



*Moshe Kones*

## **Cain's Descendants: Those Who Play the Lyre and Pipe and Those Who Forge the Spears and Pikes – From Freud to Jung to Szondi, Make Art, Not War**

### **Introduction**

Philosophers and psychologists have long utilized myths not only to describe human nature but also to understand humanity. The persistence of these stories, whether from the Hebrew Bible, Greek mythology, or other oral and written traditions, suggests their significant meaning for the cultures that carry them. Psychoanalytical thought proposes that myths can express unconscious desires or fears through symbolic characters and provide models for personal and societal development. Religious narratives may offer resolutions to fundamental psychological issues, as the characters could symbolize forces in the human psyche or types of personifications of human features that are relevant to this day. In any case, these mythological and religious stories have played a substantial role in shaping both individuals and societies through the years.

The work of Leopold Szondi, particularly his use of biblical stories and characters to understand human fate presents a compelling perspective. Szondi emphasizes the story of Cain in Genesis 4, suggesting the Judeo-Christian world continues to tell this story of fratricide because it speaks to something deep in humanity. Szondi builds a systematic foundation for this interpretation and implementation that will be briefly described here. In the book of Genesis, the story continues after Cain and Abel, mentioning the descendants of Cain. Highlighting that Cain, the first murderer, received God's forgiveness and protection and expanded his family tree. This article suggests there is more to be learned from the story that follows, describing Cain's descendants, through the Szondian perspective.

This article particularly highlights two descendants of Cain: Jubal, the father of all makers of musical instruments, and Tubal-Cain, the father of all blacksmiths and makers of war weapons. They are introduced to suggest additional insights. Jubal and Tubal-Cain could symbolize different ways of channelling inherent drives that come from Cain: one through artistic creation and the other through potential destruction.

This analysis extends Szondi's framework, which primarily focused on Cain, Abel and Moses, to include more characters from the Hebrew Bible, and it largely relies on the work of Adam Jessep.

Adam Jessep is an Australian independent scholar and PhD graduate from Flinders University, who specializes in Old Testament literature, depth psychology, the history of science, and the works of Léopold Szondi. This article describes ideas from his PhD thesis (Jessep, 2021), especially the addition of Joseph, to the Szondian framework as another archetypal solution to the force of Cain.

The views of Sigmund Freud, Carl Gustav Jung, and Leopold Szondi on evil and on art are briefly outlined to support this perspective. Although this summary may lack the depth and nuance of a comprehensive discussion of these thinkers and their perspectives, it aims to support the central argument – that inherent forces can be channelled adaptively, perhaps even that “fate” can be altered through will. Furthermore, this article relies on the Hebrew language and Jewish religious commentators' interpretations of the Hebrew Bible to deepen the understanding of what can be learned from the descriptions of Cain's descendants. Combining the ideas of the above-mentioned thinkers and the work of Adam Jessep in his thesis „Cain Rules the World: Léopold Szondi, Genesis 4, and the Nature of Evil” (Jessep, 2021), this article argues that the Jubal-Tubal-Cain dichotomy presents a powerful metaphor for the choices available to individuals dealing with their inherited aggressive tendencies. This article posits that it is possible to defy the Cain within us and choose the path of Jubal.

### **Sigmund Freud – Thanatos, Symbolism, Sublimation, and Creativity**

*“This [the death drive] would serve as a biological justification for all the ugly and dangerous impulses against which we are struggling. It must be admitted that they stand nearer to Nature than does our resistance to them for which an explanation also needs to be found... there is no use in trying to get rid of men's aggressive inclinations.”*

(Freud, 1964, 211.)

In Greek mythology, Eros is the god of love, while Thanatos is the god of death. Evil, or the tendency toward aggression and destruction, was initially classified by Freud as originating from the sexual drive, Eros. Yet later he described a new force on human nature that explained the source of evil as the death drive, or Thanatos. Freud posits that the death drive is a fundamental component of the human psyche, representing a force of negativity and destructiveness, the opposite of the life drive. The death drive can manifest in two distinct forms: externally, as sadistic aggression, and internally, as masochistic aggression directed toward the ego. Both aggression toward others and self-directed aggression serve as mechanisms to accelerate the innate, usually gradual, impulse to return to death – the ultimate resolution of this pent-up energy. As such,

they stem from, and remain within, the unconscious tendency toward regression to earlier developmental stages (Freud, 1955, 1964; McWilliams, 2011; Zilbersheid, 2013).

