Conceptualizing the Uncanny:

Focusing on E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Der Sandmann*
and Angela Carter's *The Magic Toyshop*

언캐니의 개념화과정:

에. 테. 아. 호프만의 『모래 사나이』 와

안젤라 카터의 『매직 토이숍』 을 중심으로

2014년 2월

서울대학교 대학원

협동과정 비교문학전공

이지현

Conceptualizing the Uncanny:
Focusing on E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Der Sandmann*
and Angela Carter's *The Magic Toyshop*

언캐니의 개념화과정:

에. 테. 아. 호프만의 「모래사나이」와

안젤라 카터의 「매직 토이숍」을 중심으로

지도교수 Eli Park Sorensen

이 논문을 문학석사 학위논문으로 제출함

2014년 1월

서울대학교 대학원

협동과정 비교문학전공

이지현

이지현의 석사학위논문을 인준함

2014년 1월

위 원 장 　김동석　　　　(인)

부 위 원 장 　Christian Baier　　(인)

위　　　원　　Eli Park Sorensen　　(인)

Abstract

Conceptualizing the Uncanny: Focusing on E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Der Sandmann* and Angela Carter's The Magic Toyshop

Ji Hyun Lee

Comparative Literature

The Graduate School

Seoul National University

This thesis is a study on the theme of conceptualizing the uncanny, which purposes on examining how this theme plays a significant role in terms of the "author-function" and how its variation is staged in Angela Carter's *The Magic Toyshop(1967)* and E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Der Sandmann*(1816).

In 1919, Freud defines the uncanny as "class of the terrifying [feeling] which leads back to something long known to us, once very familiar" in his essay "Das Unheimliche". And this definition of the uncanny develops itself into the legitimate standard of conceptualizing the uncanny. According to Anneleen Masschelein, this phenomena proves that Freud functions as the founder of the uncanny so that he limits and controls the text. However, he could not completely conceptualize the uncanny as he confessed at the end of his essay on the uncanny. Masschelein argues that this aspect of Freud's essay functions as a de-stabilizing force to scatter the notion of the uncanny and overflow the boundary of the text, which eventually threatens the author Freud. In this manner, this de-

stabilizing force reveals how the function of the author operates to limit and control the text by foregrounding how it threatens the author-function of Freud. On this premise, this thesis re-interprets the conceptualizing process of the uncanny in terms of the author-function in Freud's essay "Das Unheimliche" and expands this examination to Angela Carter's *The Magic Toyshop(1967)* and E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Der Sandmann*(1816), where especially Freud's version of the conceptualizing the uncanny is staged.

On the aspect, it is significant that Carter liberates the uncanny from the puppet theatre of Uncle Philip at the last scene of *The Magic Toyshop*. Carter does not describe how Uncle Philip has burnt down, she has only focused on the break-down of the toyshop. She only stimulates "wild surmise" (200), as Foucault questions at the end of his essay. By asking "What matter who's speaking?", Foucault does not suggest the specific strategy to emancipate the text. Likewise, Carter does not focuses on the collapse of the Uncle Philip. She only depicts the moment when the uncanny is unleashed from the theatre, which reflects Foucault's last question of speculating the utopian moment, when the author/text relationship is entirely dissolved and there is no need to ask "What is an author?".

Contents

Ⅰ. Introduction

This thesis is a study on the theme of conceptualizing the uncanny, which purposes on examining how this theme plays a significant role in terms of the "author-function" and how its variation is staged in Angela Carter's *The Magic Toyshop(1967)* and E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Der Sandmann*(1816).

In 1919, Freud defines the uncanny as "class of the terrifying [feeling] which leads back to something long known to us, once very familiar" [1] in his essay "Das Unheimliche". And this definition of the uncanny develops itself into the legitimate standard of conceptualizing the uncanny. According to Anneleen Masschelein, this phenomena proves that Freud functions as the founder of the uncanny, as he limits and controls the text. [2] Nonetheless, Freud could not completely conceptualize the

---

1 "Das Unheimliche sei jene Art des Schreckhaften, welche auf das Altbekannte, Längstvertraute zurückgeht." Sigmund Freud. Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S. 231.

　In this thesis, I am quoting English translation of "The Uncanny" from the Appendix of Helene Cixous essay "Fiction and its Phantoms: A Reading of Freud's Das Unheimliche (The" Uncanny")." *New Literary History* 7.3 (1976): 525-645. Further quotation of "The Uncanny" in English version is also from this same source.

2 Anneleen Masschelein, and Hendrik Van Gorp. *The Unconcept: the conceptualization of the Freudian uncanny in late-twentieth-century theory.* Sunny Press: New York, 2002, 4.

uncanny.[3] Masschelein argues that this aspect of Freud's essay functions as a de-stabilizing force to scatter the notion of the uncanny and make it overflow the boundary of the text, which threatens the author Freud eventually.[4] In this manner, the de-stabilizing force reveals how the function of the author operates to limit and control the text by foregrounding how it threatens the author-function of Freud. On this premise, this thesis re-interprets the conceptualizing process of the uncanny in Freud's essay "Das Unheimliche" in terms of the author-function and expands this examination to Angela Carter's *The Magic Toyshop(1967)* and E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Der Sandmann*(1816), where especially Freud's version of the uncanny is staged.

In order to set the genealogy of the author-function, firstly, I explore how the notion of the authorship is constructed, developed and modified in Roland Barthes and Michael Foucault. Though the death of the author is announced by Roland Barthes, Foucault asserts that the author cannot be simply muted.[5] Therefore, Foucault introduces the notion of the author-function in order to examine how the discourses around the authorship

---

[3] Quoting Freud, "it is evident that we must be prepared to admit that there are other elements besides those set down here determining the production of uncanny feelings."

Sigmund Freud. Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S. 261.

[4] Anneleen Masschelein, and Hendrik Van Gorp. *The Unconcept: the conceptualization of the Freudian uncanny in late-twentieth-century theory.* Sunny Press: New York, 2002, 4.

[5] Michael Foucault. "What is an author?", *Language, counter memory, practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard, Sherry Simon, Cornwell University Press(New York: 1977), 131.

works after the death of the author. On examining the discourses , Foucault takes an example of Freud as the author figure who exercises the author-function to be the initiator of discourses. According to Foucault, the author-function of Freud does not only limit the text but also reinforces the "enigmatic link between the author and the text"[6], which sets forth the ghostly figure of the author. The author, neither dead nor alive, thrives like a ghost in the text. I understand that this ghostly figure of the authorship points at the uncertain moment when the author/text starts to crumble.

Secondly, I present Freud's essay "Das Unheimliche" as a place where Freud exercises his author-function. According to Neil Hertz, Freud's essay on the uncanny demonstrates the enigmatic relationship between the author and the text. In other words, it exhibits how the author-function of Freud is threatened by this own text; the text of Freud transcends the endings of what Freud had limited and flows over the death of the author. Moreover, while Freud tries to conceptualize the uncanny, his own text uncannily reveals Freud's struggle to tame the uncanny. In order to see Freud's strategy to master and conceptualize the uncanny, I examine Freud's narrative strategy, following the argument of Neil Hertz and Lis Møller.

In the third chapter, I compare the different strategy of staging the theme of mastering the uncanny in two different texts: Angela Carter's *The Magic Toyshop* and E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Der Sandmann*. Both Carter and Hoffmann

---

[6] Ibid., 137.

lay down the authorial figure, Uncle Philip and Coppola/Coppelius/Spalazani, on the stage of mastering the uncanny. Uncle Philip and Coppola/Coppelius/Spalazani endeavor to appropriate the uncanny by mastering it; however, their attempt to master the uncanny ends in failure. And the uncanny foils those authorial figures by flowing over the controlling power and ends the story with the disturbing uncertainty. I believe this disturbance of *The Magic toyshop* echoes the last question of Foucault's essay, "What matter's who's speaking?"[7]. In order to specify this disturbing uncertainty, I explore the complex structure of Uncle Philip's puppet theatre featured in *The Magic Toyshop.*

---

[7] Michael Foucault. "What is an author?", *Language, counter memory, practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Cornwell University Press(New York: 1977), 138.

Ⅱ. The notion of the author: from écriture to the author-function

In 1968, Roland Barthes announced the "death of the author".[8] However, the discourses of authorship still thrives to be a valid argument. By introducing the term "author-function", Michael Foucault responds to the question why the discourses around the authorship is still valid after the death of the author. In this chapter, I examine how the notion of the author has been developed from Barthes' announcement of "death of the Author" to Foucault's conception of the "author-function".

1. The "Death of the Author"

The notion of the death or the disappearance of the author is not recent. The movement against the author is already precipitated in 1968 by Roland Barthes's "The Death of the Author".[9] In "The Death of the Author", Barthes claims that the author "enters into his own death"[10] when the writing begins, since the writing – or what he calls écriture – questions the subject of writing and unsettles the connection between the author and the text. Barthes argues that "the writing is the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin. Writing is that neutral, composite, oblique space where our

---

[8] Roland Barthes. "The death of the author", *Image-Music-text*, trans. Stephen Heath, (Hill and Wang: New York, 1977).

[9] Sean Burke. *Authorship: from Plato to the postmodern: a reader.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995. ⅹⅵ

[10] Roland Barthes. "The death of the author", *Image-Music-text*, trans. Stephen Heath, (Hill and Wang: New York, 1977). 142.

subject slips away, the negative where all identity is lost, starting with the very identity of the body writing."[11] According to Barthes' analysis, the writing process destructs every point of origin, whose process of the destruction does not exclude the physical origin, such as a voice and a hand of an author holding a pen. In other words, the writing disconnects the text from the physical quality of the author and erases the trace of its physical origin inscribed by an author. It demotes the author into a mere "scriptor"[12]. Following Barthes's argument, the author functions only to perform "a pure gesture of inscription (and not of expression)"[13]. In this manner, Barthes' exploration of the writing process leads to replace the figure of the author with the figure of écriture.[14]

According to Barthes, the traditional notion of the author postulates the author as the "the father and the owner"[15] of the book. This traditional notion upholds the author as a nourishing patron of the book who thinks, suffers and lives for it[16], as if the father takes care of his child. Barthes problematizes this father/child framework of author/text, as this

---

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid., 147.

[13] Ibid., 146.

[14] Adrian Wilson. "Foucault on the" Question of the Author": A Critical Exegesis.*" The Modern Language Review* (2004): 339-363.

[15] Roland Barthes, "From Work to text"*, Image-Music-text,* trans. Stephen Heath, (Hill and Wang: New York, 1977), 160.

[16] Roland Barthes, "The death of the author"*, Image-Music-text*, trans. Stephen Heath, (Hill and Wang: New York, 1977). 145.

framework approves the tyranic power of the author over the text.

> The image of literature … is tyrannically centred on the author, his person, his life, his taste, his passions … The explanation of a work is always sought in the man or woman who produced it, as if it were always in the end, through the more or less transparent allegory of the fiction, the voice of a single person, the author "confiding" in us.[17]

Speaking with the univocal voice from the transparent allegory of the fiction, the author imposes a limit and controls the text[18] He tyrannically corners all the possible meanings and interpretations of the text into his person, his life, his taste and his passions.

In modern days, the relationship between the text and the author is now departing from this old framework and transforming into a completely different notion; the author endows its legitimacy from his/her text. "In complete contrast [to the conventional notion], the modern scriptor is born simultaneously with the text"[19]. Thus, the notion of the author as the legitimate father of the text is no longer valid. Instead, the text creates the author; it writes the *I* who is speaking within the text[20]. The text is no longer a line of words converging into "a single theological meaning"[21] implied by the author. It is rather "a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable

---

[17] Ibid., 143.

[18] Ibid., 147.

[19] Ibid., 145.

[20] "The author is never more than the instance writing, just as I is nothing other than the instance saying I." Ibid.

[21] Ibid., 146.

centers of culture"[22]. The text rejects its biophysical author who is writing it at the table. The text exists in reference to the "pure act of writing"[23], not to the author. In other words, the writing stops being an actual physical act involving a personal figure. It becomes what Barthes calls "the instance writing"[24].

Barthes stresses that this emergence of "the instance writing", provides an effective analytical tool for the destruction of the author.[25] Linguistically speaking, the instance writing shows that "the whole of the enunciation is an empty process". The writing functions perfectly without any need to be filled with "the person of the interlocutors".[26]

> Linguistically, the author is never more than the instance writing, just as I is nothing other than the instance saying I: language knows a "subject", not a "person", and this subject, empty outside of the very enunciation which defines it, suffices to make language "hold together", suffices, that is to say, to exhaust it.[27]

The linguistic term of the instance writing disturbs the idea of the author. Linguistically, the language does not know a person with a pen; it only

---

[22] Ibid.

