

**A NEW JUNGIAN THEORY OF MALE HOMOSEXUAL PERSONHOOD:
INDIVIDUATION AS GAY**

[1991]

Mitchell Walker

The male homosexual person as a topic has received remarkably meager attention from Jungian psychology, as Samuels noted in his seminal review of the field (1985). Although Jung had little to say, certain of his brief remarks have shaped the subsequent treatment of this subject by analytical psychologists.

Robert Hopcke has shown in his exhaustive and detailed review of Jung's writings on homosexuality and homosexuals (1987b, 1988) that Jung held five distinct attitudes toward homosexuality and advanced three different theories of its etiology. Among these attitudes, Jung believed that "homosexuality is a result of psychological immaturity and, consequently, [is] abnormal and disturbed" (Hopcke, 1988, p. 68). Along with this view, he held the theory that male homosexual personhood is the result of an infantile relationship to the feminine, variously termed a "mother complex," "anima identification," and "unconscious matriarchal psychology" (Hopcke, 1988, p. 73).

Until recently this view and theory have dominated the scant discussion about the male homosexual person that has occurred in analytical psychology, while Jung's other views about homosexuals have been accorded little consideration.

Only in the past few years have analytic writers begun to question this arrangement (Hopcke, 1987b, 1988; Kelsey and Kelsey, 1987; Monick, 1987; Singer, 1976; Steele and Stockford, 1985; Stevens, 1983). Eugene Monick, in his analysis of the homosexual immaturity and femininity positions of analytic psychology, concludes that they are at heart "naturalistic fallacies" (1987, p. 116; see Hillman, 1975, pp. 84ff). He asks,

is one man more in tow of the Great Mother because he avoids
her earthly counterpart while another is less so because
he cannot live without her? Is one man frozen in the Great Mother's
embrace because he is not drawn to her breast while another
is free of her chains because he is? (Monick, pp. 119-120)

Monick is sharply critical of analytical psychology's approach to homosexuality: "The effort to dictate who a man should love is perverted theology. It is the psychological counterpart of monotheism, dominated by patriarchal triumphalism, demanding adherence to the patriarch's one true god" (p. 120).

Hopcke, in the most detailed discussion of Jung's views on homosexuality and personhood to date, is equally harsh in his summary:

Jung's view of homosexuality as psychologically "immature"
or "infantile" is based on a rigid sexual teleology, and genital
heterosexual practice in the *telos*. Such a view is neither accurate
empirically in light of subsequent research nor, for that reason
is it particularly useful in gaining a better understanding of
homosexual men and women. (1988, p. 69)

In contrast to the traditional interpretation of homosexuality as immature and abnormal, Hopcke argues that another of Jung's views would more fruitfully "provide a fertile place to examine the lives of gay people and our own inner homosexuality in whatever form" (1987b, p. 160), namely, Jung's view that

“an individual’s homosexuality has its own meaning peculiar to the individual in question and that psychological growth consists of becoming conscious of that meaning” (1987b, p. 159). To stress this position is to shift analytic consideration of homosexuality from concepts of pathology and regression to those of the teleological meaning of homosexuality, especially in terms of Jung’s central concept of individuation. From this latter view, the homosexual individual is required “to face the challenge of understanding what meaning his or her own homosexuality could have” (1987b, p. 160).

This shift in analytic thinking on homosexuality parallels similar changes in psychoanalytic thought, from considerations of drive theory to concepts of ego and self (Friedman, 1988; see also Lewes, 1988), and expresses a broad cultural transition toward acknowledging gayness as a potentially valid way of psychosexually being a fully functional person. A new theoretical stance toward the homosexual person based on Jung’s idea of individuality and its unfoldment rather than ideas of abnormality and disturbance, is called for by this ongoing social reorientation.

The primary source for these new changes is not difficult to locate: Modern gay people have declared their right to exist as themselves so forcefully and successfully that other, premodern views of gays as inadequate or incomplete are shown up as morally unjust: It is no more correct to label a homosexual regressed or otherwise incapable of full individuation because of his or her homosexuality than it is to for example bigotedly call a black person or Jew “primitive” and thus treat that individual as subhuman. Modern biopsychosocial research demonstrates that gay people exist in and from their own valid identity as gay, that gays have their own essence-in-being. A new psychological understanding of homosexuality requires Jung’s phenomenological view of psyche, for only in that way can the natural experience of gay-identified personality be accurately perceived, rather than being distorted through prejudicial lenses.

