The composite hero of the monomyth is a personage of exceptional gifts. Frequently he is honored by society, frequently unrecognized or disdained. He and/or the world in which he finds himself suffers from a symbolical deficiency. (Campbell 37)

In creative or dramatic terms, Joseph Campbell’s “monomyth” conceptualizes the heroic prominence of the protagonist in a given fiction. Although most of Campbell’s research is based on theological mythologies, his concepts are steeped in twentieth-century psychoanalytical theories (4-19). Campbell focuses on the initiatory paradigms of universal myths and formulates the hero’s rite of passage into three major stages: “separation [departure]—initiation [action]—return [reflection]” (Campbell 30). Campbell’s book on the subject, The Hero with a Thousand Faces, has consciously been appropriated by the writer and film-critic Christopher Vogler who applies Campbell’s theories, “The Adventure of the Hero,” to protagonists of several modern films ranging from Pulp Fiction to Star Wars. Similarly the tragedy of Hamlet focuses on an exceptionally gifted central character who, once the “symbolic deficiency” of his world has been identified, “Something is rotten in the state of Denmark” (1.5.90),\(^1\) vows to purge his world from that “deficiency,” “time is out of joint. O cursed spite, / That ever I was born to set it right” (1.5.196-97). By aspiring to guide his society to safety (Campbell 391), Hamlet qualifies as a mono-mythical hero since he too desires to “set [his world] right.”

In Hamlet, heroic intentions are often embedded in soliloquies. Soliloquies, claims Mary Maher, are the hallmark of Hamlet’s persona (Modern Hamlets xi, xv-xvi). Indeed the role of Hamlet is often defined by and depends upon his soliloquies for completion. “To be or
"To be or not to be" is unique among all of Hamlet’s soliloquies: on stage it is “an overheard soliloquy” (Charney 123; Orange 62, 65) but on screen it is a pivotal point in the hero’s journey. In his celebrated paper, “The Meaning of Hamlet’s Soliloquy,” Irving Richards ascertains that “To be or not to be” is “the crux of the drama, the point at which Hamlet takes the audience into his confidence and reveals the secret of his complex soul” (745). Conversely, Maher argues, film audiences of Hamlet intimately connect with him and feel obliged to identify with his dilemmas (“Hamlet’s BBC” 426). Therefore, “To be or not to be” remains central to Hamlet’s character textually, theatrically, and cinematically. The textual positioning of Hamlet’s “To be or not to be” was thoroughly assessed by Lewis Mott in 1904 (26-32). One hundred years on, I would like to examine the positioning and setting of the soliloquy in recent Hamlet films. I will examine four Hamlet films: Laurence Olivier (1948), Franco Zeffirelli (1990), Kenneth Branagh (1996), plus Michael Almereyda (2000), and apply Campbell’s hypothesis as demonstrated in “The Adventure of the Hero” to ascertain the position of “To be or not to be” in the protagonist’s journey in each of these films.

The placement of “To be or not to be” within the hero’s rite of passage framework set out by Campbell depends on its positioning within the individual film’s structure, which can easily shift from one step of the hero’s journey to another, indeed from one stage to another. I will demonstrate that, regardless of each film’s mise-en-scène, “To be or not to be” is placed in the Separation/Departure stage of the hero’s journey, which takes place inside “The Belly of the Whale” in three of the above-mentioned Hamlet films: Olivier, Zeffirelli, and Almereyda, whereas Branagh’s soliloquy takes place in the Initiation stage. “The Belly of the Whale,” according to Campbell, is a metamorphic step when “The hero, instead of conquering or conciliating the power of the threshold, is swallowed into the unknown, [where he] goes inward to be born again” (90-92). It is a nightmarish sentiment with ancient resonance; it is the last moment of decision-making before the hero has to take action.2
Olivier’s endeavor to recreate “verse” on the screen (Olivier 151) resulted in “a fumbling attempt to apply cinematic strategy [to Shakespeare’s greatest tragedy]” (Davies 41) and left his Hamlet cinematically jarred. Olivier’s Freudian interpretation (Biggs 62) might have given reason for the conspicuous camera movement around the stagy Elsinore but this too was ill-received by Roger Manvell. On the one hand, Manvell’s objection to “the over-use of traveling shots, the camera tracking, panning, and circling around the sets and the actors” (41) is justifiable critique. But on the other hand, the camera’s voyage through the labyrinthine castle that symbolizes Hamlet’s frenetic state of mind is essential to the film’s psychoanalytical reading. Olivier’s “To be or not to be” was particularly mishandled, argues Foster Hirsch, who objects to the juxtaposition of Hamlet’s voiceover together with the sound/image of breaking waves during its delivery (85). The breaking waves imagery might not be aesthetically pleasing to a traditionalist like Hirsch but it is extremely significant to the placing of Olivier’s “To be or not to be” soliloquy inside “The Belly of the Whale.”

