


UNITED WISDOM

# Archetype and Person: Freedom in Relation to One’s Self-Image

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I31 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# Archetype and Person: Freedom in Relation to One’s Self-Image

Three Levels of Freedom. And a Fourth.

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut
United Wisdom · one source—many languages

Archetypes · Author Series

Three levels of freedom. And a fourth. A map across forty traditions—from Plato and the Buddha to Jung, Heidegger, and Ibn Arabi.

> *The mask becomes clothing rather than skin.*
>
> *— From “The Mask and the Mirror,” United Wisdom*

## What This Article Is About

Freedom has a form. That sounds contradictory, but it is where an adult conversation about archetypes begins. A person cannot step entirely outside roles—even the posture “I am beyond all roles” quickly hardens into a role. But we can learn to distinguish who holds whom: do you hold the archetype, or does the archetype hold you? This article attempts to describe three levels of that situation, add a fourth concerning relationships with other people, and finish with an honest discussion of how this discussion can itself become a trap.

The subject is not new. In Book VII of the *Republic*, Plato told it through the cave image: prisoners take shadows on the wall for reality, and liberation begins when chains are noticed as chains (Plato, *Republic*, Book VII, 514a). In the *Enchiridion*, the Stoic Epictetus spoke of the *prosopon*, the actor's mask, and urged students to remember that the playwright assigns the role; it must be played honestly without confusing it with oneself: “Remember that you are an actor in a play whose character is determined by the Author” (Epictetus, *Enchiridion* §17). The Buddha called the illusion of a permanent “I” clinging to the aggregates and set against it *anatta*, the absence of self-existence; his first teaching on “not-self” survives as the *Anattalakkhana Sutta* (SN 22.59, Access to Insight). Sufis traveled through *maqamat*, the soul's stations, each a form through which the soul passes but does not remain. Jung called the outer layer the persona and warned that identifying with it is more dangerous than wearing it (Jung, CW 7, §305). This essay attempts to gather these scattered maps into one working scheme, without academic detachment or esoteric fog.

## I. Slave to the Archetype

The first figure is the most common and the least visible to the person occupying it. Someone enters a role and forgets that it is a role. They become not a person who works as a police officer, but the Policeman. Not a person who sells, but the Salesperson. Not a person who judges, but the Judge.

In *Being and Time* (1927), Heidegger described this situation as *das Man*: the impersonal "people," "what one does," in which the personal "I" dissolves and starts speaking in another's voice while taking it for its own. "The who of everyday Dasein is neither this person nor that, neither oneself nor the sum of all; the who of Dasein is the neutral, das Man" (Heidegger, *Being and Time* §127, SEP). Heidegger makes a precise point: leveling occurs not as violence from outside, but as dissolution from within.

The archetype consumes a person mechanically. Like a casting mold: pour in living metal, take out a standardized part. Every archetype has recognizable deformations. The Salesperson starts seeing people as deals. The Police Officer sees the world as threat and violation. The Judge sees life as a system of guilt and rightness. The Teacher may begin seeing everyone as children, even adult equals. The Healer looks for pain where a person is simply living. The Spiritual Leader imperceptibly becomes a prisoner of the image of "the one who knows." The Rebel is also an archetype, perhaps the most treacherous: believing himself free, he is actually obliged to deny everything, or lose himself. Buddhist tradition calls this *upadana*, clinging. We can cling to anything, including an image of renouncing clinging. In the *Anattalakkhana Sutta*, the Buddha methodically examines the five aggregates—form, feeling, perception, formations, consciousness—and shows that none is "I," because none can be maintained at will (*Anattalakkhana Sutta*, SN 22.59). Roles work the same way: you did not choose when a role would arrive or depart, so it is not you.

Sartre described the same phenomenon through the Parisian waiter in *Being and Nothingness* (1943). The waiter plays at being a waiter with such diligence, making his movements slightly sharper and more exact than the craft requires, that *mauvaise foi*, bad faith, hides in that diligence (Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, Part I, Chapter 2). Playing is easier than being. If you are a waiter, you have no choice and need not answer for choosing. Every role is seductive precisely because it removes the burden of freedom, giving predictable movements and ready-made lines in return.

The system is dangerous not because it controls from outside. It installs its voice within a person, who then thinks it is their own will. Office becomes posture. Profession becomes a way of seeing. Power becomes intonation. Money becomes a way to assess reality. Ritual becomes a habit of commanding the invisible.

