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ABSTRACT

James Reaney, Canadian playwright and poet, attempted in his early plays for adults to blend Northrop Frye's description of New Comedy with the archetypal theories of Carl Jung. Reaney was interested, as was Jung, in the inner journey of the human soul to maturity, and he wanted to portray this on stage. To this end, he used many of the archetypes described by Jung. This inward journey is usually the stuff of tragedy, but Reaney did not want to write tragedies. He wanted instead to portray success and a happy resolution. Therefore, he adhered closely to the form of New Comedy, which portrays the successful struggle of a young man to overcome the restrictions placed on him by the older generation as he attempts to marry and become an adult. The archetypes conform to the characters described by Frye as essential to New Comedy and they also allow Reaney to portray in an external and theatrical manner the inner characters of the soul.

This thesis describes the archetypes that Reaney has used and how he has used them in three of his plays, The Easter Egg, Listen to the Wind, and Colours in the Dark. These plays have been selected because each play represents a particular way in which Reaney has used the archetypes. In conclusion, a broad analysis of Reaney's progressive use
of the archetypes has been attempted as well as an examination of his more recent play \textit{The Donnellys}.

In \textit{The Easter Egg} the Jungian structure of the soul is presented in nearly perfect form. The anima, shadow and wise old man archetypes can be seen in the characters and Kenneth at the end of the play becomes the child archetype. In \textit{Listen to the Wind}, the archetypes are less important than they are in \textit{The Easter Egg}. The characters form the marriage quaternio archetype. In \textit{Colours in the Dark} the archetypes are only minimally evident in the characters. Instead, the structure of the play itself assumes importance. It is circular and creates the archetype of the sphere.

The final archetypes in all the plays symbolize wholeness and the complete soul. There is a progression in Reaney's use of them. In \textit{The Easter Egg}, the individual character has become the child archetype. In \textit{Listen to the Wind}, a group of characters has become the marriage quaternio archetype. In \textit{Colours in the Dark}, the play itself has become the sphere archetype. The archetypes have become progressively larger, less individualized and more encompassing.

When Reaney wrote \textit{The Donnellys}, he was no longer interested in the journey of the soul. These characters cannot be considered the archetypes of the soul; Reaney has become more interested in the characters for their own sakes. This focus makes \textit{The Donnellys} play not only much
more realistic, but also more theatrical. Reaney's least Jungian play is less fantastical but also more stageworthy. He has left behind the inner world of mysterious characters and treads more earthy ground where the people of everyday life are to be found. As a result, his plays have become more accessible to the theatre-going public.

Reaney's use of the archetypes allowed him to portray on stage the difficult combination of the inward journey of a soul and the happy resolution of the comedic structure. The task he set himself was difficult and the results may have been flawed, but he ingeniously used the archetypes as an imaginative solution to a perhaps impossible problem.
CONTENTS

Introduction: The Influence of Northrop Frye and Carl Jung on James Reaney................. 1

Jungian Archetypes...................................................... 10

The Easter Egg and the Child Archetype......................... 24

Listen to the Wind and the Marriage Quarternio Archetype......................... 42

Colours in the Dark and the Circle Archetype................. 59

Conclusion................................................................. 70

Bibliography............................................................... 76
INTRODUCTION

James Reaney, Canadian poet and dramatist, has attempted in his plays to blend elements of the theories of Northrop Frye with those of Carl Jung. In the 1950's, he was Northrop Frye's student at the University of Toronto. Frye was particularly influential on Reaney not only in his theories of literary criticism, but in his belief that a coherent world of myth and metaphor exists and is a valid means of understanding life and organizing experience.¹

During his undergraduate years, Reaney passed through a bleak time when he doubted that poetry had any value whatsoever. He was caught in the "final clutch of the so-called scientific world", where "metaphors seemed lies".² His salvation began with his discovery of Blake and was confirmed by Frye.³ A friend, Richard Stingle, convinced Reaney to attend a lecture Frye gave in a course "Literary Symbolism in the Bible". Reaney went unwillingly because he considered the Bible part of the repressive system from which he was trying to break away.⁴

Since my previous experience of sermons had not been happy, I went along with some reluctance, but this 'sermon' was different. As a work of literature, [Frye] calmly discussed Ecclesiasticus, a book not even in my Bible; God wants us each to be a candle of witness. Suddenly the whole congregation changed into lighted candles.⁵

He began to have faith again in "the belief I had held as a child that metaphor is reality."⁶ Frye's calm assumption of
the inherent value of metaphor gave Reaney the courage to believe again and enabled him to make a stand against the "anti-symbol, anti-analogy gang".  

Reaney found Frye's theory of literary criticism compatible with his own developing view of poetry and its place in the world. Frye proposed that the poetic world has an integral coherence that can be deciphered in myths and symbols. The world of literature not only has its own integral order, but it can also give the disorganized, seemingly arbitrary confusion of real life a structure and form too. Metaphor, myth, symbol, language and the word sort out and organize life and allow the underlying patterns to emerge. Dragland quotes the riddle that Reaney used as an advertisement for Alphabet, his literary magazine:

```
LIFE IS BMQUIBCFU
ART IS ALPHABET
```

When the second line is used as a key for sorting out the apparent randomness of the first, then it reads ALPHABET too. Under the surface confusion of life, a coherent design can be deciphered if the word, the primary building block of literature, is used as the key. The riddle makes Frye's point that art provides the means to understand the world.

According to Dragland, this view places Frye and Reaney outside of the mainstream of contemporary literature, which is based on the philosophy that life has no coherence or meaning, a belief born out of horror at the brutality of 20th Century events. Frye and Reaney disagree. Life may indeed seem arbitrary and random on the surface, but there
is an underlying order or pattern which can be discovered. The pattern is composed of the stories and myths which are the foundation of literature. They inform and order life, and are themselves the structure on which life rests.

Frye examines these myths in great detail in *Anatomy of Criticism*. Relevant to several of Reaney's plays is Frye's description of the pattern or standard plot of New Comedy:

What normally happens is that a young man wants a young woman, that his desire is resisted by some opposition, usually paternal, and that near the end of the play some twist in the plot enables the hero to have his will. In this simple pattern there are several complex elements. In the first place, the movement of comedy is usually a movement from one kind of society to another. At the beginning of the play the obstructing characters are in charge of the play's society, and the audience recognizes that they are usurpers. At the end of the play the device in the plot that brings hero and heroine together causes a new society to crystallize around the hero, and the moment when this crystallization occurs is the point of resolution in the action, the comic discovery, anagnorisis or cognitio.¹¹

Alvin Lee considers this structure to be the foundation of several of Reaney's plays, especially *The Killdeer*.¹² Several of Reaney's early plays for adults, including *The Easter Egg* and *Listen to the Wind*, conform to some degree to this structure.

This comedic plot is suited to the stage. It is externalized and deals with the interaction between individuals; such concerns are easily dramatized. But Reaney's main purpose in his drama is more introverted: he wants to portray the journey of the human soul towards maturity.¹³ This purpose, dealing as it does with the
internal workings of the individual psyche, is easily expressed in his poetry, but is less adaptable to the stage. When such a theme is portrayed dramatically, it usually assumes the form of tragedy. The fall of the tragic hero forces an examination and reevaluation of spiritual values, not social ones as in comedy. The inner self assumes more importance. It is the inner self that is of primary concern to Reaney, but he is not concerned with portraying a person exploring his inner self in the face of events which cause his downfall, but with the workings of a soul on its journey to maturity. And instead of the ultimate downfall in tragedy, Reaney wants to portray the successful attainment of maturity and the overthrow of the older, evil regime, in short, the end result of comedy. Nevertheless, he does not want to dramatize tragedy with a happy ending; he does not want to write tragicomedies. His problem then is how to combine the form of comedy with the concerns of tragedy.

This mandate is difficult; he has not always succeeded in writing stageworthy plays. He has been criticized for being "an accomplished lyric poet trying to exploit a medium which he is unwilling to come to grips with,"14 "for proceeding [in his plays] on several levels -- naturalistic, fantastic and symbolic -- which fail to coincide."15 These flaws result from his attempt to combine Frye's comedic structure with his interest in the soul's journey.

In this attempt, he has superimposed upon Frye's model of comedy a structure derived from Carl Jung's theory of the
archetypes of the universal unconscious. This structure is both symbolic and fantastic and occasionally jars the naturalistic base of Reaney's plays. Nevertheless, he uses Jung's concepts because they serve his purpose.

The archetypes allow Reaney to portray on stage the introverted, poetical, non-theatrical journey of the soul. Like Reaney, Jung was extremely interested in the soul's journey to maturity, a process he called "individuation". He proposed the theory that as the soul progresses on its journey, it meets the archetypes of the collective unconscious, first the shadow, then the anima, then the wise old man. These archetypes have become characters in Reaney's plays. As characters, they do conform to Frye's catalogue of essential characters in comedy, but they also have the added dimension of being archetypes. Thus Reaney accomplishes his purpose within the confines of Frye's description of comedy.

Although many critics of Reaney mention Jung's influence on Reaney, no detailed or systematic study of Reaney's use of the Jungian archetypes has been undertaken. Those critics who discuss Jung do so only briefly, and inevitably use as their basis an article Reaney wrote for Canadian Literature in which he describes Jung's four-sided schema of the human soul.16 Jung divided the soul into four parts: a young man, a young woman, an old woman and an old man, and Reaney has used this division as the foundation for many of his plays. Reaney's short paragraph of Jung's
schema has been a springboard for many critics in their interpretations of Reaney's plays, but none has explored in depth Reaney's debt to Jung.\textsuperscript{17}

Alvin Lee has done the most work on Reaney's use of Jungian archetypes, but it is not his chief concern. He attempts in his book \textit{James Reaney} to give an overview of Reaney's work, how it has been influenced not only by Jung, but by the Brontes, Blake, Frye, Yeats and Spenser, and how it has formed a cohesive whole in itself to create a world he calls Reaneyland.\textsuperscript{18} He does a cursory cataloguing of the archetypes as they appear in \textit{The Killdeer}, \textit{The Easter Egg} and \textit{Listen to the Wind}, but he does not attempt to describe their particular functions. He tends to be facile in his interpretations. For example,

\begin{quote}
Taken all together, Mr. Taylor, Dr. Spettigue and Mr. Gleneden might conceivably add up to one wise old man.\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}

A careful reading of the play shows Mr. Taylor to be a spineless weakling, Mr. Spettigue to be naive and gullible and Mr. Gleneden to be completely insignificant. Adding up these negative characters, old men that they might be, does not give a total of one wise old man. Lee has not explored the ramifications of the archetypes far enough.

