

The archetypal theory of history and the crucifixion of Jesus

Carlos Amadeu Botelho Byington*

Abstract

The archetypal theory of history (BYINGTON, 1983) follows the work of Bachofen and of Neumann with the modification of the concept of the matriarchal archetype as the archetype of sensuality and of the patriarchal archetype as the archetype of organization, both present in the psyche of man and woman and in the cultural Self (BYINGTON, 2013).

This theory describes matriarchal dominance during the nomad life 140 thousand years of pre-history (WATSON,2003) followed by patriarchal dominance begun more than 12 thousand years ago, after the agropastoral revolution, when we became settled societies.

Next, marked by the myth of Budha, about 2,500 years ago and by the myth of Christ, 2.000 years ago, this theory describes the beginning of the mythological civilizing implementation of the alterity (otherness) archetype, whose messianic hero preache for the elaboration of human conflicts through the dialectic of compassion.

Finally, the article elaborates the difficulty of the transcendence of patriarchal dominance in the implementation of the archetype of alterity. In conclusion, the author tries to explain the reason Jesus did not avoid his crucifixion to implant the heroic mission of transforming the patriarchal God of the Old Testament into the Trinity of the New Testament. ■

Keywords
Nomadism, matriarchal archetype, settler's societies, patriarchal archetype, metanoia, alterity (otherness) archetype, anima and animus archetypes, crucifixion.



* Medical doctor, psychiatrist and Jungian analyst. Founding member of SBPA – Brazilian Society for Analytical Psychology. Member of IAAP – International Association for Analytical Psychology. Creator of Jungian symbolic psychology. Educator and historian. E-mail: <c.byington@uol.com.br>. Site: <www.carlosbyington.com.br>.

The archetypal theory of history and the crucifixion of Jesus

In my archetypal theory of history I followed Erich Neumann's works regarding individual development described in his posthumous book *The child* (1955) and also cultural development described in his earlier work *The origins and history of conscience* (1949).

The first difference about my view and Neumann's concepts is that he considers the matriarchal archetype to be the great mother archetype. This excludes the masculine from the original formation of conscience. As I have already pointed out, I find Neumann's perspective reductive because *I conceive the matriarchal archetype as the archetype of sensuality which includes the mother and the father, the feminine and the masculine.*

In the reduction of conscience formation to the great mother archetype as a sole representative of matriarchal sensuality, Neumann followed Johann Jakob Bachofen and his epic work *Mother right* (1861). In this book, Bachofen named *matriarchate* as a stage of history that would precede modern patriarchal dominance which he named *patriarchate*. He associated the matriarchate with the great goddesses in mythology, the feminine, motherhood and with women ruling society.

The fallacy of Bachofen's thesis was decreed when anthropology and archaeology did not find societies ruled by women. And so, after a great academic success in the second half of the nineteenth century, Bachofen's work fell into total discredit.

However, Neumann considered that the idea of the precedence of the matriarchate to the patriarchate was quite valid in psychology and in mythology from an archetypal perspective and argued that Bachofen had failed because he related matriarchate to the real social history.

In this manner, Neumann defended the importance of Bachofen's thesis that matriarchal characteristics precede the patriarchal ones in the formation of collective conscience. His error in my view, in which he repeated in part Bachofen's, was that he continued the reduction of the matriarchal archetype to the great mother archetype,

to the mother role, to the feminine and excluded the father and the masculine from the origins of conscience formation.

Neumann's justification for the matriarchal archetype's reduction to the great mother was based on the supposed mythological exclusivity of mothers on fertility in the primordial period of mythology. This supposition seems to me wrong and reductive because there are many great father gods who also express primordial fertility. If on the one hand we have the great goddesses of fertility represented by Ishtar, Demeter, Isis, Artemis, Aphrodite, Baubo, Gaia, Rea, Yemanjá and many others, on the other hand, we also have great gods of fertility such as Ouranos, Chronos, Ea, Osiris, Xangô, and the great Zeus as main fertilizer in the formation of the olympic pantheon and many others. In the African-Brazilian Yorubá Nago religion, the primordial creative fertility divinities are very well balanced in gender. Among the feminine we have Yemanjá (salt water), Oxum (sweet water), Oíá-lansã (conjugal love and motherhood), Eúa (the thirst mitigator), Nanã (the provider of mud to mold humans), and many others. Among the masculine we have Exu (the sacrifice promoter – *ebó*), Ogum (the discoverer of iron), Oxóssi (the discoverer of hunting), Odudua who can be either masculine (VERGER, 1981) or feminine, creator of the earth (SANTOS, 1976).