In contrast to Olivier’s directorial methods, Zeffirelli relies on cinematic narration and not poetical discourse for his Hamlet film. “Zeffirelli,” writes Biggs, “aims at visual rather than textual seduction of his audience” (61). Being familiar with cinematic idiom, the accomplished Italian director uses traditional film conventions to relay visually the textual messages in his Hamlet film. For example, given that Claudius (Alan Bates) is not present to prompt Gertrude’s (Glenn Close) exit line, “Madam. Come” (1.2.123), she is appropriately summoned to the hunt by a sounding horn that leaves Hamlet (Mel Gibson) to deliver his first soliloquy, “O that this too too sullied flesh would melt” (1.2.129), in solitude.

However, Zeffirelli’s Hamlet was also criticized albeit for dissimilar reasons from those of Olivier’s. Zeffirelli was censured not only for the severity of the textual cutting of Shakespeare’s play but also for giving a “fast-food” image to his greatest tragedy. Zeffirelli, writes Neil Taylor, “cavalierly re-organizes the order of the text […] advancing and delaying
speeches in a bewildering manner” (192). But Zeffirelli defended his cuttings as sacrificial compromises (Zeffirelli 244), which broadened the accessibility of Shakespeare’s drama (Boyce 274). In Zeffirelli’s film, writes Taylor, “The larger speeches and scenes are broken down into bite-sized pieces” (192), whereas “To be or not to be” remains intact in its entirety. Zeffirelli thus places his Hamlet firmly inside “The Belly of the Whale.”

Ace Pilkington has clearly pointed out the many similarities between Olivier’s and Zeffirelli’s films, such as the flashbacks to Ophelia’s closet, the sea voyage to England (163-79), and, I would add, the displacement of Hamlet’s “To be or not to be” soliloquy that is preceded by the nunnery scene in both films. In Zeffirelli’s Hamlet, for example, Ophelia (Helena Bonham-Carter) is left standing in the great hall while Hamlet (Mel Gibson) climbs the stairs in frustration. A high-angular shot of Gibson portrays the hero’s attempt to cross his “First Threshold” (Campbell 77-89) but a close-up of his anxious face reveals a confidence-lacking persona and confirms his delayed crossing over to the Initiation phase of the hero’s adventure. Likewise, at the end of the nunnery scene Olivier shows an overhead-dramatic shot of the deserted Ophelia (Jean Simmons) lying face down at the base of the staircase. Concurrently, the escalation of William Walton’s musical score coupled with a fast-tracking shot racing up the staircase implies that the hero is crossing his “First Threshold.” However, the composition of the musical crescendo together with the overshooting camera framing the misty grey sky signals Hamlet’s entry into “the realm of the night” (Campbell 36), which translates to the hero’s failure to complete his Departure stage. Therefore, both Olivier and Zeffirelli depict Hamlet as ill-equipped to take action before and during the delivery of his “To be or not to be” soliloquy. Both protagonists lack the confidence or courage to proceed with the hero’s journey and consequently each Hamlet must go inward “to be born again”, given that the hero must enter into the “Belly” before the Initiation phase can begin (Campbell 91, 97).
Having displaced the nunnery scene, both Olivier and Zeffirelli use a distinctly different mise-en-scène for each of the hero’s journey inward. Olivier chooses the most prominent setting in the film for his “To be or not to be”: he sets it on the battlements, the highest location in his Elsinore where he was led by the ghost, and significantly “the film’s alpha and omega” (Silviria 151-52). Equally significant but in a completely opposite location to Olivier’s, Zeffirelli sets his soliloquy in the crypt of the castle where the dead King is buried. Zeffirelli uses the hollow darkness of a lifeless space as “The Belly of the Whale” as opposed to the psychoanalytical reading of Olivier’s film, who prompts a darkness of the mind for his Hamlet. Therefore, contrary to Donaldson’s claim that “retracing his father’s path brings [Hamlet] to the prospect of self-annihilation” (112), Olivier’s hero reaches the highest point of Elsinore to face the chasm of his own mind, which places him in the Departure stage of the hero’s journey. While both soliloquies are placed inside “The Belly of the Whale,” Olivier delivers his in the fresh air on top of the battlements whereas Gibson utters his in a lifeless claustrophobic cellar.

