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Introduction

This thesis is ambitious; I am the first to admit that what I am about to attempt may not translate in an ideal or conventional way, yet archetypal literary criticism has left me indebted to the point of devotedly pursuing its premise. As much as I mulled over the various risks and possibilities involved, the choice of molding an archetypal constellation of my own was eventually made; and with it came obstacles that pushed both my patience and academic capacity to their limits. I can readily confess that this writing process challenged me in ways earlier unimagined, especially since I had never witnessed anyone attempt anything similar. During my research, I have come across Jungian hypotheses that rely on analytical psychology to explain an already established archetype, as well as Freudian readings of various instincts and impulses in literature — but never a combination of the two. Because of this reinvented approach, however, I can fully stand by my thesis as a method of its own, which I believe has only barely started to reach its future potential.

In many ways, this thesis is the result of a personalized approach to literary criticism as a whole; after spending countless hours studying and decoding the kinds of Lacan, Foucault and Butler, I realized that theirs was not an approach that inspired me as a critic. To my dumbfounded surprise, I discovered my path along those of Sigmund Freud and Carl Gustav Jung, whose studies reflected the same desires as mine — to unravel the core and inner workings of what makes humans the way they are. Like Jung perhaps more so than Freud, the realm of myth has always piqued my fascination due to its multilayered domain; within it lies religion, history, culture and psychology — the latter in particular inspiring the Jungian archetypes. I would therefore claim to have an aptitude for archetypal readings, which has forced me into quite the passionate class discussions. As a result, this thesis fully represents me as a critic; what I am concerned with when analyzing, and what I would like to contribute with to the greater field of literary criticism. The LMD triad may be the result of an aspiring vision, yet I believe its general value to be significant enough to present it as my final thesis.

Thesis Outline

This thesis presents a thematic network and pattern rooted in archetypal criticism, which I have appropriately named the “LMD” triad. The triad itself consists of three distinct yet connected archetypes, namely “Love”, “Madness” and “Death”. Each archetype represents
psychic stages based on Freudian psychology, though the definition of archetypes used belongs to Jung. With this archetypal triad I wish to provide a method that does not currently exist, because I ultimately see the need for it as well as its potential in other branches of criticism. Although archetypal criticism is no longer as practiced, there are ways to modernize it and tweak already established methods; notably to complement a more progressive era than the one it first surfaced in. Because I am at the liberty of practicing any approach, I have chosen to forward one that I find relevant — though archetypal criticism does come with some justified critique, which I will address and abide by as fairly as possible. Aside from situating my stance and method within a larger discussion, I will provide both theoretical justification and practical demonstration of the LMD triad.

The first chapter tackles the theoretical foundation and terminology. A familiarization with psychoanalytic theory is truly the key to understanding the LMD triad; it consists not only of philosophical conceptualization but relies on our psychic ability to recognize them as such. That is why the first chapter is wholly dedicated to archetypes and their psychic abilities, which includes the role they have played in the field of literary criticism thus far. After introducing the concept and history of archetypes using mainly Carl Jung, I argue for their current relevance and potential employment in general. In the remaining section, the Freudian layer to the construction is added, which very much defines the way the archetypes behave in relation to each other. While there is more to the archetypes than just Freudian drives and principles, the psychological framework has to be established before recognizing any other characteristics.

When entering the second chapter, the LMD triad is still a fairly vague concept, which is what this chapter intends to clarify in terms of adding any remaining components. The three archetypes are first individually outlined, as they require philosophical and mythological context for added substance; hence the inherent focus on their ancient progenitors (Eros, Dionysus and Thanatos), who represent the primitive and “unconscious” state of the archetypes. The more one learns of their original roles in society throughout history, the easier it is to alienate stereotypes and recognize any modern literary function. Such context also helps justify a thematic coherence among the three, which is not fully established in the first chapter due to Dionysus’ lack of psychological conceptualization. In the second chapter, however, Dionysus as representative for Madness is solidified. Once the archetypes have been theoretically covered, the remaining task is to assemble them into the LMD constellation in a way that makes the method practical.
The third and final chapter demonstrates one way of applying the LMD triad to literature, which includes an assortment of Western works that I find suitable for illustrating various aspects of the triad. These texts carry modernist traits, which makes them prone to the psychological pattern the LMD triad inhabits. Individual analysis consists of three main sections, where each stage of the triad is accounted for in detail; and through this process, findings are produced as a result of psychoanalyzing a chosen character. This way, the archetypes can be displayed within a whole range of settings — further strengthening their flexible nature. This thesis is thereby an attempt at introducing a modernized method rooted in archetypal criticism; an initiation that I defend from beginning to end.

Methodology

Archetypal literary criticism has only left a minor dent in the history of critical theory, which prompts me to defend its relevance in contemporary practices. While I was unaware of its existence for the majority of my academic journey, its discovery motivated me to unravel and revise some of the resistance it has faced throughout the decades. From claims of literary simplification to universalizing texts, there are several hurdles to navigate in terms of updating myth criticism and its perception. Even the Jungian approach has been met with theoretical opposition among peers, making the critique of archetypal criticism both internal and external. Next to commenting on repeated issues that have plagued the field, I have adapted the LMD triad accordingly to avoid facing the exact same critique. With this I hope to showcase the potential still residing within the archetypal approach, if reinvented in accordance with current critical interests — which leads me to my alternative method consisting of both archetypes and psychoanalysis.

The intellectual school that dominates this thesis is that of Jungian archetypal criticism, with considerable influence derived from Freudian psychoanalysis. Whereas Jung’s analytical psychology covers the theoretical foundation of archetypes, I go so far as incorporating Freud’s theory of drives; an approach I find justifiable due to their earlier collaborations in the field. When reimagined and reconstructed, their work and knowledge prove themselves complementary to the extent of providing an entirely new structure — one that does not restrict itself to either schools of thought, but instead traipses in between. When applied to literary texts, this harmony is reflected through the LMD triad and its combined elements; both drives and archetypes define its structure and will be present throughout the analytical process.
Literature

Roughly half of this dissertation involves a practical demonstration using various literary works. Despite how this setup might differ from other theses, I hope to make up for the unorthodox framework with original thoughts instead — simultaneously contributing to the field of criticism in a way that is more than just presenting an analysis to finish a degree, as this is a method that I would like to develop in the future. Despite having to devote half of my thesis to present and develop the LMD triad, I do so with its literary capability in mind; and hopefully the work pays off by the time of reaching chapter three, as every theoretical step beforehand is merely preparation for the final demonstration.

The literature list includes the following: *The Great Gatsby* by F. Scott Fitzgerald, *A Streetcar Named Desire* by Tennessee Williams, “A Rose for Emily” by William Faulkner, *Passing* by Nella Larsen, and *Giovanni’s Room* by James Baldwin. Although some of the included authors may not be considered representatives of the modernist movement, the works that I have chosen to analyze contain modernist ideas and elements that qualify them accordingly. Such ideas of overrated “happy endings” and the inclusion of unexplored themes (like homoerotic love) meshes well with the inherently tragic LMD pattern, hence the choice of including modernist works as such. Additionally, the movement had a tendency of exploring the unconscious mind, which provides ample opportunity for LMD analysis.

As much as I wish I could present a list more diverse and original, my choice of literature is based on the following conditions; geographical restriction, literary experience, and material of qualification. This thesis will only focus on Western literature, which undoubtedly offers a plethora of relevant fiction; so much so that I know for a fact that there are novels and short stories that have yet to be discovered in my attempt to assemble this list. Next to the dilemma of selection, the realm of poetry has yet to be thoroughly explored using my method, as the presence of all three archetypes has proved difficult to locate. My list therefore contains no poetic representation, despite the themes being beyond popular in the Greek epics. Since collecting what I would deem a “perfect” set of texts is close to impossible due to the aforementioned restrictions, I have chosen to analyze works belonging to a literary period that offers a decent selection of LMD cases. This list is by no means reflecting the literary range where the triad might apply — which I believe stretches from ancient texts to contemporary fiction — but is suitable for this specific format. With no length limitations whatsoever, the literature list could appear as ambitious as the thesis itself.
Chapter I: Theory

II.I Chapter Introduction

Love, madness and death are all part of and define the human experience in various degrees, as numerous authors across centuries have creatively confirmed. Among those eager to aid in their exploration and development are the famous psychologists Sigmund Freud and Carl Gustav Jung. While Freud introduced central human drives, Jung was particularly inspired by other fields of study when constructing his theories, going so far as combining science with that of mythology — however contested an approach. As a result, unconventional theories were formed and reinvented with the inclusion of Greek symbolism; symbols that very much culminate into archetypes. Based on these, the constellation of Eros, Dionysus and Thanatos becomes a palpable formula that will represent the archetypes Love, Madness and Death — otherwise referred to as the LMD triad.

To present my method as one belonging to archetypal literary criticism, I intend to apply a psychoanalytic approach. With this comes the task of defending my choice as such, seeing as the branch that is myth criticism is divided in terms of literary theory — not to mention separated from the more popular branches of literary criticism. While I mesh both Freudian and Jungian ideas into one final method, my critical and theoretical approach is formally based on Jung’s; the core of my method is, after all, the archetypes and their psychological influence. Though Freud has been considered an authoritative thinker in the psychoanalytic field, Jung’s expertise with religious and mythological symbology is vital to the LMD construction. The choice to incorporate Freudian terminology in a Jungian framework is a deliberate attempt to marry complementing theories, despite them arguably representing different schools of thought: “although it excited him, the non-scientific, non-biological realm of the mythological was resisted by Freud and underemphasised in favour of bio-evolutionary theorising. Now his ‘heir apparent’, Carl Jung, brings back myth firmly into the fold of psychoanalytic theory.”1 This initiation did not only expand on previous psychological work, but added to the growing field of archetypal criticism for decades to come. I find this experimental approach intriguing, given how I intend to incorporate mythology and psychology both into my very own archetypal pattern (the LMD triad) — ideally in a way that adds to its field. First, a dive into central terminology is required, in

---

which Freudian and Jungian psychology serves as the principal premise. In the spirit of Jung, I therefore seize the liberty to build upon Freud’s theoretical opus, of which my structure is absolutely dependent.

I.II Defining Archetypes

There are several layers to the “archetype” term that will need clarification; first a general introduction to its use and history, then an angled theoretical approach with basis on Jungian psychology. Given how archetype theory has been developed by different disciplines such as anthropology and psychology — all of which have constructed and applied the concept in each their unique way — it is necessary to explore the term in detail with the set theoretical direction in mind. I have chosen to base my archetypal structure on the Jungian model specifically, which I consider the most applicable conception when unified with Freud’s theory of drives — something I will delve into in a section of its own soon enough. Because the archetypes are such a vital part of my method, it is only appropriate to outline their basic structure and functionality before assigning them any specific role; let alone threading three individual archetypes together in a final, instinctual pattern.

The standard definition of an archetype is that of something “typical”, like recurring imagery or imitation — with repetition being its most defining trait. Derived from the Greek noun archetypon, the word is constructed by arkhē- (“primitive”) and typos (“model”), which roughly translates to “the first pattern of which others are molded”. For something to be considered an archetype, its characteristics must be representative of the type in question; like the commonly used “Hero”, representing a character who is often chosen to embark on a journey or difficult task, or symbolic “Sun”, commonly representing life, power and masculinity. Whether pertaining to a character, object or a setting, they carry universal meaning in the way that a considerable amount of people can associate them with similar elements, making them recognizable across the world. They are not to be mistaken for stereotypes, however, as “archetypes lack the dehumanizing factors of stereotypes, representing instead a full spectrum of characteristics that can manifest both positively and negatively.”\(^2\) In other words, while a stereotypical Hero may be referred to as a “good guy”, the Hero archetype does not have to limit itself to such a one-dimensional description; in addition to being the Hero they can be portrayed as a “feminine” nurturer, or even as a

pessimistic anti-hero. In practice, the archetype has been utilized by authors for hundreds of years, and was only recently developed into a clinical branch. The 20th century introduced archetypes as a method of psychoanalysis, initiated by Carl Jung through the foundation of analytical psychology. Be the archetype not Jung’s original term nor hypothesis, the way he developed it from the ways of earlier thinkers has vastly influenced its contemporary usage. With this, he followed in the footsteps of Sigmund Freud, obtaining inspiration directly from Western mythology, philosophers and culture.

Archetypes are, according to Jung, a manifestation of the collective unconscious — also referred to as primordial images. They are encoded into all humans since birth as a fundamental part of their DNA and psyche; the psyche (Self) encompassing the complete personality consisting of the conscious realm, personal unconscious and collective unconscious. Treating archetypes as “‘identical psychic structures common to all’, “3 Jung claims that these have always existed as part of “‘the archaic heritage of humanity’. “4 In other words, archetypes are part of the human evolution, which humans are able to consciously re-experience through the “unconscious instinctual processes of the psyche.”5 This theory thereby dismisses the Lockean concept of tabula rasa in its entirety, where environment is the only factor influencing our perception and experiences. The emphasis on the transpersonal is significant, as it is one of the defining traits to Jung’s work regarding the unconscious that separates his studies from those of Freud’s; while agreeing that there was indeed such a realm, Jung divided the unconscious into the personal and collective respectively. While the personal unconscious includes insignificant memories and repressed trauma unique to every psyche, the collective unconscious consists of psychic structures that are inherited and shared by all. The latter realm is the home of archetypes, as Jung phrased in The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious:

> From the unconscious there emanate determining influences which, independently of tradition, guarantee in every single individual a similarity and even a sameness of experience, and also of the way it is represented imaginatively. One of the main proofs of this is the almost universal parallelism between mythological motifs, which, on account of their quality as primordial images, I have called archetypes.6

---

4 Tacey: p. 137
The “determining influences” that emanate from the unconscious must be shaped through innate structures arranged within consciousness — only to manifest through “mythological motifs”. To further explain how archetypes appear to humans, Jung separates the “sign” from the “symbol”:

Man uses the spoken or written word to express the meaning of what he wants to convey. His language is full of symbols, but he also often employs signs or images that are not strictly descriptive. Some are mere abbreviations or strings of initials, such as UN, UNICEF, or UNESCO; others are familiar trade marks, the names of patent medicines, badges, or insignia. Although these are meaningless in themselves, they have acquired a recognizable meaning through common usage or deliberate intent. Such things are not symbols. They are signs, and they do no more than denote the objects to which they are attached.7

The sign is less complicated than the symbol, as it functions as one would think a sign would; to forward a fixed message without requiring any other analysis beyond the meaning recognized — in other words, what you see is what you get. The symbol, however, is charged with something unfathomable, explaining its close connection to the realm of myths:

What we call a symbol is a term, a name, or even a picture that may be familiar in daily life, yet that possesses specific connotations in addition to its conventional and obvious meaning. It implies something vague, unknown, or hidden from us... Thus a word or an image is symbolic when it implies something more than its obvious and immediate meaning. It has a wider “unconscious” aspect that is never precisely defined or fully explained. Nor can one hope to define or explain it. As the mind explores the symbol, it is led to ideas that lie beyond the grasp of reason.8

In practice, the symbol is used to “represent concepts that we cannot define or fully comprehend,”9 and are produced both consciously (religion) and unconsciously (dreams). Jung compares our symbolic comprehension to other senses like smell and sight; humans can only utilize these to a limited extent, though scientific instruments may aid in measuring the rest. Additionally, when humans apply their senses “in the realm of reality”, the physical information is transported to our mind and translated into “psychic events, whose ultimate nature is unknowable (for the psyche cannot know its own psychical substance).”10 Thereby every experience contains “an indefinite number of unknown factors,” as the ultimate nature of matter cannot be fully known. This forms the theoretical basis and argument that humans

8 Jung, 1964: p. 20-21
9 Jung, 1964: p. 21
10 Jung, 1964: p. 23
possess an unconscious to begin with, as Freud himself emphasized through his study of dreams. And within the collective part of the unconscious, archetypes remain instinctual inhabitants, taking form through “motifs” respectively.

Because archetypes do not appear in a set form or image, they rely on the psychic conditions that allow humans to process and express them. Jung touches specifically upon the intangible aspect of symbols, crediting them of pointing to unknown elements within the unconscious:

Whenever we speak of religious contents we move in a world of images that point to something ineffable. We do not know how clear or unclear these images, metaphors, and concepts are in respect of their transcendental object. . . There is no doubt that there is something behind these images that transcends consciousness and operates in such a way that the statements do not vary limitlessly and chaotically, but clearly all relate to a few basic principles or archetypes.11

As emphasized, the archetypes do not vary “limitlessly and chaotically”, as their characteristics can be mapped across cultures and individual perception; “the individual's entire archetypal inheritance makes up the collective unconscious, whose authority and psychic energy is co-ordinated by a central nucleus which Jung termed 'the Self' or 'the archetype of archetypes'.”12 Like a dynamic entity with generative force, archetypes seek expression through “the Self” — the unification of all psychic realms (conscious and unconscious) and source of many other archetypes (with the ego being in its center). In less formal speech, the Self can be referred to as someone’s personality, where one archetype tends to act as the dominant influence. The number of archetypes is never static or fixed, as they tend to overlap and interlace at any given time. In practice, this means that archetypes project themselves upon their subject, making them act according to the archetype’s own guidelines; for instance, should a woman channel the mother archetype, she is not exerting herself as much as she is “the archetype projected upon her, which gives her a mythological background and invests her with authority and numinosity.”13 She is thereby conforming to an ideal — the perfect model of how a mother should be and act — namely the mother archetype. Like all humans, she is “‘a being operated and maneuvered by archetypal forces instead of [her] ‘free will,’ that is, [her] arbitrary egoism and [her] limited consciousness.”14

14 Walker: p. 17
Every human being has several archetypes encoded in their DNA that make up their collected personality, with each archetype exerting their influence when instincts and various stages of life call for it — as expressed through fragments of the unified Self.

Having briefly covered the realm of archetypes and their theoretical foundation, there are certain key points to take note of when moving forward; for instance, it is the Jungian definition of archetypes that remains central to the LMD triad, and is the one I will be using in later analysis. The term “archetype” thereby refers to the mental adoption of a specified type, which is only one of countless archetypes that can be derived from the collective unconscious. Like other inherited instincts and behavioral patterns, these psychological models are archaic in nature, and organize the way the subject handles their experiences through manipulating the conscious parts of the psyche. This is significant because of the way it enhances the unconscious aspects of one’s actions; depending on the archetype, some carry more negative traits than others, which may develop into destructive behavior if dominant enough. When applying the LMD triad, every analyzed character will experience three quite impactful archetypal stages represented by each their manifest representation (Love/Eros, Madness/Dionysus and Death/Thanatos), which all remain connected in a way that qualifies them as an archetypal pattern. The defining elements and characteristics within these archetypes have yet to be specified, which is something Freud’s theory of drives, as well as mythological and historical context, will help assemble and establish.

I.III Archetypal Literary Criticism

While archetypes have proved themselves useful in various academic disciplines, they also form the foundation for their own critical method of analysis. In fact, the theorist who helped break away from earlier interpretive traditions was myth critic Northrop Frye, who valued textual symbology over incorporating non-literary ideologies. As a result of his contributions in the 1950s, archetypal literary criticism earned its position as a literature-based approach. Due to the lack of modern development and representation, however, I will touch upon the field of myth criticism from different angles; including how it grew to become a recognized method of literary criticism, not to mention the academic resistance it received as a result. Despite having dwindled considerably in terms of popularity and published material, I find the orientation both insightful and relevant to contemporary research — especially with its potential for reinvention, which I am in the process of demonstrating through this thesis. Although I objectively include and recognize the scholarly critique directed at myth criticism,
and the Jungian approach in particular, I will situate my own opinion and defense amidst these claims.

Archetypal literary criticism, or myth criticism, is one of several arenas where the archetype serves as a central form of analysis. Myth critics are generally concerned with how archetypes shape and influence literary works; “such patterns can include character types, plot lines, settings, themes and images.”15 Returning to the briefly mentioned “Hero” archetype, any character exhibiting protagonist qualities, while also overcoming obstacles, would qualify (Beowulf, Harry Potter, Wonder Woman etc.). The idea is that these recognizable archetypes, which are already charged with meaning beforehand, thereby determine the structure and function of a narrative. Inspiration was originally drawn from James G. Frazer’s work with social anthropology; more specifically The Golden Bough: A Study in Comparative Religion, published in 1890. Seeking to define the connected themes across myths and religious practices, it proved influential in a critical field that would flourish in the following decades. Carl Jung introduced the “immaterial” approach in the early 20th century; based on his hypothesis, literary texts may be analyzed in accordance with collective archetypal patterns. This process relies on the human unconscious, and how the primordial images channel it to reveal repeated structures present in literature — with mythology being credited as “the textbook of the archetypes.”16 Applying this approach to the Hero, the archetype represents humanity’s quest for individuation, where a reconciliation between the conscious and unconscious serves as the final goal. The obstacles faced are no longer just monsters or tyrants, but perhaps the overcoming of primitive qualities within the unconscious. This reading provides hope to society that reaching for a higher consciousness is worth it, despite the potential struggle of facing one’s “inner demons”. The function of the archetype thereby becomes pragmatic, which again is a function Jung connected closely with myth and religion:

Behind the various religions and the vast varieties of religious experience lies a common therapeutic aim: to harmonize the inner psyche and its relationship with society and the world. From a Jungian perspective, the truth of any religious myth is simply not the issue. The value of religious mythology is pragmatic. . . Myths are pragmatically therapeutic, not theoretically true.17

16 Walker: p. 17
17 Walker: p. 170-171
In this respect, the archetype can be considered a source of which a greater understanding of society and oneself can be obtained — a “guide to potential wholeness of the individual.”

