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Cinderella: Bruno Bettelheim Analysis

By all accounts, “Cinderella” is the best-known fairy tale, and probably also the best-liked. It is quite an old story; when first written down in China during the ninth century A.D., it already had a history. The unrivaled tiny foot size as a mark of extraordinary virtue, distinction, and beauty, and the slipper made of precious material are facets which point to Eastern, if not necessarily Chinese origin. The modern hearer does not connect sexual attractiveness and beauty in general with extreme smallness of the foot, as the ancient Chinese did, in accordance with their practice of binding women’s feet.

“Cinderella,” as we know it, is experienced as a story about the agonies and hopes which form the essential content of sibling rivalry; and about the degraded heroine winning out over her siblings who abused her. Long before Perrault gave “Cinderella” the form in which it is now widely known, “having to live among the ashes” was a symbol of being debased in comparison to one’s siblings, irrespective of sex. In Germany, for example, there are stories in which such an ash-boy later becomes king, which parallels Cinderella’s fate. “Aschenputtel” is the title of the Brothers Grimm’s version of the tale. The term originally designated a lowly, dirty kitchen maid who must tend to the fireplace ashes.

There are many examples in the German language of how being forced to live among the ashes was a symbol not just of degradation, but also of sibling rivalry, and of the sibling who finally surpasses the brother or brothers who have debased him. Martin Luther in his Table Talks speaks about Cain as the God-forsaken evil doer who is powerful, while pious Abel is forced to be his ash-brother, a mere nothing, subject to Cain; in one of Luther’s sermons he says that Esau was forced into the role of Jacob’s ash-brother. Cain and Abel, Jacob and Esau are Biblical examples of one brother being suppressed or destroyed by the other.

The fairy tale replaces sibling relations with relations between step-siblings—perhaps a device to explain and make acceptable an animosity which one wishes would not exist among true siblings. Although sibling rivalry is universal and “natural” in the sense that it is the negative consequence of being a sibling, this same relation also generates equally as much positive feeling between siblings, highlighted in fairy tales such as “Brother and Sister.” No other fairy tale renders so well as the “Cinderella” stories the inner experiences of the young child in the throes of sibling rivalry, when he feels hopelessly outclassed by his brothers and sisters. Cinderella is pushed down and degraded by her stepsisters; her interests are sacrificed to theirs by her (step)mother; she is expected to do the dirtiest work and although she performs it well, she receives no credit for it; only more is demanded of her. This is how the child feels when devastated by the miseries of sibling rivalry.

Exaggerated though Cinderella’s tribulations and degradations may seem to the adult, the child carried away by sibling rivalry feels, “That’s me; that’s how they mistreat me, or would want to; that’s how little they think of me.” And there are moments—often long time periods—when for inner reasons a child feels this way even when his position among his siblings may seem to give him no cause for it.
Why a story corresponds to how the child feels deep down—as no realistic narrative is likely to do—it attains an emotional quality of “truth” for the child. The events of “Cinderella” offer him vivid images that give body to his overwhelming but nevertheless often vague and nondescript emotions; so these episodes seem more convincing to him than his life experiences. The term “sibling rivalry” refers to a most complex constellation of feelings and their causes. With extremely rare exceptions, the emotions aroused in the person subject to sibling rivalry are far out of proportion to what his real situation with his sisters and brothers would justify, seen objectively. While all children at times suffer greatly from sibling rivalry, parents seldom sacrifice one of their children to the others, nor do they condone the other children’s persecuting one of them. Difficult as objective judgments are for the young child—nearly impossible when his emotions are aroused—even he in his more rational moments “knows” that he is not treated as badly as Cinderella. But the child often feels mistreated, despite all his “knowledge” to the contrary. That is why he believes in the inherent truth of “Cinderella,” and then he also comes to believe in her eventual deliverance and victory. From her triumph he gains the exaggerated hopes for his future which he needs to counteract the extreme misery he experiences when ravaged by sibling rivalry.

Despite the name “sibling rivalry,” this miserable passion has only incidentally to do with a child’s actual brothers and sisters. The real source of it is the child’s feelings about his parents. When a child’s older brother or sister is more competent than he, this arouses only temporary feelings of jealousy. Another child being given special attention becomes an insult only if the child fears that, in contrast, he is thought little of by his parents, or feels rejected by them. It is because of such anxiety that one or all of a child’s sisters or brothers may become a thorn in his flesh. Fearing that in comparison to them he cannot win his parents’ love and esteem is what inflames sibling rivalry. This is indicated in stories by the fact that it matters little whether the siblings actually possess greater competence. The Biblical story of Joseph tells that it is jealousy of parental affection lavished on him which accounts for the destructive behavior of his brothers. Unlike Cinderella’s, Joseph’s parent does not participate in degrading him, and, on the contrary, prefers him to his other children. But Joseph, like Cinderella, is turned into a slave, and like her, he miraculously escapes and ends by surpassing his siblings.

Telling a child who is devastated by sibling rivalry that he will grow up to do as well as his brothers and sisters offers little relief from his present feelings of dejection. Much as he would like to trust our assurances, most of the time he cannot. A child can see things only with subjective eyes, and comparing himself on this basis to his siblings, he has no confidence that he, on his own, will someday be able to fare as well as they. If he could believe more in himself, he would not feel destroyed by his siblings no matter what they might do to him, since then he could trust that time would bring about a desired reversal of fortune. But since the child cannot, on his own, look forward with confidence to some future day when things will turn out all right for him, he can gain relief only through fantasies of glory—a domination over his siblings—which he hopes will become reality through some fortunate event.

Whatever our position within the family, at certain times in our lives we are beset by sibling rivalry in some form or other. Even an only child feel that other children have some great
advantages over him, and this makes him intensely jealous. Further, he may suffer from the anxious thought that if he did have a sibling, his parents would prefer this other child to him. “Cinderella” is a fairy tale which makes nearly as strong an appeal to boys as to girls, since children of both sexes suffer equally from sibling rivalry, and have the same desire to be rescued from their lowly position and surpass those who seem superior to them.

On the surface, “Cinderella” is as deceptively simple as the story of Little Red Riding Hood, with which it shares greatest popularity. “Cinderella” tells about the agonies of sibling rivalry, of wishes coming true, of the humble being elevated, of true merit being recognized even when hidden under rags, of virtue rewarded and evil punished—a straightforward story. But under this overt content is concealed a welter of complex and largely unconscious material, which details of the story allude to just enough to set our unconscious associations going.

This makes a contrast between surface simplicity and underlying complexity which arouses deep interest in the story and explains its appeal to the millions over the centuries. To begin gaining an understanding of these hidden meanings, we have to penetrate behind the obvious sources of sibling rivalry discussed so far.

As mentioned before, if the child could only believe that it is the infirmities of his age which account for his lowly position, he would not have to suffer so wretchedly from sibling rivalry, because he could trust the future to right matters. When he thinks that his degradation is deserved, he feels his plight is utterly hopeless. Djuna Barnes’s perceptive statement about fairy tales—that the child knows something about them which he cannot tell (such as that he likes the idea of Little Red Riding Hood and the wolf being in bed together)—could be extended by dividing fairy tales into two groups: one groups where the child responds only unconsciously to the inherent truth of the story and thus cannot tell about it; and another large number of tales where the child preconsciously or even consciously knows what the “truth” of the story consists of and thus could tell about it, but does not want to let on that he knows.

