In this paper doubts are expressed about the traditional survey techniques used in ascertaining the meaning of "house." The psychological theories of Carl Jung suggest another approach. His most significant contribution to the understanding of the human psyche are the concepts of collective unconscious, the archetype and the symbol. These concepts are discussed and the most basic of archetypes—self—is identified. The house reflects how man sees himself. Examples from contemporary architecture are presented, and it is shown that in poetry, literature, and dreams, houses are invested with human qualities. Jung's theories of dreams, that is, his concept of the unconscious, are used to interpret the symbolic meaning of "house" in dreams. The house is also seen as sacred, giving man a fixed point of reference to structure the world about him. The location of the threshold is symbolic of how people relate to the rest of society; the hearth also has special meaning. Cities have been built in the image, either conscious or unconscious, that people have of the world.
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INTRODUCTION

My work of the last few years comprised sociological surveys of people's responses to the designs of their houses and communication of the resultant guidelines to architects. But I have experienced a nagging doubt that I was merely scratching the surface of the true meaning of "the house." There seemed to be something far deeper and more subliminal that I was not admitting, or that my surveys and investigations were not revealing. The exciting personal discovery of the work of the psychologist Cari Jung has opened a door into another level of my own consciousness which has prompted me to consider the house from a wholly different viewpoint. This paper is a tentative initial exploration into the subject.

The reader must expect no startling, all-embracing conclusion; there is none. This is a speculative think piece and is deliberately left open-ended in the hope that it will motivate the reader, and the author, to think further and more deeply in this area.

JUNG'S CONCEPTS OF THE COLLECTIVE UNCONSCIOUS, THE ARCHETYPE, AND THE SYMBOL

Three of the most significant contributions of Carl Jung to the understanding of the human psyche are the concepts of the collective unconscious, the archetype, and the symbol. Sigmund Freud postulated an individual unconscious in which are deposited the suppressed and repressed memories of infancy and childhood. Theoretically, the psyche keeps these memories in storage until they are reawakened into consciousness by the medium of the dream, or its waking equivalent, free association.

Initially embracing Freud's theories, Jung became increasingly dissatisfied as his studies of persistent motifs in his patients' dreams and fantasies, and in primitive mythology and folk tales, revealed what seemed to be universal patterns which could not be
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accounted for solely by the theory of an individual unconscious. He began to postulate the theory of an individual unconscious plus a universal or collective unconscious linking man to his primitive past, and in which are deposited certain basic and timeless nodes of psychic energy, which he termed archetypes.

Jolande Jacobi has termed the archetype “a profound riddle surpassing our rational comprehension.” It precedes all conscious experience and therefore cannot be fully explained through conscious thought processes. Perhaps one of the simplest analogies is that offered by Jacobi of a kind of “psychic mesh” with nodal points within the unconscious. A structure which somehow has shaped and organized the myriad contents of the psyche into potential images, emotions, ideas, and patterns of behavior. The archetype can only provide a potential or possibility of representation in the conscious mind, for as soon as we encounter it through dreams, fantasies, or rational thought, the archetype becomes clothed in images of the concrete world and is no longer an archetype: it is an archetypal image or symbol. As Jacobi has written:

Man’s need to understand the world and his experience in it symbolically as well as realistically may be noted early in the lives of many children. The symbolic imaginative view of the world is just as organic a part of the child’s life as the view transmitted by the sense organs. It represents a natural and spontaneous striving which adds to man’s biological bond a parallel and equivalent psychic bond, thus enriching life by another dimension—and it is eminently this dimension that makes man what he is. It is the root of all creative activity.

If we can think of the archetype as a node of psychic energy within the unconscious, then the symbol is the medium by which it becomes manifest in the here and now of space and time. Thus a symbol, although it has objective visible reality, always has behind it a hidden, profound, and only partly intelligible meaning which represents its roots in the archetype.

Although impossible for most of us to define or describe, we are all aware of the existence of something we call “self”—the inner heart of our being, our soul, our uniqueness—however we want to describe it. It is in the nature of man that he constantly seeks a rational explanation of the inexplicable, and so he struggles with the questions: What is self? Why here? Why now?

In trying to comprehend this most basic of archetypes—self—to give it concrete substance, man grasps at physical forms or symbols which are close and meaningful to him, and which are visible and definable. The first and most consciously selected form to represent self is the body, for it appears to be both the outward manifestation, and the encloser, of self. On a less conscious level, I believe, man also frequently selects the house, that basic protector of his internal environment (beyond skin and clothing) to represent or symbolize what is tantalizingly unrepresentable.

The French philosopher Gaston Bachelard has suggested that just as the house and the nonhouse are the basic divisions of geographic space, so the self and the nonself represent the basic divisions of psychic space. The house both encloses space (the house interior) and excludes space (everything outside it). Thus it has two very important and different components: its interior and its façade. The house therefore nicely reflects how man sees himself, with both an intimate interior, or self as viewed from within and revealed only to those intimates who are invited inside, and a public exterior (the persona or mask, in Jungian terms) or the self that we choose to display to others.

Most of us have had the experience of moving from one house to another, and of finding the new abode initially strange, unwelcoming, perhaps even hostile. But with time, we get used to the new house and its quirks, and it seems almost as though it gets used to us; we can relax when we return to it, put our feet up, become ourselves. But why in this particular box should we be ourselves more than in any other? It seems as though the personal space bubble which we carry with us and which is an almost tangible extension of our self expands to embrace the house we have designated as ours. As we become accustomed to, and lay claim to, this little niche in the world, we project something of ourselves onto its physical fabric. The furniture we install, the way we arrange it, the pictures we hang, the plants we buy and tend, all are expressions of our image of ourselves, all are messages about ourselves that we want to convey back to ourselves, and to the few intimates that we invite into this, our house. Thus, the house might be viewed as both an avowal of the self—that is, the psychic messages are moving
from self to the objective symbol of self—and as a revelation of the nature of self; that is, the messages are moving from objective symbol back to the self. It is almost as if the house-self continuum could be thought of as both the negative and positive of a film, simultaneously.

