

Introduction: From Objective Facts to Historical Imagination

Historiography as a science appeared in the 19th century. By then tradition of the western historiography had fallen into the domain of the Muse Clio, one of the twelve daughters of mythic Titaness Mnemosyne. Its main representatives were singers-bards-poets like Hesiod or Homer whose insight induced by Clio would be today classified with the use of psychologico-religious terms as trance, vision, ecstasy and whose „historiography“ thus consisted of significant dose of subjectivity, sensibility and not on what we could consider scientific „objectivity“. What Ruth Meyers labels as „imaginative leap into the past“ or „trance-portation“¹ was a highly subjective psychological process requiring deep dive into the unconscious levels of psyche which was frequently understood as a contact with the dead ancestors or gods watching „sacred“ past.

Contact with what we call „past“ is not only highly ideological, political, practical and empirical matter, but also – and perhaps more importantly – psychological, spiritual and thus subjective affair. Searching for the „past“ was and frequently is highly psychological, e.g. subjective issue, searching for identity. Those who served Muse Clio were frequently trying to answer questions of origin, identity, destiny...Where are we from? Where are we coming from? Ancient story-tellers of pre-literate societies like Domodocus or Tiresias and their way of speaking to and listening to Mother-Memory, Mnémosyné are highly inspiring.

Regardless of what sort of education the given historian received, he or she is contacting deeper levels of collective memory and thus the archetypal or collective psyche. The history of Memory does not start in books but in the countryside, dwellings, settlements, sacred places, groves, sanctuaries, paths, crossroads, trees, forests. It is firmly embedded in oral culture, e.g. songs, riddles, tales, tellings, proverbs, fairy tales, myths where collective imagery became vivid and almost palpable.

Having said that, we found ourselves in the domain of psychology and its connection with history. Search for sure-footed „hard facts“ made many historians to miss out this link with psychology, depreciate, forget or deny it, but the fact is that the historiography touches many very sensitive psychological matters of individual and collective memory and identity and inevitably contains quite considerable dose of mythology.

It seems that it was rather psychology than history that was first aware of above mentioned „realities“.² In this respect great stimulus came from German romanticism. Inspired by romantic cultural production depth psychology noticed deep link between mythology and psychology. Consequently, unconscious material started being considered mythological. Already in 1897 Freud wrote to Wilhelm Fliess: *„Can you imagine what „endopsychic myths“ are? The latest product of my mental labor. The dim inner perception of one’s own psychic apparatus stimulates thought illusions, which of course are projected onto the outside and, characteristically,*

¹ MEYER, Ruth. *Clio’s Circle. Entering the Imaginal World of Historians*. New Orleans, Louisiana: Spring Journal Books, 2007.

² MASON, Moussaieff Jeffrey (ed.). *Freud, Sigmund. The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess, 1887-1904*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985, p. 286.

into the future and the beyond. Immortality, retribution, the entire beyond are all reflections of our psychic internal [world]. Mechugge? Psycho-mythology."³ In his letter to Albert Einstein Freud stated: „It may perhaps seem to you as though our theories are a kind of mythology and, in the present case, not even an agreeable one. But does not every science come in the end to a kind of mythology like this? Cannot the same be said to-day of your own Physics?“⁴ Freud's disciple C. G. Jung speaks of „the matrix of a mythopoetic imagination which has vanished from our rational age“, e.g. imagination suppressed by Enlightenment culture, but it still exists: „such imagination is present everywhere“, but „it is both tabooed and dreaded“.⁵

For sure, there was certain „rationality obsession“ in psychology as well. There were significant attempts to secularize psychic life until then permeated by what was called and considered divine, semi-divine, diabolic forces, demons and spirits. One of such attempts was to de-spiritize or totally eliminate whatever was till then understood as Soul, attempts whose main exponent was Friedrich Albert Lange and his concept of *Psychologie ohne Seele*.⁶ It seems, however, that psychology remained a domain where the influence of romanticism continued so strong that the „soul secularization“ was never completed.

In the second half of the 20th century C. G. Jung's disciple and critic James Hillman observed that „Mythology is a psychology of antiquity. Psychology is a mythology of modernity“.⁷ In its ground-breaking book *Re-Visioning Psychology* (1975) this mythopoetic concept of psyche became point of departure of his (critique) theory of science: „Even sober operational definitions in the language of science or logic are no less metaphorical than an image which presents the archetypes as root ideas, psychic organs, figures of myth, typical styles of existence, or dominant fantasies that govern consciousness. (...) They are [archetypal/ mythic images] the axiomatic first principles, the models or paradigms, that we find in other fields. For ‚matter‘, ‚God‘, ‚energy‘, ‚life‘, ‚health‘, ‚society‘, ‚art‘ are also fundamental metaphors (...) which hold worlds together (...).“⁸

Hillmanian principle „stick to the image“ needs to be applied not only to dreams and unconscious material of produced by clients but also to images produced by scientific disciplines, political doctrines and ideologies, arts. Recently this principle appears to be revolutionary not only for its application in individual disciplines (including historiography), but also it offers considerable multidisciplinary perspective.

³ ADAMS, Michael Vannoy. *The Mythological Unconscious*. New York: Putnam Publications, 2nd revised ed., 2010, note 6, p. 20.

⁴ ADAMS, ref. 3, p. 20.

⁵ JAFFÉ, A. (ed.). Jung, C. G. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (trans. R. And C. Winston). New York: Pantheon Books, 1963, p. 188.

⁶ Today academic psychology and most schools of psychotherapy deliberately avoid the concept of soul. The soul is left to poets, lovers and romantic moments. Those who want to speak about soul in academy prefer term „psyche“ because it seems scientific. In academy and western intellectual tradition it was Friedrich Albert Lange who declared demise of the soul using well-known dictum *Psychologie ohne Seele* (Psychology without Soul) in his book *Geschichte des Materialismus* (History of Materialism) from 1866.

⁷ ADAMS, ref. 3, p. 90.

⁸ HILLMAN, James. *Re-Visioning Psychology*. New York: Harper&Row, 1975, p. xiii.

Excepting some lectures, interviews and two essays (*Wotan, After Catastrophe*) Jung never entered the field of historiography, but influenced it indirectly: not only because of his attention given to „pre-scientific thought“ but also because of his reserves to the conquest of modernity. As Christopher Hauke puts it: „*Much like Nietzsche before him, Jung emphasized how on the one hand, modern consciousness has evolved in a specialised way thus enabling the greatest manipulation of the world humans have even seen. On the other hand, however, neglect of the unconscious has resulted in great losses to humanity in the way that the creative potential of the psyche is, at best, ignored in favour of an assumption that progress may be achieved through the application of conscious rationality alone.*“⁹

Later perspective of connecting depth psychology with other disciplines including historiography was well estimated Arnold. J. Toynbee in 1956. As we can see, imagery of Mnemosyne-Memory as an underworld river, depth and well Toynbee viewed as a substratum of conscious collective life: „*As an historian, I can speak only for myself, to my mind, Jung has added a new dimension to history by opening up, for historians, an entry through which they can explore the subconscious depths of psyche. And he has, I believe, done more for history than that. The subconscious is a subterranean river from which the springs of all conscious activities draw their waters. The subconscious is thus the avenue to a comprehensive study of human nature and human affairs.*“¹⁰ What Toynbee is describing here is an essential verticality shared by both historiography and psychology as a theory of soul (*Seelenlehre*: based on the hypothesis of an autonomous mind, *Geist*, as it was understood by Jung, e.g. *Psychologie mit Seele*) and such a verticality does not have to mean only relation between profane and sacred but also between consciousness and unconscious, individual and collective or, if you will, between *Erfahrung* – *Urerfahrung*.

