Masculine and Feminine Archetypes: A Complement to the Psychological Types

Tad Guzie and
Noreen Monroe Guzie
University of Calgary

Archetypes may account both for differences between individuals of the same type, and for similarities between individuals of different types.

This article presents an alternative to the work done by Keirsey and Bates in their book Please Understand Me. These authors attempt to reorganize the types into four basic “temperaments.” It is our conviction that the sixteen MBTI types cannot be simplified or watered down in any way. Isabel Myers made a capital contribution to Jung’s work by her insistence on the importance of the auxiliary function as it operates in both introverts and extraverts. As a result of this contribution, Jung’s eight psychological types became sixteen in the MBTI, and the value of the theory that underlies the MBTI is to be found in this nuance on Jung’s original theory. The sixteen types have been so finely developed and researched over the years that one type does not make sense apart from the way it interlocks with the others.

Keirsey and Bates have sensed that there are umbrella categories which overlap or mesh with the sixteen MBTI types. This insight is a good one. But their theory of four “temperaments” does justice neither to the MBTI nor to the umbrella temperaments which they attempt to name. Their book fails to make essential distinctions between types and archetypes, and between the personal and the collective unconscious.

In Jungian terms, as we understand them, the MBTI psychological types are primarily expressions of the personal unconscious. The types have to do with inborn traits which are responsible for the way our energy flows (E or I), and the way we gather (P) and organize (J) everyday information in a variety of perceiving and judging ways (S or N, T or F). In addition to these very concrete preferences, there are archetypes which have to do with lifestyles, the myths we live, the larger stories that shape our lives and give them an overarching direction. These archetypes, which are represented in mythology and art and literature, flow from the collective unconscious. Here our personal stories plug into a much larger story, that of the Hero, the Mother, the King, the Amazon, and a whole variety of archetypal stories which help to explain the values that continue to animate our lives.

The theory presented by Keirsey and Bates takes four archetypes drawn from classical mythology (Apollo, Dionysus, Prometheus and Epimetheus), lays them on top of the sixteen MBTI types, and reduces the sixteen types to four supposedly basic types which are called “temperaments.” No explanation is given for this particular choice of archetypes (all of which are masculine), and no adequate reason is given why these are basic temperaments. In the pages that follow, we will clarify the difference between “types” and “archetypes,” and show the relationship between the two realms.

In Jungian theory “archetype” is a broad term which embraces almost any expression of the unconscious, from Shadow or Anima to the MBTI psychological types themselves. Anthony Stevens (1983), in an exciting interdisciplinary study, shows how Jung’s notion of archetypes ties in with the findings of biology and ethology. Stevens defines archetypes as “innate neuropsychic centers possessing the capacity to initiate, control and mediate the common behavioral characteristics and typical experiences of all human beings irrespective of race, culture or creed.” This definition of “archetype” encompasses the MBTI “types,” and Stevens gives a scientific basis for the idea that the types involve inborn preferences—an important contribution to type theory.

The definition also suggests, as Jung himself suggested, that there are as many archetypes as there are common situations in life. We shall use the term “archetype” within the compass of Stevens’ broad definition, but we will limit the word to particular
constellations of "common behavioral characteristics and typical experiences of all human beings." In this paper, the word "archetype" will refer to four basic masculine stories and four basic feminine stories in which men and women find identity and fulfillment. Why these are "basic" stories—basic archetypes, basic myths—will unfold as the stories are told. We will give a cameo of each of the stories or archetypes, and conclude with observations which show how these archetypes relate to the MBTI types.

Toni Wolff (1951), was the first to write about the basic feminine archetypes which we will explore in this article. Irene Claremont de Castillejo (1973), used Wolff's work and added important insights from her own experience. Edward Whitmont (1969), gives a brief sketch of the analogous masculine archetypes. We have drawn from these sources, but most of the descriptions in the following pages come from our own work with some 500 people who have shared their experiences with us.