THE HOUSE AS SYMBOL-OF-SELF: EXAMPLES FROM CONTEMPORARY ARCHITECTURE

Man was a symbol-making animal long before he was a toolmaker: he reached high degrees of specialization in song, dance, ritual, religion, and myth before he did in the material aspects of culture. Describing the rich symbolism of the man-made environment in part of Africa, Amos Rapoport notes:

Among the Dogon and Bambara of Mali every object and social event has a symbolic as well as a utilitarian function. Houses, household objects, and chairs have all this symbolic quality, and the Dogon civilization, otherwise relatively poor, has several thousand symbolic elements. The farm plots and the whole landscape of the Dogon reflect this cosmic order. The villages are built in pairs to represent heaven and earth, and fields are cleared in spirals because the world has been created spirally. The villages are laid out in the way the parts of the body lie with respect to each other, while the house of the Dogon, or paramount chief, is a model of the universe at a smaller scale.

Rapoport concludes significantly that “man’s achievements have been due more to his need to utilize his internal resources than to his needs for control of the physical environment or more food.”

It would seem that there is an inverse relationship between technological advances and the cultivation of symbol and ritual. For so-called civilized man, the conscious recognition of the symbolism of what we do, how we live, and the houses we live in, has been all but lost. But if we start to delve beneath the surface, the symbolism is still there.

In a recent study of how contemporary California suburbanites chose their homes, Berkeley sociologist Carl W. Werthman concluded that many people bought houses to bolster their image of self—both as an individual and as a person in a certain status position in society. In one large suburban development near San Francisco, for example, he noted that extroverted, self-made businessmen tended to choose somewhat ostentatious, mock-colonial display homes, such as in Figure 1, while people in the helping professions, whose goals revolved around personal satisfaction rather than financial success, tended to opt for the quieter, inward-looking architect-designed styles conforming to current standards of “good design,” such as that in Figure 2.

In the contemporary English-speaking world, a premium is put on originality, on having a house that is unique and somewhat different from the others on the street, for the inhabitants who identify with these houses are themselves struggling to maintain some sense of personal uniqueness in an increasingly conformist world. On the other hand, one’s house must not be too way-out, for that would label the inhabitant as a nonconformist, and that, for many Americans, is a label to be avoided.

The house as symbol-of-self is deeply engrained in the American ethos (albeit unconsciously for many),
and this may partly explain the inability of society to come to grips with the housing problem—a problem which is quite within its technological and financial capabilities to solve and which it persistently delegates to a low level in the hierarchy of budgetary values. America is the home of the self-made man, and if the house is seen (even unconsciously) as the symbol of self, then it is small wonder that there is a resistance to subsidized housing or to the State’s providing houses for people. The frontier image of the man clearing the land and building a cabin for himself and his family is not far behind us. To a culture inbred with this image, the house–self identity is particularly strong. In some barely conscious way, society has decided to penalize those who, through no fault of their own cannot build, buy, or rent their own housing. They are not self-made men.

Numbers of studies in England, Australia, and the United States have indicated that when asked to describe their ideal house, people of all incomes and backgrounds will tend to describe a free-standing, square, detached, single-family house and yard. For example, in a recent survey of 748 men and women in thirty-two metropolitan areas in the U.S., 85 percent said they preferred living in a single-family house rather than in an apartment. It is difficult to say whether the attachment to this form is the form itself, or the fact that it subsumes territorial rights over a small portion of the earth, or the fact that apartments can rarely be owned. But we do know that almost universally the image of the high-rise building for family living is rejected. An apartment is rarely seen as home, for a house can only be seen as a free-standing house-on-the-ground.

One could argue that people have been conditioned to want this through advertising, model homes salesmanship, and the image of the good life portrayed on television. To a certain extent this must be true, but these media are in turn only reflecting what seems to be a universal need for a house form in which the
self and family unit can be seen as separate, unique, private, and protected. The high-rise apartment building is rejected by most Americans as a family home because, I would suggest, it gives one no territory on the ground, violates the archaic image of what a house is, and is perceived unconsciously as a threat to one’s self-image as a separate and unique personality. The house form in which people are being asked to live is not a symbol-of-self, but the symbol of a stereotyped, anonymous filing-cabinet collection of selves, which people fear they are becoming. Even though we may make apartments larger, with many of the appurtenances of a house, as well as opportunities for modification and ownership, it may still be a long time before the majority of lower- and middle-income American families will accept this as a valid image of a permanent home. It is too great a threat to their self-image. It is possible that the vandalism inflicted on high-rise housing projects is, in part, an angry reaction of the inhabitants to this blatant violation of self-image.

The mobile hippie house-on-wheels is another instance of a new housing form greatly threatening people’s image of what a house—or by implication, its inhabitants—should be. The van converted to mobile home and the wooden gable-rooted house built in the back of a truck are becoming common sights in a university community such as Berkeley and drop-out staging grounds, such as San Francisco. It is tempting to speculate that this house form has been adopted by hippies, not only because of its cheapness as living accommodation, but also because its mobility and form are reflections of where the inhabitants are in psychic terms—concerned with self and with making manifest their own uniqueness, convinced of the need for inward exploration and for freedom to move and swing with whatever happens. Hippies view themselves as different from the average person, and so they have chosen to live in self-generated house forms—converted trucks, tree-houses, geodesic domes, Indian teepees—which reflect and bolster that uniqueness.

It was perhaps to be expected that eventually the establishment would react. In February 1970, the city of Berkeley passed an ordinance making it illegal to live in a converted truck or van; the residents of these new houses mobilized and formed the Rolling Homes Association, but it was too late to prevent the ordinance from being passed. When others too openly display the appurtenance (clothes, hair-styles, houses) of a new self-image, it is perceived as a threat to the values and images of the majority community. The image of the self as a house-on-wheels was too much for the establishment to accept.

Even the edge-of-town mobile home park occupied by the young retirees and the transient lower middle class is somehow looked down upon by the average American home owner as violating the true image of home and neighborhood. A person who lives in a house that moves must somehow be as unstable as the structure he inhabits. Very much the same view is held by house owners in Marin County, California, about the houseboat dwellers in Sausalito. They are “different,” “Bohemian,” “nonconformists,” and their extraordinary choice of dwelling reflects these values.