Nowhere in his writings does Jung articulate a soul psychology (Stern, 1986) for homosexuals, nowhere “does he give an example of homosexual practice in a highly individuated human being” (Hopcke, 1987b, p. 158). But starting from his viewpoint on individuality, such a soul psychology of gays can be responsibly developed. This is the task now facing analytical psychology, to grasp the idea of becoming and being gay in salutary terms of the improvemental growth of valuable personhood, that is, to conceive of *individuation as gay*, in which the realization of the Self occurs through becoming and being homosexual. Models of gay individuation can then be articulated and explored, as has been done so profoundly in the work on individuation as heterosexual (that is, the *coniunctio* and the anima/animus as soul-image).

Any new consideration of homosexual personhood must start with the recognition that gay people insist on being seen in their own terms. For example, from a contemporary gay viewpoint, being gay means taking up the right for oneself to experience and identify with a homosexual erotic orientation of the personality, and to build culture and community on that basis. Thus, the word *gay* refers

not merely to the sexual orientation of the individuals or groups of individuals.... [but] to the purposeful self-definition of these individuals and groups who see their homosexuality as an inherently positive phenomenon, who actively oppose the political, social, and legal oppression of homosexuality, and who have as a conscious social aim the formation of a supportive, progressive and visible community within a larger social context. (Hopcke, 1988, p. 77n)

From a gay perspective, being gay is primarily a matter of having a gay-identified ego, and not one of sexuality per se (Cass, 1979, 1984; D. Clark, 1977; Coleman, 1988; Minton and McDonald, 1984). Sexuality in gays, rather, serves the healthful and appropriate development of the personality and the

ego, just as it does for persons whose libido is heterosexually organized (Kelsey and Kelsey, 1986; Laughlin, 1982). The gay ego's search for meaning in a homosexual organization of the personality is the principal inner concern of growthful psyche in gay people.

In terms of telos, then, being gay expresses the intent of the Self in that particular person. This view also follows from Jung's second theory of homosexuality, that it is "constitutional," that is, "determined by genetic or biological factors" (Hopcke, 1988, p. 76). In terms of the ego-Self axis (Neumann, 1973; Edinger, 1972, 1984), becoming gay and living as gay must then involve the individuation of a homosexual relationship between the ego and the Self parallel to the heterosexually organized relations Jung has articulated, especially that concerning the Anima as soul-figure. Indeed, in a gay person the structures of personality organized by the developing libido will constitutively individuate homosexually.

A Homosexual Organization of the Libido

Robert Friedman (1988), in his psychoanalytic study of homosexuality, demonstrates that modern biopsychosocial research into sexuality supersedes certain aspects of the traditional Freudian view in terms of an accurate understanding, a position echoed by Hopcke vis-a-vis Jung (1987b, p. 157). Monick (1987) also identified Jung's views on sexuality as in some aspects completely inadequate and outdated, especially his (non)treatment of masculine sexuality. As Monick makes clear, "Jung assumed the importance of phallos psychologically without exploring the basis of the assumption," in fact, there is an "avoidance of focused attention upon male sexuality" (1987, p. 55). Monick suggests that "Jung was leery of physicality," but whether true or not "the fact remains" that Jung did not engage in "significant direct research work on phallos,...[which] has resulted in a fundamental disservice to the importance of the archetypal masculine, a theoretical imbalance that cries out to be redressed" (p. 56).

Jung emphasized the feminine in his analysis of homosexuality, just as he did in many other areas, such as his treatment of parental origins (Monick, 1987, pp. 51ff). Perhaps in actuality gay male psychology is deeply involved with the masculine. This is suggested by Jung's third theory of homosexuality, that it represents "an incomplete detachment from the original archetype of the hermaphrodite" (Hopcke, 1988, p. 75), a symbol of wholeness, of the Self. If one of Jung's theories of homosexuality characterizes an "incomplete detachment" from the psychological feminine, then in terms of achieving an individuated hermaphroditism there needs to be a corresponding theory of "incomplete detachment" from the masculine, a theory of homosexual relationship to the archetypal male.

