

**ATILIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE DOCTORAL PROGRAMME**

**COLONIAL DISCOURSE AND RESISTANCE
in JEAN RHYS'S *WIDE SARGASSO SEA*, BUCHI EMECHETA'S *SECOND
CLASS CITIZEN* and FADIA FAQIR'S *MY NAME IS SALMA***

PhD Dissertation

Siray LINGERLİ AYDEMİR

Ankara, 2019

**ATILIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE DOCTORAL PROGRAMME**

**COLONIAL DISCOURSE AND RESISTANCE
in JEAN RHYS'S *WIDE SARGASSO SEA*, BUCHI EMECHETA'S
SECOND CLASS CITIZEN and FADIA FAQIR'S *MY NAME IS
SALMA***

PhD Dissertation

Siray LENERLİ AYDEMİR

**Supervisor
Prof. Dr. Oya BATUM MENTEŞE**

Ankara, 2019

ACCEPTION AND APPROVAL

This is to certify that this thesis titled “Colonial Discourse and Resistance in Jean Rhys’s *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Buchi Emecheta’s *Second Class Citizen* and Fadia Faqir’s *My Name is Salma*” and prepared by Siray Lengerli Aydemir meets with the committee’s approval unanimously as PhD Dissertation in the field of English Culture and Literature following the successful defense conducted in 24.06.2019.

Director, Prof. Dr. Dilaver Tengilimoğlu

Supervisor, Prof. Dr. Oya Batum Menteşe

Prof. Dr. Hande Seber

Prof. Dr. Nazan Tutaş

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gökşen Aras

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Kuğu Tekin

ETHICS DECLARATION

I hereby declare that;

- I prepared this thesis in accordance with Atılım University Graduate School of Social Sciences Thesis Writing Directive,
- I prepared this thesis within the framework of academic and ethics rules,
- I presented all information, documents, evaluations and findings in accordance with scientific ethical and moral principles,
- I cited all sources to which I made reference in my thesis,
- The work of art in this thesis is original,

I hereby acknowledge all possible loss of rights in case of a contrary circumstance. (in case of any circumstance contradicting with my declaration)

24.06.2019

—

Siray Lengerli Aydemir

ÖZ

LENGERLİ AYDEMİR, Siray. Jean Rhys'in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Buchi Emecheta'nın *Second Class Citizen* ve Fadia Faqir'in *My Name is Salma* Romanlarında Sömürge Dönemi Söylemi (Kolonyal Söylem) ve Direnç, Doktora Tezi, Ankara, 2019.

Bu doktora tezi, sömürge dönemi söyleminin günümüzde de etkin olduğuna vurgu yaparak Jean Rhys'in *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966) (*Geniş, Geniş Bir Deniz*), Buchi Emecheta'nın *Second Class Citizen* (1974) (*İkinci Sınıf Vatandaş*) ve Fadia Faqir'in *My Name is Salma* (2007) (*Benim Adım Salma*) isimli romanlarındaki kadın başkahramanların benlik algıları ve tanımları, ve bu söyleme karşı gösterdikleri dirence dair geniş bir anlayışa ulaşmayı amaçlamaktadır. Metin çözümlemelerinin asıl hedefi, sömürge dönemi, sömürge sonrası ve çok kültürlü dönemlerde başkahramanların erkek egemen söyleme direnç gösterirken kendilerine ait benlik tanımını nasıl yaptıklarını incelemektir. Sömürge dönemi söyleminin özünde sömürgeciyi merkeze alan ancak sömürüleni öteki olarak isimlendirip dışlayan bir dil hüküm sürmektedir ki bu da kahramanların omuzlarına aşılması imkânsız gibi görünen bir zorluk yüklemektedir. Yine de, bu söylem içerisinde başkahramanlar kendilerine ait alanlarda benlik tanımları yapabilmek ve direnç gösterebilmek adına kendi yöntemlerini geliştirirler. Bu yöntemler, zaman, yer ve kimlik bağlamında farklılık göstermektedir çünkü romanların geçtiği dönemler farklıdır. Bu farklar da gözetilerek, metin çözümlemelerinin temel amacına uygun olarak çeşitli kuramlar ve tanımlar kullanılmıştır. Emperyalizm ve erkek egemen bakış açısı, ikili karşıtlıklar, karşıt söylem, Üçüncü Alan, dil emperyalizmi ve taklitçilik tezde kullanılan başlıca kavram, kavram ve tanımlamalardır. Çalışmanın savına ışık tutan ve saptamalarına başvurulmuş, ve sömürge dönemi söyleminin ataerkil bir bakışla hala etkin olduğunu vurgulayarak beklenen sonuca ulaşılmasını sağlayan eleştirmen ve kuramcılar Bill Ashcroft, Michael Foucault, Gayatri Spivak, Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, Frantz Fanon, Hamid Dabashi, Robert Phillipson, Leila Ahmed, Alastair Pennycook, Robert Young, Richard Terdiman, Ania Loomba, Elleke Boehmer, Oyeronke Owewumi, Amin Malak ve tanımları çalışmanın amacına destek olan diğer bazı eleştirmenlerdir.