The contrasting views which people of different socioeconomic classes in the U.S. have of their houses reflect again the house as a symbol-of-self in a self–world relationship. The greater are people’s feelings of living in a dangerous and hostile world with constant threats to the self, the greater is the likelihood that they will regard their house as a shell, a fortress into which to retreat. The sociologist Lee Rainwater has shown that this image of the self, and of the house, is true for low-income blacks (particularly women) in the ghettos and housing projects of this country. With increasing economic and psychic stability (and in some cases, these are linked), a person may no longer regard his house as a fortress-to-be-defended, but as an attractive, individual expression of self-and-family with picture windows so that neighbors can admire the inside. Thus, for many in the middle-income bracket, the house is an expression of self, rather than a defender of self. The self-and-environment are seen in a state of mutual regard, instead of a state of combat.

The fact that the decoration of the house interior often symbolizes the inhabitants’ feelings about self is one that has long been recognized. It has even been suggested that the rise in popularity of the profession of interior decorating is in some way related to people’s inability to make these decisions for themselves since they’re not sure what their self really is. The phenomenon of people, particularly women, rearranging the fur-
niture in their house at times of psychic turmoil or changes-in-self, is a further suggestion that the house is very intimately entwined with the psyche.

The pregnant woman—in a very special psychological and physiological state of change—is especially likely to identify with the house, both in dreams and in reality:

Suddenly compulsive urges to do thorough house cleaning seem common among pregnant women. They are, on the one hand, practical attempts to prepare for the coming baby, but when the house is already amply clean and takes is impending, there may be a second, more significant level. The woman may be acting out her unconscious identification of the house with her own body. She may feel that if she cleans out the house and puts everything in order, she is in some way doing something about that other living space, the "house" of her unborn child. For her, it is an object rather than a word, which has taken on secret meanings.¹²

An interesting contemporary development is the interior decoration of the urban commune. In a number of examples in the Berkeley-Oakland area visited by the author, it was very noticeable that the bedrooms, the only private spaces of residents, were decorated in an attractive and highly personal way symbolic of the self whose space it was, as shown in Figure 3. The living rooms, the communal territory of six or eight or more different personalities, however, were only sparsely decorated, as exemplified by the one in Figure 4, since, presumably, the problem of getting agreement on taste from a number of disparate and highly individual selves was too great to overcome. Interestingly, the more normal family house may display an opposite arrangement, with bedrooms functionally but uninterestingly decorated, and the living room, where guests and relatives are entertained, containing the best furniture, family mementos, art purchases, photos, and so on, and representing the collective family self. The only exception to this pattern may be the teenager's room—highly personalized as a reflection of his struggle to become an individual with a personality separate from his parents.

In a recently published study of living rooms, Edward Laumann and James House have found that
the presence or absence of certain objects are good if not perfect clues to status and attitudes. It is the living room rather than any other room in the house which provides these clues because

The living room in the area where "performances" for guests are most often given, and hence the "setting" of it must be appropriate to the performance. Thus we expect that more than any other part of the home, the living room reflects the individual's conscious and unconscious attempts to express a social identity.13

For example, they looked at a random sample of 41 homes from among 156 respondents (all of which were one-and-two-family home dwellers in Detroit) who had annual incomes over $15,000 and presumably had enough money to decorate any way they wanted. They found that those with a traditional decor—French or Early American furniture, wall mirrors, small potted plants and/or artificial flowers, paintings of people or still lifes, clocks—tended to be the white Anglo-Saxon establishment, occupying occupations and status positions similar to their fathers. Those with a more modern decor, characterized by modern furniture, wood walls, abstract paintings, solid carpets, and abstract designed curtains, tended to be upwardly mobile, non Anglo-Saxon Catholics whose families had migrated to the United States from southern and eastern Europe after 1900.

The nouveaux riches have a strong need to validate their new found status, yet they are not acceptable socially by the traditional upper classes. Since their associations do not clearly validate their position, they turn to conspicuous consumption. The nouveaux riches, then, spurn the style of the traditional upper class in favor of the newer fashions. This serves a double purpose: to establish their tastefulness and hence status, while symbolically showing their disdain for the "snobby" traditionalists.14

The findings of this study of decorative styles of living rooms seem to tie in well with the result of Werthman's study of choices of house styles, for in both cases there appears to be a strong correlation between the style selected and the self-image of the consumer. The house facade and the interior design seem often to be selected so that they reflect how a person views himself both as an individual psyche, and in relation to society and the outside world, and how he wishes to present his self to family and friends.
These are just a few examples of how the house-as-self linkage becomes manifest in individual and societal behavior and attitudes; no doubt the reader can add many more instances from his personal experience. The thesis is not a new one; but it seems that the Jungian notions of the collective unconscious, the archetype and the symbol, may offer a useful conceptual structure to tie these examples together. Since the house-se lf symbolism seems to arise again and again, in many disparate settings, and since there appears to be little conscious sharing of this phenomenon, it seems reasonable to suggest that it is through the medium of the collective unconscious that people are in touch with an archaic and basically similar archetype (the self) and with a symbol for that archetype that has changed little through space and time (the house). Perhaps we can comprehend the essence of the house-self analogy more easily by looking at evidence from literature, poetry, and dreams—forms of expression that may get closer to true unconscious meanings than sociological surveys or similar empirical investigations.

THE HOUSE-AS-SELF AS MANIFESTED IN LITERATURE, POETRY, AND DREAMS

One doesn't have to look farther than the very words that are sometimes used to describe houses—austere, welcoming, friendly—to see that we have somehow invested the house with human qualities. In a book describing his experiences while cleaning and repairing a country cottage to live in, Walter Murray wrote:

So I left the cottage, swept if not yet garnished, and as I looked back at it that quiet evening with the sunset all aglow behind it, it seemed that somehow it was changed. The windows were clean, and the soul of a house looked out of its eyes; sweet cottages peep, old houses blink and welcome. NowCopford, which had at first defied, gazed after me at least as an acquaintance, and months later was even friendly. But I never knew a smile to wrinkle the hard corners of its eyes.

Although one might perhaps sneer at its cute anthropomorphizing of the environment, it is passages such as this which reveal what may be profound and barely recognized connections with, and projections onto, that environment.

In her introspective autobiography, written in the form of a diary, Anais Nin saw quite clearly both the security and sustenance that can ensue from living in a house that reflects one's own self-image, and the phenomenon of projecting onto the home one's inner fears and anxieties:

When I look at the large green gate, it is the air of a prison gate. An unjust feeling, since I know I can leave the place whenever I want to, and since I know that being in an object, or a person, this responsibility of being the obstacle when the obstacle lies always within one's self.

