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Feminists, Amazons & Daddy's Girls

JOAN. Why do all these courtiers and knights and churchmen hate me? What have I done to them? I have asked nothing for myself except that my village shall not be taxed; for we cannot afford war taxes. I have brought them luck and victory: I have set them right when they were doing all sorts of stupid things: I have crowned Charles and made him a real king; and all the honours he is handing out have gone to them. Then why do they not love me?

DUNOIS [rallying her] Sim-ple-ton! Do you expect stupid people to love you for shewing them up? Do blundering old military dug-outs love the successful young captains who supersede them? Do ambitious politicians love the climbers who take the front seats from them? Do archbishops enjoy being played off their own altars, even by saints? Why, I should be jealous of you myself if I were ambitious enough.


Antigone refused to be cowed by the physical and political power of her adversary, Creon. To the very last she resisted all compromise, so that she died tragically, before the final reprieve. Are feminists Amazons? Are they heroes? As a feminist I can ask myself just how much I see feminism as a fight, and how embroiled in it I seem to become. How do I relate to my fellow fighters? How will we know when we have won? Who, or what, is the enemy? Should I use the same weapons and strategies as the enemy? How does the enemy perceive me? How much am I prepared to give? (Would I, figuratively speaking, cut off a breast?) If it is important for me to "fight the good fight" for feminism, just what else is entailed in living the life of a warrior woman? What kind of a woman do I then become?
Amazons:

Atalanta was the only female Argonaut. She fought alongside Jason, matching the best of them, and was wounded, like Jason, in the escape from Colchis. Atalanta was a virgin huntress from Arcadia and a dedicated warrior woman. The heroes of the Greek epics had many encounters with the definitive warrior women, the Amazons. Jason captured the Sauromatians, a tribe descended from the Amazons. Heracles, for his ninth labour, had taken (amid the usual slaughter) the gold girdle of Ares from Hippolyte, Queen of the Amazons. Theseus (later the revered Athenian king who offered sanctuary to the dying Oedipus), who fought the Amazons with Heracles, was said to have abducted and later abandoned another Amazon, Antiope, thus provoking a further war. Queen Penthesileia, Hippolyte's sister, fought with the Trojans and was slain by Achilles (Graves, 1992; Guirand, 1977).

Female fighting heroes are relatively rare. They transgress the gender divide. But precisely for that reason they are remarkable when they appear. As a race of fighting women, the Amazons are especially unusual. Exceptional individuals like Atalanta are easily accommodated within the cultural structures - the exception proving the rule. However a whole race of warrior women raises speculation about difference, "otherness", in a more radical sense.

Warrior women are not, of course, the exclusive preserve of Greek mythology. As stated previously, Greek mythology has been selected for economy and consistency here. There have been fighting women who have provided heroic inspiration throughout Western history. Queen Boadicea and Joan of Arc led their respective nations into battle. Marianne, in a Phrygian cap favoured by the Amazons, has fuelled the patriotism of the French since the Revolution. In more recent times, Margaret Thatcher's steely reserve, parodied in the "Iron Lady", briefly stirred many Britons to a fever of xenophobic
heroism over the Falklands war. Some of the ironies, and at times the utter silliness, of imagery of the feminine in the service of masculine heroics, has been entertainingly recorded by Marina Warner (1987).

So why spend time on exploring the sub-plot of warrior women in hero epics? Although they are atypical, these images provide versions of the feminine which break (however brutally) the more narrow stereotypes of women as soft, weak, passive and non-aggressive. The usual role for a woman in a hero story is that of “damsel in distress”. What Amazons offer might be an unlovely vision, but it still expands the restrictive boundaries of traditional anima representations, and supplies interesting perspectives on Western social and cultural habits of understanding conflict. Warrior women are not afraid to be out in the public realm, in the thick of the action; no playing the prize to be won like Helen of Troy, no staying at home, patiently weaving and unravelling like the faithful Penelope, no getting on with another life like the disenchanted Clytemnestra, while their respective hero husbands are off battling the enemy. Yet, as already described in Medea’s case, joining the quest is not any guarantee of ultimate success. Hence it is worth exploring some of the implications of being a woman and a warrior, and of connections between women and heroism (in the context of “fighting the good fight”), in order to demonstrate the usefulness of archetypal imagery. It is profitable to explore the ways in which women who behave more like men can highlight the partiality and rigidity of masculine, public, rational ideals, and where this approaches and diverges from feminist perspectives.

Feminists are often referred to as warrior women, fighters, Amazons. To be a feminist implies being committed to a specific cause, to be prepared to fight for women’s rights or for recognition of their differences. Many feminists, for instance, particularly lesbian feminists, have adopted the labrys,
the double sided ceremonial axe of Minoan cults, as their symbol. To call oneself or to be labelled “feminist” is not as clear an indicator as it was, paradoxically, in the heady days of women’s liberation in the 1960’s and ‘70’s. Feminism has diversified into many feminisms. The variety of feminisms provides not only a range of political orientations for feminists, but an opportunity to explore the psychological implications of different orientations, something which has greatly enhanced the potential for reinterpretation and change.

Explorations of a few modern feminisms, which have themselves been influenced by psychodynamic theories, are presented in this chapter. Feminists are described in terms of warrior women, not for the purpose of setting up a preferred feminist perspective, but to consider both advantages and problems in choosing to align oneself with particular feminisms. In this stage of the quest the journey moves into remote foreign lands, to encounters with very different feminine imagery - with some instances of the feminine as “other”, then back again to the centre of Classical culture, to the Olympian goddesses. Archetypal forms of the feminine, accessed through myths of warrior women and warrior goddesses, once again provide the focus and orientation to explore more remote, shadowy aspects of the habits of masculine and feminine distinctions and separations.

*Feminisms and Psychodynamic Theories:*

Some form of human agency, or intentional behaviour, is one of the presuppositions shared by most current feminist theories and psychodynamic psychologies. Feminist theorising is itself purposive, it deliberately *intends* to expound the basis and nature of women’s experience, and simultaneously, it takes meaning in this enterprise by ascribing *intentional action* to the human
beings in the social and cultural groups which it examines. From a theoretical basis favouring intentionality a wide variety of approaches is possible.

Much feminist theory directly incorporates psychodynamic principles, particularly those of Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis and Object Relations theory. Yet psychodynamic theories remain problematic in their relationship to feminisms, originally formulated as the former are from decidedly patriarchal perspectives. Both feminisms and psychodynamic theories have equally complex relationships to the ideals of independence, rationality and single-mindedness associated with individualism. It is the interesting trio of feminist theories, psychodynamic theories and individualism on which I will speculate here.

Psychodynamic theories provide an explanatory framework for discussing the nature and degree of human agency and an account of the psychological and social factors contributing to the places in which women find themselves in modern Western society. Psychodynamic theories also propose some form of intention or purpose in human action (along with, or instead of, causal explanations); they propose intention which is to a considerable extent consciously directed and able to be articulated in language, that is, able to be attributed meaning and value.

