment of 'Humanity'" (Rousseau, 2008, p. 98). Therefore, when he was impulse-driven, he is imperatively good.¹³ But here comes the intrusion of the reason, the faculty of reflection. Now, because man can transcend his natural drives, he can be either good or bad by choice. Not inevitably driven by his sentiments, with the absence of natural sympathy, he becomes able to say, "that does not happen to me, so I'm fine" (Rousseau, 2008). Briefly, Rousseau's comparison between the morality of the modern man and *homme sauvage* concludes with the recognition that "the simpler is a person, more moral he or he is".

Rousseau's description illustrates the original and natural state of man. Related to this, Jung also suggests that being close to one's roots infers being "more natural, more 'moral'" (Jung, 1969). Therefore, accordingly, the feeling-driven state is more moral than rationality's complex and constantly-relieving structure. With its faculty of abstraction that can lead to detachment, the conscious tends to be one-sided and aim-focused. The danger of putting distance to one's own root along with the detachment is revealed here with this principle, or as Jung states: "The more differentiated consciousness becomes, the greater the danger of severance from the

¹³ Here we can see the influence of Rousseau on Kant. Kant argues that the area beyond the limits of the reason is the world of noumena which affects the person as impulses or instincts. This world of noumena is in fact the first formation of the idea of unconscious mind. But Kant thinks that this beyond reason noumena -such as God, the idea of immortality of soul and after-death places like Heaven and Hell- are united as "good will" which means will to do good.

root-condition” (Jung, 1969, p. 163). Likewise, parallelly with this idea, Rousseau argues that people become less moral with the progressive increase of rationality or of the consciousness’s autonomy.

Now we must take into consideration the motto of Enlightenment: *sapere aude*.¹⁴ “Dare to think”, aims to motivate the cultivation of more autonomous individuals into the culture. It simultaneously indicates a provoking of the *individuation* by replacing “us” centered thinking of the age with “me and my environment” way of thinking (or my precisely, in a less assimilated way, “me in my environment”). The emergence of Rousseau’s anti-enlightenment ideas come into the picture against this mentality. Inarguably, enlightenment ideas are favorable ones. Yet, when we take them into account as new and rather shocking ways of reflection, they certainly seem as they prefer to put so much responsibility on the individual alone. “Day and light are synonyms for consciousness” (Jung, 1969, p. 164) as Jung puts it. That being said, one can relate the symbolism of the name “enlightenment” to the expanding of consciousness which concludes with the archetypal event of separation (from unconscious state). Parallelly compared to the eighteenth century’s people in the Age of Enlightenment: “the coming of consciousness was probably the most tremendous experience of primeval times, for with it a world came into being whose existence no one had suspected before” (Jung, 1969, p. 164).

Sapere aude of the enlightenment wishes to create more conscious individuals. Therefore, this is a period that the conscious and unconscious differentiation takes a radical acceleration (e.g. see von Franz, 2017, specifically, p.131). As the historical dialectic ensues this enantiodromi, after this intellectual movement, romanticism comes forth with an appraisal of the irrationality. It has been indicated before that Rousseau is a precursor of the romantic movement, and hence his ideas are highlighted with the contrast to the enlightenment. He becomes *the* intellectual who takes the side of man’s origin and roots. Or if we should say more openly: Rousseau seems to be an agent of the self-regulation of the cultural psyche.

When we look from a historical point of view, romanticism follows this dialectic cycle of history. Such that enlightenment philosophy was trying to rationalize and make conscious individuals while romanticism was advocating the counter values and deindividuation. Then if the enlightenment is the light itself, romanticism should be “the dark” (which is precise for both its most characteristics, its symbolism, its interests and especially its mindset). Thus, this process can be interpreted as severance from an unconscious state, or as it is given in Jung’s analogy: “And God said: ‘Let there be light’ is the projection of that immemorial experience of the separation of conscious from unconscious” (Jung, 1969, p. 164).

¹⁴ Although Kant used this citation of Horatius in 1784, after many French enlightenment philosophers, what he did was to describe or write it out. Namely, he expressed what was already there.