He mentions the child archetype as an explanation of "Reaney's perennial use of the innocent child figure in a hostile environment".\textsuperscript{20} He describes the archetype of the hermadrophite in connection with "A Suit of Nettles", one of
Reaney's early poems. He recognizes Reaney's affinity for Jung:

Reaney is more Jungian than Freudian. By this I mean that the baring of childhood traumata and the concern with the unconscious in his writings are only a step on the way to something more than the freeing of an individual psyche. They are a movement into what Jung called the collective unconscious.\textsuperscript{21}

Nevertheless, he does not explore the particulars of the universal unconscious. He links it vaguely with Blake's discovery of all minds and the individual seeing "with the eyes of God".\textsuperscript{22} He has not attempted to understand the archetypes or their functions, nor does he explain Reaney's attraction to Jung or why Reaney has used the archetypes.

This thesis explores Reaney's use of Jung's concept of the archetypes. The next chapter discusses in general Reaney's use of the archetypes. In the following three chapters, \textit{The Easter Egg}, \textit{Listen to the Wind}, and \textit{Colours in the Dark} are examined. These plays have been selected because each play is representative of a particular way in which Reaney has used the archetypes. In the conclusion, a broader analysis of Reaney's use of the archetypes is attempted to see if a progressive development has occurred. As well, Reaney's later play \textit{The Donnellys} is examined to see how he has modified this structure.
NOTES


2 James Reaney, Editorial, Alphabet, No. 1 (Sept. 1960)

3 Dragland, 216.


6 Reaney, Editorial, 3.

7 Reaney, Editorial, 4.


9 Dragland, 219.

10 Dragland, 211.

11 Frye, 163.


13 Lee, 155.

14 Lee, 130.

15 Lee, 130.


17 The following critics mention Reaney's use of Jung, though their discussions tend to be peripheral and superficial.
Jay MacPherson briefly mentions Reaney's attraction to the four-featured soul, but does not attempt to analyze the archetypes on which this concept is based. (Jay MacPherson, "Educated Doodle: Some Notes on One-Man Masque", Dragland 93-94.)

Michael Tait discusses Reaney's use of this Jungian pattern in Colours in the Dark, but he does not discuss this pattern for its own sake. (Michael Tait, "Everything is Something: James Reaney's Colours in the Dark." Dramatists in Canada, ed. William H. New, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1972) 140-44.)

Julia Schneider discusses the fact that Reaney's use of the child archetype allows him to create a mythological level in his plays, but she does not analyze either the archetype itself or the mythological aspect of Reaney's plays. (Julia Schneider, "Negative and Positive Elements in James Reaney's Plays", Canadian Drama 21 (1976): 98-114.)

Brian Parker develops the theory that the Canadian mind is particularty amenable to a modern form of artistic expression which is non-linear and spatial. He feels that the Jungian theory of myth and archetype, as interpreted by Frye, is partially a basis for this expression. He then discusses Reaney's plays in these terms, but does not discuss the archetypes nor Jung's influence on Reaney's drama in any detail. (Brian Parker, "Is There a Canadian Drama?" The Canadian Imagination, ed. David Staines, (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1977) 152-187.)

Ross G. Woodman only once mentions Jung when he acknowledges that any mythological basis in Reaney's work is derived from Jung's theory that the source of myth is to be found in the psyche. (Ross G. Woodman, James Reaney, (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1972.)


18 Lee, 141.
20 Lee, 105.
21 Lee, 159.
22 Lee, 159.
JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES

In many of his early plays for adults which deal with the soul's struggle for maturity, Reaney has used Jungian archetypes as characters. In an article he wrote for Canadian Literature in 1962, he mentions that he used Jung's schematic representation of the human soul as the foundation for his opera, Night-blooming Cereus.

at this time one of the few sentences of literary symbolism that had sunk through to me was Carl Jung's division of the human soul into four parts represented by an old woman, an old man, a young man and a young girl. The old woman is shadowy and terrifying, the old man is wise and helpful; the young man seeks the young woman but cannot find her until he has come to terms with the older pair.¹

In his book James Reaney, critic Alvin Lee says, "It is not difficult to see that, although Reaney's comment was made about Night-blooming Cereus . . . , it underlies the patterning of character in his other fictions."²

These plays usually feature a young male protagonist who is struggling to become an adult. Some major obstacle confronts him which is impeding his progress: Owen is physically ill in Listen to the Wind and Kenneth suffers from a mental disturbance in The Easter Egg. The young man is also pitted against the older generation of parents, aunts, uncles, grandparents, neighbours. Members of this generation who are good and kind are usually weak, ineffectual and unable to help themselves, much less the
young man. Most of the adults however, are self-serving and wicked, and determined, usually for material reasons, to prevent the protagonist from growing up. The boy is held captive in childhood, and the play chronicles his struggle to leave it and reach adulthood.

Other characters appear consistently in these early plays. A sympathetic girl or young woman frequently tries to help the boy. Another woman, usually older and evil, attempts to destroy the boy or retard his progress in some way. She is sometimes aided by a man who does not usually have her brains or cunning but who is equally as wicked. A kindly older man sometimes makes an appearance, given to pithy insightful statements on the protagonist's situation.

These characters, derived from the Jungian archetypes which form the human soul, allow Reaney to portray on stage the inner journey of the soul. According to Jung, the soul meets these archetypes on its journey to selfhood. As characters, they match the characters described by Frye as essential to the plot structure of New Comedy but they have not lost their underlying archetypal quality.

Jung developed the theory that the individual soul meets these archetypes during a process he called individuation. He describes this process as follows:

I use the term "individuation" to denote the process by which a person becomes a psychological "in-dividual," that is, a separate, indivisible unity or "whole."

Individuation is the process by which the individual struggles to become himself.
Individuation means becoming a single, homogenous being, and, in so far as "individuality" embraces our innermost, last, and incomparable uniqueness, it also implies becoming one's own self. We could therefore translate individuation as "coming to selfhood" or "self-realization".

The individual struggles to realize his own unique self as fully as possible.

The process of individuation takes place across the span of an individual's life, and is not finished until death. The initial step in this process, which greatly interested Jung, was the development of the child into an adult. He believed the successful transition from child to adult was crucial to the individuation process.

Individuation is not a conscious process, that is, it is not something which an individual decides to do. Instead, its impetus is unconscious and its motivation deeply rooted in the human psyche. Its power is undiminished by the attitudes or concerns of the individual's conscious mind. It is an impulse as deep as life itself.

Just as the motivation for the process is deep in the psyche, so, according to Jung, are the process's modus operandi. These modus operandi are intimately related to the archetypes, which Jung defines as "archaic or . . . primordial types, . . . universal images that have existed since the remotest times." Archetypes reside in the depths of the human mind at the level of the collective unconscious, a level distinct from the personal unconscious.
Whereas the personal unconscious consists for the most part of complexes, the content of the collective unconscious is made up essentially of archetypes. The collective unconscious, unlike the personal unconscious, is not acquired through personal experience. Instead, it is a second psychic system of a collective, universal, and impersonal nature which is identical in all individuals. This collective unconscious does not develop individually but is inherited.

Jung calls this level of the unconscious "collective", because it exists in all individuals in all cultures at all times. It is not individual but universal. Unlike the personal psyche, it has contents and modes of behaviour that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals. It is, in other words, identical in all men and thus constitutes a common psychic substrate of a suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us.

If the collective unconscious is common to all humanity, then its forms, the archetypes, are also universal.

According to Jung, the process of individuation involves discovering oneself, primarily by exploring and absorbing the contents of one's own psyche. These contents include the archetypes. Because the archetypes are universal, the same ones are encountered by all individuals during this process. A discussion of these archetypes follows. Because all the plays analyzed in this thesis feature a male protagonist, only the archetypes applicable to the male psyche will be discussed.
The first archetype one encounters is the shadow. Jung describes the shadow as the negative side of one's personality. If one has a positive conscious opinion of oneself and does not like to face unpleasant or disturbing facts about oneself, one ignores or discounts anything negative, which is then absorbed in the unconscious by the shadow archetype. The shadow consists of the "dark aspects of the personality." The archetypes of the unconscious are difficult to face and so are usually projected onto the people in the individual's environment. This is not a conscious decision of the individual; instead it is a common device of the psyche. The shadow is usually projected onto the closest male figure. In the case of a young man just beginning on the path of individuation, the shadow is frequently projected onto his father.

The shadow archetype must be incorporated into the structure of the self, for "the shadow is a living part of the personality and therefore wants to live with it in some form. It cannot be argued out of existence or rationalized into harmlessness." For individuation to be successful, the shadow must be faced and accepted.

