

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
SANTA CRUZ

**THE *ANIMA* IN THEATRE:  
ANIMATING A JUNGIAN CONCEPT FOR DEVISERS, DIRECTORS, AND  
ACTORS**

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction  
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS  
in  
THEATER ARTS

by

**Shadow Zimmerman**

June 2016

The thesis of Shadow Zimmerman  
is approved:

---

Associate Professor Michael Chemers,  
Chair

---

Associate Professor Brandin Baron-  
Nusbaum

---

Professor Edward Warburton

---

Tyrus Miller  
Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

Copyright © by  
Shadow Zimmerman  
2016

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	iv
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	v
<b>Using Jung</b>	1
<b>What is an archetype?</b>	2
<b>Stock characters and archetypes</b>	4
<b>What types of “meaning” can archetypes convey about character?</b>	6
<b>A note on Jung</b>	8
<b>Defining the <i>Anima</i></b>	13
<b>What is the <i>Anima</i>?</b>	13
<b>Where can we find the <i>Anima</i>?</b>	15
<b>Methodology</b>	17
<b><i>Medea</i></b>	19
<b>The <i>Anima</i> in <i>Medea</i></b>	20
<b>Individual</b>	22
<b>Social</b>	26
<b>Greater Contextual</b>	28
<b>The role of the <i>Anima</i> in <i>Medea</i></b>	31
<b><i>The Great God Brown</i></b>	33
<b>The <i>Anima</i> in <i>The Great God Brown</i></b>	33
<b>Individual</b>	35
<b>Social</b>	43
<b>Greater Contextual</b>	47
<b>The role of the <i>Anima</i> in <i>The Great God Brown</i></b>	49
<b>Using the <i>Anima</i></b>	51
<b>Going Forward</b>	56
<b>Bibliography</b>	58

**The *Anima* in theatre:**

**Animating a Jungian concept for devisers, directors, and actors**

by

**Shadow Zimmerman**

Abstract

In order to distill Carl Jung's psychoanalytical theories on archetypes into a format, which can be better understood and used by dramatic analysts and theatre-makers, I explored the *Anima* archetype and its representations in two plays, *Medea* (431 BC) by Euripides and *The Great God Brown* (1926) by Eugene O'Neill. In this thesis, I first define the *Anima* in Jung's terms and explain how we can find it represented in drama. I then analyze the *Anima*-inspired conflicts in the two plays in a fairly traditional way, but through a Jungian lens. After an analysis of the use of the *Anima* in these two vastly different plays, I offer suggestions for the use of the *Anima* archetype among theatre devisers as well as actors and directors. Lastly, I briefly envision the future of this field of study and encourage others to engage in this style of analysis.

## Acknowledgements

Thank you so much, most immediately, to my adviser on this thesis, Michael Chemers. You have served as a tremendous inspiration, source of guidance, and endless library for further reading – and I appreciate few things in my learning as much as a web of connections (er, *supertextual conflicts*). Without you, this wouldn't have been possible. I look forward to continuing my studies, based on the passions you've helped me identify.

Thank you to all the members of my thesis committee and the faculty at UCSC for your guidance and for welcoming this Midwestern stranger into such a fantastic community.

Thank you from the bottom of my heart to the members of the 2015-2016 MA in Theater Arts cohort. My thesis has metamorphosed tremendously since I applied to this program last February – and it has grown in the right direction thanks to your constant genius and camaraderie. I'll keep this year with you all in my heart forever.

And, of course, thank you to my family and friends who have let me bounce half-baked ideas off their always-attentive ears; thank you for supporting me and always inspiring me to reach higher.

If I've forgotten anyone, it's only in this moment. Your help has been gratefully appreciated.

The *Anima* in theatre:  
Animating a Jungian concept for devisers, directors, and actors

**Using Jung**

During this thesis I will first encapsulate the metaphysical, problematic psychoanalytical theories of Carl Jung by challenging his thoughts with those of modern feminist writers and to distill what is usable within Jung's works on archetypes. I will then apply Jung's writings on one archetype, the *Anima*, to the dramatic analysis of two plays, *Medea* (431 BC) by Euripides and *The Great God Brown* (1926) by Eugene O'Neill. Having analyzed these two plays and how the *Anima* is represented in them, I will then demonstrate how the *Anima* can be used by theatre devisers, directors, actors, and other theatre professionals in their theatrical pursuits.

Although artists<sup>1</sup> have been using Jung's theories (or have been inspired by them) since he began writing, I believe Jungian archetypes are still an unjustly underutilized resource for theatre-makers. Jung's theories on archetypes can be used by dramaturgs in dramatic analysis, and prove especially useful in tracing supertextual conflict between plays across great expanses of time and place. Directors and actors can also use these theories to analyze and connect with characters.

---

<sup>1</sup> See writers like Carol Pearson\*, John Wright, Caroline Myss\*; and artists like Janet Rodgers and Frankie Armstrong\*, Glynn MacDonald, Caroline Goyder\*, and Richard Olivier.\* Those writers with an asterisk (\*) by their name, have works featured in the Bibliography page. Look there for full citation information.

## What is an archetype?

Jung separates himself from Freud by arguing for the existence of a *collective unconscious*, which the Freudian personal unconscious “rests upon” (3). This collective unconscious, Jung continues, “constitutes a common psychic substrate of a suprapersonal nature” for humankind; it “has contents [...] that are more or less the same everywhere in all individuals.” Jung believes that the collective unconscious unites all humans via a “shared experience,” that we receive generationally, similar to the way a bird knows its migration patterns without having to learn them. Ultimately, then, these “contents of the collective unconscious... are known as *archetypes*.” Jung tells us that the collective unconscious is not directly accessible; we are able to “speak of an unconscious only in so far as we are able to demonstrate its contents,” the archetypes (4). We can only access the collective unconscious by representing the metaphysical archetypes in our physical world. In *Four Archetypes*, Jung notes that these *representations* take on a variety of forms, as the archetypes “do not manifest themselves concretely” (13). An archetype “can be named and has an invariable nucleus of meaning -- but always only in principle, never as regards its concrete manifestation” (*Four Archetypes* 13).

The relationship of a representation to its archetype is much like the *signifier-signified* relationship Ferdinand de Saussure discusses in his *Course in General Linguistics*. Just as the “linguistic sign unites... a concept and sound image,” an archetype is connected to its representation (66). As in the *signifier-signified* relationship, “the bond between the [two -- an archetype and its representation] is

arbitrary” (67); insofar as signifiers and representations are not bound by any calculus or rules -- they can, and *do*, vary between individual examples. Jung defends the abstraction between archetypes and their representations; he writes that during the process of perceiving and interpreting an archetype, “[the archetype] takes its colour from the individual consciousness in which it happens to appear” (*Archetypes* 5).

This shows us that working with archetypes involves two levels of inherent metaphysical distance. We can only directly observe and study individually colored representations of metaphysical archetypes which are the only comprehensible parts of an incomprehensibly metaphysical collective unconscious. Jung fills this distance with much speculation in his attempts to prove the legitimacy of his theories.

Thankfully, we do not need to prove or disprove Jung’s metaphysical claims on the origins of these archetypal contents; for the sake of this inquiry, I won’t be asking how or why, I simply acknowledge that -- *somehow* -- archetypal representations *are* effective for engaging similar responses among all audience members. Rasha

Imhasly-Gandhy explains it most poetically and effectively in her article *Myth*,

*Archetype and Individuation*:

Myths and metaphors [read: representations]... are powerful tools that draw the listener, dreamer, or reader to a character, symbol or situation, as if in recognition of something deeply known... “archetypes.” These repeating patterns... are like yeast in activating deeper levels of the psyche, raising issues, memories and feelings into consciousness. When an interpretation [read: representation] reads true, it is like a discovery that casts light upon life that may, in turn, help us in knowing who we are and what is truly important for us (76).

Ultimately, archetypes are metaphysical *primordial images* that “are more or less the same everywhere in all individuals” (*Archetypes* 4). And we find them in



representations that tap into that metaphysical “invariable nucleus of meaning” (*Four Archetypes* 13), but they are always colored by the individual consciousness that interprets and manifests them. These representations can be found in dramatic conventions like *stock characters*.

### **Stock characters and archetypes**

Stock characters are powerful tools for the quick delivery of reliable information. From Menander’s *Dyskolos* through to today, these common<sup>2</sup> characters have been familiar tropes to every audience member. We see stock characters in the *senexes* (old men) and *miles gloriosuses* (braggart warriors) of Roman comedy and the *wits* and *foils* of Restoration comedy and the *ditsy blondes* and *geeky nerds* of today’s sitcoms. And each of these characters carry with it very specific information. Offering evidence to the potency of stock characters, J.O. Bartley writes in his article, *The Development of a Stock Character, Part 1*

If the audience is to follow the play effortlessly enough not to [invite] a ‘willing suspension of disbelief,’ it has to accept, readily and almost unconsciously, a set of mental and physical conventions; and hence drama accepts and clings to convention more than other branches of literature.

Among the results of this conventionality are labour-saving devices for dramatist, actor, and audience, such as stock characters. [...] A stock character is not merely the presentation of a type, which may well be novel and realistic: novelty is not conventional, and realism is not thought-saving. A stock character evokes responses and implies stock attitudes, which, as Dr. Richards says, are the result of removal from experience. He is a typical character which has lost touch with reality. He is a walking cliché (438).

---

<sup>2</sup> The Oxford English Dictionary defines “common” as “a sort or level to be generally expected,” fortifying the theory that stock characters activate similar responses in most audience members.

Here, Bartley tells us first that stock characters are a convention -- they are developed over time through a process of slowly metamorphosing change. He then tells us that stock characters are not novel or realistic, like a character type. Rather, they are caricatured in order to “[evoke] stock responses and [imply] stock attitudes” (438). This is the final, most important, piece of information. The use of stock characters generates common responses from audience members -- they mean roughly the same thing to most people. It’s obvious, then, that stock characters are tremendously useful as tools for the reliable transmission of information about characters. When we see that *ditsy blonde*, we know she’ll be attractive, unintelligent, likely gullible and used as the butt of some joke or plot point or both -- oh, and she’ll *have* to have some stud boyfriend, preferably a blue-eyed, blonde, All-American quarterback in a letterman’s jacket. And that *geeky nerd* will be a small-framed boy with greasy hair, large front teeth, and tape on his large-rimmed glasses -- and he and that All-American quarterback will always be at odds; one will probably end up in a garbage can.

That scene should be familiar to anyone who’s seen more than one modern sitcom (or anything made in the 80’s). This is one example of many, which evidence the potency of stock characters. But where does a stock character get this potency? There are many ways -- I’m sure -- to explain this. Bartley, for instance, argues that stock characters are effective because of their relationship with the audience: insofar as stock characters have been a product of direct audience response for thousands of years, we as audience have a deep connection with them that makes them useful tools. Deeper than that, though, I believe that a stock character has the ability to deliver

information about character effectively because they are representations of even more powerful Jungian archetypes. Since, as Jung writes, any representation of an archetype taps into the “invariable nucleus of meaning” of that archetype, so to do stock characters. It stands, then, that archetypes serve as excellent tools for delivering meaning about character.

