CHARACTER AND PLOT: NARRATION AND THE UNCANNY IN TAYEB SALIH'S *SEASON OF MIGRATION TO THE NORTH AND* FYODOR DOSTOEVSKY'S *THE DOUBLE*

BY

SAFINA GARBA ISA
SPS/14/MEN/00044

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES, FACULTY OF ARTS AND ISLAMIC STUDIES,BAYERO UNIVERSITY KANO, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH(LITERATURE).

JUNE, 2019

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this work is the product of my own research efforts, carried out under the supervision of Professor Muhammad O. Bhadmus, and that it has not been presented elsewhere for the award of any degree. All sources have been duly acknowledged.

_____

SAFINA GARBA ISA
SPS/14/MEN/00044

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation has been examined and approved by the Department of English and Literary Studies, Bayero University Kano, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Master of Arts Degree in English (Literature)

_____ _____

Professor Muhammad O. Bhadmus **Date**
Supervisor

_____ _____

Dr. Amina Adamu **Date**
Head of Department

_____ _____

Prof. Ibrahim Bello-Kano
Internal Supervisor **Date**

_____ _____

Prof. Tenimu Abubakar
External Supervisor **Date**

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to:

my siblings - Mubarak Garba Isa, Habiba Garba Isa, Aisha Garba Isa, Abdulmumin Garba Isa, Rabiatu Garba Isa.

And to my children: Ibrahim Aliyu Ibrahim (Haneef), Talha Aliyu Ibrahim, Hajara Aliyu Ibrahim (Nouriyya), Radhia Aliyu Ibrahim (mamana). Thank you for loving me even when I was not being the best of *Ammi*. This work is as much yours as it is mine.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All thanks are due to Allah. I praise Him and thank Him and bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship but He.

The process of putting together this dissertation has been a great learning curve, and not just academically. Tremendous thanks go to my supervisor Professor Muhammad O. Bhadmus, for taking on an unruly literature enthusiast and setting her on the path to becoming a scholar. My acknowledgements also go to my internal examiner, Professor Ibrahim Bello-Kano, for the insightful critique of the work, and to Dr Raliya Abdullahi Maijama'a and Professor Mustafa Muhammad, for their encouragement and faith in me.

To my children: Haneef, Talha, Nouriyya and Nawaal. No words can express adequately my love, joy and pride in you. Thank you for your constant prayers, for putting up with my absences, and for your efforts at good behaviour. I must also acknowledge my family; my siblings, my father, my aunts, my cousins, for the prayers and words of encouragements when the going got tough, and for constantly having my back.

Acknowledgements are due also to the staff of the H.O.D's office.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This study examines, from a psychoanalytic and narratological perspective, the novels Season of Migration to the North by Sudanese writer Tayeb Salih, and The Double, by Russian writer Fyodor Dostoevsky. This combination of psychoanalysis and narratology means that the tenor of the study is post-structuralist. The analysis of the uncanny on the other hand is one which places emphasis on the author and his corollary the character. To this effect, the study explores the extent to which narrative aspects such as character and mode of narration in the two novels are subverted and or undermined by the psychoanalytic concept of the uncanny. To achieve this, the study situated the two novels as modern narratives of prose fiction, distinct, within the scope of narratives, from other forms such as the epic, myth, folktale and fairy tale, and attempted to answer questions such as: how is character constructed in the two novels, what is the mode of narration adopted in the two novels, how does the psychoanalytic concept of the uncanny undermine character and narration in the two novels and how is the uncanny as a process of return of the repressed explicated through a psychoanalytic frame of reference. The two novels chosen are suitable for this study in that they are representative of the (r)evolutionary thread of character and narration which began in narratives of prose fiction from the beginning of the nineteenth century (The Double), and resounded down to the twentieth century (Season of Migration to the North) and beyond. The study is qualitative in approach, and based on the findings from its analysis of the two novels, concludes that there is an inter-connectedness between the emergence of modern forms of characterization and narration, and the emergence of the psychoanalytic phenomena of the uncanny.

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND, CONTEXTS AND CONCEPTS

1.0 Introduction

Within the realm of literature, the uncanny exists as a quality of literature, and as a quality in literature. As a quality of literature, it finds expression in the de-familiarising mechanism of literature; its ability to make the familiar become unfamiliar through language use, that characteristic which the Russian Formalists will argue is the chief function of literature (see Royle, 2003). As a quality in literature, it traces back "historically," "structurally," and "phenomenological," to the gothic, "from forms of the marvelous (the supernatural) to those of the purely fantastic (the inexplicable) to the uncanny (the fantasmatic unconscious) (Chisholm in Wright(ed) 1996). To this effect, Jackson (1981: 64-65), states that "frightening scenes of uncanny literature are produced by hidden anxieties concealed within the subject, who then interprets the world in terms of his or her apprehension." The uncanny has to do with the return in an unfamiliar way of something that was once familiar. It is tied to the process of repression and the return of the repressed, and so also, to repetition and return. The essay 'The Uncanny' (1919), by the German psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud, although by no means original in itself, provides the pivot from which modern analysis of the concept of the uncanny takes off.

According to Freud, the uncanny "is in reality nothing new or alien, but something which is familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only through the process of repression"(The Uncanny (1919h), i7n Smith(2010: 3691)). Freud's essay in its analysis is double pronged. Taking on the one hand a linguistic approach, and on the other, relying on empirical observation, it however arrives at the conclusion in both cases, that there is a collusion in every language, of the meaning of the word uncanny –

unfamiliar, with its opposite, canny – familiar. Concentrating on the German equivalents, Freud states that the uncanny – *das unheilmich* exists at two levels of meaning. On the one hand is *das heilmich*, the canny, which un-negated and ambivalent, signifies that which is homely, familiar, friendly, cheerful, comfortable, intimate. Yet *das heilmich* also means that which is protected, concealed, from others: hidden, secreted, obscured. Thus, its negation, das unheilmich – the uncanny, serves to un-cover, expose and or reveal that which is normally kept out of sight. (Jackson 1993). Buttressing this, Zvedenuik states that:

> In its essence, Freud's discourse of the uncanny functions as a phenomenon of de-familiarisation, where the comfort of man's world turns on him and opens him up to (an)other realm of estrangement and alienation. Theoretically realised, the uncanny encompasses the return of familiar phenomena that have been estranged through the process of repression (2012:112).

Inherent in the theory of the uncanny are the duo concepts of the mirror image and the double. The mirror image expresses the dichotomy of the familiar and the unfamiliar that make up the uncanny, while the double points to the alienation, fragmentation and discord between the self (familiar) and other (unfamiliar) found in the uncanny. In line with this, Zweicherget (2010: 14) states that: "The common denominator of all uncanny phenomena appears to be repetition – the doubling of a subject of any sort, with the second instance of it occurring as a strange one. Speaking of the doubling process in his essay 'The Uncanny', Freud posits that the double

> Is marked by the fact that the subject identifies himself with someone else, so that he is in doubt as to which his self is or substitutes the extraneous self for his own…there is a doubling, dividing and interchanging of the self. And finally there is the constant recurrence of the same thing
> The Uncanny(1919h in Smith (2010: 3686).

Royle (2003) and Jackson (1993) trace the emergence of the uncanny to around the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century respectively. This corresponds roughly with the emergence of the modern character in narratives in general, and narratives of prose fiction in particular. This emergence of the modern character in turn led to experiments with modes of narrations which favored character over and above the author. Thus while narratives of ancient and classical times such as epics, sagas, myth, were content to *tell* both in terms of characterisation and narration, modern narratives insist more on *showing*. The Russian novelist Fyodor Dostoevsky for instance, following in the footsteps of writers such as Edgar Allan Poe, Franz Kafka, Mary Shelley, Elizabeth Gaskell, Charles Dickens, set a benchmark with his novel *The Double*, regarding the subversion of character and narration by psychological factors such as the uncanny and this in turn had far reaching consequences not only in literature, but in philosophy, psychology, criticism and theory. While the Sudanese writer Tayeb Salih, following in the footsteps of writers such as Gambian Yambo Ouleguem, Ghanian Ayi kwei Armah, explores in his novel *Season of Migration to the North* (from now on *Season*), what it means for an African character to be determined by factors contained within the self, and how these affect the character's perception of things and the telling of those perceptions.

In the novel *Season*, the two central characters, Mustafa Saeed and the unnamed narrator are juxtaposed to represent the familiar, homely and the unfamiliar, the strange and frightening. Mustafa Saeed is the narrator's double and alter ego, representing the unconscious desires which the narrator has repressed. Through two first person mode of narrations that form a meta-narrative whereby the first is actually an inverted repetition of the second, and a stream of consciousness method of character exposition, the reader is led into the psyches of the two characters with the resultant realization at the end of the novel that Mustafa Saeed and the narrator are manifestations of the unconscious(id) and

conscious(ego/super-ego) of the same psyche, carrying out the tug of war that is characteristic of the familiar and the unfamiliar which constitute the uncanny. While in *The Double*, the uncanny is depicted in the central character Golyadkin's ambivalence and or unstableness. The sense of the 'homely' versus the 'unhomely' characteristic of the uncanny is revealed in the character through a series of mirror images representative of Golyadikin's view of himself and reality, his view of other characters' view of him, the actual view of other characters of him, and the author's view of him. It is as though there are two persons in one skin; always, Golyadikin has two opinions of everything. And although he likes to show that he is in control of his situation, it does not take long for the reader to realize that the reverse is actually the case, that there seems to be something and or someone controlling him. The result is a process of doubling which finds its finest expression in the emergence of Golyadkin's supposed physical double.

According to Hardy, a narrative is not just

> an aesthetic invention used by artists to control, manipulate and order experience, but [it is] a primary act of mind transferred to art from life itself…For we dream in narrative, daydream, in narrative, remember, anticipate, hope, despair, believe, doubt, plan, revise, criticize, construct, gossip, learn, hate and love by narrative. In order really to live, we make up stories about ourselves and others, about the personal as well as the social past and future…(cited in Wicker, 1975: 47)

For Cobley (2001), it is the general process of representation which occurs in any human discourse. Narratives are socially and psychologically inherent in all human societies, since human beings make narratives many times a day, every day of their lives. Narratives involve the representation of a story, vis a vis the act of 'showing' and 'telling' and how these two are maximized. In her article Literary Form, Autobiography, Creative Non-fiction: Narrative Self –Fashioning in Friedrich *Nietzsche's* Ecce Homo, Abdullahi sees narrative as a

"universal tool for knowing, as well as for telling, for absorbing as well as for expressing knowledge" (2017: 75).Buttressing this, Cobley (2001), opines that a narrative is the showing and telling of lives and events and the manner or mode chosen for that purpose. A narrative then is the process of representation, which contains at the lowest level of simplification, a sequence that is narrated or told. According to the French critic, Ronald Barthes,

> (t)he narratives of the world are numberless. Narrative is first and foremost a Prodigious variety of genres, themselves distributed amongst different substances- as though any material were fit to receive man's stories. Able to be carried by articulated language, spoken or written, fixed or moving images, gestures and the ordered mixture of all these substances: narrative is present in myth, legend, fable, novella, epic, history, tragedy drama…Moreover, under this almost infinite diversity of forms, narrative is present in every age, in every place, in every society; it begins with the very history of mankind and there is nowhere nor has been a people without narrative…caring nothing for the division between good and bad literature. Narrative is international, trans-historical, transcultural: it is simply there, like life itself (1982: 251).

Going by the above postulation, a narrative could be in an oral, written or mimetic form. Thus it can be a folktale, a saga, myth, epic, novella, a short story, novel, or a film, dance, among others, all of which involve the telling of a story, and the medium of narration chosen for that purpose. Abdullahi on this, states that "narratives tell stories…in other words, not only do stories come to life solely through narratives, but most stories if they succeed…do so because they successfully control the process of storytelling." (ibid). And a story according to Cobley(2001) comprises of all the range of events which are to be depicted by a narrator; an event or sequence of events. However, what is to be narrated is not everything about the events or story, but what is chosen out of them. Consequently, Abbot (2002: 1) opines that narratives as systems of representation allow for the depiction of some events and not others.

Narratives of prose fiction on the other hand have been explained by Rimmon-Kenan to mean the narration of a succession of fictional events. As a rider to this, Wicker (1975: 33), qualifies a narrative of prose fiction as "any story that tells of something that has not in fact happened or in a way markedly different from the way it happened." Fictional narratives according to Hawthorne(2005) can be traced almost side by side with the emergence of written records. This is in line with Scholes' and Kellogs' tracing of the beginning of narratives of prose fiction to that "moment when the epic passes from oral tradition into written, and becomes the fountainhead of a new narrative literature" (1966: 57). Richards as cited in Abbot (2002), sees narrative as an instrument to think with. This is so because as constructs, narratives should not be expected to either close the issues they raise, or even close them too easily. Thus in *Season*, we find the author dispensing with chronology and subtly playing with fluid time and space elements, and "forcing the reader to become both actor and spectator in the drama taking shape" (Amyuni 1985). The end of the novel *Season* could actually also be its beginning, as rather than closing neatly, tying up the ends, what the novel does is to open up more questions, raise more issues. The same also applies to *The Double* at the end of which the character descends into madness. Yet this madness had been constantly hinted at throughout the novel so that when the protagonist finally succumbs to it, it is as though he is actually returning to a former state, giving in to something that had been all along repressed within him.

For a narrative to succeed, it has to make recourse to the plot/ story binarism which according to Abbot (2002: 17-18) is the determinant of any successful narrative. While Cobley (2001), states that since narrative comprises of all the range of events which are to be depicted by a narrator, and since these events are different and have to be put together, depicted and or represented, plot comes to serve as a chain of causation which structures together these varied events, and in essence, show how they relate to each other. Narratives of

whatever kind are characterised by their attempt to present through the framework of stories, a copy and not an exact depiction of the world. This is so because "no events in themselves can be described or represented as literal facts outside the convention of narrativity" (Bello – Kano, 2005: 71).To this effect, in order to achieve this aim of (re)presentation, the novels *Season* and *The Double* as narratives of prose fiction, make recourse to two prominent aspects of narrative which are character and mode of narration.

Character and narration are two important pillars upon which a narrative stands. Character and narration hold a narrative together. It is through the two that other aspects of a narrative such as plot, setting and themes are delineated. Through character and narration, a writer is able to bring the world of the narrative alive for it is only through them that the narrative can be accessed, its meaning, message and or intention deciphered. This is especially so since narratives are characterised by being acts of communication within which are embedded certain values and world views which they seek to propagate.

Character is central to narratives and this is especially true of narratives of prose fiction. The novel for instance, is all about character. As a form, it owes its emergence to the rise of individualism and secularism and as a narrative it is preoccupied with character in all its manifold and variegated forms. A character in a narrative of prose fiction could be a human being, an animal, humanoid creature, or an automaton. It answers the who in a narrative and influences the what of the narrative. Character, through the peculiarity of agency moves a narrative forward. And the understanding of character/characterisation can, in the words of Laird (1999:313), "come close to an understanding of how the very notion of an individual is constituted in language." Scholes and Kellogs (1966) posit that the most essential element of characterization in narratives of prose fiction from the eighteenth century onwards is the expression of "the inward life" and the earliest emergence of this in narrative literature is traced to the establishment of Christianity, with its emphasis on "the private and

personal relationship of the individual soul with God…" (Scholes and Kellogs 1966: 167). In fictional narratives, this expression of the inward life first manifested itself in Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival,* which is considered to be the first story in western European literature which shows the inner development of the hero. However, even this kind of characterization was "developmental" and differed significantly from the "chronological" which is the more mimetic, and peculiar to characters in modern narratives of prose fiction. Mimesis then, is what distinguishes characters in narratives of the 17thc onwards, from characters located in the sagas, epics and romances of earlier times. Indeed, Western literature has distinguished itself from much of the world's art, by the extent to which it has emphasized the mimetic or representational potential of its form - "[r]ealism has proved so powerful an agent in narrative art that its influence may never wholly disappear" (Scholes and Kellogs, 1971: 85). Within the evolution of modern narratives of prose fiction, this question of mimesis of a character will be dealt with in varying ways and to varying degrees, with varying results; from the practices of Defoe, Fielding, Austen and Eliot, through Gogol, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Balzac and Flaubert, to Proust, Conrad, Joyce and Woolf in European and Continental literature, and the likes of Sembene Ousman, Nurudddeen Farah, Wole Soyinka, Hamidou Kane, Tayeb Salih, Ngugi wa Thiongo, Ben Okri And Chinua Achebe in African Literature. Dostoevsky is particular in that his works represent a distillation of the best attempts of his predecessors, and also a pushing of the frontier past what had hitherto been established, in an attempt to get to the very depth of the human subject and report what is there found. And it is this thread that Tayeb Salih, almost a century later will follow in the writing of his novel *Season*, which is about the many definitions that the subject can inhabit, and how these clash and cohere.

Narration on the other hand presupposes four things: firstly, a narrator; that is the person who narrates, second, a point of view; which is the position from which the narration

takes place, third, a narrative voice, which has to do with the distance between the narrator and that which is narrated, and fourthly, the narrative time, which refers to the time frame within which the narration takes place. The narrator and the narrative voice when combined, give rise to the point of view. At the heart of the distinction between different kinds of mode of narration in modern narratives of prose fiction is the attempt to phase out the author and the authority of rendition vested on him from antiquity. This can be gleaned from Friedman's statement to the effect that "point of view provides a modus operandi for distinguishing the possible degrees of authorial extinction in narratives" (Friedman, 1955: 1167). This is further buttressed by Joseph Warren Beach's statement regarding "the outstanding feature of technique since the time of Henry James," which is that "the story shall tell itself, being conducted through the impression of the characters." And also that "the technique of the twentieth century novel is characterised mainly by the fact that the story tells itself, the story speaks for itself. The author does not apologize for his characters; he does not even tell us what they do but has them tell us, themselves. Above all, he has them tell us what they think, what they feel, what impressions beat in on their minds from the situations in which they find themselves" (cited in Friedman 1955: 1160). Wayne Booth in his *Rhetoric of Fiction*, which is considered to be a watershed in the study and analysis of modes of narration in narratives of prose fiction points out the restrictive repercussion of neatly dividing modes of narration into the three or four categories it is associated with. However, all other forms of narrations are inevitably, permutations of the three main categories.

The narrator is the personae that presents and or speaks in a narrative. According to Culler (2007), it is assumed that every story has a narrator and this narrator can either be a character inside the story, or one that stands outside the story. To this effect, Culler goes on to say, who speaks, depends on the narrative style adopted by an author and this could be a first

person narration where the narrator uses the "I" or a third person narration where the "I" is absent but in which the narrator is all-knowing.

The narrative voice is the one that addresses the readers who in turn make sense of what they read and relate the events and situations in the story in the attempt to build up a whole structure. The narrative voice then is dependent on the reader for its identification and the common ones are the omniscient or the first person narrative voice, with second person narrative voice being the less common one. The narrative as presented by the narrative voice can take different forms. Some take on the form of stories within stories, such as is found in the novel *Season*, wherein a character becomes the narrator who tells the inner story to other characters. While others adopt the epistolary style such as is found in Fieldings.*Clarissa*, and yet others take on a combination of different narrative voices as is found in *The Double* while others still, take the form of presenting their final events first and thereafter look back on the entire sequence through a system of flashback

Point of view on the other hand "stipulates whether the events of story are viewed from the perspective of a particular character, or from that of an omniscient narrator, or indeed, from some mixture of the two" (Simpson 2004: 21). Thus a core distinction in point of view theory is the distinction in a story between who tells and who sees (Simpson 2004: 27). The analysis of any narrative is underscored by an understanding of the point of view from which the story is narrated. Thus who speaks, and with what authority, is crucial in the understanding of any narrative. And it is to this effect that Scholes and Kellog state that, "the problem of point of view is narrative art's own problem, one which it does not share with lyric or dramatic literature. By definition narrative art requires a story and a story-teller. In the relationship between the teller and the tale, and that other relationship between the teller and the audience, lies the essence of narrative art" (Scholes and Kellogs 1971: 240).