In 1970s and 1980s above mentioned terrain was further studied and explored. As far as historiography is concerned psychic primordial images or *Urbilder/ Urerfahrungen* as condensed in mythological imagery came into focus. Hillman, Edinger and Neumann delved deep into this domain. Superiority of Oedipus myth as a constituent unconscious myth/image as postulated by Freud was already rejected.¹¹ Hillman¹² or Bion¹³ propose many other myths, e.g. number of various unconscious collective imageries played out in certain historical context.

⁹ HAUKE, Christopher. The Unconscious: personal and collective. In PAPADOPOULOS, Renos K. (ed.). *The Handbook of Jungian Psychology. Theory, Practice and Applications*. London: Routledge 2006, pp. 54-73.

¹⁰ TOYNBEE, Arnold J. The Value of C. G. Jung's Work for Historian. In *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 1956, vol. 1, issue 2, pp. 193-194.

¹¹ This rejection is present already in the introduction to Erich Neumann's, *The Origins and the History of Consciousness*. NEUMANN, Erich. *The Origins and the History of Consciousness*. Bollingen Series XLII, New York: Princeton University Press, 1954, p. xxi.

¹² Eros and Psyche (love), Zeus and Hera (generativity and marriage), Icarus and Daedalus (flying and crafting), Ares (combat, anger, and destruction), Pygmalion (mimesis where art becomes life through desire), Hermes, Aphrodite, Persephone, or Dionysus – then the methods of analysis would be very different and much truer to the diversity of human experiences. ADAMS, Michael Vannoy. *The Archetypal School*. In YOUNG-EISENDRATH, Polly – DAWSON, Terrence (eds.). *The Cambridge Companion to Jung*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 107-124.

¹³ ADAMS, ref. 3, p. 53.

If the 19th-century historiography evolved mainly towards positivist perspective, nascent depth psychology anticipated idea of myth-making ability of human psyche not only on the individual but also on the level of collectives, communities, cultures, religions and civilization. Historians simply ignored deeper levels of psyche, its ability to create and produce images and thus its capacity to „shape“ what we call „reality“ from within. Saying that, it seems that psychological side of Mnemosyne and Clio constitute an unconscious side of modern historiography.

If the „dangerous field“ of human psyche in history and historiography was too challenging for historians, it was not so for psychologists. Freud (*Das Unbehagen in der Kultur*, 1930; Engl. *Civilization and Its Discontents* or *Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of His Childhood*, 1910), Erik Erikson (*Young Man Luther: A Study in Psychoanalysis and History*, 1958), Wilhelm Reich (*The Mass Psychology of Fascism*, 1946), Erich Neumann (*The Origins and the History of Consciousness*; in German 1949, in English in 1954; *The Great Mother. A Analysis of the Archetype*, in English 1955) or Jung took the first challenging steps and progressively also historians like Toynbee (*A Study of History: Contacts Between Civilizations in Time*, 1954 or article *The Value of C.G. Jung's Work for Historian*, 1956), Erik Robertson Dodds (*The Greeks and the Irrational*, 1951) or R. G. Collingwood (*Idea of History*, 1946).

From above it is quite clear that contact between historiography and psychology was not easy. According to some it was somehow incongruous or even dangerous alliance which also shows up in Ruth Meyer's book chapter entitled „*Historial Thought and Depth Psychology – a Recipe for Disaster?*“.¹⁴ Historians like Hunt, Barzun and Stannard „*have addressed why historical thought and depth psychology, which share so much in common ground, have failed to form a successful partnership,*“¹⁵ but the idea of a creative alliance was not abandoned and even received official endorsement. In 1957 William Langer, the President of the American Historical Association, urged that the future historians should use depth psychology in their works.¹⁶

Many responded to Langer's call. In 1960s and 1970s two professional psychohistorical journals were founded. There were also few university departments of history that started accepting candidates for a PhD degree in psychohistory as a field of specialization. But the relation between history and psychology wasn't smooth at all. Many critiques emerged against psychohistorical approach and one of the most persuasive was the one that called attention to psychohistorical reductionism: that all the complex historical phenomena are reduced to one simple root cause – individual psychology. This kind of reductionism was quite visible in studies about Adolf Hitler.¹⁷ In spite of that there was a special awareness of a psychological dimension of historian's creative activity, of historical

¹⁴ MEYER, ref. 1, pp. 11-13.

¹⁵ MEYER, ref. 1, p. 11.

¹⁶ LANGER, William. The Next Assignment. In *American Historical Review* 63, 1958, pp. 283-304 (speech was delivered December 29, 1957 at the annual conference of the American Historical Association).

¹⁷ MEYER, ref. 1, p. 12.

imagination. Ruth Meyer associates historian's creative work with „mysteries of the creative process“:

I am particularly interested in historical imagination. How do historians see into past? How do they enter the mind of an historical figure? Here, I believe, depth psychology and psychology – especially as articulated in the words of Freud and Jung – have something new to offer us.¹⁸

It is quite paradoxical that whereas depth psychology expands to various disciplines and becomes a necessary part of interdisciplinary approaches, historiography does fail to find an adequate footing for such collaboration. Some historians like Harvard university professor John Clive¹⁹ call for such collaboration. The same can be heard from educational theorists and researchers like Sam Wineburg:

Psychologists interested in history have traditionally looked to the extensive body of historiographic writings for clues to the nature of historical thinking ...Historiography teaches us to recognize skilled cognition but gives us scant advice for how to achieve it.²⁰

On the other hand depth psychology contributes to the new wave of autobiographical history. In his autobiographical *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* Jung added to this genre a new dimension: his own personal myth. Moreover, contrary to many historians, he defended his personal mythology, dreams, visions and synchronistic events of his life. Thus Jung – without being aware of that – was helping to found one of new genres (next to postmodernism and feminism). Later this genre was defended by James Hillman who declared that people enter therapy to recover their lost story which is why therapists are – similarly to historians – those who enter Mnemosyne waters. According to Hillman therapists are new historians, those who discover lost soul story.

It seems that during 20th century a rare collaboration between depth psychology a history led to the discovery which was well-known to ancients: that stories can heal. As we will see in further chapters, such a finding is applicable not only to individuals but also to collectives. It does not have to touch only a personal myth but also a collective and national myth.

In the following chapters I will elucidate some psycho-historical theories as they were formulated during 20th century.²¹ Neumann's theory presumes parallelism between collective psyche development and individual psyche, e.g. between phylogenesis and ontogenesis. This development proceeds from the

¹⁸ MEYER, ref. 1, p. 13.

¹⁹ CLIVE, John. *Not by Fact Alone*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989, p. 197.

²⁰ WINEBURG, Sam. *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, p. 51-52.

²¹ It must be emphasized that first psycho-historical theories appeared already in 19th century, The most well-known of them is probably that of Johann Jakob Bachofen (*Das Mutterrecht*) or German ethnopsychology (Steinthal Lazarus, Wundt) and made part in so-called *Volkisch* thought as well.

stage called (1) Uroboros (consciousness in unconscious identification with the unconscious, e.g. nature itself) to the stage (2) when the consciousness leaves the state of identity with Uroboros but at the same time it is subjected to it (it is a stage of birth and dependency) and subsequently (3) to the stage of hero (consciousness emancipated from maternal unconscious) which leads to symbolic killing of archetypal mother. Neumann describes an archetypal process, e.g. transhistorical and collectively psychological process which – because ontogenesis recapitulates phylogenesis – is at the same time individually psychological. It is a history of consciousness. In this sense Neumann is a meta-historian because history can take place only in consciousness, e.g. there is no history without consciousness. Thus development of consciousness fundamentally influences what we call history, life itself, perception of time (cyclicality, linearity), notions of old age, young age, maturity, progress, tradition etc. Because Neumann's theory involves mainly pre-literate societies, he based his research mainly on archaeological findings, artistic and religious objects and mythological material.