Anahtar sözcükler: sömürge dönemi söylemi, emperyalizm, benlik tanımları, direnç, erkek egemen söylem, sömürge sonrası dönem teorileri

ABSTRACT

LENGERLİ AYDEMİR, Siray. Colonial Discourse and Resistance in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Buchi Emecheta's *Second Class Citizen* and Fadia Faqir's *My Name is Salma*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Ankara, 2019.

With an aim to reach a wider understanding of the still functioning colonial discourse in recent decades, this dissertation argues self-definition and resistance of the female protagonists in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Buchi Emecheta's *Second Class Citizen* and Fadia Faqir's *My Name is Salma*. The protagonists' ways to define their self and resist the colonial discourse and its patriarchal hold on their life during colonial, post-colonial and multi-cultural times are the focus of the textual analyses. The essence of colonial discourse, enfolding the colonizer as the central and excluding the other as the outsider, has been a burden for the protagonists, which seems impossible to struggle with. Yet, it is their own tactics, which pave the path for them to resist, and sometimes to bow to the colonial discourse in order to find a definition for themselves within this insurmountable language. These tactics differ in time; place and identity, in that, the settings in the novels are different starting from the colonial and approaching to the multi-cultural. Therefore, the theories and definitions differ accordingly. A variety of theoretical approaches and detections are applied throughout the analysis focusing mainly on imperialism, binary oppositions, counter-discourse, the Third Space, linguistic imperialism and mimicry. Bill Ashcroft, Michael Foucault, Gayatri Spivak, Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, Frantz Fanon, Hamid Dabashi, Robert Phillipson, Leila Ahmed, Alastair Pennycook, Robert Young, Richard Terdiman, Ania Loomba, Elleke Boehmer, Oyeronke Owewumi and Amin Malak are the leading theorists and critics, whose views and theories enlightened the study to arrive at a reasonable conclusion, which emphasizes the idea that colonial discourse still keeps its essence with a patriarchal eye.

Keywords: colonial discourse, imperialism, self-definition, resistance, patriarchal discourse, post-colonial theories

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It has been long time since I started to study for my dissertation. During this time, I read works of many critics and theorists who led me to see the things from different perspectives. And authors, who beautify the world and make it more bearable for confused minds. It is an honour for an ordinary reader like me to reach their work and to thank for all the questioning and meaning they have added into our lives.

In the long process of my writing, there have been a lot of people whose presence have always given me strength. First of all, I am wholeheartedly grateful to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Oya Batum Menteşe for her invaluable guidance, patience and support. I am also deeply grateful to Assist. Prof. Dr. Kuğu Tekin for her calming and supportive attitude whenever I need. I am very grateful to Assist. Prof. Dr. Gökşen Aras for her infinite patience for my countless questions. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Hande Seber for her invaluable comments and advice.

It is a pleasure to complete my study with the smiles of many friends. First of all, I would dearly like to thank Zeynep Rana Turgut for our life-long sisterhood and the hugs she gave me in the time of difficulties. I would also like to thank my friend Dr. Gülen Göktürk for her support and funny jokes. And, it is my pleasure to express my thanks to my dear friends Özgün Aslı Özdağlı for the cosy chats we had even in minute-long break times and to Pınar Özkurt for her mind-opening comments and calming attitude during our talks. And also, I would like to thank Tuğba Tekin for her support and encouragement.

Without the support and patience of my lovely family it would be impossible to complete the study. I would like to thank my husband Serdar Aydemir for the timely coffees he made during long hours of study, and to my daughter Beste Aydemir who is waiting for the completion of my “homework” to play with me. And, it is very hard to find an expression for her presence in my life; my mother Filiz Lengerli who will always enlighten my soul with her endless love, patience and warmest words.

