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"A plant which is to be brought to the fullest possible unfolding of its particular character must first of all be able to grow in the soil wherein it is planted."

Carl Jung, Psychological Types

Archetypal Patterns in Ibsen's Hedda Gabler

Henrich Ibsen is often described as a social dramatist. In many of his plays, the focus is on such issues as the rights of women, a theme in A Doll House (1879), or illegitimacy, which is a major concern in The Wild Duck (1884). Ibsen shocked his audiences by his frank treatment of such social themes. In Ghosts (1881), a son suffers because of the venereal disease that he has inherited from his father. Because of its daring theme, the play could not be performed in the Scandinavian countries, and its first performance was in Chicago.¹

By calling attention to social issues, Ibsen reminded his world that its prudish attitudes were really hypocritical because it pretended that the realities of life did not exist. In nineteenth-century Norwegian society, appearances meant more than realities, but through his plays, Ibsen
forced people to see life's truths behind bourgeois society's pretentious exterior. He felt that it was the poet's task to "see" life and to convey his vision in such a way "that whatever is seen is perceived by the audience just as the poet saw it." Thus, in an Ibsen play, the characters must confront life as it is, not as they would like it to be or as society dictates it. In essence, Ibsen presents his characters with all their foibles laid bare. In his drama *Hedda Gabler* (1890), the confrontation with life's realities proves too shattering to the delicate psyches of Hedda and Eilert Lovborg, and they are destroyed by it. Such strong characters in desperate situations force audiences to "see" sharply the truths that Ibsen is trying to promulgate.

Today, Ibsen is also known as a master theatrical craftsman for he is responsible for many exciting innovations. For example, his characters speak everyday language rather than the "flowery" speech of the nineteenth-century stage. Even in *Peer Gynt* (1867), a romantic drama, the language is straightforward and unadorned. In 1856, while stage manager at a theater in Bergen, Ibsen threw out the old convention that actors should face an audience while saying their lines and instead made them face each other. Because he was not solely in charge of the theater, Ibsen could only block the actors' stage positions, not direct them in their interpretation of roles. Rather he tried to
"suggest the development of personality by changes in costume."³ Later, in his prose dramas, "Ibsen discarded asides, soliloquies, and other nonrealistic devices, and was careful to motivate all exposition."⁴

Also concerned with stage settings, Ibsen's ideas in this area were quite novel. He "discarded two-dimensional perspective scenery and introduced three-dimensional scenery with walls and solid properties."⁵ In The Wild Duck (1884), the drafts of the play show detailed plans for the doors."⁶ In addition, Ibsen was an early proponent of gas illumination in the theater because, being adjustable, it could set moods for action and characterization (this is very evident in Hedda Gabler). In his concern with technique, Ibsen was not just trying to be clever. Rather he wished "to break free from old theatrical forms and to achieve dramatic truth—the artist's pursuit of technique was an ethical struggle as well."⁷

In his pursuit of dramatic truth, Ibsen did more than explore controversial social issues and initiate novel theatrical techniques. Although there is no doubt that he changed radically the insipid, melodramatic theater of his time into one which in modern times is exciting and thought-provoking, Ibsen's contribution to art is an even greater one than that. He is a great dramatist because he is also a fine psychologist. Many years before Freud and Jung had advanced their theories about the unconscious or
hidden self, Ibsen was also examining the so-called "dark" side of the human psyche. As early as 1845, when he was only seventeen years old, he wrote an essay entitled "On the Importance of Self-knowledge." Later in his career, while he was portraying the outer world of bourgeois Norwegian society, he was also presenting characters who were confronting their inner selves in order to act according to their own inclinations so that their lives would be fulfilling. Ibsen, like an ancient poet-prophet, has a keen understanding of the psychological makeup of his characters and discerns that they have certain personality weaknesses that will lead ultimately to their destruction. In his plays, especially his later ones, the characters will often allow social standards and customs to interfere with their attainment of true selfhood, or what Carl Jung calls individuation. In short, the characters are not free to live their own lives as they see fit.

Ibsen's plays are full of negative comments about Scandinavian society and of Western European culture in general. One of these negative values is scientific postivism which states that all knowledge is limited to observable facts. Virchov, a nineteenth-century anatomist, said that there was no such thing as a soul since he could not find one when he cut up cadavers. Flouting such trends, Ibsen believed in a soul and stated publicly that he did. In a review, he once said that an author should
understand 'how to give his work those undertones which
call to us from mountain and valley, from meadow and shore,
but above all from within our own soul.' As I have
suggested, Ibsen believed that man's soul is a free soul.
He also thought that politics and bourgeois morality hamper
a person's search for the soul or inner, free self. For
example, he was disturbed by the politics that caused the
Franco-Prussian War of 1870, and to see the "Prussian
'state machinery' and repression turn men into numbers and
subject the world to tyranny." Because of the war, Ibsen
believed that modern civilization was doomed and that
politics and the implements of war were the sole victors.
For him, 'What really matters is the revolution of the
human spirit,' a revolution that is fought in his dramas by
freedom-loving characters such as Hedda Gabler and Eilert
Lovborg.

As for the prevailing bourgeois morality, Ibsen
despised it and attacked it in his plays. In Pillars of
Society (1877), the protagonist, Bernick, uses lies and
betrayal for the sake of social appearances and loses his
integrity at least for a while. Ibsen, however, does not
want to destroy society; he wants only to reform it. In
the climax of Pillars of Society, Miss Hessel, Bernick's
sister-in-law, tells him that "The spirit of truth and the
spirit of freedom--they are the pillars of society." In
addition, Ibsen felt that society could only be improved if
each individual would be 'true and faithful to one's self.' In fact, the individual was always his prime concern rather than society as a whole.

Ibsen also believed that the artist has a special obligation to reeducate society away from its materialistic ideas and towards more spiritual ones. In 1864, he wrote to King Carl XV of Norway, and told him that he, Ibsen, had a 'life mission' to Norway which was 'to awaken the nation and lead it to think great thoughts.' Although Ibsen was not a formally religious man and thought that organized religion was yet another of society's "pillars" that lead to inauthentic selfhood, he nevertheless felt that "his own talents and what they drove him to create were gifts from a supernatural power; with them came obligations and responsibilities that forced one to answer the call." He was like one that Jung describes: "The artist is not a person endowed with free will who seeks his own ends, but one who allows art to realize its purposes through him ... he is 'collective man'--one who carries and shapes the unconscious, psychic life of mankind."

As Ibsen pursues the inner voice of mankind through his art, certain patterns emerge from his unconscious. These patterns are composed of symbolic manifestations of primordial images called archetypes. The archetypes themselves cannot be perceived directly, but their symbols often appear in dreams, visions, abnormal states of mind, and in
works of art. The way we recognize archetypal symbols is through their universality and timelessness. For example, for all time, and in all places, the "hero" myth has been an archetypal symbol.

In *Hedda Gabler*, archetypal images are evoked through all the characters but especially through Hedda and Eilert Lovborg. These two figures symbolize the archetypal feminine and masculine psyches respectively. Hedda and the other females embody aspects of the Great Mother archetype; whereas Lovborg and the other males symbolize the different facets of the archetypal hero. In addition, Hedda and Lovborg are on a quest; unlike the heroes of old who hunted for dragons and missing treasures, their quest is for the real treasure of selfhood, the Jungian individuation. Before their search is ended, however, they must conquer the "dragons" within themselves. These inner forces or "dragons," are also archetypes which Jung calls the *animus* in a female, and the *anima* in a male. These figures represent the opposite sex in a person's psyche and until they are conquered, or at least recognized for what they are, people can have no peace. By her self-inflicted death, Hedda Gabler may have found the only way that she could escape from her *animus* figures. As for Lovborg, he would not have gone to Mademoiselle Diana's "place" if his *anima* women, Hedda and Thea had not driven him there by putting overpowering pressures on him.
Ibsen could not possibly have known about modern psychological theories since he wrote *Hedda Gabler* in the 1890s, and the works of Freud and Jung were only published in the early twentieth-century. Yet in this play and others, such as *The Wild Duck* (1884), *The Lady from the Sea* (1888), and *When We Dead Awaken* (1899), Ibsen uses many archetypal symbols found in myths, geometric forms, and in natural surroundings such as mountains, forests, and the sea.

Although the concept of archetypes is an ancient one and goes back to Plato and his innate "ideas," it was Carl Jung, the Swiss psychologist, who most clearly defined the meaning of the concept. He called the archetypes "universal images that have existed since remotest times." Moreover, they are contained in the unconscious psyche of every human being, and are therefore "collective." The "collective unconscious" is not one's personal unconscious that "consists of contents which have at one time been conscious but which have disappeared from consciousness through having been forgotten or repressed." Rather the archetypes or contents of the *collective* unconscious have never been conscious and are not "individually acquired, but owe their existence exclusively to heredity." In addition, they are, like instincts, involuntary manifestations. They order the life of the psyche as instincts order the life of the body. In other words, archetypes are instincts of the mind.
It also should be mentioned that when archetypal contents become conscious in the form of symbols each one "takes its colour from the individual consciousness in which it happens to appear." 21

Jung once said that "The practice of art is a psychological activity." 22 As Ibsen creates his art, primordial images come to the fore, and each archetype "stirs us because it summons up a voice that is stronger than our own." 23 The artist unconsciously reaches for an image, brings it to conscious present-day values, "thereby transforming it until it can be accepted by the minds of his contemporaries according to their powers." 24 In Ibsen's case, archetypes often arise in the form of myths. He employs certain myths from his own Nordic heritage. For example, he uses the Valkyrie spirit of bellicose courage in such female characters as Hedda of Hedda Gabler and Hilde Wangel of The Master Builder (1892). Ibsen also uses mythological figures from classical antiquity. From Lovborg-Dionysus to Hilde-Diana of The Master Builder, figures from classical mythology emerge from the creative imagination of the Norwegian poet-dramatist.