Although it is not always directly acknowledged, both feminist theories and psychodynamic psychologies which are concerned with human agency and choice, approach issues of value, of preferred actions, of good and not good. It is with these issues that difficulties arise in relation to purely rational understandings of human agency, choice and value. I am using “rational” in the broader, modern sense in which it is not oppositional to empiricism, but is, rather, contrasted with emotion and passion. A consideration of the added
dimension of unconscious processes in the psyche provides further capacity for addressing these issues.

It is stating the obvious to point out that attributes traditionally associated with the masculine (independence, strength, intellectual capacity, especially rationality) are highly valued in Western society, and particularly so in academic society. What intrigues me though, is the degree to which women also value these attributes. Women have typically found themselves caught in the double bind of either being “a real woman”, that is, aspiring to the complementary, but less valued, feminine attributes (nurturance, flexibility, receptivity and of course emotionality) or alternatively they can risk going against their “true nature”, so called, in order to attain the socially preferred masculine values.

Programs of equal rights and equal opportunities, including the work done by liberal feminists, have done much to redress this balance intellectually (Richards, 1980) and socially (Kaplan, 1992). Women are learning to be tough in order to find a place in the public realm while men are learning to let their feelings show ... at least a little. All the same, most people understand the limits of these changes. To have a good cry at a weekend self-development workshop is not only permitted but actively encouraged; it is said to promote personal growth, tolerance and especially bonding. Yet very few of the workshop participants would make the mistake of assuming that it would be acceptable to have a good cry, when they all meet again, at the staff meeting the following week. The distinction between public and private remains intact, despite some valiant attempts at change. Moreover, for the most part, the public remains the masculine realm and the private the feminine realm. It is this public masculine and private feminine which I see mapping across the Jungian idea of a predominantly masculine ego consciousness and an anima.
dominated unconscious. By “collective consciousness” I am referring to persistent, socially dominant habits of thinking and understanding.

When feminists attempt to redress the balance, by gaining access to the valued masculine realm, or by revaluing the feminine, or by discovering alternatives which have been previously ignored, they do this within the context of a social or collective consciousness which is masculine and is unconsciously anima dominated. Thus women’s understanding of the feminine will be anima affected too. In terms of my understanding of the anima principle operating in a masculine collective consciousness, this leads to two distinct possibilities. Women can identify with the feminine as “anima”, that is, live out anima projections, or they can respond to the feminine as “other”, as men do. There will necessarily be a tension between what it is to experience being a woman and what it is our cultural tradition understands the feminine to be. This involves rather more than dichotomies between real or false, natural or socially constructed, idealistic or realistic. Gender has become central to all levels of experience, so central it is often implied rather than explicitly stated, and of course it is the feminine which remains problematic. Teasing out the differences and similarities between the feminine as anima and the feminine as women’s personal experience will be a long and frustrating process. But it could very well be as liberating as some feminist optimists predict. It is a process which began early in the Jungian tradition, with women such as M. Esther Harding (1955) and Irene Claremont de Castillejo (1973) and continued through to Jungian feminists including Estella Lauter and Carol Rupprecht (1985), Polly Young-Eisendrath and Florence Wiedemann (1987) and Demaris Wehr (1988).
**Invoking the Warrior Women:**

What follows are my musings and elaborations on Amazons, and then the warrior goddesses, Athene and Artemis, as they evoke for me different perspectives on selected feminist theorising. Amazons are remarkable in the Western tradition, in that they represented a contradiction in terms. They were women who came from a vague and shadowy place beyond the "civilised" world; they behaved not at all like "civilised" women but quite a lot like "civilised" men. Their dedication to the warrior cause was so strong, it was even claimed, that they cut off one breast to be better able to draw back the arrow in the bow. One possible meaning of the name is "A" (no) "mazon" (breast), although Robert Graves (1992, p. 355) claims this is apocryphal, "amazon" deriving from the Armenian "moon women". The ways in which these mythological characters are seen to relate to modern feminists will vary, according to interpretation, and herein lies the power of the metaphor. Further comparisons will be made by engaging with fighting women from the very heart of Classical civilisation, with the goddesses Athene (quintessential daddy's girl) and Artemis (unpredictable child of nature). St Joan too, a more modern Athene, will reveal other facets of the woman defending a cause.

With all of the possibilities contained in the archetypal metaphor - in this case that of "warrior women" - given considered investigation and imaginative exploration, a varied, multi-layered interpretation can emerge, extending beyond the stereotype or even the ideal form, to a full range from sympathetic to highly critical. For me, the aim is to avoid being trapped at either end of the spectrum; to be able to use the metaphor to explore the full range. One advantage of archetypal forms is their bipolarity and completeness (CW 9i, § 413; CW 9ii, § 123). Warrior women, for instance, are unlikely to be exclusively courageous and dedicated, but they are equally unlikely to be
exclusively aggressive and contentious, nor are they likely to be exclusively masculinised women. If the archetype seems to present in one of these extreme forms it can fairly safely be assumed that the rest is there too, unconsciously.

**Daring Amazons:**

A comparison between twentieth century Western feminists and the Amazons of classical mythology offers some revealing patterns. Given the patrifocal orientation of the stories about warrior women, they are almost inevitably portrayed in anima terms, that is, as unusual women who engage the imaginations of men. But given the shared, dominant, masculine consciousness, the traditional images can be a profitable starting point for women too.

What little is known of the Amazons is of course presented within the context of an androcentric perspective. The Amazons were reported to be fearsome, strange, mysterious, because they did not behave like women, yet they demanded respect, however grudgingly given, because they did men’s work and did it well. They could only ever be “other”, different, in the context of Classical society; to become part of, to find a place within, Greek society for instance, they would have to be “tamed”, to learn to behave like civilised women, in a complementary (read “inferior”) role to men. Integrated tribes like the Sauromatians (conquered by Jason) for instance, are not reported as maintaining the peculiar social relationships of their ancestors. Yet there they are - the Amazons - a marginal, troubling, atypical group of women, living beyond the borders of the civilised world. Usually they are said to have lived along the Black Sea in Anatolia, or in Libya (Graves, 1992), although Malamud (1980) recalled as well the imagined associations with South America. Why was it necessary for someone, somewhere, to encounter or to invent this group of women, and then to incorporate them into enduring legends?
As inspirational and thrilling embodiments of the ideals of battle conduct, Amazons, *women* warriors, personify the dreams, represent the numinous anima form, which captivates and fires commitment. This is metaphorically illustrated by the heroes’ tendencies to fall in love with their worthy opponents, despite the fact that the relationship is initially one of equal opposites, something like a brother/sister relationship. Melanion won Atalanta’s hand in marriage (and saved himself from certain death) by being the only man to beat her in a foot race; he distracted her by dropping three golden apples supplied by Aphrodite. As stated above, Theseus abducted Antiope, beginning another war, and Achilles, with the blinding realisation that he had fallen in love with Penthesileia at the moment he killed her, was provoked to the gross desecration of necrophilia (Graves, 1992). Anima can be so overpoweringly seductive that even a hero forgets himself.