Accepting the shadow is the first and easiest step in the individual's confrontation with the unconscious. The second step involves a much more difficult archetype, the anima. Jung describes the appearance of the anima:

Whoever looks into the water [i.e. the unconscious] sees his own image [i.e. his shadow], but behind it
living creatures soon loom up; fishes, presumably, harmless dwellers of the deep -- harmless, if only the lake were not haunted. They are water-beings of a peculiar sort.\textsuperscript{14}

The creatures are related to "... a magical feminine being whom I call the anima."\textsuperscript{15} The anima is always a feminine figure, and she is amoral, disturbing, "unconditional, dangerous, taboo, magical."\textsuperscript{16} She lures into life the inertness of matter that does not want to live. She makes us believe incredible things, that life may be lived. She is full of snares and traps, in order that man should fall, should reach the earth, entangle himself there, and stay caught so that life should be lived.\textsuperscript{17}

Such snares and traps can cause much disruption in a man's life, especially if the anima is projected onto an alluring young woman to whom the man is not married.\textsuperscript{18} But the end result can be good, because if the anima is successfully absorbed into the psyche, an unexpected and most satisfying reward appears:

Although she [the anima] may be the chaotic urge to life, something strangely meaningful clings to her, a secret knowledge or hidden wisdom, which contrasts most curiously with her irrational elfin nature. ... behind all her cruel sporting with human fate there lies something like a hidden purpose which seems to reflect a superior knowledge of life's laws.\textsuperscript{19}

The archetype that presents itself after the anima has been confronted and absorbed is that of the wise old man. "This is the archetype of meaning, just as the anima is the archetype of life itself."\textsuperscript{20} This archetype appears only after the anima has been wrestled with successfully.

Only when all props and crutches are broken, and no cover from the rear offers even the slightest hope of security, does it become possible for us to experience
an archetype that up till then had lain hidden behind the meaningful nonsense played out by the anima. The wise old man archetype is "... the superior master and teacher, the archetype of the spirit, who symbolizes the pre-existent meaning hidden in the chaos of life." When one reaches this archetype, one has properly tackled the challenge of individuation. The wise old man bestows understanding and clarity, is both the symbol and the harbinger of peace and acceptance, and signifies the success of the individuation process.

The wise old man also has another function. He completes Jung's four-featured schema of the soul which appeals to Reaney. Jung describes this schema:

The integration of the shadow. . . . marks the first stage [of the individuation process]. . . . The recognition of the anima gives rise, in a man, to a triad . . . . the masculine subject, the opposing feminine subject, and the transcendent anima. . . . The missing fourth element that would make the triad a quaternity is, in a man, the archetype of the Wise Old Man. . . .

The shadow, an opposing feminine figure, the anima, and the wise old man form another archetype. "These four constitute a half immanent and half transcendent quaternity, an archetype which I have called the marriage quaternio." Together they form the structure of the completed self, which is, of course, the goal of the individuation process. "The marriage quaternio provides a schema . . . for the self." Successful individuation involves confronting and absorbing the archetypes, and results in the archetypes
resolving themselves into a symbol of a complete and whole individual.

Jung describes other archetypes which also symbolize a complete self. Reaney makes use of several of them. He uses the child archetype in *The Easter Egg*. This archetype represents the strongest, the most ineluctable urge in every being, namely the urge to realize itself.

The child motif manifests itself most clearly in the individuation process. Jung theorized that the appearance of a child in mythology, dreams or the contents of the unconscious indicated that individuation was occurring.

The child archetype not only indicates individuation, but also a complete self. The child archetype is a symbol which unites the opposites; a mediator, bringer of healing, that is, one who makes whole. Because it has this meaning, the child motif is capable of the numerous transformations . . . it can be expressed by roundness, the circle or sphere, or else by the quaternity as another form of wholeness.

Reaney has used the child archetype in both its recognizable form and in several of its mutations.

Another archetype which appears in Reaney's early plays is the circle. Again, this archetype is a symbol of a whole self.

The circle [is] a symbol of the Self. It expresses the totality of the psyche in all its aspects. . . . It always points to the single most vital aspect of life - - its ultimate wholeness.

The circle is the underlying structure of *Colours in the Dark* and is used by Reaney in other plays.

The Jungian model appeals to Reaney for several reasons. First, Reaney and Jung are both interested in the
same problem: the journey of the human soul through life. Reaney has given dramatic realization to what Jung has merely philosophized about.

Secondly, Jung's schema of the human soul is a schema, and simply for that reason finds a response in Reaney. Someone who finds Frye's careful analysis of literature's underlying myths attractive is very likely to find Jung's attempt to create order in the human psyche also attractive. Both are systems attempting to create order out of apparent chaos. Both stand outside the realm of scientific study. Neither of them allows for empirical verification of their theories. Both rely heavily on mythology and symbolism. Both assume that the universe is not meaningless, and that order and structure can be found.

Thirdly, Reaney finds Jung compatible because Jung does not deal with the everyday concerns and obvious problems of life; he is more interested in spiritual problems. Life's day-to-day concerns are well-suited to realistic or naturalistic drama, but this style of drama does not suit Reaney's purpose. As already discussed, Reaney wants to portray the journey of the soul, a theme which is incompatible with naturalism. His plays are not naturalistic or kitchen-sink drama. They do not reflect the outer world of material reality, but an inner, macabre, magical, mystical world. This inner world is not a chaotic landscape of barrenness or futility, but one with order and
richness. The soul on its journey finds this landscape peopled with the archetypes described by Jung.

The typical plot and characters of Reaney's early plays for adults are the stuff of fairy tales. Cinderella is persecuted by her wicked step-mother and is saved from her wretched life by the handsome prince. The same structure is seen in Sleeping Beauty and Snow White. (The sex of the protagonist is the opposite in Reaney's plays.) He has deliberately chosen fairy tales for his plays, because he is not interested in the stories and concerns which lend themselves to naturalism.

In this choice, he finds another common bond with Jung. According to Jung, fairy tales speak to a deeper, more profound level in the human psyche than is usually touched by common experience and everyday reality.

Myths and fairy tales give expression to unconscious processes, and their retelling causes these processes to come alive again and be recollected, thereby re-establishing the connection between conscious and unconscious.

Because fairy tales reach so deeply into the human psyche, they are the ideal vehicle for describing the journey of the soul. With their unworldly characters and melodramatic plots, fairy tales suit Reaney's purpose and his anti-realism stance.

Fourthly, Jungian archetypes, because they are universal, allow Reaney to attain a universality in his work. Also, because they are forms of the unconscious, the appeal to the audience's unconscious, a level which might
not otherwise be touched. As an artist and a playwright, Reaney finds the archetypes appealing.

Fifthly, Reaney's affinity for Jung stems from the fact that the archetypes are, according to Jung, the source of all mythological stories and characters. (Frye shares this view of the archetypes, though he is more concerned with myths as the source of both the stories and structure of the genres of literature.) If Lee is right that "Reaney has been busy at work consciously constructing his own peculiar myth of the rebirth of the human soul", then Reaney has been conscientious in going back to the ultimate source of mythology.

The myth he is trying to create is a specifically Canadian one. He is not content to use Greek or British models, and for this George Bowering in his article "Why James Reaney is a Better Poet (1) than any Northrop Frye poet (2) than he used to be", praises him. The archetypes allow Reaney the freedom to create his own mythology, because they are, according to Jung, just form with no inherent content.

Archetypes are not determined as regards their content, but only as regards their form. . . . The archetype in itself is empty and purely formal, nothing but a facultas praeformandi, a possibility of representation. . . . The representations themselves are not inherited, only the forms.

This fluidity and featurelessness of the archetypes allows Reaney to use them for his own ends. Their inherent lack of content lets him impose his own content on them. They are
empty vessels into which he pours the particularities of his local Canadian environment.

And lastly, as already mentioned, the archetypes lend themselves to the stage and to dramatic representation. They are looming and one-dimensional, with a larger-than-life quality that is particularly stageworthy. They are without minute human detail in their simplicity and lack of subtlety, and they can attain a majesty which is well-suited to the stage. Reaney has chosen well in using the Jungian archetypes in his plays.
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The Easter Egg is ostensibly a naturalistic play with a straight-forward plot outline; however, some of the characters speak in blank verse and the playwright's interest in symbolism and the fantastic soon becomes evident. Reaney has used Frye's comedic mode as the foundation, and has built upon this elements of the soul's Jungian journey to maturity. The archetypes are discernible in the main characters. The relationship between these characters and the protagonist portrays his maturing process. By the end of the play, the protagonist himself has become an archetype in his own right, symbolizing the struggle for maturity that the play has portrayed.

This play dramatizes the universal ageless fairy tale of the child battling evil and attempting to overcome obstacles which hold him back from maturing. The protagonist, Kenneth, is impeded by his wicked stepmother Bethel, and by his own possible mental illness as well. Bethel is an opportunistic matron who gets ahead by marrying men who then conveniently die. Her first husband was Kenneth's father, who shot himself in front of Kenneth when the boy was six. He left Kenneth and his inheritance in Bethel's keeping until such time as the boy marries; naturally Bethel has no interest in encouraging Kenneth to become an independent adult. She seems to have little cause
for worry because his father's suicide has left Kenneth emotionally and intellectually arrested at age six. He has been unable to learn or progress in any way since witnessing his father's suicide. His behaviour is so abnormal that most of the characters in the play believe he is crazy.

Kenneth is aided by Polly, Bethel's stepdaughter from her second marriage to the Bishop of Montreal. Polly tries to teach Kenneth practical and useful things but she is not noticeably successful in her attempt. She persists because she is convinced he is not crazy, but merely arrested and capable of overcoming his handicap.

On one level the play can be seen as a struggle between a new and old society as in Frye's description of comedy, or between good and evil. These dichotomies are personified by Polly and Bethel as they struggle for Kenneth's soul. Their battle at one point also centres on George, a cowardly theology student who has been dating Polly. Polly and George become engaged, but only because Polly insists on it, George being much too fearful to ever initiate such a bold step. She wants to be married and no better prospects have appeared. During the course of the play, however, Bethel persuades George to marry her. At this point it seems that this evil woman will triumph over all three of them. Then Kenneth regains himself, Bethel's power is broken, and George again becomes engaged to Polly. The soul has matured, the usurper is overthrown, and the new society is born.
In Kenneth's journey towards maturity, he encounters the Jungian archetypes of shadow, anima and wise old man. Reaney has allowed each archetype to be absorbed by more than one character: for example, the anima has been divided between Bethel and Polly. Kenneth's relationship with each character in the play portrays his encounter with and resolution of each archetype.

