

In the Spirit of His Time

Jung's Anima and Animus and Their Evolution

Janice Hila

School of Psychology, Bangor University, Parkville, MD, USA

janice.hila@gmail.com

Abstract

Jung's conception, his articulation, and his relationship to the anima and animus and then more current thoughts and relationships to them, a deeper understanding of the archetype and its future manifestations in the unconscious are examined. When one considers how Jung developed his theory of the anima and animus and the gender-bias that he demonstrates in his articulation of the concept, one can understand why the concept was then, and continues to be, difficult to grasp. Jung was a product of his time and so it is with the changes in gender roles and the rise in awareness of the LGBTQ community that new ideas are surfacing about how to view the archetypes of anima and animus. Within this research, Hillman and other post-Jungian theorists lend their opinions and elucidations of the anima/animus archetype with major revisions and questions raised for consideration. Connections between contemporary gender issues are addressed, especially feminism and transgenderism. Questions for further research and consideration such as the relationship between psychic reality, biological reality, and neurological reality and the relationships between the individual unconscious and the collective unconscious in relation to gender are posed. To conclude, Jung seems to have moved into a place of greater wisdom and relation to his unconscious material over the course of his life, perhaps signalling future relations between anima and animus, i.e. the inner other gendered archetype, in both individuals and society.

Keywords

anima – animus – archetype – gender – feminism – transgender

Jung was a pioneer in the field of psychoanalysis, migrating into uncharted territory within the psyche as few had ever done. Terms such as “persona”, “ego”, “shadow”, and “archetype” have made their way into the realm of general knowledge and vocabulary. But one of his concepts, that of the anima and animus, continues to be a difficult element of the unconscious to grasp. It is my contention that when one considers how Jung developed his theory of the anima and animus and the gender-bias that he demonstrates in his articulation of the concept, one can understand why the concept was then, and continues to be, difficult to grasp. Jung was a product of his time, as we all are, and so it is with the changes in gender roles and the rise in awareness of the LGBTQ community that new ideas are surfacing about how to view the archetypes of anima and animus. As we examine Jung’s conception, his articulation, and his relationship to the anima and animus and then more current thoughts and relationships to them, a deeper understanding of the archetype and its future manifestations in the unconscious begins to form.

In *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* Jung (1963: 178) recalls, “A cogent motive for my making the attempt [to commune with the unconscious] was the conviction that I could not expect of my patients something I did not dare to do myself”. This he said motivated him when his encounters felt nearly unbearable to him. In one of these dives down into the unconscious he had his first encounter with the figures Salome and Elijah. Jung describes Elijah as an old man and Salome as a beautiful young girl who is notably blind. He is shocked when he learns their names since they are well-known biblical figures. Not only is he surprised to find them in his unconscious, but he is “staggered” by the fact that he is meeting Salome. He finds it even more strange that she and Elijah are together, “... but Elijah assured me that he and Salome had belonged together from all eternity” (1963: 181). Jung continues, “I stuck close to Elijah because he seemed to be the most reasonable ... and to have a clear intelligence. Of Salome I was distinctly suspicious” (ibid).

As Jung continued to encounter these figures over the course of his lifetime, they changed and evolved depending on his situation. Elijah became Philemon, who was a sort of guide and mentor to Jung, often accompanying him as he moved through the unconscious having various encounters and experiences. Salome, however, disappears for a long time from Jung’s unconscious explorations. This may not be surprising, despite the fact that Elijah tells Jung that he and Salome have “belonged together for all eternity”. Jung did not seem able to accept this at the time and furthermore was suspicious of Salome. It is no wonder that she presents herself to him for the first time as blind, perhaps reflecting that nothing can be seen through her, at least not while Jung remains so suspicious and untrusting of her.

Here it may be needful to articulate how Jung would later define anima and animus and with what principles he associated them. Jung's argument was that the dominant function in men's psyche was Logos while for women their dominant function was Eros. With some discretion he explained that he made this distinction "for purely psychological reasons" and "I regard both concepts as intuitive ideas which cannot be defined accurately or exhaustively" (Hannah, 2011: 93).

