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Abstract

This study attempts to put forth the relationship between Carl Gustav Jung’s concept of the archetype and Muhyiddin Ibn ‘Arabi’s concept of Ayani-sabita. In this context, the nature of the concepts of Muhyiddin Ibn ‘Arabi’s Ayani-sabita and Jung’s concept of the archetype are examined, as well as the similarities and differences between each of the two concepts, by researching the issues of the relationship of these concepts with existence and humans. Attention is attempted to be drawn in the study’s results to the topics that the concept of Ayani-sabita, which is often unrecognized in the literature on psychology, can contribute to contemporary psychology, arriving at the conclusion that this concept may be one that can contribute to the science of psychology just as Jung’s archetype concept.
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The history of humanity is a magnificent treasure that undoubtedly has been constructed over accumulations. The common accumulation of humanity that has come to the present day poses a significant treasure for many areas of science, which includes psychology at the top, being particularly interested in knowing and understanding humans. A significant part of the accumulations in this context have formed the areas of philosophy, literature, and Islamic mysticism, as well as other mystical areas. Within this accumulation, the mystic schools that are based on humans’ spiritual development have drawn the attention of many important pioneers in the history of modern psychology, like C. Gustav Jung and Sigmund Freud. These names are known to have been interested in primitive tribes and religious and mystical movements and to have researched and analyzed Eastern texts (for additional information please see Freud, 2001 [1939] & Jung, 2012). In fact, one of the many psychologists who are found to have constructed their own personality theories with motion from these analyses is Jung. Indeed, the concept of archetype, which he developed by taking inspiration from the Eastern texts he had researched, constitutes an important element of his own personality theory; he conducted psychological counseling studies, which he made with his clients in pioneering this concept (Jung, 2003; Stevens, 1999; Jung, 1997).

As much as Jung’s archetype concept resembles Plato’s ideals, it also stands before us as a concept that differs through his own original rendition. Jung’s archetype concept is the pre-existing forms of comprehension; namely, it is an a priori factor that compels human intuition and its conceptions into formats specific to humans (Jung, 2003, pp. 17–21; Fordham, 2001, p. 27; Stevens, 1999, pp. 50–59). As can be understood here, abstract and even certain metaphysical concepts like Jung’s archetype are found in the psychology literature. Thus the fact is undeniable that these types of metaphysical and philosophical concepts have an effect for contemporary psychological sciences that research humanity. At this point here, the teachings of Islamic mysticism may also be an important resource for psychology, just as the Eastern teachings and other mystic schools that formed an important place in Jung’s research were able to be a source of inspiration for psychology. Namely, psychology’s research into the areas of mysticism, mystical experiences, human models, and human approaches can provide access to findings that will be able to create a benefit for modern people on the journey of discovering human nature. From this point of view, investigating the lives, works, practices, and views of the important Sufi thinkers who have given direction to mystical life for centuries from a psychological perspective can be assessed as a method that will be able to serve this purpose. On this point here, Muhyiddin Ibn ‘Arabi (1165-1239), whose actual name is Abu Bakir Muhyiddin Muhammad bin Ali and who has research institutes established today in his name, can be evaluated as an important Sufi thinker (Cebecioğlu, 2008, pp. 9–10). In fact, Muhyiddin Ibn ‘Arabi used the concept of Ayani-sabita, a concept that resembles the archetype, in also understanding humans, just like C. G. Jung (Ibn Arabi, translated 2013, p. 46; Kâşânî, 1992, p. 55; Kılıç, 1999, pp. 501–502).
Muhyiddin Ibn ‘Arabi said the ayni-sabita of the essences of objects, or in other words that which has been created, has been fixed in the wisdom of Allah since time immemorial. This concept, mostly occurring in the literature as Ayani-sabita, means the availability of objects, which exist in the outer universe as an important concept of mysticism, as knowledge in the mind of Allah before becoming visible and the essences and hidden truths of the revealed existence that are in the mind of Allah (Cebecioğlu, 2005, p. 69; Kılıç, 1999, pp. 501–502). In short, Ayani-sabita is the possible existences of the truths that are constant in the knowledge of Allah Ta’ala (Kâşânî, 1992, p. 55). At the same time, Ayani-sabita is the appearance of divine manifestations, or the scene of emergence. When the entity, attributes, and names of Allah Ta’ala emerge in the eyes of the created, the scene of the occurrence appears in different representations in terms of predisposition. The multiplicity, or multitude, emerges from the capacities of Ayani-sabita. In short, filling up the entire universe in the guise of existence is in line with the demands that the Ayani-sabitas make from Allah and the predispositions that are in ayni-sabita (Ibn ‘Arabi, 2013, p. 46). This also emerges directly in humans and determines all human characteristics. A similar situation stands out here while defining Jung’s archetype concept in defining “the pre-existing forms, namely an a priori factor that innately exists prior to the emergence of consciousness and compels its comprehension in humans in specific formats” (Jung, 2003, pp. 17–21; Fordham, 2001, p. 27; Stevens, 1999, pp. 50–59).