This dissertation is the conclusion of a promise to the dearest one, my father Şakir Lengerli whose presence and absence I have been feeling deep in my heart since December, 2007.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ÖZ.....	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1 THEORY.....	5
1.1. Historical Background	5
1.2. Theory.....	11
CHAPTER 2	
<i>WIDE SARGASSO SEA, the COLONIAL SELF and RESISTANCE</i>	31
CHAPTER 3	
<i>SECOND CLASS CITIZEN, the POST-COLONIAL SELF and RESISTANCE</i>	69
CHAPTER 4	
<i>MY NAME is SALMA, the MULTI-CULTURAL SELF and RESISTANCE ..</i>	99
CONCLUSION.....	135
BIBLIOGRAPHY	143
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	151

To my dear father Şakir Lengerli



INTRODUCTION

The aim of this dissertation is to analyse *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966) by Jean Rhys, *Second Class Citizen* (1974) by Buchi Emecheta and *My Name is Salma* (2007) by Fadia Faqir, as texts of resistance within the context of three different periods; the colonial, the post-colonial and the multicultural by finding out the female protagonists' individual efforts for a self-definition and resistance against colonial and patriarchal discourse. Due to the discursive functioning of colonial condition as reflected in culture and language, and thus, in patriarchal knowledge as a form of power, the female protagonists in the novels display resistance and still remain as the other while positioning themselves in the world.

The dissertation hypothesises that the weight of colonial discourse was not only felt during colonial and post-colonial times but it has been experienced also in the multi-cultural world of recent past and today, which can all be pursued through the female protagonists' self-definition and resistance against colonial and patriarchal knowledge. The global effect of British colonialism in terms of coloniser-colonised/other relationships, dominance of English language and culture as the transmitters of Eurocentric codes of civilisation, and the hypercritical gaze of the coloniser looking down on the other have been global matters for long. They have also affected individual lives, especially those of women and led to a constant attempt for self-definition and of moments of resistance. It is also patriarchal codes that the protagonists are both suffering from and struggling with, with consciousness and awareness.

The dissertation includes an introduction followed by four main analyses chapters and a conclusion. The Introduction sets the aim, the hypothesis and the scope of the dissertation. Chapter 1 dwells on the historical background of colonial discourse and related theories which will be referred to throughout the analyses in order to draw a framework and to provide the baseline of the discussion for the analyses chapters.

Chapter 2 focuses on Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* as a novel centring its female protagonist in the post-emancipation period when colonialism and its direct effects are at peak. In this chapter the influence of colonial discourse and British

imperialism materialised in the persona of the husband of the protagonist Antoinette and her resistance to this imposition are discussed. Antoinette as a silent character seems to be victimized from the beginning. And, she really suffers from the patriarchal weight of a male dominant discourse. However, she is quite conscious about what is happening around her and is successful at communicating the goings-on to the reader as the narrator of two chapters. She is exposed to the imperialist ideals of her husband who colonizes her life and soul. There is a mismatch between Antoinette and her husband about the way they perceive the world. This clash originates from the difference between nature/female/colonised and culture/male/coloniser. She has always been aware of the pervasiveness of the exploiters in her life. Throughout the novel, she suffers but still silently observes and criticizes, which comes out with a last reaction at the very end of the novel, and thus, which leaves her mark as a colonised but responsive character in post-colonial literature. Therefore, the narration devoted to her and her awareness together end up with an idiosyncratic resistance. As Caroline Rody states in her essay titled “Burning Down the House: The Revisionary Paradigm of Jean Rhys’s *Wide Sargasso Sea*”: “[...] [*Wide Sargasso Sea*] manages to claim a place, as if in a gap that always awaited it in English literary history” (Rody, 1993, p. 301). Chapter 3 dwells on Buchi Emecheta’s *Second Class Citizen* as a novel written in the post-independence period of Nigeria. The novel centres Adah as the witty and conscious protagonist. Adah endures patriarchal and colonial discourse both in her homeland and in England. However, she has her own ways to resist the colonial domain and struggles a lot to live and achieve in the society without sacrificing her African self but trying to figure out the environment she has difficulty in adapting herself. She was born into an obviously male-dominated culture. She brings herself up in the middle of a system which advantages the male. She challenges a pre-established system with her interpretation of the world. As she is skilful enough to reach an analytical sense, another world is opened up through the eyes of Adah who leads the reader to look at the things from an African perspective, still with a critical gaze, other than the perceptions of Eurocentric views. However, while keeping her African side, Adah also welcomes the proposals of western life style with a newly interpreted freedom. Chapter 4 dwells on Fadia Faqir’s *My Name is Salma* which takes place in modern day England and in the female protagonist Salma’s unnamed village in the