Feminine Archetypes

Mother finds her identity and fulfillment in cherishing, nurturing, and protecting. Her instinct is to assist all that is unfolding and in the process of becoming. She sees where other people need assistance or protection, and she goes to their aid. She encourages others to develop themselves, and she supports whatever is in need of nurturing or help. She attends to the comfort and security of whomever she nourishes. Mother will usually arrange her outer way of life to include marriage or a nurturing profession, such as teaching or nursing or social work.

If she marries, Mother will be concerned with the career security, social position, and paternal qualities of the father. She will protect and promote whatever enhances his role as father. At times, he could feel like a son or provider, rather than a husband and companion. In conversing with other adults, she often refers to her husband as "Father" or "Dad" instead of using his first name.

The dark side of the Mother shows itself in anxious nursing, smothering mothering, and a lack of trust in the other's strength. She might protect and assist when the other person never required it in the first place. Her fears, her prejudices, and even her religious fervors may infiltrate into those in her care, filling them with a life that is not their own.

Hetaira finds her identity and fulfillment in being a companion to others. ("Hetaira" is the Greek word for a female companion, and for a class of women who were trained to be companions to men.) Hetaira companions others intellectually, spiritually, sexually—though not necessarily all three. For her, the relationship is everything, and all else is subordinate to the relationship, be it with a man or a woman. Like Mother, this is a personal way of relating, but it is individual rather than collective, very much one-on-one.

Hetaira is instinctively related to the personal psychology of anyone she befriens. She will convey to another person a sense of personal value. Her own development requires her to experience and realize individual relationships, in all their dimensions and depths. She promotes the individual interests of her partner or her children, regardless of the consequences for family image or security. She is not preoccupied with how her actions appear to others. Social position and financial security, which are a concern for Mother, are quite secondary to the Hetaira.

A particular function of the Hetaira is to awaken the individual psyche of the male, and to lead him beyond his role responsibilities toward the formation of a more total personality—often in the second half of life. Hetaira helps to put a man in touch with his unconscious, and most males need a good Hetaira at some point in their lives. Women who are effective spiritual directors for men are often Hetairas. The relationship with a man need not be sexual. It will not usually become sexual unless a certain depth and psychic consolidation have been reached. (For some Hetairas, this might happen quite quickly.)

Hetaira must learn what belongs to a relationship and what does not, and this is where her dark side can show itself. She can put a man in touch with himself, or she can lead him astray from himself. She must learn to let go when a relationship has fulfilled itself, or when the relationship should take another form. She must be careful about turning one form of companioning into another (e.g. intellectual or spiritual into sexual) when this is not called for.

Hetaira needs relationships and often prefers to accompany or to be accompanied rather than to go on alone. As a result, she
can too easily set aside her own interests or activities, or even her personal values, in the name of a relationship and for the sake of companionship. An Hetaira with children, who does not bring her Hetaira nature to consciousness, can turn her sons into boyfriends and her daughters into girlfriends, tying them to her with apron strings that are as restrictive as those which an unconscious Mother can tie around her children.

In brief, the difference between Mother and Hetaira is this: Mother finds her identity and fulfillment in doing for others. Hetaira finds hers in doing with the Other.

Amazon finds her identity and fulfillment in managing the outer world. (If the term Amazon evokes unattractive or merely muscular women, substitute for it “Wonder Woman,” who is an Amazon.) Amazon is instinctively drawn toward outward achievements which she wants to accomplish for herself. She is independent and self-contained. The Amazon is often a woman who is committed to an ideal or a cause, and who fights for it in public. This does not imply that all Amazons are forceful and vocal extraverts who, at their worst, try to impose their opinions on everyone. The Amazon might also be a quiet introvert who finds her fulfillment simply in seeing that things are managed well.

Many sportswomen and women prominent in public life are Amazons, as are the able receptionists who make themselves indispensable in their offices. Many women who do not feel sufficiently taken up by their home or their personal relationships dedicate themselves to a task and find fulfillment in accomplishing in the outer world. There are also Amazons who stay at home and keep the family and household running smoothly. Women who think of their marriage as an “accomplishment” more than a “relationship” are usually Amazons.