In the further part I will pay attention to quite new theory of Wolfgang Giegerich, who „rehabilitates“ notion of Soul (*Seele*) only to take it out both from intimate subjectivism and religious (theological) imagery. As far as general history is concerned Giegerich's research makes fundamental difference between psychological/soul condition of pre-modern man as fundamentally different from modern man. Even though Giegerich does not consider himself Neumann's disciple, I am convinced that Neumann's and Giegerich's *oeuvres* complement each other.

In the final chapter I will introduce reader to the theory of cultural myth based on Jung's diagram of the human psyche from 1926 which started acquiring much detailed and multi-disciplinary elaboration from 1980s. Recently one can witness certain culmination of such an evolution in form of number publications that are attempting to approach national identity from psycho-historical perspective.

Mnemosyne's Springs: Universal Imagery Conditioning

Forgetting threatens to doom the individual to the captivity of amnesia, the loss of one's roots and one's soul. Mythically speaking, forgetting follows in the wake of ignorance, sleep and death. Remembering, on the other hand, is assimilated in all archaic thought and religion, to awakening, enlightenment and immortality. To go back to beginning, as we are often need to do in psychoanalysis or in archetypal psychology, is thus not to seek for a temporal framework for the events of our lives, but to get our bearings within our souls.

Mircea Eliade²²

Psychoanalysis believes that psyche produces mythological motifs as structural elements of herself. These mythological structures do not arise from personal unconscious but from the collective or objective unconscious levels of psyche. It me-

²² ELIADE, Mircea. Myth and Reality. In ASTRACHAN, Gary D. Mnemosyne, The Mother of Muses: The Role of Memory in Greek Mythology and Religion, Part II. In *Quadrant*, p. 76.

ans that psyche is intrinsically mythopoetic and spontaneously connected with the history in a specifically mythopoetic way. What lies behind such mythopoetic structures can be called archetype or archetypal imagery (Jung), *Will* (Schopenhauer) or *Urphänomene* (Goethe), something suspected already by romanticists and clearly expressed by ancients. Unconscious or archetypal imagery – as we would call it today – proves existence of creative transpersonal level of human psyche. As we could see in the introduction, in ancient times it found its creative expression in various forms of human creativity including historiography. Unconscious forces were frequently imagined, personified and mythologized.

According to C. G. Jung *„our myths, legends and fairy tales are carriers of a projected unconscious psyche. [Jung] analogizes this process to the way in which humans have projected meaningful images onto the stars ‚constellated‘ them in forms which are then named. He [Jung] disagrees with the functionalist argument that early man sought to explain natural events by anthropomorphising them. Instead, Jung argues that over millions of years, the psyche, like the body, has adapted to physical events in the environment and produced the mythological material out of a participation mystique where the separation of subject and object is not distinct. And it is not physical phenomena – the thunder or clouds or earthquakes – that remains in the psyche but ‚the fantasies caused‘.*“²³

These ideas were elaborated in detail by Erich Neumann who studied collective unconscious as manifested in human history and arising of conscious contents from the unconscious throughout history. In the first part of his book *The Origins and the History of Consciousness* entitled *Mythological Stages in the Evolution of Consciousness* Neumann exemplifies Jung's theory of archetype when saying that evolution of the consciousness proceeds *„by stages [and] is as much a collective human as a particular individual phenomenon. Ontogenetic development may therefore be regarded as a modified recapitulation of phylogenetic development.*“²⁴ This perspective itself confers to Neumann's *oeuvre* essentially interdisciplinary character. Interdisciplinarity of his work has not been sufficiently recognized. The author himself was aware of that and anticipated: *„An investigation of the archetypal stages also affords a better psychological orientation in a number of ancillary subjects, e.g., the history of religion, anthropology, folk psychology, and the like. All these can then be brought together on a psycho-evolutionary basis which would promote a deeper understanding. (...) these specialized sciences have not so far allowed themselves to be sufficiently enriched by depth psychology (...). (...) the psychological starting point of these disciplines emerges more and more plainly, and it is beginning to become obvious that the human psyche is the source of all cultural and religious phenomena.*“²⁵

According to Neumann *„these developmental stages arrange themselves in an orderly sequence and thus determine all psychic development. (...) these archetypal stages are unconscious determinants and can be found in mythology, and that only by viewing the collective stratification of human development together with the individual stratification of conscious development in general, and individual development in particular.*“²⁶

²³ HAUKE, ref. 9, p. 66.

²⁴ NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. xx. (in German original: *Ursprungsgeschichte des Bewusstseins*, 1949).

²⁵ NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. xvii.

²⁶ NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. xxi.

All Neumann's books link structural and dynamic aspect of collective psyche with (archetypal) image(ry) and its projection to countryside, nature, heavens, gods, events.

a. Neumann: Transhistorical Unconscious Behind Historical Consciousness

Besides possessing an „eternal“ significance, the archetype also has an equally legitimate historical aspect. Ego consciousness evolves by passing through a series „images“ and the ego, transformed in the passage, is constantly experiencing a new relation to the archetypes.

Neumann²⁷

Reading Neumann one becomes immediately aware that behind what is generally called historical facts there are psychic facts. Historico-empirical facts are constituted by psychic facts-images. The direction itself of his *oeuvre* is leading us beyond mere historical facts to the archetypal levels of unconscious. It is this direction that makes Neumann's project essentially romantic and evidences the strength and tenacity of romanticism in the western culture.²⁸

Equiped by his *maître's* theory, knowledge of the world mythology and numerous archaeological findings Neumann plunged deep into the study of unconsciousness during human history. Already his predecessors mentioned romanticism, probably the major cultural movement concerned with the introverted, hidden and sometimes tabooed part of the culture. First of all there was a romantic unspoken thesis about the unity of all nature (as indicated by Schelling's famous idea *Nature is visible Spirit, Spirit is unvisible Nature*) and as Claire Douglas says: „(...) romanticism gave voice to a transcendental yearnings for lost Edens, for the unconscious, and for depth, emotions, and simplicity which, in turn, led to the study of the outer natural world and the soul within.“²⁹

If Leibbrand declares that Jung's system cannot be conceived without Schelling's philosophy³⁰, the same could be said about Neumann. If, according to Jung, unconscious is creative and teleological, the same idea can be found in Neumann. For sure, there is also influence of romantic psychologist-philosopher

²⁷ NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. xvi.

²⁸ Neumann was born in 1905. He was thirty years younger than his *maître* Jung and distinguished himself in both theoretical/philosophical approach to analysis (*The Origins ...*, *The Great Mother*) and more clinical concern. His most important contribution to psychological theory constitutes is concept of „controversion“, but is known mainly because of his theory of feminine development (*The Origins and History of Consciousness*, 1949) where he elucidates interpretations of basic mythologems as they emerge from the collective unconscious and like that define archetypal stages of human consciousness development.

²⁹ DOUGLAS, Claire. *The Historical Context of Analytical Psychology*. In YOUNG-EISENDRATH, Polly – DAWSON, Terrence (eds.). *The Cambridge Companion to Jung*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 19-38.

³⁰ ELLENBERGER, Henri. F. *The Discovery of Unconscious. The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books, 1970, p. 728.