The Amazons must remain marginalised, different, mysterious, because they have no place within a patriarchal society. Yet Greek tradition has them organised into a complementary mirror image of Classical society. Like their Greek warrior counterparts, they were said to offer sacrifice to Ares, god of war, from whom they were supposedly descended (Downing, 1981). They also revered Athene and Artemis (though Artemis, interestingly, as the many breasted fertility goddess of Ephesus, leading Guirand (1977) to suggest that the “a” in Amazon refers not to a lack, but to an augmentation of breasts). Not only did the Amazons perform all the “masculine” roles in their society, but according to some accounts, they physically maimed their male children to keep them under control in their assigned “female” domestic roles (Malamud, 1980). Alternatively, they were thought to live in exclusively female tribes, consorting occasionally in wild ritual with men of neighbouring tribes, to whom were sent any male offspring (Graves, 1992). It is as if no other possible
social arrangement could be imagined. A mutually acceptable reversal of
gender roles would not make sense in a determinedly patrifocal society.
Echoes of the same fears are still repeated by antagonists of feminism; if
feminists don’t emasculate, then at the very least they are bound to exclude
men.

From the point of view of an Amazon of course, to be a woman and a
warrior was natural, normal. We can only speculate about what else may have
been normal as well for an Amazon. It was only in their difference to the
accepted social ways that they were noticed. Thus, to be an Amazon came to
be synonymous with being a fighting woman. Yet presumably they would not
have been fighting all the time, but there are only confusing reports of their
lives away from battle and almost all that has been recorded concerns their
supposed relationships with men. There is a tendency too, to define feminists
as eternal militants, so that, by definition to be a feminist is to be a fighter-
quarrelsome, aggressive, contentious, always vigilant, never at rest. And this,
in turn, by definition in a patriarchal society, is action which is inappropriate
for a woman.

Much feminist writing, following the ground breaking work of Simone de
Beauvoir (1972), has focused on woman as “other”. Initially this otherness was
seen in terms of the complementary opposite to what is considered male. In a
patriarchal world view otherness is typically a collection of qualities which is
not highly valued and is often expressed in terms of a lack (women have been
described in terms of what men are not). However the “otherness” of Amazons
does not fit the category of femininity as that which is not masculine; this is
difference of an atypical kind. In fact, seeing warrior women as “other”
highlights just how much can be subsumed under such a global term. Once
personified, the woman as “other” cannot simply be a lack; if she is to exist she
must have substance. Thus Amazons and Athene are “other” in the sense of behaving like men, not like ordinary women. Artemis’s difference is of another kind, coming from her refusal to be “civilised” at all; she is neither a good girl nor a good citizen.

Perhaps Amazons have something in common with feminisms of difference, feminisms intent on exploring differences beyond complementarity and simple dichotomies (de Lauretis, 1986). I am not suggesting that such feminisms set out to reproduce an Amazon society; I am pointing to ways in which both the power and the difficulties of such feminisms can be understood psychologically, by using the Amazon metaphor, with its representation of the feminine as radically different. Since we usually define meanings at least partially in terms of what they are not - as opposites - it is especially difficult, not only to describe, but even to envisage differences which are truly “other”. This is a task which paradoxically for warrior women, requires much patience and sensitivity.

There is for instance, another interpretation of the Amazons’ behaviour which contradicts this sense of radical “otherness”. From the patriarchal viewpoint Amazons fit the stereotype of the feminist as a discontented woman trying to pretend she is a man. Yet it is still possible to see this interpretation as part of that presented above. It revolves around the assumption (not necessarily accurate) that what the Amazon/feminist is fighting for, is precisely what her male protagonists already have. As many feminists are well aware, it can be a difficult task to persuade others that the struggle is more often than not about preserving freedoms which are at risk of disappearing in Western society and even more importantly, exploring other options which have not yet been considered (French, 1985). That the Amazons could fight like men led to the assumption that what they were fighting for must be something their opponents
had and valued. It is unlikely that we will ever know if that was the case, but
my point here is that feminists, as individuals or groups, do well to consider the
implications of their beliefs carefully and fully, and also consider that their
beliefs might be misinterpreted or reinterpreted by others.

In the context of Amazon as anima, Amazon, in the sense of “independent
woman”, is also one of the four types proposed by Toni Wolff, an associate of
Jung (Wehr, 1988), and mentioned in chapter one. The other three types she
proposed were Mother, Hetaira (companion, lover) and Medium (spiritual,
intuitive woman). As with Jung’s personality types, Wolff claimed women
tend to fit one of these types as a dominant orientation for their personalities,
with one or two of the others as secondary. The Mother and Hetaira forms,
according to Wolff, are concerned with personal relationships, while the
Amazon and Medium forms relate more to “objective cultural values”
(Mattoon, 1981). However the Mother and Hetaira types are said to be
antithetical, as are the Medium and Amazon, so they rarely occur together.

In her many re-inventions of her public persona, the popular entertainer,
Madonna, has played effectively with aspects of the four types, although
attempting to neatly pigeon-hole each manifestation underestimates the
cleverness with which she exploits the imagery. Until recently, the perversity
of her name mocked the notion of “mother” as icon, although now she has
made it literal. She has played the seductress in many guises, including the
threatening, aggressive, sado-masochistic bisexual; a sexual Amazon. Then
she recently reinvented herself, on and off screen, into a glamorous Eva Peron,
inspirational guide and mother of a nation, played to the hilt, with an overlay of
“real” maternal devotion deriving from her own impending motherhood.
Popular art and/or cynical marketing, whichever it is, she has conquered the
forms with consummate style.
Demaris Wehr (1988) has pointed out that all of Wolff's four types are in fact anima types; they are feminine types constructed by a masculine notion of what women are, and more specifically the ways in which women relate to men. Irene Claremont de Castillejo (1973) took a position between Wolff and Wehr, describing the types as female psychology, but recognizing that they represented relationships with men. Such roles, for her, exemplify different representations of the woman as mediator; as the conduit between a man and his family (Mother), or his self and ideals (Hetaira), or the collective unconscious (Medium). Only the Amazon, she claimed, is not a mediating image, being more a relationship akin to siblings. The particular qualities of the Amazon as anima are also evidenced in the absence of a comparable type in Jung's (CW 16, § 361) description of four anima types which he labelled Eve (earth mother), Helen of Troy (seductress), the Virgin Mary (spiritual mother) and Sophia (wisdom). The four types are presented in hierarchical form, from the most basic, undifferentiated (Eve) to a fully spiritual development of Eros (relatedness) in the transcendent Sophia.