As I mentioned above, the traditional psychology based on evolutionism disqualified the primordial emotional mental state of childhood (matriarchal archetype) and elected as superior and mature the principle of reality corresponding to the superego, to the persona and to the patriarchal archetype. I remarked that Neumann was an exception because he considered the primordial stage as an archetype and so the importance of matriarchal archetype throughout life was maintained.

Taking Bachofen's view, Neumann considered the matriarchal archetype as the archetype of the

great mother, maternal and feminine, and left out the masculine and the father from primordial relationships, as well as established an unbalance in the theory of psychological development which must be corrected.

This is the reason why *I changed the meaning of the matriarchal archetype as a synonym of the great mother to the archetype of sensuality, which includes the mother and the father, the masculine and the feminine*. Likewise, I changed the meaning of the patriarchal archetype as a synonym of the father and the masculine archetype to *the archetype of organization*, which also includes the mother and the father, the feminine and the masculine.

Neumann's reduction of the matriarchal to the feminine and of the patriarchal to the masculine was that *he made the same mistake as Bachofen as well as of the traditional psychology which reduced the sensuality of the primary quaterny to the mother, the breast and the feminine followed by the moral organization which was reduced to the paternal complex, to the father and the masculine*.

This reduction of sensuality (Eros and Venus) to the mother and woman and of organization (Logos and Mars) to the father and man, belongs to a circumstantial phase of history (patriarchal domination) which lasted more than 12 thousand years, which must not be considered as a structural psychological reality. On the contrary, it must be transcended together with the domination of the patriarchal polarized worldview so that women and men, mothers and fathers, children of both genders and all cultures can search for the full development of their conscience coordinated by the alterity archetype (anima and animus) within a free democratic perspective. This is what I want to foster with the conceptions of Jungian symbolic psychology (BYINGTON, 2008).

Prehistory

One of the great illustrations that archetypal integration depends on the existential experience is the 130 thousand years duration of domination

in the cultural Self of the matriarchal archetype in the passive position.

Our species has approximately 150 thousand years according to molecular biology (WATSON 2003). During approximately 140 thousand years we were nomadic hunting gathering groups with our conscience coordinated by the insular matriarchal position. *Our lives were centered on the symbols of food and on the feeding structuring function which guided our wanderings* (BYINGTON, 2002). We experienced the matriarchal archetype (sensuality) and elaborated it mostly in the passive position because we only ate what nature gave us. During centuries we integrated matriarchal sensuality little by little in the active position by improving tools for fighting and weaving, making clothes, pottery, hunting and fishing. These tools were also used to fight against rival groups. We used fire for cooking and to keep wild animals away. Magic was practiced for everything because the ego-other polarity was lived in such intimate and symbiotic way that the ego could treat the other as part of its own imagination and desire. For the same reason, religiosity was lived on pantheism where everything is sacred and subordinated to the wholeness in a "participation mystique" (LÉVI-BRÜHL, 1936). Feeling was inherent to intimacy and intuition, permanently relating the conscious and the unconscious dimensions.

During thousands of years sexuality was not associated with pregnancy and to the paternal function. Men were brothers, protectors, lovers, hunters and fighters but not fathers. Women had children and procreated with different men without associating them with sexuality and pregnancy. The aim of life was to eat and to roam, in order to search for more food, to have sexual intercourse, to sing and dance religious rituals, to escape from wild animals, to fight rival groups and survive.

During these 140 thousand years of matriarchal dominance mostly in the passive position, an integration of the archetype in the active position started slowly. However, permanent access

to food was not acquired and the coordination of the matriarchal archetype remained dominantly in the passive position. In this way, our species was merely one among countless others.

The historian Yukal Noah Harari (2011), suggests that a mutation occurred in our DNA around 70 thousand years ago which had caused the cognitive revolution. *From then on our metaphorical capacity would have increased greatly so that we became capable of forming extensive community groups united and guided by ideas.*

The agropastoral revolution The first metanoia of the archetypal theory of history

Around twelve thousand years ago we began to plant and raise animals, mainly cattle, horse, sheep and goats. Dogs were domesticated long before. *That meant the integration of the insular position of the matriarchal archetype in the active position and the activation of the patriarchal archetype in the passive position.*

After participating in the creativity of nature during more than 130 thousand years we finally learned to imitate it: digging holes in the soil, sticking seeds in them and producing our own food. After such a long time of searching for food in nomadic life, we realized a social revolution which finally subdued nature, controlled food production and we became settlers. In doing so, we surpassed most other species and began to dominate and change the life of our planet.

