



LUND UNIVERSITY
Humanities and Theology

The Presence of the Jungian Archetype of Rebirth in Steven Erikson's *Gardens of the Moon*

Emil Wallner
ENGK01
Bachelor's thesis in English Literature
Spring semester 2014
Center for Languages and Literature
Lund University
Supervisor: Ellen Turner

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
The Collective Unconscious and the Archetype of Rebirth.....	2
<i>Renovatio</i> (Renewal) – Kellanved and Dancer, and K’rul.....	6
Resurrection – Rigga, Hairlock, Paran, and Tattersail.....	9
Metempsychosis – Tattersail and Silverfox.....	15
The Presence of the Rebirth Archetype and Its Consequences.....	17
Conclusion.....	22
Works Cited.....	24

Introduction

Rebirth is a phenomenon present in a number of religions and myths all around the world. The miraculous resurrection of Jesus Christ, and the perennial process of reincarnation in Hinduism, are just two examples of preternatural rebirths many people believe in today. However, rebirth does not need to be a paranormal process where someone returns back to life or is actually born again; it can also be something less extraordinary, something more metaphorical. It might be a spiritual rebirth, or just a change in how one leads one's life, and, like the phoenix rising from the ashes, one is renewed, purged from the burdens of the past.

Belief in rebirth seems to be a ubiquitous phenomenon, so it is no wonder that it is a common theme in literature; this is definitely the case with Steven Erikson's *Gardens of the Moon* (2005), where several characters are reborn. The novel is the first book in the fantasy series *The Malazan Book of the Fallen* and it focuses on the Malazan Empire's conquest of the free city of Darujhistan. Empress Laseen, however, is not the only one with an agenda; there are factions within the empire that oppose her, in addition to the city of Darujhistan. These are not the only powers vying for supremacy, for the gods pursue their own schemes, and they have no regard for the lives of mortals as they seek to fulfill their ambitions. Several characters die when they oppose the warring factions, but some are reborn.

The first two rebirths in the novel – which are only alluded to – are those of the founder of the Malazan Empire, Kellanved, and his companion, Dancer. The elder god K'rul is reborn when his ancient temple is reconsecrated. Rigga the Seer, an old woman with prophetic powers, is reborn after being killed at the whim of a soldier. Hairlock is a mage – a practitioner of magic – in the Malazan Army, and he is cut in half outside the city of Pale when the empire assaults the city; he is reborn in the aftermath of the battle. The newly commissioned Captain Paran is murdered in an alley in Pale on the day of his arrival, but he is reborn a few hours later. Tattersail is a mage in the Imperial Army and when she pursues her own agenda, contrary to the will of her superiors, she dies, but manages to escape death due to her own ingenuity. Tattersail is then reborn again and gets the new name Silverfox. At first glance, the rebirths are inconsistent in nature – no two seem to follow the same pattern. For instance, Paran is resurrected in order to serve the needs of two gods, while Hairlock's consciousness is transferred to a wooden puppet.

Tattersail dies in a conflagration and is fused together with another individual, only to be reborn in a dream.

However, the rebirths in the novel are not as inconsistent as they seem to be, because they share similarities with C.G. Jung's theory of archetypes, presented in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* (1959). This opens up a fruitful avenue of interpretation. Jung divides rebirth into five different forms, and three of these can be applied to the rebirths in *Gardens of the Moon*, which suggests that they follow an archetypal pattern. The similarities indicate that the rebirths in the novel are not just random constructs of the author's imagination, but that they rest upon principles akin to analytical psychology. However, some of the rebirths in the novel have been distorted so that they do not always exactly follow the forms of the Jungian archetype. Thus questions arise as to why all the rebirths, on a deeper level, correspond to the Jungian forms, and why some of them are distorted, while others are not. It is also of interest to examine what effects the alteration of the archetype of rebirth has on the narrative, and if the forms are distorted consciously, or perhaps unconsciously, by the author.

The purpose of this essay is to analyze the theme of rebirth in *Gardens of the Moon*, and to show that all the rebirths experienced by characters in the novel can be organized according to certain forms of the Jungian archetype of rebirth. Furthermore, it will be argued that the conscious distortion, or lack of distortion, of these forms makes some of the rebirths appear as more fantastic, and others as more realistic. In the first section, the theory of the collective unconscious and the Jungian archetype of rebirth will be presented. The following three sections will deal with the characters in the novel and what their rebirths symbolize, and it will be shown how their rebirths can be organized according to three of Jung's forms of rebirth. The fifth and final section will focus on why the forms of the rebirth archetype have sometimes been distorted, and at other times not, as well as what consequences this has for the narrative.

The Collective Unconscious and the Archetype of Rebirth

According to Jung, the unconscious portion of the human mind consists of two parts (3). One is the personal unconscious, which is produced through empirical means, and consists mostly of "forgotten and repressed" (Jung 3) experiences that can be traced back to one's

childhood (Jung 3; Hauke 65). The other part is the collective unconscious, which is the foundation that the personal unconscious rests upon; it exists at a deeper level in the human psyche (Jung 3). Contrary to the personal unconscious, the collective unconscious is not formed through an individual process, but it is a heritage from previous generations; it is present in every human and it has been around for as long as humanity itself (Hauke 67; Jung 4). As Christopher Hauke puts it: the “collective unconscious derive[s] through aeons of repetition of human cultural imagery and experiences that, despite differences in detail, remains typically human with recognisable common qualities and meanings” (Hauke 59). Thus, certain images that have been constructed during thousands of years can be found in different cultures around the world. These images and “experiences” basically have the same form and significance whether they are found in, for example, Europe or Asia.

The constituents of the collective unconscious, compared to the personal unconscious, are not made up of “repressed or forgotten” (Hauke 67) experiences, but they consist of something Jung calls archetypes (Jung 4). In one form these archetypes are “primordial images” (57) that originate from mythology and stories (5). However, not all the archetypes are images, but they can also be “ideas, feelings and experiences”, even “patterns of behaviour” (Stevens 76). Moreover, Jung states that in their most basic shape, “the archetypes are the unconscious images of the instincts themselves” (44). The archetypes, then, constitute the way in which the mind portrays instincts. Also, according to Jung, it is from the instincts that creativity originates, and “the unconscious . . . is the very source of the creative impulse” (qtd. in Hauke 68). Therefore, creative compositions are to some extent based on the archetypes, and as Anthony Stevens writes, the archetypes “are manifest in the spiritual achievements of art, science and religion” (90). It follows, then, that the archetypes exist around us as well as in our unconscious.