The shadow is embodied most obviously in George. The stage directions describe George on his first appearance as "...a plump, young, theological graduate. Somehow he is not completely human but a special combination of weakness and shyness and boldness, even cruelty." The weak and cowardly side of Kenneth, his seeming inability to grow to maturity, his fears of life and people, his allowing himself to be dominated by Bethel, are all given expression in the character of George. George has none of Kenneth's redeeming qualities: his otherworldliness, his basic kindness, his visionary and poetic soul. He is Kenneth's dark side, and only his dark side.

Kenneth conquers and absorbs this Georgian shadow. He already vanquished George once when they were children. Both George and Bethel describe the incident, and in neither version does George act graciously. George describes it as follows:

times have sure changed since that time at the picnic when you won the race because I tripped over the tree root and you won the first prize which was the yellow ball and you wouldn't let me play with it afterwards, but then your papa said you were to give it to me and
oh you so sweetly did -- so when I took it they all said how unselfish you were and what a pig I was.2

As Bethel says when she describes the incident: "He [Kenneth] showed up so nice opposite to you."3 Kenneth's sweet and generous nature overcame George in the past.

During the play, Kenneth and George are left alone together. George belittles and mocks Kenneth, thinking that Kenneth cannot possibly understand him.4 Kenneth allows this for some minutes, then finally leaps at George:

Kenneth neatly puts George flat on the floor, then raises the top half of him up and makes George punish himself by taking George's hands and hitting George's face with them.

George is astounded, humiliated and suddenly much more respectful of Kenneth. Kenneth has again succeeded in dominating and subduing the shadow archetype in his personality, dramatized in this confrontation with George. And, at the end of the play when he finally does recover himself, he permanently overcomes his own weakness and immaturity.

Another character in the play who has assumed the role of the shadow is Kenneth's father. His main function is as a force of pure evil, though he does not actually appear in the play. He shot himself apparently because he felt responsible for Kenneth's mother's death in a mix-up over her medicine; however, Bethel accused him of purposely killing her, a conversation Kenneth overheard. But why blow off his head in front of the child? As Bethel says: "His father hated them both. The cruelest thing that man ever
did was to leave the boy alive. It would have been a kindness to take the boy with him and he knew it." This father was no normal father or friend to his child. There is no explanation for why he hated the child or the mother so much, but in killing himself the way he did, he aligned himself firmly with the child's enemies. He is a wicked elder and one of the threats that the child must overcome.

Not only has the father done terrible psychic damage to his child, but he has also delivered the child directly into the hands of the enemy: Bethel. Under normal circumstances Bethel would not be a wise choice as a guardian, but Kenneth's father has given her an added incentive to treat Kenneth badly by giving her control of Kenneth's inheritance until Kenneth marries. By killing himself in front of the child and leaving him in Bethel's hands, the father has done everything possible to ensure that Kenneth will remain childlike, disturbed and unable to progress to maturity.

Being dead, the father is no longer a physical threat. But he has done immense damage to the child, and psychically the child must overcome the father to become free and adult. The universal story of the father dying to free the child to grow up is usually told in some symbolic way. Kenneth's father, however, has obligingly done the job in reality. Now Kenneth must undo the damage the death has done to him. The father has become absorbed into Kenneth's psyche, and therefore can be seen as a shadow figure. Kenneth conquers the father/shadow by the end of the play when he overcomes
the devastating effects of his father's suicide on his personality.

The anima figure in this play is also divided between two characters: Bethel and Polly. Bethel embodies the snares, the traps and the complications of life into which the anima tries to draw the man. But she is not leading Kenneth to himself; therefore, she is less an anima figure than, like Kenneth's father, a figure of evil, the enemy holding Kenneth back from his destiny.

She has wickedly stopped at nothing to try to hold him back for her own selfish ends. When Kenneth's father died, Kenneth was left with nothing but a white kitten and a glass easter egg:

I had to have something if I was going to keep my head above water. No father, there was the kitten; no kitten, there was this [the easter egg].

Bethel got rid of the kitten by killing it, and the easter egg by burying it in the garden. Losing kitten and egg left Kenneth completely in her power: "No this [the easter egg], there was immediately a skin over everything. Bethel's skin." No act was too cruel for her to contemplate to make Kenneth completely subjugated to her.

Bethel can be considered an anima figure because the anima is not, according to Jung, necessarily a morally good figure. Bethel has absorbed the evil characteristics inherent in the anima, while Polly, the other anima figure, is unremittingly good. Polly exhibits none of the
treacherous and dangerous aspects of the true anima figure; these aspects have been absorbed by Bethel's character.

This split of the anima figure into such distinct good and evil personas has resulted in Polly being a powerful force for the good. As such, she believes that "... evil is accidental, love is permanent."9 She is no weakling, and though not as street-wise nor as experienced as Bethel, is a worthy opponent to her. She knows that the dynamics between Bethel and her involve a power struggle and she admits as much when she feels she has lost both George and Kenneth to Bethel's machinations: "I have no power. Even Kenneth betrays me. And George."10 The struggle turns in Polly's favour when Kenneth appears, summoned by Polly playing a cadenza on the piano. Polly then threatens to marry Kenneth, which would result in Bethel's losing control of his estate, so Bethel renounces George and returns him to Polly. Polly has won: she has got George back, Kenneth is free, and she has not had to concede anything to Bethel. Good has triumphed.

Polly fulfills the true anima function of trying to free the soul and lead it to life. She tries to do it by educating Kenneth, trying to teach him language, manners and dancing. She tells him stories, and teaches him how to have polite conversations, to read and to recite rhymes. Kenneth seems to learn only by rote. The significance of what she teaches him escapes him until she tells him the story of Anna Karenina. When he realizes that Anna is going to kill
herself, he interrupts Polly and refuses to let her continue. He wants to change the end of the story, as he will change the end of his own story and not let his own soul destroy itself. He does understand and is absorbing on some level what she is teaching him.

Polly can be seen as the liberating female for George as well as Kenneth. She is luring him into entanglements; for example, into marrying her, something he is too cowardly to initiate for himself, but not something against which he wants to bestir himself to fight. She also frees him from Bethel's clutches, though he is too weak even to know that he ought to want escape from her. She will lead him onward to maturity and life, immature blob that he is, and will awaken him in spite of himself.

Another anima figure is the little girl whom Kenneth sees tied to the fence. She can be seen as a reverse anima figure. She does not free Kenneth; instead, it is he who frees her, when he climbs out the window to untie her. She symbolizes his soul, which he does finally liberate.

The third archetype, that of the wise old man, is not a strong force in the play, but aspects of it appear in Ira, the local doctor. Ira fulfills some of its functions of making sense of life and giving order to the chaos which the anima, in this case Bethel, creates. To this end, he is insightful and very astute at analyzing the situations that arise. He is aware of Bethel's motives and her true character and is not diffident about voicing his opinion.
Like all characters in this play, Ira is not allowed to remain neutral; he is definitely on the side of good. He was at one time very attracted to Bethel and there is a hint that he will be her next husband; Bethel sees a wedding ring in her teacup and immediately, he appears at her door. He still wants Bethel, but is willing to forgo her charms in order to save Kenneth from her. He believes Kenneth is not crazy and can be helped. He has set himself up in opposition to Bethel and her evil intentions, and has aligned himself with Polly as a force for good.

Like the shadow and the animus, the wise old man archetype is divided between two characters. The character of Ira displays some of the wise old man attributes. But, even more than Ira, Kenneth at the end of the play can be seen as this archetype. It is Kenneth himself who finally makes sense of his life and what has happened to him; he has absorbed the functions of the wise old man archetype into himself. A reverse type of relationship has come into play between Ira and Kenneth. One might assume that Ira as the wise old man helps lead Kenneth to individuation, but in fact, Ira describes how Kenneth has played that role for him:

When my brother was still alive, we as students Went with butterfly nets to the woods Around the Big Pond. Kenneth, Kenneth, I looked up to see what my brother saw: It was you. At five years old. Stark naked.... You saw us. You stopped. A naked child With all green light and sun streams about you. You turned and vanished.... And that naked innocent who gave me God....
(my emphasis)
Kenneth has performed a function for Ira which seems more likely that Ira would have performed for him. Ira, however, will reciprocate. He continues:

And that naked innocent who gave me God
Is still lost in the forest and I shall bring him
Back to powerful friends who love him.\(^\text{12}\)

Kenneth also plays this role for Polly. She is reaching for individuation and maturity. She wants to marry George and have children; she does not want to remain in childhood and forgo becoming an adult. Bethel is her shadow and also her enemy. She is the wicked stepmother to Polly as well as to Kenneth; in fact, Bethel even calls Polly "Cinderella".\(^\text{13}\) Polly's animus is George, who is her vehicle to marriage and maturity. But most importantly, Kenneth is her animus and her liberator. It is thanks to Kenneth that she pries George from Bethel's clutches. As he does for Ira, Kenneth performs for Polly a function which Polly has performed for him.