**What types of “meaning” can archetypes convey about character?**

Archetypes can deliver meaning about character in terms of:

- Class and social standing
- “Disposition and quality”
- Relationships

I chose these three defining characteristics because of their significance. The first, *class*, is a timeless element of conflict and drama. It is the difference between kings and peasants and all the bile inherent in that relationship; it is the cause of so many star-crossed lovers; it is the haves versus the have-nots. We see class at the forefront of drama especially during the *carnival*. Helene Iswolsky mentions of the carnival that it retains “the most ancient rituals of mocking the deity” (12). During carnivalesque performances such as those of the *commedia dell’arte*, the entire world is replaced by another, and in this world traditional class hierarchies are toppled -- the poor usurp and then mock the upper classes. Across the world, *class* carries a massive social significance, and it is crucial to consider our characters’ classes while analyzing their use.

In his handbook on dramaturgy, *Ghost Light*, Michael Chemers includes in his examples of *given circumstances* (i.e. “the ‘who, what, where, when, why, and how’ of the action of the play”), “the dispositions and qualities of the characters” (77). Clearly, knowledge of the disposition and quality of a character is dramaturgically and directorially important -- it creates a foundation for all of the character’s actions. By knowing how our character is likely to act, we are able to make assumptions about how our character would act when given a particular objective or obstacle. We see this cause-and-effect relationship as the foundation for the teachings of Stanislavski and his followers. So inspired by Stanislavski are we as theatre-makers, that the importance of knowing a character’s “disposition and quality” is self-evident in 2016.

Lastly, a character’s relationships are similarly crucial. In that same handbook, Chemers lists seven lines of conflict that drive the plots of essentially all plays. Phrasing our character’s relationships in terms of these seven lines of conflict will help complete our understanding our character’s place in their world.

## A note on Jung

Carl Jung, the man at the right of Freud in the pantheon of psychoanalytical thought, was born in Switzerland in 1875, roughly at the same time that some of the earliest first-wave feminist thinkers officially became active in Europe<sup>3</sup>. As such, Jung grew up in a world where chauvinism was institutional. In particular, Switzerland was among the most oppressive countries in Europe, where women didn't gain the ability to vote until 1971 (Dejung, 101). Christof Dejung blames the World Wars for the greater delineation of gender roles in Switzerland compared to the rest of the world. Dejung writes

With *Geistige Landesverteidigung* [or “spiritual defense of the nation” (104)] and the persistent threat of a German invasion, the Swiss army achieved a hitherto unknown level of approval in Swiss society. As a result, the model of the soldierly man became dominant. But this model needed a female counterpart that would admire the soldiers and let herself be protected by them. As in other modern states, in Switzerland too the threat of war led to a polarization of gender characteristics, and the resulting polarized gender order constituted a central element of Switzerland's domestic order. This is illustrated by the thoughts expressed in a 1944 marriage advice book: “The soldier is a masculine man who fears nothing, who risks his life for the ideals of freedom and the fatherland... The woman feels clearly and surely that without these masculine spiritual goods she would not be able to fulfill her duties as a homemaker and mother. Thus the soldier is for her the indispensable, the complete man<sup>4</sup>” (117).

---

<sup>3</sup> Inga Christensen writes that Mathilde Fibiger wrote *Twelve Letters* in 1850, which pronounced “that only financial independence freed women from ‘breadwinner’ marriages” (10). This “collection of missives” was “widely discussed and was debated in the press” (10). Ultimately, in “1871 [the] Danish Women's Society [was] founded in support of better education and better-paying jobs for women” (10).

<sup>4</sup> The “marriage advice book” cited here is: “Heinrich Hanselmann, *Werktag in der Liebe und Ehe* (Zurich, 1944), 155” (117).

This is to say that Jung grew up in a world where chauvinist thought was institutional and he lived his adult life in a world where men and women had clearly defined, opposite roles and duties and characteristics. It ought to come as little surprise, then, that Jung's theories have come under countless feminist critiques.

These critiques are crucial to acknowledge in any study of Jung's psychoanalytical musings, as well as the many other modern critiques, to which Jung can fall victim. In my experience Jung is, at times, racist and primitivist, and his metaphysical notions are often too universalist for proper scientific inquiry. His entire theory on the *archetypes* is founded in a belief in "an almost universal parallelism between mythological motifs" (*Archetypes*, 58); and he promotes Lucien Lévy-Bruhl's<sup>5</sup> theories on *représentations collective* [which Lévy-Bruhl uses to "denote the symbolic figures in the primitive view of the world"] as a method of understanding the *collective unconscious* (*Archetypes*, 5).

Naomi Goldberg both criticizes Jung's misogyny and offers a new framework for understanding archetypes in her article *A Feminist Critique of Jung*. Goldberg writes that Jung's "[*Anima-Animus*] model is clearly more beneficial to men than to women" and that "Jung's stereotypes of masculine and feminine [...] [give] women and men qualitatively different kinds of unconscious" (447). Clearly, Jung's misogyny is a problem. Modern feminist thought counters Jungian thought by arguing for equality between male and female, rather than opposition or hierarchy. We as modern thinkers are moving away from the chauvinism that past thinkers embraced.

---

<sup>5</sup> Jung cites: Lévy-Bruhl, Lucien. *La Mythologie primitive*. Paris, 1935.

Goldberg, herself, suggests toppling the previous Jungian conception of an archetype “if sexism is ever to be confronted at its base” (448). Goldberg writes

Rather than rival absolutes or superior-inferior paradigms, we could begin to equate image with archetype. This would put much greater value on what is happening in the individual psyche. Images are, after all, our psychic pictures of action, our imaginal depictions of the behavioral patterns we are continually enacting and continually modifying. All imaginal activities, all images, could then be understood as archetypes to the degree that they move things and partake of what we might want to call “numinosity.” Archetypes therefore would refer to the imaginal or religious process itself rather than to past documents of that process. With this sort of notion, we can stay open to all the data of experience and cease looking for authority words to label that experience archetypal, mythological, or religious.

I am suggesting nothing less than breaking down the hierarchy of mind – to which all other hierarchies and authority structures are linked – whether political, economic, or religious (448-9).

Clearly psychology, psychiatry, and essentially all of psychoanalytical thought needs to move forward from Jung – but this is the process of science. As evidence arises – as it should in the eighty years since Jung began writing on archetypes – new hypotheses should replace the old. Today, understanding is closer to that of Goldberg’s proposition – “images are, after all, our psychic pictures of action” – than Jung’s – images are contents of the collective unconscious. Further arguments have been made against Jung’s theories, which ring similar to Goldberg’s arguments.

Susan McKenzie attacks the binary system between men and women that Jung enforces, which is counter modern thought on gender and sexuality as a spectrum – these long-debated topics are not as black and white as previous experts may have asserted, or pretended. After analyzing how gender is developed in humans, McKenzie asserts that the *Anima-Animus* “archetype is in a dynamic process in

mind/body organization and the gendered feeling that emerges from that same dynamic process is not as predictable or static as Jung's [*Anima-Animus*] theory suggests" (415). Still more writers and psychologists contend Jung's propositions. For more, see critiques like those by Bowditch, Smyers, and other post-Jungian psychologists. For further still on Jung, sources like Raffa, Stephenson, Johnston, Easter, and Paglia will help broaden one's understanding of Jung and his place today<sup>6</sup>.

Obviously, these arguments prove that Jung's writings on the *Anima* are no longer held as psychoanalytic truth. Things must change. Keenly, Goldberg observes that to "Jungians the [*Anima*, the *Animus*], and their verbal handmaidens Eros and Logos are 'archetypes,' by definition, what is unchanging and unchangeable<sup>7</sup>." This is yet another fault of Jung's that must be admitted. Jung's theories on the archetypes are not an unerring tome to be preached. They are one man's observation on something that every one of us can experience and engage. Even more, Jung was writing from only one time and place in history on a grand scale of Earth's massive timeline. The definition of the concept of an archetype is always changing. Similarly, the *Anima* is always changing. Jung wrote on an *Anima* displayed in syzygies – men and women as opposites, sometimes in tandem sometimes at odds – and stereotypical,

---

<sup>6</sup> See the Bibliography for full citation information on all artists mentioned here.

<sup>7</sup> It's interesting to note that, although Jung writes multiple times that an archetype is an unreachable content of a metaphysical collective unconscious (i.e. an archetype must be individually interpreted and "colored" at every occasion), the one thing all Jungians agree on is that archetypes are unchanging -- note the quandary.



sexist representations of women. Today, we can understand that the *Anima* must be more broadly defined, that men and women are not opposites, and that male and female are not the edges of the spectrum.

However, in moving on from and denouncing Jung's theories, we must not deny the truths he was referencing, and we certainly must not remove his works from our libraries, our mental processes. Common images among people of similar culture, location, belief definitely do exist. And they can serve as powerful tools if we as theater artists harness them while acknowledging and challenging their weaknesses and untruths. What's more, Jung's misogynistic and unequal opinions on men and women have – unfortunately – been shared by many civilizations and societies throughout history. As such, Jung's theories can serve as a lens with which to examine much of theatre history, any play from a writer with similar tendencies. We as modern thinkers must acknowledge that Jung is a product of Switzerland in the late-19<sup>th</sup> and early-20<sup>th</sup> Centuries – a racist, misogynist world, where the scholars were primitivist and universalist – and, after challenging his thought with post-modern psychoanalytical truths and theories, glean the truths to which he hints in his many musings. Ultimately, despite his many untruths, Jung still serves theatre artists a useful tool in theatre devising and production. My goal is to apply his thinking, now that his faults have been laid bare, to dramatic analysis and then to propose its use to other theatre artists.

## Defining the *Anima*

The ultimate goal of this inquiry is to translate the sparse and sporadic literature on the *Anima* archetype into a usable guide for theatre-makers, a guide that will explain what the *Anima* is, where the *Anima* can be found in texts throughout theatre history, how the *Anima* is used in a selection of those texts, and a distilled presentation of what the selected examples can teach current artists.

### What is the *Anima*?

Most simply, Jung defines the *Anima* as “the feminine and chthonic<sup>8</sup> part” of the male (*Archetypes* 59). But the *Anima* can be represented in countless forms. In *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, Jung offers several notes on the *Anima* and multiple suggestions on the forms representations of the *Anima* may take.

#### Of the *Anima*, Jung reveals:

That “we encounter the [*Anima*] historically above all in the divine syzygies, the male-female pairs of deities,” (*Archetypes* 59). He continues by saying that we “can safely assert that these syzygies are as universal as the existence of man and woman” and that we “may reasonably conclude that man’s imagination is bound by this motif, so that he was largely compelled to project it again and again, at all times and in all places” (59-60). In addition, Jung posits that “the divine pair is simply an idealization of the parents or of some other human couple” (*Archetypes* 60). In concluding the potency of the syzygy motif, Jung writes that “a masculine element is always paired with a feminine one,” as in the case of *yin* and *yang* (which Jung refers

---

<sup>8</sup> “chthonic” here meaning “inner, underneath, unconscious”

to earlier), and that the “wide distribution and extraordinary emotionality of this motif prove that it is a fundamental psychic factor of great practical importance” (65).