Jung's conception first assumes that Logos and Eros are opposing principles, then further assumes that they can be applied with enough accuracy to the male and female sex discriminately. In *Jung and Feminism*, Demaris S. Wehr (1987) concisely explains how Jung conceived of the archetypes of anima and animus. She states that Jung posited a threefold source for anima and animus: (1) personal experience; (2) an innate predisposition for imagining contrasexuality or, in other words, an archetype; (3) a collective inherited image or archetypal image (1987: 63).

Accepting this description for Jung's source for anima and animus, we see that there are some glaring problems with his methodology. While the "predisposition for imagining contrasexuality" could be demonstrated through evidence gathered from analysands; and the third method, one inherited through cultural expression, can be demonstrated with evidence and data; the first method, personal experience, is a shaky basis to build a theory upon. Wehr critiques his methodology by noting that "For Jung ... no contradiction exists between 'psychic' and 'facts'" (1983: 73). Whereas most scientists would argue that psychic perceptions should not and cannot be submitted as evidence as one develops a scientific theory, Jung would reverse this paradigm, placing personal experience, or personal psychic perceptions, above factual, verifiable evidence. This is extremely pertinent to our consideration of Jung's articulation and development of the anima and animus. By Jung's logic, if Jung perceives the world as full of contradictory opposites, which he does, and he further considers that his perceptions of the world are satisfactory evidence of reality, then his theory of anima and animus archetypes is legitimate, so long as it continues to be reflected back to him by the world, thus proving its validity.

Later in life, Jung would see Salome as his most prominent anima figure. However, the first time he "hears" her voice he does not identify her by name, but eventually makes the connection. In *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* he recalls wondering why he felt the need to write down his dreams and fantasies when a female voice within him said he was creating art. He recounts, "I was astonished ... I know for a certainty that the voice had come from a woman" (1963: 185). He identifies the voice as that of a female patient, a "talented psychopath" (ibid). Considering Salome's role in the bible, one cannot help but see

a clear parallel between this psychotic female patient and the biblical story (see Appendix). This association blooming, Jung immediately becomes defensive and adversarial. He continues reflecting, "Obviously what I was doing wasn't science. What then could it be but art? It was as though these were the only alternatives in the world. That is the way a woman's mind works" (ibid). Jung feels that he is being deceived, that this inner feminine figure is interfering. He concludes:

... that she must be the "soul," in the primitive sense ... Later I came to see that this inner feminine figure plays a typical, or archetypal, role in the unconscious of man, and I called her the "anima." The corresponding figure in the unconscious of woman I called the "animus".

1963: 186

First, we must note that Jung seems to be realizing there may be a personality inside himself which is separate from his ego and even has a voice. Upon reflection he described feeling "awed" and that "I was like a patient in analysis with a ghost and a woman!" (1963: 186). Jung does not identify with the dichotomy presented, whether recording his active imagination exercises and dreams is art or science, and ascribes the thinking to the inner female. The feeling of awe coupled with the independent reasoning is so new and strange. Jung eventually reaches the conclusion that, although this inner female is certainly wrong and must be resisted, she is also his "soul", and applies the term "anima" for the first time.

Jung's conception of the archetypes of anima and animus was heavily influenced by his cultural conditioning and his particular perspective as an intellectual male. Jung goes on to say in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* that these assertions by the anima were "full of deep cunning" and that she would have "seduced" him into misconceptions which would have utterly destroyed him (1963: 187). The particular words he chooses paint a clear picture of gender-bias and suspicion toward women, drawing on negative characterizations of women as manipulative temptresses who must be guarded against. Jung's conclusion following this encounter, that "the decisive factor is always consciousness, which can understand the manifestations of the unconscious and take up a position toward them" (1963: 187), may seem useful, but also may require slight modification. His claim that consciousness can "understand the manifestations of the unconscious" is clearly not so. If it were, where would the necessity be for psychoanalysis? Any manifestation of the unconscious would be immediately understood once presented to the conscious mind. But, his statement that the conscious mind can take up a position to the manifestations of the uncon-

scious is certainly true. One can always take a position, as Jung so clearly did when encountering his anima for the first time.