Psychology of Jean-Jacques Rousseau

After clearing the motive of Rousseau and romanticism with their counter-motive, now, we can focus on its psychological examples on Rousseau. His mother had died during his birth consequently leaving the first unpleasant impression on Rousseau about the phenomenal world. In his autobiography *The Confessions*, after telling the pleasant love story of his mother and his father, he describes his emotions as such: “After ten months I was born infirm and sick; I have cost the life of my mother and my birth has become the first of my calamities” (Rousseau, 2016, p. 18). Thus, beginning from his birth, he becomes open for a mother complex, which will reveal itself particularly more clearly in his relationship with his -temporary- caretaker Madame de Warens whom he shall call “maman”.

The first encounter with the world of phenomena unquestionably has not left a welcoming impression on him. “Nothing in all the world welcomes this new birth. [...] That is why Nature, the world of instincts, takes the ‘child’ under its wing: it is nourished or protected by animals” (Jung, 1969, p. 168). Rousseau surely has not been “fed by animals” in its basic meaning. Despite that, he will mention perpetually that Nature “feeds him spiritually”. As in the characteristics of romanticism, Rousseau will feel a drive to approach to or to be *in* the Nature. She is the root of man’s all artificiality despite its corruptness and she is the purity and simplicity for all who have been displeased by this artificiality. We can understand that the Nature is the world of unconsciousness along with all its impulses – or in Freudian topography, the *id*’s domain.

When Rousseau comes to a certain age of childhood (around seven), he starts readings including histories of antiquity (Rousseau, 2016, p. 19-20). With these readings, Rousseau will discover some ideals and surely his discontentment to his own time will increasingly grow within contrast with them (a modern reader or viewer of the fantasy genre should not feel hard to connect with feelings of Rousseau). History of antiquity, although they might not serve the same to most of the modern readers, would suffice to satisfy the wish of the child Rousseau to get away from this world’s reality. Ancient history and politics, by creating an image of a distant ideal, can be seen as to have created influences in two aspects on Rousseau: firstly, the feeling that those were the good worlds and this one here is not, and secondly that those ideals are worth to follow the examples of. Well, the first influence must have formed the romantic and the second the enlightenment philosopher. It is important to remark that Rousseau idolized Sparta while degraded Athens (chiefly in *Discourse on Arts and Sciences*). Of course, his idea which supports this attitude was the fact and supposition that Sparta was simple and natural (and extremely conservative) -creating the natural moral- and Athens, as it was the homeland of culture, was more cultivated, thus creating a society that has reached above the basic desires and habits (including luxury). According to Rousseau, in the manner it is discussed in his philosophy, this latter is a loss of its nature for mankind.

Among many events that can show the psychological mentality of Rousseau, we shall choose some among them; starting firstly with one that can reveal a certain feeling of injustice coming from the outer world to him (which also has often been highlighted by researchers of Rousseau). Because of a quarrel that ended up in court, his father is forced to leave Geneva; entrusting Rousseau to his uncle Bernard for his raising. For his education, his uncle gives him and his son to a priest called M. Lambarcier as a pupil where he will stay for two years. Spending his time with his cousin of the same age as him, Rousseau is relatively happy and content with his life in champaign along with his admire to his educators M. and Mme. Lambarcier. But an incident occurs. The wife of the priest finds her comb broken and asks Rousseau if he had broken it. He denies that he did it while M. and Mme. Lambarcier insist on interrogating him (in *Confessions*, adult Rousseau insists that he really did not break it). After that, both his cousin and Rousseau are punished for their so-called lies. This turns into a trauma for him which he has interpreted as an injustice causing to the loss of innocence:

“Thusly ended the time of serenity of my life of childhood. From this moment, I stopped enjoying a pure happiness, and today I feel as if the charms of my childhood memories have ended there. Still, we have stayed at Bossey for a few months. We were there as the state of the first man in the paradise was presented to us but as he stopped to enjoy it: in appearance, this was the same situation, and in fact a totally different way of being. Attachment, respect, intimacy, confidence was not binding the students to their guides anymore: we were not looking at them like the gods who are bound to our hearts: we were less ashamed to do deeds and more fearful of being accused: we started to hide ourselves, to be mutineer, to lie. All the vices of our age were corrupting our innocence and making our games ugly. Even the champaign lost its attraction of sweetness and of simplicity that goes through the heart: it seemed as deserted and dark; it was like covered with a curtain which hides its beauties” (Rousseau, 2016, p. 34).