The energy saved from the end of the exhaustive activity of a nomadic lifestyle was applied to the next great problem of humankind which was the organization of our communitarian social daily life as settlers. This extraordinary social challenge activated intensely the patriarchal archetype, the archetype of organization. It is difficult for us to imagine the grandiosity of this metanoia which is the acquisition of self-sufficiency in feeding and the creativity of the archetypal organization of the social life.

One result of patriarchal communal organization of settled social life was the formation of

village and small towns followed by cities. Many new structuring functions were activated like organization of individual territory, private property and heritage centered on the patriarchal family as the social cell. By then, sexuality was fully related to procreation and the father and mother roles were firmly established in the family. The incest taboo, feminine virginity before marriage and the legal prohibition of feminine adultery became political norms. Patriarchal communitarian social organization divided society in socioeconomic classes subordinated to government which in time formed the idea of the state (ENGELS, 1884).

The organization function of the patriarchal archetype abstracts from the symbiotic (ego-other) insular matriarchal position (participation mystique) and relates such abstracted polarities to form systems. Its abstracting and organizing function is very much reinforced by *the structuring functions of power and aggression to maintain, tradition, order, private property and social inequality. This rigid patriarchal organization was immensely productive to rule society and to dominate nature and nations either in times of peace or war. The patriarchal worldview organized all polarities hierarchically in such a way that the inferior-superior polarity, reinforced by the structuring functions of aggression and power, became a common denominator to all systems of conscience.*

All polarities suffered this hierarchical elaboration and were integrated in conscience according to the superior-inferior connotation. All natural forces had to be dominated and organized with the superior-inferior connotation of power and control (ADLER, 1914).

The five archetypal ego-other positions (intelligences) of consciousness

The hero archetype is a great auxiliary of the structuring function of the central archetype (BYINGTON, 2002). It acts differently in each of the five archetypal intelligences of the Self. As described before, they are the following: the unitary

non-discriminated (uroboric) ego-other position of the central archetype, the binary insular ego-other position of the matriarchal archetype, the ternary polarized ego-other position of the patriarchal archetype, the quaternary dialectic ego-other position of the alterity archetype, which includes the anima and the animus archetypes, and finally the unitary contemplative ego-other position of the totality archetype (BYINGTON, 2008).

Reinforcing the implantation of the polarized position of the patriarchal archetype, the hero archetype expressed many extraordinary deeds in conquering the natural planetary forces, crossing oceans, discovering the North and South Poles and climbing the highest mountains. Its most daring and even suicidal deeds happened in the social dimension in the battlefield, fighting enemies, conquering nations and dying in the name of duty and for the sake of glory. The function of the hero archetype reinforcing the patriarchal archetype in mythology wrongly suggested to the academic world that the patriarchal hero was the only possible pattern to express the hero (CAMPBELL, 1949).

Following Freud, I describe the formation of defenses, pathology, and shadow and of evil through the fixation of normal structuring functions. It is the concept of fixation, of defense, of complex and of shadow which allows us to understand how the patriarchal archetype was capable of creating and of organizing so many extraordinary good discoveries for the benefit of civilization and, at the same time, implant so much evil in destruction, bloodshed and horror (Byington 2006).

After many thousands of years patriarchal organization has shaped frontiers, societies, cultures, conquered the Earth, reigned and transformed most species of its fauna and flora. Its extreme form of domination is through war and genocide, which stains with blood, man slaughter, bravery, cowardice, shame and horror the most glorious chapters of "civilized" history.

Patriarchal organization has shaped a worldview systematically hierarchical in such a way that modern societies are profoundly divided between

the rich and the poor, between the economic, political and military elite and the majority of the people. Minorities are stigmatized, dominated and, when rebelled, frequently crushed. Patriarchal worldview separated all polarities and established a clear discrimination favoring one pole and disfavoring the other according to the capacity of power and aggression. *The polarities man-woman and adult-children were heavily affected.* The physical power of men and of adults clearly established a relationship of domination and oppression in patriarchal dominated societies. In spite of the slow implantation of alterity (otherness) in the economic, political and social dimensions in the search for democratic socialism, patriarchal control still resists intensely to the implantation of freedom, equality, sustainability and social love brought by the dialectic position of the alterity archetype.

The implantation of the archetype of alterity (otherness)

The myths of Buddha and of Christ

After thousands of years of patriarchal domination during which nations and empires were formed, enslaved and destroyed, social classes became firmly established and the rigid mentality of tradition, family, property and inequality was incorporated into collective consciousness.