Some aspects of “Cinderella” fall into the latter category. Many children believe that Cinderella probably deserves her fate at the beginning of the story, as they feel they would, too; but they don’t want anyone to know it. Despite this, she is worthy at the end to be exalted, as the child hopes he will be too, irrespective of his earlier shortcomings. Every child believes at some period of his life—and this is not only at rare moments—that because of his secret wishes, if not also his clandestine actions, he deserves to be degraded, banned from the presence of others, relegated to a netherworld of smut. He fears this may be so, irrespective of how fortunate his situation may be in reality. He hates and fears those others—such as his siblings—whom he believes to be entirely free of similar evilness, and he fears that they or his parents will discover what he is really like, and then demean him as Cinderella was by her family. Because he wants others—most of all his parents—to believe in his innocence, he is delighted that “everybody” believes in Cinderella’s. This is one of the great attractions of this fairy tale. Since people give credence to Cinderella’s goodness, they will also believe in his, so the child hopes. And “Cinderella” nourishes this hope, which is one reason it is such a delightful story.
Another aspect which holds large appeal for the child is the vilence of the stepmother and stepsisters. Whatever the shortcomings of a child may be in his own eyes, these pale into insignificance when compared to the stepsisters’ and stepmother’s falsehood and nastiness. Further, what these stepsisters do to Cinderella justifies whatever nasty thoughts one may have about one’s siblings: they are so vile that anything one may wish would happen to them is more than justified. Compared to their behavior, Cinderella is indeed innocent. So the child, on hearing her story, feels he need not feel guilty about his angry thoughts.

On a very different level—and reality considerations coexist easily with fantastic exaggerations in the child’s mind—as badly as one’s parents or siblings seem to treat one, and much as one thinks one suffers because of it, all this is nothing compared to Cinderella’s fate. Her story reminds the child at the same time how lucky he is, and how much worse things could be. (Any anxiety about the latter possibility is relieved, as always in fairy tales, by the happy ending.) The behavior of a five-and-a-half-year-old girl, as reported by her father, may illustrate how easily a child may feel that she is a “Cinderella.” This little girl had a younger sister of whom she was very jealous. The girl was very fond of “Cinderella,” since the story offered her material with which to act out her feelings, and because without the story’s imagery she would have been hard pressed to comprehend and express them. This little girl had used to dress very neatly and liked pretty clothes, but she became unkempt and dirty. One day when she was asked to fetch some salt, she said as she was doing so, “Why do you treat me like Cinderella?” Almost speechless, her mother asked her, “Why do you think we treat you like Cinderella?” “Because you make me do all the hardest work in the house!” was the little girl’s answer. Having thus drawn her parents into her fantasies, she acted them out more openly, pretending to sweep up all the dirt, etc. She went even further, playing that she prepared her little sister for the ball. But she went the “Cinderella” story one better, based on her unconscious understanding of the contradictory emotions fused into the “Cinderella” role, because at another moment she told her mother and sister, “You shouldn’t be jealous of me just because I am the most beautiful in the family.”

This shows that behind the surface humility of Cinderella lies the conviction of her superiority to mothers and sisters, as if she would think: “You can make me do all the dirty work, and I pretend that I am dirty, but within me I know that you treat me this way because you are jealous of me because I am so much better than you.” This conviction is supported by the story’s ending, which assures every “Cinderella” that eventually she will be discovered by her prince.

Why does the child believe deep within himself that Cinderella deserves her dejected state? This question takes us back to the child’s state of mind at the end of the oedipal period. Before he is caught in oedipal entanglements, the child is convinced that he is lovable, and loved, if all is well within his family relationships. Psychoanalysis describes this stage of complete satisfaction with oneself as “primary narcissism.” During this period the child feels certain that he is the center of the universe, so there is no reason to be jealous of anybody.

The oedipal disappointments which come at the end of this developmental stage cast deep shadows of doubt on the child’s sense of his worthiness. He feels that if he were really as
deserving of love as he had thought, then his parents would never be critical of him or disappoint him. The only explanation for parental criticism the child can think of is that there must be some serious flaw in him which accounts for what he experiences as rejection. If his desires remain unsatisfied and his parents disappoint him, there must be something wrong with him or his desires, or both. He cannot yet accept that reasons other than those residing within him could have an impact on his fate. In this oedipal jealousy, wanting to get rid of the parent of the same sex had seemed the most natural thing in the world, but now the child realizes that he cannot have his own way, and that maybe this is so because the desire was wrong. He is no longer so sure that he is preferred to his siblings, and he begins to suspect that this may be due to the fact that they are free of any bad thoughts or wrongdoing such as his.

All this happens as the child is gradually subjected to ever more critical attitudes as he is being socialized. He is asked to behave in ways which run counter to his natural desires, and he resents this. Still he must obey, which makes him very angry. This anger is directed against those who make demands, most likely his parents; and this is another reason to wish to get rid of them, and still another reason to feel guilty about such wishes. This is why the child also feels that he deserves to be chastised for his feelings, a punishment he believes he can escape only if nobody learns what he is thinking when he is angry. The feeling of being unworthy to be loved by his parents at a time when his desire for their love is very strong leads to the fear of rejection, even when in reality there is none. This rejection fear compounds the anxiety that others are preferred and also maybe preferable--the root of sibling rivalry.

Some of the child’s pervasive feelings of worthlessness have their origin in his experiences during and around toilet training and all other aspects of his education to become clean, neat and orderly. Much has been said about how children are made to feel dirty and bad because they are not as clean as their parents want or require them to be. As clean as a child may learn to be, he knows that he would much prefer to give free rein to his tendency to be messy, disorderly, and dirty.

At the end of the oedipal period, guilt about desires to be dirty and disorderly becomes compounded by oedipal guilt, because the child’s desire to replace the parent of the same sex in the love of the other parent, the wish to be the love, if not also the sexual partner, of the parent of the other sex, which at the beginning of the oedipal development seemed natural and “innocent,” at the end of the period is repressed as bad. But while this wish as such is repressed, guilt about it and about sexual feelings in general is not, and this makes the child feel dirty and worthless.

Here again, lack of objective knowledge leads the child to think that he is the only bad one in all these respects--the only child who has such desires. It makes every child identify with Cinderella, who is relegated to sit among the cinders. Since the child has such “dirty” wishes, that is where he also belongs, and where he would end up if his parents knew of his desires. This is why every child needs to believe that even if he were thus degraded, eventually he would be rescued from such degradation and experience the most wonderful exaltation--as Cinderella does.
For the child to deal with his feelings of dejection and worthlessness aroused during this time, he desperately needs to gain some grasp on what these feelings of guilt and anxiety are all about. Further, he needs assurance on a conscious and an unconscious level that he will be able to extricate himself from these predicaments. One of the greatest merits of “Cinderella” is that, irrespective of the magic help Cinderella receives, the child understands that essentially it is through her own efforts, and because of the person she is, that Cinderella is able to transcend magnificently her degraded state, despite what appear as insurmountable obstacles. It gives the child confidence that the same will be true for him, because the story relates so well to what has caused both his conscious and his unconscious guilt.

Overtly “Cinderella” tells about sibling rivalry in its most extreme form: the jealousy and enmity of the stepsisters, and Cinderella’s sufferings because of it. The many psychological issues touched upon in the story are so covertly alluded to that the child does not become consciously aware of them. In his unconscious, however, the child responds to these significant details which refer to matters and experiences from which he consciously has separated himself, but which nevertheless continue to create vast problems for him.