It must also be noted that as Jung conceived of the concept of the anima, he assumed the existence of a contra-sexual component in women's minds as a matter of course. In *The Animus: Spirit of Inner Truth in Women*, Barbara Hannah (2011) describes witnessing Jung present his conception of animus development in the psyche of women for the first time to a group of women. Here he makes it clear that his model for animus development directly corresponds to his model for anima development, the symbolic representations of the latter being Eve, Helen of Troy, Mary, and Sophia (Hannah, 2011: 101). In prefacing his suggestions for animus development, Jung explains that philosophy, which he characterizes as an early form of psychology, was articulated entirely by men with no consideration of women whatsoever. That is why there is 2,000 years worth of evidence and study of the anima and nothing whatever about the animus. He immediately equates the animus with women's "argumentative ways" and further says men never considered making a science of studying such (2011: 102).

Despite this lack of evidence and scholarship related to the animus, Jung asserts he may speculate about the development of the animus using the same scheme as the anima. But he qualifies with an apology for speaking as a man about the female unconscious, though he further challenges his listeners to suggest their own scheme (Hannah, 2011: 101).

Barbara Hannah was to later note that "Jung lay down this challenge in 1931, and I feel very strongly that not enough has been done about it since" (2011: 106). She adds, "... of course, it is very difficult for a woman to take up this challenge, for Logos is not her principle and obviously the discrimination of stages is mainly a matter of Logos" (ibid). The unfortunate irony of these two quotes is that while Jung is correct in his description of the early development of philosophy and psychology by men exclusively, the gender bias of Hannah and Jung's time shines through in her conclusion that "it is difficult for a woman to take up this challenge" due to her innate unfamiliarity with the principle of Logos. Couple this with the idea that the animus is making a "science" of women's "argumentative ways" and it's unsurprising that there is a lack of interest in studying the animus amongst women.

This perspective of Jung's becomes even more interesting once one further considers other comments he has made about the archetypes of anima and animus. He once stated "... The anima and animus have not been just invented by the conscious; they have been found by the conscious" (Hannah, 2011: 130). Here we clearly note that while Jung sees the archetypes as presenting themselves, he does not acknowledge that they must be filtered through conscious

understanding. He asserts "... the anima and the animus do make themselves felt in such a way that one can best apprehend their reality by treating them as autonomous personalities with a life and will of their own" (2011: 16) They may be independent, even "autonomous", but they are always mediated through his personal consciousness, through his ego.

This being the case, Jung's perception of anima and animus can never fail to be affected by his personal biases and his cultural conditioning. Jung's (1982: 97) description of "intellectual women" demonstrates an astonishing bias against women. Expressing that an intellectual woman is "solely intent upon exasperating the man" immediately denigrates her, her view, her opinions, her words. There seems to be no chance that she is participating in a debate or discussion, just the same as a man would. Nor is there a consideration that perhaps the man is reacting negatively because of his own psychic environment. Interestingly, his wife, Emma Jung, offers a much kinder, and probably more effective approach to an "intellectual woman". In *Anima and Animus* (1957) she suggests:

What is really necessary is that feminine intellectuality, logos in the woman, should be so fitted into the nature and life of the woman that a harmonious cooperation between the feminine and masculine factors ensues and no part is condemned to a shadowy existence.

13

This integrated approach to the animus for women, would seem to be the best possible, but we do not see Jung suggesting any such approach himself. In fact, he once said, "a man must take up a feminine attitude, while a woman must fight her animus, a masculine attitude" (Jung, 1982: 111). This is strange considering Jung is well-known for encouraging shadow integration and dialogue with the inner unconscious. But it would seem that as far as women are concerned, there are certain elements of the unconscious they should be in confrontation with, namely the masculine.

To give another example of gender-bias in Jung's articulation of the anima and animus, he once infamously stated:

No matter how friendly and obliging a woman's Eros may be, no logic on earth can shake her if she is ridden by the animus. Often the man has the feeling ... that only seduction or a beating or rape would have the necessary power of persuasion ... no man can converse with an animus for five minutes without becoming the victim of his own anima.

JUNG, 1969: 14

Strangely enough, for all his surety, Jung seems to be falling prey to his own anima, or at least according to his own theory he may be. He states:

[The anima] intensifies, exaggerates, falsifies, and mythologizes all emotional relations with his [the man's] work and with other people of both sexes ... Sometimes the man's relationship to the woman who has caught his anima accounts for the existence of this syndrome.

JUNG, 1982: 120

The clear irony then lies in Jung's own language. To suggest seduction, rape or beating as perhaps the only means of winning an argument with an animus-possessed woman seems to be the result of an anima-possessed man. But, of course, Jung may very well agree, since, he concludes, it's the woman's fault for constellating his anima in the first place.