In spite of this knowledge, I often stand at the window staring at the large gate, as if hoping to obtain from this contemplation a reflection of my inner obstacles to a full, open life. But the little gate, with its overhanging ivy like disordered hair over a running child's forehead, has a sleepy and slily air, an air of being always half open.

I chose the house for many reasons. Because it seemed to have grown out of the earth like a tree, so deeply grooved it was within the old garden. It had no cellar and the rooms rested right on the ground. Below the rug, I felt, was the earth. I could take root here, feel at one with house and garden, take nourishment from them like the plants.

In a short passage from a popular newsmagazine description of the German writer Günter Grass, the image of his style of writing, his way of working, his clothes, and the house he lives in—all reflect the inner character, the self, of this man:

Grass is a fanatic for moderation. He is a moderate the way other men are extremists. He is a man almost crazy for sanity. Balance is Grass's game. He is in love with the firm, the tangible. He has a peasant's instinct for the solid ground, an artisan's feeling for materials. His West Berlin home—described by one visitor as "a god-awful Wilhelminian house"—is solid as a fort. The furniture is reassuringly thick-legged. The floors are bare. There are no curtains. In lean, wrinkled, absolutely undistinguished clothes—open necked shirts are the rule—Grass walks from room to room with workmanlike purpose. He looks like a visiting plumber who has a job to do and knows quite well that he can do it.

The notion of house as symbol of mother or the womb is one fairly common in literature, and indeed has been the inspiration of a number of organic architects who have tried to re-create this safe, enclosed, encircling feeling in their designs. In the following fictional account, we see how the house takes on a symbolic maternal function in response to the fear of the man within and the storm outside:

The house was fighting gallantly. At first it gave voice to its complaints; the most awful gusts were attacking it from every side at once, with evident hatred and such howls of rage that, at times, I trembled with fear. But it stood firm. The already human being in whom I had sought shelter for my body yielded nothing to the storm. The house clung to...
me, like a she-wolf, and at times I could smell her odor penetrating maternally to my very heart. That night she was really my mother. She was all I had to keep and sustain me. We were alone.

Here, in the unusual circumstances of a storm, one can see how this human, protective symbol of the house might well be conceived. But what of ordinary circumstances? How does the house-as-self symbol first begin to take root? Undoubtedly, one must look for the roots in infancy. At first, the mother is its whole environment. Gradually, as the range of senses expands, the baby begins to perceive the people and physical environment around it. The house becomes its world, its very cosmos. From being a shadowy shell glimpsed out of half-closed eyes, the house becomes familiar, recognizable, a place of security and love.

The child’s world then becomes divided into the house, that microspace within the greater world that he knows through personal discovery, and everything that lies beyond it, which is unknown and perhaps frightening. In a sense, the child’s experience reflects the assessment of known space as made by preliterate societies. As Mircea Eliade has written:

One of the outstanding characteristics of traditional societies is the opposition that they assume between their inhabited territory and the unknown and indeterminate space that surrounds it. The former is world (more precisely, our world), the cosmos; everything outside it is no longer a cosmos but a sort of “other world,” foreign, chaotic space, peopled by ghosts, demons, foreigners.

As the child matures, he ventures into the house’s outer space, the yard, the garden, then gradually into the neighborhood, the city, the region, the world. As space becomes known and experienced, it becomes a part of his world. But all the time, the house is home, the place of first conscious thoughts, of security and roots. It is no longer an inert box; it has been experienced, has become a symbol for self, family, mother, security. As Bachelard has written, “geometry is transcended.”

In the following poem, written by a child of 12 years, the notion of the family house being a special place of security and love to which the child anxiously returns after school, is feelingly evoked.

O JOYOUS HOUSE

When I walk home from school, I see many houses Many houses down many streets.

They are warm comfortable houses But other people’s houses I pass without much notice

Then as I walk farther, farther I see a house, the house It springs up with a jerk That speeds my pace, I lurch forward Longing makes me happy, I bubble inside It’s my house

As we become more ourselves—more self-actualized, in Maslow’s terms—it seems that the house-as-symbol becomes even less tied to its geometry. A writer quoted by Bachelard describes his house thus:

My house is diaphanous but it is not of glass. It is more of the nature of vapor. Its walls contract and expand as I desire. At times, I draw them close about me like protective armor. But at others, I let the walls of my house blossom out in their own space, which is infinitely extensible.

The symbol has become flexible, expandable according to psychic needs. For most people, the house is not actually changeable, except by such measures as opening and closing drapes and rearranging furniture to suit our moods. For one French poet, these alternate needs of expansion and contraction, extroversion and introspection, openness and withdrawal were made physical realities in the design of his dream home—a Breton fisherman’s cottage around which he constructed a magnificent manor house.

In the body of the winged manor, which dominates both town and sea, man and the universe, he retained a cottage chrysalis in order to be able to hide alone in complete repose.

The two extreme realities of cottage and manor take into account our need for retreat and expansion, for simplicity and magnificence.

Perhaps the suburban home buyer’s yen for both an opulent facade with picture-window view and colonial porch and for a private secluded den is a modern manifestation of this need.

A recent news story suggests, in somewhat startling fashion, what may be strong evidence for the significance of house or home to the psyche:

When both his parachutes failed in a recent jump from a plane 3,300 feet above the Coolidge, Ariz., airport, sky diver Bob Hall, 19, plummeted earthward and hit the ground at an estimated 60 m.p.h. Miraculously, he survived. A few days later, recovering from nothing more serious than a smashed nose and loosened teeth, he told reporters what the plunge
had been like: "I screamed. I knew I was dead and that my life was ended. All my past life flashed before my eyes, it really did. I saw my mother's face, all the homes I've lived in [salons added], the military academy I attended, the faces of friends, everything."23

Surely, the fact that images of "all the homes I've lived in" flashed through the mind of a man approaching almost certain death, must indicate a significance of that element of the physical environment far beyond its concrete reality.