From www.sutterfield.weebly.com

Red Riding Hood
An Excerpt from Bettelheim’s “Uses of Enchantment”

Perrault's story begins like all other well-known versions, telling how the grandmother had made her granddaughter a little red riding hood (or cap), which led to the girl's being known by that name. One day her mother sent Little Red Riding Hood to take goodies to her grandmother, who was sick. The girl's way led her through a forest, where she met up with the wolf. The wolf did not dare to eat her up then because there were woodcutters in the forest, so he asked Little Red Riding Hood where she was going, and she told him. The wolf asked exactly where Grandmother lived, and the girl gave the information. Then the wolf said that he would go visit Grandmother too, and he took off at great speed, while the girl dallied along the way. The wolf gained entrance at the grandmother's home by pretending to be Little Red Riding Hood, and immediately swallowed up the old woman. In Perrault's story the wolf does not dress up as Grandmother, but simply lies down in her bed. When Little Red Riding Hood arrived, the wolf asked her to join him in bed. Little Red Riding Hood undressed and got into bed, at which moment, astonished at how Grandmother looked naked, she exclaimed, "Grandmother, what big arms you have!" to which the wolf answered: "To better embrace you!" Then Little Red Riding Hood said: "Grandmother, what big legs you have!" and received the reply: "To be better able to run." These two-exchanges, which do not occur in the Brothers i Grimm's version, are then followed by the well-known questions about Grandmother's big ears, eyes, and teeth. To the last question the wolf answers, "To better eat you." "And, in saying these words, the bad wolf threw himself on Little Red Riding Hood and ate her up."

There Lang's translation ends, as do many others. But Perrault's original rendering continues with a little poem setting forth the moral to be drawn from the story: that nice girls ought not
to listen to all sorts of people. If they do, it is not surprising that the wolf will get them and eat them up. As for wolves, these come in all variations; and among them the gentle wolves are the most dangerous of all, particularly those who follow young girls into the streets, even into their homes. Perrault wanted not only to entertain his audience, but to teach a specific moral lesson with each of his tales. So it is understandable that he changed them accordingly. Unfortunately, in doing so, he robbed his fairy stories of much of their meaning. As he tells the story, nobody warned Little Red Riding Hood not to dally on the way to Grandmother's house, or not to stray off the proper road. Also, in Perrault's version it does not make sense that the grandmother, who has done nothing wrong at all, should end up destroyed. Perrault's "Little Red Riding Hood" loses much of its appeal because it is so obvious that his wolf is not a rapacious beast but a metaphor, which leaves little to the imagination of the hearer. Such simplifications and a directly stated moral turn this potential fairy tale into a cautionary tale which spells everything out completely. Thus the hearer's imagination cannot become active in giving the story a personal meaning. Captive to a rationalistic interpretation of the story's purpose, Perrault makes everything as explicit as possible. For example, when the girl undresses and joins the wolf in bed and the wolf tells her that his strong arms are for embracing her better, nothing is left to the imagination. Since in response to such direct and obvious seduction Little Red Riding Hood makes no move to escape or fight back, either she is stupid or she wants to be seduced. In neither case is she a suitable figure to identify with. With these details Little Red Riding Hood is changed from a naive, attractive young girl, who is induced to neglect Mother's warnings and enjoy herself in what she consciously believes to be innocent ways, into nothing but a fallen woman.

Rapunzel

In “Rapunzel”, we learn that the enchantress locked Rapunzel into the tower when she reached the age of twelve. Thus, hers is likewise the story of a pubertal girl, and of a jealous mother who tries to prevent her from gaining independence—a typical adolescent problem, which finds a happy solution when Rapunzel becomes united with her prince. But one five year old boy gained quite a different reassurance from this story. When he learned that his grandmother, who took care of him most of the day, would have to go to the hospital because of serious illness—his mother was working all day, and there was no father at home—he asked to be read the story of Rapunzel. At this critical time in his life, two elements of the tale were important to him. First, there was the security from all the dangers in which the substitute mother kept the child, an idea which greatly appealed to him at that moment. So what normally could be viewed as a reassuring meaning under specific circumstances. And even more important to the boy was another central motif of the story: that Rapunzel found the means of escaping her predicament in her own body—the tresses on which the prince climbed up to her room in the tower. That one’s own body can provide a lifeline reassured him that, if necessary, he would find similarly in his own body the source of his security. This shows that a fairy tale—because it addresses itself in the most imaginative form to essential human problems, and does so in an indirect way—can have much to offer to a little boy even if the story’s heroine is an adolescent girl.

From Bettelheim’s *The Uses of Enchantment* www.swcta.net
**Snow White**

*Phase of Reincorporation and Rebirth*

The dangerous transition from childhood to psycho-sexual maturity and full membership in the cultural life of the society is accomplished by these rites—the bringing of a girl into social, psychological, and religious adulthood. There is an obvious relation between this scenario and what happens in the story of Snow white; at the most fundamental level of action, the tale starts with the abrupt movement from birth to a symbolic movement of transition (at the age of seven) during Snow White’s childhood, the focuses in the longest section on the events of Snow White’s sequester in the forest with the dwarves where she undergoes various ordeals, and finally concludes rather suddenly with the “eucatastrophe” of her revival from “death” and her marriage with the prince. The implication is that as Snow White lay deathlike in the crystal coffin for a “long, long time,” she was if marriageable age at the end of the story—that is, she was around fourteen years old, or seven years beyond the age of seven.

When Snow white became seven, therefore, she was at the threshold of the passage to puberty and adult married life and had to undergo various tests and training for becoming fully a woman. It is also worth noting van Gennep’s observation that the moment of puberty is sociologically and not physiologically determined, and that the period transition and training tend to be prolonged as a culture becomes more and more complex. Other aspect of this is that as primitive puberty initiation is signaled and, in a sense, effectuated through the sacred medium of menstrual blood, so also does the story of Snow white constantly turn on the symbolism of blood (color symbolism of blood-red) as the transforming agent. The color triad of red, white, and black is particularly important, and, as Victor Turner states, “in the ethnographic literature it is noteworthy that among societies that make ritual use of all three colors the critical situation in which these three appear is initiation.”

With these preliminary comments in mind, it is best to proceed more methodically in order to see how Snow white portrays a basic initiatory pattern reminiscent of the primitive scenario set out above. The procedure followed here is to break the story down into its functional sequence of action represented by what might be called the core sentences or “narremes.” It should be emphasized that, as Propp and Luthi suggest, the functional aspect of possible meaning of layers of meaning. Thus, the characters in fairy tales are almost always stylized and colorless; they are no more than stock figures that emphasize various functional and symbolic values.

In particular, the figure of Snow White as heroine is hardly a developed personality or even very heroic. Snow White, in fact, is always acted upon and seems incredibly stupid in her repeated failure to see through the wiles of the evil stepmother. Indeed, the distinctly stylized and mechanical protagonists in fairy tales, as differentiated from the more defined tragic heroes of epic tradition, may represent an essential functional trait associated with the type of initiatory theme found in fairy tales. In the way, Kay Stone’s comments on what she considers to be the insipid and uninspiring “passivity” of female characters in the Grimm tales, while not entirely unfounded, do seem to miss the point that ultimately initiation is the
fortuitous work of the gods (however they are disguised). Heroes and heroines in fairy tales, more so than in epic or saga, do not ordinarily succeed because they act, but because they allow themselves to be acted upon—helped, protected, saved, or transformed—by the magic of the fairy world.

