Hello fellow readers and Subaru Glazers, this is a Google doc that combines what people analyzed and talked about in a discord server where we analyze Subaru and many other fictional characters in, this is a combined effort compressed into one document for your enjoyment and interest, I personally fixed some grammars here and there due to it originally requiring preconceived context which I filled the gap in myself, expect many psychological and philosophical subjects included in this document especially psychological and philosophical charts and slopes. - Aj

This is mainly the combined effort of:

1. Opp199 (Piobenneci)
2. Kasm.1337 (The Ultimate Subaru Glazer)
3. Sekiryuuteire
4. Rblxspw
5. NatsuVA
6. Ajjsjsns (Reblex369, me!!!!!)

And much much more

Feel free to join the discord server btw!!
https://discord.gg/NSKxkEEVuB

Disclaimer:
This document is mostly made for fun and there are many grammatical errors and other stuff that will be hard to understand so if you find any of them, do hit me up with a DM in discord so I can fix it. (ajjsjsns)
Also warning, the last segment will include sensitive topics like r*pe and p*dophillia so if you are not comfortable reading such things, feel free to only read the first half and not the second half of this document, as it won't be too in depth or discussed.
the first half won't include any of these topics and will be considered the main Subaru analysis. The sensitive topics will appear in the second half, titled “the rebuttal for major counter arguments made against rezero*.
Now all that's said, let's dive into the main Subaru analysis.

Full current Subaru analysis:

—----------

Explaining subaru’s complexity in a way ppl actually get why he’s a top tier in fiction requires someone to frame him as more than a surface level character. Subaru is a narrative experiment in what happens when you take the human condition and force it into a paradox. The paradox is this: he has infinite and limitless possibilities and chances but with zero freedom. Every reset looks like a choice but it’s just another prison where he alone carries the memory of death. This

creates the central theme of rezero which is agency under absurdity, same thing where camus wrote about with sisyphus; the stone rolls back down every time. But what makes Subaru different is that he doesn't push it just to merely escape and prevent his own predestined fate that leads him to his demise, but he pushes it to also keep other people alive. His suffering is not a bug in the story but instead the main point of it. Rezero asks if a human can retain identity, empathy and sanity when condemned to eternal recurrence with no acknowledgment and no validation, not even from god (this is much more shown and explained in arc 6). That's why his breakdowns are essential. Every time he breaks it's the story testing if the peak of humanity itself can survive in the face of total absurdity because Subaru IS the embodiment of peak humanity. The answer Rezero gives is a yes, but barely. And only through genuine bonds and relationships could Subaru achieve such a thing, such as genuine aid and support from others, will you be able to strengthen yourself and become mentally motivated despite numerous burdens and suffering. That's why Subaru's complexity is deeper than other people generally give it credit for. he's one of the first characters written to embody the philosophy of narrative weight itself, he's a human trapped as the load-bearing pillar of the entire world. he's not just a protagonist for the sake of having to be a protagonist, he's the glue that makes every other character's existences and purpose even narratively possible. He's literally fiction proving that suffering, choice, love is enough to create meaning even when the universe strips everything else away. That's what makes him modern-philosophy-tier in terms of writing. Subaru IS rezero and rezero IS Subaru. The story doesn't properly function without Subaru because Rezero and Subaru are so intertwined and connected, providing more parallels and characteristics to its characters by creating other characters that serve as other versions of Subaru if their circumstances were different and they had gone into different paths, and vice versa.
The Chart of the Dunning Kruger slope is literally Subaru's life in narrative form if u map it out. He's the embodiment of the dunning kruger slope but instead of knowledge it's survival and self meaning. At the start he's in the "know nothing" zone that's when he gets isekaied. He thinks being transported to another world means he's some sort of special predetermined hero, this shows that he often bases his life around fictional scenarios. That's arc 1 when he flexes fake confidence thinking he can brute force his way through just because he's the mc. He thinks the resets make him untouchable but then reality smacks him with the valley of despair and proves otherwise of his so-called invincibility. arc 3, especially the betelgeuse arc is pure collapse, everything dies around him, resets don't feel like second chances anymore but reminders of his failures and human error, and despair swallows him. This is where he breaks the hardest but this valley is the core of his complexity in the beginning of the story because it's the first time his "confidence" dies and he has to rebuild his confidence, not from an illusion of power but from actual meaning and purpose that isn't just a house of glass waiting to be broken by a simple rock throw, one that isn't just fragile ego. The second slope, the slope of enlightenment, begins when he realizes the point isn't to win alone but to understand people and to form bonds and lead through authenticity, not force. That's why arc 4's "trial of the sanctuary" is the enlightenment zone..

he's literally forced to face his trauma, such as his parents, his insecurities, the repetition of his own deaths, and to integrate them into himself instead of running away, and then the plateau of sustainability (the 3rd slope/chart) is where he grows into stability that's not just happy victories

that serve no purpose or meaning for the story nor his character. Subaru sustains a new way of leading with humility, compassion, resilience, and the confidence comes back but now grounded in wisdom instead of delusion and that's why his narrative is complex and meaningful. It's a literal psychological map of human growth. Starting from cocky ignorance → collapse → despair → enlightenment → sustainable authenticity. Subaru's writing completes the cycle and integrates the whole tree into one continuous development, it isn't even linear aswell because he still makes the same mistakes he did in the past before he learnt his lesson, it's just not as often compared to before, which shows realistic growth.
This is actually huge for his complexity cause it shows how tappei didn't build subaru as a "chosen hero who unlocks people by default". Instead, he's written under a conditional narrative law like the style of visual novels, except in a way that exposes psychology. Subaru doesn't automatically get rem's loyalty or ram's trust. it's not free and the route only opens if he earns their goodwill and raises a flag that earns their trust. In other words the narrative itself is structured around the idea that relationships aren't guaranteed, they're contingent on how u act such as what choices u make and whether ur sincerity is proven or not. This makes Subaru's story less about destiny and more about a negotiation with reality. Every bond he gets is conditional and not absolute and that reflects his complexity because it shows how fragile his survival is. If he doesn't learn how ppl think or if he doesn't learn empathy, he literally dies faster because of it. It's a metanarrative law. u can treat it like tappei saying: subaru exists in a world where human connection is the trigger for survival routes, so his arc's complexity isn't just him struggling against monsters or villains, but moreso struggling against the hidden conditionality of trust and love. this makes his writing deep because it's not about him "unlocking" people where THEY have to -fully- change instead of him, that's just slothful and arrogant. it's about him reshaping HIMSELF to align with the laws and common belief of human psychology that the others abide and respect, so they can respect him back. it's closer to existentialism, the "flags" aren't badly written but are instead conditions of reality. People will only open up on you if you earn their love and trust; or anything that is similar to such things.
Think about this chart like trying to map how people generally work based off of what you've been given about them. It's like saying "u got memory, u got motivation, u got emotion, u got knowledge, and then all of that connects in a messy way but then the scientist goes "nah, too messy. let's clean it up into one straight line so we can study it."
But life doesn't really move like a straight line. When you actually live through pain or fear or even doubt, it all comes at once like a living storm; Memory and Emotion crash into each other; pride and insecurity pull against each other; motivation rises and collapses in seconds.
Now Subaru is written exactly as that 'living storm'. he doesn't live or exist in a simplified and linear "arrow" of cause and effect. He is LITERALLY the whole diagram in motion inside one person. When he dies and resets it isn't really memory resetting but instead: his emotional weight, his sense of self, his motivation, his broken pride, all resetting and fluctuating in different ways depending on how heavy it hit him. so u don't just watch him get stronger, u feel the entire net shifting and rebalancing. that's why he feels more human than most charts can explain.

This chart is basically a scientist's safe version of humanity and Subaru is the raw uncensored reality of it. (the chart wants order but Subaru shows what happens when order collapses and

its opposite side, known as chaos, is lived through instead of order). That's why his complexity hits harder than academic models because he embodies the mess instead of cleaning it away.
I believe re:zero is intentionally designed by tappei (the author) to be a very largely interpretive narrative by its nature, a story that adapts its meaning to the individual audience's worldview rather than constantly providing fixed explanations or moral answers.
Tappei structures the series as a sort of reflective system where ambiguity, repetition, and psychological realism invite personal interpretation.
Each viewer projects their own beliefs, emotions, and philosophies onto Subaru's character, making the narrative experience uniquely subjective but still connected with the general intention of the story. This design transforms re zero from a conventional fantasy into a participatory exploration of identity, trauma, and moral understanding, a story that evolves through the interpretations of those who engage with it without it being too much of a reach.

Side note: This is actually pretty genius from the author cause although he wont have to write every single thing intentionally for the readers to take in and consume that piece of statement/words as a fixed interpretation that doesn't grow meaningfully in future chapters, he still writes every little thing in alot of chapters that passively let this interpretation of theirs grow by being equally ambiguous and interpretive but still seemingly meaningful and benefitting for the story.

Side note: That's probably one of the major reasons why tappei keeps rewriting past chapters in the web novel, yeah that guy's a perfectionist and I love him for that.)
The other major reasons on why he got this goated is probably because he wrote so much fuckin side stories in rezero it's uncountable, so that definitely boosted his writing skills by alot, and also not to mention this is practically his passion project).

Subarus 5 stages of grief:
**1. Denial **
Subaru tries to deny his weakness and his lack of personality. He does this by trying to convince himself that he is an Isekai MC hero. It should be noted that Subaru ideology on how personality is built is flawed. He believes that how he is as a man and his achievements makes him who he is. He acts as they do, trying to mimic their behaviors and traits. He is trying to build something so he can say that he truly is a person. A strong, reliable hero. After each moment of weakness he tries to console himself by feeding the delusion that he "will get strong". The thing is he never does. He treats this as a video game trying to make any excuses to his faults. He tries his best to push these delusions further anytime something bad happens. He still knows many of his failures are due to his weakness yet he still tries to hold on trying to shirk responsibility. He looks up to people like Julius, the finest of knights; Reinhard, a figure who is known among many to be the strongest; and Roswaal, the greatest magician. Subaru tries to be like them. He wants to believe that he will have the recognition that Reinhard has, the chivalry of Julius, and the generational talent that Roswaal has. Most of all he wants to fit the masculine image of a strong man who can defend his loved ones and be impenetrable. Rem stokes this delusion (sort of) by calling Subaru her hero. He believes her and tries to hold on to this statement. This is a problem because Subaru believes he must fit this hero figure. Subaru wants to meet these expectations

of a hero, this would reaffirm that he is a valuable person with actual personality. He clings to any wins and statements that confirm his greatness.
When everything boils over during his fight with Emilia he tries to use his victory as justification for his actions. He is far into this delusion that he is a hero. That is when he is smacked out of his denial by Emilia's speech. He was being selfish, he was in the wrong. He wasn't an isekai MC who was always correct and as Emilia left him the facade of being an Isekai MC shattered. He was never a knight in shining armor but an insecure boy in a new world with no strength. This is when the story starts slowly breaking down Subaru's character forcing him to confront this fear of being a nobody with no actual personality.
2. Anger
Subaru attempts to blame everyone and everything around him. This is shown when Reinhard tries smoothing things out. Subaru rejects this offer quickly and angrily. This highlights Subaru's fragile mental state. His strong grief has transformed into a quick and hot anger. He views Reinhard's act of kindness as patronizing. There are many other show cases of this anger. During one of his failed loops he attempts to get the help of Crusch. She notes that his anger towards the witch cult is blinding him from his main goal to save Emilia. The anger that he harbored clouded his judgement, making forget everything that was once important and only focus on revenge. This is also exemplified during his outbreak when he was detained by Pettleguese. He mocks Subaru for his fake madness. He is told that it was all due to his Sloth. This leaves Subaru with less and less excuses to be angry at the world for. Subaru was angry toward the witchcult, but he was also angry with himself and his inability to help the people around him. These bouts of anger continue as he fails his negotiations with Crusch and Anastasia. During this time all Subaru feels is intense anger and despair over the situation. This anger is directed not only toward his own failures but the actions of other people. He questions everything such as the candidate's "mean" behavior toward him. He questions why it is him who is being tortured by these loops. As he fails to get the help of both of the candidates he goes through the stage of bargaining.
3. Bargaining
During this stage Subaru tries to find a way out of this pit. Not only from the shitty situation but from himself. He now knows he isn't enough and it is clearly painted out. He tries desperately to fix the situation not only for the other people but himself. He goes to the last of the royal candidates in an attempt to salvage the rotting situation. He is willing to do anything to get something about the situation done. Subaru is trying to gain control over the situation. He is even willing to sacrifice his own pride just to reach this goal. This should be an obviously wrong choice but Subaru continues because that is what he could give up at the moment. Subaru's desperation causes his willingness to give up anything at a moment's notice to reach what he views as a good outcome. Him almost getting Emilia dropped from the royal selection with his interactions of the other candidates. He almost licks Priscilla's foot just to get out from this pit he has dug. These sacrifices are in vain as it never directly leads to a positive outcome as it was all just failures in Subaru's eyes. This makes Subaru fall into a state of depression.
4. Depression
This is the most apparent of Subaru's stages of grief. He is completely mentally destroyed. Subaru nearly completely gives up without considering every possibility. His depression is also exemplified by his almost complete unwillingness to keep on going. It should be noted that the

immediate trauma from deaths didn't entirely cause this. Subaru's mental state crumples due to the failures stacking up and the feelings of hopelessness. Subaru has been able to come back from very traumatic experiences such as when he dies in very gory ways in arc 5 but he was able to do much better because of his better mental state. The tipping point for Subaru is during his talk with Rem. At this point Subaru is 1000% sure that he will never be a strong hero who can challenge this adverse situation, but he never fully accepts this fact. He anguishes over it as he talks to Rem. Subaru's self-hatred and loathing stems from this depression. In his talk with Rem he says how he has no personality (Due to his flawed perception of it). Subaru highlights all his failures during this dialogue which is the source of his grief. Rem counters this with what great things he has done. This leads to Subaru's acceptance.