This does not operate at the level of thought. The archetype captures a layer deeper than thought: breathing, facial muscle tone, speech rhythm, the speed of response to another's pain. This makes leaving a role through the willful decision “I am no longer the Judge” almost impossible: the body keeps judging while the mind declares freedom. In *Phenomenology of Perception* (1945), Merleau-Ponty showed the body as not an instrument of consciousness but a subject in its own right, which “knows” before the mind (Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, IEP). The mask has grown into the nervous system because the nervous system is the primary bearer of roles. The head is the last to hear about a change of role.

The shamanic traditions of Siberia and Altai knew this phenomenon by another name. When a helping spirit enters a shaman for too long and the shaman does not perform a return ritual, the spirit begins living in his place. Ethnographers recorded Nanai and Evenki stories of shamans who “forgot to return” and lived out their days half animal, half the neighbors' relative. Archetype is a Western, study-room synonym for the same situation. Instead of a spirit, an office, ideology, diagnosis, or image enters.

The Gnostics told the same story in the “Hymn of the Pearl,” preserved in the apocryphal *Acts of Thomas*. A royal son is sent to Egypt for a precious pearl, eats the local food, forgets his parents and himself, and falls asleep in a stranger's house (*Hymn of the Pearl*, *Acts of Thomas* §109, Gnosis Archive). “I forgot that I was a son of kings, and served their king.” In the Gnostic perspective, an archetype is more than a mask. It is the sleep-inducing food of a foreign house, erasing memory of one's origin. Awakening begins with a letter from home: an external reminder that you came here for something else.

## II. Freedom from Archetypes

The second figure is a beautiful idea, but almost unattainable in its complete form.

A person cannot act without forms. Even declaring “I am free of all roles” soon becomes a role. The Hermit, Wanderer, Mystic, Anti-System Outsider, Invisible King, or Free Wolf appears. Consciousness without archetypes resembles water without a vessel: it exists, but cannot act in the world. To speak, love, govern, earn, protect, create, teach, fight, or pray, we must enter some form.

Complete freedom from archetypes is perhaps possible only in pure contemplation: when you are neither father, man, businessman, priest, warrior, lover, nor thinker, but simply presence. Advaita calls this *atma-vichara*, “Who am I?”: a question addressed to oneself and repeated, uncovering every layer of answer until answers end. Ramana Maharshi's method rests on that single question: “Of all thoughts arising in the mind, the thought ‘I’ is the first. Only after it arises do the others arise” (Ramana Maharshi, *Nan Yar?*). If the “I”-thought is held in focus long enough, it begins to melt, together with all the roles resting on it.

The Upanishads offer a parallel formula: *neti neti*, “not this, not this.” Whenever the mind proposes a definition of itself, it must be rejected as too small. Describing Brahman, the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* refuses every positive description: “And now the teaching: not this, not this. For there is nothing higher than that it is ‘not this’” (BrU 2.3.6, VivekaVani). In the eighth century, Shankara developed this intuition into precise technical language: what we take for “I” is actually *upadhi*, limiting attributes superimposed on pure consciousness (Shankara, *Vivekachudamani*). Body is upadhi. Mind is upadhi. Name is upadhi. Role is upadhi. Consciousness itself is none of these; it is merely illuminated through these limitations.

In Christian mysticism, the same move is called apophaticism: God and the soul can be spoken of only through negation, since any assertion constricts them. Dionysius the Areopagite wrote in the sixth century that approaching the source means successively removing every name until the mind enters the “superluminous darkness of silence” (Dionysius, *Mystical Theology*, Chapter I). In the fourteenth century, Gregory Palamas formulated a related intuition in hesychasm: the mind must descend into the heart so that names cease to partition the person from life's source (Palamas, *Triads* I.2.3). The Muslim Sufi Ibn Arabi expressed the same through *fana*, the disappearance of the “I” in the divine, followed by *baqa*, abiding, a return to the world with renewed vision (Ibn Arabi, *Fusus al-Hikam*). In the twentieth century, Simone Weil offered her own term, decreation: voluntarily returning the “I” to the one who gave it. “Decreation: to make what is created pass into the uncreated” (Weil, *Gravity and Grace*).

