ARCHETYPAL WOMEN IN FILM: A PSYCHOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE *MYSTIC* AND *BETRAYER*

ЖІНОЧІ ОБРАЗИ У КІНО: ПСИХОЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ АРХЕТИПІВ «МІСТИК» ТА «ПІДСТУПНА ЖІНКА»

Berezhna M.V.,
orcid.org/0000-0002-3345-256X
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of English Translation Theory and Practice
Zaporizhzhia National University

This article investigates the discursive construction of powerful female archetypes, the *Mystic* and *Betrayer*, within contemporary cinematic narratives (1999–2023). Employing a mixed-methods approach that integrates Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Speech Act Theory, and Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (*LIWC-22*), the study examines how these characters articulate their unique identities, extraordinary powers, and complex relationships with others and society. By analyzing specific dialogue exchanges, the research uncovers the psycholinguistic mechanisms through which these archetypes navigate challenges, express their inner worlds, and engage in manipulation or self-realization. This comprehensive linguistic exploration reveals nuanced portrayals of female agency, vulnerability, and the origins of villainy in modern media.

Findings indicate the *Mystic* archetype's discourse consistently centers on an innate connection to her abilities, often met with external misunderstanding or attempts at suppression. Her language conveys a profound inner world, characterized by self-reflection, a quest for authentic self-realization, and a deep yearning for acceptance, reflected in *LIWC-22* analysis by self-focus and mixed emotional expression. Despite facing 'otherness' that can lead to isolation, *Mystics* often seek balance or a true place where their powers are embraced. Conversely, the *Betrayer* archetype's discourse is defined by manipulative strategies, overtly expressed threats, and articulated plans for vengeance when initial deceptions fail. Her language unmasks a calculated, ruthless pursuit of power, frequently stemming from a cynical perspective on love and relationships, or a bitter response to past rejections. The *LIWC-22* profile for *Betrayers* shows higher scores in power-related language and negative emotions, coupled with lower social orientation, reflecting a self-serving, isolated worldview. The study highlights that the *Betrayer* often emerges as a corrupted manifestation of the *Mystic*, a dark evolution triggered by persistent societal unacceptance, profound personal loss, or betrayal. This linguistic shift from the *Mystic's* quest for belonging to the *Betrayer's* embrace of ruthless self-interest underscores this archetypal transformation, offering insights into how female power is discursively constructed in media.

Key words: female archetypes, psycholinguistics, film discourse, *LIWC-22*, the *Mystic* archetype, the *Betrayer* archetype, verbal portrait.

У статті досліджується дискурсивна репрезентація жіночих архетипів «Містик» та «Підступна жінка» в кінематографічному наративі 1999–2023 років. Застосовуючи змішаний підхід, що інтегрує критичний дискурс-аналіз, теорію мовленнєвих актів та статистичний аналіз *LIWC-22*, дослідження визначає, як в мовленні персонажів відбивається їхнє самосприйняття, архетипові риси та взаємодія із суспільством. Психолінгвістичний аналіз діалогів демонструє, як героїні обох архетипів долають виклики, формують уявлення про себе, вдаються до стратегій маніпуляції або реалізують внутрішній потенціал. Комплексне лінгвістичне дослідження виявляє нюанси жіночої суб'єктності та вразливості до сприйняття суспільством, а також причини моральної деградації, презентовані в сучасних медіа.

Результати свідчать, що дискурс персонажів архетипу «Містик» фокусується на темах здібностей та саморозвитку, нерозуміння та протидії суспільства. Мовлення «Містик» розкриває глибокий внутрішній світ, що характеризується саморефлексією, прагненням до самореалізації та бажанням прийняття, що відбивається при аналізі *LIWC-22* як зосередженість на власному «я» та амбівалентні емоції. «Інакшість» персонажів може призводити до їхньої ізоляції від оточуючих та самотності; відтак «Містик» намагається досягти балансу або знайти оточення, в якому її здібності не викликатимуть остракізму. Натомість дискурс архетипу «Підступна жінка» вирізняється маніпулятивними стратегіями, експліцитними погрозами та планами помсти. Персонажі архетипу «Підступна жінка» прагнуть влади, що часто вкорінене в цинічній оцінці міжособистісних стосунків або реакції на травматичний досвід. *LIWC-22* засвідчує високі показники у категоріях «влада» та «негативні емоції», а також низькі – у соціальних категоріях, що свідчить про егоцентричний, ізольований світогляд. Дослідження простежує архетипову трансформацію: «Підступна жінка» постає як темна альтернатива «Містик», що формується у відповідь на неприйняття, травматичний досвід або зраду. Виявлений дискурсивний зсув – від прагнення до інтеграції до безкомпромісного егоїзму – ілюструє механізми конструювання образу владної жінки у сучасних медіа.

Ключові слова: жіночий архетип, психолінгвістика, кінодискурс, *LIWC-22*, архетип «Містик», архетип «Підступна жінка», вербальний портрет.