To understand such a relationship it is necessary to have a new understanding of homosexuals, and of psychosexual development generally, rather than distorting preconceptions. And it is here that modern biopsychosocial research provides a firmer foundation for theorizing than the faulty aspects of old psychoanalytic frames. Friedman (1988) has shown in precise detail how the picture of homosexuals seen from modern research can be understood psychoanalytically. Rather than in terms of the old drive theory, he says, psychosexual development should be seen as concerning construction of the "self-concept," the "sense of self-cohesion" that exists in rudimentary form even in earliest infancy, and which develops through the formation of structure to become the "sense of identity" of young adulthood (1988, pp. 227ff). This self develops through two psychosexually organized stages. The first occurs in the differentiation of "core gender identity" as male or female during the second year. Following this period of structure formation, gender identity is stable and at the unchangeable center of the unfolding self.

The next stage concerns "erotic fantasy differentiation," in the culmination of which "the affect of lust, biologically programmed to increase in intensity during late childhood, functions at that time as a new organizer of inner life" (Friedman, 1988, p. 252). It is during this period that "lust and image are

irreversibly linked” and thereby “the gender self of early childhood is modified and becomes a sexual-gender self” now organized by a homosexual, a heterosexual, or a mixed erotic fantasy life (Friedman, p. 252). The differentiated sexual-gender self, in turn, becomes the core structure in the adolescent emergence of the ego, the mature sense of personal identity whose further development is discussed by Erik Erikson and others.

This model of psychosexual development, reflecting modern biopsychosocial understanding, marks a revolutionary departure from earlier psychoanalytic views in separating gender identity from sexual object choice and reformulating being gay in terms of a homosexual organization of the self. That is, both gay and straight boys identify as biological males, then in the subsequent stage differentiate alternative yet parallel sexual selves. Thus, in gay boys’ development just as for straights, sexuality and the self are not to be separated and in conflict but intertwined and interdependent, mutually fostering a lifetime of personal growth and fulfillment as gay. Both straights and gays are capable of the adult maturity described by Erikson and Kohut.

Thus, this new psychoanalytic model of homosexual development explains a homosexual organization of the libido in the service of the structuring of the self, as the “natural” process for some individuals in terms of their individuation considered psychoanalytically. The concept of a homosexual organization of the libido, as distinct from a heterosexual organization, then, would likewise underlie any analytic attempt to understand important issues concerning psyche in gay people today, such as the relationship with the unconscious. For a homosexually organized man, the “orientation” of the god Eros would have to be gay, the relationship to phallos would be homosexual, the relationship with the feminine and the Anima would be a gay rather than a straight one, the actions of the libido, for example in the constellation of complexes and symbols of transformation, in the transcendent function, and so on, would occur through homosexually differentiated forms. The inner universe would be gay.

To understand gay-identified men requires the ability to perceive in a “gay way,” within a libidinal economy and an archetypal cosmology informed by gods of homosexual love. It becomes understandable then how thinkers in a strongly homophobic age, such as Jung, would find the attempt to achieve a homosexual understanding of psyche difficult, thus precluding any serious, in-depth consideration of this area. In the case of male-female incest, a sexual subject of potentially equal repugnance to that of homosexual phallos, Jung discourses vigorously at length, but he could obviously muster no overt enthusiasm for the world of gay love (compare “incest” and “homosexuality” in the *General Index, CW 20*). With this precedent set, his followers would only echo it, turning a blind eye to homosexual Eros while gay people themselves continued to develop their culture, communities, and personalities as gay (Adam, 1987; D’Emilio, 1983; Duberman, 1986; Katz, 1983).

Homosexual Archetypes

In a psyche developing according to a homosexual organization of the libido, the individuation process will be homosexually informed. Therefore, in analytic terms the cyclic development of the ego-Self axis (Neumann, 1973; Edinger, 1972; Fordham, 1985) will come to be homosexually organized. On what basis can a new Jungian model of such ego-Self relations be constructed?