But as soon as someone steps back into the world from this question, they put on a form. Action works this way. The Zen “Ten Bulls” sequence, composed by the twelfth-century master Kakuan, depicts the cycle with complete honesty. After the eighth stage, where both bull and herdsman disappear and an empty circle remains, two more follow: returning to the source and entering the marketplace empty-handed. The awakened person does not remain in emptiness. He returns to roles without being captured by them: “Barefoot and bare-chested, I mingle with the people of the world. My clothes are torn and dusty, and I am always blissful” (Kakuan, *Ten Bulls*, verse 10, Terebess). In the marketplace he cannot outwardly be distinguished from the others trading and arguing. This is the final figure of liberation. Leaving the cave does not mean never returning to it.

In *The Sickness unto Death* (1849), Kierkegaard describes the same fork through Christian language: a person either despairs of being themselves or despairs of not being themselves. Both despairs share a root: trying to find a final answer to “Who am I?” “The self is a relation that relates itself to itself... not the relation itself, but the fact that the relation relates itself to itself” (Kierkegaard, *The Sickness unto Death*, Part I.A). For Kierkegaard, the way out is the ability to hold the question open before something greater than oneself. Merleau-Ponty's modern phenomenology reaches a related conclusion through the body: the “I” is not a point

behind the eyes, but a fold of the world through which the world senses itself. Removing every archetype would mean smoothing out that fold—disappearing as a place of perception.

The question is therefore not whether you wear a mask. It is whether you remember the face beneath it.

Here, incidentally, hides the subtlest trap in the whole construction: the archetype of the One Who Sees Archetypes. Someone who understands the levels quickly acquires a new image: the Observer, the Disidentified One, the One Who Never Gets Caught. This image is more dangerous than many others because it disguises itself as freedom. Its deformation is a slight superiority toward those "still in a role." The person ceases to be salesperson, judge, warrior—and becomes the Analyst. This is another room in the palace, with mirrors instead of walls. In the 1970s, Chogyam Trungpa called the phenomenon spiritual materialism: "The ego can turn anything into material of its own, even spirituality. The ego is constantly trying to acquire and apply spiritual teachings for its own benefit" (Trungpa, *Cutting Through Spiritual Materialism*, 1973). One sign you have entered that room: you begin noticing archetypes in others faster than in yourself.

## III. Freedom Within Archetypes

The third figure is mature.

A free person is not someone who enters no system. A free person can enter a system without inward surrender. They can sell without turning every person into a wallet. Be a judge without losing mercy. Be a warrior without becoming a machine of violence. Be a leader without feeding on adoration. Be spiritual without making spirituality a new throne.

Freedom here is the ability to say honestly: "I am using this archetype now, but it is not all that I am."

This is a shamanic changing of masks. Today a warrior, tomorrow a merchant, then a father, priest, pupil, then nobody. The center remains still. The archetype becomes a tool rather than a master. Taoist tradition describes a similar principle through *pu*, the uncarved block of wood. The block can become a table leg, an axe handle, a musical instrument, or a sculpture. Its value lies in not yet having become anything finally. In chapter 28 of the *Tao Te Ching*, Laozi says: "Knowing masculine strength and keeping the feminine, one becomes a channel for all under Heaven; eternal de will not leave him, and he returns to the state of a child" (Lao Tzu, *Tao Te Ching*, chapter 28). *Wu wei*, "nonaction," does not describe passivity here. It is the capacity to act from such incompleteness: enter a form, give it its work, leave the form.

The *Bhagavad Gita* makes this even more practical. Before battle, Arjuna refuses to fight: his warrior role has suddenly become alien. Krishna does not suggest abandoning the role. He

proposes changing the relationship to it: “You have a right to action, but never to its fruits. Let the fruits of action not be your motive, and let there be no attachment to inaction” (*Bhagavad Gita*, 2.47). *Nishkama karma*, action without attachment to fruits, is perhaps the most practical formulation of the entire subject. Not “leave the role,” but “act within the role without regarding yourself as its owner or its fruits as your property.”

