



SURVIVAL, TRAUMA, AND THE UNCONSCIOUS: A PSYCHOANALYTIC READING OF POST-PANDEMIC NARRATIVES IN FOURTEEN DAYS AND DAY

Dr. Muzaffar Qadir
muzaffarqadir786@gmail.com

Assistant Professor, Department of English, Bahauddin
Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan.

Jawad Ali
jawadhaider854@gmail.com

MPhil Scholar, Department of English, Bahauddin Zakariya
University, Multan, Pakistan.

Warda Muzaffar
wardamuzaffar966@gmail.com

BS English, Department of English, Bahauddin Zakariya
University, Multan, Pakistan.

Abstract

This article looks at the psychoanalytic side of post-pandemic literature by closely reading *Fourteen Days* (edited by Margaret Atwood and Douglas Preston) and *Day* by Michael Cunningham. It uses ideas from Freud and trauma studies to see how these stories show survival as an ongoing emotional and mental process, not something that ends quickly. In *Fourteen Days*, the rooftop becomes a shared space where people tell stories to release emotions and build a sense of community. In *Day*, the focus is on home life and how small tensions can quietly affect a person's identity within the family. After studying the settings, symbols, and character interactions, the article shows how these works bring out hidden fears that remain even after the pandemic. Overall, it highlights how literature can help people work through trauma and imagine new ways of understanding themselves after such a crisis.

Keywords: *Post-Pandemic, Survival, Trauma, Unconscious*

Corresponding Author: Dr. Muzaffar Qadir (Assistant Professor, Department of English, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan)

Email: muzaffarqadir786@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic, which began in early 2020, was not just a health crisis. It marked a turning point that deeply altered the way people worked, connected with each other, and even experienced the passing of time. Streets that were once crowded became eerily quiet. Parks, markets, and gathering places stood empty. Everyday life was turned into a routine dictated by masks, social distancing, and extended lockdowns. This complete change in lifestyles produced a suffocating feeling of insecurity and rendered the majority of individuals weak and vulnerable, both individually and collectively as a society. Dread of getting sick was only half of it. People also had to adapt to solitude, changing economic conditions, and the challenge of adjusting to a world no longer familiar.

Meanwhile, the pandemic caused a spectacular outbreak of imagination and writers, artists and directors struggled to encapsulate the times and they documented events not only but also logged the emotions, anxieties and unobtrusive psychological shifts as well. Writing, especially, was a useful method of coping with what was going on. With story and characters, communities were able to look at their shared trauma, redefine the idea of normal life, and cling the everyday details of everyday life that otherwise would have been forgotten. This imagination kept alive the memory of a trying time and provided an open space to people for finding meaning, connection and hope in times of uncertainty.

The literary connection with pandemics is not something new as classical works such as Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* highlight the plague as both a literal and symbolic crisis hence, relating disease with moral and political corruption. Later, Mary Shelley's *The Last Man* (1826) imagined humanity's nearextinction through a pandemic lens, blending Romantic individualism with apocalyptic vision. In the twenty-first century, works like Emily St. John Mandel's *Station Eleven* (2014) have revived interest in epidemic narratives, portraying survival and human connection in the wake of societal collapse. As Pamuk (2020) observes, pandemic literature has consistently served as a cultural mirror, reflecting the fears, inequalities, and ethical dilemmas that crises bring into sharp focus. COVID-19 fiction adds to this tradition but also departs from it. Rather than focusing solely on catastrophe, many contemporary pandemic narratives attend to intimate spaces kitchens, rooftops, bedrooms and to the microdynamics of relationships under stress. These narratives often function as a form of cultural memory, recording not only events but also the shifting emotional climate of the time.

1.1. The Relevance of Psychoanalysis to Crisis Narratives

Most studies of COVID-19 literature have focused on politics, sociology, or public health, but the psychoanalytic side has received far less attention. Psychoanalysis, developed by Sigmund Freud and later expanded by thinkers like Jacques Lacan and Melanie Klein, offers a way to understand how trauma, repression, and unconscious

desires find their way into stories. From this point of view, literature is not only a cultural product but also a symbolic expression of inner conflicts that have not been fully resolved.