In her relationship to men, Amazon can be a refreshing comrade who makes no demands. She and the male act as mutual challengers, and her own psychological development does not depend on male response unless she lets it. Success and independence are her watchwords, professionally and in her personal relationships. Amazon must learn to be patient with what is undeveloped in herself or others. She must be careful not to misuse her relationships with others. Since she is so concerned with achieving, she must learn to be attentive to her own values and feelings and those of others, and not to view them as awkward complications. And since she is so independent, Amazon has to be careful to recognize that there might be legitimate authority and wisdom outside herself.

Mediatrix or the “mediumistic woman” finds her identity and fulfillment in mediating the world of the unconscious. She is immersed in the psychic atmosphere of her surroundings, the spirit of her time, and especially the collective unconscious. She senses what is going on under the surface of a group or an event, and she is drawn to voice it or act it out, whether this is appropriate or not. She is often affected by the unconscious of another person, and she sometimes has dreams on behalf of others. If she learns discernment, she can give a voice or a shape to what is unseen and unconscious to others. She is not usually a very public person in her role as Mediatrix. Mediumistic women sometimes find a place to exercise their particular genius in arts and skills that society considers more or less esoteric, such as counseling, creative writing, painting, astrology, graphology, and herbal medicine.

The mediumistic woman has an important role in mediating the world of the collective unconscious to men. She often finds herself assisting other people in dying, especially men. In some cases she might be aware of what she is doing, but often enough her role is unplanned and unconscious. If she lacks focus and direction, the Mediatrix will often subsume elements of her own personality in the personality of the man she loves.

It is very important for this woman to become aware of her mediumistic qualities and to acquire discernment. If she is not discerning, she will be overcome by the puzzles of the unconscious. She will be vague, unfocused, confused, not knowing what thoughts and feelings are her own. The Mediatrix can have a very positive and productive influence on others, provided that she develops a strong and healthy ego—a task which is more difficult for her than for any other archetype. If she does not develop a strong ego and find a life-giving work, she will never become a true “mediatrix,” and she will be only a source of confusion and a disruptive force in the lives of others.

The Amazon and Mediatrix archetypes both have to do with a way of relating to the
non-personal or a-personal world. While Amazon finds her identity and fulfillment in managing the outer world, Mediatrix finds hers in mediating the inner world to herself and others.

**Masculine Archetypes**

**Father** finds his identity and fulfillment in providing and protecting. He is a natural complement to Mother, but whether he is married or not, and whether he is a parent or not, he enjoys those roles where he can provide for others and protect their well-being. He is not concerned with power for its own sake, but he enjoys directing things in a protective way, whether in a household or in the business world. He is the archetypal leader whose word is law. The Judeo-Christian image of God as Father comes from the bright side of this archetype. Jesus used this image to express the idea of God as a faithful love who is always present to his people, caring and providing for them. This is the Father at his best.

Father tends to relate to other people insofar as they rely on his care, and so he knows others as children or subjects. He has difficulty relating to others as true peers, individuals in their own right, one-on-one. Father is a natural leader, but he can also be a director. Unless he learns to relate to others as peers, he will tend to be authoritarian and condescending. And unless he develops wisdom, his leadership will come across as rigid and one-sided, cold and inflexible.

Father and Mother are natural complements to each other. They tend to look for and find each other when it comes time to marry and raise a family. They often call each other “Father” and “Mother” long after their children have left home. In the second half of life, both Mother and Father need to explore another dimension of their archetype or a second archetype, especially when they do not have grandchildren or other young people around them whom they can mother and father in their special way.

**Eternal Boy** finds his identity and fulfillment precisely in the search for identity and fulfillment. He seeks his own individuality, and he is always looking for new opportunities. In the personal realm, he seeks one-on-one peer relationships with a variety of men and women, and it is usually easy to strike up a casual companionship with him. In relating to different people in a variety of situations, he discovers who he is. Eternal Boy goes his own way, “does his own thing,” and he does not concern himself with permanence. He can be very upsetting to the Father, who is concerned with stability and long-term relationships. Eternal Boy is Adonis or Peter Pan—the Knight Errant, the eternal seeker, who is always off on new adventures. Understand “new adventures” in a metaphorical sense. The Boy might never leave home or set off in new geographical directions. He might stay right at home, but he will always be off into new projects, new ideas, and the attractions of new relationships.