Problem statement. In contemporary cinematic narratives (1999–2023), female characters possessing extraordinary powers have emerged as potent symbols of agency and influence, reflecting and shaping societal perceptions of female strength and capability. Yet, despite their increasing prominence, the nuanced construction of such figures, particularly in roles extending beyond conventional hero/villain

binaries, frequently remains underexplored. Existing archetypal frameworks provide broad categorizations, but a significant gap persists in linguistic analyses that delve into how specific female archetypes, such as the *Mystic* (characterized by innate abilities, introspection, and a quest for authentic self-realization) and the *Betrayer* (defined by manipulation, a thirst for dominance, and often a cynical worldview), are precisely articulated through dialogue and discourse in modern media. This absence of detailed examination hinders a comprehensive understanding of their psychological complexities, narrative functions, and the mechanisms by which they resonate with audiences.

Literature review. The concept of archetypes forms a foundational pillar in understanding universal human experiences and their manifestation across cultures and narratives. As Carl Jung emphasized, archetypes are not merely specific images but rather deeper, unoriginated psychological patterns that manifest symbolically in human fantasies and spontaneously reproduce themselves in any time or in any part of the world [1, p. 69]. Jung further posited the inherent dynamism of these patterns, noting their initiative and specific energy, which enables them to produce a meaningful interpretation (in their own symbolic style) [1, p. 79]. This active quality allows archetypes to spontaneously emerge and exert a profound influence, forming the bedrock of myths, religions, and philosophies that influence and characterize nations and epochs of history [1, p. 79]. While acknowledging definitional complexities, M. Adams [2, p. 108] clarifies Jung's view of archetypes as purely formal, categorical, ideational potentialities that must be actualized experientially, structuring the acquisition of particular, concrete contents and images. Building on this, neo-archetypal theory extends the concept into narrative, where archetypes are understood as generic story characters possessing familiar and consistent constellations of traits, directly recognizable and acting within a given story plot [3, p. 308]. This framework provides a vital lens for analyzing recurring character patterns in fiction.

Within the broader landscape of archetypal figures, the witch stands as a particularly potent and historically charged representation of female power, often associated with malevolence and the supernatural. The Western conception of a witch, deeply rooted in medieval times, was significantly shaped by theological interpretations that laid the groundwork for widespread persecutions and trials. Etymologically, terms like the German *Hexe* (connected to *Hag*, meaning fence or edge) suggest the witch as a demonic being dwelling on fences or hedges, symbolizing a creature of the border region between the human and the demonic – psychologically, between the realm of consciousness and the unconscious [4, p. 201]. In folklore and fairy tales, witches are commonly depicted as ugly and elderly women and were historically held responsible for threatening expectant mothers and newborn children besides other malevolent acts [5, p. 93].

Historically, fear often targeted women who appeared to challenge established norms or possessed seemingly inexplicable powers. Dundes et al. associate the European witch hunts with anxieties over women allegedly encroaching on male domains during periods of social upheaval, suggesting that witch persecution functioned as a tool of social control [6, p. 6]. This interpretation corresponds with Ben-Yehuda's view that as women entered emerging industries, their shifting societal roles provoked tension; thus, the witch hunts – framed as purging alliances with Satan – served an unconscious function: to counteract the destabilizing effects of social change and anomie and reassert the moral order of medieval society [7, p. 22].

This historical context is further exemplified by the accusations against midwives, who were commonly accused of being witches because of their highly skilled knowledge in herbalism, medicine and other practices related to reproduction and the female body such as contraception and their role in assisting the labour process [5, p. 94]. Such practices were perceived to loosen male control over female sexuality, placing midwives in a suspicious position due to their inexplicable powers [5, p. 94].

Psychologically, the witch functions as an archetypal figure representing overwhelming and threatening emotional experiences – those perceived by the ego as hostile, intrusive, and disempowering. In this state, the ego feels victimized, constrained, or even emptied, leading to a sense of alienation from the self. Mythologically, this condition is expressed as being "bewitched" [4, p. 200]. Within the framework of a man's negative mother complex, the witch embodies a destructive maternal force that obstructs individuation and impairs the capacity for forming meaningful relationships [4, p. 197]. Beyond their hostility toward mothers and infants, such female figures are frequently linked to sorcery and witchcraft, marked by their ability to shift forms or assume multiple appearances [5, p. 100]. Significantly, the motivations for shapeshifting in female characters often diverge from those of their male counterparts. As Catharina Raudvere notes, while men with such abilities may act from varied motives, women are depicted as transforming primarily out of greed,

envy, moral corruption, depravity, or unreciprocated love [8, p. 47].

Building upon the general understanding of archetypes and the historical context of powerful female figures, this study focuses on two specific, interconnected archetypes: the *Mystic* and the *Betrayer*, as defined by Victoria Lynn Schmidt [9]. These archetypes provide a nuanced framework for analyzing female characters who possess extraordinary abilities and navigate complex internal and external conflicts.

The *Mystic* archetype is defined by a profound connection to the spiritual or supernatural realm. She seeks comfort in solitude, often resists conventional romantic attachments or motherhood, and engages in her pursuits with joyful focus, unaffected by external time constraints. Central to her identity is an aesthetic drive for harmony, order, and transcendence. Yet her path is shadowed by fear – particularly the fear of lacking a space where her abilities can be expressed and met with acceptance rather than suspicion. If these fears remain unresolved, the *Mystic* may transform into the *Betrayer* archetype. Despite the richness of her inner world, she tends to avoid social engagement and harbors a fear of rejection, which may lead to a compulsive need to gain approval from others – ultimately resulting in psychological distress and a loss of self-regulation [9, p. 67–70].

