

## GENDER IDENTITY AND GENDER ROLES: THEIR PLACE IN ANALYTIC PRACTICE

*Katherine Bradway*

A businesswoman is fired from her job. A man is left by his wife. Both bring their pain of failure—she as an office administrator, he as a husband—into their analytic hour. For reasons that will be discussed later in this chapter, it seems clear that their experience of failure in an outer role penetrates to the level of gender identity: Am I adequate as a woman? Am I adequate as a man? Many of the wounds brought to analysts for healing have been inflicted at points when people are vulnerable about being a male or a female and about the roles they take in the outer world. Before considering the healing of such wounds in analytic practice, and the place that gender holds in the individuation process, I would like to first offer some facts and reflections on male-female and masculine-feminine differences.

---

Katherine Bradway, Ph.D., maintains a private practice in the San Francisco Bay area. Formerly an associate clinical professor at Stanford University, she is a founding member and past president of the Society of Jungian Analysts of Northern California and a founding member of the C. G. Jung Institute of San Francisco. Dr. Bradway is the author of "Hestia and Athena in the Analysis of Women" (1985), *Sandplay Bridges and the Transcendent Function* (1985), and *Villa of Mysteries* (1982); she is also a coauthor of *Male and Female, Feminine and Masculine* (1974) and *Sandplay Studies: Origins, Theory, and Practice* (1981, 1990).

### *Male-Female*

It has been commonly observed that men are in general more aggressive than women, and that women tend to show more nurturance and concern for people, but the extent to which these differences are a consequence of what is expected of each sex, and the extent to which they are linked to chromosomal and hormonal differences is less obvious.

Studies of neonates give compelling evidence that potentials for some male-female behavioral differences are present at birth. A review of such studies shows that the differences can be grouped under muscle strength, sensory dissimilarities, and degree of affiliative behavior toward adults. In comparison with newborn females, for example, newborn males have been found to have greater gross muscular strength, to be able to lift their heads from the prone position earlier, and to have more flexible limbs. Newborn females, on the other hand, are more receptive to oral and cutaneous stimuli, as exemplified in their surpassing males in an early taste for sweets, in frequency of reflex smiles during irregular sleep, in oscillations of the tongue, and in mouth domination in hand-to-mouth approach behavior. The activity of male neonates involves the whole body, whereas that of the female is focused in the muscles and skin of the face. Moreover, it has been found that female infants look at, vocalize to, and maintain proximity to their mothers more than do their twin brothers (Green; Korner; May).

Starting with these findings, one can surmise a course of development that would lead to some of the characteristic differences between men and women without bringing in stereotyping to explain them. As the infant-to-child boy experiences his muscular strength, one can imagine how using it would bring its own rewards in addition to its being reinforced by the persons attending him. It could be conjectured, then, that he would work toward perfecting his strength, become competitive in mastering tasks requiring it, and develop aggressiveness in achieving recognition for it. As the infant girl's smiles elicit smiles from adults, and as her receptivity to cutaneous stimuli leads her to reach out for touch experiences, one can conceive how her "skill" in relating might be developed, and with it an increasing interest in people. Stereotyping would reinforce these developments, but the roots of the differentiation between

aggressiveness in the boy and the affiliative behavior in the girl may exist at birth.

Additional findings pointing to inborn and/or psychobiological differences are provided by animal, cross-cultural, and hormonal studies (Green; May; Money and Ehrhardt; Stoller) as well as by Erikson's study of the play constructions of preadolescents. Erikson found parallels between the constructions of boys and girls and the different structures and functions of their sex organs. Boys' involved height, outdoors, motion; girls' were low, indoors, concerned with threats from outside.

The demonstration in the early 1970s of a bimodal brain in humans has provided further evidence of a possible link between psychological and biological gender differences. Ornstein, who is responsible for some of the early research on bimodal consciousness, uses the words *masculine* and *yang* in association with the left side of the brain, which is used predominantly for analyzing data, making logical deductions, and processing information sequentially, and the words *feminine* and *yin* in association with the right side, which is related to artistic talent, body awareness, and diffuse as opposed to linear processing of information (50–52).

Later research suggests that male brains are more lateralized than female brains. Males excel in tasks that do not involve shifts between the two sides of the brain and females in tasks requiring flexible shifts between the sides (McGuinness and Pribram). This is reminiscent of the associations that Neumann makes between focused consciousness and masculinity, and between diffuse awareness and femininity (1954a).

### *Anima and Animus*

The evidence supporting natal predispositions to gender-linked behavior is consistent with the opinion of Jung and most of his followers that there are basic psychological differences between men and women that should not be ignored. However, Jungian theory on contrasexual archetypes provides for the potential of each sex to behave like the other. In fact, the bringing to consciousness of one's opposite-sex components contributes to one's approach to totality and wholeness. Jung was not the first to recognize that each sex carries the potential for being like the other, but he was the first to perceive the contrasexual parts as archetypal images and to name them *anima* and *animus* (Jung 1928a, 186–209).

In Jung's early descriptions of these contrasexual archetypes, he

emphasizes their disruptive qualities. He sees the *anima*, the feminine image within man, as producing obscure, undifferentiated emotional states he calls "moods," and the *animus*, the masculine image in woman, as the source of undeveloped reasoning capacities that lead to outbursts of "dogmatic opinions." The negative effects of the *anima* and *animus* are magnified by the fact that the man and woman are unaware of them, are not anticipating their appearance, are taken by surprise. Jung speaks of persons "being possessed" by the *anima* or *animus*, usually at times of challenge or threat. A man may react to a slighting remark or a disappointment by withdrawing into a dark mood. A woman may react in situations that threaten her self-confidence by a sudden burst of impersonal and unrelated opinions.