Levant. The events in her homeland appear as traumatic moments or joyous memories of the past. She was born into a male-dominated culture like Adah, yet with a difference this time. She is an Arab. The protagonist Salma is the sufferer of her patriarchal local environment in her homeland because of a non-marital relationship. She tries to find a way to survive and finds herself in England. She manages to escape into freedom, to England, and, makes a life for herself. However, it is not easy for her to find a place in this multicultural world of England where Arabs are not welcomed, not only by the westerners but also by some non-Europeans who define themselves as being far closer to the British and to the global culture than an Arab. She develops ambivalent manners which are blended with resistance and the drive to survive. Still, she is conscious enough to be aware of the existence of colonial discourse as the supercilious one and its patriarchal presence. While coping with legal issues to be a permanent migrant, Salma tries to look European by removing her veil and beautifying herself with cosmetic products as the time and place require. She herself not only notices but also is made aware of the fact that she is different. Despite the changes in her life and appearance, her soul longs for something different and more articulate about her own self. What leaves her desperate is also the haunting memory of her past which shows itself in dreams with a dangerous invitation back to her homeland.

Female protagonists in the novels are enduring the hardships of colonial discourse, its patriarchal application and their male-dominated locales to some extent but this does not prevent them from observing, criticizing and taking action. Although they are silent, they do not bury the happenings into their subconscious blindly for the sake of adaptation. In contrast, all the events are well-stored in their mind waiting for the last manoeuvre to define their own self.

The Conclusion sums up the analysis and the discussion. This part makes detections about the novels and sets a comparative and summative finding. While comparing the analyses, the points which have made the protagonists suffer and the commonalities in their resistance against the colonial and patriarchal systems will also be discussed. Therefore, the dissertation aims to reach a final, claiming that colonial discourse that started some hundreds of years ago is still taking hold of lives of others. Antoinette as a white Caribbean, Adah as a black Nigerian and Salma as a brown Arab

seem to be the passive interlocutors of colonial discourse, its patriarchal outgrowth and the patriarchal practices of their local environments. However, their thoughts and full awareness of the goings-on prefigure their resistance and self-definition.



CHAPTER 1

THEORY

1.1. Historical Background

This chapter firstly deals with the agents of colonial discourse in order to set its historical and thus causal background. Secondly, the theories and approaches as coherent sources will be emphasized in the second part of this chapter.

“More than three-quarters of people living in the world today have had their lives shaped by the experience of colonialism” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 1989, p. 1) because “[f]rom Renaissance to the late nineteenth century, European colonial powers invaded, occupied or annexed a huge area of the globe” (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 1). These introductory words of Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin in *The Empire Writes Back* and in *Post-colonial Transformation* shed light to the panorama of today’s world order, which was and has been permanently affected by colonialism and its never-ending discursive power. This power formed by civilizational sophistication is still among the claims of the West taking advantage of the inheritance of industrial, technological, intellectual and linguistic privilege all of which converge on a better economy and imperial pursuits. The assertion that bridges the justifications of the past and the affirmations of today, and conserve the essence of both is self-consciously articulated by Samuel Huntington whose reference to western superiority is obvious. Being better, economically and technologically, is emphasised by Huntington in his article “The Clash of Civilisations”:

[...] they shared the common experiences of European history – feudalism, the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, the Industrial Revolution; they are generally economically better off than the peoples to the east; they may now look forward to increasing involvement in a common European economy and to the consolidation of democratic political systems (Huntington, 1993, p. 30).

These historical phenomena centre the attention on a shared European past, envisage a powerful future for the west and set the difference with its others. The progress in intellectuality and humanities was followed by mechanization. The European idea of its centrality was rapidly nourished by the Industrial Revolution, as