Carl Gustav Carus (1789-1869)³¹ Another influence constitutes Johann J. Bachofen, e.g. his thesis about matriarchy and three historical epochs.³²

In his book *The Great Mother* Neumann defines psychohistory as a study of „stages in the development of the human psyche“:

„If we offend against „history“ by removing documents and representations from their cultural context, we hope to compensate by correlating our archetypal investigation with a „psychohistory“, that is to say, with the stages in the development of the human psyche. Taking the development of consciousness as the decisive phenomena of human history, we arrive at an arrangement of the phenomena that does not, to be sure, coincide with the usual sequence of historical events, but makes possible the psychological orientation we require.“³³

For Neumann existing concept of historiography is obsolete. Neumann rejects purely factographic approach to history because in his view – due to the discovery of unconscious – determinative of mankind history is unconscious, e.g. primordial images gradually emerging from the unconscious. Beside rejecting linear concept of history, Neumann rejects „ordering principle“ as well:

„The old interpretation of history as a straight line, leading from prehistory through antiquity and the Middle Ages to modern times, is no longer accepted. It has given way to a historical consciousness that looks upon the various coexistent and successive cultures as individualities and not as links in a continuous chain. The view makes it possible to do justice to the individual character of each culture, but it is also a symptom of the decline of the

³¹ Carus inspired both philosopher Eduard von Hartmann and later philosophers of unconscious as well as Scherner's theory of dreams. His notion of autonomous, creative and compensatory function of unconscious was to be emphasized fifty years later by Jung. Carus not only proposed triple division of psyche (and thus anticipated Freud and Jung) but also thesis that the unconscious has „prometheic“ and „epimetheic“ aspects, is turned to the past and to the future but does not know anything about present, finds itself in permanent transformation, is indefatigable (it does not need periodic rest), it is healthy (it does not know illness) and disposes of „healing power of Nature“. ELLENBERGER, ref. 29, pp. 207-208.

³² According to Johann J. Bachofen matriarchy was not only a social and political system and involved religion and *Weltanschauung*, all the culture and all aspect of private and social life. Bachofen was convinced that development of mankind passed through different stages: 1) heitarism (period of sexual promiscuity where women were exposed to the brutality of men and children did not know their fathers), 2) matriarchy (established after thousands of struggle where women founded the family and agriculture a wielded social and political power it was a time of freedom, equality and freedom – this stage had various sub-divisions) 3) patriarchy (established after thousands years of struggle) which signified „a complete reversal of the matriarchic political and social organization“. For Bachofen Amazonism and the cult of Dionysus represented passage from hetairism to matriarchy. ELLENBERGER, ref. 28, p. 218-223.

³³ NEUMANN, Erich. *The Great Mother. A Analysis of the Archetype*. New York: Princeton University Press, Bollingen Series XLVII, 1974, p. 89.

*ordering principle that had hitherto enabled European, Christian mankind to regard itself as the culmination and climax of human development.*³⁴

Neumann's theses followed up with Jung's concept of individuation, but Jung never – with very few exceptions³⁵ – applied this concept on wider social groups, communities, nations or humankind. Neumann as Jung's immediate disciple suggests that individuation – simply put, an evolutionary process of becoming whole whose main task consists in integrating unconscious contents – is directed from the unconscious center of the psyche.³⁶ Neumann's ambitious project has a universalist and interdisciplinary claims, but it seems that historians are still quite untouched by his work. His two great books *Origins* and *The Great Mother* still serve for study of evolutionary-dialectical relations between consciousness and unconscious in individual psyche³⁷, but historians have not entered this field yet.

It must be said that Neumann's great *oeuvre* is partly speculative; especially as far as the most distant past of human history is concerned. But similarly to Jung he insists that 1) consciousness is arising from unconscious (personal psyche emerges from transpersonal psyche) which is symbolized by what he calls GREAT ROUND or UROBOROS (in mythology snake eating its tail and thus symbolizing permanent and self-contained vegetal cycle of natural reproduction and renewal). Preeminent symbol of UROBOROS CONSCIOUSNESS is a great round or great circle that in itself contains many other primordial images:

*„One symbol of original perfection is the circle. Allied to it are the sphere, the egg, and the rotundum (...). Circle, sphere, are round are all aspects of the Self-contained, which is without beginning and end; in its prewordly perfection it is prior to any process, eternal, for its roundness there is no before and no after, no time; and there is no above and no below, no space. (...) It is also the perfect state in which the opposites are united – the perfect beginning because the opposites have not yet flown apart and the world has not yet begun (...) The Uroboros appears as the round ‚container‘, i.e., the maternal womb, but also as the union of masculine and feminine opposites, the World Parents joined in perpetual cohabitation.*³⁸

³⁴ NEUMANN, ref. 32, pp. 89-90.

³⁵ Such an exception is of course Jung's short-term interpretation of German nazism during first half of the 1930s. McGUIRE, William – HULL, R. F. C (eds.). *C. G. Jung Speaking. Interviews and Encounters*. New York: Princeton University Press, Bollingen Series XCVII, 1977.

³⁶ Jung and his first disciples considered Self almost a deity. First critic of such perspective was Hillman in the end of 1960s who started emphasizing Psyche, its plural, changeable and fluent character.

³⁷ An excellent prove of my statement is Murray Stein's article entitled „Individuation“ (pp.196-214) or the Warren Colman's article „The Self“ (pp. 153-174). In PAPADOPOULOS, ref. 9, pp. 54-73.

³⁸ NEUMANN, ref. 11, pp. 8-13.

Then 2) consciousness progressively absorbs unconscious contents, emancipates itself from UROBOROS'S containment, passes through archetypal historical stages and acquires independence.³⁹ This process conveys emergence of opposites, freeing from maternal clutch of the very nature and increasing independence which corresponds with the historical process of freeing from Mother Nature through succession of revolutions (cognitive, agricultural, scientific, industrial etc.) and discoveries as expressed through the exploration of the globe, space, world of elementary particles or unconscious, inventions, science, industry but also law, justice etc. Such is the process of consciousness evolution from the unconscious as a universal evolutionary process (even though it does not follow the same pace everywhere) as it is documented in numerous symbolic material findable in mythologies, religious traditions and in psychological material of modern individuals.

As it was already mentioned in the note 24 Neumann is aware that his project is interdisciplinary, but cannot count with the help of other disciplines. At the same time emphasizes, that „(...) *our exposition of myth is not based on any specialized branch of science, whether archaeology, comparative religion, or theology, but simply and solely on the practical work of psychotherapist, whose concern is the psychic background of modern man.*“ It is obvious that expression „*psychic background of modern*“ is a reference to the condition of pre-modern man because „*the connection between his psychology and the deeper layers of humanity still alive in him is therefore the real starting point and subject of this work.*“⁴⁰ This is very important because from the perspective of the depth psychology a collective past – previous phases and levels of psychological development, psychological phylogenesis of mankind – is still present. In other words Mnemosyne-Mother Memory is a Titaness still present within human psyche which is also confirmed by romantic psychologists' idea that the archaic psychological condition is still present in us.⁴¹

According to Neumann psychic contents are either personal or transpersonal and the latter are primary, e.g. historically precede the former and should not be confused with external natural or social conditions, they are rather structural elements.⁴² This is also a reason why „*every history inquiry (...) must therefore begin with the transpersonal.*“⁴³ In Neumann's view at the very beginning of the human race and society there was a preponderance of transpersonal (unconscious)

³⁹ Neumann was convinced that during at least last 10. 000 years the development of the consciousness in the West and Far East was continuous and uninterrupted. But such creative evolution cannot be observed „*in stationary cultures, or in primitive societies where the original features of human culture are still preserved, the earliest stages of man's psychology predominate to such a degree that individual and creative traits are not assimilated by the collective.*“ NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. xix.

⁴⁰ Neumann refers to Jung's legacy and reminds us that his work represents a combination of a comparative method and analytical psychology, NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. xvii.

⁴¹ „*The fascinating aspect of memory (...) is that Mnemosyne, the Goddess, becomes ensouled, encoded in us (...). Additionally, as much as memory and psyche exist within us, so too do we live in Mnemosyne, and in psyche. We live in Memory's body. We live in a dimension of soul as in a medium through which we move, see, smell, taste and breathe.*“ ASTRACHAN, ref. 21, p. 76.