As the time went on, patriarchal domination and its hero grew extraordinarily powerful. Their fixation and shadow of bloodshed and exploitation of nature and of society began to appear in each century more threatening to the survival of the species (LOVELOCK, 1979). The progressive exhaustion of natural resources, overpopulation, the growing destructivity of heavy weaponry, the elite privileges and the poverty of the people in the major part of societies, the pollution of nature, climate dysfunctions, corruption and organized crime, all began to threaten our survival. The greatest issue which revealed itself within the patriarchal dimension was exactly due to its power of organization which had secured its successful expansion. It was the solution of conflict

by aggression and in extreme cases by war which in time became a clear demonstration of the patriarchal domination. It was obvious that the increasing destructive power acquired by rival nations would make the world confrontations impossible to be expressed in a creative way.

An emblematic collision occurred in the beginning of our era when the gigantic Roman Empire occupied the Middle East and enslaved Israel. Both cultures expressed a very organized patriarchal development which was extremely differentiated. Rome had submitted a great part of the world through military power and Israel had accumulated one of the oldest traditions of military deeds, refined culture and spiritual life, all registered in the Old Testament and based on the union with God and this was incompatible with slavery. *Their armed confrontation and the eminence of genocide of the Israelites created an extraordinary tension in the cultural Self of Israel which activated very intensely two archetypes and two heroic representations of the Messiah myth which are both traditional in Jewish culture* (BRIERRE-NABONNE, 1933).

The messianic myths are very old in Jewish mystical tradition and deal with autonomy, glory, military domination but also salvation, death, resurrection, and with the union of opposites in the Godhead (BRIERRE-NARBONNE, 1933).

The messianic patriarchal archetype in Jewish mysticism was activated in the beginning of our era based on the glorious patriarchal tradition which had been structured since the Exodus from Egypt, the revelation of the Ten Commandments in the desert and the long journey to the Promised Land. The military glory came from the brilliant monarchies of Saul, David and Solomon. In many messianic patriarchal prophecies, the patriarchal Messiah is the King David himself (BRIERRE-NARBONNE, 1933).

Such strong patriarchal tradition dominated the Synedrion, the government of the Israeli community. The majority of the people followed the patriarchal tradition identified with the feeling of armed rebellion against Rome. It longed for the

archetypal messianic patriarchal hero with its glorious connotation of sacrificial death in battle.

However, a very different messianic hero was also activated in the Jewish cultural Self. It belonged to Jewish messianic tradition, but instead of the solution of conflicts by aggression and power, it prophesied compassion and peaceful interaction to elaborate conflict. It preached affectionate and compassionate relationship to face disagreement and to substitute power for love to avoid repression (BRIERRE-NARBONNE, 1933).

This position of ego-other relationship to elaborate human conflict clearly belongs to a different archetype from the polarized ego-other organizing position of the patriarchal archetype. I named it the archetype of alterity (otherness), because alter means "the other" in latin and it is of common usage in latin rooted languages.

The alterity archetype is expressed by the ego-other in the quaternary dialectical position. It is fundamentally different but reunites either the insular ego-other binary position of the patriarchal archetype, which is coordinated by sensuality and desire, as the ternary patriarchal polarized position of the patriarchal archetype which is coordinated by organized hierarchy based on power and domination. In order to operate fully in its complex and profound way, the intelligence of alterity needs to encompass the structuring capacity of the matriarchal and patriarchal archetypes and of all opposites. The ego-other position of the alterity archetype is quaternary because it is coordinated by compassion and equality. *The ego can assert itself and has the right to disagree with the other and also to point out its shadow.* In the same way, the other may disagree with the ego and also point out its shadow. It encompasses the anima and animus archetypes described by Jung as the leading archetypes (psychopomps). Alterity (otherness) coordinate development in the individuation process in order to transcend patriarchal domination of the individual and of the cultural Selves, *which makes it the archetype of the second metanoia the archetypal theory of history.*

Following Erich Neumann in the description of the archetypal formation of conscience (NEUMANN, 1949), we see that he described the coordination of collective consciousness by the matriarchal archetype followed by the patriarchal archetype *and succeeded them by what he called the transformation myth which he illustrated by the Egyptian myth of Osiris*. Although Neumann was very creative to bring in the myth of Osiris in order to go beyond the patriarchal myth through the theme of death and rebirth, he side-stepped the mythological sequence of western culture. In this way, even though he remained in the mythological archetypal perspective to describe post-patriarchal cultural transformation, *Neumann ignored the central role of the Christian myth in western culture and in so doing, lost the sense of real history*.