From N. J. Giradot’s *Initiation and the Meaning of Snow White* [www.iscte.pt](http://www.iscte.pt)

**Jack and the Beanstalk**

*The Challenge of Male Development*

The tales of the Jack cycle are of British origin; from there they became diffused throughout the English speaking world. By far the best-known and most interesting of this family of stories is “Jack and the Beanstalk.” Important elements of this fairy tale appear in many stories all over the world: the seemingly stupid exchange which provides something of magic power; the miraculous seed from which a tree grows that reaches into heaven; the cannibalistic ogre that is outwitted and robbed; the hen that lays golden eggs; the musical instrument that talks. But their combination into a story which asserts the desirability of social and sexual self-assertion in the pubertal boy, and the foolishness of a mother who belittles this, is what makes “Jack and the Beanstalk” such a meaningful tale.

In “Jack and His Bargains” we are told that Jack is a wild boy, of no help to his father. Worse, because of Jack, the father has fallen on hard times and must meet all kinds of debts. So he has sent Jack with one of the family’s seven cows to the fair, to sell it for as much money as he can. On the way to the fair, Jack meets a man who asks him where he is headed. Jack tells him, and the man offers to swap the cow for a wonderous stick: all its owner has to say is “Up stick and at it” and the stick will beat all its enemies senseless. Jack makes the exchange. When he returns home, the father, who expected to receive money for his cow, gets so furious that he fetches a stick to beat Jack with. In self-defense, Jack calls on his stick, which beats the father until he cries for mercy. This establishes Jack’s ascendancy over his father in the home, but does not provide the money they need. So Jack is sent to the next fair to sell another cow...

The magic formula “Up stick and at it” suggests phallic association, as does the fact that only this new acquisition permits Jack to hold his own in relation to his father, who up to now has dominated him. It is this stick which gains him victory in the competition with all suitors—a competition which is a sexual contest, since the prize is marrying the princess. It is the stick that finally leads to sexual possession of the princess, after it has beaten the wild animals into submission...

“Jack and His Bargains” begins with adolescent phallic self-assertion (Up stick and at it) and ends with personal and social maturity as self-control and valuation of the higher things in life are achieved. The much better known “Jack and the Beanstalk” story starts and ends considerably earlier in a male’s sexual development. While loss of infantile pleasure is barely hinted at in the first story with the need to sell the cows (the end of nourishment from the mother), this is a central issue in “Jack and the Beanstalk.” We are told that the good cow
milky white, which until then had supported the child and the mother, has suddenly stopped giving milk. Thus the expulsion from infantile paradise has begun; it continues with the mother’s deriding Jack’s belief in the power of his seeds. The phallic beanstalk permits Jack to engage in oedipal conflict with the ogre, which he survives and finally wins, thanks only to the oedipal mother’s taking his side against her own husband. Jack relinquished his reliance on the belief in the magic power of phallic self-assertion as he cuts down the beanstalk, and this opens the way toward a development of mature masculinity. Thus both versions of the Jack story cover the entire male development.

From Bruno Bettelheim’s *The Uses of Enchantment* [www.psychology.sunysb.com](http://www.psychology.sunysb.com)

---

**JAMES LAPINE BIO**

JAMES LAPINE was born in 1949 in Mansfield, Ohio and lived there until his early teens when his family moved to Stamford, Connecticut. He attended public schools before entering Franklin and Marshall College in Lancaster, Pennsylvania where he majored in History. He went on to get an MFA in Design from the California Institute of the Arts in Valencia, California.

After graduate school, he moved to New York City where he worked part-time as a waiter; a page and tour guide at NBC; a free-lance photographer and graphic designer; and an architectural preservationist for the Architectural League of NY. One of his free-lance jobs was designing the magazine of the Yale School of Drama, Yale/Theater, then edited by Rocco Landesman and Robert Marx. The dean of the School of Drama, Robert Brustein offered Lapine a full-time job designing all of the printed materials for the School of Drama and the Yale Repertory Theatre as well as a faculty position teaching a course in advertising design.

While at Yale, his students urged him to direct a play during the annual January period when both faculty and students undertook a project outside of their areas of study or expertise. At their suggestion Lapine directed a Gertrude Stein play, PHOTOGRAPH. The play was five acts, and just three pages in length. Assembling students and friends, the play was presented in New Haven and came to the attention of director Lee Breuer, who helped arrange for a small performance space in Soho to present the work for three weeks. The production was enthusiastically received and won Lapine an Obie award.
Lapine was approached to create a new piece for the Music-Theatre Group. He wrote and directed a workshop version of TWELVE DREAMS, a work inspired by a Jungian case history. The play was later presented at the Public Theatre and revived by Lincoln Center Theatre. Lapine eventually left the visual arts for a career in the theatre where he has also written and directed the plays TABLE SETTINGS, LUCK, PLUCK and VIRTUE, THE MOMENT WHEN, FRAN'S BED and MRS. MILLER DOES HER THING. He has written the book for and directed Stephen Sondheim's SUNDAY IN THE PARK WITH GEORGE, INTO THE WOODS, PASSION and the multi-media revue SONDHEIM ON SONDHEIM. He also directed MERRILY WE ROLL ALONG as part of Encores! at New York City Center. With William Finn he has collaborated on MARCH OF THE FALSETTOS and FALSETTOLAND, later presented on Broadway as FALSETTOS, A NEW BRAIN, MUSCLE and the soon to be produced, LITTLE MISS SUNSHINE which will open at 2nd Stage Theatre. On Broadway he has also directed David Henry Hwang's GOLDEN CHILD, THE DIARY OF ANNE FRANK, Michel Legrand’s AMOUR, and THE 25th ANNUAL PUTNAM COUNTY SPELLING BEE. He directed Jenny Allen's solo piece I GOT SICK AND THEN I GOT BETTER with Darren Katz. Lapine directed the 2012 Broadway revival of ANNIE. He is co-producing and directing the upcoming HBO documentary SIX BY SONDHEIM, which is due to be released this winter. In the Spring of 2014 Lincoln Center Theater will produce his stage adaptation of the Moss Hart memoir, ACT ONE. Lapine has also directed several productions off-Broadway as well as three films. He is the recipient of three Tony Awards, five Drama Desk Awards and the Pulitzer Prize. In 2011, he was inducted into the Theater Hall of Fame.

Lapine is a member of the Dramatist Guild Council and for the last twelve years has been a mentor for TDF’s Open Doors Program. He is also on the board of Ars Nova Theatre. He currently lives in New York City.

From www.jameslapine.com

Why Is Sondheim So Difficult? Here’s a brief history and explanation from the man himself.