Freud's view is that aggression is inherent and innate. He suggests that the survival instinct requires the externalization of aggression – turning it outward – since failing to do so would lead to self-destruction. In this sense, aggression, as a manifestation of the death drive, is seen as a necessary part of human existence. There is no point in attempting to eradicate “evil” because human nature consists of “instinctual impulses” directed at satisfying primal needs; and this aggression is only classified as evil in the societal context. The motivation to avoid evil is to avoid feeling social anxiety; in other words, in a society where cruel actions are judged as positive, there is no avoiding perpetrating evil. As Albert Einstein wrote to Freud, “man has within him a lust for hatred and destruction...” (Freud, 1964, 201.). However, the destructive human predisposition can be channelled to build rather than destroy, using the force of Eros, of love, thorough intellect; “two of the most important phenomena of culture are, firstly, a strengthening of the intellect, which tends to master our instinctive life, and, secondly, an introversion of the aggressive impulse, with all its consequent benefits and perils” as Freud answered (Freud, 1964, 214-215.).

### **C. G. Jung – The Shadow, Hidden Memories, Autonomous Complex, and Participation Mystique**

*“...unconsciousness makes no difference between good and evil.”*

(Jung, 1959, 53.)

Unlike Freud, Jung saw good and evil as two interpretations of action. Good and evil reside in the unconscious united, yet when they surface at the conscious level, individuals can understand what is good and what is evil and can differentiate them. Good and bad rely on our subjective judgment rather than just the social norms of our particular time and society. Rather than viewing evil merely as the absence of good, as did the Christian culture he was part of and debated with, Carl Jung conceptualized it as an independent force. Jung believed that good and evil were a pair of opposites that needed to be united in the self, just as much as the conscious and the unconscious did. According to him, it was the suppression of the dark side of the self in Christianity that had led to the appalling outbreaks of violence and the unprecedented evil of Jung's own time – the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Jung's framework, particularly regarding this interpretation of evil, notably includes the concept he called “The Shadow”. (Jung, 1995; Jung, 1959; Papadopoulos, 2006.)

The Shadow's origin is in the collective unconscious, a human element Jung describes as not relying on individual early childhood experiences but on the experience of the entire human race. The shadow incorporates the unconscious needs or aspirations of all “unacceptable” thoughts, feelings, and actions. The shadow is a

moral problem that challenges the whole personality. It is important to mention that the shadow is not inherently negative; it can also encompass the repressed positive aspects of an individual.

Jung highlights the need to acknowledge evil as an aspect of the self as if it is not acknowledged, it will be projected. Recognizing the shadow cultivates humility and induces a genuine apprehension of the depths of human nature. Jung emphasizes that obliviousness to these aspects is a danger to humanity (Jung, 1959; Jung, 1995; Papadopoulos, 2006). An infamous example of the collective shadow being projected, is that of the Shadow the German people projected onto the Jews, instead of understanding the danger of Hitler, their own worst shadow (Casement, 2012).

*“Not the artist alone, but every creative individual whatsoever owes all that is greatest in his life to fantasy.”*

(Jung, 1921, 103.)

Art, according to Jung, is not merely a sublimated sexual fantasy or an expression of an early life complex. Jung believed that art comes to be from a far deeper source in humanity. Art, as per Jung, comes from “hidden memories”. Artists often have an illusion of creating something new, only to re-discover it as their own, to re-discover humanity’s memory hidden inside their own subconscious expression. Art plays a role in connecting the conscious and the unconscious. These hidden memories flow from the artists by impulse. The artist only later interprets them consciously or doesn’t. Jung attributed this force as the source of creativity and art, but also the source of hallucinations and insanity (Van den Berk, 2012).

Not only do forgotten personal memories surface through art, but memories of the race, derived from the collective unconscious. Autonomous complexes unfold deep unconscious tendencies that are formed uncontrollably by physical and non-physical experiences. This is how an artist creates something new. This dynamic can be applied to a “father complex”, the element of “father” could resurface arbitrarily, as a “dark feeling of inferiority that is attached to different situations” (Van den Berk, 2012, 17.). This description of father-complex-driven energy, wanting to express itself uncontrollably from a collective unconscious, perhaps sets the ground for Szondi’s view- adding the family aspect to this particular complex and naming it the Cain complex, which will be further discussed.