The Jungian approach grew popular in the 1930s, while scholarly productivity in general peaked in the early 1960s. Northrop Frye’s influential contribution originates in the 1950s, where his intertextual method relied on a strictly literary perspective — as is reflected in his criticism of Jung respectively.

The most common attack against the Jungian approach is the way it caters to the “mystical” realm; because his theories remain vague and metaphysical in nature, they cannot be empirically proven or researched. “In fact, the transition from archetypal image to myth, from spontaneous representation of instinct to culturally elaborated verbal narrative, is not clearly delineated in Jung’s writings.” This, along with his “tendency to personify and give names to differing aspects of the mind of one person” posited the question whether or not archetypal theory belonged in the field of science — namely because his analytical approach differed from all other schools in claiming that the personified aspects of the mind were also universal. Though these are issues that post-Jungians have tried tackling, related attacks have been made by literary critics. Among these critics was Northrop Frye himself, who claimed in Anatomy of Criticism (1957) that the theory of a collective unconscious was an “unnecessary hypothesis”, and that a critic should only be concerned with the patterns within the very text they are studying — however they ended up there.

As the archetypal critic is concerned with ritual and dream, it is likely that he would find much of interest in the work done by contemporary anthropology in ritual, and by contemporary psychology in dreams. Specifically, the work done on the ritual basis of naive drama in Frazer’s Golden Bough, and the work done on the dream basis of naive romance by Jung and the Jungians, are of most direct value to him. But the three subjects of anthropology, psychology, and literary criticism are not yet clearly separated, and the danger of determinism has to be carefully watched.

Resisting the tendency to base a reading upon non-literary frameworks, Frye advocated for critical principles that revolved around literature as its main source and inspiration: “the framework is not that of literature itself, for this is the parasite theory again, but neither is it something outside literature, for in that case the autonomy of criticism would again disappear.

---

19 Walker: p. 18
and the whole subject would be assimilated to something else.”\textsuperscript{22} A common conception is therefore that Jung, and perhaps more so his followers, are dealing with a theory that compromises the integrity of science and literary criticism both. In a response of my own, I disagree with Frye given how I view the critical sub-branch that is psychoanalysis as a disciplinary asset; while Frye’s theories have been accused of not being applicable on modern, more genre-fluid literature, psychoanalysis has been revised and developed in tandem with new research. The latter is therefore more contemporary and attuned to current waves of both art and science. Whether or not Frye provides a more appropriate archetypal approach to literature remains debatable, however.

Like other branches in the critical field, the archetypal approach is met with mixed enthusiasm. While I acknowledge that the field may have its faults (some I have been guilty of catering to myself), I find some of the criticism redundant — especially when the discipline offers several approaches as opposed to a “standard” one, depending on which theorist one wishes to conform to. Regardless, the academic attacks are helpful in the way they help highlight potential weaknesses in the theses presented, in which potential misunderstandings can be further explained and help strengthen the discipline as a whole. To fully grasp the context of these claims, one might first consider the impact the archetypal approach has had on literature: for instance, there was a growing cultural interest in myths and archetypes in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, in which artists and poets sought them out for inspiration. Among these was J. R. R. Tolkien, who was particularly inspired by Germanic and Norse mythology when producing fictional works of his own. Following this movement, some critics naturally adopted an archetypal approach to explore the creative outcome, and potentially make discoveries that would have earlier been overlooked by traditional critics. In other words, archetypal criticism arose as an answer to the cultural zeitgeist and was not lacking in material to apply itself to — on the contrary, it served a purpose as an approach that attuned itself to the times, criticizing aspects in a new and untraditional way. This is a potent argument in my opinion, as an advocate for the field; no matter how many approaches to literary analysis there are, every approach may produce a reading that is unique based on what the critic is searching for. Since myth critics exist in relatively few numbers, their findings become all the more interesting as representatives of an approach that is not as preserved, and therefore contribute to a nuanced practice of literary study.

The second purpose the field has served is its capability of “evaluating and perhaps

\textsuperscript{22} Frye: p. 6
redirecting mass media culture, whose infinitely reproducible image-products have led to a severe reduction of ancient archetypes into mass culture’s comic-book stereotypes.23 Who could possibly be better equipped than a myth critic to investigate stereotypes in relation to their ancient antecedents? Contemporary audiences know little of the symbolism used in the media they are daily exposed to, which these critics may readily make more accessible to spread greater cultural awareness and understanding. Thirdly, the critical genre is useful in how it surveys literature with “imaginative impulses” in mind, taking into consideration the effects on both author and reader; a myth critic is thereby likely to step beyond the formal limits of a literary work, which may prove fruitful if the text in question has yet to be approached in such a way.

The field of archetypal criticism has also faced academic resistance for its tendency to “simplify” and “universalize” literary works. In doing this, scholars believe archetypal critics are too concerned with placing a text into some universal pattern (one constructed mainly by Westerners), simultaneously neglecting the “cultural and historical context” of the given work — a complaint that has very much molded the contemporary style of archetypal criticism practiced today. Because archetypes contain some minor differences depending on geographical location, they can help provide identity and a cultural heritage that is unique to various groups of people. Even Tolkien himself confessed to wanting to provide England with some kind of mythological identity, seeing as England was never part of the Celtic culture and polytheism. As for non-Western cultures, an archetypal approach would be a way of exploring the impact mythical structures has had on cultural traditions — especially if some of those traditions have been lost or suppressed due to Western contamination. This is why the LMD triad is, as of now, a strictly Western construction meant to be applied on Western literature only; even though based on universal themes and human experiences, each culture processes and develops the primordial images differently and independently. I do not believe individuality maims the integrity of archetypes, as they manifest differently even from person to person depending on both external and internal factors — which is why there would be no reason to force Western archetype representations upon people whose non-Western or indigenous culture already provides ample equivalents. These are mainly the reasons why I would not be comfortable practicing my method on colonial literature for instance, due to the inappropriate and infringing nature of characterizing non-Westerners and their psyche using

Greek deities (the ultimate symbol of Western power and civilization). That is not to say that my triad could not apply, however, should I alter and reconstruct the archetypal pattern to cater to the local pantheon. The triad might then, if applied on Indian works of literature as an example, include the Hindu deities Rati (Love), Shiva (Madness/Destruction) and Yama (Death) instead.

A common objection stems from myth critics and their proclivity for “symbol-hunting”, in which a myth critic may overestimate the significance and influence of a symbol or archetype present in a text. While I undoubtedly recognize and relate to this behavior, I do not consider it an attempt at validating an archetypal approach as much as I believe it is merely how a devoted myth critic’s mind functions:

Although Frye’s work is uniquely prestigious, his commitment to a mythic view of literature parallels what has become a widespread interest in mythical thought in philosophy, anthropology, psychology, classics, and related fields. When myth criticism is considered in this context—and when it is considered as a mode of thought—its power and importance become much clearer. For myth criticism is not what is often called an “approach to” literature; it is not a method which one can add to a collection of techniques for producing facile explications of poems. Rather it is a committed way of thinking of literary experience from within the experience itself.²⁴

While Frye remained skeptical of other non-literary influences in criticism, I find his devotion to his field and literature in general highly respectable; like other myth critics and forerunners, he recognized patterns and archetypes within literature in such a way that he based an entire critical theory on a mythological framework. In a similar spirit, whenever reading a text, I always find myself searching for patterns and symbols that may add some hidden meaning and dimension to the story. The challenge is thereby to evaluate whether their presence do contribute to our understanding of the text, or if they are merely incorporated for the sake of prose or other lesser roles. While other critics may sooner devalue or ignore such discoveries, a myth critic would sooner argue that no symbol is incorporated without serving a higher purpose (whether the author is aware or not) — consequently “ignoring other important aspects of the work.”²⁵ This is but one of the struggles of this approach, yet one I find reasonable based on the way it adds to a balanced discussion; after all, literary works benefit greatly from critics who scrutinize and investigate different aspects of them.

Another obstacle is how an archetypal approach is not always appropriate depending

²⁵ Friedman: p. 78
on the text; in comparison to other branches, like historicism and cultural studies, myth critics
have traditionally had less to work with in general. That does not exclude them entirely
however, seeing as some of the most famous literary works easily qualify for an archetypal
reading; including any Shakespearean play, Greek epic and religious or mythical texts. The
literary practice of “mythopoeia” (myth-making) in particular benefits greatly from an
archetypal reading, in which the critic can investigate cases ranging from mythological
appropriation to original adaptations of traditional myths. Contemporary examples of this
practice would include the *Percy Jackson & the Olympians* series written by Rick Riordan,
*American Gods* by Neil Gaiman, as well as an array of comic books and similar media that
both modernize and reinterpret traditional myths. Archetypal analysis also holds relevance in
other branches of literary study — like those of “gender studies, comparative literature,
cultural studies and narrative theory.”

Any text that calls for analysis based on gender, childhood, marriage and so forth all benefit from archetypal criticism. In my opinion, the
archetypal field can be molded into several interesting and focused directions, which is what I
have taken advantage of when constructing a method of my own. Despite having created the
LMD triad on the basis of archetypes and their original myths, the psychoanalytic structure
allows for wider application due to simple qualifications; as long as the text contains
characters whose psyche is made available for analysis, the LMD triad may possibly apply if
one can defend a presence of all three archetypes and their chronological connection. This
emphasis on “archetypal psychological situations” renders the triad an accessible one, as the
text requires no traditional references to mythological figures or symbolic imagery.

Although archetypal literary criticism was originally derived from other non-literary
disciplines, it eventually grew into a critical branch of its own thanks to Northrop Frye’s
contributions; and since then, little progress has been made in terms of reviving it. The
reasons for its stagnation may be many, yet Frye’s treatise on literary theory prevails as a
monumental part of a critical history. Equally influential, in my opinion, was Jung and his
immaterial approach to archetypes, which arguably holds a more promising future due to the
psychological angle — one that has every reason to develop and produce new and innovative
methods. Given how the world has changed tremendously since the 1950s, I do believe that
embarking on a path of reinvention is both appropriate and justified; not only has related
branches of study like psychology and anthropology evolved, providing the realm of myths
and archetypes with updated content, but the literary trend itself has changed in progressive
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ways that would benefit from an archetypal reading. Critique attacking the “universalizing” and “symbol-hunting” tendencies of the approach have less to worry about today; and leading by example, I will later return to the contemporary tendency to study archetypes within a set “cultural or historical context” — which I readily abide by, given how I will apply the LMD triad to literature produced within a specific geographical and historical frame.

I.IV The Freudian Framework

During the latter part of the First World War and the early 1920s, Sigmund Freud “made extensive additions to, and revisions of, psychoanalytical theory.”27 Whereas external criticism was often resisted, creative adjustments made under his own direction happened on a regular basis. This included the modification of his own ideas, where the most important of them concerned the structure of the mental apparatus, as well as recognizing the significance of aggressive and sexual impulses. His new model of the human mind thereby consisted of the “ego (partly unconscious but with conscious functions of reality testing, discriminatory thinking and protection), the unconscious id (the instincts or ‘the passions’) and the super-ego.”28 Despite the theoretical development, his idea of how the sexual instincts functioned as fuel to the psyche remained unaltered; not even his last thesis on the tension between Eros and Thanatos dismissed the significance of sexuality. These later contributions of Freud’s were not only significant in terms of superiority in the field, but serves as personal inspiration for even attempting to construct an original method of interpretation. As I now approach the next stage of construction, where Freud’s contributions will be essential, the archetypal triad will soon be structured in accordance with the theory of drives respectively. In relation to said triad, the most central of Freud’s publications are Beyond the Pleasure Principle, The Ego and the Id and Civilization and Its Discontents.

Published in 1920, the essay Beyond the Pleasure Principle presented a reconstructed version of Freud’s initial vision of the sexual instinct — as suggested by the title. The principle in itself had already been introduced, but the way he reformed it contained notable expansion; “it goes a little further beyond, but it does not abandon whatever preceded it.”29 In a line of metapsychological work to come, this publication arguably marked the beginning of the end concerning Freud’s theoretical development; the idea of how all civilized life was
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affected by repressed sexual and aggressive instincts had already started to develop. The essay touches upon relevant ideas like the “life and death instinct” dichotomy, of which he further elaborates in *The Ego and the Id* — and finally, applies to *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Freud proposed that each instinct manifested within humans in the form of an intrinsic drive; the first being Eros, the drive of life-maintenance, and the second being the death drive(s), or Thanatos — as commonly referred to by later scholars for complementary purposes. Eros, or sexual love, forms the basis of all life. It is not to be mistaken for the sex drive itself, also called *libido*; “the name ‘libido’ can once more be used to denote the manifestations of the power of Eros in order to distinguish them from the energy of the death instinct.”

Its goal is to ensure survival for the species, which includes encouraging procreation and safe practices. This instinct stands in opposition to the death drive, which “comes from the biological need of every organism to return to its original inorganic state.” Freud suggested by this theory that “the aim of all life is death,” as the instincts in question appear in every cell of all organic life. Eros and Thanatos are at a constant war with each other, though the two also happen to coincide:

But how can the sadistic instinct, whose aim it is to injure the object, be derived from Eros, the preserver of life? Is it not plausible to suppose that this sadism is in fact a death instinct which, under the influence of the narcissistic libido, has been forced away from the ego and has consequently only emerged in relation to the object? It now enters the service of the sexual function.

While contradictory, Eros and Thanatos can sometimes serve a common goal — like that of gratification — which may be achieved in ways that render the two indistinguishable, due to the referenced libidinal interference. Because of their elusive nature, the ideal state is allowing the drives to co-exist to achieve a balance in life, as opposed to allowing one to overpower the other. Both have the capability to render humans in a distinct way based on their psyche and reality; while some cater to a healthy and proactive lifestyle, others swear to a life filled with risk and temptation. This tendency towards self-destruction can be blamed on Thanatos, whose influence presides over aggression and sabotage. Through excessive drinking, extreme sports or masochistic fetishes, the repeating pattern of self-destructive behavior all

---
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demonstrate the ways humans deal with (or rather, avoid) reality — one of the ways being to seek pleasure and temporary thrills. “The pleasure principle seems actually to serve the death instincts,” as the need for instant relief and gratification triumphs that of restraint and moderation. In opposition to pleasure there is reality, its principle a supporter of the civilized ego whose task is to subdue the impulsive, primitive id. When comparing the pleasure principle to the reality principle, neither necessarily overpower the other; they can appear in conflict and in peace both, just like Eros and Thanatos — making the process of functional distinction a difficult one. A third and central force is the Nirvana principle, often confused with and mistaken for being the pleasure principle;

The dominating tendency of mental life, and perhaps of nervous life in general, is the effort to reduce, to keep constant or to remove internal tension due to stimuli (the 'Nirvana principle', to borrow a term from Barbara Low [1920, 73]) — a tendency which finds expression in the pleasure principle; and our recognition of that fact is one of our strongest reasons for believing in the existence of death instincts.

The Nirvana principle, as mentioned, is a psychic tendency to erase tension, and remains a close companion to the death drive. Whereas pleasure may under certain circumstances create more tension than what it relieved, making the principle arguably a servant of Eros and the id, the Nirvana principle strictly seeks to reach a state of oblivion — similar to that of Buddhism, where reaching Nirvana is the equivalent of returning to nothingness. Eros’ task is therefore to channel and redirect these forces to the material world, as manifested through the reality principle — be its positive agency questionable due to Freud’s conflicted distinction between principles. Theoretical dissonance was a result of the arguments used in Beyond the Pleasure Principle, which posed as a disservice to later claims made in The Ego and the Id and “The Economic Problem of Masochism.” In the end, he maintained that “the Nirvana principle expresses the trend of the death instinct; the pleasure principle represents the demands of the libido; and the modification of the latter principle, the reality principle, represents the influence of the external world.” Like any other contrasting parts of the psyche, they are capable of coexisting and tolerating each other; although their conflicting demands regarding stimulus are bound to collide.

In The Ego and the Id (1923), Freud outlined the various tensions within the psychic
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apparatus, and explained how these specific dynamics shaped human beings. One of the first topics concerned the various forms of awareness — or, like Freud sorted them: conscious, preconscious and unconscious. These form the basis of all mental life, and have later become famously demonstrated through the use of an ice berg illustration; the sky and partly visible ice represents the ego and conscious, which consists of daily thoughts and memories. Then the preconscious appears along sea level to represent how it may go from unconscious to conscious, and so does the super-ego appear as ice barely observed by the conscious. Lastly, the unconscious is the sea representing repressed parts of the mind, where the id is found completely submerged. This structure is the result of theoretical concerns posed when Freud attempted to merge a similar outline with the ego and the id, which led him to reevaluate his earlier definitions. Starting with the id, it is the oldest part of the mind and roots of all other structures. Appearing in the The Ego and the Id as “das Es” prior to translation, it functions as a polarity to the ego, similarly referred to as “das Ich”. He later described it in An Outline of Psychoanalysis as “[id] contains everything that is inherited, that is present at birth, that is fixed in the constitution—above all, therefore, the instincts, which originate in the somatic organization and which find their first mental expression in the id in forms unknown to us.”37 It fuels itself on the energy from instincts, utilizing the primary process mode when serving the pleasure principle. The objective is to achieve a free flow of energy, whereas the second process works to constrict the same energy through the reality principle. The latter process is employed by the ego, which is the organized part of mind that covers reason, control, intellect and so on. It generally represents consciousness, though Freud also discovered how the ego can host unconscious fragments when repressing itself. Most of all, the ego is connected with bodily senses; though derived from id, the ego is our sense of self — our “I” — and operates as the agent between the id and the external world. As a contrast to the primitive id, the ego’s main task is self-preservation through the adjustment of stimuli. This does not necessarily mean that it avoids all kinds of pleasure — on the contrary, it has the task of delegating the right flow of stimuli at the right time, as exemplified through the reality principle. Pleasure is welcomed, as long as it conforms to the expectations of one’s external environment. The third and final division is the super-ego, which is the vehicle of our conscience. Formed by parental supervision, it observes and polices the ego whenever it fails to adhere to the ego-ideal (the idealized image of the self); it thereby functions as a judge and moral compass, applying guilt

with the intention of instructing the ego in accordance with acceptable and encouraged societal behavior. As a whole, the id, ego and super-ego continuously interact and challenge each other in meeting with external influences, contributing to an ideally balanced psyche.

Freud’s perception of love and death is a significant one — one that he discusses in his 1930 essay *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Although the text in general revolves around social regulations, he addresses and applies several of his theories throughout. Having already covered how the instincts rule each individual psyche, how do Eros and Thanatos manifest within society as a whole? Freud argues that love is an experience where the self is being tested — not only by the object of interest, but the laws and religious tendencies of society. At first, attraction occurs, where qualities like beauty and desired comfort lead erotic or emotional passion to commence. While two individuals may complete a transaction of desires, they do so under the guidance of local customs; libido can thereby be considered the currency, in which society is in control of the economical market. Homosexual relations are but one of these various regulations, “but hetero-sexual genital love, which has remained exempt From outlawry, is itself restricted by further limitations, in the shape of insistence upon legitimacy and monogamy.” One’s sexuality becomes impaired in favor of communal benefits, given how a monogamous relationship between male and female is the preferred unity and default family foundation — though “not all civilizations go equally far in this; and the economic structure of the society also influences the amount of sexual freedom that remains.” People are thereby urged to adjust their instinctual energies accordingly, in which only a successful balance can grant them happiness. As a result, “civilized man has exchanged a portion of his possibilities of happiness for a portion of security.”

What happens when one’s desires clash with society’s guidelines? Ruled by civilization and super-ego both, the ego is punished with a feeling of guilt should the instinctual id challenge these constructed boundaries. The pressure to adhere to civilization’s ideal lifestyle comes at the cost of sexual satisfaction, deeming society a structure where not everyone can obtain happiness — provided that happiness is directly derived from social and environmental bonds. That is not to claim that people will never fall victim to their instinctual desires regardless, often rendering their path a destructive one:

We said there that man’s discovery that sexual (genital) love afforded him the strongest experiences of satisfaction, and in fact provided him with the prototype of all happiness, must have suggested to him

---
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that he should continue to seek the satisfaction of happiness in his life along the path of sexual relations and that he should make genital erotism the central point of his life. We went on to say that in doing so he made himself dependent in a most dangerous way on a portion of the external world, namely, his chosen love-object, and exposed himself to extreme suffering if he should be rejected by that object or should lose it through unfaithfulness or death. For that reason the wise men of every age have warned us most emphatically against this way of life; but in spite of this it has not lost its attraction for a great number of people.\textsuperscript{41}

This passage touches upon a common cycle, where the pursuit of pleasure may ultimately lead to unhappiness. Sexual love, as differentiated from familial and platonic love, is meant to inspire the individual to branch out from the family union; entering puberty is but one of these stages, which is further encouraged by society through initiation rites. Civilization depends on this development and is thereby “obeying the laws of economic necessity.”\textsuperscript{42} While Eros is the glue that holds society together, driving people to copulate and sustain their communities, Thanatos exists to destroy these foundations; if one’s happiness depends on the love-object, that path may just be a self-destructive one — often depending on the reaction of the external world, including that of the chosen love-object. Freud applies this destructive pattern to drug users and hermits, among others, who seek a solution in order to deal with their repressed desires — a solution that does not necessarily add pleasure, but at the very least lessens pain (or replaces it with another preferable pain). Neurotics can oftentimes derive pleasure from this struggle, which further adds to its destructive tendencies. While there are various levels of this form of “numbing” behavior, the descent into an unhappy, nervous state — and eventually, inertia — is a recurrent outcome; one that I provide an archetypal structure for.