The myth which dominantly coordinated the implantation of the patriarchal archetype in western culture was exuberantly illustrated by the Old Testament. Its transformation with the implantation of the alterity archetype was illustrated by the New Testament and the myth of Christ. By choosing the myth of Osiris to express this transformation, Neumann did not follow the factual historical connection between myth and culture.

Although myths express archetypes and archetypes are universal, they have a historical sequence and cannot be interpreted out of it as Neumann did. When he chose the myth of Osiris to express the transformation of patriarchal domination in western culture, he brilliantly brought in the alterity archetype with its theme of death and resurrection to approach the post-patriarchal transformation in Egyptian mythology. Unfortunately, in so doing, he abandoned the real historical mythological path in western culture. Although Neumann was as usual brilliantly creative, he went astray by suggesting the Egyptian myth of Osiris to express the implantation of the alterity archetype in the mythological formation of western conscience. The myth of this transformation is the myth of Christ. It is clear that the New Testament

is the mythological way which continues and transcends the Old Testament.

The myths which showed the historical development of conscience in both West and East in order to transcend patriarchal domination were respectively the myth of Christ and the myth of Buddha.

The Buddha myth expressed the cultural implantation of the dialectic ego-other position of the alterity archetype in India through the functions of compassion and desire detachment, five hundred years before the myth of Christ.

The implantation of the alterity archetype through the myth of the Buddha was not as tragic and brutal as the hero myth in Christianity which needed to crucify the hero for its implantation. The explanation can be in the fact that India already had a significant acceptance of the exuberance of the matriarchal archetype much greater than Jewish culture and also because Buddha is the ninth avatar of Vishnu. The eighth avatar lived in the myth of Krishna who developed dialectically the relation of opposites (ego-other) to a high degree, mainly the masculine and the feminine in the marriage of the Krishna shepherd with Rahda. Their love story goes far beyond the limitation of the relation of opposites (ego-other) in the traditional polarized patriarchal position and prepared greatly the revelation of the messianic myth of Buddha.

The first archetypal era in the archetypal theory of history lasted 140 thousand years and ended with the agropastoral revolution. From then on it was developed the second archetypal era of the patriarchal domination which I have conceived *as the first metanoia in the archetypal theory of history*.

The concept of cultural metanoia follows Jung's conception of metanoia employed by him to describe the individual midlife archetypal crisis of the individuation process. I use it here in cultural transformation because *I consider as metanoia a change of archetypal dominance whether in the individual or in the collective development of conscience*. The mythological activation of the alterity

archetype expressed in the myth of Buddha and of Christ was intensified respectively 2.500 e 2.000 years ago. *Its integration in the collective consciousness is in the beginning of the second metanoia.* This integration is seen in the exercise of ego-other position in the democratic dialectic alterity pattern. It oscillates progressively and regressively with the domination of the polarized patriarchal position and of the matriarchal sensual position.

The first metanoia was much more distinct than the second one because of the decisive concrete effects of the agropastoral revolution. The second metanoia is still beginning because of the difficulty for the alterity archetype to include and surpass the matriarchal and the patriarchal patterns. The difficulty is, above all, to detach from the magic-mythic worldview widely present in the matriarchal and in the effort to transcend the attachment in the power function of the patriarchal archetype.

The Israel-Roman conflict in its most intense confrontation included the crucifixion of the alterity heroic Messiah. The conflict ended thirty seven years later with the foreseen genocidal massacre of Jewish messianic patriarchal heroism, followed by the second destruction of the temple of Solomon, and the Diaspora (scattering) of the Jewish people (70 A.D.).

Within the archetypal theme of the Resurrection of the heroic Messiah of alterity, Helen, mother of emperor Constantin (272-337 A.D.), went to Jerusalem in 310 A.D., converted to Christianity, and returning to Rome, she influenced the conversion of her son. Says one legend that on the early eve of the battle of Milvia Bridge, in 312 A.D., between Constantin and his brother Magentio for the leadership of the empire, Constantin had a dream and saw a fired cross with the words "with this sign you will win" (*cum hoc signo vincet*). Following his dream, the legend relates that Constantin ordered that a cross should be painted on the shield of his soldiers. Having defeated his brother and unified the empire, Constantine the Great went on to accept officially the Christian faith and in the

Milan Edict, in 313 A.D., decreed the interrupting of the persecution of Christians. From then on Christianity grew intensely and became the official religion of the empire under Emperor Theodosius in 350 A.D. *That which was lost to patriarchal power, was won through the miracle of faith of alterity, in the Resurrection.* This miracle expresses the archetypal transcendent function of the Self (JUNG, 1916).