At his best, the Eternal Boy has much to offer. He can be the most open of all the types—open to new things, new thoughts, new friends. He is not threatened by adventure, and he easily assimilates new ideas and new ways of doing things. In fact, he is usually looking for a better way. But if he does not learn self-discipline, he will lack stability and never find for himself the personal identity for which he is always seeking. He can too easily walk away from a relationship rather than deal with it thoroughly. Both Eternal Boy and Hetaira are inclined to “love them and leave them.” The Hetaira is usually better at loving, the Eternal Boy at leaving. This points to Boy’s greatest fault: He can lack stability to the point of being totally undependable. He might have a whole gamut of interesting acquaintances, but few enduring friendships. He might be a very poor provider in a family, an undependable partner in a business venture, and fickle in his friendships.

**Warrior** finds his identity and fulfillment in accomplishing in the outer world. He is a good competitor, who is not afraid of a struggle or fight. In fact, he enjoys competition, which sometimes brings out the best of his talents. He is Achilles or Siegfried, the archetypal “hero,” the go-getter type who gets things done. Warrior is different from Father, in the sense that he is not primarily interested in protecting and caring for others. Warrior likes to manage power, and this is a satisfying end in itself. He is often very good at it. The arena where he manages power is not necessarily the world of big business, though of course many Warriors are found there. A Warrior might also be a counselor or
a pastor, and in this case he needs to become sensitive to the kind of power he exercises over his clients.

The Warrior archetype is especially useful as a man in establishing a place for himself in society, in a business or in a profession. This is the socially approved archetype for a man in his twenties or thirties. A man of that age who is not a Warrior and who is not psychologically energized by this archetype often finds himself at odds with what the world (and perhaps his own family) want from him. The Warrior is not necessarily a good leader, and he often finds it difficult to be receptive to ideas and values that are bigger than the project or struggle at hand. He has to develop strong personal values, a wisdom that reaches beyond the moment of this task, and he must learn to appreciate the wisdom and personal values of others. Otherwise he will be concerned only with what can be accomplished, and he could turn out to be a "cutthroat." This applies not only to the world of big business, but also to Warriors who are in the helping professions. A doctor or counselor or pastor who does not develop empathy and an ability to listen well will end up misusing the power he has to help others. Instead of freeing them, he could bind them to himself. Instead of helping them, he could subtly use them to enhance his own name and professional reputation.

Sage is opposite to Warrior in his way of relating to the a-personal or objective world. The Sage finds his identity and fulfillment in drawing forth meaning for himself and for others. While the Warrior is oriented to the outer world, the Sage is oriented toward the inner world of meaning. He organizes his world around a philosophy, a system of significance, a search for meaning. He might change his mind about what makes for meaning or significance, but always he wants to bring things to meaning. His inner drive is to put himself and others in touch with Logos, mind, thought, spirit, or whatever name he chooses to give to ideas worth considering simply because they are worthwhile ideas.

The Mediatrix woman mediates the world of the psyche, especially the unconscious. The Sage also mediates the inner world of the psyche, but he focuses especially on conscious meaning and ideas. This does not mean that he is found only in the professions of teaching or scholarship. He might be a cabinet-maker or a mechanic, a "cracker barrel philosopher."

The Sage is idea-oriented rather than people-oriented. He might be a good people-person, but his best contact with other people takes place through sharing ideas and visions. At his best, he is a prophet. He is Socrates, Moses, Jesus. He might be successful in the professional world, but competition does not excite him or motivate him. His source of energy is the search for the meaning of things, and he often helps others to understand the significance of their experiences.

One of the dark sides of the Sage is that he never gets anything done. He can't translate his ideas into realities, and so he finds himself at odds with the outer world that is so distant from his theoretical visions. The "absent-minded professor" is a stereotype of this dark side of the Sage, especially the introverted type.