5. Acceptance

As Rem tells Subaru about the good things he starts to realize he did great things. His bias against himself was due to his self-hatred and low self-esteem. As Rem starts telling him what is good about himself, he starts seeing the good side. He looks at himself not from the flawed lenses which his ideology gave him but from a healthier stand point. He isn't physically able to win but he can rally people together and help create a cohesive group. He accepted the fact that he can't be a strong figure who can solve problems by his own strength. This acceptance isn't absolute as he still has moments where he feels that he doesn't do enough. Rem's speech was very helpful but wasn't a full cure to Subaru's condition. A common misconception is that Subaru simply got better after that speech, which isn't true. Subaru was simply able to be mentally well enough to put up his usual happy act. This time it isn't a fake personality but simply hiding his fear and pain. Subaru initially had been faking everything entirely but now this is the actual Subaru. He isn't some strong knight who can solve every problem with ease. He isn't a bloodline talent, he is a strategist and someone who helps out in battle not with pure strength but with insights. He has relapses where he feels very similar self-hatred to his depressive state. It isn't a linear path to self-acceptance. Subaru is literally starting from zero at this moment. His actual self is coming out and giving a hand during the battle. He let go of his desire to be an Isekai MC. He is slowly changing himself for the better.

Conclusion

Subaru's 5 stages of grief works very well as a way to develop Subaru as a character while adding nuances to these changes. Subaru's development isn't truly done and this conflict isn't simply ended. His character arc is a show of how flawed ideologies can build up and can hurt you. It also shows how you can grow out. It also is a criticism of the classic Isekai trope. Subaru was actually wrong, but he can change.

People love to say "suffering doesn't equal good writing," and I agree. Suffering is just a tool as it can be used to benefit the story or to water it down, but it's not automatically good or bad just because it exists, it still ultimately depends on how the writer deals with it and how it's executed. Where I disagree is when people throw the criticism of "Suffering ≠ good writing" at Subaru Natsuki. Sure, some suffering in Re:Zero feels unnecessary (especially in the WN, though the LN tones it down to lower levels of brutality that people either like or dislike, it depends). I get

why some viewers bounce off it. But to act like Subaru's suffering is just a pointless edge? Fuck no bro 🥀
Subaru's suffering is actually one of the best written parts of the series. It's not just gore and shock value, it's tied to his flaws and growth. He dies brutally, but the real weight is the emotional and psychological damage. He struggles because he's a dumb 17 year-old neet with an inferiority complex, self-hatred, and a tendency to center his own perspective. That's why he ignores the values and motivations of others until it smacks him in the face. Arcs 3 and 4 exist to show this exact flaw. He's not a trained warrior, he's just a 17 year old neet. Which is why he needs allies and companions to aid him. Not to mention his eventual realizations of this hit so hard.
This is why his suffering works. It has purpose and meaning. It shows us that he's a human like the rest of us and he's not inherently above or inferior to everyone else.
And this isn't just old arcs of Subaru either, look at Arc 9. People complain about Al's "Loopflation," saying his suffering is meaningless now. But that's literally the point with Al. He's been through so much. he's numb, insane,and desensitized. That contrast with Subaru is intentional and meaningful writing, it shows their parallels and how they are the same person in different circumstances, both figuratively and theoretically.
Yeah i guess some stuff feels shaky because the story's unfinished, so we don't have the full picture. But in standalone terms, the writing's already amazing despite it being unfinished.
All in all i suggest to just be more attentive to the story.

---

his personality during arc 1-2 is that he's an egocentrical person. he's a loser and an otaku and he's living off of his parents, after going to the fantasy world, he wants to be a hero and have people be "grateful" to him, he believes that if he "becomes a good person to others", they will inherently and automatically return the favour and praise him for it, his "affection" or "the way he acts" is to seek validation from others and he thinks that by helping someone or being the person that they expect him to be will make them like him more., his toxic viewpoints of affection and relationships are what made him selfish in the first place, he wants people to like him and he's always looking for validation and support from everyone, and after his death and suffering, he learns and grows, he's still "affectionate" and kind to others, but he does it for genuine and authentic reasons now instead of being inherently selfless or selfish, and without expecting anything in return. also Arc 5 (Re:Zero Arc 5 Chapter 42 [The Newest Hero And The Most Ancient Hero] (Part 2/3)) he says "I am weak. I know it better than anyone. That's why I'll fight." or "No one knows how much it hurts. No one knows what I've lost. But if I give up, then nothing I did will mean anything." he went from an egocentric loser who would give the world to be loved by anyone, to becoming a genuine and authentic person who doesn't seek reward or validation, and does the right thing without expecting anything in return, even if the world doesn't like or want him, he still doesnt want others to suffer, and he wants to help people unconditionally; even if they hate him. and he even sacrifices his life and mental health for them, The core is self-worth through meaningful sacrifice without reward. Subaru starts as a boy who equates love

with transaction, thinking if he saves someone they will adore him. Every loop shatters and breaks that toxic expectation.
subaru’s strength doesn’t originate from suffering itself, it comes from how the narrative is constructed around him. Every failure, death, and reset forces recalibration, the story’s structure allows him to change himself and affect others meaningfully, the loops and consequences are designed so that growth is cumulative and relational, his development is a function of narrative mechanics, not raw endurance. And the way he interacts with the plot and it's characters makes him a conduit for transformation, turning the imposed constraints of the narrative into a system where choice, adaptation, and impact drive his effective strength.
Subarus story is built so that his love and compassion force him to act, not just for giving feelings or emotions, but to instead provide the structure of the narrative. Making responsibility unavoidable. Every choice hits other people negatively so he can’t just ignore it. that’s levinasian ethics in play, he’s constantly accountable for others, he weighs what will help the most, all in the style of utilitarianism. The loops make him confront failures again and again so he learns, the story turns his care into action, his responsibility into growth, and the way the plot is built makes it so that through this he changes himself and shapes others, it’s all in the structure, not in an abstract ideal..
Using his development, it allows Subaru to continue to evolve his perspective based on life, the evolution allows him to make a fully fledged narrative structure that balances the intent of the story and to the philosophy of his character. This evolution in his development during arc 3 allowed him to grow further to face the struggles which made the narrative turn to a different path of direction. This particular execution was magnificent for the sole reason of making him change his view on life and his own existence and others as well. He no longer suffers without a reason or a reckless view on himself, but he suffers to continue to change the story's intent and make his suffering meaningful towards his philosophy (and other categories at the same time) perfectly. This is proven during rem's confession which allowed Subaru to live and care for himself and not just that, it entirely changed everything about his character while still maintaining that core which made it more deeper and leveled by multiple layers and dimensions that became a complete and meaningful execution inside that core. Subaru now goes up to live with his struggles as he chooses to view it. he no longer escapes it, instead he faces it because life isn't always filled with enjoyment but we have to go through it and live through it. Thus this allowed him to have one of, if not the greatest philosophy by far in media/fiction by making him evolve his perspective multiple times to add dimensions that aligns to the function of the narrative and character categories.
and using his development, Subaru keeps evolving his perspective based on his life experiences. Every failure, every death, every moment where he’s pushed to the edge adds something new to how he sees himself and others. This evolution builds a narrative structure that balances the story’s intent by using the philosophy of his character to represent it. He learns to face his struggles instead of running away, to act instead of panicking, and the narrative moves with him because of it. The execution is insane because it makes his suffering meaningful not just for him but for everyone around him. Existentially, it’s not random pain. It’s the story forcing him to confront the absurdity of it all. He sees that life is cruel and unfair but he keeps acting anyway. He carries the weight of every choice, fully understanding what he can and can’t do. Rem’s confession makes him realize that living isn’t just surviving, it’s being

responsible and forming connections and bonds with other people around him. His suffering becomes the engine for growth, for changing himself and shaping others, it's existential at its core. He doesn't escape, he keeps walking through it; integrating despair into meaning and purpose. Each trial reinforces Subaru's awareness of himself and other people around him and builds layers onto his philosophy making him structurally and thematically deep. The Light Novel shows this perfectly, its living philosophy itself in motion, actionable and layered across different arcs.
His narrative is a sandbox for free will and moral responsibility. The story throws him into extreme circumstances that test freedom and will, every choice he makes matters because the narrative tracks consequence and influence, forcing responsibility onto him. His morality isn't abstract, he literally has to act to prevent death or suffering, and the narrative punishes failure naturally without cheating the stakes because ultimately it depends entirely upon Subaru to change the predetermined future, it's either he does something or does nothing and the future events leading up to said choice shows that. indeterminism shows up because the loops make it feel like he could act otherwise, but determinism is still present since the world reacts predictably to his actions. default responsibility exists and he can't opt out, he always has to make a move; punishment comes in real, structural ways. Not just pain, but consequences for others, relationships, and survival. Alternative possibilities are baked into his past death loops, like a built in Frankfurt Case scenario where the principle of alternate possibilities is tested. He often can't avoid outcomes without choosing deliberately, creating leeway in incompatibilist scenarios, alternative sequences where he tests options and other possibilities such as revenge, rehabilitation, and restitution. All of that appears narratively: he could act selfishly for revenge, he can rehabilitate broken relationships, or try to restore what he's disrupted. Each path has real consequences and the story makes him live with them. Consequentialism and retributivism intersect because the narrative forces him to consider both outcomes and fairness, every moral action is weighed in terms of effect and justice, so structurally and thematically, these philosophical concepts aren't just decoration; they're the engine of his character, making the story a living experiment in ethics and human choice while also integrating narrative weight, growth, and existential stakes.

Different philosophies of Subaru Natsuki:

1. Eclecticism (impure and pure)
Subaru is a markedly eclectic character. His behavior mixes elements from different philosophical currents, depending on the situation. In his most impulsive moments, he adopts an impure eclecticism, guided by intense emotions and contradictions. Over time, he matures toward a purer eclecticism, where he combines ideas and strategies in a more coherent and flexible way, adapting to his environment without losing his internal compass.

2. Existentialism

His recurring death forces him to constantly question himself: what is the point of continuing to live if everything repeats itself?
Subaru faces existential emptiness, the weight of freedom, and the need to create his own meaning. As an existentialist character, his growth comes from suffering, responsibility, and personal choice in the face of absurdity.

3. Hermeticism
The series is riddled with hermetic symbols such as destiny, causality, and occult knowledge. Subaru is a seeker of inner wisdom: he needs to understand the logic of the world, but also to confront his inner self, his “shadow,” and be reborn from it, as a kind of spiritual alchemy.

4. Humanism
Despite his pain, Subaru never loses his humanity. He defends the dignity of others, seeks love, and wants to live in a world where people matter. His empathy and struggle to save those he loves make him a defender of the human experience as the core of value.

5. Complex utilitarianism
Subaru tries to maximize the well-being of others, even if it means sacrificing himself. However, his ethics aren't purely utilitarian: they're selective, nuanced, emotional. He finds himself in constant dilemmas where he must choose between the lesser evil and the unattainable good, knowing that whatever he does, someone will suffer.
6. Stoicism (under stress)
Throughout the story, Subaru learns to endure suffering with greater fortitude. He tries to master his emotions, control what depends on him, and resist the inevitable. However, his stoicism is imperfect: there are relapses, crises, but also constant learning.

7. Nihilism (transitory)
There are moments when Subaru falls into total despair. He believes that nothing makes sense, that no one can understand him, that his efforts are futile. It is an emotional and existential nihilism that brings him to the brink of collapse, but also to the threshold of change.

8. Absurdism
Subaru lives in a reality that defies conventional logic: dying and coming back, without explanation, without justice. Faced with the absurd, he struggles, suffers, and sometimes laughs with dark humor. His story embodies the tension between the desire for meaning and a universe that does not guarantee it.

9. Cynicism
Over time, Subaru stops idealizing authority figures or the magical world he finds himself in. He criticizes power structures, rejects manipulation, and becomes more cautious and sharp. This cynicism stems from the loss of innocence, but it does not turn into indifference.

10. Redemptionism

A central motivation for Subaru is redemption. He wants to correct his mistakes, repair the damage he has caused, and be better for others. This quest pushes him to evolve and gives him strength when all seems lost. Redemption, in his case, is both personal and relational.
11. Impure Realism
Subaru starts out as a dreamer, but with each death, each failure, his view of the world becomes more stark. He learns to see reality as it is, without idealization, but without surrendering to it. He recognizes his mistakes, his limitations, and the moral complexity of the world around him.