In short, a number of similarities and differences are considered between Jung’s concept of archetype and Ibn ‘Arabi’s concept of Ayani-sabita. When examining the literature, particularly in Turkey, although some studies (Öztekin, 2011) on this issue have been encountered, the need for various comprehensive studies is understood. Therefore, researching the relationship between Jung’s archetype concept and Ibn ‘Arabi’s Ayani-sabita concept forms the main purpose of this study.

**Jung’s Concept of Archetype**

According to Jung, archetypes are forms of expressions of the legacy left to their innate self by way of universal motifs common for all of humanity that each individual possesses and carries within themselves (Jung, 2014). Jung referred to Plato’s concept of idea while describing his archetype concept, stating the archetype concept to have been used more in ancient times and being a concept synonymous with Plato’s idea (Jung, 1976/2003, p. 17). In support of this argument, Jung illustrated the concept of Corpus Hermeticum (the archetypal light), marking the existence of the idea of the phenomenon of the Light of God in ancient times, which is the “first image” of all the lights preceding and above this phenomenon. Afterwards he also stated, “If I had been a philosopher, this Platonic claim would continue and I would say this; there is a maternal primary image that precedes and is above all phenomena
related to the elemental state somewhere in a celestial place. However, defending my private temperament or my personal opinion as a general passing thing in the face of intellectual problems is not possible because I am an empiricist, not a philosopher” (Jung, 1976/2003, pp. 17–18).

According to Jung, the archetype concept is an extension and part of the social (collective) unconscious. Jung noted the collective unconscious on this issue, taking it one step further then the views of previous thinkers by saying, “If I have a share in these discoveries, it is in also showing that archetypes are spread not only through traditions, language, and the eyes but that anytime and anywhere they can spontaneously reappear independent of any external factors” (Jung, 1976/2003, p. 20).

Jung also referred to common symbols that exist in humans by associating the concept of archetypes with the collective unconscious. The image of God that exists in humans and the common symbols (i.e., mandalas, basic cults) that exist in various cultures are evidences of the existence of the collective unconscious (Jung, [trans.] 2014, p. 23).

According to Jung, critiquing the essence, source, and methods of psychology is necessary with the stipulation of not falling into the trap of psychologism. The center of this critique forms the essence of human actions. According to this, an a priori factor is found in human actions. This is also what comes innately from the psyche, and therefore is the preconscious and unconscious individual structure. The issue that needs to be watched out for here is that a baby is not a blank sheet that can be filled when providing suitable conditions after being born. On the contrary, humans are a highly complex entity with very clearly defined individual phenomenon even at time of birth. The reasons this comes to us in darkness are that we cannot see it directly. However, when the first observable psychic responses start to be given, humans need to be blind according to Jung in order to not see the individual characteristics in these responses, namely to not see the original personality. Moreover, these details also clearly do not form the moment that they are observed. At most here, psychological factors are found to pass from generation to generation similar to genetic transference (Jung, 1976/2003, p. 19).

According to Jung, if there is a psyche that allows for exhibiting behaviors specific to species just like other creatures, humans have a preformatted psyche specific to their species. Here one must accept the existence of unconscious psychic structures that allow humans to behave like humans. Jung called this “image” (Jung, 1952/1977, p. 216; Jung, 1976/2003, p. 20). Because these images are species specific, they are primary images and emerge simultaneously with the emergence of the species. In fact, Jung likened archetypes to the fossils of animals’ old ancestors in a speech in 1952 (Jung, 1952/1977, p. 209). According to Jung, these particular features exist in the core of humans. Jung, in his own words, interprets this as: “Humans have this specific style in their core, and the assumption that it is not hereditary, that it forms
anew in every person, is as ridiculous as the primitive belief that the morning sun is a different sun than the one that set the previous evening” (Jung, 1976/2003, p. 20).