The boys become so untamed that after then Lambarciers send them both back to his uncle. After a while, Rousseau is sent to learn apprenticeship from a clerk. The young boy is so bored and unwilling that his master sends him back also. After this, now he is sent to an engraver for an apprenticeship. But he is even more dissatisfied next to his new master. He even accuses him and his work with corrupting his nature: “my master whose name was Monsieur Ducommun, was a rude and young man who succeeded in a short time to darken all the light of my childhood, to turn my character which was alive and full of love into an astounded one and to decrease both my fate and my soul to the level of an apprentice” (Rousseau, 2016, p. 46). This period continues until Rousseau decides to leave the city: one day when he was outside the city with his friends, just when they were about to enter the city, the bridges at the border are raised, leaving them all out of the city till morning. His friends will turn back into their town but Rousseau, his apprenticeship in his mind,

decides to leave Geneva for good (Rousseau, 2016) “At the time, however, it was a thrilling break for freedom. He was not quite sixteen, and he had no money and not much in the way of skills, but he somehow harbored a conviction that he was an exceptional person and bound to succeed” (Damrosch, 2007, p. 40). As he already was “fond of freedom” (Rousseau, 2017, p. 55), this experience was a breaking of chains: “Free and my own master, I believed I could do everything and achieve everything; I had only to leap to rise up and fly through the air.¹⁵ I was entering the vast space of the world with perfect safety, and my merit was going to fill it up” (as cited in Damrosch, 2007, pp. 40-41). Now, Rousseau becomes a wanderer for a while (except some short periods, in fact, he never becomes “stable” during his life).

When it comes to Rousseau’s relationships with women, he is rather shy but always emotional and sentimental. However, as it is remarked before, Rousseau has always problematic relationships with them. The young boy who grew up without seeing his mother, has tendencies to idealize and project his anima to women by describing them sometimes just like goddesses who shine grace and goodness. From his aunt to his instructresses and to women he met – he will see many of them as such. But the most interesting relationship of Rousseau is with Mme. de Warrens who took him to her care in the next year he left Geneva. Mme. de Warrens is a divorced woman who lives by herself with her house workers. They will develop such intimacy that in the end he will call her “Maman” and she will call him “Petit” (Rousseau, 2016).

The only balance that Rousseau has obtained, out of solitude in Nature, is his times in the house of “maman” – keep in mind that, civilization, for Rousseau, is a force of unnatural dynamism which corrupts man. All along his life he will be on a pendulum both mentally and physically. He will change many environments and many occupations. Meaning that, he will never really “rest” as he wishes. Although, this does not mean that he is a hard worker who spends a hundred hours a week by working; rather, the problem for him is that he cannot have a proper mental homeostasis. But the times spent in unity with Nature are different. In his second autobiography *Reveries of the Solitary Walker*, Rousseau in exile on a lake island called Saint-Pierre, describes his perfectly balanced and passive happiness: a place distant from any civilization and with only a few people who live there:

“What do we enjoy in such situations? Nothing external to one’s self, nothing but ourselves and our existence. As long as this state lasts, one is sufficient to himself, just like God. The sentiment of existence, stripped of any other emotion, is in itself a precious sentiment of contentment and of peace which alone would suffice to make this existence dear and sweet to anyone able to avoid one’s self from all the sensual and earthly impressions which incessantly come to distract us from it and to trouble its sweetness here-blow. But most men, agitated by continual passions, know

¹⁵ Keep in mind that flying is a symbolism for kind of leaving earthly existence.

little of this state and having tasted it only imperfectly only for a few moments, preserve only an obscure and confused idea of it which does not let them feel its charm. It would not even be good in the current structure of things that these sweet ecstasies would make people disgusted with the active life of their ever-recurring needs prescribe to them as a duty. But an unfortunate person who has been cast off from human society and who can no longer do anything here-blow useful and good for neither for another nor himself, can find compensations of happiness which fortune and men cannot take away from him” (Rousseau, 2011, p. 62).