Freud's ideas about repression, displacement and the "return of the repressed" highlight the way stories can create a safe space to examine topics that are uncomfortable or even forbidden. His concepts of the death drive and repetition compulsion help to explain why certain fears and relationship patterns keep coming back even in new forms. These ideas connect closely with trauma theory which shows that the effects of a crisis can be just as important as the crisis itself and scholars like Cathy Caruth (1996) and Dominick LaCapra (2001) point out that trauma can disrupt the normal flow of time and leave people with fragmented memories, symbolic replacements and repeated images in their stories. Looking at pandemic literature through this lens helps reveal how the experience of crisis is reflected not just in the events of the plot, but also in the deeper patterns, symbols, and rhythms of the text.

1.2. The Selected Texts: Fourteen Days and Day

The analysis looks at two contemporary novels, *Fourteen Days* and *Day*, both of which reflect on the impact of COVID-19, but differ in approach and emotional engagement. *Fourteen Days* is a novel comprised of different stories and is edited by both Margaret Atwood and Douglas Preston. The novel displays a multifaceted narrative set in a New York City apartment building and spans the first few months into the lockdown. Atwood and Preston infuse the novel with characters, in the form of residents of the building, who take part in nightly storytelling on the roof and each resident telling stories shaped by their individual life experiences. This storytelling dynamic serves not only as a method of addressing the fear and anxiety that was in the air, but as a method of building bonds and maintaining a semblance of normalcy. This approach creates a strong tapestry of interwoven perspectives, which demonstrates both the heterogeneity of the pandemic and the impact of collective narrative as psychological sustenance.

Michael Cunningham, on the other hand, offers a more singular and personal narrative in *Day* focused on pandemic life. The novel depicts the life of a single family living in Brooklyn and spans over three Aprils, 2019, 2020, and 2021. Initially, the family is living under normal, prepandemic, conditions. In the later two sections, they navigate the era of the pandemic and gradually work their way towards a hesitant recovery. Through the three parts, Cunningham draws attention to the transformations of New York life as a result of or during the pandemic.

1.3. Research Objectives

- To analyze how Margaret Atwood and Douglas Preston's *Fourteen Days* and Michael Cunningham's *Day* represent the psychological dimensions of the COVID-19 pandemic through Freudian concepts of repression, displacement, and the life and death drives.

- To examine how symbolic spaces and objects in both novels function as mediators between conscious and unconscious experiences of crisis.
- To contribute to the emerging body of pandemic literature scholarship by integrating trauma theory and psychoanalysis, offering a deeper understanding of how contemporary fiction processes and transforms collective trauma into narrative form.

1.4. Research Questions

- How do *Fourteen Days* and *Day* depict unconscious anxieties and repressed psychological struggles related to the COVID-19 pandemic?
- In what ways do the novels illustrate key Freudian concepts such as repression, the return of the repressed, and the conflict between life and death drives?
- How do settings, symbols, and character interactions in these narratives function as representations of deeper psychological realities?

1.5. Significance of the Study

This study offers a psychoanalytic reading of post-pandemic literature, contributing to ongoing discussions about how fiction processes collective crises. While political and sociological analyses of pandemic narratives are increasingly common, psychoanalytic approaches remain less explored. By focusing on *Fourteen Days* and *Day*, the article provides insights into the unconscious dimensions of pandemic life, showing how literature can give shape to experiences that resist straightforward expression. The analysis is significant for three reasons. First, it demonstrates how Freudian theory can illuminate the symbolic and emotional undercurrents of pandemic fiction, revealing layers of meaning not immediately visible in the plot. Second, it highlights the role of narrative in mediating between individual psychological states and collective cultural memory. Finally, it contributes to the broader field of trauma studies by showing how literature captures the persistence of crisis in the unconscious, even after visible recovery begins.