The organization of the Church having as model roman imperial tradition greatly influenced the defensive patriarchalization of Christianity. *I consider it defensive because the dialectic alterity essence of the Christian message was in many dimensions fixated and dominated regressively by the polarized patriarchal position. People were imprisoned tortured and killed during centuries in the name of Christ* (BYINGTON, 1991).

The persecuted became persecutors and punishers of heretics (the Greek word *haireis* comes from the verb *hairein* which means to choose, referring to those who disagree with doctrinal standards). Although the persecutions only became institutionalized under the inquisition by Pope Gregory IX in 1231, and acquired the right to use torture to obtain confession in 1252, under Pope Innocence IV, (THE NEW ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA, 1993). Synagogues were burned in Israel in 350 A.D. and the Spanish Bishop Priscilian was condemned as heretic and burned in 385 A.D. (THE NEW ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA, 1993). It is very meaningful that the last decapitation of a woman for witchcrafting occurred in Glarus, Switzerland, as late as June 18, 1782 (ZILBOORG, 1941).

Although the Holy Mass with the full passion of Jesus is celebrated in the Catholic Church until today, the Inquisition and the Holy Office illustrate the defensive patriarchalization of the Christian myth during many centuries. In this sense it seems possible that many Christians do not yet understand the meaning of the Christian myth.

Following the function of the Resurrection expressed in the myth, the archetype of alterity continued to be integrated in collective conscience

in the divided Church. In spite of the defensively patriarchalized aspect of the myth which coordinated the Church in political alliances and military actions such as the Crusades and the genocidal repression of the albigensis and the cataris, the inner life of the monasteries elaborated profoundly the suffering of Jesus, to feel the pain of his wounds and the reason why he let Himself be imprisoned, tortured, and crucified.

After five decades of elaboration I came to the conclusion that the way Jesus chose to denounce, repudiate and transcend the cruelty of patriarchal repression was His crucifixion. I think that His sacrifice should not be compared to Abraham's offering Isaac in holocaust. On the contrary, because in Isaac's holocaust, Abraham experienced total agreement and submission to the Godhead, while through his sacrifice, Jesus denounced and separated from the archetypal repressive patriarchal God of the Old Testament to transform it in the Trinity through His sacrifice, His death and Resurrection.

Within the Trinity of the Son, the Father and the Holy Ghost in the New Testament, the Son sacrificed Himself to save and transform the father, not to replace him through parricide as was the custom in patriarchal tradition but through compassion to detach and reunite with Him within love the dialectical quaternary relationship of the archetype of alterity.

In the second millennium of our era, the elaboration of the Christian myth continued in extroversion and the monasteries became universities. The experimental method and the relation to error followed the dialectical pattern which had been lived and practiced in confession during the elaboration of sin. Many began to elaborate sin as a psychological traumatic event (Freud's fixation) which could be cured by confession and repentance (through psychological work). The conscience examination in monastic life trained the mind to recognize the shadow as a sin and an error as well as to elaborate its fixations as a condition for redemption. Simultaneously the older monks, who acted as spiritual guides, admitted that they too were subject to temptation

and sin (SAINT JOHN OF THE CROSS, 1578/79). In this manner, the ethical function came to be lived in the dialectical quaternary position of the alterity archetype which centuries afterwards became a pattern to elaborate fixations (sin, symptom and error) within the transference in dynamic psychotherapy (BYINGTON, 1983).

The conflict between the defensive patriarchalization of the myth and the dialectic quaternary position of the alterity archetype became to be experienced in the daily interpretation of the relationship between the Earth and the sun. The conflict occurred initially in the study of the heavens, exactly where the projections of the Godhead (the central archetype) were highly concentrated.

In 1543, Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543) described a new relationship between the Earth and the sun which was contrary to the millenary tradition adopted as truth by the Church. Contrary to traditional astronomy which confirmed the Holy Scriptures, Copernicus inverted traditional knowledge and described the Earth rotating around itself and around the sun. He not only radically contradicted the Church, which was heresy, but even more serious and important than that, he based his formulation of truth on a method of direct observation of nature which included necessarily *the permanent modification and correction of the positions of the ego and of the other during research (elaboration)*. This meant that the search for truth had to admit and correct error (sin) both in the part of the ego as well as the other. This procedure was something unheard of in the esoteric practice of knowledge which has been oriented by the magic-mythic mentality of the insular matriarchal position since immemorial times. The main change was that the traditional method of the search for truth based on esoteric revelation and appearance gave place to the direct observation of the forces relation within the phenomena.