Another relevant Jungian concept is the “participation mystique,” a term Jung borrowed from the anthropologist Lucien Lévy-Bruhl. While initially describing a “pre-logical” mindset, arguably a racist characterization of indigenous peoples, Jung reinterpreted this term as an appreciation for ancient practices and their access to a universal unconscious. In this context, the state of “participation mystique” is seen as a blurring of psychological boundaries between individuals and their environment, and sometimes objects, presenting an opportunity to re-examine established ideas (Winborn, 2021). This dynamic of enlightenment through the unity of all things is another description of the deep source of art vis a vis Jung.

## Leopold Szondi – Cain, and the projection of interior drives from the Family<sup>1</sup> Unconscious

*“In Szondi’s conception, people’s fate is shaped by their choices.”*

(Kiss, 2010, 2.)

Szondi’s advancement of the concept of evil differs from both Freud and Jung and is described as part of fate analysis. Freud described evil as a deep instinct that could not be defeated but only suppressed through social norms. Jung argued that evil could not be overcome because it is the same as a physical principle that exists and merely can be perceived by individuals (but perhaps can be defused by acknowledging it).

Szondi’s solution to evil is that we should not only become aware of it, but we should defeat it. Similarly to Freud’s use of Thanatos as an addition to the Eros drive, Szondi separates sadistic aggression (that comes from the sexual drive) and the paroxysmal drives. Similarly to Jung, he added to his theory the influence of an innate force alongside the impact of early childhood experiences. Szondi expanded the Freudian model and specified four drives: Sexual, Paroxysmal, Ego, and Contactual.

The paroxysmal drive encompasses two categories of needs: Refined and Coarse emotions. The Coarse emotions include representations of “goodness” personified by Abel, and Evil is personified by “Cain”. Szondi differentiates between aggression, which can be driven by all drives to some extent – primarily by the sexual drive (echoing Freud’s concept of “sadism”) and evil acts motivated by “Cainitic” traits<sup>2</sup> such as anger, rage, envy, jealousy, hatred, and vengeance. The paroxysmal drive is fundamentally centred on the emotional realm of existence. It embodies “Cainitic” or “Abelitic” emotions that act independently or interact in complex ways, which Szondi describes as refined emotions. He emphasizes that the Cain element can incorporate the Abel element; for instance, during an evil act, an individual may feel remorse, prompting a noble stance against evil, thereby assuming the Abel element. Conversely, excessive self-righteousness from an act of goodness of Abelitic nature, can drive a person to commit violent, “Cainitic” acts (Jessep, 2021).

As mentioned, Szondi integrates both Freudian and Jungian perspectives on evil to develop a more comprehensive model. Similarly to Jung’s concept of the Shadow, Szondi posits in fate analysis that good and evil are of the same substance, both essential for achieving personal wholeness. Like Freud and Jung, he applies his theory to interpret clinical cases, identifying four manifestations of “Cain” in individuals: the “Ill Cain,” the “Criminal Cain,” the “Neurotic Cain”, and “Cain, the everyday person” (Jessep, 2021, 39.). Szondi also integrates ethology<sup>3</sup> into his theory. He identifies biological and environmental factors as the deterministic elements of fate, whereas

---

<sup>1</sup> In some sources: Familial or Family unconscious. The word used by Szondi is “*familiären*” or “*familiäre*” in German, that translates to “Family” in English – and that is why I chose that term.

<sup>2</sup> Personality traits coming from the Cain.

<sup>3</sup> The study of animal behaviour, which was prominent in the early 20th century.

psychological and spiritual factors symbolize an individual's ability to choose and surpass their biological and environmental limitations (Jessep, 2021).

“If a Cainite is possessed of hypernational delusions and gains political power, it will not only lead to the hell of tyranny and the mobilisation of the hidden Cainitic sentiment among the masses, which is then called “Volk,” but to mass murder and war. That’s the way it always was, and it will remain so into the future.”<sup>4</sup> (Szondi, 1969, 61.)

Szondi also described a collective Cain of some sort. He articulated the dire implications of the Cain figure gaining extreme power, appealing to “the Cain in every person”, so to speak. The Cain in power can create masses of perpetrators. The ultimate example of a Cain figure possessing political power is the case of Adolf Eichmann. Szondi calls Eichman a “Desk Cain” – somebody who, without killing with his own hands, was able to destroy millions of lives “effectively with a fountain pen.” (Szondi, 1969 in Jessep, 2021, 171.).