If we start to consider the messages from the unconscious made manifest through dreams, we have even more striking evidence of the house-as-self symbol. Carl Jung in his autobiography describes quite vividly a dream of himself as house, and his explorations within it:

I was in a house I did not know, which had two storeys. It was "my house." I found myself in the upper storey, where there was a kind of salon furnished with fine old pieces in rococo style. On the walls hung a number of precious old paintings. I wondered that this should be my house, and thought, "Not bad." But then it occurred to me that I did not know what the lower floor looked like. Descending the stairs, I reached the ground floor. There everything was much older, and I realized that this part of the house must date from about the fifteenth or sixteenth century. The furnishings were medieval; the floors were of red brick. Everywhere it was rather dark. I went from one room to another, thinking, "Now I really must explore the whole house." I came upon a heavy door and opened it. Beyond it, I discovered a stone stairway that led down into the cellar. Descending again, I found myself in a beautifully vaulted room which looked exceedingly ancient. Examining the walls, I discovered layers of brick among the ordinary stone blocks, and chips of brick in the mortar. As soon as I saw this I knew that the walls dated from Roman times. My interest by now was intense. I looked more closely at the floor. It was on stone slabs, and in one of these I discovered a ring. When I pulled it, the stone slab lifted, and again I saw a stairway of narrow stone steps leading down into the depths. These, too, I descended, and entered a low cave cut into the rock. Thick dust lay on the floor, and in the dust were scattered bones and broken pottery, like remains of a primitive culture. I discovered two human skulls, obviously very old and half disintegrated. Then I awoke.24

Jung's own interpretation of the dream was as follows:

It was plain to me that the house represented a kind of image of the psyche—that is to say, of my then state of consciousness, with hitherto unconscious additions. Consciousness was represented by the salon. It had an inhabited atmosphere, in spite of its antiquated style.

The ground floor stood for the first level of the unconscious. The deeper I went, the more alien and the darker the scene became. In the cave, I discovered remains of a primitive culture, that is the world of the primitive man within myself—a world which can scarcely be reached or illuminated by consciousness. The primitive psyche of man borders on the life of the animal soul, just as the caves of prehistoric times were usually inhabited by animals before man laid claim to them.25

Jung describes here the house with many levels seen as the symbol-of-self with its many levels of consciousness; the descent downward into lesser known realms of the unconscious is represented by the ground floor, cellar, and vault beneath it. A final descent leads to a cave cut into bedrock, a part of the house rooted in the very earth itself. This seems very clearly to be a symbol of the collective unconscious, part of the self-house and yet, too, part of the universal bedrock of humanity.

Jung, unlike Freud, also saw the dream as a possible prognosticator of the future; the unconscious not only holds individual and collective memories but also the seeds of future action. At one period of his life Jung was searching for some historical basis or precedent for the ideas he was developing about the unconscious. He didn't know where to start the search. At this point he started having a series of dreams which all dealt with the same theme:

Beside my house stood another, that is to say, another wing or annex, which was strange to me. Each time I would wonder in my dream why I did not know this house, although it had apparently always been there. Finally came a dream in which I reached the other wing. I discovered there a wonderful library, dating largely from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Large, fat folio volumes bound in pigskin stood along the walls. Among them were a number of books embellished with copper engravings of strange character, and illustrations containing curious symbols such as I had never seen before. At the time I did not know to what they referred; only much later did I recognize them as alchemic symbols. In the dream I was conscious only of the fascination exerted by them and by the entire library. It was a collection of incunabula and sixteenth century prints.

The unknown wing of the house was a part of my personality, an aspect of myself; it represented something that belonged to me but of which I was not yet conscious. It, and especially the library, referred to alchemy of which I was ignorant, but which I was soon to study. Some fifteen years later I had assembled a library very like the one in the dream.26

Thus here in another dream Jung sees an unexplored wing of the house as an unknown part of himself and a symbol of an area of study with which he would become very absorbed in the future, and which per-
mitted him to expand his concepts of the transformation of the self.

From many house dreams I have collected, two will suffice here to further emphasize the point. In the first one, the dreamer had, in reality, just lost a close friend in an auto accident. She reports the dream thus:

I was being led through a ruined house by a tall, calm man, dressed all in white. The house was alone in a field, its walls of rubble, the layout and doorways no longer visible. The man guided me slowly through the house pointing out how it used to be, where rooms were connected, where doorways lead to the outside world.

My interpretation of this dream is that, the tall man is a part of me, maybe my masculine, strong, calm side, and he is pointing out that despite the fact that my self-life house appears to be in ruins right now, due to my shock and grief at A's death, there is part of me that calmly and clearly will know how to find my way through the chaos. It was a very comforting dream at a time of great stress.

In another dream, the dreamer was in reality under much pressure from students and colleagues in his academic job. He described his dream thus:

There was a house, a large English stately home, open to the public to look at and trampse through. But on this day, it was temporarily closed, and visitors were disappointedly reading the notices and turning away. I was in the basement of the house, sorting through some oil paintings, to see if there was anything there of value.

With the aid of a therapist, skilled in the interpretation of dreams, he saw the following message within the dream:

I need to 'close up shop,' take a vacation from all the pressures and human input I'm experiencing right now, and have time to sort through some ideas in my unconscious (the basement of the house) to see if any are of value in guiding my future direction.

Returning to Jung's autobiography, he describes how, later in his life, he made manifest in stone the symbol which had at times stood for self in his dreams. He describes how he yearned to put his knowledge of the contents of the unconscious into solid form, rather than just describe them in words. In the building of his house—the tower at Bollingen on Lake Zurich—he was to make "a confession of faith in stone":

At first I did not plan a proper house, but merely a kind of primitive one-story dwelling. It was to be a round structure with a hearth in the center and bunks along the walls. I more or less had in mind an African hut where the fire, ringed with stone, burns in the middle, and the whole life of the family revolves around this centre. Primitive huts concretise an idea of wholeness, a familial wholeness in which all sorts of domestic animals likewise participate. But I altered the plan even during the first stages of building, for I felt it was too primitive. I realized it would have to be a regular two-story house, not a mere hut crouched on the ground. So in 1923 the first round house was built, and when it was over I saw that it had become a suitable dwelling tower.

The feeling of repose and renewal that I had in this tower was intense from the start. It represented for me the maternal hearth.