Ibsen did not use mythological images arbitrarily. At first, in his early saga-like verse dramas, he tried to arouse the Norwegian people to nationalism by telling tales of the Vikings. Later, however, his purpose was psychological. By calling his characters "trolls," "Diana," and
"Dionysus," and showing Hedda Gabler yearning for a young man with "vine leaves in his hair," Ibsen wishes to make his audiences aware that human beings, like gods and goddesses of old, also have their dark, primitive, erotic side. Ibsen also evokes the archetypal symbols of nature such as the sea, the mountains and the fjords of his native Norway. These symbols, as well as the ones from myth, are used by the playwright to probe the nature of the human soul.

In the provincial world of small town Norway, people gave little attention or outward recognition to the animal side of their nature, but Ibsen reminded them that they not only possess such a nature, but they should freely express it. Ironically, he used ancient mythical symbols to downgrade the prudish morality of his own time. Besides making people look inward, the heroism of the old gods supported Ibsen's contention that even in modern times, his plays are "capable of expressing his sense of the heroic potential that exists even in modern man." 25

Yet Ibsen was no radical reformer; in fact, he was rather conservative politically, and in his plays such as The League of Youth (1868), and Pillars of Society (1875), he castigates both the left and the right, respectively. 26 What he really wanted was that each person be able to realize his or her selfhood, free from social and political restraints that hamper individuation. He once said in a
letter to a friend: 'It is quite immaterial whether our politicians bring about isolated reforms if they do not achieve liberty for the individual.'

Although he lived away from Norway for almost thirty years, Ibsen, through his characters, still acted as if he was struggling against the pettiness of its bourgeois culture. Like James Joyce, Ibsen castigated his society from afar. Yet one wonders if Ibsen whether near or far from his native environment ever came to terms with his own inner self. Perhaps, like Hedda and Lovborg, he could only strive for happiness without ever attaining it: 'Our whole being is nothing but a fight against the dark forces within ourselves.' He felt that when one looked within: 'A goblin is lurking in the depths.'

One can perceive Ibsen's struggle especially in his later plays which are very autobiographical. Sometimes he uses female characters to reflect his own thoughts. Indeed some of them, such as Hedda Gabler and Rebecca West are rather masculine. In Lady Inger of Oestraat (1854), Lady Inger, like Ibsen, is "a spokesman in the debate over Norway's cultural independence," She also reflects the despondency that Ibsen felt over a recent unhappy love affair. Again in Hedda Gabler, he projects himself onto a female character. He and Hedda even share a distaste for flowers. They both are also fascinated by the dark, sexual side of the psyche; yet neither one of them can come
to terms with his or her own sexuality. Ibsen's biographers, Halvdan Koht and Michael Meyer both say that he had a certain reticence about sexual matters. Although Ibsen had several romances with young women, his biographers claim that these liaisons were probably platonic.

Ibsen often evoked the archetypal image of darkness both in his plays and in his poetry. He once wrote a poem, "Afraid of the Light," in which he tells of the 'demons of daylight,' and 'the clatter of life'; the last two lines forecast Hedda Gabler's intentions, which of course she carries to fruition: 'If ever I perform a deed/ It will be a deed of darkness.' Hedda liked the dark side of life and so did her creator. Michael Meyer, the writer of Ibsen, a 1971 biography of the playwright, relates that a Norwegian psychologist, Dr. Arne Duve has argued that Hedda represents Ibsen's "repressed and crippled emotional life." They both ran away from life and could only experience it vicariously. In any case, Meyer thinks that if Hedda is a self-portrait of Ibsen, it is "almost certainly an unconscious one." If one agrees with the Jungian hypothesis that people project their own hidden masculinity of femininity on the opposite sex as anima or animus, then the idea that some of Ibsen's female characters are self-portraits is a valid one.

If Ibsen's anima projections reflect his female side, the males in his plays also project part of his personality,
that is, his own male sexual identity. He once admitted that his character Brand 'is myself in my best moments.' In *Peer Gynt* (1867), he parodies his own nationalistic daydreams. In *The Master Builder* (1892), Halvard Solness is another self-portrait; the playwright once described him as 'a man who is somewhat related to me.' In *Hedda Gabler*, "Lovborg stands for Ibsen's emotional self, Tesman for his intellectual self." Finally, through all his characters, both male and female, Ibsen went through his own individuation process. It is as if he, as creative artist, let loose all the dark forces within his psyche, but in a healthy way, through his art.

It may be true that Ibsen's characters are projections of his own psyche, but Hedda, Lovborg, and others are also their own persons with their own set of problems. For example, Hedda's father was a general, and that fact is significant in her psychological development or lack of it, yet it has nothing to do with Ibsen's own life as some other facets of her character do. Even if they are partly Ibsen's self-portraits, and reflect his inner psyche, they also have their own set of archetypes, peculiar to themselves. Both Hedda Gabler and Eilert Lovborg are symbols of the feminine and masculine archetypes. In these characters, however, some aspects of each archetype are stronger than others. For example, in Hedda the destructive
part of the feminine archetype is more prevalent than her maternal phase.

Geometric forms are often used as archetypal images. Often these forms symbolize the complete person or Self which is the "most important and central of archetypes."\textsuperscript{40} The Self incorporates all parts of the human personality, the conscious and the unconscious, the bad and the good, the masculine and feminine natures that are contained in every human psyche. Below is a drawing of a circle that shows the Yang-Yin principle which represents the wholeness and unity of the Self as it combines masculine and feminine elements. In relation to \textit{Hedda Gabler}, this diagram is important because in the play, masculine and feminine distinctions tend to overlap in certain characters. It is also useful for the discussion of this play, to know the archetypal principles of each sex.

c. Yang-Yin: a Chinese symbol representing the union of the opposite forces of the Yang (masculine principle, light, activity, the conscious mind) and the Yin (female principle, darkness, passivity, the unconscious).
Besides the Self, geometric forms may also symbolize other archetypes. In his book, *The Great Mother*, Erich Neumann uses a circular schema to illustrate the different aspects of the feminine character or Great Mother archetype:
In *Hedda Gabler*, the psychological makeup of Hedda and the other female characters may be expressed through referral to Neumann's chart. All their psyches are seen in terms of mythological feminine figures such as Demeter, or "Good Mother," the creative side of the feminine personality; Hecate, the "Terrible Mother," or destructive facet of the archetype; and Sophia, the "Wise Woman," or inspirational aspect of the female nature. Diana-Artemis and Athene, the virginal goddesses, are not on the chart, but Neumann discusses them in relationship to the chart. All these embodiments of the eternal female character are shown through myths and folklore throughout history and prehistory as in the classical Greek stories told about them. The mythical figures enable us to grasp psychological truths symbolically, their stories giving "form to countless typical experiences of our ancestors." In other words, the ancient deities have the same foibles and problems as modern people do. They are, in their tales, like actors and actresses on the stage, for they too serve as surrogates for people to express their innermost feelings vicariously. Through his characters in *Hedda Gabler*, Ibsen presents symbols of the same archetypal figures who appear in the ancient myths. Like the people in myths, the characters on-stage are somewhat larger than life in their excesses and sins.

The masculine characters in *Hedda Gabler* may also be seen in terms of mythological figures. In this play,
however, there are not as many facets of the masculine archetype shown as there are of the feminine. As in all plays, the protagonist is usually the most "rounded" or many-faceted character in the play. As Hedda Gabler is the central figure in this play, she is the most complicated character. In *The Master Builder*, Solness is the protagonist and he has several facets of the masculine archetype in his personality. Nevertheless, the men in *Hedda Gabler*, do have certain primordial traits that are associated with the masculine archetype. First, there is the Apollonian male who is devoted to order and learning. Although Tesman is only a pedantic scholar, he still represents that side of the male personality. He has no inner life, and is simply the representative of the so-called "light" world of the patriarchate. Brack, on the other hand, is also in the bourgeois world, but really not of it. His deviousness, however, covers up his true wicked and licentious behavior. He is essentially a devil or "trickster" figure. In between Tesman and Brack, is Eilert Lovborg who is a combination of the Apollonian and sensual worlds. He is someone who stands between "gods" and "devils." In other words, he is a true man.

Besides their own two complicated personalities, Hedda and Lovborg have powerful *animus* and *anima* archetypal figures. Hedda has two male figures who control her actions: her dead father, General Gabler, who is the
rational, patriarchal, and societal force in her life, and Eilert Lovborg who represents the dark, Dionysian aspect of her psyche. In essence, Hedda is torn apart as she tries to reconcile these two aspects of her nature.

In Lovborg's case, he has three anima images who are: Hedda, Thea, and Mademoiselle Diana. Hedda and Diana stand for his sensual side, Diana symbolizing the extreme form of that aspect; she is also the "Circe" or extreme form of the feminine archetype (see Neumann's chart, p. 12). Through her, Lovborg becomes totally depraved. Thea Elvsted, by contrast, is his spiritual anima; she is the woman who guides him in the ways of responsible behavior.

In Neumann's schema on p. 12, Hedda Gabler fits at least three aspects of the archetypal feminine expressed in mythical terms: Demeter, the "Good" Mother or creative aspect of the female personality, Diana, the chaste and paradoxically fertile goddess, and the aforementioned Hecate, the evil or "Terrible" Mother facet of the feminine psyche. Of course, Ibsen did not realize that his female protagonist was like the ancient Greek goddesses, but he did realize that he was creating a complicated woman who probably represented millions of other women who were dissatisfied with their lives. In essence, Hedda has certain traits that have always been present in the feminine psyche.
It may be difficult to see Hedda Gabler as a "Good" Mother or Demeter symbol. After all, Hedda not only destroys herself, but also her unborn child. She hates flowers, the symbols of fertility, and quickly removes most of them from her home.\(^{45}\) Hedda, however, is a contradictory figure for she talks frequently about "vine-leaves," and is attracted to Lovborg, a Dionysian figure who imbibes the juice of the fertile grape. While drinking, he also enjoys, at Mademoiselle Diana's "place," the pastimes that go with his alcoholic binges.