Such a basis can be developed through analytic research into homosexually organized archetypes, as they can be studied in symbols and motifs from literature and other arts, mythology, dreams, visions and so on. For example, in his *Symposium* Plato tells us that Aphrodite Urania, daughter of Uranos, was the goddess of gay love, whereas a different goddess, Aphrodite Dione, daughter of Zeus and Dione, was the goddess of heterosexual love (Plato, 1956, p. 343). Not only that, Plato says further that each goddess had her own son, so actually there are two gods of love, an Eros of homosexual love and an Eros of heterosexual love. Plato, thus, proposes two “homosexual archetypes,” one female and

one male, counterparts of two heterosexual archetypes, who embody and express a homosexual organization of gendered love and libido as counterpart to a heterosexual organization.

Plato goes even further yet. He tells us the story of the origin of the emotion of love (Plato, 1956, pp. 353ff), when in a mythic time humans were twice what they are now, having four arms and four legs and so on. Some of these original beings were formed of two males, some of two females, and some of a male and a female. When Zeus split these primordial beings in two, he thereby created love, which is that yearning by each split half to rejoin its “other half,” to regain the original unity: Those who were part of male-female wholes pursue heterosexual union, while those of the same-sexed wholes pursue the homosexual union. The former, then, follow Aphrodite Dione and her Eros, the latter, Aphrodite Urania and her Eros.

In Jungian terms, the original Platonic hermaphrodite broken into male and female describes heterosexual development and the Anima/Animus dynamic, as Jung and other writers have discussed (Jung, *CW* 9i, par. 326; 12, par. 109, n. 38; Bennet, 1983, p. 124; Campbell, 1962, p. 31; Singer, 1976, pp. 117ff). It is all too typical that, in contrast to this treatment, the “union of sames” in Plato’s story has not been discussed by these authors, or, as in one case, was mentioned but in a distorted, trivialized version (Singer, 1976, p. 120).

But Plato in his *Symposium* provides the outline for an archetypally-based image of homosexual love: “Each of us when separated, having one side only, like a flat fish, is but the indenture of a man, and he is always looking for his other half” (Plato, 1956, p. 355).

There is an important archetype embedded in this image, and another line of approach will amplify it further. One of Jung’s favorite portrayals of the *coniunctio* was the alchemical Royal Pair as typified in the *Rosarium* woodcuts (*CW* 12, Figs. 54, 167, etc.; 16, pars. 353ff). This same image of the Royal Pair can also be seen in the astrological third sign of the Zodiac (MacNeice, 1964, p. 292), and also in the sixth trump of the Tarot, called the Lovers (Cavendish, 1975, pp. 86ff). The third zodiacal sign, however, has also been known from ancient times as Gemini, the Twins, portrayed by two similar-looking men embracing (MacNeice, p. 86). Likewise, as Alester Crowley (1974) has discussed, the sixth trump “refers to Gemini, ruled by Mercury. It means The Twins” (p. 80). Thus, in astrology and Tarot divination, occult “sciences” historically contemporaneous with alchemy, there existed two alternate images for the same position. Gemini, of course, refers to the Greek myth of the Dioscouri, the inseparable twins born from Leda’s egg, one mortal and one immortal, and placed in the sky by Zeus as a testament to their love and devotion for one another (Graves, 1960, pp. 245ff). Thus, that image of the “union of sames” articulated by Plato as a basis for homosexual love can be seen amplified as the figure of Gemini. The celestial Twins, therefore, express a symbolism of mutual relationship in which libido is homosexually organized. Through analyzing this symbolism, then, a homosexual organization of the developing gay personality can be exploratorily studied.

The Gay Soul-Figure

Anima as soul-image is one of the classic formulations of Jung’s psychology (*CW* 7, pars. 297, 314; Hillman, 1985, p. 9). But when Aphrodite Urania as discussed above rules the world of romantic love, the situation of the feminine is going to be different. Rather than the King with his Queen, it is Plato’s image of two sames, the image of the Star Twins, that better expresses the archetypal soul relationship. This image describes a symbolic situation of a man having a special, erotic, twin “brother” who is felt to be the alluringly personified “source of inspiration.” I have previously termed this male soul-figure the *Double* (M. Walker, 1976), a term first proposed by Otto Rank in 1914 (Rank, 1971). It is a different figure than those described by Jung as the Anima, the Shadow or the Self, but can and does enter into the constellation of these other archetypes in a way analogous to the role of Anima, who because of her

overwhelmingly-personalized libidinal power, also “leads into” psychic growth in the most highly determinative way (that is, *Anima as Fate*, Brunner, 1986).