1.1 A Brief on the Primary Authors

Tayeb Salih

In his 2009 obituary of Tayeb Salih, Mahjoub Jamal, in the Guardian newspaper London, states that the author was born in 1929 in the Northern Province of Sudan and also that he came from a background of small farmers and religious teachers and his original intention was to work in agriculture. However, after his studies in the University of Khartoum, he travelled to London as part of the first generation of Sudanese to be educated in Britain in preparation for the independence that was to come in the late fifties. Salih's encounter with the West was to permanently mark his fiction and his life. He began his working career with the British Broadcasting Corporation as Head of Drama in the Arabic Service. Later, he worked as Director-General of information in Qatar in the Arabian Gulf; with UNESCO in Paris, and as UNESCO's representative in Qatar. For more than ten years, Tayeb also wrote a weekly column for the London-based Arabic language newspaper *Al Majalla* in which he explored various literary themes. Thus it can be said that culturally, as well as geographically, Salih, lived astride Europe and the Arab World. Salih is consideredby many to be perhaps, the most accomplished Arab writer in Africa, and certainly, the best to come out of Sudan (Wail 2003).

Before writing *Season,* Tayeb Salih published the novella, *Ursul Zein – The Wedding of Zein,* which was made into an Arabic film that won an award at the Cannes Film Festival in 1976. In 1966, Saleh published his first novel *Mausimil Hijra Ilal Shamal,* and established himself as an Arabic writer to reckon with. The publication of the novel in English as *Season of Migration to the North* in 1969 on the other hand gained for the author immediate global acclaim and recognition. Other works by Tayeb Salih include the short stories "A Handful of Dates", "The Cypriot Man", and "Under the Doum Tree", and the yet to be translated novel, *Bandarshah*.

Wail (2003) is of the opinion that as a writer, TayebSalih drew from his experience of village communal life that is centered on people and their complex relationships. Through a rendering that is both realistic and absurdist, he transformed that humble setting into a universal stage. At different levels and with varying degrees of psychoanalytic emphasis, he tackles questions of reality and illusion, the cultural dissonance arising from the locus of perception between the Occident and the 'exotic' Orient, the ambiguities of brotherhood and a subject's responsibility to search for a middle ground between contradictions. The motifs of his works are informed chiefly by his Islamic background and his experience of both pre, and Postcolonial Africa.

Before his death, Saleh made a prize money donation that has enabled The Abdulkarim Mirghani Cultural Center in Omdurman, Sudan, to host a yearly cultural initiative that supports literary activities in Sudan. A committee of writers and academics in Sudan evaluates participating novels and selects winners. The winners are announced on the 21st of October of each year and the winning titles are published by the Abdelkarim Mirghani Cultural Center. Other awards in his honor are the Tayeb Salih Prize for Creative Writing. He was married to Julia Maclean, with whom he had three daughters.

Fyodor Dostoevsky

Dostoevsky is today considered to be not only one of the greatest of Russian writers, but one of the greatest of world writers in general. A novelist, short story writer, essayist, journalist and philosopher, his works explore human psychology in the troubled, political, social and spiritual atmosphere of 19thc Russia in particular but with a significance that is universal. His psychological penetration into the darkest recesses of the human heart, together with his uncanny moments of illumination, are seen to have had an immense influence on

20thc fiction: literary modernism, existentialism and various schools of psychology, theology and literary criticism have been profoundly shaped by his ideas.

According to Payne (1961), unlike many other Russian writers of the first part of the 19thc such as Tolstoy or Turgenev, Dostoevsky was not born into the landed gentry that enabled those writers to write from a comfortable position about their 'musings' and 'observations' of their society. The result of this lack of privilege on his style has been a certain urgency that characterizes most of his writing especially the early ones, as he had to meet deadlines for financial purposes. While on the other hand, it has affected the themes which his works have explored, of the ordinary man, the common man, the civil servant and the everyday struggle of survival. Born in Moscow, Russia, on November 11, 1821, Breger (1989), in his book *Dostoevsky:The author as Psychoanalyst*, states that the author's father was a stern, suspicious and rigid man while his mother was kindly, indulgent and cultured; a situation which perhaps accounts for Dostoevsky filling his novels with characters who seem to possess opposite extremes of temperament. Dostoevsky's early childhood was on the grounds of the Mariinsky hospital for the poor in Moscow where his father served as a surgeon in addition to running a private practice. The memories of this period of his life would later form the basis for his first literary work, *The Poor Folk.* Dostoevsky's early education was at home and it was there that he was introduced to a wide range of literature by his parents and his nanny. Around the age of thirteen, he was sent to a private school and not long after that he lost his mother. His father's death which followed some years later was shrouded in controversy. On the one hand is the official report which states the cause of the death as an apoplectic fit, while on the other is the popular belief that he was murdered by the serfs on his estate. Be as it may, the death had a profound effect on Dostoevsky as is seen in his preoccupation with murder and parricide in his two major works, *Crime and Punishment*,

and *The Brothers Karamazov* (Breger 1989:4). The psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud has explored this relationship in his essay, "Dostoevsky and Parricide" (1928).

Doestoevsky was trained to be a military engineer. However, his delicate physical constitution, coupled with his love of the arts particularly literature, made him unsuitable for a military career. His first literary work, *The Poor folk* was described as Russia's first social novel by influential Russian literary critic Vissarion Belinsky (cited in Gasperretti 1989)The success of the book enabled Dostoevsky toresign from the military and concentrate on a full time writing career. *The Double*, his second work was however, not well received and in the subsequent years after its publication, Dostoevsky's life and work were characterized by uncertainties. His work during this period was mostly experimental in different forms and subject matter and was not well received. He gambled a lot. His health deteriorated and he had more frequent episodes of epileptic attack which perhaps were aggravated by the financial strain which the failure of his works brought about. He became interested in socialism and joined the somewhat subversive Petrashevsky circle which proposed social reforms in Russia. The circle provided Dostoevsky with some form of financial aid. The activities of the Petroshevsky circle did not go unnoticed and it was not to be for long before the members of the circle were arrested on the orders of the Tsar. A number of them, including Dostoevsky were tried, found guilty and condemned to be shot by a firing squad. At the last second however, after they had been assembled at the firing ground, tied and blindfolded, a messenger arrived from the Tsar with orders of a reprieve. It turned out that the Tsar had merely intended to teach Dostoevsky and his friends a lesson with the death sentence. Dostoevsky never forgot the harrowing experience and it colored all of his depictions of encounter with death in his subsequent works.

After the commutation of the death sentence, Dostoevsky was sent to Siberia to serve four years of prison and army work and there, in horrible living conditions, he began to re-

examine his values and this led to a total change in his entire outlook on life. Upon his return from Siberia, he continued to pursue a literary career but it was not until the publication of *Notes from the Underground* that he would regain the success he had achieved with his first work. Before that, his life would be characterized by the same problems as of old: poor health, compulsive gambling and poverty, added to which would be emotional complications arising from his relationships with different women. The success of *Notes from the Underground* set his literary career back on track, and the novel marked the beginning of his best years as a writer. Approximately two years after *Notes from the Underground,* Dostoevsky published *Crime and Punishment*. Considered by many to be the most popular of his great novels perhaps due to its appeals to various levels of sophistication, the novel can be read as a serious work of art, and can also be enjoyed as an engrossing detective novel. Three more great novels were to follow *Crime and Punishment* (1866),*The Idiot* (1867), *The Possesed* (1872), and *The Brothers Karamazov* (1880). *The Brothers Karamazov* is considered to be the greatest of Dostoevsky's novels and the culmination of his life-work. Certainly, Freud ranked it as one of the greatest artistic achievements of all time. The section titled "The Legend of the Inquisitor" is considered to be one of the greatest pieces of writing in literature. Dostoevsky died on January 28th, 1881, a few months after sending the epilogue to *The Brothers Karamazov* to his publisher.

1.1.2 A Brief On the Primary Texts

Season of Migration to the North

According to Roger Allen in his book *The Arabic Novel – An Historical and Critical Introduction* (1982), "when season of migration to the North first appeared in 1967, it was greeted with wonderment by a number of distinguished literary critics", and this led to the publication of a book containing a selection of critical articles on the book and describing Salih as "the genius of the modern Arabic novel." Wail S. Hasan in his introduction to the

2008 edition of the novel states that Edward Said, the Postcolonial theorist described the novel *Season of Migration to the North* as "among the six finest novels to be published in modern Arabic literature". In 2001, the book was declared "the most important Arabic novel of the 20thc" by the Arab literary academy and it has also been adapted into a theater production in Israel. Described alternatively as an idiosyncratic novel and a prose poem, the novel has two stories that run parallel to each other, and which dovetail at the end. Season of Migration to the North is also considered to be the best rewrite of the classic European novel *Heart of Darkness* (Wail, 2003, Makdisi, 1992). It has also been related to Frantz Fanon's *Black Skin White Masks*, due to its extensive analysis of the politics of desire. After its publication in English, the novel due to its graphic sexual contents was banned in Sudan by the Sudanese government. The ban was however later lifted and today, the novel is considered to be a classic par excellence.

The Double

The Double (1846) is Dostoevsky's second work. Published within the same year as his first book *Poor Folk*, it however did not get the recognition and or acclaim which his first book garnered. Indeed, the very same celebrated Russian literary critic, Vissarion Belinsky, who had gushed accolades on *Poor Folk* was full of nothing but condemnation for *The Double* which was the first of Dostoevsky's many works that would reveal his fascination with psychological doubles. Chizhevsky (1962), Cravens (2000), and Gasperreti (1989), state that *The Double* suffered numerous attacks from the critics of the early nineteenth century due to the fact that although on the surface it seemed to preserve elements of the Natural School which was the dominant literary background of nineteenth century Realism in which it was initially published, however, underneath, it actually subverted those very tenets. As a result, with its dream like topography of madness, as well as the strangeness of its language and narration, *The Double's* deviation from the stylistics of the Natural School created a surge of

negative attention. Much of the dissatisfaction with *The Double* was as a result of its depiction of madness which critics argued was fantastic. And the fantastic,has a place only in the madhouse not in literature, and it requires the expertise of doctors not of writers.Modern criticism however situates *The Double* as a work which depicts the world of the psyche and which pre-empted later psychoanalytic discoveries notably those of Freud and Lacan. In his book *Dostoevsky After Bakhtin: Readings in Dostoevsky's Fantastic Realism*(1990), Malcom V. Jones, states that the emphasis on repetition and doubling in *The Double* belong to the motifs of the Uncanny as explicated by Freud. *The Double* is also considered to be the prototype of Dostoevsky's two great works; *Crime and Punishment and The Brothers Karamazov.*

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Character is the primary vehicle for meaning in a narrative and without character there can be no action. However, as characters move in a narrative plot, as they act and are acted upon, the meaning which they generate changes, clashes and coheres. And the factors which lead to this are as much extrinsic but preodominanatly intrinsic. This is especially true of characters in modern narratives of prose fiction where the emphasis has been more on the inner workings of the mind. Works such as Al-Halool's The Nature of the Uncanny in *Season of Migration to the North* and Breger's *Dostoevsky: The Author as Psychoanalyst,* have examined respectively, the novel *Season* and *The Double* from a psychoanalytic perspective, while others such as Bakhtin's *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* and Wail's *Ideology and the Craft of Fiction* have examined the two novels from a narratological perspective. However, to the best knowledge of this researcher, no work has been carried out involving a combination at one and the same time, of psychoanalysis and narratology in the study of the two novels. The pre-occupation of this research then, is the inter-connectedness of the psychoanalytic phenomena of the uncanny with modern forms of character and narration and thus, the

process of relationality which the uncanny exerts on character and narration as is found in the two novels under study.

1.3 Research Questions

This research intends to answer the following questions:

1. How is character constructed in the novels *Season and The Double?*
2. What are the modes of narration employed in the novels *Season* and *The Double?*
3. How are character and narration undermined by the psychoanalytic phenomena of the uncanny in the novels *Season* and *The Double?*
4. How is the uncanny, as a process of recalling the repressed, explicated through a psychoanalytic frame of reference?

1.4 Aim and Objectives

The primary aim of this work is to use a synchronization of the two theoretical frameworks psychoanalysis and narratology to demonstrate the interconnectedness of the psychoanalytic phenomena of the uncanny with modern forms of character and narration, through an analysis of the process of relationality which the uncanny exerts on character and narration in the two novels *Season* and *The Double* respectively. Objectives include:

1. To demonstrate how characters are constructed in the novels *Season* and *The Double*
2. To illustrate the mode of narration employed in the novels *Season* and *The Double*
3. To show how character and narration are undermined by the uncanny in the novels *Season* and *The Double*
4. To demonstrate how the uncanny, as a manifestation of repression, is explicated through a psychoanalytic frame of reference in the novels *Season* and *The Double*

1.5 Significance of the Study

The significance of this research lies in its attempt to make a synchronization of two theoretical farameworks- pychoanalysis and narratology, to trace the process of relationality which the psychoanalytic phenomena of the uncanny exerts on character and narration in the two texts under study. To this effect, the study is significant in that it bridges a gap which other studies on the two novels being either purely psychoanalytical or narratological have left open. The work is also significant in its attempt to juxtapose two writers from two different backgrounds, milieus and or epochs, but in whose work is found the thread of evolution of character and mode of narration that has come to characterise modern narratives today. Also, the research is significant in that despite the significant position he occupies in African literature in general, academic works such as these, on the Sudanese writer Tayeb Salih, are very scanty in Nigerian Universities and certainly in B.U.K, while on the other hand, most academic works on Dostoevsky focus on his more popular works such as *Notes From the Underground, The Brothers Karamazov, Crime and Punishment* and *The Idiot,* while ignoring *The Double* which a close study interestingly reveals to be the prototype from which the later famous works evolved.

1.6 Scope and Delimitation

This work will limit itself to the two texts, *Season* and *The Double.* It will also limit itself to two among other aspects of narrative prose fiction: character and narration. To this effect then, it will have no recourse to the other works of the authors, except perhaps, for purely intertextual allusions. The theoretical frame of analysis will be a combination of psychoanalytic literary criticism, with emphasis on Sigmund Freud's reading of the psychoanalytic phenomena of the uncanny and narratology with emphasis on narratives, characterisation and narration. However, other readings which support, buttress, and or agree with the main ones will be used where necessary. The use of secondary material will be wide

and varied, in as much as the material used suitably and validly explicates the thesis of the research.

1.7 Research Design

This work is desk oriented and will depend largely on research made in the library, based on books and journals from primary and secondary data. Supplementing the print materials will be knowledge acquired from the electronic media. Thus, the research is strictly qualitative in approach.

1.8 Theoretical Framework

A combination of two theoretical frameworks, Psychoanalytic literary criticism and Narratology, was used as tool of analysis in this research. This combination of the two theoretical frameworks was necessary so as to create the space in which is identified the relationality which the uncanny exerts on character and narration in the two novels under study. This is due to the fact that Psychoanalytic literary criticism is concerned with repressed instincts and motives which in turn affect character traits and actions. Thus through psychoanalytic literary criticism, it becomes possible to locate the uncanny as a psychoanalytic phenomena and its effects on the subject; an effect which is projected in literature either by the author, the character, the text or a combination of either two or all three. Narratology on the other hand is concerned with narratives; how they work and their component parts vis a vis story, plot, characterisation, narration, narrative time, among other things. Thus through the framework of narratology, the research was able to situate the character types and mode of narration used in the novels *Season* and *The Double*, vis a vis the different character models or approaches and different narrative modes of different schools of narratology. A combination of the two theoretical frameworks of psychoanalysis and narratology gives rise to a post-structuralist domain in which the former interrogates the latter.

According to Belsey (2002: 5), "Post-structuralism names a theory or a group of theories, concerning the relationship between human beings, the world, and the practice of making and reproducing meaning." It describes the work of a group of thinkers "who seek to vindicate the arguments "that there could be no stable conceptions of meaning, subjectivity, and *identity* (emphasis mine) because human cognition is always subject to temporal decentring and rupture. Consequently, meaning, subjectivity and identity are destabilizing both to human thought and to themselves" (Abdullahi 2017: 24). This is in line with Belsey's positing that post-structuralism challenges traditional accounts of what it is possible to know, as well as what it means to be a human being" (Belsey 2002: 6). To this effect then, in this research, the combination of psychoanalysis and narratology forged a post-structuralist domain for the location of the uncanny in the characterization and mode of narration adopted in the two novels, and how these two aspects of a narrative as given are subverted by the uncanny.

1.8.1 Psychoanalysis

From the beginning of the twentieth century, psychoanalysis has played a pivotal role in the analysis and interpretation of literary texts. Indeed, it can be said that from the time of Sigmund Freud onwards, literature and psychoanalysis have become rather like conjoined twins: sometimes naturally, sometimes forcibly. As a theory, psychoanalysis proceeds from the premise that the human subject is determined by those thoughts and ideas which are sublimated and or repressed in the unconscious. Sigmund Freud is considered to be the father of psychoanalysis and all variations of the practice whether theoretical or clinical, e.g Jungian, Lacanian, Rankian, Adlerian, Kleinian, Hornian, have his postulations as their starting point. Psychoanalys is is not *primarily* a literary practice. It was initiated as a therapeutic technique by Freud in Vienna at the end of the 19thc. However, since its

inception, its influence has extended far beyond clinical practice and has had profound effect on assumptions about art, culture, philosophy, politics and society.

In literary criticism, psychoanalysis has had a long and complex relationship to practices of reading and writing; to assumptions about the subject as a creator or consumer of literary texts. Felman(1982) on the one hand sees the relationship of psychoanalysis and literature as that of a subject – literature as a body of language to be acted upon, and object – psychoanalysis as a body of knowledge, whose competence is called upon to interpret. On the other hand, the reverse, Felman posits, can also hold true. This is further buttressed by the fact that:

> The key concepts of psychoanalysis are references to literature, using literary 'proper' names – names of fictional characters (Oedipus complex, narcissism) or of historical authors (masochism, sadism). Literature, in other words, is the language which psychoanalysis uses in order to speak of itself, in order to name it. Literature is therefore not simply outside psychoanalysis, since it motivates and inhabits the very names of its concepts, since it is the inherent reference by which psychoanalysis names itself (Felman 1982: 9).

Going by this observation then, the relationship of literature and psychoanalysis can be seen as having an uncanny, double edged facet, in which one mirrors the other. Philip (cited in Green and Lebihan 2009), substantiates this further when he points out that "at its inception, psychoanalysis had "no texts, no institutions and no rhetoric" of its own. "All it had to see itself were analogies with other forms of practice." Freud, the founding father of psychoanalysis Philip goes on to say, "had to improvise". And he did; a lot. He used analogies from other fields, notably the sciences and arts. "Something new, after all, can be compared only with ***something from the past; something already established"*** **(**emphasis mine).

According to Freud,

> The assumption that there are unconscious mental processes, the recognition of the theory of resistance and repression, the appreciation of the theory of sexuality and the Oedipus complex – these constitute the principle subject matter of psychoanalysis and the foundations of its theory (Freud 1957: 122).

To this effect then, "the psychoanalytic process relies on attaining an understanding of the operation of repression" (Green &Lebihan 2009: 148). Freud discusses the function of repression through a number of different models. At the heart of his analysis, is a conflict at work in the operation of the subject whose physical and emotional demands and desires, what Freud terms the 'pleasure principle', clash with the forces of reality that make up what Freud calls 'the reality principle'. The unconscious also known as the 'id' is the host of the pleasure principle and is constantly involved in a 'power tussle' with the ego and the super-ego, which are the enforcers of the reality principle. The unconscious according to Eagleton(2003) is a non-place which arises only as a result of the repression which takes place in the conscious. And although the conscious is constantly trying to repress the contents of the unconscious, the latter is able to redirect and reshape these concealed wishes into acceptable social activities, presenting them in the form of images or symbols in dreams or writings. Consequently, the psyche creates an opening which allows the 'reformed' materials of the unconscious to filter into the conscious. However, the situation might occur whereby the unconscious is unable to soften certain repressed feelings or ideas suitably enough for them to pass through to the conscious. The result is an internal battle which Freud termed neurosis, between the id or conscious and the ego, or unconscious.

For Freud, all artists are neurotics. However, unlike other neurotics, they are able to negotiate the outward manifestations or end results of neurosis such as madness and or self-destruction by finding a pathway to saneness in the act of creating their art. A Freudian

literary reading and or criticism then, focuses on the figure of the author and his corollary, the character. Freud provides a specimen of this kind of reading in several of his essays, notably: "The Uncanny" (1919h), 'Leonardo Da Vinci and a Memory of His Childhood'(1910c), 'The Theme of The Three Caskets' (1913f), 'Delusions and Dreams in Jensen's Gradiva' (1907a) among others.