It is observable that his condition in this solitude surrounded by the Nature is a temporal substitute for the living of *homme sauvage*'s state of nature. He is profoundly stripped from all artificiality and he is distant from *société moderne* of his time; which signifies a pure and innocent happiness of the Golden Age for Rousseau. Now we can highlight the resemblance of the life in Nature and the life besides “maman”, described with Rousseau's words in the last chapter of the same book:

“[...] in the later periods of my life, because I was weak and unresisting, I was so agitated, joggled and pushed around by the passions of others that, almost passive as in a stormy life, I barely sort out what is mine in my own nature that during all this time, and the pressure of harsh needs did not cease to dwell on me. But during those few years, loved by a woman full of complacency and tenderness, I did what I wanted to; I was what I wanted to [...] I persuaded maman to live in champaign. A house isolated by a valley¹⁶ side has been our sanctuary, and it is there that in time of four or five years I have lived the joy of a life of a century and a pure and full happiness which covers its charm on horridness of present. I needed a friend in accordance with my heart, I had it. I wanted the champaign, I obtained it; I could not suffer from subjugation, I was perfectly free, and better than free, because subjugated only to my feelings, I was doing nothing but what I wanted to do” (Rousseau, 2016, p. 119).

He describes his ego as it was rather weak. Of course, this can be related to openness of mind that leads to creativity; but most importantly, revealed also by his wanderer character, he carries the dynamism of the Nature. This dynamism surely cannot flow parallelly with society because the flux of Nature and culture -particularly Western culture- are rarely the same. We can interpret the difference of the ways of the flux of the nature and society such as the first tends to aim to homeostasis while the latter one is incapable of moving forward.

When we return to the subject of Mme. de Warrens, Rousseau's main occupation in the house is to help her with the house. Period by period he comes and goes to this house till he leaves permanently at around his twenty-six. Mme. de Warrens is a nice, gentle and a moderately pretty woman. Educated enough, she generally

¹⁶ It is interesting that Sparta, which Rousseau admires profoundly, is located on a valley surrounded by mountains as well and it is a state which always prefers isolation in culture and any outer relations.

knows her ways and how to handle her house (Rousseau, 2016). Shortly, for a while, Rousseau genuinely finds in her a mother figure and he feels himself like a son: “By saying her *maman*, by showing her casualness of a son, I had used to see myself as a son” (p. 247). But it is intriguing that, sexually inexperienced Rousseau will have his first intercourse with her: when she finds out that he is still inexperienced, she offers him to compensate his inexperience herself (p. 247-248). As Rousseau indicates, she tells this with tenderness and without any lustful wish. He naturally finds himself in contradiction, not because she already has affairs with her current steward but because he feels the hesitancy as she seems like his mother. He feels a vivid desire and a repulse at the same time. In the end, he has the intercourse with her, but he describes his experience as “poisoned with a sorrow” (p. 248). Apart from a feeling of an incest relationship, it can be seen as his unwillingness to degrade the purity of platonic feelings as well. In the previous paragraph, he depicts this love for her as an ideal form of a platonic love:

“I always used to love her as passionately as one could; but I used to love her more for herself and less for myself, or at least I was seeking happiness besides her rather than pleasure; she was much more to me than a sister, a mother, a friend, and even a lover and because of this that she was not a lover to me. After all, I loved her too much to covet; here is the clearest thing among my ideas” (Rousseau, 2016, p. 248).

After the steward of the house dies, a new young man called Vintzenried comes for his place. With his coming, Rousseau feels a coldness entering between him and “*maman*” (or he thinks so). This becomes an experience of disillusionment for him; he feels like his paradise is crumbling down (Rousseau, 2016, p. 327). Taking the place of the previous was not pleasant for him but sharing “*maman*’s” affection and interest with a newcomer does not seem bearable for Rousseau. Consequently, he decides to leave the house (in fact, he cannot be seen entirely as a spoiled young man, she has affairs also with the new steward). His separation from Mme. de Warrens is caused mainly by two reasons that he mentions: first is that he does not want to share her interest with the new steward (although, she tells him this situation does not mean that “he lost his rights because he was sharing them with another”); and the second is that, in his words, “he would choose to die thousand times instead of devaluing his loved one because of his desires” (Rousseau, 2016, p. 328). Thus, in order to keep her pure and goddess-like image intact, he rather chooses to suffer from her absence.

From Mother Complex in Relation with Anima to Puer Aeternus

Rousseau, in person, has always been considered as a man who is hard to get along (with examples including famous quarrels with thinkers of his age such as Voltaire and Hume). He was an eccentric character. He was often emotional and impulsive in his relations and his environment (which reveals his anima problem).