Kenneth is the central soul in the play striving for individuation; he also helps others, especially Polly, in their struggles. Therefore he can be seen as a force for individuation in general, even a symbol of the process itself. In fact, he can be seen as the archetype of individuation, an archetype which Jung calls the "child". This archetype

\text{ represents the strongest, the most ineluctable urge in every being, namely the urge to realize itself.}^{\text{14}}

Kenneth is a powerful embodiment of this archetype which Reaney has used because of its power on the human mind:
"the symbol of the 'child' fascinates and grips the conscious mind".\textsuperscript{15} It appeals directly to the unconscious, and speaks to the depths of the psyche. Jung considers the child motif to manifest itself most clearly and significantly in the process of individuation.\textsuperscript{16}

Reaney underscores his use of this archetype in a myriad of ways; for example, by the image of a child caught in the fence. It is an apparition which only Kenneth and Polly see, and is a moving image of the soul struggling to be free. The child has been tied to the fence by a grouchy neighbour for stealing berries. This wicked old man is similar to Kenneth's father, and like the father, is the enemy. This image of the little girl reverberates with the power of the child archetype. The whole play is embodied in this image: she is caught, struggles to get free, and at the end of the play, does. Kenneth sees her get away, but then she gets entangled again. It is only when Kenneth climbs out the window to cut her free that she is permanently released. She represents his soul, which he himself finally liberates.

Another way in which Reaney reinforces the child archetype is by emphasizing Kenneth's childishness. The adults talk about him as a child. Bethel and George use baby talk to him. His childlike quality is further illustrated by another image which recurs during the play: that of the little naked child running in the woods one sunny afternoon clothed only in a turban made from a silk
scarf. This image emphasizes Kenneth's present childish state, but also hints at his potential to be free again.

Reaney has created in Kenneth a character who exemplifies features described by Jung in his discussion of the child archetype:

the "child" is on the one hand delivered helpless into the power of terrible enemies and in continual danger of extinction, while on the other he possesses powers far exceeding those of ordinary humanity.17

Kenneth certainly is in the power of enemies, Bethel and George, thanks to his father. On the other hand, he seems to have strange visionary powers: he sees the house backwards, he sees the spirit of the little girl, he goes back and forth in time. He has enough strength for Ira to recognize him as a formidable enemy for Bethel, and he helps both Ira and Polly. He is powerful and godlike enough himself to bring Ira to God.

Reaney exploits the child archetype further in the play when he introduces the easter egg. The egg was given to Kenneth by his godmother and was buried in a locked box by Bethel in the garden when Kenneth was still a child. Polly dug it out of the place in the garden where Kenneth was digging when Bethel stopped him. The egg is significant because it is one of the forms which the child archetype can assume. The child archetype is

a symbol which unites the opposites; a mediator, bringer of healing, that is, one who makes whole. Because it has this meaning, the child motif is capable of the numerous transformations ... it can be expressed by roundness, the circle or sphere, or else by the quaternity as another form of wholeness.18
The egg as circle or sphere is a manifestation of the child archetype. It is a symbol of individuation and of the ultimate goal of wholeness.

The symbolic quality of the egg is given a practical expression in the play in helping Kenneth leave his childhood. He escapes from his room where Bethel has locked him, amidst the eerie, unworldly sound of smashed glass, "a formidable, magic sound that should fill the whole theatre." He comes down to the parlour where Bethel and Polly are locked in combat over George. The battle continues. Polly gives Kenneth the easter egg. The sound of breaking glass again fills the theatre and Kenneth has a seizure. He later describes the effect seeing the egg had on him:

it was being circumcised of a tight fold of skin that held you back from ever quite touching anything or being a father or seeing—oh God, it hurt when she gave it to me, . . . . it hurt like a rabbi with a sharp bright silver knife, it cut away Bethel's skin over my eyes and I saw. Seeing the egg has freed him.

The sound of smashing glass is an auditory symbol of Kenneth's liberation. Kenneth breaks the glass window of his room and the hotbed windows when he escapes from his room. The same sound occurs when he sees the easter egg. Polly earlier described her frustration in trying to teach Kenneth:

Sometimes he reaches up to me and I Reach down to him. But our hands touch the glass Of impossibility and you sink back to sleep.
Glass is transparent, but is a barrier. The smashing of glass is an act of freedom, which allows human contact.

He is finally free and ready to be an adult. Polly tries to persuade Bethel to allow him to go to her party, that is, be accepted by her as an adult. Finally Bethel capitulates. She acknowledges that Kenneth is not crazy and requests another place be set at the table for him. He has finally overcome all obstacles including Bethel, and even Bethel has to admit it.

Kenneth's recovery has enabled Polly to become re-engaged to George. A marriage between Bethel and Ira is a possibility; at the end of the play Bethel mentions the ring again. Of these two possible marriages, one member of each pair is somewhat dubious and the other good. These marriages will indeed be a union of opposites: the goodness of Polly and Ira with the wickedness of Bethel and George. Reaney has given dramatic realization to the idea that the child archetype can unite the opposites, is indeed "a symbol of the creative union of opposites". Kenneth's development has allowed the opposites to be united, with evil subdued and controlled in a balance with good.

These two marriages result in the quaternity, the symbol of wholeness and the scheme of the soul. Jung considered a successful marriage to be an excellent indication of maturity, of individuation successfully in progress. This process has been successful in this play. But Kenneth, while he does achieve maturity, is not the one
Polly chooses to marry. She opts instead for George, a mean-minded, mean-spirited weakling. Kenneth seems to remain somewhat outside the human sphere, a little otherworldly and detached, and so does not seem capable of being married. This slightly inhuman quality of Kenneth's is heightened by the fact that he is not only the protagonist but also the archetype symbolizing the individuation process.

Even after his recovery, Kenneth's specialness is indicated by his going back and forth in time. According to the stage directions, Kenneth "directly addresses [the audience] as if we had leapt ahead about two or three years. . . . there should be overlapping of speeches to suggest several layers of time." He suddenly becomes an older, more mature person in the future describing the scene that is being enacted in the play. He is in two times at once, and because he is narrating, the play seems to invert and become his vision, his telling of the story. He supersedes all boundaries and previous definitions of the play and becomes a godlike, controlling force, which emphasizes his unearthliness and archetypal qualities.

At the very end, he changes clothes in the parlour. "How was I to know you aren't supposed to change your clothes in front of everybody in the parlour?" When he is changed and ready to greet Bethel's guests, his feet are still bare. He is almost within the realm of the ordinary, everyday world, but not quite. He remains a very special
person, elevated still above the merely human, the powerful embodiment of all that the child archetype represents.
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LISTEN TO THE WIND AND THE MARRIAGE QUARTERNIO ARCHETYPE

Compared to *The Easter Egg*, Reaney has paid less attention in *Listen to the Wind* to Frye's comedic structure and concentrated instead on the archetypes. The shadow, anima and wise old man archetypes are present, though the protagonist's meeting and conquering them is less well defined than in *The Easter Egg*. Analyzing these archetypes is complicated by the fact that *Listen to the Wind* involves a play within a play, and each character is not only himself or herself, but a player in the inner play. This doubling allows Reaney to explore and play with Jung's four-sided schema of the human soul and to create multiple images of it. The play that results is not as systematically structured as *The Easter Egg* but it allows Reaney to create with the characters themselves an archetype of the soul that Jung calls the Marriage Quaternio. By the end of the play, the anima, shadow and wise old man have been superceded by this archetype.

The basic story in *Listen to the Wind* is the same as in *The Easter Egg*. A young boy, Owen, is growing to maturity but, like Kenneth, faces obstacles which impede his progress. Owen is sick from a physical illness and might die. Unlike Kenneth, he is not fighting a wicked elder like Bethel who is trying to restrain him. But like Kenneth witnessing his father's suicide, Owen has suffered psychic
damage because his heartless mother has left him and her husband and run off with another man.

*Listen to the Wind* takes place in the summer holidays of Owen's twelfth year. His cousins, Jenny, Ann and Harriet, have come to visit him. They decide to put on a play in an attempt to entice Owen's mother home, and choose to act out a Victorian novel called *The Saga of Caresfoot Court*. This novel is a sordid tale of love, betrayal and intrigue, which the children "dream out". Ann describes their acting as:

> Dreaming it out. Imagining. My cousin and I used to call it "the world below" which we can enter whenever we are alone or . . . Listening to the wind. . . .

Each of the children takes a part in the play, and the adults in the everyday world also become characters. This play within the play constitutes the majority of the action that is seen on the stage, though the action shifts back and forth between the present world of the summer holidays with Owen sick and his cousins keeping him company, and the world of the play they act out. There are also occasional flashforwards to moments which occur some ten or twenty years later, when Ann as a grown-up school teacher tells her class about the dreaming out she did as a child with her playmates.

*The Saga of Caresfoot Court* is a melodrama filled with wicked and conniving people who are out only to satisfy their greed or lusts; they think nothing of destroying the lives or happiness of others. Compared to these characters,
Bethel in *The Easter Egg* appears restrained and almost kindly. In the play within the play, Piers, the son of Devil Caresfoot of Caresfoot Court, is engaged to be married to Maria Lawry of nearby Hawkscliffe Hall. Maria is sweet and plain and does not inspire passion in Piers. He falls in love with her beautiful companion Claudia and secretly marries her while still pretending to be engaged to Maria. Claudia finally tells Devil Caresfoot the truth, then gives birth to their daughter Angela and dies. Maria marries a Mr. Brenzaida and gives birth to Arthur.

Piers' cousin Douglas, who also lives at Caresfoot Court, has had a long-term affair with Geraldine, an ambitious young village girl. She kills their illegitimate baby because she does not want to be hindered in her attempts to better her position in life. She marries Edward Eldred, the local attorney.

Piers and Douglas have been rivals for Devil Caresfoot's affections since they were children, and when Devil finds out that Piers has married Claudia, he changes his will. He leaves Piers the house only, and Douglas the rest of the estate. Piers becomes obsessed with getting back his rightful inheritance and devises many unscrupulous plans to make money to buy it back from Douglas.

Angela and Arthur grow up and fall in love. But Douglas wants Angela for his wife and blackmails Geraldine into helping him. They persuade Piers to send Arthur away for a year by promising to get Piers' inheritance back for
him. While Arthur is away, they fake his death and convince Angela that he has died. She marries Douglas and the next day, Arthur returns. He is horrified at her marriage and believes that she has succumbed to a lustful desire for Douglas; he does not bother to inquire further. Angela breaks down at this turn of events. But justice is eventually served: Douglas falls down a well, Piers is torn apart by his starving dogs, and Geraldine tries to commit suicide, but only succeeds in permanently paralyzing herself. Arthur redeems himself at the end, by forgiving Angela and marrying her.