1.6. Delimitations of the Study

This study is limited to the analysis of two contemporary novels, *Fourteen Days* (edited by Margaret Atwood and Douglas Preston) and *Day* (by Michael Cunningham), which were selected for their direct engagement with the COVID-19 pandemic. The focus is on literary representation rather than empirical accounts of the pandemic, and the scope is restricted to English-language fiction published in the early 2020s. The analysis is conducted through the lens of Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis, complemented by trauma theory, without incorporating other theoretical perspectives such as feminist, postcolonial, or ecocritical frameworks. The study examines thematic and symbolic dimensions within the texts, leaving aside broader comparative studies with other genres,

languages, or media. As such, the findings are interpretive and context-specific rather than universally evident.

1.7. Research Gap

Even though there is a growing amount of literature about COVID-19, very few studies have explored these works through a psychoanalytic lens. Most existing research focuses on public discussions, epidemiological metaphors, or social and political critique. This article aims to fill that gap by offering a comparative psychoanalytic reading of *Fourteen Days* and *Day*, combining Freud's core ideas with insights from trauma studies. This study makes two main contributions. First, it shows how psychoanalysis can uncover the hidden structures of meaning in pandemic fiction and reveal the symbolic roles these stories play. Second, it argues that pandemic literature is more than a temporary response to a historical event.

2. Literature Review

The COVID-19 pandemic has produced a wide variety of literary works that act as both an artistic response and a cultural record of a global crisis. Davis (2021) describes pandemic literature as a kind of "immediate cultural archiving" that captures the lived experiences of isolation, fear and adaptation. Novels like *Fourteen Days* by Margaret Atwood and Douglas Preston and *Day* by Michael Cunningham extend the history of pandemic while focusing on personal stories and the inner lives of characters. Unlike historical plague works such as Daniel Defoe's *A Journal of the Plague Year* or Albert Camus's *The Plague*, these novels turn attention away from large public disasters and toward domestic and community spaces. This shift reflects what Trexler (2015) calls "the interior turn" in twenty-first-century crisis writing, where private spaces and relationships take center stage.

Trauma theory offers a useful way to understand the narrative choices in pandemic fiction. Caruth (1996) explains trauma as an event that is not fully processed at the time, returning later in fragmented and indirect ways. This view is highly relevant to COVID-19 literature, where the crisis often appears not in direct description but through symbolic images and subtle narrative patterns. LaCapra (2001) distinguishes between "acting out" and "working through" trauma, a distinction that resonates in the structural differences between *Fourteen Days* and *Day*. The former's polyphonic storytelling allows multiple characters to "act out" anxieties through anecdote and memory, while the latter's triptych structure suggests an attempt to "work through" the lingering psychological residue of the pandemic year by year. Similarly, Luckhurst (2008) observes that trauma narratives often resist closure, which is evident in the open-ended nature of both novels.

Eakin (2004) emphasizes the role of narrative in shaping identity during and after trauma, arguing that stories provide a way to integrate disruptive experiences into a coherent selfconcept. In *Fourteen Days*, identity is co-constructed through communal

storytelling, whereas in *Day*, identity work takes place within the intimate sphere of family life.

Psychoanalytic theory, particularly Freud's (1917, 1920) work on repression and the death drive, remains a valuable tool for literary analysis. Brooks (1994) argues that narratives function like dreams, in which latent desires and fears are transformed into symbolic and displaced content. In pandemic literature, this transformation allows for the indirect representation of fears that may be too overwhelming to address directly. In *Fourteen Days*, displacement happens when the residents tell stories that seem unrelated to the pandemic but still carry its emotional weight. This reflects what Felman (1982) calls "the testimonial function" of literature, where indirect speech can express what feels impossible to say directly. In *Day*, repression shows up in the way characters stick to their daily home routines. This follows Freud's idea that mental energy can be redirected into safe, socially acceptable activities to protect against anxiety.