As is true with many other archetypes, the *anima* and *animus* tend to function in negative ways as long as they remain wholly in the unconscious and therefore function only autonomously. When a man becomes aware of and accepts his contrasexual part, he no longer has to deny it, and its disruptive aspects are diminished. Furthermore, as he discovers the positive quality of the *anima*—the principle of relatedness—he finds he can use it to better understand himself and those around him. Likewise, as a woman familiarizes herself with her *animus*, she learns how to monitor its outbursts and let it help her focus (Harding), throw light as a torch does (Castillejo), and become a creative power (Emma Jung).

Descriptions of the characteristics of the *anima* and *animus* appear throughout Jung's writings, and a review of them shows the development of his ideas. There were no radical changes, however, from his early perception of the autonomous *anima* as being personal, emotional, and a producer of moods, and of the autonomous *animus* as being relatively impersonal, rational, and a producer of opinions. Moreover, there was a continuity in his view that the conscious approach to and acknowledgment of the *anima* and *animus* provide experiences that carry one into contact with inner conflicts as well as with one's own vital resources. The *anima* and *animus* thus provide for consciousness a bridge or link with the unconscious and contribute to the individuation process, which requires the bringing of unconscious components into consciousness.

Jung's observations regarding the contrasexual archetypes were made at a time when the standards of male and female behavior were more rigidly prescribed than they are today. Men were supposed to be "all male" and women to be "gentle ladies." Consequently Jung's proposal that all men had an inner woman, and women an inner

man, was a more revolutionary idea than it is today, when men have learned how to change a baby's diaper and women how to change a flat tire. Changes in cultural standards are both consequent to, and reflected in, a decrease in the polarity of the behavior of today's men and women.

Several of today's analysts who have responded to cultural changes by dissenting from Jung's major premise regarding the anima and animus, arguing for the theoretical and treatment advantage of seeing both the masculine and feminine or the animus and anima in the unconscious of each sex, include Hillman (1974), Whitmont (1980; 1992), and Hill. Douglas argues for the retention of Jung's concept of the contrasexual "other," but notes that "the archetypes of animus and anima remain unconscious and incapable of full delineation" (200).

### *Masculinity-Femininity*

There are times in my personal life and in my analytic practice when the precise fit between an immediate experience and Jung's definitions of anima or animus elicits the "aha" feeling that accompanies the bringing of an unconscious component into consciousness. At these moments, I find the ability to recognize the functioning of the contrasexual archetypes, as Jung conceived them, tremendously useful, and consequently I retain the terms *anima* and *animus* to represent exclusively the unconscious contrasexual sides of a man and of a woman respectively.

However, since most of the women and, more recently, most of the men in analysis readily recognize two sides of themselves that are roughly identifiable as a "masculine" side and as a "feminine side"—or perhaps as an achieving, assertive, or mastering side and a relating, nurturing, or affiliative side—I speak of masculine and feminine sides in both men and women without regard for the degree to which either side is conscious or unconscious. The usage of the terms *masculine* and *feminine* was called into question in the late 1960s by women who claimed that using the terms implied a put-down to women. It became clearer to both women and men in the 1970s that linking traits to gender probably was perpetuating stereotyping that was potentially limiting to the development of both sexes. In the early 1980s Gilligan pointed out that a woman's being assertive and achieving and a man's being nurturing and relating does not necessarily mean that they are dealing with qualities of the opposite sex (163).

Male-female, referring to a biological classification, is not brought into question. Whether one is male or female, that is, has male or female genitalia, is determined at conception except in the rare instances of pathological absence in males, or presence in females, of fetal androgens. These hormones may reverse the chromosomal fetal development and result in biological transsexualism or ambiguity of natal gender together with psychological ambiguity as seen in transsexual identity (Green; Money and Ehrhardt; Stoller).

Although the terms *male* and *female* are used in a single sense that is readily understood, the terms *masculine* and *feminine* are used in two overlapping senses: to identify the psychological traits and the range of behavior associated with being a male or a female, and to denote principles or patterns that are experienced as opposing or complementary sides of individuals irrespective of their gender. If we can separate the terms *masculinity* and *femininity* from being male or female, we can reserve them for reference to principles that function in either sex. This usage would avoid the suggestion that maleness or femaleness is diminished or enhanced by the expression of masculinity or femininity and would also avoid implying that we support traditional stereotyping.

I think an appreciation of the functioning in *both* sexes of the complementary principles of masculinity and femininity is essential in Jungian work. Bernhardt, taking off from some of the work of Neumann (1954a, 1954b, 1963) and Whitmont (1969), describes subclassifications of these principles based on a dynamic-static dimension. She makes a distinction between the dynamic-masculine that we associate with the "animus spirit" archetype, and the static-masculine that we associate with the "Great Father." Similarly, she distinguishes between the static-feminine embodying the characteristics associated with the "Great Mother" and the dynamic-feminine that yields characteristics associated with the "anima soul" archetype.