Since she stands apart from, often in opposition to, her male associates, there can be a failure to recognize that the Amazon still relates to men. In fact, Polly Young-Eisendruth (1994, p. 90) was provoked to claim that; "Amazon is the invention of men. They have nothing to do with women." The most obvious interpretation of the Amazon's lack of relatedness comes from her virginity. When the notion of "virgin" is extended however beyond its sexual definition, to mean a self-contained, self-focused woman, "one-in-herself" to use M. Esther Harding's (1955, p. 105) phrase, the tendency to subsume "relationship" under sexual, especially heterosexual relationship, becomes evident. From a patriarchal viewpoint, if an unattached woman should choose to refuse male sexual advances, she must be different in some radical way.
Yet Amazons relate - very directly - with men. By reflecting quintessentially masculine values and actions, but embodied as female, Amazons unquestionably mediate meaning, which is why the heroes typically fell in love with them. Likewise, I cannot agree with Young-Eisendrath (1994) that they have nothing to do with women; from women’s responses to them, they can tell us much about women’s responses to the masculine preferences they personify. My guess is that both Wolff and Wehr are correct. Women have been defined in terms of the ways they relate to men for so long that this has become the normal definition, even for women themselves. This is precisely the dilemma faced by feminists who find the options restrictive and want to extend the boundaries.

_Civilising Athene:_

There are significant instances of warrior women in myth who are less marginalised, they fit more easily into Western, masculine anima categories, but they still remain exceptional. Within the Classical tradition, Athene and Artemis are two such figures. (I am referring here to the virgin goddess of the hunt - Artemis to the Greeks, Diana to the Romans - not to the many breasted Artemis of Ephesus, a fertility goddess). Once again, they are atypical women-goddesses, no less - and once again they can contribute to an understanding of feminism in a personal and social context with their atypical qualities. Athene was very much her father’s daughter, “born” fully grown and fully armed from Zeus’s head. Fearing a prophecy that a son would usurp his power, Zeus had swallowed the pregnant Metis (Wisdom). Athene sprang from her father’s head after Hephaisstos, to relieve Zeus’s headache, had split open his skull with, significantly, the double edged Minoan axe (Downing, 1981). In light of this particular discussion about rationality, feminism and fighting, it is noteworthy that she is both goddess of war and goddess of intellectual wisdom, or more
precisely, practical wisdom (Woolger & Woolger, 1987). She is an embodiment of valued qualities which, given female form, become inspirational to Western society; she is clever, brave, steadfast, single-minded and of course, chaste. Like her favourite, Odysseus, Athene uses her cleverness, her cunning, to confuse and deceive her enemies; it is an essential aspect of her martial skills (Warner, 1987). Athene, respected, virtuous, serious, has the advantage of power *within* the establishment. Malamud (1980), in considering her as an anima figure, pointed to the *masculine* qualities Athene epitomises and stated that Jung too acknowledged the masculine elements of anima. This highlights the complexity of distinguishing between "woman", "feminine" and "anima" and the added immediacy of this when one is a woman.

One aim in this chapter is to point to some of the difficulties in rational discussions of feminist theorising and to stress the unconscious as an important factor in understanding human behaviour. The reification of rationality, logic and analysis, as the only credible forms of assessing knowledge, is a legacy of the Enlightenment. It was a response to the elitist exclusivity of the preceding era of control of knowledge by men of the Church. Yet, paradoxically, rationality and its concomitant ideal of individualism have become the exclusive preserve of a rival group of mostly white, mostly privileged, mostly male initiates who use their knowledge for power and control. Athene is an interesting female personification of many of the "civilised" qualities celebrated in individualism. The ideal of individualism will be discussed again in the chapter on Self, so, at this point, I will merely explain briefly my use of the term, as it impinges on feminist perspectives. The individualist is, predictably, committed to rationality and logic - to understanding the world scientifically. Being responsible and capable are also important; to use one's
skills to improve oneself, one’s environment, nature in general, to make the
world a better place, is praiseworthy. Above all, the committed individualist
values autonomy; being self-motivated and independent demonstrates maturity.
The ideal is implied in the models of successful professionals in almost all
vocations, from business entrepreneur to scientist. It also informs the
presuppositions of almost all theories of psychology which describe the
“healthy” personality (to be taken up again in the chapter on Self). Men,
especially, are given every encouragement to pursue the ideal, while women
too are increasingly prompted to see it as within their reach, although feminists
like Elizabeth Fox-Genovese (1991) have stressed the limitations:

Individualism flattened particularistic distinctions by positing a single,
unform, and universal model of excellence - the individual - and
overthrew particularistic premises by assuming that the individual preceded
all groups, which could only derive their meaning and legitimacy from the
conformity to and respect for individual rights.


Individualism has positive aspects, but like any ideal, when taken to extremes it
produces narrow-minded pedantry, bullying interference, and denigration of
interpersonal relationships - in short, it produces a unidimensional, unsociable
and potentially dangerous individual.

Rationality is an ideal in Western society generally, and is also the accepted
mode for academic discourse. In this context I am using “rationality” to refer
to logical and especially causal analyses, as preferred explanatory modes,
characterised by the “scientific” approach to knowledge. My intention is not to
condemn either logic or science - a well reasoned argument is intellectually
satisfying, as well as useful. But I do mean to draw attention to value
judgements usually underlying such preferences, most obvious in accusations,
typically in academic discourse, of “illogical” or “irrational” arguments. The implication that only logical, analytical explanations are legitimate fails to acknowledge that, psychologically, we are also swayed and convinced by the emotional impact of certain explanations, that is, by rhetoric, just as we establish understandings through other techniques such as allusion, association and metaphor. The difficulties for feminist theorists revolve around both of these factors, namely, the Western Enlightenment and particularly the academic ideals. A rational argument is no guarantee of success in working towards political change. In addition, for those feminists who have serious reservations about the worth of rational discourse, there is the difficulty of arriving at another form of effective discourse, especially in academia.

My concern here is not whether theories based purely on reason, logic and science will or will not be shown to be true in the future, but rather the irony that the Western world makes an act of faith, rather than an act of reason, in believing they will be proven eventually. People are encouraged to live their lives as if there were definitive final causes and final ends. Yet logical explanation, especially of human action, remains suspended, consisting of partial causal chains and logical accounts of parts of human behaviour. Just as the causal account is incomplete, the purposes of and rationales for human action hover in a vague teleological mist of possible freedoms and personal expressions. So instead of relying solely on rational argument for the application of Jungian theory to feminist explanations, in accordance with the alternative approach I am advocating, I elaborate on feminist perspectives also through allusion and metaphor; through searching out connections in the imagery associated with Classical warrior women and modern feminisms. Just as Amazon territory remains uncharted, the possibilities of feminisms have
barely been signalled, even as they risk being truncated by post-modern post-feminism.