Feeling that something more needed to be said, four years later Jung added another building with a tower-like annex. Again, after an interval of four years, he felt the need to add more and built onto the tower a retiring room for meditation and seclusion where no one else could enter; it became his retreat for spiritual concentration. After another interval of four years he felt the need for another area, open to nature and the sky, and so added a courtyard and an adjoining loggia. The resultant quaternity pleased him, no doubt because his own studies in mythology and symbolism had provided much evidence of the completeness and wholeness represented by the figure four. Finally, after his wife's death, he felt an inner obligation to "become what I myself am," and recognized that the small central section of the house

which crouched so low and hidden was myself! I could no longer hide myself behind the "maternal" and "spiritual" towers. So in the same year, I added an upper storey to this section, which represents myself or my ego-personality. Earlier, I would not have been able to do this, I would have regarded it as presumptuous self-emphasis. Now it signified an extension of consciousness achieved in old age. With that the building was complete.

Jung had thus built his house over time as a representation in stone of his own evolving and maturing psyche; it was the place, he said, where "I am in the midst of my true life, I am most deeply myself." He describes how:

From the beginning I felt the Tower as in some way a place of maturation—"a maternal womb or a maternal figure in which I could become what I was, what I am and will be. It gave me a feeling as if I were being reborn in stone. It is thus a concretisation of the individuation process. During the building work of course, I never considered these matters . . . Only afterwards did I see how all the parts fitted together and that a meaningful form had resulted: a symbol of psychic wholeness.

In examining at some length Jung's own reflections on the house as dream-symbol, and the building of his own house as a manifestation of the self, we are not
just examining one man’s inner life; hopefully, there is something here of the inner symbolism of all men. Jung, perhaps more than any other thinker or writer of this century, has fearlessly examined his own unconscious and delved into a great range of disciplines which together aided him in his quest to build a theory of the unconscious and the self.

We must return again to Jung’s concept of the collective unconscious. It should be possible if his notion of an unconscious stretching through space and time beyond the individual is correct to find comparable indications of the house-self linkage in places and times far removed from contemporary Western civilization. If there is indeed an archetype self, then perhaps in other places and times, the house has become one (though not necessarily the only) symbol for that indefinable archetype in the physical world. For, as Jung has confirmed with ample evidence, the older and more archaic the archetype, the more persistent and unchanging the symbol.

**MAKING SPACE SACRED**

In the opening chapter of his book *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* entitled “Sacred Space and Making the World Sacred,” the noted historian of religion, Mircea Eliade describes how for many preliterate societies, space was not homogenous; inhabited parts were seen as sacred while all other space around was a formless, foreign expanse. In settling a new territory, man was faced with both a horizontal expanse of unknown land, and a complete lack of vertical connections to other cosmic levels, such as the heavens and the underworld. In defining and consecrating a spot as sacred, be it shrine, a temple, a ceremonial house, man gave himself a fixed point, a point of reference from which to structure the world about him. In doing so, he consciously emulated the gods who, many believed, created the world by starting at a fixed point—for example, an egg, or the navel of a slain monster—then moving out to the surrounding territory. As Hebrew tradition retells it: “The Most Holy One created the world like an embryo. As the embryo grows from the navel, so God began to create the world by the navel and from there it spread out in all directions.”

Through finding a sacred space, generally with the aid of signs or the revelations of animals, man began to transform the shapeless, homogeneous chaos of space into his world.

Once located, the sacred space had to be consecrated, and this very often took the form of a construction which had at its center a pillar, pole, or tree. This was seen as a symbol for the cosmic axis and the means by which communication was made possible from one cosmic level to another. Whether seen as a ladder, as in Jacob’s dream, or as a sacred pillar, as worshipped by the Celts and Germans before their conversion to Christianity, the vertical upright was an almost universal symbol for passage to the worlds of the gods above and below the earth.

Having created a sacred place in the homogeneity of space, man erected a symbol for the cosmic axis and thus centered this place at the Center of the World. But, Eliade maintains, there could be many Centers of the World, and indeed the Achipa people of the Arunta tribe of Australian aborigines always carried the sacred pole with them so as not to be far from the Center or its link with other worlds. The religious man of fixed settlements, although he knew that his country and village and temple all constituted the navel of the universe,

also wanted his own house to be at the Center and to be an “imago mundi” (He) could only live in a space opening upward, where the break in plane was symbolically assured and hence communication with the “other world,” the transcendental world, was ritually possible. Of course the sanctuary—the Center par excellence—was there, close to him, but he felt the need to live at the Center always.

Thus it was that the house, like the temple and the city, became a symbol of the universe with man, like God, at its center and in charge of its creation. The house, like the temple or shrine, was sanctified by ritual.

Just as the entrance to the temple was, and still is, regarded as the dividing line between the sacred and the profane worlds and is suitably embellished to ward off evil spirits which might attempt to enter the inner sanctum, so the threshold of the house is regarded as one of the most important dividing lines between inner private space and the other public world. Even if few living in the Western World would admit today to a belief in household spirits, there are still parts of
the world where there are strong beliefs about how
the house should be entered (right foot first among
country dwellers in Finland, Syria, Egypt, and
Yorkshire), and the custom of carrying the bride over
the threshold is widespread throughout the world and
has been recorded since ancient Roman times. Among
contemporary city dwellers, the sanctity of the threshold
is still revered by such behavior as removing one’s
hat and wiping one’s shoes before entering the dwelling,
or in Arab houses, by removing one’s shoes. In China,
the orientation of the door toward the south, and in
Madagascar toward the west, are examples of the
importance of a felicitous orientation of the door to the
cosmos. Among orthodox Jews, the Commandments
are attached to the doorpost of the house, for they
have been ordered: “Thou shalt write them on the posts
by thy house and on thy gates” (Deuteronomy VI: 9).
In northern England working class districts, the daily
routine of polishing the front door knob and whitening
the doorstep is a further contemporary example of
special, almost ritualistic, attention paid to the threshold.