Hill, inspired by the work of Bernhardt, uses the model of polarities to discuss the natural flow of opposites in the psyche and to illustrate the overarching life cycle and individuation, as well as the day-to-day unfolding of consciousness. Development proceeds from the static-feminine to the dynamic-masculine, through the fiery initiation to the static-masculine, from where it moves to the dynamic-feminine, and then through the watery initiation to a return to the static-feminine. Hill sees men and women taking similar paths but with different emphases and styles (26–35).

Other Jungian writers, in recognition that the masculine and

feminine principles function as archetypes, have drawn upon the gods and goddesses of Greece and India to depict aspects of these principles (see, for example, Bolen 1984, 1989; Bradway 1978; Guggenbühl-Craig; Hillman 1973, 1974; Schmidt; Whitmont 1980; Zabriskie).

Other pairs of terms commonly used in connection with gender are *Logos-Eros*, *thinking-feeling*, and *yin-yang*. *Logos* and *Eros* refer to the principles of rational reasoning and of relatedness respectively; usage has often equated them with the masculine and feminine principles. Jung felt that the consciousness of men was guided by *Logos*, and that of women by *Eros*. Whitmont (1980, 1992) has argued for freeing these principles from gender linkage so that they can be appreciated independently of whether they make their appearance in men or women, just as has been argued for freeing the principles of masculine and feminine from gender linkage. *Eros*, of course, was a male god, so that linking *Eros* specifically with femininity and with women has a paradoxical element. Solar and lunar consciousness are sometimes used as alternatives for *Logos* and *Eros*.

Although not a pair of gender-linked terms, the *thinking-feeling* dichotomy is occasionally used as if it coincided with the *Logos* and *Eros* principles. There are similarities in the ways the two pairs are described. But thinking and feeling are evaluative functions in Jung's system of typology and refer to whether a person evaluates something more with his or her thinking function or more with the feeling function. In simplified formulation: is something evaluated or judged after consideration of the facts (thinking) or from a subjective impression of the personal values involved (feeling)? Jung found the feeling function more highly developed in women and the thinking function in men. The corroborative statistically significant differences shown in two studies of type frequency are numerically small (Gray; Schaefer).

The pair of terms *yin-yang* is represented by an ancient symbol that places the light yang on the right and the dark yin on the left. Although the cluster of traits associated with the masculine principle is assigned to yang, and those associated with the feminine principle to yin, the two terms encompass more than the masculine and feminine. The symbol portrays the relationship between opposites; together the two parts form a whole, and within each half the nucleus for the other half exists. The symbol could stand for any pair of opposites, such as light-dark, consciousness-unconsciousness, hot-cold. The symbol denotes this relationship in the abstract and has

been assigned, or defined by, various clusters of opposite characteristics. The two parts symbolically portrayed have a spiritual or numinous aura to them, which is a quality to be honored with the masculine and feminine principles themselves.

It is clear that the use of gender terms is not precise, but neither is our differentiation between what we think of as masculine and feminine. Despite the imprecision in the use of gender terms by Jungians, there seems to be a general conviction that human beings are guided by archetypal principles that are separate and complementary to one another.

### *Cultural Expectations*

To understand gender identity problems more fully, it is important that we take account of the extent to which expectations of our culture affect the behavior of its members. In addition to the early stereotyping of boys and girls, which many of today's parents are trying to minimize, there is the influence of society's expectations for adults, in which there have been noticeable shifts. In the last several decades, women have been responding to mixed and sometimes diametrically opposed demands. In the 1930s, with its devastating economic depression, women were expected to limit their pregnancies, and this resulted in the lowest birthrate on record in the United States for any one decade. In the 1940s women were called upon to leave home and occupy jobs left by men who went off to war. Then the 1950s brought the message that woman's place was in the home, and the record baby boom took off. In the 1960s, as the women's liberation movement got under way, women were told they must reject their housewife roles and their financial dependence upon men. And in the 1970s many women heard a voice that told them they must make good both as a wife/mother and in a career. Beginning in the 1980s, women began to listen to their own inner plea not to try and do everything at once. Today's women have become less uncomfortable in choosing to be either an unmarried career woman or a wife/mother without an outside career. And some are solving their dilemma by sequential focus: first a career and later a family, or first a family in the younger years and a career later.

Society's expectations for men have also changed in the last few decades, although perhaps less dramatically than for women. Traditionally men were asked to show courage, achieve, produce, and provide for a family. The women's movement, however, changed the expectations that women had of their husbands. As women entered

the workforce, they came to expect their husbands to share in household work so that women would have more time and energy to continue their education or take up careers or both. The initial stage of this expectation involved men's merely accepting their wives' aspirations for careers, by *letting* them go to school or work outside the home. But many women, spurred on by such concepts as the Rapoport's "dual career family," and supported by each other, came to expect their men to share the responsibility in the home, including both housework and child rearing. Moreover, many women began to seek men who were less "macho" and more willing to expose their vulnerabilities.

Paralleling the changes in society's expectations of men and women are the changes in men's and women's images of themselves—their self-identities. Women currently see themselves as more capable of taking their place beside men in work, sports, politics, armed forces, social affairs, and careers. They have demanded and in many ways have obtained their equal rights. As women have gained in their self-esteem as achievers, they have been looking at their role as caretakers less negatively. I have found that women who have felt more secure in their masculine side have been more willing to honor their feminine sides. As one side develops, the other one does too—either simultaneously or sequentially. This is true for men too.