Warrior women, especially of the Athene type, run the risk of being taken over, seconded to, the establishment cause. The practical wisdom attributed to Athene is a creative, civilising wisdom which results in social and cultural development, represented materially in the city and culture of Athens (Woolger & Woolger, 1987). Athene continues to flourish in the Enlightenment ideals, and closer to psychology, in the aims and achievements of applied science (as opposed to pure science). She displays many qualities which are associated with liberal feminism, and its subscription to rationality, fairness, equal rights and opportunities. The Amazons or Artemis, by contrast, are more readily allied with the aims of feminisms of difference.

Feminists who use psychoanalytic theories as the basis for their work fit the Athene mould less easily; but close parallels remain. Psychoanalytic feminisms acknowledge the power of the unconscious but still propose some ideal of ego development which would enable a psychologically acceptable compromise between the conflicting demands of the libido and socialisation (Chodorow, 1989; Gallop, 1982; Mitchell, 1974). Usually, in these accounts, reason and logic are meant to empower the ego. Feminist Object Relations theorists aim at a reappraisal of subject/object relations (Benjamin, 1988). They point to the importance of the relationship, rather than the conflicting aspects of interactions between primary caregivers (usually mothers) and young children. Once again most of this reassessment and proposed change has to do with ego development; the successful resolution of crises of early child/parent relations. In both cases there is an appeal for a more rational, reasonable ego consciousness. The appeal itself is also largely made in rational terms. Hence Athene still seems to be the dominant archetype here. (I am also aware that the
case I am presenting at this point can be seen to fit these same criteria and will discuss it below.)

Consequently, Athene fits a more familiar anima type. She is an embodiment of many of the most valued masculine qualities in the Western tradition, but she represents them in female form (the ideal form for inspiration). This singular, even unnatural, woman can be safely adored, looked up to, invoked. As female she provides the source of feeling, passion, to stir the soul in the quest for intellectual expression (and successful battles). As the female offspring emerging from her father’s mind, she encapsulates the externalised, material, creative product of the masculine consciousness. Once again though, I want to stress that she can make this important contribution for women as well as for men, to the degree that women see themselves as part of the same Western tradition. Christine Downing (1981, p. 126) provided a liberating insight with a wonderfully Jungian paradox: “Out of head comes body; out of Zeus comes Athene.” Conceived by Metis, and a woman herself, Athene does not have to be lost to restrictive patrifocal interpretations. As Downing (1981) suggested, by carefully uncovering the biases in the historical accounts, it is possible to work one’s way towards a more complete picture of goddesses like Athene.

Elusive Artemis:

Artemis is much less likely to be appropriated by anyone or anything. The virgin huntress lives apart from society, at home in the forest and in the company of her female companions and her hunting dogs. Her usual contribution to human society is to assist in the hunt and at childbirth. However the greatest source of difficulty, in her interactions with mortals, arises from her being a maddeningly beautiful yet unattainable woman. This renders her an object of voyeuristic fascination for men and to this she reacts
violently. (For such insolence, Artemis transformed Acteon into a stag so that he was slaughtered by his own hounds).

As an anima representation Artemis presents rather different aspects of the traditional feminine. Where Athene calls upon lofty and noble ideals, Artemis conjures up the associations of the feminine with wild and uncivilised nature, with irrationality and danger. Her attraction is perversely sexual, if she wasn’t so dangerous she would be called a tease. She is associated with the feminine as unconscious; the dark and primitive forest, the night and the moon. She is consequently not only huntress, but protector of the land and the hunted creatures, in short she is a pantheistic embodiment of wilderness (Downing, 1981). It might be thrilling to meet this wild woman, but considering the danger, it is probably preferable to encounter her at a safe distance on television or at the movies. You certainly wouldn’t want her in your home, as a wife or mother.

This is feminine beauty well beyond the bounds of prettiness. It is the kind of excess traditionally associated with nature, the fascination of unknown places and uncontested power. It is also an aspect of the traditional feminine remote from the lives of most “civilised” Western women. It is relatively easy for women to relate to Artemis’s rage in finding herself the unwitting and unwilling object of male sexual appropriation. It is perhaps harder to recognise the ways in which women too, as inheritors of the same way of seeing, the same habit of objectifying what one is looking at, are to some extent voyeurs to the erotic fascination of the unattainable woman (Berger, 1972). In the mad rush to recapture the “lost feminine” it is treacherously easy to objectify the dark and mysterious, the “other”. It can so easily be turned again into commodity, or even quarry, to be chased, possessed and introjected. Her rage
is no doubt justified, but her retribution chilling. To be either Artemis, or one of her victims, is to be caught up in an excess.

Artemis has a special function in the lives of women in the classical tradition. She is a goddess of childbirth and childhood, especially girlhood (Kerenyi, 1980). She is not a fertility goddess, but instead has control over survival, choosing who lives and who dies - women are both companions of the huntress and victims of the hunt. For Kerenyi, Artemis is not represented simply as a virgin huntress, but as a pre-pubescent girl, a wilful nine-year-old tomboy untouched by the moderating influences of female maturity. Even at nine years most modern girls have been thoroughly socialised into their appropriate gender roles, so the picture of this lovely, unpredictable, feral child has some explanatory appeal. The socially sanctioned masculine qualities are highlighted, accentuated, by being given female form in Athene. If we can reach past the distaste for Artemis’s bloodthirsty actions, there are perhaps aspects of feminine energy, independence, strength and endurance, currently tamed out of recognition, to be rediscovered here. Artemis is more remote, more unconscious than Athene.

In academic feminism, Artemis would be more readily invoked in creative literature - the passion and freer expression of fiction and poetry giving greater reign to the unconscious elements. However, within feminist psychoanalytic theory, the French feminist, Luce Irigaray drew on philosophy and psychoanalytic theory, yet produced complex, poetic prose more reminiscent of fiction, in a deliberate attempt to break the boundaries of academic disciplines and especially the boundaries within which women could express themselves in academia (Grosz, 1990; Marks & de Courtivron, 1980). Like any archetypal form, though, Artemis does not necessarily wait to be asked. She can be
present, unconsciously, yet effectively, exerting her influence in surprising ways.

**Identifying the Archetypal Protagonists:**

Thus far my illustrations of the feminine archetypes in feminism have been fairly straightforward. Reality is rarely that way. So I will now present an example of the ways in which these forms can interact with each other and with unconscious as well as conscious elements in the psyche. Where Athene might provide the feminine archetype appropriate to a feminism based on more traditional psychoanalytic theory, the Amazon would seem to be more appropriate to feminists influenced by Lacanian psychoanalysis.

The French feminists, Luce Irigaray and Julia Kristeva (Grosz, 1990) were concerned, in their different ways, with the construction of gender and subjectivity through language, or the "symbolic", to use the more comprehensive Lacanian term (Mitchell & Rose, 1982). They set out to show the extent to which Western values, understandings, the entire world view are logocentric and phallocentric. They used argument, irony and especially for Irigaray poetic expression, to demonstrate the ways in which we come to understand the world and ourselves through the word and the text. They attempted to employ the linguistic tools of their patriarchal heritage to deconstruct existing hierarchies. Although I do not pretend to follow either of them with any ease, I do admire their attempts to break old habits.