a monumental event in world history, with its diffusion in the production of knowledge on mechanization and its applications. Europe possessed the power with technological superiority and transmitted it to distant ends. Chris Dixon and Michael Heffernan claim that Industrial Revolution enabled Europe with technological sophistication; therefore, the acceleration in mechanisation and industrialisation hastened the spread of colonisation (Dixon and Heffernan, 1994, p. 2). The expansionist policy supplied initially by ocean-going ships was then carried to an advanced level with the railways which situated Europe and mainly Britain in the centre of a period of abundance mainly provided by the colonies. Whether it is seen as a leap or a disadvantage is a discussion of two opposite ends. In *English Social History*, George Trevelyan says “[t]he railways were England’s gifts to the world” (Trevelyan, 1942, p. 531) which helped Europe and Britain become extremely rich with transported goods from distant places and colonies. In *Post-Colonialism: An Historical Introduction* Robert Young clarifies that reaching for distant places meant “[...] the empires no longer had to be geographically coherent” [so] “[...] the vast empires [...] gradually crept across the world” (Young, 2001, p. 16). The consequence is voiced by Frantz Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth*: “Europe is literally the creation of the Third World. The riches which are choking it are those plundered from the underdeveloped peoples” (Fanon, 2004, p. 58). Later, this is also proclaimed by Edward Said in *Orientalism* as “[t]he Orient is an integral part of Europe’s *material* civilisation and culture” (Said, 1979, p. 2). Europe was and is both an identity and a territorial entity on the map in other minds, too. The idea of Europe was structured in others’ minds by associating it with industrial and capitalist development, and thus economic power. These views can be paired with Gerard Delanty’s as he states in his book *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality*. He says “[...] something can be discerned in the great flux of history and it is not the unity of history but adversity: the European idea has been more the product of conflict than of consensus.” Delanty further states that Europe itself is the constructing force so what is clear is “the discourse in which ideas and identities are formed and historical realities constituted”. It is a unifying theme and it is the “emblem and central organising metaphor of a complex civilisation.” It is “an idea and an identity” which did not exist before its definition and categorization (Delanty, 1995, pp. 3-4, 73). This metaphorical

formation of civilisation and continental solidarity within Europe has been marked by phenomenological events constituting European belonging.

Colonialism has created a prominent Europe with its long and restless history. Its key objective remained strongly economic and peaked in the nineteenth century. It is agreed by many critics that despite the long time span behind colonial expansion, no century had been considered like the nineteenth century when the guarantee of the current economic system was assured by the monopolist discourse of “technological sophistication”, “acceleration in industrialisation,” and the emergence of global powers with an influence on the whole world where “the foundations of this power had been laid[...]”; so, the wealth having been transferred to the parent countries demonstrated that European colonial experience and the new European travels changed the whole world in a way that previous colonialisms did not (Loomba, 1998, p. 2-3, Fieldhouse, 1992, p. 3, Dixon and Heffernan, 1994, p. 2, Boehmer, 1995, p. 30). It is also highlighted that its five-hundred-year-long past wraps untold histories of slavery, deaths, neglect and displacement of millions from Africa, America, Arab territories, Asia and also Europe by establishing “somewhat unfair relations” while forming a new community (Young, 2001, p. 4, Loomba, 1998, p. 2). Therefore, colonialism has become a catchword for social sciences and humanities as it has left a legacy of numerous historical, cultural and literary discussions with their strong focus on a new economic system. For Ashcroft, such a situation is the “eruption of capital-driven late-nineteenth century imperialism” (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 1).

In *Colonialism's Culture*, Nicholas Thomas claims that politics alone or economic relationship does not suffice; colonialism is better understood when it is analysed as a cultural process. “[I]ts discoveries and trespasses are imagined and energized through signs, metaphors and narratives [...] [and] structures of meaning. [They] [...] are also expressive and constitutive of colonial relationships in themselves” (Thomas, 1994, p. 2). Colonial activities, knowledge, culture and experience under British dominance created its own discourse that reproduced itself in many forms of texts during colonial times. Although there was also much in the untold histories of the colonised lands, it was the coloniser’s history and text that were

constantly voiced. Referring to the voice of the coloniser, Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism* concentrates on culture, centrality, Britain and its narration. For him, although many empires established domination and ruled over distant lands, there is something systematic about British imperial culture. England, for Said, is a unique imperial class by itself together with its cultural centrality and an unbroken tradition of novel writing (Said, 1993, p. xxv) which is the main point of Elleke Boehmer's discussion, likewise. For Boehmer, as she states in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*, literature of the coloniser was particularly busied itself with colonial expansion and imperialist perspective, which means it was the literature produced "by and for colonizing Europeans about non-European lands dominated by them" (Boehmer, 1995, p. 3). From literary texts to travel writings, the omnipotence of colonial discourse as a process and product of colonialism's tradition, national awareness, imperialist pride, and the influence of English all over the world, was incorporating the idea of exclusion and disregard. Boehmer further states that "colonial settlement was expressed textually" because treaties which were regulating the new order and which claimed territory were the written forms of expression so "the text" functioned as the conveyor of the imperial authority. The British Empire's intention to establish a vast communication network was represented by the text in all forms not only in literary ones, but also with law reports, journalistic articles, anthropological journals, periodicals, diaries, travel writings, maps and the like. They had a pervasive influence on imaginative writing and contributed to the vocalisation of the "ideologies of moral, cultural and racial supremacy [...]" (Boehmer, 1995, pp. 7,12-13,17,24). Imperial ideals and fiction mutually nourished each other through the narration but at the same time silenced and constrained the other as the objects of colonial process and imperial development.