During the trial of Adolf Eichman in Israel, Szondi received the results of a Szondi test that Hungarian Israeli psychiatrist István Kulcsár conducted on Eichman, and Szondi analysed the results himself, without knowing that the test belonged to Eichmann. Szondi’s conclusion states: “This man is a criminal with an insatiable killing intention,” and that no other test he had conducted before this evidenced the same level of the “Cain figure with homicidal intention...an almost unique case” (Szondi, 1969 in Jessep, 2021, 171.).

The Cain that is part of humanity’s unconscious is a dangerous force, that can cause a great deal of suffering to other humans, to brothers, to Abel, both on an individual and societal level. This understanding serves as a warning and a view of evil’s inherent nature, that needs to be acknowledged and dealt with. Szondi describes the ability to defy this force through choice.

## The Resolution to Cain

### *Moses or Joseph?*

*“And what can I tell you my brother, my killer,  
What can I possibly say?  
I guess that I miss you, I guess I forgive you,  
I’m glad you stood in my way.” – Leonard Cohen  
(Cohen, 1971, 15.)*

---

<sup>4</sup> “Kainiten entwickeln aber nicht nur religiöse, sondern – unter chaotischen Umständen – auch gefahrbringende politische Wahnideen. Wenn ein Kainit von einer hypernationalistischen Wahnidee besessen ist und politische Macht erlangt, so führt das nicht nur zur Hölle der Tyrannei und zur Mobilisierung der verborgenen kainitischen Gesinnung in der Masse, die dann »Volk« heißt, sondern zum Massenmord und Krieg. So war es immer, und so wird es auch künftig bleiben. Als Beispiel bringen wir hier die Geschichte zweier Kriegsverbrecher aus der Zeit des dritten Reichs.”

In his work, Szondi highlights another fundamental character in addition to Cain and Abel: Moses. Moses, perhaps the most dominant figure in the Hebrew Bible, is described by Szondi as the ultimate counterpoint to Cain.

Moses becomes a killer early in his story by killing an Egyptian. The story has some similarities to the story of Cain and Abel. Moses sees the suffering of his brothers, sees an Egyptian hitting his “brother,” kills him and buries him in the sand. Szondi views this act as pivotal. Moses kills to protect his brothers; his killing of the Egyptian is rooted in compassion for the suffering of all his brothers. Szondi portrays Moses as a combination of Cain and Abel:

“Moses would never have been the historical author of the state and person of God if he had not killed in his youth. In my opinion, the killing motive in the fate of Moses is the original, fate-forming element”<sup>5</sup> (Szondi, 1973, 153.).

Szondi elaborates on Moses, distinguishing between “Moses the Mann” and “Moses the Mensch”: the universal man, who could be anyone, and the latter as the symbolic, perhaps ideal man. According to Jessep (2021), Szondi used the term “der Mensch” because it signifies a quality that is universally human, transcending the individuality implied by the German term “der Mann”. One could speculate that Szondi was influenced by his Jewish background and how the Yiddish language understood “der Mensch” as an honourable and decent person (Jessep, 2021).

Moses incorporates Cain but chooses to channel this Cainitic element within him, which is a part of any human, for the good of humanity. He uses evil for his people, ultimately to serve God. According to Szondi, Cain killed his brother because he felt the urge to kill God, the ultimate father (Jessep, 2021). The first killing is an act of defiance towards the ultimate father figure. Conversely, Moses kills to please the heavenly father. Moses encompasses Cain in his actions throughout the stories of the Hebrew Bible, using vengeance and aggression in multiple incidents, beginning with killing the Egyptian, followed by ordering the slaughter of 3,000 worshipers of the golden calf (Bible Gateway, Exodus 32: 27-28), killing the devotees of Ba'al Peor (Bible Gateway, Numbers 25: 5-6), and ordering the killing of women and children in the war against Midian (Bible Gateway, Numbers 31:17). Moses's character does not resolve the Cain complex in a way that ends violent aggression; rather, he incorporates the killing of brothers (symbolically speaking) into the will of the father. This struggle transforms him from merely a man (Mann) to the ultimate mythological Mensch. Cain killed Abel, his brother, fuelled by his resentment toward God, the father. It was violence that defied the will of the father. Moses kills in every instance that he does, not fuelled by resentment, but incorporating God's will into his actions. He did it not as merely a man jealous of his brother, but as a leader of a people, for the betterment of humanity.