⁴² NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. xix-xx.

⁴³ NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. xx.

factors slowly absorbed by the collective and individual conscious. To take such an attitude was enabled to Neumann, Jung and others by one really factual and provable factor, e.g. the magical power of primordial images (*Urbilder*):

„(...) the early history of the collective is determined by inner primordial images whose projections appear outside as powerful factors – gods, spirits, or demons – which become objects of worship“ whereas in modern times the same collective symbolisms „appearing the individual, and the psychic development, or misdevelopment, of each individual is governed by the same primordial images which man’s collective history.“⁴⁴

Dawn of the ego-consciousness, e.g. civilization or culture is depicted in myths of origin. The initial phase of such myths consists of images that describe wholeness and totality. Such description has a symbolic or mythological form. In other words ego (culture) is totally dominated by these images that exert their power from within: *„There is as yet no reflecting, self-conscious ego that could refer anything to itself, that is, reflect. Not only is the psyche open to the world, it still identical with and undifferentiated from the world; it knows itself as world and in the world and experience its own becoming as a world-becoming, its own images as the starry heavens, and its own contents as the world-creating gods.“⁴⁵* In such a case Neumann speaks about „primordial era“ where *„the unconscious was predominant and consciousness was weak“⁴⁶* and where the human condition was dominated by the archetype of Great Mother/Primordial Mother. Cult of the goddess at those times (Stone Age) was globally widespread. These divinities were linked to the fertility of the earth, Moon cults, Mother-goddess ruled vegetal cycles, the dead (underworld), but also in heavens. To this category pertain figures like Demeter (Greek), Isis (Egyptian), Tiamat (Babylonian) the Virgin Mary (Christian), or triple feminine divinities (Moirae, Hesperides, Hecate etc.), all mirroring three lunar phases/three stages of female life (virgin, mother, widow). As it was already said „Mother“ symbolizes self-enclosed world but her role *„extends far beyond the biological and physical feeding functions (...). Its primary mission is not to feed people materially (...). (...) its main meal is a symbolic and spiritual one. Nurturing institutions are typically represented by mother images.“⁴⁷* According to Neumann at times of UROBOROS (or else matriarchal consciousness) symbolical Motherhood was seen both as a creative and destructive. At that time masculine consciousness was not separated and differentiated from feminine maternal consciousness but it was engulfed by it. This first period of consciousness history Neumann describes using following equation: *woman = body = vessel = world*, equation which expresses very well „feminine mysteries“ (always associated with female body, earth, reproduction, transformation) always containing „spirit“. But as Neumann points out, there is still no *„Apollonian-solar-patriarchal spirit“* which *„present itself as sheer being, as*

⁴⁴ NEUMANN, ref. 11, p.xx.

⁴⁵ NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. 160.

⁴⁶ NEUMANN, ref. 32, p. 90.

⁴⁷ STEIN, Murray. Individuation. In PAPADOPOULOS, ref. 9, pp. 196-214.

pure existence in absolute eternity, but remains „sonlike“⁴⁸ detached from the earth. Masculinity (spirit, individuality, separateness from the earth) – symbolizing disengagement from the Maternal (e.g. nature, instinct, vegetative cycle) – frequently linked with solar deities – takes place within the mythic heroic figure, who overcomes the negative aspect of the maternal:

„The hero's fight is always concerned with the threat to the spiritual, masculine principle from the uroboric dragon, and with the danger of being swallowed by the maternal unconscious. The most widely disseminated archetype of the dragon fight is the sun myth, where the hero is swallowed every evening by the nocturnal sea monster dwelling in the west (...) The hero is always a light-bringer and emissary of the light.“⁴⁹

This revolutionary act is again accompanied by number of primordial images (Urbilder) that express emergence of the conscious ego out of the maternal unconscious:

„the head and the eye occur everywhere as symbols of the masculine and spiritual of consciousness, of „heaven“ and sun. The breath and Logos groups also belong to this canon of symbols, where higher masculinity is distinguished from the lower masculinity of the phallic stage.“⁵⁰

But this path – which should be understood rather symbolically and psychologically and not literally, sociologically – is not linear. The passage to masculine is constituted by several stages (phallic „sonlike“ or „eunuch“ stages where the masculine-conscious is subject to maternal law⁵¹) but with the birth of the solar hero slaying of dragon-Mother (maternal unconscious) takes places, i. e. heroic act which signifies birth of individual conscious described already before Jung by Wilhelm Wundt in his work *Elements der Völkerpsychologie (Elements of Folk Psychology, 1912.)*. Human psychology passes from the maternal instinct to the paternal mind and spirit.⁵²

Maternal aspect of civilization – described by Neumann as strongly linked to instinct, nature and family – slowly and gradually recedes (but never disappears completely), but masculine consciousness slowly overcomes the gravity and the clutch of maternal unconscious:

The matriarchal group with its mass-emotionality between mothers and children, its stronger local ties and its greater inertia, is to a large extent bound to

⁴⁸ NEUMANN, ref. 32, pp. 55.

⁴⁹ NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. 160.

⁵⁰ NEUMANN, ref. 11, pp. 158-159.

⁵¹ „(...) the law by which it is informed [matriarchy] is the law of instinct, of unconscious, natural functioning, and this law subserves the propagation, preservation, and evolution of the species rather than the development of the single individual.“ NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. 147.

⁵² According to Neumann unsuccessful development of such process is exactly what describes in myth of Oedipus, NEUMANN, ref. 11, pp. 162-163.

nature and the instincts. Menstruation, pregnancy, and lactation periods activate the inctinctual side and strengthen woman's vegetative nature, as the psychology of modern woman still shows. In addition, there is the powerful earth-tie which arises with the development of gardening and agriculture by women, and the dependence of these arts upon the natural rhythm. (...) „The matriarchal system of exogamy hinders the formation of male groups, because the men are obliged to marry outside their tribe and thus get dispersed, having to live matrilocally, as strangers in the wife's tribe. (...) when, as was originally the case, he lives matrilocally, in his wife's place of residence, he is a tolerated stranger; (...) The autonomy of the female group is (...) strenghtened by this institution, since the line runs from grandmother to mother and from mother to daughter, particularly if the nuclear group in the community is a matriarchal continuum of mothers, women, and children.“⁵³

Getting out of maternal unconscious is symbolically expressed in hero myth. Hero myth refers to coordination of ego, will and consciousness. That is stimulated by the confrontation with UROBOROS⁵⁴ which has bisexual structure, e.g. has not only a feminine side but also a masculine one.⁵⁵ Defeat of maternal unconscious starts in spiritual groups and requires a „second birth“, e.g. initiation that takes place individually:

„The spiritual collective as we find it in all initiations and all secret societies, sects, mysteries, and religions is essentially masculine and, despite its communal character, essentially individual in the sense that each man is initiated as an individual and undergoes a unique experience that stamps his individuality.(...) [group] is dominated by the archetype of the hero and by the dragon-fight mythology, which represents the next stage of consciousness development.“⁵⁶

Such a group invokes its „heavenly father“ (primogenitor-creator) and establishes its own leader-hero. According to Neumann defeat of matriarchal consciousness is possible only if the consciousness/hero identifies with so-called „masculine heaven“. Such an identification culminates „in the feeling that he the son of God, embodying in himself the whole mightiness of heaven. This is as much as to say that all heroes are god-begotten.“ And what is important, according to Neumann this is exactly the moment when the human culture comes into being as separated from the nature and natural cycles. It is a great conquest of the consciousness at the expense of unconscious: „Representing and upholding this spiritual world in the

⁵³ NEUMANN, ref. 11, pp.138-139.