Actually, the idea of one’s soul as a “double” is very ancient and can be traced back to the earliest Sumerian and Egyptian writings. For example, one of the oldest surviving examples of written literature is the Gilgamesh cycle, dating to the early third millennium B.C. (Gardner and Maier, 1984). In that story, the Sumerian king Gilgamesh is redeemed from a wasteful, purposeless life by, and subsequently goes on great heroic adventures with, a strong man named Enkidu, specifically created by the gods as a “second image of Gilgamesh: may the image be equal to the time of his heart” (Gardner and Maier, p. 68). Their love and union is explicitly likened to that between husband and wife (Gardner and Maier, pp. 82, 86), indeed, it is portrayed as “the paradigm of primary social relationships: male bonding, husband and wife, brother and brother” in one (Gardner and Maier, p. 42). Ultimately, it is through passionate love for manly Enkidu, a same-sex figure too grand and bright to be a Shadow, yet too weak and mortal to be the Self, that every-inch-a-man Gilgamesh finds spiritual realization and maturity (Gardner and Maier, p. 42).

Ancient Egypt provides another rich and untapped repository of imagery concerning the Double as soul-figure. The Egyptians believed that within each person existed an invisible being from whom emanated the source of life and breath, and they called this figure the *Ka*, depicting it as an idealized image of the person himself or herself (Breasted, 1912; Cavendish, 1970; R. Clark, 1959; Hornung, 1986; Lamy, 1981). Your *Ka* was born into life with you, always embracing and protecting you with his love, and connecting you with the world of Paradise, with the deity. The *Ka* served in this capacity because, as the image of the beloved soul, it was itself a body containing within it a soul, just as the person contained the *Ka* within his or her own body. This soul of the *Ka* was called the *Ba*, and it was usually portrayed as a small bird with the idealized face and head of the person (Lamy, 1981; Reed, 1978). In this Egyptian belief, the *Ba* had flown down from heaven during pregnancy and incarnated the *Akh*, the Light of God which it brought down with it, into the “body” of the *Ka* within the maturing fetus. The *Ba* inseminated the *Ka* with the seed of Light, from which flowed the Waters of Life, animating the soul. In this way, it was actually the great *Akh* which brings life to mortal flesh, only to be withdrawn back into heaven upon the person’s demise.

However, the Egyptians held an even more sophisticated view of the soul and its workings. They held that the *Ka* itself was actually the summatory expression of fourteen constituent aspects, each itself considered a *Ka*. These fourteen *Kas*, in turn, were grouped in seven pairs as the incarnation of seven distinct *Bas*, each with its own aspect. The qualities of the seven *Ka* pairs can be seen to portray a developmental sequence: Subsistence and Nutrition; Creative Power and Greenness; Penetration and Consideration; Venerability and Vassalage; Force and Worth; Magic and Illumination; Splendor and Radiance (adapted from Lamy, 1981, p. 26). Through development of these fourteen aspects of the *Ka*, the soul could thereby be “perfected.” Perfection of the *Ka* was conceived of as a spiritual “ladder” of development, up which a person could move, and thereby obtain a form of spiritual self-realization, portrayed as eternal residence with the *Ka* soul in heavenly paradise (Schwaller de Lubicz, 1967, 1981; see also Breasted, pp. 52-53; Budge, 1959, pp. 189ff).

The spiritual ladder of development from Earth to heaven was conceived as belonging to the twin gods Horus and Seth (see Budge, 1959, p. 122; 1969, pp. 241-242). They helped the ascendant up the ladder, and were its lords. Horus and Seth are among the most ancient of Egyptian gods, and were seen to personify the workings of the eternal opposites, as they represented light and dark, just and unjust, in and out, and all such dyads (Budge, 1969, pp. 242ff; Lamy, 1981, p. 28). Their eternal struggle yet ultimate reconciliation has been aptly characterized by Joseph Campbell: “Mythologically representing the inevitable dialectic of temporality, Horus and Seth are forever in conflict; whereas in