[23] Michael Foucault. "Labour, Life, Language" Order of things, Vintage Books (New York: 1973), 300.

[24] Roland Barthes. "The death of the author", Image-Music-text, trans. Stephen Heath, (Hill and Wang: New York, 1977).145.

[25] Barthes argues that this effect is based on the tendency of the language itself, as language is a system and the aim of the movement being so that it is at the same time a direct subversion of codes. Ibid., 144.

[26] Ibid., 145.

[27] Ibid.

knows a discursive subject belong to the sentence. Namely, this subject stands for not a person but an element of the language system. The discursive subject plays a role only as an empty signifier of the *I* so that the meaning of the *I* will be immediately exhausted after the sentence is over. The language system requires the same manner to the author, when he/she enters into a subject in a language system. The author is no longer a person who holds his physical trait but just a discursive subject which will be displaced and canceled out by another anonymous subject in a following sentence. In this manner, the author becomes no more than an instance writing,[28] since he can engage in the text merely as a discursive subject of a sentence.

Partly agreeing with Barthes's idea that the text has been liberated from the biophysical authorship, Foucault claims that Barthes' announcement of the death of the author needs more specific qualification.[29]

> [The conception of écriture] stands for a remarkably profound attempt to elaborate the conditions of any text, both the conditions of its spatial dispersion and its temporal deployment … It appears, however, that this concept, as currently employed, has merely transposed the empirical characteristics of an author to a transcendental anonymity. The extremely visible signs of the author's empirical activity are effaced to allow the play. In granting a primordial status to writing, [do we not]

---

[28] Ibid.

[29] Foucault does not explicitly point at Barthes notion of the death of the author. However, he does point out the concept of the "écriture", which is the essential element to support Barthes' argument of the death of the author, and problematize this very concept. Michael Foucault. "What is an author?", *Language, counter memory, practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Cornwell University Press(New York: 1977) 119.

conceive the writing as absence a transposition into transcendental terms of religious belief in a fixed and continuous tradition or the aesthetic principle that proclaims the survival of the work as a kind of enigmatic supplement of the author beyond his own death?[30]

Foucault argues that although the conception of the écriture is "taking full measure of the author's disappearance"[31], the écriture did not fully achieve the disappearance of the author. Foucault problematizes the naiveté of Barthes' announcement of the death of the author as it can only operate via re-introducing the "transcendental anonymity". Moreover, Foucault focuses on this transition from the disappearance of the author to the transcendental anonymity, raising the question after "the death of the author". According to Foucault' speculation, something anonymous becomes the supplement of the empty position where the author used to occupy. He points out that there remains something "enigmatic and religious". There is some ghostly figure is still keeping the text together, instead of the dead author. Foucault questions, "Who is speaking thus?"[32]in the empty position of the dead author. He questions that after the author who conditions "the spatial dispersion and its temporal deployment". In other words, he problematizes the ghostly figure occupying the position of the dead author, which functions to designate the beginning and the ending of the text, as if the dead author is coming back to life.

---

[30] Ibid., 120.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Roland Barthes. "The death of the author", *Image-Music-text*, trans. Stephen Heath, (Hill and Wang: New York, 1977). 143.

As Foucault points out, texts are still structured with beginnings and endings. They are not proliferating and overflowing unlike Barthes's prediction in the "death of the author". Barthes predicted the roseate future of the text's total emancipation:

> Once the Author is removed… everything is to be disentangled, nothing deciphered; the structure can be followed, "run" (like a thread of a stocking) at every point and at every level, but there is nothing beneath: the space of writing is to be ranged over, not pierced; writing ceaselessly posits meaning ceaselessly to evaporate it. In precisely this way literature, by refusing to assign a "secret", an ultimate meaning, to the text liberate an activity that is truly revolutionary since to refuse to fix meaning.[33]

Barthes argues that when the author is removed, there will be no authority which is to "impose a limit on that text" with "final signified, to close the writing".[34] The meaning of the text will be entangled so that nothing can be deciphered, but evaporate into nothingness. And yet, it is undeniable that the text is still readable. The text still has its meaning beneath the surface, which allows the reader to grasp the meaning. The text may not stand on the firm ground of "reason, science and law"[35] as it used to hold. But the limit of the meaning still exists so that it marks out the beginning and ending, capturing a story in a comprehensible format. This contradiction from what Barthes has predicted implies that the position where author used to occupy is not completely vacant. As Foucault

---

[33] Ibid., 147.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid.

described, the "enigmatic supplement" still lingers in the empty position of the author and holds the text together. The text is still not liberated from the author in a "truly revolutionary"[36] way. Therefore, if Barthes sticks to claim the notion of death of the author, ignoring that there is still an empty position occupied by something else, this conception will only reintroduce the "transcendental anonymity" and block the further investigation of the authorship. And the ignoring gesture will only amplify the ghostly voice of the author. As Jacque Derrida warns:

> [The author], himself, he is dead, and yet, through the specters of memory and of the text, he lives among us and, as one says in French, il nous regarde – he looks at us, but also he is our concern, we have concerns regarding him more than ever without his being here. He speaks to us among us. He makes us or allows us to speak of us, to speak to us. He speaks (to) us [Il nous parle][37].

The author is dead. However, his disembodied presence haunts back to the text. It looks at "us", speaks to "us" and speaks of "us". It speaks "strangely to us now through the fissures of seemingly impersonal and imperturbable theoretical prose"[38]. The author's biological death is already announced in his writing, hence his voice anchoring on the biological ground cannot be transmitted through the text. However, he survives like a ghost. He even speaks of us and haunts us with his "biological figure with

---

[36] Ibid.

[37] Jacques Derrida, "Like the Sound of the Sea Deep within a Shell: Paul de Man's War", *Critical Inquiry* 14, no. 3 (1988): 590–652.

[38] Sean Burke, *The death and return of the author: Criticism and subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida.* Edinburgh University Press, 1998, 7.

a chilling and tragic intensity".[39] Foucault raises the question from this haunting moment of uncertainty, repeating the question of Barthes, "Who is speaking thus?"[40], in a varied form: "What is an author?" In other words, Foucault seeks an answer to this chilling and tragic intensity by asking the subject of this bodily feeling. Furthermore, to inspect more of the haunting quality of the death of the author, he introduces the "author-function" in order to examine the form, the complexity, and the "possible specifications of the subject"[41].

2.2. The "author-function"

While Barthes criticizes and tries to overcome the traditional author-figure, Foucault problematizes it. He sets "the author" as the site of an enquiry:[42]

> It is obviously insufficient to repeat empty slogans: the author has disappeared. Rather, we should reexamine he empty space left by author's disappearance; we should attentively observe, along its gaps and fault lines, its new demarcations, and the reappointment of this void;

---

[39] Ibid., 6.

[40] Roland Barthes. "The death of the author", *Image-Music-text,* trans. Stephen Heath, (Hill and Wang: New York, 1977). 142.

[41] Ibid., 138.

[42] Adrian Wilson. "Foucault on the" Question of the Author": A Critical Exegesis." *The Modern Language Review* (2004): 339-363.

we should await the fluid functions released by this disappearance.[43]

Foucault's notion of the author is not pinning on the "revolutionary" event of the author's death. Instead, what he focuses on is to observe the way how the complexity of the author functions, while the author endlessly disappears into the "black hole"[44] of the writing space[45]. Foucault asserts that it is the function of the author which emerges in "the empty space left by the disappearance of the author"[46], holds the text together and keeps text from tumbling down into the black hole.

In order to observe how the system around the author functions, Foucault firstly poses a problem related to the name of the author. He asserts that the proper name of the author has other than indicative functions:

> The name of an author is a variable that accompanies only certain texts to the exclusion of others: a private letter may have a signatory, but it does not have an author; a contract can have an underwriter, but not an author; and, similarly, an anonymous poster attached to a wall may have

---

[43] Michael Foucault. "What is an author?", *Language, counter memory, practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard, Sherry Simon, Cornwell University Press(New York: 1977), 121.

[44] Jay Cantor and Jack Kerouac comments on the black hole of the text to explain the impossibility of writing a "true life". When the author includes everything, the words will pile up and eventually it will collapse under its own weight like a dead star and become a black hole which will only give a glimpse that there is a truth.

Jay Cantor and Jack Kerouac, "The Novel as Document", *Who says this?: The authority of the author, the discourse, and the reader.* ed, Everman, Welch D. SIU Press, 1988, 13.

[45] Michael Foucault. "What is an author?", *Language, counter memory, practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard, Sherry Simon, Cornwell University Press(New York: 1977), 116.

[46] Ibid., 121.

a writer, but he cannot be an author.[47]

The name of the author operates around the boundaries of texts and separates certain texts from the other, defines their form, characterizes their mode of existence.[48] Due to this complexity of the use, the name of the author bears the meaning more than the simple symbol indicating "a function of a man's civil status"[49]. The name of the author is "fictional; it is situated in the breach"[50]. In other words, none of these conditions can fully describe how the name of the author functions. In the use of the author's name, it functions neither solely as an empty symbol which is easily transferable, nor merely as a bodily figure which has an earth-bound substance responding to the real. According to Foucault, the complex use of the author's name unmasks that the discourse of author-function runs in a complex manner including the legal and institutional systems:

> The author-function is tied to the legal and institutional systems that circumscribe, determine, and articulate the realm of discourses; it does not operate in a uniform manner in all discourses, at all times and in any given culture; it is not defined by the spontaneous attribution of a text to its creator, but through a series of precise and complex procedures.[51]

Foucault introduces the author-function as an institutional operation,

---

47 Ibid., 124.

48 Ibid., 123-124.

49 Ibid.

50 Ibid.

51 Ibid., 127.

in contradistinction to "the spontaneous attribution of a text to its creator"[52]. The author-function cannot be summed up as an "instance writing" that solely functions to activate an instant relation between the author and the text. It is a system above the instant author/text relationship where the discourses are determined, articulated, and circumscribed. For example, the name of the author is one of the element of this system which controls and determines the text; by the name of the author, we decide a black letter on the paper either as a simple scribble or as a literary work. This aspect of the author-function which eventually involves "us" demonstrates that Foucault's notion not only sets the author as a controlling figure, limiting the text. It also controls "our handlings of the texts"[53]:

> the author is a certain functional principle by which, in our culture, one limits, excludes, and chooses; in short by which one impedes the free circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition, and re-composition of fiction … The author is therefore the ideological figure by which one marks the manner in which we fear the proliferation of meaning.[54]

Employing the third person plural "we", Foucault shows the author-function as a lively practice which mirrors the relationship between the author and "us". The author-function offers us a way to respond to the

---

52 Ibid.

53 Ibid.

54 Michael Foucault. "What Is an Author?" in *Aesthetics, Method and Epistemology*, vol. 2 of *The Essential Works of Foucault*, ed. James Faubion and Paul Rabinow (New York: The New Press, 1998). 222.

"chilling and tragic intensity"[55] of the dead author. The empty position of the author becomes a site for an author-function, where the author is neither dead nor alive. The author haunts back to the text like a ghost and speaking to "us". Foucault claims that this chilling and tragic intensity caused by the anonymous, ghostly author is the very reason why "we" marks the author as an ideological figure, as it prevents the proliferation of meaning what we fear most. As we voluntarily sets the author figure out of fear, Foucault admits that "the existence of the author is far from immutable"[56]. However, Foucault's intention of introducing "author-function" does not aim to restore the traditional authority of the subject.

> The subject [of the discourses] should not be entirely abandoned. It should be reconsidered, not to restore the theme of an originating subject, but to seize its functions, its intervention in discourse, and its system of dependencies.[57]

According to Foucault, the subject position cannot be entirely abandoned. In a similar manner, the position of the author cannot be completely ignored. Nonetheless, Foucault asserts that the traditional notion of the authorship as an originating subject can be still questioned.

---

[55] Sean Burke. *The death and return of the author: Criticism and subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*. Edinburgh University Press, 1998, 6.

[56] Michael Foucault. "What is an author?", *Language, counter memory, practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard, Sherry Simon, Cornwell University Press(New York: 1977), 138.