⁵⁴ Uroboros and dragons are the images of the same significance and, among others, expression of hero's fear. It is a specifically masculine sort of fear – fear of women. NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. 15.

⁵⁵ this masculine side is apparent in its destructivity and aggressivity. These qualities are rather masculine than paternal. Here Neumann refers to Jung, who identified this quality of Great Mother in phallic attributes of Hecate: key, whip. Snake, dagger and torch. NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. 155.

⁵⁶ NEUMANN, ref. 11, pp. 146-147.

face of the dragon, the hero becomes the liberator and savior, the innovator and bringer of wisdom and culture".⁵⁷

Hero myth is frequently sun myth. Glorified hero is frequently deified. This is the way how the patriarchal consciousness – expressed through religions, ideologies, social order – is born. Following Jung, Neumann says that the beginning of human culture and civilization starts with successful masculinization of ego, e.g. its fighting spirit and readiness expose itself to danger.⁵⁸

Neumann repeatedly emphasizes that in psychological – both collective and individual – development of human being, a confrontation with the unconscious is fundamental. In this context the key-idea is the idea of „rebirth“ and „dual parentage“. When the birth of the hero is taking place, hero has to start espousing a transpersonal, e.g. non-biological father (symbolically „Great Father“, God, political or social doctrine, philosophy, ideology etc.). Later he has to find his way to the transpersonal mother (the point is here overcoming female and male aspect of UROBOROS).

Neumann's theory does not deviate from Jung's theses in *Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido* (1912), but extends and complements them. Jung insisted on thesis according to which ontogenesis recapitulates phylogenesis and thus interpreted history in terms of libido development. Contrary to Freud, Jung was able to prove a transpersonal meaning of hero's struggle, because behind it he revealed a development and transformation of libido.

In this transformative process hero's struggle plays eternal and fundamental part in overcoming of inertia of libido symbolized by the embrace of dragon-mother or Uroboric unconscious.

b. Wolfgang Giegerich: Modernity as a „Birth of Man“

There are peoples and epochs where it [soul/psyche] is outside, peoples and epochs that are unpsychological as, for example, all ancient cultures, and among them especially Egypt with its magnificent objectivity (...)

JUNG (CW 10, §§ 158)

German analyst Wolfgang Giegerich is an extremely prolific writer, author of many inspiring books and after Hillman's death in 2012 the most prominent figure of contemporary Jungian psychotherapy both in the field of practice and theory. Whereas Neumann belonged to the most orthodox followers of his *maître* Jung, Hillman and consequently Giegerich read Jung in more critical and innovative way.

Departing from the thesis of primacy of the psychological, Giegerich charts notion of the soul throughout history of the western world and, consequently,

⁵⁷ Further Neumann confirms that another characteristic features of hero is a symbolic incest (journey to the maternal unconscious) whose result is the „second birth“. Hero myth is frequently sun myth. Glorified hero is later frequently deified. This is the way how patriarchal consciousness, process visible in religious or ideological imagery or social order. NEUMANN, ref. 11, pp. 148-149.

⁵⁸ NEUMANN, ref. 11, p. 154.

proposes a deeper look at still existing and misleading dichotomy subject (historian) – object (historical fact), this time from the perspective of the Soul, notion that went through significant but also quite delicate and probably hardly noticeable changes which were still not sufficiently described and understood.

In his view at history Neumann was not so concerned with psyche as Giegerich is. His concept of psychohistory is rather based on the model of Jung's individuation. Giegerich is concerned with the notion of soul and its changes and transformations in the course of history. He is concerned with the changes in subjectivity, mainly with its transformation from pre-modern to modern subjectivity. His concept cannot be viewed as evolutionary. Nor it is study of consciousness evolution but can be seen as a suggestion in terms of contrast between modernity – pre-modernity from the western modern subject perspective.

b. 1. Premodernity and Modernity

Archaic concept of soul speaks of that aspect of human being that joins dead and nearly-divine ancestors after the death. For Homeric Greeks it was that part of human beings that lived as a shade in the underworld but continued immortal. For Christians soul is immortal as well – otherworldly, eternal and immortal aspect of human being whose right place is hereafter and beyond and not in this spatio-temporal world. Human beings constitute *coniunctio oppositorum* of its mortal part (body) and immortal part (soul). However, according to Giegerich, in pre-modern times there was almost no subjectivity, personal feelings or intimacy. All that was found in objective and not subjective psyche:

In former times, relationship feelings (including the feelings of love) had their authentic place in the objective, not the subjective psyche: in poetry, literature, and ritualized enactments and not in the actual personal relationships of real human beings themselves. These personal feelings (...) were first invented, created and practiced as cultural acquisitions in the public and objective sphere of literature. And only much later, in modernity, did they sink down in the private sphere of intimate personal contacts, where (...) they were imitated by individual persons.⁵⁹

Elsewhere Giegerich reminds us that what is generally and intuitively viewed as soul, what we consider soulful and what we somehow consider expression of our innerness was in the past out of sphere of innerness, intimacy and was found in objective soul:

When the Song of Songs, Ovid, the medieval Minnesingers, Petrarch, Shakespeare, and so on express feelings of love, we must not retrojectively read their poems as their self-expression, their personal feelings ,coming from

⁵⁹ Giegerich corroborates this fact using example of weddings in royal houses in baroque where „the discrepancy between the frequently rather dreary empirical reality of royal marriages and the poetic idealization of it in highest mythological images is striking. GIEGERICH, Wolfgang. What is Soul? New Orleans, Louisiana: Spring Journal Books, 2012, p. 175-176.

*their inner', as if they had already been modern individuals. Their poems – and the love feelings articulated in them – are essentially literature. (...) The feelings were born ,above' and ,outside of' the poets as literal persons; they first appeared in and as those literary texts, in and as words, in and as the rhetorical phrases, images, and metaphors they found, not in the person or psyche (...) of their authors.*⁶⁰

The interiorization of feelings took place much later. In fact „innerness“ is a product of history. That history that Giegerich calls „history of the soul“. What was originally cultural institution, custom, symbol or an idea became an inner part of individual person through the process of sublation and sedimentation.⁶¹

First emergence of *I-ness* in prehistoric times is of course speculative. Giegerich suggests *I-ness* as momentary or insular or not a once-and-for-all acquisition. There was no inner space and no subjectivity for what we call soul. There was no subjectivity as a feeling of self. In pre-modern times there was no or almost no subjective aspect of soul. Premodern soul is „I-less“ soul, soul without subjective aspect, soul without permanent subjectivity, without subjective feeling nature. „I“ and subjective feeling of „I“ was rather a rare and exceptional event. Giegerich says that *„I and Thou are not self-identical entities, but logical concepts uroborically related and reciprocal. (...) By getting accustomed to the occurrence of the emergence of subjectivity, this ,content' could slowly be appropriated by and interiorized into consciousness as consciousness's own idea of personal identity and subjectivity (...).“*⁶² In spite of all that ancients knew idea of a „loss of soul“. Jung compared such loss to a dog that runs away from its master overnight and then it is a medicine-man who tries to fetch it back. Paradoxically, also the same phenomenon exists in the modern times as well and *„it is precisely only through its loss, its absence, that the soul first makes itself felt“.*⁶³ Baroque age constitutes a moment of change when *„the old concept of soul as an immaterial substance“* remained still undisputed (people believed in immortality of soul, e.g. eternal salvation) but philosophy initiated a significant shift from that old notion. That is quite visible in Descartes, but also in Locke and Hume.⁶⁴ On the other hand Giegerich refers to Shaftesbury, Rousseau, sentimentalism, protestant movement of Pietism and German Enlightenment where the organ of religion was not the soul but human sensibility (*Empfindsamkeit*) which means that the soul started being psychologized, e.g. it was subjectivized and became privatized and personalized. Also Schleiermacher is included to this category because according to him *„Religion ...is neither a metaphysic, nor a morality [as for Kant], above all and essentially an intuition and a feeling.“*⁶⁵

⁶⁰ GIEGERICH, ref. 59, p. 178.