the sphere of eternity, beyond the veil of time and space, where there is no duality, they are at one” (Campbell, 1962, p. 81). The union of Horus and Seth was known by the Egyptians as “the Secret of the Two Partners” (Campbell, p. 81), and the united oneness of Horus-and-Seth was called “the double god,” pictured as the heads of Horus and Seth upon one body (Budge, 1969, p. 247). Scenes exist in which the two men are shown tying together two rope-like plants into a binding knot, that is, a kind of wedding scene (Aldred, 1984, p. 179). Finally, it should also be noted that texts exist in which Horus and Seth are specifically likened to a man and his Ka (Lamy, 1981, p. 26) and also to a man and his sexual partner (Bullough, 1976, pp. 64-65). The relationship between a man and his Ba soul is also repeatedly likened to that between husband and wife in “The Dialogue of the World-Weary Man with his Ba” (Jacobsohn, 1968, pp. 29-34). In the latter text (ca. 2000 B.C.), the Ba says to his man, “In that stillness shall I alight upon you; then united we shall form the Abode” of spiritual rebirth (Reed, 1987, p. 83).

From this review, it can be seen that in Egyptian belief development of the soul concerned the struggle between and integration of the opposites, that essential feature of the *coniunctio*. Thus, here in the ancient Egyptian we have a philosophy of the unconscious (Hornung, 1986) and of soul-making (Hillman, 1972, 1975) based on and concerned with a marriage of man and manly soul-double, a sacred union animated by a male-male eros, which leads to the integration of opposites and to psychic wholeness:

Your soul, BA, become[s] conscious little by little in your incarnate KA. Our texts tell you that “he rises from your vertebrae”; from the dual fire in them, that is. That “he quickens your spiritual heart, opens your mouth and eyes to the Real”; that “being realised in you and having at last stripped you of your transient names, freed you from the humanity that is in your members,” he will “reveal your true face,” your face of Maat, and “make you one of the KAs of universal Horus.” (Schwaller de Lubicz, 1967, pp. 198-99)

The idea of gaining this “perfection,” that is, individuation, through a gay sort of love echoes down from these original Egyptian and Sumerian ideas through subsequently recorded mythologies. Plato, of course, discourses at length on how this love leads to union with God (Plato, 1956, pp. 378-79), and similar ideas can be seen in Gnostic and Sufi thought (see below). When the eye of homosexual libido is regardfully opened, its worthy manifestations can be meaningfully perceived, and thus more accurately studied and better understood. Far from nonexistence, the phenomena of homosexual Eros have always been expressed by humanity, and can be reasonably observed when they are approached with respect and openness. From studying such phenomena an accurate conception of a gay male soul-figure and his workings in psyche can be (re)constructed.

The Homosexually Organized Ego-Self Axis

Although the Ka in Egyptian mythology was not seen to be God, through one’s Ka one could come to God (Schwaller de Lubicz, 1981). Likewise, through his love of Enkidu, Gilgamesh finally reaches his initiation as a shaman (Gardner and Maier, 1984, p. 31). Similarly, through a beautiful youth Socrates knows truth (Plato, 1956, p. 378). In His “Angel-Soul,” Ibn Arabi finds Allah (Corbin, 1969). Further, as the Egyptian idea shows, the Ka soul vis-a-vis the ego personality is a dynamic figure that itself evolves from lower to higher forms, in an interactive relationship with the spiritual seeker (Schwaller de Lubicz, 1981). Such a dynamic articulates an ego-Self axis of relationship and growth, whose cycles of

evolution (Edinger, 1972; Fordham, 1985) occur through a cyclic rising and sinking (Jung, *Symbols of Transformation*, CW 5) of homosexual libido.

Jung has formulated the concept of Eros as the secret operator of the transformations by which the processes of individuation occur, a figure who both inspires and guides this process, and he has also seen this operator in the Egyptian Thoth, the Greek Hermes, and the alchemical Mercurius (CW 5, pars. 198ff; 7, pars. 32-33; 13, pars. 239ff). This is Eros as teacher. Such a teaching figure in terms of soul the Egyptians called the “divine ka,” he who guides with his man the collaborative effort of spiritual self-realization (Schwaller de Lubicz, 1981 p. 37): A man’s Ka, it was said, “arouses” him with a “contagious joy” to seek and “enjoy immortal union” with the perfected Ka, a union of the human and the divine (Schwaller de Lubicz, 1981, p. 49), and this is what drives true spiritual seeking. The god Thoth, *Tahuti* in Egyptian, was alluded to be the child of Horus and Seth, the son of two fathers (Boylan, 1987, p. 27; Bullough, 1976, pp. 65-66). He represented the “fruit” of the sacred union of the Great Opposites: spiritual realization and knowledge. As such, Tahuti was considered the original shaman, the first alchemist, the first gnostic, the archetypal initiate of the Wisdom of God (Boylan, 1987; Chetwynd, 1982, p. 269; Jobes, 1962, p. 1562), who is both the originator and product of the developmental process of self-realization gained through union with the Ka soul. The Ka, which is the “personal” approximation to the spirit of God, becomes more purely the actualized potential resident in the Spiritual Heart within, the Great Lover Who Is God.