12. Impure rationalism
Subaru is an evolving strategist. With each cycle, he learns, analyzes, and makes plans. However, his reasoning is deeply influenced by his emotions, his bonds, and his traumas. This makes his rationality human, imperfect, but powerful.

13. Tragic morality
Subaru often faces decisions where there is no clear “right” choice, only the possibility of a lesser evil. This moral conflict places him in a tragic narrative: his choices always come at a cost, and yet he must choose. He cannot run away from responsibility, which makes him ethically heroic.

14. Phenomenology
Subaru is the only one who remembers every timeline. His experience is subjective and unique, which separates him from the rest of the world. He lives in a personal dimension of time and suffering, which makes him a deeply phenomenological figure: reality, for him, is what he experiences, not what others understand.
15. Authenticity (Heidegger / Sartre)
Subaru, when facing his fears and contradictions, struggles to live authentically, that is, to be true to who he really is, not to what others expect. In many moments he acts “for the sake of others,” but as he matures, he begins to act out of internal conviction, not external validation.

16. Categorical Imperative (Kant)
Although Subaru does not always act out of “duty,” he is constantly faced with decisions where he could apply this Kantian ethic:

What if everyone did what I am going to do?
At key moments, Subaru acts not out of convenience, but because he believes it is the right thing to do, even if it costs him dearly.

17. Philosophical Buddhism
Re:Zero has a strong Japanese spiritual vibe, and Subaru reflects principles such as:

Samsara: the cycle of suffering and rebirth (very literal with his deaths).

Dukkha: the suffering inherent in existence.

Renunciation of the ego: Subaru has to abandon his pride many times.

Progressive enlightenment: he learns to detach himself from the desire for control and possession.

18. Determinism vs. free will
Subaru lives in constant tension between feeling trapped by fate (the curse of returning from death) and his desire to exercise free will. The series plays with this duality: is he predestined to suffer? Or can he change the future with his decisions?
19. Philosophy of personal identity
Subaru changes with each death, experience, and choice. Is he still the same after everything he has been through? Where is Subaru's “self”? This relates to thinkers such as Locke and Parfit, who raise questions about the continuity of the self through time and change.

20. Ethics of Care
His relationships with Emilia, Rem, Beatrice, and others reflect an ethic that prioritizes emotional bonds, empathy, and mutual care over abstract principles. This ethic—closer to a feminist or communitarian view of morality—is especially evident in how he strives to protect and understand others, not only out of duty, but out of love.

21. The eternal return (Nietzsche)
Subaru literally lives the idea of the eternal return: repeating the same events over and over again. Nietzsche asks:

Would you accept to live this same life eternally, with every pain and every joy, without changing anything?
Subaru, over time, begins to affirm his existence despite suffering, which aligns with this philosophy.

22. Anxiety (Kierkegaard)
Kierkegaard speaks of anxiety as the vertigo of freedom. Subaru fully embodies this:
He can choose, but he knows that every choice can lead to death, pain, or betrayal. That freedom suffocates him, but it also builds him up.
23. Heroic tragedy (Nietzsche / classical literature)
Subaru is a tragic hero: he knows that suffering is inevitable, but he still chooses to act, resist, and love. In this, he resembles the Dionysian hero who embraces pain as part of an aesthetic and affirmative life.

24. Ethical altruism vs. self-destruction
A very fine line in Subaru is:

Is he sacrificing himself for others... or because he hates his own life?

This tension between ethical altruism (giving out of love) and emotional self-destruction (giving because he doesn't feel valuable) is very present, especially in the darker arcs.

25. Narrative identity (Paul Ricoeur)
According to this theory, the “self” is constructed as a story we tell ourselves.
Subaru rewrites his identity in every loop, every failure, every relationship. The Subaru of episode 1 and the Subaru of the end of season 2 are physically the same being, but they have radically different internal stories.

26. Ethics of compassion (Schopenhauer)
Although Schopenhauer is pessimistic, he believes that compassion is the only possible basis for morality. Subaru, when he acts out of love and real compassion (and not guilt or ego), comes close to this way of thinking:

He does not seek reward, only that the other person does not suffer.
27. Redemptive suffering (Philosophical Christianity)
Without getting into religion, Subaru takes on the role of a redeeming figure: his pain saves others.
There is a kind of “existential cross” that he chooses to bear, even though it brings him no glory, because he believes it is worth doing. This can be interpreted as a symbolic redeemer figure.

28. Hegelian dialectic (Thesis - Antithesis - Synthesis)
Subaru represents this cycle:

Thesis: his naive view of the world (saving everyone, being the hero).

Antithesis: the brutal clash with reality, death, failure.
6yu
Synthesis: a new understanding of himself and the world, more complex and authentic.

29. The actor's paradox (Hegel / Kierkegaard)
Subaru is caught in an existential paradox: he must act to change the future, but his actions are themselves an expression of his suffering and despair. In this sense, his being is contradiction.
This concept can be seen in the work of Hegel or Kierkegaard, who describe how people face the contradiction between being and doing when they try to live authentically.

30. The struggle for meaning (Viktor Frankl)
Frankl, in his book Man's Search for Meaning, argues that even in the most extreme circumstances, people can find purpose. Subaru represents this struggle when he faces utter despair but continues to search for the meaning of his suffering. He does not simply run away from pain, but faces it with the hope of giving it meaning.
in his suffering. He does not simply run away from pain, but faces it with the hope of finding meaning, which is central to his evolution.
31. The Absurd and Rebellion (Albert Camus)

Camus' concept of absurdity and rebellion can be perfectly applied to Subaru. Although he knows that his struggle seems absurd—to live again only to die and suffer over and over—he does not give up. Camus would say that Subaru, by choosing to carry on despite the absurdity, is rebelling against the common sense of the universe and asserting his freedom in a meaningless context.

32. The concept of “the Other” (Levinas)
The philosopher Emmanuel Levinas argued that encountering the other (otherness) is essential to our ethics. Subaru lives in constant relationship with the other (Emilia, Rem, Beatrice, etc.). Throughout the series, his understanding of the ethics of the other changes: it is not just about saving others out of an abstract duty, but out of his direct responsibility towards them, which allows him to reach a deeper understanding of himself through his relationship with others.

33. The “death of the self” (Nietzsche)
As Subaru dies over and over again, he faces the dissolution of his original identity. This process of continuous death can be seen as a form of “death of the self,” similar to what Nietzsche proposes as the overcoming of the limited ego. Subaru not only experiences literal death, but also undergoes a transformation of being, where his “self” is repeatedly reconstructed.
34. The distortion of time (Henri Bergson)
Bergson, philosopher of duration, reflects on how lived time is different from time measured by a clock. Subaru, by constantly reliving, experiences time in a distorted way. Each death and rebirth gives him a subjective sense of time, which can be described as an internal “duration” that distorts his perception of his own life and existence.

35. Self-transcendence (Maslow/Jung)
Subaru, through his suffering and constant confrontation with pain, is in a process of self-transcendence. This idea comes from both Maslow (in his pyramid of needs, where self-actualization is achieved through understanding and overcoming) and Carl Jung, who speaks of the integration of the “self” and the acceptance of the shadow (one's dark side). Subaru, by confronting his own traumas and mistakes, has the opportunity to transcend his being and become something greater than his suffering.

36. Eternity in the moment (Heraclitus / Zen)
Heraclitus said that “we cannot step into the same river twice,” reflecting the constant transformation of being. Subaru, although he revives, is never the same, and, in turn, lives each moment as unique and ephemeral. In Zen terms, eternity resides in the present, and Subaru, by living the same situation so many times, finally understands that every moment of his life, even in his suffering, has intrinsic value.
37. The paradox of the tragic hero (Aristotle/Nietzsche)
Subaru is a tragic hero, similar to characters in classical tragedy (such as Oedipus) who, although endowed with virtues, is trapped by his destiny. Through his deaths and failures, he seeks greatness or redemption, but is always doomed to lose something along the way. In

Nietzschean terms, this paradox also reflects the will to power, which is confronted with human limitations.

38. The paradox of identity (Derrida)
Jacques Derrida spoke of the indeterminacy of identity, the constant displacement of being. With each death, Subaru experiences a reconfiguration of his identity. Who is Subaru really? The one from before or the one from now? Derrida would say that Subaru is never “completely” present or defined, as his identity is the result of his relationships and experiences, always unfinished and in process.

39. Existential solipsism
Trapped in a cycle where he is the only one aware of past events, Subaru experiences a certain existential solipsism: his consciousness is so focused on himself and his own internal processes that he can lose touch with the outside world. Although he is surrounded by people, no one else shares his experience, creating a unique philosophical isolation.
40. Transcendental guilt (Nietzsche / Heidegger)
Subaru's guilt at not being able to save everyone leads him to transcendal guilt because every loop possibly creates more and more world's, leaving the others behind, causing Subaru to become more burdened transcendly because he is guilty of failing everyone that died in the past loops because they are possibly and permanently dead, there are other factors of Subaru's transcendal guilt not just because of his friends dying, but just the failed loops in of itself serving a reminder of Subaru's struggles and failures.
41. Philosophy of the mind and the “self” (Descartes / Kant / Hume)
In his continuous travels and deaths, Subaru is confronted with the fragility of the “self.” What constitutes Subaru as a ‘self’? Is it his body, his consciousness, or the memory he possesses? This dilemma resonates with the philosophical problems of the “self” raised by Descartes, Kant, and Hume, who discussed the relationship between body, mind, and the nature of being.
42. Metaphysics

Metaphysics is the branch of philosophy that examines the basic structure of reality. It is traditionally seen as the study of mind-independent features of the world, but some theorists view it as an inquiry into the conceptual framework of human understanding. Some philosophers, including Aristotle, designate metaphysics as first philosophy to suggest that it is more fundamental than other forms of philosophical inquiry. Subaru executes metaphysics as a whole through his meaningful introspection as a whole to understand the world around him and his own self during arc 2-3

The 7 cardinal sins and 7 cardinal virtues.
This list being the first concepts of cardinal sins from a fourth century evargius monk.
Gula (gluttony)
Luxuria (lust)

Avaritia (greed)
Tristitia (melacholony)
Ira (anger/wrath)
Acedia (sloth)
Vanagloria (vanity)
Superbia (pride)

In the concept of the list the sin of invidia (jealousy/envy) is not found, it being added in 590 AD by pope Gregory I
Then it replaced two sins
Tristitia and melacholia

Now compare this to re:zero
We have seven witches introduced through the series, then we learn about the two other sins.
Pandora and hector.
They were forgotten after Satella swallowed the half the world.
Interesting isn't it?
Even more interesting is is the existence of the so called cardinal virtues

Humility vs superbia (pride)
Temperance vs gula (gluttony)
Luxuria vs fornicatio (lust)
Patience vs ira (wrath)
Diligence vs acedia (sloth)
Charity vs avaritia (greed)
Kindness vs ividia (envy)

They where created when the pope I mentioned before made a list of the 7 sins
Subaru lists these in arc 6 chapter 76

Bishops of the witch cult

According to what we know, archbishops have absolutely authority of other members of the witch cult.
Holding a high position in the witch cult their outfits are eerily similar to priest outfits, tappei most likely taking inspiration from said outfit.

In the re:zero gospel, it's shown to "bring them to the right path" another inspiration, and now it wasn't even light influence, Regulus literally quotes the bible in arc 5.

It is the quotation of Matthew and more specifically: if anyone slaps you on the right cheek, turn the other towards him also. (MT 5:39)

Look at the knives the cultists use!
Looks like a cross right?
Well not only does it look like a cross it looks exactly like the cross of saint James

---

In the first preview of re:zero there is a cross!

right under the painting
Light coming from Subarus side.

Subarus return by death: Self explanatory

Subarus invisible providence: here's how Subaru first explains his new ability that comes from overcoming sin

Subaru can be a bit overly dramatic sometimes but again it is a motive of god.

Cor Leonis: another skill that is gained from overcoming sin.
Its main ability is taking the burden of other people. That is the main assumption of Christian doctrine about taking the sins of mankind by Christ.

Founder of the witch cult.
We know that the conversation between regulus and geuse that there were two founders of the witch cult.
Petelgeuse and one more. People believe it's flugel because of a line made by a lazy guy.

The fruit of paradise and the "appa"

An apple is the fruit of paradise
You probably thing I'm spitballing here but let me say sumthin
Only that the author himself uses it as a comparison in arc 1 that the happy life of Subaru has ended

Directly referencing Adam and Eves story.

Please listen to some ost tracks from re:zero

https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=nLx9_Ojk--k

https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=HC2757Jf_wA

Hymme of despair and atonement
Is remix of Gloria in Exclesis Deo.
It was introduced in the years 125-136
And its origins can be found in the gospel of Luke (2:14) when it was sung at the birth of Christ.

(Had to delete this segment right after this because of discord's character limits so I'll do it in replies)

Conclusion: Subaru is definitely supposed to represent a messianic character.

Especially how he saves others despite it being towards his own inconvenience, and how he always chose the path of the 7 cardinal virtues over the 7 cardinal sins. Dying again and again.