The concept Jung described as the “primary image” is equivalent to the archetype concept. According to Jung, this primary image becomes certain only through the conscious, namely through the materials of conscious experience. Jung explained this with the crystal metaphor, saying:

However, the form of the archetypes can be compared with a crystalline axis system, as I have also explained elsewhere before. The crystalline axis system has in a sense preformed the crystal formation in the primordial fluid yet itself does not have a material existence. Material existence emerges through the clustering of only ions in a special form, then later molecules. The archetype itself is void; it is purely a formational element; because self-depiction is an a priori possibility, it is nothing more than facultas praeformandi (designed power). What is transferred by way of heredity here is not depictions but forms. In this respect, they correspond to instincts that are also still formational. If the existence of archetypes cannot somehow be proven, neither can instincts unless they are seen concretely. (Jung, 1976/2003, p. 21)

Jung attempted to make it easier for us to understand the concept through the crystal analogy while explaining the archetype concept. According to him, although the crystals’ structures change, the one thing that does not change in principle is the axis system, which always has the same geometries. The same is true of the archetype according to him. As such, the emerging form of the archetype, which can be characterized in principle, is never concrete; it just has an invariant meaning in its core (Jung, 1976/2003, p. 21). For example, the empirical appearance of the various archetypes defined by Jung, such as the emergence of the mother archetype or the anima/animus archetypes, do not derive solely from these archetypes but can also be caused by the people who appear or different cultures, religions, and traditions symbolically. They appear as images in different cultures, mythologies, legends, and fairy tales. They appear as creatures, animals, and plants that are real or a product of fantasy, as in countless examples in mythologies such as half-human beings, dwarves, and giants (Jung, 1976/2003, p. 21).

Archetypes also show themselves through symbolisms and images in dreams (Jung, 1952/1977, p. 216). They can additionally show themselves in the form of emotions as in images or imagined constructs. These effects become evident at peoples’ births, deaths, achievements earned in the face of natural obstacles, the period of transitioning to puberty, or times when facing great danger (Fordham, 2001, p. 28).

Jung’s archetype concept basically has a dualism, because aside from being psychic, it also has a neurological structure. It is both spirit and material. Jung saw this as a compulsory precondition of psychophysical events (Stevens, 1999, p. 57). According to Jung, archetypes are hidden essences of the conscious mind, or using his analogy, “roots that are not just put out into the soil in the narrow sense of the spirit, but generally
to the whole world” (Jung, 1976/2003, pp. 20–21; Stevens, 1999, p. 57). By moving
the archetype concept a little further here, Jung advocates that archetypal structures
are not just the basic condition for the existence of all living organisms; at the same
time they are a structure that also supervises the behaviors of inorganic substances. In
this respect, the archetype concept is evaluated “generally as a bridge transitioning to
thought deeply impacted physicist Wolfgang Pauli and the archetype concept according
to him transferred what he believed to have important contributions to our ability to
comprehend the principles of the universe (Stevens, 1999, p. 57).

**Muhyiddin Ibn ‘Arabi’s Concept of Ayani-Sabita**

The composition of Ayani-sabita means the things and essences that do not change.
According to the Islamic Sufi Ibn ‘Arabi, it is “science of the circumstances about
the eternal fixed truths in the knowledge of Allah before coming into the realm of
existence” (Cebecioğlu, 2005, p. 69; Kâşânî, 1992, p. 55). Ibn ‘Arabi used the term
*Ayn*, which occurs in this concept of Ayani-sabita, in the sense of truth, the original
essence and nature, and used *sabita* in the sense of the wisdom of form, the body
mental (Kılıç, 1999, p. 505). Sabita, which is mentioned here, namely the concept of
certainty, has the meaning of the occurrence in the visible universe of a thing that is
fixed in the knowledge of Allah. Human nature is also from the things that are fixed
in this knowledge. In this case, Ibn ‘Arabi through the expression of Ayani-sabita
means what is found among the universe where objects appear through the universe,
where the truth of objects or things is found, and an essence of all things apart from
Allah that provides contact with Allah. However, this essence (ayn) is one that has
not received the aura of existence (Konuk, 2005, Vol. 1, pp. 15, 17, 39, 40).