[57] Ibid.

By questioning the traditional notion, the authorship opens a dimension which enables Foucault to re-examine the authorship and the discourses around its system. It effectively provides the way to reveal "the manner in which discourse is articulated on the basis of social relationships."[58] Furthermore, it points to the culture of "a pervasive anonymity" is not difficult to imagine. His speculation expands even further from the moment of the liberation of the text. His challenging questions show his interest in the different frame set beyond the subject/ object dichotomy.

> "What are the modes of existence of this discourse?"
> "Where does it come from; how does it circulated; who controls it?"
> "What placements are determined for possible subjects?"
> "Who can fulfill these diverse functions of the subject?"
> Behind all these questions we would here little more than the murmur of indifference:
> "What matter who's speaking?"[59]

Foucault's last question, "What matter who's speaking?", points at the anxiety of the proliferation of the meaning [60]. This simple question transforms into the terrifying anxiety as it unfolds a dimension where author/text boundary completely blurs, where the death of the subject is no longer a topic and author/text dichotomy becomes obsolete. The proliferating, overflowing, authorless text, free from any authorities, will be

---

58 Ibid., 137.

59 Ibid.

60 Michael Foucault. "What Is an Author?" in *Aesthetics, Method and Epistemology*, vol. 2 of *The Essential Works of Foucault*, ed. James Faubion and Paul Rabinow (New York: The New Press, 1998). 222.

no longer identified with its former position, which is the object. The question will be not about who is writing and from where it is originated, but about how we can deal with this utopian moment of the text, where no authority exists to tell us what the text is. Foucault ends the utopian speculation on a future of texts with no further explanation, letting the strong sense of uncertainty rampant. As Foucault shortly comments on, this uncertainty provokes the feeling of "fear".[61] It is a strange, disturbing, even frightening feeling, as it unsettles the whole notion of the authorship, which eventually threatens our own understanding of the readership. "[The infinite text caused by the proliferation of the meaning] would speak beyond the individual speaker/writer/reader, beyond the history of all speakers and writers and readers."[62] It is a feeling of terror, which stirs the moment when the text steps beyond the history of all speakers/ writers/ readers and flows over every directions above the death of the author.

2.3. The author-function of Freud

Foucault's last question, "What matter who's speaking?", indicates the moment of uncertainty when the author/text dichotomy crumbles. However, this moment of total liberation goes into the different direction from

---

61 Ibid.

62 Everman, Welch D. "The Word and the Flesh: The Infinite Pornographic Text", *Who says this?: The authority of the author, the discourse, and the reader*. SIU Press, 1988, 107.

Barthes's roseate vision of total emancipation[63]. Foucault takes rather an indifferent stand and depicts this unsettling moment. "[Man] perhaps nearing its end … Then one can certainly wager that man would be erased, like a face drawn in sand at the edge of the sea."[64] According to Foucault's vision, there is not even a subject slayer which liberates the text from the authorship. Whereas Barthes's declaration of the death of the author brings the notion of écriture as the killer of the author, Foucault does not claim any kind of element which directly occurs the disappearance of the author. The subject – in Foucault's analogy from "What is an author?", the author - is erased helplessly and powerlessly, when the indefinite wave merges, leaving no substance who wants to seek the trace of the author. Foucault's exploration of the complete break-down of subject/object relation ceases just in front of the merging wave.

In short, Foucault does not endeavor to hunt down the traditional authorship from its observation tower in order to liberate the text, but awaits the moment when not only the sentinel at the tower but also the tower itself completely blown over. Nonetheless, Foucault claims that the notion of the author-function offers a way to problematize the traditional

---

63 In the "death of the author", Barthes triumphantly announces the birth of the reader enabled by the total emancipation of the text.

Roland Barthes. "The death of the author", *Image-Music-text*, trans. Stephen Heath, (Hill and Wang: New York, 1977) 148.

64 Michael Foucault. "The Human Sciences" *Order of things*, Vintage Books (New York: 1973) 387.

role of the author. According to Foucault, the author-function can strip off the traditional perception of the authorship and reveals its true nature as a complex function of discourse.[65] In other words, the author-function foregrounds the system of the authorship "under what conditions and through what forms can an entity like the subject appear in the order of discourse; what position does it occupy, what functions does it exhibit; and what rules does it follow in each type of discourse?"[66] And these questions point at the moment when the discourse dissolves into the "pervasive anonymity"[67]. In explaining this aspect of the author-function, Foucault takes an example of Freud who has exercised this author-function in order to formulate and take control of his own discourses. In this chapter, I examine the author-function of Freud explored in "What is an author?" and how it functions within the relationship between the author and the text.

In "What is an author?", Foucault examines how discourses around the author-function works. To distinguish the author-function from other elements surrounding the text, he selected four most obvious characteristics, which manifests its systemic works which "circumscribe, determine and articulate the realm of discourses"[68]. However, Foucault

---

65 Michael Foucault. "What is an author?", Language, counter memory, practice, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard, Sherry Simon, Cornwell University Press(New York: 1977), 137-138.

66 Ibid.

67 Ibid., 138.

68 Ibid., 130.

admits that there exist other types of authorship which go "beyond the limited sense of a person to whom the production of a text, book or a work can be legitimately attributed"[69]. And I think this type of authorship gives a clue to the moment of a pervasive anonymity, as it exposes the enigmatic link between the author and the text.[70] To examine his link more closely, Foucault draws out Freud and introduces him as "an initiator of discursive practices"[71], or an author who is in the "transdiscursive"[72]position:

> Freud, as "an initiator of discursive practices," ... made possible a certain number of differences. He cleared a space for the introduction of elements other than his own, which nevertheless, remain within the field of discourse he initiated. In saying that Freud founded psychoanalysis, we do not simply mean that the concept of libido or the techniques of dream analysis, but that he made possible a certain number of differences with respect to his books, concepts, and hypotheses, which all arise out of psychoanalytic discourse.[73]

In this passage, Foucault brings in Freud as an initiator of discourses who founds his own field of psychoanalysis. However, the place spared for the initial author does not aim at petrifying the discourses. Freud, an initiator of psychoanalysis, does not necessarily functions to prevent the discourses from diverse expansion. It is rather the other way around. According to Foucault, authors proliferate anchoring on texts. The text

---

69 Ibid., 131.

70 Ibid., 137.

71 Ibid., 131.

72 Ibid.

73 Ibid., 132.

outlines the author. It literally addresses the author out of numerous candidates entangled with its system of authorship[74]. Basing on this premise, Foucault draws out two practices of Freud's author-function as the initiator of discourses. Firstly, the author-function of Freud offers the sieve of guidelne that enable the endless possibility of discourse:

> The distinctive contribution of [Homer, Aristotle, and the Church Fathers] is that they produced not only their own work, but the possibility and the rules of formation of other texts. In this sense ... Freud is not simply the author of *The Interpretation of Dreams* or of *Wit and its Relation to the Unconscious*: he established the endless possibility of discourse.[75]

Foucault argues that the author-function of Freud operates not only as a regulating principles, but also as a tool to gather diverse discourses. As Foucault commented on, in contrast to a novelist who is basically never more than the author of his own text, the author-function of Freud works not in the direct connection to his work, such as the production of a text, a book, or a work.[76] For example, psychoanalysis, a discursive field that Freud founded, does not correspond to a single text of Freud. It is a systemic field where more than one text corresponds to the various authors. Therefore, among endless possibility of discursive expansion, the discourses need a place to anchor on, unless the discourses will be scattered into a space. The author-function emerges at this moment and

---

74 Ibid., 131.

75 Ibid.

76 Ibid.

secures the place for this anchorage.

Secondly, Foucault focuses on the practice of the discourses that inevitably "return to the origin"[77]. "The phrase, "return to" designates a movement with its proper specificity, which characterizes the initiation of discursive practices."[78] However, this practice of returning to the origin is not an automatic mechanism which petrifies and minimizes the discourses into the original arguments. Rather, it is a "movement" which creates the productive discourses oscillating between two poles of expansion and contraction around the initial discourse.

> We find the oscillation of two characteristic responses; "This point was made – you can't help seeing it if you know how to read"; or, inversely, "No, that point is not made in any of the printed words in the text, but it is expressed through the words, in their relationships and in the distance that separates them." It follows naturally that this return, which is a part of the discursive mechanism, constantly introduces modifications and that the return to a text is not a historical supplement that would come to fix itself upon the primary discursivity and redouble it in the form of an ornament which, after all, is not essential. Rather, it is an effective and necessary means of transforming discursive practice.[79]

This two oscillating poles of contraction and expansion is a part of a discursive practice, which constantly stimulates the modifications and transformations of the field of discourse. In other words, "return to the origin" provides the standard by which the discursive practice can define

---

77 Ibid., 134.

78 Ibid., 134-135.

79 Ibid., 135.

itself[80]. And at the same time, it ensures enough solidity to the discourses so that they can "travel among disciplines in the wake of the common frame of reference that psychoanalysis, no matter how modified, still provides"[81]. This characteristic of the author-function that flexibly accepts the modifications and transformations, not only plays a role in activating diverse discourses but also foregrounds an "enigmatic link between the author and his works"[82]. Foucault's notion of an author-function drives this link into a more enigmatic way, as it is neither Barthes' notion of écriture nor the traditional notion of the author. According to Foucault's notion of the author-function, not every elements can occupy the position of the authorship and control the text. However, it does not mean that the author-function completely appropriates his works and allows no modifications from the other discourses. Unlike Barthes's notion of écriture, which eliminates other elements and allows the single position of écriture, Foucault's notion of author-function leaves the position of the author and let it fluctuate and reinforce "the enigmatic link between an author and his

---

[80] Anneleen Masschelein. "The concept as ghost: conceptualization of the Uncanny in late-twentieth century theory." *Mosaic: A journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature* 35.1 (2002): 53-69.

[81] Ibid.

[82] Michael Foucault. "What is an author?", *Language, counter memory, practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard, Sherry Simon, Cornwell University Press(New York: 1977), 137.

works"[83].

> A last feature of these returns is that they tend to reinforce the enigmatic link between an author and his works. A text has an inaugurative value precisely because it is the work of a particular author, and our returns are conditioned by this knowledge. ... Bringing to light *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*, to the extent that we recognize it as a book by Freud, can transform not only our historical knowledge, but the field of psychoanalytic theory – if only through a shift of accent of the center of gravity. These returns, an important component of discursive practices, form a relationship between "fundamental" and mediate authors, which is not identical to that which links an ordinary text to its immediate author." [84]

Foucault focuses on the link between an author and his works that author-function exposes. Foucault claims that not only an author reflects his works, but also his works reflect an author though he is already dead. Freud died more than 100 years ago, but his author-function mysteriously survives and still modifies and gathers the discourses. And his works, which have an inaugurative power, can also modify Freud who died already. It brings Freud out of his tomb and re-characterizes him fitting well to the text. And this restless self-reflexive mode of an author and his works intensifies a dynamic relationship between fundamental and mediate authors. In the third chapter, I will examine how this self-reflexive dynamics between author and his works functions in Freud's essay, "Das Unheimliche"(Das Unheimliche, 1919)

---

[83] Ibid.

[84] Ibid., 136.

Ⅲ. Freud's uncanny narrative

Foucault's last question, "What matter's who's speaking?", implies that there is no longer a legitimate authority extant, not even an "author-function", which can answer to the finitude of the text. What Foucault suggests is the speculating moment when there is no authority which subjectivizes the subject [85] and the complete break-down of the subject/object relation becomes trivial and powerless like a face drawn in sand.[86]

The text unleashed from the authorship becomes a huge web of words, as the author-function evaporates. And this web of words is incommensurably huge so that no endings and beginnings can be recognizable. The words that we used to know slips away from the dictionary knowledge and returns to its raw state, breaking loose from the textual system. As a result, the text transforms into something unfamiliar and uncertain. The text becomes suddenly uncanny as soon as the authorship disappears. In order to conceptualize this uncanny moment, I

---

[85] Foucault's analysis on subjectivization is fully scrutinized in his lengthy book on *History of Madness*, focusing on the concrete example of how madman has been defined through the history. According to Foucault, there is no mad man, but lazy, drunken man who is marked as mad man by the society which desires to tame him and categorize in to the common sense. The man in an idle life later becomes a madman voluntarily; as there is only one option left for him in order to be a subject, he needed to be subjectivized as a mad man so that he is willingly becoming a madman so that he can be a subject after all.
[86] "[Man] perhaps nearing its end … Then one can certainly wager that man would be erased, like a face drawn in sand at the edge of the sea." Michael Foucault. "The Human Sciences" *Order of things*, Vintage Books (New York: 1973) 387.

believe Freud exercises the author-function in his essay on the uncanny, "Das Unheimliche(1919)". In "Das Unheimliche", His manipulation of the author-function tilt in more of the traditional notion of the author who controls over the text and fixes the meaning on the firm ground. On the other hand, his essay, "Das Unheimliche", unfolds in a converse way. It exposes the practice of Freud's author-function and reveals his incomplete mastery of conceptualizing the uncanny. To examine how Freud conceptualize the uncanny and how he fails, I firstly examine how the conceptualizing practice of the uncanny has been developed and later show how the author-function works in "Das Unheimliche".