That “the [*Anima*], which lends the mother such superhuman glamour in the eyes of the son, gradually becomes tarnished by commonplace reality [...] but without in any way losing its original tension and instinctivity” (69).

That the *Anima* can be seen in a man’s love life “in the form either of boundless fascination, overvaluation, and infatuation, or of misogyny in all its gradations and variants” (69).

That “the [*Anima*] is a factor of the utmost importance in the psychology of a man whenever emotions and affects are at work. She intensifies, exaggerates, falsifies, and mythologizes all emotional relations with his work and with other people of both sexes [...] she softens the man’s character and makes him touchy, irritable, moody, jealous, vain, and unadjusted” (70). While this obviously dives into the realm of metaphysics, these characteristics Jung highlights enforce the male-female dichotomy inherent in the *Anima* -- here Jung lays out what he thinks is wholly feminine, and therefore wholly unmasculine.

That the *Anima* has been discussed by poets at length. Jung writes that Rider Haggard’s *She*, *The Return of She*, and *Wisdom’s Daughter* contain the best descriptions of an *Anima*-style character. Carl Spitteler’s *Prometheus* and *Imago* also contain “admirable” descriptions (71).

That the *Anima* can also take the form of a nixie, “water-beings of a peculiar sort [...] a female, half-human fish” and that these “[n]ixies are entrancing creatures”

(24-5). Whether in the form of a nixie, or a “siren, mermaid, wood-nymph [...] or succubus,” these female characters “[infatuate] young men and [suck] the life out of them” (25). Jung also suggests that the “nixie is an even more instinctive version” of the *Anima* (25). The nixie “causes states of fascination that rival the best bewitchment” and “unleashes terrors in us not to be undone by any manifestation of the devil. She is a mischievous being who crosses our path in numerous transformations and disguises, playing all kinds of tricks on us, causing happy and unhappy delusions, depressions and ecstasies, outbursts of affect” (26).

That “for the son, the anima is hidden in the dominating power of the mother” and to” the men of antiquity the anima appeared as a goddess or a witch, while for medieval man the goddess was replaced by the Queen of Heaven and Mother Church” (29). Today, however, the *Anima* “no longer crosses our path as a goddess, but, as it may be, as an intimately personal misadventure [...] [w]hen, for instance, a highly esteemed professor in his seventies abandons his family and runs off with a young red-headed actress” (30).

### **Where can we find the *Anima*?**

In short, Jung reveals that we can find the *Anima* in any male’s representation of a female. But he offers insight into a deeper understanding of these representations: throughout the majority of history, what was women was considered *opposite* the man -- a feminist reader of Jung today can easily see that he was guilty of this himself. So, before the onset of feminism and the beginning of the concept of male-female-equality, we can find the *Anima* in hyperbolized examples of what was

considered feminine; or, as Jung states, that which is “touchy, irritable, moody, jealous, vain, and unadjusted” (*Archetypes* 70). This opposite nature of the *Anima* is also embodied in its representations as a male-female syzygy; this is yet another place we can find it. We can find the *Anima* in any succubus or vamp, a woman that uses her sexuality to exploit men. Conversely, we also see the *Anima* in heroic females, and in caring mothers (*but also vilified mothers!*). We see the *Anima* in lovers, especially those in love with *love*; in romance in its sweetest forms, and also its most guilty.

## Methodology

For the selected focus of this inquiry, I'm most intrigued by the representations of the *Anima* that involve love and the syzygies thereof. Jung's most romantic defining note on the *Anima* is that "it is always the *a priori* element in his moods, reactions, impulses, and whatever else in [...] life. It is something that lives of itself, that makes us live; it is a life behind consciousness" (*Archetypes* 27). Here Jung nods to the throes of love, a domain well-trodden by playwrights for thousands of years. The examples of the *Anima*'s representation in drama I have included here contain powerful examples of syzygetic oppositions, the struggle for desirability, and polarizing responses to love. Characters of this sort have proven popular throughout theatre history, likely due to their relatability. Because of their frequency and relatability, these characters bear examination; as they are likely the most approachable and have the most to teach about how productive this kind of analysis can be.

I have chosen to search for and analyze the use of the *Anima* in two plays: *Medea* by Euripides, written in ancient Greece and first performed in 431 BC, as translated by George Theodoridis<sup>9</sup>; and *The Great God Brown* by Eugene O'Neill, written in post-WWI America in 1926. These plays offer striking use of the *Anima* archetype, and I've found it possible to trace supertextual conflicts through them -- by

---

<sup>9</sup> I chose to work with George's version of *Medea* for a few reasons. George has translated dozens of ancient Greek plays; he does so with tremendous poetry and approachability, and his work is available online for free. Plus, George was a pleasure to work with when I produced his translation of "Iphigenia in Aulis" in 2010; and I'm more than happy to promote him whenever I can.

examining the two together, we'll be able to paint a grander picture for the use of the *Anima*. In examining them, I've found that the *Anima* inspires three similar levels of conflict in each of these plays: an *Individual* level of conflict; a *Social* level of conflict; and a *Greater Contextual* level of conflict. I plan to present my findings in these terms and to ultimately compare the role of the *Anima* in these pieces supertextually.

## *Medea*

*“Oh, what a dreadful thing love is” (330-335).*

The story of *Medea* details the effects that love can have on an individual, and it had many iterations by the time Euripides wrote his version of the myth. Medea was widely known to have been struck by one of Eros’ arrows, which caused her to instantly fall in love with a foreign man who landed on the shores of her home. Jason references this past in Euripides’ play when he tells Medea, “You don’t want to admit that it was Eros only, Eros, with his faultless arrows who persuaded you to save me and nothing else. Lust and only lust!” (520-551). In examining the original Greek text, one can see that the ultimate statement “Lust and only lust!” is not found. More literally, Jason merely mentions that Eros and his bow compelled Medea to preserve Jason’s body (Kovacs, 530-1). But Theodoridis wisely added this expression to add an appropriate flavor to the text. The Chorus reveals the effects a powerful love can have. They sing

When Aphrodite arrives in the hearts of people, with no fuss and with no exaggerated madness, she is a very enjoyable visitor but, alas, overwhelming lust brings neither honour nor glory to any one.  
Oh, Lady Aphrodite!  
I sincerely hope you don’t shoot any of your unfailing golden arrows, dipped in lust at me!  
I hope that wisdom, the most treasured gift the gods have given us, protects me from that misfortune!  
And, Lady Aphrodite, don’t plant into my heart improper love and then send me all the curses that go with it: Hatred, jealousy, endless fights (627-663).

Eros’ arrow had a tremendous effect on Medea and caused her to act counter her traditional self in leaving her homeland, sabotaging her father, murdering King Pelias,



helping Jason kill her brother, and -- ultimately -- killing her sons. Knowing that Medea had a “frenzied heart” and that her mind was not “intact” during her taboo actions is essential for understanding her character (431-446; 282-316). While modern feminist interpretations of *Medea* would likely posit a different understanding of Medea’s actions and mental state, for the purposes of this examination (and its brevity), I plan to focus only on this one theory for Medea’s causality.

### **The *Anima* in *Medea***

Euripides’ *Medea* is one of the oldest, most striking examples of the male-female syzygy that we can find in theatre history. Throughout the play, the pair debates the qualities of men and women and their respective roles in society; and the two are *always* placed in direct opposition to one another. In *Medea*, the *Anima* is used to highlight several levels of opposition. In addition to the oppositions between male and female and Jason and Medea, we see the opposition between Medea and Jason and the societally ideal *wife* and *husband*, and we see the opposition between Medea and society’s mores regarding motherhood *and* her own personal maternal tendencies and desires. These oppositions create several lines of conflict between the characters of the play and the other characters of the play, the expectations society has for their familial roles, and natural and supernatural forces like love and the Erinyes<sup>10</sup>.

In our examination of the *Anima* in *Medea*, remembering that the definition of the *Anima* is always in flux across time and space, it is important for us to define

---

<sup>10</sup> a.k.a. The Furies, the demigods who would hunt down and punish any Greek who harmed their friends or relatives

common Greek (i.e. Euripides') views on women in Athens in 431 B.C. Marilyn Katz aptly reminds us that professional academic writing on the topic has been blurred itself by "the nineteenth- and twentieth-century discourse on race and sexual degeneracy, where the men and women of ancient Greece often figured as exemplars" (86). As such, it is hard to trust writers like Jean-Jacques Rousseau when he writes

Among all the ancient civilized peoples [women] led very retired lives; they did not have the best places at the theatre; they did not put themselves on display; they were not even always permitted to go; and it is well known that there was a death penalty for those who dared to show themselves at the Olympic games. In the home, they had a private apartment where the men never entered. When their husbands entertained for dinner, they rarely presented themselves at the table; the decent women went out before the end of the meal, and the others never appeared at the beginning. There was no common place of assembly for the two sexes; they did not pass the day together. This effort not to become sated with one another made their meetings more pleasant. It is certain that domestic peace was, in general, better established and that greater harmony prevailed between man and wife than is the case today (88-9).

Instead, for an ideal picture of true Greek perspective on women in 431 BC, I turn to written sources from just before that time period. Katz summarizes the picture nicely:

Semonides, an elegiac poet of the seventh century b.c.e., writes that "from the first, god made the mind of woman [a thing] apart"; Hesiod, an epic poet of the same period, spoke of "the race of women" (genos gynaikon).<sup>65</sup> This notion of a "race" (genos) of women was part of a general predisposition in Greek thought and Greek society towards sexual dimorphism, and this feature too of ancient Greek culture has been readily assimilated to later, as well as to current oppositions between male and female and masculine/feminine (86).

Semonides and Hesiod would have been familiar sources to Euripides. As such, we can assume he was likely inspired by these writings in some way. Although it's not correct to assume these two perspectives comprise the entire Greek opinion, it does

offer us two opinions from that time period. As such, basing the world of our production of *Medea* on either of these opinions (or both) would not be anachronistic or necessarily incorrect.

The *Anima*-inspired levels of conflict I will examine in *Medea* are as follows:

<u>Individual</u>	<u>Social</u>	<u>Greater Contextual</u>
Medea vs. Jason	Medea and Jason vs. society's expectations for wives and mothers and husbands	That which is <i>Greek</i> vs. that which is <i>barbarous</i>

### **Individual**

As Jung wrote, the male-female syzygy is often an “idealization of the parents or of some other human couple” (*Archetypes* 60), represented as a nurturing, symbiotic mother-father pair. But the term *syzygy* also implies opposition. The syzygy that we see in *Medea* and Jason is obviously a broken one. Opening the play, the Chorus remarks

When she first arrived here, the local folk loved her. They saw in her a perfect wife for Jason. Perfect in every way. She never argued with Jason. Always compromising, always accommodating – and that, you see, is how a woman earns her security: never argue with your husband!