---

<sup>5</sup> „Aus der Sicht der Schicksalsanalyse steht für mich fest, daß Moses nie der historische Staatsverfasser und Gottesmann geworden wäre, wenn er nicht in der Jugend getötet hätte. Das Tötungsmotiv im Schicksale Moses ist m.E. das urgründige, schicksalsformende Element. Nur durch das Töten eines Menschen ist Moses durch die nachfolgende Schuldkenntnis vom Töten zu Gott und zu dem Gewissensverbot im Dekalog gekommen: Du sollst nicht töten!“

Furthermore, Moses as a baby was ordered to be killed by the Pharaoh, as every male baby was to be thrown into the Nile. Yet, he was saved. His name is derived from Moshe which comes from the Hebrew verb Meshiya (“משייה”), meaning “pulled out of the water” (“משה כי מן המים משייתהו”). He was named Moses by the Pharaoh’s daughter who saved him. This is another hint to Moses’ Family unconscious formation and fate, suggesting that the Pharaoh’s daughter’s decision to save the baby broke her own Family unconscious disposition through choice, saving rather than killing, opposing her fathers’ law.

The internal and external struggles of the Cainitic force and its counter, represented by Moses, can result in a taxonomy of six different potentialities described by Szondi: 1. The Sudden Change: the rise of the Cain in Moses, manifested as anger, rage, and hatred in various instances in the biblical story, starting with the slaying of the Egyptian. 2. The Synthesis: the violent conflict between two polarities. 3. The Decision: a conscious decision of the ego to embody either “Moses” or “Cain”. 4. The Indecision: remaining in an ambivalent stance. 5. The Socialization: satisfying a Cainitic tendency within a socially acceptable framework (similarly to Freud’s concept of sublimation). 6. Szondi’s (not Freud’s) Sublimation: attempting to simultaneously satisfy both Cainitic and Mosaic dispositions on a spiritual level, observed in creations related to religion, art, and science. To reach this potentiality, one must seek a common spiritual object and goal that combines both Cainitic and Mosaic tendencies (Jessep, 2021).

However, it is important to examine the integration of the Cainitic and the aim to please God (or the greater good) tendencies. This mixture of divine justification and violent actions can lead to even more destruction. The choice of Moses as the symbolic counter-character to Cain can be interpreted as an explanation for acts of violence in the name of God. From the stories described in the Old Testament and other popular myths, through historical implications, and up to this day, many horrible, “Cain” actions have been committed, and have been justified as being God’s will. Leaders, soldiers and people across cultures perpetrated violence, while believing that what they were doing to other people, to their brothers and sisters, was what God want them to do. If we simply take the character of Moses as the answer to Cain, the service of God with the Evil Cain drive, it could lead to dangerous conclusions (not to say it is the only conclusion possible).

Jessep (2021), suggests Joseph as an alternative biblical character to oppose Cain, instead of Moses. Joseph was thrown into a pit by his brothers, stranded, and then taken as a slave by traders. He was effectively “killed” by his brothers but survived and became the governor of Egypt. His brothers, sent by their father, his father too, to obtain food during a famine, came to Egypt. They did not recognize Joseph, yet he recognized them. Joseph had his brothers, his killers, at his mercy. Joseph falsely accused them of spying. When Joseph overheard his eldest brother mention that this is their punishment for what they did to Joseph years before, he started crying. He then sent them back and forth until ultimately, he confronted them, exposing himself as their brother. Unlike Cain, he held no grudge against his brothers, but rather saw it all as a divine plan that saved the lives of many people (Joseph managed through his dreams to predict the famine and collect stocks of grain that prepared Egypt for the



famine). Despite their bad intentions, his perspective was that it led to the current positive outcome. He promised to provide for them and their children, and so he did until his death.