Kramer (2021) points out that symbolic spaces often play a psychological role in pandemic stories. In *Fourteen Days*, the rooftop becomes a space between isolation and exposure. In *Day*, everyday objects like mugs and blankets act as sources of comfort and stability. This connects with Bollas's (1987) idea of the "transformational object," something that provides a sense of continuity in times of emotional disruption.

Community and isolation often appear together as tensions in pandemic literature. McGregor (2022) explains that these stories move between a desire for connection and a pull toward withdrawal. This back-and-forth can clearly be seen in the way *Fourteen Days* emphasizes shared experiences while *Day* turns inward toward private, domestic life. *Fourteen Days* highlights collective storytelling as a way for people to cope, while *Day* focuses on the inner lives of family members, often showing emotional withdrawal. Bishop (2020) notes that the physical restrictions of a pandemic change how people experience closeness, creating small "micro-worlds" where new patterns of relationships form. These micro-worlds appear in the rooftop gatherings of *Fourteen Days* and in the private home of *Day*. Both settings act as what Foucault (1986) calls "heterotopias" special spaces that exist outside normal social life but still reflect and reshape it in a condensed way.

3. Theoretical Framework: Freudian Psychoanalysis

Analyzing literature is made easier during times of crisis such as a pandemic by Freud's psychoanalytic approach. He splits the mind into three: the id, ego, and superego. Grabbing instant reward falls under the id, negotiation of impulses and consequences is the ego, and the last internalized moral code is the superego. In fiction, these and the internal friction resolve as symbols, motifs, and character actions. Repression is core in Freud's work. If a character's thoughts or wishes embody a radical idea, then they must be silenced and pushed past the conscious threshold. While these elements appear to be pushed into the background, they are actually surfacing in the form of unresolved dreams,

symbols, or actions. In pandemic fiction, limitation, loss of control, and acts of illogical reasoning emerge as silenced urges manifesting through erasure.

Another foundational Freudian theme is the interplay between eros (the life drive) and thanatos (the death drive). A creative, connected, and surviving edge is eros, whereas thanatos is stagnation and repetition. Moreover, Freud explains that actions are motivated by unconscious anxieties and desires in ways that are rare for people to understand. In literature, these forces manifest in the unknown in the form of space, objects, and routines; such as a gathering on a rooftop signifies a collective unconscious experience or a door that is locked symbolizes safety and entrapment at the same time.

The article looks at novels such as *Fourteen Days* and *Day* and explores the ways in which fiction narrates the psychological impacts of the pandemic. It looks at three central Freudian motifs:

1. Repression and its return: the return of the repressed as the subjects of the narratives experience the silence in the memories and unexpressed emotions unarticulated emotions.
2. Conflict between Eros and Thanatos; both of them are manifest in the struggle between the preservation and the self-destructive instinct, within a specific character.
3. Symbolic displacement; through the act of everyday spaces or actions, there is an interplay with much deeper psychological realities.

Freudian psychoanalysis explores the ways pandemic literature creates structure to the underlying feelings of fear, unexpressed longing, and tangled emotions that exist amidst human life.

4. Methodology

This study uses a qualitative textual analysis approach, focusing on a close reading of *Fourteen Days* by Margaret Atwood and Douglas Preston and *Day* by Michael Cunningham. Qualitative analysis is well suited to psychoanalytic interpretation because it enables detailed examination of symbolic structures, recurring motifs, and character behaviors that reveal unconscious processes.

The novels were chosen based on three main criteria:

- They directly engage with the COVID-19 pandemic as a central narrative context.
- They contain rich symbolic and psychological dimensions that invite psychoanalytic interpretation.
- They offer contrasting narrative scopes: *Fourteen Days* presents a collective, multivoiced portrayal of quarantine life, while *Day* focuses on an intimate, family-centered perspective.

The analysis began with multiple readings of both novels to notice recurring images, motifs, and emotionally intense moments. These observations were then organized using Freudian ideas such as repression, displacement, the return of the repressed, and the

tension between life and death drives. The final step was to connect these findings to psychoanalytic theory and consider their meaning within the broader cultural and pandemic context.