Gloria in excelsis Deo Et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis.Laudamus Te,benedicimus Te, adoramus Te,glorificamus Te.Gratias agimus Tibipropter magnam gloriam Tuam, Domine Deus,

Rex cæléstis, Deus Pater omnipotens.Domine Fili Unigenite, Iesu Christe Domine Deus, Agnus Dei, Filius Patris:Qui tollis peccata mundimiserere nobis;Qui tollis peccata mundisuscipe deprecationem nostram,Qui sedes ad dexteram Patrismiserere nobis.Quoniam Tu solus Sanctus, Tu solus Dominus, Tu solus Altissimus, Iesu Christe, Cum Sancto Spirituin gloria Dei Patris.Amen.

Translation:
Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to people of good will. We praise you, we bless you, we adore you, we glorify you, we give you thanks for your great glory, Lord God, heavenly King, O God almighty Father.Lord Jesus Christ, Only Begotten Son, Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, you take away the sins of the world, have mercy on us; you take away the sins of the world, receive our prayer; you are seated at the right hand of the Father, have mercy on us.For You alone are the Holy One, you alone are the Lord, you alone are the Most High, Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit, in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

Now that the current main analysis for Subaru/rezero is done, we will now move onto:
“Rebuttals for counter arguments made against rezero”
(side note, some responses are not intended to provide sufficient arguments due to them being considered too obvious and easy to refute if you read and understood the story well enough, though I acknowledge this doesn't fully excuse the lack of meaningful sufficient explanations regarding the rebuttals so we will consider the second part of this document as side content compared to the first half of this document which are intended to be properly understood of, just a reminder that this whole last segment is probably gonna be longer than the first half of the doc because Pio is cracked af at rebutting against random counterarguments against rezero’s writing, so if you are planning to read this, have fun. and enjoy the wild debates made here).

—----------

You made a lot of points that just make no sense:

“Definitely puts into words some of what I feel about the show's inconsistent or nonsensical morals.”

Except it literally disagrees with half your points? The guy is arguing that, quote:

"Like for a good portion of season 1 several characters, mainly Emilia but also a blond chick who's name I don't remember, and to a lesser extent Rem and Ram, criticize Subaru for being arrogant and self serving,"

Which means that he is claiming the immediate opposite as you: that Subaru did nothing wrong, didn't violate any boundaries and that rather it is the other characters who are wrong in here for calling out Subaru. I think your reasoning process was just “Oh look, this guy is criticizing Re:Zero, I have no idea what he is saying but I’ll immediately agree because my hate for the story is totally brainless”.

“I hate her because of what she is in the context of the story: a naive, demure girl with no romantic experience and limited mental development who is supposed to be the main romantic interest of the story.”

Why should being emotionally immature and sheltered for all of your life immediately stop you from having any meaningful relationships with other people? Emilia deserves to be loved, and she is not responsible in any way for her isolation throughout 117 years. So, why is it wrong for a teenager, in similar conditions of immaturity due to his NEET past, pursue her romantically.

Specially when he is trying to make her evolve from her past self who was completely sheltered by making her take proactive decisions such as liberating the sanctuary and participating in fights to save other people?

Like, this criticism genuinely makes no sense.

“She does not have agency within the story or goals that she prioritizes, she does not make her own decisions or control the conversation.”

This has already debated before, it is just straight up wrong:

https://www.reddit.com/r/ReZeroSucks/comments/1gpocam/emilia_doesnt_have_any_agency_as_a_character/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web3x&utm_name=web3xcss&utm_term=1&utm_content=share_button

“She is simply someone that other characters orbit around because she's supposed to be important.”

She is not supposed to be important, she is important: her past is connected to the seal and Pandora (the main antagonist), she has a very strong connection with the witch of envy, she is constantly targeted by cultists and other enemies, she has one of the biggest mana reserves of everyone in the camp for a reason that connects her to the witches (specially to Minerva, who some people claim to be her mother), she is the only one who gets an active buff thanks to witch miasma (hinting to further connection with The Witch of Envy, etc…)

Is this just a blanket statement you threw away because you didn’t know what to say?

“She is passive, non-threatening and reactive. She barely resists Subaru's romantic advances when she has no reason to tolerate them”

Either she is passive or she is reactive. Pick one. And I think you are still having terrible issues trying to accurately describe your criticisms: no, Emilia takes a lot of active decisions throughout the story, one of them for example in arc 7 that is going to a whole ass different country to save Subaru. What you are trying to criticize here is that she is highly empathetic and tolerating of other's behavior, which is a character trait, hence a narrative choice.

And, narrative choices cannot be criticized inside stories: the only thing you can criticize is execution, which you didn't correctly do: you stated she had no reason to tolerate Subaru's advances when she actively chose cut ties with Subaru in arc 3 because his attachment with her was turning toxic, making him act recklessly and put his own life in danger.

Even that decision was taken from a place of empathy: she cared more about Subaru self-destructing than herself, so all of this is consistent with her. That means: well executed.

That means, in turn, well written.

"and the only reason it isn't extremely weird is because those advances are so tame to even begin with. It's not like she just doesn't know how to say no and is getting walked over, she actually just isn't given the narrative opportunity to think and act for herself."

Not really, she doesn't act upon rare behaviors of Subaru, like him being straight up misogynistic at times because she is insanely sheltered and has no reference to call out that behavior. Not to mention she lacks knowledge about love (again, she didn't have proper human contact for 117 years of her life, is she did get all of these concepts in 2 years I would consider it to be actual plot convenience and bad writing, due to the fact that she is carrying 117 years of obliviousness in her back).

And what does "she isn't given the narrative opportunity to think and act for herself" even mean? It sounds like buzzword salad. How is her "not given the narrative opportunity" to do those thinks? She actively engages in that behavior.

What does "not being given the narrative opportunity" even mean?

"This isn't some nuanced high school romance where the issues of naiveté and passivity is being explored with any real depth either."

They are explored in depth: it is her naivety that got her killed in many different loops, and her naivety naturally arises from a plot consequence, that is, that she has been sheltered for years. And due to that, she cannot understand Subaru's attachment for her nor love him back.

Where is the lack of sense here when all of this matches the moment you decide to think about the plot?

“She is just an anime waifu who is naive as a character trait in a way that is supposed to make her attractive.”

She is naive, and naivety is one of her personality traits due to all those years of isolation, yet why would that make her “just an anime waifu who is made to be attractive”, the fact you need to slap them mighty labels instead of actually producing an argument is very telling.

“She is an idealized character by the word of the author himself.”

Gonna need some citations for that.

“The only personality traits that stand out to me are the ones from Episode 1 that don't show up after and how she is extremely sore about the topic of promises beyond the point of reasonableness.”

That is because you didn’t even watch the anime. Emilia is brave, insecure, highly empathetic, contradictory in some of her behaviors (like when she said she was doing things just to repay a debt with Subaru when, in reality, she was just being kind), naive, and emotionally dependent on a figure that guides her or protects her, and it is all of those precise behaviors which made, for example, Subaru fall in love with her. She was the first one to help him out and the first one to guide him in that world, and it was that precise kindness that led her to her first death in arc 1.

And about promises, “unreasonable” is very funny when the only thing she asked Subaru was to not intervene in a royal meeting with the high nobility of the country meant to determine the future of it.

In which way is this unreasonable?
“I disagree with you on the point that she has not many flaws,they are just not meant to be flaws in the first place. They are not acknowledged or challenged. But that is the case with about every character bar subaru but with her it is extra obvious.”

I’ve debated this in the past too already:

This (saying Emilia’s flaws are not challenged) is a borderline braindead reading of the story.

“Her passivity and naiveté are flaws, but they are often not treated as such for a disturbing reason.”

One of the first things Subaru says upon meeting her is precisely how her naivety and generosity will lead her to ruin, so idc what the fuck you are talking about (and they did, or did you forget all the times she died in arcs 1-4?).

“Think about it, Emilia, many times over has defied Subaru many times over.”

That happened once, and she had every reason in the world to defy him, since shit was turning toxic.

Also, aren't we going to talk about all the many times she emotionally supported Subaru too?

"Hell, in the novels, she disagreed with subaru about the arlam villagers like him because he's a hero, (she claims they like him because he's weird)"

You see, this is why I say that nothing that comes out of your mouth has any value: you just straight up parrot things that others have told you, any and all of your arguments are borderline useless.

"she told him to give him a reason to trust her in arc 3 (despite him bailing her out of her messes)"

Same fucking shit, you are straight up repeating what others have said in this subreddit without even questioning, you are the CEO of gullibility.

on

"and when subaru disobeyed her, (despite being respected for it by a counselor) she rejected him being her knight right in front public and never ONCE thanked him for defending her from unfair prejudice."

Maybe because she shouldn't be validating behavior that makes Subaru self-destruct more and make his attachment towards her more toxic than it already is? IDK, crazy idea.

Also "respected by a counselor" said counselor (Miklotov) had already a vastly superior image of Emilia than the other sages, specially since the whole "threatening" act that Puck performed was something that he had already arranged with Roswaal as Emilia's form of presentation, and he was highly collaborative of his camp. Miklotov was gonna say she ended up being positively benefited by Subaru's behavior either way.

"Their argument after the beatdown Julius gave to Subaru, she refused to try to understand Subaru, yelled at him, and left him behind,"

The strawmanning of this scene IS ABSOLUTELY INSANE: Emilia literally told him to explain all of his actions and his attachment towards him and his response was "Emilia, you don't understand" and refused to give a proper explanation. And she wasn't leaving him behind: the original pact they had was that she would make Ferris heal his gate (which, again, he ignored by using Shamac like a total retard against Julius).

She had every intention to understand Subaru but he couldn't explain himself: that was in part due to the fact that his behavior was inexcusable, specially the part of storming into a ROYAL MEETING HE HAD NO IDEA ABOUT and due to his RBD not allowing him to talk about other loops.

Matter of fact, the one who started yelling was Subaru himself in the novels.

I suggest reading the extract with some of my emphasis and stop being deluded:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-D6aDOggV1oNhfprrlzUsVeWKDaVE8fF_MyQhq5Qrms/edit?usp=sharing

"In arc 4, Subaru volunteered to take the trials when he saw how traumatized Emilia was, yet she gets pissed off and questions if Subaru trusts her to succeed."

BECAUSE IN THAT LOOP SUBARU MADE THAT PROPOSAL AFTER EMILIA FAILED ONCE, of course you are gonna feel incredibly betrayed by your friends if they lost trust on you the moment you fail, you are strawmanning every single event of the plot.

"Even in arc 5, when Subaru and Beatrice condemned her for following, Emilia stood her ground and told them that she was going to fight alongside them."

BECAUSE SHE KNEW THAT THERE WAS SOMETHING WRONG GOING ON WITH SUBARU, OF WHICH SHE WASN'T INFORMED BECAUSE SUBARU YET AGAIN TRIED TO SHELTER HER.

The fact she went to try to PROTECT HIM and not let him carry the burden of everything alone, AND THE FACT SHE SAID SHE DIDN'T WANT TO BE PROTECTED ANYMORE BUT RATHER TO PROTECT HIM ARE MEANT TO PORTRAY HER ENTIRE GROWTH THROUGHOUT ARC 4, and yet your stupid ass threw it away as her "being annoying", when she decided to support Subaru WHEN HE WAS ON THE VERGE OF TEARS.

The scene is there and the subtitles are readable. Either rewatch it or read it from here, because your misrepresentation is insane…

"Not to mention, she literally asks to wait an ENTIRE YEAR for her to accept or reject his confession (which to me feels like she's using Subaru's devotion to have him acquiesce to her demands because a year timeframe is not reasonable, regardless if you understand love or not)."

Yet again, no one forced Subaru and she knows that the request she is making is hurting Subaru, but she is not slacking off: she wants to repay his love, and it is proven by her arc 8 statements

And quite literally all of them like him for who he is: Rem in arc 3 do be literally refusing to let his true self behind and run away, and Emilia has a dialogue in arc 8 about how her main goal is making Subaru happy:

Emilia: “Yes. After all, Subaru, everyone was reaaally worried about you, and never left your side.”

At Emilia’s words, Subaru lowered his head, remembering the state of the cabin up until a moment ago.

No matter how strong Subaru’s feelings about causing them worry had been, whenever he was told it was

a bad habit of his, he felt bad about it, but.

Subaru: “I’m… such a lucky guy.”

Emilia: “That’s definitely true. But I want Subaru to be more and more happy, so this tiny amount is not

enough at all.”

Subaru: “Even after all the good you’ve done for me?”

Emilia: “So, when you do something for me, do you ever feel satisfied, and that it’s enough, Subaru?”

Emilia tilted her head, and while she felt her beautiful, silver hair cascade down her slender shoulders,

Subaru was at a loss for words, completely cornered.

She was right. When he wanted to do something for the people he loved, he never thought if what he

was doing was enough, but rather he thought if there was more that he could do.

Seeing Subaru’s reaction, Emilia smiled and said “Hehe”,

Emilia: “What do you think? I’m not wrong, am I? My Knight.”