Here again, however, Jung might take a unique turn from what we could easily decry as traditional misogyny. He argued that:

Everything unconscious is undifferentiated, ... that is to say, there is no determining whether it belongs or does not belong to oneself. It cannot be established *a priori* whether it concerns me, or another, or both.

JUNG, 1982: 95

Considering such, it can at least be argued that were he being misogynistic in his articulation of the anima and animus archetype, he may not have been aware because his conscious and unconscious minds remained undifferentiated. While this does not excuse misogyny, it does reveal how powerful the influence of the archetype of anima/animus may possibly be. Afterall, it appears to have subverted its own articulator.

Thus far we have seen that Jung conceived of the idea of the anima and animus while participating in active imagination, during which the voice of a woman came from within. His reaction was to be astonished and defensive, to see her influence as seductive and deceptive, but moreover to experience her as "other". He then went on to assume that there must be a similar gendered "other" in the minds of women, which he called the animus. And since within his own unconscious he saw the principles of Logos embodied in a male figure (Elijah) and Eros embodied in a female figure (Salome) he assigned these functions to men and women at large. This may have seemed natural considering the gender-biases of the time. Jung did not seem to consider the role that culture could play in him, nor in the collective unconscious, at least not enough to question whether these archetypes were indeed *a priori*.

If the anima and animus represent the inner “other”, then can they not be the opposite gender of whatever the ego of the individual most identifies with? Jung would likely argue no, this cannot be the case. Barbara Hannah clarified the distinction when she described the anima and animus as demonstrating the contrast between the feminine soul and masculine spirit, which she said Jung argued could not be interchangeable. (Hannah, 2011: 2) So anima and animus cannot even be gendered expressions for the same basic psychic function, they are fundamentally different. However, later Jungians and post-Jungians would come to view the anima and animus in new ways. Interestingly, maybe even prophetically, Barbara Hannah once stated, “As soon as we attempt to liberate ourselves from possession by the anima or animus we get into a different order of things, and this attempt challenges the old order” (2011: 14).

James Hillman, the founder of archetypal psychology, proposes that the anima as an archetype can never be assigned to only one sex, since being an archetype it is by definition beyond the bounds of individuals and therefore categories of gender or sex (Hillman, 1985: 55). In proposing that anima be an archetype which is accessible and active in women, Hillman addresses some major issues that Jung himself faced as he developed his theories of anima and animus, namely that women didn’t seem to innately understand animus. Jung himself stated:

So far as my experience goes, a man always understands fairly easily what is meant by the anima; ... But I have, as a rule, found it very difficult to make a woman understand what the animus is, and I have never met any woman who could tell me anything definite about his personality.

HANNAH, 2011: 65

Barbara Hannah also recounted, “Jung once pointed out in a seminar that, whereas portraits of the anima are exceedingly common in literature, good portraits of the animus are very rare” (2011: 4). It’s strange that considering Jung’s phenomenological methodology that Jung does not see the lack of evidence of animus within the psyche of women or culture as problematic.

Despite the lack of evidence of animus as exclusive to women, Emma Jung (1957) clarifies the association between the principle of Logos and the archetype of the animus. She describes the progressive development of the animus in women, mirroring Jung’s suggested anima development, as power, deed, word, and meaning (1957: 2–3). This concept springs from the association of Logos with these four elements. Here she is perhaps better articulating the quintessence of the masculine principle than she is proving that it is a function of the animus or proof of the animus as *a priori* within the female psyche.

While both demonstrating the gender bias of her time and expanding the possibility that animus, or more accurately the archetypal Logos, can be in men and women, Emma Jung states:

Am I going too far when I say that the magic of the word, the art of speaking, is the thing in a man through which a woman is most unfailingly caught and most frequently deluded? But it is not woman alone who is under the spell of word magic, the phenomenon is prevalent everywhere. The old runes of ancient times, Indian mantras, prayers, and magic formulas of all sorts down to the technical expressions and slogans of our own times, all bear witness to the magic power of spirit that has become word.

E. JUNG, 1957: 19

Again, it is interesting to note that while Emma Jung recognizes the ubiquitous influence of archetypal Logos in the world at large, it seems the constraints of her age prevent her from going as far as James Hillman in declaring that the animus and anima need not be confined to biological gender, but are rather actively influencing all psychic material.