In sharp contrast, the *Betrayer* archetype represents a darker psychological evolution. As an antagonist, she often conceals her malevolence behind a façade of quietness and innocence, using this unassuming exterior to mask a manipulative and, at times, monstrous inner self. Her capacity for deception is profound; she earns others' trust only to betray it, exploiting their lowered defenses. Typically isolated and self-serving, the *Betrayer* shows little regard for moral boundaries and may resort to violence without remorse. She frequently experiences a sense of entrapment and may exhibit traits associated with sociopathy, with her deviant behavior potentially rooted in psychological disturbance. Beneath her manipulations lie unresolved fears of inadequacy and rejection, which – when compounded by a compulsive need for approval – can lead to psychological collapse under pressure [9, p. 69–74]. Schmidt's framework illustrates the transitional dynamic between these archetypes, suggesting that the *Mystic's* unprocessed vulnerabilities can evolve into the *Betrayer's* cold pragmatism and emotional detachment.

Contemporary cinematic narratives – particularly in animation and fantasy genres – have increasingly moved toward more nuanced representations of powerful female characters, moving beyond reductive villainous stereotypes. Greg Singh notes that Jungian film scholars often prioritize popular texts due to their pervasive cultural resonance and accessibility, which make them fertile ground for archetypal analysis [10, p. 122]. Traditionally, Disney's fairytale adaptations, typically situated in a mythic past, center on princess protagonists who confront female antagonists such as witches or sorceresses, ultimately culminating in the triumph of good over evil [11]. A paradigmatic example is Ursula from *The Little Mermaid*, whom Amy Davis identifies as fitting the classic model of the "Disney Villainess" – a "monstrous other" wielding magical powers. Ursula's use of deception, including disguise and black magic, parodies earlier heroines, while her inevitable defeat at the hands of a male hero reinforces conventional gender dynamics [12, p. 215].

In recent decades, a notable transformation has occurred in the representation of female villains in popular cinema. Zsófia Tóth identifies *Frozen* (2013) and *Maleficent* (2014) as landmark films that depart from conventional portrayals of evil by granting "iconic evil, wicked and violent women" the opportunity to articulate their own perspectives and motivations [13, p. 188]. These narratives move beyond superficial depictions of wickedness, instead foregrounding the inner lives and personal struggles of such characters. A prominent example is Elsa from *Frozen* (2013), who exemplifies the *Mystic* archetype. Her story challenges traditional fairy tale conventions, notably as "the only princess character in a Disney fairy tale narrative who does not engage with romance" [14, p. 126]. Madeline Streiff and Lauren Dundes argue that while Elsa's abilities may be empowering, they also serve as a substitute for romantic attachment and may alienate potential male partners, who risk feeling emasculated in the presence of a powerful female counterpart [15]. This perceived incompatibility between extraordinary female power and conventional romantic arcs is a recurring feature of the *Mystic* archetype.

Elsa's internal conflict serves as a compelling illustration of the *Mystic* archetype's psychological journey. As Smith observes, Elsa internalizes a series of powerful parental prohibitions – "Don't be you, Don't be close, Don't feel, and Don't belong" – rooted in adult anxieties, which compel her to conceal her abilities and suppress her authentic self [16, p. 10]. Her narrative arc – centered on self-acceptance, emotional regulation, and reclaiming control over her powers – resonates strongly with audiences and reflects the *Mystic's* central fear of lacking a space where one's gifts are embraced rather than rejected. Psycholinguistic analysis of Elsa's dialogue using *LIWC-22* further supports this interpretation,

revealing linguistic indicators such as pronoun usage, speech act patterns, and references to self and anxiety that signal her emotional detachment and internal struggle for self-mastery [17, p. 23]. Together, these studies highlight a broader shift in contemporary media toward more psychologically complex representations of powerful female figures, providing a foundation for the present study's focus on their linguistic construction.

The primary problem this article addresses lies in uncovering the discursive strategies employed by two archetypes, particularly focusing on the linguistic markers that differentiate the inherently powerful, often misunderstood *Mystic* from the manipulative, power-driven *Betrayer*. The study seeks to illuminate the psycholinguistic trajectory that transforms a *Mystic* into a *Betrayer* – a shift often catalyzed by persistent societal rejection or betrayal. Understanding these discursive constructions, through Critical Discourse Analysis, Speech Act Theory, and quantitative linguistic analysis via *LIWC-22*, is vital not only for appreciating character development depth but also for comprehending how media narratives shape and reinforce societal attitudes towards powerful women, thereby influencing broader perceptions of female agency and villainy beyond simplistic stereotypes.

This study aims to investigate the psycholinguistic features of female characters in popular English-language films released between 1999 and 2023, with a focus on the *Mystic* and *Betrayer* archetypes. Grounded in C. G. Jung's theory of archetypes and A. Maslow's hierarchy of needs, these figures – often depicted as sorceresses, seers, or witches – are united by a shared pursuit of self-realization and personal growth. The extent to which this quest is fulfilled or obstructed determines their narrative role as either protagonist (the *Mystic*) or antagonist (the *Betrayer*). Employing a mixed-methods approach, the study combines quantitative linguistic analysis using *LIWC-22* on the speech of 20 characters across 29 films, with qualitative interpretation informed by Critical Discourse Analysis and Speech Act Theory. This integrated methodology seeks to reveal how linguistic patterns reflect underlying psychological motivations and contribute to the discursive construction of archetypal identity.

