u iných ekonómov. Korupcia, disfunkčný štát, nedostatky privatizácie, odliv ziskov cez nadnárodné firmy a podobne, sú len niektoré momenty, ktorým autorka venuje pozornosť. Konštatuje, že napriek kritickému pohľadu sa vykonalo aj mnoho dobrého, avšak ešte viac je potrebné urobiť, čo platí pre slovenskú ekonomiku rovnako výstižne ako pre tú českú. Napriek pomerne vyhranenému názoru autorky a expresívnejšie zvolenému slovníku, je publikácia predstavujúca alternatívny pohľad na transformačný proces nepochybné zaujímaný a hodnotným príspevkom do celospoločenskej diskusie a nepôsobí bulvárné, či konšpiračné.
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James Hillman, founder of the archetypal (imaginal) psychology and according to some the most original post-Jungian thinker of the 20th century, passed away in October 27, 2011. His death became an opportunity to summarize not only his thought but also the expansive character of post-Jungian and archetypal tradition. I say “tradition” because in Jung’s times one could speak only about analytical psychology, Jung and his disciples or followers, but since late 1960s (also thanks to Hillman’s remarkable contribution) the Jungian thought started expanding to various disciplines and ramify itself into different schools. Such expansion was repeatedly underscored by London analyst Andrew Samuels but was and still is also visible in works of such authors like Susan Rowland, Lawrence R. Alschuler, Roberto Gambini, David Tacey, Ann Belfort Ulanov, Michael Vannoy Adams,  

---

Rafael Pedraza, and others. Hillman’s contribution to this process was remembered by Richard Tarnas at Memorial that took place in New York City. For him Hillman “brought the very word ‘soul’ back to psychology out of the consulting room into the world”, and contributed to our thought by his extraordinarily comprehensible visions and thoughts about “ecology, aging, war, destiny, puer and senex, the city and urban design, architecture, economics, the men’s movement, racism, pornography, language, philosophy, cosmology, astrology, phenomenology, public education, art, animals, emotion, Shakespeare, the Renaissance, Romanticism, [and] Neoplatonism” (Marlan 2015, 420). Whereas in 1980s Samuels differentiated four schools within analytical psychology (classical, psychoanalytical, developmental and archetypal), in later published Cambridge Companion to Jung (1997, 2008) one can find different studies where Jungian theories are applied to literature (Dawson 2008, 269–298), politics (Alschuler 2008, 299–314) or philosophy (Kugler 2008, 77–91) and a special paper by Michael Vannoy Adams dedicated exclusively to archetypal psychology (Adams 2008, 107–124). Such an expansive nature of today’s post-Jungian studies and Hillman’s thought are familiar to readers of Spring Journal founded by Hillman himself.

The extent of Hillman’s work is enormous. Summarizing Hillman’s work, David Tacey mentioned 25 books (including co-authorships) and four decades of creative work. Because of such an extent there is no surprise that the first volume of Russell’s biography contains 678 pages and that its writing took him seven years. When Russell approached Hillman in 2004, Hillman warned him: “This will take years, you know. I hope you’re not looking at this as a fast book” (Marlan 2015, 420).

Hillman participated in Russell’s writing project and broadened the perspective of the work. Russell’s literary talent and passion for this project were indispensable part of the biography. If Hillman declared on his lectures “if you want to know, press me like a grape” (Marlan 2015, 421), Russell took his advice literally.

Long and confidential talks between Russell and Hillman take us very deep. At the very beginning of his project Russell was “neither a psychologist nor therapist and did not major in psychology in college” (Marlan 2015, 421), but he was already an accomplished and recognized writer who published “on the Kennedy assassination, the genius of African Americans, following the migration of grey whales” (Marlan 2015, 421), and newly known for his “collaboration with wrestler-turned-governor Jesse Ventura” (Marlan 2015, 421). As a leading principle of his work Russell choose Hillman’s best-selling book The Soul’s Code: “tracing roots back to Plato’s Myth of Er, the book expressed an idea found in many traditions: that it is useful to envision one’s life following a pattern, neither genetic nor environmentally determined, but guided by a daimon – an in-between, imaginal figure, neither material nor spiritual, that accompanies each of us and ‘nudges’ us toward our purpose, identity, and fate” (Russell 2013, xv-xvi).
The same says the introductory chapter *The Figure in the Carpet* where Russell quotes Hillman’s idea according to which “The great question of biography is what Henry James called the ‘figure in the carpet’. How to discern a definite pattern, a comprehensible figure” (Russell 2013, xxiii). With the help of Hillman Russell attempts to weave a tapestry of his life, character, space and time and identify his “soul spark” or daimon behind all this.