Men whose observations I have sought regarding their view of themselves report significant changes over the last thirty years. One male colleague explained it this way: In the 1950s, men took it for granted that being masculine was right. In the 1960s they felt that masculine was all wrong and that the feminine was right. In the 1970s they saw that masculine wasn't all bad, but needed to be *integrated* with the feminine. In the 1980s they started to see that the aspect of the masculine that was manifest was too narrow, and the need—in addition to integration with the feminine—was for more, broader aspects of the masculine to be developed (J. Steinhelber 1992, personal communication).

The modification in expectations for men and women has been paralleled by a growing appreciation for androgyny. The word *androgyny* comes from the Greek *andro* (male) and *gyn* (female), and thus represents a combination of male and female. Becoming androgynous means overcoming stereotypical attitudes about what is appropriate behavior for males and females so that one develops more flexible behavior appropriate to a given situation: an assertive or aggressive behavior if that is required, a caring or nurturing

attitude if that is required (Bem; Gelpi; Heilbrun; Rupprecht; Singer).

Singer observes that androgyny is an archetype that represents in human form the principle of wholeness. As a symbol, androgyny has been represented since ancient times as the hermaphrodite. Henderson has pointed out that Jung saw the symbol of the hermaphrodite as tending to break down into its components, thus turning into a symbol representing potential dissociation. Jung would have seen *coniunctio* as offering a more stable symbol than the hermaphrodite or androgyne in the formation of wholeness (J. Henderson 1980, personal communication).

To me, androgyny represents dual attitudes and behavior at a conscious level, whereas the *coniunctio* represents the coming together—the "marriage"—of the masculine and feminine principles at an unconscious level. Androgyny seems to have to do with role, *coniunctio* with identity.

#### ANALYTIC PRACTICE

Analysts learn—in fact when we are patients ourselves—that the seeds of healing lie in the unconscious. The woman who had lost her job and the man who was losing his wife had dreams that provide examples of this truth. On the night she was fired, the businesswoman dreamed that she was with her mother and daughter. She sensed this meeting as a reconnecting with her feminine nature. If she had not made this observation herself, I might have suggested it to her, but her discovering it for herself facilitated the healing and was in itself a moment of healing. The imaging in a dream or fantasy of three generations of women—either grandmother, mother, and the dreamer herself, or the dreamer as daughter to her mother and mother to her daughter—is frequently experienced as a thread of femininity. The dreamer reported at a subsequent session, "I realize that my animus has been living me. I am not going to look for a job right away. I am going to take time for my feminine side. I am going to look at my relation with Andy [her male friend] and at me."

The man whose wife had left him had a dream image of a kind of dagger that was an equilateral triangle with a handle: "It would be awkward to use." So it was the shape of the dagger and not its cutting ability that was significant to him. He drew it with light rays emerging from the three sides. It was clear to both of us that this image represented masculinity, that it was a masculine symbol. I

thought how different this was from the conventional male sign, the arrow pointing upward from a circle. The triangular symbol had a numinous quality for this man. He formed it with clay to show its three-dimensional aspects. During the following session he outlined it in the sand tray and placed pieces of turquoise within it. Honoring it in this way may suggest that it was also functioning as a self symbol. Moore and Gillette have developed the way in which the triangular pyramid may function as a self symbol for males (1992, 44). The maker of the dagger symbol told me: "Every time I think 'This is it; I can't take it; I'll have to end it,' I think of this. It has become brass—layers of brass." So the image was becoming stronger.

For both of these persons who had suffered jolting blows, the unconscious provided symbols of their own gender. In some other instances, there might have been a connection with the contrasexual side, or with the Self indicated by a mandala. But the wisdom of the unconscious determined that a same-sex symbol reaffirming their gender identity was needed for this man and for this woman at this time.

In addition to dream fragments and images such as these, there are several recurrent dream themes that alert the dreamer to a neglect of the anima or animus. A strange man trying to enter the house, which often occurs in dreams of women, for example, has been found to represent the attempt of the animus to gain the attention and acknowledgment of the dreamer (Marcus).

Experience in working with homosexual men and women has shown that the contrasexual "other" is still found in the unconscious. The female figures in a homosexual man's dreams had been confined to his mother until he dreamed of a girl standing in the rain playing music. Later he dreamed:

|| Dream: *I find a woman who is ill. We climb some perilous stairs and she loses her footing. I save her at the risk of my own life.* ||

The first dream presents the image of the anima with no interaction with her. The second portrays the urgency of saving the feminine part of himself. This sequence is similar to those I find in dreams of heterosexual men: the activation of the anima, followed by the rescuing of the anima. And with this comes the possibility of relating to women, to the world, and to their own unconscious in a new way, free from the dominance of the great mother archetype.

Neglect of, or attempts to save or get help for, the feminine or masculine side are represented in dreams of both men and women. For example, a young lesbian dreamed:

|| Dream: *I picked up the body of a little girl and realized it was me. I took it to the undertaker but he refused to take it. I went to two. I was still carrying it trying to find help when I awoke.* ||

At another time she dreamed of hurting, and then trying to save, a masculine figure:

|| Dream: *I was driving with Jill [her lover] and we ran over a little boy. I went up to two officers asking for help but neither would help. I went back to the little boy and realized I could not save him without help.* ||

This young woman had suffered psychological damage from both her mother and father and was subject to suicidal depressions in which she thought nothing could help her. But she persisted, working at one time with both a male and a female analyst, and eventually saved herself.