The location of the threshold varies in different cul-
tures, and it may well be that this location vis-à-vis
the outside world is symbolic of how the people as
individuals relate to the rest of society. In the American
house, the front yard is generally unfenced and part
of the streetscape, and may be viewed as semipublic
territory; the real threshold to the house is the front
doors itself. This may reflect an American interpersonal
trait of openness to strangers and of (initial at least)
f Friendliness to people they hardly know. In England,
however, the fenced front garden with a gate puts the
initial threshold at some distance from the house itself,
and is probably symbolic of the greater English reserve
at inviting strangers into their houses and at opening
up to people before they know them very well. The
compound of a Moslem house puts the threshold even
more forcibly and deliberately at some distance from
the house, and reflects the extreme privacy required
by individuals, particularly women, from strangers and
neighbors.

Traditionally one of the principal tasks of the woman
of the house was to keep the hearth fire perpetually
burning. Lord Raglan in his study of the origins of the
house suggests that the hearth was originally con-
deived as a microcosm of the sun. Cooking took place
outside, or in a separate building, and the sacred hearth
was seen as a parallel to the sacred flame in the temple,
not something to be cooked on, but a symbol of the
sun which must never be allowed to go out for fear
the sun itself would go out.

It is probable that fire existed before man built his
first dwellings. Pierre Defontaines has suggested that
the house originated as a shelter for this sacred fire
that must not be allowed to go out. Among the ancient
Greeks the sacred fire was first enclosed in a special
precinct, which later was surrounded by the living quar-
ters of the family. The dwelling thus came into existence
to protect the fire, and the Greeks maintain it was the
sacred hearth that inspired man to build the house.
In the houses of northern China, the kang, a large
central hearth of brick and earth, is thought of and
referred to as “the mother of the dwelling.” Defontaines
reports that until recently in houses in rural Sardinia,
the hearth fire was kept perpetually alight and only
extinguished when someone died, for the period of
mourning. The belief that the house had its traditional
beginning in the protection of fire is still maintained
in Madagascar, where fire must be the first item brought
into a newly completed dwelling.

The hearth was, until very recently, still the focus of
family life in England, where wives left behind by their
soldier husbands in World War I were enjoined to “keep
the home fires burning.” Although central heating is
becoming more and more common in England, and
antipollution laws prevent the burning of coal in open
fires in most parts of the country, many families have
replaced the perpetual hearth with an electric heater
displaying artificial smouldering “logs.” It is not easy,
after many centuries of veneration of the hearth, to
replace it overnight with concealed hot air vents and
to feel that something of the home has not been lost.
An interesting parallel reported in the San Francisco
Chronicle in May 1971 told of the demolition of a soup
kitchen in the Mission District where the only item to
be saved for incorporation in a new old men’s hospital
was the much loved symbolic hearth.
The ritual of keeping the hearth alight because it
represents the sun can be termed a cosmic ritual. Such
rituals are based upon the belief that one can affect
the macrocosm by acting upon a microcosm. There
are many indications that temples of various faiths have
been built as symbols of the universe, with the dome or high vaulted roof as symbolic of the heavens, and the floor symbolic of earth below. Raglan reports "in the rituals of the Pawnees the earth lodge is made typical of man's abode on earth; the floor is the plain, the wall the distant horizon, the dome the arching sky, the central opening, the zenith, dwelling place of Tirawa, the invisible power which gives life to all created beings." 39

Since one of the most widespread primitive beliefs about the creation of the world was that it originated from an egg, so many of the first cosmic manifestations in temples and houses were round or spherical in shape. Lord Raglan has suggested that an original belief in the world as circular began to be replaced by a belief in the world as square, and starting in Mesopotamia and Egypt, and spreading later to China, India, Rome, North America, and Africa, the temple and the house as cosmic manifestations began to be built on a square or rectangular plan, instead of a circular one. 40 People as far apart as the Eskimos, Egyptians, Maoris, and tribes of the North Cameroons believed that the sky or heavens were held by four corner posts which had to be protected from decay or damage, and whose guardian deities had to be placated by ritual. The weathercock on the roof, which is believed in parts of England to crow to wind spirits in the four quarters and ward them off, is one of the few contemporary western manifestations of the ancient cosmic significance of the square and the four cardinal points.

In most parts of the world, the rectangular house predominates today, but the circular shape has often been retained in the form of the dome for religious or important secular buildings (for example, city hall, the state capitol, the opera house), recalling much earlier times when the circle had specific cosmic significance.

To summarize Raglan's thesis, he suggests that house forms were derived from the forms of temples (the houses of the gods), and symbolize man's early beliefs concerning the form and shape of the universe. Drawing conclusions from his studies of myth and folklore, rather than buildings, Eliade comes to similar conclusions.

By assuming the responsibility of creating the world that he has chosen to inhabit, he not only cosmicizes chaos but also sanctifies his little cosmos by making it like the world of the gods. That is why setting somewhere—building a village or merely a house—represents a serious decision, for the very existence of man is involved; he must, in short, create his own world and assume the responsibility of maintaining and renewing it. Habitations are not lightly changed, for it is not easy to abandon one's world. The house is not an object, a "machine to live in"; it is a universe that man constructs for himself by imitating the paradigmatic creation of the gods, the cosmogony. 41

THE SELF-HOUSE/SELF-UNIVERSE ANALOGY

It seems that consciously or unconsciously, then, many men in many parts of the world have built their cities, temples, and houses as images of the universe. My contention is that somewhere, through the collective unconscious, man is still in touch with this symbolism. Our house is seen, however unconsciously, as the center of our universe and symbolic of the universe. But how does this connect with my earlier arguments regarding the house-as-symbol-of-self? Primitive man sees his dwelling as symbolic of the universe, with himself, like God, at its center. Modern man apparently sees his dwelling as symbolic of the self, but has lost touch with this archaic connection between house—self—universe.

The phenomenon of dreaming or imagining the self as a house—that package outside our own skin which encloses us and in which we feel most secure—is perhaps the first glimmering of the unconscious that the "I" and the "non-I" are indeed one and the same. As Alan Watts has so eloquently written in The Book: On the Taboo Against Knowing Who You are, 42 the notion that each individual ego is separate (in space) and finite (in time) and is something different from the universe around him is one of the grand hoaxes of Western thought. Although virtually impossible for most of us nonmystics to grasp in more than a superficial way, this knowledge of our indivisibility from the environment is buried deep within the collective unconscious and becomes manifest symbolically (often without our recognizing it) in fantasies, flashes of intuition, dreams, poems, paintings, and literature.