Details of our lives can have very often extraordinary symbolic meaning. Russell looks closer at such details and their symbolic meaning in Hillman’s life. His approach is not simply intellectual but also olfactory and, again, refers to *The Soul’s Code*. It is in this book where Hillman points out that “the self starts off amid the smells of a geography” (Russell 2013, 4). In his review Stanton Marlan adds that “smells” “are not simply literal, but reflect the subtle background aromas and complexities of a larger life” (Marlan 2015, 423). Describing his native New Jersey to Russell, Hillman used an image of sea gulls dropping down into the depths: “sea gulls who fly right down and get what they want from the oceanside. I am like them, dropping down into the depths of our culture and seizing what I need to understand things and make a point!” (Russell 2013, 4). Marlan interprets this as a symbolic expression of Hillmanian “scavenging style” of a sea gull further elaborated in Hillman’s masterpiece and a founding work of archetypal psychology *Re-Visioning Psychology* (1975) where the images of “The Knight-Errant” and “bricoleur” were used as further elaboration of a “sea gull style”. For Hillman “the knight-errant” is “scrounging rogue, ..an odd-job man, like Eros the Carpenter who joins this bit with that, a handyman, a bricoleur ...psychologizing upon and about what is at hand” (Hillman 1975, 164). A bricoleur is – like “knight-errant” – “anarchic, a law breaker, knowing no bounds of proprium. Not criminal – no – but not moral either” (Hillman 1975, 162). Hillman swoops down like a sea gull, takes bits and pieces and creates an original mixture of visions and ideas – like the knight-errant.

In his review Marlan focused on the very personal aspect of Hillman’s life whereas I consider much more interesting the closing chapter of Russell’s book where Hillman’s participation and contribution to *Eranos*, his critical distance to Jung and criticism towards native America come to the fore (Russell 2013, 559–601).

When, in 2005, Hillman’s disciple Australian David Tacey summarized his professional career he did not (similarly to Russell) separate it from his personality and divided Hillman’s life into four “incarnations”: the first one started in 1950s and lasted till the end of 1960s. Russell’s biography finishes with the end of the first phase, i.e. with the very incubation of the second phase called “archetypal psychology” and I consider this moment the most important in his career. According to Tacey Hillman of this first period was “a Jungian analyst who worked within the limits of classical Jungian theory” but at the same time there was a visible tendency of Hillman to go beyond Jung. The polemic with his maître
started at *Eranos Tagung* (Conferences) whose tradition started already in 1933 and where Jung's visions and ideas got their multidisciplinary extensions. Hillman appeared there for the first time in 1964 and according to his own words “was absolutely taken by the place” (Russell 2013, 562). Already in 1966 Hillman in his Eranos lecture started questioning a classical Jungian thesis of Logos-Eros polarity: “The phallic aspect of Eros points to its male essence. This quality has sometimes been forgotten by analytical psychology, especially when Eros is contrasted with Logos and then associated with the lunar and feminine side. Kerényi assures me, however, that the usage of the word in the classical corpus shows a preponderantly masculine context. Besides, his avatars and forms are masculine, as satyr or boy or arrow or torch...The principle of active love, the function of relationship, of intercourse, of the metaxy [in-between or middle ground], of loving, is masculine” (Russell 2013, 567). What is interesting is that in order to separate himself from Jung father-figure Hillman resorted to another father-figure, Karl Kerényi, the mythograph, Jung’s close collaborator living in near canton of Ticino. The process of separation is quite visible in his letters to his friend Stein: “As men we must realize that life is not a feminine maternal principle, but that we as men have a masculine principle of life in us” (Russell 2013, 567). In fact it was an attack against conventional Jungian stress on Great Mother as it is present in Jung’s “crown prince” Erich Neumann. Russell shows us how important figure was Karl Kerényi for this Hillman’s shift at that time: “I feel like a schoolboy when with him, or any learned person. My voice goes up and I feel twenty. Tonight I realized how inferior I am in leasing and in logos. Omnipotence fantasies crushed. Inferiority in me is experienced as youthfulness, as with a woman when I fear not making the grade. I wonder if logos makes younger men weak as Kerényi makes me weak?...” (Russell 2013, 568). Hillman reminded emancipation later on in more theoretical terms in his book *Interviews*: “I don’t emphasize, or even use, some of Jung’s terms, like: self, compensation, opposites, types, psychic energy. You won’t find anything about mandalas and wholeness, and I don’t refer much to Eastern thought, synchronicity, and the Judeo-Christian God-image. My favorite books are not *Aion* and *Answer to Job*. When I use the term ‘ego’, I put some ironic marks around it: the so-called ego, because for me the task of psychology is to see through it and get around it. I certainly don’t place this construct, ego, in the center of consciousness...” (Hillman 1983, 30). In quite different context and from different perspective David Tacey indicates that there were two archetypal figures behind such a fatal “upward movement”, figures that seemed to be in charge of Hillman’s life: “a ‘Hermes’ pattern that insists on fluidity, openness and complexity, and an ‘anima’ emotionality that produces high-flown rhetoric, extremism and dramatic reversals” (Tacey 1998, 215). Even though according to Tacey Hillman’s thought and work can be divided into several periods, dominant role of these archetypes remained unchanged: “Hillman’s
career combines intellectual brilliance, subtlety and elusiveness, tricksterism, self-contradiction, and moments of silliness where he outwits him-self” (Tacey 1998, 215).