It so happened that Copernicus' method coincided with the dialectical method practiced for centuries – the examination of conscience in the monasteries – to identify sin and ransom through

*confession and repentance those sinful symbols (fixated) which separate Christians from Christ. Both the introspective monks and the extroverted scientists were relating respectively to sin and error within the dialectic quaternary pattern of the alterity archetype. The monks were protected by the secret introversion of the monasteries; but not the scientists, because they published their ideas openly to collective conscience. Copernicus was perfectly aware of his heresy and waited for his deathbed in 1543 to publish the last version of his book *On the revolutions of the heavenly spheres* which described the heliocentric system. Copernicus' method was not only "a" heresy. It was "the greatest of all heresies". So great that it defeated the canonic interpretation of the heavens by geocentrism and in doing so, invalidated scientifically the right of religion to state the truth of reality which opened the way to separate religion from the state in many modern countries.*

The Church continued to fight and persecute scientists during 250 years until it was finally defeated in the French Revolution (1789 A.D.). The battles between the scientific heresy and the Church lasted 246 years. Unfortunately, even today, most historians of science and of religion view the conflict between science and religion as a conflict between faith and rationalism. Much to the contrary. *It was a mythological battle within faith between the genuine essence of the Christian myth expressed by science and its defensive patriarchalization expressed by canonic law created by the Holy Office in the Inquisition.*

However, the cultural integration of the archetype of alterity, and the history of modern science have not as yet been associated with the Christian myth. *My conception is that science was the greatest of all heresies and separated itself from the Church because it continued to express the essence of the myth while the Church patriarchalized and deformed it.*

However the catastrophic separation of science from the Church (1789) was the fact that *the western cultural Self-suffered a severe pathologic dissociation between the subjective and the ob-*

jective dimensions. Science equated the truth with the objective dimension and identified the subjective dimension with error, irrationality, superstition and even quackery. *In this way, science created the defensive dissociation of materialism and expelled the subjective dimension from the university.* Tragically for humanism within the subjective dimension, other structuring functions were also separated from the scientific perspective such as humanist ethics, feeling, intuition, hope and faith. The materialist dissociation, positivism and dialectic materialism were disseminated together with the scientific dissociated perspective to the rest of the planet within globalization.

The materialist dissociation developed extraordinarily the objective dimension in science and has gone as far as discovering the theory of relativity, quantum physics and atomic fission with its genocidal capacity. The development of the subjective dimension within scientific humanism lagged far behind the objective and could not avoid the genocide of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The United Nations does a most valuable work to reunite the subjective and the objective and to protect human rights, in spite of being challenged by enormous resistances.

The XIX century developed much progress to heal the subjective-objective wound present in the dissociation of cultural and planetary Selves. The study of the subjective dimension in the normal and in the pathological psychologic dimension have been of a great value. However, in all disciplines such as medicine, sociology, anthropology, archeology, economics, education and politics among many others, we encounter the battle for control between the polarized patriarchal position generally fixated and defensive and the dialectic quaternary position of the alterity archetype frequently also fixated and defensive (BYINGTON, 2004). The polarized patriarchal position is frequently defensive when it is disguised as the dialectic quaternary relationship of alterity to appear politically correct. The dialectical alterity position presents itself defensively generally in demagoguery and populism which is the main social and

political disease of democracy, and in “savage” capitalism disguised as “liberal”.

The progressive implantation of the alterity archetype is bringing much progress to the study of the development of conscience which is the central theme of *Jungian symbolic psychology* (BYINGTON, 2008). I stress the new concept of identity formation of man, woman, masculine, feminine, father, mother, child, adult, marriage, society and their fixations, defense and shadow

formation, in order to understand and foster the implantation of the quaternary dialectic alterity archetype which is here conceived as the symbolic way to elaborate the shadow and lead humanity away from social misery, individual and collective destructivity and evil towards love freedom, social welfare, equality, sustainability, compassion and Self-realization. ■

Recebido em: 9/3/2016

Revisão: 29/7/2016

Resumo

Uma explicação arquetípica da crucificação de Jesus pela teoria arquetípica da história

Minha teoria arquetípica da história (BYINGTON, 1983) segue os passos de Bachofen e de Neumann com a modificação do conceito do arquétipo matriarcal para o arquétipo da sensualidade, e do arquétipo patriarcal para o arquétipo da organização, ambos presentes na psique da mulher, do homem e do Self cultural (BYINGTON, 2013).