Despite her interest in Lovborg and his lascivious adventures, however, Hedda detests her fertility as manifested in her pregnancy. She is also very jealous of Thea Elvsted, not only because Lovborg may be romantically interested in Thea, but also because Thea, a former schoolmate of Hedda's, has wavy, abundant hair, a fertility symbol that Hedda herself lacks. In short Hedda has ambivalent feelings about fertility. However, whether she likes it or not, she is "fertile."

Demeter, the symbol of the "Good Mother" archetype, is a goddess of death as well as of life. In his chart (p. 12), Erich Neumann shows that "rebirth" is one of Demeter's characteristics. However, there cannot be a rebirth without a death. In the natural world of Demeter, the corn-goddess, there is a cycle of birth, death, and rebirth, that is, things in nature are in a constant state of change.
When speaking of archetypes, Neumann calls this state of change the "transformative" character of the archetype. In contrast, the basic, static, and nourishing aspects of the archetype are called its "elementary" character which is that "unchanging part of the feminine which predominates in motherhood."  

Hedda Gabler's personality belongs to the "transformative" character of the "Good Mother" aspect of the Great Mother archetype (p. 12). Hedda is always restless and changing; she is never satisfied with the status quo. She admits that she is bored, and Brack points out why this is so: "You've never experienced anything that's really stirred you" (p. 256). His statement is not quite true, for Hedda does get "stirred" by things, only she is unable to act on her emotions because she lacks courage and fears scandal.  

In her own way, Hedda, like the "Good Mother" archetype is creative. She loves to play her piano and marries George Tesman simply because he shares her "passion" for the elegant Falk house. By her constant desire to improve her social situation through the acquisition of butlers, horses, and fine houses, Hedda shows that she longs for a better life, and that wish is itself a creative sign. Where Hedda fails is that she does not realize that material possessions alone do not insure happiness.
It is through Eilert Lovborg that Hedda really tries to be creative. She tells Thea why she is interfering in Lovborg's life: "For once in my life, I want to have power over a human being" (p. 217). To relieve her boredom, Hedda has found a reason for living and that is managing Lovborg's life. Through an assertion of power, Hedda finds a sort of fulfillment, but it is not a wholly satisfying experience for missing still is any sort of love and as Carl Jung states: "Where love is lacking, power fills the vacuum." As Hedda soon finds out, power is no substitute for love.

Whether Hedda is right or wrong in pursuing power, it still must be said that the urge for power is a productive force: "a manifestation of natural energy, the creative force of the world play, shaping and dissolving form. It is the life process itself, in which the human experiences its own nature, its vitality and motivation. Life is power at play, Shiva or Dionysus dancing." Hedda hopes that she can make Lovborg die "beautifully" and thus she will have power over him. Once more, however, Hedda's plans go awry, and he dies accidentally in a brothel brawl. In the end, Hedda has power only over herself and she uses it.

As Edward Whitmont states, "Aggression cannot be gotten rid of. It is absolutely necessary for survival and a basis of ego strength and self-confidence." As Hedda fails to release her aggressive and creative energies in the outer world, she redirects them inwardly on herself. She at last
does something that she wishes to do, that is to die with
courage in a manner that she has chosen. She is finally
free from a life that she hates. Through her suicide, she
evidently experiences what Whitmont defines as a "primal
ecstasy of annihilation of self or others for the sake of
renewal, the rapture of merging in the oceanic mystery of
the maternal nonself."51 In Hedda's mind, to die
"beautifully" is much more creative than being a mother.

Ibsen himself believed about women that: "1. They are
not all made to be mothers."52 He also believed that they
lacked the courage to assert themselves in any other
direction; as he says of Hedda, "But she lacks courage.
Her thoughts remain theories, ineffective dreams."53 Nora
Helmer of A Doll House (1879), is another mother who turns
her back on motherhood. Both she and Hedda Gabler first
have to find themselves as persons before they can deal
with society's demands. Nora does find her true self, but
Hedda only arrives at self-realization at the end of the
play. She finds the courage that Nora has simmering within
herself all along. Hedda's tragedy is that she did not
listen to the inner voice of her real Self, a person's most
important archetype. As Jung says, "Archetypes were, and
still are, living psychic forces that demand to be taken
seriously, and they have a strange way of making sure of
their effect."54 Yet even though Hedda Gabler did not heed
the callings of her inner self until the end of her life,
she still has unfulfilled creative aspects to her character. Her aggression, her quest for power, her muted but real sense of beauty, and her dynamism and urge for change clearly place her in the category of the "transformative" character of the "Good Mother" phase of the Great Mother or Archetypal Feminine.

On Neumann's chart (p. 12), Hedda also fits another aspect of the feminine archetype, that of the virginal goddess, Artemis-Diana who, in some cultures, is also a fertility goddess. Artemis is not shown on the chart but Neumann says that she belongs to "The A+ pole of inspiration." In mythology, Artemis is also a goddess of the hunt. Although in Hedda Gabler, Ibsen gives the huntress role to the unseen character, Mademoiselle Diana who is "a mighty huntress of men" (p. 281), Ibsen's Diana is more like the mythological Circe who lures men to their doom. On the chart, the Ibsen Diana character corresponds to the negative transformative character, A- or "drunkenness" aspect of the Great Mother archetype.

Hedda, however, fits Artemis's chaste aspect. There is something very prudish about Hedda's attitude when she agrees with Judge Brack's wry observation about how upset she would be if someone looked at her legs (p. 252). The goddess, Artemis, was also upset when Actaeon watched her bathe and that indiscretion cost the young man his life. Of course, Hedda also points her pistol at Lovborg and Brack
but dares not kill them because unlike Artemis, she must live in society and as she states: "I'm--much too afraid of scandal" (p. 267).

The fear of scandal keeps Hedda very chaste, and she is only able to view life vicariously. Years ago, she and Lovborg sat in front of her father and looked at magazines but in reality, talked about Lovborg's adventures as a carousing libertine (p. 264). Hedda is always a viewer or voyeur of life, never its full participant. Even in the last scene before her death, she peeks from behind a curtain to have a final look at the world (p. 303). Hedda's fear of life keeps her as chaste as the goddess Artemis.

Artemis and Hedda Gabler have other traits in common besides their chastity. When Hedda got married and no longer rode horses, she still had her music and returned to it by playing her piano. So too did Artemis: "When weary of the chase she turned to music and dancing; for the lyre and flute and song were dear to her." The goddess and the woman also share a love for weaponry. Artemis hunts animals with bows and arrows; Hedda frightens her human "prey" with her pistols. Because her husband George cannot give her the material things for which she married him, Hedda angrily leaves him and goes off to "play" with her dead father's pistols (p. 247). Thus, Hedda with her weaponry, terrifies George, Lovborg, and Brack. The pistols give her power over the men in her life which, as a woman, she would not
otherwise have. Although Athena is the traditional goddess of warfare, Artemis-Diana is also revengeful and belligerent. Like her literary counterpart, Hedda Gabler, Artemis is easily offended, and is "quick to resent injury to her sacred herds or insult to herself."

Ibsen has aptly named his heroine, for Hedda means "strife" in German.

Still another connection between Hedda and Artemis is their love for animals. Hedda loves horses, and after she is married, misses not having one. Artemis also loves her hinds which accompany her on her hunting forays. There is a kind of primitive, earthy wildness about both the goddess and Hedda Gabler. This is manifested by their frenetic movement through life. Diana is: "the swift-rushing goddess" whose "gleaming arrows smote sea as well as land." Hedda is also wildly kinetic when she has one of her brutish tantrums, "Hedda moves about the room, raising her arms and clenching her fists as if in a frenzy" (Stage directions, p. 231).

The conception of Hedda as a horsewoman reminds one of Plato's idea that man's reason is the driver of his passions which are symbolized by horses. In other words, in Plato's ideal (and patriarchal) world, the mind or reason is in charge of the animal instincts that are always ready to "run" out of control. Hedda does try to be in control of her basic instincts as Artemis is in "her role as ruler over the unconscious powers that still take on animal form in our
dreams--the 'outside' of the world of culture and consciousness." But Hedda Gabler, unlike Artemis, is really not in control of her unconscious life. Since she became Hedda Tesman, she lacks control over any phase of her life, conscious or unconscious. The loss of her beloved horses symbolizes her present lack of control over the things that concern her, such as how she should use her time, or how she can keep clear of an interfering relative like Aunt Julie. Hedda is no longer the skillful horsewoman, but now is like a dismounted rider on a battlefield, wandering aimlessly around in circles. By their rapid motion, the horses also symbolize the "transformative" character of the archetypal feminine which is by nature, kinetic and changeable. When she lost her horses, Hedda also lost some of her verve.

Another role that the two fictional women share is that they want males to be sacrificed to them. In this manifestation of the Great Mother archetype, exemplified by Artemis and Hedda, the "Great Goddess as a goddess of the hunt and of war is for males a goddess of death. She magically dehumanizes the men and transforms them into wild beasts." By goading him into drinking, Hedda turns Lovborg into a wild beast, just as the goddess Artemis turned Actaeon into a wild beast. In ancient Crimea, there existed a people called the Tauric Cheronese who worshiped a goddess "who was later identified with the Hellenic
Artemis and who was honored by blood sacrifices. All strangers who were shipwrecked on the coasts of Tauris were sacrificed to her. In Hedda Gabler, Hedda wants Lovborg to sacrifice himself for her sake. She would really like to die herself, but since at first she lacks the "courage" for suicide, she wishes Lovborg to serve as her scapegoat or sacrificial victim. Hedda, unlike Diana, is a failure in her attempts at male sacrifice because the "ritualistic" death that she plans for Lovborg fails to materialize since he dies accidentally and ignominously.

It is ironic that although Diana is the goddess of fertility, and Hedda perhaps unwittingly evokes such fertility symbols as "Dionysus" and "vine-leaves," neither of these feminine archetypes desires maternity for herself. Hedda not only kills her own child, but she also destroys the symbolic "child," the manuscript that Lovborg and Thea have created between them. The goddess Diana also killed someone else's children. Once when she was in a fit of temper, she and her brother Apollo murdered Niobe's children. In the matter of death, Diana, the patroness of a speedy and painless death, must have been watching over her earthly counterpart, Hedda Gabler, who at last found the courage to escape from an unhappy existence through a quick suicide.