Moreover, the Sage is not necessarily a "wise" person (even though Wise Man is one of the names for this archetype). The Sage is convinced that there is a meaning to be found in anything that happens, and he can easily put his personal world-view in front of facts and events that contradict him. Any man, any woman acquires true wisdom only through time and experience and serious reflection, no matter what his or her archetype might be. If the Sage pretends at wisdom which he does not really possess, he may delude himself into believing his own pretensions. Then he is likely to become the kind of fool that Shakespeare gave us in Polonius, who no one believes is wise except himself.

Archetypes and the MBTI

We have worked with some 500 people in classes and workshops which include a thorough explanation of type theory. This explanation, which takes three or four hours, is given before the results of the Type Indicator are given back. This method offers participants the opportunity to understand type theory, step by step. They "walk through" the whole theory, and name their preferences on each of the MBTI scales, before they learn the results of the Indicator. In a few cases, people have decided that they told the Indicator the "wrong thing," i.e. a preference which was not really their own. The reason for this often has to do with their archetypes,
as we shall explain below.

We do not have an “archetype indicator.” After our students have worked through the MBTI types and have come to understand the implications of the types, we present the archetypes described above. We “tell the stories,” much as you have read them. It is up to the participants in our workshops to name their own story, and nine out of ten are able to do this with a bit of reflection. (Young adults in their early or middle twenties are often not sure of their dominant archetype: They are still trying out the different stories and have not yet fastened onto the archetype which is theirs.)

Our clients and students consistently remark that the archetypes have answered important personal questions which the MBTI left unanswered. In the final part of this paper, we will show a few significant ways in which the archetypes complement the MBTI types and enrich them.

Note the diagonal planes in the above diagrams. As in the case of the MBTI, where one is along a diagonal plane (ST, SF, NF, NT), so with the archetypes: Many people relate to two archetypes along a plane, with one more “dominant” than the other. E.g. a man might be Father-Warrior, or Warrior-Father, or Sage-Eternal Boy, or Sage-Father, etc. Similarly with the feminine archetypes.

Often enough, one’s secondary or “auxiliary” archetype emerges and calls for attention in the second half of life. To give a very common example, a Mother-Amazon who has raised children in the first half of her life might get interested in public and political life, or even set up a business in the second half of her life. To flip it the other way around, an Amazon-Mother might have managed her marriage and her children very successfully in the first half of her life. Parenting was her task, and she did very well at it. In the second half of life, our Amazon might be drawn to the Mother archetype. She might turn out to be more “motherly” toward her grandchildren than she was to her own children, who were her “accomplishment.” Or she might “mother” through a profession like teaching or nursing or social work.

Some people find total satisfaction throughout their lives in one archetype, developing different facets of that archetype. But two are the more common pattern. Part of the challenge (and sometimes confusion) of the midlife transition is the call or urge to develop a second archetype. Look again at the diagrams above. This second or “auxiliary” archetype which calls for development in the second half of life appears to the right or to the left of your dominant archetype. No one jumps to the archetype that is opposite from his or her dominant archetype. E.g. a Father does not become an Eternal Boy, a Mediatrix does not become an Amazon. Father looks in the direction of Warrior or Sage for the energy that is likely to animate the second half of his life. Hetaira looks in the direction of Amazon or Mediatrix. Just as we don’t suddenly develop our inferior function (our opposite MBTI type), neither do we suddenly find identity and fulfillment in our opposite archetype. My opposite archetype may call for attention from time to time, just as my inferior function does. But the archetype that is opposite to my dominant archetype is never likely to be the story that most energizes me.

The archetype that is opposite to one’s dominant archetype is, in other words, similar to the “inferior function” among MBTI types. This “inferior” archetype remains a dark side, a Shadow side of the personality, just as one’s opposite psychological type always remains an inferior function, one’s youngest and least trusted child in the family of four. (People who are not sure about their dominant archetype can often name it by deciding which of the four stories least describes their values or priorities.)

It is important to realize that all of us are involved in the activities represented by all the archetypes. But we do not find our identity and fulfillment in all of these activities. For example, the Sage has to learn how to manage his household, how to parent his children, and how to be a companion to his wife. The Amazon has to learn how to parent, or how to be intimate, and how to be open to the unseen and the unconscious. If we went on to name all eight archetypes, similar items would appear on all the lists, with different shades of challenge and concern. But when do I most feel me? Which of these ac-
The activities that give me the most joy, the most satisfaction? In which of these stories am I the most myself? Which roles energize me? What activities drain me?