The main play and the play within the play are not sharply separated from one another. For example, Owen's mother arrives to visit Owen after the children have begun to act out *The Saga of Caresfoot Court*, and Owen begs his mother to take over the part of Geraldine from Ann, which she does. In another example, the children pull straws to see if Angela will die. Owen decides later to change the end of the play and let Angela live. The children influence the plot of the play within the play as they wish.

This fluidity of plot of the play within the play is mirrored by a significant indecision in the main play, that is, Owen's illness may or may not kill him. This decision is left up to the director. There are many references to the fact that Owen may indeed be dying.

MOTHER: [to her husband] . . . And inside, you're rotten. The baby girl you gave me died. Now the baby boy is. I want nothing more to do with you.
But there are also many indications that Owen may possibly recover.

FATHER: [My family is] the family that all either dies at seventeen or lived to seventy-five. Generation after generation. I had what Owen has but I got over it. (my emphasis)

At no point in the script is it indicated that Owen will definitely die. The question is asked directly to Ann in one of the flashforwards when she is a school teacher. The answer must be filled in by the director; Reaney has refused to answer it himself:

ANN: It was our cousin who led us in dreaming it out.

CHORUS: (an individual as if in a class at a school ANN is teaching) Did this cousin die, Miss?

We do hear her answer as the thunder of the storm begins. (my emphasis)

Reaney does not give an answer. At this point, the director must decide. There are enough indications in the play both for or against his death that the director can safely choose either answer.

Listen to the Wind is more complicated than The Easter Egg in that it involves not only more characters but a multiplicity of roles. There are numerous figures in the play which could be considered archetype figures. Often, as in The Easter Egg, the archetypes are split and one character absorbs the negative aspects of the figure and another the positive. This schism is so severe that the play within a play begins to resemble a morality play, with evil struggling with good for one soul. The evil characters
are very evil and the good characters are either flawed or weak or alone.

The anima archetype is the most prominent in the play; the shadow and the wise old man play minor roles by comparison. As Harriet says about The Saga of Caresfoot Court, there are "lots of good parts for girls". The anima is split in this play across more than two characters, and aspects of this figure surface frequently during the play in the many female characters.

Owen's mother has absorbed only the negative features of the anima. Like Geraldine, she has rejected motherhood but in a less drastic way. She has not committed infanticide, but she does desert her husband and Owen because it was so painful when her first child died.

MOTHER: ... And inside, you're rotten. The baby girl you gave me died. Now the baby boy is. I want nothing more to do with you.

She utterly rejects motherhood because dying children are too painful to cope with: "I can't stand sickness and death. You gave me two children who died." She is, in her own way, as heartless as Geraldine.

I don't care about Owen. I don't care about my husband. I care a bit about my horses. ... I don't care about myself. In the fall, I'm going away with a friend and by that time Owen'll be dead. If he isn't, he'll never see me again. ... Not only does she leave husband and son, but "She rode off on Dad's best horse too." She ultimately betrays Owen. She is certainly negative, and embodies all the torments the anima can bestow.
Geraldine, the character that Owen's mother acts in the play within the play, is similar to the mother but worse. She is absolutely evil, a destroyer, a murderer of her own baby. If the anima is "the 'Spinning Woman' - Maya, who creates illusion..." then Geraldine certainly qualifies. Using Arthur's ring and Rogue as a corpse, she persuades Angela that Arthur is dead. She sets traps, but like Bethel, she is most obviously the enemy. She does not fulfill any of the positive anima functions.

Owen's cousins are kind, simple children who are supportive and good to Owen. But they are too ordinary to have the capabilities of the anima figure; however, their characters in the play within the play display some of the characteristics of the anima.

Maria, played by Jenny, is simple and trusting. She is betrayed by Piers and fades from the play with no final word after she discovers Piers has married Claudia. She is too ineffectual to exhibit any of the positive aspects of the anima. Though she might lead Piers to maturity through marriage, she is not powerful enough to do this effectively. She does not lure or entice or captivate Piers; instead, she waits dumbly and passively for him to make all decisions.

Claudia, played by Ann, is beautiful and bright, but as trusting as Maria. She puts her faith in Piers, though she sees him betray Maria. She plays the anima more fully in that she does involve Piers in marriage and fatherhood. And
she causes him to face his own misdoings and confront the consequences of his actions.

Angela, played by Harriet, is, like Polly in *The Easter Egg*, a true force for the good. She is beautiful, intelligent, loving and loyal.

GERALDINE: As to her person, Angela Caresfoot is one of the most beautiful women I have ever seen. As to her character, she is deep as the haunted well at her father's house and is as filled with strange springy fantasies and musings combined with a simple forgiving innocence. She is kind in that she springs open the traps her father has set and puts Geraldine's dead baby's soul to rest by kissing the doll which contains its bones. She is the epitome of womanly perfection.

She plays the anima to Arthur, and does indeed lead him to maturity. When they first meet as children, she wrestles with him and overcomes him. Later, he is overcome emotionally by her when he falls in love with her. She leads him to marriage and adulthood. Though he temporarily loses her when he leaves for a year and she marries Douglas, he finally does forgive and marry her.

The anima figure in this play differs from the anima in *The Easter Egg*. In *Listen to the Wind*, the anima slips out of the neat limits which are so clear in *The Easter Egg*. Sometimes it is completely assimilated by the sinister characters. Sometimes it fulfills the positive functions, but when it does, it is not focussed on one male character only. It is fluid and elusive and more difficult to describe than in *The Easter Egg*. 
The anima's effect on the protagonist is problematic, because the protagonist is not always the focus of either the play or the play within a play. Though the central character is Owen, his part is small in the overall action of the play. The part of Arthur, which he plays in the play within the play, is small too, especially when compared to Angela's. Geraldine describes Angela as "a woman . . . immeasurably above the man on whom she has set her affections." He does not seem worthy of an anima's efforts. The play within the play is Owen's dream, "I can almost see them as I lie here," so it is hard to dispute the fact that he is the central character. But his minor part in the action of either play means that the figure of the anima dominates the action without having a strong central male character on which to focus. Also, because it is impossible to know if Owen survives, it cannot be definitely said that the anima figure has fulfilled its proper functions.

The shadow figure is easier to describe, partly because it is a simpler archetype and partly because the male characters are less dynamic and complicated than the female characters. The most obvious shadow figure is Owen's father. He is basically good, but sickly and weak and unable to help his son. Unlike Polly in *The Easter Egg*, the father cannot be considered a powerful force for the good. He has given his wife two children, one of whom is dead, and the other possibly dying. His wife describes his weakness:
Just look at you sitting there with that silly little grin and the curls. Too weak to raise your arm. Well, raise your arm. Ah, you see, you can't even raise your arm.¹⁴

He lacks passion and force, and is much less able than Arthur to make decisions and take action. He cannot even bestir himself into a rage over his wife's desertion:

HARRIET: Well, if I were your father I'd go over to him [the man with whom the mother has run off] and beat him up and drag her back. By the neck.

OWEN: Father agrees with you. But he says . . . he just hasn't got the temperament for it. He would like the horse back though.¹⁵

He is pathetic in his inability to care much about his wife's desertion.

As Owen's shadow, he embodies Owen's sickliness. Because the decision to let Owen live or die is left up to the director, it is impossible to say from the script if Owen succeeds in conquering this shadow figure. Depending on the director's decision regarding Owen's fate, the father is either the conquered or the conqueror. The fact that the father is still alive indicates that Owen may be able to overcome his hereditary sickness. As a child, Owen's father had what Owen has, but got over it. He thus slips out of the Jungian definition of the shadow, and becomes a figure of hope that Owen will live.

The characters Piers and Douglas can be discounted as the shadow archetype. They are played by Mitch, the caretaker of the nearby church, and Tom, a neighbour's boy, who do not have large parts in the main play. Piers and Douglas are disreputable characters, but are less vital and
compelling than the women characters. Their rivalry is important in the play not for its own sake, but as a vehicle for allowing the battle of wills between Geraldine and Angela to occur. Their relationships to the women are more important than their functions as shadow figures to the protagonist.

The character who could be considered a shadow figure to Arthur is Rogue, who is the son of Douglas and Brenzaida's younger sister. He looks like Arthur, but is stupid, simple and easily led. He becomes an unwitting pawn in the Geraldine and Douglas plot and plays Arthur's corpse. As the shadow of Arthur, he embodies Arthur's weakness, his gullibility and inability to see evil when it looks him in the face. At the end, Arthur's acceptance of Angela indicates that he has overcome this negative side of his own personality.

Arthur himself can also be considered a shadow figure to Owen. He is a weak and pale character, who is self-centred and gullible. When it seems as though evil has finally conquered Angela, Arthur is willing to believe it. He stupidly gives up the ring he promised Angela to keep and so begins the chain of events that leads to Angela's marriage to Douglas. He then believes that Angela has betrayed him. He is similar to Owen's father in that he is basically good, but completely ineffectual. Because Owen's fate is unknown, Arthur also remains either conquered or unconquered. His final dance with Angela can be seen as
either the marriage dance, celebrating individuation finally accomplished, or his first dance with the figure of death.

The wise old man archetype in *Listen to the Wind* is virtually non-existent. Neither Owen nor Arthur at the end of the play comes close to attaining the stature that Kenneth does in *The Easter Egg*. The father is too feeble to be considered.