A variation on Freudian literary criticism, one which places emphasis on the reader, is Jungian literary criticism with its emphasis on the concept of archetypes developed by the Swiss physician, psychiatrist, philosopher, and psychologist, Carl Gustav Jung. Considered the most famous of Freud's pupils, his favorite "son" and appointed successor, Jung however developed dissatisfaction with some elements of Freudian psychoanalysis, most notably the interpretation of dreams and the model of the human psyche. His seminal work *Symbols of Transformation* earned him a five year ban from the psychoanalytic community and it was during the ban that building on Freud's concept of the unconscious, he developed his own model of the human psyche which would become his most important contribution to psychology and literary criticism. For Jung, the human psyche consists of three parts: the personal conscious, the personal unconscious and the collective unconscious. The collective unconscious is the store house of archetypes which are patterns or images of repeated human experiences such as births, deaths, the seasons, motherhood, childhood and so on. And archetypes are what make readers respond to certain myths or stories in the same way; not because everyone knows or appreciates the same story but because lying deep in the collective unconscious of mankind are memories of humanity's past. In literary criticism, Northrop Frye is considered to be the primary advocate of the principles of archetypal criticism. According to Frye (cited in Bressler 2007: 151), "the archetypal symbols found within literature help to emphasize and portray the…story every author is telling."

Emphasis on the Text in psychoanalytic literary criticism is associated principally with the work of French psychoanalyst, Jacques Lacan whose work is a strikingly original attempt to "rewrite" Freudianism in ways relevant to all those concerned with the question of the human subject, its place in society and above all, its relationship to language (Eagleton 2003). Similar to Freud and Jung, Lacan too devised a three-part model of the human psyche: the imaginary order, the symbolic order and the real order. The imaginary order is the period from birth to around six months, when the subject functions primarily in the part of the psyche that is made up entirely of wishes, fantasies and images of the self. It is the preverbal stage in which the subject's image of self is constantly in a state of flux due to the inability to differentiate where one image stops and another begins. The mirror stage on the other hand is the period in which differentiation is learnt. Observing the mirror image allows the child to become aware of his/her self as separate entities. However, this mirror image of a whole and complete being is an ideal, an illusion. The final order, the real, is the phase wherein the individual comes into language. In this stage, contends Lacan, the individual's identity as a separate being is shaped by language and his psyche molded. As in Freud's model, each of Lacan's orders interacts with the other. However, unlike Freud's model, underlying Lacan's model is the assumption that language shapes and structures the individual's conscious and unconscious minds, and self -identity; an assumption that gave rise to the famous Lacanian maxim, "the unconscious is structured like a language". A Lacanian literary criticism will concern itself with identifying how the three orders are symbolically represented in a text and through this representations, examine the fragmentary nature of the self: the splintered nature of all individuals, the impossibility of the existence of a "fully integrated and psychologically whole person"(Bressler 2007: 159).

In literary criticism, a psychoanalytic reading of a text is one that considers as self - evident, the position of contradicting, unconscious mental processes and how past events can

and do affect the present. It also examines the "role of sexual and aggressive wishes in consciously and unconsciously influencing thoughts, feeling and behavior…" (Western 1985: 22). To this effect, the application of psychoanalysis as a tool of inquiry covers:

1. The author: known as psychobiography, this form of assesment uses the author's biographical information and the author's canon to theoretically construct the author's personality with all its idiosyncracies, internal and external conflicts, andn more importantly, neuroses to illuminate an author's individual works, giving rise to the latent content in the author's texts.
2. The character: this form of criticism is concerned majorly with the character, with a view to studying the various aspects of characters' mind found in an author's canon. Here, individual characters within a text become the focus.
3. The reader: here, the reader's conception of the character's personality is brought to bear on the analysis and the character's motivations and actions become more complex than simply attributing them to theh author's ideas. Believing that the author had in mind a particular personality for his characters, a characters motivations and actions are seen to be more complex than simply attributing them to the author's ideas.
4. The Text: In literary criticism, a psychoanalytic reading of a text is one that concerns itself with the text alone, outside of the author's intentions, history and presuppositions.

1.8.2 Narratology

Narratology is the study of the ways in which narratives function. It is "the theory of narratives, narrative texts, images, spectacles, events; cultural artifacts that 'tell a story'" (Bal, 1997: 3). Brooks (1984: xiv) defines it as "organized and coherent analysis of narrative structures and discourse." While for Barry (2002: 222-223), it is "the study of how narratives

make meaning, and what the basic mechanisms and procedures are which are common to all acts of story – telling." The principal value of narratology lies in its application and to this effect, the narratologist Shlomith Rimmon – Kenan, posits that it should have "a double orientation" which will on the one hand allow it "present a description of the system governing all fictional narratives," while on the other hand enabling it 'to indicate a way in which individual narratives can be studied as unique realisations of the general system" (Rimmon – Kenan 1983: 4). As a tool of analysis, narratology

1. Looks at individual narratives, seeking out the re-current structures which are found within all narratives
2. Emphasises the teller and the act of telling over and above content
3. Foregrounds action and structure in narratives.

At the heart of narratology lies the assumption of a dualism within every text: the dualism of story and plot. A basic definition of the two terms is that story is what happens and plot is how it happens. According to Green and Lebihan (2009: 64), "both story and plot are features of narrative, but the plot transforms the events by combining temporal succession with *cause* (original emphasis)." And also that: "the essential distinction is between the events that can be said to happen in 'real' time and their transformation and realization in a text" (ibid). Elaborating on this, Rimmon-Kenan states that while the story "is a succession of events," the plot on the other hand is what "undertakes their telling." To this effect, Kenan says, the plot is what is read, and "in it, the events do not necessarily appear in chronological order, the characteristics of the participants are dispersed throughout, and all the items of the narrative content are filtered through some prism or perspective ('focaliser')" (Rimmon-Kenan, 1983: 3). Buttressing this, Brooks (1984: xi), states that "plot…is the design and intention of narrative, what shapes a story and gives it a certain direction or intent of meaning." It is in the plot that the various aspects of a narrative such as characterization,

setting, theme, narrative mode are fully delineated so as to provide the development, elaboration, and embellishment that is characteristic of narratives, most especially narratives of prose fiction.

Although there are several versions of narratology, which in turn allows for its translation across diverse media, contemporary narratology however emerged from literary studies, notably the study of prose fiction and has been defined by certain concepts such as time, narration/focalization, narrative communication and narrative levels. One of the earliest typologies of narratives is that carried out by Vladimir Propp who in his Morphology of the Folktale (1968), which is an analysis of Russian folktales, states that "[t]he question of *what* a tale's dramatis personae do is an important one for the study of the tale" (Propp, 1968: 20)and also that "the function of the dramatis personae are basic components of the tale (Propp, 1968: 21). Propp goes on to propose a thirty one function model. According to him, "the functions of characters serve as stable, constant elements in a tale, independent of how and by whom they are fulfilled. They constitute the fundamental componenets of a tale" (ibid). Propp's analysis of folktales focused on the recurring elements, what he termed consonants, and the random ones, which he termed variables. His conclusion was that the actions of the characters in the tales were constant, even though the characters may be variable.

Stanzel in the 1950s, formulated a typology based on what he calls a 'Morphology of Texts', wherein he postulated three types of narratives: first person narratives, authorial narratives, and figural narratives. These narrative situations he says, are aimed at capturing the typical patterns of narrative features. A first person narrative tells a story of personal experience and is told by a narrator who is also a character in the story. On the other hand, an authorial narrative tells the story of others. Here, the narrator is not a participant in the story and reports events from a position of absolute omniscience that enables him to know everything.

While in figural narratives, events are seen through the eyes of a third person reflector character who is so covert that theorists such as Banfield (1982) claim that texts with figural narrators are actually narrator less. Later, in his *Theory of Narrative* (1984), Stanzel revised his previous typology and introduced a number of binary oppositions such as telling vs showing, teller mode vs reflector mode.

Gerard Genette is considered to be one of the leading contemporary narratologists and h*is Narrative Discourse* (1980) has set out templates which subsequent narratologists such as Prince (1982, 1987), Bal ({1985} 1997, 1999), Rimmon-Kenan ({1983} 2002), built upon. Genette's typology is significant for its particularity to the temporality of narrative as seen in his distinction between order, duration and frequency, and also for his distinction between homodiegesis and heterodiegesis that unraveled the different positions a narrator could occupy in the story world. His concept of focalization on the other hand, largely replaced the traditional terms perspective and point of view and his famous distinction between "who speaks" and "who sees" led to the development of a narratology which makes best use of discreteness and precision. In this way, Genette set himself apart from the much earlier model of Stanzel.

In *Narrative Discourse*, Genette makes use of three fundamental linguistic categories; tense, mood and vice for the analysis of narrative which he considers essentially to be a study of the relationships between "a discourse and the events it recounts (narrative/narrating). The first two, tense and mood, "operate at the level of connections between story and narratives", while the last, voice, concerns the relationships established between narrating and narrative. This in turn produces a three level analysis of a narrative text: story, which is the contents; narrative- the discourse or narrative text itself, and narrating, which is the act of producing the narrative discourse, that is, the relationship between the narrator and the narrative that is being told (Genette, 1980: 32).

Three notably influential narratologists after Stanzel and Genette whose works have also continued to shape contemporary narratology are Gerald Prince, Miek Bal, and Seymour Chatman. Prince is significant for his two important refinements of the Genettean model - the introduction of the narratee who is the text-internal figure whom the narrator addresses, and, secondly, the extensive definition of narrativehood, that is, what makes a narrative narrative, and of degrees of narrativity which refers to the well-formedness of narratives. Prince's attempt to define the basic requirements for a text to be considered a narrative has inspired major reformulations of the term and concept of narrativity in contemporary narratological studies. On the other hand, Miek Bal developed what was initially a controversial extension of Genette's focalisation theory, but which has now become accepted in mainstream narratological discourse. According to Bal, focalization properly defined requires both a focalizer and an object of focalization. She therefore distinguishes between who does the focalizing (an extradiegetic narrator, a character) and what is being focused on (the external behavior of a character or the character's mind and this corresponds to Genette's external vs. internal focalization). To this effect then, Bal rewrites Genette's model into a neat binarism of focalizors and the focalized. This then results in the introduction of a narrator-focalizor, a narrator who ''sees.'' Her second important innovation was her extension of narratology to cover film, ballet and drama.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter will be concerned with the review of the related literature on character and characterization, narration, the uncanny, and the novels *Season* and *The Double* and also critical opinions on the phenomena of the uncanny. The chapter will concentrate on a review of relevant materials and through a combination of the theoretical framework and the literature review, the premise will be established for the subsequent analysis in the chapters that will follow after this.

2.1 Character and Characterisation

In narratology, early approaches to character and characterization viewed characters solely in terms of their roles or actions in a narrative, and this means that characters are subordinated to the action or plot of a narrative and are thus termed "*actants".* Known as the actional character model or approach, it is influenced by the movement known as structuralism, which "much concerned not to define characters in terms of psychological essences," uses varying hypotheses "to define a character not as a 'being' but as a 'participant,'" and "[t]he most important…is the definition of the character according to participation in a sphere of actions, these spheres being few in number, typical and classifiable" (Barthes, 1977). The proponents of this approach range from the likes of Vladimir Propp to Tzvetan Todorov, Greimas, Roland Barthes and Gerard Genette.

Propp (1968) in his Morphology of folktales analyses characters based on seven 'spheres of actions' and designates roles to them accordingly: Villain, donor, helper, sought-for person (and her father), dispatcher, hero, false hero. Propp's character model has been proved to be applicable to modern narratives such as the novel, short story and film and Simpson (2004),

has used it to analyse the movie Harry Potter and The Philosospher's Stone by Chris Columbus, albeit with some shortcomings. The semanticist A.J Greimas (1977) on the other hand reduces Prop's seven spheres of actions categories into three pairs of opposed actants. His character model proposes to describe and classify characters in narratives not according to what they are, but what they do. This, for the semanticist is so, in as much as the characters operate within three main semantic axis: communication, desire and ordeal. This operation is ordered in the binary opposition of subject versus object, sender versus receiver, helper versus opponent and the result is that "the infinite world of characters is bound by [this] paradigmatic structure which is projected along the narrative" (Barthes 1977:106-107). Greimas sought to create a typology of general roles to which (the indefinitely many) particularised actors in narratives could be reduced. The actional approach to character and characterization has been criticized by theorists interested in fictional prose narratives based on the fact that readers do not always respond to characters in relation to the plot, and this is true even in fairy tales and myths where plot *is* important. Also, the manifestation of human consciousness peculiar to characters in modern narratives has enabled readers to try to look at aspects of characterisation which are not neccessarily manifested in characters's actions. Again, in many complex narratives, characters are engaged with, not so much in terms of their inherent actions, but in terms of their inherent qualities.

Chatman (1978), Leitch (1986) and Rimmon-Kenan (1983) on the other hand see characters in terms of their inherent qualities. Also partly structural in nature, their approach views characters in terms of a paradigm of traits. To this effect, for Chatman (1978), a character exists in a paradigmatic relationship with the plot or action which in turn is syntagmatic. To Chatman (1978), characters can be analysed based on the analysis of their routine behavior which he defines in terms of the repeated appearance of certain dynamic traits associated with a character. To this effect, for Chatman, only habitual traits are

significant in the analysis of character, and thus temporary ones are not considered. However, he does concede that variations could occur, since character traits "are not, after all, physical objects to be drawn like trees" (Chatman, 1978: 7). Leitch (1986) agrees with this, stating that in some cases, characters become indelibly stamped in the readers' mind through a subtraction rather than an addition of traits. This is especially the case in minor characters which are noticeable due to the fact that they lack certain common human traits.

Another character traits approach to character and characterization is that of Rimmon-Kenan, who sees character as a construct of traits and defines characterization in terms of a network of character traits. For Rimmon-Kenan then, the underlying question in the analysis of character is 'who does what and how?' This in turn is determined by the "textual indicators of character" of which Rimmon-Kenan identifies two: "direct definition and indirect presentation" (Rimmon- Kenan, 2002: 59-61). The first, direct definition, Rimmon-Kenan says, is the process whereby a character is introduced through descriptions both physical and otherwise, usually on the character's first appearance in a narrative. While the second, the indirect presentation comprises of action, speech, external environment as textual indicators. In this regard, characters are shown in action, and the action is mediated by the narrative either through the manipulation of narrated time or through the specification of the narrative situation ("who tells what about whom") whereby character is viewed either through an authorial characteristion which could involve implicit or explicit authorial narration, or through a figural characterization which involves a reflector-character-narrator. However, unlike Chatman who is of the opinion that only routine, persistent, habitual traits are of significance in character analysis, Rimmon-Kenan sees the possibility of a trait being implied either by "one-time(or non-routine) actions", or by "habitual ones" (Rimmon-Kenan, 2002: 61).

An extreme version of structurally oriented character approaches is the dehumanizing approach which sees characters as purely text-based constructs. To this effect, according to Weinsheimer

> As segments of a closed text, characters at most are patterns of recurrence, in motifs which are continually re-contextualised in other motifs. In semiotic criticism, characters dissolve(cited in Culpeper 2002).

Weinsheimer goes on to use one of the most famous characters of narratives of prose fiction, Jane Austen's Emma Woodhouse, to make his point: "Emma Woodhouse is not a woman nor need be described as if *it* were" (Weinsheimer, 1979: 187). The dehumanising approach has been criticized for its failure to take into cognizance the dynamics of text- reader relationship, and also reader response relationship. Culpeper (2002), on this, states that characters are words in a text only in so far as those words have no readers or listeners. Another criticism of the dehumanizing approach is based on its failure to acknowledge the *constructed* nature of characters which necessitates that a character's identity is determined by both the origin and social attributes that inform that characters action or inaction. Thus in the Emma example, it becomes impossible to neuter-alise Emma as her female gender is an undeniable part of her character for any reader.

Henry James on the other hand sees character and action or plot as being intertwined and indistinguishable in a narrative. To this effect, he postulates that a narrative is made up principally of the presentation of humans or non-humans and their actions within the narrative. This is expressed in his famous oft- quoted remark:

> What is character but the determination of incident? What is incident but the illustration of character? What is either a picture or a novel that is not of character? What else do we seek in it and find in it? It is an incident for a woman to stand up with her hand resting on a table and look out at you

> in a certain way; or if it be not an incident I think it will be hard to say what it is.

This "Jamesian" character approach is rooted in epistemology with its emphasis on consciousness and the different ways in which the subject apprehends phenomena. The concept of character proposed in such character approach is a presentation of individuality. Thus, characters are interpreted based on the actions they perform, and their identity discerned as their characters and behaviors are presented in the narrative. Also, approaches in this category lay emphasis on the reader's conception of character, based on the information made available to the reader by the narrative. In doing this, the reader fills in the gaps left by the narrative: that which the narrative leaves out about the characters, but which can be surmised based on the reader's interpretation. Again, unlike the structurally inclined character approaches, James's character approach is much concerned to define characters in terms of both psychological and environmental essences, what Culler (1997) terms the "given" and the "social". To this effect, James character model is constructed on the realistic principles that began to underscore narratives from the eighteenth century; that cleaved a distinction between ancient narratives such as the epic, saga, and myth; the progenitors of modern narratives such as the romance, the tales, and modern narratives such as the novel, the novella and the short story.

Similar to the Jamesian character approach is the humanising character approach of such critics as Mead (1990) , who states that "we recognise, understand and appreciate characters in so far as their appearances, actions, and speech reflect or refer to those of persons in real life" (Mead, 1990: 442 cited in Culpeper 2002). For Mead, characters in narratives are physically and intellectually representative of humans, and thus cannot be reduced to mere actants. Mead's and similar approaches to character aligns with the

Aristotelian idea about character which sees characters as 'people portrayed or constructed by 'mimetic artists. Also, like James, Mead recognizes the conception of readers about, and their response, to characters. In its extreme version, the humanising character approach sees characters as being actual real people and this has been criticized as been naïve by scholars such as Chatman, who states that "The text-independent life of character does not mean that their lives 'extend beyond the fictions in which they are involved'. Characters do not have 'lives'; we endow them with personality only to the extent that personality is a structure familiar to us in life and art (Chatman, 1978: 138).

Other character models or approaches include that of E.M Forster who in his *Aspects of the Novel* states that

> We may divide character into flat and round…flat characters are called types and sometimes caricatures. In their purest form, they are constructed around a single idea or quality; when there is more than one factor in them, we get the beginning of the curve towards the round…The test of a round character is whether it is capable of surprising in a convincing way. If it never surprises it is flat. If it does not convince, it is flat, pretending to be round(Forster 1977: 73, 81).

2.1.1 Mode of Narration

In his highly influential book *The Craft of Fiction* (1960 {1921}), Percy Lubbock sees narration as a matter of method which is influenced by whether a narrative is a "dramatic" narrative, a "pictorial" narrative, a "scenic" or "generalized" story, all of which are in turn influenced by the story which the writer has chosen to tell, and the manner in which he chooses to tell it. Also related to the question of narration Lubbock says, is the issue of the form or shape of the narrative. As a template for his analysis, Lubbock uses French writer Gustave Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, about which he says "it is a book that with its variety of method…and with its careful restriction of that variety…gives a good point of departure for an examination of the methods of fiction"(Lubbock, 19? 92). Lubbock then goes on to use a

different novel each for an illustration of the different forms of narration as they are found in *Madam Bovary*. To this effect, *The Craft of Fiction* presents one of the early attempts at therorising about the concepts that will come to be characterised with the question of narration in modern narratives of fiction. Lubbock himself makes mention of this in his introduction, citing the writer and critic Henry James as the one whose theoretical works provide the first serious account of the practice of narratives of modern narratives of prose fiction.

Norman Friedman on the other hand, in his essay 'Point of View in Fiction: The Development of a Critical Concept' (1955), provides an isolated and systematic study of the concept of narration in prose fiction, visa a vis point of view. His paper he says, aims to "sketch in the aesthetic background" of the concept of point of view, "its emergence as a critical tool," "outline and exemplify its basic principles," and lastly, "discuss its significance in relation to the problem of artistic technique generally." Central to Friedman's analysis is the question of showing and telling as it relates to the issue of point of view. According to Friedman, "[t]he sculptor can only show; the musician… can never tell." Literature on the other hand, "derives its very life from this conflict of showing and telling, which is basic to all its forms – and the history of its aesthetics could in parts be written, in terms of this fundamental tension, to which the particular problem of point of view in fiction is related as part to whole. " As a result of this, he says, "the writer is torn continually between the difficulty of showing what a thing is and the ease of telling how he feels about it." Friedman then goes on to trace the origin of this distinction of showing and telling from Plato, through to Joyce, and then considers "briefly the emergence of the specific application of this basic distinction to the analysis of point of view in fiction…." His 'consideration' covers an inventory of his predecessors and their works regarding point of view in fiction and they include Edith Wharton (*The Writing of Fiction*; New York and London, 1925), Henry James;

The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces), Joseph Warren Beach, Percy Lubbock (*The Craft of Fiction*). E.M Forster (*Aspects of the Novel*), Allen Tate (The Post of Observation in Fiction).