Likewise the Mercurius of European alchemical texts is the cause and result of the operations which complete the *opus* (Jung, CW 13, par. 283). In fact, to effect the operations Mercurius, who is “duplex” (CW 13, par. 267), splits himself up into an active half and a passive half, and it is those two halves that are then called the King and the Queen, and it is they that combine to recreate Mercurius on a more refined level, that is, the process of “perfection” we examined previously, here gained through Mercurius’s submission, by his feminine half, to the inseminating union of his masculine half (CW 14, par. 120). That the figure of Hermaphroditos, the basis for the alchemical combination, was taken at that time, the Middle Ages and Renaissance, as an allusion to homosexuality, has been demonstrated historically (Saslow, 1986, pp. 78ff). There is a woodcut in *de Architectura* by Vitruvius (1511) showing the alchemist being inseminated by the “masculine spirit” in an act of anal intercourse (Monick, 1987, p. 115). Another ancient homosexual motif implying anal intercourse, the story of Zeus and Ganymede, was also used by alchemists to represent the alchemical union and transformation (Fabricius, 1976, p. 146; Saslow, pp. 90-96). In fact, a scene of the alchemist riding on the Eagle’s back as Ganymede forms the title page illustration in Andrea Libavius’s *Alchymia...recognita, emenda et aucta* (1606; Saslow, p. 92).

As such dialectic motifs show, the twinship union could be perceived of as procreatively potent, as enacting a form of generation in its own right. Otto Rank was the first modern psychologist to identify “the self-creative tendency symbolized in the magic meaning of twinship. As the twins appear to have created themselves independently of natural procreation, so they were believed to be able to create things which formerly did not exist in nature;” the twinship union has an “inherent creative power” making the twins “independent of [hetero]sexual procreation” (Rank, 1958, p. 92). Such generative capability gives the twinship union as developmentally engaging a homosexual form of ego-Self relationship the viability to sustain and further the individuation process in gays in a productive manner valuationally parallel to that occurring through heterosexual procreativity.

The Feminine in Gay Men

To consider one further point mentioned above, the homosexual organization of libido under discussion would extend to the feminine in gay men as well, which I noted earlier in Plato’s distinguishing a

homosexual from a heterosexual love goddess. Under the aegis of Aphrodite Urania, the feminine is not projected as the soul-figure, but rather constellates a helpful attitude toward the masculine soul, that is, one of receptivity toward feeling love well. Such a feminine homosexual attitude can be seen in Gnostic thought about Sophia and Jesus (Mead, 1963), and in the Classical tale of Amor and Psyche (Neumann, 1956): It is the Sophia, the Psyche in a gay man which allows him to orient to and gain union with the divine Eros (J. Clark, 1987, p. 11). From this perspective, the positions of Psyche and Ganymede are metaphorically the same. It is not a question of effeminizing an otherwise properly masculine person: In becoming and being gay, a gay man's ego becomes attitudinally "wife" to his masculine soul "husband," he attends raptly to psyche organized homosexually, so as to undergo the processes of union and transformation with the Angel within. In this homosexual way a gay man, still grounded in his core gender identity as male but now fruitfully "receptive," in felt alliance with his Anima becomes the crucible for psychic change and maturation via congress with and insemination by the Spirit of God, that is, the Self, in subsequent order to productively bear the Sacred Child of the Two Fathers. Through quickening relationship with this transformative union a gay man can meaningfully progress towards an individuated androgyny, and thus wholeness and completeness of being.

Copyright © 1991 by Mitchell Walker