When Jung saw that undeveloped contrasexual archetypes were erupting into men's behavior in the form of irritable moods, and into women's behavior as opinionated declarations, he advocated using a method he called active imagination. [This has some commonalities with methods used by Gestaltists and others; it is given a separate discussion in the chapter by Cwik, above.] Jung used as an example a man with an "honorable, flawless persona" whose tantrums and explosive moodiness were estranging him from his wife and children. When men have such episodes, they often feel they are being weak and unmanly; their masculine ideal for themselves is threatened. "Clearly," writes Jung, "the anima is trying to enforce a separation." Before making assumptions as to why this is happening, one can, Jung continues, "investigate what is behind the tendencies of the anima. The first step is what I would call the objectivation of the anima." By this, Jung meant to use one's imagination to experience the anima as a real woman. When this was done, one could face her with the question, "Why do you want this separation?" Jung notes, "The more personally she is taken the better" (1928a, 198–99).

In explaining the value of this process, Jung writes, "The purpose of the dialectical process is to bring these contents into the light; and only when this task has been completed, and the conscious

mind has become sufficiently familiar with the unconscious processes reflected in the anima, will the anima be felt simply as a function" (ibid., 209).

The technique of coming to terms with the animus is the same in principle as with the anima, but Jung felt that the animus was likely to be experienced as a plurality of persons rather than as a single figure. Often a woman perceives her animus as a jury passing judgment on her. A young married woman who had a punishing animus, for example, used sandplay, a variation of active imagination, to depict herself in a cage before a jury of twelve who were going to sentence her. Despite the fact that soldiers were placed ready to shoot her unless she repented or could find her way out of a maze, she maintained her innocence. Later her animus worked for her to cope with her mother's powerful animus, and eventually she made a sandplay scene of a royal father-daughter connection. It's as though she had been able to stand up successfully against her own and her mother's negative animus (the jury and the firing line), and then to let her feminine side relate to a positive archetypal father. The final scene after this one indicated the approach to wholeness in the form of two concentric circles (Bradway 1979).

There are other variations of active imagination in which an encounter with one's contrasexual side occurs. Shortly after starting analysis, a young professional woman reported an experience of spontaneous imagery that was like a waking dream. A male figure, which she later drew as a hobo, was directing her to go and save a twin who had been in an automobile accident. She went to the accident and extricated her girl twin from the car and gently carried her to safety. She felt that the twin was still alive and would recover. Since this woman had been ignoring her feminine side in her challenge of patriarchal authority, the saving of a female twin at the direction of a male figure made her take notice of the relationship between the masculine and feminine sides of herself. The numinosity of the experience helped her to stay with it until she could understand that her masculine side was helping her to revitalize her feminine side. She had several subsequent spontaneous images involving benevolent male figures until she had one in which she had a daughter whom she was teaching to ride a horse. At about the same time, she made a sandplay scene in which two female figures were riding horses. She made a connection among all of these fantasies or images. In her outer relationships she became less challenging toward men and more able to relate to them as friends.

The contrasexual side also makes itself known in projections.

Falling in love includes the projection of the contrasexual side onto the loved one, the animus onto the man and the anima onto the woman, or in the case in which the loved one is the same sex, onto the contrasexual side of the loved one. This latter kind of projection was experienced by one of my women analysands, and I have since discovered that it holds for men also. The analyst helps the analysand to sort out what is projection and what is the real person, and then to look for and recognize in him- or herself the characteristics that had been erroneously perceived in the loved one. There is a mutual withdrawal of projections—that is, as a woman takes back her projections, the man on whom she has placed them is helped (forced) to withdraw his projections onto her. Increasingly, the sorting out of projections is being done through couple and family therapy. In a 1978 international survey, 60 percent of the responding members of the analytical societies indicated they had either themselves used family therapy, or referred one or more patients to others for it (Bradway and Wheelwright, 220). The percentage has no doubt risen in the intervening years.

Most of the women who have come to me for analysis identify two sides or parts of themselves, each having both positive and negative aspects. One side is experienced as the part that cares for people, for all life; it's the part that can enjoy the noncompetitive creation of things. In its less positive aspects it's the part that feels overly dependent—one young woman described it as her "puppy dog" feeling. Then there is the side that relishes a challenge and is effective in getting things it wants in the way that Jung once defined masculinity: "Knowing what it wants and doing what is necessary to achieve it." But in the negative column is the danger that its quality of driving ahead may tend to push others away or to block one's own relating side. One young poet complained that while trying to get her poems published utilized her masculine side, this effort blocked her poem-writing feminine side.

In an attempt to study these two sides, I looked at what had been happening in the women I had seen in analysis. I found that all but one of thirty-one women I had seen in a preceding five-year period could be identified as belonging to one of two groups that were characterized by the lifestyle of the women: one group consisted of wife/mothers without outside jobs, and the other group of unmarried women who were actively engaged in the helping professions. I came to identify these two groups as the Hestia and Athena groups.