The answers you give to these questions illustrate what we mean by saying that we find identity and fulfillment in only one or two archetypes. Your source of energy, and the story that best explains your life and the most comfortable choices you have made, comes from one or two of the archetypes, the dominant and the auxiliary.

The archetypes choose us, as much as or more than we choose the archetypes. This is another way to speak of what Christian theology calls “grace,” the grace of vocation, or the gifts of the Spirit. Sometimes the dominant archetype is already evident in a small child (observable, for instance, in the role which a child prefers to play in children’s games). Upon hearing the archetypes described, many people will quickly identify their dominant archetype, recognizing it as the story they have lived ever since they were little. Often enough, other people who know us can recognize our archetype, even if we can’t name it for ourselves.

The fact that an archetype has “chosen you” does not mean that it is developed in you. (Note the similarity to type theory: The fact that you are a certain type does not mean that you have developed your preferences.) Read the descriptions of the archetypes given above: All of them include a dark side. If an archetype is working in an unconscious and undifferentiated way, the dark side will keep showing itself, even to the point of overshadowing the bright side. An undifferentiated Father will be a dictator, in much the same way that an undifferentiated feeling type will be an emotional plague on others. An undifferentiated Amazon will give her energies to one cause after another, an undifferentiated thinking type will drive a person mad with irrelevant analysis. Whether one is dealing with type or archetype, the undifferentiated or unconscious form of it is anything from unpleasant to ugly.

Thus far, we have been describing some of the similarities between the quadriform structures of the MBTI types and the archetypes. Let’s turn now to a few ways in which the archetypes shed some light on the MBTI types.

People’s archetypes are usually more prominent and more immediately noticeable than their psychological type, especially when they are in their midlife years or older. When meeting someone new, and before many words have been said, we pick up positive vibrations from a person who is living an archetype similar to our own: There is a sense of the familiar. We pick up negative vibrations from our opposite archetype: There is an immediate wariness. At a cocktail party, Mother tends to have an instant dislike for the Hetaira, and a Sage is put off by a Warrior the moment he enters the room. We seem to “wear” our archetype in public without even intending it.

Married couples whose MBTI types are totally opposite have obvious difficulties in communication. But opposite types often find a real source of harmony and communication when they live complementary archetypes. For example, an ISTJ husband who is a Father and an ENFP wife who is a Mother weather their storms successfully because their archetypes mesh: They are living a similar story and pursuing a similar goal. Conversely, spouses who are the same psychological type may have severe marital difficulties because their archetypes are very different - as when an INFP Hetaira is married to an INFP Father: The different stories they are living (or want to live) might represent opposing values and very different attitudes toward parenting.

A person’s archetype can be so overriding that it is misleading in relation to the MBTI types. In our experience, many female F’s who are Amazons have tended to believe they were T’s, because some of the personality traits of Amazons (self-contained, independent) were confused with the qualities of thinking types (objective, a-personal). In a similar vein, Warriors who are very capable in managing the outer world, but who happen to be introverts, have thought that their ability to deal with the outer world made them extraverts.

Warriors and Amazons tend to be extraverts rather than introverts, but the proportion in our sample is only 2 to 1. It is evident that a good many introverts are oriented toward accomplishing in the outer world and managing the outer world. In our experience, many introverts thought they were extraverts, because they confused their extraversion with their archetype (especially Amazon and Warrior).

This kind of data suggests that some of
the items in the Type Indicator should be re-evaluated. Are people answering out of their type or out of their archetype? A good illustration of this problem is item #7 which asks: "When you are with a group of people, would you usually rather (a) join in the talk of the group, or (b) talk with one person at a time?" On the MBTI, this is an E-I choice. But we have found that all Hetairas and almost all Eternal Boys who were extraverts made the introverted choice: they preferred talking with one person at a time. The reason for this is that Hetaira and Eternal Boy, extravert and introvert, prefer relating one-on-one rather than to groups. It would be useful to examine all of the items in the MBTI in relation to the archetypes, in order to see which items are not as focused on type preferences as they should be.