The so-called mentally ill may in fact be more closely in touch with these lost connections between self and
environment than any of us realize. After a long career working with schizophrenics, Harold Searles noted:

It seems to me that, in our culture, a conscious ignoring of the psychological importance of the nonhuman environment exists simultaneously with a (largely unconscious) over-dependence upon that environment. I believe that the actual importance of that environment to the individual is so great that he dare not recognize it. Unconsciously it is felt, I believe, to be not only an intensely important conglomeration of things outside the self, but also a large and integral part of the self. 43

The concreteness of the child's thinking suggests for him, as for the member of the so-called primitive culture and for the schizophrenic adult, that the wealth of nonhuman objects about him are constituents of his psychological being in a more intimate sense than they are for the adult in our culture, the adult whose ego is, as Hartman and Werner emphasize, relatively clearly differentiated from the surrounding world, and whose development of the capacity for abstract thinking helps free him from his original oneness with the nonhuman world 44.

Perhaps it is the so-called normal adult who, having been socialized to regard self and environment as separate and totally different, is most out of touch with the essential reality of oneness with the environment, which small children, schizophrenics, preliterate people, and adherents of certain Eastern religions understand completely. There are certain religions, for example Buddhism, that regard the apparent separation of the individual and the universe as a delusion. My contention is that in thinking, dreaming, or fantasizing about self and house as somehow being inextricably intertwined, as being at some level one and the same thing, man may be taking the first step on the path towards what Zen adherents would term enlightenment. He is risking himself of the delusion of the separation of man from his environment.

CONCLUSION

If there is some validity to the notion of house-as-self, it goes part of the way to explaining why for most people their house is so sacred and why they so strongly resist a change in the basic form which they and their fathers and their fathers' fathers have lived in since the dawn of time. Jung recognized that the more archaic and universal the archetype made manifest in the symbol, the more universal and unchanging the symbol itself. Since self must be an archetype as universal and almost as archaic as man himself, this may explain the universality of its symbolic form, the house, and the extreme resistance of most people to any change in its basic form.

For most people the self is a fragile and vulnerable entity; we wish therefore to envelop ourselves in a symbol-for-self which is familiar, solid, inviolate, unchanging. Small wonder, then, that in Anglo-Saxon law it is permissible, if necessary, to kill anyone who breaks and enters your house. A violation of the self (house) is perhaps one of man's most deep-seated and universal fears. Similarly, the thought of living in a round house or a houseboat or a mobile home is, to most people, as threatening as is the suggestion that they might change their basic self-concept. A conventional house and a rigidly static concept of self are mutually supporting. Perhaps with the coming of age of Reich's Consciousness III generation, and the social movements (civil rights, women's liberation, human potential movement, etc.) which are causing many to question the inviolate nature of old self-concepts, we can expect an increased openness to new housing forms and living arrangements, the beginnings of which are already apparent in the proliferation of communes and drop-out communities.

This long statement on house-as-symbol-of-the-self brings me back to my original problem: how to advise architects on the design of houses for clients who are often poor, whom they will never know, let alone delve into their psychic lives or concepts of self. I have no pat answer, but if there is some validity to the concept of house-as-self, we must learn ways—through group encounters, resident-meetings, participant observation, interviews—of empathizing with the users' concepts of self, and we must devise means of complementing and enhancing that image through dwelling design. If in new housing forms we violate this image, we may have produced an objective reality which pleases the politicians and designers, but at the same time produced a symbolic reality which leaves the residents bewildered and resentful.

Certainly, one area that every architect involved with house design can and should investigate is his or her own biases based on images of self. Bachelard, in his very thought-provoking study The Poetics of Space, suggests somewhat fancifully, that along with psychoanalysis, every patient should be assisted in making a topoanalysis, or an analysis of the spaces
and places which have been settings for his past emotional development. I would go further and say this exercise should be required of every designer. He or she should begin to understand how present self-images are being unconsciously concretized in design, and how scenes of earlier development (particularly childhood between the ages of about 5 and 12) are often unconsciously reproduced in designs in an effort, presumably, to recall that earlier often happier phase of life.

In the past few years, as a teacher in the College of Environmental Design at Berkeley, I have had students draw, in as much detail as they can remember, their childhood environments. After an interval of a few weeks, they have then drawn what for each of them would be an ideal environment. The similarities are often striking, as also are the similarities they begin to observe between these two drawings, and what they produce in the design studio. The purpose of the exercise is not to say that there is anything wrong with such influences from the past, but just to point out that they are there, and it may well be to his advantage as a designer to recognize the biases they may introduce into his work.

In the field of man's relationship with his environment, the type of approach which might be termed intuitive speculation seems to have been lost in a world devoted to the supposedly more scientific approach of objective analysis. As Alan Watts has speculated, this emphasis on the so-called objective may indeed be a sickness of Western man, for it enables him to retain his belief in the separateness of the ego from all that surrounds it. Although certain objective facts have been presented in this paper, it is hoped by the author that its overall message is clear: allow yourself to be open to the consideration of relationships other than those that can be proved or disproved by scientific method, for it may well be in these that a deeper truth lies. Perhaps no one has stated it more eloquently than Watts, and it is with a quotation from his Nature, Man and Woman that I will end this paper:

The laws and hypotheses of science are not so much discoveries as instruments, like knives and hammers, for bending nature to one's will. So there is a type of personality which approaches the world with an entire armory of sharp and hard instruments, by means of which it slices and sorts the universe into precise and sterile categories which will not interfere with one's peace of mind.

There is a place in life for a sharp knife, but there is a still more important place for other kinds of contact with the world. Man is not to be an intellectual porcupine, meeting his environment with a surface of spikes. Man meets the world outside with a soft skin, with a delicate eyeball and ear-drum and finds communion with it through a warm melting, vaguely defined, and caressing touch whereby the world is not set at a distance like an enemy to be shot, but embraced to become one flesh, like a beloved wife. Hence the importance of opinion, of instruments of the mind, which are vague, misty, and melting rather than clear-cut. They provide possibilities of communication, of actual contact and relationships with nature more intimate than anything to be found by preserving at all costs the "distance of objectivity." As Chinese and Japanese painters have so well understood, there are landscapes which are best viewed through half-closed eyes, mountains which are most alluring when partially veiled in mist, and waters which are most profound when the horizon is lost, and they are merged with the sky.
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