But that was then.

Now, well, now there's nothing but arguing, nothing but hatred, nothing but poison, nothing but –

Jason betrayed his children and his wife, married the Princess, King Creon's daughter, Glauce and now sleeps in a royal bed. Meanwhile, my mistress, Medea, the Fates fully against her and feeling totally dejected, screams and cries out at him, asking him to remember his promises to her (1-49).

A once happily cohabitating couple is now at odds with one another. The once-idealized syzygy has been usurped by a broken syzygy, composed entirely of

opposites, rather than two pieces of a whole. We see Medea and Jason placed on opposites sides of a dialectic debate on multiple occasions. In her entrance speech, Medea finishes by asking the Chorus not to tattle if she manages “to find some means by which [she] can punish [her] husband and his father-in-law” (259-267); in her earliest thoughts and words in this play, she’s already planning to harm her former husband and at least one of his relatives.

Oppositely, when Jason enters roughly two hundred lines later, he does so with incredible compassion and love. Again, as a mirror of Medea, culminating his first speech, he states “Still and all, here I am, with my love for you intact, to make sure that you and the children don’t leave this land lacking money or anything else. Exile carries enough hardship as it is. Even though you hate me, I’ll never wish you any harm (459-496).” In their earliest words, Medea and Jason have demonstrated that they are on opposite sides of the individual conflict around which this play centers. This conflict culminates from lines 1317-1415, after Medea has murdered her sons, where she and Jason are shouting at each other, blaming each other for their miserable lives and the death of the boys. Jason angrily shouts, “Medea! Hateful bitch! Most evil of all women!” (1317-1336); he later refers to her among the greatest monsters of Greek legend. Medea responds, “Sure, call me what you like, Lioness, Tuscan Skylla, whatever you like! My job is done and I took my rightful vengeance” (1351-1370). Then, Medea flies off and Jason is left mourning; he cries out to the gods and grieves over the loss of his sons.

In this individual conflict, the *Anima* is represented by a twisted, mirror-reversal of the ideal male-female syzygy, one in which the two opposites have been overwhelmed by their opposing qualities and spun out of control. In presenting the *Anima* in this form, Euripides creates a clear and immediate conflict between two ideals and two individuals who represent these ideals. This conflict then drives an entire plot between these two individuals. Similarly, presenting any similar broken syzygy could drive any number of plots.

Next, although it's not fully accurate to say Medea and Jason serve as figureheads for some male versus female debate that this play is so often claimed to center around (because Medea has characteristics the Greek would label both masculine and feminine), we *do* see Medea and Jason arguing over the roles and value of men versus women in Greek society, and in this dichotomy we can see the *Anima*. And understanding this representation can give us a useful lens for working with *Medea* and any Greek play from the same time period. Only nine lines after her entry, Medea dives into her famous speech on the value of women in Greek society. She lampoons the traditional subservient woman:

Of all the living things, of all those things that have a soul and a sense,  
we, yes we, the women, are the most pathetic!

Imagine!

We need to spend a fortune to buy us a man who... what will he do?  
He will become the master of our bodies! And, it's obvious, that this  
dangerous thing we do, becomes even more dangerous when we don't  
find the right husband. Is he a good husband? Or is he a bad one? By  
the time you find that out it's already too late...

And if all these things work out well and our husband lives with us  
without thinking the marriage yoke to be too heavy, well that would  
indeed be a great life. If not, though, only Death opens his arms for us.  
Only Death awaits us.

Whereas the husband, however, if he finds the house to be too great a burden for him, he leaves the place, he finds a friend or someone of similar age and immediately his heart shrugs off that weight. We, on the other hand, we, women, can only let our eyes fall upon one person and one person only, our husband.

Then people also say that while we live quietly and without any danger at home, the men go off to war. Wrong! One birth alone is worse than three times in the battlefield behind a shield (225-259).

Here Medea -- and perhaps Euripides -- eloquently rampages against the limitations oppressing Greek women. They are subject entirely to the whims of their husbands and have no right or recourse to enforce their expectations as wives and humans. Euripides also, however, includes several derisive opinions on women and their apparently subhuman natures. After confronting Creon and laying plain her plans against Jason and his house, Medea comments "We, women might be awful at doing something good but we are very competent when we're doing something evil. No one is better than us" (401-410). In conversation, Jason mentions that women are prone to anger when "their husband is planning other marriages" and Medea facetiously confesses women "are weak creatures and their eyes are constantly full of tears" to tell Jason what he wanted to hear (906-930). Later in that conversation, Medea again concedes to Jason that women are inferior in discourse and preoccupied with trivial objects (945-959). As the *Anima* is found in women in drama and their relationship to their male expectations, by laying this foundation for the expectations for and male opinions of women, Euripides uses the *Anima* to create another opposition and conflict. Medea does not fit the expectations for women of the time (and certainly not Jason's ideals), and this both adds to her individual conflict with Jason and creates another, social level of conflict.

## **Social**

In addition to the individual conflict between Medea and Jason, the *Anima* is used in *Medea* to create a social level of conflict between Jason and Medea and both their expectations for husbands and wives and mothers respectively, and those held by the Greek populus. It begins with Jason spurning his original wedding bed, he “betrayed his children and wife, married the Princess, King Creon’s daughter” (16-49). This is especially vile given all Medea has done for Jason previously in the name of their love (and under the influence of love’s madness), as she details later

First, let me tell you, let me remind you, that I have once saved your life.

All those Greeks who were with you when you came on that ship, Argo, they all know this. When you were made to yoke the fire-spewing bulls and sow that deadly field with dragon’s teeth, all those Greeks who were with you then, know that I have saved your life. And it was I who also saved your life by killing the sleepless dragon who guarded the golden fleece with the coils of its body.

And again, it was I who betrayed my father and my home to come with you to Pelios’ Iolcos, not moved by a mind but by a mindless heart.

And finally it was I who had killed Pelias, in the most abominable way, by his own children so as to save you from every fear (456-496).

Medea accuses Jason of breaking “all oaths, old and new”(456-496) and creating a sacrilege of their matrimony. Medea is rightfully disappointed and upset. And she responds by being the opposite of Jason’s expectations for a wife; and, in doing so, she challenges her own expectations for a mother. And in all these oppositions, we can reverse-engineer one speculation for a common ancient Greek perspective.

First, we see Creon accost Medea. He yells, “Frowning woman! Always arguing with your husband!” when he first enters (267-282). Medea’s opposition has started in the form of disagreeing with her husband’s ultimate control over the house. Her opposition escalates very quickly, as she begins scheming barely one hundred lines later to “kill three of [her] worst enemies: A father, a daughter, a husband!” (357-376). Medea has gone from caring wife to husband-killing succubus. Ultimately, Medea’s murderous intent turns away from Creon and Jason and onto her sons, as she decides this deed, killing her sons, “more than all others, will hurt him -- [her] husband! the most!” (811-824).

In this act, Medea embodies the completely un-ideal wife and mother. When the Chorus pleads with Medea to consider her what would happen if she were to kill her sons, they cry, “But you, too, Medea! You will be the most hurt woman on earth!” (811-8214). Medea humbly responds “That may be so...” (811-824). In conceiving her plan to murder her children, she acknowledged contemporaneously the pain that it would cause her as a mother. After defending her decision to the Chorus as the only weapon she has against Jason that can hurt him properly, Medea struggles with her decision in private. The scene is powerful; and Medea’s plight as a mother is perhaps the most resonant theme of this play among modern audiences. She languishes over her darlings

You will always be without your mother and I will now leave for  
another country, exiled, before I enjoy you, before I see your joy,  
before I see your weddings, before I dress your brides, before I fix  
your wedding beds before I hold your wedding candles!  
How miserable my arrogance has made me!



There were other things in my mind as I brought you up, my darlings. I had other things in my mind when I agonised and burned under the awful pains of your births.

So many hopes! This ill-fated woman had nourished so many hopes for you. To look after me in my old age and when I leave this world, to adorn my body with your own hands, a thing which every parent hopes for.

What a heavy loss the loss of this hope is!

Now I shall live an unhappy life, bitter and without the slightest joy  
(1015-1040)

Ultimately, Medea determines these pains are not enough to dissolve her resolve. She states, “No, I must go through with this plans!” and “My hand will not shun the deed” (1040-1056). She kills her sons later offstage from lines 1273-1293 as they struggle and the Chorus comments in horror. Here Medea culminates her opposition to the *mother* and the *wife* by enacting the ultimate mirror-reversal of that which is nourishing -- she kills his offspring instead of furthering their life. This almost universally abhorrent act was most immediately an anti-*Greek* act. And this otherness of Medea opens a grander level of conflict within the play.

### **Greater Contextual**

Medea is, in her utter nature, a mirror-reversal of that which is *Greek*. She is a Colchian; she lives at the edge of the known Greek world. As we see in the *Argonautica* -- the story of Jason, Medea, and the Argonauts -- the residents of the islands the *Argo* visited became more and more strange as they sailed farther away from Greece. In Colchis, then, people are essentially opposite what they are in Greece. The first description of the Colchians Apollonius gives us after the *Argo* lands on their shore is that they do not “bury the dead in the earth and raise a mound over them. Instead they wrap corpses in untreated ox-hides and suspend them from

trees far away from the city” (70-71). Medea’s people hang their dead from trees; Antigone nearly died to bury her brother -- Medea was a stranger in a strange city, and she continually acts in an un-*Greek* manner. Yet through her reliance on logic, she embraces an iconically *Greek* characteristic and serves as an ideal vessel for Euripides to implement dialectic change in Greek society.

The most un-*Greek* fault Medea committed had other archetypal implications as discussed earlier, but by killing her sons, Medea cemented herself irreparably as un-*Greek*. Filicide, along with any form of familial harm, was incredibly taboo in Greek society. So much so, that it was the focus of the only extant Greek trilogy, the *Oresteia*. In the *Oresteia*, we see the tale of curse of the House of Atreus, specifically as it triggers the deaths of Iphigenia, Agamemnon, and then Clytemnestra and then the trial and eventual acquittal of Orestes. After Agamemnon sacrifices his daughter Iphigenia to appease Artemis for the Trojan War effort, his wife Clytemnestra kills him in justifiable vengeance. Then, to avenge their father’s death, Electra and Orestes plot to and eventually do kill their mother. Orestes is then pursued by the Erinyes, or Furies. The Theoi Project Encyclopedia defines the Erinyes as

THE ERINYES were three netherworld goddesses who avenged crimes against the natural order. They were particularly concerned with homicide, unfilial conduct, crimes against the gods, and perjury. A victim seeking justice could call down the curse of the Erinyes upon the criminal. The most powerful of these was the curse of the parent upon the child--for the Erinyes were born of just such a crime, being sprung from the blood of Ouranos, when he was castrated by his son Kronos.