Joseph's rise to power is accompanied by his capacity for forgiveness and generosity (Bible Gateway, Genesis 37-50). In Szondian terms, Joseph's rise to power, reveals his psychological maturity in resisting the Cainitic pattern through his introjection of the ultimate father – God – and his biological father, Jacob. Joseph and his brothers received a Family unconscious from the same father, but made different decisions, notably they chose to kill him and he chose to forgive them. Joseph embodies mercy, reconciliation, and justice, resisting intense and uncontrollable emotions present in his Family unconscious. Joseph refrains from acts of violence and killing, fully embracing the role and qualities associated with “the father,” aligning with Szondi's proposed resolution to the problem represented by Cain. Using Szondi's terminology, Joseph can be considered as “*der Mensch*”, the biblical symbol for resolving the issue raised by Cain (Jessep, 2021). Joseph is the Abel, that managed to achieve power, incorporating the Cain element, and using free will to use that power not to kill but to save his brothers. The psychological solution to innate forces of victims and of perpetrators, is to use both compassion and forgiveness for the betterment of mankind which could be apparent and not divine. The victim does not have to victimize his killers when he has the upper hand. Solving the Cain complex by projecting vindictive urges onto the will of the father, as suggested by Szondi with the use of the character of Moses, is problematic. Instead, finding salvation in becoming a merciful father, rather than avenging him. God forgave the original Cain in Genesis and allowed him to prosper. Interoperating the Szondian view through Joseph rather than Moses offers a more constructive solution to this important issue.

### **(Jabal), Jubal and Tubal-Cain<sup>6</sup>**

*“Jubal sang of the golden years  
When wars and wounds shall cease –  
But Tubal fashioned the hand-flung spears  
And showed his neighbours peace.  
New – new as the Nine point Two<sup>7</sup>,  
Older than Lamech's slain –  
Roaring and loud is the feud avowed  
Twix' Jubal and Tubal Cain!”  
(Kipling, 1994, 580.)*

---

<sup>6</sup> The original passage from Genesis is: “Cain knew his wife, and she conceived and bore Enoch. When he built a city, he called the name of the city after the name of his son, Enoch. To Enoch was born Irad, and Irad fathered Mehujael, and Mehujael fathered Methushael, and Methushael fathered Lamech. And Lamech took two wives. The name of the one was Adah, and the name of the other Zillah. Adah bore Jabal; he was the father of those who dwell in tents and have livestock. His brother's name was Jubal; he was the father of all those who play the lyre and pipe. Zillah also bore Tubal-Cain; he was the forger of all instruments of bronze and iron.”

Genesis 4:1–26, <https://biblia.com/bible/esv/genesis/4>

<sup>7</sup> “A massive breech-loading gun with a caliber of 9.2 inches (23.4 cm.) Commonly known as a Nine-two.” [https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/readers-guide/rg\\_jubal1.htm](https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/readers-guide/rg_jubal1.htm) by John McGivering and John Radcliffe.

Shortly after the description of Cain murdering his brother Abel, the Bible details the lineage of Cain's descendants, depicting the establishment of the first city. This new civilization perpetuates Cain's genes, and its inhabitants share a Family unconscious, that of the first murderer. The lineage progresses from Cain to Enoch, Irad, Mehujael, Lamech, who had three sons: Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-Cain.

The similarity in the sound of their names suggests a resemblance to each other, and also to Abel's name. Jabal ("יָבֵל") was the father of those who dwell in tents and have livestock ("מִקְנֵה"). The Hebrew word for livestock "Mikne" notably echoing the name of Cain ("קַיִן"). Additionally, the Hebrew word "יבול" (Yevul) which means crop, is almost identical to "יבל" – "Jabal". This could suggest the synthesis of Cain and Abel in the creation of human nourishment. Of the Szondian potentialities, this could be an example of the Szondian sublimation concept.

Jabal's half-brother, Tubal-Cain ("תּוֹבַל-קַיִן"), fathered all who forged bronze and iron. Many commentators of the Hebrew Bible interpret the forgers of bronze and iron as makers of tools of war- the instruments of killing. Yet also, the metal could be used to build tools for plowing and harvesting. The name Tubal-Cain combines two words: "Tubal" and "Cain". Rashi, a prominent commentator of the Hebrew Bible in traditional Jewish reading, highlights that the word Tubal in Tubal-Cain ("תּוֹבַל-קַיִן") is derived from the same word used for seasoning ("תִּבּוּל" – Tibul), which would be the exact same word for "was seasoned" ("תּוֹבַל" – Tubal). This combination could suggest the meaning of Tubal-Cain a "seasoned Cain". This implies that Tubal-Cain, as a seasoned version of Cain, would forge metal into tools that enable both the cultivation of crops (the power of life) and instruments of war (the power of death). This could exemplify the Szondian concepts of Indecision – remaining in an ambivalent stance, or perhaps the synthesis in which the two polarities, Cain and Abel, coincide with each other. Tubal-Cain is neither Cain nor Abel, nor is he Moses, forging the tools, that enable destruction and creation, death and life at the same time, without a clear implication or direction for the intended use of those tools.

