

*Psychodrama, Group Processes, and Dreams*, by Wilma Scategni. New York: Brunner-Routledge and Taylor & Francis. 2002.

Scategni's understanding and appreciation of the archetypal world of myth, symbol, and ritual makes this work an important contribution for both Jungians and psychodramatists. The author captures humanity's awareness of a domain beyond human consciousness and our collective attempts to gain access to it. Viewed by mystics and "archaic man" as the world of the gods and spirits, we continue this grail-like search for the sacred in our daily life.

In tracking our collective relationship with the transcendent, Scategni thoughtfully includes the work of two of the greatest thinkers of our time, Mircea Eliade and James Frazer. Understanding the human imperative to move beyond the restrictions of the profane, both spent a lifetime studying the role of the divine in primitive cultures.

Eliade describes "archaic culture as essentially in harmony with the cosmos and its cyclic rhythms, while modern man is someone who considers himself in harmony with history and its linear progression" (Eliade, 1963, p. 388). Frazer suggests that "spells and magic ceremonies were used by people at a primitive stage of development in order to affect the forces of nature directly through human interference" (Frazer, 1922, p. 376).

Since time immemorial, humanity has known that contact with the divine can only occur within a sacred space. Indigenous prayer circles, sacred groves, prayer tents, and early and modern places of worship were understood as portals to the gods and goddesses. Within those arenas, rituals were reenacted as a means to establish a relationship with the gods.

From a study of the history of the healing professions, beginning with Asklepios and the Asklepien Healing Temples, one realizes that all professed a deep regard for ritual and space. Those early spas could only be sanctioned as a true healing site if the gods had deemed them sacred. Freud's discovery of psychoanalysis, Jung's development of an archetypally based treatment, and virtually every other form of treatment has responded consciously and unconsciously to that in-born, archetypal need to enter a domain, which is uniquely different from ordinary reality, within which spirit can be approached and summoned. Psychoanalytically oriented therapists have established a well-defined set of ground rules that frame the parameters of the treatment for both patient and therapist. The entire practice of psychotherapy is built on an implicit (although largely unconscious) understanding of the need for ritual and the creation of a "sacred space." Masud Kahn's *The Privacy of the Self*, along with Robert Langs's and D. W. Winnicott's works, all consider in great detail the importance of boundaries and framing of the therapeutic relationship. Although they focused on the material and concrete conditions of treatment, they intuited the need for a special space within which change and contact with the archetypal may occur.

Perhaps no other treatment modality takes the creation of a space as far and perhaps as literally as psychodrama. J. L. Moreno, the founder of psychodrama, went on to create an actual multileveled theater, which served as the canvas on which clients sketched out their life dramas. Moreno's intuition of the need for three levels of staging, including a balcony, was a stroke of genius. In many regards, we can see the parallels in those three stages to Freud's id, ego, and superego, and to Jung's ego, personal unconscious, and collective unconscious. Perhaps Freud, Jung, and Moreno each sensed the existence of a trinitarian structure inherent within the human psyche, needing representation within the therapeutic situation.

Scategni clearly presents her understanding of the human spirit and the archetypal backdrop of life. In part 2 of her book, she describes a number of pivotal archetypal dynamics common to humanity. Included are the ascent, the sacred tree, hermaphroditism, ritual dismemberment, suicide, transvestitism, and the voyage to the underworld. Each section is rich in history and descriptions and represents yet another reason why this book is so valuable. Scategni's awareness of the various ways archetypes affect daily life is profound, and here she becomes our teacher, thoughtfully and articulately taking both experienced and novice students into the archetypal realm, helping them to understand its symbolic means of expression, meaning, and perhaps even its goal.

Scategni concludes, "Psychodrama is a ritual . . . [and] . . . allows a participant to make a crossing from the chaos of his or her unconscious into the world-cosmos he or she has inside" (p. 140).

Before my training as a Jungian analyst, I attended the Moreno Institute of Psychodrama, in Beacon, New York, where I studied with the brilliant Zerka T. Moreno and was fortunate enough to have attended a handful of seminars with Jacob L. Moreno, the founder of this movement. With that professional background, I am particularly intrigued by the notion of confluence suggested by Scategni.

In more than 25 years of clinical practice, I have never seen a psychotherapeutic approach touch an individual's emotional core as deeply and as powerfully as does psychodrama. Nowhere have I seen the utter joy or terror of human experience expressed with such gripping realism and pathos. Zerka Moreno was fond of saying that psychodrama was "a dose of insanity in conditions of control." I have personally seen the activation and de-activation of psychotic states on the psychodrama stage, in which the individual temporarily loses all ego boundaries and is brought into the moment of the trauma.

Scategni's belief that psychodrama allows for an opening into the archetypal world is also accurate. Here is where I want to offer a few comments and observations. What we find in those case descriptions are a client's

experiences within the various archetypal fields. Their association and relationship to what is at root transpersonal and nonpersonal—the archetypal—appears to be strictly personal, however. We can have many associations to an archetype based on our personal experiences, feelings, and associations, yet the ontology of the archetype remains unaffected by human desire, will, and cognition. The archetype represents a set of universal experiences, which will inevitably be traversed by each of us as we proceed through life's experience. Human hubris, however, calls for the archetype to become mutated and seeks for it to correspond to our human emotions and desires. With that in mind, I am left wondering how the interplay of a client's personal associations to the objective psyche within a psychodrama session creates change. I have the same question regarding the psychodramatic approach to dreams. Much of what the client brings to the dream in both traditional psychotherapy and in psychodrama is their personal associations to an image or situation. Scategni points out that those images and associations, although accessed by the personal unconscious, are essentially archetypal. If that is the case, what if the archetypal becomes accessible in the course of a psychodrama session? If that is the case, what then is the ultimate purpose of blending psychodrama with Jungian analysis? I needed to see this Jungian analyst/author grapple with issues involving the relationship between the personal and the archetypal. Though there is little question in my mind about the value of psychodrama for helping individuals better understand their lives, I am still left wondering what role the archetype plays in the amalgam. If the value is in having an individual enter a space that is akin to the sacred space of the ancients and important archetypal material and experiences occur within that domain, then I can be more on board. Is the author striving for an entrainment with archetypal dynamics and suggesting that that occurs within the psychodrama format? With many questions still lingering, I am left wanting more. *C'ho ancora fame!!!*

Scategni has a precise feeling for the sacred and objective psyche. To present a more thoughtful presentation on the role of the archetypal in the psychodramatic experience, she needed to draw more fully on her many obvious reserves of talent and insights.

I consider this book to be an important one for psychodramatists wanting to learn about the world of archetypes and for Jungians considering a more active way of engaging the objective psyche in their practice. It is a thoughtful, readable, and serious book, making many valuable contributions. I look forward to the author's further development of these ideas.

MICHAEL CONFORTI  
Brattleboro, Vermont