Colonial discourse is still an effective part of western mentality accelerated by colonialism itself and imperialism. The persistent emphasis of the west on civilisation, modernity, development and welfare still keeps the twenty-first century individual under surveillance. Therefore, the other defines him/herself over this superiority of the west. Decades ago, Fanon's reproach in *Black Skin White Masks* was referring to the nonexistence of the black man:

The black man has no ontological resistance in the eyes of the white man. Overnight the Negro has been given two frames of reference within which he has had to place himself. His metaphysics, or, less pretentiously, his customs and the sources of which they were based were wiped out because they were in conflict with a civilisation that he did not know and that imposed itself on him (Fanon, 1986, p. 110).

Behind the “ontological resistance”, lay the issue of injury, abuse and damage, which can form a setting for Fanon’s anger. In *Empire, Colony, Postcolony*, Robert Young expands on this complicated background. A considerable number of Europeans arriving at the colonies were from the poor populations. Some of them were forced to leave by their landlords, or because of breaking the law, or only because of their poverty or beliefs. They themselves were the victims. Yet, this did not lead them to feel sympathy for the indigenous. The indigenous populations were killed, evicted or used as labour because the colonists needed them to appropriate the land. Consequently, forced labour, serfdom and slavery became the practice (Young, 2015, p.33). All those unequal encounters, forced labour and slavery deepened the matter which had been distressing already. The issue penetrated into the cultural field in time. This was another phase of colonial expansion. In Young’s terms, “deprivation of all social, cultural, and political rights as in the case of slavery, inevitably produced a society in which differences between coloniser and labourer were then reified in cultural terms constructed to match the political conditions of power” (Young, 2015, p. 33).

The imposition of another culture, and ignoring the history and knowledge of the other have led to age-long discussions because it has not been an issue of colour only. It is also about centuries-long literary tradition and culture which othered the black as somebody having no cultural reference. Also, Edward Said’s theory of Orientalism has clarified the definition of the other because civilisation for him is defined by Europe like many similar definitions. Said criticizes Europe’s central position as the decision maker of statements through academic and literary circles; and he brings forward a criticism where he says West studies the East as its other in detail and claims a say on its dynamics. Said further states that Orient is a part of European

Western experience in terms of culture, language and the image of the other (Said, 1979, p. 1).

Following Fanon and Said, years later, in the twenty-first century, the scene of the colonial discourse is reinterpreted by Hamid Dabashi, in his book *Brown Skin, White Masks*, by referring to further variables in the time of multi-cultural formations. For him, “the Arab and the Muslim have replaced the Black and the Jew as the demonic other”. He mainly dwells on migration and focuses on the position of the Arab and the Muslim as the “new demons, especially in the aftermath of the 9/11”. He claims that anti-Semitism in Europe has turned into Islamophobia with the self-loathing Muslim (Dabashi, 2011, p.35). Dabashi also takes Fanon’s “revolutionary” comments and extend them into today’s world by saying that in the time of cross-coded multiculturalism, newer forms of hegemony is needed. Today, we see the evidence of “a more advanced condition of capitalism in its globalized stage” because ideological language is reviewed with different forms of hegemony (Dabashi, 2011, p.37) and:

It is thus absolutely imperative that we do not counter-fetishize any particular color-coded mode of ideological domination—black or brown, Jew or Muslim—as a target of moral assassination. Capital, in the end, is color-blind and gender-neutral. It wants to produce cheaply and sell massively to the widest possible market, and it could not care less who buys, who sells, who profits, and who suffers the consequences of this treacherous cycle (Dabashi, 2011, p. 37).

Hamid Dabashi argues that in Fanon’s time, the world was divided into two as the coloniser and the colonised; North and South, and West and East but the world today is not divided. Nevertheless, people are still being colonised and the powerful is still invading, occupying, ruling and plundering. He goes on saying although whites remain the same, they have lost their iconic power which used to hold the authority to name, to colour and to designate because “capital is promiscuous” so Black and White stayed in yesterday; now it is the time of brown and white in this new world of capital (Dabashi, 2011, pp. 20-21, 25).