As Carl Jung has stated, "Like any other archetype, the mother archetype appears under an almost infinite variety
of aspects." Although Hedda Gabler has many positive qualities, the negative or "Terrible" Mother aspects of her character predominate in the play. On Neumann's chart (p. 12), this aspect of the Great Mother archetype is presented as M-, the mother of the death mysteries. Hedda, like the archetype, has a tendency to destruction and meanness that overcomes any fine feelings that she might have. Furthermore, Hedda recognizes her underlying cruelty but does not know what to do about it. When Judge Brack chides her for being nasty to Aunt Julie, Hedda replies: "Well, it's--these things come over me, just like that, suddenly. And I can't hold back. Oh, I don't know myself how to explain it (p. 254). Of course, as archetypal image of the negative mother, Hedda would naturally detest Aunt Julie's constant "mothering." Furthermore, Hedda displays her aversion to her husband's aunt by a verbal attack on the old lady's hat (p. 229), and this is the rudeness for which Brack scolds her. In addition, by her attack on the hat and her pretense that it is the maid's, Hedda shows the Tesmans that she considers herself their social superior.

On the Neumann diagram (p. 12), the goddess Hecate represents the "Terrible Mother" aspect of the Great Mother archetype. Hecate is associated with darkness, death, and destruction and like Artemis, she is a moon goddess, but "Goddess of the Dark of the Moon, the black nights when the moon is hidden." Like Hedda, and the person in Ibsen's
poem (see p. 9), Hecate is also "associated with deeds of darkness, The Goddess of the Crossways, which were held to be ghostly places of evil magic." 69 Like Hedda Gabler, Hecate is a horsewoman, and "in Hesiod she is counted the patron goddess of riders." 70

The "Terrible Mother" or Hecate also appears in German mythology in the form of the Valkyries who go to battlefields and decide "at Odin's bidding who should win and who should die." 71 The brave Viking dead are then brought to Valhalla, the great hall of heroes. Orley I. Holtan thinks that Ibsen used the Valkyries as models for several of his female characters, and in Hedda Gabler, "the destructive element is clearly predominant." 72 Hedda fits the Valkyrian pattern because she tries to persuade Lovborg to die a heroic death, but her efforts are in vain since her "hero" dies most unheroically.

Fig. 40. HECATE
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Mother Goddess in her devouring aspect as earth, night, and underworld. 73
Unlike other goddesses, there are not many specific legends about Hecate. She is primarily known as "guardian of the gate of Hades," and as moon goddess is the sender of lunacy, the "moonsickness." Many of Hecate's symbols fit Hedda Gabler quite well. Three of these symbols are the torch, the whip, and the dagger (see figure 40 on preceding page). The torch is Hecate's instrument that guides people to the underworld as when Demeter was searching for her daughter, Persephone. Because fire is destructive, it is also symbolic of her role as the destructive "Terrible Mother." Erich Neumann sees the torch and fire as symbols of the libido or animal instincts, and the making of a fire as analogous to the sexual act, "with the fire arising, or rather being born, in the feminine wood." Hedda is also connected with fire symbolism for she not only burns Lovborg's manuscript, but she threatens to burn off Thea's hair because she thinks, erroneously, that Thea and Lovborg are lovers (p. 271). Hedda is also frequently found either near the stove or tending it (p. 276). This stove-tending suggests that she is stirring up her hidden, sexual, and destructive instincts and feelings.

Hecate's symbol of the whip is another indication of her role as the "Terrible Mother" archetype. It is also a symbol of her cruel, beastly nature as horse goddess. Hedda too is a horsewoman, but since she no longer has a horse to beat, she "whips" human beings with her venomous tongue. As
an instrument and symbol of death, Hecate's dagger finds its echo in Hedda's loaded pistols.

Like Hecate, Hedda Gabler is also a creature of the night and darkness. Although Judge Brack decorated her house while she was on her honeymoon, the house could not have suited Hedda's personality any better if she had planned the décor herself. Its colors are dark and gloomy as befits a goddess of the night. Hedda herself prefers the shade (p. 229). Even her skin is "pallid" and "opaque" which is a sign that she is not exposed to the sun very often. In Act IV, she wears a black dress because of Aunt Rina's death, but the dress also foreshadows her own death and Lovborg's. Aunt Juliana recalls Hedda horseback-riding with her father, General Gabler, and wearing a "long black riding outfit, with a feather in her hat (p. 222), a description that recalls Hesiod's description of Hecate as noted by Jung (p. 23 of this paper). Hecate and Hedda both evoke a picture of a witch riding her "night mare."

Finally, the feather in Hedda's riding hat, by its delicacy and impermanence suggests life's fragile and fleeting quality and thus foreshadows Hedda's death.

Ibsen's autumnal setting is another portent of impending doom. The "yellowed" and "withered" leaves persage not only the coming winter but also Hedda's death and that of her baby and Eilert Lovborg. The falling leaves also remind us of the "falling" nature of tragedy
itself as Northrop Frye has shown in his book, *Anatomy of Criticism* in which he classifies tragedy as "The Mythos of Autumn." 77

Even Hedda herself is cognizant of "the odor of death" in the old Falk mansion which is now her home: "Ugh--all the rooms seem to smell of lavender and dried roses . . . . It's like a corsage--the day after the dance (p. 255). Ibsen's dance metaphor really symbolizes a dance of death as he uses it three times to signify or foreshadow death: First, when Hedda tells Brack that she had danced herself out, and her time "was up," a thought that she recognizes as ominous (p. 251). Next, in the aforementioned lines about the Falk house, and lastly, when she plays a "dance" melody on the piano just before she dies (p. 303).

There is little doubt that Hedda Gabler has many of the traits of the "Terrible Mother" aspect of the Great Mother archetype; Hedda's *modus operandi* is to destroy. She ruins people's feelings, reputations, possessions and lives. Yet Hedda, as noted previously, does not know why she is so vicious and realizes that her actions are uncontrollable. If she can have that modicum of self-awareness, perhaps she is as Holtan suggests, "a potentially creative force that has become aborted." 78

Hedda's cruel conduct stems from the fact that she acts compulsively rather than rationally. In other words, her actions come unbidden from her unconscious mind that is
controlled, in Jungian terms, by an archetype called the \textit{animus}. This \textit{animus}, as I have explained, is the male side of the female psyche, which is sometimes projected onto an outer male figure. The \textit{animus} figure and even its outward projection is not necessarily negative. Sometimes a woman's \textit{animus} "can turn into an invaluable inner companion who endows her with the masculine qualities of initiative, courage, objectivity, and spiritual wisdom."\textsuperscript{79}

In Hedda Gabler's case, however, her \textit{animus} figures possess her, and she is like someone who has in their personality "a strange passivity and paralysis of feeling, or a deep insecurity that can lead almost to a sense of nullity."\textsuperscript{80}

Her fixations are so strong that she has no idea what her own true feelings are.

Hedda is possessed by two \textit{animus} projections: one, the lesser of the two is that which is cast on her former suitor, Eilert Lovborg; the other, a stronger and more important one is that of her dead father, General Gabler. Hedda is never really free to be herself because she is always trying to emulate either Lovborg's "beauty," or her father's "power." Her father also left her with a strong sense of social propriety. Because of her \textit{animus} figures, Hedda has no feelings towards her husband and his family, which includes her own unborn child. She does not seem to have any feelings at all except for her father, and to a lesser extent for Lovborg. No one and nothing else really
matters to her, and she sees herself as having no creative qualities whatsoever except for "boring myself to death" (p. 256). And she does. When everyone rejects her after Lovborg's death (except for Brack and his indecent proposal), Hedda has, according to her lights, nothing else to do but end her life.

Hedda's weaker animus figure is projected on her former suitor, Eilert Lovborg. She and the writer seem to have genuine romantic and sexual feelings for one another both now and in the past. To Hedda, Lovborg is like the ancient Greek god Dionysus who loved drinking and sexual orgies. Ibsen aptly named his character, for "lov" means "leaves" in Norwegian. The idea of leaves may also have occurred to Ibsen because of "the fall festivals held by the Scandinavians in Rome." The leaf image also hearkens back to the motif of autumn as a death symbol.

Through Lovborg, Hedda realizes a vicarious kind of sexual fulfillment. Because the fear of scandal prevents her from fully indulging in sex, Lovborg becomes her sexual surrogate showing her, through his stories, a forbidden world of sensuality. In short, he is the animus projection of Hedda's inner, suppressed desires. He can be recognized as a figment of Hedda's unconscious because when his true personality emerges, as he urges Hedda to become more serious with him, she rejects his entreaties. She has no desire for a real relationship with Lovborg; she simply
wants to cling to her fantasies about him. In other words, Hedda does not know the real man, only her projection of him. For his part, Lovborg recognizes that Hedda has a suppressed "hunger for life" but he cannot determine why she rejects her true self until he finally realizes that she is "a coward at heart" (p. 265). Therefore, although Hedda has strong emotional ties to Lovborg, she wants him to kill himself (she cannot kill him for fear of scandal and because she lacks the courage to do the deed), so that through him she can "kill" her own repressed sexual nature.

The cause of Hedda's squeamishness concerning sexual matters stems from her second and stronger animus figure, that of her father, General Gabler. Dr. Marie von Franz, a close associate of Carl Jung makes the following psychological hypothesis:

Just as the character of a man's anima is shaped by his mother, so the animus is basically influenced by a woman's father. The father endows his daughter's animus with the special coloring of unarguable, incontestably "true" convictions—convictions that never include the personal reality of the woman herself as she actually is.82

For Ibsen, and indeed for most of the characters in the play, Hedda is never Hedda Tesman but always Hedda Gabler; as the playwright explained, 'In this way I have wished to suggest that as a personality she is more to be considered her father's daughter than her husband's wife."83 And Hedda
is her father's daughter because she scorns her inner sexual and feminine nature in order to be like him.