Having traced the development of point of view, Friedman then attempts "a concrete and coherent definition of its parts and their relationship", stating that "Since the problem of the narrator is adequate transmission of his story to the reader," the questions that need be asked are along the lines of:

a. Who speaks to the reader?
b. From what position?
c. What channels of information does the narrator use to convey the story to the reader?
d. What is the distance between the reader and the story?

Through the answers to these questions, Friedman identifies eight types of point of view: editorial omniscience, neutral omniscient, "I" as witness, "I" as protagonist, multiple selective omniscience, selective omniscience, the dramatic mode, the camera.

The melting pot of all analysis on narration from the beginning of the twentieth century to its middle is found in Wayne C. Booth's *Rhetoric of Fiction*. Booth's analysis on point of view and the functions of the narrator in relation to the author, text and reader is considered to be his most significant contribution to the theory and criticism of prose fiction. It brought together all the previous strands in the analysis of narration, and also provided the springboard from which later works on narration, most notably regarding point of view will be launched. As a critic, Booth was interested in works of prose fiction not as aesthetics objects in themselves, but as acts of communication; a stand which was in opposition to that of the then dominant New Critics who saw a text as "autotelic, as a structure of words independent of its context…" (Rawlings 2006: 33). To this effect, his aim in chapters six and seven of his book, in which he discusses "Types of

narration" and "The uses of Reliable Commentary" respectively, is to expound his stand against the idea that "anyone way of writing a novel can become the rule for writing all others" (ibid). To this effect, what Booth did, and what prose fiction remains indebted to him for, was the pinpointing of the finer shades that could and do exist regarding the narrator, the point of view, the narrating voice and the narrating time. Thus according to Booth, "If we think through the many narrative devices in the fiction we know, we soon come to a sense of the embarrassing inadequacy of our traditional classification of "point of view" into three or four kinds, variables only of the "person" and the degree of omniscience" (Booth, 149). To this effect, for Booth, establishing whether the story is in the first or third person and working out how much the narrator knows about the characters and events is insufficient. As a result of this, Booth introduced the dramatised and un-dramatised narrator, as a further distinction of the narrator whether first person or otherwise. According to Booth, although there are "rigorously impersonal" stories in which there is no sign of actual story-telling, however, most stories are passed through the consciousness of one or more tellers. Where such narrators are given few or no personal characteristics, "the inexperienced reader may make the mistake of thinking that the story comes to him unmediated. But no such mistake can be made from the moment that the author explicitly places a narrator into the tale, even if he is given no personal characteristics whatever" (Booth, 151). Booth calls these kinds of narrators "un-dramatised". The dramatised narrator on the other hand booth says, is one who irrespective of whether he takes part in, or has any effect on the story he is telling, is a character in his own right and to this category of the dramatised narrator, Booth adds the further distinction of "disguised narrators" who are dramatised narrators that are however not labeled by the author as narrators, and also "narrator agents" who are dramatised narrators that are the principal tellers of the story and yet also fully involved in the events. These in

turn he differentiates from dramatised narrators who are "mere observers" and do not have any "measurable effect" on the story.

Another concept which Booth introduced and which went a long way in shaping subsequent analysis of narration in works of prose fiction is that of "the implied author". This is in line with Booth's view of a work of prose fiction as an act of communication, to which effect he argues that it must resemble a message which has a sender, and at least one receiver. All three (message, sender and receiver), interact in the negotiation of meaning which is not in the message, but a result of the communication process as a whole. The implied author is the author's second self who whether or not the author is dramatised, Booth says, "Creates an implicit picture of an author who stands behind the scenes" (Booth 1961: 155), but is different from the real author of the work and also from the dramatised narrator. The concept of the implied author led Booth to the further distinction of "reliable and unreliable narrators". Like Lubbock and Henry James before him, Booth's analysis of narration is linked to issues of summary and scene, aesthetic distance, center of consciousness and dramatic irony. And like Friedman, Booth emphasized the importance of avoiding general rules and instead applying specific ones, such as how a comment, portrayed in a particular style, served or failed to serve a particular structure, shape or form.

The French narratologist Gerard Genette on the other hand is of the opinion that a third person narrator does not exist. All narratives he says, are first-person because at any time the narrator can intervene in the narrative. Thus for him, the narrating subject is always in the 'first person'. "This presence is invariant because the narrator can be in his narrative (like every subject of an enunciating in his enunciated statement) *only* in the 'first person'…"(Genette 1980: 224). Rather, Genette says, what is more important is whether the narrator is present in the narrative (homodiegetic), or absent from the narrative (heterodiegetic); a distinction which is similar to Booth's dramatised and undramatised

narrator. Genette further follows up on the Booth distinction when he distinguishes between degrees of presence in homodiegetic narrators, stating that narrators that are the main characters of the stories they tell are autodiegetic while the othersare witnesses or observers. Regarding point of view, Genette (1980: 189) based his analysis on the concept of "focalisation" which has to do with the regulation of narrative information and the subject (focaliser) through whom narrative information is presented. Thus he states that where the narrator knows more than the character does, or says more than what any of the characters knows, zero focalisation obtains. While in a situation whereby the narrator says only what a given character knows, internal focalization obtains, and lastly, when the narrator says less than the character knows, external focalization obtains. Genette further divides internal focalization into the fixed: where there is a constant, single point of view through which the reader perceives the events of the narrative; the variable: which is a shifting point of view where different episodes of the narrative are perceived by the reader through different focalisers and the multiple: the same event of a narrative repeatedly perceived by the reader through different focalisers.

One of the major points in Genette's theory is the distinction which he makes between focalization and the narrator, whom for him, is also the "voice". According to Genette most of the works on point of view preceding his have discussed the two categories under point of view, an act which he finds erroneous stating that such narrow treatment of the subjects "suffer from a regrettable confusion …between the question who is the character whose point of view orients the narrative ? And the very different question who is the narrator – or, more simply, the question who sees? And the question who speaks?" (1980: 1860). Genette's position generated a substantial amount of controversy and led to a revision of his postulation by such scholars as Bal (2009), and Rimmon – Kenan (2002).

For Bal, focalization properly defined requires both a focalizor and an object of focalization and to this effect she distinguishes between who does the focalizing (an extradiegetic narrator, a character) and what is being focused on the external behavior of a character or the character's mind – a distinction which corresponds to Genette's external vs. internal focalization. She uses the term "perspective" which she says "reflects precisely" what she means by focalisation. Thus for Bal, the distinction between Genette's zero focalization and his internal focalisation lies in the agent or subject that sees the story. (Narrator in the first, character in the second) while the difference between his internal and external focalization has less to do with the subject that sees, and more to do with the object that is seen (thoughts and emotions in the first and actions and physical appearances in the second). The result for Bal is a binary distinction that replaces Genette's model: there are two types of focalization: character-bound or internal (Genette's internal focalization) and external (Genette's zero and external focalization combined into one). Bal states further that the objects of focalisation can also like with focalization itself, be focalised either internally, what she calls imperceptible focalisation: thoughts, feelings, e.t.c, or externally, what she terms perceptible focalization (actions and appearances). Bal's influential modification of Genette's theory is an example of the re-interpretation of focalization in terms of point of view, a position which is shared by Toolan (2001), Phelan (2001), Prince (2001), Herman and Vervaeck (2004), Abbot (2008) and Margolin (2009).

2.2 The Uncanny

In his essay 'On the Psychology of the Uncanny'(1906), which is considered to be the earliest work on the phenomena of the uncanny as it relates to psychoanalysis, aesthetics and also to literature, Jenstch characterizes the uncanny as arising principally from certain forms of uncertainty or un-decidability. The word, he says, "suggests that *a lack of orientation* (original emphasis) is bound up with the impression of the un-canniness of a thing or incident." However, he finds a conceptual explanation of the uncanny as having little value and instead settles for "a working definition of the concept of the 'uncanny'" which seeks to establish "how the affective excitement of the uncanny arises in psychological terms, how the psychical conditions must be constituted so that the "uncanny" sensation emerges." The result is that Jenstch arrives at two conclusions: the uncanny arises from uncertainty and or doubt, and the uncanny is the result of the (re)occurrence in an unfamiliar manner of something that is already known.

Sigmund Freud, writing thirteen years later, would express dissatisfaction at the former, and further develop the latter. Yet, the un-decidability which Freud rejects as a defining characteristic of the uncanny is embedded in his own essay and that, together with the many other parallels that run through the two essays point to the uncanny presence of Jenstch's essay in Freud's (see on this, the chapter Freud on Jenstch in Royle 2003, and the introduction in the book *Uncanny Modernity* Collins and Jervis(ed), 2008). For Freud, the uncanny is intimately related to repression, castration and the death drive. The familiar, known, "old established" feeling characteristic of the uncanny, he says, "is tied to an "infantile complex" that has been repressed, subdued, due to the sexual nature which makes it forbidden. This in turn gives rise to the Oedipus complex, the resolution of which leads to repression (The Uncanny 1909). Using E.T.F Hoffmann's short story The Sandman, for his analysis, Freud emphasizes the motif of the gaze - eyes/seeing in the story as relating to, and

or symptomatic of the castration complex found in the uncanny. Helen Cixous on the other hand, in her essay, Fiction and its Phantoms: A reading of Freud's Das Unheilmich (the "Uncanny"), sees the phenomena of the uncanny in terms of its relationality, and as a result states that it exists only in relation to the familiar and the normal. Thus for Cixous, the uncanny refuses any re-presentation of a cohesive reality such as is found in Freud's analysis. "Unheilmich," she says, "is in fact a composite that infiltrates the interstices of the narrative and points to gaps we need to explain" (Cixous 536). Cixous sees Freud's analysis of the uncanny in The Sandman based on the castration complex as foreclosing other interpretations. For her, the text of The Sandman is appropriated by Freud in such a way that he actually re-writes the tale himself.

In her seminal book *Fantasy: the Literature of Subversion,* Rosemary Jackson states that "the uncanny is a term which has been used philosophically as well as in psychoanalytic writing, to indicate a disturbing, vacuous area" (Jackson 1993: 63). The German philosopher Martin Hedeigger, she says, "described as 'uncanny', that empty space produced by a loss of faith in divine images" (ibid). For Jackson (1993), the recognition of this uncanny region is what gave rise to the emergence of the literature of the uncanny, notably, the gothic and fantasy. Basing her analysis of the uncanny on Freud's essay 'The Uncanny', she states that there are two levels of meaning to the German term for the uncanny – *das Unheilmich,*. On the one hand is D*as Heilmich,* the un-negated version, which is ambivalent and on the first level of meaning signifies that which is "homely, familiar, friendly, cheerful, comfortable, intimate; giving a sense of being at home in the world. Its negation then, calls up the unfamiliar, uncomfortable, strange, and alien. Yet *Das Heilmich* also means that which is concealed, screened off, hidden, from others. And so, *das Unheilmich*, its negation then serves to "dis-cover, reveal, expose areas normally kept out of sight." The uncanny Jackson says, "Combines these two semantic levels" and "its signification lies precisely in this

dualism. This is so because the uncanny reveals what is hidden and by so doing, brings about "a disturbing transformation of the familiar into the unfamiliar."

Zvedenuik (2012: 113) buttresses this when he states that the "uncanny posits the notion that what was once an internal and homely sensation for the individual can, in time, become a de-familiarising harbinger of great emotional distress. And also that Freud's etymological discovery that within the canny lies the uncanny "not only destabilizes the semantic codes that exist between binary oppositions (it is strange at the same time as it is familiar) but also motions towards a deeper problem around the self."

Because the uncanny incorporates most of the tenets of psychoanalysis, it is seen by some critics to be the fulcrum upon which psychoanalysis revolves. Indeed, for Dolar(1991), the uncanny is "located at the very core of psychoanalysis." It is, he says, "the dimension where all the concepts of psychoanalysis come together, where its diverse lines of arguments form a knot." The reason for this, Dolar goes on to say, is because inherent in the theory of the uncanny is the whole gamut of psychoanalytic concepts – "repression, castration complex, Oedipus, narcissism, death drive, compulsion to repeat, anxiety, psychosis, etc." Dolar concludes that "the uncanny provides a clue to the basic project of psychoanalysis." Dolar's reading of the uncanny is in relation to the French psychoanalyst, Jacques Lacan's subversion of the Freudian Uncanny.

For Royle (2003: 1), "the uncanny is the crises of the proper. It entails a critical disturbance of what is proper (from the latin *proprius 'own')."* And is also "necessarily bound with analyzing, questioning, and even transforming what is called "everyday life…in relation to issues of sexuality, class, race, gender, age, imperialism, and colonialism…." (23). For Royle, the canny moment is always uncanny, double, besides itself; partaking of what the French Critic Jacques Derrida calls the "non-s contemporaneity with itself of the living

present" (123). To this effect, Royle sees the uncanny as repeating itself either compulsively and or comically, *returning*, again and again, existing in the maze of Freud's "maddening" essay and showing how well beyond reading it is, how inexhaustible, how difficult to contain. Thus, Royle points to how Freud's essay itself takes an uncanny dive and also to how the mechanism of the uncanny exists well beyond the instances mentioned in Freud's essay, to almost everywhere. Echoing Jackson (1993), Royle posits that the unfamiliar emerges as the uncanny double of the familiar, and also that the uncanny is everywhere yet can be found nowhere; its workings are always in evidence yet never evident. "Something comes back," he says "because it was never properly there in the first place" (2002: 84). Thus for Royle, the ucanny harbours within itself a new, different, (an)other way of seeing and to this effect he goes on to situate it within contemporary global ethics and politics vis-a vis instances such as "9/11", a date which continues to exist in the global now, well past its time and moment.

Similarly, Collins and Jervis in their introduction to the book *Uncanny Modernity* (2008), situate the uncanny within modern rhetoric's. For them, "the uncanny is an experience of disorientation, where the world in which we live suddenly seems strange, alienating or threatening," and the questions to ask regarding the uncanny have to do with its origin, the reason for its compulsion to repeat, and "could it be that the uncanny is a distinctly modern experience?" This last question they relate to the fact that although the uncanny has been a significant theme in literature from "high gothic", it is however Freud's paper on the uncanny that has become its "key cultural resource." "This paper itself," they go on to say, "led a suitably subterranean twilight existence for its first century," then staged "a dramatic return in the 1970s" becoming "widely read throughout the humanities and cultural studies on both sides of the Atlantic." And here it "converged with a second stream of influence deriving most directly from Walter Benjamin – and ultimately from Max…" This in turn was given a further twist with the publication of Derrida's Specter's of Max." (Collins and Jervis,

2008: 1). To this effect, for the duo, the uncanny is not just about animistic beliefs, but rather, "like what Max Weber called the 'disenchantment of the world', whereby the 'supernatural', as a category comes to contrast with the 'natural' in the realm of the real, object of empirical knowledge." Echoing Jenstch's line of argument Collins and Jervis state that the uncanny "suggests a fundamental *indecision* (original italics), an obscurity or uncertainty at the heart of our ontology, our sense of time, place, and history, both personal and cultural." The uncertainty of the uncanny, they go on to say, "is both unsettling, even potentially terrifying, yet also intriguing, fascinating." And that "far from being 'abnormal', it seems to testify to something fundamentally alienated, and dislocated that is pervasive within the modern experience and modern construction of selfhood." Taking this further, they tie the uncanny to such manifestations of modernity as technology, vis a vis the photo, film, telephone and computer programming.

Within an even broader context, Helen Johnson in her essay 'Can Rationality Embrace the Uncanny?: New Ways to Manage Conflict in the South Pacific.' sees the uncanny as a possible tool that could be used in the resolution and management of conflict in non-western regions. While scholars such as Paul K. Saint-Amour, in 'Bombing and the Symptom: Traumatic Earliness and the Nuclear Uncanny.' have used it to (re)think the nuclear age and its traumas.

2.3 *Season of Migration to the North*

Al-Halool (2008) is of the opinion that a sort of consensus exists among its critics that the theme of the novel *Season* "has more significance on the historical or communal level, than it has on the individual level." To this effect, the novel is considered to be a watershed in postcolonial Arabic discourse; breaking open and critically examining the long standing traditional categories of "East" and "West", "Modern" and "Traditional", "Old" and "New". And not only that, it insists also on a re-examination of the very way of life which postcolonial works of literature seek to reaffirm, and also questions the very process of re-writing of which it is also a part. This line of thought is what has informed works such as those of Wa'il (2003), Al- Makdisi (1992), Davidson (1989), Amyuni (1985). However, although not quite departing from this assumed consensus, Al-Halool(2008) sees Season from a largely psychoanalytic point of view, emphasizing most especially, the concept of the uncanny as it appears in the novel. According to him, although the novel on the surface appears to be about the character of Mustafa Saeed and his sexual conquests during his stay in England, however, through the fears which Mustafa Saeed generates in the narrator, it soon becomes obvious that the former is actually a personification of the latter's alter ego, left behind in Europe when the narrator returned home. This points to the fact that Mustafa Saeed and the narrator are actually one and the same person, and that Mustafa is actually the uncanny -that which is familiar, known, forgotten, but which returns as something strange – come to haunt the narrator. This is further augmented Al-Halool says, by the fact that although the narrator denies that Mustafa Said is an obsession with him, however, the entire novel *Season* is, "about the narrator's obsession with, and profound involvement in, Mustafa's life." This is so because "having just returned to his native village from an alien country," the narrator is anxious to repress all those feelings that remind him of the fact that his encounter with the west has marked him for life by turning him into a stranger. At first, he

resists this fact, consoling himself with all that is familiar to, and loved by him in the village. However, gradually he comes to realize that the very act of returning is not enough and that the alienation which he seeks to deny, repress, "has preceded him in the form of Mustafa Said, the product of both North and South." The result of this, Al-Halool says, is a compulsion to repeat, which is characteristic of the uncanny: "in the narrator's subconscious, Mustafa is a repressed phenomenon whose presence on the conscious level is threatening because it stirs up in him a latent compulsion to repeat his alienating experience in England" (Al-Halool 2008). To this effect, for Al-Halool, "the very uncertainty about how Mustafa ended his life if at all, lends validity to the claim that Mustafa Said is nothing but the narrator's alter ego." In conclusion, Al- Halool(2008), states that in the novel *Season*, "the intention of Tayeb Salih is to expose to the postcolonial narrator that, no matter how much he renounces it later, his anti-colonial sexual vengeance will come home to roost.." and also that, "this double exposure… serves two purposes: first to highlight that the pursuit of vengeful sexuality belongs to the colonial mentality and in the imperial metropolis; and second, to demonstrate that such pursuit is not only totally alien to the native culture but also a destructive force whose repercussions are ineluctably felt even in the postcolonial period." To this extent then, Al-Halool's reading of the novel is one which seeks to situate *Season* in its Arabic context alongside works such as Tawfik-al Hakim's *A Bird from the East,* Yahya Haqqi's *Om Hashim's Lamp* Suhayl Idris's *The Latin Quarter,* all of which deal with the subject matter of romance between males from the colonies and females from Europe.