The Erinyes hunted down family-killers. Jason cries to them indirectly after the death of his sons multiple times. Immediately after Medea appears as the ultimate other,

flying above the stage “inside a golden, brilliant carriage” -- which is lifted through the air by flaming serpents in some versions of the story -- Jason angrily shouts

All the gods and I and the whole generation of men abhor you! How could you manage to kill your very own children? And, at the same time, deprive me of my own?  
You’ve destroyed me!  
And yet, there you are, alive! Alive, even though you’ve committed this most loathsome deed! How is it you are still allowed to see the Sun and the Earth? (1317-1336).

A Greek audience at the time would similarly be stunned. At the end of this play, Medea has literally magically flown away, unpursued and unpunished by the Erinyes; there is no punishment. Ian Johnston’s translation of the exode (or final choral ode) captures Euripides’ intent with this play best. Through the Chorus, he writes, “Zeus on Olympus,/ dispenses many things./ Gods often contradict/ our fondest expectations./ What we anticipate/ does not come to pass./ What we don’t expect/ some god finds a way/ to make happen./ So with this story (1682-1692). Not only are Medea’s actions un-Greek; the repercussions of her actions are un-Greek. Euripides purposefully flipped order on its head to deliver a message to the Greek people.

But despite her oppositeness, Medea coexists flawlessly among the Greeks as an idol until Jason betrays her. One characteristic of Medea’s that assists her in this acclimation is her logic. The Greek championed *σωφροσύνη*, or “soundness of mind” (*Centauromachy* 4); and numerous thinkers like Socrates and Aristotle had celebrity status. The Greeks valued a logical decision made in a sound mind. Although Medea’s earlier actions were inspired by the throes of love, her decision to kill her

children is weighed quite heavily in her mind. In her final speech before exiting into her home to slaughter her sons, Medea defends herself to the Chorus. She states

Enough, my friends!  
My mind is made up. I've decided to kill my children and to leave this country. I haven't a moment longer lest someone takes my children and they are slaughtered by some enemy's hands. Die they must and so, better they die by me who gave birth to them (1220-1251).

This is an incredibly logical decision. Medea rationalizes that her sons will become threats to and enemies of anyone in power over them; they will inexorably be killed. So she logically weighs their impending deaths and determines it is best that they be killed by her<sup>11</sup>, used by her to hurt their father. Although Medea is committing the ultimate un-*Greek* action, she is defending the action in a very *Greek* manner, through logic. And in this way, Medea acts as a bridge for dialectic change (or at least conversation) in Greek society. Medea radically espouses new roles and honor for women and suggests leniency on previously black-and-white legal matters, and it's very possible Euripides used her character to start a bevy of new conversations among Greek lawmakers.

### **The role of the *Anima* in *Medea***

Ultimately, the *Anima* is used in *Medea* in a very classical way -- the archetype carries a tremendous weight in the world of this play. The ideal male-female pair is upheld as the ideal, and by failing to meet these standards, Medea and

---

<sup>11</sup> It should be noted that the Euripides version of the myth contains only one possible ending – Medea killing her own children; in other versions of her tale, for instance, Medea's children are blessed with immortality by Zeus, she has a surviving daughter (Eriopis), and an eldest son (Medeus, who becomes the king of the Media) (Graves, 355-6).

Jason suffer. The *Anima* archetype is lauded, and then its representation is purposefully tarnished, harnessing the inherent opposing powers of the syzygy in order to create an organic, straight-forward conflict with personal, individual, social, natural, and supernatural levels. This representation of the *Anima* is an easily-replicable tool that can be used to form conflicts from any syzygy.

***The Great God Brown***  
“By proxy, I love you” (Prologue).

*The Great God Brown* has been especially interesting to examine, as it contains a modern sense of metatheatrical, self-referential irony. Eugene O’Neill knew the tropes of both his contemporaries and his predecessors and he used them to add power to his text. Examining *The Great God Brown* is beneficial, because the play fits nicely supertextually alongside *Medea*, and it helps to fill in our understanding of how the *Anima* can be used.

***The Anima in The Great God Brown***

*The Great God Brown* is rife with examples of representations of the *Anima*. In the prologue and first act, we are introduced to the broken syzygy of Dion and Margaret, much like we see in *Medea*. However, this syzygy is broken not because of some conflict between its two pieces, but because its foundation is based in lies. It is not a love between two individuals, but between two individuals and two facades -- their masks. The world of this play is one inhabited both by characters and their masks, both functioning as separate individuals. Within this schism lies much of O’Neill’s metatheatricality, and through this metatheatricality, he is able to extend his use of the *Anima* into the sphere of the audience member. O’Neill not only explores the role of the *Anima* in theatre; he makes commentary on our lives as readers through the *Anima*.

Again, it is important to define the *Anima* in O’Neill’s time and place – post-WWI America. Estelle Freedman offers a fantastic summary of both the literature on women’s role in society from the 1920’s and the true state of women in society in the

1920's in her article, *The New Woman: Changing Views of Women in the 1920's*.

Freedman writes that several authors mimic Frederick Allen Lewis proclamation in

*Only Yesterday*:

The revolution [in manners and morals] was accelerated . . . by the growing independence of the American woman. She won the suffrage in 1920. She seemed, it is true, to be very little interested in it once she had it; she voted, but mostly as the unregenerate men about her did.... Few of the younger women could rouse themselves to even a passing interest in politics: to them it was a sordid and futile business, without flavor and without hope. Nevertheless, the winning of the suffrage had its effect. It consolidated woman's position as man's equal (95-6).

Women had won suffrage in 1920, and were then labeled as “man’s equal,” yet they were also commonly depicted as politically disinterested and inactive, as well as obsessed with trivial, sexual matters. Freedman concludes

The portrayal of the 1920s as a period of full equality, when in fact discrimination in education, hiring, salaries, promotions, and family responsibilities was abundant, has perpetuated a myth of equality, one which has helped undermine women's attainment of group consciousness. Similarly, to write and teach on the basis of unsubstantiated observations -that women were politically apathetic but sexually active during the 1920s is to create sexually stereotyped historical roles for women. Historians' use of the "sexual revolution" as an explanation for women's history in the 1920s was perhaps an extension of their own inability to conceive of women outside of sexual roles. Furthermore, if the admittedly minimal evidence on writings in the 1930s and 1940s is substantiated, American historians' emphasis on woman's place in the home rather than her capacities for non-domestic careers may have contributed to the perpetuation of cultural stereotypes which helped weaken feminism since 1920 (393).

In reality, women in O’Neill’s world were perhaps closer to those in Euripides world than we as modern theatre-makers would prefer. Understanding that women had newfound political freedoms in O’Neill’s world, but that they were still very much

encapsulated within a patriarchal society is helpful in analyzing *The Great God Brown* and its characters. Freedman’s work offers us an ideal lens for this purpose.

The *Anima*-inspired levels of conflict I will examine in *The Great God Brown* are as follows:

<u>Individual</u>	<u>Social</u>	<u>Greater Contextual</u>
Dion vs. Margaret/Cybel	Each character vs. their <i>mask</i>	Outgrowing the <i>mask</i> vs. wearing the <i>mask</i>

### **Individual**

We see syzygies, both intact and broken, at many times in *The Great God Brown*. The first syzygies we see are those of Billy and Dion’s parents. Billy’s family is painted by O’Neill as an ideal family unit, and his parents are two unified pieces of a whole, harmonious syzygy. When onstage, Billy’s mother and father both comment negatively about the father’s business rival, they both agree that Billy ought to be an architect after graduation, and they share a moment of romantic nostalgia and a kiss before leaving for a pleasant evening together. Billy has been raised by a solid, supportive, healthy syzygy. Thanks -- at least in part -- to this,

Billy Brown is a handsome, tall and athletic boy of nearly eighteen. He is blond and blue-eyed, with a likeable smile and a frank good-humored face, its expression already indicating a disciplined restraint. His manner has the easy self-assurance of a normal intelligence (Prologue).

Billy Brown is a characteristically attractive boy; he has an ideal physique and personality. Dion, Billy’s best friend, unlike Billy, is not attractive. We first see him slowly and awkwardly following behind his parents, “as if he were a stranger,



walking alone;” O’Neill describes Dion as “about the same height as young Brown but lean and wiry, without repose, continually in restless nervous movement,” with a face that was “dark, spiritual, poetic, passionately supersensitive, helplessly unprotected in its childlike, religious faith in life” (Prologue). Dion is a mirror-reversal of Billy. Where Billy is “self-assured,” Dion is “nervous;” where Billy is “blond and blue-eyed,” Dion is “dark.” Much as we would expect, Dion’s parents are similarly a mirror-reversal of the positive syzygy that is Billy’s parents. When Dion’s parents are onstage, the two bicker with each other, his father ruthlessly attacks him as a “fool,” and Dion is ultimately treated coldly and distantly (Prologue). Although they are not a proper syzygetic example of the *Anima*, as they are a male-male pair, the syzygetic opposition between them often places them at odds with one another; and this conflict is a central foundation for the world of the play.

The central broken syzygy at the heart of this play is that of Dion and Margaret. As mentioned earlier, this syzygy is broken not because of some conflict inherent within the characters’ oppositions, as with *Medea*; rather, *Dion and Margaret* is broken because it actually isn’t Dion and Margaret. Before Dion and Margaret have shared their first moment together on stage, we see them both separately and hear their thoughts on each other. Immediately after Dion and his parents leave the stage in the scene mentioned earlier, Billy and Margaret walk onto the stage. Billy intends to and finally does express his love to Margaret, but throughout the scene Margaret can only think of Dion. The conversation is as follows:

BILLY--(*fidgiting*) Margaret!

MARGARET--(*to the moon*) Dion is so wonderful!

BILLY--(*blunderingly*) I asked you to come out here because I wanted to tell you something.

MARGARET--(*to the moon*) Why did Dion look at me like that? It made me feel so crazy!

BILLY--I wanted to ask you something, too.

MARGARET--That one time he kissed me--I can't forget it! He was only joking--but I felt--and he saw and just laughed!

BILLY--Because that's the uncertain part. My end of it is a sure thing, and has been for a long time, and I guess everybody in town knows it--they're always kidding me--so it's a cinch you must know--how I feel about you.

MARGARET--Dion's so different from all the others. He can paint beautifully and write poetry and he plays and sings and dances so marvelously. But he's sad and shy, too, just like a baby sometimes, and he understands what I'm really like inside--and--and I'd love to run my fingers through his hair--and I love him! Yes, I love him! (*She stretches out her arms to the moon.*) Oh, Dion, I love you!

BILLY--I love you, Margaret.

MARGARET--I wonder if Dion--I saw him looking at me again tonight--Oh, I wonder...!

BILLY--(*takes her hand and blurts out*) Can't you love me? Won't you marry me--after college--

MARGARET--Where is Dion now, I wonder?

BILLY--(*shaking her hand in an agony of uncertainty*) Margaret! Please answer me!

MARGARET--(*her dream broken, puts on her mask and turns to him--matter-of-factly*) It's getting chilly. Let's go back and dance, Billy.

BILLY--(*desperately*) I love you! (*He tries clumsily to kiss her.*)

MARGARET--(*with an amused laugh*) Like a brother! You can kiss me if you like. (*She kisses him.*) A big-brother kiss. It doesn't count. (*He steps back crushed, with head bowed. She turns away and takes off her mask--to the moon*) I wish Dion would kiss me again!