Women in both groups wanted what those in the other group had, not to replace what they had, but in addition to it. The married

women wanted to "count" more outside their homes, and the women with careers wanted a husband and children, or at least a lasting intimate relationship. The analysis with both groups had the common element of finding an "inner core." This was expressed by members of both groups in a variety of ways: "I want to know who I am; no, that sounds too much like persona; I want to find my inner core." "You can sense when your core gets vitalized and growth can start." "It's like an inner flowing." "I am finding my focal point." The common quality of caring for or nurturing others—family or patients and clients—had sent members of both groups outside themselves. The resolution came in relating to, and later from, their inner core through focusing on themselves, drawing or painting the inner place, developing body awareness, or providing themselves with more opportunities for relationships with other women who were also seeking an inner core.

After relating to this central place, a place not identified with either gender but a nearly sacred place of their own being, they were freed from subservience to the previously dominant archetype, be it masculine (the career group) or feminine (the family group), and the opposite archetype was constellated or strengthened. Furthermore, the functioning of the initially dominant side was typically enhanced rather than jeopardized. Symbols of centering and wholeness appeared in fantasy productions (Bradway 1978).

An example of the development toward wholeness through relating to a central inner place is contained in the sandplay process of one of the women in the Hestia group. Her initial sandplay scene portrayed a conflict between fear of patriarchal authority, represented in the sand tray by policemen, and respect for her instinctual feminine side, represented in the sand tray by domestic animals. A sequence of twenty-five sandplay productions in which a centered pool played the dominant part, with gradual shifts in the placement of female and male figures, was followed by a centered circle made up of all the significant figures from the preceding sandplay scenes. Placement of animal families in the four corners formed a "squared circle," which completed her sandplay journey. This sequence of sand trays was made in the last part of an interim between a D-and-C operation that was followed by a psychotic break and, four years later, an emergency hysterectomy with no adverse psychological effects. Her feminine identity had become sufficiently secure during this interim to withstand the loss of her internal female organs (Bradway 1990).

More women coming for analysis today are both wife/mothers and

career-oriented persons than was true in the 1970s, when the women in the above study entered analysis; many are having problems in their relationships with men. In the 1980s the double standard of sexuality that plagued the previous generation of women was replaced by a double standard regarding availability. Today's women often complain that their men expect them to be available at all times, to listen, comfort, and reassure, but then feel put upon if the woman expects a similar degree of availability. Swings between extremes of guilt and resentment rob the women of energy and further limit their availability in all outer roles—in relationships with their family and friends and in their careers. The animus function judges them inadequate at the same time that their femininity feels threatened. Of course they have too little time and energy for themselves. One of their tasks in analytic work is to search for an inner core, just as was true for the family and career groups of women described above. And as they are finding it, they are more able to say no and to reserve spaces for themselves where they can *be* and *become*.

The gender identity problems of today's men who come for analysis are often expressed in their relationship with two types of women who are nearly polarized opposites; sometimes the two are differentiated from one another in their orientation to family and career. As one man put it, "If I could only mix them together and come out with one woman . . ." Recognition of what parts of themselves are projected onto each woman permits a gradual withdrawing of the projections and consequent formation of a relationship with the real woman in one (or both) of them.

As men withdraw their projections, they begin to own their feminine sides and become willing, sometimes eager, to take on "feminine" roles. When mother-child relations are being discussed, men in audiences are demanding, "Where does the father come in?" Male peer groups, which began soon after women's consciousness-raising groups were started, are providing a means for men to explore and to share their feelings. Self-disclosure was a taboo for men not too many years ago. But some men have been experiencing the healing that can come from emotional intimacy with their peers. Books on male psychology began to appear in the 1970s (see, for example, Goldberg; Johnson 1977; Pleck and Sawyer; Steinmann and Fox) and have been increasing in numbers since (for example, Bly; Hopcke; Johnson 1991; Monick; Moore and Gillette 1990, 1992; Pedersen).

Since gender wounds are suffered within the relationship with one



or both parents, an important ingredient for healing these wounds is found within the transference-countertransference relationship, or co-transference, with the analyst (Bradway 1991, 29). Whether male or female, Jungian analysts commonly use both their masculine and their feminine sides in relating to the analysand, thus providing means for the analysand to identify with the same sex and complement the opposite sex. This practice directs the healing process to the specific point where early damage due to deprivation in parenting may have occurred.

A common fear among the women in both the Hestia and Athena groups in my study was that of being like their mothers: feeling inadequate, being critical of self and others, being unable to give. One of the women with this complaint had lost her father when she was three years old. She needed to experience both my positive feminine and positive masculine sides, not only as behavior models but also in a complementary relationship, since she had missed these in growing up. If the analyst and the analysand feel that the contrasexual side of the analyst is not sufficiently available for a particular task, a referral to an analyst of the other sex may be made, usually for a relatively brief period, for example for a few months, and usually in conjunction with the primary analysis—that is, the primary analysis continues, although perhaps at a temporarily reduced frequency.

It is my impression that the initial stages of many analyses are marked by an acceptance of the analysand by the analyst in a way that might be likened to "mothering." Later, after the *temenos* is well established, the analyst, regardless of gender, diminishes the "mothering," and the interchange is more at a level that might be described as "fathering" (similar to Kohut's "mirroring" and "idealizing" stages). This is one way that analysts make use of both gender sides of themselves. Many years ago a young woman who had been coming to me for analysis for about a year voiced this specifically: "I don't want you to love me any longer for being just me; I want you to love me for what I can do"—a good differentiation between the mothering and fathering stages. Many times the mothering has to go on for a long time to reestablish what Edinger calls the ego-Self axis. But the next stage is equally important, and is reflected in a shift in the attitude of both analyst and analysand.