There are several terms and principles to take away from Freud; and the most important ones include his theory of drives, which composes the psychological pattern for the LMD structure. Starting with the promising pursuit of love and pleasure (Eros), tension follows as a result of external and internal regulations — ending with the fulfillment of the death drive (Thanatos), where the individual either destroys themselves or another target. One must keep in mind that this lineup is final and chronological, where the pleasure principle marks the beginning, the Nirvana principle the middle, and complete destruction the end. The path is always of a destructive nature, characterized by a psychic imbalance which renders the subject unreliable from beginning to the end; this due to the process of succumbing either to the demands of the super-ego or the id, depending on the individual and their past. A person
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that has suffered great trauma or injustice is more likely to fall victim to their id, while someone who has had no problem abiding by society and their super-ego is likely to do so when under pressure as well — which is what the Madness stage puts to the test. One key aspect to this process is the unconscious centrality of it; just like the Freudian drives, Jungian archetypes are instinctual and situated around the ego they influence — which is further encircled by the expressive Self. Regardless of how the ego processes these demands during this nervous stage, the outcome is always either a self-destructive or an aggressive one. Madness is dominated by internal (and often external) chaos as a result of clashing drives and forces, which is why I have appointed Dionysus to be its representative entity — a choice that will be further justified when moving on the second chapter.

I.V Chapter Conclusion

Challenging as it can be to reformulate the theories of the brightest minds in their fields, the goal was to cover any academic ground necessary before moving on to fleshing out the archetypes themselves. The theoretical scope has therefore been focused from the very beginning, the chapter only lightly touching upon the many connected theories and developments. With that said, I view my archetypal structure as a literary method, which is why focus is less on classifying it either as a Jungian or Freudian model, and more on the LMD triad as an independent concoction of both literary and non-literary material. Where one theory does not add enough to the construction, another theory fills in with necessary components for the method to function how I envisioned. With such a liberal approach to a branch of criticism that lacks modern representation, I intend to showcase both its relevance and potential in an age where archetypes are still actively being used and recognized.

By addressing the most relevant parts of the Freudian and Jungian disciplines, the theoretical groundwork has been laid for new content to fill any remaining gaps. Though later analysis will rely on Jung’s definition of archetypes, the pattern they follow is more so based on Freud’s theory of drives. As will be further explored and illustrated in the next chapter, Eros as a manifestation of desire forms the first archetype in the pattern; as of now, the Freudian pleasure principle defines its psychic tendency. Dionysus marks the second archetype through the Nirvana principle, which is as a deteriorating consequence of the former stage; the goal of this stage is to remove tension through whatever means possible and is a definite step in Thanatos’ direction. Thanatos inspires the last and concluding archetype of the LMD construction, offering a permanent ending to the psychological pattern entered.
Chapter II: Archetypes

II.I Chapter Introduction

From the Classical epics depicting doomed desire, to modern fiction challenging societal expectations, writers have continued to explore the many ways the themes “love”, “madness” and “death” mark and shape our existence. It is their recurring qualities, as well as tangible connection within literature that serves as the premise for the archetypal constellation named the LMD triad. Their complex nature and history makes the process of conceptualizing them difficult, which may explain why countless artists and philosophers have previously attempted such a task — some of whose interpretations I will be taking a closer look at in regards to defining all three archetypes individually. Whereas Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung contributed theoretically to the psychological framework they manifest in, I have yet to outline the specific qualities each archetype carries; what does it mean to be influenced by the Love archetype? Or the Madness and Death archetype? Not to mention, how do they relate to each other? In attempts at providing a nuanced overview of the characteristics that form their foundation, the chapter will supplement the LMD triad to the point of structural completion.

Based on their mythological representatives, Love (Eros), Madness (Dionysus) and Death (Thanatos) form a unique sequence of thematic symbols and events — all of which are rooted in ancient tradition and philosophy. Each concept will thereby be closely analyzed and developed in accordance with their primordial deities, given how that is the closest one may get to their most raw and “unconscious” state. This to strip the archetypes of any generic stereotypes that remain charged with predefined expectations, which would only contaminate their integrity as psychic forces — hence the use of capitalization (“Love” versus “love”) to emphasize their primitive, archetypal state. With the separation of the generic concepts and the primeval entities, their position in the archetypal construction can be further solidified — one that does not disclaim the generic concepts, but rather completes a psychological pattern. Following these distinctions, I will further delve into the concepts and their most significant appearances; ranging from references in Greek myths, to philosophical discourse and symbolic contribution to Western literature. In the end, I will present the LMD triad in its finalized form, based on the archetypes as analyzed thus far. Only when they are properly placed into the psychological framework does the LMD pattern become applicable as a method of critical analysis, as Chapter III will duly demonstrate.
II.II Eros as “Love”

The presence of love spans across centuries’ worth of literature; it is one of the principal themes explored by authors, playwrights and poets alike, and can be found in any existing genre. From romantic clichés to heartbreaking tragedy, love has the power to summon an array of emotions within those exposed to it — all of which reveal how central and relatable the theme continues to be. Ever since Classical Greece, the growing emphasis on literature helped establish an early tradition in Western culture — one that focused on portraying the human experience. Stories ranging between forbidden love, adultery, homoerotic desire (“Greek love”) and incestuous relationships provide a multilayered image of love and its abstruse and unpredictable nature. Common for all of these is the way love rarely presents itself as the main focus, but as the driving force behind a larger concept; it commonly behaves like the fuel to a process, like that of a moral dilemma, for which a didactic message or resolution is often produced. Whether the result is of a satisfying or discouraging nature, love functions as the starting point of a philosophical journey rooted in the human psyche. The theme of love therefore, in its raw and abstract complexity, defines a cultural heritage through its continuous literary power and relevance.

This might be why scholars have long investigated the impact of Eros in Western culture; everything from religious background to philosophical development has aided in the process of grasping its meaning. Still, I believe there is room for exploration given how there exists more tools than ever to dissect even the most researched of literary themes; for instance, “only recently has critical or theoretical attention pointed to the problematic nature of desire—that is, on its psychological, phenomenological, and gendered bases.” In an attempt to avoid the most conventional representations of love, Eros as the embodiment of mad desire becomes the textual wellspring for archetypal definition. Its complex history renders the concept difficult to define, which is why there are three individual types of Eros’ that will be further distinguished; the Eros of Hesiod’s Theogony, the Platonic Eros, and lastly, the Literal Eros. Although differing in textual content and intellectual purpose, every concept constitutes the idea of Eros as a force that drives the human psyche — be it biologically or spiritually. Each interpretation ties chronologically in with the next and is relevant to constructing Love as a final archetype.

---

The concept of Love holds many faces — most famously among them, Eros (ἔρως) and Aphrodite (Ἀφροδίτη). Although the former’s popularity decreased towards late antiquity, the word “Eros” has maintained its relevance in various fields of study — as will be further elaborated in this chapter. In Greek, love can be divided into separate categories that discern and emphasize its use; Eros (ἔρως) meaning sexual love, Storge (στοργή) referring to familial love, Philia (φιλία) representing brotherly love, and Agape (ἀγάπη) being the love for all. While the latter three also had their representative personifications, the first carried the most cultural and philosophical value; the concept of sexual love was thereby early incorporated into ancient humanities.

Ascribed poetic influence, the depiction of Eros developed into that of a handsome youth — or cherub — guilty of spreading love and attraction among gods and man alike. This creative rebirth of the mythical Eros would stem from Hesiod’s initial vision when incorporating the deity into his poetic work; as one of the earliest depictions, Theogony presents Eros as the distributor of the sexual love that flows through gods and mortals. After introducing primeval beings such as Chaos (Χάος) and Gaia (Γαῖα), the text immediately continues to the entrance of Eros; a necessary force that induced others with carnal desire and impulses, allowing for the world and other deities to be conceived.

First of all Chaos [Gap] came into being. But then
Gaia broad-chested, always the unshakable seat of all
the immortals who hold the peaks of snowy Olympus. . .
and Eros, the most beautiful among the immortal gods,
loosener of limbs, who subdues the mind and prudent counsel
in the chests of all gods and of all men.\textsuperscript{44}

Hesiod emphasized the power and celestial position of the preceding gods, if only to magnify Eros’ potent influence. Through cosmic stimulation, reproductive energy paved the path for all creation, its subduing power paramount for the sake of furthering divine generations. Eros as a primeval entity then becomes the manifestation of passion and physical attraction; he is less prominent as a material god, but rather “the compelling drive that makes the other gods (and also humans) embark upon their various lineages.”\textsuperscript{45} His primary purpose in the world is to provide erotic drives, applicable to everyone but himself as he remains childless. Eros is thereby not a deity of romantic love, but that of a fierce and overwhelming feeling of lust and desire — which may be considered as destructive as it is productive, as suggested by later
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appearances and philosophical interpretation.

Eros, in its most classical form, invokes perverse connotations rooted in ancient Greek culture — to which an ascetic approach to sexual morality has always reacted. Sexual life in itself was commonly accepted and was not the primary topic for discussion; Greeks were much more occupied by what role individuals played in society, and how the following dynamics would affect them. Sex and love were “involved in the fact that sex has a spiritual meaning that connects it with man’s creative powers and which goes beyond its meaning as a physical act and as a set of social customs.” 46 Separating the physical from the spiritual, the latter concerned itself more with the soul, rather than the body. The question became to what extent sexual love shaped one’s social life, not to mention the ethical status; what were the differences in physical union, whether heterosexual or homosexual? While opinions differed on what was deemed an appropriate lifestyle, the most central question revolved around the spiritual bond shared among humans. The emotional and ethical aspects of making love proved themselves significant concepts, where intellectual tension brought forth a great many texts revolving the relationships between the sexes; and while some of them chaste in nature, others dared challenge the conventional human experience. It is therefore safe to suggest that the ancient Greeks weighed the topic of sex against morality and human interaction. Such themes regarding relationships, for which sexuality was occasionally a part, inspired the minds of great classical philosophers — some of them being Aristotle and Plato, where the latter became distinctly influential.

Among the ancient dialogues, Plato’s Symposium and Phaedrus both stand out as pivotal texts. The former addresses different relationships among males and females, whether physical or not, in a refreshing way compared to other philosophical contributions at the time. It was almost certain that Plato was homosexual himself, thereby inspiring kindred readers with the same sexual inclination, as well as provoking academic peers supporting a more conventional sexuality. Socrates is one of the orators present in the text, and also considered the mouthpiece of Plato’s doctrine. In the dialogue Phaedrus, Socrates declares the following in his speech:

Now, as everyone plainly knows, love is some kind of desire; but we also know that even men who are not in love have a desire for what is beautiful. . . We must realize that each of us is ruled by two principles which we follow wherever they lead: one is our inborn desire for pleasures, the other is our acquired judgment that pursues what is best. . . Now when judgment is in control and leads us by

reasoning toward what is best, that sort of self-control is called ‘being in your right mind’; but when desire takes command in us and drags us without reasoning toward pleasure, then its command is known as ‘outrageousness’. . . The unreasoning desire that overpowers a person’s considered impulse to do right and is driven to take pleasure in beauty, its force reinforced by its kindred desires for beauty in human bodies—this desire, all-conquering in its forceful drive, takes its name from the word for force (rhômê) and is called love (erôs).47

He goes on to describe how love can be harmful, as it is indeed a force known as “the madness of love.” Plato thereby entertains the idea of love and desire as a burden which may not always benefit the lover: “Eros is a powerful and potentially dangerous force whose excess must be kept in check by ‘temperance’. It is also a deeply ambivalent force. Love is madness, but madness is divine and has kinship to prophecy, ritual and poetry.”48 When combining these readings of Plato’s visions, love is defined by overpowering lust, with the ability to render the spectator mad with desire.

Love, in the form of Eros, shares both literary and philosophical connections with Madness and Death. For instance, in the ancient epic Dionysiaca written by Nonnus, Eros invokes mad desire in Dionysus towards a virgin nymph — a normal form of punishment when sexual victims were involved. This was a common consequence and is not unique to the case of Dionysus. Eros was infamous for his love darts, smiting targets who would fall victim to their consuming desires; prompting what the ancient Greeks referred to as theia mania ("madness of the gods"), a condition where all reason was lost as a result of powerful infatuation. Plato saw love, when “caused by the wayward arrows of the playful [Eros], as leading to enslavement and involuntary loss of personal freedom.”49 In almost all poetic accounts, Eros’ actions had disastrous consequences for those involved, deeming him a popular character among classical tragedians. Rarely were feelings reciprocated, and often hindered by other external forces, ultimately resulting in a serious decline in mental health — and sometimes, even death. Although the deity is no longer as popular nor commonly depicted, the theme of love still appears and influences the narrative the way it did in the ancient classics:

Whether in the sphere of art and legend or in real life, a dramatic and tragic end for lovers seems inevitable. Even when the causes of such a tragedy seem external and extrinsic to the conscious will and human desire of the lovers and appear due to an unlucky destiny, it is the inner, transcendental
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logic of the situation that demands a tragic outcome. For as a poet has said: “But a thin veil divides love from death.”

Treating passionate love as a curse has been a tradition for thousands of years, where the themes of madness and death have remained its intimate associates through frequent and related manifestations. Little has thereby changed in the literary realm, justifying an archetypal approach to all three concepts.

II.III Dionysus as “Madness”

The theme of madness has made countless appearances in Western culture, as evident in the primordial symbolism dating back to Ancient Greece. Based on its literary treatment, madness ranges from personal withdrawals to an exploration of the deranged mind — all depending on the text’s thematic focus. Its ancient originator, Dionysus (Διόνυσος), is not only the oldest symbol dating three thousand years back, but one that manifests in many different but unifying ways — including, but not limited to, the embodiment of wine, mystery religion, ecstasy and theatre. Aside from being a god that was given his own cult, Dionysus represents more than anything the dualism that is life and death; “he is the mad ecstasy which hovers over every conception and birth and whose wildness is always ready to move on to destruction and death. He is life which, when it overflows and grows mad and in its profoundest passion is intimately associated with death.”

This interpretation is supported by his mythological projections, given the god’s many contrasting epithets; Antheus (“the blooming”), Hyes (“the fertilizing god”), Lyaeus (“the god who frees men from care and anxiety”), Enyalius (“the warlike”) and Omadius (“the flesh-eater”). As the harbinger of chaos, Dionysus was considered both a liberator and a destroyer, both a lover and a murderer; all characteristics supported by the god’s many symbols and poetic references, which will aid in constructing the Madness archetype. Situating Madness between those of Love and Death requires supporting context as such, which mythological, philosophical and literary definition will provide.

Classical mythology presents Dionysus (equivalent to the Roman Bacchus) as an Olympian deity, his parents being the godly Zeus and mortal Semele. Due to Semele’s wish to witness her lover’s godly splendor, Zeus watched her being struck to death by one of his lightning bolts. With their unborn child still growing inside her womb, his father proceeded to
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remove him and sew the six months old fetus up inside his thigh. Dionysus was later born healthy and perfectly formed as “the god of the vine, of wine and of mystic ecstasy”\textsuperscript{52}, his name also meaning “twice-born”. Zeus eventually entrusted his son to the Nymphs of Nysa, since leaving the boy with a royal family did not fool his vengeful wife Hera. Dionysus remained safe with the nymths until reaching manhood, having been the first to learn of the vine and its uses. As Hera found him and cursed him with madness, the result was a military journey that most famously led him to India, among other eastern states — all of whose rich wine culture supposedly bred Dionysian cults. During this trip, he not only cured his madness, but gained his loyal following in the form of the Bacchantes (or Maenads, his female retinue), the Sileni (woodland divinities), the Satyrs (male retinue), and other minor deities like Priapus. When returning to Greece, a plague of madness mysteriously affected women of the cities visited. Any opposition towards the Dionysian rites were punished by the god himself, earning him and his cult wide recognition. On one instance, he traveled down to the Underworld in order to retrieve the soul of his mother, Semele, where he ended up trading one of his favorite plants, the myrtle, with her release. All of these achievements led the god to finally retire to Mount Olympus, the mysteries of Dionysus already widely established and evolving into representations of theatre and various mystic sects. He remained a popular and worshiped god even through the Imperial Age, the mystic traditions retained by loyal sects despite the attempted prohibition of the Bacchanalia.

The Bacchic mysteries left ample documentation in the forms of art, poetry and philosophy, many of which paints Dionysus as a dualistic god catering to both life and death:

\begin{quote}
The obscenity at the Dionysiac festival would be shameful without its deeper meaning, namely the unity of the opposites of death and (phallic?) generation in the mystery-cult that is often the heart of the festival. Herakleitos’ doctrine of the (concealed but fundamental) unity of opposite derives – in part at least – from mystery-cult, notably from the unity of death and life implicit in the mystic transition.\textsuperscript{53}
\end{quote}

To understand how the two opposing forces come together during the Dionysiac celebrations, a closer look at the practices is necessary. As Dionysus is closely associated with fertility (mostly through the domain of nature and vegetation), the phallus has also become a related symbol of his; as mentioned, the minor god Priapus, whose permanently engorged penis became his emblem, joined the satyrs in the name of fertility and growth. The phallic representation is symbolic of male sexuality, which Dionysus’ cults celebrated and liberated

\textsuperscript{53} Seaford: p. 78
to the fullest. Both men and women were unrestricted during these gatherings, the lack of sexual control and boundaries characteristic of the mysteries. Intoxication, music, dance and orgies dominated these secret events, as the goal of the ritual worshiping was to unite with nature in an altered state of consciousness — to achieve momentary apotheosis through ecstasy and sexual excitement. By entering this cathartic and trance-like state, the participants could merge themselves with the spirit of Dionysus, and ideally have intercourse with him to conclude the ritual. It was imagined that Dionysus himself, during the Anthesteria (Athenian festival), “sexually united with the wife of the ‘king’ (in fact a magistrate) in the old royal house.”

These festivals were not only sources of joy and revelry, however, as several elements also embodied death:

The fullness of life and the violence of death both are equally terrible in Dionysus. . . But to the Greeks this entity appeared as a god in the form of a god. And the mad god who appeared with a host of raving female attendants summoned mortal women to share his madness with him. He brought the primeval world along with him. This is the reason why his onslaught stripped mortals of all of their conventions, of everything that made them “civilized,” and hurled them into life which is intoxicated by death at those moments when it glows with its greatest vitality, when it loves, procreates, gives birth, and celebrates the rites of spring.

Despite the drunken festivities and loose atmosphere, Dionysus brought darkness with him as well — both in terms of mental and physical corruption. There are myths documenting how the wine poisoned its consumers, making it an ambivalent gift — both a delight and a curse to man. In poetic representations, the rituals also contained a shamanic, flesh-eating tradition involving sparagmos (“pulling to pieces”), where small animals or even humans were caught and ripped apart with bare hands, only to be consumed raw (omophagia) for the purpose of honoring the wild forces Dionysus represented. The god was in fact dismembered by the titans and later reborn, according to his manifestation as Zagreus, also called “the first Dionysus”. The dismemberment would then be followed by the restoration of life, a transition that emphasized Dionysus’ connection with both life and death within the mystery cult; the rituals themselves further tying “the physical world to the spiritual.” These contrasting activities became the heart of the Dionysiac, where ecstasy and music interlaced with that of
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ritualistic carnage. Bound by the all-important wine, the madness present was not so much about aimless erratic behavior as it was about personal liberation;

Dionysus frees his initiate in the face of death. This is one of various ways in which he liberates. He liberates psychologically through wine, but here there may also be anticipation of the next world. . . Wine in mystic ritual may provide a taste of the next world, as may also the kind of wine-free ecstasy experienced by, for instance, the Theban maenads in *Bacchae* (686-713).\(^{57}\)

Through the “‘right kind of madness’”, sufferings of this world (and possibly, the next) could be released with the help of mystic initiation; “inasmuch as mystic ritual is a rehearsal for death.”\(^{58}\) Even Plato supports such a reading of madness in *Phaedrus*; “madness can provide relief from the greatest plagues of trouble. . . So it is that the right sort of madness finds relief from present hardships for a man it has possessed.”\(^{59}\) This is the core of the deity and his legacy, where the desire to control and direct their unconscious drives is but a human tendency — often one that manifests in ways considered destructive.