Wail (2003) on the other hand, sees the novel *Season*, as a "dual critique of the discourse of colonialism and the Nahda," vis a vis questions of race and gender, which he says the novel achieves by pitting against one another "several contending discourses and ideologies" while at the same time revealing the "limitations, convergences, inconsistences and potentials of their respective logics." For him, *Season* embodies "the return of the

repressed" which manifested itself in "the terrible setback of 1967, of Arab reality and consciousness, beset as it was then by colonial hangover, heady pan Arabism and fateful obliviousness to the potentially catastrophic ripples within Arab society," all of which Salih's other works such as *Wedding of Zein* repressed with its utopianism. To this effect, Wail sees *Season* as a departure from Salih's other works in its use of "a web of inter-textual connections to previous Arabic and European texts" to address the issues which it tackles. The understanding that literary texts create meaning in relation to other texts has created many theories of influence and inter-textuality and these theories are genealogically traced back to Bakhtin's concept of double voicedness. Thus for Wail, *Season* through its "double-voiced inter-textuality," is a parody of "previous European and Arabic texts that thematise the cross cultural encounter between Europe on the one hand, and Africa and the Arab world on the other." Salih, Wail goes on to say, achieves this through his central characters. On the one hand is Mustafa Saeed, who benefits the village of Wad Hamid through his acquired education, yet also disrupts its patriarchal authority as a result of his influence on his wife Hosna. While on the other hand is the narrator, who despite deliberate attempts to eradicate from his consciousness his seven years of study in England finds that "he no longer shares the values or worldview of the villagers." To this effect, Wail sees *Season* as pointing to the fact that "radical social change involves necessary but difficult negotiation and holds the potential for disastrous consequences…." He also likens Salih's polemical revision of earlier Arabic novels as an attempt similar to Nigerian Chinua Achebe's in his Book *Things Fall Apart*, to counter negative representations of Africa, while at the same time showing how "certain social ills weaken a culture's resistance to foreign intrusion." Salih, Wail says, achieves this in *Season* through his castigation of "colonial discourse and its representations of Africans and Arabs," while at the same time showing how the falling apart of things in the village of Wad Hamid results from a combination of colonialism and native patriarchy. Consequently,

Wail disagrees with Makdisi(1992), stating that rather than "re-inventing the present" as the latter argues, *Season* "reveals the bankruptcy of the present and suggests that the correct conceptualisation of it lies not in the claims of western modernity and its Arab champions, nor in those of the traditionalists, but in an often painful negotiation between old and new, North and South, that erases the discourse boundaries within which each has been construed as a timeless essence." And also that "As the novel's title suggests, a constant, relentless migration that erodes the monolithic conceptions of identity and that asserts the dynamic primacy of history is the answer to the challenge of modernity."

Al Makdisi(1992), Davidson(1989), Amyuni(1985), have each, also, engaged in various ways with the questions of inter-textuality, gender and race in the novel *Season*. Amyuni (1985), in her article 'Images of Arab Women in Season of Migration to The North', broadly defines politics as "a set of stratagems designed to maintain a system of public power, and as a result sees sexual relationship in *Season* as a part of politics; the power-structured relationships within socially decayed systems. The system of guardianship in patriarchal Arab societies she says "protects women much as it does children, with the resultant effect that women are denied even the possibility of autonomy." Identifying three categories of women in *Season*, Amyuni states that "Hosna's middle position is held in tension between the old fashion people of her village, and the sexually liberated women that her husband had known in London." This means that Hosna is a no man's land, and a harbinger of things to come. Thus for Amyuni, "Tayeb Salih subtly weaves the village's voices into the fabric of Hosna's intimate life" and by so doing, 'highlights the inhumanity of the female predicament in the traditional Arab world." This predicament she goes on to say, is further worsened by the treatment which the women themselves mete out to each other as exemplified by the attitudes of Bint Majzoub, the narrator's mother and Mabrouka, towards Hosna. For Amyuni then, *Season* is a condemnation of the power-structured relationships

within the village and the world at large. And also, Hosna's “interior colonisation" echoes her country's larger successive colonisations….” To this effect, she sees the emergence of modern Sudan as being simultaneous with that of the modern Sudanese woman who is birthed “in agony and blood, through the immolation of Hosna.” This is captured in her statement that “Hosna is the precursor of the future woman of the Sudan, for she is not allowed to live her present, to live her life….Her self-sacrifice in the name of dignity and autonomy…is one of the important elements that might bring about the birth of the modern Arab woman.”

Davidson (1989) buttresses this when he posits that Hosna succeeds where her first husband Mustafa Saeed fails. Unlike Mustafa Saeed’s, Hosna’s end, Davidson opines, is not passive but active for she strikes against the brutality that Wad Rayyes represents. “She accomplishes in the village what Mustafa Saeed failed to do in London - she changes the way the village can look at the world, she affects history.” Similar to Wail (200), Davidson is of the opinion that although on the one hand Salih in *Season* “celebrates the pre-colonial culture notably in the character of the narrator, he also on the other hand “exposes its evil, just as he sees the potential benefit that comes with the British gunboats.” To this effect, for Davidson, *Season* is different from many African novels from the neocolonial period in that “it goes beyond a simple rejection of the European invasion and legacy. It offers a stunning critique of cultural segregationist moods by exposing in Sudanese culture the oppression that predated British intrusion.” This it does he says, by its use of inter-textuality and references to prominent European works, most especially, Joseph Conrad’s.

Similarly, Makdisi (1992) sees *Season* as the counter-narrative of the same bitter history which texts such as Conrad’s Heart of Darkness narrate, “of the history of modern British imperialism from a position deep within its metropolitan center.” Like Wail (2003) and Davidson (1989), Makdisi (1992), sees *Season* as contributing to, and to a significant

extent, influencing the postcolonial Arab discourse "which has long been centered on the debate between "traditionalism" and "westernism"; a debate which Makdisi posits as having "its origins in the 19thc, when the ideology of modernity…began to be imposed on Arab social formations, in many cases long before the actual arrival of the European armies." Makdisi goes on to say that "from the very beginning, this ideology had to compete with the residual(but still very powerful) ideological structures of traditionalism, and the interaction of these ideologies has shaped the whole process of modernization of Arab societies from the nineteenth century until the present day." The result of this, Makdisi contends, was a formation of different classes of intellectuals who tried to deal with the issues in different ways. On the one hand was the group which sought to elide the dichotomy between Western civilization and the Islamico-Arab civilization, claiming that the latter is immanent in the former, while on the other hand was the group that saw western civilization as being the only way for any society that sought to progress in the modern world. For this latter group, Europe became the standard "to which Arabs could aspire…" and it is this group's ideology of modernity Makdisi says, that is "at the center of the movement in the Arab world that came to be called the Nahda – literally a re-birth or re-awakening." The novel *Season*, Almakdisi posits, "shatters the very terms of this opposition and explodes the dualism developed before and during the Nahda."

Tarawneh and John(1988), taking a psychoanalytic turn similar to that of Al-Hool (2008), see the novel *Season* as a manifestation of the affinity between Salih and Freud vis-a vis "the Freudian concept of fate, the shaping influence of early childhood experiences on later development of character, the Oedipal feelings towards the mother, the nature of man's instincts, the sado-masochistic tendencies of instinctual life, fantasy and the pleasure principle as opposed to the reality principle, the sense of guilt and the need for punishment…." However, according to the duo, Salih, unlike Freud, does not subscribe to the

absolute determinism of human destiny, which the character of Mustafa Saeed, represents, but rather, argues for spiritual regeneration, human freedom, and universal love as reflected in the Narrator's moral education. Thus for Tarawneh and John (1988), although Salih makes use of most of Freud's psychoanalytic concepts, he however, subverts them in a bid to achieve his own positive moral vision which celebrates "the triumph of life, rather than the triumph over life."In the analysis of the novel *Season* in this research, the views which will be built upon will be those of Al- Halool (2002), Wail (2003) and Tarawneh and John (1988).

2.3.1 *The Double*

Rene Wellek in his introduction to the book *Dostoevsky: A Collection of Critical Essays* (1962) provides a panoramic view of the different criticisms on the works of Dostoevsky from the nineteenth century period in which they were published, to the middle of the twentieth century. Permutations of the various views give rise to categories such as the early, later, and modern criticisms and within these categories can be located further distinctions such as the Russian versus the Western, the religious/philosophical versus the political and the psychological versus the ideological.

According to Wellek, "Dostoevsky's reputation - and one main trend of criticism - was established more than a hundred years ago when Vissarion Belinsky (1811-48),still revered as the greatest Russian critic, welcomed his first novel, *Poor People* (1846), with excited praise: ""Honor and glory to the young poet whose Muse loves people in garrets and basements and tells the inhabitants of gilded palaces: 'look, they are also men, they are also your brethren."" This early criticism of Dostoevsky's works established in the nineteenth century Wellek goes on to say, continued more or less unchanged into the twentieth century, buttressed only by the religious/philosophical and political criticisms that joined its stream. However, towards the end of the nineteenth century, with the introduction of Dostoevsky's works to Western scholars, notably, French and German, the tone of criticism of his works

began to significantly change. To this effect, around the end of the 1880s, the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, “picked up a French translation of *Notes from the Underground* and immediately recognized a kindred mind: "the only psychologist from whom he had anything to learn" about the psychology of the criminal, the slave mentality, and the nature of resentment” (Wellek, 1962: 3). On the other hand, in Russia, political reviews of Dostoevsky’s works proclaimed him “as an enemy.” A distinction was made between “the "good," progressive, humanitarian Dostoevsky (up to and including Crime and Punishment),” and “the "bad," reactionary, religious Dostoevsky of the later years” (Wellek,1962: 4). “Even so sophisticated a Marxist as the Hungarian Gyorgy Lukacs,” Wellek opines, “utilize(s) a simple dichotomy between Dostoevsky's instinctive sympathies and his overt ideology, and ignore vast stretches of his work that not only carry his deepest emotional and intellectual commitments but also succeed most triumphantly as art” (ibid).

The emergence of the formalist movement led to studies on the styles and techniques of Dostevsky’s work ,and notable among these works is M Bakhtin’s *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* which Wellek criticises for what he sees as the “patently false conclusion that "all definitions and all points of view are made part of dialogue. There is no final word in the world of Dostoevsky”(Wellek 1962: 5).

Later twentieth century criticism situates Dostoevsky’s works within a predominantly psychological/psychoanalytic view, acknowledging what Wellek terms one of “the most original and seminal of Dostoevsky's characteristics…” (ibid). One of such views is that of the French scholar Andre Gide, whose *Dostoevsky* (1923) according to Wellek, emphasises Dostoevsky's psychology, ambiguity, and indeterminism, and seeks support for Gide's own central concern with human freedom, with the *acte gratuit*” (Wellek, 1962: 7).

The early criticism of *The Double* sought to situate the novella within the pre-dominant 19thc Realist/Naturalist school of literature whose aim was according to Vissarion Belinsky who was one of its major proponents, "not putting [daily representation] on a pedestal, not exaggerating…not idealizing (it) rhetorically, but giving a precise rendition of everyday life in which "the negative aspects of life give the possibility…to represent the positive sides of life with verisimilitude" (cited in Harrison, 2008). Belinsky, who at first praised *The Double* for its depiction of the "downtrodden little man", whose everyday proclivities are governed by the oppressive social hegemonies which doom their subject to a life of social alienation, soon however, condemned it for what he saw as its "misleading representations of reality", for its "fantastic colorations", which for him, constituted a break from the accurate aims of literature. Regarding *The Double*'s innovativeness in narration and language vi-a-vis its excessive use of repetition and depiction of madness, Belinsky stated that although the book has its wonderful moments, nonetheless, the same thing over and over again however wonderful, wearies and bores."

Critics such as Aksakov on the other hand see the central character in the novel as a literary kinsman of such Russian fictional characters as those of Gogol in The Overcoat and Pushkin's in *The Bronze Horseman*, characters whose existence tied up with the readers' humanitarian values. To this effect, Aksakov opines that the double is "a naked imitation of the external features of the great works of Gogol." (Cited in Gasperreti 1989). On the surface then, *The Double* seemed to uphold and or make use of elements of the Natural School genre and this, according to Gasperreti (1989), is an attempt on Dostoevsky's part to "lull readers into a false sense of security and passivity" which he says, the author does by providing the reader with ample familiar materials in terms of setting and character, capping it all with "references to a living literary tradition" that began with *The Bronze Horseman*." However, at a deeper level, the text's meaning signals something else.

In his essay “The Theme of the Double in Dostoevsky” (1962), Chizhevsky opines that “The important thing for us is to recognize that Dostoevsky's "realistically psychological" analysis is at the same time also "transcendentally psychological," "existential," and that all events and the whole pattern of his theme are always an ideological construct as well.” To this effect, his view is one that ties together the various threads of Dostoevsky criticism – realistic, fantastic, philosophical, existential, and political, in his analyses of the concept of the double in the novel *The Double* in particular, and also the rest of Dostoevsky’s works in general. According to Chizhevsky, in *The Double*, the normal is subverted, influenced by the abnormal. To this effect he states that “[from the very first pages of *The Double*, Dostoevsky insists that the meaning of the younger Golyadkin's appearance lies exclusively in the peculiar psychic "situation" of the elder Golyadkin, even though the strange event might well be explained on the plane of reality”. Chizhevsky goes on to say that although at the beginning of the novella the delusion has not yet possessed Golyadkin, yet his whole behavior, the outside manifestation of himself which is presented at first, “testifies to the pathological character of his split personality.” To this effect then, Golyadkin’s double, despite the concreteness of his reality nonetheless arises from Golyadkin’s soul, and so is psychologically conditioned. Thus, he says, Dostoevsky makes it”what matters is not the behavior of a real younger Golyadkin,

> the appearance of the double raises a question about the concreteness of man's real existence. It shows that simply "to exist" "to be" is not a sufficient condition for man's existence as an ethical individual. The problem of "stability," of the ontological "fixity" of an ethical being is the real problem of the nineteenth century; or, more accurately, the problem of the distinction of human existence from any other kind of existence, which could be defined generally and abstractly as anything specific in space and time.

This problem he posits, traces back to Kierkegaard, Hegel, Feuerbach, Bruno, and determines in certain respects, the development of Marx, and plays a central role in the philosophy of Niezstche. However, Chizhevsky goes on to say that while "there is an indubitable similarity in the problem of the existence of the individual self as it confronts these thinkers and Dostoevsky, there is still a very great difference between their points of view"

In his book*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984), the Russian scholar, theorist and critic, Mikail Bakhtin, states that he considers Dostoevsky "one of the greatest innovators in the realm of artistic form", an innovator who in Bakhtin's opinion, created a completely new type of artistic thinking. However, Bakhtin goes on to say, "literature on Dostoevsky has focused primarily on the ideological problems raised by his work" and that "while the chief distinctive features of Dostoevsky's poetics could not have gone unnoticed," however, "the fundamental innovation that this poetics represents, its organic unity within the whole of Dostoevsky's work has recieved too little elucidation in the scholarship." Critics, he says, due to the "topical acuteness of the problems which Dostoevsky's works raise, "are apt to forget that Dostoevsky is first and foremost, an artist…and not a philosopher or a publicist" (Bakhtin, 1963: 4). Bakhtin goes on to provide a review of the 20^{thc} literatures on Dostoevsky which "concern themselves with questions of Dostoevsky's poetics," and also "come closest to dealing with the basic distinguishing features of this poetics as we understand them'(Bakhtin, 1963: 9), before proceeding to present his own "thesis" vis-à-vis language, narration, character and plot.

According to Bakhtin, "Any acquaintance with the voluminous literature on Dostoevskyleaves the impression that one is dealing not with a single author artist who wrote novels and stories, but with a number of philosophical statements by several author-thinkers To this effect, Bakhtin characterizes Dostoevsky's works as polyphonic, stating that,

> In hisworks a hero appears whose voice is constructed exactly like the voice of the author himself in a novel of the usual type. A character's word about himself and his world is just as fully weighted as the author's word usually is; it is not subordinated to the character's objectified image as merely one of his characteristics, nor does it serve as amouthpiece for the author's voice. It possesses extraordinary independence in the structure of the work; it sounds,as it were, alongside the author's word and in a special way combines both with it and with the full and equally valid voices of other characters (Bakhtin, 1963: 7).

For Bakhtin, Dostoevsky's style successfully destroyed the monologic structure that had characterized the monologic structure typical of previous narratives of prose fiction, and enthroned what he calls the "dialogic" discourse. The dialogic discourse he says, has to do with "the crossing and intersection, in every element of consciousness and discourse, of two consciousness's, two points of view, two evaluations- two voices interrupting one another intra-atomically. Situating *The Double* within this discourse, Bakhtin goes on to say that this "characteristic trait of consciousness and speech… is expressed with asharpness and clarity not found in any other work of Dostoevsky's" (Bakhtin, 1984: 211).

On the other hand, Breger (1989)pinpoints two features which he says situate Dostoevsky's works as psychoanalytical. The first is "a working through process that moves across developmental levels" (Breger 1989: 4). This means that when Dostoevsky's works are read, "one sees the sort of progress from early to late stages that can be observed in a successful personal analysis" (ibid). The second he says, is Dostoevskys "awareness of the self-exploratory process" wherein the author is present as an observing ego, even in the midst of the deepest emotional chaos" (Breger 1989: 8). To this effect Breger sees the problem of *TheDouble's* central character Golyadkin, as a psychological rather than social one. For Breger, Dostoevsky's characters are actively engaged in a world where the psychoanalytic process of free association is being depicted and this profound insight into the workings of psychoanalysis, which would years later be theorized by Freud, is according to Breger one of

the major reasons for its poor reception. Breger thus in his reading of *The Double*, vis-a vis its depiction of dreams, hysteria and the unconscious, situates the novel as having been far ahead of its time.

CHAPTER THREE

CHARACTER FLUX AND FLUIDITY IN *SEASON* AND *THE DOUBLE*

3.0 Introduction

Although in the two novels under study differing character approaches are used to delineate characters and attribute to them certain qualities with which the reader is expected to identify and judge them, however, the uncanny continuously subverts and or undermines these attempt at characterization. This is so because the uncanny lies hidden, concealed within the character, is a repertoire of hidden anxieties in the character, which then influence the character's interpretation of the world. In *The Double* for instance, "a protagonist who seemed to be a reliable literary type begins to act erratically" (Gaperreti 1989). This is also true of the novel *Season*, wherein Mustafa Saeed who is seen in the village as a kind, intelligent, and selfless person turns out to actually be a killer, and the narrator who at the beginning of the novel presents himself as someone who honors and prefers the village ways reveals himself to actually loath and despise said village life.

This chapter analyses how character is constructed in the two texts under study, and also how character and characterisation are undermined by the psychoanalytic phenomena of the uncanny. In *Season*, this will be analysed in terms of "The Postcolonial Subject and the Sundered Psyche", and "Doubling, Dividing and Inter-changing of the Self; while in *The Double,* the analysis will be along the linesof "Unhomeliness and the Interruption of Character".

3.1 The Self and the Sundered Psyche in Season

In *Season,* a combination of Greima's character approach, Rimmon-Kenan's and the humanising character approach is used. The two central characters of the narrator and Mustapha Saeed are characterized in terms of Greima's first pair of opposing actants, that is,

subject versus object. This, in turn, is buttressed by Rimmon-Kenan's character traits approach, with its direct presentation and indirect definition textual indicators of character. The direct definition textual indicator is used in the case of the central character Mustapha Saeed, on the very first page of the novel where the narrator describes him as "a man of medium height, of around fifty or slightly older, his hair thick and going grey, beardless and with a moustache slightly smaller than those worn by men in the village; a handsome man" (1). And also, a few pages later, when Mustafa Saeed pays the narrator a visit, the narrator says of him that

> He was without doubt a handsome man, his forehead broad and generous, his eyebrows set well apart and forming crescent-moons above his eyes; his head with its thick greying hair was in perfect proportion to his neck and shoulders, while his nose was sharply-pointed but with hair sprouting from the nostrils. When he raised his face during the conversation and I looked at his mouth and eyes, I was aware of a strange combination of strength and weakness. His mouth was loose and his sleepy eyes gave his face a look more of beauty than of handsomeness. Though he spoke quietly his voice was clear and incisive. When his face was at rest it gained in strength; when he laughed weakness predominated. On looking at his arms I saw that they were strong, with prominent veins; his fingers none the less were long and elegant, and when one's glance reached them, after taking in his arms and hands, there was the sensation of having all of a sudden descended from a mountain into a valley (5).

> The direct definition textual indicator of character is also used in the case of Hosna, when the narrator describes her as "a slim,tallish figure, firmly built and as lithe as a length of sugar cane; while she used no henna on her feet or hands, a slight smell of perfume hung about her. Her lips were naturally dark red and her teeth strong, white and even. She had a handsome face with wide black eyes in which sadness mingled withshyness. When I greeted her I felt her hand soft and warm in mine. She was awoman of noble carriage and of a foreign type of beauty – or am I imagining something that isnot really there? A woman for whom, when I meet her, I feel a sense of hazard and constraint, so that I flee from her as as quickly as I can. (54).

The indirect definition textual indicators of character on the other hand are scattered all through the book in the case of the two central characters Mustafa Saeed and the narrator, and also other characters such as the narrators grandfather, Bint Majzoub and Wad Rayyes. The humanising character approach is used most notably in the case of the two central characters, Mustafa Saeed and the narrator, who are both representatives of the real post-colonial African subject.