The study does not treat the novels as exact reflections of real events. Instead, it sees them as symbolic stories that reveal the hidden psychological aspects of living through a crisis. This approach follows the psychoanalytic view that literature can both reflect cultural anxieties and provide a space where repressed thoughts and feelings appear in transformed or indirect ways. 5. Analysis and Discussion

4.1. Fourteen Days

Margaret Atwood and Douglas Preston's *Fourteen Days* take place in an apartment building in New York City during the initial phase of the COVID-19 pandemic. The story is revealed through the perspective of the residents who come together each evening on the rooftop to tell stories. The enterprising structure of many voices serves as more than a simple narrative method. It is, in fact, as a psychological space where characters express emotions, manage fears, and, in a sense, wrestle with and symbolically navigate through their experiences during the crisis.

4.2. Repression and the Return of the Repressed

The rooftop interactions enhance a sense of safety within which people can discuss matters of deeper significance and more personal nature, which would otherwise remain in silence. At first glance, childhood memories, past relationships, and bizarre occurrences, seem to be of little to no relation to the pandemic. However, Freudian lens reveals the existence of a deeper meaning.

Such stories are interpolated onto current fears, anxieties, and emotions as a coping mechanism.

For instance, a patient sharing a story about escaping an accident might, beneath the surface, be processing the societal anxiety surrounding the possibility of a sudden grave injury or illness in the context of the pandemic. Addressing issues tangentially often serves as a shield from panic. Still, feelings from the past, thought to be forgotten, return to the surface masked in different forms.

4.3. The Conflict Of life drive and death drive

The rooftop community is also a living example of the tension between Freud's libido, Eros, and his death drive, Thanatos. Citizens joining in community to eat, talk and socialize perfectly represents the energy of Eros. Conversely, Thanatos is a drain on life that will impact the way we retreat or mock in the face of loss and suffering.

Everything has shifted and some characters have come to terms with the fact that life won't ever be what it was, even though others still see a light at the end of their previously functional lives. This behavior is in line with Freud's concept of repetition compulsion which is the tendency to repeat what has already happened until we heal and

expand our potential. And the story seesaws between comradeship and solitude, revealing how these two inseparable forces have always tugged at people.

4.4. Symbolic Spaces and Transitional Objects

The rooftop itself acts as both an emblematic and liminal space. It is above the apartments, yet still enclosed within the building, creating a space that is both physical and mental. It is a quasi area that exists in between the private, claustrophobic pandemic isolation and the outside world, which is often deemed hostile during these times. The rooftop is a space where the residents can mediate between their anxious thoughts and the reality during the pandemic in psychoanalytic terms. The items that are used during the gatherings, drinks, folding chairs, and the distance between the storytellers are all, in a sense, transitional objects. They provide solace, order, and coherence in a world that feels volatile and unpredictable. By ascribing emotional significance to objects, residents are able to create small psychological anchors that help them manage the psychological strain.

4.5. Collective Narrative as Containment

The multi-voiced structure of *Fourteen Days* also serves as a mechanism of shared emotional containment. Through each individual story, there exists a shared emotional atmosphere where individual fears can be expressed, diffused, and absorbed back into the collective. This resembles group therapy, where the normalizing of personal distress and isolation can happen by simply listening to other people voicing their struggles. The rooftop gatherings help individual anxieties be shared, contained, and supported within a collective framework. To summarize, *Fourteen Days* illustrates how people deal with the psychological burden of the pandemic using storytelling, symbolic spaces, and shared objects. The novel depicts, through repression, the coping mechanisms of fear, loss, and uncertainty alongside the drives of life and death through symbolic negotiation. The rooftop serves as a literal and metaphorical space where personal and collective anxieties are articulated, managed, and transformed. *Fourteen Days* illustrates the importance of emotional connection, shared narrative, and symbolic meaning as a way to survive crises.