Subaru: “…Yup. You’ve grown so much while I’ve been away, and I’m so proud of you, but I’ve missed

you, Emilia!”

Emilia: “Emilia?”

Subaru: “…No, it’s… Emilia-tan.”

You have her complain about Subaru not calling her by her nickname even, so they do have a genuine relationship.

You have many more examples about Otto, Garfiel, Beako and more people from the supporting cast treating him this way.

Second of all, about your Reinhard point: Reinhard is following the orders of Felt, which is the royal candidate he swore to follow, so you cannot blame him. And their actions are something to commend, not to criticize: they are literally rehabilitating thiefs from the slums into good people and making them strive away from crime.

And the point about Reinhard not rescuing Subaru in Pride If for not making a woman voice is literally false and you have already been proven wrong about this in the main subreddit:
Reinhard didn't come to Subaru's rescue because he didn't call him at all, not because of not sounding womanly enough.
Not to mention at no point in time she stated a specific time-frame of 1 year, you are making that shit up.

“Here's the issue with Emilia. It's not that she's a pushover. It's the fact that she thinks Subaru is supposed to be submissive to her every single command.”

She literally does not and in arc 4 and 5 she self-guilts for throwing so much responsibility on Subaru as regard with things she cannot solve on her own.

“The audacity to get mad at Subaru for treating her like a fucking doll, yet she thinks she's entitled to expect Subaru to wag his tail like an obedient dog and say "yes Emilia -tan! i will wait for you as long as I have to!" “

She does not feel entitled to it, and she actively self-blames for making Subaru do that, which further destroys this point. She didn’t even force him to do any of the things he did, nor is Subaru being forced to do so (in arc 3 he was encouraged to even do nothing to save her by Crusch and Ferris).
“He never even pushes her for an answer.”

Because he is empathetic of her situation of 117 years of isolation, he has no reason to blame her for her present inability to give an answer. Besides, the entire point of arc 3 was to not push

others to do what you personally want, which is the mistake Subaru commits by storming into the Royal Selection and declaring to be the knight of a girl he met… a week ago.

“She expects complete and utter obedience from Subaru, and whenever he doesn't, she gets pissy at him.”

None of your examples back this up.

“Even in episode 17, she questions why Subaru comes back, but when Subaru WARNS her about danger, she resists him CONSTANTLY.”

Maybe because Subaru is having a psychotic break while crying? She has every reason in the world to not take his words seriously, specially in the state in which he is in.
Matter of fact, the thing she does after watching him cry is explicitly noticing the pain he is feeling, by saying:

“Why are you crying as if you are in such pain?”

While trying to understand him.

So yet again a red-herring.
“I kind of agree but I don't think Emilia's argument with Subaru has ever been a rejection of him.”

Going by text, it was. They were going to permanently cut ties after Ferris finished healing Subaru.

“If you pay attention to what she's actually saying it's normally "I don't understand why you are like this!" and the canonical answer is that this is because she's so sheltered and distrusting.”

If you read what she is actually saying (which is something you can do if you find my other comments), you’ll see that her understanding does not come from her distrust of Subaru but rather from Subaru’s own erratic behavior that even he himself is unable to explain.

In part due to the fact that it makes no sense and in part because of RBD: his reasons for saving Emilia are in the first loop, a loop that no longer exists for anyone else but Subaru, which makes him unable to explain his attachment towards Emilia, and makes him come as an irrational person.

Another reason why Emilia decides to stop him is for his sake. If you didn’t notice before that precise point in time the many times Emilia babysitted Subaru because he was acting recklessly everywhere he went due to his toxic attachment towards her (to the point she made him swear that he would stay with Rem and not follow her to the Royal Selection), you, my friend, suffer from severe chronic blindness.

“The whole Arc 3 nonsense was because Emilia didn't understand Subaru's motivation for trying to help her because she didn't understand "love" and assumed he must be doing it for selfish reasons (which he was in another way, but not in the way she actually says.)”

Didn’t we already debate this and I proved you wrong literally using a textual quote from Emilia? If this level is what you consider to be peak criticism, you need to leave 😭

“It’s not going to get better.”

I mean, when you already proclaimed that you were going to hate on it, no, it won’t get better.

Your greatest achievement on life is hating on a fictional piece of media, that in itself sounds wild

“The show had plenty of time to demonstrate a more mature awareness of human infatuation”

It did though, and it showed how it developed into obsession.

“obsession and the complexity of romance where two people get to know each other and must learn to resolve conflict”

I like your funny words magic man.

It is like you are not criticizing anything in particular on purpose.

“but we’re waaaaaaaay past that now.”

Is “we” in the room with us right now?

“This isn’t the only problem with Re:Zero but it’s definitely one of the ones that first put me off.”

I like that if you dislike something about the series it is instantly the series’ fault instead of yours.

That is why I call you sarcastically little ego person.
“Generally, she just accepts that Subaru is going to follow her around”

Yeah, that is why she literally decided to cut ties with him.

“and even engages with him intimately despite not supposedly understanding it,”

She is more intimate, but she does not do “intimate things she doesn’t understand”, what the fuck is this weird ass comment you made?

“I see your point, but a part of me feels like, sheltered or otherwise, she should have at least come to some conclusion that Subaru is just a kind-hearted boy who cares about others' safety.”

The fact that she knows that is the reason why she can recognize when he diverges from that path into toxic obsession that destroys him and those around him.

Do you think that good people are always good and never have failings? Subaru was always a good person, yet his attitude in arc 3 was self-destructive (seriously, what was he thinking when he accepted Julius duel) and highly toxic.
“That wasn't obvious to her when she said that the arlam villagers don't care for Subaru because he's some hero.”

Debunked already in a previous comment.

“Even if you want to use the excuse of being sheltered and distrusting, they don't work because if that's the case, what the fuck is puck's purpose then? How does her distrusting people have any value with him around?”

Puck can only read malice in someone’s mind. Emilia didn’t distrust Subaru because she suspected he was malicious: he distrusted him because of his erratic behavior, his tendency to break promises and his toxic self-sacrificial tendencies.

I am starting to think you didn’t even watch the anime.

“Even then, it's kind of hypocritical of her to be distrusting of others (or rather coerce subaru into making a promise) when she threatened to kill people in the novels during the royal selection.”

The emotional coercion above was debunked in another server responding to you in this same post.

And you are completely misunderstanding what happened with the whole threatening act, an act that MIKLOTOV HIMSELF WAS INFORMED OF EVEN BEFORE IT TOOK PLACE.
“Emilia just downplaying Subarus role in events to justify herself looking down on him.”

Except she didn’t? When did she downplay Subaru’s saving. The whole reason why she cut ties with him was for his sake: so that he stop acting recklessly near her. The whole situation was unhealthy.

“I’ll be real if you would slap Subaru in the face for actually standing up for you, that makes you seem like an ungrateful and just straight up bad person in my eyes.”

If you were to allow his toxic mindset by not saying nothing to him, you are worse than the one punishing Subaru.

“There really is no debate. People in the throne room aren’t mocking subaru, they are mocking Emilia. Because of herself.”

They are quite literally mocking Subaru, first things Sages do is ask who that random butler is. Don’t get me wrong, they also did mock or insult Emilia, the difference here is in the way both reacted. Emilia’s reaction was far more mature than Subaru’s.
“And Subaru literally does prove Emilia isn’t dangerous when Emilia herself if anything proves she is a threat by having puck growl at everybody.”

You do know that they had Miklotov in that performance, right? And probably the knights too:

“—Ho, ho, ho!”

The sight of Miklotov jubilantly slapping his thighs seemed enormously out of place.

“Even my heart skipped a beat. Allow me to call this a most amusing presentation.”

Miklotov’s words caused Puck to drop his expression and shrug his shoulders.

“Mm, we’re busted. See, Roswaal? I told you it wasn’t good to overdo things.”

That instant, the cold enveloping the chamber vanished. Amid the bewildered onlookers, Roswaal lightly smacked his own forehead.

“Oh myyy, and I had such confidence… It is so dispiiiriting.”

“W-wait…! What in the world are you talking about?”

It seemed only Puck, Roswaal, and Miklotov were in on this elaborate joke. Roswaal finally shifted his gaze to the bewildered Bordeaux and said,

“To put it simply—this exchange was the speech from Lady Emilia’s camp. I understand that the format somewhat differs from that of the other candidates, but…”

Under Miklotov’s gaze, Roswaal raised both hands in a show of surrender.
“She doesn't even need to understand what love is to understand that Subaru wants to make sure her and other people are safe.”

The thing is that none of his actions in the Royal Selection contributed to it. He literally just got beaten up, and that was his most major achievement. Things in arc 3 would have been significantly easier had he not stepped a foot where he shouldn’t had to.

“She could just tell him she can't accept his feelings”

She accepts them, she said so herself in arc 5, what she is unable to do but wants to is reciprocate them. Seriously, this reading of the story is borderline braindead.

“rather than dangle a carrot over his head while giving him false hope”

IT IS NOT "FALSE HOPE" FROM HER PART WHEN THEIR INTIMACY IS ACTIVELY DEVELOPING THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE FUCKING STORY ARC 5 ONWARDS.

And she is actively trying to make sure she succeeds in her purpose.

“she indulges it intimacy despite not understanding it, and it comes off as her unintentionally manipulating Subaru into waiting for an answer to a question that SHOULDN'T TAKE SO FUCKING LONG TO ANSWER!”

This is just a repetition of what I already debunked above.
“Yeah I mean it doesn't make sense.”

It does, though it’ll be hard for you to get it since uhh… it requires brain usage.

“There is no romantic tension with a person who does not understand romance to begin with hahaha.”

This is a false dichotomy: Emilia lacks knowledge about romance, that is completely true, yet that knowledge is not 0. She can recognize affection and she can even blush when others talk about what she feels about Subaru (arc 4, scene at the start when she talks with Frederica about him).

“Her behaviour though still boils down to not giving him an answer for years and her saying sentences like 'subaru is hers but she is not his' .”

That sentence holds literally though, because of Subaru’s status as Emilia’s knight. He vowed his entire existence and soul to serve his liege: that is, Emilia.

And any answer she gave at that point in time would be a false and underbaked one. Yet again, I want to remind everyone of the fact that Emilia was sheltered for a grand total of 117 years of her life, of course she would be indecisive about this and it is not her fault she cannot give a proper answer.

Why do people say this as if this is all her fault? She has stated herself she desires to reciprocate Subaru’s affection and that he wants to make him the happiest she can
“There is barely even a relationship between them that does not go beyond subaru worshipping her and giving her everything.”

The countless times she emotionally supported him when he was at his lowest and his role as emotional support and light of Subaru would like to speak with you.

And I am sure I have mentioned each of those occasions to you in the past and you ignored it (normal behavior coming from you tbh).
“She knows about nothing of him and she does not ask a single question to get to know this person”

The first she did upon meeting him was trying to figure out where he came from and testing him by using the name “Satella”, what the fuck are you talking about.

LITERALLY EVERY SINGLE ARC 2 AND ARC 5 SIDE STORY WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK WITH YOU.

They have literally held countless conversations about him. The fact he tries to be reserved about his past is a completely different thing.
Huge ass bible.

"Re:Zero, oh boy, what can I say that I haven't said before. This is a big question mark for me and was a big miss."

Subjective, fine. But “a big miss” needs criteria if you want to have a reasoned discussion. The rest of the comment tries to offer those, so let’s keep going.

"I'm confused as to why it has such a big fandom, but I guess it just shows that everyone has different tastes."

Anecdotal confusion isn't an argument. Re:Zero’s large fandom implies, at minimum, that the show is doing something that resonates structurally, emotionally, or narratively. If your conclusion is “I don’t get it, but I guess people have different tastes,” then logically, you’ve conceded you’re evaluating from a personal lens, not a flaw in the work itself.

"The premise is good; I'm a sucker for Groundhog Day tropes. I think, like you, the execution was a miss on so many levels."

What levels? The entire post only critiques two things: (1) emotional stakes around death, and (2) Subaru’s learning curve. Both are addressable. So “so many levels” is unsubstantiated rhetoric
"I just think the anime adaptation must have been very bad. From my understanding, the LNs are quite long, and it can be difficult to include everything in 12 or 24 episode bursts."

This contradicts the previous logic. First you critique the execution, then you say it might be the adaptation. That’s a key distinction. If the anime didn’t include enough, then it’s incomplete, not flawed. And unless you’ve read the source material, you’re not in a position to evaluate whether

the adaptation failed to represent the ideas properly. Logical consistency requires one of two paths:

-Critique the adaptation as incomplete, and acknowledge you're missing context.

-Or critique the source itself, which you haven't read.

You can't do both.
"I wasn't looking for anything too profound when watching Re:Zero. Just give me decent pacing, some logic, and not attempt to drown me in 'sadness,' when 99% of deaths have no repercussions."

The story has Return by Death as a mechanism. By design, deaths do not persist externally, because Subaru is the one who remembers them. That is the entire conceit. Saying "the deaths have no repercussions" only holds if you ignore the one character they do affect. And if that one character is the main character, then yes, they have narrative function.

You can't accept the premise (Groundhog Day loop) and then complain that people don't remember the deaths. That's like watching Memento and complaining that the protagonist forgets things.