BILLY--(*painfully*) I'm a poor boob. I ought to know better. I'll bet I know. You're in love with Dion. I've seen you look at him. Isn't that it?

MARGARET--Dion! I love the sound of it! (Prologue).

Margaret is so distracted in her swooning over Dion that she is able to miss entire conversations with the boy standing beside her. Clearly O'Neill knew the stock character of the *dreaming lover*, the Romeos and Juliets of the dramatic world,

helplessly and breathlessly in love with love and enraptured by this love; and here, he uses it well. Because of Margaret's cliché, overly romantic and dramatic longing for Dion, we as an audience assume that her love for and of Dion must be equivalent to those great loves, around which the best poets of all time built their careers. Similarly, when Dion first hears of Margaret's love for him, he reacts with deeply romantic, poetic language. He murmurs first "Miracle? I'm afraid! I love, thou lovest, he loves, she loves! She loves, she loves--what?;" then

Underneath? I love love! I'd love to be loved! But I'm afraid! (*then aggressively*) Was afraid! Not now! Now I can make love--to anyone! Yes, I love Peggy! Why not? Who is she? Who am I? We love, you love, they love, one loves! No one loves! All the world loves a lover, God loves us all and we love Him! Love is a word--a shameless ragged ghost of a word--begging at all doors for life at any price!

and then

(*He slowly removes his mask. His face is torn and transfigured by joy. He stares at the sky raptly.*) O God in the moon, did you hear? She loves me! I am not afraid! I am strong! I can love! She protects me! Her arms are softly around me! She is warmly around me! She is my skin! She is my armor! Now I am born--I--the I!--one and indivisible--I who love Margaret! (*He glances at his mask triumphantly--in tones of deliverance*) You are outgrown<sup>12</sup>! I am beyond you! (*He stretches out his arms to the sky.*) O God, now I believe! (Prologue).

O'Neill has spent a lot of poetic energy demonstrating the romantic power between Margaret and Dion. Yet when an unmasked Margaret and Dion meet onstage for the first time, we are treated to the following scene:

(*From the end of the wharf her voice is heard.*)  
MARGARET--Dion!  
DION--(*raptly*) Margaret!  
MARGARET--(*nearer*) Dion!

---

<sup>12</sup> Note that this quote will also be referenced in the *Greater Contextual* subsection.

DION--Margaret!

MARGARET--Dion! (*She comes running in, her mask in her hands. He springs toward her with outstretched arms but she shrinks away with a frightened shriek and hastily puts on her mask. Dion starts back. She speaks coldly and angrily.*) Who are you? Why are you calling me? I don't know you!

DION--(*heart-brokenly*) I love you!

MARGARET--(*freezingly*) Is this a joke--or are you drunk?

DION--(*with a final pleading whisper*) Margaret! (*But she only glares at him contemptuously. Then with a sudden gesture he claps his mask on and laughs wildly and bitterly.*) Ha-ha-ha! That's one on you, Peg!

MARGARET--(*with delight, pulling off her mask*) Dion!

(Prologue).

Margaret's first reaction upon seeing Dion is to shriek. Until Dion slips on his *mask*<sup>13</sup>, she is unwilling to move closer to him, and she acts as though she has no idea who he is. This demonstrates that the love Margaret has for Dion is not for the real Dion, but for his *mask*. The character-*mask* relationship will be explored further in the next section; and as we can see from the above quote, there is an obvious schism between the two, and they are not interchangeable. The emotions Margaret felt for Dion are not the same as those she felt for his mask. Rather than simply recycling some conflict between characters, O'Neill used the *Anima* in an incredibly modern way to show us the downfalls of a love between two people who aren't themselves. Because Dion and Margaret do not love each other, we see them in I:i, unhappily married seven years later. This then plays out like any broken syzygy would -- the pair argues (over money, as Dion refuses to work), one derides the other (the wife, the husband, for being a poor father-figure for their children); and eventually they end the scene apart

---

<sup>13</sup> I use "mask" here as a term; because, as I detail later, the masks are more than simply a physical item: the masks the characters wear are the literal incarnation of the way society perceives each of them.

(Dion has left to go “up the street,” and he will not be back for dinner). Ultimately, just as we expect a broken syzygy to wind up broken (without some *deus ex machina*), Dion finds a new match in Cybel.

And in Dion’s relationship with Cybel, we see another modern conflict, inspired by the *Anima*. Cybel is a tremendously intriguing character, very much the mirror-image of the pretty, girlish, “lithe” Margaret (Prologue). Despite her youth, Cybel is every bit a woman; O’Neill describes her as

a strong, calm, sensual, blonde girl of twenty or so, her complexion fresh and healthy, her figure full-breasted and wide-hipped, her movements slow and solidly languorous like an animal's, her large eyes dreamy with the reflected stirring of profound instincts. She chews gum like a sacred cow forgetting time with an eternal end (I:iii).

In her book, *Eugene O’Neill’s Creative Struggle: The Decisive Decade, 1924-1933*, Doris Alexander writes that in this description of Cybel, O’Neill “suggests the statues of fertility goddesses” and “[recalls] the cow-mother goddesses” (67). Later, O’Neill refers to her as “like an idol” six times (four times in II:i, twice in IV:ii). Cybel embodies the reproductive *maternal feminine*. And O’Neill continually reinforces this maternal quality in her character. Her first act onstage is to “[put] her hand gently” on the forehead of a sleeping Dion; she refers to him later as a “good boy,” after which Dion calls her “maternal;” and the music her player piano plays is “a sentimental medley of ‘Mother--Mammy’ tunes”(I:iii). Throughout I:iii, O’Neill rather heavily suggests maternal overtones in the actions and sentiments between Dion and Cybel. This foreshadows the eventual *Anima* conflict that will become apparent when the curtain rises one scene later.

In II:i, we see Dion and Cybel, sitting in Cybel's parlor seven years later, playing individual games of solitaire like an old, married couple. It soon becomes apparent that the two have kept up their promise to remain platonic for the past seven years, as Cybel says, "We've been friends, haven't we, for seven years? I've never let myself want you nor you me." But after a heavy conversation regarding Dion's broken marriage with Margaret, Dion tells Cybel that she has "given [him] the power to die." When he turns to leave, the two finally share a moment of amorous love, rather bizarre as it may be:

DION--(*presses her convulsively--then with forced harshness*) Well, homeward Christian Soldier! I'm off! By-bye, Mother Earth! (*He starts to go off right. She seems about to let him go.*)

CYBEL--(*suddenly starts and calls with deep grief*) Dion! (*He looks at her. A pause. He comes slowly back. She speaks strangely in a deep, far-off voice--and yet like a mother talking to her little son.*) You mustn't forget to kiss me before you go, Dion. (*She removes his mask.*) Haven't I told you to take off your mask in the house? Look at me, Dion. I've--just--seen--something. I'm afraid you're going away a long, long ways. I'm afraid I won't see you again for a long, long time. So it's good-by, dear. (*She kisses him gently. He begins to sob. She hands him back his mask.*) Here you are. Don't get hurt. Remember, it's all a game, and after you're asleep I'll tuck you in.

DION--(*in a choking, heart-broken cry*) Mother! (*Then he claps on his mask with a terrible effort of will--mockingly*) Go to the devil, you sentimental old pig! See you tomorrow! (*He goes, whistling, slamming the door.*) (II:i).

In their final moment together before Dion's death two scenes later, the true nature of their love is revealed. First, the kiss suggests the erotic tension that has existed between the two since they vowed to be friends and "never anything less" (I:iii). Secondly, we see that this erotic love between them is polluted: a significant factor in

Dion's love for Cybel is his need for a mother-figure in his life after he watched her die.

In the very last pieces of dialogue in Act 1, Dion details to Billy his memories of his mother. He reveals

And my mother? I remember a sweet, strange girl, with affectionate, bewildered eyes as if God had locked her in a dark closet without any explanation. I was the sole doll our ogre, her husband, allowed her and she played mother and child with me for many years in that house until at last through two tears I watched her die with the shy pride of one who has lengthened her dress and put up her hair. And I felt like a forsaken toy and cried to be buried with her, because her hands alone had caressed without clawing (I:iii).

Dion shared a close bond with his mother, so close that "her hands alone had caressed without clawing" (I:iii). One must assume, based on this statement, that the only love Dion ever knew was that for his mother. It makes sense, then, that in seeking to obtain any other love, Dion would do it through the means of mother-son expression. As such, when presented with an archetypally maternal figure in Cybel, he falls in love with her both filially and erotically. Here, again, O'Neill is making modern metatheatrical commentary, this time on the character of Dion and his love for Cybel. Here, O'Neill represents the *Anima* through Dion's polluted sexual preferences. In *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, Jung states that "the [*Anima*] projects herself by preference on the opposite sex" (29). Because the *Anima* can be found whenever a male (or male character) encounters the "not-I," or that is which is "felt as not belonging to me and therefore as outside me" -- i.e. the feminine -- men project the *Anima* onto women in the form of their sexual preference (27). Again, O'Neill does not simply rely on the conflicts inherent within the *Anima's* representation as

sexual preference (i.e. another character's dissimilarity to those preferences); he adds the color of contemporary psychoanalytic thought and harnesses another level of meaning within the *Anima*.

### **Social**

Just as in *Medea*, the characters in *The Great God Brown* are at conflict with society's expectations for them, based on their gender, their qualities, and their position in society, life, the home. Only, again, O'Neill adds a modern, metatheatrical flair to this conflict. Society's perception of each character in *The Great God Brown* is literally incarnated in the *mask* that they each wear (or don't wear, with great purpose). What's more, these masks act as entire personas<sup>14</sup>, wholly separate from the wearer. We already saw this evidenced in the Prologue, where Margaret failed to recognize Dion until his mask was on. This phenomenon occurs again when Billy doesn't recognize Cybel without her mask in II:i, and again when the committee mourns the death of what is nothing more than a disembodied mask -- representing, or rather, which *was*, to them, Brown -- in IV:i. By making these masks entire characters in and of themselves, O'Neill takes what was a fairly normal love story with a flair until the end of Act 2 and twists it into absurdity throughout Acts 3 and 4, when Billy lives out the lives of two individuals by changing between their masks.

We see several characters in conflict with their masks. Least touched on in the text is Cybel's conflict with her mask, which "is the rouged and eye-blackened countenance of the hardened prostitute" (I:iii). It is suggested, both through her mask

---

<sup>14</sup> Another metatheatrical conflict: "persona" is the Latin word for "mask" -- O'Neill *really* dove into the metatheatricality in this play.



and her actions -- when she first dons her mask, she tells Dion to “Kindly state [his] dishonorable intentions, if any!” (I:iii) -- that Cybel is a sex-worker. For her financial security, she is “kept” by Billy for over seven years. She is forced to fold to her mask, to live under society’s expectations for her. Unfortunately, Cybel’s conflict doesn’t seem to be resolved when she reappears in IV:ii. She still wears her mask and “a black kimono robe and [...] slippers over her bare feet,” suggesting she is still working as an exotic sex object (IV:ii). But Cybel is never seen revolting against her mask with any fervor. Also, despite her mask, Cybel is still treated with an exceptional amount of respect, both by the characters of the play (especially Dion and Billy, but also the police in IV:ii), but also the author, who reveres her as a goddess. This suggests that perhaps Cybel has reached some sort of symbiotic relationship with her mask. In this conflict, O’Neill uses the *Anima* to show that Cybel is the type of character to embrace her social roles.