Main findings. Characters embodying the *Mystic* archetype – such as Elsa (*Frozen*, 2013), Mulan (*Mulan*, 2020), Captain Marvel (*Captain Marvel*, 2019), Mantis (*Guardians of the Galaxy Vol. 2*, 2017), Luna Lovegood (*Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*, 2007), Ratcatcher 2 (*The Suicide Squad*, 2021), Kiri (*Avatar: The Way of Water*, 2022),

and Galadriel (*The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring*, 2001) – are characterized by inner quests for self-realization, a distinct attunement to the world around them, and the struggle for acceptance of their extraordinary abilities.

In contrast, the *Betrayer* archetype is represented by figures such as Tia Dalma (*Pirates of the Caribbean*, 2006), Xianniang (*Mulan*, 2020), the Enchantress (*Suicide Squad*, 2016), the Fairy Godmother (*Shrek 2*, 2004), Ursula (*The Little Mermaid*, 2023), Ravenna (*The Huntsman: Winter's War*, 2016), and the White Witch (*The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, 2005), whose narratives center on manipulation, power-seeking, and often vengeful responses to personal grievance or social exclusion. Wanda Maximoff (*MCU*) emerges as a particularly illustrative case, inhabiting the liminal space between these archetypes – her unmet need for belonging and understanding ultimately driving the transformation from a misunderstood *Mystic* to a destructive *Betrayer*.

A key moment that highlights the divergent trajectories of the *Mystic* and *Betrayer* archetypes unfolds in the exchange between Mulan and Xianniang in *Mulan* (2020). In this dialogue, Xianniang (the *Betrayer*) attempts to align herself with Mulan (the *Mystic*), emphasizing their mutual experience of possessing exceptional abilities and facing societal rejection as a rationale for forming an alliance.

Xianniang: You can never go home. Your disgrace is worse than death. I understand. I was a girl like you when people turned on me. You don't think I longed for a noble path? I've lived a life of exile. No country, no village, no family. We are the same.

Mulan: We're not.

Xianniang: We are. The more power I showed, the more I was crushed. Just like you. You saved them today and still they turned on you. You are just at the beginning of your power. Merge your path with mine. We will be stronger together.

This dialogue provides a compelling example of the *Betrayer's* manipulative rhetoric. Xianniang meticulously constructs a shared identity of victimhood and ostracism, using phrases like *"You can never go home. Your disgrace is worse than death"* and asserting *"We are the same. We are."* This discourse subtly shifts blame externally, emphasizing an *"us versus them"* dichotomy rooted in the *Betrayer's* fear of unacceptance and lack of belonging. Her empathetic appeals *("I understand. I was a girl like you")* and declarations of unity aim to exploit Mulan's vulnerabilities, presenting a false solidarity to draw her into a ruthless, self-serving worldview.

80

From a Speech Act perspective, Xianniang employs assertive statements about Mulan's bleak situation, combined with expressives of shared experience, culminating in a direct commissive: *"Merge your path with mine. We will be stronger together."* This veiled promise of strength and security is designed to manipulate Mulan's anxieties by positioning Xianniang's path as the logical alternative for those whose formidable powers are rejected by society. However, Mulan's concise counter-discourse, *"We're not,"* functions as a direct assertive that unequivocally rejects Xianniang's constructed reality. This signifies the *Mystic's* unwavering commitment to finding acceptance for her powers without succumbing to the *Betrayer's* cynical worldview, highlighting a core ideological distinction between the archetypes regarding power, belonging, and moral choice.

The following three examples, featuring King Agnarr (*Frozen*, 2013), Hua Zhou (*Mulan*, 2020), and Yon-Rogg (*Captain Marvel*, 2019), demonstrate a patriarchal anxiety surrounding inherent female power, characteristic of the *Mystic's* challenges:

King Agnarr (about Elsa): She can learn to control it. I'm sure. Until then... We'll lock the gates. We'll reduce the staff. We will limit her contact with people, and keep her powers hidden from everyone.

Hua Zhou (to Mulan): Your chi is strong, Mulan. But chi is for warriors… not daughters. Soon, you'll be a young woman… and it is time for you… to hide your gift away. To… To silence its voice. I say this to protect you. That is my job. Your job is to bring honor to the family. Do you think you can do that?

Yon-Rogg (to Captain Marvel): I always told you… you'll be ready the day you can knock me down as yourself. This is that moment. This is that moment, Vers! Turn off the light show… and prove to me you can beat me without…

These male authority figures employ discourses of containment, gendered confinement, and conditional power. Agnarr's commands *("We'll lock the gates," "keep her powers hidden")* frame Elsa's abilities as a dangerous defect requiring isolation, driven by fear. Hua Zhou's paternal advice *("hide your gift away," "silence its voice")* instills a gendered ideology, demanding Mulan's conformity to traditional roles for the sake of familial honor and perceived protection. Similarly, Yon-Rogg's directives *("Turn off the light show," "prove to me you can beat me without...")* impose a restrictive framework on Captain Marvel's powers, conditional on his male-sanctioned validation.