"If you want me to feel something for deaths, let their be consequences outside of the arbitrary mental anguish Subaru may or may not go thru depending on when the author wants to showcase it."

This misrepresents the structure of the story. Subaru's psychological deterioration is shown consistently, and it's not "arbitrary." The moments when he breaks, in the mansion arc, the Sanctuary trials, the Suicide Loop, or Arc 6's multi-loop trauma spiral, are dictated by accumulation. He breaks after compounding failures, not randomly.

Moreover, "outside of Subaru" makes no sense. He's the narrative's sole memory-keeper. The mental consequences must be filtered through him. You're rejecting the consequences because they aren't visible to side characters, but the whole point is that trauma builds internally.
"Going this route, at least, show me a gradual degradation of mental struggle that alters decision-making that doesn't simply get erased by pep-talks."

This directly contradicts the series, and I've been through this so many times I've lost count:

-Subaru does degrade mentally (early Arc 3, Arc 4 trial breaks, Arc 6 breakdowns, post-Witch of Envy death in arc 4 when he sees Emilia, arc 7 10 second loop, etc…).

-His decisions do change, he becomes more diplomatic, more humble, more cautious with trust, more open to others' help.

-Pep-talks are not magical resets. They are positioned at turning points after collapse, usually when Subaru has exhausted all alternatives (see Rem in Arc 3, Emilia in Arc 4, Otto in Arc 5, Beatrice in Arc 6). Each speech doesn't erase trauma, it realigns it, and I can say this because From Zero didn't make his trauma go away, or did you forget his gigantic relapse in arc 4?
"Admittedly, looking back, that has sort of soured my opinion on arc 3 a little... that, and arc 7 Rem."

Your opinion on Arc 3 should be based on Arc 3's content, not Arc 7's. Arc 7 Rem has zero relevance to the plot, pacing, or themes of Arc 3. The two arcs are separated by over ten volumes and function independently. There is no connection between Rem's coma arc and her role in Arc 3.

"Ngl, I do appreciate Rem for helping Subaru save everyone in arc 3, and she's my favorite version of her, (sloth if rem being a close second)

Good. Then acknowledge that in Arc 3 she's consistent, loyal, proactive, and deeply involved in Subaru's survival and planning. She literally risks her life multiple times, against the mabeasts, against the cultists, and in her defense of Subaru after he breaks down in front of the council. That's not an "if," that's canon.

"but looking back, (and realizing her role of teppei having her be the main heroine of arc 3 and using her for develop the mc)"

Yes, she supports Subaru's growth in Arc 3. That is a normal function of a major supporting character. Rem is not the "main heroine" of the story, Emilia is. Rem is a critical ally in Arc 3 because Emilia is politically and emotionally sidelined at that point. This is situational writing, not favoritism.

"I feel she comes off as... forced in some cases, which can be said about a lot of things in arc 3."
"Forced" is not a description. In what case? What line? What decision? What action? If you mean the confession scene, that happens after she's spent 20+ episodes watching Subaru fall apart, try to hide his pain, and get rejected and humiliated. She speaks up because no one else will. That's not forced, that's earned.

"Like when people say the royal selection ceremony with Subaru was forced…"

Subaru interrupts a political meeting after being told not to, speaks impulsively, and is thrown out. That is consistent with his character across multiple timelines. The scene is not forced, it's predictable based on the context. Everyone else acts logically: Crusch is offended, Priscilla is disgusted, Anastasia is amused, and Felt doesn't care. That's exactly how they're written from their first appearances.
"or when you and others say character behavior comes off as extremely overly mean spirited for the dumbest of reasons that amount to: we need to bring Subaru to the depths of despair…"

They act that way because he acts like a liability. He hides facts, begs incoherently, and shows emotional instability during a national election. The reactions are grounded in status, risk, and self-interest. Crusch has no reason to follow him without a plan especially when she is about to slay the white whale and Emilia is her political adversary. Priscilla laughs at weakness. Wilhelm is bound by allegiance. These are not “mean” behaviors. They are in-character.

“otherwise the plot won't be able to move, and rem won't be able to give her speech and have subaru grow.”

The plot moves through Subaru’s actions, not Rem’s speech. Rem only intervenes after Subaru fails repeatedly: publicly and privately. She gives her speech after the mansion gets attacked multiple times in different loops and Subaru witnesses Rem’s own brutal death. And she gives her speech when the situation presents her a Subaru that is totally broken It’s not a shortcut. It’s the consequence of everything that happened before.

“It makes the story drag to a snail's pace, then her speech moves the plot along.”

The speech happens after four major deaths, two full loop resets, a failed alliance, and a full breakdown in the capital. That’s not a snail’s pace. That’s buildup. Her speech doesn’t “move the plot” alone: Subaru has to then convince Crusch, train with Wilhelm, strategize with Anastasia, and fight the Whale. The plot keeps moving with or without her.
“My issue with that is, with all the bullshit Subaru went through, realistically, a speech shouldn't have done much to help him spring back into action…”

It didn’t. He doesn’t “spring back.” He cries. He rejects her confession. He admits he hates himself. Then he begs her for help. And then Rem addresses his personal flaws and perception of himself and promises to help him deal with that, just as Subaru already did with her at the end of arc 2: what Rem did wasn’t just a speech, he literally tackled each and every single one of the negative thoughts that dwelled inside of Subaru’s mind and helped him temporarily cope with it (and I say temporarily because you can watch him relapse in arc 4 after he lost Rem, so it is even more realistic).

“and if it was the solution to everything, it shouldn't be so automatic.”

It wasn’t the solution to everything. The solution to his root problem was starting to depend on those who are close to him and actively strategize with them, which was his problem since the very start, since he always bottled up his feelings from Rem. Then Rem helps him calm his state of mind and helps him plan things, just as it happened in arc 4: so it makes total sense that things would be fixed, it is not automatic.

“It should take time for him to recover, which is what I like about the sloth if.”

In the Sloth IF, Subaru doesn't recover. He runs away. That's not a counterexample, it's a different outcome. It proves that without people like Rem not letting him abandon his true self, he gives up. That's what makes the canon arc more meaningful: he chooses the hard path.
"A human mind that goes through a fraction of what subaru goes through, realistically, a speech would BARELY do a fucking dent…"

Except Subaru has already reached rock bottom. He's mentally collapsed. He's already accepted that he's garbage. The speech gives him one reason to try again. That's not a dent. That's a spark. If a character can be traumatized over time, he can also be encouraged over time. You're pretending only one direction is allowed. And it is specially stupid if you take into consideration the amount of support he receives from those around him, example, emilia
"yet subaru bounces back SO QUICK that it feels inhuman."

No. He didn't bounce back quickly at all, did you forget all the buildup to that moment, which was the payoff of the story? Before being able to bounce back he had to endure constant failure, until someone reminded him of his true worth and helped his cries of help. Nothing is inhuman. I'd recommend watching the arc 3 speech and point to me at which point Subaru acts inhuman or unrealistic, because you are making shit up.

"It almost feels like the story is basically saying that they fucked up and dragged the drama out for far too long…"

That's your interpretation. Tappei structured Arc 3 around escalating rejection, failure, and trauma, culminating in a shift. The story never implies it "dragged." The drama peaks, then pivots. That's deliberate structure, not apology.

"and they gotta speed the recovery process since they have 7 episodes left."

Arc 3's second half (episodes 18–25) is eight full episodes. The speech is in episode 18. From 19–25, Subaru continues failing, adapting, and fighting and he even dies again due to Petelgeuse's intervention.

"This story becomes littered with this issue.

There is no pattern. Arc 4: Subaru stars fearing losing people once again like he did with Rem and starts acting recklessly. Arc 3: he goes catatonic for three days and can't even form a plan. Arc 6: he loses his memory and starts behaving erratically. Recovery is never instant.
"This isn't the last time subaru is given a speech that motivates him to keep going (arc 6 chapter 54 with Emilia's speech and arc 7 chapter 31 with Al's speech)."

Correct. Because trauma victims need support more than once. That's not a flaw. That's a character trait. Emilia's speech comes after Subaru is emotionally isolated in a labyrinth and nearly kills himself again. Al's speech happens when Subaru is completely physically destroyed and facing total mission failure. These are worst case moments, not casual pep talks.

And it is important to analyze the content of each of those, because you are dismissing the value of the speeches and saying that they don't matter without actually showing that. Those speeches address the crux of each of Subaru's internal conflicts, so of course they'll make him not give up.

Just like a speech a lieutenant or a general might give during a war that might make people who were terrified take the arms and fight against the enemy. It works, specially since they help cope with the situation: the root issue is not necessarily fixed. As you can see, even after arc 3, Subaru is a mentally troubled person which has flaws to fix.

Those flaws are tackled long run, like his low self worth, which is tackled in arcs 3, 4 and 6 in its entirety.
"You have this guy go through unspeakable trauma and failure, only to give him band-aid solutions that aren't realistic but somehow work because the plot demands it does and makes the trauma look weak."

None of these are band-aids. They're full conversations about death, failure, and self-worth. They don't erase trauma. They let him function. The trauma continues into Arc 4 (Subaru PTSD hallucinations), Arc 6 (Subaru self-mutilation), and Arc 8 (Subaru berating himself after letting Priscilla die). The trauma is never "solved."

"He's not allowed to stew in his trauma or have it truly take hold of him like how a normal human would."

In Arc 4, Subaru refuses to talk to anyone and tries to kill himself multiple times in one loop. In Arc 6, he freaks out and acts with constant paranoia. In Arc 7, he breaks down and cries when he realizes Rem forgot him. In Arc 8, he breaks down again when his allies die. He stews. You just ignore it.

"It's even worse in arcs 7 and 8 when he dies an UNGODLY amount of times to the point where teppei doesn't even keep count…"

Tappei doesn't count them for the reader. That doesn't mean Subaru is unaffected. In Arc 7, he starts becoming more reckless, and that happens specially since he is infantilized. In Arc 8, well, why are you bringing in arc 8? During the second part of arc 8 he barely died, specially after getting out of the infantilization.
"yet he's somehow not freaking out and crumbling like a cookie."

He constantly does so, especially in arc 7 when Olbart constantly kills him over and over, and he becomes incredibly paranoid of Todd. In arcs 2, 3 and 4… well, this main post already talks about that.

"1. Teppei sadistically torturing Subaru alongside his biased hatred for Subaru"

This is made up. Tappei said in interviews he wrote Subaru based on his own life failures and wanted to show that people can overcome hopelessness. The suffering is structured to build resilience, not as sadism. You're projecting.

And this projection comes from one time Tappei said that he enters in flow mode writing Subaru's deaths, which doesn't mean he enjoys the act of another person dying but its depiction in words.

“2. Teppei wanting to write a protagonist who never gives up while trying to portray him as realistic.”

Yes. That is the point. “Realistic” means he suffers and his pain is actual and real. “Never gives up” means he tries anyway. The contradiction only exists if you think people who try again after failure are fake. Which would be a very weird thing to believe.
"oh... i forgot about why arc 7 rem makes me dislike arc 3 rem to some degree."

This is not a valid connection. Arc 3 Rem is based on full memory, trust development, and past experiences. Arc 7 Rem has no memories and treats Subaru like a stranger. The two Rems are not comparable in behavior or context.

"Now this may seem unfair, but the drama with her and Subaru got on my nerves, and it got worse and more tedious to read through"

You're not describing a flaw. You're describing personal impatience. The drama exists because Subaru is emotionally tied to a person who has forgotten everything about him. That’s narrative tension, not filler.

"(it doesn't help that rem doesn't put anyone through a fraction of what she subaru through, or barely even have conflict with fucking strangers in a dangerous environment)."

False. Rem interrogates Subaru, strangles him, sets over 10 traps in the forest to evade him, and maintains emotional distance even after he's saved her multiple times . She treats him as a potential enemy. She does not do this with others like Flop or Katya because they didn’t reek of Witch miasma and didn’t suggest abandoning a child (Louis) in front of her, who was her emotional anchor at that time, despite her intrinsically knowing there was something wrong with her (this is a psychological defense mechanism, still well written, read my arc 7 post). Not to mention how Subaru hides info and acts reckless.
I've presented many more reasons on my arc 7 Rem essay.

"Then the feeling sinks in when I know the narrative will ignore it and treat her abuse of subaru like a big joke.

Completely false. Arc 8 Chapter 23 directly tackles her abuse of Subaru. She cries, screams, breaks down emotionally, and restrains herself from physically hurting Subaru out of guilt and grief . There is no joke, no punchline, and no comedy in that scene.

"Why? From Zero."

"From Zero" happened in Arc 3. Rem remembered Subaru, trusted him, and saw his efforts. In Arc 7, she has amnesia and sees him as suspicious. You cannot invoke "From Zero" to excuse or override a timeline where her memories were devoured.

"This means, if a scenario like this were to happen AGAIN, Rem can abuse (even kill) subaru again and again and again, and it won't matter by the story because from zero is a thing."