Rimmon-kenan's character model is grounded and or underlined by the question *who tells what about whom?* And this question is central to the novel *Season* as a postcolonial novel, and to how the uncanny undermines character and characterisation in the novel. Inherent in the questioning *who tells what about whom,* are the parameters of authorial characterisation (explicit or implicit) and figural characterisation. The authorial characterisation is one in which the characters are narrated through the author either through a character or through an omniscient perspective, while figural characterisation is the type of characterisation wherein the characterizing subject is a character; a participating character-narrator, whose account of the narrative the reader must necessarily share. In figural characterisation, a character characterises himself, and also some other character (Jahn 2005: 59). This is seen clearly in *Season*, in the narrator's characterizing of himself and Mustafa Saeed. The character who does the characterizing in figural characterisation is known as the reflector character, that is the one through whom other characters (and by implication their actions), are portrayed and or shown. To this effect, it follows then that the perceptions which the reflector character reflects of other characters is likely to be influenced by certain factors on the part of the reflector character, notably those of the unconscious.

According to Selden et al (2005: 155), The uncanny is clearly relevant… to literary narratives… including instances of the postcolonial gothic, where the figure of the alien, or Other, proves to be the projection of a repressed inner self and unsettles notions of a unified

personality." The unnamed narrator in *Season* then, through a figural form of characterisation in which he characterises himself – self, and Mustafa Saeed – other, is enmeshed in a narrative in which there is a tug of war between the two factions of the sundered psyche of the postcolonial self which in the novel *Season*, are represented by the characters of the narrator and Mustafa Saeed.

The unnamed narrator through figural characterisation characterises himself and characterises everybody in the novel. He answers the question *who does what and how?* Sometimes, he does that through other characters, but ultimately, every character in the novel is characterized through him. Through figural characterisation, the unnamed narrator opens up the enigma that is the character of Mustafa Saeed. In the beginning he characterises Mustafa Saeed as the outsider, the other. This is apparent when in his very first description of Musafa Saeed he says of him that "he had a moustache slightly smaller than those worn by the men in the village" (). The inherent alienation of Mustafa Saeed implied by the narrator to the statement that Mustafa Saeed's moustache is different from that of the villagers, thus meaning that Mustafa Saeed could not originally be from the village, is made explicit when in their first encounter, the encounter in which Mustafa Saeed says the narrator should have studied engineering or Agriculture for they had no use in the village for the poetry which the narrator had actually studied, the narrator says, "Look at the way he says 'we' and does not include me, though he knows that this is my village and that it is he — not I — who is the stranger" (6). However, as the narrative progresses, the uncanny takes over, subverting the narrator's characterisation and it becomes apparent that in characterising Mustafa Saeed, using both the direct indicator and indirect representation textual indicators of character, the narrator is actually characterizing that aspect, part of himself, that he had repressed when he returned home, in an attempt to confirm to himself that sameness of life for which he yearns. Thus, when he speaks of the weakness that alternates with strength in the character of

Mustafa Saeed, it is as though the narrator is hinting at his own yet to be realized weakness – his inability to settle down to life in the "small village at the bend of the Nile" (1), despite his enthusiastically professed happiness to be home. The weakness which he identifies in Mustafa Saeed is a weakness lying latent within his self, the murmurations of which says that he too, could be not *this*, that he too, could be an 'o*ther'* very much like Mustafa Saeed. This is seen in the fact that in all his seven years abroad, what the narrator had cherished was not so much the reality of his village, but his idealized version of it. "I used to treasure within me" he says, "the image of this little village, seeing it wherever I went, with the eye of my *imagination.*" (49).(italics mine).His weakness then, lies in his inability to, upon his return and realizing that his village no longer was (and perhaps had never been) that idyllic picture he had imagined, accept the transformation. Instead he keeps up the refrain to himself that everything is as it had been before he left, that life in the little village at the bend of the Nile is the same and unchanged. In their essay 'The Quest for Identity: The I-Thou Imbroglio in Tayeb Salih's " Season of Migration to the North", John, Tarawneh and Tawarneh, point to the fact that the unchanged nature of the village which the narrator keeps re-iterating to himself is found more in the natural aspect of the village than in its "human milieu". However, this sameness, both in his perceived self, and in the village, for which the narrator rejoices is soon shattered and this is seen in the scene of the drinking session in Mahjoub's house where Mustafa Saeed recites "English poetry in a clear voice and with an impeccable accent." Relating his response, the narrator says:

> I tell you that had the ground suddenly split open and revealed an *afreet* standing before me, his eyes shooting out flames, I would not have been more terrified. All of a sudden there came to me the ghastly nightmarish feeling that we — the men grouped together in that room — were not a reality but merely some illusion (9).

And indeed, the uncanny *is* an *afreet* (demon, djinn)in that it is both frightening and comes upon one suddenly, and without warning. The narrator's equilibrium is shaken from hearing Mustafa Saeed recite poetry because it points to the very thing that he, the narrator would love to do, but which he has forbidden himself from doing, repressed the inclination, because his village has no need of poetry, and certainly not the poetry of the Europeans. Thus in the words of Al-Halool, "For the narrator who just recently completed his doctoral work in English poetry, the content of the poem is as stunning as it is frightenenig, and it possesses a sense of dread and foreboding…Mustafa symbolizes for the narrator his own European "ghost" or past come to haunt him in his own home village among kith and kin. This scene is foreshadowed by a previous one in which there occurs an uncanny subversion of character and characterisation. This is the scene in which Mustafa Saeed characterises the narrator, and by so doing, characterises himself. Put another way, the narrator inadvertently characterises Mustafa saeed, through the latter's attempt to characterise the former, all of which happen through the narrator's reflector- character:

> I have heard a lot about you from your family and friendsNo wonder, for I used to regard myself as the outstanding young man in thevillage. 'They said you gained a high certificate — what do you call it? A doctorate?' What do you call it? He says to me. This did not please me for I had reckoned that the ten million inhabitants of the country had all heard of my achievement. 'They say you were remarkable from childhood.' 'Not at all.' Though I spoke thus, I had in those days, if the truth be told, a rather high opinion of myself. A doctorate — that's really something (5).

The things that Mustafa Saeed says of the narrator are things that the narrator will later discover to be true of Mustafa Saeed himself. After the latter's death, the narrator will hear so

much about him from different people, he will learn too, in the course of Mustafa's narration to him, that he too had excelled academically and was possessed of a great intellectual prowess, and also that he had been "remarkable from childhood." To this effect, Mustafa Saeed becomes the very uncanny itself, the return of something familiar in an unfamiliar manner. This is also true of the questionable nature of Mustafa Saeed's death of which there is no clear evidence to show that it actually happened. If the uncanny is about repetition, the re-occurence of an incidence, then it is possible that Mustafa Said as a consciousness, merely passed through the psyche of the narrator and has moved on to other places, other consciousness.

A similar mechanism whereby the uncanny undermines character and characterisationn is found in the narrator's characterisation of Hosna, Mustafa Saeed's wife. At the first mention of her, it is said of her family by the narrator's father that it "does not care to whom it gives out its daughters in marriage"(4) implying a break with the village's given tradition, which in turn situates Hosna's family and thus Hosna herself as ano*ther* . When the narrator firstcharacterises her, she is a woman with "a handsome face with wide black eyes in which sadness mingled with shyness", and also, "a woman of noble carriage and of a foreign type of beauty."Much later however, when he remembers her, when he reminisces about her, it is as "a wild young girl climbing trees and fighting with boys," and as a child who used to swim naked with him and his friend Mahjoub, in the river. This later characterisation puts Hosna in a different light, investing her with a quality more in line with the women of Mustafa Saeed's acquaintance in London. It also foreshadows the possibility of her committing the double murders of Wad Rayyes and herself, which the earlier characterisation does not suggest. Also, in characterising Mustafa Saeed's widow, the narrator characterises his ideal woman and this is buttressed by the fact that he says of Hosna that she is the "only woman I have ever loved" (86). However, this Hosna whom the narrator

professes to love is a creation of Mustafa Saeed's. The qualities in her which the narrator admires are as a result of her contact with Mustafa Saeed, that side of himself which the narrator has repressed. This, the sundering of the psyche in which however, the 'other' re-asserts itself through the uncanny, leads to the process of doubling, dividing and interchanging of selves.

3.2 Doubling, Dividing and Interchanging of the Self in *Season*

According to Freud in 'The Uncanny', the process of doubling "is marked by the fact that the subject identifies himself with someone else, so that he is in doubt as to which his self is, or substitutes the extraneous self for his own…there is a doubling, dividing and interchanging of the self. And finally there is the constant recurrence of the same thing…"

The emergence of the motif of the double can be traced back to the German Transcendental idealist philosophy, notably the works of Hegel, Schelling and Fichte, and finds its most popular expression in the literature of Romanticism. Along these lines, Kittler opines that "the emergence of the double in the literature of classical Romanticism occurred due to the spread of literacy and the possibility of identification which the literature of Romanticism offered to its readers. Early examples of works in which the motif of the double is explored include Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship,* Hans, Christian Anderson's tale *Shadows*, Dostoevsky's *Brothers Karamazov,The Double* and Maupassant's *Le Horla*. Others include Shakespears *Comedy of Errors*, while some of the most popular works of doubling include Edgar Allan Poe's 'William Wilson', R.L Stevenson's *Dr Jekyll and Hyde* and Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Sharer*.

The German Psychoanalyst Otto Rank in his seminal study on the concept of the double- *Der Doppelganger*- which is also the first psychoanalytic study on the phenomena, states that the first stage of the development of the double is one's shadow or mirror image.

Rank in his study is concerned with the double as a cultural phenomenon and he traces the motif in collective psychology. Freud and Lacan on the other hand, building on Rank's work, will go on to theorise on the double at the level of the individual subject.

In his essay 'The Ego and the Id', Freud sees the phenomena of doubling as arising within the relationship that exists between the Ego, the Id and the Super Ego; the topographical model of the mind which he proposed in the 1920s, which forever altered the division between the conscious and the unconscious and introduced mechanisms which perform differinf tasks. However, although distinct, these topographies nonetheless overlap in some parts such that a part of the ego is located in the Id and the superego, stretching over them both. To this effect, according to Freud, the superego which he also calls the ego ideal, appears as a part of the ego, whose function has been to tone down the demands of the Id. It exercises power over the ego and also over the Id. And therein lies the ambivalent nature characteristic of the process of doubling. Building on this, Lacan situates the double within his mirror image theory, which theorises about the formation of the subject's self and is in turn influenced by the German existentialist philosopher Martin Heidegger's view of the self as self-projection and perception by others.

Lacan's mirror stage theory has to do with the subject's formation of self-consciousness and of its own self. And for this to happen Lacan argues, the child needs to see itself as it is seen by others. Thus the 'mirror' is not always necessarily, a literal image, and the double, reflection, which the child sees of itself in it forms the vehicle of ego formation. Thus by means of the 'double' reflected back at it, the subject obtains its ego and perceives itself as an autonomous and compact self- the "I". Thus, for Lacan, the ego is all at once, the result of the image of wholeness and of alienation. This is so because in that process of ego formation, the mirror-image, the reflected double, is taken for the actual self, and ends up taking the place of the self. And so, the double is representative of alienation, the self and the

other. On the one hand it "carries out the repressed desires springing from the Id", while on the other hand, "with a malevolence typical of the superego, prevents the subject from carrying out his desires…" (Mladen, 1991).

In analyzing the phenomena of doubling in the novel *Season,* one of the questions that needs be settled is regarding who it is between the unnamed narrator and Mustafa Saeed that is the double of the other. This is because in the words of Schweigert,

> There are certain characteristics which are common for most literary doubles. The doubles can usually be seen only by their subjects, and by their actions they shatter the subjects' lives. There are two ways doubles operate, andthe contradictoriness of these renders the doubles' function ambiguous. In some texts, the double realizes the subject's hidden desires and this type of double could be said to represent the Freudian "id". In other texts, however, it acts as the consciousness – the superego – preventing the corrupted subject from acting according to his desires (2010: 30).

In most works of doubling, such as Poe's William Wilson, Stevenson's Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde Dostoevsky's The Double, and Conrad's The Secret sharer, it is the first category of the double, the one which represents the Freudian Id that prevails. However, in the novel Season, a process of uncanniness seems to occur such that the narrator and Mustafa Saeed continuously alternate as each other's double vis-a vis the two categories of doubling mentioned above. If "through the fears he generates in the narrator… Mustafa is somehow the personification of the former's alter-ego which he had left behind in England, then on the other hand the narrator is Mustafa Saeed's superego in that he censures all that Mustafa has done and refuses to give in to the pleasure principle like Mustafa Saeed had done. Yet again however, going by the postulation that doubles can usually be seen only by their subjects, and by their actions they shatter the subjects' lives, we see how it is only the narrator who among all the villagers sees Mustafa Saeed the way he does, and it is only on him that Musatafa has the kind of effect that he does. This is because he it is, who has also sojourned to where

Mustafa Saeed has, both physically, and mentally. The effect which Mustafa Saeed has on the narrator is not the same as the one which he has on say Mahjoub even though Mahjoub has known Mustafa much longer before the narrator's acquaintance with him. This is so because unlike the narrator, Mahjoub's psyche is not sundered. There is no ambivalence in Mahjoub regarding where he belongs: he belongs to the village, to the land which he farms and the Nile from which he waters his crops. Thus the narrator says of him that:

> When we finished our elementary education Mahjoub had said, 'This amount of education will do me —reading, writing and arithmetic. We're farming folk like our fathers andgrandfathers. All the education a farmer wants is to be able to write letters, toread the newspapers and to know the prescribed rules for prayers. Also so that if we've got some problem we can make ourselves understood with the powers-that-be (60).

Unlike the narrator, Mahjoub has not lived with the people of the village "superficially neither loving nor hating them" (29). Also, unlike the narrator, Mahjoub has not tasted of the 'forbidden fruit', the knowledge of which the narrator has had to repress on his return in order to be the native son par excellence. Mustafa Saeed then is the narrator's double to the extent that the latter acknowledges, albeit covertly, the hidden desires lying latent in him and which Mustafa Saeed through his own European experience has fulfilled. This then explains the narrator's unrelenting interest in him. To this effect, John and Tarawneh (1986) posit that Mustafa "is the narrator's alter ego representing the dark potential within the narrator himself. However, this characterisation of Musafa as the narrator's double is subverted when the latter having followed in Mustafa's almost exact steps, refuses to give in to the pleasure principle, starting with his refusal to marry and or actually profess his infatuation to Hosna. The result is that he in turn becomes the superego which puts a check on the excesses of Mustafa Saeed, the Id. To this effect, Freud states that behind the super ego lies the dissolution of the Oedipal complex and the identification with the father who is representative of the law and or

authority. In Lacanian terms, this is the introduction of the subject to the real, the transition from the imaginary. In *Season,* this happens when the narrator chooses to live, and also, to live for others. This in turn enables him to overcome the death drive which Mustafa Saeed as his double beckons him to, through the pleasure principle.

Another instance of doubling which results from the sundering of the psyche and points to how the uncanny undermines characterisation in the novel Season is seen in the narrator's recall of the voice of Mustafa Saeed as the latter narrates his story to the former. According to Schweigert (2010), "to hear oneself speak is an uncanny experience on its own. Always, there is an element of surprise, of shock, of disgust even. Is that really me? Yet to have one's exact hidden thoughts, one's secret yearnings voiced by another, but in tones that are exactly one's own is an even more uncanny experience." Thus in *Season*, although the narrator has already characterised Mustafa saeed as the speaker of the words, yet it is through him that the words are heard, indeed, the words are *inside his* head, as is seen in various instances such as when he recollects Mustafa Saeed's letter, and when Mustafa Saeed's voice comes back to him on his visit to the latter's family in the night. To this effect, Schweigert (2010) states that when the double speaks, the voice is external, but also, internal to the body of the other, and also that "the double supplements, being both outside and inside"(2010: 40).The narrator himself captures this when he likens Mustafa Saeed to "a genie who has been released from his prison and will continue thereafter to whisper in men's ears" (33). `

The two finest instances of doubling in the novel Season are first in the scene when after Mustafa Saeed's death, the narrator meets up with a colleague and together with a white man, they discuss the person of Mustafa Saeed. After hearing an erroneous version of the life of Mustafa Saeed, vis-s vis his worldly possessions from his colleague, the narrator "without

realizing it", proclaims the truth about what Mustafa Saeed had died and left of material goods and

> "In the instant it takes for a flash of lightning to come and go I saw in the eyes of the young man sitting opposite me a patently live and tangible feeling of terror. I saw it in the fixed look of his eyes, the tremor of the eyelid, and the slackening of the lower jaw" (ibid).

The question which the colleague asks the narrator following this reaction- "are you his son?" binds the narrator in the most intimate form of doubling- the biological- to Mustafa Saeed. The concept of doubling as it relates to patronomy is one which has been used by other notable writers such as Poe in his story 'William Wilson'. In the novel *Season*, it finds its culmination towards the end of the novel when the narrator finally enters Mustafa Saeed's rectangular room. This room is a representation of both Mustafa Saeed and the narrator's psyche, and the encounter between the two is representative of the 'face-off' between the Id as represented by Mustafa Saeed and the superego, as represented by the narrator. Standing in front of the door to Mustafa Saeed's rectangular room, the narrator says: "I begin from where Mustafa Sa'eed had left off" (82). And then:

> For a long time I stood in front of the iron door. Now I am on my own: there is no escape, no place of refuge, no safeguard. Outside, my world was a wide one; now it had contracted, had withdrawn upon itself until I myself had become the world, no world existing outside of me. Where, then, were the roots that struck down into times past? Where the memories of death and life? What had happened to the caravan and to the tribe? Where had gone the trilling cries of the women at tens of weddings, where the Nile floodings, and the blowing of the wind summer and winter from north and south? Love? Love does not do this. This is hatred. Here I am, standing in Mustafa Sa'eed's house in front of the iron door, the door of the rectangular room with the triangular roof and the green windows, the key in my pocket and my adversary inside with, doubtless, a fiendish look of happiness on his face. I am the guardian, the lover, and the adversary (ibid).

He enters the room, and he is assailed by a smell that is like "an old *memory"* (ibid) (italics added). Then he strikes a match, and

> "The light exploded on my eyes and out of the darkness there emerged a frowning face with pursed lips that I knew but could not place. I moved towards it with hate in my heart. It was my adversary Mustafa Sa'eed. The face grew a neck, the neck two shoulders and a chest, then a trunk and two legs, and I found myself standing face to face with myself. This is not Mustafa Sa'eed — it's a picture of me frowning at my face from a mirror(ibid).

The doubling act is completed. He and Mustafa Saeed have become one and the same person. Significantly, it is here that he professes his love for Hosna bint Mahmoud, and also hints at his latent attraction to Jean Morris. The stage then, is set: for the final scene; his own attempt at suicide, for the double is in the words of Freud, an uncanny harbinger of death. The double is characterized ultimately by the death drive, that instinct to return to an inanimate state which is the mother's womb, the ultimate heim. Thus, like Mustafa Saeed, the narrator attempts to drown himself in the Nile which is representative of the womb in terms of its life giving nature, and also its watery quality(think, amniotic fluid). However, unlike Mustafa Saeed, the narrator thwarts the death drive, refuses to succumb to it even after having doubled in the footsteps of Mustafa Saeed right up to the manner of the latter's death. At his own point of drowning, of return to a state of inanimateness, the narrator comes to a decision:

My mind cleared and

> My relationship to the river was determined. Though floating on the water, *I was not part of it (*italics mine). I thought that if I died at that moment, I would have died asI was born — without any volition of mine. All my life I had not chosen, hadnot decided. Now I am making a decision. I choose life (103)
>
> And so he cries out, "help!" "help!" (ibid).

Within this light, the novel *Season*, subverts the concept of doubling. It subverts the death drive inherent in the double, and rather, reaffirms the possibility of life instead. While for this research, it points to the fact that in the final analysis, contrary to most opinions that see Mustafa Saeed as the double, it is the unnamed narrator who is the actual double in the novel *Season*, representing as he does, the second characteristic of the double which is the one that triumphs right to the very end.

3.3 Unhomeliness and the Interruption of Character in *The Double*

The Double is structured loosely around the structure of the Russian folktale and the underlying character approach used in character and characterisation is Propp's (1968) character model approach which subordinates characters into various "spheres of actions". To this effect, the central character Golyadkin is assigned the role of the hero, Klara Olsufyevna is the sought after person, while her father Olsufy Ivanovitch represents the sought after person's father, appearing together as they do; Golyadkin junior fills in the position of the villain and Krestyan Ivanovitch is assigned the role of the donor/helper.