Even though he joined them, he was never able to involve really in saloon gatherings of intellectual *société*. It is notably interesting as well that when he found a woman to spend his life with (who is called Thérèse and was rather naive and simple), he did not legally marry her (until a very old age). Instead, they spent their life together without an official engagement. And Rousseau had five children with her; each of whom he sent to an orphanage. His excuse was that “he could not take care of them as they would need or deserve” (Rousseau, 2016, p. 438). One could say that he really internalized his proposition that “man is enchained everywhere he goes” (Rousseau, 2017b, p. 4). He *de facto* did not wish to be enchained anywhere. The problem is, behind his invincible liveliness that directly comes from the purity, in the end “Peter Pan, [as is Rousseau], was a sorrowful young man. His life was full of contradictions, paradoxes, and chaos” (Killey, 1997, p. 20).

Beginning from his birth, with the loss of his mother, Rousseau becomes susceptible to a mother complex. Thus, the total absence of the mother turns into a search for a mother in the women he met in his life. Idealization of women -in fact not just of women but of everything- was a characteristic of all romantics but in the case of Rousseau, the reason should not be a mystery¹⁷. The lack of a mother figure had to be psychologically compensated. For that, the attitudes of Rousseau can be related to a projection of anima to women, as:

“[Anima] is responsible for the mechanism of projection. [...] Hence a man's anima development is reflected in how he relates to women. [...] Within his own psyche, the anima functions as his soul, influencing his ideas, attitudes and emotions. The anima intensifies, exaggerates, falsifies, and mythologizes all emotional relations with his work and with other people of both sexes. The resultant fantasies and entanglements are all her doing. When the anima is strongly constellated, she softens the man's character and makes him touchy, irritable, moody, jealous, vain, and un-adjusted” (Sharp, 1991, p. 18).

Now, as it is observed in Rousseau, just like Peter Pan, his search for a mother is linked directly to his mind's will to stay child – which seems to be reflected in his philosophy as *stay untamed and uncivilized*. This is mainly provided with a simple cycle as such: a boy will always seek a mother and a man who always seeks a mother will eternally be a boy. It can be predicted and seen that one cannot find a woman who is just like his anima which resides in his unconscious, because, principally, divided by the *lack* in Lacanian term, the reality and the ideal are never equals.

¹⁷ For example, he describes his father's youngest sister, aunt Suzanne: “In *The Confessions*, he praised her as ‘a maiden lady full of graces, intelligence, and good sense’ (as cited in Damrosch, 2007: 12). In his adulthood, he tells about the songs she used to sing that he cannot hum them without shedding tears (Rousseau, 2005: 23). Then around his age of forty-five, he meets Comtesse d'Épinay who will turn into Julie in his novel *Julie or New Heloise*. His educator, wife of M. Lambardier, Mme. Lambardier's punishments gives a lustful pleasure to him by making her even more sublime (Rousseau, 2016: 27), and so on.

For a period of time, Rousseau finds Mme. de Warrens, namely “maman”, and this period of his life is described as a paradise as it is mentioned previously. When he leaves her house, although it can be seen as a mature act, it is not because he chooses his independence from a mother figure but because if he would stay, -as cited before- the situation would degrade her ideal image. In the end, Rousseau naturally is not able to find his anima in real life. Even though he is an extreme case, it must be seen that Rousseau did not have a mother to be concretely separated from and correspondingly, the separation could not be concretely achieved.

We know that Rousseau’s romanticism is born out of his opposition to enlightenment ideals, and thus, from a mentality which is against the rationality and forming of the individual – against the differentiation of the consciousness that can lead to severance from the root-condition. Appraisal of irrationality, then, must be an anti-logos thinking; revealing of which in the romantic thought now can be cleared as such: “There is no consciousness without discrimination of opposites. This is the paternal principle, the Logos, which eternally struggles to extricate itself from the primal warmth and primal darkness of the maternal womb; in a word, from unconsciousness” (Jung, 1969, p. 96). This means that romantic principles are deeply related to dependence on the mother -or a mother figure- along with a symbolization of the womb, the unconscious state, the wholeness, and different forms of mother complex.