3.1. Conceptualizing the Uncanny[87]

Freud defines the uncanny as the "class of the terrifying [feeling] which leads back to something long known to us, once very familiar"[88] in his

---

[87] As I have stated at the introduction, I will examine the Freud's essay as a model for conceptualizing the uncanny. Therefore, I will not fully cover the conception of the uncanny. For the full coverage of the uncanny, see Nicholas Royle. (Royle, Nicholas. *The Uncanny*. Manchester University Press, 2003.)

To see the uncanny in relation to Lacan's mirror stage, see Samuel Weber. (Samuel Weber. "The sideshow, or: Remarks on a canny moment." *MLN* 88.6 (1973): 1102-1133.) Mladen Dolar also exhibits interesting themes. She reads the uncanny as the symptom of the modernity. (Mladen Dolar. ""I Shall Be with You on Your Wedding-Night": Lacan and the Uncanny." October 58 (1991): 5-23.)

[88] "Das Unheimliche sei jene Art des Schreckhaften, welche auf das Altbekannte, Längstvertraute zurückgeht." Sigmund Freud. Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S. 231.

In this thesis, I am quoting English translation of "The Uncanny" from the Appendix of

monumental essay "Das Unheimliche". He insists that this terrifying feeling originates from its association with the infantile castration anxiety[89], which enables him to relate the uncanny, mainly discussed as "the subject of aesthetics"[90], with psychology. As Freud brings the uncanny into the psychoanalytic field, he becomes the "founder" or the legitimate appropriator of the uncanny. In this manner, Freud's argument of the uncanny regarding psychoanalysis becomes an inevitable gateway for using the term "the uncanny".

However, there are history of the uncanny pre-dating Freud's conceptualization. Nicholas Royle argues that the uncanny has a pre-history, before it was appropriated by Freud[91]. Prior to Freud, it was "bound up with the history of Enlightenment and with European and North American Romanticism."[92] Anthony Vidler gives more detailed description on historical transformation of the uncanny. He argues that the uncanny

Helene Cixous essay "Fiction and its Phantoms: A Reading of Freud's Das Unheimliche (The" Uncanny")." *New Literary History* 7.3 (1976): 525-645. Further quotation of "The Uncanny" in English is also from the same source.

89 Ibid., S. 257.

90 Ibid., S. 229.

[91] "The uncanny has a history: this is a fact that Freud scarcely acknowledges, even its significance is at issue everywhere in his essay." Royle, Nicholas. The Uncanny. Manchester University Press, 2003, 8.

[92] See Royle"s *The Uncanny* for details. Royle explains how the notion of sublime has expanded, diverged and transformed focusing on the English tradition. (Royle, Nicholas. *The Uncanny*. Manchester University Press, 2003. 8-12.) As I would like to give a brief and more general introduction to the history of Uncanny, I chose the other text by Anthony Vidler.

as a feeling of unease, diverged from Burkean sublime, was first identified in the late eighteenth century[93]. It was once "aesthetically an outgrowth of the Burkean sublime, a domesticated version of absolute terror as Gothic novel suggests, or the minor genre of the Märchen"[94]. In the short stories of E.T.A. Hoffmann and Edgar Allan Poe, the uncanny becomes independent and separately recognized from the sublime. Borrwoing Vidler's words, the uncanny found its first home in these two short stories.[95]

As Freud confessed, it was Ernst Jentsch who firstly pointed out the intimate relations between psychology and the lexical compistion of the uncanny in an essay "Zur Psychologie des Unheimlichen"(1906). "With the word *unheimlich* ["uncanny"], the German language seems to have produced a rather fortunate formation. Without a doubt, this word appears to express that someone to whom something "uncanny" happens is not quite "at home" or "at ease" in the situation concerned, that the thing is or at least seems to be foreign to him."[96] In German language, the uncanny [unheimlich] has intimate connection to the word home [heim]. With the prefix "un-", the uncanny [unheimlich] obtains the general meaning, which is the feeling of not at home or something not familiar. However, the uncanny does not

---

[93] Vidler, Anthony. The architectural uncanny: essays in the modern unhomely. MIT press, 1994, 3.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Ibid.

[96] Ernst Jentsch. "On the psychology of the uncanny (1906) 1." *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 2.1 (1997): 7-16.

completely disconnect itself from the feeling of homeliness. It is still connected to the conception of homeliness and familiarity. According to Jentsch, the condition of the uncanny phenomena reveals this complexity explicitly. It is comprehensible, "if a correlation of "new/foreign/hostile" corresponds to the psychical association of "old/known/familiar"." [97] Jentsch develops this complex relationship between the uncanny and its lexical origin, in order to condition the psychical uncanny effect as "intellectual uncertainty"[98] as Freud summarized. However, unlike Freud, Jentsch focuses on how to condition the psychical process of the uncanny, refusing to define the uncanny. "No attempt will be made here to define the essence of the uncanny … it is better not to ask what it is, but rather to investigate how the uncanny arises in psychological terms, how the psychical conditions must be constituted so that the "uncanny" sensation emerges."[99]

Taking Jentsch's argument as a starting point, Freud develops the notion of the uncanny further, interpreting E.T.A. Hoffmann's fantastic tale *Der Sandmann* as an exemplary text for demonstrating the uncanny. Freud argues that the threatening motifs of eyes, evoked and repeated by the sandman, function to hark-back to the "particular phases in the evolution

[97] Ibid.

[98] Sigmund Freud. Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S. 231.

[99] Ernst Jentsch. "On the psychology of the uncanny (1906) 1." *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 2.1 (1997): 7-16.

of the self-regarding feeling, a regression to a time when the ego was not yet sharply differentiated"[100]. According to Freud, the repetition of eye motifs drives the male protagonist Nathanael of *Der Sandmann* to regress into his early ages, when he meets his traumatic villain who attempted to take out Nathanael's eyes, and traps him in the infinite infantile anxiety till he commits suicide. Unlike Jentsch's conceptualization of the uncanny, which can be intellectually mastered[101] and brought to the day-light, Freud's infantile anxiety cannot be mastered nor comprehended. Regardless of how har Freud tries to master the uncanny, his conceptualization of the uncanny only sets the boundary of something unexplainable or unspeakable by locating the prefix "un" as the "token of repression."[102]

Not until the late 1960s, "Das Unheimliche" and the concept of uncanny itself did not receive much attention.[103] Starting with Ludwig Eidelberg,

---

[100] Freud, Sigmund. Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S.249.

[101] Ernst Jentsch. "On the psychology of the uncanny (1906) 1." *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 2.1 (1997): 7-16.

[102] ‚Das Unheimliche ist das ehemals Heimische, Altvertraute. Dis Vorsilbe "un" an diesem Worte ist aber die Marke der Verdrängung." Sigmund Freud. Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S.259.

[103] Anneleen Masschelein, and Hendrik Van Gorp. *The Unconcept: the conceptualization of the Freudian uncanny in late-twentieth-century theory*. Sunny Press: New York, 2002, 4. Anneleen Masschelein. "The concept as ghost: conceptualization of the Uncanny in late-twentieth century theory." *Mosaic: A journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature* 35.1 (2002): 53-69. David R. Ellison, "Freud's "Das Unheimliche": the intricacies of textual uncannincess", *Ethics and aesthetics in European modernist literature*. Cambridge University Press, 2001, 52.

including the term in his *Encyclopedia of Psychoanalysis[104]*, the uncanny begins to gain the growing interest. It was not only accepted in psychoanalytic circle, but also adopted in broader fields: literary theory and criticism, aesthetics, philosophy, art history, architecture, film studies and cultural studies. According to Anneleen Masschelein, the actual conceptualization phase of the uncanny occurs in the 1970-1980s. [105] During this period, the concept of the uncanny underwent significant changes. New meanings of the uncanny were introduced, and critics associate the uncanny with "a specific kind of corpus, various types of narratives and motifs and with a method of reading."[106] Masschelein also points out the crucial feature of the uncanny which triggers the turning point in that prospering era.[107] The conception of the uncanny - prefix "un-" does not mean simple opposite, but it opens the other marginal territory, hidden and suppressed - gives an alternative to the binary logics of "either/or". It becomes transformed into the "open-ended deconstructive "neither/nor or, more affirmatively, in the plurality of "and/and.""[108] And this conceptual transformation tendency makes the uncanny a prominent

---

[104] Ludwig Eidelberg. *Encyclopedia of psychoanalysis*. New York: Free Press, 1968.

[105] Anneleen Masschelein, and Hendrik Van Gorp. *The Unconcept: the conceptualization of the Freudian uncanny in late-twentieth-century theory.* Sunny Press: New York, 2002, 4.

[106] Ibid.

[107] Ibid., 8.

[108] Ibid.

concept in a wide variety of cultural discourses.[109] Moreover, this type of thinking becomes a destabilizing power of all kinds of concept as it not only questions the discourses around the concept but also questions possibility of the concept itself.[110]

However, as Masschelein claims, the conceptualization of the uncanny itself still anchors on Freud's "author-function" [111] , regardless of the proliferating tendency of the uncanny as it has been explored across diverse fields of literary theory and criticism, aesthetics, philosophy, art history, architecture, film studies and cultural studies. According to Foucault, it is because author-function sets Freud as the "founder of the discourse".[112] And as those statements of the founder considered inessential or

---

[109] Ibid.

[110] Ibid., 127.

[111] Focusing on Foucault's comment of Freud – that he becomes the "founder of discourses" - not only Masschelein, but also Nicholas Royle, Nancy Luxon and Helene Cixous points out the author-function of Freud as a founder of a discourse of the uncanny.

Helene Cixous et al. "Fiction and its Phantoms: A Reading of Freud's Das Unheimliche (The" Uncanny")." *New Literary History* 7.3 (1976): 525-645. Nancy Luxon. *Crisis of Authority: Politics, Trust, and Truth-telling in Freud and Foucault*. Cambridge University Press, 2013. Anneleen Masschelein, and Hendrik Van Gorp. *The Unconcept: the conceptualization of the Freudian uncanny in late-twentieth-century theory*. Sunny Press: New York, 2002. Anneleen Masschelein and Hendrik Van Gorp. *The Unconcept: the conceptualization of the Freudian uncanny in late-twentieth-century theory*. Sunny Press: New York, 2002, 127.

[112] Michael Foucault. "What is an author?", *Language, counter memory, practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard, Sherry Simon, Cornwell University Press(New York: 1977), 135.

"prehistoric", the discourses return to the origin with the theoretical validity.[113] In this manner, the discourses around the uncanny have to return to the original, not because it is the only authority which endows the theoretical validity, but because the discourses of the uncanny are anchoring on the original argument which supplies a viable model. Next chapter, I examine how Freud supplies the original model of conceptualizing the uncanny and how he competes with the text of E.T.A. Hoffmann, *Der Sandmann.*

3.2. Freud's interpretation of the uncanny in *Der Sandmann*

Freud deals with E.T.A Hoffmann's fantastic tale *Der Sandmann* as the major text to demonstrate the uncanny, which has "mass of themes"[114] to form the condition of the uncanny. However, Freud's analysis reveals more than what he intended. Freud's exploration of the uncanny in Hoffmann's tale unveils the narrative technique of Freud's competition with Hoffmann, which shows that Freud has exercises his author-function to limit and set the boundary around what he believed that he founded, which is the uncanny.

To "found" the uncanny in *Der Sandmann*, Freud employs the literary

---

[113] Anneleen Masschelein, and Hendrik Van Gorp. *The Unconcept: the conceptualization of the Freudian uncanny in late-twentieth-century theory.* Sunny Press: New York, 2002, 5.