Incorrect. Arc 7 shows that Subaru's treatment at Rem's hands does matter. He is emotionally affected, cries over it, and tries to win her back gradually. The story devotes multiple chapters to this conflict (see Arc 7 Forest Chase, Arc 8 Chapter 23). It is not glossed over.
"She can abuse, manipulate, and make subaru's life a living hell despite EVERYTHING he did for her..."

She has no knowledge of what he did. Her memories are gone. She literally says "You ring no bells at all" upon meeting him . You cannot expect gratitude for things she cannot remember. That's not abuse: that's ignorance caused by trauma and more.
"(not even thanking him and still having the audacity to not trust him, despite being more trusting to fucking strangers who don't even have to earn her trust)"

She trusts Louis because Louis appeared to be a helpless girl who woke up beside her. Flop and Katya never showed hostility or suspicion, and didn't reek of Witch scent. Subaru triggered multiple danger signals, including suggesting they abandon a child. And, on top of that, he was the one who her past self was the closest with, so she feels irked due to Subaru's actions being more intimate and close than what she would expect, which annoys her because she cannot remember him. Her caution is based on in-world logic.

"and it will not matter."

By Arc 8, it clearly does matter. Rem emotionally breaks down when Subaru reveals the truth about Louis. She cries "more than when anguishing over her own memories," is shocked by Subaru's kindness, and begins softening her behavior. This is narrative resolution.

"This mentality makes me super uncomfortable because it shows to me that Subaru is a massive doormat to not only Emilia, but to Rem in an almost equal degree."

Subaru isn't being a doormat. He chooses not to abandon people who are broken or lost. He restrains himself from lashing out at Rem because he understands she's traumatized and memory-wiped. That is patience, not weakness.

"I guarantee you, if the genders were swapped, people would be taking this way more seriously, and Emilia and Rem would get their karma."

False equivalence. Regulus physically, mentally, and spiritually enslaved his wives for decades. Rem in Arc 7–8 restrains herself from lethal violence, cooperates in battle, and eventually apologizes with her actions . The narrative treats Rem’s aggression as emotional trauma, not as romanticized cruelty.

"Look at Regulus. His abuse of his wives was treated as something serious, but when Emilia and Rem do something disgusting to Subaru, it's just reasons."

Regulus’s actions are premeditated sadism. He mutilated women for disobedience and justified it with warped philosophy. Rem panicked when faced with a stranger she suspected was dangerous, then stopped herself from killing him, then cried over hurting him later. Not comparable in any metric.

"The story doesn't put them in their place or have them punished for treating a human being like a worm, but they get pampered..."

Rem is not pampered. She wakes up in enemy territory, physically disabled, confused, chased, strangled, emotionally shattered, and later kidnapped. Her only emotional lifeline turns out to be the person who stole her identity. She is put through literal psychological hell.
"I guarantee you, if the genders were swapped, people would be taking this way more seriously, and Emilia and Rem would get their karma."

False equivalence. Regulus physically, mentally, and spiritually enslaved his wives for decades. Rem in Arc 7–8 restrains herself from lethal violence, cooperates in battle, and eventually apologizes with her actions . The narrative treats Rem’s aggression as emotional trauma, not as romanticized cruelty.

"Look at Regulus. His abuse of his wives was treated as something serious, but when Emilia and Rem do something disgusting to Subaru, it's just reasons."

Regulus’s actions are premeditated sadism. He mutilated women for disobedience and justified it with warped philosophy. Rem panicked when faced with a stranger she suspected was dangerous, then stopped herself from killing him, then cried over hurting him later. Not comparable in any metric.

"The story doesn't put them in their place or have them punished for treating a human being like a worm, but they get pampered..."

Rem is not pampered. She wakes up in enemy territory, physically disabled, confused, chased, strangled, emotionally shattered, and later kidnapped. Her only emotional lifeline turns out to be the person who stole her identity. She is put through literal psychological hell.

"(Rem knew subaru was right and knew about his intention, but the story gives her what she wants by having Louis like)."

Wrong. Rem breaks down because she realizes Subaru was right and that Louis hurt her. She says “Please stop… I don’t want to hear it!” and tries to deny the truth, then tackles Subaru in grief. She does not “get what she wants”—she begs to forgive Louis as a desperate escape from reality.
"What kind of double standards is that?"

There are no double standards. Different characters, different contexts, different motivations. Regulus acts out of ego. Rem acts out of fear and loss. The story condemns Regulus explicitly. The story portrays Rem’s actions as misguided, painful, and tragic—not excused, but understood.

"Sigh... it's the mc so of course the abuse is treated like a joke."

There is no scene in Arc 7 or Arc 8 where Subaru’s mistreatment by Rem is treated humorously. None. The scenes are somber, emotionally raw, and followed by gradual resolution. No “joke” music. No punchline. No comic framing. You invented that.
And about the last comment as regards to Otto and Minerva, Minerva cannot hurt him and Otto had to beat some sense into him because he was not listening
You are pressuming linear deterioration with no rebounds, which is not how trauma works in real psychology. People do recover in bursts, especially in high-stakes environments.

"You think that someone that relives certain moments over and over would pick up habits. For example, if a character sneezes, he could hand them a handkerchief right before they sneeze. This conveys that Subaru is gaining 'control' over that day."

Subaru doesn’t have control. He never replays the exact same day in a clean loop. Every RBD point is in a different context, with complex variables. He’s not redoing a sitcom scene with identical beats. He’s re-entering a warzone with evolving conditions.

Also, learning when a character sneezes isn’t useful. It’s a comedic beat, not a progression marker. The way Subaru displays growth is through:

-Planning differently.

-Choosing who to trust.

-Sacrificing his own desires to avoid past mistakes (see Arc 4’s sanctuary route planning).

This is how “control” is gained, not via trivial gimmicks, and the story not using them doesn’t make it badly written.

"Instead, Subaru mostly just feels like he's in a pinball machine, bouncing around until he gets things right."

The challenges themselves he has to face are what force him into being unable to properly take a grasp of the conflict, because the conflicts are designed so that each of them are too much for him to handle on his own.

Yet that doesn't mean he doesn't learn from his mistakes: every single one of them were fixed thanks to his decision making, not by pure chance. He does need info to help him strategize, yet that doesn't mean he fails because he is incompetent.

The man who got from being a hikikomori to being the leader of a squad that slayed one of the most dangerous monsters that has been roaming the world for 400 years by sheer willpower is definitely not a fraud and this DID NOT occur by chance (he had to plan everything). Same thing in arc 4, and 5, and 8, etc…
"Anyway, I think if Re:Zero didn't suffer from so many issues, and maybe just a couple of them, I would have been able to continue the series. It's disappointing because I really wanted to like it."

Then name one. "So many issues" is meaningless unless you specify at least one with internal impact, and you should since you are claiming "so many". "I wanted to like it" is also meaningless if you're unable to engage with what the story actually does, rather than vaguely gesturing at unlisted "issues." You're signaling frustration, not making an argument.

"Yeah. The many flaws in the story hold it back immensely."

Flaws = what? List them. No one disputes every story has flaws; the question is whether they're structural, thematic, or imagined by viewers with surface-level engagement. You're asserting quantity without content. That's not analysis, it's empty hand-waving.

"Now that I'm older, re zero is one of those shows where on the surface, there's a lot of enjoyment to be had with it, but it's a show that when you analyze it and go deeper, the result feels like an egregious mess..."

Dude be like: "when I think harder about things I didn't understand the first time, I get more confused, so now I blame the story." If you analyze something "deeper" and it becomes worse, that doesn't automatically mean the writing failed, it means you need to show why those deeper elements fall apart. And spoiler: you won't, because everything you're about to say is a shallow gripe in disguise.

Also, you are not older than 15 years of age.
"...with its many inconsistencies, character behaviors, trying to tell so many themes while switching it up constantly, and many many things that doesn't make the story work, it really can give you with a really negative impression overall."

Pure soup. “Many inconsistencies”, give one. “Character behaviors”, again, which ones? Saying the story “switches themes constantly” is not a critique unless you show incoherence or contradiction. Re:Zero's thematic structure is layered (trauma, agency, consequence, love, death) but none of those themes contradict or cancel each other out. So what’s the problem? That it doesn’t stay on one emotional note for your comfort?

"To me what hurts it the most are 2 things."

Finally, something to work with.

"It expects you to take it seriously."

Yes. Because it’s a serious story. You don’t watch Grave of the Fireflies and complain that it’s not “harmless fun.” Not every isekai is meant to be background noise. The expectation to be taken seriously is only a problem if the story fails to earn that weight…
Re:Zero earns it by making trauma central, decisions permanent, and psychology grounded in cumulative experience. The real issue here is that you expected something else and blamed the story for not being what you wanted.

"The others (with the exception of debately jobless reincarnation) are exceptionally harmless and aren't meant to be taken seriously. You can see them as just mindless anime that are fun to watch."

Cool. Then go watch them. But don’t confuse “harmless” with “better.” That’s a value judgment rooted in preference, not logic. Stories that challenge, disturb, or unsettle the viewer can be more valuable, not less.

"Re: zero isn't like that at all. You're meant to take it seriously, but with many flaws, contradictions, and moments that make you feel uncomfortable (not even in a good way, just fucking nauseating)."

“Flaws” and “contradictions”, not demonstrated.
“Uncomfortable”, yes..? that’s intentional. Characters die. Mental health collapses. People betray each other. That’s the point. Saying “it made me feel bad” is not an argument unless you're critiquing how it manipulates emotion, and you’re not. You’re just expressing dislike for discomfort, which is insanely stupid when trying to judge the writing.

"It almost forces you to feel a certain way about someone, even if you don't want to."

A story cannot force you to feel in a certain way since a story is not a being and cannot act. This is called a reification fallacy, and one that comes from self-victimization: after realizing something that contradicts your system of beliefs, you decided to attack the source instead of reflecting upon it.

"The other three at least have their own identity."

Name them. And explain what makes them more “defined” than Re:Zero, which, for the record, is one of the most tonally distinct and narratively complex isekai in the genre (there are other isekais that rival it but they are mostly chinese or korean webnovels, so they don’t count here).

Also, the whole talk about “identity” is very bad because it incentivises to reducing an entire story written by an author so that people can enjoy said complexity above the level of “unga bunga, story about man that dies and returns saving waifus”.

If a series can be reduced to a small set of things that are “its identity” then it sure is superficial as hell.

"Re zero tries to be unique with the combination of time traveling by death in a fantasy world, but it's all over the place."

How? The fantasy setting and RBD mechanic are perfectly compatible: high-fantasy stakes justify the use of a death-reset system. If anything, it’s tighter than most time-travel shows. Loops are fixed, resets are weighted, knowledge is limited, and Subaru never becomes omniscient. Nothing is “all over the place”, you just wanted a simpler story.
"One moment it tries to be one thing, then it acts like how an isekai would, then it tries to be a shonen."

Genres are tools. Re:Zero uses them deliberately. It has action (shonen), worldbuilding (fantasy), trauma drama (psychological), and subversion (meta-isekai). These aren’t contradictions, a story surprisingly can do many things at once, and that won’t take away from its identity (at no point it stopped being a psychological thriller). The mood shifts because the story evolves. If a show stuck to one genre tone for 50 episodes, you’d call it stale. So which is it?

"It's like re zero struggles to have its own identity despite it parading around itself to be deconstruction of isekai tropes and a realistic take on the isekai genre, while doing the same thing it criticizes other isekai for..."

Re:Zero doesn’t “criticize” other isekai. It reframes the expectations. It asks: what would actually happen if someone like Subaru (emotionally stunted, self-centered, powerless) got thrown into a nightmare world and we keep that premise without making him a Kirito? Re:Zero does subvert a good amount of tropes (don’t believe me, then go check on TV Tropes about Re:Zero). And using tropes is something every series in existence will ever do: whether it is well written or not comes down to execution, something you didn’t judge.

So wrong again.

"(even the weak protagonist thing isn't unique since kazuma isn't overpowered and has been killed several times).”
Red herring. Subaru and Kazuma serve completely different narrative functions. Kazuma is a satire of the lazy gamer. Subaru is a psychological case study of trauma, self-worth, and moral responsibility. They are both weak, sure, but the meaning of that weakness is diametrically opposed, not to mention Kazuma is psychologically unscathed with each death because Konosuba is a satirical series, which makes the comparison even more stupid.

"It tries to act like it's something special and that it deserves special attention, but in reality, how did Re: Zero get popular as it did? Simple. It followed the crowd."

The moment you say something is both “trying to be different” and “just following the crowd,” you’ve contradicted yourself. Either it’s unique and flawed, or derivative and safe. It can’t be both. And the reason it got popular is because it didn’t follow the crowd: it emotionally pulverized its audience, it broke pacing norms, and it gave us an arc-structured epic with psychological focus over power scaling, which is why shonentards mostly complain. You just don’t recognize those distinctions because you’re busy flattening everything into “other anime.”
“This applies to basically the entire story. The wins feel scripted and fake because they’re always engineered by Subaru’s RBD. It just feels hollow.”