Even though Jung sees a man’s mother complex’s result finally ending up with Don Juanism or homosexuality -in the first as the search of mother in every woman he is with, and in the second with the inflation of anima as identifying with it- (Jung, 1969, p. 85), in the case of Rousseau, neither is completely applicable. He keeps searching the maternal figure; but resulting in constant disillusionment, women in flesh and blood cannot conclude his search. Instead, now he finds the mother of all (Rousseau, 2011, p. 82), namely the Mother Earth (which can be seen in other aspects as Earth Mother or Primordial Mother [see Peterson, 2002, specifically 124-145]).

This is where we identify the negative aspect of puer aeternus. The child archetype is not a negative archetype in itself, but it is in its negative aspect when it turns into a complex as in all the archetypal inflations. For Rousseau’s example, it is seen most clearly in his philosophical ideas that any form of individuation is seen as a separation¹⁸ from the natural state. In this case, natural state is a symbolization of the unconscious state, and in the mind, the symbolization of mother’s womb. Within a relation to unity with and separation from the mother, Otto Rank argues this idea of Nature as mother’s womb (Rank, 2019); because the birth is the first individuation which separates “me” from “everything”. A normal person’s natural and civilized

¹⁸ Separation from wholeness, with a change of context, is called “nothingness” in existential philosophy. This idea is also a counterpart of individuation as being one’s own essence.

side coexist, but a puer has a by far stronger relationship with his unconscious. In its positive aspect, as von Franz notes, this leads to creativity of the person. Since he is very close to the mind's vital source, his energy is often vivid; thus, leading to creativity. Rousseau surely has this vitality alive too: even in just one year in 1762, he publishes three of his thickest and probably most famous works: *Emile*, *Social Contract* and his novel *New Heloise*. He also has some music compositions including an opera. Additionally, his first text that undermined the Athenian culture and the notion of civilization in general was what made him famous. Therefore, we cannot deny his genius and yet in fact in fact this is also related to his puer psychology.¹⁹

Rank, sees the will to recreate the state of the womb in the main part of the actions of creatures, including humans (Rank, 2019). "The birth symbolizes passing from the condition of complete dependence on a person and of the absence of a need to struggle, to a life of which is to be a separate being and which requires carrying the responsibility for one's own acts" (Geçtan, 2017, p. 206). Individuation starts with the birth and it signifies the separation from the environment – or even from the pantheistic "one". Still, "man's struggle to be an independent being is the essence of life. The counterpart of this is returning to the effortless existence in the womb, or the tendency of the person to be one with the environment instead of becoming a separate being which Rank interprets as the will to return to death" (p. 206). Surely, this death indicates the death of *the consciousness* or *of the individual*. It seems like the life that is symbolized in Nature's creatures will keep on and only what is artificial and unnatural will cease its existence²⁰.

Now, while the romantic is driven by the anxiety of separation in the manner of trying to reunite, the enlightenment idea's tendency is closer to the anxiety of unity which means the death of consciousness or the individual. The puer's desire for independence should not be mistaken with the desire of being an individual, but rather it is a search for independence from cultural and social constraints in their whole. This comprises the escape from responsibility and all kinds of norms, because the principle of reality in all its forms "destroys the power of fairy dust" (Killey, 1997, p. 21) which made Peter Pan fly. Thus, the puer is close to the unconscious and the Nature, but distant from the power of conscious or social values.

Conclusion

In the end, the characteristics such as the despise of growing up or being separated from the nature and unity, overvaluing the dream world and a strong mother complex, show us the puer psychology of Rousseau in person. And as a historical figure, he seems as a Peter Pan, namely the leader of the legion of lost children

¹⁹ Remember that Freud argues Leonardo da Vinci, as a polymath, to be a man-childish individual. Thus, genius seems close to being in a childish mindset.

²⁰ For Rank's idea of "will to death" (in or through unity) in the puer aeternus see also: (Killey, 1997, p. 149 ff.).

– in this case, of the romantics. He carries with himself this figure of ideal romantic. Young man of his period, as this way of thinking is implicit under the *zeitgeist*, follow the tradition of romanticism.