To return then to this possibility, let us further examine Hillman's argument:

Why do we call the same behavior in one sex "anima" and in the other "naturally feminine" or "shadow"? ... By depriving by definition women of anima—"Woman has no anima, no soul, but she has an animus" (CW 17, 338)—is not analytical psychology willy-nilly continuing a very ancient tradition of denying woman soul and casting the images of this soul into shadow?.

HILLMAN, 1985: 59

Not only must one wonder why an archetype would limit itself to only communicating with certain sexes, but one must also wonder why any distinction would be necessary when the function very likely is the same. Except that, as Hillman states, by denying women anima and soul, unconscious gender-biases continue forward unchecked and the ego's understanding of these archetypes remains limited by contemporary cultural assumptions.

Hillman further challenges Jung's assumptions about animus and anima development and their roles in individuation. He continues by criticising the conflation of women and soul. He asserts that the "sense of soul is not given to woman just because she is born female" and that to neglect its development is as detrimental to women's development as it is to men (Hillman, 1985: 59). He

argues soul and spirit are necessary and must be balanced within one's psyche to be healthy. They are not, as Hillman makes clear, biological givens that can stand to be neglected.

Jungian feminists began challenging Jung's binary thinking as a first point of attack on the anima and animus construct. Demaris S. Wehr (1987), presents Jung's foundational perspective when she states, "Jung believed that without the energy generated by the opposites, the psyche would not exist" (1987: 55), but then goes on to add, "Symbols, or archetypal images, both contain and transcend opposition, and this is what makes them so powerful" (*ibid.*). Jung seemed to have a sense of this notion when he made it clear that there is a positive and negative pole to both the anima and animus. He recognized that there were contradicting elements within the same archetype, but Jung did not seem to see the potential for archetypal images to "transcend opposition".

Hillman calls Jung's tendency to see all things in binary pairs the, "fantasy of opposites" (Hillman, 1985: 9). As Hillman previously stated, Jung would have considered certain archetypal manifestations within a female's psyche to be shadow, never anima, with the same being true for a man. But this binary thinking has some obvious weaknesses. Hillman asserts, "... the anima's definition tends to be derivative of—and not demarcated enough from—her cultural and historical occasions" (Hillman, 1985: 15). This is evidenced in Jung's earliest experiences of his anima as Salmone, a biblical figure, an image which is both archetypal and particular to his time and place of living. The presentation of Jung's anima being affected by his environment, should not be surprising to anyone, nor was it surprising to Jung. What does seem to be particular to his time and place, but which he never seemed to consider, was binary thinking about gender presentation. Hillman boldly suggests:

Whenever it comes to a choice between saving the theory and saving the phenomena, the history of thought shows that it profits more to side with the phenomena, even if for a while theory is dislocated and some things we had considered clear fall back into a new obscurity.

HILLMAN, 1985: 63

So while reconsidering the relationship of all these elements of the unconscious to the ego, the issue may seem obscured, moving in this direction could yield some potentially enlightening and freeing results for all involved. As Hillman says, "... as spirit is not soul, so animus is not anima, and neither can be neglected or substituted for the other. The syzygy needs both" (Hillman, 1985: 63).

In search of the syzygy, let's return to Jungian Feminist criticism. In Susan Rowland's *Jung: A Feminist Revision* (2002), Rowland argues that Jung strove to imitate Enlightenment-era grand narratives in his thinking, hoping to find a universal pattern for all psychic expression. She argues, "Most significantly from a feminist point of view, Jung is most deeply a man of the Enlightenment in his retention of oppositional thinking about gender" (Rowland, 2002: 139). This is evidenced by the many earlier examples already given, but Rowland explores how very strange this is given Jung's articulation of the collective unconscious coupled with his ideas about the "subtle body". She states:

Archetypes, with their bodily and numinous dimensions, supply part of the structuring of the archetypal image-as-body realization, a subtle body. Personal history and culture also play a role, although they can never be the governing factor in a Jungian paradigm (a place reserved for the creative, unknowable unconscious). Despite Jung's own interests, the Jungian subtle body remains related to cultural ideas and competing social practices.