No, they’re not. Subaru dies over and over because RBD alone isn’t enough. He doesn't get guaranteed wins: he gets chances, and he fails most of them. In Arc 3, he can’t save Emilia’s camp without help. In Arc 4, he’s locked out of the Tomb while Emilia has to solve the trials alone. In Arc 5, every faction defends their own gate. The wins only happen when other characters choose to act. RBD lets him try again: it doesn't control people or outcomes. The fact that Subaru needs others is what makes the wins earned, not hollow.

”Even if you look past all that, the characters themselves aren’t good people.”

We already talked about this a thousand times: RBD IS INTRODUCED SO THAT SUBARU CAN SEE EVERY SINGLE FACET OF THEM AND JUDGE THEM FAIRLY, so as to avoid making the same mistake you are doing here and judge them by one terrible ending that wasn’t even caused by character malice.

“It’s irritating that Subaru would even consider some of these people his “friends.””

He bonds with people through shared hardship. Rem saves his life multiple times. Otto betrays him in arc 3 and then sacrifices himself in arc 4. Garfiel threatens him, then joins him. You’re ignoring the actual character arcs to complain about tone.
The whole purpose of the story, as I said, is for Subaru to never judge at first sight, and for him to be able to judge characters based on all their interactions, not only on the lows.

Which, btw, MUST occur since that is what RBD is for: show each catastrophic outcome of the events in the story.

There is probably an alternate reality out there in which you commit genocide: does that mean you aren't truly a good person?

This is the case for any person that exists. Does that mean they are not good people?

Not to mention that this whole "they are bad people" ignores every single ounce of context.

"Ram, for example, is rude to everyone for no reason. That's supposed to be "funny," but it's not. She's just annoying."

She's emotionally repressed, loyal to Roswaal, and distrustful of strangers due to her past. Her "rudeness" is part of a defense mechanism. By Arc 4 and 5, she shows vulnerability and support: see her conversation with Subaru after Garfiel's defeat, or her care for Emilia in the sanctuary.

And her "rudeness" are literally irrelevant gags: it makes no sense for you to be that irked about it unless you are a literal snowflake.
"In real life, she wouldn't be considered anyone's friend unless you like being berated constantly."

In real life, people have trauma, loyalty, and sarcasm too. "Wouldn't be a friend IRL" is not an argument against fictional character quality. Especially when Ram consistently acts in support of others, regardless of how she talks.

And, in real life, good friendships have a lot of berating each other in a non-serious way.

Not that 90% of the members in this subreddit would know though.

"Three out of the five royal candidates are morally bad people."

I have addressed already this in the past:

1- Anastasia didn't stand there while her knight humiliated Subaru. He humiliated himself by screeching in the middle of a royal meeting in a society whose culture and traditions he barely knew. With his bare-bones knowledge of the situation, he criticized the knights, not for the purpose of pointing out a problem in society but rather for mere arrogance, all because Julius told him that he had no reason to boast about his lack of strength, since weakness is not something to be prideful of (true).

Proof of this is the fact that he had no reason to accept Julius' duel since he knew he was gonna get beaten up either way.

He was blinded by his ego, and it doesn't really matter whether a certain sage commended him for his efforts (or rather for proving that Emilia is harmless provided that he has people willing to humiliate themselves that much for her sake) or whether he was allowed there, all of the shit he did was for no sufficient reason at all from his POV.

It was just a rant.
Granted, saying "I will destroy your whole camp" was absurdly radical, and she can genuinely be criticized for that, yet her lesson wasn't wrong despite her methods.

"Crusch should've helped Subaru when he brought up the Witch Cultists. She had an army of knights and didn't send a single one. Even if he seemed mad, she knew he wasn't lying. But she needed incentive? "Do something for me, and I'll help"? Literal lives were on the line."

You are not taking into consideration that Crusch was going to send all of her troops to the white whale, which is a significantly greater evil than the Witch Cult.

Unless Subaru proposed an actual plan that wasn't just splitting the troops and getting them all killed in different battlefields, she had no reason to agree to this.

All of this is truly Roswaal's fault, who just decided to let the events of arc 3 occur without doing anything.

That is why It makes no sense to blame Crusch. She was selfish though, don't get me wrong: but that is something someone needs to be able to reign properly.

And if she did intervene in Roswaal's territory to save another candidate, she would destroy her entire career, since that would prove that the camp itself is totally useless without external help.

"Then in S3 she gets poisoned, and I'm supposed to feel bad? Yeah, she didn't deserve it, but she kinda earned it."

Absolutely not. She helped fight both the Whale and Petelgeuse on faith. Her punishment was memory erasure. If you think trusting a stranger with no plan at all before killing a monster that dwelled the earth for 400 years makes you deserve brain damage, then your ethics are broken. She was one of the most altruistic characters in Arc 3.
"Priscilla is useless and a jerk."

She's arrogant, yes. But "useless" is false: she saves Subaru in Arc 5, personally defeats Sirius, and keeps control over a city during a multi-pronged coordinated attack. Her worldview is extreme, but she has power, political reach, and insight. And, for all that matters, she helped multiple times save more than 1k people in total.

"The short purple-haired girl (Anastasia) is also a jerk. Sure, she gave Subaru important info—but she didn't know about RBD and was just trying to waste his time."

Huhhh, what are you talking about? Why would she have to know about RBD.

She gave critical intel that let Subaru survive. Whether she knew about RBD is irrelevant: her strategic mind and willingness to share knowledge proves her competence. She chooses to assist despite zero obligation. And she doesn't waste time, she accelerates it by predicting enemy movement.

“Only Felt and Emilia are morally good.”

Felt endorses revolution and violence to destroy the nobility. Emilia lies to herself to cope with her trauma. Both are flawed: and that’s what makes them good characters, not just “good people.” This whole paragraph relies on a shallow moral binary Re:Zero actively deconstructs.
“From a viewer perspective, I get to see the worst aspects of these characters—then we get to see their best.”

Yes, and that’s how actual people work. That’s the point. You don’t meet someone once and instantly know their depth. RBD makes character growth visible in layers. If you only want static arcs, you’re watching the wrong show.

“But the best aspects don’t make up for the worst:”

False premise. Nobody said they “make up for” anything. The arcs reconcile good and bad traits into full characters.

In addition to this, what kind of abstract and arbitrary calculation are you making to determine whether they make up for something or not?

As long as the characters themselves got over their pasts and do not evidence the same flaws as before for a non-justifiable reason (relapses exist), there is literally no internal reason for Subaru to bear resentment.

“Rem and Ram killed Subaru in Arc 2. That’s the worst.”

Rem did, out of Witch Cult trauma and protection. And Ram had her own issues too throughout that arc (and in later arcs): Read my replies to this post, this post and a rebuttal I made in this post.

And by the way, Subaru was acting suspicious, carrying the Witch’s scent, and got multiple warnings. It wasn’t unjustified, it was escalation.
“Later, Rem dies for Subaru and does everything to help him—that’s her best. That’s believable.”

Good. So you understand that even someone who makes a bad call in fear can change when they learn the truth. That's exactly what happens across all arcs.

"But Ram? At worst, she murdered Subaru. At best, she burns a book and takes forever to help, which leads to her getting knocked unconscious."

As for Arc 4: she saves Subaru from Roswaal's plans by taking out the gospel which was the root cause of practically all conflicts since arc 1, she didn't just burn a book, and it isn't easier to confront your emotional dependence towards another person. She hides her intentions to avoid tipping off Roswaal, not out of laziness.

Like, you are not even trying to analyze things.

"That's not redemption. Also, the author confirmed that if Ram wasn't in the woods, Subaru could've gotten Rem to calm down. So... Ram sucks. And Subaru calling her a friend is just dumb."

It is, since she got rid of her main character flaw, so this is total nonsense.

And where the fuck did you take this confirmation from? Did you make it out of thin air?.
"With Subaru's powers, someone needs to stop him from going off the deep end. Everyone else either coddles him or just insults him outright."

False. Beatrice saves him from suicide. Emilia rejects his selfish heroism. Otto punches his ideology down in Arc 4: he literally knocks sense into him. The entire point of Arc 4 is that he doesn't get coddled anymore. This claim is outdated after Arc 3.

"Capella was disturbing and fun to watch, but her loli design makes it harder to take her seriously. Still, her fight with Al was cool."

Capella is not a loli though.

" Lastly, why does Subaru have every emotion except anger?"

He does have anger: it just isn't directed at others most of the time. His fury is internalized: see his breakdowns in Arc 3, 4, and especially 6. When he explodes, it's almost always mixed with guilt and despair. That's consistent trauma behavior.

And, btw, you are making the same remark Roswaal did in arc 4, and he explained it there.

"He's gone through all this pain alone—yet in S3, he's still a happy-go-lucky guy. That makes no sense. He has PTSD, sure, but he should be way more on edge."

You’re mistaking repression for happiness. He masks his pain to keep others stable (which is why Emilia stops him in the last loop from trying to hide his anguish and decides to help) it's a coping mechanism. Arc 4 shows this in full. The fake cheer is an act he always had since young.
“Example: If Subaru is sitting by himself and someone drops something, he should freak out. He lives in a world where death is always around the corner.”

You're assuming PTSD manifests as loud panic. It doesn't always. In fact, hypervigilance can look like freezing, scanning, or silent anxiety: not cartoon freak-outs. Subaru does show that: note how he checks his surroundings constantly in Arc 4 and flinches at sudden touches in the mansion.

And you forgot that he has the most mental resilience out of the entire cast: Rui couldn’t bare a single one of his loops.

“He should feel tired. He should be easily annoyed.”

He is. He sleeps poorly, has visible mental fatigue in Arc 4, and isolates himself during mental strain. The reason why he doesn’t treat always others like shit is thanks to the emotional support he receives from them which helps him a damn lot (see all the times Emilia comforted him).

Your assumption that these traits should be externalized constantly ignores how real people suppress trauma to function socially.

“Another example: If Rem accidentally dropped something on him (like a plate), he should flip out—completely scared and angry. He should lash out in fear and then apologize later. That would be realistic.”

He does still experience this kind of responses, you are assuming what should happen here out of thin air. When facing the rabbit in arc 4 he even twitches due to the PTSD and Beatrice has to help him.

And, as I said, in arc 6 it was revealed he self-harms.

“Subaru should be trying to hold himself together for the sake of his friends, not acting like SpongeBob with tiny PTSD moments that only show up after he dies.”

He is holding himself together for his friends. That’s the entire structure of Arc 4: he cracks in private, smiles in public. The “SpongeBob” take is a lazy misread of a character who masks his damage to avoid burdening others.
Not that it matters since this is an unproven ridicule that seems made like a child, but whatever
“And this guy is supposed to be a regular teenager from the real world? Teenagers have rage. They snap all the time. You’re telling me this teenager who’s constantly dying and going through the most ridiculous crap never tweaks out?”

He does snap. Arc 3: he screams at Julius. Arc 4: he collapses mid-speech, begs Echidna for help, breaks down in front of Rem. Arc 5: he loses composure under pressure when facing Capella, fears dying again and when they face Roy he feels enraged. The reason why you don't see him become enraged in arc 5, for example, is because Beatrice and Otto hold Lye back so that Subaru does not have to face him: someone that Subaru despises the most.

In addition to this, he does experience and can experience anger. Does "WRATH IF" not ring any bells? Well, you didn't read it though, so…

But again, you assume rage is the "default" teen emotion: Subaru's default is shame.
"who can't even admit this story has disgusting morals (where giving up is worse than murder, rape, emotional manipulation, mass genocide, pedophilia, etc,)"

Well, geez, like 500k people who enjoyed the story and watched the anime disagree with you, so it seems that 500k people are wrong and you are the illuminated one finding out the BS with the story…

you know what, hell nah, you are just a whiny little child whose only form of entertainment (due to the lack of job and studies) is to rant on reddit for a copious length about how much he dislikes something.

And btw, never has anyone stated that giving up is worse than any of those things, though strawmans do help people form a self-image that they are winning a discussion when they are just looking like a childish clown.

Also, rape, pedophilia and emotional manipulation are… where exactly? One of those three I can only see Roswaal doing, and he was beaten up for it.
No argument at all.

"which involve killing a 12 year old all because they're a part of an evil organization and not because of their crimes (lye)"

WAIT WAIT WAIT, YOU ARE TRYING TO DEFEND LYE OF ALL PEOPLE? HASHAHSHA

Do you know how many people he has killed by his own hands so far??? And I make this clarification because that is what makes him irredeemable.

If anyone decided to forgive him, he would have gone straight up to killing people yet again, because his mental damage received both from his authority and the past made him a person that is impossible to redeem.

Not to mention there was a personal grudge with him eating Rem's name and memories AND MAKING FUN OF IT IN FRONT OF OTHERS HJASHASHAH

“while another gets a pass while being in the same cult”

Spica and Louis are two different people. Spica is not to blame for what Louis (her past identity) did. They share the same body and that’s it.

One of the two is literally a mentally disabled child.

“(even though the cast has a murderous child who also murders the mc in arc 6, but the story doesn't give a shit about what she did in that arc, along with 2 and 4).”

You mean Meili? Sorry, did you seriously try to put Meili on Lye’s level of madness? Am I missing a joke or something? or ur just retarded?

Input your suggestions regarding the document here!

(Currently WIP since im still learning how to properly manage Google documents)