4.6. Day

The approach Michael Cunningham uses in his novel *Day* regarding the COVID-19 pandemic is distinct. Rather than employing a multitude of voices, he focuses on a single family from Brooklyn, spanning the years of 2019, 2020, and 2021. This form enables the novel to reveal the complexities of the evolving relationships, routines, and emotions as the pandemic transitions from an anticipated event to a full-on crisis and eventually to enduring its aftermath.

4.7. Repression in Domestic Spaces

The *Day's* repression focuses on the absence of public stories, instead emphasizing daily life. Members of the family avoid open communication regarding the COVID-19 pandemic, trying to hide their fears from one another. Masking anxiety through the

performance of the mundane becomes a coping strategy, offering routines that fend off unmanageable dread and stress. To illustrate, a parent may dedicate hours to meticulous meal planning and cooking, not because they enjoy it, but to distract from the constant worry of potential illness, financial challenges, or both. This is an example of Freudian displacement, where some form of mental energy is diverted from threatening ideas to much less threatening, symbolic actions. The kitchen transforms into a space that simultaneously provides sustenance and serves as a refuge from the full confrontation of the crisis' magnitude.

4.8. Eros and Thanatos in Intimate Relationships

In family dynamics, one can observe a dance between Eros, the life force, and Thanatos, the life force's opposite. Shared breakfasts, late-night conversations, small gestures, and shared kindnesses reflect Eros and help preserve relationships during challenging periods. Simultaneously, the quiet withdrawal, irritability, or retreat to singular sitting spaces expose the gentler side of Thanatos. People tend to isolate themselves in designated rooms and engage in focusing pursuits. While this is a self-care strategy, it indicates the slow erosion of intimacy that results from prolonged stress. Freud observes that the death drive tends to show up as a pull away, which is the case in these isolated retreat spaces.

4.9. Symbolism of Time and Repetition

The three-April structure illustrates the cyclical form of trauma. The return to the same month each year evokes Freud's repetition compulsion theory of unresolved experiences. No matter how much things change on the surface, there are certain emotional patterns that are constant. This illustrates how the aftermath of the pandemic psychologically and socially transcends time, stark periods of history. In the novel, time bears symbolic weight as well. The first April, 2019, exists pre-crisis. The second April, 2020, is unabashedly entrenched in the pandemic. The third, 2021, is a cautious rebuilding phase. This layering of history echoes Freud's notion of trauma in the context of time; how it distorts the relationship with the past and every moment becomes a simultaneous presence.

4.10. Domestic Items as Emotional Anchors

Just as a rooftop serves as a significant marker in *Fourteen Days, Day* highlights the emotional significance of everyday objects. A cherished mug, a used blanket, and a couch used for sitting together holds great comfort and stability. These items provide psychological anchors which allow the characters to deal with the turmoil of the outside world. From a Freudian perspective, such objects may represent replaced determinacies, enabling characters to concentrate their feelings upon a protected and controllable target. This framework explains the intimate, quotidian dimensions of the pandemic, with its

layered psychological impact, and how domestic life strives to organize and respond to those invisible pressures.

4.11. Comparative Discussion

Though the filmmaker behind *Fourteen Days* and the novelist *Day* take absolutely different approaches to the narration, coverage, and mood, they both explore the hidden psychological effects of the pandemic days. By making the two storylines face each other, it is shown that the ideas of repression, life battling death, and how objects and spaces can be a part of a dark social and narrative context can also be illustrated for different purposes in the storytelling.

Fourteen Days shows the type of setting where people enjoy the privacy of large gatherings and occasionally heighten the atmosphere to allow dormant fears to have a rewarding revival. People share their stories about their past lives, providing a way to transfer their current worries of the pandemic to something elsewhere. Such an approach makes it possible for the residents to overcome their fears by avoiding any direct confrontation. The novel consists of a group of people with different outlooks, and such a diverse group mirrors a counseling session where individual views merge to a holistic representation of the emotional life. In contrast, the director of the film *Day* displays repression as more personal, safe, and inside. The family is not very keen on dwelling on their pandemic-related fears; hence, they create a kind of force field that protects each other from very hard situations. By rearranging their day through daily rituals and tiny activities, they relocate their emotions and alleviate the stress. Altogether in the *Fourteen Days*, connection is explicitly visible on the rooftop; however, at *Day*, the setting is indoors. This kind of intimacy is maintained, whereas being cooped up can sometimes breed tensions and conflicts in a relationship.