In our data, a good majority of Fathers are F's. The qualities of Father as provider and leader are therefore likely to be based on personal values rather than on impersonal judgment. This suggests that many Fathers are not most easily reached by logic or objective arguments. Their dark side, their rigidity, will be more easily softened by "people" factors than by logical persuasion.

Most Warriors in our data are ST's. An ST Warrior has to be very careful about the way he manages power. His sensing-thinking preferences don't tend to assist him in developing values having to do with people and relationships. As we mentioned earlier, the Warrior is the man who most needs to develop personal values and wisdom if he is not to be a cutthroat. Some Warriors are F's. This combination tends to offer a good balance.

In our data, Eternal Boy almost always combines with Sage as the "auxiliary" archetype. The Eternal Boy seems to find his stability in searching for meaning (Sage), rather than in accomplishing in the outer world (Warrior). Most Eternal Boys in our sample are P's rather than J's, but our data include both. Eternal Boys can be sensing or intuitive, and again our data include both. But it is not surprising that most male intuities named Eternal Boy as their dominant or auxiliary archetype.

Everyone who has been part of our workshops has been helped by the archetypes as a complement to the MBTI, but no one more than the Mediatrix woman. Mediumistic women have felt most intense-ly, after working through their MBTI type, that something was missing, that something important was not said. Recall that the Mediatrix is not inclined to have a strong ego. Knowing about the Mediatrix and her tendencies is very freeing for the mediumistic woman, whatever her type. Although the Mediatrix is the most affected by the collective unconscious, do not assume that all mediumistic women are N's simply because the unconscious is the province of the intuitive. We have met a few sensing women who suffer from much confusion emerging from the collective unconscious, because their intuition is undeveloped. S's have greater difficulty than N's in rising above the dark side of the Mediatrix, which consists in witch-like behavior.

Our MBTI type names the basic styles that we use to communicate our thoughts and values. But our archetype, the myth that shapes our lives, explains the source of our personal values. This is why people of the same psychological type can be disruptive to each other. An NF, for example, usually understands quite readily what another NF is saying. But if one NF is an Amazon and the other a Mediatrix, the message can lead to argument and conflict because of the difference in personal values coming out of the different archetypes. Two ST males communicate easily enough, but if one is a Father and the other an Eternal Boy, sparks are likely to fly. Once again, we seem to wear our archetype like a suit of clothes, and it is often our archetype that people pick up most quickly when they meet us.

Parent-child differences seem to work in a similar way. A daughter who is an intuitive (N) Hetaira will very likely get more compassion and understanding from a female parent who is a sensing (S) Hetaira than from one who is an intuitive (N) Mother. A sensing (S) Warrior is more likely to understand his intuitive (N) son who is also a Warrior, than his other intuitive (N) son who is a Sage. When all is said and done, a difference in archetypes between parents and children seems to be more significant than a difference in types, because of the strong difference in personal values that are embodied in opposite archetypes.

Here are a conclusion and a tentative generalization: The MBTI types explain how we communicate or fail to communicate with
one another. The theory of types accounts for *communication* in a profound way that does not have to be explained to any reader of this journal. The theory of archetypes which we have explored in this article talks about *what we communicate*, namely, the stories we live, the source of our energy and motivation, the thing that helps us get up in the morning and face the day.

Which comes first, the chicken or the egg, types or archetypes? In our experience, there is no better way to begin working with people than with the MBTI: Pedagogically, it is much easier to start with *how we communicate*. But as we continue working with people who are seeking to learn about themselves, we find that they have to *name the story* they are living, the source of their values and energies. That is where the archetypes come into play. My story, my values, and the sources of my energy explain why I act like an ISTJ or an ENFP in just the way I do.

As a complement to the MBTI types, the theory of archetypes opens up an exciting field of research which throws light on lifestyles, career choices, and styles of working and relating with others. The archetypes also touch upon important facets of heterosexual and homosexual relationships. We plan to explore many of these areas in future publications, and we would appreciate comments on this article from the readers of this journal.
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