According to Propp (1968: 25), "a tale usually begins with some sort of initial situation…the future hero…is simply introduced by mention of his name or indication of his status." In *The Double* the central character Golyadkin is introduced after this fashion thus:

"It was a little before eight o'clock in the morning when Yakov Petrovitch Golyadkin, atitular councillor, woke up from a long sleep" (1).And a few pages later his function is assigned when out in his carriage on the street, he meets two of his colleagues and instead of answering back to the greeting of one of them, "[o]ur hero concealed himself and did not respond" (5).All through The Double, one or the other of the thirty-one function model of the dramatis personae as outlined by Proppin his Morphology of the Folktale (1968) underscore the narrative. Thus, after the initial introduction of Golyadkin, we find him fulfilling the first

function which is that of absention from home. Golyadkin after the initial introduction is shown to get ready and leave his apartment together with his valet in a rented carriage. By carrying out this first function, the second function which is the address of an "interdiction to the hero" is also carried out. An interdiction involves the giving of an order to the hero, and in the case of Golyadkin, the interdiction is that he shall not go to Klara Olsufyevna's ball, since he has not been invited. According to Propp (1968), generally, an absentation is made first, and then an interdiction. In the case of Golyadkin, the interdiction is not explicitly stated, but only realized by the reader when Golyadkin turns up at the ball and Gerasimitch, Olsufy Ivanovitch's old butler declares that he has orders not to admit Golyadkin into the ball. The third function which is the violation of the interdiction is also implied here, for since Golyadkin is at the venue of the ball, then it follows that he had violated the interdiction of his not attending due to his not being invited.

According to Propp (1968), the point at which the interdiction is violated is the point at which a new personage, the villain, appears. And his role is "…to cause some form of misfortune, damage, or harm." In The Double, Golyadkin's insistence on gaining entrance into the ball, his subsequent embarrassing attempt to dance with Klara Olsufyvena and his resultant expulsion lead him to the confused and agitated state from which his double emerges. According to Propp (1968: 28), the villain enters the scene either on foot, is sneaked up, or flown down, e.t.c, "and begins to act." In the case of The Double, the villain arrives on foot:

> Mr. Golyadkin had hardly said or thought this when he saw a person coming towards him, belated, no doubt, like him, through some accident. An unimportant, casual incident, one might suppose, but for some unknown reason Mr. Golyadkin was troubled, even scared, and rather flurried. It was not that he was exactly afraid of some ill-intentioned man, but just that "perhaps . . . after all, who knows, this belated individual," flashed through Mr. Golyadkin's mind, "maybe he's that very thing, maybe he's the very principal thing in it, and isn't here for nothing, but is

> here with an object, crossing my path and provoking me." Possibly, however, he did not think this precisely, but only had a passing feeling of something like it — and very unpleasant. There was no time, however, for thinking and feeling. The stranger was already within two paces. Mr. Golyadkin, as he invariably did, hastened to assume a quite peculiar air, an air that expressed clearly that he, Golyadkin, kept himself to himself, that he was "all right," that the road was wide enough for all, and that he, Golyadkin, was not interfering with any one. Suddenly he stopped short as though petrified, as though struck by lightning, and quickly turned round after the figure which had only just passed him — turned as though someone had given him a tug from behind, as though the wind had turned him like a weathercock. The passer-by vanished quickly in the snowstorm. He, too, walked quickly; he was dressed like Mr. Golyadkin and, like him, too, wrapped up from head to foot, and he, too, tripped and trotted along the pavement of Fontanka with rapid little steps that suggested that he was a little scared (42).

Having arrived, Golyadkin's double "begins to act", and this he does first by presenting himself at the very department where Golyadkin works and getting himself employed, then he goes on to carry out the function of attempting "to deceive his victim (the hero) in order to take possession of him or of his belongings" Propp (1968: 29). To do this however, Propp states that the villain needs a disguise, and Golyadkin Jnr'sdisguise is in the form of a meekness of behavior which predisposes him favorably to Goyadkin Snr. Thus when the latter states rather querulously to the former after office hours that they couldn't possibly be going in the same direction (in reference to their first encounter when Golyadkin Snr had seen his double go into his house and had found him in his room, on his bed), Golyadkin Jnr answers timidly: "If I might venture to hope that you would accord me an indulgent hearing, Yakov Petrovitch . . ." (58). And when after settling themselves in Golyadkin Snr's apartment he asks, "You . . . allow me to ask you, to what am I indebted for the honour . . .?" (62).The double plays on Golyadkin's vanity and states that "Knowing your generosity and your benevolence…I have ventured to appeal to you and to beg for you . . . acquaintance and protection . . ." (ibid). The result is the fulfilling of the function whereby

"the victim submits to deception and thereby unwittingly helps his enemy" (Propp, 1968: 30). This in turn leads to the next function in which the villain causes harm or injury. Here Propp outlines varying ways in which the function is carried out and the one relevant to *The Double* is that in which the villain effects a substitution. Thus, Golyadkin Jnr, having gained Golyadkin Snr's trust, goes on to replace him in all the social circles to which the latter belongs. Regarding this function, Propp states that it is "exceptionally important, since by means of it, the actual movement of the tale is created" (Propp, 1968: 30). And indeed in The Double, we find that it is after the impersonation that the narrative gains momentum and the plot thickens as one intriguing incidence after another takes place.

However, although the central character is assigned the role of the hero, and is thus addressed through-out the narrative, Golyadkin is a hero whose heroism is arrested. His heroic character is interrupted by the uncanny so that all through the narrative, he fails to rise to the incidences of the story like a true hero. Through a sense of unhomeliness which manifests itself in the uncertainty and fear that pervade every act of Golyadkin, his role as a hero is subverted by the uncanny, so that there is a certain touch of irony to the constant refrain of "our hero" with which he is addressed through-out the narrative. This is due to the fact that the topography within which his "reality" unfolds is situated in his mind and is the topography of the uncanny; and the uncanny is "related to what is frightening – to what arouses dread and horror." But this fear is not fear in the accepted sense of the word – it is not the stuff of nightmares and ghosts. This is a fear metamorphosed from something frightening into something strangely familiar – the fundamental leitmotif underpinning Freud's "The 'Uncanny'." This uncanny fear is that which "ought to have remained secret and hidden but has come to light. The singular mark of the uncanny is that within that which is homely, lurks also equally that which is unhomely – *heilmich - unheilmich*, and this points to a problem around the self, who beyond his homely exterior, harbors the existence of an alien

presence. According to Freud, the fundamental hallmark of the uncanny is that the notion of 'home' is transformed into its opposite through the recurrence of repressed memories and impulses.

In *The Double*, the central character Golyadkin is not of a stable mind and as a result, constantly experiences a feeling of unhomeliness even within the confines of his home. The reader is first introduced to Golyadkin when the latter has awoken and he is presented as a man "not yet entirely certain if he has woken up or is still asleep, if everything around him was now actually happening or was simply a continuation of his chaotic daydreaming." And it is this sense of uncertainty that pervades the entire narrative of *The Double* and leads to the state of unhomeliness which undermines the heroic role assigned to Golyadkin. Golyadkin's entire experience is invested with uncertain fear. Not only is Golyadkin uncertain about his surroundings when he first wakes up, but when after getting ready he goes out onto the street, "a most disagreeable sensation made Mr Golyadkin shudder" (1).Subsequently, he shrinks, hides, pretends not to be himself, all in an attempt to avoid been seen by people he knows, but whom he sees as and calls enemies. Such simple and basic acts as ringing the doorbell of his doctor's house become rife with trepidation and anxiousness for Golyadkin. Every action of his is characterised by ambivalence: when Andrey Fillipovinitch, his senior officer at work, passes by in the street in his own carriage, Golyadkin is torn as to what he should do:"Bow or not? Call back or not? Recognize him or not?" This sense of uncertainty, of fear that leads to un-homeliness, is what undermines the character of Golyadkin as a hero in *The Double*. Thus, although he is given the role of the hero, and he fulfills within the narrative structure some of the functions associated with the heroic role, he is however unable to sustain this role vis a vis the uncanny which subverts his given role. To this effect, Golyadkin becomes a failed hero, a subverted and or undermined hero. This is seen clearly in his inability to fulfill the function of the hero in which "the hero and the villain join in direct

combat", which leads to the function in which "the villain is defeated". In*The Double*, when Golyadkin Snr and Golyadkin Jnr joinin combat towards the end of the narrative, it is the former who due to the fear and uncertainty characterising his person, that is defeated. Golyadkin Snr receives a letter of elopement from Klara Olsufevyna which he is not sure that he has actually received. Thus every action which he takes after the reception of the letter, until his struggle with Golyadkin Jnr at Olsufy Ivanovitch's apartment and his hiding behind the woodstack,is rife with uncertainty. Indeed, all the descriptions with which his situation is rendered are in very unheroic terms. Upon the realization that he had been discovered behind the woodstack where he was hiding, the narrator says of Golyadkin that "[our hero] would have been delighted at that moment to creep into a mouse-hole in the woodstack, and there meekly to remain, if only it had been possible" (111). The culmination of this undermining of the heroic character by the uncanny is that at the end of the novel, Golyadkin's flight, unlike that of the hero's in Propp's spheres of actions whereby the hero takes off to safety, to retrieve a desired object or beloved person , is into madness and an asylum.

CHAPTER FOUR

NARRATION AND NARRATIVITY IN SEASON AND *THE DOUBLE*

4.0 Introduction

Generally, the structure of any narrative involves the exposition, the rising action or conflict and the resolution. While the exposition is always found at the beginning, it is however in most cases, not the beginning of the narrative. Rather, it is the constituent of the plot and the ordering of events is what develops the plot. The usual order of the sequencing of events in a narrative is that of causality. Thus, a narrative gives the impression of sequence of cause and effect through its presentation of events in an orderly manner. In a narrative with a linear structure, the events are arranged chronologically while the reverse is what obtains in a non-linear narrative. The narrative could be either in a flashback or in *medias res* and is either way, accessed through narration; most notably through the point of view (narrator+ narrative voice) adopted. The analysis on narration in the two texts under study will be carried out at the level of the point of view adopted in the two texts *Season* and *The Double*, and how through the point of view, the uncanny subverts narration/ narrativity. In the novel *Season*, this will be analysed from the perspective of "Plotting, Repetition and Return: The First Person Point of View and the Increment of the Plot", while in *The Double*, the analysis will be based on "Point of View and the Narrative of the Unconscious". In both analysis, the aim will be to examine how the uncanny undermines the points of view which the texts adopt, most notably regarding the question of who sees? And who speaks?

4.1 Plotting, Repetition and Return: The First Person Point of View and the Increment of the Plot in *Season*

The novel *Season* is a first person narrative and with first person narratives, "considerations of character are intimately related to considerations of point of view" (Scholes and Kellog, 1971: 256). Two types of "I" narrations are found in Season; The "I" as witness narration of the unnamed narrator who is also the frame narrator, and the "I" as protagonist narration of Mustafa Saeed whose narration is embedded within the frame narration of the unnamed narrator. Regarding the "I" as witness, Friedman states that with him, the author hands his job completely over to another. And while the narrator remains the creation of the author, however, the latter no longer has any direct voice in the narration at all. "The Witness narrator is a character in his own right, *within* the story itself, more or less involved with the action, more or less acquainted with its chief personages, who speaks to the reader in the first person." To this effect, the reader has access to the story only through the thoughts, feelings and perceptions of the witness narrator and as a result he is said to view the story from the wandering periphery. However, the "I" witness has recourse to methods with which he supplements his somewhat 'restricted' point of view: "he can talk to the various people within the story and can get their views on matters of concern." In the novel Season, the narrator makes use of this method to piece together the story of the marriage and death of Hosna bint Mahmud and Wad Rayyes. The "I" witness "can also have interviews with the protagonist himself." The narrator in *Season* has 'encounters' with the protagonist Mustafa Saeed in which the narrator gets to know more about the latter and also about other characters and incidences which he would otherwise not have known of. Also, the "I" witness can "secure letters, diaries, and other writings which may offer glimpses of the mental states of others" (Friedman 1955: 1174). In the novel *Season*, the narrator has access to a letter from Mustafa Saeed's friend Mrs. Robinson, which sheds more light on the personality of Mustafa

Saeed, and also on Mrs. Robinson herself. He also has access to Mustafa Saeed's library and pictures which go a long way in substantiating what Mustafa Saeed had narrated to him and which he had begun to doubt. At the end of his wits, the "I" witness narrator Friedman states, "can draw inferences as to what others are feeling or thinking" (ibid). Thus in the novel *Season*, the narrator tries to imagine what the last moments of Mustafa Saeed could have been like, and also what could have driven him to kill himself. The "I" witness narrator is a homodiegetic narrator, who is present as a character in the story which he narrates. He is also a dramatised narrator who is however extradiegetic to the story in that although he is a character in his own right within the story he however does not affect the story. To this effect, the kind of focalization which the "I" witness provides is largely external due to the fact that he has "no more than ordinary access to the mental states of others" (Friedman 1955). The kind of narration which the "I" witness narrator provides is also known as first degree narration (Genette 1980).

Mustafa Saeed's narration on the other hand is an "I" as protagonist narration in which a first person narrator is centrally involved in the action. The "I" as protagonist Friedman states, "…is limited almost entirely to his thoughts, feelings and perceptions." The focalization which he provides then, is predominantly internal. In Season, Mustafa Saeed's narration is characterised by being sensual. A lot of reference is made to sensory perceptions and even external physical things are rendered through highly sensual images.

According to Makdisi in his article "The Empire Re-narrated: Season of Migration to the North and the Reinvention of the Present (1992), "season of migration sprawls not only between the past, the present and the future; it fans out through and across the different registers of textuality, narrative, form chronology and history, none of which remains stable, and each of which is wrapped up in a series of endless and constantly expanding contradictions. It shuns the straight forward narrative taken by some of Salih's earlier works

(such as *The Wedding of Zein*), and presents itself as the narrative of a vast puzzle of which it is also one small part and its reader another…." What Makdisi posits, the novel *Season* is able to achieve through the point of view which it adopts, most notably with regards to voice. Genette (1980) under his category of voice is concerned with the narrating agent – "who speaks?" and the relation between the narrating agent (narrator) and the narrative. This relation he divides into three: temporal relations, relations of subordination (levels of narrative) and person. Of the three, the last has been discussed in relation to this research under the literature review (see 2.) and the second is that which has bearing on this particular analysis. According to Genette, the relations of subordinations/levels is concerned with the different levels of narrative; the narrative within narrative, narratives that are framed or embedded. In the novel *Season*, two levels of narratives exist. On the one hand is that of the unnamed narrator and on the other is that of Mustafa Saeed. However, both narratives are seen through the unnamed narrator of the first narrative, and it is his voice that regulates the narrative vis a vis what is told, and how it is told. In the first narrative level, the narrator is telling his story to an audience, the story of how he met Mustafa Saeed, and also the story of Mustafa Saeed's story. While in the second narrative level, it is Mustafa Saeed who is doing the narrating, telling the unnamed narrator his story. This leads to the formation of a narrative and a metanarrative and also to the meandering of the plot through the alternating point of view. According to Genette (1980: 244), any event a narrative recounts, is at a diegetic level immediately higher than the level at which the narrating act producing this narrative is placed".

In the novel *Season*, the unnamed narrator in the first narrative level tells of Mustafa Saeed who is a character in that narrative level but also a narrator and character in the second narrative level. The unnamed narrator attempts to understand Mustafa Saeed at the first narrative level through an imaginative sharing of the latter's experience which is provided in

the second narrative level. This is clearly expressed by the narrator himself, who, after going through Mustafa Saeed's documents states that:

"All this whetted my imagination in an extraordinary manner." (11)

The story of Mustafa Saeed, which is a second degree narration (Genette 1980) then, becomes the outward manifestation of the inward story of the narrator. And it is at the level of this interplay of the first and second narrative levels that the uncanny asserts itself and undermines the point of view and also affects the plot.

"It was, gentlemen, after a long absence — seven years to be exact, during which time I was studying in Europe — that I returned to my people" (1).

So the unnamed narrator begins his narrative. However, a few pages later, *his* previous "perception" of his return is undermined, challenged through the realization of another return which has preceded his.

> Mustafa who? Was he one of the villagers who'd gone abroad and had now returned?
>
> My father said that Mustafa was not a local man but a stranger who had come here five years ago… (2)

Thus his own return which he had singularized in his earlier focalization is revealed to be a repetition of Mustafa Saeed's return which had happened five years ago. This process of repetition and return is what characterises the plot of the novel Season and attests to the effect of the uncanny on the narrator's point of view. Indeed, the uncanny itself is peculiarised by these processes of repetition and return, and their manifestation in the plot become proof of the existence of the uncanny in the point of view through which the plot is accessed. This is seen in the manner in which Mustafa Saeed's narrative as it is heard and *re*-imagined by the narrator breaks through the narrative *topos* and presents itself in the first narrative level-like

something that had been repressed, bounded, but which has now broken free. According to Malpas and Wake (2008: 24), "the co-existence of different narrative levels manifests itself in the appearance of the narrating voice..." thus the narrator says, "

"But I would hope you will not entertain the idea, dear sirs, that Mustafa Sa'eed had become an obsession that was ever with me in my comings and goings" (37). And also,

> As for me, I am sometimes seized by the feeling which came over methat night when, suddenly and without my being at all prepared for it, I had heard him quoting English poetry a drink in his hand, his body buried deep in his chair, his legs outstretched, the light reflected on his face, his eyes, it seemed to me, abstractedly wandering towards the horizon deep within himself and with darkness all around us outside as though satanic forces were combining to strangle the lamplight. Occasionally the disturbing thought occurs to me that Mustafa Sa'eed never happened, that he was in fact a lie, a phantom, a dream or a nightmare that had come to the people of that village one suffocatingly dark night, and when they opened their eyes to the sunlight the was nowhere to be seen (27).

This narrative voice is markedly different from that of Mustafa Saeed's which in the second narrative level does not openly address the reader and or listener.

4.2 Point of View and the Narration of the Unconscious in *The Double*

Bakhtin in his book *The Problem of Dostoevsky's Poetics* opines that Dostoevsky is the creator of the polyphonic novel which was a fundamentally new novelistic genre that set his works apart. In Dostoevsky's works, Bakhtin goes on to say,

> A hero appears whose voice is constructed exactly like the voice of the author himself in a novel of the usual type. A character's word about himself and his world is just as fully weighted as the author's word usually is; it is not subordinated to the character's objectified image as merely one of his characteristics, nor does it serve as a mouthpiece for the author's voice. It possesses extraordinary independence in the structure of the work; it sounds, as it were, alongside the author's word and in a special way combines both with it and with the full and equally valid voices of other characters (1984: 4).

To this effect, two kinds of narratorial points of views are identified in *The Double*. On the one hand is the neutral omniscient point of view wherein according to Friedman (1955: 1172), "the author speaks impersonally in the third person."In this point of view, the narrator is a heterodiegetic narrator, who is situated extradiegetically from the text, and the focalization is predominantly external. On the other hand is the selective omniscient narrative point of view in which the story comes directly through the mind of a single character who is "at the fixed center" (Friedman, 1955: 1176). Here, the narrator is homodiegetic and the focalization is internal.

According to Bakhtin (1984), for Dostoevsky, the character of the hero as it appears in his works is of interest to him as a particular point of view on the world and on oneself, as the position enabling a person to interpret and evaluate his own self and his surrounding reality. What is important to Dostoevsky is not how his hero appears in the world but first and foremost how the world appears to his hero, and how the hero appears to himself. This in turn forms an important and necessary feature of the way a fictional character is seen. Thus the hero, "as a point of view, as an opinion on the world and on himself, requires utterly special methods of discovery and artistic characterization." This is so because "what must be discovered and characterised …is not the specific existence of the hero, not his fixed image, but the sum total of his consciousness and self- consciousness and ultimately the hero's final word on himself and on his world" Bakhtin goes on to say that the author maintains as his own view, "not a single essential definition, not a single trait, not the smallest feature of the hero", entering it all as he does "into the field of vision of the hero himself." casting it all into "the crucible of the hero's own self- consciousness" ((Bakhtin 1984: 48-49). Thus in the novel *The Double*, Dostoevsky merges the two forms of views to give the impression of one. He creates a polyphony of voices in which the narrators and the characters interweave and

mesh into one. *The Double* opens with an objective third person voice – a form of camera eye –

"[i]t was a little before eight o'clock in the morning when Titular Counsellor Yakov Petrovich Golyadkin awoke after a long sleep" (1). However, a little further down the passage, the point of view shifts almost imperceptibly: "Soon Mr Golyadkin's senses began to take in more clearly and distinctly their normal, everyday impressions" (ibid).