Dionysus’ treatment in philosophy arguably started with Heraclitus’ theory of opposites, which was a precursor to the Nietzschean opposites (Apollonian and Dionysian), and possibly even Freud’s theory of drives. Dating back to sixth century BC, Heraclitus was the first to consider Dionysus as the embodiment of an abstract principle, which was based on the metaphysical foundation of a “unity of experience”. According to his doctrine, the universe was a system of opposite elements that were continuously connected in the way that they are interchangeable: “God is day and night, winter and summer, war and peace, satiety and famine, and undergoes change in the way that fire, whenever it is mixed with spices, gets called by the name that accords with the bouquet of each spice.”\(^{60}\) Similarly, Dionysus was part of both the physical and the spiritual world — both life and death — thereby the paradoxical unity of opposite forces. Heraclitus emphasized this when addressing a phallic rite performed by maenads: “if it were not in Dionysus’ honour that they make a procession and sing a hymn to the shameful parts, their deed would be a most shameful one. But Hades and Dionysus, for whom they rave and celebrate the festival of the Lenaeae, are one and the same!”\(^{61}\) While different readings and translations can be found, the most consistent interpretation is that of Dionysus and Hades equating with life and death — and because of
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their synergy, the maenads end up honoring them both. “The further claim that they are ‘one and the same’ can then be unpacked, in Freudian terms, as a claim that the desire to reproduce oneself and the death-wish are ‘one and the same impulse’” — which is reasonable when considering how Eros and Thanatos often become instinctually indistinguishable. While it may be farfetched to credit Heraclitus for Freud’s psychoanalytic contribution, similarities can undoubtedly be traced in the work of Friedrich Nietzsche:

Let us think of our own estrangement from the chorus and the tragic heroes with regard to that tragedy, both of which we were unable to reconcile with our habits as little as with the tradition — until we retrieved the ambiguity of the origin and essence of the Greek tragedy itself as the expression of two intertwined driving forces — the Apollonian and the Dionysian.

As creative powers originating in nature, the Apollonian and Dionysian are dualistic impulses that come together in the forms of Greek tragedies; the former representing qualities such as harmony and structure, and the latter representing chaos and passion. The presence of both is necessary, and ideally in a balanced union. This treatment of Dionysus as a driving force (alongside Apollo) corresponds well to those made by Heraclitus and Freud, not to mention adding to the chaotic duality that defines the Madness archetype.

Madness, especially when based on Dionysus, can embody several meanings when applied to literature; it can refer to the wild side of man, political rebellion, medical conditions, religious possession and so on. Common for all versions is that it centers around a “psychological process”, where mental functioning is used either as a theme or metaphor — most commonly in tragedies, or to shed light on social conditions in a certain historical period. For instance, Northrop Frye based his analysis on Nietzsche when discussing artistic expression in tragedies — of which Dionysus was very much a part:

But, just as the literary critic finds Freud most suggestive for the theory of comedy, and Jung for the theory of romance, so for the theory of tragedy one naturally looks to the psychology of the will to power, as expounded in Adler and Nietzsche. Here one finds a "Dionysiac" aggressive will, intoxicated by dreams of its own omnipotence, impinging upon an "Apollonian" sense of external and immovable order. As a mimesis of ritual, the tragic hero is not really killed or eaten, but the corresponding thing in art still takes place, a vision of death which draws the survivors into a new unity.
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The key words used are “psychology”, “intoxicated” and “death”, which all highlight the Dionysian madness; this “mimesis” of the ancient mysteries includes a sacrifice of some kind, which does not necessarily mean being ripped apart or consumed, but perhaps a metaphorical or less permanent version of those. Dionysus is only a prototype for the Madness archetype, meaning that the descent to madness does not have to be as brutal as it may have been in the ancient tragedies — which often contained “primordial symbolizations of delusions, mania, and other bizarre forms of thought and behavior,” and could have been the result of divine interference (like in the case of Hera and Dionysus). Archetypal Madness can manifest in the forms of alienation, emotional suffering or ecstasy, social humiliation, primitive behavior or a loss of identity; and in the case of the LMD triad, will be the direct result of archetypal Love, with disastrous and often tragic outcomes represented by Death. The key to understanding such a descent dwells within the unconscious of the character — because no matter one’s stance on the sanctity of literary criticism, madness is first and foremost a psychic condition. It is not an emotion, like those of love or grief, and requires some level of psychological observation — which the LMD triad readily provides. My focus has thereby been to present Madness in a way that pays homage to its ancient predecessor, and which makes its connection to Love and Death less of a vision and more of an apparent fact.

II.IV Thanatos as “Death”

The final and concluding archetype is Death, which largely bases itself upon the Greek personification Thanatos (Θάνατος). Though mythological material remains scarce, I find him to be an accurate representative of Death in the LMD structure; as the deity of peaceful death, Thanatos provides closure in a meaningful way — insofar that it puts an end to one existence, opening for another existence to follow. Because the ancient Greeks believed in the soul and afterlife, death was not considered as final as it may seem today; it was merely an end to the life as they had come to know it. The concept of death, whether used as a symbol or plot device, often accompanies related themes like life, religion, morality, or, as is the ultimate goal of this thesis to emphasize, love and madness. The literary term “liebestod”, stemming from the German “Liebe” (love) and “Tod” (death), is but one example of a thematic dyad already recognized, marrying sexual love and death into one recurring concept. With death being such a universal and abstract subject, however, there is only so much scholars have been able to say about it; “death is little more than the discourses around it (funeral, legal, and
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medical languages), and the historical and fictional narratives in which it is inevitably included. Nevertheless, this has not prevented philosophers from meditating on its inevitability — on the contrary, it has stirred the minds of several great thinkers, some of whose work will aid in our understanding of Death and its concluding role in the LMD triad.

In Greek mythology, Thanatos appears as the twin brother of Hypnos (Sleep) and the son of Nyx (Night). As is the tradition with chthonic and lesser deities, they often appear together in pairs or triads, like the three Moirai (Fates). His myths and poetic appearances are few and minor, yet this genealogy provided by Hesiod’s *Theogony* is the one most find agreeable. Although his representation has been altered to accommodate the visions of individual poets and artistic movements, Thanatos is generally characterized as being disliked among gods and men. In later renditions, he appears as a slumbering youth along with Hypnos, while older sources depict him as a dark and gloomy figure busy retrieving the souls of mortals. That did not prevent resistance from arising, however, as seen in the cases of Sisyphus and Herakles who outwitted and physically prevented Thanatos from completing his appointed task. Following Homer’s *Iliad*, Thanatos and Hypnos are seen as they are ordered to retrieve the fallen body of Zeus’ son, Sarpedon, from the battlefields; in contrast to his three sisters and goddesses of violent death, the Keres (Κῆρες), Thanatos is associated with peaceful and non-violent death — making his touch a merciful one. This position made him a guider of souls from the living realm to the Underworld, which is only fitting for the personification of death; though this position was also shared with Hermes (Ἑρμῆς), the Olympian messenger god. Given his minor appearances and lacking sources, Thanatos may not have had cults founded in his name, nor been a deity that received worship; “for, alone of gods, Death loves not gifts; no, not by sacrifice, nor by libation, canst thou aught avail with him; he hath no altar nor hath he hymn of praise; from him, alone of gods, Persuasion stands aloof.” As the complete opposite of Eros and his victims, Thanatos cannot be swayed with lavish promises or offerings; he remains an inevitable and non-discriminatory force that is as persistent as he is peaceful.

Thanatos’ encounters with Eros and Dionysus are few and nearly as insightful, yet there are a few mythological references that are significant to Death’s construction. His epithet “Paean” emphasizes the ambivalent nature of Death. Paean, or “Paian” (Παῖαν) as
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used by Homer and Hesiod, can be translated to “the healing”, which is an epithet interestingly attached to Thanatos and Apollo — both whose task was to deliver man from pain and evil. Simultaneously, the epithet holds allusions to the word “paiein” (παίειν), meaning to strike, which further alludes to their function as destroyers; Apollo with his ability to bring upon deadly plagues, and Thanatos as the sword-bearing and indiscriminate collector of souls. Archetypal Death can therefore be interpreted in two ways; one side displaying the merciful and relieving aspects of its presence, and the other side painting the archetype as a complete and merciless destroyer. Aside from the sword, the god is also related to the butterfly, used to symbolize the soul or psyche (from Psyche, the goddess of souls and consort of Eros). When applying these to arts and literature, Thanatos becomes closely related to Eros in his representation as a winged youth;

In Hellenistic times the favorite types of Eros were those of a boy or a mere child, or even a babe; and it is usually assumed that his progressive diminution in size was the natural outcome of fourth-century art with its well-defined penchant for youth and beauty. It must not, however, be forgotten that this tendency, which was undoubtedly a vera causa, gave fresh effect to the very ancient belief in the soul as a tiny winged form sent forth from the lover to compass his desires. That is the ultimate reason—I take it—why Eros with crossed legs and torch reversed became the commonest of all symbols for Death: a resting Eros meant a restful soul.58

This symbolic depiction ties Eros and Thanatos through the ancient concept of the soul, which translates well to the Freudian concept of a life and death dichotomy present within the psyche; Love and Death exist within the same sphere as opposite forces, bound by the same psychic entity (ego) which they in turn manipulate.

The soul is also linked to madness as Plato considered its influence a form of possession trance, to which Heraclitus credited the Dionysiac since “the passage of the immortal soul through a cycle of bodily death and birth was a doctrine held in mystery-cult.”69 Plato associated the philosophical soul with the pre-enactment of death that was a central part of the Bacchic rituals. During these mystic rites, the liberation and purification of the soul was a desired effect, which could be felt and achieved through the attempt to release the soul from the body as much as possible — in other words, mimicking death. Furthermore, the mythic instance that marked the dismemberment of Dionysus grew to be an allegory for the soul, which again was a state meant to be projected through possession; “the transition from anxiety to joy is envisaged as the transition from mental fragmentation to mental
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wholeness.” The process of dismembering the soul, or psychological fragmentation, could thereby be considered the same as descending into madness. In terms of the LMD triad, this process equates to the psychic imbalance that dominates the Madness type — to which Death is inevitably achieved as a result.

In philosophy, Plato deals with death in direct relation to the soul (psyche). “The Greeks understood that the body and the soul parted in death,” which was often recognized in myths and rituals; with the body being an entombment of the soul, dying was considered a process where the soul released itself from its vessel. This is covered in one of Plato’s most famous works *Phaedo*, also known as *On The Soul*, as well as *Phaedrus*. In both dialogues, the protagonist Socrates presents and argues for theories supporting the existence of the soul as immortal, establishing the classic concept that is metempsychosis — the “simple” belief that the soul transmigrates; “every soul is immortal. That is because whatever is always in motion is immortal, while what moves, and is moved by, something else stops living when it stops moving.” The ultimate goal of the soul is to achieve a godlike status, as the soul seeks to become free and independent; “for just this reason it is fair that only a philosopher’s mind grows wings, since its memory always keeps it as close as possible to those realities by being close to which the gods are divine.” According to this speech, philosophers are predisposed to divinity, as the soul depends on the growth of wings to ascend to heaven; in Jungian terms, this might equate to the process of individuation (the complete understanding of the Self), in which philosophers were considered to be more introspectively adept.

Plato also emphasized how a soul remains immortal, only to become mortal when combined with that of a solid shape — whether animal or human. A relevant example and account on the soul is the vivid way Socrates explains a process similar to that of the LMD triad:

As nourishment flows in, the feather shafts swell and rush to grow from their roots beneath every part of the soul (long ago, you see, the entire soul had wings). . . But when it looks upon the beauty of the boy and takes in the stream of particles flowing into it from his beauty (that is why this is called “desire”), when it is watered and warmed by this, then all its pain subsides and is replaced by joy. When however, it is separated from the boy and runs dry, then the openings of the passages in which the feathers grow are dried shut and keep the wings from sprouting. Then the stump of each feather is blocked in its desire and it throbs like a pulsing artery while the feather pricks at its passageway, with
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the result that the whole soul is stung all around, and the pain simply drives it wild—but then, when it remembers the boy in his beauty, it recovers joy. From the outlandish mix of these two feelings—pain and joy—comes anguish and helpless raving: in its madness the lover’s soul cannot sleep at night or stay put by day; it rushes, yearning, wherever it expects to see the person who has that beauty.²⁴

This descriptive section mirrors the way Eros and Thanatos influence the psyche, not to mention Dionysus’ effect when pleasure is unattainable. It paints an image of internal forces and impulses, including those of intoxicating desire and antagonistic demands of the id; the very same that define the Freudian psyche. As in the case of divine Dionysus, however, where intellectuals started replacing their gods with naturalistic concepts and explanations, so did thinkers eventually think of death as complete nothingness — excluding the soul entirely. This to partly reclaim man’s moral responsibility, as well as to seek the truth behind laws of nature which had earlier been ascribed to divine wrath. Nevertheless, Plato’s metempsychosis was later reinvented by German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer, who inspired the minds of Carl Jung and Friedrich Nietzsche — and perhaps more importantly, Sigmund Freud, who constructed his idea of the death drive (Thanatos) while crediting Schopenhauer specifically.

As reflected in Western literature, death is both feared and romanticized, making its role almost as dynamic as the preceding themes of love and madness. Like in Homer’s Iliad, and later Ovid’s Metamorphoses, its appearance as an underlying theme was only the beginning of death-centered works to come; like those of Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein and Herman Melville’s Moby Dick. Most of all, there has always been something mysterious and inevitable about the theme, rendering the general approach one of either caution or fascination. As a plot device, death may appear in the beginning of the narrative to pique interest and spark mystery — as widely used in crime fiction — or appear at the end of the narrative to provide solid closure. Fictional works where the Death archetype appears have different layouts; in some narratives it leads to suicide, in others murder or sacrifice — even several deaths can occur within the same narrative, so long that Love and Madness both precede them. This is achieved when Freud’s concept of Thanatos is either directed at the self or someone else; the former is considered self-destructive behavior, while the latter manifests in the form of aggression. While biological death may not initially appear as a positive outcome, it has the power to provide catharsis; “an Aristotelian concept which explains how negative events and emotions can be used to serve ‘moral’ purposes by helping the reader to
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process negative issues and release emotional tension with a positive solution.”\textsuperscript{75} Such ‘moral’ purposes is but one way of adding meaning through death, as there are several ways of utilizing it other than as an emotional reliever:

Contemporary versions of death have preferred storylines, in which either the meaning of life is not revealed at the point of the death, or death and closure may not be related to each other at all, or death can actually work as a beginning or opening of a new story... Various life stories and their telling of the moment of death are a good point to test and play with the construction of meaningfulness in narration... In postmodern poetics in particular, death is no longer seen as an ultimate ending, but rather something that offers a potential for new narratives or new ontological or liminal levels.\textsuperscript{76}

The way death is incorporated into a narrative may therefore add to its meaning — if such a meaning can be traced at all. Due to the concluding position of Death within the triad, its narrative position fits accordingly with the function being to end all climactic tension; which does not necessarily have to be achieved through biological death, but has a powerful enough impact to alter the subject’s life to the point of changing it forever. The triad is therefore open to being repeated, which is likely and due to the human nature of seeking happiness:

Passionate love is still regarded as the sole basis for a meaningful life... In reality, the relationship of lovers is always vulnerable to frustration either by a hostile society or as a result of the waywardness of human emotion. Romantic extremism responds by showing its willingness to sacrifice reason, social order and, if necessary, life itself for the sake of its absolute commitment to love ‘even unto death’. The impossibility of love in this world becomes the reason for its pursuit in another.\textsuperscript{77}

Though I do not consider the LMD triad romantic in any way, earlier depiction of the love-death dynamic (in particular) tends to perpetuate the Martyr archetype through a ceaseless romance; like in Wagner’s Tristan and Isolde, of which the term liebestod is most befitting, death practically overlaps with love as it remains strong until the very end. This is not the case in the LMD triad, due to the psychological shift from one distinct archetype to another — which will be further elaborated in the coming section.

II.V The LMD Triad

The time has come to assemble the theoretical elements necessary for the LMD triad to become a practical method of analysis. Eros, Dionysus and Thanatos may not have substantial
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mythological evidence of their union, yet academic research and studies validate a literary, philosophical and psychological dynamic. Based on these domains, the three archetypes encompass the following: Love (Eros) as intoxicating desire, Madness (Dionysus) as the loss or destruction of oneself, and Death (Thanatos) as the fatal conclusion and release of tension. Together they form the foundation of a psychological and archetypal process I refer to as the LMD triad, consisting of three individual stages that influence the subject in various ways. Before applying the archetypes to literary works, however, a closer look at its completed structure and potential usage is required.

After mapping each archetype in relation to each other, the LMD triad looks like the illustration shown. Despite its infinite shape, the lines merely help convey that the archetypes are equal in importance and connection, as well as their archetypal construction being a repetitive one. Although Love, Madness and Death can apply to literary works on an individual basis, the LMD triad treats them exclusively as a pattern. The triad then depends on the presence of all archetypes in a text, as well as a chronological succession and thematic coherence. When applied to a fictional work, as will be the focus of the next chapter, Death marks the end of the archetypal cycle in each individual case; its thematic relation to Love remains the same, but does not introduce or lead to anything beyond the (“inorganic”) state achieved, like the kinds initiated by Love and Madness — all of which can be represented both literally and symbolically within a text. The pattern is thereby representative of three related and consequential stages that may affect individuals more than once throughout their lifetime. Narratively speaking, these stages most commonly align with the climactic progression of the story; the plot is sparked by the entrance of Love, then builds tension through Madness before culminating into its release — which is peaceful Death. Stories that seem to attract this archetypal structure is often dominated by restricted societies; ones where individuals struggle to assimilate for various reasons, significantly complicating
their path to happiness — which Freud himself theorized when applying his theory of drives on contemporary society.

Taking all versions of Eros into consideration, Love becomes an archetype rooted in impulsive desire. From Hesiod’s conception of primeval passion to Plato’s dialogues on mad love, Eros is continuously depicted as a force that rouses its victims with sexual impulses. Within the text, settings that introduce a superficial or erotic atmosphere is common (but not necessary), such as parties or intimate arrangements, while the language used often contains words like “desire” or other synonyms. In seeking pleasure and satisfaction, however, there are risks involved which render the subject vulnerable to destructive behavior. Because of the powerful influence, subjects are prone to sacrificing their sanity in the process of acquiring their love-object; all other values and principles are readily discarded, leaving them with no moral compass other than one steered by destructive, merciless desire. This makes for the general outline of the Love archetype, which is further supported by Freud’s pleasure principle. As noted in the first chapter, the pleasure principle is a servant of the Freudian Eros, but as opposed to catering to tasks such as basic life-maintenance (satisfying needs such as immediate thirst and hunger), the Love archetype channels libidinal demands in ways that prioritize the id and excludes the super-ego entirely. In other words, Love has the power to revert adult individuals with functioning egos back into a primitive state, making them answer to the libido and the id as opposed to the reality principle (often influenced by the super-ego) — most commonly because of earlier trauma, hence the need for instant gratification. The love-object, though often aesthetically pleasing on a surface level, may also represent something much deeper and psychological — namely what the LMD victim truly wants in life to achieve happiness; whether it be wealth and status, a domestic family life, or freedom to express their sexuality. The quest of acquiring them is thereby not so much about the love-object itself, but to fill some void caused by external boundaries imposed upon them. Though this process may come off as extreme, it is only a systematic way of describing the first step in moving from life to death — from Eros to Thanatos — a process with disastrous results as initiated by Love.

The Madness archetype embodies several of Dionysus’ ancient traits; as the dualistic god catering to both life and death, his rituals reflect the human tendency to seek release through destructive means. Similarly, Madness projects itself upon the subject as the need to erase tension — though the destructive means are not necessarily as brutal or rebellious as those of Dionysus’ followers. While the archetypes of Love and Death fall quite naturally into
place psychology-wise through Eros and Thanatos, Madness is defined by the intermediate stage between the two; the shift from pleasure to pain, when the subject becomes overwhelmed with stimuli and seeks release. This tension narratively surfaces and translates into dramatic build-up. As the medial archetype within the LMD constellation, the tension that Madness wishes to remove is that caused by Love; a goal that the archetype has no distinct method of achieving aside from abiding by the Nirvana principle. Even the levels of desperation vary as much as the stories themselves, depending on other internal and external factors that may influence the subject. While some may try to save the situation for selfish gain, like refusing to give up their desired love-object, others resort to repressing their desires or aimlessly distract themselves to try and move on from the chaos they have created.

Common for all is how the psyche is no longer in a balanced state, as the ego is swayed either by the super-ego, or further swayed by the id (in a now destructive way) after having been under Eros’ influence. In the end, the only requirement is that Madness, in whatever form, must be sparked by the promises made by Love, and when further denied, the result must be Death. The ways Madness manifests can, and will, range from story to story, in which the true task is to link the three archetypes together within the same body of text.

Death, as an archetype and component of the LMD triad, embodies the tragedy that is “love” gone wrong. It is less of a goal-fulfilling stage and more of a consequence — the conclusion to the process prompted by Love. These conclusions may include suicide, a physical or mental removal from the situation, murder, or externally inflicted death; and symbolically, a change of season or atmosphere normally follows the Death archetype.