With its far-reaching effects in human history, colonial expansion is still provoking discussions along with new concepts and additions. Related to this, it can be said that a protagonist of any novel based on the above-mentioned issues can be

read over a system which is unattainable for the individual/protagonist him/herself. Systems may generate people of obedience but at the same time systems give rise to resistance and reaction. Even if the reaction is at an individual level, it is still a reaction and is worth being understood and deciphered.

1.2. Theory

In addition to the historical reference mentioned in the previous subchapter, it can be relevant to refer to the essence of discourse and its relatedness to cultural, historical and social side of power which have become an inseparable part of studies on colonialism. In *Meaning, Discourse and Society*, Wolfgang Teubert specifies discourse having two faces: the accessible part and the inaccessible part of discourse. “It is discourse that constitutes our only unquestionable reality. All we can negotiate is discourse itself not the world outside of it” (Teubert, 2010, p.116). It can be concluded that it is the omnipresent essence of discourse that has a say on people’s lives, life styles, culture, knowledge, their past, present and future, and a controlled reality that was established long ago.

Post-colonial studies concentrate around some key concerns and inquiries. The concerns are mainly led by the necessity to unearth the culture and experience of the once colonised with reference to colour, race and linguistic variety. And correspondingly, the studies are based on the culture of the oppressed communities, the demand for the unspoken truth behind colonial and missionary activities to adapt the local cultures to imperial and capitalist world order, and the need to understand the oppressed and marginalized women of colonial and post-colonial societies who have been doubly affected by suppression and who need empowerment to make their own choices. In *Post-colonial Theory and the Specter of Capital*, where he makes a summary of the outlet of post-colonial understanding, Vivek Chibber states that post-colonial studies originated from literary and cultural studies, and “it started as a movement to transcend the marginalization of non-western literatures in the canon”. Going beyond literary analysis, post-colonial studies expanded its circle spreading towards other domains such as anthropology, history, cultural analysis and social

theory, and by that way it has become the focus of cultural, critique. Thus, as Chibber concludes, it has become known for its critique of Eurocentrism, nationalism, colonial ideology and economic determinism (Chibber, 2013, p. 1-4). Today, with globalization and multi-culturalism new dimensions have been added to these studies due to the ascending mobilisation of populations, which arouses the question whether the centres of colonial and post-colonial history are still the centres of today.

It is obvious that colonial, post-colonial and multi-cultural environments shape the others' self-perception. In his introductory essay in *Post-colonialism: A very Short Introduction*, the questions that Robert Young asks are outstanding in this sense. Young highlights the common opinion that two kinds of white people exist; the ones who have never experienced a situation where the majority are not white; and those who are the only white people in the room. At that moment, may be for the first time, they notice how it feels to be from a minority or to live as a person who lives on the margins, and "to be the person who never qualifies as the norm, the person who is not authorized to speak" (Young, 2003, p. 1). Here, Young directs the attention to feelings and self-perception. He questions how a white person would feel if he were at the margins. It can be deduced from Young's point of view that it may still be difficult to see the things through the other's eyes even when the situation is hypothetical. Young goes on by asking a few more questions to emphasize the post-colonial concern as such:

[...] when you hear others speaking, that you are only ever going to be the object of their speech? Do you sense that those speaking would never think of trying to find out how things seem to you, from where you are? That you live in a world of others, a world that exists *for* others? (Young, 2003, p. 1)

These questions for him are the basic ones that post-colonialism is interrogating, and the primary concern is "[h]ow can we find a way to talk about this?" (Young, 2003, p. 1).

In this sense, this chapter concentrates on the related detections of post-colonial approaches, resistance, self-definition and multi-cultural propositions which have found "a way to talk about this". On the other hand, even if a way is found, this might still be from a male-dominant order and the voice of the oppressed women cannot be

heard because they do not even have a voice to the view of many scholars. One of the most distinguishing examples of this comes from Gayatri Spivak. She discusses the position of the oppressed women, especially the poor women of the South from a multi-dimensional perspective. For Spivak this is a problem of representation. In her book *Gayatri Spivak: Deconstruction and the Ethics of Post-colonial Literary Interpretation*, Ola Abdalkafor states that Spivak deals with the “native subaltern female”, who cannot represent herself in international conferences, so organisations try to find solutions to the problems of these women without listening to them. As a result, the voice of the Southern women is lost (Abdalkafor, 2015, pp. 8-9).