After the nunnery scene, Gibson descends the stairs toward the burial chamber where the backlight gives his profile a sharp oxymoronic imaging. On the one hand, the composition of vertical and horizontal lines, his legs, and the stairs he is descending denotes solidarity while, on the other hand, the crypt indicates that Hamlet is being swallowed up thus conveying a distorted image. By contrast, in Olivier’s Hamlet the “Belly” has no spatial boundaries. Olivier’s camera descends in a falling-vertical shot before it stops to focus on the back of Hamlet’s head in a crane shot. The camera then moves in and out of focus until an extreme-focus shot indicates entry into Hamlet’s mind and confirms the film’s psychoanalytical significance. As the camera pulls back, a crane shot, shamelessly copied from Alfred Hitchcock’s Rebecca, reveals the stormy sea below. The rhythmic force of the waves symbolizes the hero’s encounter with the fearsome Poseidon (Campbell 91) and Hamlet’s dark thoughts.
The deep-water symbol is a significant and long-established part of the hero’s adventure. Both classical heroes, such as Odysseus⁵ or Beowulf,⁶ and modern ones, like George Bailey (James Stewart),⁷ have encountered its force. By looking down toward Poseidon’s kingdom, Olivier’s Hamlet connects with his innermost fears that could lead him to experience an element of danger or excitement: his fear of the unknown is juxtaposed with Poseidon’s powerful force calling him to take action. A frontal shot reveals a Hamlet suspended between heaven and earth (see Plate 4)⁸ at which point Olivier begins his “To be or not to be” soliloquy in voiceover.

Olivier’s Hamlet gives the impression of being about to take some action as he says, “Or to take arms against a sea of troubles / And by opposing end them” (3.1.59-60), whereas, on “To die—to sleep” (3.1.60), Gibson sympathetically stares at the coffins stacked in the innermost part of the cave. Gibson seems to have yielded to melancholia by the time he says, “To sleep perchance to dream” (3.1.65), whereas Olivier tightens a frontal shot and reveals his Hamlet holding a dagger in his hand to indicate his readiness to take action. However, on “fly to others that we know not of?” (3.1.82) Olivier slumps back into a mermaid-like pose⁹ at which point a reversal shot shows the dagger (ambiguously) falling from his hand into the ocean below and with it all signs of Olivier’s Hamlet taking any action in this scene. The falling dagger confirms that this hero is still in his Departure stage.

Action symbolisms were similarly eliminated from Zeffirelli’s Hamlet. For example, the shot of Hamlet seizing his father’s sword in the “To be or not to be” scene was, according to Andrew and Gina MacDonald, editorially removed (47). Instead, Gibson leans against the King’s crypt to deliver his almost muted lines. Without Ennio Morricone’s score as background music, the “magnificently bronzed and rich voice” (Tibbetts 126-27) of the star of Lethal Weapon is given free rein to depict, in Zeffirelli’s words, “not a poetical aria, but a real suffering” (Tibbetts 126-27) during his “To be or not to be” soliloquy.
Zeffirelli’s mise-en-scène depicts Gibson’s body movement by changing camera angles. As Gibson moves inside the cave, we become aware of the absence of color in the frame; the grey stones against Hamlet’s black clothes drain what little hue the overhead sunlight tries to color (see Plate 5). Even when Gibson’s body movement catches the occasional sunray, the iron grid above Hamlet’s head darkens the overhead light; in turn the pattern gives the impression of imprisonment in a dark dungeon and reinforces Hamlet’s tormented state of mind. Furthermore, the tombs stacked in the concave wall resemble commonly-perceived images of a whale’s rib cage. Moreover, the echoing sound of Gibson’s footsteps on the hard floor underpins the void in the frame. Zeffirelli adds to the hero’s bewilderment by using steady shifting shots of Gibson’s head in profile with intimate juxtaposition of close-ups of his face. Paradoxically, this composition brings the focus back to Hamlet’s thoughts as he contemplates the next step in the hero’s journey. In addition, the overhead light shining on the hero’s hands reinforces their upcoming usefulness in taking action that is in sharp contrast to the dark void, thus representing the hero’s position firmly inside “The Belly of the Whale.” Hence, contrary to Philippa Sheppard’s statement that Zeffirelli’s “combination of illustration and semaphore” (181) is a directorial indulgence, it seems that, by focusing his camera on a central point of view, Zeffirelli gives his hero the necessary pause for contemplation. Furthermore, the freeze frame at the end of the scene marks the end of Hamlet’s Departure stage, a visual full stop if you like. The director’s technique thus gives his hero the decisive Separation from his upcoming Initiation phase.