These utterances are predominantly directives and assertions designed to control and compel female behavior. They serve to assert the male figures' authority, whether as protector, father, or mentor, ultimately aiming to suppress or redefine the female character's unique power for the sake of external order or male approval. This consistent linguistic pressure, rooted in societal fears and patriarchal norms, directly contributes to the *Mystic* archetype's core vulnerability: the profound fear of rejection and the desperate need for a place where her powers are accepted. Such unfulfilled needs become a critical catalyst, pushing the *Mystic* towards the path of the villainous *Betrayer*, who responds to this suppression with deception and a ruthless pursuit of self-preservation.

The following extracts illustrate how female characters embodying the *Mystic/Betrayer* archetype linguistically define and express their powerful, often 'witchy' or 'treacherous,' identities.

Tia Dalma: …it was a woman as changing and harsh and untamable as the sea.

Galadriel: …you would have a queen… not dark but beautiful and terrible as the dawn! Treacherous as the sea! Stronger than the foundations of the earth! All shall love me… and despair.

Serafina: My name is Serafina Pekkala… clan-queen of the witches of Lake Enara.

Ursula: They weren't kidding when they called me / Well, a witch… / And I fortunately know a little magic / It's a talent that I always have possessed…

Unlike instances where male figures attempt to suppress their abilities, here, the women themselves articulate their inherent nature, power, and roles. Tia Dalma (*Pirates of the Caribbean: Dead Man's Chest*, 2006) embraces an untamable, elemental essence, asserting her intrinsic connection to nature and challenging acceptance of her authentic self. Galadriel (*The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring*, 2001) articulates the terrifying scale of her potential power if corrupted, using hyperbolic language to demonstrate a chilling self-awareness of the destructive force she could unleash. Both Serafina Pekkala (*The Golden Compass*, 2007) and Ursula (*The Little Mermaid*, 2023) engage directly with the *"witch"* identity, with Serafina proudly declaring her lineage and leadership within an accepting community, while Ursula strategically re-appropriates the label, using deceptive charm to disarm and manipulate. These utterances reveal diverse self-constructions of power, ranging from inherent force and terrifying potential to re-appropriated identity and manipulative performance. The characters use direct assertions, rhetorical challenges, and strategic deceptions to define their nature. Collectively, these linguistic acts underscore the archetypes' distinct paths: the *Mystic*

seeking acceptance and balance for her inherent gifts, and the *Betrayer* leveraging deception and an embrace of dominance in response to a world that may have rejected her true self.

The following extracts illustrate the linguistic expression of alienation and societal rejection experienced by characters embodying or transitioning between the *Mystic* and *Betrayer* archetypes.

Kiri: Why can't I just be like everyone else?.. Why am I different?

Wanda: I used to think of myself one way. But after this (transformation)... I am something else. I'm still me, I think, but... that's not what everyone else sees. / I know what it's like to be on your own, hunted for abilities you never wanted... / You break the rules and become a hero. I do it, and I become the enemy. That doesn't seem fair.

Ursula: And now look at me, the family pariah. Wasting away to practically nothing... Banished and exiled, driven halfway to madness in this dim little crevice for fifteen long years.

These utterances reveal deep internal conflicts, such as Kiri's longing for conformity and Wanda's frustration with being perceived as an enemy despite heroic actions (*Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness*, 2022), highlighting a painful discrepancy between self-identity and external fear. Ursula's lament of banishment and exile further exemplifies a discourse of victimization and injustice. These narratives expose pervasive societal prejudices against extraordinary female power, which actively contribute to the characters' sense of isolation and marginalization. Here characters employ direct questions, poignant laments, and forceful assertions to articulate their emotional burden and challenge the unfairness of their situation. Whether seeking empathy, justifying their existence, or expressing profound disappointment, their language conveys the pain of being misunderstood and feared. Ultimately, these experiences of unacceptance – ranging from quiet internal struggle to overt persecution – serve as catalysts in the archetypal journey. They directly feed the *Mystic's* core fears of rejection, often initiating the transformation into the vengeful *Betrayer* who reacts to such societal hostility by prioritizing self-preservation and embracing darker, manipulative paths.

These extracts illustrate the *Betrayer's* mastery of linguistic manipulation, consistently disguising self-serving agendas beneath facades of benevolence or the promise of fulfilling desires.

Enchantress: Why are you here?.. Why do you serve those who cage you? I am your ally. And I know what you want. Exactly what you want.

Fairly Godmother: Your fallen tears have called to me / So, here comes my sweet remedy / I know what every princess needs / For her to live life happily...

Ursula: And I'm only here to help... Daddy's been so unfair to both of us, controlling everything we say and do. In a way, we're the same, you and I.

Rose: Look, can I be frank?.. Look, I'm trying to help you... and if you don't want my help, I understand... but the Toussaint isn't doing you any good... sitting in a vault... when it could be going viral... around the world...

Characters like the Enchantress (*Suicide Squad*, 2016) and Ursula (*The Little Mermaid*, 2023) craft discourses of deceptive alliance and shared grievance, framing themselves as allies or fellow victims to exploit vulnerabilities. While Rose (*Ocean's 8*, 2018) subtly manipulates through flattery and appeals to professional interests, the Fairy Godmother (*Shrek 2*, 2004) epitomizes the deceptive 'wish-granter,' offering guaranteed happiness as a cover for her own controlling agenda. These manipulative acts primarily manifest as deceptive assertions, strategic questions, and veiled promises. Whether offering aid, challenging existing power structures, or promising a *"sweet remedy,"* the illocutionary force of these utterances is carefully constructed to entice, bind, and ultimately exploit the target. This sophisticated linguistic profile directly reflects the *Betrayer's* core characteristics as an expert liar who uses a nice disposition to disguise her dark side.