ROWLAND, 2002: 134

Here she articulates the fundamental problem that archetypes, including the anima/animus and subtle body, manifest themselves through images, but these images will always be influenced by one's culture and conditioning. Jung preferred to imagine that he was finding theories which transcended such boundaries. And he was inclined to believe he was successfully pursuing such an aim. As he discovered concepts from Eastern thought and alchemy such as Yin and Yang, Sol and Luna, sulphur and mercury, he found confirmation of the binary paradigm he felt was constellating in his mind around anima/animus.

Furthermore, in his exploration of "subtle body" Jung pursued interrelated ideas from both Eastern and Western thought, which were calling toward a clearer understanding of a universal mysticism as it relates to the physical and spiritual realms of humanity. I do not want to explore the subtle body in too much depth because it would go beyond the scope of this research and is a concept Jung seemed both intrigued and overwhelmed by, but with that said, it's worth noting a fundamental tenet of the subtle body from Jung's perspective. He stated, "The psychic seems to me to be in actual fact partly extra-spatial and extra-temporal. "Subtle body" may be a fitting expression for this part of the psyche" (Jung, 1975: 522–523).

So while he seeks for a grand narrative, an all-encompassing theory which transcends time and place, between the archetypes of anima/animus and the human body, he does not appear to see a potential in which the spatial or tem-

poral body has no effect on the subtle or psychic body. It brings forward the challenge, which Jungians still face today, of how the psychic, archetypal, subtle realms interact with the biological, neurological, physical realms. With a phenomenological methodology we are left to witness the interactions between the subtle and physical bodies, collectively and individually, ourselves both the subjects and objects of observation.

Rowland argues that moving forward with Jung's anima and animus may simply not be feasible, especially as it is stated by Jung. She states that fundamentally, "Gender subjectivity and the body are a matter for continual psychic reformation in which social discourses can never restrict or congeal identity" (Rowland, 2002: 145). This will likely remain a point of tension, as society interacts with the psyche and the archetypes. With the tension of the opposites always at play alongside dualistic politics, it's hard to imagine what changes will appear within individual psyches as the archetypes interact with the conscious realm. But Rowland offers at least one potential paradigm shift:

To reverse conventional assumptions, society does not have two genders because there are self-evidently two different sorts of human bodies. Rather, persistent duality in thinking about gender constructs a sense of two absolutely different types of body to justify the desire to retain binary inequalities.

2002: 141

In "Transgenderism and transformation: an attempt at a Jungian understanding", Michael Marsman (2017) seeks to find a way to reimagine anima and animus while considering the situation of LGBTQ people in society today. He suggests viewing anima and animus as "function rather than fixed form" (2017: 682). The anima would then be understood as the "inner other [which] draws one into a relationship with the unconscious, often carrying something of the erotic" regardless of one's gender identity (ibid). Marsman also explores Erich Neumann's suggestion that the illnesses which befall certain patients signal a future problem humanity has yet to address. Marsman notes, "Transgender people at least in part suffer because there is not yet collective psychic space to exist", (2017: 684) suggesting that a collective psychic transformation may be on the horizon.

In "Queering gender: anima/animus and the paradigm of emergence" Susan McKenzie (2006) criticizes Jung, unapologetically stating, "Jung's [anima/animus] is a terrible fit for our time. We live in an era of emergent, not fixed realities, and are beginning to value the overt display of masculinity and femininity in both sexes" (2006: 407). McKenzie further criticizes Jung's theory as it

relates to transgendered individuals, or more specifically that it does not consider them. She states:

Jung's anima/animus (A/A) thinking leads us into a trap of linear orderliness, fixed identities, androgynous symmetries, and archetypes that are differentially inherited, based on sexual anatomy, a breach in the universality of the collective unconscious. ... Jung's A/A cannot account for the transgendered experience with its reversal of starting points and fluidity of sexual attractions.

ibid

McKenzie makes a point, similar to Rowland's, that the foundation of Jungian theory must lie in the unconscious, which is universal and therefore cannot be gendered.

However, McKenzie also calls for a reinterpretation of Jung's anima/animus thinking based in emergent mind theory. Within this paradigm McKenzie wonders:

Could the image of the transgendered body, as a symbolic and mythic body, be a living artifact that holds open a culture's potential for the development of hermaphroditic consciousness, a consciousness that reaches far beyond gender and pierces the veil of opposition in all realms?

