

Nithin Raghavan

Jake Dalton

SASIAN C154

26 April 2020

As Jung attempts to reconcile the differences between the *Bardo Thödol* and Western psychoanalysis, he adopts a fundamentally Eurocentric viewpoint: assigning Tibetan concepts to Freudian concepts, and chaotically dissecting the original Tibetan presentation of events. When Jung aims to define *karma* as “psychic heredity,” or when he claims that the *Bardo Thödol* “make[s] clear to the dead man the primacy of the soul,” he neglects to take into account the complex cultural foundations upon which the *Book of the Dead* is written; primarily, that the European soul is not equivalent to the *atma* in Indic tradition (further contradicting the Buddhist concept of *anatma*), and that *karma* refers to actions that influence an individual’s *samsaric* rebirth, instead of just a simple transfer of unconsciousness into an immortal soul. Just as one must address the marginal to understand the *Gestalt*, so too must one understand the context behind the *Book of the Dead* to theorize its relationship with European psychoanalysis.

It stands to reason that Trungpa would also disagree with Jung; the introduction notes that a chosen English word will “contain all kinds of...implications which may be quite alien to the...assumptions of Buddhism,” further acknowledging that an understanding of the original context is paramount to understanding Buddhist doctrine. In this manner, as Lopez does, I would prefer Trungpa’s analysis, due to its emphasis on overcoming duality, which is a fundamental aspect of Buddhism (*avidhya*). Additionally, Lopez notes that Trungpa describes the abodes of rebirth as a psychological portrait of oneself -- attempting to address a more scientific viewpoint from a Tibetan Buddhist standpoint, rather than on a Freudian one as Jung does, which stays

faithful to both the original Buddhist interpretations as well as to a less limited, modern psychoanalysis.