Olivier’s Hamlet, on the other hand, takes his cue on “the pale cast of thought” (3.1.85) by standing upright in a profile shot that indicates the hero’s inclination to leave the Departure stage. For the first time during the scene we see Olivier’s Hamlet in a vertical position, he turns to look at the horizon before slowly walking in the opposite direction from which he entered the scene. Thus Olivier steps forward and seems, like Gibson, ready for the Initiation phase of his Hamlet’s journey. Therefore, Olivier’s “To be or not to be” has also
taken place in “The Belly” albeit this hero’s journey has been in the mind. This is perhaps a more appropriate place for it since this film is a psychological reading of Hamlet.

The positioning of “To be or not to be” in Almereyda’s Hamlet is more complex to read and therefore requires further deciphering. Set in New York City 2000, Almereyda’s hotel Elsinore setting suggests temporary accommodation and transitional life-style as opposed to the traditional worlds of Olivier’s and Zeffirelli’s films. Therefore, old-fashioned values of solidarity, continuity, and social correlations are in stark contrast to Almereyda’s disposable, fast-moving, and slippery corporate world of stockbrokerage, mergers, and acquisitions on Wall Street. The capitalistic high-consumer society with its disjointed existence, its loud music, and twenty-first-century technological world of heavy surveillance gives Almereyda’s Hamlet its abstract style.

Ethan Hawke’s Hamlet is a filmmaker who produces The Mouse Trap movie as a decoy for Claudius (Kyle MacLachlan). However, this twenty-first-century Hamlet seems constantly lethargic and almost in a drugged state. One gets the distinct impression that this Hamlet is more to do with the director since Almereyda keeps reminding us that he is the filmmaker behind his Hamlet filmmaker. For example, in anticipation of Hamlet’s famous speech, Almereyda tricks cinema audiences into thinking that his “To be or not to be” soliloquy begins with the televised message of the Zen master, Thich Nhat Hanh: “to be is to inter be.” Two more false starts take place before Hawke delivers his soliloquy in its entirety during which this Hamlet watches himself on his pixel vision holding a handgun to his head and pondering suicide. Both times, we hear Hamlet begin saying “To be or not to be,” then he pauses and rewinds, then replays the speech only to repeat the same function (rewinding and pausing) over and over again. In Mark Thornton Burnett’s words, “[Hawke’s Hamlet is] either fast-forwarding or rewinding (endlessly rehearsing)” (58), or perhaps he is re-enacting Almereyda’s directions, given that Almereyda is constantly calling action/cut during filming.
Since action and cut are the alpha and omega of filming, the director reinforces his presence in the film: Almereyda repeatedly interrupts the hero’s momentum by stopping and starting, thus manipulating the film’s rhythm.

Finally, and after Ophelia’s (Julia Stiles) closet scene (set in her dark room), Almereyda signals Hamlet’s “To be or not to be” soliloquy with a shot of an external tower. Almereyda appropriately sets the famous soliloquy in a Blockbuster Video store where the filmmaker’s fears are emphasized in the store’s mise-en-scène. Inside the video store, Hamlet seems unprepared as he clumsily awaits the director’s call for “action.” Hawke stands awkwardly in the centre of a wide shot contemplating whether to go forward toward the section with familiar films or go back toward uncharted territories of action-packed movies. (It is perhaps moments like these that prompted Cameron-Wilson to describe Almereyda’s film “as an academic exercise” [62]). Eventually Hawke turns, faces the camera, and begins his “To be or not to be,” like Olivier before him, in voiceover.