First, she is very aggressive, behaving like a general who is about to attack the enemy. This trait is shown by her browbeating of Thea Elvsted, and her pushing herself between Thea and Lovborg in order to destroy their relationship. Hedda also tries to keep her husband's aunt away from her, but the old lady, a resolute woman like Hedda, is not disposed of so easily. As noted before, Hedda acts aggressively towards Lovborg by goading him into carousing and away from higher pursuits, such as his writing. She even tries to push him into suicide, but again her aggressive behavior backfires. Hedda's marriage to George Tesman is itself a result of her bold pursuit of him because she thought that he could provide her with the luxuries that she enjoyed when her father was alive.

Secondly, since a general's real business is killing the enemy, Hedda, by emulating her father, also deals in death. Her father's pistols are symbols of the "deadly" aspect of her animus projection. Hedda often relies on violent solutions to her problems. Not only does she urge Lovborg to kill himself, but she herself "kills" his manuscript, the "child" of his and Thea's collaboration. Even her pulling of Thea's hair is a kind of murder. Hedda's "warlike" temperament eventually leads to her own destruction and that of her unborn child.
In any army, a general is a powerful person. Hedda's animus makes her seek power too. The search for and maintenance of power is Hedda's third and most powerful projection. At first she thinks that material possessions will bring her this power, but she soon finds out that even if they do, this is not what she really wants. For example, she tells Brack that after all the trouble that she went through to possess the famous Falk house, she does not care for it after all (p. 255). In another quest for power, Hedda proposes a political career for her husband, a career for which he is totally unsuited, according to Brack. George is the instrument by which she hopes to regain the power she once had as her father's daughter. However, he proves to be an ineffectual instrument in her quest.

Social position is another way that Hedda tries to maintain power in the community. That is why she is so afraid that scandal will undermine that position. Yet again, as with Lovborg, Hedda is acting according to her animus projections and not according to what she herself feels. This is shown by the fact that she invites into her life the very thing that she fears most, scandal. For example, in Act II, she so unnerves Lovborg that he goes to Brack's party although originally, he had no plans to attend it. Later on, scandal ensues as Lovborg brawls at Mademoiselle Diana's place, and Brack tells Hedda that Lovborg may try to use the Tesmans in some way (p. 282).
Eventually Brack tries to blackmail Hedda because he knows that Lovborg's death was caused by one of her pistols (p. 301). In short, Hedda's rash actions lead to the destruction of her reputation rather than its enhancement.

Symbols of Hedda's two animus projections permeate the play. Some of these symbols apply both to her father and to Lovborg. The "inner" room that is mentioned throughout the play is a symbol for the place where the two animus figures dwell—in Hedda Gabler's secret, unconscious self. Her old piano is in that room, and she will not part with it even when Tesman offers to buy her a new one (p. 232). The piano represents the old life that she had with her father, but it is also a symbol of her passionate nature that she realizes through music, and vicariously, through her animus projection onto Lovborg.

Horses are another symbol shared by both of Hedda's animus figures. They recall her former life with her father as he and she went riding through the park together. They are also, like any animal motif, symbolic of man's primitive and instinctual nature. Thus the horses symbolize both Hedda's paternal and sexual animii: she used to go riding with her father, and she has projected her "animal" drives onto Lovborg.

Each animus also has his own symbols. In Hedda's house, there are two footstools called "taborets" (p. 221), and their name suggests the word "tabor," which is a small
drum that was played at the ancient Dionysian revels. To Hedda, Lovborg is Dionysus, "with vine leaves in his hair" (p. 272). His appearance justifies Hedda's Dionysian fantasy of him for he looks as if he carouses a great deal: "He is lean and gaunt, the same age as Tesman, but looks older and rather exhausted" (p. 258). Just before her death, as Hedda plays a "wild dance melody," it seems that she at last looks at her own inner self and does not like the picture that she sees. Since Lovborg's death, she no longer has her animus figure with which to define her identity. The music suggests that Hedda knows that she is a "Dionysian" in her own true self but cannot live with that reality. She can survive without one animus figure, but not without two.

In addition to the symbols associated with her strong animus projection onto Lovborg, there are also those connected with her even stronger projection on her dead father. General Gabler's portrait, prominently displayed in the "inner" room, is a symbol of his lingering and overwhelming influence on the unconscious psyche of his daughter. She lives in the house of Secretary Falk, another prominent person like her father whose social position she would like to retain for herself. There are also the ever-present pistols that General Gabler bequeathed to Hedda. They are symbols of power, the only powerful things that Hedda will ever own. At least they reinforce the sole
positive aspect of her paternal **animus** which is to have the courage to be true to herself and refuse to live an inauthentic existence. In her own way, Hedda Gabler finally achieves individuation. As John Northam aptly states: "Absurdly, destructively, but with a strange kind of integrity, Hedda has broken through in the only way she can."^{85}

As archetypes surround and permeate the character of Hedda Gabler, they also emerge in relation to other characters in the play. Thea, Aunt Juliana, and Bertha (an extension of Aunt Juliana), all express, like Hedda, phases of the Great Mother archetype as it appears on Erich Neumann's chart (p. 12). The male characters, too, exhibit aspects of the hero or masculine archetype. With the exception of Eilert Lovborg, all these other characters are "flat" characters since their personalities are really one-dimensional. They have no sense of self-awareness and are quite comic with their endlessly "busy" movements that accomplish nothing. Like Hedda, they all have other archetypal symbols connected with them besides their main feminine and masculine ones. For example, if Tesman represents the orderly male, some of that orderliness stems from his **anima** projection on his Aunt Juliana.

The first character to appear onstage is George Tesman's aunt, Miss Juliana Tesman who is childless, yet extremely maternalistic. She hovers over her orphaned, but now adult
nephew, George and indeed sees herself as the guardian of the Tesman dynasty since George's wife, Hedda is now pregnant. Now that the young Tesmans are home from their honeymoon, she has come over to their house to see if everything is in order. The couple are still asleep, but Aunt Juliana feels that she must busy herself by arranging things for their comfort (and her pleasure).

Juliana Tesman is one of those women who has no life of her own but leads a vicarious existence through service to others. Not only does she watch over George and Hedda, even mortgaging her pension so that they can live stylishly, but she also nurses her invalid sister, Rina. When Rina dies, Juliana searches for someone else to look after, that is, "some poor invalid in need of care and attention" (p. 290).

Aunt Juliana is primarily a symbol of the "Good Mother" aspect of the Great Mother archetype. Because she means well, she is a "good" mother, but on account of her meddling, she also has the "transforming" quality of the "devouring" or "Terrible Mother" as seen on Neumann's chart (p. 12). She is one of the characters in Hedda Gabler that have both positive and negative aspects to his or her archetype. Erich Neumann states that it is possible for a phenomenon (an aspect of the Great Mother archetype) "to shift into its opposite." In short, Aunt Julie's "goodness" is often "transformed" into something evil.
Miss Tesman "devours" Hedda and George by making them financially dependent on her. She also plans to visit them every day, and when Hedda rejects her overtures, Juliana makes sure that George comes over to her house (p. 249), although she prefers his house because it is a "house of life" since a new Tesman will arrive there soon. When Rina dies, Juliana is not so grieved by her sister's death that she does not find time to run over to George's house and see what interfering she can do there: "Well, thank God, in this house as well, there ought to be work that an old aunt can turn her hand to" (p. 291). In essence, Aunt Juliana is like so many "good" mothers who are overly possessive with their children. Such mothers stifle their children's psychic growth so that the youngsters never attain self-awareness or individuation. More specifically, George Tesman can never be a whole man while he remains his aunt's "dear boy" (p. 290).

Ibsen surrounds Aunt Juliana with the symbols of fertility and maternity. She has a "kind and good-natured look" (p. 221), and loves flowers, the sun, and "this fresh morning air" (p. 222). The Tesman house, like many houses, is a womb symbol, and Aunt Juliana's financial interest in it mirrors the stake that she, as matriarch of the Tesman family, has in Hedda's womb. She safeguards that stake by having her maid, Bertha keep an eye on things and report back to her.
Juliana is a very comical character if one can overlook the fact that her lack of self-awareness makes her almost pitiful. However, her "bustling" demeanor is very funny as can be seen in her running back and forth from her house to George's. She is almost a caricature of a mythological priestess who presides over the rituals of life (safeguarding Hedda's womb), and the rituals of death (preparing Rina for burial).

George's slippers are another humorous symbol connected with Aunt Juliana (and of course, with George). They are a token of the parent-child relationship between him and his aunts, and Juliana makes sure that tie is not broken by Hedda, the new mistress of the Tesman clan. In other words, the slippers reinforce Julie and Rina's pre-Hedda claim on George. The fuss over these innocuous objects is quite comical because it shows the immaturity and silliness of the bourgeois society that Ibsen is satirizing for their over-concern with material things.

Thea Elvsted is another female in *Hedda Gabler* who, like Hedda and Aunt Juliana, embodies aspects of the Great Mother archetype. Thea's nature, like part of Hedda's, corresponds to the chaste, virginal phase of the archetype as manifested by the goddess Artemis-Diana. Thea's place on Neumann's chart (p. 12), is that of the A+ positive transformative character of the Great Mother, and although Artemis's name is not shown on the chart, on p. 80 of the
book, Neumann discusses her place in his schema. Like Artemis, there is something very "maidenly" about Thea. She is a childless married woman who has a very poor relationship with a husband who is twenty years older than she is: "I just can't stand him! We haven't a single thought in common. Nothing at all--he and I" (p. 239). In addition, Tesman often addresses her by her maiden name, and never uses her first name which seems rather odd since she was once "an old flame" of his (p. 232). Moreover, neither he nor Lovborg ever view Thea as a sexual object; they always treat her as a companion instead of a lover, although both of them were romantically linked with her.