The narrator essays into Golyadkin's gaze, and we find that throughout the story it is almost impossible to pinpoint the exact moment where the narrator's speech ends and Golyadkin's begin. Thus Bakhtin (1984), states that Dostoevsky transferred the author and the narrator, with all their accumulated points of view and with the descriptions, characterizations,and definitions of the hero provided by them, into the field of vision of the hero himself, thus transforming the finalized and integral reality of the hero into the material of the hero's own self-consciousness.And not only the reality of the hero himself, but even the external world and the everyday life surrounding him are drawn into the process of self-awareness, are transferred from the author's to the hero'sfield of vision.

In *The Double* this is achieved through the spatial and temporal co-ordinates from which the narration is conducted. The author/narrator's position and the central character's positon all merge into one and the narration is carried out from Golyadkin's point of view. Thus although it is the author that introduces the character, however, immediately after the 'introductions', Golyadkin's view takes over, and everything that the reader sees or hears, is what Golyadkin sees or hears. And even when the author intrudes, he does so not to say what he sees or thinks but to think and see along with the character. This is seen not long after the story begins, when:

> … Mr. Golyadkin's senses began more clearly and more distinctly to receive their habitual and everyday impressions. The dirty green, smoke-begrimed, dusty walls of his little room, with the mahogany chest of drawers and chairs, the table painted red, the sofa covered with American leather of a reddish colour with little green flowers on it, and the clothes taken off in haste overnight and flung in a crumpled heap on the sofa, looked at him familiarly. At last the damp autumn day, muggy and dirty, peeped into the room through the dingy window pane with such a hostile, sour grimace that Mr. Golyadkin could not possibly doubt that he was not in the land of Nod, but in the city of Petersburg, in his own flat on the fourth storey of a huge block of buildings in Shestilavotchny Street (3).

At the time of the writing of *The Double*, the stream of consciousness technique as it would be used in the modernist sense was far-off from coming into practice. However, its seeds, early forms can be seen in *The Double*, most notably in its use of Free Indirect Speech and the minimizing of indication of change of setting. Indeed Cravens (2000), is of the opinion thatat first glance, Dostoevsky's novel appears to be a standard third-person narrated novel in which an external narrator relates the words, thoughts, and actions of the protagonist, but that a closer examinationhowever, reveals that the narrator narrates only Golyadkin's thoughts and actions, and that the actions of other characters are apprehended only when they appear in Golyadkin's vicinity. Furthermore, the narrator speaks with the words, accents, and intonations of Golyadkin himself.This is in line with Friedman's description of the selective omniscience point of view as one wherein the story comes directly through the minds of the characters. The appearance of the characters, what they do and say, the setting – all the story materials can only be transmitted to the reader only through the mind of someone present." Friedman goes on to say that "…much of the distortion characteristic of modern stories and novels [(sic)modern being anything from the 19thc, and also distinct from *modernist*, which is more of a movement than a period]is a result of the "use of multiple and selective omniscience, for "if the aim is to dramatise mental states, and depending upon how far "down" into the mind you go, the logic and syntax of normal daytime public discourse begin

to disappear" (Friedman 1955:1177). Differentiating it from the omniscient point of view, Friedman (1955), states that the former differs from the latter in that "it renders thoughts, perceptions, and feelings and explains them after they have occurred (narrative)"(ibid).According to Cravens (2000), Dostoevsky's reluctance to go entirely the fantastical way, his insistence on situating his fantasy within realism – fantastic realism – is what made the author unable to do away completely with the narrator, and to develop the stream of consciousness technique that would have been better suited to his work. However, he goes on to say, "in general, Dostoevsky's fantastic realism anticipates modernism in its almost mystical presentation of life and the conception of human consciousness as often irrational and under only limited, conscious control."

The Double is essentially a narrative that is set internally, and located in the protagonist's realm of consciousness. The narrator is placed in a position that is close to the character, bringing about a different kind of psychological presentation. Thus there seems to be a dialogue going on between the third person narrator of the author and the selective omniscience of the character:

. . I am talking nonsense, like a fool! A suicidal fool! It's not like that at all, you suicidal fool . . . This is how things are done, though, you profligate man! . . . Well, what am I to do with myself now? Well, what am I going to do with myself now. What am I fit for now?

> Come, what are you fit for now, for instance, you, Golyadkin, you, you worthless fellow!Well, what now? I must get a carriage; 'hire a carriage and bring it here,' says she, 'weshall get our feet wet without a carriage,' says she . . . And who could ever have thought it!Fie, fie, my young lady! Fie, fie, a young lady of virtuous behaviour! Well, well, the girl weall thought so much of! You've distinguished yourself, madam, there's no doubt of that!you've distinguished yourself! . . . And it all comes from immoral education. And now thatI've looked into it and seen through it all I see that it is due to nothing else butImmorality (135).

In the above quote, a dialogue between different characters is shown and it is transmitted through the consciousness of Golyadkin. A back and forth dialogue seems to occur between the voice of the narrator and that of Golyadkin yet all two are within the consciousness of Golyadkin.

The narration in the words of Cravens (2000), "weaves in and out of the protagonist's consciousness with barely perceptible transitions, creating the impression that everything—the inner and the outer—emanates from a single conscious center." However, this is not the case, for as Bakhtin states, When narrator and character enter the same temporal plane in Dostoevsky, they inevitably clash and battle for superiority. And it is herein that the uncanny subverts and or undermines the narration in the text.

In *The Double*, a single voice both narrates, that is, "creates" the main character and speaks to him. Yet the voice has different and shifting points of origin. The taunting voice of the narrator is both inside and outside the hero simultaneously, and the reader is never able to locate specifically the source. This is so because the third person omniscience point of view in *The Double* defies the characteristics and or features associated with its kind. According to Friedman (1955), a predominant tendency of the omniscient point of view whether neutral or otherwise, is to explain or describe (telling) and or dramatise (showing) things as the narrator sees or hears them, rather than as a character does. However, in *The Double*, the reverse is the case: the third person point of view describes things in Golyadkin's voice, and sees them as Golyadkin sees them. This points to the existence of the uncanny; the return of something familiar in an unfamiliar manner - of the attempt of repressed materials to resurface through a split psyche. The result is that the narrator and the character being on the same plane, are in a constant dialogue, facing one another, and are thus each other's double. What is thought to be a third person point of view turns out to be a reflection of the character's own focalization.

"The narrator's voice "sounds" like Golyadkin's, and the narrator himself seems to be infected with Golyadkin's hallucinations. The external perspective, it turns out, is not external at all…" (Cravens 2000). To this effect, the reader is not so sure of what he hears and or sees through this merged point of view. Everything that Golyadkin does or says, everything that the omniscient point of view relays, is tinged with un-canniness. As a result, the further the reader goes into the text, the less progress he seems to actually make. What is said and revealed, rather than shedding light on the present situation, doubles back on itself to something long forgotten and repressed. To this effect, in *The Double*, Dostoevsky, through the point(s) of view which he adopts, "punches holes in the temporal unity of his work…." Readers are more often than not left hanging in limbo; "trying to decide if something has really taken place on the streets and in the apartments of the Northern capital or only in the mind of one deluded civil servant" (Gasperretti 1989). Temporal relations is one of the three relations which Genette (1980) discusses under his category of voice. According to Genette (1980: 216), "the chief temporal determination of the narrating instance is obviously its relation to the story". The relationship between story and narrating he says, is defined by antecedence, posteriority, simultaneity and a fourth possibility, the interpolated. The posteriority which makes use of the past tense is the most common form for the majority of narratives. The use of the past tense makes a narrative subsequent "without indicating the temporal interval which separates the moment of the narrating from the moment of the story" (Genette 1980: 220). However, in *The Double*, the interpolated level (between the moments of action)is also used and the uncanny subverts point of view and punches holes in the temporal unity of the work. This is seen most notably in the scene regarding the five letters which Golyadkin Snr is supposed to have written and sent to his double, but the existence of which cannot be proved by either Golyadkin himself or those who are purported to have

come in contact with the letters in one way or the other. Here, the letters act as a medium of the narrative and also as an element of the plot.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

This research has analysed in the two texts under its study, the construction of character and mode of narration adopted, and how these two narrative aspects are undermined and or subverted by the psychoanalytic phenomena of the uncanny. The introductory chapter has provided a general context for the study through an overview of the related concepts. To this effect, it has discussed narratives in general, then narratives of prose fiction in particular, after which it looked at character and characterisation and narration, with emphasis on point of view. This is followed by the statement of the research problem, research questions, aims and objectives, delimitation of the study, significance and the chosen theoretical framework for the analysis. A synthesis of two theoretical frameworks was used: psychoanalysis and narratology. The study draws upon Freudian psychoanalytic criticism, most notably Freud's work on the uncanny, for its analysis of the psychoanalytic phenomena of the uncanny in the two texts under study. While Rimmon- Kenan's character traits character model and Vladimir Propp's actantial character approach were used in the analysis of character and characterisation. On the other hand, the postulations of Genette and Friedman were used for the analysis of narration and point of view.

Chapter Two has reviewed some of the existing literature relevant to the study and the relevant literature, together with the theoretical framework provided the premise for the subsequent analysis in chapters three and four. The study in its analysis has been concerned with how the uncanny subverts and or undermines character and narration in a given subject who is circumscribed within a given discourse. Thus in the novel *Season* which is a post-colonial text, both the narrator and Mustafa Saeed, struggle, each in his own way, to escape the definitions which have been imposed upon them by circumstances beyond their control. Their struggle is also a struggle against a history, the writing of which they had no hand in.

This is seen in the very fact that the novel itself is a re-write of what is considered to be the classic par excellence of empire narrative, Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*.For the narrator in *Season,* the uncanny undermines character in that he is unable to be, truly, 'the son of the village', despite the fact that he returned after eight years of study abroad (suggesting that there are those who did not), that he did not marry a white woman (suggesting that there are those who did), and that he professes to be actually glad to be back. And also, in the fact that he ends up desiring the very things that he condemns Mustafa Saeed for – Hosna, Jean Morris and Mustafa Saeed's tomb of books which he (the narrator) derides, swears to destroy but leaves intact. That he is unnamed alludes to his generalness, for I is everyone, is all of us.For Mustafa Saeed on the other hand, the uncanny manifests itself in his insistenceto surmount the definitions which are forced upon him in London, in his return to Sudan, the very place from which he had ran away, and in the very uncertain manner of his death. Mustafa Saeed is the return of the repressed in the collective consciousness of all those who come across him, and points to the way in which the certain can and does become uncertain through something that was repressed and assumed to have long been surmounted as is characteristic of the uncanny.

The Double on the other hand, presents an attempt to subvert the dominant assumption of the self as whole and integrated, which still existed at the beginning of the nineteenth century and found literary expression in Russia in the Naturalistic School with its emphasis on realism. Both at two levels of characterisation – as a hero in a tale and as a typical Russian clerk in a novel, the uncanny is shown to subvert the construction of the central character Golyadkin through actions that point to the presence of hidden or repressed impulsesand their subsequent return. From the very beginning of the novel, it is obvious that Golyadkin is struggling against something, and that something is contained not without, but within him,and that something is also familiar but is now apprehended in an unfamiliar

manner. And nothing encapsulates this better than the narrative point of view through which the incidences of the novel are rendered.

All through the study, a re-current leitmotif has been the interconnectedness of the psychoanalytic phenomena of the uncanny with the modern construction of character and mode of narration. This is seen in the fact that the period of the emergence of the uncanny as posited by Royle (2003), and Jackson (1993) (see above) coincides with the period in which the modern character in narratives began to emerge. Thus it is the conclusion of this research that the psychoanalytic phenomena of the uncanny as it exists in narratives in general and narratives of prose fiction in particular could not have been possible without the emergence of the modern character with its inward looking nature, which in turn owes its existence to the reconstruction of the self not as the integrated whole of previous postulations, but as a split –subject whose actions are governed and or influenced by latent impulses over which s/he has no control. The same also goes for the uncanny as it relates to narration/point of view, since the evolution of the latter has been concerned chiefly with the phasing out of an authorial perspective in favor of an objective one vested majorly in the character.

An interesting finding in the course of this study has been the various *other* angles and or perspectives through which the uncanny can be approached in the two texts under study. On the one hand is the Lacanian reading of the uncanny, which subverts and re-writes Freud's 'The Uncanny'- an uncanny process then, and on the other is the manifestation of the uncanny in such motifs as those of darkness and night which abound in the novel *Season*, and its presentation as a modern phenomenon vis- a- vis the urban, the city, as is found in *The Double*

(See Collins and Jervis (ed) (2008), and Royle (2003)). Indeed, Dostoevsky as opposed to his pastoral brethrens such as Tolstoy and Turgenev has been dubbed as a writer of the city life. Thus an analysis of the uncanny in his work, within a modern context, under the motifs of the city and or urbanization is bound to yield interesting results.

REFERENCES

Abbot, P.H. (2002). *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative.* Cambridge: Cambridge Press.

Abdullahi, R. (2012). 'Literary Form, Autobiography and Creative Non- fiction: Narrative Self- Fashioning in Friedrich Nietzsche's *Ecce Homo*'. *Katsina Journal of Linguistics and Literary Studies,* vol 1, no 1, p. 71-88.

Al-Halool, M. (2008). The Nature of the Uncanny in "*Season of Migration to the North*". Arab Studies Quarterly, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 31-38.http://www.jstor.org/stable/41859034

Amyuni, M. K. (1985) Images of Arab Women in *Midaq Alley* by Naguib Mahfouz, and *Season of Migration to the North* by Tayeb Salih.*International Journal of Middle East Studies.* Vol. 17. No. 1, pp. 25-36. http://www.jstor.org/stable/163307.

Bal, M. (2009). *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Barry, P. (2002). *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory* (2nded). Manchester: Manchester University Press Ltd.

Barthes, R. (1982). *A Barthes Reader*.Ed. S. Sontag. New York: Hill and Wang.

Bello, S. (2012). "The Discourse of Class, Gender, and Narrative in Jane Austen's Pride and Prejudice. An Unpublished M.A Dissertation. Bayero University, Kano.

Booth, C.W. (1983). *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. (2nded). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Breger, L. (1989.). *Dostoevsky: The Author as Psychoanalyst.* New York: New York University Press.

Brooks, P. (1984). *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Chatman, S. (1978). Story and Discourse. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Chizhevsky M. (1962). "The Theme of the Double in Dostoevsky" In Wellek, R. (Ed).*Dostoevsky: A Collection of Critical Essays*..Prentice- Hall, Inc, pp 83-89.

Cobley, P. (2001). *Narrative.* Oxford: Routledge.

Collins, J and Jerves, J. (2008).*Uncanny Modernity: Cultural Theories, Modern*

*Anxieties.*London: Macmillan.

Cravens, C.S. (2000). Capek's Hordubal and Dostoevsky's *The Double*: Madness and Free-Indirect Discourse.*Comparative Literature* 52, no. 1, 53-71.

Culler, J. (1997). *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Culpeper, J. (2001). *Langugae and Characterization: People in Plays and Other Texts*. London: Longman.

Davidson, E. J. (1989). In Search of a Middle Point: The Origins of Oppression in Tayeb Salih's *Season of Migration to the North.Research in African Literatures*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 385-400.

Dolar, M. (1991). I Shall Be with You on Your Wedding-Night: Lacan and the Uncanny. *October*, vol. 58, pp. 5-23.

Dostoevsky, F. (). *The Double: A Petersburg Poem.* Trans. Constance Garnett. https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/d/dostoyevsky/d72d/index.html. Accessed on 27-03-2017 at 11: 53

Eagleton, T. (2003). *Literary Theory: An Introduction.*Oxford:Blackwell.

Eagleton, T. (2005). *The English Novel: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ellmann, M. (ed) (1994). .*Psychoanalytic Literary Criticism*. London: Longman.

Felman, S. (ed).(1982). *Literature and Psychoanalysis: The Question of Reading: Otherwise.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Forster, E.M. (1977). *Aspects of the Novel.*Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Freud, S. (1919). "The Uncanny". In Smith, I. *Freud – The Complete Works.*(pp. 3673-3700). (?): (?)

Freud, S. (1957). *Collected Papers.* Vol. V. Ed. J. Strachey. London: The Hogarth Press.

Friedman, N. (1955) Point of View in Fiction: The Development of a Critical Concept. PMLA, Vol. 70, No. 5, pp. 1160-1184. Accessed: 12-02-2018: http://www.jstor.org/stable/459894

Gasperreti, D. (1989). The Double: Dostoevskii's Self-Effacing Narrative.*The Slavic and East European Journal*, vol. 33, no 2, pp. 217-234. Accessesd: 07-01-2018

Genette, G. (1980). *Narrative Disc*ourse. (2nd Ed). Ithaca: Cornwell University Press.

GoldKnopf, D. (1972). *The Life of the Novel. Chicago:* University of Chicago Press.

Green, K and Lebihan, J. (2009). *Critical Theory and Practice.* London: Routledge.

Hale, D. (2006) (Ed). *The Novel.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Hassan, W.S. (2003). *Ideology and the Craft of Fiction.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Hawthorn, J. (2005). *Studying the Novel.* London*:* Hodder Education.

Jackson, R. (1993). *Fantasy: The Literature of Subversion.* London: Routledge.

James, H. (1972). *Theory of Fiction.* University of Nebraska Press.

Jentsch, E.(1995).On the Psychology of the Uncanny.trans. Roy Sellars, *Angelaki 2.1,* pp. 1-16.

Jones, V. M. (1990). *Dostoyevsky After Bakhtin: Readings in Dostoyevsky's Fantastic Realism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bello-Kano, I. (2005). Theories of Narrative and Narrativity: A Bibligraphic Essay in Kwofie E.N Haruna, B.H (eds). Vol X (2005). *Lagos Notes and* Records. Lagos: Dmodus Publishers.

Laird, A. (1999). *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Representation and Latin Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lubbock, P. (1960). *The Craft of Fiction.* London: (?)

Makdisi, S. S. (1992) "The Empire Re-narrated: *"Season of Migration to the North*" and the Reinvention of thePresent" *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 804-820. Accessed: 11-03-2018 05:56

Malpas, S and Wake, P. (2008). *The Routledge Companion to Critical Theory.* New York: Routledge.

Mikhail, B. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics.* Trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

New, H. William (Ed) (2000). *Encyclopeadia of Literature in Canada.* University of Toronto Vol. 58, 5–23.

Parsons, D. (2007). *Theorist of the Modernist Novel.* London: Routledge.

Payne, R. (1961). *Dostoevsky: A Human Portrait*, New York: Knopft.

Phelan J and Rabinowitz. P. (Ed) (2005). *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Blackwell Publishing:

Propp, V. (1968). *Morphology of the Folktale.* Trans Laurence Scott. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Rawlings, P. (2006). *Three American Theorists of the Novel.* London:Routledge.

Rimmon- Kenan, S. (1983). *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics.* London: Methuen.

Royle, N. (2003).*The Uncanny*: *An Introduction*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Salih, T. (1969). *Season of Migration to the North.* Trans. Denys Johnson- Davies. Oxford: Heinemann Press.

Schole, R and Kellog, R. (1966). *The Nature of Narrative.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schweigert, J. (2010). "The Uncanny: The Double as a Literary Convention." An Unpublished M.A. Dissertation. Masaryk University.

Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students.* London: Routledge.

Stanzel, F. (1984). *A Theory of Narrative.* Cambridge: CambridgeUniversity Press.

Stevick, P. (Ed) (1967). *Theory of the Novel.* London: Macmillan Publishers.

Tarawneh, Y and John, J. ((1988). "Tayeb Salih and Freud: The Impact of Freudian Ideas on *"Season of Migration to the North" Arabica*, 35, pp. 328-349.www.academia.edu/30207241. Accessed: 27-03-2018.

Umar, A. (2015). "The Early Novels of Abubakar Gimba: A Narrative Stylistic Approach." An Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Bayero University Kano.

Watt, I. (1968). *History of the Novel*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Wellek, R. (Ed) (1962). *Dostoevsky: A Collection of Critical Essays*. NewYork: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Western, D. (I985). "Psychoanalytic Approach to Personality". *Theoretical Perspectives* 5, 1-45.

Wicker, B. (1975). *The Story Shaped World.* Bradford:The Athlone Press.

Wright, E. (Ed). (1992) *Feminism and Psychoanalysis: A Critical Dictionary. Oxford:* Blackwell

Zvedeniuk, M. (2012). "Doubling, Dividing and Interchanging of The Self": The 'Uncanny' Subjectivity in Dostoevsky's *The Double: Linguistics and Literature* Vol. 10, No 2, pp. 109 – 124.Accessed: 10-06-2017