It is particularly symbolic as well that Cain's curse was the barrenness of the earth. The earth, soaked with Abel's blood, becomes unyielding for Cain, the farmer by trade. It could be implied that the introduction of iron tools by his descendants defies this curse, allowing for cultivation even in hard soil. Tubal-Cain represents both the source of the curse and the answer to it; either forge the means to put your brothers in the ground or the means to feed your brothers, by softening the ground.

Jabal's half-brother, Jubal, is said to be the father of all musicians. The instruments played by his descendants are mentioned explicitly: the lyre and pipe ("כַּנּוֹר וְעִינָב"). One of these musical instruments is derived from the linguistic root ע-ג-ב, which is used in words describing love, more specifically sexual desire. This corresponds to Freud's theory of art originating from Eros countering Thanatos. These countering forces can also be symbolized by agriculture versus livestock, planting seeds versus slaughtering animals. Interestingly, Cain, the tiller of soil, becomes the murderer rather than Abel, the herder of sheep (who presumably had to kill sheep for nourishment). In

Szondian terms Jubal could represent socialization, creating the opposite of his unconscious familial tendencies. Music rather than violence, life instead of death.

Also, the names Jubal, Jabal, and Tubal-Cain resemble the Hebrew term “Jubilee” (“יובֵל”), particularly Jubal (“יובָל”), which has the exact same letters with different punctuation as Jubilee (pronounced “Yovel” – “יובֵל”). In Jewish tradition, the Jubilee is a year occurring every 50 years, during which slaves are released, debts are dismissed, and acquired property is returned to its original owners. This concept of release or dropping (“שמִיטָה”) of property (“קנין”-” Kinyan”) echoes the name of the first murderer, Cain (“קין”) that is similar to the word for property. Jubal, a descendant of the first murderer and the mythical father of all musicians, symbolizes the transformative potential of human dispositions, perhaps a proposed choice to use the inherent evil drive in a productive rather than destructive way. To “drop” the hate and the resentment and share the land, the music, the beauty.

## Conclusion

*“Whoever kills, kills his brother.” – Ellie Weisel*

(Shanks, 2004, 1.)

Ellie Wiesel’s statement speaks to the painful reality of human violence and underscores the central theme of the Cain and Abel narrative: our aggression often arises not towards strangers but towards those closest to us. This biblical story, examined through the lenses of Freud, Jung, and Szondi, reveals profound insights into the psychological underpinnings of human aggression and choice, through artistic and creative transformations. Returning to the themes introduced in the beginning, myths are more than just stories – they are powerful frameworks that offer a deeper understanding of the human psyche and the forces at play within it.

Freud’s view of myths as expressions of human neuroses, Jung’s idea of myths as symbols of unconscious forces, and Szondi’s perspective on myth as a reflection of familial and genetic predispositions all enrich the psychology of religion. Myths, such as those found in Genesis, bridge our collective history with our personal psychological experiences, linking ancient archetypes with modern issues. Szondi’s work highlighted that we find a unique intersection between mythology and psychoanalysis by studying biblical figures such as Cain, Abel, and Moses. Inspired by it, I tried to apply similar interpretation to other biblical figures through Szondi’s disposition to learn about possible psychological solutions to one of the most fundamental human problems: the innate evil. By illuminating the destructive potential inherent in human nature alongside the possibility for transformation, these stories contribute significantly to both religious psychology and broader psychological theory, inspiring thought and even action and choice.

This analysis suggests that myths like Cain and Abel resonate because they reflect something fundamental within all individuals. The Cain-Abel narrative, when

extended to their descendants like Jubal and Tubal-Cain, underscores this point: from the beginning point, the Family unconscious, many paths could be chosen; one leads to creativity, the other one leads to violence, and many combinations or exaggerations of the two. The paths illustrate Szondi's concept of the "Cain complex," showing that the familial and genetic predispositions present within each individual offer choices for constructive or destructive outcomes.