The following extracts illustrate the *Betrayer's* pivot from subtle manipulation to overt threats and vengeful planning when her initial strategies falter.

Tia Dalma: Caution, Barbossa. Do not forget it was by my power you return from the dead. Or what it mean if you fail me.

Fairly Godmother: Harold, you force me to do something I really don't want to do... We made a deal, Harold, and I assume you don't want me to go back on my part... If you remember, I helped you with your happily ever after. And I can take it away just as easily. Is that what you want? Is it?

Enchantress: The humans turned against us. Now they worship machines. So I will build a machine that will destroy them all...

Characters like the Enchantress (*Suicide Squad*, 2016) construct narratives of justified destruction, framing victims as betrayers to legitimize their extreme retribution. Tia Dalma (*Pirates of the Caribbean: At World's End*, 2007) and the Fairy Godmother (*Shrek 2*, 2004) leverage past favors to assert absolute control, reminding their targets of the precariousness of their indebted positions. This shift in discourse reveals a fundamental change

in power dynamics, as the *Betrayer* moves from veiled coercion to direct assertion of dominance and the explicit threat of dire consequences. These utterances are predominantly forceful directives, warnings, and declarations of destructive intent. The Enchantress's plan to *"destroy them all"* is a direct threat of apocalyptic scale, while Tia Dalma's *"Or what it mean if you fail me"* uses veiled menace to compel obedience. The Fairy Godmother's threat to *"take it away just as easily"* directly aims to revoke past boons, coercing compliance. This aggressive linguistic pivot highlights the *Betrayer's* ruthless nature, her capacity for extreme measures, and unyielding drive to maintain or regain dominance when her desires are thwarted.

The following extracts offer a nuanced look into the *Mystic / Betrayer* archetype's complex relationship with children, often marked by the absence of biological offspring and a redefinition of maternal roles. It is directly linked with the monstrous mother archetype.

The White Witch: But you see, Edmund, I have no children of my own. And you are exactly the sort of boy who I could see, one day, becoming Prince of Narnia. Maybe even King.

Ursula: Poor child. Poor sweet child. He can be so angry. He thinks he knows everything… What has your father told you about me?.. I'm not half the monster he claims I am.

Wanda: I don't relish hurting anyone, Stephen. But she's not a child. She's a supernatural being. Such raw power could wreak havoc on this and other worlds. Her sacrifice would be for the greater good… You gave all those lives just to keep me from my children… I'm not a monster, Stephen. I'm a mother.

Ravenna: Did you not think I wanted a child? Did you not think I wanted love? But these things were not meant for me… I killed your daughter and released the greatest power within you. A power you have wasted on nothing but cheap sentiment!

Characters like The White Witch (*The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, 2005) and Ursula (*The Little Mermaid*, 2023) employ a discourse of manipulative surrogate motherhood, using the 'child' address and false kinship to exert influence and exploit vulnerabilities for personal gain. Wanda (*Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness*, 2022) and Ravenna (*The Huntsman: Winter's War*, 2016) reveal a deeper pain stemming from the loss or denial of children, shaping their discourse into justifications for extreme actions or a bitter rationalization for their pursuit of power. This highlights how their unfulfilled maternal desires or traumatic experiences can fuel a distorted

ideology of nurturing or compensatory ambition. Here characters utilize a range of linguistic acts from manipulative promises and deceptive claims of empathy to desperate justifications and cynical critiques. Their utterances, whether designed to gain trust, sow discord, or assert a fragmented identity, underscore how the lack or loss of children becomes a significant factor in their archetypal journey. This complex interplay often pushes the *Betrayer* towards villainy, where the concept of 'motherhood' is either strategically performed or serves as a profound source of pain that contributes to their ruthless and controlling nature.

The *LIWC-22* data for the *Mystic* archetype reveals a distinctive linguistic profile, characterized by a pronounced focus on internal and cognitive processes, a complex emotional landscape, and a notable detachment from conventional social and material pursuits. These empirically observed patterns align strongly with the archetype's defining traits, particularly its drive for self-realization, introspection, and a nuanced engagement with the world.

A prominent feature of the *Mystic's* language is a high prevalence of 'function' words, especially 'personal pronouns', with a significant emphasis on first-person singular. This robust self-referential language highlights a profound focus on the individual's thoughts, feelings, and internal experiences. While deeply introspective, the elevated use of 'they' pronouns suggests an awareness of or a referential stance towards external groups or abstract "others," which can be interpreted in light of the *Mystic's* fears of societal rejection. The *Mystic's* discourse is also rich in 'verbs' and 'adjectives', indicating a dynamic linguistic style that emphasizes actions, states of being, and detailed descriptions, aligning with an active internal life and a nuanced perception of their world.

The *Mystic's* language exhibits high scores in 'cognition' and 'cognitive processes', signifying a deep engagement with thought, knowledge, and abstract reasoning. This is further elaborated by high usage of 'discrepancy' and 'differentiation' words, suggesting a cognitive style that acknowledges complexities, explores alternatives, and engages in nuanced distinctions. This approach supports the *Mystic's* quest for higher knowledge and balance. Furthermore, the elevated numbers in 'visual' and 'feeling' categories indicate a strong engagement with sensory perception and emotional experience, reinforcing the *Mystic's* ability to sense the life forces and explore her profound subjective internal world.