2006: 417

Notably, McKenzie calls for an exploration of what was articulated by Jung originally as an element of the unconscious, a psychic reality, to be explored in neurological and biological fields and personal experience. McKenzie would see this as the interchange between psychic experience on the one hand and neurological, biological and cultural experience on the other where the latter experiences have a greater effect on the former, essentially reversing Jung's paradigm.

Interestingly, we see that the conflict between the concretization of the anima/animus in human form and the archetypes existing in the unconscious regardless of sex is a major focus of societal conflict and reform today. While many trans activists call for the availability of medical interventions for individuals wishing to transition to the opposite gender to be increased, the archetypal nature of the anima/animus seems to be strongly activated. In "Outbreak: On Transgender Teens and Psychic Epidemics" Lisa Marchiano (2017) raises Jung's warning that "we must be rooted 'not only in the outside world, but in the world within'" (2017: 363). In her article she recounts, "Transgender author and

activist Serano (2007) tells us that we all have a subconscious sex—a deeply innate sense of gender. It is this subconscious sex, rather than our physical sex, that determines who we really are. Therefore, ‘feeling like a woman’ or ‘identifying as a woman’ is to be a woman.” (2017: 348).

To such an assertion, Marchiano argues that while Jung would agree that a gendered “other” within is a universal element of the unconscious, he would not however agree that the concretization of that psychic reality by permanent or semi-permanent means is likely to aid in either physical and mental well-being. Marchiano reminds us, “Jung stated that archetypal contents such as anima and animus are liable to escape from conscious control due to their numinosity, and as a result can lead to psychic possession” (2017: 346). Remarkably, we see a reflection between Marchiano’s concerns and Marsman’s. While one is concerned about the concretization of gender exploration, the other is concerned about the lack of exploratory space, but fundamental to both concerns is gendered expression. An activation of poles seems at play and Neumann’s prediction that illnesses which befall certain patients is an indication of a future problem which humanity has yet to address, be they patients who regret transition or patients who long for it, is too insistent to be ignored.

Could the concretization of the experience of the inner “other” be viewed as a collective psychic possession? Or is it, as McKenzie suggests, a way to move toward a consciousness that defies all forms of opposition? And perhaps, to take Jung’s concepts even further, can there be a paradox in which the physical and archetypal, the collective and the individual, the conscious and unconscious, are straining one another through a mutual process of alchemical transformation, separating and conjoining, distilling and coagulating, in a continuing process of mutual exploration?

Whatever the case may be, the presence of so much psychic energy around the concept of gender could well be argued to be the result of a lack of engagement with the anima and animus within individuals which is now being explored in the collective. But it is no wonder that such an exploration is necessary. Jung himself grappled with the concept, as we’ve seen, and was clear that “everything unconscious is projected” (Jung, 1982: 86). Inner dialogues with the “other” within seem to be playing out in the collective where individuals are embodying the projections of archetypes which in the past would have been seen in religion and myth. Jung states “Just as the archetypes occur on the ethnological level as myths, so also they are found in every individual, and their effect is always strongest, that is, they anthropomorphize reality most, where consciousness is weakest and most restricted, and where fantasy can overrun the facts of the outer world” (Jung, 1982: 117). Society, having moved relatively quickly toward a broader acceptance of women’s presence in the public sphere,

has perhaps not dealt with the inner archetypal anima/animus, which Jung would say has been developing within the individual and collective unconscious over centuries. Having not done so, have we, as Jung further suggests, anthropomorphized reality by exploring through projection the constructs of gender and whether these constructs must or must not be concretized in physical form in order to be connected to the numinous qualities of the archetypal feminine and masculine?

The results of these explorations are yet to be seen, but undoubtedly we are in a time of transformation. And perhaps, more importantly, a time in which conscious awareness of the archetypes of the anima and animus, an acceptance of the power they carry, and a desire to exist in healthy relation to them, can lead to a positive transformation. Hope for such transformation comes most strikingly in Jung's *Red Book* (2009). He describes his search for his soul and his longing to reconnect after years of rejecting "her" by saying:

I still labored misguidedly under the spirit of this time, and thought differently about the human soul. I thought and spoke much of the soul. I knew many learned words for her, I had judged her and turned her into a scientific object of my judgement and knowledge; much more are my judgement and knowledge the objects of my soul. Therefore the spirit of the depths forced me to speak to my soul, to call upon her as a living and self-existing being. I had to become aware that I had lost my soul.