Almereyda encapsulates the magnitude of the video store in a frontal-reversal shot that illustrates the vast number of Action films on display. Moreover, this central shot reveals Hamlet’s nightmare: the film-maker’s “sea of troubles” (3.1.59) is being confronted with the popular film genre (Action) at a time when his genre (Suspense) seems antiquated and outmoded in the bustling New York City of 2000. Furthermore, the frontal shot compositional arrangement shows two rows of videotapes on either side of Hamlet, their purple rims representing a film reel with Hawke in his Peruvian knitted cap in central frame transposing the shot into a 16mm negative, thus framing Hamlet’s figure (see Plate 7) inside “The Belly of the Whale.” The Suspense filmmaker seems bewildered among the Actions film section of the video store.

Moreover, Almereyda’s composition denotes his protagonist’s greatest challenge: that of the artificial lighting inside the Blockbuster Video store, which in turn transposes into
the filmmaker’s darkest fears. As Hawke looks up on “To die—to sleep” (3.1.60), Almereyda cross-cuts into The Crow II showing Eric Draven (Vincent Perez) also contemplating revenge which inevitably reminds us of the real-life tragedy that took place on the set of the original Crow: that is Brandon Lee’s death during filming. This mise-en-scène implies that this Hamlet’s nightmare is also the director’s (Almereyda) nightmare. As Hawke continues with “there’s the rub” (3.1.65), we hear the echoing sound of his footsteps as we did during Gibson’s soliloquy. By cross-cutting to the action film and keeping Hamlet as an observer rather than a participant, Almereyda signifies that Hawke’s Hamlet, similar to Gibson’s reframing from holding the sword and Olivier’s dropping of the dagger, takes no action during his “To be or not to be” soliloquy. The cross-cuttings suggest that Ethan Hawke’s Hamlet is also contemplating on taking action but his failure to do so places this hero inside “The Belly of the Whale.”

To recap, I have shown that each of Olivier’s, Gibson’s, and Hawke’s “To be or not to be” soliloquy takes place inside “The Belly of the Whale,” since each of these protagonists fails to take action and each faces a nightmare sentiment of his own and in accordance with individual film genre. By contrast, Kenneth Branagh’s Hamlet (1996) contains the full text and closely adheres to the original Q2 structure in which Branagh decides to take action during his “To be or not to be” soliloquy. Branagh uses the historically significant Blenheim Palace for his nineteenth-century setting of Hamlet. He utilizes Victorian technological advancements, such as the mini-steam engine used for the arrival of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern and large-scale mirrors in the great hall, to portray the grandeur and vanity of a corrupt state (Burnett 78-82). Poised, virtually motionless, looking at his own reflection in the mirror, Branagh begins his “To be or not to be” soliloquy in the great hall. On “to take arms” (3.1.59) Branagh defiantly clinches his right fist and begins to take very precise and small steps toward his own reflection in the mirror behind which Claudius (Derek Jacobi) and Polonius (Richard Briers) are hiding. Branagh stops on “With a bare bodkin?” (3.1.76);
he swiftly takes his dagger and points it at his own image. A cross-cut to a central shot of Claudius behind the two-way mirror shows Jacobi’s jolt in reaction to the dagger that seems to be pointing at the antagonist’s throat. Another cross-cut through the two-way mirror shows a long-frontal shot of Hamlet dressed in black; the composition portrays Hamlet as a “black knight” challenging the “white house” of Elsinore (see Plate 8). By taking action, Hamlet forces Claudius to react—for one cannot have a reaction without an action. Therefore, Branagh’s “To be or not to be” is placed in the Initiation stage of the hero’s journey, for Branagh’s Hamlet is on his way to “The Road of Trials” where the action-taking adventure begins and where “he must survive a succession of trials” (Campbell 97) before his heroic journey can be completed.

Subsequently, the nunnery scene following Branagh’s soliloquy, in keeping with the play’s structure, becomes another step in the hero’s trial phase. By contrast, Almereyda displaces the nunnery scene and positions it much later in the hero’s Road of Trials, thus changing Ophelia (Julia Stiles) into the Temptress.12 Olivier and Zeffirelli, on the other hand, follow Campbell’s psychological reading of Hamlet, which states that Gertrude and not Ophelia is Hamlet’s Temptress in the same way that Jocasta is Oedipus’ (123, 7n). Furthermore, the Zen master’s speech “to be is to inter be” in Almereyda’s film becomes yet another Supernatural Aid (Campbell 72)13 for Ethan Hawke’s Hamlet. This is not surprising since this Hamlet was prompted by a telephone call to the rendezvous with his father’s ghost (Sam Sheppard).