Contrary to an expectation of pure serenity, the *Mystic's* discourse reveals a significant amount of negative affect. High scores in 'tone negative', 'emotion negative', 'anxiety', and 'anger' suggest an underlying emotional complexity. This linguistic evidence points to the internal struggles of the archetype, particularly their fears of unacceptance, rejection, and inadequacy. The high 'focus_present' further anchors these emotional and cognitive states in their immediate, lived experience.

Another defining characteristic of the *Mystic's* linguistic profile is a consistent disengagement from categories associated with conventional social interaction, material concerns, and highly structured discourse. Low scores in 'social behavior' and 'communication' indicate a reduced focus on direct social engagement and interaction, aligning with their preference for solitude and tendency to avoid people and social situations. Similarly, low frequencies in 'lifestyle', 'leisure', 'home', 'work', 'money', 'food', and 'acquire' underscore their detachment from everyday material pursuits and conventional societal interests. This reinforces the idea that their motivations are driven by higher needs (Maslow's self-actualization) rather than basic or social needs.

From a structural linguistic perspective, the *Mystic's* language shows low usage in 'analytic' (indicating a less formal, more personal thinking style), 'determiners', 'articles', and 'prepositions'. This pattern suggests a discourse that is less about explicitly specifying, quantifying, or formally structuring relationships between concrete entities, reflecting a more fluid, perhaps abstract, or less overtly formal mode of expression. The low score in 'quantifiers' further supports this. The low 'achieve' category confirms that their language is not centered on external accomplishments, and the low 'curiosity' and 'question marks' suggest a more internal, declarative knowing rather than an outward-directed inquiry. Finally, the low 'time' category, despite specific 'focus_present' and 'focus_future' being high, implies that while they contemplate temporal dimensions, time itself as a rigid concept is meaningless to them.

The *LIWC-22* data for the *Betrayer* archetype reveals a distinct linguistic profile characterized by a strong drive for control, intense internal turmoil, and a strategic detachment from genuine social engagement. These patterns consistently reflect the archetype's villainous transformation, driven by unmet needs for self-realization and fueled by manipulative and self-serving tendencies.

Similar to the *Mystic*, the *Betrayer's* language exhibits a high proportion of 'function' words, including prominent 'personal pronouns' and a strong emphasis on first-person singular. This underscores an intense self-focus, aligning with the *Betrayer's* characteristics of selfishness and self-preservation. Crucially, this self-focus is coupled with a high use of 'power' words. This directly reflects the *Betrayer's* unwavering use of her powers for dominance and her drive to regain control of her life when feeling trapped. The high frequency of 'allnone' words suggests an absolutist or categorical thinking style, which can signify a lack of nuance in judgment and reinforce their decisive, often destructive, actions or convictions. High 'auxiliary verbs' and general 'verb' usage suggest a focus on potential actions and states, reinforcing their agency and capacity for decisive action. The elevated use of 'they' pronouns, as with the *Mystic*, indicates an awareness of or a reference to external others, often framed as antagonists or targets of manipulation.

The *Betrayer's* language is saturated with negative affect, indicated by high scores in 'tone negative' and 'emotion negative'. More specifically, high frequencies of 'anger' and 'sadness' point to profound internal turmoil. The anger likely stems from feeling betrayed by societal rejection of their power, fueling their calculated vengeance. Sadness may reflect their shattered identity or the unfulfilled longing for acceptance. A striking finding is the high prevalence of 'death' words. This suggests a preoccupation with mortality, destruction, or perhaps the consequences of their actions, aligning with the physical annihilation that often befalls the *Betrayer* and her willingness to take her (imagined) enemy's life. Their high use of 'want' words also points to unfulfilled desires or intense cravings, which drive their actions.

The *Betrayer* exhibits low scores across social and interpersonal categories. The consistently low numbers in 'social behavior', 'communication', and 'politeness' words indicate a fundamental lack of genuine social engagement This aligns with the *Betrayer's* characteristic of being socially inept, and lacking genuine empathy. Furthermore, the low scores in 'lifestyle', 'leisure', 'home', 'work', 'money', 'food', and 'acquire' reinforce the *Betrayer's* detachment from conventional daily life, material pursuits, and external achievements. Their motivations are not rooted in these spheres but in power, control, and self-preservation.

The *Betrayer's* cognitive profile is intriguing. While showing high numbers in 'function' and 'differentiation', they exhibit notably low scores in 'analytic' thinking, similar to the *Mystic*, suggesting their thought processes are not primarily driven by highly formal or detached logical reasoning. Instead, their cognitive style is characterized by a strong 'focus_

future', indicating forward-looking planning and strategic thinking, which is crucial for their manipulative schemes and pursuit of dominance. However, their low scores in 'insight' (reflecting understanding or knowing), 'perception', 'attention', and 'question marks' are highly significant. This suggests a lack of genuine curiosity, a reduced openness to external stimuli or nuanced understanding, and a disinclination to ask questions or seek deeper insights, particularly if they challenge their own fixed worldview. This aligns with the *Betrayer's* deceitful and potentially sociopathic nature, where they are less concerned with objective truth or others' perspectives and more with manipulating their own reality for strategic gain.

