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Hans Christian Andersen was a lonely, emotionally backward man who gave form to a disturbed inner life through his writings. So argues Wolfgang Lederer in his recent book, The Kiss of the Snow Queen: Hans Christian Andersen and Man's Redemption by Woman. By correlating events from Andersen's life with excerpts from his private and public writings, Lederer makes a persuasive and entertaining call for a competent psychoanalytic approach to Andersen's work. But The Kiss of the Snow Queen is also disappointing. It leaves its own call unanswered.

Throughout the book Lederer corroborates (or simply implies) his theories with imagery borrowed from the Gilgamesh epic, Gnostic belief, Carlos Casteneda, and sundry other sources without ever justifying their generalization to the analysis of a nineteenth-century Dane. Such impressionistic "proofs" are rarely central to Lederer's theme, though, so they only muddy his arguments, without adding or detracting much. He similarly supports his theories with insightful plays on words in both English ("atonement" as "at-one-ment" p.6) and German (as in the ambiguity of "sich ueberheben" p.7), but not in Andersen's native Danish, which Lederer cheerfully admits not knowing. "What would have informed me most," says Lederer, "remained inaccessible....I could have knowledge only through summaries and reviews." Or through use of a translator when it seemed "particularly important" (Preface, p.x).

By beginning and ending his thesis with the same dubious translation—"et griin," which as his notes admit would normally be translated as "grin" or "smirk," is rendered instead as "a carnal grin" (p.222)—Lederer leaves me wondering where if not at that point he would have considered an accurate translation prerequisite to interpretation. He justifies his chosen translation by circular argument, in terms of his own conclusions of Andersen's work. These conclusions? That little Kay, with fragments of the Devil's mirror in his eyes and heart, seeing ugliness all around him and rejecting lively fellowship, "would do quite well as an ego representation for a man, as symbolic of that part of a man's function that he most readily supports and furthers with all the will power at his command—that part of him . . . for the sake of which he most esteems himself—a real manly part" (p.173). In so failing to properly appreciate the masculine principle, in relegating it to the Northern wastelands, Andersen is really expressing his longing for validation, of his machismo ("Logos") through sex, without which redemption "even such a man as Andersen could not function" (p.174). "Woman," Lederer has already told us, "redeems through love—through physical love—which is why the redeeming woman is so often shown as a prostitute" (p.157). Failure to integrate these definitions of gender into his conception of self kept Andersen in a state of psychic infantilism, we are
told, from which in "his childlike goodness he castrated God, and he castrated himself, and he castrated, finally, his own body of work."

In epilogue, Lederer draws a lesson from this for modern man. We, too, are straying from Lederer's definitions of gender, failing to integrate them into our conceptions of self and society, and are ourselves thus verging on the kind of castrating divisiveness to which Andersen subjected his world. He reminds us that the "basic truth stands to become submerged" (p.184)—that man needs validation from woman, "for whom he works and hunts and fights and to whom he brings his victories and his wounds," while woman, in her turn, needs to be reminded how, "the redemption of such a lonely man is one of the magic feats, one of the miracles a woman can perform" (p.183).
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Folklorists, scholars of children's literature, and feminists should appreciate particularly the wide scope of this collection—primarily essays with a few Cinderella variants—now available in paperback with an updated Bibliographical Addendum.


What are most helpful are the two-page introductions to each variant and to each essay which include a brief overview of the historical times as well as suggested additional sources for more discussion. The volume is possibly weak in only two areas: only one of the essays comes from the last two decades, Yolen's "America's Cinderella"; and feminist critiques of Cinderella are only briefly touched upon in the Bibliographical Addendum (pp.315-16). One hopes