[114] ‚ganzes Bündel von Motiven' Sigmund Freud. Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S, 246.

writing process, as the strategy to appropriate the text. In other words, Freud takes over the authority as if he is a literary writer, in order to grasp the moment of the uncanny and conceptualize it.

> This fantastic tale begins with the childhood recollections of the student Nathaniel: in spite of his present happiness, he cannot banish the memories associated with the mysterious and terrifying death of the father he loved. On certain evenings his mother used to send the children to bed early, warning them that "the Sand-Man was coming"; and sure enough Nathaniel would not fail to hear the heavy tread of a visitor …When questioned about the Sand-Man, his mother denied that such a person existed except as a form of speech; but his nurse could give him more definite information: "He is a wicked man who comes when children won't go to bed, and throws handfuls of sand in their eyes so that they jump out of their heads all bleeding. Then he puts the eyes in a sack and carries them off to the moon to feed his children. They sit up there in their nest, and their beaks are hooked like owls" beaks, and they use them to peck up naughty boys' and girls' eyes with."[115]

Freud tries to "reconstruct" the "original arrangement"[116] of Hoffmann's tale. He retells the story, keeping the objective tone of reasoning. It indicates that he strives to achieve the position of the legitimate narrator by reasoning the story. The rivalry between the original narrator of the sandman tale and Freud's voice mark out Freud's striving trial. While retelling the story, Freud quotes Hoffmann's tale only when it is already in the quotation marks. Namely, he quotes nothing but a dialogue of a character. Consequently, the words of narrator from Hoffmann completely disappeared[117]. Hoffmann's

---

[115] Ibid., S. 244

[116] Ibid.

[117] Neil. Hertz. "Freud and the Sandman", *The end of the line: essays on psychoanalysis and the sublime*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985). 105.

narrative, which is rather extravagant, becomes simplified.

Freud's reconstruction of the Hoffmann's original arrangement means that he acts out his authority over the untamable text. Moreover, the simplifying process during the reconstruction process suggests that Freud treats the text as if the text is his patient, waiting for his scientific analysis. For example, Freud examines the story of sandman as if the narrative of the story itself is in need of aid from Freud. Freud briefly commented on the footnote that "Hoffmann's imaginative treatment of his material has not played such havoc with its elements that we cannot reconstruct their original arrangement"[118], which conversely indicates Freud's implicit idea that Hoffmann's imaginary treatment of the sandman needs Freud's reconstruction.[119] In this manner, Freud sets himself as an appropriate and vicarious storyteller who can decipher and rearrange Nathanael's dream-like story in an apprehensible way. In other words, Freud becomes the "director of the dramatic play and an actor"[120]of the text that the patient provided.

However, Freud is not the only legitimate author in the text; the patient

---

[118] Sigmund Freud. Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S. 245.

[119] Freud even comments on Hoffmann's unhappy childhood at the end of his commentary on Hoffmann's narrative technique, which relates Hoffmann to one of his patients suffering from the childhood trauma. "Hoffmann was the child of an unhappy marriage. When he was three years old, his father left his small family, never to be united to them again. According to Grisebach, in his biographical introduction to Hoffmann's works, the writer's relation to his father was always a most sensitive subject with him." Ibid.

[120] Hans W. Loewald. "Psychoanalysis as an art and the fantasy character of the psychoanalytic situation." *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* (1975).

also functions as an author. Therefore, in Freud's reading of the sandman story, a patient as the original author of the sandman tale, functions as "co-authors of the play"[121]. The patient is a "direct participant, as well as the initially unwitting co-author."[122] In this manner, Freud becomes situated in the position where he needs to compete with the original author of his own play. When Freud plays his role as an actor or as a director of the play, the text, which is supposed to be dead, starts to respond to what he has played out so far. As Freud re-narrates the story, he becomes more and more involved in the story, as the text lures him to stage himself as if Freud is the part of the story. In other words, Freud becomes an actor competing with the original text on the stage of mastering the uncanny. At last, the text of the sandman story becomes an uncanny mirror which constantly reflects what Freud has done so far.

Freud's analysis of the sandman story exhibits this rivalry against the original text by Hoffmann within the introduction of the summary of the sandman. Referring to Freud's words right after the introduction of the summary, it is clear that Freud consciously employs the dialogue of the character in order to exclude the words of the narrator:

> It is true that the writer creates a kind of uncertainty in us in the beginning by not letting us know, no doubt purposely, whether he is taking us into the real world or into a purely fantastic one of his own creation. He has admitted the right to do either; and if he chooses to

---

[121] Ibid.

[122] Ibid.

stage his action in a world peopled with spirits.[123]

Freud openly admits that Hoffmann's narrative creates the uncertainty, which he justly ignored in his summary of *Der Sandmann* by vacuuming the voice of the narrator. In other words, Freud praises Hoffmann for his talent as he can create an imaginative force; however, Freud conceals the effect of its force which unravels the textual anxiety that stems from the original author.[124] Following Freud's argument, the power of the author in the tale of uncertainty becomes more visible and strengthened, as the author holds the key to solve the enigma through his writing. Thus, the "imaginative way"[125] of telling the novel is closely related to the power of the author who can perform his right through positioning the readers within the uncertainty. As Freud comments, Hoffmann has succeeded better than anyone else in producing uncanny effects,[126] treating his texts in his own unique imaginative narrative. Especially, several narrators in *Der Sandmann* exhibits the complex manner of discourses of the uncertainty. Three of them, not only Nathanael and Clara but also the visible narrator, express different ideas and perception of the fictional world. For example,

---

[123] Sigmund Freud, Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S. 242.

[124] ""I invented psychoanalysis because it had no literature," Freud once remarked, joking about what is now lugubriously known as the Burden of the Past or the Anxiety of Influence".

Neil Hertz. "Freud and the Sandman", *The end of the line: essays on psychoanalysis and the sublime.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985). 95.

[125] Sigmund Freud, Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S. 238.

[126] Ibid.

Nathanael believes that Sandman exists, so that he narrates the story in a way he perceives the sandman. (1-12) On the contrary, Clara gives completely opposite idea of the sandman; the sandman is a mere fantasy to her. (16-17) In this manner, three different narratives forces the reader to carry the burden of identify the 'true' narrative from what three narrators posed. To deliver more straightforward story of the sandman and stream the meaning in a way he aims at, Freud flattens the layers of narratives voices, which becomes a strategy to solidify his status as a narrator and take control over the text.

In a similar manner, he consciously erases the importance of the automaton Olimpia. "Uncertainty whether an object is living or inanimate, which we must admit in regard to the doll Olimpia, is quite irrelevant in the connection with this other, more striking instance of uncanniness."[127] As Freud admits that she is the object "living or inanimate", Olimpia generates the uncanny feeling, since the element of the uncertainty constitutes her appearance. However, Freud needed to cancel her uncanniness as it would inevitably revive the voice of the original narrator. At the beginning of "Das Unheimliche", Freud argues that "intellectual uncertainty"[128] is not the element which can explain the uncanny. However, Oliimpias, which is not certain whether it is alive or not, engenders the terror closed to the feeling of the uncanny. Therefore, the presence of Olimpia becomes an element to

---

[127] Ibid., S.242.
[128] Ibid., S.231.

threaten Freud's argument, as she is the object which constantly creates uncertainty in *Der Sandmann.*

By framing the uncanny and imposing the unilateral meaning, Freud tries to tame the uncanny and situate it in a sensible position, such as the infantile anxiety, which is "harking-back to particular phases in the evolution of the self-regarding feeling, a regression to a time when the ego was not yet sharply differentiated from the external world and from other persons."[129] However, Freud soon finds out, while categorizing and fixing the meaning of the uncanny, that the uncanny elements cannot be contained inside of what he has provided. Though Freud ends his essay gathering all the elements he has discovered in one single conception of castration anxiety, there remain certain things still that he did not explain.[130] As Lydenberg comments on, "there is something else in the stories that exceeds their logical and rhetorical function as examples of repetition."[131] As a result, the narrative register avoids the closure by spilling out more stories unconsciously, while the psychoanalytic story maneuvers its closure.[132] The Italian adventure, for example, is followed immediately by two more tales – the tale of the repetition of 62 and the tale

---

[129] „Es handelt sich bei ihnen um ein Rückgreifen auf einzelne Phasen in der Entwicklungsgeschichte des Ich-Gefühls, um eine Regression in Zeiten, da das Ich sich noch night scharf von der Außenwelt und vom Anderem abgegrenzt hatte." Ibid., S.249.

[130] Ibid., S. 261.

[131] Robin Lydenberg. "Freud's Uncanny Narratives." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* (1997): 1072-1086.

[132] Ibid.

of the alligator - that illustrate the uncanniness of repetition.[133]

At the end, Freud fails to claim the perfect enclosure of defining notion of the uncanny; "It is evident that we must be prepared to admit that there are other elements besides those set down here determining the production of uncanny feelings. We might say that these preliminary results have satisfied psychoanalytic interest in the problem of the uncanny, and that what remains probably calls for an aesthetic valuation."[134] Freud admits that there remains something that he does not cover and that those elements can be covered by the aesthetic valuation. Freud's statement hints that he is again admitting the authority of the literature which has explored the uncanny. Therefore, instead of exploring further, he murmurs the incomplete ending, spitting out several words, "silence, solitude and darkness", which mirror the dark abyss of *Der Sandmann*. "Concerning the factors of silence, solitude and darkness, we can only say that they are actually elements in the production of that infantile morbid anxiety from which the majority of human beings have never become quite free."[135]

---

[133] Sigmund Freud. Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S. 250-255.

[134] Ibid. S.261.

[135] Sigmund Freud, Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S. 268.

4. Re-enacted uncanny in *Der Sandmann*(1816) and *The Magic Toyshop*(1967)

Both *The Magic Toyshop*(1967) and *Der Sandmann*(1816) repeats the theme of the uncanny, by enacting the character who tries to master the uncanny by domesticating, appropriating process which results in a failure. In the following, I cover how Hoffmann is staging the mastering of the uncanny. Secondly, I examine how Angela Carter repeats Hoffmann's theme in her novel *The Magic Toyshop* by adopting Hoffmann's plot from *Der Sandmann.*

4.1. Der Sandmann

Hoffmann's deals with the uncanny, closely linked to the function of the eye.[136] In *Der Sandmann*, Hoffmann employs Coppelius (or, Coppola) who owns the eyes which exhibits the uncanny feature. By appropriating the eyes, Coppelius/Coppola acts out the theme of mastering the uncanny, which is again repeated through puppet/puppeteer relationship. Furthermore, staging the tyranic figure of the puppeteer in relation to the puppet, Hoffmann supplies the model to explore the dynamic between the text and the author in a fresh view.

---

[136] Lis Møller ""The Sandman": The Uncanny as Problem as Reading", *The Freudian Reading: Analytical and Fictional Constructions*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991. 115.

4.1.1. The function of the eye

The function of the eye is the key motif which conveys the dynamics of the uncertainty, which engenders the uncanny beyond dead and undead. In order to examine the dynamics of the uncertainty involving the uncanny, I firstly observe the function of the eye.

The bodiless eyes in *Der Sandmann* have several variations; not only the actual organic eyes, but also the Glasses(28) and the Spyglass(29). And this variation constructs the complex doubling between the possession of the eyes and the lack of the eyes. The possession of the eyes is linked with life and warmth while the lack of them suggests the meaning of the death and coldness[137]. However, what makes the dynamics in *Der Sandman*'s plot is not the strict phenomenal dichotomy of possessing and dis-possessing of the eyes. It is the function of the detached eye which destabilizes the conventional opposition of life and death.[138] In *Der Sandman,* the eyes do not belong to someone permanently, it is detached and bodiless.

The detached eyes makes its first appearance when Coppola tries to sell glasses to Nathanael and when Nathanael is looking at Olimpia through the Spyglass.