The Roman Stoic Epictetus supplied a Western equivalent a thousand years before the Gita was translated into European languages. “Remember that you are an actor in a play whose character is determined by the Author: short if he wishes it short, long if long. If he wishes you to play a poor man, play him well; or a disabled person, a ruler, or a private citizen. Your duty is to play well the role assigned to you; choosing it is not your affair” (Epictetus, *Enchiridion* §17). Epictetus adds a subtlety absent in Sartre: a role is not an escape from freedom if consciously accepted. Sartre's waiter plays at being a waiter out of terror of freedom. Epictetus's warrior or slave plays his role as an act of freedom: he did not choose it, but chooses to play it well.

The difference between possession by an archetype and mastery of it matters.

The possessed person says, “This is who I am.” The master says, “This force is acting through me now.” The possessed defends the role because without it they are empty. The master removes it because they know they exceed any form. The possessed Judge judges even at home. The possessed Warrior wages war even with the woman he loves. The possessed Businessman monetizes even friendship. The possessed Mystic turns every domestic question into a cosmic sign. A free person can return to simplicity: eat, laugh, be silent, admit a mistake, refrain from performing grandeur where simply being alive is needed.

Sufi tradition marks this difference with *hal* and *maqam*. Hal is a state, a temporary experience that comes and goes. Maqam is a station, a stable position where the soul has settled (Hal, Wikipedia; Maqam). The danger is not hal, which is transient by nature. The danger is confusing hal with maqam and taking the temporary ecstasy of the warrior or mystic as one's permanent nature. The master knows the difference. The possessed person turns every hal into a maqam, and the palace quickly becomes a one-room prison.

Kashmir Shaivism goes further. In the tenth and eleventh centuries, Utpaladeva and his commentator Abhinavagupta articulated *pratyabhijna*, “recognition.” Liberation here is not leaving the role but recognizing Shiva playing it. “The power of consciousness, through its own free will, is the cause of all the universe's perfection,” Ksemaraja writes in the opening sutra of the *Pratyabhijnahridayam* (*Pratyabhijñāhṛdayam*, Sutra 1). A warrior recognizing Shiva-the-warrior within himself does not stop being a warrior. He stops being only a warrior, because the same power playing the warrior in him plays a father in another, a priest in a third—all one consciousness entertaining itself through many forms. Tantric deity yoga makes this move experiential: the practitioner deliberately puts on the archetype of a deity—Tara,

Chakrasamvara, Vajrasattva—and through that role's very exaggeration lays bare the structure of roles generally (Deity Yoga, Wikipedia). The exaggerated role ceases to be invisible.

Here, however, two superficially similar practices are easily confused.

Freely changing masks and a splitting of personality can be outwardly indistinguishable. Someone shifts flexibly from role to role: warrior in one room, father in another, pupil in a third. Internally, however, the difference is immense. Masterful change rests on a center. Splitting rests on terror of the emptiness between roles. The marker is simple: after changing roles, does quiet remain, or exhaustion from another performance? The master has someone in the pause between archetypes. The fragmented person has an empty space that must urgently be filled by the next mask, or anxiety rises. The formula “sovereignty of the center” therefore needs a test: the center is recognized by the ability to be silent there without anxiety. The hesychast tradition of Mount Athos knows this test as *hesychia*, silence filled from within. Quiet can signal both maturity and disintegration. The difference lies in what lives within it.

Modern psychology offers its own language for this distinction. In the mid-twentieth century, Roberto Assagioli built psychosynthesis around subpersonalities: semi-autonomous behavioral patterns that successively “take control”—the Critic, Victim, Hero, Caregiver, Rebel. For Assagioli, treatment begins with disidentification: “I have a body, but I am not my body. I have emotions, but I am not my emotions. I have a mind, but I am not my mind. I am a center of pure consciousness” (Assagioli, *Psychosynthesis*). This is the same intuition as Shankara's and Ramana's, translated into the language of the therapist's couch. Maturity is not rejecting subpersonalities but being able not to be any one of them.

Jung's student James Hillman added an important correction. He criticized Jungian monotheism of the Self: the idea of a single inner center toward which everything must converge. Instead he proposed a polytheistic psychology: the psyche is inhabited by many autonomous figures, and the task is not to reduce them to one, but to learn a separate conversation with each (Hillman, *Re-Visioning Psychology*). This qualifies the idea of a “center”: perhaps the center is more like a square where a council gathers than a point. Polyphony, not a solo performance.

## IV. The Archetype You Did Not Choose

One kind of archetype is usually left unmentioned when freedom and roles are discussed: archetypes sustained not by you but by a network of other people.