This liveliness can be both attractive in social encounters to him and productive if it can be evaluated well. The creativity that comes from the invincibility of life surely cannot be denied. However, the energy of youth that makes the genius is directly linked to one's dependence on the Mother and her representations. Because the puer does not take over responsibilities and does not show commitment socially, thus he is able to stay always in a way "untouched" and "pure". An adaptation to the principle of reality means the loss of the ideal in favor of the real in the world of phenomena. As an ideal in its nature is a mere idea, the real can contain only some aspects of the ideal; thus, seeming like a corrupted aspect of the ideal, it is less preferable for a puer.

Philosophical ideas of Rousseau are founded on the basis that the technical and civil development of man has corrupted him. Starting from this ground, he argues that man increasingly becomes less and less moral. These, in principle, do not offer a true solution except a philosophy of undermining civilization. Till now, Rousseau seems as a pure romantic. To give him his due, we would have to accept that compared to his earlier philosophical text (the discourses), the later ones (*Social Contract* and *Emile*) internalize the principle of reality much more reasonably than the previous ones. It has been mentioned that he was both romantic and enlightenment philosopher. Still, the Rousseau we know in general is mainly a romantic and much more original and in his habitat with romanticism. And related to these, even this paradox of the unity of two different ways of thought shows us a puer characteristic: either in the manner of internal conflict that creates a hidden sorrow -as cited before in Killey (1997)- or as a form of a hermaphroditic being.

Starting with a mother complex, it is observed that this pattern ends up with a true puer psychology in the example of Rousseau. Thus, the projection of the anima neither can be satisfied nor can be overcome by him and this constant and unsatisfied search channelizes to the mother of all, namely, the Nature. As the seeking of the mother can only be realized and the result of it can only be achieved by the child, closer the person is to childish state, closer he is to the Mother. This leads to the cycle of being eternally child. Staying in a childlike state for the sake of being close to mother is ultimately compensated by not being a proper -or authentic- individual or not to adapt to the principle of reality with its all required aspects. Here, the concept of wholeness that the child-god can be the provider of, as it is in Rousseau, does not seem as a unity of opposites in the Self symbol but rather it seems as a bringer of a complete unconsciousness which is free from interference of the conscious or its differentiation. Wholeness in Rousseauian theory thus is wished to be achieved by the loss of a limb, which means the sacrifice of the consciousness of the psyche.

This shows itself within his ideas in the manner of praising pre-civilization state and a search for eternal peace in Nature as a both psychical and mental homeostasis.

References

- Barrie, J. M. (2017). *Peter Pan*, pp. 187-188. İstanbul: Karbon Kitaplar. (1904).
- Damrosch, Leo. (2007). *Jean-Jacques Rousseau – Restless Genius*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Von Franz, Marie-Louise. (2000). *The Problems of Puer Aeternus*. Toronto: Inner City Books.
- Von Franz, Marie-Louise. (2017). *Interpretation of Fairy Dreams*. Colorado: Shambala Publications Inc.
- Geçtan, Engin. (2017). *Psikanaliz ve Sonrası*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. (2015). *Maskülen – Erilliğin Farklı Yüzleri*. (Çev.: D. G. Erdin). İstanbul: Pinhan Yayıncılık. (1991).
- Jung, Carl Gustav. (1969). *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, (Edt.: Sir Read, H., Fordham M., Adler, G. and Mcguire W.), *Volume 9, Part 1, The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. (Trans.: R. F. C. Hull). New York: Princeton University Press.
- Killey, Dan. (1997). *Peter Pan Sendromu – Hiç Büyümeyen Erkekler*. (Çev.: S. Kunt). Ankara: HYB Yayıncılık. (1983).
- Peterson, Jordan (2002). *Maps of Meaning: The Architecture of Belief*. New York: Routledge.
- Rank, Otto. (2019). *Doğum Travması*, ss. 104, 46. (Çev.: S. M. Tara). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları. (1988).
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. (2017a). *Bilimler ve Sanatlar Üstüne Söylev*. (Çev.: S. Eyüboğlu). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları. (1750).
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. (2008). *Discours sur l'origine et l'inegalité parmi les hommes*. Paris: Flammarion. (1755).
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. (2018). *Emile ya da Eğitim Üzerine*. (Çev. : Y. Avunç). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları. (1762).
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. (2016). *İtirafılar*. (Çev.: K. Somer). İstanbul: Isık Yayınları. (1782).