Of the remaining male characters in the play, even those who are not completely weak or completely evil are suspect. Dr. Spettigue, who looks after the sick Owen, plays Devil Caresfoot. With such an ill-favoured name, he seems more like a vision of death, especially because he shaves his beard, which is an omen of Owen's death. Mr. Glendenen, the Vicar, is an simple old fool, advising as he does that the terrified Angela return to her conniving father at Caresfoot Court.¹⁶ He is hardly the wise old man archetype, a fact further emphasized by the stage direction: "He could be played by the same actor as played Devil Caresfoot, but without beard."¹⁷ It is hard to agree with Alvin Lee when he says: "Taken all together, Mr. Taylor [Owen's father], Dr. Spettigue, and Mr. Gleneden might conceivably add up to one wise old man."¹⁸ Only one old man appears in the play: "a disreputable but vaguely gentlemanly-looking violinist"¹⁹ who plays music to which Angela and Arthur dance just after they have agreed to the year's separation. Given the violinist's appearance at this
inauspicious moment, he cannot be considered the wise old man archetype. Like Spettigue, he seems a portent of doom.

As far as the child archetype is concerned, Owen does not bring it to life as does Kenneth. This archetype is not as significant in *Listen to the Wind* as it is in *The Easter Egg*.

Another archetype, the quaternity, is much more prominent than any of the above mentioned archetypes. The number "four" figures constantly in this play. There are four children who dream out the play:

CHORUS: Listen to the Wind! Once there were four grownups who helped the four children listen to the wind.  

Their most important props are "four chairs" which become Caresfoot Court, Hawkscliffe Hall, etc. Four genii appear at Claudia's death:

Perhaps also the four giant shadows of the four genii appear looking down at the dawn they have made.  

They reappear at the end of the play when Arthur and Angela dance at Arthur's betrothal party:

The dance continues and the giant shadows of the four genii lean over the dawn they have made.  

And most importantly, the children listen to the four winds as they dream out their play.

The number four is also significant in the numerous pairs of pairs in this play, especially in the play within the play. Douglas/Geraldine and Piers/Maria are paired together at the beginning; Geraldine/Elfred and Piers/Claudia eventually get married; Douglas/Geraldine try
to destroy Arthur/Angela. These pairs become more complicated in the main play as each couple in the main play is physically the same couple and a different couple in the play within the play.

These pairs of pairs or groups of four are significant as the Jungian schema for the structure of the soul. The male/female groups form the marriage quaternio archetype of the soul. As discussed in connection with *The Easter Egg*, "the circle (or sphere) [is] a symbol of the Self. It expresses the totality of the psyche in all its aspects."\(^{23}\) The circle and the square differ in that "roundness (the mandala motif) generally symbolizes a natural wholeness, whereas a quadrangular [square] formation represents the realization of this in consciousness."\(^{24}\) Reaney uses the number four and constructs the four-person soul structure to create a symbol of the conscious realization of the self.

The play within a play portrays a dream which Owen's soul is dreaming -- in fact, not only dreaming, but also living. This dream or play within the play portrays one soul, and its fragmented pieces that break apart, come together, reform and disintegrate. It portrays the life of a soul in motion through life, with the archetypes as lively and vital and changeable as the soul itself. Thus, the characters take on many different roles, slip in and out of themselves, mirror themselves and others, form pairs and triplets and quaternities with fluidity like a watery kaleidoscope in a multitude of different patterns.
The soul portrayed is not simplistically good. It contains all human emotion and experience. Lust, greed, betrayal and evil are present, as are passion, love, tenderness, forgiveness and fidelity. Reaney has said that the play is "a symbol of a mind." But it is more than that; it is a dramatic presentation of a soul, and Reaney has portrayed it by skillfully using Jung's archetype of the marriage quarternio.
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Compared to *Listen to the Wind* and *The Easter Egg*, *Colours in the Dark* seems little more than a confused jumble of disconnected scenes. Reaney does not obviously use Frye's comedic structure and the archetypes are not easily found. The central figure is apparently not an individual, threatened boy struggling against a wicked mother figure and his own inherent weaknesses. He emerges only sporadically and in numerous incarnations. No specific female figure or kindly older man comes to his aid. But on closer examination, both the comedic structure and the Jungian structure do emerge, and a definite form controlling this collection of seemingly unrelated scenes emerges. This form is circular and archetypal. Like the child and the marriage quaternio archetypes, the Jungian archetype of the circle symbolizes a complete psyche. It is this archetype which finally dominates the form of the play.

This play presents a multitude of characters who each have different roles. The six main characters, Pa, Ma, Gram, Gramp, Son, Niece, are known only by the names of their positions in a family. Their roles are not divided between a main play and a play within the play as in *Listen to the Wind*; instead, these characters assume any number of roles. The cast list begins:
PA plays the Father, the Hero, the Schoolmaster, the Executive etc. 
MA plays the Mother, the Lawyer, the Announcer, the Wind Lady, the Girl at the boarding house, the Rich Young Lady etc.

There is no consistency in the roles they assume. For example, the father character does not always play an older man; he sometimes plays the child to the son's authority figure.

This play lacks the obvious plot structure which is evident in both The Easter Egg and Listen to the Wind. There is no readily distinguishable cause and effect sequence. Instead, a series of short, apparently disconnected scenes are presented with a bewildering array of different characters. Reaney presents a hodge-podge of scenes in a conscious attempt to create a theatrical "play box".

I happen to have a play box and it's filled with not only toys and school relics, but also deedboxes, ancestral coffin plates, in short a whole life. When you sort through the play box you eventually see your whole life, as well as all of life. . . . The theatrical experience in front of you now is designed to give you that mosaic-all-things-happening-at-the-same-time-galaxy-higgledy-piggledy feeling that rummaging through a play box can give you.2

He has created an apparently disorganized structure for the play with this goal in mind. In his note from the original production, he states that the play is the story of

a person growing up, leaving home, going to big cities, getting rather mixed up and then not coming home again but making home and identity come to him wherever he is.3

Through the seemingly confused structure of the play, his purpose is revealed.
And, eventually, a structure in the play surfaces which is identical to the structure in *The Easter Egg* and *Listen to the Wind*. The theme of a young boy struggling to reach adulthood, facing enemies and adversity, finally emerges. Pa emerges as the protagonist, but because the play does not show him consistently as the protagonist, but as many different characters, any sense of him as an individual is lost. He is not a specific character, nor an embodiment of an archetype as is Kenneth, nor the mind/soul which contains the play as is Owen. He is an everyman figure who lacks particulars, embarking on the universal journey to maturity.

The rest of the characters are also general characters. They are not one or two specific characters but many, and they are types, not true individuals in the sense that Bethel, Mrs Taylor, Geraldine, etc. are. These characters are interchanged amongst themselves: for example, the Gran and Gramp, and Ma and Pa characters play children and vice versa. This lack of specificity also applies to the enemy figures: the bear, the school master, Dr. Button, the landlady of the boarding house, Lady Death, etc. Reaney is trying to present a general view of individuation as a universal human experience instead of a process confined to only one or two characters, as in *The Easter Egg* and *Listen to the Wind*.

To this end, the characters in the play take on many different roles:
Two night-shirted Ma and Pa figures appear and prepare for bed. They are played by GRANDMOTHER and GRANDFATHER.4

Another example is "FATHER and SON here play young boys just about twelve."5

Reaney explains in a stage direction why he has chosen to allow his characters this multiplicity:

These two parts are played by the MOTHER who brought out the birthday cake and the BOY whose hand proclaimed him a Poet some day -- actually the scene took place years ago between the GRANDMOTHER and the FATHER when he was sick with the measles at about ten years of age. The whole play is going to be like this -- six actors playing many different roles -- suggesting how we are many more people than just ourselves. Our ancestors are we, our descendants are us, and so on like a sea.6

He explains again in another stage direction:

dimly we remember that a man is both his father and his son; everyone is a multiple character.7

Allowing his characters to slip in and out of roles and generations creates confusion in the audience as to who is who and when they are who, but Reaney is trying to create a sense of the individuation process occurring constantly in all people.

Like the characters, the incidents in the play are also unspecific. Cause and effect between scenes is minimal; continuity at first glance seems non-existent. The play is divided into two acts of 21 scenes each. It is further divided into seven segments, each segment describing one experience or specific stage or aspect of individuation. Each segment includes from two to nine scenes.

The first four scenes of the play identify the thrust of the play, that is, that a life is to be described. The
play begins with a birthday party, a celebration of the beginning of the father's life. The father is blindfolded and tries to guess the colours of objects by touch. He says he will tell how he became proficient at guessing colours in the dark: he then describes a scene which took place between the grandmother and him years ago. This scene is enacted by the mother and boy. Like Owen, this boy is sick. He must stay in a darkened room until he recovers. Because he will go blind if he sees the light, he decides to colour in his colouring book in the dark.

He begins his colouring in the dark and a dream or the story of a life begins. It is the boy's dream of his own life, his vision of the future. It is also the story of the father's life as he tells it to the children gathered around him at his party. Reaney reminds us in a stage direction later in the play, "... this started with a Man remembering his life, being initiated into finding some pathway through it."\textsuperscript{8}

The archetypes usually associated with individuation are minimal in this play. The anima can be seen in Bible Sal, who has a faith which the son does not. He asks Sal to teach him to believe like she does. She is unable to, and in fact lacks most of the power and drama of the anima figure. She is not alluring nor does she entangle the protagonist, marry him or provide him with insights. As an anima, she is weak and unsatisfactory. None of the other female characters can be considered an anima, though some
can be considered an enemy figure — for example, the Boarding House Lady.

The wise old man archetype can be seen in the Mr. Winemeyer/Hermit character. This character bequeaths to the Son his artistic heritage by giving him a piece of a falling star. But though this character does help the boy, he is not a strong or dominant force in the play.

The shadow archetype is the most obvious and appears in the bear, the School Master and Dr. Button, who can also be considered enemy figures. Each of these figures is conquered, but they seem to represent aspects of the external world with which the child must come to grips rather than facets of his own personality which he must subdue and absorb.