JUNG, 2009: 128

After all that Jung had said over the course of his life, he finally comes to the personal realization that he "labored misguidedly under the spirit of this time", being subject to the influences of his culture and society. Despite Jung's constant assertions that intellect, reason, and discrimination belonged to the masculine principle; to Logos, which stands in opposition to Eros, to soul; he further realizes "much more are my judgement and knowledge the objects of my soul." Though he spent the majority of his career clearly discriminating between the anima and animus, assigning them exclusive roles within the male and female psyche, and creating a fundamental conflict between those archetypes and the conscious ego, he came to realize that there was another way to relate to them.

Jung may not agree that the anima and animus can be applied to both genders or that they should be rejected all together, but he seems to have made a significant leap from the Jung who first encountered his anima with suspicion and derision to now seeing "her" as the source of his inspiration, judgement, and knowledge. He seems to have moved into a place of greater wisdom and relation to his unconscious material, perhaps signaling future relations

between anima and animus in individuals and society. We then are presented with a dilemma similar to Jung's: What will we labor under—the spirit of our time or the spirit of the depths and which will bring the balance the collective conscious calls for now?

References

- Hannah, B. (2011). *The Animus: The spirit of inner truth in women*. Wilmette: Chiron Publications.
- Hillman, James. (1985). *The Anima: An anatomy of a personified notion*. Putnam: Spring Publications, Inc.
- International Standard Version Bible*. (2014). Bible Gateway. <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Mark+6%3A21-28&version=ISV>.
- Jung, Carl. (1969). *Aion: Researches into the phenomenology of the Self*. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, Carl. (1982). *Aspects of the Feminine*. Translated by R.F.C Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, Carl. (1975). *C.G. Jung Letters, Vol. 1: 1906–1950*. Edited by Gerhard Adler and Aniela Jaffé. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Princeton. Princeton University Press.
- Jung, Carl. (1963). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Translated by Richard and Clara Winston. New York: Random House Inc.
- Jung, Carl. (2009). *Red Book: A reader's edition*. Translated by Mark Kyburz, John Peck, and Sonu Shamdasani. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Jung, Emma. (1957). *Animus and Anima*. Putnam: Spring Publications, Inc.
- Josephus, Flavius. (2009) *The Antiquities of the Jews*. Translated by William Whiston. Project Gutenberg. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/2848/2848-h/2848-h.htm>. (Original work published AD 93).
- Lisa Marchiano (2017) Outbreak: On Transgender Teens and Psychic Epidemics. *Psychological Perspectives*. 60:3, 345–366
- Marsman, Michael A. (2017). Transgenderism and transformation: an attempt at a Jungian understanding. *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*. 62(5), 678–687.
- McKenzie, Susan. (2006). Queering Gender: anima/animus and the paradigm of emergence. *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*. 51. 401–421.
- Rowland, Susan. (2002). *Jung: A Feminist Revision*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Wehr, Demaris S. (1987). *Jung & Feminism: Liberating Archetypes*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Appendix

The biblical account of Salome may be relevant to understanding the tension in Jung's initial relationship to his anima. The Gospel of Mark chapter 6 verses 21–28 reads:

An opportunity came during Herod's birthday celebration, when he gave a banquet for his top officials, military officers, and the most important people of Galilee. When the daughter of Herodias came in and danced, she pleased Herod and his guests. So the king told the girl, "Ask me for anything you want, and I'll give it to you." He swore with an oath to her, "I'll give you anything you ask for, up to half of my kingdom." So she went out and asked her mother, "What should I ask for?" Her mother replied, "The head of John the Baptist." Immediately the girl hurried back to the king with her request, "I want you to give me right now the head of John the Baptist on a platter." The king was deeply saddened, yet because of his oaths and his guests he was reluctant to refuse her. So without delay the king sent a soldier and ordered him to bring John's head. The soldier went and beheaded him in prison. Then he brought John's head on a platter and gave it to the girl, and the girl gave it to her mother.

International Standard Version, 2014; MARK 6:21–28

While the name Salome is not applied to the girl in the New Testament, the biblical figure was later identified by name in *The Antiquities of the Jews* by Flavius Josephus.