In the thoughts of Ibn ‘Arabi, Ayani-sabita is the initial determination of all beings
and the point of being created on earth. Here, Ayani-sabita means both the divine
names and at the same time the truths of things possible (Izutsu, 2015, pp. 215–225;
Afifi, 1994, pp. 56–60; Kılıç, 1999, p. 505). Ibn ‘Arabi examined this concept in
detail in his works *The Meccan Revelations* and *The Ringstones of Wisdom*.

The concept of Ayani-sabita is one that basically establishes the relationship of
existence with the creator. This concept is understood to have been produced in order
to express the ability of what is possible to establish the connection of its need for
Because of this here, fixed truths (Ayani-sabita) must be found in the face of the
existence of the Truth. These are characterized through nonexistence in infinity. What
is being mentioned forms that which no other thing has aside from Allah (the first,
the eternal). The existence of Allah has spread in the way that their claims require
regarding this Ayani-sabita. Thus, not having a mental or illusory emptiness in the

Ayani-sabita, which in a nutshell means the essences of things, is the origins of the entire universe, namely that which has been created. In fact, Ayani-sabita is the exemplifications fixed in the knowledge of Allah. The concept of Ayani-sabita is located in the basis of Muhyiddin Ibn ‘Arabi’s as well as human understanding. According to him, everything that is apparent in existence can realize existence through Ayani-sabita. Ibn ‘Arabi said in this respect in his work The Meccan Revelations:

He is Lord all the time, therefore Ayani-sabita, by saying the name of existence given to its selves, must look to Him all the time. Allah looks to them through the eyes of mercy because they constantly pray. Thus Allah is also always Lord in our state of existence as in our state of absence. Just as the characteristic of possibility belongs to us, the obligation belongs to Him. (Ibn ‘Arabi, [trans.] 2014, C11, p. 170)

As can be understood here, Muhyiddin Ibn ‘Arabi expresses that, by constantly looking to Allah, one aspect of Ayani-sabita is virtually a place of manifestation, the dispenser of all attributes, designations, and existence. Like other creatures, therefore, humans also emerge through the pretext of Ayani-sabita.

According to Ibn ‘Arabi, humans at this point are the Ayna-Haqq (Ibn ‘Arabi, [trans.] 2014, Vol. 11, p. 513). Namely, they are the mirror (ayna) of the Truth (Haqq) because our bodies are as much as what is in His wisdom. To say His knowing is to say His intending; that which He does not intend is a thing He does not render into being. In the Qur’an (2:117) also on this topic is said “(He) is the unique creator of the heavens and the earth. When He wills a thing to be [when He intends] He only says ‘Be’ to the thing and so it immediately happens.” Accordingly, Allah has intended our existing being and our own identic, namely while not existing, and rendered us into being over our fixed appearances (our Ayani-sabitas; Ibn ‘Arabi, 1985, Vol. 1, p. 167; [trans.] 2016, Vol. 1, p. 91). Through this characteristic, humans have converged on a quality where they can be the ordained vicegerent on earth (Qur’an, 2:30, 6:165, 27:62). Thus, in terms of Islam, humans are an existence where the concepts of jamiyat (as the collection and reflection of all the names and attributes of Allah), berzahiyyat, (which expresses the contradictions in the structure of human existence), and khilafat (which signifies being efficient in accordance with the moral principles on earth in line with what humans and the state of this existence and knowledge require) can be gathered within the self (Erginli, 2008). In the Qur’an, Adam is taught the names of everything. He then offered these to the angels, saying “Inform me of the names of these if you are truthful” (Qur’an, 2:31); this ayah expresses that the names of Allah were taught to humans through the personage of Prophet Adam. This also indicates that in being created, humans have the characteristic of being able to understand the names of Allah and even be the locus in the manifestations of names
So, how is this possible? Ibn ‘Arabi answered this question with “By means of Ayani-sabita it is possible” (Ibn ‘Arabi, [trans.] 2013, p. 46).