Thea has other attributes in common with the goddess, Artemis besides her essentially "chaste" personality. Both of them live outside the mainstream of society, Artemis in the woods and Thea in "an out-of-the way place" (p. 233). Thea's provincialism is shown by her old-fashioned clothes (p. 233). Lastly, Thea, like Artemis, is connected with rebirth because she not only attempts to "resurrect" Lovborg's manuscript from her old notes, but in the past, she has valiantly, though unsuccessfully tried to resurrect Lovborg himself. She is utterly dismayed when she realizes that he is going to start drinking again.

As Hedda descends to the "devouring" or "Terrible Mother" aspect of Artemis, Thea ascends to the Sophia or "inspirational" phase of the goddess. On Neumann's chart,
Thea is closest to the positive "Good Mother," whereas Hedda is closest to the negative, "Terrible Mother" aspect of the Great Mother archetype. However, archetypal manifestations are not always static, and at least in the Great Mother archetype, there is an "unfathomable paradoxical character of the archetype." 87

Like the other characters in Hedda Gabler, Thea has several symbols that enhance her image as the "Sophia" aspect of the Great Mother archetype. Her eyes are "light blue" like the sky which is far above the vulgar and mortal earth that she disdains. In addition, they are large and round like Artemis's moon or Apollo's sun (p. 233). As befits a virginal goddess, Thea's form is "slender" (p. 233). Her beautiful hair is symbolic in two ways: first, it is "wavy" and "unusually abundant" (p. 233) which signifies that Thea, like Diana a chaste person, is nevertheless a fertility goddess even though her fertility is of the "spiritual" kind. After all, she does try to stimulate Lovborg's creative instincts even though her efforts are unsuccessful. Also, by her gift of flowers, Thea brings her own brand of "inspirational" fertility to the Tesman household. Strangely, Thea's flowers are the only ones that Hedda keeps in her home. It is as if the flowers fascinate Hedda in the same way as Thea's hair does, although she wants to tear out the hair, she saves
the flowers. Again Ibsen has puzzled his audience with yet another quirk of his mysterious Hedda.

Thea in her "Sophia" phase is like Artemis-Diana in her role as sister of Apollo. Apollo and Diana represent the rational, orderly, learned, and "patriarchal" side of the human psyche. Thea stimulates scholarly work in both Tesman and Lovborg. For her, Tesman discards Hedda, and he and Thea supposedly go on to become the modern equivalent of the Apollo and Diana team. At least that is what they would like to be.

Because they are pedants, not scholars, Tesman and Thea are merely comic versions of the classical deities. They will never be able to reconstruct Lovborg's book because they are two shallow people who, even were they able to collect enough "scraps," could never ascertain Lovborg's meaning. As Ibsen says in his notes, "How hugely comic it is that those two harmless people, Tesman and Mrs. E. should try to put the pieces together for a monument to E.L." Lovborg is a man of mind, body and spirit, whereas they, like a modern computer, only know how to assemble data. Thea and Tesman never consider man's inner emotional or sexual life. Neither do they have any sense of self-awareness or conception of the Self, the totality of the human psyche.

In their obsession with "busy" work, Thea and Tesman quickly forget prior loyalties. After she finds a new
"spiritual" partner in Tesman, Thea forgets that she ever knew Lovborg, her now deceased friend and collaborator. It seems that manuscripts mean more than men to this very "spiritual" image of the Great Mother archetype. As for Tesman, he tells his wife Hedda to amuse herself with Judge Brack while he and Thea assemble their scraps. However, George and Thea will never create a work about the future of civilization because they do not understand anything about human nature, or grasp what Lovborg meant when he said that his book was about "my true self" (p. 259).

As the female characters embody certain aspects of the Great Mother archetype, the male characters exhibit facets of the hero or masculine archetype. Some of these aspects are similar to those which are seen in the Great Mother. For example, as in Hedda we see the "witch," or "Terrible Mother" aspect; in Judge Brack the "trickster" or Satanic phase of the hero is apparent. Furthermore, in Hedda Gabler, certain facets of the hero archetype are viewed as "aspects of Ibsen's own self; Lovborg is an idealised portrait of himself as he had been in the wild years of his youth, Tesman a reductio ad absurdum of what he had chosen to become."89

As the Great Mother is the archetypal feminine, the hero is the archetypal masculine, and he "symbolizes man's unconscious self."90 The hero image also "includes the archetype of the father and the wise old man. To that
extent, the hero is his own father and his own begetter."\textsuperscript{91}

In Greek mythology, Zeus is the father figure, and he has many sons. The two who have meaning in \textit{Hedda Gabler} are Apollo and Dionysus. They represent the so-called "higher" (Apollonian), and "lower" (Dionysian) parts of the masculine psyche. Edward Whitmont succinctly presents the differences between the two brothers: "Apollo represents light, life, immortality, harmonious balance, and permanence. Dionysus represents darkness, disruption, death and transience."\textsuperscript{92}

In modern times, the Apollonians are now in charge of what is called a "patriarchal" society, whereas the Dionysian or "matriarchal" elements in the world are downgraded for being sensual and lawless.

In \textit{Hedda Gabler}, in the male characters as well as the female ones, there is a variety of movement between the deep, instinctual depths of the psyche to the rational spiritual plane of existence. In other words, there is, in the hero archetype, a "transformative" or changing character comparable to that which we have seen in the archetypal feminine. Judge Brack, George Tesman, and Eilert Lovborg all exhibit different aspects of the hero archetype. Tesman and Judge Brack typify the extreme forms of the hero image; Tesman is his Apollonian side, and Brack is his Dionysian aspect. Lovborg's character combines the two opposing forces as he tries to reconcile his carousing, sexual, Dionysian nature with his scholarly
Apollonian pursuits. He attempts to achieve individuation, the Jungian process which "is the synthesis of the self" in order to achieve psychic "wholeness." In order to do that, an individual must not only be aware of his conscious self and the world around him, but he also must come to terms with his inner, unconscious self which is the home of sexual and other basic urges. Of course, Lovborg fails in his efforts to achieve individuation.

The first stage in the development of the hero archetype is that of the "trickster" figure who "corresponds to the earliest and least developed period of life. Trickster is a figure whose physical appetites dominate his behavior; he has the mentality of an infant." In Hedda Gabler, Judge Brack is such a figure, and though his "mentality" is far superior to that of a baby, his sensuous desires are quite infantile. Brack lives only for pleasure as seen by his penchant for stag parties and his pursuit of married women who make no demands on him. He enters people's homes by the back door which signifies his clandestine activities with the lady of the house, as a friend of the family would enter through the front door. Brack wants to have such a secret relationship with Hedda but she is not receptive to his entreaties and recognizes him for what he is: "the one cock of the walk" (p. 282), the cock being a symbol for sexual appetites.
Throughout the ages, the "trickster" archetype has often been portrayed as a mischievous but delightful creature such as Puck or a fairy tale brownie. Brack, however, is the trickster in his most sinister phase, that is, "lacking any purpose beyond the gratification of his primary needs, he is cruel, cynical, and unfeeling." As the "devilish" aspect of the "trickster" archetype, Brack is a master of intrigue and Ibsen's description of him is classically Satanic (p. 242). At first, because he takes Aunt Juliana home from the pier (p. 223), and assists Hedda and George with their new home, both financially and aesthetically, Brack seems as if he is really a kind man. As the play progresses, however, the audience sees that the wily judge is not acting out of kindness. Rather he is maneuvering himself into the lives of the Tesmans in order to obtain sexual favors from Hedda. Not only has he arranged terms for and decorated the Tesman's new house, but he also seems to have control over George's job prospects (p. 245). When Lovborg assures George that he will not thwart his career opportunities, Brack is momentarily nonplussed for now he will lose his financial hold over the Tesmans and not be able to blackmail Hedda into sleeping with him.

Later, after Lovborg's death, Brack has new ammunition with which to blackmail her for he has found out that Lovborg was killed by Hedda's pistol, either accidentally
or through a fight with Mademoiselle Diana. If Brack should tell the police who owns the pistol, scandal would ensue, and Hedda will lose whatever power that she has attained in society. Unless she accedes to Brack's vile demands, she is completely at his mercy. Thus Brack cruelly destroys whatever little power and freedom that Hedda has attained. Again Ibsen has aptly named his character—by giving him the title of "Judge," the playwright shows us that Brack is very wise and knowledgeable in the ways of human nature as most "tricksters" are. Most importantly, Brack really knows the psychological makeup of Hedda Gabler as is seen throughout the play but especially in the line: "You're not really happy—that's the heart of it" (p. 254).

As Brack's evil nature is paralleled by the Hecate or "Terrible Mother" aspect of the Great Mother archetype, George Tesman's mirrors her "Sophia" aspect. George symbolizes the conscious, rational, so-called "higher" order of the masculine psyche, namely, "the Apollonian-solar-patriarchal spirit." Apollonians like George are primarily interested in order, learning, and preserving the status quo. While on his honeymoon with Hedda, George earned his Ph.D. in history, a subject that intrigues him far more than does his young wife. Like the ancient Apollonian Greeks, George Tesman loves order: "Setting other people's papers in order—it's exactly what I can do best" (p. 300).
George is really not like the ancient Greeks; he is a pseudo-Apollonian because although he is like them in his regard for order, he has no feeling for beauty and truth as they did. In addition, by his pedantic and petty concern for his brand of order, he is oblivious to the fact that his own house is in serious disarray. He is blind to what occurs around him, especially as regards Hedda's nature and her relationships with other men.