As mentioned above, the archetypes have not taken the same form in every culture through the course of history. In the words of Stevens, the archetypes may be “common to all humanity” but “they are nevertheless manifested in every individual in a manner peculiar to him or her” (79). This is because when an archetype enters the conscious mind of an individual – something they mainly do in dreams, or as shown above, in acts of creativity – they take on a slightly different shape (Jung 5, 79). The individual’s consciousness changes the archetype slightly, and this is important because it

can be seen as one reason for the distortion of the rebirth archetype in *Gardens of the Moon*.

Of the five forms of rebirth distinguished by Jung, three are applicable to the novel and they are *renovatio* (renewal), resurrection, and metempsychosis.¹ These forms, according to the definition of an archetype given above, are present in our unconscious and as a result also in the world around us. It should be noted that Jung describes the nature and form of symbolic rebirths, or rebirths that are viewed as historical – for example the resurrection of Jesus Christ or Buddha’s reincarnations. Since *Gardens of the Moon* is a work of fantasy, the rebirths in the novel will at times correspond to the more fantastical elements of the archetype’s forms, like someone returning from the dead. Moreover, Jung’s theories are not only relevant because the subject matter of this essay is rebirth, but also because *Gardens of the Moon* is a fantasy novel – a genre specifically associated with the phenomenon of archetypes. According to Brian Attebery, Jung’s theories are especially applicable to fantasy narratives and fit the fantasy form very well (30). This is because a work of fantasy is a “symbolic narrative” and therefore “it must present archetypes” (30). Or, in the words of Jung, “[i]n the products of fantasy the primordial images [the archetypes] are made visible” (78). What Jung means is that through “creative fantasy” (78), through the process of imagining something, the archetypes become discernible. This process is, arguably, similar to creating a work of fantasy, since then something is imagined – for example, another world or a character – and thus archetypes arise in the narrative.

Attebery addresses the question of the value of applying Jung’s theories to fantasy because the result is so obvious, since recognizing archetypes in such a narrative is easy (30). For instance, as Attebery points out, it is easy to identify Gandalf in *The Lord of the Rings* as embodying “the Wise Old Man archetype” (30). Instead of just identifying the archetypes, Attebery writes that one should utilize the theories in order to analyze and understand the “perceptions and motives” (31) of the author: how he perceives the archetypes, and how they have been formed by his experiences and are presented in his work (30-31). Therefore, it is not enough to identify the rebirth archetype in *Gardens of the Moon*, but it is important to construe its implications for the narrative and why the author has made the choices he has.

¹ Of course, Jung’s five forms of rebirth do not encompass the complete framework of all possible types of rebirth; finer distinctions can be made, as Jung himself admits (113).

The first form of the rebirth archetype is *renovatio* and it is the form of rebirth that is related to a renewal of character during a person's lifetime, and it can be expressed in two ways (Jung 114). The first type of *renovatio* is about the renewal of certain aspects of an individual. According to Jung, it might be a renewal where "the personality which is renewed is not changed in its essential nature" (114), but is instead restored or enhanced, and it does not need to concern the whole individual, but only certain elements (114). A renewal of this kind is arguably something one cannot be subjected to by someone else; it is a renewal that originates from within and it can only be determined by oneself whether one has been reborn or not. The second type of *renovatio* that Jung outlines is about "transformation" and a "total rebirth of the individual" (114). In this case the person is fundamentally altered in the process of being renewed, and it can be manifested in the "transformation of a mortal into an immortal being" or from "a human into a divine being" (114). An example Jung brings up is the "transfiguration and ascension of Christ" (114) when Christ ascends to heaven on Ascension Day. Neither of the two types of *renovatio* involve the death of the one being reborn, but it is something that occurs while one lives. To take Jung's example, Christ did not die and then ascend, but he was transformed during his lifetime.

The second form of rebirth is resurrection, which entails that someone dies and then returns back to life (Jung 114). Jung uses the resurrection of Jesus Christ – when the physical man Jesus is resurrected three days after his crucifixion – as an example of this kind of rebirth (114). The one who is resurrected, according to Jung, goes through a "change, transmutation, or transformation of one's being" (114). The alteration can be minor, which means that one might simply be resurrected in another location than where one died, or one is resurrected "in a body which is differently constituted" (114), which means that one's previous body has been modified in some sense. The alteration might also be major, which means that one's whole existence is remodeled and one does not awaken in one's previous body, but instead in a completely new one (114).

The third form of rebirth is metempsychosis, a "transmigration of souls" (Jung 113). This type of rebirth, Jung explains, is when "life is prolonged in time by passing through different bodily existences" (113). One is born again several times and these births are part of the continuous existence of the individual (113). To clarify, metempsychosis means that one is actually reborn biologically, and not just renewed during one's lifetime, as with *renovatio*, or brought back to life, as with resurrection. It

then follows that metempsychosis results in a rebirth in a completely new body; there is no continuity of appearance. In addition, Jung states that there is no assurance that the individual who experiences metempsychosis will retain his whole identity in the process of his rebirth, whether he will have a “continuity of personality” or not (113). Jung gives Buddha’s metempsychosis as an example of this type of rebirth (113). While alteration is part of all three forms of rebirth, the alterations differ from one another. The alteration that supplements the form of *renovatio* has to do with “healing, strengthening, or improvement (114). The one who is renewed becomes better in some sense than what one was before. When someone is resurrected the body may, or may not, be altered. The alteration is purely physical. In contrast, with metempsychosis the alteration is always of the body, and sometimes of the mind; it is both physical, and mental, though the alteration of the mind is not guaranteed. What ultimately determines what kind of rebirth someone goes through has to do with the nature of their death and rebirth. That is, if someone is renewed during one’s lifetime without dying (*renovatio*), or brought back from the dead (resurrection), or biologically reborn (metempsychosis).

Except for metempsychosis, the two other forms of the rebirth archetype that are applicable to the novel focus on rebirth as it occurs in Christian mythology. This is understandable since Erikson is a western writer and Christianity is the dominating religion in western civilization and the Bible is an influential text. As a result, the rebirths in *Gardens of the Moon* mostly reflect the western view of rebirth, though this serves as a representation for a more universal analysis of rebirth as a phenomenon.

***Renovatio* (Renewal) – Kellanved and Dancer, and K’rul**

The first form of the rebirth archetype that will be discussed is *renovatio*. The first characters in the novel whose rebirths correspond to the form are Kellanved and Dancer, the previous Emperor of the Malazan Empire and his companion. They are both believed to be dead, assassinated by the current empress Laseen. However, this is not the case, because instead of dying they have become the two gods Shadowthrone and Cotillion.²

² As becomes apparent in *Night of Knives* – a prequel to *Gardens of the Moon* written by Ian C. Esslemont, the co-creator of the fantasy world that the books take place in – Kellanved and Dancer only fake their deaths. They then enter the Deadhouse and, due to some obscure circumstances or occurrences within, ascend and become gods.