According to Ibn ‘Arabi, Ayani-sabita, which exists in humans, fulfills its function through the Entity’s (Allah’s) manifestation. In this aspect, humans have a passive location across from the Entity. Each entity has their own special abilities and talents; no one is the same as another. The Truth, having an absolute body, reveals the representation of that ayn (being) as appropriate to each of the ayn’s abilities from the Ayani-sabita. (Ibn ‘Arabi, [trans.] 2013, p. 46). The affectation of these abilities and talents is also just the corporeality of the entity of Allah. In this respect, the Ayani-sabita demands the Truth to manifest being within the framework of the abilities and talents that are their requirements. This demand is not through words but through states. The relationship of Ayani-sabita with human psychology comes into play here. Namely, Ayani-sabita has effects on humans’ physical and psychological states. In fact, Ibn ‘Arabi established the relationship of humans’ Ayani-sabita with the attributes and states they carry, saying:

You know our provisions are found in the ranks of the Truth. These are provisions whose matters are attributed to the self in countless numbers, like mastery, worship, and desire. Humans see these when they research the states of their nafs (carnal desires). For this reason, Allah has characterized Himself as the possessor of names and morals. (Ibn ‘Arabi, [trans.] 2014, Vol. 17, pp. 198–199)

As will be understood from these statements, Ibn ‘Arabi emphasized that moral and psychological characteristics like mastery are associated with the states of the human soul. Ibn ‘Arabi, motioning from this, stated the appearance of the truth in humans undergoes a change even more clearly due to Ayani-sabita. As a result, all of humans’ bio-psycho-spiritual dimensions, or in the most basic sense, their disposition and personality, can be understood to be related to Ayani-sabita.

**Results and Assessments**

As a result of this study, which we have done for the purpose of understanding the relationship between Carl Gustav Jung’s archetype concept and M. Ibn ‘Arabi’s Ayani-sabita concept, the conclusion has been reached that similarities and differences exist between these two concepts.

When we look at the similarities between these two concepts, we see both concepts have been addressed as an *a priori*, or innately basic and deterministic, concept in human actions. In fact, according to Jung, archetypes are forms of expression that each individual possesses within the self and carries inside and has a legacy left to the
innate self by way of universal motifs that are common for all of humanity (Taylor, 2009, p. 108). Jung, finding that these related interests have an *a priori* factor in human actions, showed the concepts of *Corpus Hermeticum* (Archetype light) as evidence of this and connected the perception of God to this as “light” (Jung, 1976/2003, pp. 19–21). Here is understood that Jung’s archetypes are also an abstract scientific essence just like Ayani-sabita. In addition, Allah is also understood as “light” in the Islamic Sufi tradition, and this issue is explained in Surah An-Nur, the 24th surah of the Quran (24:35) in that the connection of the Truth with things is attempted to be understood through the degrees of His Light’s manifestations. Ibn ‘Arabi’s concept of Ayani-sabita is also one associated with the appearance of the Entity’s Light (Ibn ‘Arabi, [trans.] 2013, p. 46; [trans.] 2014, Vol. 11, pp. 170, 513).

Another similarity between the two concepts is that they are also used in the sense of “unchanging (fixed) reality.” According to Jung, archetypes, which can in fact be characterized in principle, are never tangible in their revealed form; they only possess an “unchanging (fixed)” sense that can be perceived in principle in their core (Jung, 1976/2003, p. 21). Ibn ‘Arabi also preferred to say “unchanging (fixed) truth, just like Jung, for the concept he used for this (Ayani-sabita; Ibn ‘Arabi, [trans.] 2013, p. 46).

Another issue where the concepts were also used similarly is Jung’s evaluation of archetypes and Ibn ‘Arabi’s evaluation of Ayani-sabita “as a transitional bridge to matter in general” (Jung, 1976/2003, pp. 17–21; Stevens, 1999, p. 57). Archetypes again possess a number of capacities and abilities like Ayani-sabita. What emerged is from the following viewpoint. Namely, the archetype itself is empty, a purely formational element; its self-depiction is nothing other than its *a priori* possibility, or its *facultas praeformandi* (designed power; Jung, 1976/2003, p. 21). Ibn ‘Arabi’s concept of Ayani-sabita has also been similarly described, stating it to possess a number of abilities and talents and that the manifestations of the Truth are in accordance with these talents (Ibn ‘Arabi, [trans.] 2013, p. 46). In other words, Muhyiddin Ibn ‘Arabi established a connection between his Ayani-sabita and its physical appearance among all aspects, including its creation and personality (İbnü’l-Arabî, [trans.] 2013, pp. 46–47; Fusus, 1980, p. 49; Futuhat, [trans.] 2014, Vol. 1, pp. 98–99). Jung also established a connection through archetypes between the personality structure and daily behaviors of humans (Jung, 1976/2003, pp. 17–21). In other words, archetypes also have a hidden structure in humans that is abstract and unseen and that determines who a person is, just like Ayani-sabita. As can be understood here, the abilities that archetypes and Ayani-sabita have and that appear have both been defined as elements that shape humans.