Conclusion. Drawing from the comprehensive analysis employing Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Speech Act Theory, and *LIWC-22*, distinct linguistic profiles emerge for the *Mystic* and *Betrayer* archetypes, offering profound insights into their psycholinguistic essence and narrative trajectories. The *Mystic* archetype, characterized by high *LIWC* scores in 'cognition' and 'feeling', tends to articulate her extraordinary abilities as intrinsic connections to universal forces or unique perceptions of reality. Her discourse, often marked by self-reflection and a desire for authentic self-realization, navigates the complexities of her "otherness" and the fear of societal unacceptance. When faced with external attempts to control or suppress her powers, the *Mystic's* language reveals an internal struggle between conformity and authenticity, frequently leading to self-imposed isolation or a persistent quest for a place where her true nature is understood and accepted rather than feared.

The *Betrayer* archetype presents a linguistic landscape defined by high *LIWC-22* scores in power, negative emotions (particularly anger and sadness), and a future orientation, coupled with lower social engagement and analytical thinking. Her discourse is predominantly manipulative, utilizing deceptive benevolence and strategic appeals to vulnerability, often through speech acts designed to entice and control under the guise of granting wishes or offering help. When these manipulations are thwarted, the *Betrayer's* language shifts dramatically towards overt threats and declarations of vengeance, reflecting a ruthless desire for dominance. Her complex relationship with love and motherhood, frequently marked by cynicism or unfulfilled desires, further fuels her destructive actions, serving as a bitter justification for her cruelty. Ultimately, the linguistic patterns of the *Betrayer* often represent a dark culmination of the *Mystic's* unaddressed needs for acceptance, showcasing a character driven to villainy when her inherent power is continually rejected and misunderstood by the world.

REFERENCES:

1. Jung C. G. *Man and his Symbols*. New York: Anchor Press, Doubleday, 1988 (first published 1964). 320 p.

2. Adams M. V. The archetypal school. In Young-Eisendrath P., Dawson T. (Eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Jung*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. P. 107–124. doi: 10.1017/CCOL9780521865999.007

3. Faber M. A., Mayer J. D. Resonance to archetypes in media: There's some accounting for taste. *Journal of Research in Personality*. 2009. Vol. 43, no. 3. P. 307–322. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2008.11.003

4. Jacoby M. The Witch in Dreams, Complexes, and Fairy Tales: The Dark Feminine in Psychotherapy. In I. Riedel, V. Kast, & M. Jacoby (Eds.) *Witches, Ogres, and the Devil's Daughter: Encounters with Evil in Fairy Tales*. Boston and London: Shambhala, 1992. P. 197–216.

5. Önal L. The discursive suppression of women: Female evils as the villains of the motherhood narrative. *Folklore*. 2011. Vol. 48. P. 85–116. doi:10.7592/FEJF2011.48.onal

6. Dundes L., Buitelaar M. S., Streiffi Z. Bad Witches: Gender and the Downfall of Elizabeth Holmes of Theranos and Disney's Maleficent. *Social Sciences*. 2019. Vol. 8, no. 175. P. 1–17. doi:10.3390/socsci8060175

7. Ben-Yehuda N. The European witch craze of the 14th to 17th centuries: A sociologist's perspective. American Journal of Sociology. 1980. Vol. 86. P. 1–31.

8. Raudvere C. Now You See Her, Now You Don't: Some Notes on the Conception of Female Shape-shifters in Scandinavian Traditions. In S. Billington & M. Green (Eds.) *The Concept of the Goddess*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. P. 41–56.

9. Schmidt V. *The 45 Master characters*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Writers Digest Books, 2007. 338 p.

10. Singh G. *Film After Jung. Post-Jungian Approaches to Film Theory*. London and New York: Routledge, 2009. 218 p.

11. Deszcz J. Beyond the Disney Spell, or Escape into Pantoland. *Folklore*. 2002. Vol. 113, no. 1. P. 83–91.

12. Davis A. M. *Good Girls and Wicked Witches: Changing Representations of Women in Disney's Feature Animation, 1937–2001*. New Barnet, North: John Libbey Publishing Ltd., 2007. 274 p.

13. Tóth Z. A. Disney's Violent Women in Quest of a 'Fully Real' Violent Woman in American Cinema. *Brno Studies in English*. 2017. Vol. 43, no. 1. P. 185–212. doi:10.5817/BSE2017-1-11

14. Mollet T. L. *A Cultural History of the Disney Fairy Tale: Once Upon an American Dream*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan. 2020. 181 p. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-50149-5

15. Streiff M., Dundes L. Frozen in Time: How Disney Gender-Stereotypes Its Most Powerful Princess. *Social Sciences*. 2017. Vol. 6, issue 2, no. 38. P. 1–10. doi:10.3390/socsci6020038

16. Smith D. *The Psychology Workbook for Writers*. Tools for Creating Realistic Characters and Conflict in Fiction. Wooden Tiger Press, 2015. 86 p.

17. Бережна М.В. Психолінгвістичний образ Ельзи (у фільмі *Frozen*). Сучасні дослідження з іноземної філології. 2021. Випуск 2 (20). С. 16–24. doi:10.32782/2617-3921.2021.20.16-24