Their ascension to godhood might not be immediately apparent from just reading the first novel in the series, but there are implicit indications of this throughout *Gardens of the Moon*.³ However, in the second book, *Deadhouse Gates*, it is stated explicitly in a conversation that Kellanved is Shadowthrone, and Dancer is Cotillion (Erikson 160). In *Gardens of the Moon*, they are reborn as a consequence of their own ambitions because they actively pursue godhood. Their endeavor symbolizes the human desire to escape, or at least delay, death. When they become gods as a result of their rebirths, this means that they actualize this desire for longevity. However, Kellanved and Dancer do not become immortal in truth, for as Oponn, the twin god of chance, says, “[e]ven for the gods . . . death awaits” (129). So, while they postpone their deaths, they might still die, and this reflects the uncertainty of death; it might occur at anytime and to anyone. However, Michael Sebek writes about literature in relation to psychoanalysis that “the rebirth fantasy is connected with initial hopes for a better life and a change for the better” (230). Therefore, while Kellanved and Dancer can still die like anyone else, their apotheoses reflect the hope of having a better life after one is reborn, because they become more powerful and successful after their renewal.

Kellanved’s and Dancer’s rebirths are both a *renovatio* of the second type, because they are men who ascend and become gods, one characteristic of *renovatio*, and they also undergo a “transformation of a mortal into an immortal being” (Jung 114). They do not die and return to life, but are renewed during their lifetime, which is another indication that their rebirths correspond to the form of *renovatio*. In *Gardens of the Moon*, the allusion to their renewal occurs before the prologue in the poem “Call to Shadow” (xxi). It begins with the line: “The Emperor is dead” (line 1) and this refers to emperor Kellanved. Line two continues with “[s]o too his [the Emperor’s] right hand—now cold, now sev- / ered!” (2). The “right hand” is Dancer, because he is Kellanved’s loyal companion. The hand that symbolizes Dancer is both “cold” and “severed” and this indicates that he is also dead, or at least that is what characters in the work generally believe. In the poem, Kellanved and Dancer are referred to as “dying shadows” (4) who disappear “from mortal sight” (6). This means that they disappear from the world, to a place not for mortals, but immortals. Their *renovatio* is alluded to as a “burgeoning return” (14), and they return to the world of the living, renewed as gods. Kellanved’s and

³One instance when it is indicated that Kellanved and Dancer are Shadowthrone and Cotillion is in the poem “Call to Shadow”. Another example is when Tattersail talks to Kalam about Kellanved and Dancer in relation to the recent rise of House Shadow in the aftermath of their deaths, and how Shadowthrone and Cotillion only appeared after Kellanved and Dancer presumably died (123).

Dancer's rebirths correspond to the form of the archetype of rebirth in a very clear fashion, which, as will become evident, is not usually the case with the rebirths in the novel.

The second *renovatio* concerns the elder god K'rul and his return to sentience, and his rebirth is mostly according to form, though there are some discrepancies. K'rul declares himself: "I am reborn" (629). He goes through a partial renewal of character, related to the first type of *renovatio*; K'rul is already a "divine being" but he has fallen from his previous might, and through this renewal, he is restored to something of his former status. His renewal is triggered when K'rul's Belfry, an ancient temple in Darujhistan dedicated to him, is reconsecrated when blood is shed there (207). K'rul also awakens because he is played by "the Child Gods" (208), who are the current generation of deities, and they set him up to fight Raest, a Jaghut Tyrant who is freed by agents of the Malazan Empire in order to conquer the city of Darujhistan. K'rul is reborn through a combination of manipulation by the younger gods and the fact that blood falls on his old temple. Therefore, one discrepancy in comparison to the form of the archetype is that K'rul's rebirth is involuntary, which is usually not the case with *renovatio*, since it is something that originates from within, something one can only decide for oneself.

K'rul's rebirth symbolizes the lack of control some people have over their lives, and how one is forced to adapt to external circumstances. K'rul is renewed in order to serve the will of others, contrary to his own desire. At first, K'rul appears to have little interest in the imminent battle between him and Raest, because he knows that he will be defeated, and he does not care (208). However, regardless of his own desires, K'rul eventually does what is expected of him and he confronts Raest, though the Jaghut Tyrant escapes (595). People constantly perform tasks they do not want to do in order to achieve some higher purpose, and this is what K'rul's rebirth and subsequent actions represent.

The discrepancy compared to *renovatio* – that K'rul is awakened by others – raises the question of whether his rebirth perhaps corresponds to the form of resurrection instead. This question is significant because it is important to show that the forms of the rebirth archetype are distorted rather than completely disregarded. That is, the author has not constructed the rebirths by whimsically combining haphazard elements, but they follow a pattern based on human traditions in the form of the archetype. This becomes important especially in the last section of this essay when the archetype will be discussed in relation to the fantastic and the realistic, and how a deviation from the pattern evokes certain responses in the reader.

To return to the novel, K’rul’s rebirth does not correspond to the form of resurrection, but to *renovatio*, only the form has been distorted. This is because K’rul does not die and is brought back to life, which are indications of resurrection, but is renewed. Before his awakening, K’rul is in “the Realm of Chaos” (629) – an otherworldly place that can be accessed by means of magic, and he is not dead. When Raest and K’rul meet on Genabackis years later, Raest says that long ago K’rul “passed into the Realms of Chaos—returned to the place of [his] birth—[he is] among us no more” (595). Raest is also surprised to see the elder god since he probably believed that K’rul was still in the Realm of Chaos. K’rul thinks that he will go back to the Realm of Chaos after confronting Raest, but Raest flees before K’rul can bring him there (629). When K’rul considers this confrontation before it occurs, he says to Kruppe that if he is defeated by Raest he “will not die” (208). It follows, then, that K’rul is not dead when he is in the Realm of Chaos before his renewal. In addition, the Realm of Chaos is not a place for the dead, but for incarceration. Anomander Rake indicates that in the Realm of Chaos, Raest would have been in captivity, but that he “found imprisonment elsewhere” (629) in the House of Azath in Darujhistan. This means that K’rul is perhaps imprisoned before his renewal, or, since K’rul is in “the place of [his] birth” (595), he might also have existed as an incorporeal entity in the Realm of Chaos without being imprisoned. Moreover, K’rul says to Kruppe that “[i]t has been a long time since I walked on soil” (207), which indicates that he existed in an incorporeal state before his *renovatio*. K’rul also asks if Kruppe is the one who has “summoned” (207) him, but Kruppe says that he is not. K’rul has been summoned, and not brought back from the dead, and he is, therefore, not resurrected. Also, it seems unlikely that the Realm of Chaos – in K’rul’s case – is a location related to death, because he was, at least according to Raest, born there.⁴

Resurrection – Rigga, Hairlock, Paran, and Tattersail

Rigga is killed in the first chapter of the book while standing by a road beside the fishergirl who is about to be possessed by Cotillion. This unnamed girl will later become

⁴However, after reading *Forge of Darkness* – an independent prequel to the *Malazan Book of the Fallen* written by Erikson – the veracity of Raest’s statement that K’rul is born in the Realm of Chaos is called into question. There are, however, not enough facts available at this time to regard Raest’s statement as untrue, though these facts might appear in a later novel.