So what I have to say here has more relevance to their followers and to some other post-modern writers who celebrate their supposed liberation from modernism - from the restrictions of being obliged to speak as the clearly defined and unchanging autonomous individual. Post-modernists speak of the death of the self, and of human subjectivity as neither permanent nor immutable - it is described as shifting, changing, flowing with the text or
discourse. The danger here, I believe, is that one form of tyranny has merely been substituted for another. Certainly the ideal of individualism, of the autonomous human agent, can readily be shown to be illusion, a convenient social construction. However by moving the accent to the “play of the text”, to the shifting and various meanings of the “discourse”, it is now the word which has been reified, an ironic reversal of John’s summation of the Christian ideal “... the Word was made flesh...” John 1:14 (Revised Standard Version).

Lacanian psychoanalysis and post-modernism are logocentrism of the most refined kind, revolving around, and paying court to, the Phallus as “signifier”.

In such a scenario, where the attempt was to discover some alternatives, some truly different ways for women to express their experiences, the Amazon as “other” would seem to be the desired ideal. Yet it is certainly Athene who seems to have full sway, helping to build onto the mighty edifice of academic theorising. Here, in the postmodern text, women can express themselves in any way they choose; swim, or drown, in an ocean of words, but it seems to me that what was a barrier between experience and expression has now become a gap, a gulf in fact. Interestingly this is a perspective I find I share with the stridently anti-Jungian feminist, Naomi Goldenberg (1990).

Also relevant in this context is the work of Jungian feminists such as Estella Lauter and Carol Rupprecht (1985). Although they have invoked Hermes (via James Hillman), thus moving more in the direction of the pluralities associated with post-modernism, they are still drawing on the associations with an explicitly phallic god. There is a continuity, rather than a change, from modernism to post-modernism exemplified in the phallic, Logos oriented, Hermes. He certainly moves around much more - spreads his seed widely, if you like. But along with the flighty playfulness, there are the roadside markers, the phallic Hermes, or milestones, providing permanent
reference points. A Hermes consciousness has liberated its thinkers from many of the rigours of the Apollonian precursor, but it still carries with it the same tradition of respect, even adoration, of the Word. The seduction is just that much harder to see behind Hermes’s tricks. In contrast, in her aim to institute genuine dialogue between true equals in heterosexual relationships, the Jungian analyst Polly Young-Eisendrath (1994) would seem to draw the civilising intelligence of Athene together with the equality the Amazons held with their opponents (her reservations about Amazons notwithstanding).

To complete the picture, it is worth attempting to locate my own enterprise in this company of fighting women. The intellectual, academic nature of the work immediately places it with Athene. However there are further links as well. Feminists, from Mary Daly (1984) to Naomi Goldenberg (1990), have relentlessly attacked the intrinsic essentialism of Jungian theories. They have claimed that no theory which entrenches rigid categories of psychic development (particularly those relating to gender) can ever be sufficiently expansive to accommodate changing gender relationships. Instead, it is argued, they are theories which inevitably reinforce conservative stereotypes. Certainly Jung’s theory is solidly grounded in a particularly androcentric Platonist philosophy. The misogyny is not inevitable however. Jung was less misogynist and transcendentalist than Plato, and many of those developing Jungian theory since have made their adaptations increasingly sensitive to women’s concerns. Ultimately, conceptualisations of archetypes do not have to be any more restrictive or sexist than those of Freudian instincts. Whether they are conceived of as situated in some transcendent realm (archetypes), or in psychophysiological forces (instincts), they enhance understandings of persistent, unconscious psychological influences and this must be the key and the appeal to working with them.
Although borrowing from Plato's theory of Ideal Forms, Jung (CW 9i, § 413; CW 9ii, § 123) also understood there is a paradox between perfection (the ideal good) and completeness (the inclusion of all aspects, positive and negative). Discovering archetypal form is not meant as an escape from the world, rather a key to understanding it; not an ascension to the celestial realms, but a spirited involvement in the world around. Hillman (1980a) has tried to close the gap between abstract form and instantiation even further, suggesting the archetype be understood as immanent in a given individual image. Both Jung and Hillman take pains to warn of the problems inherent in attempting to define the ineffable - the abstract form itself.

In archetypal theory, the problem identified by feminist critics arises, I feel sure, when the archetypal form and certain of its cultural manifestations are confused with one another, the archetypal form itself (the subject of interest, the signified) is equated, defined and limited to the descriptive terms (label, signifier). The fault lies not only with the critics of Jung; it comes primarily from the tendencies of Jungian theorists themselves to assume that they have captured the totality of an archetype once they identify its culturally instantiated form. The results are narrow value judgements and stereotypes. Add to this the necessity to extrapolate the definitions backwards, from the evidence of the concrete example to the abstract, unknown archetypal form, and the imposition of arbitrary restrictions can easily follow. Jung's writings (especially CW 10) are littered with examples of the social preferences of his time (for women as homemakers and men's helpmeets, or men as independent, free-thinking individuals) elevated to the level of archetypal forms. Considerable caution is called for when advancing possible definitions of archetypes. Caution is required, but certainly not dismissal of the entire theory. Archetypes can be understood as holding the inevitability, for Hillman (1980a) the necessity, of
certain underlying forms in tension with the corresponding instantiated images, a combination which allows for re-evaluation and reinterpretation.

To return to the example used in this chapter, not only are my musings about warrior women likely to differ from musings of other women, but my own are likely to change too, at different points in my life. Yet by definition they will always be warrior women, and Athene will always be distinct from Artemis. Since critics like Daly (1984) and Goldenberg (1990) also use the same familiar myths and metaphors to represent meanings which captivate and enthrall, I suspect their abhorrence of the Jungian version comes, not from any objection to metaphorical imagery per se, but from the association with the androcentrism of the transcendent realm of forms inherited from Plato. It is unquestionably a "heady" masculine tradition, to which Athene is a true daughter, but referring again to Downing's (1981, p. 126) "... out of Zeus comes Athene...", Athene, the quintessential daddy's girl, does not have to be a lost cause to women. I am (like Daly and Goldenberg) able to use the intellectual academic tools of my Western, patriarchal tradition to reinterpret the images and the myths. Not any interpretation will do; twisting the metaphor until it no longer makes sense, or changing the story until it has a different plot, breaks the thread of meaning. It is there, in the thread, the intrinsic meaning, that I locate the archetypal form.