In using both their masculine and feminine sides, Jungian analysts form a syzygy with the masculine and feminine parts of their analysands. During analysis, there is always a four-sided relationship going on among the masculine and feminine sides of each member of

the dyad. One side is always conscious and the other side is typically unconscious. The awareness of the interpersonal and intrapersonal relationships between the various parts (ego and masculine and feminine parts—*animus* and *anima*) comes from the analyst at first, but then may come from either analyst or analysand, and thus helps in bringing about the syzygy. Jung writes: "An emotionally charged content is lying ready in the unconscious and springs into projection at a certain moment. This content is the syzygy motif, and it expresses the fact that a masculine element is always paired with a feminine one" (1954, 65). "The male-female syzygy is only one among the possible pairs of opposites, albeit the most important one in practice and the commonest" (*ibid.*, 70). I think it is this syzygy, whether experienced consciously or not, that is at the heart of Jungian analysis. "The touchstone of every analysis . . . is always this person-to-person relationship" (Jung 1928b, 137).

Often it is nonverbal interactions that best illustrate the functioning of the syzygy. A male analysand and I were modeling with clay as we talked, not consciously noting what either was making. When the time was up, we compared what we had done. He had formed a round ball; I had made a bowl. I offered him my bowl and he placed the ball into it—a perfect fit. He observed, "That feels good. I like that." The image of the ball in the bowl provided a reference point in subsequent sessions.

An example of my using my masculine side with a patient occurred in an initial session with a woman who had come for an exploratory therapy visit. She noted the miniatures that were on a table by her chair and placed a woman figure with a train going toward it. Without thinking, I turned the train away from the woman figure. Nothing was said at the time, but the young woman entered analysis. Several years after termination, this woman came to see me for one visit. She reminded me of this incident and explained what it meant to her. She had been feeling unable to cope with authoritarian threats and needed someone to help her. She wanted to go to a woman for analysis but wanted a woman who was stronger than herself or her mother. My *animus* provided a kind of protection until hers became sufficiently strong to take over.

Another woman in analysis had been talking to me about her memories of being left in a crib while her mother was at work. In one session she drew vertical lines without at first recognizing that they resembled bars of a crib. When she did, she pounded the drawing and screamed out her anger. Then she sobbed in my arms. Many sessions later, she brought in a draft of a feminist article she was writing. It

was her first such writing and she wanted to share it with me and get some feedback. We talked about it that hour. In the first instance, it was the feminine part of the analyst that was functioning; in the second it was the masculine side that was being used. Women frequently bring what they are writing or have written to the analytic hour. They are often daughters of mothers who are weak and of fathers who are opposed to higher education for girls. Their masculine sides need the masculine side of the analyst to make up for what was lacking in their mothers and to defend against the put-down experience from their fathers.

My preferred way of handling nonverbal interchanges such as the above is to let them do their work without interpreting. Connections among these interchanges and dreams, previous history, or other experiences may at some time be made, but I am reluctant to dilute the immediate experience with words. In subsequent sessions, there may be a collection of connectable items to which we jointly refer to increase our understanding of the process.

The examples I have used from my analytic practice cover a span of over thirty years. As I was looking through my records, I began to wonder if the tremendous changes in attitudes and life-styles that I see reflected in the content of the analytic hours might be producing discernible changes at a deeper level—at a dream level. I started to look for recurrent images or themes in dreams that might represent masculine or feminine status or function. But I soon realized that there were far too many variables to permit me to discover anything with such a casual approach.

As I went to sleep one night, I was trying to design a study to compare dream symbols over the years. And I had this dream: I was holding a box with black sides and a white lid that I removed to reveal a multitude of "symbolic" figures (royal, religious, mythological) like I use in sandplay. I tried to take them to a brighter light so that I could get a better look at them. I was holding out my skirt to carry them. But they kept falling out of my hands and my skirt so that by the time I reached the light, I had lost many of them. Perhaps this is what would happen if one were to apply a scientific method to the study of symbols; perhaps we would lose more than we would gain. The numinosity of symbols makes their meaning elusive and requires that they remain somewhat in the dark, out of the light of rational understanding. In that way they retain their ability to function as symbols and to connect us to the source of the Self's own mystery.