The archetypes are much less well-defined than in either The Easter Egg or Listen to the Wind, and in keeping with the thrust of the play, are generalized, non-specific and constantly changing. They do not focus on one individual and are not individuals themselves. In this way, they emphasize the multi-levelled generational theme.

Not content with dramatizing the process of individuation for human beings, Reaney has attempted to describe an all-encompassing process in which many other animate and inanimate entities participate. Each segment in the play portrays aspects of the human process and includes other individuating beings. In a short speech at the beginning of each segment, the mother recites a list of
things which are included in the segment: for example, the planets, the names of flowers and butterflies, the days of the week, the letters of the alphabet, songs and hymns. The days, the letters and the planets progress through the segments in order: for example, Sunday, Alpha and the sun are included in segment one, Monday, BCDE and Mercury in segment two, etc.

The process of individuation is also applied to the Bible, which Bible Sal works on copying throughout the play. At the beginning of the play, she has copied the book of Genesis and says that she will go on to do the rest. As the play progresses, so does she. The play is like the Bible; Sal is like the author/playwright. The process of individuation in each is mirrored by the other.

This similarity of Bible and play is emphasized by the fact that both are divided into two parts. The beginning of Act II relates the story of the Hermit who died Friday, then rose again Saturday. "Can't quite make it to Sunday." In this way, Act II mirrors the New Testament, but it does admit its lesser position. Like the Old Testament, the first half of play is more universal, mystic and ancient. The second half of the play deals with more immediate concerns. The story of mankind is told in the Bible and is being retold in the play.

Mankind's mother and father appear in the play in the scene where Gram and Gramp find the snake in their bed while Durer's picture of Adam and Eve is projected onto the screen
behind. The individuation of the human race begins in this scene dramatizing mankind's loss of innocence and the beginning of trouble in paradise. The individuation of mankind is indicated again by Tecumseh, who takes the children to meet their own ancestors. He is an ancestor in spirit to these children of European heritage and he invokes their ancestors by chanting the names of the European boats of the immigrants.

From the ancestors of all of mankind to the ancestors of Canadians, Reaney then proceeds to the ancestors of individuals. Several times in the play, a verbal and physical pyramid is constructed describing the number of parents and grandparents that one child has. "And it takes a lot of people to produce one child." He then proceeds to the history of the immediate family, especially the three generations which cross and recross each other in the play. Reaney ironically describes what he is doing in the play in the following speech:

SON: I'm not so fond of Chicken Pie... it has hardboiled eggs cooked in it. I think that's going too far. Sort of cooking the child with the mother you know." (my emphasis)

The sense of the multiplicity of people, of the multiple layers of generations within one individual is given added strength by this portrayal of the individuation process through generations.

As well as mankind in general and the generations, Reaney also portrays the individuation process of the country.
Dimly we realize that not only are we going through the hero's life and stories he heard as a child, but we are going through Canada's story -- glacier and forest, also the world's story.  

He begins Canada's story with the Gram's description of the ice age. She remembers when our world was underneath a glacier, then it melted and coniferous trees were the first to come back. Then came the deciduous hardwoods and they're still pushing the fir trees farther and farther north.  

The battle between the coniferous and deciduous trees is enacted by two teams of children who battle each other using branches as swords.  

The human history of the country is also described. Tecumseh appears, representing the native inhabitants; the history of the conflict between Indians and Europeans is mentioned. The European heritage is evoked by the chanting of the names of the boats which brought over the European settlers. The Hermit's cement sculptures are of famous figures in Canadian history: for example, John A. Macdonald, Louis Riel, Mackenzie King. The modern era is recognized by the mention of the Walt Disney film *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs*. A connection between past and present is made in the scene showing Gramp and Gram as an Indian and Britannica on the Toronto coat of arms. A "series of philosophers, teachers such as Frye and McLuhan" is shown on the screen. The individuation of the country continues up to the present day.
By the end of the play everything that Reaney can possibly include in the play has gone through the process of individuation. The scene returns to the birthday party and the story of the child colouring in the dark for 40 days. As in Listen to the Wind, there is an indication that the play has been only a child's dream. In this final segment, which includes someday, Omega, and the Earth, the child is allowed to take his bandages off. "MOTHER: The Spring has come." The year, the child's life, the individuation process begin again.

The ending of the play leads back to the beginning. This circular structure can be seen in Jungian terms as the archetype of wholeness and completeness. The "circle (or sphere) [is] a symbol of the Self. It expresses the totality of the psyche in all its aspects." The play itself is complete, as is the individuation process. The soul of the child has become whole and the child is able to go forward to live his life. This life which has just been presented on stage, has been well lived and the process of individuation has been completed. The purpose of both play and protagonist has been fulfilled. The final scene enumerates the number of ancestors it takes to make one child and the cycle begins again. While Reaney has not concentrated on the archetypes which normally are most important to the individuation process, he has made good use of the archetype which both symbolizes the purpose of his play and provides its ultimate form.
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Reaney has found the Jungian theory of the archetypes helpful in his attempts to dramatize the human soul's journey to maturity. He has used Jung's four persona scheme of the soul, as well as the child archetype, shadow, anima, wise old man, marriage quaternio and circle archetypes. The characters he presents on stage display the attributes of several of these archetypes and the plays themselves take on an archetypal form.

In *The Easter Egg* the Jungian structure of the soul is presented in nearly perfect form. The anima, shadow and wise old man archetypes can be seen in the characters of Bethel, Polly, George, Kenneth's father and Ira. Kenneth at the end of the play becomes the child archetype which symbolizes both the process of individuation and its successful completion. It also reconciles opposites, portrayed in the play by the marriages of the good and evil characters.

In *Listen to the Wind*, the archetypes are less important than they are in *The Easter Egg*, and have become blurred and harder to distinguish. The structure is looser than in *The Easter Egg*, but is still evident. The main difference is the play within the play which allows Reaney to create a doubling effect as each character is not only a character in the main play but also in the inner play.
Reaney has taken the Jungian structure of the soul and, using the multitude of characters, played with it to create numerous multiple images of the original. These characters as a group also become the marriage quaternio archetype which is in part the structure of the play. This is the archetype of the soul which is created by Owen's dream. This dream is the play within the play, and a dramatization of Owen's soul. The focus in this play is larger and more encompassing than one character as in *The Easter Egg*.

In *Colours in the Dark* the archetypes are only minimally evident in the characters. Instead, the structure of the play itself assumes importance. It is circular. The end leads to the beginning; the life that has just been told as a story is about to begin. The play's structure creates the archetype of the sphere, which symbolizes wholeness and the individuation process completed.

The final archetypes in all the plays symbolize wholeness and the complete soul, but a progression is evident in Reaney's use of them. In *The Easter Egg*, the individual character has become this archetype, that is, Kenneth has become the child archetype. In *Listen to the Wind*, a group of characters has become the marriage quarternio archetype. In *Colours in the Dark*, the play itself has become the sphere archetype. The archetypes have become larger, less individualized and more encompassing.

Reaney wrote *The Easter Egg* in 1962, *Listen to the Wind* in 1966 and *Colours in the Dark* in 1967. He then took a
long hiatus from playwrighting because he became obsessed with the story of the Donnellys, a family in Biddulph, Ontario, who had been murdered by their neighbours. When he returned to writing plays, it was to dramatize the Donnellys' story.

He was no longer interested in the journey of the soul. These characters cannot be considered the archetypes encountered by the soul as it progresses through the inward landscape, and all the ramifications of the characters as these archetypes are lost. They don't make miraculous recoveries, dream dreams of their souls, or live out their whole lives in fantasy and on stage at the same time. They are much more individualized, detailed and human. Reaney has become more interested in the characters for their own sakes and not for their symbolic qualities representing the soul's journey to maturity.

He now wants to portray living people, a "real" story, so real in fact that it actually did happen. He is no longer interested in fairy tales or children's stories. The individual story of the incomplete soul has lost its appeal. The souls in *The Donnellys* are already intact. They have an ultimate strength which is completely formed and unmalleable, though it is constantly being tested.

The fantastic and otherworldly have become much less important, though the mythological level remains. Reaney is still trying to create his own myth, but in *The Donnellys*, the myth is now particularly Canadian, based as it is on an
actual incident in Canadian history. It lacks the fairy-tale quality of the early play. Instead of imposing a fairy tale on a Canadian locale, Reaney has allowed the locale to present him with the story. He is seeking to create a Canadian hero of mythological proportion by using facts and personalities that are immediately available to him as a Canadian.

Like *Colours in the Dark*, *The Donnellys* is in the form of short vignettes. The vignettes in *The Donnellys* portray specific incidents which actually happened to actual people, unlike in *Colours in the Dark*, where the incidents are generalized experiences of the young person growing up. In both plays, the actors play a variety of characters. In *The Donnellys*, however, most of the main characters have actual names, and are not the vague, non-specific characters that appear in *Colours in the Dark*.

This new involvement in the external world makes *The Donnellys* play not only much more realistic, but also more theatrical. Reaney's least Jungian play is less fantastical but also more stageworthy. Possibly the seductive world of the archetypes and the production of well-crafted plays are an incompatible combination for Reaney.

A progression can be seen in Reaney's development as a playwright. As his focus and purpose has changed, so has his use of dramatic devices. As his plays become more stageworthy, he leaves behind the inner world of mysterious characters and treads more earthy ground where the people of
everyday life are to be found. As a result, his plays have become more accessible to the theatre-going public. Ronald Huebert praises Reaney for making this leap from the archetypal world to the realistic world as evidence of his maturing as a playwright, though he sees the schism to be between the lyrical world of the poet and the more hard-headed world of the dramatist.¹

Though Reaney may write more successful plays within the realistic mode, his use of the archetypes allowed him to portray on stage the difficult combination of the inward journey of a soul and the happy resolution of the comedic structure. The task he set himself was difficult and the results may have been flawed, but he ingeniously used the archetypes as an imaginative solution to a perhaps impossible problem.
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