> Und damit holte er immer mehr und mehr Brillen heraus, so, dass es auf dem ganzen Tisch seltsam zu flimmern und zu funkeln begann. Tausend Augen blickten und zuckten krampfhaft und starren auf zum Nathanel aber er konnte nicht wegschauen von dem Tisch, und immmer

---

137 Ibid.

138 Ibid., 117.

mehr Brillen legte Coppola hin, und immer wilder und wilder sprangen flammende Blicke burcheinander and schossen ihre blutrote Strahlen in Nathanaels Burst.(28)

(A thousand eyes stared and quivered, their gaze fixed upon Nathanael; yet he could not look away from the table, where Coppola kept laying down still more and more spectacles, and all those flaming eyes leapt in wilder and wilder confusion, shooting their blood-red light into Nathanael's heart.)(112)

The sight of the thousands of glasses glancing upon him creates terror in Nathanael. This scene suggests that the eye motif is not essentially converging into the castration anxiety as Freud explained in "Das Unheimliche".[139] The uncanny effect is rather created by the autonomous aspect of the eyes. It is uncanny to Nathanael since the bodiless, authorless eyes are staring at him, demonstrating its ambiguous status of being: neither alive nor completely dead.

The most frequent theme of detached eyes is associated with the doll Olimpia.[140] Her eyes were once stolen from Nathanael (37-38), then again detached from her body and finally becomes autonomous without bodily subject, gazing at Nathanael. "Nun sah Nathanael, wie ein Paar blutige Augen auf dem Boden liegend ihn anstarrten"(38) (And Now Nathael saw something like a pair of bloody eyes staring up at him from the floor)[141] In this scene, the gaze of the eyes detached from any substance proves that

---

139 Sigmund Freud, Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S. 243-245.

140 Ibid.

141 E.T.A. Hoffmann. "The Sandman", *Tales of ETA Hoffmann*. University of Chicago Press, 1972. 120. I also use this version of English translation for the further quotation of "The Sandman" in English, thereby I put only the page number of English translation.

now the eyes have autonomous power. In this manner, the theme of the detached eyes repeatedly appears and sways the narrative in uncertainty.

On this aspect, Møller draws out the important quality of the detached eyes in connection with "the impossibility of mastering the narrative". She asserts that "the bodiless eye is a figure for this ambiguity or uncertainty, just as it is the figure for the impossibility of mastering the narrative". She continues, "for Coppola's spyglass is not only associated with Olimpia, Spalanzani and Coppelius/Coppola's oeuvre, and with Nathanael's demonic poem; ultimately, the bodiless eye become a metaphor for "The Sandman" itself."[142] Moreover, the repeated motive of bodiless eye or detached eye in Hoffmann's text shows the uncanny connection to the author and the authorless, automatic text. The bodiless eye stimulates the uncanny feeling, as it can be autonomous and gives an unwanted gaze back. Likewise, the authorless text inspires the uncanny effect, as it insinuates that it exists on its own and reflects something that we may have not desired to be discovered.[143]

Nathanael's gesture involving glasses and spyglasses also has significant

---

[142] Lis Møller ""The Sandman": The Uncanny as Problem as Reading", *The Freudian Reading: Analytical and Fictional Constructions*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991. 115.

[143] As Lydenberg argued, Freud's narrative becomes uncanny through the writing process and reveals what Freud does not want to reveal; such as his age as 62 is giving him an uncanny moment.

Robin Lydenberg. "Freud's Uncanny Narratives." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* (1997): 1072-1086.

importance. Nathanael perceives the world through those materials, but at the same time they deceive Nathanael. The spyglass falsely reflects the automatic figure, when he uses the spyglass to see Clara. "Er fand Coppolas Perspektiv, er schaute seitwärts - Clara stand von dem Glass! ... Holzpüppchen dreh dich Holzpüppchen dreh dich" (41) (He found Coppla's Spyglass, and looked to one side. Klara was standing in front of the glass ... "Whirl wooden doll! Whirl wooden doll!")(124) In front of Coppola's Spyglass, Clara deforms herself and turns into a "wooden puppet". This Spyglass also gives the fictional liveliness to Olimpia. Using the spyglass, Nathaniel can find his ideal self, Olimpia.[144]

> Nur die Augen shienen ihm gar seltsam starr und tot. Doch wie er immer schärfer und schärfer durch das Glas hinschaute, war es, als gingen in Olimpias Augen feuche Mondesstrahlen auf.(28)

(Only her eyes seemed peculiarly fixed and lifeless. But as he continued to look more and more intently through the glass, it seemed as though moist moonbeams were beginning to shine in Olimpia's eyes.)(112)

To his own naked eyes, Olimpia looks just like a lifeless doll; yet she is transformed into an angelic beauty when he uses his spyglass. As the German word for the spyglass, Perspektiv, indicates[145], the spyglass does not provide the transparent, objective view of the world. As the term, Perspektiv, suggests, the spyglass indicates the several perspectives of

---

[144] Later on, Nathaniel finds out that the eyes of Olimpia was in fact his, and her body is a mere wooden piece.

[145] Sarah Kofman. "The Double is/and the Devil: The Uncanniness of The Sandman (Der Sandman)" *Freud and fiction*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991, 134.

different characters. It specifically points out that Nathanael's gesture of seeing through the Spyglass is "another principle which constructs the narrative". In other words, drawing out the spyglass functions as an evidence that Nathanael is seeing the world in his own perspective, which is "the confusion of surface and depth, of outside and inside, of the living and the dead, of self and other, of recognition and deceit"; which is also the structuring principle of the narrative itself."[146]

According to Møller, *Der Sandmann* is a "gallery of mirrors in which everything is doubled and distorted."[147] For example, the original scene of Nathanael's childhood is repeated in a distorted way.[148] The fight between Coppola and Spalazani repeats the scene where Nathanael's father struggles to keep his child from Coppeilus. Furthermore, the peeping scene is again repeated by Nathanael. When he was a child, he peeped his father's experiment hiding behind the curtain, which is repeated through Nathanael peeping the Olimpia under Spalazani's control. In this manner, the sandman, Coppelius/Coppola/Spalazani constitutes the "distorted repetitions"[149] of Nathanael's father. As Freud mentioned in his original

---

[146] Lis Møller ""The Sandman": The Uncanny as Problem as Reading", *The Freudian Reading: Analytical and Fictional Constructions*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991. 115.

[147] Ibid.

[148] Ibid.

[149] Ibid.

quotes of "Das Unheimliche", Coppola/Coppelius and Nathanael's father constitute the double figure of the father[150]: one as tyranic, the other benevolent. However, such a dichotomy of good and evil is disturbed through the "Perspektiv" (the Spyglass) and stimulates the constant self-reflexive movement.

As is well known, "the eye is the mirror of the soul." However, in Hoffmann's narrative, "this saying becomes ambiguous; the mirror is reversed so that one sees oneself as one believes one sees the other."[151] The eye is supposed to be the clear medium that mediates the inner self and the outside world without distortion, as it is suggested by Clara's eye in *Der Sandmann*. Clara's eye shows the traditional aspect of the eye. Her eyes clarify the dark side or the unknown of the world and make it into the acknowledgeable notion which can be utilized in an explicable word. She sees the incident of the Sandman in a reasonable view and believes that her explanation can get rid of the uncertain anxiety. In other words, she sees Nathanael's anxiety as an object of knowledge which can be analyzed and clarified, drawing open the curtain of uncertainty. On the other hand, the eye of the Nathanael works in a different direction. The mirroring aspect of his eye is rather mal-functioning: it shows not what he expects to see but

---

[150] Sigmund Freud, Das Unheimliche, in*: Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S. 244.

[151] Lis Møller ""The Sandman": The Uncanny as Problem as Reading", *The Freudian Reading: Analytical and Fictional Constructions*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991. 115.

what he desires to see. In other words, the gaze of the eyes becomes autonomous; it gazes upon what Nathanael does not intended – though he secretly desired I– and seeks its authority detached from the actual body.[152]

Moller argued that "the theme of detached eyes" (117) encompasses this autonomous element of the eyes. Thus, the eye of Nathanael is situated between "the confusion of surface and depth, of outside and inside, of the living and the dead, of self and other, of recognition and deceit" (115). The autonomous character of the eye in *Der Sandmann* becomes even more intensified by its repetition through spyglasses and glasses. The glasses confusingly arranged by Coppola effuses the red light without the direct order neither from Coppola nor from Nathanael's intention. And the spyglasses, which Nathanael has bought from Coppola, show what Nathanael has repressed and hidden for a long time so that he can keep distance from his imaginary world. The Narrator does not comment on the autonomous quality neither, so that it is never clarified by any narrators who are the superior authority of the eyes permeating the whole narrative of Der Sandman. As a result, the detached eyes seeking for the authority remains as a ghost, uncannily floating along the fictionality of Nathanael's story.

---

[152] The eyes were attached to Nathanael at first, then it had been owned by Coppeilus/Coppola and then Professor Spalazani in the form of the eyes of Olimpia. However, the eyes were not completely owned or mastered by any other characters and constantly slips away from any kind of ownership.

4.1.2. Coppelius/Coppola/Spalazani

Regarding their relationship to Olimpia, Coppelius/Coppola/Spalazani performs the theme of mastering the uncanny. In original footnote of Freud's essay on the uncanny, Frau Dr. Rank associates name of the Coppola with ""Coppella" =crucible, connecting it with the chemical operations that caused the father's death; and also with "coppo"=eye-socket".[153] As his name and occupation states, Coppola is the owner of the "eyes"; the eyes of actual human and the eyes of perception ("Perspektiv"). In other words, Coppola can be interpreted as the alchemist – as his identical, yet different twin Coppelius suggests – who endeavors to master the uncertainty. Coppola owns the eyes; however, he has not mastered the eyes yet, which explains why he loses his precious eyes from his hand stolen from Nathanael.

> mein bestes Automat - hat er mir geraubt Zwanzig Jahre daran gearbeitet - Leib und Leben daran gesetzt - das Räderwerk - Sprache – Gang - mein - die Augen - die Augen dir gestohlen! (38)
> (my best automat – he has stolen it what I have worked on for 20 years – I've been risking body and soul – the clockwork – the speech – the movement – the eye- eye is stolen)(120)

Coppola's obsession to the eyes suggest that, he feels uncomfortable when the eyes glancing back at him in an autonomous way. For it signifies that the eyes can be out of control and run out from his mastery.

There is also another figure Spalazani, who invented the automat so that he assumes that the eyes will be no longer detachable from the subject he

---

[153] Sigmund Freud, Das Unheimliche, in: *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. ⅩⅡ, S. 245.

can control. In other words, Spalazani invented the subject, the automat Olimpia, so that the eyes will not be bodiless and proliferate as the authorless text does. However, the invented subject cannot be the subject proper after all, as it will be always objectivized and confirmed its subjectivity by the eyes. As Spalazani sets the principle when he invented the doll, it is the eye which comes first so that the eye determines the subject, not vice versa.

When Nathanael discovered Olimpia without eyes in her eyeholes, Olimpia the subject was no longer there; she was demoted down as a mere puppet.

> Erstarrt stand Nathanael – nur zu deutlich hatte er gesehen, Olimpias toderbleichtes Wachsgesicht hatte keine Augen, Statt ihrer schwarze Höhlen; sie war eine leblose Puppe. (37)

(Nathanael stood transfixed; he had only too clearly seen that in the deathly pale waxen face of Olimpia there were no eyes, but merely black holes; she was a lifeless doll.) (119)

This scene explains that the eye was the agent which endowed the meaning to Olimpia. As Spalazani could not achieve complete mastery of Olimpia's eye through framing it, he failed to appropriate or master the eyes. What Spalazani has done to the eyes is giving the certain frame and the finitude, which is Olimpia, so that he can grasp the uncertainty. However, what he has been working on was contouring the boundaries of the eyes, educating Olimpia so that he believed that he mastered it.

Spalazani's act of framing the eyes can be also compared to what Freud did in his narrative strategy in "Das Unheimliche". As Freud tries to limit

the meaning of the uncanny by categorizing[154] and exercises his author-function in order to appropriate the uncanny, Spalazani cages in the untamable eyes inside of Olimpia's waxen face. In short, the author-function of Freud exhibited in Freud's essay, "Das Unheimliche", forms the parallel relationship to the Spalazani's act of mastering the eyes. Spalazani, "Mechanicus und Automat-Fabrikanten" (38) (skillful craftsman and maker of automatons), claims his legitimate authority over Olimpia what he has founded[155], which repeats the theme of conceptualizing the uncanny what Freud has pursued in his essay. As the narrator of the sandman story introduced, Spalazani is a skillful craftsman and maker of automatons, which gives him the name of the originator of Olimpia. In a similar manner, the traditional concept of the author, what Freud tries to achieve throughout his essay, claims to be the creator and the father of the text.