A Judge is free to remove the robe on going home. But a Father cannot “leave the father's role” while a child exists. A Husband cannot disidentify from being a husband while a wife looks at him. A Leader cannot stop being a leader while people follow him—even if he is no longer a leader inwardly, the field continues shaping him. A Teacher remains a teacher to those

who listened, whether or not teaching continues. In *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), sociologist Erving Goffman showed that much of our behavior is stage work, and our fellow performers are those who watch us (Goffman, *The Presentation of Self*). “When an individual appears before others, they commonly seek information about him or apply information they already possess.” One cannot stop performing alone: the play continues while the audience remains in the hall.

Such archetypes are not clothing you put on. They are an agreement you signed with others. Confucian ethics of *ren* and *li* was built around precisely this situation: human dignity is determined by how one carries assigned relationships—son, father, ruler, subject, friend. “To overcome oneself and return to ritual propriety is to become humane, ren,” Confucius says in *Analects* 12.1. He did not propose leaving these roles, but carrying them with such inner precision that they would not become a lie.

Freedom operates differently in them: no longer “remove the mask,” but carry the role honestly without presenting it as your essence. This is a fourth level, irreducible to the first three. Freedom here becomes relational and therefore no longer solely yours. Its test is not how easily you leave a role, but how capably you remain without deceiving yourself or another.

In the early sixteenth century, the Neo-Confucian Wang Yangming refined this thesis through *liangzhi*, innate knowledge of the good. “The original substance of the mind is nothing other than heavenly principle... To be sincere in one's will is to do good and remove evil” (Wang Yangming, *Instructions for Practical Living*). Liangzhi is the voice already knowing whether truth or falsehood is being demanded of you. If clear, the role is carried from the center and relational obligations cease to press like a yoke. If clouded, a person performs for spectators, and the role becomes a cage.

Jewish tradition knows this as *tikkun*, repairing the world through fulfilling what is entrusted to us. Sixteenth-century Lurianic Kabbalah added that each soul has its own tikkun: a repair only it can accomplish, often taking the form of relationships entered without choosing them (Shattered Vessels, Chabad). Freedom here is not escape. It is the quality with which you hold what you did not choose. Hasidic tradition, which grew from Lurianic Kabbalah, added *bittul ha-yesh*, the “annihilation of existing selfhood,” the ego's transparency before God (Bittul, Satyori). Bittul is neither self-abasement nor rejection of a role. It is a state where ego ceases to be an independent source: a person acts fully, but not “from themselves.” A channel rather than a pump.

The Japanese concept *giri*—duty toward those connected to you by circumstances, blood, or promise—describes the same territory. Giri is opposed to *ninjo*, personal feeling, and much Japanese drama of the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries is built on their conflict. In *The Love Suicides at Sonezaki* (1703), Chikamatsu Monzaemon showed that when giri and

ninjo are incompatible, the characters in a classical play are left only death as a way to remain faithful to both simultaneously (Love Suicides at Sonezaki, EBSCO). Japanese aesthetics does not seek release from the role; it experiences its limit as beauty. Chikamatsu's mature hero does not choose one side: he bears both, and in that bearing a figure emerges irreducible to either role or feeling. This is relational freedom in action: not a choice that unties the knot, but the capacity to hold it without lying.

In *Oneself as Another* (1990), Paul Ricoeur offers a philosophical move that carefully separates two ideas of the self. There is *idem*-identity, "I as the same," recognized through character, habits, and roles. And there is *ipse*-identity, "I as a promise": the one who keeps their word (Ricoeur, *Oneself as Another*, SEP). Ipse needs no substance and does not need character to remain unchanged. It needs the promise fulfilled. Relational archetypes—father, husband, teacher—rest precisely on ipse. They survive changes of character if the promise holds, and break on the day the promise ceases to be fulfilled, even if every outward feature remains.

## V. Inner Hygiene

The longer someone occupies one archetype, the more deeply it begins growing into the nervous system. Freedom therefore needs regular practice, not merely a declaration. Let us call it inner hygiene: periodically leaving a role. Not resting, but specifically disidentifying.

A few questions serve as an evening mirror.

Where today did I speak as a living person, and where as a function? Where did I feel, and where perform an image? Where did I choose, and where did a pattern choose for me? Who am I afraid to stop being?