Margaret also struggles against her mask. When Margaret first appears on stage, her mask is “an exact, almost transparent reproduction of her own features,” which shows us that there is essentially no conflict between her and her mask; they are nearly identical. However, in the first Act, a conflict develops. Seven years after the Prologue, Margaret “has grown mature and maternal, in spite of her youth. Her pretty face is still fresh and healthy but there is the beginning of a permanently worried, apprehensive expression about the nose and mouth--an uncomprehending hurt in her eyes” (I:i). However, when she appears in public later, her mask is that “of the pretty young matron, still hardly a woman, who cultivates a naïvely innocent and

bravely hopeful attitude toward things and acknowledges no wound to the world”

(I:ii). They are no longer identical, Margaret no longer lives up to her social expectations. We can see that her unfulfilling relationship with Dion has taken its toll on her and robbed her of her youthful gaiety.

But we see that Margaret is able to overcome this conflict. After Dion dies in II:iii and Billy assumes his position under Dion’s mask, Margaret’s relationship with her husband reaches new heights. It is immediately revitalized. In the first moments of Billy-as-Dion, the two husband and wife reconnect:

*(They file out and close the front door as Brown, dressed in Dion's clothes and wearing his mask, appears at left.)*

MARGARET--*(taking off her mask, gladly)* Dion! *(She stares wonderingly at him and he at her; goes to him and puts an arm around him.)* Poor dear, do you feel sick? *(He nods.)* But you look--*(squeezing his arms)*--why, you actually feel stronger and better already! Is it true what Billy told me--about your swearing off forever? *(He nods. She exclaims intensely)* Oh, if you'll only--and get well--we can still be so happy! Give Mother a kiss. *(They kiss. A shudder passes through both of them. She breaks away laughing with aroused desire.)* Why, Dion? Aren't you ashamed? You haven't kissed me like that in ages! (II:iii).

Margaret is invigorated by this new passion between her and her husband. So much so that when she reenters a scene later, she “does not need to wear a mask now. Her face has regained the self-confident spirit of its youth, her eyes shine with happiness” (III:i). She seems to have displaced herself from the social system that is the masks through true love. However, when we see Margaret in the closing moments of the play, O’Neill writes

She wears her mask of the proud, indulgent Mother. She has grown appreciably older. Her hair is now a beautiful gray. There is about her manner and voice the sad but contented feeling of one who knows her

life-purpose well accomplished but is at the same time a bit empty and comfortless with the finality of it (Epilogue).

Here, O'Neill suggests the end of Margaret's conflict with her mask. Ultimately, just as Cybel did, Margaret resolved her problems within their social system. Rather than stepping out, as it seemed she would; Margaret resolves her conflict by once again matching her persona with that of her mask, as was the case in the Prologue. Again, O'Neill shows us the strength of Margaret's character through the *Anima*. She flirts with the power to leave behind her oppressive social system, but ultimately chooses to live more comfortably within it as happily as she can.

However, perhaps the most apparent conflict we see between a character and his/her mask is in the case of Dion. Dion struggles with his mask from the very first moment we see him in the Prologue. Dion is painted as an artist by his mother and later by Margaret. His mother says to him after his father demands he become an architect, "You ought to make a wonderful architect, Dion. You've always painted pictures so well" (Prologue). Dion immediately disproves her, he says to himself, "Why must she lie? Is it my fault? She knows I only try to paint" (Prologue). Dion is also claimed by Margaret to "write poetry;" and she says he "plays and sings and dances so marvelously" (Prologue). He is also painted as a lady-killer. When Margaret is first swooning over Dion, she dreams, "Why did Dion look at me like that? It made me feel so crazy!" and "That one time he kissed me--I can't forget it! He was only joking--but I felt--and he saw and just laughed!" (Prologue). However, when we first see Dion alone on stage, he lays plain exactly who he is. He questions

Why am I afraid to dance, I who love music and rhythm and grace and song and laughter? Why am I afraid to live, I who love life and the beauty of flesh and the living colors of earth and sky and sea? Why am I afraid of love, I who love love? Why am I afraid, I who am not afraid? Why must I pretend to scorn in order to pity? Why must I hide myself in self-contempt in order to understand? Why must I be so ashamed of my strength, so proud of my weakness? Why must I live in a cage like a criminal, defying and hating, I who love peace and friendship? (Prologue).

In telling us, the audience, this, Dion admits and identifies the conflict between himself and his mask, how everyone else perceives him. His very existence is comprised of oppositions -- he is always at odds with his mask. But this *Anima*-inspired conflict between Dion and the paragon he ought to be does not play out as any other individual conflict. Rather, it metatheatrically seeps into the other conflicts of the play. It sours his relationship with Margaret, as she loves his mask and not him. It catalyzes the envious opposition between Dion and Brown. It serves as his foundation, which he will eventually “outgrow” through his love for Cybel. Dion’s social conflict with his mask is resolved when he does “outgrow” it and steps outside of his social system. In doing so, Dion highlights the *Greater Contextual* conflict within the play.

### **Greater Contextual**

The conflicts that Billy and Dion have with the masks of Dion, and that which Margaret has with her mask, offer evidence for a deeper level of conflict in this play. By having two characters wear one mask, O’Neill gives us something like a scientific experiment: by comparing the way the two characters respond to the same mask, we can identify and examine this additional level of conflict. We have detailed the

beginnings of Dion's conflict with his mask. But the manner in which it resolves has metatheatrical implications. Dion wears his mask constantly with Margaret in order to uphold the foundation their relationship requires until II:ii, after Dion has had his revelation on love with Cybel (as detailed in the *Individual* conflict analysis). Instead, Margaret sees Dion unmasked, reading to his mask from *Imitation of Christ* by Thomas à Kempis "like a priest, offering up prayers for the dying" (II:ii). Earlier in the Prologue, Dion claims to have "outgrown" his mask because he redefined himself as the "I who love Margaret," but this changes almost immediately as he is forced to don his mask before Margaret will even speak to him. In Cybel, he finds he is able to properly redefine himself in terms of love. Counter to his relationship with Margaret, Cybel forces Dion to keep his mask off in the house. Dion then realizes that it is possible to share love with another, unmasked human -- to share real love. Through this redefining action, Dion is able to offer up dirges for his now-unneeded mask, which he ultimately offers to Billy before his death. Dion's "last will and testament" is to "leave Dion Anthony to William Brown--for him to love and obey--for him to become me--then my Margaret will love me--my children will love me--Mr. and Mrs. Brown and sons, happily ever after!" (II:iii). Billy takes this charge with pleasure, finally having the opportunity to realize his long-held love for Margaret.

In embracing the mask of Dion, Billy seals his fate. Already in the next scene, we see that the mask is wearing on Billy. During a conversation with Margaret -- while wearing the mask of *Billy*, as *Dion* is now his norm -- Billy breaks down and tears off the mask, pleading with Margaret to leave Dion and love the man who

always loved her. In doing so, he reveals his face, which is “a suffering face that is ravaged and haggard, [...] tortured and distorted by the demon of Dion's mask” (III:i). Margaret rejects him and Billy is forced to continue living as Dion. Billy’s suffering continues as he becomes more and more unravelled. He is forced to enact a plan to stage the death of *Billy* so he can live as Dion unbothered. Unfortunately, after a darkly comic scene in which Billy is forced to don the masks of *Billy* and *Dion*, Billy botches his plan and stages the death with a full room of committee members next-door. Worse, Billy arrives in the room, donning Dion’s *mask*, and announces the death of *Billy*. Obviously, as *Dion* and *Billy* were thought to be in the same room, Billy, as Dion, is considered the prime suspect in the death, and is thusly pursued by police and killed in the pursuit. Although both characters’ experiences with the mask end in death, one is instilled with more hopefulness than the other. And in this difference lies O’Neill’s intention with this conflict.

O’Neill here engages the *Anima* to engage directly with us as an audience, teaching us a lesson in love. In seeing these *Anima*-inspired conflicts play out in this way, we as an audience are instructed to self-actualize like Dion, not to rely on facades like Billy. Dion replaced his surface-level love with an actual love between two human beings; in doing so, he thrived. Billy embraced this inferior, surface-level love and suffered great torment.

### **The role of the *Anima* in *Great God Brown***

O’Neill uses the *Anima* in *Great God Brown* to great success. He is able to step beyond its uses in *Medea* and engage directly with the audience to deliver

instruction in-between the lines of the play's plot. First, he uses the *Anima* to instruct the audience on the downfalls of putting on facades in a relationship. He demonstrates that not one, but two relationships failed because of this poor foundation. Then O'Neill offers us an alternative: self-actualization. He demonstrates that through self-actualization, but stepping outside of facades and embracing actual human beings, despite their flaws, one can achieve love -- even if it's a flawed, polluted love. O'Neill then enforces this through Billy's failures in the old system.

## Using the *Anima*

In explaining the collective unconscious and the archetypes, Jung wrote

From the unconscious there emanate determining influences, which, independently of tradition, guarantee in every single individual a similarity and even a sameness of experience, and also of the way it is represented imaginatively. One of the main proofs of this is the almost universal parallelism between mythological motifs... (*Archetypes* 58).

Now, any modern, interculturally competent reader can acknowledge that this statement has its weaknesses. To claim that cultural representations of the *mother* or the *paragon* are “similar” or perhaps even the “same” across the world is to ignore -- and, really, to insult -- the indescribable amounts of cultural connotation those representations contain. However, by broadly applying Jung’s theories to dramatic analysis, it has become very apparent that there *is* a “parallelism between mythological motifs.” Because of this, it is possible as dramaturgs to use the *Anima* -- and surely other archetypes -- to analyze supertextual conflicts between plays across great times and distances. More practically, other theatre-makers can also use the *Anima* -- and, again, other archetypes -- as a tool during the devising process.

Jung’s theories on archetypes offer a tremendous tool for dramaturgs in their dramatic analysis, because it offers a backbone for supertextual connections. In defining *supertextual conflict*, Chemers writes

These aesthetic concerns involve other plays, traditions of playwriting and production, common symbolism or allusion, or dialogues with other cultural forms. This is not a question of contention between a protagonist and antagonist but about the relationship between streams of cultural products (82).



The similarities between this quote and the Jung quote above should be apparent. Supertextual conflict concerns the “parallelism between mythological motifs” (*Archetypes* 58). As such, if a dramaturg needs to analyze a particular supertextual conflict between any number of plays, they can simply follow an *archetypal* supertextual conflict between them, as I have done by following the *Anima* through *Medea* and *The Great God Brown*. In doing so, I can now directly compare the way syzygies are used in both pieces, the way social expectations affect characters similarly or differently, and the conflicts that arise from these representations. In doing *that*, I can deliver this information to actors, directors, devisers, designers in order to fuel their creative process.