Sorry and eventually Apsalar. They are watching a troop of soldiers ride by and Rigga says to the fishergirl: “Mark this truth. I am the last to speak to you. You are the last to hear me. Thus are we linked, you and I, beyond all else” (13). Moments after Rigga utters these words, she is killed by one of the passing soldiers. Upon her death, she transfers her consciousness to the fishergirl, and this is how they are “linked”. Right after Rigga’s death, the fishergirl speaks “in a thick, odd voice” (14) and later, her voice becomes “young, normal” (15). After a while this happens once more and it is an indication that Rigga is inside the girl’s mind and causes the alterations to her speech.

Rigga’s presence in the fishergirl’s, and Sorry’s, mind is symbolized by a “black stone” (16) inside the girl’s head. When Sorry is with Whiskeyjack in Darujhistan he utters the word “[s]eer” (339) when Sorry is near, and this initiates a reaction in her mind. Sorry “felt as if a dark, compacted thing in her brain had burst open with that word, and now warred against all that surrounded it” (348) and she can “hear the weeping of a child” (348). This thing in her mind is Rigga and she is keeping Cotillion, who is “all that surrounded it”, at bay. Rigga keeps Cotillion from destroying the identity of the fishergirl, who is the one crying. After Cotillion has withdrawn his influence from the fishergirl, she names herself Apsalar. She feels “as if something inside is keeping things together” (553) and it is “like a smooth, black stone” (553). This is further proof that Rigga is watching over her; she is the “black stone” and she makes Apsalar calm when she becomes frightened (553). Mallet, a healer, says that Apsalar has “got someone else inside her” (602), and this is Rigga, who was “there all along” (603) while Cotillion possessed her (603). Rigga is in Apsalar’s mind to watch over her and keep her sane, because if she were to recall the atrocities she has committed during the years when she was under Cotillion’s influence it “would drive her insane” (603). Since Rigga is a seer and knows certain things about the future, she knows that Cotillion will possess the fishergirl. Rigga decides to act so that Cotillion will not destroy the girl, and she is killed by a soldier and then sacrifices herself, her soul, to save the fishergirl. Rigga is an old woman whose family is dead, and, arguably she relinquishes what is left of her life so the fishergirl will have a chance to one as well. With her sacrifice Rigga momentarily delays her own death and keeps the fishergirl alive. This represents a continuity of life; Rigga is reborn and exists for a time in the fishergirl’s mind, and the girl’s identity is not destroyed by Cotillion. Her life continues after the possession, when she becomes Apsalar.

On one level, Rigga's rebirth corresponds to the form of resurrection because she undergoes a "re-establishment of human existence after death" (Jung 114). Rigga dies and returns to life. However, the distortion is that Rigga is not resurrected in her own body, which is one possibility, and neither is she resurrected in a new body of her own, which is another possibility. Instead, Rigga is resurrected in the body of another person who is still alive, and this is not covered by the form; Erikson has expanded it. Therefore, her rebirth does follow the form of resurrection when it comes to the "change, transmutation, or transformation of one's being" (Jung 114), but it has been slightly altered. Moreover, Rigga's personality and existence is changed when she is reborn and enters the fishergirl's body. She is severely restricted and diminished as a result of her resurrection. Paran asks Mallet if the presence in Apsalar's mind is female, and he answers that "[it] was" (Erikson 603) but he does not "know what it is now" (603). Mallet refers to Rigga's diminished form as "it"; she is not even a person anymore, but only a "thing" of abject grief (603), that can do nothing but keep Apsalar sane. This is also proof that Rigga undergoes a "transformation" as a result of her rebirth.

Something that further complicates Rigga's resurrection is the matter of possession. Cotillion possesses the fishergirl who is later known as Apsalar, and it is therefore evident that possession exists in the fantasy world of *Gardens of the Moon*.⁵ As with K'rul's *renovatio*, it is important to determine that the rebirths actually follow a pattern. Since Rigga is resurrected in the body of another character, this might be interpreted as possession. When Mallet and Paran talk of Rigga possessing Apsalar, this only occurs after Rigga is dead and only exists as a "thing" within Apsalar's mind, and they are only discussing the matter of a potential possession (603). Moreover, Rigga has not been in any position to possess Sorry, because Cotillion has already possessed her. Also, Rigga does not possess Apsalar once Cotillion withdraws, so the only time when Rigga could have possessed the girl is between her own death and Cotillion's possession. During this brief period of time, Rigga is able to speak while she is in the mind of the fishergirl, something that might indicate possession. Rigga cannot, however, control the girl – something Cotillion can when he is possessing her – and the girl remains fully aware of herself, though not of Rigga's presence (14). A crucial difference between Rigga's potential possession and Cotillion's is that Rigga dies and exists within the girl's mind, while Cotillion is only influencing the girl temporarily, while still existing in another form

⁵ Raest also appears to have the ability of possession since he takes control of Mammoth at the Fête.

as well. The essential difference here is that he has not died, but Rigga has, and, therefore, Rigga is resurrected in the fishergirl's body and does not possess her.

Another character who is resurrected is Hairlock, though there are discrepancies compared to the form. Hairlock is a mage and he is grievously wounded in the battle outside the city of Pale; his whole lower body is gone, but he clings to life by using magic (50). He has made a deal with the Bridgeburners, an elite military unit in the Malazan Army, so that Quick Ben, a wizard, will transfer his soul to a wooden puppet upon his death (76, 83). Tattersail refers to Hairlock's rebirth as "[s]oul *shifting*" (83 emphasis in original) and one discrepancy in relation to the form is that Hairlock does not seem to die, and then be resurrected, but instead his soul is transferred to another existence without him dying. This results in the death of his body, but not his consciousness, and it is not until after Quick Ben completes the ritual that transfers Hairlock's soul to the puppet that Hairlock's body stops functioning (76). This indicates that he is not returned back to life from the dead, but his life is sustained in another form – that of a wooden puppet.