From The Paris Review. Interview by James Lipton.
http://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/1283/the-art-of-the-musical-stephen-sondheim
Stephen Sondheim was born in New York in 1930. He has written the music and lyrics for twelve Broadway musicals and the lyrics for *West Side Story*, *Gypsy*, and *Do I Hear a Waltz?*, as well as many other songs. He has composed film scores and has won an Academy Award best original song for “Sooner or Later,” which was sung by Madonna in *Dick Tracy*. He won the Tony Award and the Drama Critics Circle Award for best score for *Company*, *Follies*, *A Little Night Music*, *Sweeney Todd*, *Into the Woods*, and *Passion*. He received the Pulitzer Prize for *Sunday in the Park with George*. In 1983 he was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Letters. In 1990 he was appointed the first visiting professor of contemporary theater at Oxford University and, in 1993, was a recipient of the Kennedy Center Honors for Lifetime Achievement. In 1992 he refused to accept the National Endowment’s Medal of Arts Award because he felt the NEA had been, in his words, “transformed into a conduit and symbol of censorship and repression rather than encouragement and support.” He accepted the award in 1997.

This interview was excerpted from a craft seminar at the New School in New York City, which appeared on the Bravo network as an episode of *Inside the Actors Studio*. The seminar ended with a classroom session in which questions were invited from the audience.

**INTERVIEWER**

When you were ten and your parents divorced, your mother moved to Pennsylvania and it was there at the age of eleven that you encountered Jimmy Hammerstein and were welcomed into the family of Oscar and Dorothy Hammerstein. I understand you’ve said that if Hammerstein had been a geologist, you would have become a geologist.

**STEPHEN SONDHEIM**

Yes. He was a surrogate father and a mentor to me up until his death. When I was fifteen, I wrote a show for George School, the Friends school I went to. It was called “By George” and was about the students and the faculty. I was convinced that Rodgers and Hammerstein couldn’t wait to produce it, so I gave it to Oscar and asked him to read it as if he didn’t know me. I went to bed dreaming of my name in lights on Broadway, and when I was summoned to his house the next day he asked, Do you really want me to treat this as if I didn’t know you? Oh yes, I said, to which he replied, In that case, it’s the worst thing I’ve ever read. He saw me blanch and continued, I didn’t say it was untalented, but let’s look at it. He proceeded to discuss it as if it were a serious piece. He started right from the first stage direction; and I’ve often said, at the risk of hyperbole, that I probably learned more about writing songs that afternoon than I learned the rest of my life. He taught me how to structure a song, what a character was, what a scene was; he taught me how to tell a story, how not to tell a story, how to make stage directions practical.

Of course when you’re fifteen you’re a sponge. I soaked it all up and I still practice the principles he taught me that afternoon. From then on, until the day he died, I showed him everything I wrote,
and eventually had the Oedipal thrill of being able to criticize his lyrics, which was a generous thing for him to let me do.

INTERVIEWER

I’ve read that one of the things you learned from him was the power of a single word.

SONDHEIM

Oscar dealt in very plain language. He often used simple rhymes like day and May, and a lot of identities like “Younger than springtime am I / Gayer than laughter am I.” If you look at “Oh, what a beautiful mornin’! / Oh, what a beautiful day!” it doesn’t seem like much on paper, but he understood what happens when music is applied to words—the words explode. They have their own rainbows, their own magic. But not on the printed page. Some lyrics read well because they’re conversational lyrics. Oscar’s do not read very well because they’re colloquial but not conversational. Without music, they sound simplistic and written. Yet it’s precisely the hypersimplicity of the language that gives them such force. If you listen to “What’s the Use of Wond’rin’ ” from Carousel, you’ll see what I mean.

INTERVIEWER

He also stressed the importance of creating character in songs.

SONDHEIM

Remember, he’d begun as a playwright before he became a songwriter. He believed that songs should be like one-act plays, that they should have a beginning, a middle, and an end. They should set up a situation, have a development, and then a conclusion . . . exactly like a classically constructed play. Arthur Pinero said about playwriting: “Tell them what you’re going to do, then do it, then tell them you’ve done it.” If that’s what a play is, Oscar’s songs are little plays. He utilized that approach as early as Show Boat. That’s how he revolutionized musical theater—utilizing operetta principles and pasting them onto American musical comedy.

INTERVIEWER

That afternoon, as I recall, Hammerstein also outlined for you a curriculum and told you he wanted you to write four things. It sounds like a wonderful fairy tale. What were they?
SONDHEIM

First, he said, take a play that you like, that you think is good, and musicalize it. In musicalizing it, you’ll be forced to analyze it. Next, take a play that you think is good but flawed, that you think could be improved, and musicalize that, seeing if you can improve it. Then take a nonplay, a narrative someone else has written—it could be a novel, a short story—but not a play, not something that has been structured dramatically for the stage, and musicalize that. Then try an original. The first one I did was a play by George S. Kaufman and Marc Connelly, *Beggar on Horseback*, which lends itself easily to musicalization because it’s essentially a long fantasy. We performed that at college when I was an undergraduate at Williams. I got permission from Kaufman to do it and we had three performances. It was a valuable experience, indeed. The second one, which I couldn’t get permission for, was a play by Maxwell Anderson called *High Tor*, which I liked but thought was sort of clumsy. Then I tried to adapt *Mary Poppins*. I didn’t finish that one because I couldn’t figure out how to take a series of disparate short stories, even though the same characters existed throughout, and make an evening, make an arc. After that I wrote an original musical about a guy who wanted to become an actor and became a producer. He had a sort of Sammy Glick streak in him—he was something of an opportunist. So I wrote my idea of a sophisticated, cynical musical. It was called “Climb High.” There was a motto on a flight of stone steps at Williams, “Climb high, climb far, your aim the sky, your goal the star.” I thought, Gee, that’s very Hammersteinish. I sent him the whole thing. The first act was ninety-nine pages long. Now, the entire script of *South Pacific*, which lasted almost three hours on the stage, was only ninety-two pages. Oscar sent my script back, circled the ninety-nine, and just wrote, Wow!

INTERVIEWER

That’s a step up from “the worst musical I’ve ever read.” At Williams your major was in music and your mentor there was Robert Barrow?

SONDHEIM

Yes. I was a mathematician by nature, and still am—I just knew I didn’t want to be a mathematician. So I decided not to take any mathematics courses. Williams being a liberal-arts college, the natural, neutral major is English. As an elective my first year, I took music, which was generally known as a gut course. Williams in those days had eleven hundred students, all male, and a tiny music department. Robert Barrow was the senior of two teachers. The students hated him because he was cold and Mary Poppinsish. He taught rigidly out of a little black book compiled over the years into which he had compressed a lot of texts. He had a completely antiromantic approach to music. I had always imagined that writing music was all about sitting in your penthouse or your studio until this lady muse twitters around your head and sits on your shoulders and goes, Da-da-da-dum, da-da-da-dum. Instead, Robert Barrow was talking about leading tones and diatonic scales,
and I fell in love. He took all the mystery out of music and taught craft. Within a year I was majoring in music. He changed my life by making me aware that art is craft, not inspiration.

INTERVIEWER

When you graduated from Williams, you received the Hutchinson Prize for music, which was a fellowship for further study. With whom did you study?

SONDHEIM

Milton Babbitt, the avant-gardist’s avant-gardist. When I started studying with him, he had already gone beyond twelve-tone music and was working up at Columbia on synthesized music, which in those days was a science fiction, the idea being that (his example) he could make a bassoon play a high C. He was a rigorous intellectual but also happened to be a frustrated songwriter. When I first met him, he was writing a musical for Mary Martin. I would meet with him once a week for about four hours and we’d spend the first hour analyzing his favorite songs—I can still analyze “All the Things You Are” according to Babbitt, which in fact I did for my students at Oxford. Then we’d spend the rest of the time analyzing Beethoven and Mozart.