Essa teoria descreve a dominância matriarcal durante a vida nômade dos primeiros 140 mil anos da história (WATSON, 2003) e a dominância patriarcal iniciada após a revolução agropastoril, mais de 12 mil anos atrás, quando nos tornamos povos assentados.

A seguir, marcada pelos mitos do Buda, há 2.500 anos, e do Cristo, há 2 mil anos, essa teoria descreve o início da implantação mitológica e civilizatória do arquétipo da alteridade, cujos heróis messiânicos pregam a elaboração dos confrontos humanos pela dialética da compaixão.

Finalizando, o artigo elabora a dificuldade da transcendência da dominância do arquétipo patriarcal para a implantação do arquétipo da alteridade. Concluindo, o autor tenta explicar a razão para Jesus não haver evitado Sua crucificação na implantação da missão heroica para transformar o deus patriarcal, do Velho Testamento, na Trindade, do Novo Testamento. ■

Palavras-chave: nomadismo, arquétipo matriarcal, sociedades assentadas, arquétipo patriarcal, metanoia, arquétipo da alteridade, arquétipos da alma e do animus, crucificação

Referências bibliográficas

- ADLER, A. (1914). *Individual psychology*. New Jersey: Rowman and Allanheld, 1973.
- BACHOFEN, J. J. (1861). Mother right. In: *Myth, religion and mother right*. Selected writings of J. J. Bachofen. New York: Princeton University Press, 1967.
- BRIERRE-NARBONNE, J.-J. *Les prophéties messianiques de l'Ancien Testament dans la littérature juive*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1933.
- BYINGTON, C. A. B. A symbolic theory of history: the Christian myth as the main structuring symbol of the alterity pattern in western culture. *Junguiana: Journal of Brazilian Society of Analytical Psychology*, Petrópolis, n. 1, p. 120-177, 1983.
- BYINGTON, C. A. B. Preface to *Malleus Maleficarum: The Witches' Hammer (1484)*, by Heinrich Kramer and James Sprenger. Rio de Janeiro: Rosa dos Tempos – Record, 1991.
- BYINGTON, C. A. B. (2002). *Creative envy: the rescue of one of civilization's major forces*. Wilmette: Chiron Publications, 2003.
- BYINGTON, C. A. B. (2004). *Education from the heart: a Jungian symbolic perspective*. Wilmette: Chiron Publications, 2010.
- BYINGTON, C. A. B. (2006a). *Jungian symbolic psychopathology*. São Paulo: Linear B, 2006.
- BYINGTON, C. A. B. (2008). *Jungian symbolic psychology. The voyage of humanization of the cosmos in search of enlightenment*. Wilmette: Chiron Publications, 2012.
- BYINGTON, C. A. B. *The journey of being in search of eternity, and peace. The seven archetypal stages of life according to Jungian symbolic psychology*. São Paulo, 2013.
- CAMPBELL, J. (1949). *The hero with a thousand faces*. 2nd edition. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- COPERNICUS, N. (1543). *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium (On the revolutions of the heavenly spheres)*.
- ENGELS, F. (1884). *The origins of the family, private property and the State*. New York: Penguin Classics, 2010.
- HARARI, Y. N. (2011). *Sapiens, a brief history of humankind*. Londres: Harvill Secker, 2014.
- JUNG, C. G. (1916). *Transcendent function*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960. (Collected works, v. 8).
- LEVY-BRÜHL, L. *L'expérience mystique et les symboles chez les primitifs*. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1936.
- LOVELOCK, J. E. (1979). *Gaia: a new look at life on Earth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- NEUMANN, E. (1955). *The child*. New York: Putnam's and Sons, 1970.
- NEUMANN, E. (1949). *The origins and history of consciousness*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1954.
- SANTOS, J. E. (1976). *Os Nagô e a morte*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1977.
- ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS (1578/79). *The dark night of the soul*. New York: Penguin Books, 2004.
- THE NEW ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA, Chicago: Ency. Brit. Inc, 1993.
- VERGER, P. F. Orixás. Salvador: Corrupio, 1981.
- WATSON, J. D.; BERRY, A. *DNA: the secret of life*. New York: Random House Inc., 2003.
- ZILBOORG, G.; HENRY, G. W. *A history of medical psychology*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1941.