Each of the four Hamlet films considered in this paper places its interpretation of Hamlet in a very specific historical and social context. Hamlet’s soliloquies no longer epitomize Shakespeare’s novel convention of actor/audience relations, rather they are being adapted and edited to suit each production and to formulate separate steps in the hero’s journey within each film structure. Whether assimilated following the Shakespearean
tradition (Branagh; Charney 116) or presented as a detachable speech (Auden 159-60), “To be or not to be” is an interregnal step of the hero’s adventure in Hamlet on film. Branagh uses cinematic conventions to place Hamlet’s most famous soliloquy in the Trial and not the Departure phase of the hero’s journey: that is the action-taking phase as opposed to the decision-making one. Some critics have suggested that Branagh’s Hamlet is closer to Shakespeare’s intentions (MacDonald 48; Richardson 21). It is incongruous to think of “authorial intentions” when referring to Shakespeare on film since, once in a cinematic form, the plays are best analyzed using film narrative. Whether it is Olivier’s psychological presentation, Zeffirelli’s traditional filming approach, or Almereyda’s presentation of the rotten core inside the Big Apple, “To be or not to be” has been presented as a transitional step in the hero’s journey that requires Hamlet to face his fears and show great courage before he can advance into the Initiation stage of his journey. Furthermore, “The Belly of the Whale” could vary from a state of mind, a mental journey, or a physical allegory, as I have shown in the above films.

The reading of Campbell’s “The Adventure of the Hero” in films is not static and unchanging; it can be applied to different film genres such as out-of-sequence films (It’s a Wonderful Life), surreal films (Groundhog Day), or science-fiction (The Abyss). The protagonist in Hamlet, unlike the majority of modern heroes, has an extremely complex mental structure that requires further reading to help uncover his multi-dimensional heroic adventure. Therefore, I do not claim that I have covered every aspect of Campbell’s hypothesis: far from it. But in focusing on Hamlet’s “To be or not to be,” I have shown the significance of relating the soliloquy to Campbell’s theory in four Hamlet films. My reading of these Hamlet films is based on viewing them on a small screen in their original commercial releases. But, given the escalating rate of technological advancements, future students might be able to alter the stages of the hero’s journey by experimenting with cutting,
editing, and rearranging film structures in order to obtain different readings of Campbell’s “monomyth […] personage” concept and/or other stages of the hero’s journey.

Notes

1 Quotations from the play are cited from *The Arden Shakespeare*, Harold Jenkins, ed., *Hamlet*, 1982.
2 For biblical references see Matt. 12:40 or Jon. 1:17.
3 Quoting Campbell, “the powers that watch at the boundary are dangerous; to deal with them is risky; yet for anyone with competence and courage the danger fades, 82.”
4 The hero cannot begin his initiation phase until he has successfully crossed the threshold.
5 “Two nights, two days, in the solid deep-sea swell / he drifted, many times awaiting death” (*The Odyssey*, Book V, ll.388-89 in Homer).
6 Beowulf “struggled on / for five nights, until the long flow / and pitch of the waves, the perishing cold, […] some ocean creature / pulled me to the bottom” (ll. 544-46, 553-54) in *Beowulf*, Seamus Heaney, trans.
7 George Bailey dives twice into icy-cold waters during Frank Capra’s *It’s a Wonderful Life*; once to save his brother and once to save his guardian angel, Clarence.
8 Please refer to published article for the plates.
9 Although Edward Eriksen’s bronze sculpture is unknown to Shakespearean audiences, the little mermaid’s symbolic significance is familiar to twentieth-century filmgoers.
10 It is important to note that Almereyda distinguishes between natural light and artificial light in his film. For example, the ghost (Sam Sheppard) walks around comfortably in the artificially lit hotel room but the cock’s crow signifies natural light that forces his exit.
11 Both of these items are inventions made possible by the Industrial Revolution.
12 Campbell writes, “The mystical marriage with the queen goddess […] for the woman is a life.” (120)
13 The Zen master is perceived by many to be “enlightened” and since he is “masculine in form” I have giving him a “supernatural” status according to Campbell’s suggestion who wrote, “frequently, the supernatural helper is masculine in form,” 72.
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