_Modern Warrior Women:_

To return to the Amazons again, it is time to consider some modern stories in which warrior women feature, in order to point to the variety of ways in which the warrior woman story continues to be told. The relentlessly aggressive female hero of the movie, _Aliens_, didn't inspire me all that much, I have to admit. I found my sympathy lay more with the enemy, the hideous monster frantically trying to protect her brood. Where _Star Trek_ stories are self
consciously and didactically moralistic, thrillers like “Aliens” are unapologetically visceral. There is literally no time for moral agonising in the avalanche of shocks and thrills. Molly, the bionically enhanced female companion to the young hero in William Gibson’s (1995) cult classic of cyberspace, *Neuromancer*, with her prodigious powers of destruction and ruthless will to exercise them, held a rather repellent fascination for me. Thelma and Louise captured more of my enthusiasm, in their manic trip to freedom and death, although the satisfactions never moved beyond those of release and revenge. A more appealing Amazon springs to life in Barbara Walker’s (1996) succinct retelling of George and the Dragon as Gorga (as in Gorgon) and the Dragon. In a feminist fairy tale version of the hero’s struggle Gorga, the unlovely but skilled Amazon, saves the stolen maidens and the prince’s lands from the ravages of the dragon (a mechanical creation) and its inventor, and subsequently becomes co-ruler with the prince. Although a deliberately political allegory with uncompromising message, the story, one of the most successful in the book, makes the gender switch with panache.

To find a warrior woman who represents more of the complexities of the form (a woman in contrast with the social mores, a woman “one-in-herself”, Harding, 1955), and a problematical anima image, I turned to G. B. Shaw’s (1967) *Saint Joan*. It is in the story, the interactions, as well as the character of Joan, of course, that the rich layers are revealed. Joan was a naive, prudish, but single-minded and forceful young woman, as well as a brilliant military tactician. Her singular status is described by Shaw (1967, p. 7): “As her actual condition was pure upstart, there were only two opinions about her. One was that she was miraculous: the other that she was unbearable.” In leading her French comrades to victory over the invading English she was feted, as she restored the morale of both nobles and soldiers, fanning the stirrings of French
nationalism. Simultaneously however she scandalised with her refusal to dress
or behave like a woman and offended gravely with her summary dismissal of
any opinion contradicting her own.

Shaw's talent (as with most convincing story tellers) is his ability to make
Joan's story plausible. He does this, not by portraying a wronged martyr
surrounded by scoundrels, but by presenting her as a brilliant but difficult
woman relating, sometimes well, often abominably, with fellow protagonists
who are accorded equal credibility. Both the "miraculous" and the
"unbearable" are presented with wit and convincing argument, to create, not a
melodrama, but "high drama" (Shaw, 1967, p. 43). Shaw further explained the
distinction as follows:

There are no villains in the piece. Crime, like disease, is not interesting: it
is something to be done away with by general consent, and that is all about
it. It is what men do at their best, with good intentions, and what normal
men and women find that they must and will do in spite of their intentions,
that really concern us. (Shaw, 1967, p. 43).

As an anima figure, Joan is a particularly interesting exemplar. She reflects
all of the charisma and ambivalence associated with an image of the feminine
which has captivated and swept along her associates from nobles and
churchmen to ordinary soldiers and peasant girls. Her fervent, unswerving
conviction infects those around her, provoking them to extremes of courage in
battle. But Joan is no Marianne, charging dramatically in billowing draperies.
Joan wears full armour and formulates careful strategies; she is a cool-headed
Athene demonstrating the essence of the ideals of individualism. Interestingly,
Claremont de Castillejo (1973) calls her not an Amazon, but a Mediumistic
anima type, mediating unconscious nationalism and altruistic civil ideals. It
would seem that Joan embodies the civilising, socialising and intellectual
aspects as well as the warrior aspects of Athene, and consequently provides evidence that the Amazon and Medium types are not always antithetical.

Joan's spectacular military triumphs followed by, what was to her the bewildering desertion of her comrades leading to her trial and execution, portray vividly the maddening excesses of anima possession. The Maid is acclaimed as saint while ever she achieves prodigious military feats, but gradually her single-minded preoccupation with more and further victories, becomes an encumbrance and a strategic hazard. She is too good a tactician to die gloriously and conveniently on the battlefield, so is tried for heresy with scrupulous fairness by her Bishop and the Inquisitor, before being handed over to the English to be burnt.

Having so successfully captivated the psyches of her compatriots and enemies alike, this preoccupying, rousing influence can only be exorcised by drastic means. Little wonder ordinary women, who find themselves in anima roles, can emerge shocked and bewildered, after the adulation has turned to victimisation and desertion, especially if they have no clear appreciation of the roles they were allotted in the drama: "Why is it all my fault?" Or as the more knowing Joan says, in the epilogue, "Woe unto me when all men praise me!" (Shaw, 1967, p. 158). In fact, in the epilogue, in a dramatic recapitulation of earlier interactions, there is a trenchant portrayal of the effects of anima; of the inspirational, captivating, ennobling, but finally impossibly unrealistic ideals, personified in engaging human, female form. In King Charles's dream Joan and the men she influenced gather to fill in the events of the intervening twenty years. After a "gentleman" from the future declares Joan's formal canonisation (as a Saint of the same Catholic Church which had condemned her) each of the men humbly kneels to pay homage for the particular ways in which she enabled him. Then Joan shocks them by asking if she should come back to life, and so
she is provoked to declare; "What! Must I burn again? Are none of you ready to receive me?" (Shaw, 1967, p. 158). They are not. Each in turn now makes his entirely reasonable excuses and departs.

Although Shaw's *Saint Joan* is a play about one woman's interactions with men, in an exclusively male environment, and in that sense an excellent portrayal of anima, there is nothing stereotypical about the representations. The interactions between characters demonstrate the complexities of power, morality and ethics, attachments and allegiances - all enhanced by the singularity of Joan's role. It is a precise but extensive exposition of a particular type of male-female interaction. The type of engagement, the brutalities of war and execution notwithstanding, has to do with Athene’s civilising capacities rather than Artemis’s raw wildness. The warring and execution are horrific, not because of their lack of control, but precisely because they are pursued inexorably with scrupulous attention to their proper regulation and conduct - civilised violence.

**In Summary. “Out of head comes body”:**

Fighting women, as single individuals, occur throughout history (and fiction), conspicuous in their uniqueness. However an entire race of fighting women, the Amazons, elicits a different set of images. The difficulties in defining who and what they might have been, mirror the difficulties in defining the aims of feminisms, especially militant feminisms. Just as Amazons were not necessarily fighting for patriarchal values, so it is reductionistic to assume that feminists are only fighting for what men already have.

There is a certain inevitability in finding Athene in feminist academic theorising. It could even be seen as a requirement, if the theorising is to have any academic credibility. The problems arise from the difficulty in being able to evaluate break-throughs. The occasional excitement of making a discovery,
of breaking through barriers, is sometimes simply no more than breaking further into the centre of the maze. It seems exciting, right, satisfying precisely because it fulfils the conscious Athene aspect, the intellect. Maybe that excitement is also mischievously whipped up by Artemis. She is much more difficult to access intellectually, and no doubt she prefers it that way. Whether conceived of in terms of a quest for understanding, or more urgently, as a battle for survival, the feminist enterprise does fit with the metaphor of warrior women. But in the Western cultural context the meaning, and especially the accepted rules and weapons for quest or battle, fit more easily with the Athene or Atalanta aspects.