From this description of the punctilious and obtuse George, one can hardly classify him as a heroic figure. Yet he is a hero of the patriarchal world, that is one who survives in bourgeois society because he adheres to its dictums. In George's sphere, order and reason rule in opposition to the chaos and emotion of the exciting, vital world of the matriarchate. However, it is not George who dies in the play but the non-conformist Hedda Gabler who refuse to be bullied by the patriarchal world. In this play, Ibsen lashes out at the patriarchal nature of modern society, and his sympathies are clearly with the female sex and how it has been subjected by men. He states his position in some notes he made for A Doll House (1879): 'It is an exclusively male society, with laws made by men and with prosecutors and judges who assess feminine conduct from a masculine standpoint.' Through the character of George Tesman, Ibsen tells the world that patriarchal society is a failure.
Ironically, for a man who supposedly personifies the strong, masculine patriarchate, George shows very few stereotypical masculine traits which of course lends strength to Ibsen's denigration of that patriarchal world. Unlike his wife Hedda, George does not behave very forcefully; in fact, he is a rather timid person who allows everyone else to run his life. Aunt Julie, Judge Brack, and of course Hedda, have made all George's decisions for him. Nor is George sexually aggressive; Hedda has her own bedroom, and their honeymoon was essentially a research tour through several libraries (p. 255). Even at a stag party that was planned for him, the highlight of George's evening was when Lovborg read to him (p. 276). Moreover, at all times, George is so engrossed with books that he does not even realize that Hedda is pregnant.

George Tesman can never be a real man because he projects his anima, or archetypal feminine self onto his Aunt Juliana. Although an audience might perceive her as a meddling old woman, from George's viewpoint, his experience of his aunt is a positive one. He wants to be with her constantly so that she can envelop him in her maternal love. He never thinks of her as an interfering person and cannot understand Hedda's rejection of her overtures: "If only you could bring yourself to speak to her warmly, by her first name. For my sake, Hedda? Uh?" (p. 232). A man who has such positive anima projections often either "becomes
effeminate or is preyed upon by women and thus is unable to cope with the hardships of life." George Tesman fits both categories in the above description of men who are controlled by their positive anima projections.

No matter how sympathetic an audience might feel towards Hedda Gabler, throughout the play, it would become plain to it that she certainly "preys" on her husband, simply using him to further her own interests which are to gain power and prestige in the community. Brack is right about George—he is a "simple soul" (p. 280) with a soft, pliable nature who was cajoled into marriage by a woman whom he does not understand in the slightest. Furthermore, George was flattered that such a prestigious person as Hedda should so honor him as to accept his offer of marriage. He is so obtuse that, at the time of his proposal, he never suspected her real motives for accepting him which were to advance herself in society as chatelaine of the Falkmansion. Later, she regrets her rashness in marrying him, but accepts her fate as she tells Brack: "you make your bed and then you lie in it" (p. 255).

For Hedda, George was "acceptable," "dependable," and not "ridiculous" (p. 251). As she tells Brack, if George keeps working on his research, perhaps someday he might even "make a name for himself" (p. 251). On the surface it seems as if Brack agrees with Hedda's surface confidence in George, but there is a sub-textual note of falsehood in
their conversation, which is later verified by Brack's remark that George is "a simple fool" (p. 278). Hedda really has the same attitude toward her husband as Judge Brack does, that is, she thinks poorly of him because he misses the mark both as a scholar and as a man. Furthermore, she neither loves nor respects him; in fact, for most of the play, she does not even address him by his first name.

Perhaps George's effeminate nature is a reason for Hedda's lack of respect for him as she makes clear when he serves drinks to her and Lovborg and she asks: "Why do you do the serving?" (p. 278), and this is after he comes bursting into the room shouting: "Look out! Here comes the goodies" (p. 264). As George fussily serves the drinks, one cannot help but think of his dear Aunt Juliana and her fussiness.

George's "fussing" over Lovborg suggests that there is a certain unmanliness in his attitude toward the writer. After all, Lovborg is a rival of George's, both professionally and with Hedda, and so George has no reason to be friendly with him although he is probably too obtuse to notice anything untoward between Lovborg and Hedda. At one point in the play, he does not want Lovborg and Hedda to be alone, not so much because they are fond of each other, but because it is not "quite right" that is, socially correct for them to be alone since "Aunt Julie isn't coming"
(p. 257). In any case, George is not at all jealous of Lovborg since he wishes that the writer had accompanied him and Hedda on their honeymoon! (p. 264). In short, George shows an inordinate amount of interest in Lovborg's life and writings. Here is a man who may take away his livelihood, and George cannot wait to see him: "Yes, but I would really like to wait for him as long as possible" (p. 257). When they finally meet, George is thrilled—a rather strange feeling to have for a rival who is pursuing one's wife and supposedly one's job as well.

Lastly, the aforementioned slippers are yet another symbol of George's effeminancy. Hedda turns away in disgust when he tries to show them to her (p. 229). Even on their honeymoon, he talked about them incessantly (p. 229). The fact that the slippers are embroidered suggests that they were made for someone with a rather dainty, feminine nature. Because he has so many "memories bound up" in them, George's behavior towards these very mundane items seems rather silly and unmanly.

Aside from his effeminancy, George has genuine problems in his relationships with women. When, after many years, he sees Thea Elvsted, one would never know that she had once been an "old flame" of his (p. 232). Unlike the "seething" encounter between Hedda and Lovborg when they meet again, George and Thea's meeting is cordial and correct. Except when a convention has been flouted, George seems devoid of
emotion. As Ibsen himself states in his notes: "Tesman stands for correct behavior." It seems that George only gets emotional over Hedda when she is breaking some rule such as playing with her pistols, not addressing his aunt properly, or playing music when there has been a death in the family (p. 303).

In typically nineteenth-century bourgeois, patriarchal fashion, George treats Hedda as if she is a commodity rather than a woman. He is so insensitive to Hedda's needs that he thinks that all he has to do is to supply her with material comforts and all will be well in their marriage. Sometime after they are married, however, Hedda realizes that there are worse things in life than living like "a grocer's wife"(p. 243), which to George is a terrible fate for a woman like Hedda. He simply does not understand that there are more important things to do than collecting material goods whether they be scraps of paper or houses and horses.

As did so many people in the previous century, George Tesman developed only one side of his personality, the outer, social side of it. Like Judge Brack, who is also a one-dimensional character, George has never explored the different aspects of his personality. He follows the trends and mores of his society, never stopping to consider whether or not these social virtues have any relevance to what he feels inside.
As George Tesman represents the negative Apollonian phase of the archetypal masculine, Eilert Lovborg evokes its positive or learned form. Of all the characters in *Hedda Gabler*, besides Hedda herself, Lovborg comes closest to achieving authentic selfhood or individuation. Yet he only comes close to such awareness as his heroic efforts are unsuccessful. His intentions are noble because through his art, he tries to speak "for my true self" (p. 259). However, Lovborg is a weak man who throws away all his advantages. The son of an influential family, he so wasted his gifts that his relatives wanted nothing more to do with him. He has little ambition and even lets Tesman have his job, a job that everyone knows (including Tesman) would not be his if he were forced to compete with Lovborg. Lovborg makes the Byronic gesture that he is not really interested in job appointments, but "only wants to win in the eyes of the world" (p. 261). The world will never see Lovborg's great work, because even before Hedda gets her hands on it, Lovborg is so careless that he loses it while on one of his drunken sprees. He would not have been on the spree except that he allowed Thea and Hedda to unnerve him with their nagging and goading. If he only he could have controlled his life instead of letting other people manipulate him, his career and personal relationships probably would have been a lot more successful.
Unlike Tesman, Lovborg is not a stupid person, and he realizes that his nature has two facets to it: one rational and orderly, the other emotional and chaotic. Ibsen himself says that "Eilert Lovborg has a double nature." In addition, Lovborg has three powerful anima figures that pull him one way or the other. These archetypal female figures make it impossible for him to communicate with his own true self. Moreover, he lacks the strength to fight them although he certainly tries to, and in the end, like so many demons, they overpower him. Lovborg personifies what Ibsen said about life: "Life--a war with demons waged in the caverns of our hearts and minds."

Lovborg's first two anima figures are projections of his inner, sexual nature, and they are Mademoiselle Diana and Hedda Gabler herself. Diana does not even appear in the play, but she is a force in it, nevertheless. Brack calls her "a mighty huntress of men" (p. 281), and her red hair symbolizes her fiery nature as when "she'd taken to fists" in an altercation with Lovborg (p. 281). She likes to have "animated" parties that often conclude with the arrival of the police. Lovborg was one of her favorites back in his "palmy days" (p. 281); for him, Diana is an anima projection of his own wild, Dionysian nature. As a negative femme fatale, she reflects his erotic side and also encourages in him "a receptiveness to the
The powerful inner forces of his psyche are exemplified by Lovborg's early carousing with her, and his continuing wild excesses finally lead to his death at Diana's place.

Hedda Gabler has also been a negative anima figure for Eilert Lovborg. He has had a long-standing, though unfulfilled, sexual relationship with her. Because he is also her sexual animus, she torments him unmercifully; she threatens to shoot him, goads him into drinking, and even tells him to shoot himself. Yet Lovborg accepts Hedda's harsh treatment and returns for more. It as if he is fascinated and hypnotized by the strange power that she has over him and is too weak and vulnerable to resist it. When he comes back to town, he is overjoyed at seeing her, never mind that the last time they met she threatened him with a pistol. Lovborg returns to Hedda because for him, she is the living symbol of that "hunger for life" (p. 266), that all the academic honors in the world cannot give him.

Besides the two sensual animae in Eilert Lovborg's psyche, there is also another anima facet to his nature. When he goes to live in the country with the Elvsted, his creative nature is encouraged, if not "inspired" by Thea Elvsted. Thea helps Lovborg focus his creative energies on a concrete project which is the "child" manuscript that in a sense, is really Thea's child too because she prodded Lovborg to create it. He may not be in love with Thea, and
she most likely did not inspire his writings, but she forced him to work and not waste his talents. In that sense, she has been a "positive" anima figure for the writer. After his work is published, however, Lovborg decides that he wants to experience a full life; he does not wish to be tucked away somewhere in the country, existing in a spiritual vacuum. When he sees Hedda again, he tells her that Thea is "stupid" about the things (sex) in which he and Hedda are interested (p. 266). No matter how kind and understanding Thea is, Lovborg has had enough of her. Despite the riches and fame that she has enabled him to obtain by her support for his work, he still feels that she has "broken" his "courage" and "daring for life" (p. 286). In essence, Lovborg wants some sexual excitement, and he is not receiving it in his relationship with Thea.