Both Tacey and Russell also emphasize “anti-academic” trait of Hillman's character, which, as it seems, became very visible in Eranos Tagung. Already at the very beginning of the first chapter Russell observes: “… Hillman is rarely mentioned in the psychology departments of most American universities. While his name remains synonymous with deep thought in countries like Italy, Japan, and Brazil, here in his native land a newspaper profile in 2004 was headlined: ‘The wisest man you've probably never heard of’” (Russell 2013, xvi). After being Director of Studies for some time Hillman had an opportunity to teach in the new department Willets at University of Chicago. At the beginning he was delighted: “In Chicago I shall attempt to give a series of public lectures on psychology and alchemy, in order to demonstrate the development of the personality from the point of view neither pathological nor normal but traditional. Imagine, alchemy at Chicago!” (Russell 2013, 619) Later, in 2007, Hillman commented all that period in totally different terms: “I’ve often written, don’t expect love in a university. The professors don’t love the students, the students don’t love the work, the administration doesn’t love the professors, and the professors hate the administration. Within all the departments, there are rivalries. There’s really an absence of eros, is the best I can say. In Zurich, it was full of passion – hatreds and affections – I mean, it was real in the emotional sense. It was ugly but it was real” (Russell 2013, 22).

If C. G. Jung is becoming, slowly and surely, a classical figure of intellectual history, Hillman is accepted only with difficulties. No doubt, their common denominator was Eranos Tagung and Karl Kerényi. If, for Hans Thomas Hakl Eranos, this Jungian institution existing for more than eighty years, is “the counter current of the common intellectual history” (Hakl 2015, 59–78) and for others “the edge of the round table” (Miller 2015, 153–167), for Hillman represents not only the place where his separation from Jung started but also the place where Hillman as a “thinker on the edge” was born. Hillman was continually driven to that edge and also we who read his works are moving on the metaphorical edge between academy and pop, empirical and imaginal, diurnal and nocturnal, conscious and unconscious. In this respect Hillman is the heir of all Jungian tradition and the depth psychology.
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Emil Višňovský: Richard Rorty a zrkadlo filozofie
Bratislava, Kalligram 2015, 360 s.

Na konci roka 2015 sa z pera slovenského filozofa Emila Višňovského dostala slovenskému čitateľovi do rúk kniha o diele a myslení jedného z najvýznamnejších a najoriginálnejších filozofov 20. storočia – Richardovi Rortym. Kniha, ako uvádza autor, je pozvaním k čítaniu Rortyho filozofie, ktorá je dnes príležitosťou pre reflexiu súčasných aktuálnych a závažných tém: poznanie, hodnoty, ľudský život, morálka, politika, demokracia, náboženstvo, spoločnosť, kultúra. Višňovský predstavuje Rortyho filozofiu ako neuzavretý spôsob myslenia práve o tých otázkach, ktoré sú pre človeka v súčasnom svete dôležité.

Autor recenzovanej monografie sa dlhodobo zaoberá filozofiou Richarda Rortyho, napísal viaceré významné práce o pragmatizme a neopragmatizme, je prekladateľom textov pragmatickej proveniencie. Višňovský je aj zakladateľom a predsedom Central European Pragmatist Forum. Jeho posledná monografia inšpiruje čitateľa k tomu, aby sa kriticky pozrel na dedičstvo pragmatistov, umožňuje čitateľovi výbornú orientáciu a prehľad v Rortyho filozofii, a ukazuje ponor do meandrov filozofického myslenia 20. a 21. storočia.

V posledných rokoch je filozofia Richarda Rortyho v popredí záujmu svetovej filozofie, aj keď v našom prostredí slovenskej filozofie sa tento záujem len prebúda. „Naša domáca filozofia sa s Rortym doteraz ani len nestretla“ (s. 16 – 17). Preto v našom intelektuálnom priestore môžeme s radostou uvištať, že práve na Slovensku vychádza rozsiahle a seriózne dielo o jednom z najoriginálnejších filozofov 20. storočia.