I asked him if he would teach me atonal music. He said, There’s no point until you’ve exhausted tonal resources for yourself. You haven’t, have you? I said, No, and I suspect I’ll never want to. So I never did study atonal music. He taught tonal as rigorously as Barrow did. It was a similar approach: Analyze the music, look at what the music is. How do you sustain something, hold a piece together for forty-five minutes if it’s a symphony, or three minutes if it’s a song? How do you manage time? That’s what he taught me.

INTERVIEWER

Why did you hesitate when you were offered the chance to write the lyrics of West Side Story?

SONDHEIM

I wanted primarily to write music. But Oscar advised me that the job would be an extraordinary opportunity to work with men of such ability, talent, and imagination as Leonard Bernstein, Jerome Robbins, and Arthur Laurents. So I took it. And he was right.

INTERVIEWER

I’ve heard you disparage your lyrics for West Side Story, but I would give a great deal to have written “oh, moon, grow bright and make this endless day endless night.”
SONDHEIM

It’s fine until you remember that it’s sung by an adolescent in a gang.

INTERVIEWER

You’ve said, “I’ve always thought of lyric-writing as a craft rather than an art, largely a matter of sweat and time. Music is more challenging, more interesting, and more rewarding.” Do you still feel that way?

SONDHEIM

Sure. Because music’s abstract and it’s fun and it lives in you. Language is terrific, but the English language is a difficult tool to work with. Two of the hardest words in the language to rhyme are life and love. Of all words! In Italian, easy. But not English. Making lyrics feel natural, sit on music in such a way that you don’t feel the effort of the author, so that they shine and bubble and rise and fall, is very, very hard to do. Whereas you can sit at the piano and just play and feel you’re making art.

INTERVIEWER

The love rhymes are shove, above, dove, glove, and of. That’s all we’ve got.

SONDHEIM

And they’re not easy to use. Live isn’t easy, either. You have give and sieve and then you’re in a lot of trouble.

INTERVIEWER

The English language has forty-two sounds in it, French a dozen, so everything rhymes with everything else. That’s why Molière was able to write those alexandrines, couplet after couplet, without ever straining for a rhyme.

SONDHEIM

But lyrics are also about open vowel sounds. The Italians have it all over us and the French because everything is ahhhh! Try to sing me on a high note. And me is a very useful word.
INTERVIEWER

Or him.

SONDHEIM

Exactly. *Short* is terrible. Singers will tell you that their throats close up.

***

INTERVIEWER

*Sunday in the Park with George* marked a new collaboration. There was the long period in which Hal Prince produced and directed your musicals and now we enter the Sondheim–James Lapine period, which has given us a different sensibility. Lapine comes from photography and graphic design. He's experimental, a poet.

SONDHEIM

I admired Jim Lapine’s work. I’d seen a play that he wrote and directed called *Twelve Dreams*. A mutual friend, a producer, got us together, and we were talking one night about theme and variations, because that’s a kind of show I had always wanted to do. I showed him a French magazine I had that was devoted to variations on the *Mona Lisa*. And we started talking about paintings. He had used the Seurat painting *La Grande Jatte* in a piece he had done up at Yale. And he said, Did you ever notice there are over fifty people in it and nobody’s looking at anybody else? We started to speculate why. Suddenly I said, It’s like a stage set, you know. It’s like a French farce, isn’t it? You know, maybe those people aren’t supposed to be seen with each other. We started to talk about how it might make a story, and then James said the crucial thing: Of course, the main character’s missing. I said, Who? He said, The painter. As soon as he said that, we knew we had a show. It would be more than a stunt, it would be a play about a man and his landscape and how he controls it. And how hard it is to make art.

INTERVIEWER

*Into the Woods* was another groundbreaking musical. Once again you worked with Lapine.

SONDHEIM

Well, another kind of piece I’d always wanted to do was a fairy tale, so I asked James if he’d like to write one. He said, The trouble with fairy tales is that they’re really only five minutes long. There’s
one incident, maybe two, and that’s all there should be. Which is exactly the trouble with all the attempts to expand fairy tales and make them into plays and musicals. So the notion arose of mashing a number of fairy tales together. James held them together by inventing his own, the story of a baker and his wife. Some of the fairy tales got dropped on the road. We had the Three Little Pigs in there, we had Rumpelstiltskin, we had everybody—everybody was in the woods. But eventually we had to cut it down.

INTERVIEWER

There seems to be a philosophical war in that musical between the theories of Bruno Bettelheim and Jung.

SONDHEIM

It’s interesting you say that. Everybody assumes we were influenced by Bruno Bettelheim. But if there’s any outside influence, it’s Jung. James is interested in Jung—Twelve Dreams is based on a case Jung wrote about. In fact, we spoke to a Jungian analyst about fairy tales.

INTERVIEWER

The moral of your fairy tale seems to be beware of wishes, they may come true.

SONDHEIM

It’s about moral responsibility—the responsibility you have in getting your wish not to cheat and step on other people’s toes, because it rebounds. The second act is about the consequences of not only the wishes themselves but of the methods by which the characters achieve their wishes, which are not always proper and moral.

Bruno Bettelheim: Freudian Philosopher and Fairy Tale Fanatic


Once upon a time there was a Freudian psychiatrist and American author named Bruno Bettelheim who was best known throughout the psychological kingdom for deconstructing fairy tales as the primary tool for promoting childhood cognitive development through his 1976 study entitled "The Uses of Enchantment." Now a few years after his suicide, Bruno Bettelheim is best known for being full of crap.

Bettelheim created this foray into the meaning of classic folk tales after years of working with mentally handicapped children. Bridging the gap between philosophy and Freudian dogma, the author asserts that the end design of life is
to find a meaning for existence and although adults are equipped for this mental struggle, children need guides - like fairy tales - to explain core life concepts and intrinsic human flaws that they would eventually uncover for themselves through experience. Although it is one of the most basic parental instincts to protect a child from the bad in the world, fairy tales flaunt human flaws and highlight universal problems to not only instruct children, but arouse their curiosity and stimulate intellect. "The juxtaposition of opposite characters is not for the purpose of stressing right behavior...Presenting the polarities of characters permits the child to comprehend easily the difference between the two."

He breaks down all the Disney-adopted fairy tales like "Snow White" and "Cinderella" as well as lesser known folk tales like "The Queen Bee" and "Brother and Sister" and exposes the "true" lessons they teach children. For example, "Hansel and Gretel" helps a child get over separation anxiety when he or she comes of age and needs to discover autonomy. It also teaches not to be overcome by greed (eat bread and not sweets). "Snow White" is about a teenage girl who breaks away from her Freudian evil stepmother and is rescued by males, teaching the natural order of transferring attachment and loyalty.

Bettelheim delves into the Freudian definition of the id, ego and superego and asserts that "the child's unconscious processes can become clarified for him only through images which speak directly to his unconscious. The images evoked by fairy tales do this." But after a prolonged estrangement from his daughters that led to his suicide, Bettelheim was found out for being a fraud. "It's now clear that he plagiarized parts of The Uses of Enchantment, and that for many years he inflicted severe verbal and physical abuse on the children under his care in a group home," said Mark Abely in a 1992 article in the Montreal Gazette. Harvard professor Maria Tatar is the first to challenge his overly Freudian analysis of fairy tales in her book "Off With Their Heads!: Fairy Tales and the Culture of Childhood." She calls his analysis "radically unjust, misleading and inaccurate."