Lovborg's misfortune is that he cannot withstand the onslaughts of his three anima figures. Hedda, in burning the "child" manuscript makes "ashes" out of Lovborg's "future" plans, the future being a prime concern of his (p. 259). Of course, he never knew that she had destroyed his work, but if she had told him of its fate, or better yet kept it from him, Lovborg might never have gone to Mademoiselle' Diana's place and thus to his death. Yet even while there, he keeps looking for his manuscript, or lost "child." Diana, however, cares nothing about a lost
child, and when Lovborg accuses her of stealing from him, tempers flare, and Hedda's gun goes off, accidentally killing him (p. 299).

The devoted Thea destroys Lovborg's self-confidence by not trusting him to take care of himself in the big city. Hedda maliciously conveys Thea's mistrust to Lovborg, but like the proverbial dog in the manger she does not want Lovborg for herself either. Her cruelty is a sign that she simply wants to control other people's lives because hers is so boring. In any case, by his death Lovborg escapes from his tormentors, Thea and Hedda. He lies about the manuscript to Thea, thus removing her from his life. He also thwarts Hedda's plans by his failure to die "beautifully." In essence, Lovborg defeats at least two of his anima figures, and dies a quick death at the home of the third.

Lovborg's great work, the "child" manuscript is the symbol for a complete person, or in Jungian terms, a fully realized "Self," as the child archetype "expresses man's wholeness." In Hedda Gabler, it is significant that Ibsen uses the child symbol because Jung states that "the child is potential future," and that it "paves the way for a future change of personality." Lovborg's manuscript is about the future, the future of civilization, the "forces" that shape it, and the "lines of development it's likely to take" (p. 259). The "child" manuscript is a
symbol for Lovborg's potentiality for change both in his personality and in his way of life. He realizes that he has not attained true selfhood, but he hopes that he can do so in the future as he has plans "to make a fresh start" (p. 260) and to do "a lecture series" (p. 260).

Lovborg's quest for individuation is a noble, though fruitless, one. His flaw is that he is too weak and irresolute to do battle against the forces that beset him. Whether it is women, drink, or society in general, Lovborg simply does not have the strength to resist temptation. If only he could be "resurrected" through his work, his death would not have been in vain. Thea and George, however, have only the "scraps" of their own limited self-perspectives with which to work, and cannot rejuvenate the whole person that Lovborg wanted to be. They are the proof that the values of the patriarchal world with its un-emotional, materialistic, and business-like approach to life really have little to offer in understanding the nature and motivations of the human psyche.

In Emperor and Galilean (1873), Julian asks, "Do you really think these tales of the gods have no great design and no vital purpose?" For Henrik Ibsen, myths, the tales of the gods, do serve a purpose as they and other archetypal symbols point out the truths of human nature. Unlike Thea and Tesman, they help us understand the inner nature of the human psyche. Carl Jung says that "Whoever
speaks in primordial images speaks with a thousand voices." In other words, when artists use these images they are speaking for mankind, as all humans, according to Jung and many other psychologists, have these images in their unconscious minds. Mythological figures are "sample" figures of human beings. These samples or types have existed in all places and in every era. As Edward Whitmont states: "The images produced by the psyche may be highly personal, but the drama on our inner stage often enacts the general human drama as well. Artists and sages have always understood this."  

In Hedda Gabler, if Ibsen's characters evoke archetypal or any other kind of symbol, this assumption was denied by their creator: 'I only write about people. I don't write about people. I don't write symbolically. Just about people's inner life as I know it—psychology if you like.'  Yet by studying man's "inner" life, Ibsen was really probing his own unconscious mind and from it plucking the primordial images that suited his artistic purpose (see p. 6) which was threefold: social, psychological, and personal. As he advanced in his career, his focus became more and more introspective.

Ibsen was a playwright who had deep social concerns. In Hedda Gabler, he wishes to show how the nineteenth-century Norwegian woman is burdened by provincialism and outmoded conventions. Hedda Gabler is a woman who is strong-willed
and rebels against the restrictions on her life, but for fear of scandal, she lacks the courage to act as she pleases. To have a "comradeship" with a man, or to lead a "bohemian" life would be Hedda's idea of an ideal existence, but in her society, she cannot live that way. Men like Brack can live any way they like, but women cannot for as Ibsen says in his notes for A Doll House (1879): 'There are two kinds of moral laws, two kinds of conscience, one for men and one, quite different for women.' Like the mythical Valkyries and the Greek goddesses on Neumann's chart, Hedda is dynamic and vital, moving forward whatever the consequences. The status quo does not suit either Hedda or her creator. They both are apostles for freedom, freedom from narrow-mindedness and restrictive social codes that hamper individuation.

There is no doubt that Ibsen was interested in improving social conditions for women as is demonstrated in Hedda Gabler, and in A Doll House. Yet Ibsen was not so much interested in women's causes as he was in showing "the need of every individual to find out the kind of person he or she really is and to strive to become that person." Ibsen promoted the individuation process long before Jung had given it a name.

In order to discover the motivations behind human behavior, Ibsen used myth to portray the inner life of his characters. By making Hedda deep, dark, and mysterious,
Ibsen called up the archetypal feminine whose basic sensual nature had been suppressed by the puritanical patriarchate. Hedda is an archetypal symbol that closely corresponds to Erich Neumann's chart (p. 12) which depicts the Great Mother archetype in all her phases. Hedda's "elementary" character is primarily that of Hecate, the "Terrible Mother" aspect of the archetype. Hedda destroys herself because she has no outlet for her energies. In essence, "she is closed from life; with all her lusts locked up within her." Her energies are finally turned inward towards herself.

In her less destructive phase, Hedda is related to Diana, the Roman goddess of hunting and fertility. Diana is the Roman version of the Greek goddess, Artemis. Both of them have affinities with the Norse Valkyries who were so familiar to Ibsen. Whether Greek, Roman, or Norse, however, the archetypal image is the same--the strong female in charge of her own life. Hedda Gabler tries to be such a woman, but her assertive, warlike traits lead only to defeats, not victories. Yet she is a conqueror of sorts because she ultimately escapes from society's pressures. She dies nobly and "beautifully" because she retains her own personhood and self-respect by choosing when and how she will die.

Because he was interested in psychology, Ibsen also explored the inner world of the male psyche. Through the
character of Eilert Lovborg, he brilliantly outlines the problems of the non-conformist artist in society. Such a person has to reconcile the demands of his art, a part of his inner self, with the demands made by the patriarchal world of rules and order. Lovborg is the archetypal image of the artist as loner and outcast, which was so prevalent in the nineteenth-century both in literature and in life as is seen in the careers of Byron and Baudelaire. The male "loners" of the world are overwhelmed by society's pressures just as women are. Lovborg attempts to come to terms with his inner self, but he fails to do so because he weakly lets himself be led around by others. Unfortunately, as Ibsen suggests in the play, the man or artist who gives vent to his emotional nature is considered either immoral or eccentric, or both.

The third and final reason for Ibsen's use of symbols that often turn out to be archetypal is that he wanted to explore his own psyche as well as those of his characters. While writing about people's inner natures, artists go through a self-purgation, that is they release their own inner feelings through their characters. One time, in a letter about Peer Gynt (1867), Ibsen stated: 'Everything that I have written is most minutely connected with what I have lived through, if not personally experienced; every new work has had for me the object of serving as a process of spiritual liberation and catharsis...'. Another
time, when giving a speech, Ibsen told his audience that looking inside himself—"at the dregs and sediment of one's own nature," was like taking a "bath from which I have risen feeling cleaner, healthier, and freer."

Critics often see Hedda Gabler as one of Ibsen's self-portraits. They accuse him of having "demonic" impulses as Hedda had. He thus could release such impulses by projecting them on a character. In a sense, Hedda was one of Ibsen's anima figures. Hedda is therefore an archetypal symbol for her creator. Besides being archetypes, Hedda and Hilda Wangel of The Master Builder (1892), also represent young women in Ibsen's life. In his dramas, he could deal with them more easily than he could in real life. By the same token, the women in his life gave him ideas that he incorporated into his female characters.

Ibsen also projected himself onto his male characters. He is at once the intellectual Tesman and the bohemian Lovborg. Ibsen somehow felt that "he had stifled his emotional self and that only his bourgeois and slightly ludicrous intellectual self had lived on." In 1889, after meeting Emilie Bardach and Helene Raff perhaps he felt that in his strait-laced life he had missed something. Maybe he would have liked to have been like Lovborg but lacked the courage to do so. Besides, after having suppressed for years his emotional side, it now "had happened too late for him to gain any joy from it."
Actually, he was afraid that he had become someone like Tesman who had hardly any emotional life at all. However, as far as his life in Norwegian society was concerned, Ibsen was never like Tesman. He may have resembled him emotionally, but Ibsen despised the bureaucratic and materialistic society of which Tesman is the "ridiculous" symbol.

Whether his artistic purpose was social, psychological, or personal, Henrich Ibsen used archetypal symbols derived from myth and from the world at large. He deliberately employed mythical characters and symbols and defended their use by authors: "Since the subject matter of myth is timeless, its validity in time can never be so limited as to disqualify an author from laying another stone upon that mythical foundation." Wherever his archetypal symbols came from, Ibsen was a visionary artist who Jung describes as one whose artistic material comes not from the conscious mind, but rather "derives its existence from the hinterland of man's mind," that is, from the unconscious mind. There lie the primordial images or archetypes that "rend from top to bottom the curtain from which is painted the picture of an ordered world, and allow a glimpse into the unfathomed abyss of what has not yet become." In Hedda Gabler, Ibsen exposes the Jungian "night-side of life," and in so doing has 'created a new mythology and the theatrical
He exemplifies the creative process in Jungian terms:

The creative process, so far as we are able to follow it at all, consists in the unconscious activation of an archetypal image, and in elaborating and shaping that image into the finished work. By giving it shape, the artist translates it into the language of the present, and so makes it possible for us to find our way back to the deepest springs of life. Therein lies the social significance of art: it is constantly at work educating the spirit of the age, conjuring up the forms in which the age is most lacking.
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