Spalazani insists that he can wield the authority over his own creation, especially on Olimpia, which he worked on for twenty years. So is Freud; he founded psychoanalysis[156]and works on conceptualizing the uncanny by

---

[154] "In proceeding to categorize those things, persons, impressions, events and situations which are able to arouse in us a feeling of the uncanny in a very forcible and definite form, the first requirement is obviously to select a suitable example to start upon." Freud claims that in order to define the forcible form the uncanny, the first requirement is the categorization (Musterung) of the phenomena. Ibid., 237.

[155] Spalazani claims for his authority on Olimpia when he quarrels with Coppelius/Coppola, which is quoted in page 51 of this thesis. In that quarreling scene, Spalazani cries out that Coppelius has stolen his best automaton, which he worked at it for twenty years.(38)

[156] Michael Foucault. "What is an author?", *Language, counter memory, practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard, Sherry Simon, Cornwell University Press(New York: 1977), 133.

rationalize the effects and phenomena of what the uncanny has left over and claims for his authority on the concept of the uncanny. In this manner, Spalazani uncannily reflects the mirroring image of Freud and even foretells Freud's future failure of the conceptualization of the uncanny. The quarreling scene between Coppola and Spalazani shows the explicit example. Olimpia was discovered as a mere wooden puppet with the eyes scooped out, when Spalazani thought that he achieved the ultimate goal of appropriating the eyes[157]. Inside of Olimpia's empty black hole of eye socket, there was nothing left (keine Augen, Statt ihrer schwarze Höhlen(37)) and the eyes detached from the fake human body blazes its fire-like gaze(37). The eyes instantly returning into its original, raw state of fire circle(Feuerkreis); uncontrollable and infinite. Likewise, when Freud thought that he completed the conceptualization of the uncanny and solidify it, the uncanny slips away from the surface of the words. In other words, Freud could not pin down the uncanny on the several samplings of what he concluded to be the castration anxiety. As Masschelein argues, the discourse on the uncanny is always "meta- or self-reflexive concern with concepts".[158] Therefore, when the discourse on the uncanny is about to

---

[157] The narrator of the sandman story comments that Spalazani was most pleased when the intimacy between Olimpia and Nathanael had developed (36), which implies that Spalazani had almost achieved the completion of Olimpia – or the mastery of the eyes - so that she can even marry a man as if she is a real woman.

[158] Anneleen Masschelein, and Hendrik Van Gorp. *The Unconcept: the conceptualization of the Freudian uncanny in late-twentieth-century theory.* Sunny Press: New York, 2002, 7.

close, the uncanny turns out to be the empty dark hole of Olimpia's empty eye socket where the uncanny is already slipped away.

4.2. The Magic Toyshop

The theme of mastering and staging the uncanny also echoes in Carter's text.[159] Its echoing tone gets even stronger for Carter deliberately employs the framework of Hoffmann. However, Carter's work on the uncanny advances rather towards opposite direction. Instead of restricting and limiting the meaning of the uncanny, Carter liberates the uncanny which has been distorted and tamed inside of the frame of Freud and Coppola. In

---

[159] I will not do the full coverage of The Magic Toyshop here, in order to focus on Uncle Philips' function inside of the story.

However, these critics coves *The Magic Toyshop* as a whole piece. For the general feminist reading, Jean Wyatt covers it with an extensive feminist reading. Aidan Day reads *The Magic Toyshop* in a more extended arena of power relationship– from male against female to Englishman Uncle Philip against Irish Jowles Family and objects the general approach of feministic reading at the last scene. Robyn Ferell, Kitty Carriker and Linden Peach reads the text in two different psycho-analytic ways. While Robyn Ferell and Carriker sticks to the feminist critiques of psychoanalysis and joins the mainstream of the reading of The Magic Toyshop, Linden Peach gives a psycho-analysis based on the "subversive" character of the fairytale.

Jean Wyatt. "The violence of Gendering: Castration Images in Angela Carter's The Magic Toyshop, The passion of New Eve, and "Peter and the Wolf"", Alison Easten. ed. *Angela Carter*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000. Aiden Day. "Shadow Dance, The Magic Toyshop and Several Perceptions", *Angela Carter: the Rational Glass,* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998. 31. Kitti Carriker. *Created in our image: The miniature body of the doll as subject and object*. Lehigh Univ Press, 1998. Robyn Ferrell. "Life-Threatening Life: Angela Carter and the Uncanny" *The Illusion of life: essays on animation*., Alan Cholodenko, ed. University of Sydney, Power Institute of Fine Arts, 1991.

this chapter, I explore how Uncle Philip as the mastering figure is staged and how the uncanny is liberated.

4.2.1. Uncle Philip's puppet theatre

Uncle Philip in *The Magic Toyshop* is the figure who mirrors Freud and Coppola, engaging in the act of mastering the uncanny. Carter's re-staging of Freud can be observed in the manner by which she is dealing with the tyrannical puppet-master Uncle Philip. Uncle Philip's peculiar way of presenting himself - absorbed in staging a puppet theatre and the desire of taking the tale under his control – indicates the basic traits of Freud and Spalazani, framing the uncanny under one's authority.

The strategy that Uncle Philip picks up to control his own family is framing them inside of his reticence which makes his presence even heavier. In other words, his reticence becomes a frame itself which encompasses his toyshop. Uncle Philip hardly speaks. And when he speaks, it is mostly in a roaring imperative form which is completely rejecting any communication among the characters in the text. At the dining table, he says only a short phrase of a prayer "for what we are about to receive" (72), which gives a signal to the family that they can start to eat the porridge. In other words, the thanking prayer at the dining table changes its meaning into an imperative signal when it is spoken out by Uncle Philip. In this manner, Uncle Philip keeps his imperative tone throughout the story. He shouts out, "Finn change plates! Pronto!" (73) "Finn, get decent and come down at

once."(74) His attitude toward the puppets are not much different from the one toward his family; Uncle Philip orders them to move in a way he wants and controls under the strong presence of himself.

Though Uncle Philip does not speak a lot, his presence is too much powerful that he can even control the whole family through his absence; it even develops into the mystical alchemy. (168) "[Melanie] saw her uncle only at mealtimes but his presence, brooding and oppressive, filled the house. She walked warily as if his colourless eyes were judging and assessing her all the time" (92) Melanie feels that she is always being watched by Uncle Philip as the house constantly haunts her with dead but moving objects contrived by Uncle Philip. His mastery over the moving toys even endows him with alchemistic power, so that he can freely use the hot water which always breaks down whenever Melanie attempts to use it. "Uncle Philip bathed in the tub as often as once or twice a week; he seemed to exercise some occult authority over the geyser" (117). Melanie even finds out that Uncle Philip has alchemistic power of turning something into totally different thing after she is transformed into a wooden puppet of Uncle Philip's theater. "She watched Uncle Philip empty four green-banded cups of tea and thought of the liquid turning slowly to urine through his kidneys; it seemed like alchemy, he could transmute liquids from one thing to another." (168)

As if a puppet performs the stage direction that Uncle Philip contrived, people at the toyshop follow Uncle Philip's order. Uncle Philip's absolute

reign prevails not only over the puppets but also the people at the toyshop who are gradually turning into puppets. At first, only Margaret demonstrates her puppet like movement. "[Margaret] dried and put away knives, and spoons, also. She was a wind-up putting-away doll, clicking through its programmed movements. Uncle Philip might have made her over, already. She was without volition of her own." (76) As the story goes on, however, it becomes not only Margaret who turns into a puppet of Uncle Philip; Melanie and Finn also follow Margaret's trail and become puppets. "Melanie hung cups on hooks on the dresser; her arm went up and down, up and down. She watched it with mild curiosity; it seemed to have a life of its own" (78). Uncle Philip also makes Finn "creak"(148) like a puppet, which explains his attempt to give a fixed form to Finn, as Finn's eel-like slipping movement does not germane to his well-controlled puppets. "Finn slipping back and forth like an eel, a laughing ell, for he kept on laughing."(69) And this eel-like movement of Finn exhibits clear contrast to his revised movement. "[Finn] creaked, indeed, like a puppet. He had forgotten his grace was all gone."(148).

Not only Finn, but also all the Jowles family has an element which disturbs and even threatens Uncle Philip. They all have fire-like traits that signifies something uncontrollable and powerful enough to burn all the toyshops that contains what Uncle Philip has achieved so far. For example, Aunt Margaret shows her fire-like appearance with her hair. "Aunt Margaret's face was skim milk, a bluish white, against her flaming hair."(50)

"She pulled out all the pin again and let the hair fall down like a shower of sparks. A firework display."(188-189) Unlike wooden puppet, which can be destroyed and controlled without much efforts, Fire shows entirely different aspects; it has the quality to burn down everything, including all the toys and puppets that Uncle Philip has mastered and kept as trophies. Therefore, Uncle Philip has Margaret bind her fire-like red hair and suffocates her with the metallic leash so that she will not effuse any more fire-like elements.

> The necklace was a collar of dull silver, two hinged silver pieces knobbed with moonstones which snapped into place around her lean neck and rose up almost to her chin so that she could hardly move her head … she did her hair with far more care than usual, arranging it in smooth red coils and loops … [Unclie Philip] gazing at her with expressionless satisfaction, apparently deriving a certain pleasure from her discomfort, or even finding that the sight of it improved his appetite. (112-1113)

When Jowles family has their Sunday dining, Margaret dressed up with her only dress, the necklace which blocks her head's movement and her hairs tightly bound together. Margaret can barely moves her head due to the dull silver collar so that she becomes a pure puppet of Philip, which pleases the puppet master Philip. Margaret's puppet-like movement clearly indicates Philip's mastery over Margaret. And it becomes intensified, when Philip derives certain pleasure and satisfaction from her discomfort. His pleasure explicitly exhibits Philip's perverse desire to control and master the untamable element.

4.2.2. Carter and the "wild-surmise"

When Uncle Philip believes that he makes all his family members into a

puppet so that they are under his control, Philip discovers that his family was not entirely tamed as he desired. While Philip went outside with Jonathan, the white swan that conquered Melanie is chopped off by Finn (171) and Margaret, who he believed to be the well-tamed puppet of his, makes Philip to be a cuckold by his own brother-in-law (195). Raged with the betrayal and failure of the mastery of the uncanny, Philip set fire on his puppet theater to punish his family who betrayed him.

However, After Uncle Philips has set on a fire, his mastery over his family becomes powerless. Unlike the wooden puppets, which can be easily broken down and stays where it starts, the fire goes anywhere though it is not intended by the first initiator. Uncle Philip shouts and gives order to the fire as he used to do, "Trap them like rats and burn them out!" (197-198) However, the house, which used to follow the orders of Philip, allows Finn and Melanie to escape. In other words, Philip's order fails and the Margaret becomes the one in power. "[Margaret] was a goddess of fire; her eyes burned and her hair flickered about her."(197)

However, there is still the remnant of the Uncle Philip in burning toyshop. "[Philip] wore his overcoat and broad-brimmed, familiar hat. He was too big and wicked to be true"(198) And Carter does not describe how Uncle Philip has been burnt down; she only focused on the break-down of the toyshop where the puppet theater was staging the mastering of the uncanny. So Uncle Philip, the master of the puppetry, is captured in the living-dead end of the text.

After the break-down of the toyshop, Carter raises "wild surmise" (200), as Foucault raises the crucial question at the end. What is going to happen when the tamed uncanny is unleashed again and dissolved into the air? What Foucault suggests at the end of his essay is the radical speculation on the liberation of text. His speculation is focusing on how to propose the "wild surmise" (200), which shows the modes of existence. In other words, Foucault's last question mirrors not the death or collapse of the Uncle Philip, but the "wild surmise" of Melanie and Finn looking at the house where all the elements of the dichotomy lie.

> All burning, everything burning, toys and puppets and masks and chairs and tables and carpets and Mrs Rundle"s christmas card with all her love and lightshades bursting open with fire and the bathroom geyser melting and the bathroom plastic curtains dripping to nothing as the fire licked them over.(200)

The bathroom geyser which distinguishes the master of the toyshop and the puppets melts down. And toys, puppets, masks which Melanie is obliged to identify were also burnt down. Even the Christmas card of Mrs Rundle, which can be the anchor for Melanie's subjectivity, has been demolished by the fire. The unleashed uncanny, the fire, has devoured everything which used to stand subject/object relationship. This is the reason why Melanie and Finn were sitting on the roof, pondering upon, not jubilating their emancipation. The unleashed uncanny does not only burn down the controlling power of tyrant Philip, but also the whole boundaries of subject/object relationship, which is the only term for Melanie and Finn to identify themselves with.