On the surface, Hairlock's rebirth might seem more similar to the form of metempsychosis than that of resurrection. When someone is reborn through metempsychosis their "life is prolonged in time by passing through different bodily existences" (Jung 113). It is a "transmigration of souls" (113). Hairlock's soul migrates from his body, which seems to be in accordance with metempsychosis. One difference is that his consciousness is transferred to an inanimate object, and not something animate like a human or an animal, which would usually be the case in metempsychosis. However, this might just be an element that Erikson has altered, while at the same time retaining other elements, like the migration of the soul. In addition, the fact that Hairlock's personality changes as a result of his rebirth is another indication that it corresponds to metempsychosis. Jung writes that there is no assurance that someone will have a "continuity of personality" (113) when they are reborn through metempsychosis. This is manifested in Hairlock's case as his increasing insanity. Tattersail says that "Hairlock is insane . . . That edge to him was always there" (Erikson 118). After Hairlock is reborn, Quick Ben states that "[o]f course he's insane . . . But that's to be expected . . . [H]e's got the body of a puppet! Of course that's twisted him" (118-119). Here it is insinuated that when Hairlock is reborn and his soul is transferred to the puppet his madness becomes worse. This is confirmed by Crone who refers to the soul-shifting that resulted in

Hairlock's rebirth by thinking that "[t]oo many tales of madness [are] born within the shifting" (322).

However, change is not only a characteristic of metempsychosis, but of resurrection as well, though the alteration that supplements the form of resurrection is of the body, and not of the mind. Hairlock is reborn in a different body and his whole existence is remodeled. However, he is not reborn in an animate body, but in an inanimate object; the form has been distorted. To sum up, Hairlock's rebirth seems to have the characteristics of both resurrection and metempsychosis. What essentially determines the matter is that Hairlock is not reborn biologically. The core of metempsychosis "is a life-sequence interrupted by different reincarnations" (Jung 113). The "transmigration of souls" (113) entails that one is born again – born, and not just transferred to another existence. Therefore, Hairlock's rebirth is a resurrection, though it has been severely distorted.

Hairlock's rebirth symbolizes the human will to live, no matter what the cost might be. After his rebirth, he has the body of a puppet and he is gradually descending into madness. However, if nothing else, Hairlock is still alive and he does anything within his power to avoid death. He even bargains with Paran, his hated enemy, for help when the Hounds of Shadow are approaching to kill him (440). Hairlock is killed by the Hounds despite his attempts to stay alive, and this represents the futility of trying to escape death; everyone dies, eventually. Rebirth, however, cannot exist without death, and since several characters are reborn in *Gardens of the Moon*, the finality of death is called into question. This is a central theme in the novel and it will be further discussed below in the fourth section, after each character's rebirth has been considered.

The next character who is reborn is Ganoes Stabro Paran, though his rebirth seems to lack some of the elements of resurrection. Paran is made captain over the Bridgeburners and he is put in command over Sorry among others. She is the reason that he receives that particular commission, because Paran has hunted Sorry, or rather Cotillion, since she was possessed. Before Paran can take action, however, he is mortally wounded by his quarry and bleeds to death in an alley (116-117). He awakens in another place near the Warren⁶ called Hood's Path, the realm of Hood, the god of death. He is outside Hood's Gate, the portal leading to the afterlife (128). Paran is kept between life and death by Oponn, and this twin god manages to broker a deal with one of Hood's

⁶ Warrens are otherworldly domains of existence from which magic derives.

servants, so that Paran is allowed to return to life (128-129). However, Hood's servant demands that "[s]omeone close to [Paran]" (129) has to die so he can be resurrected. Paran is horrified and begs them to let him die instead, but his pleas are disregarded. Paran would rather die than kill someone close to him; his own will to live and fear of death are not as strong as his desire to protect those he love. The novel suggests that death might be preferable under certain conditions, and that the human desire to live can be overruled. It all depends on the circumstances. To return to the nature of Paran's rebirth, it corresponds to the form of resurrection since he dies and is returned to life. However, the deviation from the form is such that Paran does not seem to be altered in any way. For instance, he does not wake up in another location than where he was killed, and while he is transported to another location during his rebirth, he awakens in the same alley he died in. Moreover, he has the same body as he had before and it has not been modified.

The last rebirth that is in accordance with the form of resurrection is Tattersail's when she is reborn in Nightchill's corpse. Her rebirth is one of the few – the other being Kellanved's and Dancer's – that very closely follows one of Jung's forms. Tattersail is a mage in the Malazan Army and she is one of the few survivors of the siege of Pale. After Nightchill, another Malazan mage, dies in the battle, Tattersail casts a spell on her which conserves her body so it will not putrefy (96). This spell enables Tattersail to escape death when she is confronted by yet another Malazan mage named Bellurdan. When Tattersail notices her spell she thinks: "*Is this my way out?*" (310 emphasis in original). Tattersail and Bellurdan are both in an area that is affected by the Warren of Tellann, projected by Onos T'oolan – a T'lan Imass, simply put, an undead warrior. Onos T'oolan's influence causes the effect of the offensive spell that Tattersail casts towards Bellurdan to multiply, and both Tattersail and Bellurdan are consumed in a conflagration of sorcery. However, because of her spell of conservation, Tattersail, upon her death, is able to transfer her soul to Nightchill's remains (310). This is made clear by Kruppe when he meets her later and says that Tattersail's "soul is trapped within a body that is not [her] own" (333).

As may be apparent, Tattersail's rebirth is similar to Hairlock's; his soul is transferred to a puppet, and her soul is transferred to a corpse. Tattersail actually gets the idea to transfer her soul to Nightchill's body because of what Hairlock does. Moments before she is about to die, Tattersail "[thinks] of Hairlock, the journey from the dying body to a lifeless. . . vessel" (310). As with Hairlock, Tattersail's rebirth follows the form of resurrection and not metempsychosis, because she is, like Hairlock, not biologically

born again, but she dies and returns to life in Nightchill's corpse. Her death and return to life are more obvious than Hairlock's, which is indicated by Onos T'oolan when he comments that the "source" (311) – which is Tattersail – inside the conflagration is "destroyed" (311). Onos T'oolan says that "something has also been born" (311) and that it is "new" (311), which is further proof that Tattersail's death and rebirth are a resurrection, since alteration of the body is part of the form. Tattersail dies and is resurrected in another body, which means that she undergoes a "transmutation" (Jung 114) where her whole existence is remodeled, since she is not reborn in her own body. Another similarity Tattersail's resurrection shares with Hairlock's is that their rebirths represent the will to live. She has witnessed what "soul-shifting" did to Hairlock, how it fueled his madness, and yet she is ready to risk the same fate if there is the slightest chance that she will continue to live.