It has also become evident that the *Anima* can be found in almost every play. As seen earlier in the *Methodology* section, Jung has a lot to say in describing the *Anima*. At one point in his musings -- less than one paragraph after stating that the *Anima* is a “natural archetype that satisfactorily sums up all the statements of the unconscious, of the primitive mind, of the history of language and religion” -- Jung catches himself and admits

Although it seems as if the whole of our unconscious psychic life could be ascribed to the [*Anima*], she is yet only one archetype among many. Therefore, she is not characteristic of the unconscious in its entirety. She is only one of its aspects (*Archetypes* 27).

It's easy to get lost in the breadth of the *Anima*. I, myself, at many points in this analysis was tempted to simply equate *love* with the *Anima* -- which isn't the case. Rather, the *Anima* acts on love via its representation as sexual preferences and syzygetic oppositions. Nevertheless, the *Anima* is everywhere. It's seen in those

sexual preferences and syzygetic oppositions, but also in any maternal relationship, and every male-female pair, every single heroine, and, in fact, every female character written by a male author and every societal opinion of women in every play ever written. The influence of the *Anima* is massive, and its representations are innumerable. As such, it can be used by a dramaturg to find and analyze supertextual conflicts between almost any two or more plays.

What's more, this type of dramatic analysis can be applied to any archetype. We know from Jung that the number of archetypes is endless. Jung writes that "archetypes are not disseminated only by tradition, language, and migration, but that they can rearise spontaneously, at any time, at any place, and without any outside influence" (*Four Archetypes* 12). In addition to the classical archetypes, like the *mother*, the *father*, the *trickster*, and the *wise old man*, new archetypal characters can appear in drama at any point, sometimes with no precedent. As such, we can apply an analysis of an infinite number of archetypes to a similarly infinitely refreshing number of dramatic pieces. This tool proves both widely applicable and wide-reaching.

In addition, I have noticed that my study of the *Anima* has also given me a new framework with which to consider opposition. Traditionally, opposites in my mind -- and this seems to be the trope -- are always presented as conflicting -- think god vs. the devil -- and we see this in *Medea*. Yet, although the term *syzygy* implies opposition, this opposition does not always need to be in conflict. We see this evidenced by classical theories like that of *yin and yang*, where opposites coexist

symbiotically and perhaps beneficially. We also see it in every positive, working syzygy both in drama and our world. As a dramatic analyst, keeping this my mind within the framework of this (somewhat ironic) dichotomous nature of opposites will widen my understanding on all syzygies. As an actor, this can help open up a breadth of character that may have previously been unavailable -- to know that a character's conflicts tend to be mirror-reversals of their passions. It also allows us as actors, directors, and audience members to develop a level of compassion for opposing characters that was previously unavailable. We must remember the opposite side of our characters -- the lovers in Medea and Jason; the potential successful couple in Dion and Margaret -- and, in doing so, we can more easily see ourselves in them and connect on a deeper level.

In a practical sense, after a dramaturgical analysis of an archetype -- or many - - is completed, theatre-makers can apply it as a vocabulary of dramatic elements. In the devising process, the application is especially useful. For instance, in application of the *Anima* alone, we can find countless characters -- any variety of *mother*: a good one, a bad one, one that's attracted to her eldest son; any variety of *lovers*: successful, failing-but-pretending-to-be-fine, violently opposed, or metatheatrically actually in love with each other's personas; even simply any variety of classical *female*: the heroine, the courtesan, the governess, the succubus. We can then place those characters in a variety of conflicts inspired by any number of archetypes. As we've seen with the *Anima*, conflicts can range from individual opposition (a couple falling apart) to societal clashes (a mother who kills her children) to metatheatrical questions

(how we love? how do *I* love?). And other archetypal characters, like the *trickster* carry with them a variety of conflicts and plot elements that can be useful when devising an original production. We can see this formula used in some form in *commedia dell'arte*, *farce*, and *melodrama*, and even modern realist drama. This dramaturgical analysis is also useful in a more traditional production, in application to existing characters. When actors and directors analyze their characters and their actions, it can be helpful to do so through an archetypal framework. For instance, we saw that understanding that Medea also desperately loves Jason opens up an entire spectrum in her personality that we can engage as actors and directors.

## Going Forward

Ultimately, this archetypal analysis is only a very limited analysis. I have only examined a handful of representations of only one archetype within two plays. Although, the *Anima*-inspired supertextual conflicts between these two rather distant plays begins to demonstrate the application of this type of analysis, there are still many breaches to explore. An ideal analysis would include non-Western examples from far more time periods, as well as a similar examination into at least two other archetypes in order to further-supertextually examine how the representations of the multiple archetypes differ or coalesce.

In addition, in applying these theories to production, one should always be sure to apply post-Jungian thought to any dramatic analysis done. Simply blindly presenting Medea and Jason as gendered opposites, for instance, works to promote untrue gender discourses – if one were to do so, it should be noted as intentional, with reason. Regardless of the time and place of the characters' conception, all characters produced today exist, too, in our time and place – theatre makers must always consider this in the use of these dated theories. As such, I hope to conclude the research proposed above by also applying post-modern psychological thought on gender, the *feminine*, and the *Anima* to dramatic analysis the way I have applied Jung's theories. This will both give us as theatre-makers a better idea of how to apply these studies to productions and characters today, and allow us to supertextually compare the role and uses of the *Anima* across psychoanalytical time and space. Doing so should nearly fully round out our picture of the *Anima*.

In all, my hope is that those reading this can begin to identify how Jung's theories on the archetypes -- most specifically, the *Anima* -- can be useful to them as artists; even better, hopefully this examination has spurred an interest in additional examination from further, more talented minds than my own. This seems to be a relatively new frontier that bears further exploration. I plan to undertake more myself, but I thankfully encourage any and all to do so themselves.

## Bibliography

- Alexander, Doris. *Eugene O'Neill's Creative Struggle: The Decisive Decade, 1924-1933*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP, 1992. Print.
- Allen, Frederick Lewis. *Only Yesterday: An Informal History of the Nineteen-twenties*. New York: Harper & Row, 1957. Print.
- Apollonius, and R. L. Hunter. *Jason and the Golden Fleece: (the Argonautica)*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993. Print.
- Astro\*Synthesis. "Centauromachy: The South Metopes of the Parthenon." *Astro\*Synthesis.com.au*. N.p., n.d. Web. 05 May 2016.
- Bakhtin, M. M., and Helene Iswolsky. *Rabelais and His World*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984. Print.
- Bartley, J. O. "The Development of a Stock Character I. The Stage Irishman to 1800." *The Modern Language Review* 37.4 (1942): 438. Web.
- Bowditch, Lucy. "Unpacking Pollock's "Male and Female:" Art Persona, Hermaphrodite, Anima, and Individuation." *Source: Notes in the History of Art* 27.2/3 (2008): 65–69. Web.
- Chemers, Michael M. *Ghost Light: An Introductory Handbook for Dramaturgy*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2010. Print.
- Christensen, Inga. "Early 20th-Century Danish Women Artists in Light of De Beauvoir's "The Second Sex." *Woman's Art Journal* 9.1 (1988): 10. Web.
- Dejung, Christof. "'Switzerland Must Be a Special Democracy': Sociopolitical Compromise, Military Comradeship, and the Gender Order in 1930s and

- 1940s Switzerland." *The Journal of Modern History* 82.1 (2010): 101-26.  
*JSTOR*. Web. 18 May 2016.
- Easter, Sandra. *Jung and the Ancestors: Beyond Biography, Mending and Ancestral Web*. N.p.: n.p., n.d. Print.
- Euripides. "Medea." *Bacchicstage*. Trans. George Theodoridis. N.p., 25 Feb. 2011.  
 Web. 03 May 2016.
- Euripides. "Medea." *Euripides, Medea, Line 1*. Ed. David Kovacs. N.p., n.d. Web. 03 May 2016.
- Freedman, Estelle B. "The New Woman: Changing Views of Women in the 1920s." *The Journal of American History* 61.2 (1974): 372-93. Web.
- Goldenberg, Naomi R. "A Feminist Critique of Jung." *Signs* 2.2 (1976): 443-49.  
*JSTOR*. Web. 19 May 2016.
- Graves, Robert. *The Greek Myths*. Baltimore: Penguin, 1955. Print.
- Goyder, Caroline. *Gravitas: Communicate with Confidence, Influence and Authority*.  
 N.p.: n.p., n.d. Print.
- Imhasly-Gandhy, Rashna. "Myth, Archetype and Individuation." *India International Centre Quarterly* 19.4 (1992): 76-87. *JSTOR*. Web. 03 May 2016.
- Johnston, James Graham. *Jung's Compass of Psychological Types*. Perrysburg, OH: MSE, 2011. Print.
- Jung, C. G. *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung. The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious. - 2. Ed. - 1971. - (RU-idnr: M102527259)*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970. Print.



- Jung, C. G. *Four Archetypes: Mother, Rebirth, Spirit, Trickster / C.G. Jung*. N.p.: n.p., 1986. Print.
- Katz, Marilyn. "Ideology and "The Status of Women" in Ancient Greece." *History and Theory* 31.4 (1992): 70-97. Web.
- Mckenzie, Susan. "Queering Gender: Anima/animus and the Paradigm of Emergence." *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 51.3 (2006): 401-21. Web.
- Myss, Caroline M. *Archetypes: Who Are You?* Carlsbad, CA: Hay House, 2013. Print.
- O'Neill, Eugene. "The Great God Brown." *THE GREAT GOD BROWN*. N.p., Jan. 2004. Web. 03 May 2016.
- Olivier, Richard. *Inspirational Leadership: Henry V and the Muse of Fire: Timeless Insights from Shakespeare's Greatest Leader*. London: Industrial Society, 2001. Print.
- Paglia, Camille. *Sexual Personae*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1990. Print.
- Pearson, Carol. *Awakening the Heroes Within: Twelve Archetypes to Help Us Find Ourselves and Transform Our World*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991. Print.
- Raffa, Jean Benedict. *Dream Theatres of the Soul: Empowering the Feminine through Jungian Dream Work*. San Diego, CA: LuraMedia, 1994. Print.
- Rodgers, Janet B., and Frankie Armstrong. *Acting and Singing with Archetypes*. New York: Limelight Editions, 2009. Print.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, and Jean Le Rond D' Alembert. *Politics and the Arts, Letter to M. D'Alembert on the Theatre*. Glencoe, IL: Free, 1960. Print.

Saussure, Ferdinand De. *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. Print.

Smyers, Karen A.. "Shaman/scientist: Jungian Insights for the Anthropological Study of Religion". *Ethos* 29.4 (2001): 475–490. Web.

Stephenson, Craig E. *Jung and Moreno: Essays on the Theatre of Human Nature*. N.p.: n.p., n.d. Print.