From Portfolio NYU. http://journalism.nyu.edu/publishing/archives/portfolio/books/book411.html

Psychology in Fairy Tales:

"...deeper meaning lies in the fairy tales of my childhood than in the truth that life teaches."—Schiller

Beginning with the fathers of the field, Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung, psychoanalysts have turned to fairy tales in an effort to understand the human mind. This is accomplished in two ways—either by studying the psychology and needs of the creators of these stories or by examining the characters in the stories. Just as many fairy tales hinge upon a revelation of the truth about those who have been somehow disguised, so too, fairy tales cut to the essence of the human psyche.

Freud suspected that dreams and fairy tales stem from the same place, and the relaxation of inhibition that occurs in the dream state is also true of many story tellers. So fairy tales might prove, like dreams, windows into the unconscious. (Indeed, many fairy tales include dream-states as important plot points.) For Freud fairy tales are rife with wish fulfillment fantasies and complicated sexual undercurrents.
Fairy tales are inextricably linked to the work of Carl Jung. The “collective unconscious” that lies at the core of his work, and which he believed is shared by all human beings, is revealed through archetypes, forms and symbols found in ample evidence in fairy tales. Some Jungians argue that one reason fairy tales appeal to children is that they are in a stage of their development only slightly removed from deeper layers of the collective unconscious. Jungian therapists study fairy tales to help analyze the dreams of their patients. Jung’s disciples have gone on to interpret fairy tales as lives in miniature, suggesting, for example, that each character within a tale may represent an aspect of personality.

More recently, perhaps the best known and certainly the most widely quoted psychologist to incorporate fairy tales into his practice is Bruno Bettelheim, who published *Uses of Enchantment: The Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales* in 1976. Bettelheim argued that fairy tales are an important tool for children learning to navigate reality and survive in a world ruled by adults. The family conflicts and moral education of the protagonists (conveniently often children themselves) could provide models of coping. “Fairy tales are loved by the child…because—despite all the angry, anxious thoughts in his mind to which the fairy tale gives body and specific context—these stories always result in a happy outcome, which the child cannot imagine on his own.”

Others have disputed aspects of this interpretation. The German cultural critic and philosopher Walter Benjamin notes that the morality of fairy tales is very complicated, with protagonists known to lie, cheat, steal and torture villains. But there remains something empowering and psychologically insightful in these stories that, fairy tale scholar Maria Tatar writes, demonstrate the “triumph of small and weak over tall and powerful.”


### Carl Jung: Fairy Tales

**Why did primitive man go to such lengths to describe and interpret the happenings in the natural world, for example the rising and setting of the sun, the phases of the moon, the seasons?** Carl Jung believed that the events of nature were not simply put into fairytales and myths as a way of explaining them physically. Rather, the outer world was used to make sense of the inner.

In our time, Jung noted, this rich well of symbols – art, religion, mythology – which for thousands of years helped people understand the mysteries of life, had been filled in and replaced by the science of psychology. What psychology lacked, ironically given its borrowing of the ancient Greek term, was an understanding of the psyche, or the self in its broadest terms.

For Jung, the goal of life was to see the ‘individuation’ of this self, a sort of uniting of a person's conscious and unconscious minds so that their original unique promise might be fulfilled. This larger conception of the self was also based on the idea that humans are expressions of a deeper layer of *universal* consciousness. To grasp the uniqueness of each person, paradoxically we had to go beyond the personal self to understand the workings of this deeper collective wisdom.

**The collective unconscious**

Jung admitted that the idea of the collective unconscious “belongs to the class of ideas that people at first find strange but soon come to possess and use as familiar conceptions.” He had to defend it against the charge of mysticism. Yet he also noted that the idea of the unconscious on its own was thought fanciful until Freud pointed to its existence, and it became part of our understanding of why people think and act the way as they do. Freud had assumed the unconscious to be a personal thing contained within an individual. Jung, on the other hand, saw the personal unconscious mind as sitting atop a much deeper universal layer of consciousness, the *collective* unconscious – the inherited part of the human psyche not developed from personal experience.
The collective unconscious was expressed through ‘archetypes’, universal thought-forms or mental images that influenced an individual's feelings and action. The experience of archetypes often paid little heed to tradition or cultural rules, which suggests that they are innate projections. A newborn baby is not a blank slate but comes wired ready to perceive certain archetypal patterns and symbols. This is why children fantasize so much, Jung believed: they have not experienced enough of reality to cancel out their mind's enjoyment of archetypal imagery.

Archetypes have been expressed as myths and fairytales, and at a personal level in dreams and visions. In mythology they are called 'motifs', in anthropology 'représentations collectives'. German ethnologist Adolf Bastian referred to them as 'elementary' or 'primordial' thoughts that he saw expressed again and again in the cultures of tribal and folk peoples. But they are not simply of anthropological interest; usually without knowing it, archetypes shape the relationships that matter in our lives.

Archetypes and complexes

Jung highlighted a number of archetypes, including the ‘anima’, the ‘mother’, the ‘shadow’, the ‘child’, the ‘wise old man’, the ‘spirits’ of fairytales, and the ‘trickster’ figure found in myths and history. We look at two below.

The anima

Anima means soul with a female form. In mythology it is expressed as a siren, a mermaid, a wood-nymph, or any form which 'infatuates young men and sucks the life out of them'. In ancient times, the anima came represented either as a goddess or a witch – that is, aspects of the female which were out of men's control.

When a man 'projects' the feminine aspect within his psyche onto an actual woman, that woman takes on magnified importance. The archetype makes itself present in a man's life either by infatuation, idealization or fascination with women. The woman herself does not really justify these reactions, but acts as the target to which his anima is transferred. This is why the loss of a relationship can be so devastating to a man. It is the loss of a side of him that he has kept external.

Every time there is an extreme love or fantasy or entanglement, the anima is at work in both sexes. She does not care for an orderly life, but wants intensity of experience - life, in whatever form. The anima, like all archetypes, may come upon us like fate. She can enter our life either as something wonderful or as something terrible – either way her aim is to wake us up. To recognize the anima means throwing away our rational ideas of how life should be lived, and instead admitting, as Jung puts it, that "Life is crazy and meaningful at once".

The anima is profoundly irrational – and yet she carries great wisdom. When she comes into your life it may seem like chaos, but it is only later that we are able to divine her purpose.

The Mother

The Mother archetype takes the form of personal mother, grandmother, stepmother, mother in law, nurse, governess. It can be fulfilled in figurative Mothers such as Mary Mother of God, Sophia, or the Mother who becomes a maiden again in the myth of Demeter and Kore. Other Mother symbols include the Church, country, the Earth, the woods, the sea, a garden, a ploughed field, a spring or well. The positive aspect of the archetype is Motherly love and warmth, so celebrated in art and poetry, which gives us our first identity in the world. Yet it can have negative meaning – the loving mother or the terrible mother or goddess of fate. Jung considered the Mother the most important archetype because it seemed to contain all else.

When there is an imbalance of the archetype in a person, we see the Mother 'complex'. In men, the complex may give rise to 'Don Juanism', which can make a man fixated on pleasing all women. Yet a man with a mother complex may also have a revolutionary spirit: tough, persevering, extremely ambitious.