⁶¹ GIEGERICH, ref. 59, p. 182.

⁶² GIEGERICH, ref. 59, p. 259.

⁶³ This refers to what Giegerich calls „negativity of the soul“. Giegerich considers this fact as a today's „normal state“.

⁶⁴ If something does come out from experience then it does not exist. Soul is rather *„bundle of continually changing feelings and representations“*, GIEGERICH, ref. 59, p. 8.

⁶⁵ GIEGERICH, ref. 59, p. 9.

But in fact demise of the soul was established already in the second half of the 18th century with George Christoph Lichtenberg. Then, long before Nietzsche, „Soul became fossilized relic of the past.“⁶⁶ Overall 18th-century world-view shifted to individual and his/her subjectivity but *mens humana* was – in the spirit of Enlightenment – viewed as universal: „With Kant the old metaphysic of soul had once and for all been replaced by the (...) theory of subjectivity (...) Despite the anthropological shift that had become explicit in Kant, they were nevertheless not fundamentally individual. (...) An individual person participated in the universal mens, or, later, in Kant's ‚pure reason‘“. Already at the beginning of the 19th century, however, „to honestly think such a universal had become an impossibility.“⁶⁷ Modernity as it is conceived by Giegerich starts with the 19th century and signifies loss of traditional notion of the soul: „(...) modernity also necessarily had to lose the soul“ (p. 15).

Passage to modernity in terms of the soul is expressed by the change of the mediation by which the subject experiences it:

[In premodern times] mythology was the expression of the innermost logic or truth of actually lived life at the time of a nature-based life. What in the transition to modernity has changed is the medium or element in which the soul of the Real is immersed. In former times, the medium was Nature. Life was fully governed by and integrated into the natural sequence of day and night and the seasons, of birth, life and death..... Now that the soul has been born out of nature, that it has – logically, psychologically – left nature, substance, and content fundamentally behind itself, now that man has been able to go to the moon and, via satellites, essentially looks down upon Earth from outer space (...) mythic imagination has fundamentally become incapable of expressing the soul.⁶⁸

Moderns frequently equal their innerness and – as Giegerich says „human-all-too-human“ „I-ness“ – with their subjectivity and are unable to see its objective, transpersonal aspect. Their modern subjectivity is a totalitarian subjectivity, subjectivity attempting to „colonize“ soul/psyche which consequently leads to various pathologies.⁶⁹ Whereas premodern man lived his/her soul almost entirely its soul through projection and, consequently, his subjectivity condition Giegerich compares to „island“ or „walled garden“ threatened both from above and from below by the „wilderness of the soul“.⁷⁰ In other words, world of civilized modern man is an oasis in the desert of the soul.

One of the symptomatic theories of modern man is Rudolf Otto's neologism „the numinous“ introduced at the very beginning of the 20th century.⁷¹ For Giegerich this is a „thoroughly modern, early-20th-century fantasy or construct“. In pre-modern times people could not have and use such a term. There would

⁶⁶ GIEGERICH, ref. 59, p. 182.

⁶⁷ See note 60 of this article, pp. 262-264.

⁶⁸ GIEGERICH, ref. 59, p. 151.

⁶⁹ GIEGERICH, ref. 59, p. 155 (similar arguments are findable throughout Hillman's works).

⁷⁰ GIEGERICH, ref. 59, p. 153.

⁷¹ OTTO, Rudolf. *Das Heilige* (1917).

not have any need of it. The soul manifested itself through outside events and phenomena, people spoke of Gods, demons, fairies, spirits as really existing and cosmos constituting forces. They all were ontological. For Otto „numinous“ denotes divine quality but he – as an original contributor to psychology of religions – conceived it as a theoretical and abstract concept understandable for modern subjectivity. What was divine and sacred for premoderns became „numinous“ for moderns, e. g. it became subjectivized.

Modernity means the birth of man as we know him today. On the one and a modern man is characterized by rampant subjectivity where, on the other hand the outer world is devoid of meaning, things are devoid of the soul. Soul is not outside anymore. Modern psychology is extremely subjective, private, personal. Meaning of things is cornered – in the human subject.

b. 2. Nazism : Giegerich vs Jung

Nazism provoked many different interpretations not only between historians but also among psychologists who decided to venture into deep psycho-historical waters of European past. One of them was Carl Gustav Jung. Already in 1910s Jung elaborated idea of individuation and at the very beginning of 1930 applied it to Nazism. In *Wotan* (1936) Jung diagnosed his „patient“ Germany as if the collective persona (i.e. outer social mask) of Germans as civilized, rational and Christian was slowly dissolving and enabling the repressed barbarian contents of their unconscious to erupt. According to him such a development was directed by the Self archetype. Consequently Germans were seized by the archetypal forces that, according to Jung, were to lead to authentic identity of German nation. Such a process, Jung induced, required elimination of whatever what was not authentically German or Germanic. In other words, to progress means also means to take some steps back (*reculer pour mieux sauter*) and integrate what was not integrated:

It is a regression and injustice, there is no doubt about that; but they [the Germans] cannot get together as a nation, they cannot celebrate their love feast, if strangers are in between. Of course you can say that Jews are scapegoats; of course they are scapegoats, but other people, individuals, do the same thing: in the process: in the process of individuation, for instance, they exclude many things, they may desert their relations, which is unjust, cruel, or foolish perhaps, but it serves that one purpose of individuation, of coming together.⁷²

In Jung's interpretation it was unconscious that directed all the nation and that also choose its leader – Adolf Hitler. The seizure (*Ergriffenheit*) as a description of unconscious-divine force corresponded with Otto's description of numinous but also with that of Nietzsche who described classical Greek dilemma between

⁷² JUNG apud PIETIKAINEN, Petteri. Future's Past. C. G. Jung's Psychoutopia and the 'German Revolution' of 1933. In JUNGINGER, Horst (ed.). *The Study of Religion under the Impact of Fascism*. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2008, pp. 591-611.

Dionysian and Apolonian. Classical Greeks were also seized (*ergriffen*) by their own barbarian (Dionysian) side which threatened them with the dissolution back to unconscious. Jung interpreted this as a split in psyche, e.g. as a psychological conflict and was convinced that resolution of such a conflict in Germans must come from within and not from without. Such inner force was represented by ancient pagan Germanic god Wotan as a „call for authenticity“, an urge for the most authentic and the deepest Self of the German nation. And for Jung, mediator of such a collective and unconscious call was Hitler. As it is known Jung's attitude to National Socialism changed already during 1930s and „he had to admit that, in the end, the brutal reality of the Third Reich refused to conform to his psychology, throwing archetypes overboard, as it were.“⁷³

Giegerich, on the contrary, says that Jung's diagnosis of Germans as suffering from „sacred illness“ or neurosis with archetypal depths or as seduced by archaic Germanic god, Wotan, is totally erroneous. In his view there was no need „to introduce the category of archetypes or gods for comprehending the Nazi movement.“⁷⁴ Such a movement,

*Can be adequately explained as a resulting from a mixture of deep resentments due to undigested disappointments and not accepted losses, of unresolved conflicts, inferiority complexes compensated by a hysterical demonstration of grandiosity, of severe social and economic problems, genuine political fears, the use of ideology-formation and simulation as an ennobling cover, ingenious propaganda, much bluff, etc. etc. – at any rate in terms of nothing but human, all-too-human factors. No Wotan, no god. Nothing numinous or archetypal. Quite banal. Very worldly and superficial.*⁷⁵

A very similar critique of Jung's „archetypal approach“ applied to history and society can be found also in the school of cultural complex:

*(...) Jung went straight to the archetypal level of psyche – often quite compellingly. (...) in his seminal 1936 „Wotan“, Jung warns of the primitive, mercurial god of lightning and destruction that was seizing the German psyche. But, by leaving the social, economic, and political level of German psychological experience out of his analysis in „Wotan“, Jung opened himself up to profound misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Had he included a more careful analysis of the historical and cultural aspects of the German experience and perhaps been able to frame it in terms of the activation of a cultural complex in the German psyche, he may not have been subject to the accusations of anti-Semitism and intoxication with Wotan (...).*⁷⁶

⁷³ PIETIKAINEN, Petteri. *Alchemists of Human Nature: Psychological Utopianism in Gross, Jung, Reich and Fromm*. London: Pickering&Chatto, 2007, p. 112.