Another common point of the two concepts that we have characterized is that each of the two concepts has been described as a center of spiritual transference. Ibn ‘Arabi stated “The son is the father’s secret” in “The Ringstone of Seth” from his
work *The Ringstones of Wisdom*, mentioning the talents and grants that humans are given by means of the ayns (fixed truths; Ibn ‘Arabi, [trans.] 2013, p. 52). This issue recalls the spiritual transference that Ayani-sabita uses, just as Carl Gustav Jung used while describing the archetype concept. After stating that Seth has this knowledge on this issue, Ibn ‘Arabi says:

Due to this knowledge, he was named Seth. The name means the gift of Allah (Hibetullah). The keys to different types of gifts are in His Hands. Allah firstly gave Seth to Adam. Allah gave Seth to Adam, only from Adam himself because the child is the father’s secret. Therefore, he stems from him and returns to him. (Ibn ‘Arabi, [trans.] 2013, p. 52)

Clearly Ibn ‘Arabi describes that the person’s innate characteristics can be transferred spiritually. Thus, because this is a spiritual classification and it refers to the manifest knowledge in the related section, the transference is understood to be a spiritual transference. We say this situation resembles the spiritual transference of Jung’s collective unconscious and archetypes.

In summary, certain similarities are understood to exist between Jung’s archetype concept and Ibn ‘Arabi’s Ayani-sabita concept. In particular, Jung’s assessment of archetypes as “a transitional bridge to matter in general” (Jung, 1976/2003, pp. 17–21; Stevens, 1999, p. 57) brings the two concepts closer together in terms of the existence of Ayani-sabita being an essence that enables itself and its emergence. Again, the idea that it covers all that has been created and has collective (shared, social, universal) common essences is from the parts of these two concepts that are able to be shared.

Just as similarities are found between C. G. Jung’s archetype concept and Ibn ‘Arabi’s Ayani-sabita, so too do differences exist. The issue that needs to first be emphasized on this matter is that the archetype concept and the concepts of Ayna-sabita are not the same one-to-one concepts. Thus when investigating the nature of the archetype concept in general, this concept is not understood to have the fixed truths that are in the entity of the Truth, as Ibn ‘Arabi qualifies his Ayani-sabita concept, but to contain certain information that exists at a lower order and in the realm of ideas. Here we can make the comment that archetypes correspond to the Ayani-sabita of the universal model in Ibn ‘Arabi’s thoughts. In fact, Ibn ‘Arabi stated on this matter, by referencing the ayah informing that Allah is at a new task every moment (Qur’an, 55:29), that the absolute existence of the Truth is manifested in every moment, namely by constantly being revealed, from the Ayani-sabita of all that exists (Ibn ‘Arabi, [trans.] 2013, p. 51). This case continues this way in every world and in every stage of creation in a state of succession (Konuk, 2005, p. 55; Ibn ‘Arabi, [trans.] 2014, Vol. 8, p. 189). Therefore, we can understand with motion from here that Ayani-sabitas exist in all universes.