The last question is strongest. Where you fear removing a mask, it has already grown into you.

This hygiene is not intellectual. Asking is half the task. The other half is noticing which muscle answers first. Usually the jaw, shoulders, or diaphragm. That is where the role sits. In *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology* (1928), Jung called individuation a process of softening the persona—not destroying it but restoring its transparency (Jung, CW 7, §305). A rigid mask must be softened so the face behind it can be seen. This softening occurs in the body, not the head. Eastern practices have long known this. Hatha yoga works precisely here: jaw, diaphragm, pelvic floor—the three points into which self-image is usually sewn. Tibetan *tsa lung* works with the same knots through breath and movement. Sufi dervish whirling dissolves the persona through monotonous rhythm exceeding the mind's capacity to maintain its self-story.

This hygiene is no twentieth-century invention. In the *Spiritual Exercises* (1548), Ignatius of Loyola described it as the *examen*, an evening examination of conscience: a five-step review

of the day—gratitude, asking for clarity, reviewing thoughts and actions, regret for errors, and resolving to amend them (Ignatius, *Spiritual Exercises* §28). Tibetan monks practice *lojong*, mind training, whose key maxim in the twelfth-century Chekawa sounds almost provocative: “Give gain and victory to others; take loss and defeat upon yourself” (Chekawa, *Seven Points of Mind Training*). The logic is the same: regularly giving away what ego normally claims softens the ego, and the role ceases to be your skin. The Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius recorded the same questions in his diary in the evenings: “What have I done? Was it according to reason and nature?” (Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations* IV.3). Different traditions, one hygiene.

Crucially, the center to which this process returns is not static. It is not the “I” supposedly sitting behind all the masks, waiting to be discovered. It is more like the capacity to discover anew each time that someone is beneath the mask. More an act than an object. The Buddha expressed this through a paradox: anatta, absence of an unchanging soul, does not mean there is nobody. It means that whoever is there is closer to a process than a thing. A stream. Dzogchen, the Tibetan tradition of the “Great Perfection,” calls this state *rigpa*: primordial, self-knowing awareness that knows itself without being captured by mental contents (Rigpa, Wikipedia). Rigpa is neither emptiness nor an “I”; it is clarity through which any roles can pass without leaving sediment. Freedom is therefore not possession of a center but a renewable practice of returning to it. It can be lost in a week of an intense role and restored in an hour of silence. It is not an achievement; it is hygiene.

## VI. A Palace of Rooms

The highest freedom is not freedom from archetypes. That resembles trying to leave language while continuing to speak. In the *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (1921), Wittgenstein observed: “The limits of my language mean the limits of my world” (*Tractatus* 5.6). Archetypes are the language spoken by the collective unconscious. One cannot step outside them any more than outside grammar while continuing to form a sentence.

The highest freedom is sovereignty of the center.

You can enter archetypes as rooms in a palace. In one room you are a warrior, in another a diplomat, in a third a lover, a fourth a teacher, a fifth a mystic, a sixth a child, a seventh a king. But you are locked in none of them. The palace image is ancient. In *The Interior Castle* (1577), Teresa of Avila described the soul as a castle of a single diamond, with seven mansions through which life travels, stressing the importance of not stopping prematurely in any one. “Let us imagine within us an exceedingly rich palace, built entirely of gold and precious stones... built for such a Lord” (Teresa of Avila, *The Interior Castle*). In the Sufi Farid al-Din Attar's *The Conference of the Birds* (around 1177), seven valleys lie on the way to the Simurgh: Quest, Love, Knowledge, Detachment, Unity, Bewilderment, Poverty and Annihilation (Conference of the Birds, Wikipedia). Thirty birds pass through them and finally recognize that

they themselves are the Simurgh—*si murgh* means “thirty birds” in Persian. Kabbalists have the ten sefirot through which light passes before becoming the world. Everywhere the same motif: the soul moves through rooms, and maturity is measured not by where it settles but by how it passes through them.

Immanuel Kant adds a rigorous philosophical distinction without which talk of the “center” easily becomes romantic. He distinguished the human being as a creature of nature—the phenomenal person, a persona in the social play—from moral personality, the noumenal self acting by reason's inner law. “Two things fill the soul with ever new and increasing wonder and awe: the starry heavens above me and the moral law within me” (Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason*, Conclusion). The moral law within is neither a role nor a social norm. It is the voice of the noumenal “I,” free of all phenomenal masks. For Kant, freedom from a role does not mean stepping out of it, but asserting a moral subject beneath it to whom no role can be reduced.