Common for all cases is how the LMD triad is finalized and completed, meaning Death in other words functions as a necessary end to a merciless pattern. It is the only stage that can free the subject from the two preceding archetypes, which renders it as an almost cathartic archetype to adopt; one that is completely free of tension, thereby catering to Freud’s concept of Thanatos. As opposed to the common theme of liebestod, Death is not related to the Martyr archetype or any other romantic trope; the LMD triad is a step-by-step process, where Love — be it very much related to Death — is not present once the final archetype interferes. Love must precede Madness, and only Madness can lead directly to Death. That is not to say there cannot be any sense of affection or devotion present when death occurs, but it will not be the definition of love already established in the Love archetype. This is again due to Freud’s theory of drives, as Madness represents the stage where Dionysus starts serving Thanatos (death instinct) as opposed to Eros (life instinct) — from pleasure principle to Nirvana.
principle. Accordingly, one may trace a dividing line within the narrative where Love borders into Madness, and Madness into Death, in which each of those sections must be dominated by their respective archetype. Once the Death archetype has settled within the narrative, the LMD triad is no longer in effect. This is where I believe my construction primarily differs from others, as the focus never strays from the chronological and irreversible succession between archetypes. As a triad, it provides a different and potentially pragmatic reading compared to any existing dyads.

How would critics go about applying my method, then? A psychoanalyst approach might be a given, but the triad is not exempt from being further explored both within its branch and others; for instance, I believe the LMD triad would be particularly useful in the field of queer theory, as some of the texts I will be analyzing deal with homosexuality (or bisexuality) — not to mention the consequences of its repression. A historicist approach would also mesh well with this method, as the LMD triad readily highlights social and cultural issues that are either vaguely or directly referenced; whether it be a lack of legal recognition or the presence of social taboos. Even a structuralist critic could align the triad with some universal, mythic structure, seeing as the field shares many similarities with those of Northrop Frye’s studies, and archetypal criticism in general. These are just a few examples where I could see my archetypal constellation provide new and different angles, possibly even producing results that other approaches would not have revealed. Despite the triad representing three themes that are very much universal in nature, I hope to display how versatile and relevant they can become when applied in a considerate way — regardless of them belonging to a field that remains “outdated”.

II.VI Chapter Conclusion

This chapter concluded the theoretical basis for the LMD triad as a literary method; with academic input ranging from ancient philosophers to modern critics, the archetypal structure of Love, Madness and Death is now disclosed to its fullest. The goal has thus far been to justify a thematic and psychological union, as well as to prepare the triad for its first ever application. Though the theory might at times seem dense or overtly complex, the triad is simpler to follow once aligned with an actual narrative; as opposed to referring to a ‘subject’ and ‘love-object’ throughout my explanation, a fictional work will help me clarify the LMD process by providing solid names and situational examples — as well as dialogue and physical actions to analyze accordingly. The archetypes’ function and meaning will therefore
be greatly enhanced once various pieces of fiction and narratives can be borrowed; all based on Western English literature from a specifically selected era. What remains is demonstrating the triad in its humble glory, which leads us to the final chapter.
Chapter III: Analysis

III.I Chapter Introduction

Archetypes, as we have come to know them through Carl Jung specifically, stem from a collective unconscious that is universal for all; they consist of symbols that are fundamental to understanding the human condition. This does not, however, mean the archetypes manifest identically, but vary as much as the human experience itself. People may be subject to the same emotions and motives, but their power of influence differs tremendously — as will be reflected in the literary selection at hand. Their only shared element is the LMD triad, which provides a thematic structure that deals predominantly with the psychological process. The plot, characters and setting are subject to change, as long as they abide by the archetypal framework provided. Consequently, the literary analyses in themselves are not as in-depth as most other theses would have it, as my goal is to display the many intricate ways the LMD triad may be applied — which forms the basis of why I have chosen the texts I have. My thesis is not so much about specific pieces of literature, as it is about proving the worth and relevance of an analytic method. Despite this approach, I still wish to coordinate the triad in terms of a specific literary era, if only to justify the selected body of fiction at hand.

The literary period I wish to focus on stretches roughly from the 1920s to 1950s and includes various American writers. The period itself is heavily dominated by the modernist movement, which was influenced by times of war, depression and a repressed society — hence the period being a frugal era for exploring the devoid man and psyche. Some writers were even directly inspired by non-literary figures like Sigmund Freud and Friedrich Nietzsche, as the desire to unravel the human mind and its motives peaked in tandem with the Western horrors exposed at the time. Although the period experienced development that benefited society, such as a more inclusive voting system, a growing pessimism is justified by the many financial and political setbacks society suffered; such as the Great Depression and two impactful world wars. The period is thereby a natural breeding ground for literature predisposed to the LMD triad, as the contemporary tendency to explore the darker sides of man’s conscience characteristically prevailed in both arts and sciences. Like Freud concluded in *A Difficulty in the Path of Psycho-Analysis*: “the ego is not master in its own house,” which accurately describes the mental state the LMD victims find themselves in. The struggle
between the id and super-ego is covered in the coming analyses, where the psyche is consistently at the center of scrutiny.

III.II *The Great Gatsby*

To start off this list, I have included a true classic among classics. F. Scott Fitzgerald received posthumous recognition for *The Great Gatsby*, a modernist novel originally published in 1925. Following narrator Nick Carraway, he shares his journey of befriending Jay Gatsby, whose mad love for Daisy Buchanan seals his unfortunate fate. The decadent setting filled with conflict and intrigue makes it a story catering to many of the characteristics found in LMD patterns; the indulgent revelry, the hiding of secrets, social scrutiny and division, maintaining false façades and so on all fall under the “superficial” atmosphere and tendencies common for the Love stage. The novel sticks to a chronological timeline for the most part, with only a few flashbacks to learn of Gatsby’s past — making an LMD analysis “simple” and straightforward. Out of the entire chosen selection, this story in particular highlights the way Love blinds its victim — not to mention how it makes one’s motive ambiguous when under its influence. Does Gatsby truly love Daisy, or is there something else that makes her an obsession? I will argue for the latter and less romantic approach, as will I situate Madness and Death accordingly. This will also be the only case when Death is externally inflicted on the LMD victim, but only as a direct cause of Gatsby’s own Love and Madness stage.

Love is an archetype that does not necessarily peak within a text — yet it has a definite beginning, most often taking place when two individuals physically meet. This is true in the case of Gatsby, as he “found her excitingly desirable”\(^78\) when visiting her house with other officers one night. The words “exciting” and “desire” are pinnacle indicators of the archetype, rendering Daisy as an instant love-object. Before dedicating himself to her in full, “he took what he could get, ravenously and unscrupulously,”\(^79\) which is an attitude Love only enhances; he knows he has no right to claim her, yet proceeds to abide by the pleasure principle regardless. Love is even further set in motion when he starts courting her, as revealed in another flashback:

> His heart beat faster and faster as Daisy’s white face came up to his own. He knew that when he kissed this girl, and forever wed his unutterable visions to her perishable breath, his mind would never again


\(^{79}\) Fitzgerald: p. 114
romp again like the mind of God. . . Then he kissed her. At his lips’ touch she blossomed for him like a flower and the incarnation was complete.80

At first glance, Gatsby seems like a young man who happened to fall head over heels with a girl of his past. This element of complete devotion is characteristic for the Love archetype, as it allows desire to eventually triumph that of reason. Recognizing Gatsby’s attachment to Daisy is not the challenging part, however, as the entire novel revolves around his quest of reclaiming her; the LMD triad offers instead an angle that discredits the classic romantic interpretation, seeking to unravel other possible motives explaining how an individual can sacrifice everything else for the prize that is “love” — in this case, for the sake of personal profit. After Gatsby invested all his ambition into obtaining Daisy, he simultaneously adopted the Love archetype and the mindset and behavior attached to it — and a lot points to it being out of selfish gain, as the Madness stage especially will help highlight. The wording of his flashbacks generally depicts the process as an almost rosy one, yet other instances render his fascination ambiguous:

He had intended, probably, to take what he could and go – but now he found that he had committed himself to the following of a grail. He knew Daisy was extraordinary, but he didn’t realize just how extraordinary a “nice” girl could be. She vanished into her rich house, into her rich, full life, leaving Gatsby – nothing. He felt married to her, that was all.81

Daisy represents everything Gatsby does not have; she comes from an affluent background and has always been surrounded by opportunities. The wealth and status are elements that are so closely attached to her that they become almost inseparable — at least to Gatsby, who appears to be blinded by the glamor and its promises. Knowing his lowly origin will never be enough in comparison to other potential suitors, he proceeds to climb the social rank and pose as a gentleman, although he still needs to marry Daisy to complete this “vision” of himself. After barely having spent much time together, Gatsby has already glorified her to the point of physically and emotionally needing her; in other words, his happiness revolves around whether or not she is in his possession. Much like an addict, Gatsby wants Daisy and her lavish lifestyle as his escape from reality, which is represented through his past as James Gatz — a reality he did not accept, and thereby physically and mentally escaped from. He adds as late as in chapter seven, right before Madness is about to set in, how “her voice is full of
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money”⁸² and leaves it at that. Nick did not understand his statement at the time, but admits that “that was the inexhaustible charm that rose and fell in it, the jingle of it, the cymbals’ song of it… high in a white palace the king’s daughter, the golden girl…”⁸³ His interpretation suggests that Daisy is indeed some unattainable prize that Gatsby is trying to win, less so than being a woman he loves and adores as a human being — though there is room for such as well, as he would most likely not pursue her so stubbornly if he felt no other attraction to her besides her status. However, when taking the Madness stage into consideration, his love seems tainted by a sense of delusion and self-fulfillment — something only Death can free him of. This overpowering desire to achieve his goal and obtain Daisy qualifies his psyche as one influenced by Love.

The starting point of the Madness archetype can arguably be placed differently depending on individual analysis, yet I am as always interested in locating that irreversible peak which seals Madness’ inevitable connection to Death. In The Great Gatsby, I argue that the Madness stage enters in the scene beginning at the Plaza Hotel, and culminates into the crash and consequential death of Myrtle Wilson. Before leaving for the city, however, Gatsby and Daisy share a kiss that reaffirms his belief that he has “won”. By saying that she loves him, they can sooner share the news with her husband, Tom Buchanan — which they do, once situated in a private suite at the Plaza.

“I’ve something to tell you, old sport—” began Gatsby. But Daisy guessed at his intention. “Please don’t!” she interrupted helplessly. . . “Your wife doesn’t love you,” said Gatsby. “She’s never loved you. She loves me.” . . . She hesitated. Her eyes fell on Jordan and me with a sort of appeal, as though she realized at last what she was doing — and as though she had never, all along, intended doing anything at all.⁸⁴

Up until this scene, Daisy may have falsely filled Gatsby with hope of starting a new life together, when in reality she is not comfortable with leaving her life behind. She hesitates and acts nervous, trembling and pleads as the confrontation escalates. Furthermore, Gatsby blatantly undermines the relationship she has had with Tom by stating how she never loved him, only himself. This is part of the climax within the narrative, as Gatsby learns of Daisy’s wavering heart for the first time after rekindling their relationship.

⁸² Fitzgerald: p. 92
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“Oh, you want too much!” she cried to Gatsby. “I love you now – isn’t that enough? I can’t help what’s past.” She began to sob helplessly. “I did love him once – but I loved you too.” Gatsby’s eyes opened and closed. “You loved me too?” he repeated.85

Shocked by her confession, he insists on speaking with her alone, claiming that “she’s all excited now.”86 Tom responds with outing the swindler business Gatsby is seemingly linked to, which prompts Daisy to draw “further and further into herself” while he tries to desperately defend himself. Her husband suggests they ride in Gatsby’s car on their way back, noting how he probably will leave her alone now that their “little flirtation” is over. Daisy is clearly upset with the event as a whole, having wished to return home ever since the confrontation started; Gatsby, on the other hand, keeps grasping for the hope earlier provided when they kissed, as he seems incapable of accepting defeat. Although parts of her may have intended to leave Tom, such prospects are no longer there once they leave the hotel. As opposed to taking her wishes of withdrawing seriously, his following actions defy those of a sane and balanced mind, simultaneously opening for Death to eventually claim him — as poetically described by the narrator himself; “so we drove on toward death through the cooling twilight.”87

The Plaza scene is only a prelude to the coming culmination of Madness, though it still plays a significant part in mapping and understanding Gatsby’s later actions. When he and Daisy leave in his car, they are both suffering from confusion and emotional turmoil after arguing with Tom: “they were gone, without a word, snapped out, made accidental, isolated, like ghosts, even from our pity.”88 Gatsby, who has so far acquired everything he needs except Daisy, is doing everything in his power not to lose her completely — not to lose his only chance at happiness. The selfish nature of his actions validates how this is a desperate attempt to secure his love-object; it is not a process of allowing Daisy to choose what she wants in order to be happy, but one where her husband and lover are both laying their claim on her. That is not to suggest Daisy has no fault in how the situation has escalated; had the narrative provided more information about her or her point of view, she would undoubtedly qualify for an LMD analysis. Nevertheless, Gatsby proves to be influenced by the triad as their car manages to crash with Myrtle Wilson, in which he immediately covers for Daisy’s driving and continues the task of taking her home: “the ‘death car’ as the newspaper called it.
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didn’t stop; it came out of the gathering darkness, waivered tragically for a moment, and then disappeared around the next bend.”

When Nick and Gatsby meet again outside the Buchanan residence, relevant insight is shared in wake of the tragedy that was Myrtle’s death. Gatsby, having fully entered the Madness stage at this point in time, explains how he did everything in his power to prevent the crash — despite admitting Daisy was the one driving:

“You see, when we left New York she was very nervous and she thought it would steady her to drive – and this woman rushed out at us just as we were passing a car coming the other way. It all happened in a minute, but it seemed to me that she wanted to speak to us, thought we were someone she knew. Well, first Daisy turned away from the woman toward the other car, and then she lost her nerve and turned back. . . Anyhow – Daisy stepped on it. I tried to make her stop, but she couldn’t, so I pulled on the emergency break. Then she fell over into my lap and I drove on.”

The crash itself is an accident, though it may have been avoidable had the two not attempted to drive while still emotionally affected and possibly distracted. Regardless of counterfactual conditions, Gatsby wishes to cover for Daisy’s actions, showing close to no interest in the victim besides learning of the fatal outcome. His main concern is that of Daisy’s safety and wellbeing — which again fails to conform to the reality of the situation. On top of taking the blame for a murder he did not commit — all in the name of “love” — he remains hidden in the bushes outside Tom and Daisy’s home, expecting her husband to “bother her about that unpleasantness this afternoon.” Nick does not believe something like that will happen, which he supports by going to physically check on the couple through the windows. Like predicted, Tom and Daisy are civil and talking in the kitchen: “there was an unmistakable air of natural intimacy about the picture, and anybody would have said that they were conspiring together.” With no sign of commotion, Nick urges Gatsby to return home and sleep, to which he simply shakes his head:

“I want to wait here till Daisy goes to bed. Good night, old sport.” He put his hands in his coat pockets and turned back eagerly to his scrutiny of the house, as though my presence marred the sacredness of the vigil. So I walked away and left him standing there in the moonlight – watching over nothing.
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This passage marks the end of chapter seven, and also where Madness is at its most prominent and recognizable; however romantic and heroic his decision might appear, this “love” is the root cause of his inability to decipher the situation and adapt accordingly. As described by Nick, Gatsby is left watching over nothing, indicating how his mindset is more concerned with catering to a distant Daisy than dealing with the chaos he has left behind. Losing her would equal him never getting rid of his past self, James Gatz, which is a reality he cannot bear to accept. Staying true to his initial vision is his only purpose and coping mechanism; and it has yet to dawn on him how their “little flirtation” has indeed ended, serving as proof of an absent super-ego and fundamental connection with reality.

Because Death manifests under relatively rare circumstances, its connection with Love and Madness becomes even more important to establish. In this case, one might argue that there is nothing Gatsby could have done to prevent Wilson from shooting him due to external influences; however, since the LMD triad focuses on the narrative as a whole, I must argue that each of Gatsby’s choices — whether deliberate or not — led him to his Death stage in the eight chapter. The chapter itself is characterized by a poetic heaviness, as is common for the atmosphere of the Death stage. Said heaviness is also reflected in Gatsby’s state of holding on to something already lost:

“Go to Atlantic City for a week, or up to Montreal.” He wouldn’t even consider it. He couldn’t possibly leave Daisy until he knew what she was going to do. He was clutching at some last hope and I couldn’t bear to shake him free.94

Nick appears to be convinced that Daisy has chosen Tom, but cannot bring himself to share that impression. Instead he focuses on the prior accident, which Gatsby ought to concern himself with as well; as opposed to heeding Nick’s advice, who represents reality and the super-ego, his mind is incapable of focusing on anything other than the woman he believes will complete his life — after all, giving up on her equals giving up on his future vision. Madness is thereby still in effect, which his added denial becomes proof of:

“I don’t think she ever loved him.” Gatsby turned around challengingly. “You must remember, old sport, she was very excited this afternoon. He told her those things in a way that frightened her — that made it look as if I was some kind of cheap sharper. And the result was she hardly knew what she was
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saying.” He sat down gloomily. “Of course she might have loved him just for a minute, when they were first married – and loved me more even then, do you see?”

Gatsby is still challenging reason in order to keep his dream alive — despite it now being a definite delusion. By refusing to accept her possible attachment to Tom, he is placing himself in an utmost vulnerable position as he keeps waiting for Daisy’s phone call. Had he listened to Nick (reason) and left that day, his life might have been spared and possibly disqualified as one influenced by the LMD triad. However, that is not the path Fitzgerald chose for him, which he poetically frames throughout the remaining paragraphs of Gatsby’s life. As the day progresses, an “autumn flavor” tinges the air, setting the mood for a tragic finale characterized by Death.

Gatsby lounges in his pool long before his murderer, Wilson, appears:

No telephone message arrived, but the butler went without his sleep and waited until four o’clock — until long after there was any one to give it to if it came. I have an idea that Gatsby himself didn’t believe it would come, and perhaps he no longer cared. If that was true, he must have felt that he had lost the old warm world, paid a high price for living too long with a single dream. A new world, material without being real, where poor ghosts, breathing dreams like air, drifted fortuitously about… like that ashen, fantastic figure gliding toward him through the amorphous trees.

If Nick’s imagination was correct, then the Death stage would have entered in that moment he stopped waiting for Daisy. Losing that “old warm world” that was his make-believe life would suggest reality finally caught up with him, simultaneously killing a part of him he had clung to for “too long”. Gatsby does not consider the material world real in this description, as referenced by the ghosts breathing their dreams like air — just the way he would in that moment, should the presumption be accurate. However, without knowing for certain whether Gatsby ever gave up on his dream or not, I consider the Death stage to be finalized when he is shot by Wilson in revenge over Myrtle’s death. Since this is a literal death that happens while the narrator is not even present, the “inorganic” state is achieved in its entirety, concluding the LMD pattern within the narrative. As a direct consequence of his choice to pursue Daisy so thoroughly, the realization that he had lost entered too late for him to stand a chance against Madness and Death both.

Gatsby has often been referred to and interpreted as a self-made man, which the LMD triad does not necessarily discredit — on the contrary, it was Love that first fueled him with
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ambition to achieve the grandiose things he did. Through his devotion to Daisy, he almost succeeded in becoming part of elite society, despite his character being compromised by judgmental minds like Tom’s. When mapping the progression of the triad within the narrative, Love, Madness and Death all followed each other and influenced the subject accordingly; starting with Gatsby’s choice to pursue someone out of his league like Daisy, culminating into being confronted with the harsh reality of her heart and situation, and finally the state of giving up on his quest for Daisy and happiness — whether willfully or not. As it turned out, society was ultimately right in how Gatsby did not belong in the social class he entered; by trying to obtain Daisy and her status, he was chasing a goal so impossible and out of reach that he sacrificed his own life and sanity in the process.

III. III A Streetcar Named Desire

Tennessee William’s A Streetcar Named Desire will serve as the only stage play on the list to be analyzed. Presented on Broadway in 1947, the drama depicts the situation of a New Orleans couple located in the French Quarter, where the arrival of Southern belle Blanche DuBois ends up stirring the family dynamic. The title itself suggests that Love is a defining archetype, which is true when considering Williams is revered for his narrative use and reinvention of sexual desire; A Streetcar Named Desire represents the sexual drive living inside of all humans, not to mention the fuel that powers the plot itself. I chose this play in particular for the tangible relationship between lust and destruction, where Madness also appears as an interlocutor. Another interesting aspect is how an instance of the LMD triad is referenced as a case of the past, when Blanche reveals the truth of her former marriage. Ironically, Blanche goes from causing destruction to being destroyed herself; from an enabler of the triad to its victim.