## REFERENCES

- Bem, S. L. 1974. The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 42:155-62.
- Bernhardt, A. 1976. Synthesis of the developmental frameworks of Erik H. Erikson and analytical psychology: Ego and self development. Ph.D. dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology.
- Bly, R. 1992. *Iron John: A book about men*. New York: Vintage.
- Bolen, J. 1984. *Goddesses in everywoman*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- . 1989. *Gods in everyman*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Bradway, K. 1978. Hestia and Athena in the analysis of women. *Inward Light* 41:28-42.
- . 1979. Sandplay in psychotherapy. *Art Psychotherapy* 6:85-93.
- . 1982. *Villa of mysteries*. San Francisco: C. G. Jung Institute of San Francisco.
- . 1990. A woman's individuation through sandplay. In *Sandplay studies: Origins, theory, and practice*, 133-56. Boston: Sigo.
- . 1991. Transference and countertransference in sandplay therapy. *Journal of Sandplay Therapy* 1, no. 1:25-43.
- Bradway, K., and J. Wheelwright. 1978. The psychological type of the analyst and its relation to analytical practice. *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 23:211-25.
- Bradway, K., K. A. Signell, G. H. Spare, C. T. Stewart, L. H. Stewart, and C. Thompson. 1990. *Sandplay studies: Origins, theory, and practice*. Boston: Sigo.
- Castillejo, I. C. de. 1973. *Knowing woman*. New York: Putnam.
- Dieckmann, U., K. Bradway, and G. Hill. 1974. *Male and female, feminine and masculine*. San Francisco: C. G. Jung Institute of San Francisco.
- Douglas, C. 1990. *The woman in the mirror*. Boston: Sigo.
- Edinger, E. F. 1972. *Ego and archetype*. New York: Putnam.
- Erikson, E. 1951. Sex differences in the play constructions of preadolescents. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 21:667-92.
- Gelpi, B. C. 1974. The androgyne. In *Women and analysis: Dialogues on psychoanalytical views of femininity*, ed. J. Strouse, 227-38. New York: Grossman.
- Gilligan, C. 1982. *In a different voice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Goldberg, H. 1976. *The hazards of being male*. New York: Nash.
- Gray, H. 1948. Jung's psychological types in men and women. *Stanford Medical Bulletin* 6:29-36.
- Green, R. 1976. Human sexuality: Research and treatment frontiers. In *American handbook of psychiatry*, ed. S. Arieti, 665-73. New York: Basic Books.
- Guggenbühl-Craig, A. 1977. *Marriage—dead or alive*. Zurich: Spring.
- Harding, M. E. 1945. *The way of all women*. New York: Longmans, Green.

- Heilbrun, C. G. 1973. *Toward a recognition of androgyny*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Hill, G. S. 1992. *Masculine and feminine*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Hillman, J. 1973. *Anima*. *Spring* 1973:97-132.
- . 1974. *Anima II*. *Spring* 1974:113-46.
- Hopcke, R. H. 1990. *Men's dreams, men's healing*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Johnson, R. A. 1977. *He: Understanding masculine psychology*. New York: Harper and Row.
- . 1991. *Transformation: Understanding the three levels of masculine consciousness*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Jung, C. G. 1928a. The relation between the ego and the unconscious. In *Collected works*, vol. 7, 186-209. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.
- . 1928b. The therapeutic value of abreaction. In *Collected works*, vol. 16, 129-38. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954.
- . 1954. Concerning the archetypes, with special reference to the anima concept. In *Collected works*, vol. 9, part 1, 54-72. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959.
- Jung, E. 1957. *Animus and anima*. New York: Spring.
- Kohut, H. 1971. *The analysis of the self: Systematic approach to the psychoanalytic treatment of narcissistic personality disorders*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Korner, A. 1973. Sex differences in newborns with special reference to differences in the organization of oral behavior. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 14:19-29.
- McGuinness, D., and K. Pribram. 1978. The origins of sensory bias in the development of gender differences in perception and cognition. In *Cognitive growth and development*, ed. M. Bortner, 3-56. New York: Bruner Mazel.
- Marcus, K. 1960. *The stranger in women's dreams*. Paper #7. Los Angeles: The Analytical Psychology Club.
- May, R. 1980. *Sex and fantasy*. New York: Norton.
- Money, J., and A. Ehrhardt. 1972. *Man and woman, boy and girl*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Monick, E. 1987. *Phallos: Sacred image of the masculine*. Toronto: Inner City Books.
- Moore, R., and D. Gillette. 1990. *King, warrior, magician, lover*. San Francisco: Harper.
- . 1992. *The king within*. New York: William and Morrow.
- Neumann, E. 1954a. On the moon and matriarchal consciousness. *Spring* 1954:83-100.
- . 1954b. *The origins and history of consciousness*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 1963. *The great mother: Analysis of the archetype*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Ornstein, R. E. 1972. *The psychology of consciousness*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Pedersen, L. E. 1991. *Dark hearts: The unconscious forces that shape men's lives*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Pleck, J. H., and J. Sawyer, eds. 1974. *Men and masculinity*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Rapoport, R., and R. Rapoport. 1977. *Dual-career families re-examined*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Rupperecht, C. 1974. The martial maid and the challenge of androgyny. *Spring* 1974:269-93.
- Ryce-Menuhin, J. 1989-90. Some plain talk about men. *Harvest* 35:9-31.
- Schaefer, S. 1974. A study of sex and age differentials in typologies as derived from the test score of 200 adults on the Jungian Type Survey and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Unpublished paper, University of Minnesota.
- Schmidt, L. 1980. The brother-sister relationship in marriage. *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 25:17-35.
- Singer, J. 1976. *Androgyny: Toward a new theory of sexuality*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Steinmann, A., and D. Fox. 1974. *The male dilemma*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Stoller, R. J. 1979. *Sexual excitement: Dynamics of erotic life*. New York: Pantheon.
- Ulanov, A. B. 1971. *The feminine in Jungian psychology and in Christian theology*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Whitmont, E. C. 1969. *The symbolic quest*. San Francisco: Harper.
- . 1980. Reassessing femininity and masculinity: A critique of the Eros/Logos concept. *Quadrant* 13/2:109-22.
- . 1992. Gender archetype. In *Gender and soul*. 179-84. Wilmette, Ill.: Chiron.
- Zabriskie, P. T. 1974. Goddesses in our midst. *Quadrant* 17/2:34-45.