An unfree person lives in one room so long that it begins to seem the universe. Hence the fury with which they defend its walls: from outside this looks principled; from within it is fear of losing the only familiar space. A free person is recognized by how they leave. Not loudly, demonstratively, or with a manifesto. They simply close the door behind them and enter another room. And return when needed. The palace remains whole.

## VII. A Brief Formula

Bondage is when the archetype wears the person.
Freedom is when the person wears the archetype.
Wisdom is knowing when to take it off.

And one more thing, a little quieter: maturity is wearing even the archetypes you did not choose, without pretending you chose them and without pretending you are not wearing them.

This formula is a contemporary retelling of what Sufis called four stages: *shariat*, law, form, observance; *tariqat*, the path on which form becomes conscious; *haqiqat*, truth, where someone no longer needs the form's external support because they carry it within; and *marifat*, recognition, the ability to see form in another and oneself simultaneously, without hierarchy or contempt. In the eleventh century, al-Hujwiri put this with the utmost brevity: “Law without mystical reality is hypocrisy; mystical reality without law is heresy” (Hujwiri, *Kashf al-Mahjub*). Form without essence burns out into a performance; essence without form disperses into fog. Freedom holds between them.

## VIII. What Remains

Look closely, and freedom is power over the transition between forms. The ability to enter and leave an archetype without dissolving in it. A living center able to put on any name without losing itself.

A wholly free person need not be outside the system. They can be inside it without being its property. They can use its language, offices, mechanisms, and statuses without leasing out their soul. Speak on behalf of a role and remember it is they who speak, not the role. Play it to the end without confusing play with reality. India's *Bhagavad Gita* describes this through *nishkama karma*, action without attachment to fruits. Krishna tells Arjuna: perform your warrior dharma, but do not consider yourself its source. Act while remaining free.

This is a rare state. It neither arrives as a discovery nor persists as an achievement. It is sustained only by repetition—the inner hygiene without which any maturity crumbles within a month. Ignatius of Loyola's Jesuit tradition of *exercitia spiritualia* knew this and proposed the nightly examen: a short review of the day, asking where one was alive and where automatic. Tibetan monks ask the same questions in lojong. The same questions underlie Marcus Aurelius's nightly Stoic meditation. Different traditions, one hygiene.

The mask becomes clothing rather than skin. The shadow becomes a part rather than a threat. The mirror shows not the persona but the face beneath it. The archetype becomes a room one can enter and leave.

Then “Who am I?” ceases to be an anxious question and becomes a working one. It can receive different answers on different days without any of them being a lie. Perhaps this is where a path ends that every tradition names differently: Jungian individuation; liberation in Advaita; Sufi fana-baqa, disappearance and return; Hindu moksha; Zen nirvana-in-samsara; Dzogchen rigpa; Simone Weil's decreation; Hasidic bittul; Ricoeur's ipse-identity. The names differ. The description is one: a person learns to wear the world without becoming its property.

Yet the last word belongs to whoever reads this essay and asks, “Am I reading now as a living person or as a function?” The question works only when repeated. It will be asked again tomorrow, next week, next year. An archetype does not leave forever; it steps back when named, and returns when forgotten.

Freedom is not a finale. It is a way of operating.

## Sources and Guides for Further Reading

The archive states that quotations in the essay refer to accessible academic translations and primary texts. That historical statement is retained here; quotation wording and precise locators have not been newly verified for this translation. Quotations follow the supplied Russian text. The article's map of traditions is:

- Plato, *Republic*, Book VII, allegory of the cave—text.
- Epictetus, *Enchiridion* §17; *Discourses* I.2—text.
- Buddha, *Anattalakkhana Sutta*, SN 22.59—text.
- *Bhagavad Gita*, 2.47, nishkama karma—text.
- *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* 2.3.6, neti neti—text.
- Shankara, *Vivekachudamani*, upadhi—text.
- Laozi, *Tao Te Ching*, chapter 28, pu and wu wei—text.
- Confucius, *Analects* 12.1, ren and li—text.
- Wang Yangming, *Chuanxi Lu*, liangzhi—overview.
- Kakuan Shien, *Ten Bulls*, twelfth century—text.
- Dionysius the Areopagite, *Mystical Theology*—text.
- Gregory Palamas, *Triads*—overview.
- Teresa of Avila, *The Interior Castle*—text.
- Ignatius of Loyola, *Spiritual Exercises*—text.
- Ibn Arabi, *Fusus al-Hikam*, fana and baqa—quotations.
- Al-Hujwiri, *Kashf al-Mahjub*, shariat–tariqat–haqiqat–marifat—text.
- Farid al-Din Attar, *The Conference of the Birds*—overview.
- Lurianic Kabbalah, tikkun olam and shevirat ha-kelim—overview.
- Hasidism, Shneur Zalman, bittul ha-yesh—overview.
- Kashmir Shaivism, Ksemaraja, *Pratyabhijnahridayam*—overview.
- Tantric deity yoga—overview.
- Dzogchen, rigpa—overview.
- Chekawa Yeshe Dorje, *Seven Points of Mind Training*—text.

- Ramana Maharshi, *Who Am I?*—text.
- Gnostics, *Hymn of the Pearl*, *Acts of Thomas*—text.
- Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*—text.
- Chikamatsu Monzaemon, *The Love Suicides at Sonezaki* (1703)—overview.
- Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason*—overview.
- Kierkegaard, *The Sickness unto Death*—text.
- Heidegger, *Being and Time*, das Man—overview.
- Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, mauvaise foi—text.
- Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*—overview.
- Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* 5.6—text.
- Jung, *The Relations Between the Ego and the Unconscious*—quotations.
- Goffman, *The Presentation of Self*—overview.
- Assagioli, psychosynthesis—overview.
- Hillman, archetypal psychology—overview.
- Chogyam Trungpa, *Cutting Through Spiritual Materialism*—quotations.
- Simone Weil, *Gravity and Grace*, decreation—overview.
- Paul Ricoeur, *Oneself as Another*, idem/ipse—overview.

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut
United Wisdom · one source—many languages

## Archival Editor's Note

This translation preserves an authorial synthesis, including its confident claims of equivalence among traditions and its descriptions of bodily mechanisms. Those claims are the authors' interpretation, not newly verified scientific or clinical conclusions. Archetypes, professional roles, subpersonalities, and religious practices are not established here as identical categories. The narrative about Nanai and Evenki shamans has no specific ethnographic citation in the supplied bibliography. The precise quotation wording, locators, attributions, and the title's count of “forty traditions” have not been independently confirmed.

The essay's contrast between role flexibility and “splitting of personality,” especially its proposed test of silence without anxiety, is not a diagnostic test. Anxiety, fatigue, bodily tension, or difficulty being still does not establish fragmentation or a lack of maturity. Claims locating roles in the nervous system or particular muscles, assertions about yoga and whirling, and the one-hour, one-week, or one-month time frames are not validated treatment findings in this package.

The Sonezaki passage interprets a fictional tragedy. Its aesthetic language must not be used to present suicide as necessary, mature, or a route to freedom. Conflicting duties and relationships can be reconsidered, renegotiated, or left; responsibility does not require enduring harm or surrendering consent. The archive's statements that spouses or leaders cannot leave roles are not legal or ethical prohibitions on leaving. Religious accounts of self-negation and inherited duties remain distinct doctrines and do not authorize coercion or loss of personal boundaries.

## References Inherited from the Archive

The following source IDs and URLs are restored from archive metadata. They are inherited references, not newly read or verified sources.

- PDF-L001
- PDF-L002
- PDF-L003
- PDF-L004
- PDF-L005
- PDF-L006
- PDF-L007
- PDF-L008
- PDF-L009
- PDF-L010
- PDF-L011
- PDF-L012
- PDF-L013
- PDF-L014

- PDF-L015
- PDF-L016
- PDF-L017
- PDF-L018
- PDF-L019
- PDF-L020
- PDF-L021
- PDF-L022
- PDF-L023
- PDF-L024
- PDF-L025
- PDF-L026
- PDF-L027
- PDF-L028
- PDF-L029
- PDF-L030
- PDF-L031
- PDF-L032
- PDF-L033
- PDF-L034
- PDF-L035
- PDF-L036
- PDF-L037
- PDF-L038
- PDF-L039
- PDF-L040
- PDF-L041

- PDF-L042