The play A Streetcar Named Desire introduces the Love archetype early in the text; Stella and Stanley Kowalski immediately display their sexual dynamic when he opens by throwing her a package of meat. The thrusting of bloody butcher’s meat symbolizes the raw and physical connection between the two, which Stella fully accepts. This is the same impulse that not only drives them individually, but the whole of New Orleans. Blanche DuBois, who is the protagonist of the play and the ultimate victim of the LMD triad, enters the scene while daintily dressed in white, dazedly looking for her sister Stella. When a concerned neighbor questions her, she replies: “they told me to take a street-car named Desire, and then transfer to
one called Cemeteries and ride six blocks and get off at—Elysian Fields!” Although the
names and references coincide with real places in New Orleans, the reply is also an allegorical
one; as a wilting beauty and indecently flirtatious woman, she has descended to an amoral
abyss as her final stop — the Elysian Fields being a mythical realm actually belonging to the
Greek Underworld. The loss of both her teaching position and the family plantation (Belle
Reve) has forced her to visit Stella, though Blanche cannot help but share her distaste for the
neighborhood her sister has settled herself into — condemning both the conditions of the city
as well as the lower-class apartment. In short, Blanche appears as an angel fallen from grace,
though her past is a lot more tainted than what the first scenes reveal. This angelic imagery is
enhanced when Stanley arrives home in the first scene, his initial impression of Blanche, as a
*woman*, being that of a sexual object; his sweaty and masculine presence stands in direct
opposition to her frail femininity, something that will culminate into an inevitable disaster. By
the end of the first scene, Blanche and Stanley’s dynamic has been established as a clashing
dynamite, with him being the “unrefined type” and her being the polished Southern belle
completely out of her depth. As confessed a few scenes later, however, she is no longer the
type of woman she wishes to be;

Blanche: I wasn’t so good the last two years or so, after Belle Reve had started to slip through my
fingers.
Stella: All of us do things we—
Blanche: I never was hard or self-sufficient enough. When people are soft—soft people have got to
shimmer and glow—they’ve got to put on soft colors, the colors of butterfly wings, and put a—paper
lantern over the light…. It isn’t enough to be soft. You’ve got to be soft *and attractive*. And I—I’m
fading now! I don’t know how much longer I can turn the trick.  

This dialogue reveals all her insecurities, her feminine beauty and glow proving to be her
most valuable asset — one she will feign if necessary, something Stanley eventually sees
through, if not right away.

In the second scene, their dynamic evolves and anchors her to the Love archetype —
the one that will directly lead to Madness and Death. After having taken a bath, Blanche
appears in a red satin robe as the embodiment of desire, flaunting herself for her brother-in-
law to see. Once changed into “a pretty new dress”, she goes on to try and fish for a

---
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compliment from Stanley, right after asking him to help button up the back of her dress. Although he tells her that she looks “all right”, he does not accept the risqué invitation of aiding her. Unlike other men, he is not intrigued by the glitzy lifestyle women often posed themselves with, which categorizes him even more as a primitive character; he wants all cards on the table, which earns him her fascination. As of now, Blanche’s psyche is dominated entirely by the pleasure principle, not even considering the possible consequences her actions might have. She is a closeted alcoholic running away from her grief and problems, seeking male comfort for the ultimate distraction and selfish fulfillment; she is also a torn individual, wishing she had never let her life spiral out of control so that she ended up in New Orleans — hence her clinging to what ounce of Southern belle charm she still has in her. She embodies the Love archetype on the basis of these qualities, as she pursues her own primal needs with no regard for those around her; to Blanche, love and beauty are her means of survival, and are the only currencies she deals with when interacting with others. Having learned that a certain coy behavior earns her the things she wants in life, it is her most potent tool when attracting potential suitors — and also what ultimately dooms her.

Mitch serves the role of this “potential suitor”, as he and Blanche end up bonding over lost love when he attends the Kowalskis’ poker night. He appears as a gentleman compared to Stanley, which further prompts Blanche to appeal to his masculinity by donning her most innocent and feminine mask — again, a superficial tool often employed by those influenced by the Love stage. Said night also ends with Stanley aggressively striking Stella in a drunken fit, which consequently brings Blanche and Mitch closer due to his comforting kindness. He becomes her personal sanctuary and can possibly offer her what she wants — which would be a new life with a new love. However, he is not aware of her sullied past and promiscuous behavior, which when revealed causes him to end their relationship. This illusion of pristine femininity is what her “market” desires, and so her worth as a commodity relies on the maintenance of her fading beauty and elegance. Ironically, Blanche admits to her own hypocrisy when confronting Stella about her relationship with Stanley;

Blanche: What you are talking about is brutal desire—just—Desire!—the name of that rattle-trap streetcar that bangs through the Quarter, up one old narrow street and down another…
Stella: Haven’t you ever ridden on that streetcar?
Blanche: It brought me here. —Where I’m not wanted and where I’m ashamed to be…
Stella: Then don’t you think your superior attitude is a bit out of place?
Blanche: I am not being or feeling at all superior, Stella. Believe me I’m not! It’s just this. This is how I
look at it. A man like that is someone to go out with—once—twice—three times when the devil is in you. 99

The allegorical “Desire” comes into play once again, as Blanche admits to her promiscuity and how it brought her to this lowly pit stop. While accusing Stella for staying with animalistic Stanley out of carnal desire, Blanche fails to abide by her own advice, setting herself up for potential destruction when choosing to continue the path she has taken; to her, Stella is playing with an uncontrollable fire, which is the same kind Blanche sparks in the men she seduces. Although this paints her less of a victim and more of a contributor to the coming consequences, I pause to emphasize the psychological process that is the foundation of the archetypes; the LMD triad represents three individual forces and stages that exist in realms outside of the conscious mind, meaning they cannot be controlled and will manifest however they please — and usually, through the most primitive methods available. Its victims may not be completely faultless in their journey, but they are merely acting in correspondence with this archetypal pattern of impulses I have chosen to name Love, Madness and Death.

Moving on to Madness and its influence, the play comes to reveal how Blanche already suffers mentally when arriving at the Kowalskis’. She enters the play while in a constant state of neurosis, appearing anxious and restless due to the past haunting her. Her late husband, Allan Grey, whom she confronted when discovering him in bed with another man, ended up committing suicide in a case I would also identify as influenced by the LMD triad — though it is hard to conclude anything without analyzing the specific narrative. Unable to overcome the grief of her lost love, her life begins to spiral as she behaves like a coquette in order to heal her dwindling conscience. In scene nine, Blanche gives that exact account to Mitch; “after the death of Allan—intimacies with strangers was all I seemed able to fill my empty heart with…”100 This while a blind Mexican woman tries to sell them her “flores para los muertos”, meaning flowers for the dead — which indirectly causes Blanche to spiral into a breakdown, saying things like how death is the opposite of desire, and how she involved herself with locally stationed soldiers at Belle Reve. Madness has undoubtedly begun to manifest at that point as her hold on Mitch (and the hope he provides) is slipping, though it has yet to narratively peak.

Blinded by her quest for validation, her involvement with both Mitch and Stanley starts culminating into the Madness archetype in scene ten; having ended things with Mitch in
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the closing dialogue of scene nine, where he claimed she was not “clean enough to bring in the house” with his mother, Blanche finds herself drinking and behaving oddly. Mitch represented the life she wanted, the potential of marriage no longer there as the reality of her situation sinks in. The earlier panic and hysteria has settled into a drunken numbness as she dresses herself up, placing a “rhinestone tiara” on her head while cooing at imagined admirers. The loss of Mitch mirrored that of Allan, and Blanche is unable to handle the shame and guilt as both losses are arguably her own fault. Enter Madness, in which she has succumbed to the comfort of alcohol to momentarily cure her suffering — an act that brings her closer to Death by quelling any tension in her life, as orchestrated by the Nirvana principle. Madness has yet to peak, however, which is where Stanley comes in when Blanche is at her most vulnerable yet. While Stella is at the hospital waiting to deliver her and Stanley’s baby, he arrives at the apartment with a few hours to spare — already in an inebriated state. He immediately comments on her outfit, to which she responds with a false claim that she has been on the phone with “an old beau of mine”. Stanley removes his shirt like he did in the first scene, before cracking open a beer bottle that foams to his delight. These sexual undertones continue as he fetches “the silk pyjamas I wore on my wedding night!”, before eventually calling out her phone bluff;

Stanley: As a matter of fact there wasn’t no wire at all!
Blanche: Oh, oh!
Stanley: There isn’t no millionaire! And Mitch didn’t come back with roses ‘cause I know where he is—. . . There isn’t a goddamn thing but imagination!
Blanche: Oh!
Stanley: And lies and conceit and tricks!
Blanche: Oh!
Stanley: And look at yourself! Take a look at yourself in that worn-out Mardi Gras outfit, rented for fifty cents from some rag-picker! And with the crazy crown on! What queen do you think you are?
Blanche: Oh—God…
Stanley: I’ve been on to you from the start! Not once did you pull any wool over this boy’s eyes! You can come in here and sprinkle the place with powder and spray perfume and over the light-bulb with a paper lantern, and lo and behold the place has turned into Egypt and you are the Queen of he Nile! Sitting on your throne and swilling down my liquor! I say—Ha! —Ha! Do you hear me? Ha—ha—ha!

With this, he tears down the last façade she held up, stripping her of her dignity and faux self-esteem — all while she continues to exclaim her “oh!” in an almost sexual simulation, ending
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with “oh—God” as their argument climaxes. As the scene progresses, the staging adds to the external and internal chaos, displaying demonic shadows on the walls with inhuman voices echoing in the background. The sexual energies present in the scene are made to feel uncomfortable and unsettling, leading Blanche to try and call for help and Stanley to reappear wearing his wedding night silk. Desperate to ward the danger off, she smashes a bottle to threaten him with, in which Stanley manages to overpower her both physically and mentally while shouting; “we’ve had this date with each other from the beginning!” The scene ends in what is strongly suggested as rape, with him carrying her “inert figure” to bed — a reference to the Greek tragedies, where similar acts were always carried out off stage.

The loss of Mitch and her dignity are both elements contributing to Blanche’s Madness stage, though her sister’s choice of not believing in her rape accusation is what solidifies her psychological descent. In the final scene, the Death archetype is fast approaching, as weeks have passed since the night of the rape. Stella confesses to her neighbor how she “couldn’t believe her story and go on living with Stanley”, to which her neighbor comforts her saying she did the right thing, and that life moves on. Blanche soon appears in her red satin robe like in the beginning of the play, though with a “tragic radiance” to her; the way she behaves shifts from hysterical interrogation to submissive silence, suggesting she is in an emotionally unstable state. After having dressed up after one of her many cleansing baths, the cathedral bells start chiming, prompting her to say they are “the only clean thing in the Quarter.” The tolling of church bells is a commonly used omen and helps stage the atmosphere of Death, alluding to funeral rites — which is also a topic Blanche starts discussing, mentioning how she wishes to “die on the sea.” This is Death’s cue, as the scheduled doctor and matron arrive to escort her to a mental institution, as orchestrated by Stella and Stanley. The difference in Blanche’s mentality shows in the change in adjectives used to describe her actions; whereas the first scenes referred to her as “radiant” and “light”, the last ones emphasize her behavior as “tense” and “panicky”. There is a lingering disconnection between Blanche and the real world, with her expecting a gentleman from Dallas to knock on their door when it is really the doctor and matron. The realization of her situation renders her non-compliant and resistant, to which Stanley tears off the paper lantern she had used to dim the lighting — resulting in Blanche crying out. This is a significant part of the Death stage, as Stanley symbolically kills the fantasy version she had spun for herself.
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all along. Without the paper lantern, she has nowhere to hide herself nor her fading appearances, which at first summons an aggressive response as she tries to physically break free from her situation. The matron manages to overpower Blanche in her hysteric fit, to which the doctor attempts a more personal approach in order to soothe her. Her famous response of “I have always depended on the kindness of strangers” wraps up her presence and role in the play, as she relies on his support and is escorted off stage.

By being removed from society and placed in an anonymous state institution, the Death archetype is finalized; her psyche has retracted itself to an internalized existence equivalent to that of death, as the physical world no longer accepts her or wants her there. I may go so far as to interpret the doctor as death himself, as his gentle approach is akin to Thanatos’ role as the harbinger of peaceful death (though that might require a separate analysis of its own). With Blanche equating him to the kind gentlemen she has earlier relied on, the cycle of desire and destruction is complete; without being aware of it, her desperate attempts to “fill the void” after Allan’s demise turned out to be utmost self-destructive — abiding by the pleasure principle at first through seduction and inappropriate dalliances, and the Nirvana principle afterwards through mindless drinking. Although she reacted with frightened resistance when the matron and doctor first arrived, the latter’s gentle approach erased any initial terror she harbored, despite the “danger” still being there threatening to take her away from the apartment. This cycle is representative of how she has handled her life during her grief, failing to recognize potential danger for the benefit of momentary company and relief — abiding by her id rather than the self-preservative warnings provided by the ego and super-ego. In the end, Blanche’s poor attempt to cope with her losses, causing her sanity to dwindle, made her a victim to the LMD triad.

III.IV “A Rose for Emily”

Finding it necessary to include a short-story to the list, the choice easily fell on William Faulkner’s “A Rose for Emily”. This was his first national publication dated in the spring of 1930, and has become a famous American short-story that has been widely anthologized thereafter. The story is set in a fictional town in Mississippi called Jefferson, where the reader follows the dynamic between the local inhabitants and that of a mysterious woman named Emily Grierson. Its descriptive prose and dark, thematic foundation is characteristic for Faulkner, where death and psychologically conflicted minds especially define the genre of Southern Gothic — not to mention, relate to the modernist movement. The narrative stands
out in terms of not being chronological, calling for a different approach when applying the LMD triad. For the first time, the triad must be employed in a way that is both intriguing and challenging, as the subject affected by the LMD triad never share their point of view. Despite this minor obstacle, all archetypes appear in their literal and chronological state based on the limited insight provided by the townsfolk.

The Love archetype is hinted at in the second section of the short-story, where the narrator describes how Emily Grierson vanished from the public eye after refusing to pay taxes; “that was two years after her father’s death and a short time after her sweetheart—the one we believed would marry her—had deserted her. After her father’s death she went out very little; after her sweetheart went away, people hardly saw her at all.”104 Emily was clearly in love with this as-of-yet unnamed “sweetheart”, as she chose to retreat to a life of a hermit after losing him. Recalling Freud’s Civilization and Its Discontents, people isolating themselves is considered a result of not being able to handle the social world — either because of too many responsibilities, or because their needs are no longer met or fulfilled in that sphere. In this case, Emily was not granted the love she wanted, causing her to distance herself from the world almost completely. Another element is added at the end of the section, claiming that no suitor was ever good enough for Emily, according to her father, and that he was the one who turned everyone away from her; “we remembered all the young men her father had driven away, and we knew that with nothing left, she would have to cling to that which had robbed her, as people will.”105 Her father had to be buried in a rush after his death, seeing as Emily had oddly declined all condolences and attempts at disposing his body — ultimately resulting in a breakdown once law threatened to interfere.

Still recovering from the loss of her father, however, she later gained interest in a foreman by the name of Homer Barron, who entered town at the time on a construction mission. Section three and four in the story account for Emily and Homer’s relationship based on outside observation, and leave just enough information to conclude Emily as a woman subjected to the Love archetype. Having been denied romance for the entirety of her life, the restrictions made by her father no longer apply once he has departed. She is free to pursue Homer, and so she does out of her own selfish needs and desires. Before meeting him, the inhabitants describe her as looking “like a girl, with a vague resemblance to those angels in
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colored church windows—sort of tragic and serene.”\textsuperscript{106} The Griersons maintained a high social rank, and Emily is continuously referred to as “Miss Emily” to sustain this pedestal the family made for themselves — one that the townspeople find unjustified, despite how the late Mr. Grierson once donated a sum for the benefit of the community. As the narrator briefly reminisces about past impressions, Emily is even mentioned as “a slender figure in white” positioned behind her father; all of which paints her as an innocent figure. This girl-like, angelic female is actually a white, Southern woman in her early thirties, deeming her infatuation with dark, Northern Homer socially unacceptable. The townspeople immediately suspected her of abandoning her family roots and pride, witnessing both Emily and Homer on their repeated Sunday afternoon drives. They did not consider Homer the marrying kind, seeing as “Homer himself had remarked—he liked men, and it was known that he drank with the younger men in the Elks’ Club.”\textsuperscript{107} This made them start pitying and shaming Emily instead, some women going so far as sending a Baptist minister to help her reconsider her actions. At that point in the timeline, Emily has met several defeats in her personal life; first the inability to find love, then the death of her father, and lastly, when she does find love, she is unable to make her advances due to social norms and Homer’s alleged male preferences. This is a solid setup of doomed love; one that leaves Emily utmost vulnerable, despite her respected position in society. Her affections are further validated after she ordered “a man’s toilet set in silver, with the letters H. B. on each piece,”\textsuperscript{108} which convinced everyone that they were going to go through with marriage — most of them even supporting such a development. Homer is thereby the “sweetheart” earlier referred to in the first section, and Emily is most definitely smitten by Eros’ merciless influence. The true consequences of her desires are revealed when Madness and Death shed light on the rest of her tragic life, as testified by other locals.

If there is one archetype Emily’s psyche is predisposed to adopting, it is that of Madness. There is a brief reference to her other relatives in Alabama, suggesting mental illness already exists within the family: “she had some kin in Alabama; but years ago her father had fallen out with them over the estate of old lady Wyatt, the crazy woman, and there was no communication between the two families.”\textsuperscript{109} Although a psychological diagnosis is not required for Madness to manifest, its possible presence might call for a closer analysis —
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with possible deeper connections and behavioral explanations. As mentioned at the end of section two, the narrator emphasizes how “we did not say she was crazy then” when referring to her struggle to part with the body of her father, suggesting their perception of her will change for the worse. In the narrative provided, Madness peaks when Emily visits a druggist to purchase arsenic specifically; when asked what purpose the poison will serve, she “just stared at him, her head tilted back in order to look him eye for eye, until he looked away and went and got the arsenic and wrapped it up.”

Because of her status, she is able to leave the shop with her purchase, without any explanation given. The poison is labeled “for rats”, but the locals suspect Emily for attempting suicide — adding how “it would be the best thing.”

They collectively consider her to be “fallen” at this point, though she keeps carrying her head high; though earlier described as angelic, her looks have changed to “thinner than usual, with cold, haughty black eyes in a face the flesh of which was strained across the temples and about the eyesockets as you imagine a lighthouse-keeper’s face ought to look.” As her sins start accumulating so does her visage worsen, prompting morbid descriptions. Judging by their relatively negative perception of her, it would seem like they believe death might be her only and best way out — with her being an outsider who does not conform to society’s expectation of her. According to the narrator, the purchase happened over a year after they started pitying her, which initially began when Emily and Homer started seeing each other.

What happened in the span of that year is not fully accounted for, but whatever it was, it led Emily to buying arsenic. Afterwards, the townspeople seem convinced that she and Homer will marry as he leaves town — conveniently while she has her Alabama relatives visiting. Only when the cousins leave did Homer return to town, and was last seen by her neighbors while entering Emily’s home. What happened afterwards shocks the entire local community, which they only discover after Emily passes away decades later.

The full extent of her Madness stage is revealed at the end of the short-story, when Death has already entered. Through the years, Emily withdrew herself more and more from the public, eventually shutting herself completely off from society. Her last appearances are characterized as unbecoming, having gained weight and grey hair, among other things; “her eyes, lost in the fatty ridges of her face, looked like two small pieces of coal pressed into a lump of dough.”

After Homer’s disappearance, her angelic exterior has been replaced with
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that of an unattractive — almost repulsive — woman, whose family home “filled with dust and shadows” has also started to wear down. Although these processes may be ascribed to natural and universal causes like aging, they can also serve as a metaphor for her withering psyche. Her hair remained “iron-gray” up until her death at seventy-four, which is when the locals finally were granted entry to her abode — an opportunity they exploit to the fullest by accessing the restricted rooms upstairs, though only after “Miss Emily was decently in the ground,” suggesting she maintained respect until the end.

Earlier in the short-story, a case of an “odor” attached to Emily’s home was brought up; although the community found a way to deal with it, like sprinkling lime on her property, the final section of the story suggests a grotesque explanation to this instance.

The violence of breaking down the door seemed to fill this room with pervading dust. A thin, acrid pall as of the tomb seemed to lie everywhere upon this room decked and furnished as for a bridal: upon the dressing table, upon the delicate array of crystal and the man’s toilet things backed with tarnished silver, silver so tarnished that the monogram was obscured. . . The man himself lay in bed.

The remains of Homer Barron had been resting in a bed upstairs of Emily’s home all along, surrounded by wedding-themed trinkets and clothing — including the silver toilet set she had gotten him prior to his last visit. Faulkner’s prose alludes to some sort of altar, where everything present in the room holds significant meaning to Emily’s constructed vision; little suggests she could have lived happily together with Homer due to external elements, meaning the arsenic was a last resort to fulfill her bridal fantasy. Her physically poisoning him would be the ideal climax of the Madness stage if included in the narrative, but given how she must have purchased the drugs with a set intention in mind, the shop scene accurately represents the archetype regardless. Emily’s dedication to her own illusion is also discovered, as beside Homer’s body — which “had apparently once lain in the attitude of an embrace” — an indented pillow with “a long strand of iron-gray hair” is also found. The suggested conclusion is that she often slept beside him, if not every night, furthering theories that she suffered from necrophilia; not necessarily in the sense of being sexually attracted to corpses, seeing as she also clung to her father’s body, but in the sense of being stimulated by them in a satisfying manner. This general tendency of being drawn to death and the macabre stands in opposition to biophilia, meaning the love of life, which would be represented by Eros. There
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is therefore potent evidence that Emily was influenced by Thanatos; with her desired conquest safely entombed in her bedroom, she would have little to no reason to engage with the outside world — making Death and its isolating tendency a natural development.