In conclusion, this study contends that biblical myths enrich psychological discourse by illustrating the complex interplay between aggression and redemption, nature and choice, especially when framed within psychoanalytic thought and terminologies. These ancient stories encourage us to confront the potential for violence within ourselves and, ultimately, to transform it. Just as myths have guided societies throughout history, so too can they guide individuals in channelling their inherent aggressions and destructive impulses into pursuits of creativity, love, and peace. Through Leopold Szondi's use of these myths in describing these dynamics, the understanding that by consciously engaging with these narratives, we not only deepen our understanding of religious psychology but also enhance our ability to choose paths that lead to constructive and redemptive ends. Freud introduced the personal unconscious and the manifestation of it in psychological illness, Jung added the collective unconscious, and its implications in symbols, Szondi contributed the Family unconscious and its role in existential decisions. Looking into Jubal and Tubal-Cain's supposed dichotomy can illuminate how inherited aggressive drives can manifest through different pathways, suggesting that genetic or familial predispositions do not deterministically lead to destructive outcomes. This aligns with and extends Szondi's concept of fate analysis. The conclusion is that the unconscious aggressive forces in every person, and even in societies, can be used for creation rather than destruction, for art, not war.

## References

- Bible Gateway.** (n.d.). Bible gateway passage: Genesis 42 – new international version. <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+42>
- Bible Gateway.** (n.d.). Bible gateway passage: Genesis 37 – new international version. <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+37>
- Bible Gateway.** (n.d.). Bible gateway passage: Numbers 31 – new international version. <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Numbers+31>
- Bible Gateway.** (n.d.). Bible gateway passage: Exodus 25 – new international version. <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Exodus+25>
- Biblia by Logos.** (n.d.). Genesis 4: 1–26 – English standard version. <https://biblia.com/bible/esv/genesis/4>
- Casement, A.** (2006). The shadow. In: R. K. Papadopoulos (ed.), *The Handbook of Jungian Psychology* (94-112). London & New York: Routledge, 2012.

- Cohen, L.** (1971). *Famous Blue Raincoat*. [Vocal Score]. Columbia Records.
- Freud, S.** (1955). *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud: Beyond the Pleasure Principle, Group Psychology and Other Works*. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.
- Freud, S.** (1964). *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (1932-1936): New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis and Other Works*. (201-215). London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.
- Jessep, A.** (2021). "Cain Rules the World": Léopold Szondi, Genesis 4, and the Nature of Evil. Doctoral dissertation. Flinders University Theses Repository. [Flinders University – RHD Theses](#).
- Jung, C. G.** (1921). *Psychological types*. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire (Eds.), *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 6). New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1971.
- Jung, C. G.** (1959). *Aion. Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jung, C. G.** (1995). *Jung on Evil*. Ed. M. Stein. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Kipling, R.** (1994). *The Works of Rudyard Kipling*. Ware: Wordsworth Editions.
- Kiss, E.** (2010). Personality and the Family unconscious in Szondi's fate-analysis. *Empirical Text and Culture Research*, 4: 70-80.
- Lévy-Bruhl, L.** (1910). *Les fonctions mentales dans les sociétés inférieures*. Paris: F. Alcan, 1922.
- McWilliams, N.** (1994). *Psychoanalytic Diagnosis: Understanding Personality structure in the Clinical Process*. New York: Guilford Press, 2011.
- Papadopoulos, R. K.** (Ed.). (2006). *The Handbook of Jungian Psychology: Theory, Practice and Applications*. Hove: Psychology Press.
- Shanks, H. – Cross, F. M. – Wiesel, E.** (2004). Contrasting Insights of Biblical Giants. *Biblical Archaeology Review*, July-August. <https://library.biblicalarchaeology.org/article/contrasting-insights-of-biblical-giants/>
- Szondi, L.** (1956). *Heilwege der Tiefenpsychologie*. Bern: Verlag Hans Huber.
- Szondi, L.** (1969). *Kain. Gestalten des Bösen*. Bern: Verlag Hans Huber.
- Szondi, L.** (1973). *Moses. Antwort auf Kain*. Bern: Verlag Hans Huber.
- Van den Berk, T.** (2012). *Jung on Art: The Autonomy of the Creative Drive*. London: Routledge.
- Winborn, M.** (2021). *Participation Mystique: An Overview*. <https://iaap.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Participation-Mystique.pdf>

**Wiseman, M.** (1994). Art and Psychoanalysis by Laurie Schneider Adams. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 52(4): 485-486.

**Zilbersheid, U.** (2013). The historical character of human nature in Freud's theories. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 73(2): 184-204.