Metempsychosis – Tattersail and Silverfox

The rebirth that corresponds to the form of metempsychosis is that of Tattersail when she becomes Silverfox, the name Tattersail is given after her rebirth.⁷ To clarify, Tattersail is reborn twice. First, she is resurrected in Nightchill's body⁸, as was discussed above, and then Tattersail goes through a metempsychosis and becomes Silverfox. The circumstances of Tattersail's rebirth into Silverfox are preternatural to say the least. She is reborn in one of Kruppe's dreams in a time where the primordial past and the present exist simultaneously "within the influence of Tellann" (334). Her soul is transferred from Nightchill's corpse to the empty womb of a woman – later known as the Mhybe – who then gives birth to her (335-336). As with Kellanved's and Dancer's rebirths, Tattersail's metempsychosis reflects the hope that rebirth leads to a better life. Before she is reborn, Tattersail is trapped in a corpse and cannot use her magic or even speak. After she is reborn, however, Tattersail, in the form of Silverfox, becomes more powerful than she was before and is granted a new life. She receives a second chance.

Tattersail's rebirth as Silverfox follows the form of metempsychosis completely. She is born biologically in a new body – that is, a different one than Tattersail's – and her

⁷ Note that Tattersail reborn as Silverfox is not referred to as Silverfox until in *Memories of Ice*.

⁸ This rebirth can also be seen as Nightchill's rebirth as well as Tattersail's, but this is not apparent until in the third book in the series, *Memories of Ice*, and will not be dealt with here.

“life is prolonged in time by passing through different bodily existences” (Jung 113). It is even mentioned that “[s]oul-shifting” (Erikson 335) occurs when Tattersail is reborn as Silverfox, a characteristic of metempsychosis, which is referred to by Jung as a “transmigration of souls” (113). Tattersail’s rebirth also conforms to the element of metempsychosis that concerns one’s personality, whether or not someone remains the same person after being reborn. Kruppe asks K’rul: “[H]ow much will this Tattersail remember of her former life?” (Erikson 335). K’rul answers that it is “[u]nknown” (335). At this stage in the novel, it is uncertain if Silverfox will have a “continuity of personality” (Jung 113) or not. Later, when Tattersail – or rather Silverfox – communicates with Paran, she seems to recall at least the parts of her life before the metempsychosis that are related to him (472, 655). This is developed in the third book in the series, *Memories of Ice*, when Silverfox says that what she remembers from Tattersail’s life is nothing but “[f]aces . . . [a]nd the feelings attached to them” (135). She is unable to say anything more about Whiskeyjack other than that they “were allies” (135). She cannot recall details of their relationship, and this indicates that Tattersail’s memory is not continuous after her metempsychosis.

The fact that Silverfox’s personality is not the same as Tattersail’s, even if some of her memories are, also becomes apparent in the third book. Silverfox confesses that she has both Tattersail’s and Nightchill’s souls within her (*Memories of Ice* 127). Whiskeyjack, who has met both Tattersail and Nightchill before their deaths, comments on Silverfox that Nightchill’s presence within her “had cast a shadow over the child – the soft gleam in Tattersail’s sleepy eyes had darkened” (129). Therefore, Tattersail’s personality cannot be seen as completely continuous, because then she, and only she, would make up the entity that is Silverfox, and this is not the case since Nightchill is also a part of Silverfox, as is, of course, Silverfox herself. When Whiskeyjack first sees Silverfox he is reminded of both the appearance of Tattersail and Nightchill (129). With metempsychosis, there is no continuity of appearance, and this is partly the case with Silverfox’s rebirth, because she is not identical to Tattersail; she only has some similar features. It must also be taken into account that Silverfox is a child, while Tattersail and Nightchill are both grown women, and it is therefore impossible to know if Silverfox will bear any resemblance to them when she is older.

As was mentioned above, the multiple rebirths in *Gardens of the Moon* address the question of the finality of death. The novel challenges the notion that death is the end

since several characters are reborn. Even characters who seem to die in the book, but actually remain alive, appear later in the series, like Toc the Younger. The stance the novel takes on the theme of rebirth is that death is not final, and this is symbolized by Anomander Rake's sword Dragnipur. If one is killed by the sword, one is instantly reanimated and enslaved in a Warren connected to the weapon. Therefore, Dragnipur also symbolizes death and rebirth at the same time, since when one is killed by it, one is also reborn in another existence, though one becomes a slave, chained to a gigantic wagon. One has to pull it, or else be consumed by Chaos. Here, Chaos represents a final death and the flight of the individuals within the Warren of the sword symbolizes the human desire to live as they struggle to escape death. Ostensibly, the death Dragnipur causes is actually final. When Anomander Rake kills the demon called Pearl, Sorry thinks that there is "a finality to its [Pearl's] end" (408). She observes that it is "[a] death in truth" (408). However, later in the book it becomes evident that the death Dragnipur causes is not final, since the two Hounds of Shadow that Anomander Rake kills with the sword are released by Paran.⁹ They manage to escape the supposed terminal death of Dragnipur – something the characters in the novel do not think possible – and this symbolic action indicates that death is not the end, no matter how final it may seem.

The Presence of the Rebirth Archetype and Its Consequences

As has been established, the rebirths in *Gardens of the Moon* can be organized according to the forms of the Jungian archetype of rebirth. Some rebirths in the novel fit these forms, while others diverge from them in some way, and these are instances when the forms have been distorted by Erikson. As was touched upon in the background section, one reason for the distortion is that the archetypes are automatically altered when they enter the conscious mind of an individual. The alteration is of course not fundamental. The archetype still retains several of its characteristics, and, according to Jung, an archetype only "takes its color from the individual consciousness" (5) and is not rendered unrecognizable. This helps to explain why, at some levels, the rebirths in the novel conform to the archetype and at the same time have other characteristics. The archetype of

⁹ Moreover, in *Toll the Hounds* everyone who is chained in the Warren of Dragnipur is released. This is further evidence that the book takes the stance that death is not final. Even the "finality" of the death that Dragnipur causes is only apparent.

rebirth was in this case altered by simply being made conscious when Erikson wrote the book. However, this does not seem to be the only reason for the distorted archetype, because some rebirths – for example Tattersail’s resurrection, or her metempsychosis into Silverfox – do follow the forms of the archetype. They have not been altered. Moreover, the forms of the archetype have sometimes been severely distorted, as with Rigga’s and Hairlock’s resurrections. The fact that the archetype is not always changed at all, and sometimes changed in fundamental ways, indicates that Erikson is aware of the rebirth archetype.¹⁰ He uses this awareness to alter some of the rebirths in the novel, while at the same time keeping others according to the forms.

One reason for Erikson to consciously distort the archetype could be a desire for originality. By being conscious of the rebirth archetype and then to sometimes conform to it and at other times not, Erikson achieves originality, since what he presents is unfamiliar. This is because the archetypes have been used time and again in narratives and are therefore familiar to the reader. Therefore, the reader might expect the archetype to take a certain form, as they have appeared in narratives, with minute changes. When this pattern is broken – when the changes are not minute – originality might be achieved, because the author succeeds in doing something surprising and innovative. This is what Erikson does in regard to the rebirths in the novel.