One might argue about the exact moment the Death archetype sets in; whether it is when Emily dies in the biological sense, or when she becomes a total recluse. According to Freud’s definition, a hermit is acting according to their death drive, removing themselves from unwanted tension. They are anomalies in society, as anyone with a balanced psyche should function accordingly and participate in their community — especially those catering to Eros. I would therefore argue for the latter case, in which the stage of mentally and physically separating herself from the real world outside qualifies as Death. The difference between her secluded lifestyle and actual death is minimal when judging the narrator’s point of view, as they “had long since given up trying to get any information from the Negro. He talked to no one, probably not even to her, for his voice had grown harsh and rusty, as if from disuse.”

If Emily barely interacted with her own retainer, he cannot count as social interaction, nor act as a representative of the outside world; even with him entering and exiting her home, she lived her remaining decades a most private and solitary way — along with her “sweetheart”, the body of Homer Barron.

Despite the limited information provided about Emily Grierson, the LMD triad is traceable when mapped accordingly; Emily’s past of denied courtship combined with mentally unstable relatives may help explain her predisposition to adopting the archetypes she did, yet she is arguably the only character analyzed that may have harbored some underlying mental condition (like necrophilia). Her past is only one of several that have laid the groundwork for the LMD triad to interfere, making her case not so much reliant on devoid characteristics, but rather her upbringing and the way she chose to handle it. In theory, anyone can become an LMD subject at any time, hence the archetypal triad being a method of delineating the manifestations of Love, Madness and Death in each relevant case. With Emily, the case is one dominated by a lonely void she was desperate enough to fill to the point of claiming Homer Barron’s life. His intentions were never revealed, yet little suggests he had plans of courting her since that would not have required such drastic measures on her end — and even if he did, she might have been so paranoid by the thought of losing him that she could think of only one way to secure his permanent presence. The path from Love then started with Emily’s possible obsession with the first man who ever entertained her, followed
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by the Madness stage where she ended up poisoning him to end all threats to their relationship, and lastly, the Death stage where she withdrew from society to live in the make-believe world she created for herself and the late Homer — safely stored away from the judgmental community that disapproved of their union to begin with.

III.V *Passing*

Introduced to me fairly late in my studies, Nella Larsen’s *Passing* stood out to me as a perfect example of the LMD triad in action. It is perhaps the most enthralling discovery I have made on my syllabus, from which I have collected the majority of these literary works. When reading *Passing*, I could not help but notice the many central elements that define the triad in its most archaic and fundamental form; vanity, sexuality, homoerotic desire, tension and obsession are just some of the components that elevate the story — further qualifying it as a representative of the triad. Published in 1929, the modernist novel centers around protagonist Irene Redfield and her closest associates, including her childhood acquaintance, Clare Kendry. Despite how the narrative is racially charged, race has no influence on the LMD triad; as emphasized by Carl Jung, archetypes stem from the collective unconscious, and are thereby universally applicable regardless of cultural, religious or geographical origin. As will soon be disclosed, *Passing* also deals with a biological — though highly ambiguous — death, marking the very stage between Madness and Death.

The novel introduces the themes of superficial beauty and sexuality almost immediately, setting the scene for Love to emerge. Because it is never confirmed that the protagonist falls in love with Clare — which she strictly does not have to for Love to influence the situation — this archetype will rely on literal hints of attraction present within the narrative. It opens with Irene receiving a letter from Clare about wanting to meet, which prompts Irene to nostalgically reminisce: “catlike. Certainly that was the word which best described Clare Kendry, if any single word could describe her.”119 This is the first and perhaps most telling clue of how Irene perceives Clare; the feline description alludes to female sexuality, which she feels Clare exudes all too comfortably to the point of it being provocative. In other words, Irene and her associates do not think too highly of Clare, or so she would have others think:

For there had been rumors. . . There was the one about Clare Kendry’s having been seen at the dinner hour in a fashionable hotel in company with another woman and two men, all of them white. And
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dressed! And there was another which told of her driving in Lincoln Park with a man, unmistakably white, and evidently rich. . . Well, Irene acknowledged, judging from her appearance and manner, Clare seemed certainly to have succeeded in having a few of the things that she wanted.\textsuperscript{120}

Whether or not this sexualized conception of her coincides with reality is unknown, as the reader only has access to the world from Irene’s point of view. The physical descriptions escalate as a flashback to them meeting in Chicago two years ago is shared, in which Irene dedicates several lines in the novel to describing even the smallest details of Clare’s beauty:

Clare Kendry was still leaning back in the tall chair, her sloping shoulders against carved top. She sat with an air of indifferent assurance, as if arranged for, desired. About her clung that dim suggestion of polite insolence with which a few women are born and which some acquire with the coming of riches or importance. Clare, it gave Irene a little prick of satisfaction to recall, hadn’t got that by passing herself off as white. Just as she’d always had that pale gold hair, which unsheared still, was drawn loosely back from a broad brow, partly hidden by the small close hat. Her lips painted a brilliant geranium-red, were sweet and sensitive and a little obstinate. A tempting mouth... Yes, Clare Kendry’s loveliness was absolute, beyond challenge, thanks to those eyes which her grandmother and later her mother and father had given her. In those eyes there came a smile and over Irene the sense of being petted and caressed. She smiled back.\textsuperscript{121}

The attention Irene devotes to Clare’s looks is something restricted to women only, as she does not go into such gushing detail when interacting with men — despite being married to one. When describing her husband, Brian, it is more of a listing of qualities (like the “irregularity of his nose” and “heaviness of his chin”) and hardly as romantic as the words she uses with Clare. Her adjectives represent attractive qualities, such as “tempting” and “brilliant”, which suggests she harbors repressed attraction towards Clare (or women in general) — though the persistent skepticism also highlights her own insecurities regarding sexuality. Irene would never admit to her apparent physical attraction, because of the way homosexuality was both illegal and taboo in the United States at the time. Because of how Clare is perceived in Irene’s community, as well as by her own super-ego, she does not want to be publicly associated with her. Despite this, she finds it “a dreadful thing to think of never seeing Clare Kendry again. Standing there under the appeal, the caress, of her eyes, Irene had the desire, the hope, that this parting wouldn’t be the last.”\textsuperscript{122} As a result, tension already started building back then as Love rooted itself into Irene’s psyche.

Another validating experience takes place five days after Irene received Clare’s letter,  

\textsuperscript{120} Larsen: p. 21-23  
\textsuperscript{121} Larsen: p. 37-38  
\textsuperscript{122} Larsen: p. 38-39
when Irene and Clare are on their own upstairs, sheltered from the eyes of the public. Their dynamic is persistently charged with an intrinsic curiosity for each other; Irene being curious about the white world in which Clare passes, and Clare being curious about the community she left behind with Irene. Additionally, the narrative seems to support how Irene is curious in more ways than one, hence her confusion whenever finding herself longing for Clare’s presence. The word “desire” is often used to describe their curiosity, alluding once again to the power and influence of Eros. This magnetic pull that Irene feels enhances her emotions whenever interacting with her:

For Clare had come softly into the room without knocking, and before Irene could greet her, had dropped a kiss on her dark curls. Looking at the woman before her, Irene Redfield had a sudden inexplicable onrush of affectionate feeling. Reaching out, she grasped Clare’s two hands in her own and cried with something like awe in her voice: ‘Dear God! But aren’t you lovely, Clare!’”

In contrast to her moments with Clare, Irene and her husband are barely physical with each other, let alone kissing. Clare kisses her friend on several occasions, not to mention performing subtle gestures like touching her arm “caressingly”. These affectionate actions summon pleasant emotions within Irene, as evident in her vivid reaction. The scene progresses as Clare confronts Irene about not replying to her letter, consequently making her feel ignored and lonely — to which Irene admits that she is guilty: “her own resentment swept aside and her voice held and accent of pity as she exclaimed: ‘Why, Clare! I didn’t know. Forgive me. I feel like seven beasts. It was stupid of me not to realize.’” This marks the beginning of a rekindled friendship, as the two reconcile and agree to attend the Negro Welfare League dance.

The Madness stage is introduced when Irene starts suspecting Clare and Brian of having an affair. Prior to the unwarranted realization, a tea party has been arranged at Irene’s house for her friend Hugh, in which Brian brings up the topic of Clare while Irene is getting ready to attend the party. He makes his wife aware of Clare’s presence downstairs, which does not sit well with Irene as she did not even ask her to attend. When Brian admits that he was the one who invited her, there is a shift in Irene’s tone and demeanor both:

She shook her head, unable to speak, for there was a choking in her throat, and the confusion in her mind was like the beating of wings. Behind her she heard the gentle impact of the door as it closed behind him, and knew that he had gone. Down to Clare. For a long minute she sat in stiffness. The face
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in the mirror vanished from her sight, blotted out by this thing which had so suddenly flashed across her groping mind. Impossible for her to put it immediately into words or give it outline, for, prompted by some impulse of self-protection, she recoiled from exact expression.¹²⁵

Though Brian blames the invitation on compassion, Irene has gotten the impression that Clare has seduced her husband — which is enough for her to suffer an emotional breakdown. The suspicion comes across as unfounded due to the vague nature of her realization; and though it can be due to denial, the notion of her husband cheating does seem to arrive out of thin air. She soon starts crying tears of “rage and shame” before pulling herself together, intending to join the party despite the sudden and unpleasant vision. Irene’s mindset does not change much for the better once downstairs, though she finds herself distracted while serving tea: “so like many other tea-parties she had had. So unlike any of those others. But she mustn’t think yet. Time enough for that after.”¹²⁶ She is doing her best to keep up appearances, but it does not take long before her thoughts wander back to Clare and Brian — and more importantly, the consequences of their supposed affair.

The boys! She had a surge of relief. It ebbed, vanished. A feeling of absolute unimportance followed. Actually, she didn’t count. She was, to him, only the mother of his sons. That was all. Alone she was nothing. Worse. An obstacle. Rage boiled up in her. There was a slight crash. On the floor at her feet lay the shattered cup.¹²⁷

The sudden fit is a result of the emotions she has repressed since suspecting her friend and husband, wanting the guests to “notice her, to be aware of her suffering.”¹²⁸ Hugh quickly intervenes to help her cover the scene up, however, making the party run smoothly again afterwards. However immature Irene’s actions may appear, she admitted how she is probably not worth much to Brian to begin with, meaning Clare now threatens the harmony of their family. Her fear of losing him to another woman may be a warranted response, seeing as the life of a single mother at the time was a harsh existence — one that Irene wants to avoid at all costs: “it did hurt. But it didn’t matter. But it did matter. It mattered more than anything had ever mattered before. What bitterness! That the one fear, the one uncertainty, that she had felt, Brian’s ache to go somewhere else, should have dwindled to a childish triviality!”¹²⁹ While fretting over the supposed affair, she also admits to not having proof; “she had seen nothing,
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heard nothing."\textsuperscript{130} In an attempt to calm herself down, she reflects upon the reality that is her unfounded suspicion; how she must remain fair, having had no such proof or suspect observations of Brian in the past either. This would arguably have disqualified the Madness stage as being present, seeing as Irene is very much capable of personal insight and common sense. However, when moving forward, she does not let this impression go at all, fearing the worst as opposed to giving them the benefit of the doubt: “she wanted to feel nothing, to think nothing; simply believe that it was all silly invention on her part. Yet she could not. Not quite.”\textsuperscript{131} Though her distaste for Clare now seems to root in the suspected liaison, Madness is about to peak as her darker thoughts triumph over reason.

   The first hint of Death appears as Irene fantasizes about ways to end the tension and anxieties Clare causes her, suggesting Madness has by then fully replaced the Love archetype. First, she considers telling Clare’s white husband, John Bellew, of Clare’s racial background — a thought she soon dismisses due to the loyalty she feels towards her own race, next to the possibility that John might divorce her and make her an available woman. “Then came a thought which she tried to drive away. If Clare should die! Then— Oh, it was vile! To think, yes, to wish that! She felt faint and sick. But the thought stayed with her. She could not get rid of it."\textsuperscript{132} However morbid such a thought process might initially appear, I believe Irene is actually projecting her repressed desires onto Clare, meaning she wants her queer tendency to vanish and not necessarily Clare herself. Further supporting this claim, she does not mind it whenever Clare and Brian are left on their own, which does not seem realistic should she truly believe they are having an affair. Irene continues to muse about her situation, in which the wording suggests there is more to her frustration than just the belief she is being fooled:

   Security. Was it just a word? If not, then was it only by sacrifice of other things, happiness, love, or some wild ecstasy that she had never known, that it could be obtained? And did too much striving, too much faith in safety and permanence, unfit one for these things? Irene didn’t know, couldn’t decide, though for a long time she sat questioning and trying to understand. Yet all the while, in spite of her searchings and feeling of frustration, she was aware that, to her, security was the most important and desired thing in life. . . Now that she had relieved herself of what was almost like a guilty knowledge, admitted that which by some sixth sense she had long known, she could again reach out for plans.\textsuperscript{133}
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The first indication is how Irene contemplates giving up “ecstasy” — one that she has *never known* — for her life to remain safe and secure. If she answered to her repressed attraction towards Clare, that might destabilize her life to the point of losing her family; which again is something she wants to avoid. Like concluded, safety is her biggest desire in life, leading her to prioritize her stable relationship with her husband. Given how Irene has yet to receive any real indication that Brian and Clare are deceiving her, the constructed affair is more than likely an excuse Irene uses to justify her hatred towards her; not only is Clare a woman who seems confident in herself and her sexuality, but Irene might even envy Brian (and men in general) for receiving her friend’s romantic advances. This “guilty knowledge” she relieves herself of can be all these things; how she always had feelings for Clare, or how she now truly believes Clare is having an affair with her husband, or that she craves security above everything else. In the end, the plan she resorts to leads her Madness stage to peak with Death as inevitable outcome.

The climaxing finale surrounds a party where all central characters are present, and marks Irene’s shift from Madness to Death. Entering the scene, Irene is already catering to a dark mindset, as is fitting for the Madness archetype; it does not help how Clare and Brian maintain an amiable tone, further adding to Irene’s discomfort and possible envy. Driven by the desire to keep her life balanced and safe, she has chosen to “share” her husband as well as keep Clare’s secret background away from John Bellew — anything to maintain this stable life she has always wanted, despite giving up her happiness in the process. Having settled themselves at Felise Freeland’s party on the sixth floor, tension happens to spark when John confronts Clare about her ethnicity, to which her lack of a defensive response prompts Irene to lose herself and her touch with reality.

Clare stood by the window, as composed as if everyone were not staring at her in curiosity and wonder, as if the whole structure of her life were not lying in fragments before her. She seemed unaware of any danger or uncaring. There was even a faint smile on her full, red lips, and in her shining eyes. It was the smile that maddened Irene. She ran across the room, her terror tinged with ferocity, and laid a hand on Clare’s bare arm. One thought possessed her. She couldn’t have Clare Kendry cast aside by Bellew. She couldn’t have her free.¹³⁴

The window was previously opened by Irene personally, and now Clare is at Irene’s mercy. In this moment of desperation, Madness peaks as a result of having her secure lifestyle threatened — with John now waiting for Clare to spill the truth, she must do whatever it takes
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not to let her disclose her race. Irene claims not to remember much of what happened afterwards, however, suggesting she most likely wants to forget due to guilt: “what happened next, Irene Redfield never afterwards allowed herself to remember. Never clearly. One moment Clare had been there, a vital glowing thing, like a flame of red and gold. The next she was gone.”

Her involvement is at the very least ambiguous, if not a definite fact. While everyone rushes down to the street where Clare fell, Irene oddly enough sits down while processing the incident; trying to convince herself that it was an accident, she immediately wants to erase the image of her hand on Clare’s shoulder — none of which are common or reasonable reactions of an innocent and stable human being. Irene does not display any signs of regret, only a fear of Clare having survived the fall, potentially leaving her “glorious body mutilated.”

Aside from thinking of Clare in a purely physical (almost sexual) way, she also offers Brian a thought, fearing he might get a cold from standing outside with the others. The lack of grief and empathy is startling, which fulfills the Madness archetype’s task of soothing her selfish, self-destructive needs only. Irene has yet to confirm that Clare is dead, however, which brings her to the Death stage as she descends to the street where her friend landed. There she asks if Clare truly is dead, where the fatal confirmation summons the following response: “Irene struggled against the sob of thankfulness that rose in her throat.”

Pleased to hear her friend died instantly, Death is achieved as the tension Clare brought to her life has now been successfully erased — most likely by her own aggressive initiation. While Irene sinks down on the ground while moaning, everything becomes dark, ending the narrative with an official and authoritative man concluding that Clare died “by misadventure.”

Irene Redfield is an interesting case of the LMD triad, as she is so far the first to have murdered her love-object as a result of repressed attraction. Even if she did not physically push her, she was not actively preventing it either due to the forceful hand she had placed on her prior to the fall. All in all it was a dangerous situation, one that Irene potentially exploited on a whim while feeling threatened by Clare’s rebelliously apathetic attitude. The path to this tragic finale started with Irene’s internal conflict regarding whether or not she ought to allow Clare into her life; a conflict that succumbed to her pleasure principle, prompting her to keep her around if only because of her attractive character and beauty. After all, Clare is the one that provides her with physical confirmation — be them small and innocent — something she
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lacks in her relationship with Brian. Then Madness takes over as she realizes it was a poor decision to involve herself with Clare, fearing that her life will fall apart should certain secrets come to light. Though she may achieve happiness, it is not worth the risk of keeping her friend around and potentially losing the safe life she has acquired for herself. Irene concocts a plan to free herself from Clare’s sexual hold (and herself from her queer preferences) in attempts to restore her old life and existence, which ultimately results in Clare’s ambiguous death. The Death archetype is thereby fulfilled when Irene learns of her friend’s death, finding relief in the fact that her life can return to its static and “passion-free” state. One may also consider Clare Kendry as a victim of the LMD triad — perhaps similar to Blanche DuBois with her “exploit” of men — though I would refrain from entertaining that thought with such limited information combined with Irene’s unreliability. Regardless, Irene is a definite case of how the LMD triad clouds and obscures one’s judgment; where the path from innocent attraction may inevitably lead to destructive obsession.

III.VI Giovanni’s Room

Written by American novelist James Baldwin, Giovanni’s Room is a 1956 novel depicting the consequences of homoerotic desire. It shares a similar structure to that of Passing, as both deal with closeted desires and biological deaths as consequence. Unlike Nella Larsen, however, James Baldwin was early introduced to me in a time when the LMD triad had only barely started to take form. Because of this, I wished to revisit this piece of literature with my new archetypal structure in mind. Giovanni’s Room follows the queer journey of American David, who during his Parisian adventure meets and connects with Giovanni, an Italian immigrant and bartender. Giovanni would also most certainly qualify as being influenced by the LMD triad, yet my analysis covers only the pattern of David for convenience’s sake. Their story is both complex and tragic, and contains certain elements hitherto unexplored in relation to the LMD triad. For instance, both Madness and Death must be situated in a multilayered situation, where Love is arguably not the only force that inspires destruction; cultural dissonance and financial struggles are but some of the other elements that may influence the characters. It is, on the other hand, a definite cause, whether the effect is solely relying on Love’s presence or not.

As is often the case with the Love archetype, its mindset is adopted when the subject first meets their love-object. Although the novel follows David’s own account of his past, the flashbacks provide detailed insight into the events that led him to his present situation. Such is
the case when he first met Giovanni, which took place at the bar the latter worked. From the moment David and his homosexual friend, Jacques, notice him, he is immediately depicted as an object of desire:

> It was like moving into the field of a magnet or like approaching a small circle of heat – of the presence of a new barman. He stood, insolent and dark and leonine, his elbows leaning on the cash-register, his fingers playing with his chin, looking out at the crowd. . . Jacques was immediately attracted. . . I knew that Jacques could only hope to conquer the boy before us if the boy was in effect, for sale; and if he stood with such arrogance on an auction block he could certainly find bidders richer and more attractive than Jacques.¹³⁹

According to David’s impression, Giovanni appears attractive enough to be out of his friend’s league. The description itself focuses on the physical aspects of him only, rendering him a sexual object for sale with the auction reference. He goes on to confess how he uses Jacques’ eye for handsome men to his personal advantage; how his “vaunted affection for me was involved with desire”¹⁴⁰ — a dynamic they are both aware of yet fine with, as Jacques also uses David to not come across as lusting and desperate. While his friend attempts to seduce Giovanni almost immediately, David maintains a low profile as he is originally there to ask for money. This soon changes as Jacques reunites with the bar owner, Guillaume, which leaves David and Giovanni to connect on their own; which they do, leaving David internally flustered.