I believe this is how Carter liberated the uncanny from Freud and returns to Hoffmann. By setting Uncle Philip, re-enacted instead of Spalazani/Coppola/ Coppelius from the sandman tale, Carter stages the mastering process of the uncanny. As Spalazani contrives a puppet to cage in the uncontrollable eyes, Uncle Philips administers his private puppet theater to control his family which has fire-like traits uncontrollable. By setting the fire on the puppet house, the uncanny appropriated by Freud returns to its unsettled, raw state of infinite fire circle. In other words, Carter undermines the author-function of both Freud and Hoffmann by re-writing their texts, which used to confine the meaning of the uncanny. As a result, the meaning of the uncanny imposed by Freud and Hoffmann transcends their texts and lives on beyond it.

Ⅴ. Conclusion

By staging the uncanny in *The Magic Toyshop* and *Der Sandmann*, Angela Carter and E.T.A. Hoffmann problematize this conceptualizing process of the uncanny. Following the plot what they have provided, neither Uncle Philip nor Coppola nor Spalazani achieved the mastery of the uncanny. Three of them approaches to the uncanny in a three different way: by being the puppeteer, appropriating it, and lastly to frame it, which ends with the uncertain ambience. Therefore, by burning the stage where the puppet theater was performed, Angela Carter recovers the original status of the uncanny; where neither finitude nor suppression exists.

In the first chapter, I suggest the notion of the authorship is a still valid discourse. As Foucault asserts that the author cannot be easily muted[160], though the traditional notion of the author loses its firmly grounded position due to Barthes' declaration of the "death of the author".[161] Furthermore, by laying the notion of the "author-function", Foucault argues that the position of the author is not to be denounced but to be reconsidered so that the author-function becomes a site to

---

[160] Michael Foucault. "What is an author?", *Language, counter memory, practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard, Sherry Simon, Cornwell University Press(New York: 1977), 131.

[161] Barthes, Roland. "The death of the author", *Image-Music-text*, trans. Stephen Heath, (Hill and Wang: New York, 1977). 147.

inspect "its functions, its intervention in discourse, and its system of dependencies"[162].

In the second chapter, I examine Freud's essay as a model for showing how the author-functions plays a role. Following the argument of Neil Hertz and Robin Lydenberg, this chapter suggests that Freud's narrative strategy to frame the uncanny shows a constant mirroring between the author and the text.

The third chapter covers the reading of *The Magic Toyshop* and *Der Sandmann*, focusing on the theme of staging the uncanny. In this chapter, I compare the strategy of staging the uncanny enacted by Uncle Philip, Spalazani and Coppola/Coppelius. At the last scene of *The Magic Toyshop*, Carter liberates the uncanny from the puppet theatre of Uncle Philip. However, Carter does not describe how Uncle Philip has burnt down, she only focused on the break-down of the toyshop. She stimulates "wild surmise" (200), as Foucault questions at the end of his essay. His question of "What matter who's speaking?"[163]can be rephrase as What is going to happen when the tamed uncanny is unleashed again and dissolved into the air? Foucault does not suggest the specific strategy to emancipate the text. Likewise, Carter does not focuses on the collapse of the Uncle Philip. She only depicts the moment when the uncanny is unleashed from the

---

[162] Michael Foucault. "What is an author?", *Language, counter memory, practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard, Sherry Simon, Cornwell University Press(New York: 1977), 137.

[163] Ibid., 138.

theatre, which reflects Fouault's last question of speculating the utopian moment, when the subject/object relationship is entirely dissolved and there is no need to ask "What is an author?".

Works Cited

Primary Source

Carter, Angela. *The Magic Toyshop* [1967]. *London: Virago* (1987).

Hoffmann, E.T.A. *Der Sandmann*[1816]. Reclam: Stuttgart, (2006).
-- *Tales of ETA Hoffmann*. University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Secondary Source

Armitt, Lucie. *Contemporary Women''s fiction and the fantastic* (Basingstoke:Macmillan, 2000).

Benjamin, Jessica. *The bonds of love: Psychoanalysis, feminism, & the problem of domination*. Pantheon, 1988.

Brooks, Peter. *Reading for the Plot*, Random House: United States, 1984.

Barthes, Roland. "The death of the author", *Image-Music-text*, trans. Stephen Heath, Hill and Wang, 1977.
-- "From Work to text", *Image-Music-text*, trans. Stephen Heath, Hill and Wang, 1977.

Bernheimer, Charles, and Claire Kahane, eds. *In Dora''s case: Freud-hysteria-*

feminism. Columbia University Press, 1990.

Bloom, Harold. *Agon: Towards a Theory of Revision*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Booth, Wayne C. *The rhetoric of fiction*. University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Carriker, Kitti. Created in our image: The miniature body of the doll as subject and object. Lehigh Univ Press, 1998.

Carroll, Daid. "5. Institutional Authority vs. Critical Power, or the Uneasy Relations of Psychoanalysis and literature" *Taking Chances: Derrida, Psychoanalysis, and Literature*. Smith, Joseph H., and William Kerrigan, eds. No. 7. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Carter, Angela, *Burning Your Boats: The Collected Short Stories*. Random House, 1996.
   -- *Fireworks: Nine Stories in Various Disguises*. Harper & Row, 1981.
   -- and Esmae Emerson. *The Sadeian Woman: an exercise in cultural history*. London: Virago, 1979.

Cixous, Hélène. "Fiction and its Phantoms: A Reading of Freud's Das Unheimliche (The" Uncanny")." *New Literary History* 7.3 (1976): 525-645.

Day, Aidan. *Angela Carter: The Rational Glass*. Manchester University Press, 1998.

Ellison, David R. "Freud's "Das Unheimliche": the intricacies of textual uncanniness", *Ethics and aesthetics in European modernist literature*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Ferell, Robyn. *The Illusion of life: essays on animation*. University of Sydney, Cholodenko, Alan, ed. Power Institute of Fine Arts, 1991.

Foucault, Michael. "What is an author?" *Language, counter memory, practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard, Sherry Simon, Cornwell University Press, 1977.
   -- "The Human Science" *Order of things*, Vintage Books, 1973.

Freud, Sigmund. Das Unheimliche, in: Gesammelte Werke, Bd. ⅩⅡ.
  --*The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works*. London: Hogarth, 1955, 17.
  -- *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works*. London: Hogarth, 1953-74, 64.
   -- *Totem and taboo: Some points of agreement between the mental lives of savages and neurotics*. No. 143. WW Norton & Company, 1950.

Garber, Marjorie B. *Shakespeare"s Ghost Writers: Literature as uncanny causality,* Psychology Press, 1997.

Gamble, Sarah, and Angela Carter. "Writing from the Front Line." *Edimburgh* (1997).

Hertz, Neil. "Freud and the Sandman"*, The end of the line: essays of psychoanalysis*

and the sublime. Columbia University Press, 1985.

Higgins, Lynn A., and Brenda R. Silver, eds. *Rape and representation*. Columbia University Press, 1991.

Kang, Minsoo. *Sublime Dreams of Living Machines: The Automaton in the European Imagination*. Harvard University Press, 2011.

Kofman, Sarah. *Freud and fiction*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.

Luxon, Nancy. *Crisis of Authority: Politics, Trust, and Truth-telling in Freud and Foucault*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Loewald, Hans W. "Psychoanalysis as an art and the fantasy character of the psychoanalytic situation." *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* (1975).

Lydenberg, Robin. "Freud's Uncanny Narratives." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* (1997): 1072-1086.

Martin, Wallace. *Recent theories of narrative*. Cornell University Press, 1986.

Masschelein, Anneleen. "The concept as ghost: conceptualization of the Uncanny in late-twentieth century theory." *Mosaic: A journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature* 35.1 (2002): 53-69.

--- and Hendrik Van Gorp. *The Unconcept: the conceptualization of the Freudian uncanny in late-twentieth-century theory*. Sunny Press: New York, 2002,

Møller, Lis. ""The Sandman": The Uncanny as Problem as Reading", *The Freudian Reading: Analytical and Fictional Constructions*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.

Peach, Linden. *Angela Carter*. Basinstoke: Macmillan, 1998.

Royle, Nicholas. *The Uncanny*. Manchester University Press, 2003.

Sage, Lorna. *Angela Carter*. Northcote house, 1994.
-- Flesh and the mirror: essays on the art of Angela Carter. Virago, 1994.

Sara Mills, Lynne Pearce, Sue Spaull and Elanie Millard. *Feminist Readings/Feminists Reading*, (Hemel Hempstaed: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989).

Searle, John R. *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Vol. 626, Cambridge university press, 1969.

The return of the uncanny. Paradoxa, 1997.

Vidler, Anthony. The architectural uncanny: essays in the modern unhomely. MIT press, 1994.

Weber, Samuel. "The sideshow, or: Remarks on a canny moment." *MLN* 88.6

(1973):1102-1133.

Wright, Elizabeth. *Psychoanalytic criticism: Theory in practice*. London: Methuen, 1984.

Wyatt, Jean. "The violence of Gendering: Castration Images in Angela Carter's The Magic Toyshop, The passion of New Eve, and "Peter and the Wolf"", in Easten, Alison. ed., *Angela Carter*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).

국문초록

본고는 언캐니의 개념화 과정을 주제로 한다. 그리고 이 주제가 다음의 세 텍스트, 프로이트의 에세이 <두려운 낯설음>("Das Unheimliche"), 안젤라 카터의 『매직 토이숍』(1967)과 에. 테. 아. 호프만의 『모래 사나이』(1816)에서 어떠한 양상으로 변주되는지 검토해보고자 한다.

프로이트는 <두려운 낯설음>에서 언캐니(the uncanny)를 "오래전부터 알고 있었던 것, 오래전부터 친숙했던 것에서 출발하는 공포감의 한 특이한 변종"으로 정의한다. 이 정의는 언캐니의 개념화 과정에 가장 합당한 출발점이 되어왔다. 앤린 마슐린에 따르면, 이는 프로이트가 현재까지도 언캐니라는 개념을 전유하고 있고 더 나아가 언캐니의 실질적 창작자로 군림하고 있음을 증명한다. 하지만 프로이트 자신이 인정한 바와 같이 그의 에세이는 언캐니 개념 전체를 포괄하지 못한다.

<두려운 낯설음>에 드러난 불완전한 개념화는 그의 텍스트가 단순히 또 다른 담론에 열려 있다는 것 그 이상을 의미한다. 다시 말해, 개념화의 불완전성을 노출시키는 프로이트의 텍스트는 언캐니 전체 개념화 과정의 기반을 뒤흔들며 프로이트가 가진 작가로서의 지위마저 위협한다. 그리고 텍스트는 작

가가 한정한 의미를 넘어서서 그가 은폐하려 한 내러티브 전략을 노정한다. 본고는 바로 이 지점이 푸코가 『저자란 무엇인가?』에서 지적한 '작가-기능'과 교차한다는 점에 주목한다. 그리고 이 교차점에 놓인 '작가-기능'이 안젤라 카터의 『매직 토이숍』(1967)과 에. 테. 아. 호프만의 『모래 사나이』(1816)에서 어떻게 작용하는지 검토한다.

작가-기능의 개념을 대입하여 두 작품 속에 나타난 언캐니를 짚어보았을 때, 『매직 토이숍』의 마지막 대목은 푸코가 『저자란 무엇인가?』에서 제기하는 마지막 질문과 상응한다. 카터는 필립 삼촌의 매직 토이숍을 모두 불태움으로써 핀과 멜라니, 자울 가족, 그리고 이들의 특질들을 포괄하는 개념 언캐니가 필립의 꼭두각시 극장으로부터 벗어나게 한다. 이 때, 카터는 필립이 꼭두각시 극장에서 어떻게 불타 죽었는지에 주목하기 보다 언캐니가 필립의 통제에서 벗어난 후 멜라니와 핀이 처한 "무한한 억측"에 초점을 맞춘다. 이는 푸코가 『저자란 무엇인가?』에서 작가-기능 마저 사라진 작가/텍스트의 관계의 불안한 미래에 대하여 제기하는 "누가 말하건 무슨 상관인가?"(What matter's who's speaking?) 라는 물음과 밀접하게 맞닿아 있다.

주요어: 언캐니(uncanny), 작가-기능(author-function), 저자성, 저자의 죽음

학번: 2009-22798