In some of J.R.R Tolkien’s and C.S Lewis’s books there are examples of a more conventional use of the rebirth archetype, compared to the distorted archetype in *Gardens of the Moon*. These two authors are good examples, because their works, according to Edward James, form the foundation of contemporary fantasy (62-63), and, therefore, they have probably influenced Erikson in his writing. In addition, Attebery states that one method of identifying fantasy books is to see if they, to some extent, “tend to resemble *The Lord of the Rings*” (14), though he admits that this definition is not completely accurate. C.S Lewis’s books, while not equally important or influential to the genre as Tolkien’s, are still widely read by many people (James 62). Concerning Tolkien, James states that “most subsequent writers of fantasy are either imitating him [Tolkien] or else desperately trying to escape his influence” (James 62). Compared to “most writers”, Erikson has, however, succeeded in escaping the influence of Tolkien and Lewis, and has managed to accomplish something original in regard to the rebirths in *Gardens of the*

¹⁰ It is difficult to discern if Erikson is consciously applying a knowledge of the Jungian archetype of rebirth and its forms. That is, if he is aware of the *archetype* as described by Jung, or if he is aware of the conventions that the archetype creates. When he distorts “the archetype” consciously, he might instead be distorting narrative conventions. For the sake of this analysis, the result is the same.

Moon. The rebirths in the works of Tolkien and Lewis appear to follow the form of the resurrection of Jesus, and, in general, therefore also the form of resurrection presented by Jung. Gandalf the Grey dies and is reborn as Gandalf the White, and his rebirth echoes Jesus's resurrection (James 69). In Lewis's books, Aslan is "a Narnian version of Christ" (71), and his rebirth in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* resembles the resurrection of Christ (71). Erikson does not utilize just one form of the rebirth archetype, or even keep to these forms, but he uses several, and since Tolkien and Lewis do not do that, Erikson achieves originality by escaping their influence.

Originality might be one of Erikson's motives, and it is arguably a consequence of the distorted archetype, but it is not a very interesting conclusion to the whole matter. It is a motive that seems too obvious since most authors probably strive to be original. The distorted archetype creates more profound ramifications on the narrative than originality, which is a secondary motive at best. Moreover, whatever the reason is for the distorted archetype, and whether it is done consciously or unconsciously by the author, it is more important to consider the effects this distortion has on the narrative.

A more profound consequence that the distorted archetype creates, compared to originality, is a heightening of fantastical elements. When something familiar, like the traditions and conventions established by an archetype, is changed, it becomes unfamiliar, or strange, even alien. Richard Mathews defines fantasy literature as something that "may best be thought of as a fiction that elicits wonder through elements of the supernatural or impossible" (2). Attebery's definition is slightly more specific and according to him, the genre of fantasy "is a form that makes use of both the fantastic mode, to produce the impossibilities, and the mimetic, to reproduce the familiar" (16-17). Thus, fantasy is a mixture of the fantastic and the mimetic, and a work might include more of one than the other. If Mathew's and Attebery's definitions are combined, the relationship between the "fantastic" and the "mimetic" and the components that evoke "wonder" might be seen as points on an arbitrary spectrum. At one end are the works of fantasy that are closer to what is realistic, and at the other end are the works that include components of a more fantastic nature. If a work of fantasy is close to the mimetic side, it is more familiar since it resembles the real world to a greater extent. By changing the archetype of rebirth, Erikson "moves" his work towards the more fantastic side of the spectrum, and it therefore becomes unfamiliar. This is because the rebirth archetype is present in the collective unconscious and in the reader's mind in its pristine, unaltered state and this state is

familiar. In addition, the archetype's form is also strengthened by being part of narrative conventions, and due to this the reader creates expectations as to the nature of the archetype. When these expectations are not met, because the archetype has been distorted, a dissonance¹¹ might be perceived.

However, the reader obviously expects something fantastic to occur in a fantasy novel, and therefore, it can be argued that one might not perceive a "dissonance". As Mathews writes: "[F]antasy consistently incorporates a radical departure from the real" (4). The pertinent question, however, is not how "radical" this "departure from the real" is, but how "radical" the deviation is from the reader's expectations. The reader expects the archetype to be presented in a particular form – created by conventions and traditions, even the unconscious – and when this does not occur, there is a dissonance. This has nothing to do with the reader expecting something fantastic, but it is about the reader expecting the fantastic to take a certain form.

Farah Mendlesohn supports this claim to some extent by writing that "a fantasy succeeds when the literary techniques employed are most appropriate to the reader expectations of the category of fantasy" (xiii). It follows then that when these expectations are not met, there is a dissonance; the author's intentions do not "succeed" in meeting the reader's expectations. Since Mendlesohn focuses on a broader element – the fantasy genre itself – and not on minor elements like the distortion of an archetype, she writes about the success of a whole text, and whether the book as a whole lives up to the reader's expectations. For instance, when one expects a book to belong to the fantasy genre and then, when one has read it, it does not really coincide with one's preconceived notions about the genre, one will probably feel frustrated with the text, even alienated. However, the smaller elements in a fantasy text deserve consideration as well. When minor things, like the distorted archetype, deviate from the reader's expectations, one will not be frustrated, but rather surprised, and a dissonance is perceived. This dissonance is not so acute that the narrative fails because the reader's expectations are not met, and neither is the dissonance so minute that, as Mendlesohn puts it, it is "firmly within the reader's expectation of the text" (xiii). The dissonance only challenges the reader's preconceived

¹¹ To clarify, this "dissonance" is not a bad thing, not necessarily, anyway; the way the word is used here is to signify that the archetype is not in accordance with what one has come to expect due to previous experience. The dissonance one might perceive as a result of the distorted archetype is something akin to surprise – the surprise, and possibly delight, of having one's expectations exceeded. Moreover, this dissonance is also related to the increase in the fantastic and it is the dissonance of something breaking the consistency of logic, of what is mimetic.

notions about the form of the archetype, resulting in an increase in the fantastic because its form is unfamiliar.

To take an example from the novel, Hairlock's resurrection does not follow the form of the rebirth archetype, because he is resurrected as a puppet. This is something that is on the fantastic side of the spectrum, something unfamiliar. If Hairlock had been resurrected in his own body, it would be perceived as more "realistic" – or rather, less fantastic. However, since Hairlock is reborn as a puppet his resurrection becomes more fantastic. This is based on the fact that what is realistic follows what is logical, while the fantastic does not, because, as Mathews writes: "[u]nlike realistic fiction, fantasy does not require logic . . . to explain the startling actions or twists of character and plot recorded on its pages" (3). Which is most logical, someone being resurrected from the dead in his own body, or as a puppet? Granted, both are illogical, but there are millions of people who believe in the former – i.e the resurrection of Jesus Christ – but who would consider the latter ludicrous.