> I watched him as he moved. And then I watched their faces, watching him. And then I was afraid. I knew that they were watching, had been watching both of us. They knew that they had witnessed a beginning and now they would not cease to watch until they saw the end. It had taken some time but the tables had been turned, now I was in the zoo, and they were watching.¹⁴¹

Prior to this realization, David has experienced several signs of attraction towards Giovanni; symptoms such as a tightening of his chest whenever he left him alone, not to mention finding his laughter to be “the most incredible sound.”¹⁴² The voyeuristic atmosphere that has settled disturbs him, prompting him to describe the setting as a “zoo” which further enhances the animalistic urges stirring within the bar. Present time David reminisces about that event, adding how “we connected the instant we met”¹⁴³; how he also wished that he had left and
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hooked up with a girl, which seemed impossible after meeting Giovanni.

From the moment they meet, tragedy is established as an inevitable outcome; while the reader may vaguely know of the present time situation, David is warned from the very beginning while in the bar where Giovanni works. After being approached by what he describes as a “mummy or a zombie”, the individual proceeds to question him about his interactions with the bartender: “he did not move at once, but smiled at me again. ‘Il est dangereux, tu sais. And for a boy like you – he is very dangerous.’” Whether or not David understands what the words truly mean, he brushes them off with a defensive attitude. He already has a girlfriend named Hella whom he intends to marry, which arguably places him anywhere between bisexual and homosexual; regardless of his sexual preferences, he does not want to be publicly associated with queerness. The individual goes on to warn him how he “will be very unhappy,” which accurately foreshadows the destructive path he is about to embark on. Like other characters subjected to the LMD triad, they continuously display egocentric qualities as a consequence of the adopted Love archetype — which David is arguably an example of. Even though he has a partner and the freedom to live comfortably with her, there is something that is missing in his life which makes him liable to temptation; while his super-ego strongly supports heteronormativity and its depiction of masculinity, he simultaneously feels drawn to beautiful men. He admits to this after Jacques teases him for having “flirted” with Giovanni:

I could not look at Jacques; which he knew. . . I did not dare mention Hella. I could not pretend to myself that I was sorry she was in Spain. I was glad. I was utterly, hopelessly, horribly glad. I knew I could do nothing whatever to stop the ferocious excitement which had burst in me like a storm. I could only drink, in the faint hope that the storm might thus spend itself without doing any more damage to my land. But I was glad. I was only sorry that Jacques had been a witness. He made me ashamed.\footnote{Baldwin: p. 37}

Notably, David only feels “ashamed” about his orientation when scrutinized by others. When these homoerotic desires interlace with shame and guilt — because of contemporary society and their traditional expectations — Madness and Death become tenable archetypes as a result. He still chooses to abide by his desires, which once again displays how powerful the forces of Love are in practice. Once sparked, the Love archetype does not consider any possible consequences before it is too late, which David learns the hard way through later regret. The more David continues to repress his needs and chances of happiness, the further
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his destructive influence reaches; eventually claiming his relationships with both Hella and Giovanni.

The path to Madness is taken as soon as David and Giovanni start a physical relationship. Prior to this, David is warned about his way of dealing with his affairs, and how he should choose to officially be with men if that makes him happy:

‘Love him,’ said Jacques, with vehemence, ‘love him and let him love you. Do you think anything else under heaven really matters? And how long, at the best, can it last, since you are both men and still have everywhere to go? Only five minutes. . . And if you think of them as dirty, then they will be dirty – they will be dirty because you will be giving nothing, you will be despising your flesh and his. But you can make your time together anything but dirty, you can give each other something which will make both of you better – forever – if you will not be ashamed, if you will not play it safe.’ 147

Jacques goes on to warn him about becoming trapped in his own dirty body forever — which was what happened to himself. Being almost twice David’s age, Jacques’ life is something that lacks reason and happiness, as he spends his money on courting boys and satisfying his needs; something they both know, which David finds both useful and pathetic. In many ways, his friend is the living example of how he should not lead his life, with him still being in his twenties with plenty of opportunities still ahead. Unable to commit to the prospect of ‘loving’ Giovanni, however, he instead follows Jacques’ example of using men to satisfy his homoerotic desires in secret — which only further adds to his self-imposed abhorrence. This is something he is consciously aware of throughout his Parisian adventures, though it leaves him no wiser nor closer to a better solution.

In the beginning, because the motives which led me to Giovanni’s room were so mixed; had so little to do with his hopes and desires and were so deeply a part of my own desperation, I invented in myself a kind of pleasure in playing the housewife after Giovanni had gone to work. . . But I am not a housewife – men can never be housewives. . . I was in a terrible confusion. Sometimes I thought, but this is your life. Stop fighting it. Stop fighting. Or I thought, but I am happy. And he loves me. I am safe. 148

This passage represents the ongoing dialogue he internally endured while living under Giovanni’s roof, which was a place he could be whoever he wanted to be without society judging him (though his super-ego still could). David has, after all, grown up in a country where homosexuality is both illegal and unethical, which enforces his super-ego to regulate him accordingly. The Madness stage is thereby not a process of completely ignoring one’s
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super-ego, but rather halfheartedly giving in to its regulations while simultaneously rebelling against them — all because of an internalized conflict he fails to tackle. Since he cannot bear to face the reality of his own sexuality, he attempts to adhere to society’s expectations of manhood while also satisfying his most primitive desires — the frustration he feels because of this being something he takes out on Giovanni; “with this fearful intimation there opened in me a hatred for Giovanni which was as powerful as my love and which was nourished by the same roots.”

David lives his life in confusion, to which Giovanni is the source of both his momentary happiness and misery. This conflict is the root of all tension he helps build, and the tension he in the end escapes from; thus leaving him and his loved ones with nothing, as a result of trying to obtain everything.

There is a significant point of no return in the narrative, when David finally has an excuse to distance himself from Giovanni; the choice comes as no surprise, as he has been plagued with guilt from the moment he felt attraction towards him. Adding to their already complicated relationship, Giovanni has personal and financial problems of his own that weigh on David: “the burden of his salvation seemed to be on me and I could not endure it.”

Warning signs aside, the decision qualifies as Madness because of the way he goes about it; instead of coming clean to Hella and reconciling with Giovanni, he avoids the topic altogether to make it as easy for himself as possible — the so-called “coward’s route”. When Hella arrives in Paris, David spends time with her for several days straight without notifying Giovanni — who in return starts to worry and tries to find out what is going on. The couple runs into Jacques and Giovanni purely on accident, which is an opportunity that David does not seize to make amends:

When Giovanni spoke his voice was thick with fury and relief and unshed tears. ‘Where have you been?’ he cried. ‘I thought you were dead! I thought you had been knocked down by a car or thrown into the river – what have you been doing all these days?’ I was able, oddly enough, to smile. And I was astonished at my calm.

While Giovanni appears upset about David’s behavior, the latter does not want to make a scene nor have any kind of confrontation. Instead, he introduces his fiancée, pretending he has not done anything wrong per se. This instance marks the beginning of the end of their relationship, as this persistent and apathetic wall that David maintains around him never falters — on the contrary, it is only strengthened. Later while in bed with Hella, he admits that
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he desperately wants to get out of Paris — out of Giovanni’s room — so he can start thinking straight again: “‘I just can’t stand it anymore. I have to get out of there. Please.’”

Although she struggles to interpret this wish, the room has become a symbol of his homosexual tendency — and now he has had enough of the guilt it sows.

The Madness archetype culminates into David leaving Giovanni to reclaim his heterosexual manhood; everything that has happened prior fuels this climactic conversation, realizing the transition from Love to Madness by making their separation official. The scene begins with David seeking Giovanni out in the room they shared, where he already appears to be in a distressed state of mind. Now that they finally meet again after the chance encounter, the air has changed between them as a result of David’s dismissive attitude; Giovanni accuses him of lying, among other things, while David tries to describe how he feels about the situation — without excusing his own behavior.

‘Giovanni,’ I said, ‘you always knew that I would leave one day. You knew my fiancée was coming back to Paris.’ ‘You are not leaving me for her,’ he said. ‘You are leaving me for some other reason. You lie so much, you have come to believe all your own lies. But I, I have senses. You are not leaving me for a woman. If you were really in love with this little girl, you would not have had to be so cruel to me. . . You want to leave Giovanni because he makes you stink. You want to despise Giovanni because he is not afraid of the stink of love. You want to kill him in the name of all your little moralities. And you – you are immoral.’

Judging by his reaction, Giovanni appears to know David almost more than he knows himself — or more that he would like to admit. He is right about David’s detestation, as well as how his excuse of loving Hella is not enough to explain his treatment of him. There is a sense of desperation on both ends, though their goals and desires are clashing; while Giovanni wants to be with him and work out their situation, David wants to leave the room and their homosexual affair behind for good. The polarity of their stances matches those of the emotional and irrational id, and the objective and logical super-ego. Their relationship lacked a necessary balance from the beginning due to David’s view of their actions, deeming them impure and temporary in contrast to Giovanni’s passionate investment. David was in it for the physical satisfaction, and yet, “‘I do not know what I felt for Giovanni. I felt nothing for Giovanni. I felt terror and pity and a rising lust.’”

There is most likely an element of denial present, as he later claims that “I felt that it was my heart which was broken. Something had
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broken in me to make me so cold and so perfectly still and far away.” Unfortunately for
Giovanni, he was blinded by his love for the American, resulting in his inevitable
abandonment: “‘Giovanni,’ I said, helplessly, ‘be careful. Please be careful.’ He gave me an
ironical smile. ‘Thank you,’ he said. ‘You should have given me that advice the night we
met.’” Once they part ways, they never really speak afterwards, and David has successfully
achieved the Madness stage: “and with every step I took it became more impossible for me to
turn back. And my mind was empty – or it was as though my mind had become one
enormous, anaesthetized wound. I thought only, One day I’ll weep for this. One of these
days I’ll start to cry.” Mentally, the Nirvana principle is in effect, which he maintains until the
Death stage by distracting himself as much as possible.

I argue that Death, similar to Passing, enters when David indirectly inflicts biological
death upon Giovanni. The latter admitted it himself how “‘if you cannot love me, I will die.
Before you came I wanted to die, I have told you many times. It is cruel to have made me
want to live only to make my death more bloody.’” Though the LMD triad is not about
victimization or placing blame, it is central to map and analyze what elements led the
characters in the direction of tragedy. In addition to there being a physical death, the symbolic
death constitutes a mental change within David; as his lover is executed, so is a part of him —
the part that would have brought him happiness in life. Nevertheless, David gets time to
contemplate his actions from the moment he leaves Giovanni to the day of his execution. Like
in The Great Gatsby, the setting helps set the mood for the approaching archetype: “‘the
autumn is beginning.’” Leaves begin to fall and the color of the river fades, the city of Paris
now losing its vibrancy to that of something dead and lackluster. David stays with Hella in
her room as time progresses, symbolic of his choice of a hetero relationship. He runs into
Giovanni on occasion, taking note of physical and behavioral changes; as much as he hates
witnessing his evolution into someone more “giddy and girlish”, he does nothing about it but
internally despise him for it. Additionally, while hating the sight of Giovanni with Jacques, he
also notices how “though he was often rather better dressed, he did not look well.”

Everything suggests that Giovanni is spiraling, a fact that is soon reinforced through criminal
action; when David learns that he has started hanging with street-boys instead of Jacques, it
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does not take long before his following murder of Guillaume is announced. David reacts to how media chose to angle the case, tying Guillaume’s name to French honor and manhood — rendering the later death penalty symbolic of how society finds Giovanni’s lifestyle a threat. Like the media, David had to remove Giovanni from his life as he threatened his masculinity — and like society, his super-ego has played a part in sentencing his former lover to the guillotine.

The Death archetype is finalized on the day of Giovanni’s execution, which is characterized by a combination of aggression and self-destruction; the former due to the way David has treated those around him, and the latter because of how he has treated himself. Prior to this, David has felt guilty in the forms of: “I looked to Hella for help. I tried to bury each night, in her, all my guilt and terror. The need to act was like a fever in me, the only act possible was the act of love.” To himself and his friends, Giovanni was only a handsome toy to quench their immediate desires with, which David believes was the realization that pushed him to the edge when killing Guillaume. After all, Giovanni had lost his bartender job after David moved in with him, and only after he stopped seeing Jacques was his position offered to him again — when Guillaume knew no other lover was in the picture. David imagines the scene of the murder, concluding why his old roommate did what he did:

He wants Giovanni to undress… Perhaps at this moment Giovanni realizes that he cannot go through with it, that his will cannot carry him through. He remembers the job. He tries to talk, to be practical, to be reasonable, but of course, it is too late, Guillaume seems to surround him like the sea itself. And I think that Giovanni, tortured into a state like madness, feels himself going under, is overcome, and Guillaume has his will. I think if this had not happened, Giovanni would not have killed him. . . Giovanni certainly did not mean to do it. But he grabbed him, he struck him. . . Then Guillaume fell. And Giovanni fell – back into the room, the streets, the world, in the presence and the shadow of death.

Despite media’s dreadful representation of the foreign Giovanni, David does not view him as anything close to a coldblooded killer; if anything, he is the only one who truly understands why and how the incident happened — and the reader has every reason to agree with his theory and suspicion. What the real motive was is never disclosed from Giovanni’s point of view, though it is revealed that he pledged guilty with robbery as his motive. Winter has long since arrived by the time of execution, and David has felt his heart grow colder accordingly: “much has been written of love turning to hatred, of the heart growing cold with the death of

161 Baldwin: p. 135
162 Baldwin: p. 137-138
love. It is a remarkable process. It is far more terrible than anything I have ever read about it, more terrible than anything I will ever be able to say.” David has been deeply affected by the process and headlines, even to the point of no longer finding Hella pleasing. His fiancée no longer stimulates him physically or emotionally, and the realization frightens him; having clung to her for his dear life, his guilt is now ripping their relationship apart. David cannot help but feel like he “placed him in the shadow of the knife,” which shows how his conscience is finally dealing with the aftermath of his actions. Now that the heteronormative life awaits him, he can no longer bear to embrace it.

As soon as Hella discovers his homosexuality, she leaves their room with haste, leaving him completely alone on the execution date. The imagined execution process itself is both graphic and poetic, complementing David’s process of accepting and coping with the situation — if only to be able to live on afterwards.

The body in the mirror forces me to turn and face it. And I look at my body, which is under sentence of death. . . I long to crack that mirror and be free. I look at my sex, my troubling sex, and wonder how it can be redeemed, how I can save it from the knife. The journey to the grave is already begun, the journey to corruption is, always, already, half over. Yet the key to my salvation, which cannot save my body, is hidden in my flesh. . . I move at last from the mirror and begin to cover that nakedness which I must hold sacred, though it be never so vile, which must be scoured perpetually with the salt of my life.

I must believe, I must believe, that the heavy grace of God, which has brought me to this place, is all that can carry me out of it.

Giovanni has contributed to a significant change in David’s life, which he seems to realize when halfheartedly beginning his life anew as Giovanni is executed; once the door opens for Giovanni and his journey into death awaits, David closes the door to his room behind him before walking off to a nearby bus stop. These parallels of their journeys and their unholy bodies are elements that Baldwin emphasize especially in the closing paragraphs, leaving the narrative on a less optimistic note. The biggest difference is that Giovanni is punished for his “sins” and thereby receives salvation, while David must live on with the weight of his actions wearing on his conscience. Though he is perfectly alive and single, not to mention able to go wherever he wants and start his life anew, there is little that suggests he will ever get over the unfortunate choice of trading Giovanni’s room for that of Hella’s — qualifying his psyche as one influenced by Death.
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The novel posed several interesting and contemporary questions, which made an LMD analysis difficult to accomplish due to the many different factors weighing in on the storyline. It is important to remember, however, that the LMD triad offers its own archetypal angle on a narrative and does not discredit any other reading. With that said, I stuck with the novel because it contained factors that might complicate my analysis; all main characters were involved with alcohol and suffered a lack of financial support, making the influence of Love just one of several damning ones. Except for *A Streetcar Named Desire*, all other stories analyzed contained a financially solid setting — and like Blanche DuBois, David resorted to alcohol and shutting himself off emotionally when entering the Madness stage (not counting “A Rose for Emily” seeing as Emily retained her social status and privileges despite the lack of proper financing). This may or may not be due to how the accumulation of issues have become too much to handle, which makes the significance of Love-influence harder to defend. In David’s case, I have mapped the scenes and experiences I find telling of an LMD presence; from his first meeting with Giovanni which prompted the primal desire of Love, to the slow descent into Madness as he realized he could not go on living in Giovanni’s room, to finally Death overcoming him when sentencing his body and lover both to death. The Death stage in particular leaves the victim changed to the point of no return, which I believe the death of Giovanni sufficiently demonstrates through David’s lack of salvation; there is no saving his body, leaving him in this limbo between living and dying — in other words, rendering the rest of his existence one based on completing the journey to death and corruption.

III.VII Chapter Conclusion

This chapter has roughly demonstrated how a critic may go about employing the LMD triad; by analyzing fictional works belonging to a set geographical location and historical period, the LMD triad can highlight social tendencies as well as their roots and causes. I chose to scrutinize one particular literary period, and have thereby mapped a common pattern that predominately affects the characters — which in this case reflects the era they have been written. Due to how the unstable conditions prevailed, so did modernism continue to influence writers and their narratives for several decades; some of which have now been analyzed in relation to an archetypal structure. The LMD triad has helped confirm the characteristic presence of a psychic imbalance in modernist literature, which translates to narratives that all eventually cater to the destructive death drive. This was only a minor and
less developed goal of the chapter, however, as the central focus was to walk through the stages of an archetypal analysis — more specifically, the stages belonging to an LMD analysis.

Through analyzing various texts that all conform to the pattern of the LMD triad, several of its literary functions and characteristics have been underlined. The triad itself thrives in restricted societies — especially those bound by social norms, as theorized by Freud in his attempt to map the origin of humans’ unhappiness and social dysfunction. Love sparks the process, typically for a subject who is already searching for something to fill some void within — whether it be affection, personal exploration or status. Through Love, they falsely believe they will achieve what they want and gain happiness, pursuing their chosen love-object regardless of any possible consequences. It is a desperate process, seeing as the subject must disregard all logic and the super-ego entirely, consequently risking their own lives in doing so. After all, happiness is the main goal for all life according to Freud, which in the case of the LMD triad appears legit.

Madness symbolizes a mental change of direction, when Love has successfully corrupted the subject to the point of them defying Eros entirely; as mentioned earlier, the goal of Madness is not the same as that of Love, as the stage is characterized by psychological imbalance. Acquiring their love-object did not work out as planned due to external or internal conditions, and so this stage is led by a sense of damage control; either to secure what portion of their initial goal they can (The Great Gatsby and “A Rose for Emily”), or to seek ways to mend the chaos they created (Passing) — which can also mean ignoring the situation altogether, should that be how the psyche decides to cope (A Streetcar Named Desire and Giovanni’s Room). Madness is therefore the culmination of tension earlier built up by Love, which seeks its release when the archetype psychologically (and often narratively) peaks.

Death has also appeared and influenced the characters in different ways, depending on the subject’s prior Love and Madness stage; it has manifested through both aggression and self-destruction, and has not always included a biological death. What most cases share is how, when Death has claimed the subject, the narrative climax has passed and tension is released — with “A Rose for Emily” arguably being the exception, due to the nonlinear structure that introduces the climax at the very end of the story. Regardless, the Death archetype concludes a psychological journey initiated by Love, putting an end to the suffering and chaos that erupted; and should the subject survive the process, there is a chance that the LMD triad may strike again.
Conclusion

This thesis has managed to present the following: an original archetypal structure, the guidelines of how to apply it to literature, and the context of its critical and theoretical origin. In reinventing what has arguably become an outdated method, I hoped to display the perks and pliability of literary archetypes; while some might believe they belong to another time and age, I contend that they are part of our present as much as our past. What archetypal criticism provides is a way of tracing modern and reimagined archetypes back to their ancient roots, which may provide information ranging from historical changes to a greater cultural understanding. This thesis applied a psychoanalytic approach specifically, which focused on humans and their repetitive tendencies; having recognized the way three particular themes continued to influence fictional characters, I proceeded to construct a method to try and provide an explanation as to why this thematic pattern occurs. The LMD triad serves this purpose in a way no other method could, due to the way it combines psychoanalysis with Jungian archetypes; without the former, the pattern would not have any instinctual fuel to shift from one archetype to another, and without the latter, the psychological process would not have the structure or mythological context to support a fundamental connection. The triad thereby offers a new and innovative approach with traditional tools at hand, filling a gap in the critical field where former methods would not produce the same results — similar, perhaps, but none as psychologically focused while still culturally aware.

As mentioned in the introduction, I believe this thesis is only the beginning. A lot is left unexplored, which is more motivating than anything else; from further adjusting and perfecting my method to expanding its literary scope, the potential has only barely been exploited. I would not go so far as claiming the construction is incomplete, yet I do consider this thesis to be somewhat of a prototype. There is still a lot I could add to and explore with the LMD triad, but this is currently how it stands as of 2018. I can only imagine what it may look like ten years from now.