Another issue that again supports this interpretation of ours is Jung’s description of the collective unconscious as the place humans can reach in dreams and acquire
common archetypes (Jung, [trans.] 2014, p. 23). This place is also equivalent to the realm of exemplification (Misal alemi) in Ibn ‘Arabi’s ranks of existence. Thus the realm of exemplification that corresponds to the fifth stage in the stages of existence is an intermediate realm between substance and souls. The reason it’s called the realm of exemplification at this stage is that a representation resembling the one that each person who emerges in the universe of souls acquires in the realm of matter is also formed in this realm. In other words, the stage of exemplification is the surface of the stage of souls and the offshoot of the stage of matter. Therefore, some call this realm the realm of imagination because these representations which we can only realize through the power that belongs to imagination also occur in the most beautiful dreams (Konuk, 2005, pp. 67, 111). In other words, one of the places souls arrive at in dreams and receive steadfast information is this realm according to Ibn ‘Arabi (1980, pp. 99–106). For this reason, dreams pose an important place for both C. G. Jung and M. Ibn ‘Arabi. Thus according to Ibn ‘Arabi, people can learn the terms that occur from the Truth by reaching universal exemplification in dreams; they can learn what will be, what has been, and the things the Truth has told itself (Abn Arabi, 1980, pp. 99–106; Konuk, 2005, Vol. 1, pp. 38, 108, 458, 577; Qur’an, 37:102; 12:4). In short, Ibn ‘Arabi’s definition of universal exemplification has a group of common symbols, just like what exists in Jung’s collective unconscious. Thus we can say Jung’s collective unconscious corresponds to the universal exemplification in the literature on Ibn ‘Arabi and the archetypes that are included here correspond to the Ayani-sabita in the universal exemplification.

The aim of the dervish who progresses in Sufism is to complete their ascension to the edgeless expanse of space beyond the limits of the human mind by reaching divine favor and becoming nothing in within the presence of Allah, and afterwards to exist in and continually remember Allah. All efforts are for this. This situation, which forms a sense of meaningfulness that is decisive only in one’s own self and appears opposite the mind on this journey, reveals itself through the symbols special manifestations that exist within. Here we can say that Sufi views and Jung’s approach each other on issues such as cosmic potentials, archetype symbols, and the revelation of divine programming that humans innately bring through unexpected events whose understanding is difficult with the everyday mind. However, the most basic difference between the two concepts here we can say to be Ibn ‘Arabi’s concept of Ayani-sabita being used as a basic term that forms a wider and more bio-psycho-spiritual understanding of the human than Jung’s. In other words, if it is necessary to identify from another point of view, we can say perhaps the most important difference of Jung from Ibn ‘Arabi is that archetypes are unable to establish a connection with divine being. This is because the concept of Ayani-sabita has no such reference to archetypes while being used as a basic concept that provides a connection between humans and the Truth. While expressions beyond the consciousness of the concepts of archetypes and Ayani-sabita such as being unique to humanity, being
able to possess a collective reality beyond time and space, and archetypes’ formation in
the wait between worlds bring these two concepts closer together, its position across from
being is the most significant issue separating these two concepts, as the concept of Ayani-
sabita reaches a higher metaphysical dimension and is the source of all things created that
also surround humans. Indeed, the concept of Ayani-sabita is the essence that forms the
face of not just humans but of all existence that looks at the creator; it receives no whiff of
existence (it has not been created; Konuk, 2005, Vol. 1, pp. 15, 17, 39, 40). Namely, Ayani-
sabita is a much wider and stronger concept that also covers humans. In fact, separating
Ibn ‘Arabi’s understanding of humans from his understanding of existence is not possible.
On this point, the concept of Ayani-sabita is an essence that, through the dimension that
looks at humans, connects them to Allah and reveals all human characteristics in the
visible realm. Ayani-sabita here is a divine essence that while through one sense in fact
determines the fate of all of humans’ actions, attributes, and characteristics in daily life,
in another sense brings humans to the state of Allah’s visible (nazar-gah) and manifested
(tajalli-gah) place. In short, Ibn ‘Arabi identified humans as a divine existence through
the concept of Ayani-sabita and indicated that, by reason of this precious essence that they
carry, are cognizant of the secret of the khalifa (vicegerents of morality; Ibn ‘Arabi, 1985,

As a result, the possibility is seen to exist in the case of interpreting the concept
of Ayani-sabita, which is associated with the deep spiritual structure of humans,
like the understanding of psychotherapy, personality theory, and the Myers-Briggs
Type Indicator personality test that have been produced over the concept of Jung’s
archetypes, through contemporary psychology in evaluating what may be inspired in
producing different personality approaches, human typologies, and psychotherapeutic
methods. Varied and more detailed studies are recommended for this purpose on Ibn
‘Arabi’s concept of Ayani-sabita, such as his understanding of and views on humans
regarding this concept, the psychological effects of Ayani-sabita on humans, the
relationship of personality to Ayani-sabita, and the relationships Ayani-sabita has
with the views of various psychologists.
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