In women, the complex can result in an exaggeration of the maternal instinct, with a woman living for her children, sacrificing her individuality. Her husband becomes just part of the furniture. Men may be initially attracted to women with a mother complex because they are the picture of femininity and innocence. Yet they are also screens onto which a man can project or externalize his anima, and he only later discovers the real woman he has married.
In other forms of the archetype, a woman will go to any lengths to not be like her biological mother. She may carve out a sphere of her own, for example becoming an intellectual to show up her mother's lack of education. A choice of marriage partner may be to antagonize and move away from the mother. Other women in the hold of the archetype may have an unconscious incestuous relationship with the biological father and jealousy of the mother. They may become interested in married men or having romantic adventures.

* * * *

Jung noted that in evolutionary terms the unconscious came well before the development conscious thought. Yet in its youthful enthusiasm the conscious mind feels it can defy or deny its deeper counterpart; it is all-powerful while the unconscious seems a murky irrelevance. Yet he believed that "Man's worst sin is unconsciousness". We project everything we internally don't like or can't accept onto the world, so that we wage war instead of studying ourselves. It is a case of 'anything but self-knowledge' – but in the end we pay the price, whether as individuals or collectively.

**Spiritual archetypes**

Why is psychology as a science so young? Jung suggests it was because for most of human history it simply wasn't necessary. The wonderful imagery and mythology of religions was able to express the eternal archetypes perfectly. People feel a need to dwell upon ideas and images relating to rebirth and transformation, and religions supply these in abundance for every aspect of the psyche. The Catholic Church's strange ideas of the Virgin Birth and the Trinity are not fanciful images but packed with meaning, Jung wrote, archetypes of protection and healing that administered to any ruptures in the minds of the faithful.

The Protestant Reformation reacted against all this. The rich Catholic imagery and dogma became nothing but 'superstition', and in Jung's view this attitude made way for the barrenness of contemporary life. Genuine spirituality must engage both the unconscious and the conscious mind, the depths as well as the heights.

Jung observed the trend of people in the West flocking to Eastern spirituality, but felt this was hardly necessary given the depth of meaning embedded in the Christian tradition. Another result was that that people are attracted to political and social ideas that were "distinguished by their spiritual bleakness".

Humans have a religious instinct, Jung believed, whether it is a belief in God or in some secular faith like communism or atheism. "No one can escape the prejudice of being human" he observed.


**The Uses of Fairy Tales in Psychotherapy**

**Bette U. Kiernan, MFT**

An exploration of fairy tales has special value for psychotherapy: Psychoanalysts such as Sigmund Freud, Otto Rank, and Carl Jung among others looked to fairy tales and myths to represent of the anatomy of the psyche. The deep truths embodied in fairy tales, which depict complex developmental processes and group dynamics, and afford the means for transforming the pain of psychological wounding into creativity, continue to offer much to the steadily expanding field of psychotherapy. Their very brevity, and arresting themes, and imaginative treatment of significant events allow them to be interpreted, reinterpreted, and expanded upon in an infinite number of ways to allow individuals to comprehend their environment and their personal difficulties and to construct guides to action through enhanced knowledge.
Close scrutiny of the patterns in fairy tales from such contemporary psychological perspectives as family systems, object relations, and cognitive frameworks can yield new insights. As Joseph Campbell stated, “The folk tale is the primer of the picture of the soul”. An understanding of the dynamics represented in the journey of the fairy tale heroine or hero that typically lead them from misery to their highest realization may reveal means for helping clients in their psychotherapy.

***

The fairy story reveals the heroine as a model who calls upon using inner resources to solve problems. According to Carl Jung, we have a favorite story that goes with us throughout life. By connecting clients to their cherished early stories, the therapist can highlight the means for coping and problem-solving and suggest to one still struggling that she too can discover solutions to problems. Thus the stories serve as important reminders that can enable one to find inner resources beyond conscious awareness even when one is overwhelmed by states of anxiety or depression.

Readers of fairy tales can weave every day personal events intertwining their own inner processes to give more understandable forms to previously inexpressible painful emotions through the imagery of witches, cruel elder brothers, and stepmothers. As the fairy tale heroine or hero escapes or defeats threatening destructive forces, they provide powerful images that can help point those still suffering towards transcendence. For example, in Hans Christian Andersen’s The Little Match-Seller, a poor child wanders the streets in freezing cold and darkness. “She did not dare to go home; for she had not sold any matches and had not earned a single penny. Her father would beat her and besides it was almost as cold at home as it was here”. Lighting her unsold matches at Christmas time to warm herself, she has fantastic visions of herself as she is warmly nurtured in a warm dwelling enjoying a roast goose feast under a lovely Christmas tree whose candles are transformed into shining stars flying heavenward and the child interprets the star flying down to earth as the sign of someone dying, of a soul going up to God. Striking her last matches, she has a vision of her dead grandmother who takes the little girl in her arms and they fly, “in joy and splendor” to be with God. “Nobody knew what beautiful visions she had seen, nor in what halo she had entered upon the glories of the New Year”. This tale considered by many to be a sad tale of want and death, also shows that old, painful patterns of living can die, so that more fruitful new ways of living can come into being.

During the process of therapy, the client encounters aspects of the self that were kept from conscious awareness. Sometimes these take the form of deep sadness, or rage. But as these parts of the self become known and assimilated into the personality, clients often discover new energies within that subsequently enable them to create new ways of living that bring new meaning. When clients are encouraged to consider the characters from their favorite fairy tales, such as the witch or fool as aspects of themselves, then the personality integration that is associated with psychological healing is encouraged.

*From www.web.mit.edu*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 8</td>
<td>Jack’s Mother: “WHILE HER <strong>WITHERS</strong> WITHER WITH HER.”</td>
<td><strong>Withers:</strong> The highest point of a horse’s/cow’s back along the nape of the neck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 12</td>
<td>Florinda: “<strong>CLOD.</strong>”</td>
<td><strong>Clod:</strong> a stupid person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 14</td>
<td>Witch: “BUT I’LL LET HIM HAVE THE <strong>RAMPION.</strong>”</td>
<td><strong>Rampion:</strong> “A European bellflower having tuberous roots that are used with the leaves in a salad.” <a href="http://www.flickriver.com">www.flickriver.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 15</td>
<td>Witch: “I’M STILL NOT <strong>MOLLIFIED.</strong>”</td>
<td><strong>Mollified:</strong> appeased, placated, pacified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 19</td>
<td>Stepmother: “<strong>LENTILS ARE ONE THING BUT-</strong>”</td>
<td><strong>Lentils:</strong> a high protein pulse that is dried and cooked before eating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 29</td>
<td>Wolf: “<strong>HARK! AND HUSH</strong>”</td>
<td><strong>Hark:</strong> to listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 106</td>
<td>All: “<strong>INTO THE WOODS AND DOWN THE DELL.</strong>”</td>
<td><strong>Dell:</strong> a small valley, usually among trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 164</td>
<td>Witch: “I’M THE <strong>HITCH,</strong> I’M WHAT NO ONE BELIEVES.”</td>
<td><strong>Hitch:</strong> a temporary obstacle or problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg. 171</td>
<td>Cinderella: “We’ll lure her to an area smeared with <strong>pitch.</strong>”</td>
<td><strong>Pitch:</strong> a sticky, resinous substance that is semi-liquid when hot. i.e tar, asphalt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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