As opposed to an enhancement of the fantastic, the consequence of not altering the forms of the archetype results in an increase in the realistic. Returning to the spectrum of the fantastic (unfamiliar) and the mimetic (familiar), an unaltered archetype "moves" a work of fantasy towards the mimetic end. Attebery writes that "[r]eliance on traditional motifs can be an easy way to make sure that the reader will respond to the fantastic" (8). This means that when the archetype is not changed, when the narrative conventions are met, the reader will not encounter something unfamiliar, but something familiar. No "dissonance" will be experienced, or at least the dissonance will not be as acute, since the familiar outweighs the unfamiliar. Magnus Vike observes that "fantasy as a genre has to create a sense of or a reference to our own world in one way or another, to avoid complete estrangement from the narrative" (23). While he brings this up in relation to the magic system in *The Malazan Book of the Fallen*, and argues that this is one of the "main point[s] of reference to our world" (23), it is also relevant when considering the subtler similarities between Erikson's fantasy world and the real world – for instance, the rebirth archetype. When Vike mentions the "complete estrangement from the narrative" (23) it is when something is so alien that it is incomprehensible. Arguably, this could happen if an archetype is completely disregarded instead of distorted, though that would be very difficult to achieve. In contrast, if the archetype is not changed, it will create a "reference

to our world” (23) since it echoes reality, and what the reader expects because of traditions and conventions in literature.

In the novel, one example where the form of the rebirth archetype is not altered is Tattersail’s metempsychosis into Silverfox. As has been pointed out, the circumstances of this rebirth are very fantastic – she is reborn in a dream in an existence beyond the normal perception of time. These are components, unrelated to the archetype, that move her rebirth towards the fantastic and unfamiliar end of the spectrum. However, since the metempsychosis corresponds to the form of the archetype, it is also moved towards the realistic end. Thus, a kind of equilibrium is achieved. The unchanged archetype is, as Vike puts it, a “reference point” (23) which serves to anchor the reader in the narrative and make it more realistic. While Tattersail is reborn in a fantastical location during preternatural circumstances, the fact that her rebirth includes the established convention of someone being biologically born in a new body makes it more familiar. Millions of people who are adherents of Buddhism believe in the process of metempsychosis.

Conclusion

Rebirth is a central theme in Steven Erikson’s *Gardens of the Moon*, and in the book it represents the will to live and the hope that when death eventually comes, it is not the end. This hope might be manifested in the real world as the promise of Paradise in Christianity, or the conviction in Hinduism that after death, life begins anew on Earth. No matter what the nature of the afterlife is, the novel takes the stance that death is not final. Other than the multiple rebirths in the book, which in themselves represent a postponement of death, this is symbolized by the sword Dragnipur and the death it causes, which is believed to be terminal, but actually is not. The characters who are reborn defeat death and the novel is a celebration to life and the human will to live. However, the circumstances of Paran’s resurrection suggest that under certain conditions the desire to save others takes precedence over one’s own desire to stay alive.

At first, the rebirths in the *Gardens of the Moon* do not appear to follow any pattern. However, upon scrutiny it is discovered that they share similarities with the forms of the Jungian archetype of rebirth. The reason that the rebirths are inconsistent, and at first do not seem to correspond to Jung’s forms, is because some of them have been

distorted by Erikson. For instance, Kellanved's and Dancer's ascension to godhood follows to the form of *renovatio*, while the form of Rigga's resurrection has been distorted, since she is reborn in the body of another character. It can be argued that the distortion is done unconsciously by the author since an archetype is automatically changed by entering the conscious mind of an individual. However, because some of the rebirths adhere to the forms and others have been severely distorted, this indicates that Erikson has consciously manipulated the forms of the archetype. If this was not the case, all the rebirths would coincide with the forms with only minute changes, and this is something they do not do.

The consequences that the rebirth archetype have on the narrative depend on whether it has been distorted or not. A rebirth that closely corresponds to the form of the archetype is experienced as mimetic, since it resonates with the reader's unconscious; it resembles what is mimetic and familiar. Moreover, a rebirth that follows a form is also similar to rebirths in other texts, because they tend to resemble the traditions created by the collective unconscious. Therefore, when a rebirth does not seem to correspond to one of Jung's forms because it has been distorted, a dissonance is perceived, a feeling akin to surprise. This is because one expects the rebirth to take a certain form, generated by the collective unconscious and by literary conventions. When these expectations are not met, the dissonance occurs and the rebirth is experienced as more fantastic.

Another effect of the distorted rebirth archetype is that Erikson achieves originality, because an altered archetype goes against the conventions in narratives, myths, and legends established by the collective unconscious. It is difficult to achieve originality, and this is a possible way to break free from the influence of previous authors. It is therefore a way for authors to challenge traditions and provide their readers with something new and innovative, and not yet another clichéd narrative. Beyond originality, the archetypes provide authors with subtle techniques to make their readers respond to something fantastic or mimetic, or both at the same time. At times, it might be useful to distort an archetype, and at other times it might be beneficial to conform to one – even clichés have their uses. It all depends on what the author wants to achieve, but an awareness of the archetypes provides deeper possibilities.

Works Cited

Primary Source

Erikson, Steven. *Gardens of the Moon*. New York: Tor, 2005. Print.

Secondary Sources

Attebery, Brian. *Strategies of Fantasy*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1992. Print.

Erikson, Steven. *Deadhouse Gates*. New York: Tor, 2006. Print.

Erikson, Steven. *Memories of Ice*. London: Bantam, 2002. Print.

Hauke, Christopher. "The Unconscious: Personal and Collective." *The Handbook of Jungian Psychology*. Ed. Renos K. Papadopoulos. London: Routledge, 2006. 54-73. Print.

James, Edward. "Tolkien, Lewis and the Explosion of Genre Fantasy." *The Cambridge Companion to Fantasy Literature*. Ed. Edward James and Farah Mendlesohn. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012. 62-78. Print

Jung, C.G.. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. New York: Pantheon Books, 1959. Print.

Mathews, Richard. *Fantasy: The Liberation of Imagination*. New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.

Mendlesohn, Farah. *Rhetorics of Fantasy*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan UP, 2008. Print.

Sebek, Michael. "Rebirth Fantasy and the Psychoanalytic Process." *Journal Of Analytical Psychology* 47.2 (2002): 225-234. Web. 14 May 2014.

Stevens, Anthony. "The Archetypes." *The Handbook of Jungian Psychology*. Ed. Renos K. Papadopoulos. London: Routledge, 2006. 74-93. Print.

Vike, Magnus. "'The Familiar and the Fantastic': A Study of Contemporary High Fantasy in George R. R. Martin's *A Song of Ice and Fire* and Steven Erikson's *Malazan Book of the Fallen*." N.p. University of Bergen, May 2009. Web. 9 February 2014.