So, where is Artemis in all of this? Is she simply being bloody minded and injecting a little passionate rage, hidden behind a self-deluding pursuit of justice and retribution? Is she refusing to be the object of scrutiny deflecting attention away from herself onto this abstract notion of the text and discourse? Are these her traps for the unwary? I am still trying to sort this one out. But whatever it is, it probably won’t be expressed easily in words. The feral Artemis is still too close to chaos. Given the traditions, there is a need to find the narrow path between simply reiterating all of the old values and shying off the track, unequipped, into an unknown wilderness.

It is, consequently, of particular psychological value to be able to side-step some of the limitations of a reasoned argument, and to actively engage in the process, emotionally as well as intellectually. By paying close attention to the feelings I experience through the process, especially the resistances and the negative feelings, I have an opportunity to extend my understanding of my own attitude to the feminist enterprise. Jung (CW 8, § 683) after all, considered “feeling” as the complement of “reason” (rationality), within a complete notion of “meaning”. This part of the journey to the outer limits and back again to the
centre of my cultural heritage has left me musing about the implications of difference. Opposites, role reversals for instance, are not the same as radical difference. But the latter is notoriously difficult to describe, so a natural tendency is to reduce it to an antithesis - to describe it in terms of what it is not. However Amazons, Athene and Artemis are neither equivalent nor neatly oppositional. I need to carefully feel my way through.

**Battling with butterflies:**

_In the attempt to do psychology in the discussion of warrior women, I have been confronted with my own distaste for images of women wielding weapons and shedding blood. Even in fantasy I resist images of myself as violent. I want to be able to say, with Young-Eisendrath (1994) that Amazons really have nothing to do with women. I would like to be able to explain away violence in terms of inappropriate socialisation - the warped, restrictive, martial ideals of the West. The narrow, explosive, masculine consciousness it engenders is as destructive to men as it is to women. I do believe this to be the case; we are burdened and maimed by the oppressive requirements of development, expansion and control (materially and psychologically), where competition soon translates to violent struggle. So, it must be the fault of our cultural tradition. What I want to be able to do, is to shrug off the fascination for hero-warriors and occupy myself with gentler images. But what to do about the battle for survival, or the ennobling quest which gives purpose to life? Even if I ignore them, the brooding presences are still there, whether as the unnerving, shadowy “others” who destroy the environment or attack unwary pedestrians on city streets, or else as the heroic scientists, medicos, environmentalists, artists, who occupy the pedestals cluttering the noble halls of my ideals._
The question returns. Why cannot I dismiss aggressive heroes as masculine fantasies? In particular, why cannot I dismiss those belligerent anima women in the same way I dismissed Ayesha, that epitome of numinous anima from Rider Haggard’s (1995/1887) She, so often referred to by Jung? I no more identified with Ayesha, “She-who-must-be-obeyed”, than with either of the male protagonists, in what struck me as a silly, dated, adventure yarn, presented in terms of a coy Victorian allegory of the fearful, all-devouring “vagina dentata”. Such descriptions of the captivating attraction and repulsion of the mysterious feminine are surely just male fantasies; aspects of masculine psychology? However I have to admit to responding differently to Marie Corelli’s (1892) Romance of Two Worlds. Again I chuckled over the gothic excess of this contemporary of She. There are obvious complementarities; two women and one man (instead of two men and one woman) as principle protagonists, the quest for knowledge (this time set in the apparent security of civilised Europe rather than alien lands). The story-teller heroine is suitably enthralled by the Apollonic animus figure of Casimirs Heliobas, with his sunny name and spectacular electrical contraptions. But the greatest influence and the deepest inspiration come from his sister, the mysterious, mesmeric, Zara. There is even the same undercurrent of forbidden sexuality, this time coyly lesbian (though at the time Corelli wrote, probably quite daring). Labelling Zara an example of archetypal Shadow or Self fails to capture the particular qualities of the numinous feminine character. Zara serves precisely the same function as She-who-must-be-obeyed. If Ayesha is anima, so is Zara.

To say that women don’t experience the archetypal images as anima is as perverse as claiming that woman doesn’t have a soul - a provocative barb in which Jung seemed to delight (CW 7, § 298; CW 17, § 338). Using as basis a
truly simplistic and literalist complementarity, it is alleged that, already female, women don't need (or can't relate to) the female soul image. However the further question then must follow, do they not have soul because they are soul (Claremont de Castillejo, 1973), a concept which had undercut masculine spiritual elitism even with the medieval mystics? St. John of the Cross had the soul ecstatically proclaim, of her closeness to Christ,

Upon my flowering breast
Which I kept wholly for Him alone,
There He lay sleeping,
And I caressing Him
There in a breeze from the fanning cedars.

(St. John of the Cross, trans. 1979, p. 296).

But the medieval female mystic, Mechtilde of Magdeburg, was even more direct and more erotic in her reference to herself as soul and Bride of Christ;

Lord, now I am a naked soul
And Thou a God most glorious!
Our two-fold intercourse is Love Eternal
Which can never die. (Dourley, 1987, p. 33).

Whether soul and anima are combined, as was the case at times in Jung's writings (CW 6, § 804; CW 7, § 297), or whether they are clearly differentiated (CW 9ii, § 25), or even if anima is subsumed by the more inclusive notion of soul-making (Hillman, 1978), a persistent association with the feminine remains. If such images of the feminine remain the preserve of male fantasies, then women probably don't have much of either anima or soul, and moreover, probably would not even miss them. Once the imagery is taken beyond the confines of traditional male fantasy, though, there are broader, shared
understandings. How could women not know these aspects of the feminine, to be reinterpreted and reclaimed as their own?

Of course, if I really want to be selfish and spiteful I can claim "psyche" as female as well; Psyche, "butterfly", "breath", "soul", the brave young woman who married Eros, to be encountered in the following chapter. In addition there is Eros himself, as the feminine principle of relatedness (CW 9ii, § 29). That makes the living force of personality (psyche), and the passionate, appreciative soul (anima), as well as the capacity for relationship (Eros) all feminine. By contrast, the remainder, the celebrated masculine Logos consciousness and the remote, unattainable, ideal Self then seem isolated, deserted in a bleak psychic landscape. Just as well then, women and men are not as psychically different as we are sometimes led to believe. Strangely, in this account of warrior women, where women fight men rather than relate to them in the conventional sense, there is much to discover about gender relations. I'm not yet ready to concede that masculine and feminine are no more than the habits of complementarity familiar both in Western linguistic explanation and social identification (identifying something by what it is not). The archetypes of Feminine and Masculine, and particularly the myths, stories and images (which provide archetypes with character and context, with recognisable instantiations) are orienting markers in the vast territory of gender habits and gender differences.