The themes of the life force and the death force differ greatly in (omit)the novels mentioned. Eros, the life instinct in *Fourteen Days*, appears in the act of crowds gathering together, people sharing tales, and them creating fragrant, déjà vu moments by briefly connecting with each other. the side of the death drive Thanatos at times of isolation and in the midst of dark humors is manifested. In *Day*, acts of care within the family mirror the life drive, but the death drive is seen in the emotional pursuit of silence and quiet isolation.

Symbolism contributes significantly to the development of the stories. The rooftop plays a crucial role for the performers as it merely attempts to bridge the chasm of isolation and social inclinations, permitting whatever personal terrifies exist to be innocently set free within the safety of this area. For *Day*, this regular aspect of life, such as warm blankets and a coffee cup, comes to symbolize stability and security, just like anchors against the vast unknowns of the outside world. They both tell varied stories of the

pandemic's effect, revealing even weeks after the immediate loss and setbacks have been taken with long-lasting and coping through what remains in the individual.

5. Conclusion

This study employs Freudian psychoanalysis when analyzing *Fourteen Days* and *Day* by emphasizing repression, the drive to kill (death drive) and the drive to live (life drive), as well as the symbolism that accompanies the process of displacement. Although both novels are narrated in different styles and have different focuses, the two authors prove how people attempt to understand and assimilate to lose, fear, and the need for connection in the same deeply unconscious way. In *Fourteen Days*, people form a community to combat the pandemic. The communal acts hosted on the rooftops act as temporary zones where people express their longoverlooked fears through symbolic legends. The cacophony within the novel portrays the disturbance, but exact connections in the sense of numerous persons mourning past events but indirectly through oral tradition. *Day* shows a private perspective of the same family, who openly negotiate their relationship and daily lifestyle during the pandemic. Everyday life shows drives for simple care and protection. However, life-driven energy sometimes struggles with closure and solitude. That is when household objects serve as emotional holders, resulting in stability contrary to the chaos in those times of the unknown. These fictions visualize such mental responses to the disease as the challenge continues beyond (omit) wrapping the disease up. They make it clear that literature is a tool to reflect on emotional trauma, offering an opportunity to readers to grapple with similar experiences in a kind way.

References

- Atwood, M., & Preston, D. (Eds.). (2024). *Fourteen Days*. HarperCollins.
- Bishop, K. (2020). Pandemic spaces and the micro-geographies of intimacy. *Cultural Geographies*, 27(4), 511–527. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474020936443>
- Bollas, C. (1987). *The Shadow of the Object: Psychoanalysis of the Unthought Known*.
- Brooks, P. (1994). *Psychoanalysis and Storytelling*. Blackwell.
- Caruth, C. (1996). *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Columbia University Press.
- Cunningham, M. (2023). *Day*. Random House.
- Felman, S. (1992). *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*.
- Foucault, M. (1986). Of other spaces. *Diacritics*, 16(1), 22–27. <https://doi.org/10.2307/464648>
- Freud, S. (1917). Mourning and melancholia. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 14, pp. 243–258). Hogarth Press.

- Freud, S. (1920). Beyond the Pleasure Principle. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 18). Hogarth Press.
- LaCapra, D. (2001). Writing History, Writing Trauma. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Luckhurst, R. (2008). The Trauma Question. Routledge.
- Outka, E. (2019). Viral Modernism: The Influenza Pandemic and Interwar Literature. Columbia University Press.
- Pamuk, O. (2020, April 23). What the great pandemic novels teach us. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/23/opinion/sunday/coronavirus-pandemic-novels.html>
- Routledge.
- Trexler, A. (2015). Anthropocene Fictions: The Novel in a Time of Climate Change. University of Virginia Press.