⁷⁴ GIEGERICH, ref. 59, p.161.

⁷⁵ GIEGERICH, ref. 59, p. 161.

⁷⁶ SINGER, Thomas – KIMBLES, Samuel L. Introduction. In SINGER, Thomas – KIMBLES, Samuel L. (eds.). *The Cultural Complex. Contemporary Jungian Perspectives on Psyche and Society*. New York – London: Brunner-Routledge, 2004, pp. 2-3.

c. Cultural Complex: Cultural Unconscious – History Revisited

Cultural complex is a recently developed multidisciplinary concept whose predecessors are without doubt Neumann, Jung, Bachofen and ethnopsychology as well. It was inspired by Jung's diagram of the human psyche (1926). School of cultural complex is a direct consequence of the first critiques toward C. G. Jung within Jungian international community. First critiques made by Hillman in the end of 1960s were later supplemented by Hillman's revolutionary work *Re-Visioning Psychology* (1975) and in 1980s concept of cultural unconscious as conceived by Joseph Henderson (1984), later by Michael Vannoy Adams (1996) and at the very onset of the 21st century by Thomas Singer and Samuel L. Kimbles (*The Cultural Complex*, 2004).

Departing from Jung's diagram of human psyche Singer says:

This diagram shows us that Jung believed that inside each human being the psyche connects the individual to the history of life's evolution, from human to primate to the very origins of life itself in what Jung termed „the central fire“ at the bottom of the diagram.⁷⁷

Overall picture becomes much more complex when we start taking into consideration process of globalization, history of different nations, regions, continents, religions, cultures, today's migration waves, differing patterns of femininity and masculinity etc. However, as it was already said at the beginning of this paper, the move to the past can get highly subjective, emotional, imaginal and irrational process which we should be conscious of. It is not exaggerated to say that collectively shared unconscious, e. g. emotionally shared complexes/images can govern „destiny“ of this or that nation. This is a very tricky business but it makes part of interdisciplinarity:

We define a cultural complex as an emotionally charged aggregate of historical memories, emotions, ideas, images, and behaviors that tend to cluster around an archetypal core that lives in the psyche of a group and is shared by individuals within that identified collective.⁷⁸

Of course, cultural complex signifies study of big social groups, communities and nations in their specific psycho-historical condition which is something Jung evaded. He himself was naturally introverted and concentrated on the phenomena of individuation within individual. In the Jungian studies concept of cultural complex is a sort of revolution because

(...) a substantial part of Jung's genius was his sensitivity to the perils of the individual's falling into the grips of collective life. Like all who lived through

⁷⁷ AMEZAGA, Pilar – BARCELLOS, Gustavo – CAPRILES, Axel – GERSON, Jacqueline – RAMOS, Denise (eds.). *Listening to Latin America. Exploring Cultural Complexes in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Uruguay and Venezuela*. New Orleans, Louisiana: Spring Journal Books, 2012, p. 5.

⁷⁸ AMEZAGA – BARCELLOS – CAPRILES – GERSON – RAMOS (eds.), ref. 77, p. 5.

*the twentieth century, Jung witnessed the terrible side of collectivity. (...) In the later part of his life, he shared in the nightmare horror of imagining nuclear holocaust. It is easy to see why Jung had such a dread of the individual and group psyche falling into possession by collective and archetypal forces.*⁷⁹

Another critique of Jung points to his use of archetype in the interpretation of more complex social and political phenomena:

*To understand collective psychology, Jung went straight to the archetypal level of the psyche – often quite compellingly. For example, in his seminal 1936 essay „Wotan“, Jung warns of the primitive, mercurial god of lightning and destruction that was seizing the German psyche. But, by leaving the social, economic, and political level of the German psychological experience out of his analysis in „Wotan“, Jung opened himself up to profound misunderstanding and misinterpretation.*⁸⁰

Thus, cultural complex was defined and clearly differentiated from concepts as national identity or national character and soon applied to the study of human societies all over the world:

*So, it is important to be clear at the outset that the notion of cultural complexes is not the same as either cultural identity or national character, but can easily be confused with them. (...)An individual or group with a unique cultural identity that is not in the grips of a cultural complex is much freer to interact in the world of people from other groups without being prey to the highly charged emotional contents that can quickly alter the perception and behavior of different groups in relation to one another. Once the cultural complex is activated in an individual or a group, however, the everyday cultural identity can be overtaken by the affect of the cultural complex, often built up over centuries of repetitive traumatic experience.*⁸¹

If, at the very beginning of the paper, I referred to Anglo-american historian Ruth Meyer and her allusion to possible collaboration of depth psychology and history as a „recipe for disaster“, then I must claim here that such a collaboration exists even though it is more frequently initiated by psychologists. However, Meyer is a historian and similarly to Dodds or Toynbee and other historians (for example Trevelyan, Shama) for whom connection of innermost subjectivity and a *genius loci* of historically distant place and event (as in the case of Jung, Freud or Hillman) was very natural.

However, above mentioned examples of interdisciplinary History-Psychology connection are quite different. Neumann could be included into classical school

⁷⁹ SINGER – KIMBLES, ref. 76, p. 4.

⁸⁰ SINGER – KIMBLES, ref. 76, pp. 2-3.

⁸¹ SINGER – KIMBLES, ref. 76, p. 6.

of analytical psychology, Giegerich into an archetypal/imaginal school (founded by Hillman in late 1960s) whereas school of cultural complex – inspired by Hillman as well – is really multi- or inter-disciplinary (its principles are applied only to social communities and nations). However, it must be reminded that already Freud emphasized importance of knowledge of mythology and culture in general for the successful psychoanalytical practice.

There has been a significant growth of psycho-historical studies recently. They do not have to be necessarily of Jungian inspiration. There are often whole nations and continents that need – in times of not always favourable symptoms of globalization – more profound understanding of themselves.⁸² Points of departure and perspectives can be different but it seems that all follow Hillman's thesis: *„Freud made a Jewish move with his case history: he deliteralized it. The Jewish approach is the story and the variations on the story. History is a series of images, tales, geographies, figures, lessons. It's not so much fact. Psychologically, it's the story of Christ, not the historical Christ – the redeemer is in imagination, in the imaginal, always about to appear, but never phenomenal.“*⁸³

Words: 11287
Characters: 74592

⁸² VRBATA, Aleš. A Alma ancestral e a contemporaneidade brasileira: imaginário consciente e inconsciente na interpretação do Brasil em Roberto Gambini. In *Romanica Olomucensia* 28.2, 2016, pp. 237-253.

⁸³ HILLMAN, James. *Inter Views. Conversations with Laura Pozzo on Psychotherapy, Biography, Love, Soul, Dreams, Work, Imagination, and the State of Culture*. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1983, p. 80.