Regarding the above detections and parallel to the overall concern of the analyses, the theoretical framework will be limited to the ones which are applicable to the textual analyses of the novels over the protagonists. In order to understand the protagonists within the conceptual framework drawn in the “Historical Background” section, the analyses will benefit from theories, definitions and detections of some eminent scholars who focus their attention basically on post-colonial theory. These major scholars and critics whose theories, findings and statements lend themselves to the implications from the novels are primarily Bill Ashcroft, Michael Foucault, Gayatri Spivak, Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, Frantz Fanon, Hamid Dabashi, Robert Phillipson, Leila Ahmed, Alastair Pennycook, Robert Young, Richard Terdiman, Ania Loomba, Elleke Boehmer, Oyeronke Owewumi, Juliana Nfah-Abbenyi, Amin Malak and some other scholars.

Michel Foucault’s definition of power and discourse is embedded in the theoretical scope so as to relate the colonial, post-colonial and global conditions to the flow of power and discourse. Gayatri Spivak’s perspective of the Third World women, imperialism and the problem of representation will be referred to in all the novels. Ania Loomba, Elleke Boehmer, and Bill Ashcroft and his colleagues’ overall detections on colonial discourse, knowledge, dominance and resistance will be mentioned to supply references to the other theories. Also, Ashcroft’s detections and compilation on binary oppositions and the criticisms on binarism referring to theoreticians will be concentrated while analysing *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *My Name is Salma*. Furthermore, Ashcroft’s reference to canonical “counter-discourse” coined by Richard Terdiman

will be referred to in the analysis of *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Homi Bhabha's theory of Third Space will be applied to *Second Class Citizen* and *My Name is Salma*. In addition, Bhabha's definition of mimicry will be used in the last novel. Robert Phillipson and Alastair Pennycook's views and theories on linguistic imperialism during the post-colonial and multi-cultural times and their relation to the protagonists' self-perception will be mentioned related to *Second Class Citizen* and *My Name is Salma*. Oyeronke Oyewumi, Juliana Nfah Abbenyi and Leila Ahmed will be mentioned as they say that moulding womanhood only within western outlook is not sufficient to understand the oppression or self-definition of women in other parts of the world. These scholars will be referred to in the analysis of *Second Class Citizen* and *My Name is Salma*. Fanon's criticism, detections and reproach in *Black Skin, White Masks* will be applied together with Hamid Dabashi's twenty-first century interpretation on Fanon in the analysis of *My Name is Salma* to refer to self-loath and whiteness. Lastly, Edward Said, Hamid Dabashi, Leila Ahmed's and Amin Malak's perspective and theoretical frame about Muslim identity in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century will form the basis of *My Name is Salma*. All the scholars and theorists mentioned above will form the general scope of the analysis and lead to the synthesis in the conclusion part.

In *Post-colonial Studies: Key Concepts* Ashcroft *et al* make a clear definition of colonial discourse dwelling on the centrality of Europe together with the assumptions that have been coupled with modernity in terms of history, language, literature and technology. They state that "colonial discourse is a system of statements" which are articulated about colonies, their people, colonisers and the relationship between them. Colonial discourse is a "system of knowledge and beliefs within which acts of colonisation takes place" (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2007, p. 37). If colonial discourse refers to a systematic production of knowledge and definitions; then, it is the signifier and transmitter of power which leads to irreversible aftereffects.

The aftereffects of colonialism have come to a point that its discourse cannot remain refined within the borders of Europe. Today, it is blended with its others. Foucault's definition of power in *Power/Knowledge* can be a related reference to the general concern of the analyses:

[...] power, [...] is not that which makes the difference between those who exclusively possess and retain it, and those who do not have it and submit to it. Power must be analysed as something which circulates or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localised here or there, never in anybody's hands. Never appropriate as a commodity or a piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of its articulation. In other words, individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application (Foucault, 1980, p. 98)

As he remarks on the nonhomogeneous feature of power, its circulation, its chain-like functioning and its non-localized essence, Foucault's detection is pertinent to all three novels in the dissertation. Once being in the hands of the coloniser, power has spread through the word of the coloniser and the colonised both. It has secured its place in the imperial context and among individuals, and thus, it reproduces itself constantly in the language and attitude of both parties whether colonizing or colonised. Therefore, Foucault's definition can be reinterpreted by saying while in the past the colonised were the points of application of power, now they are the vehicles. In that sense, the practice of power is not in the manners or practices of the power-holders only, but it is also in the self-perception of the others. This language communicates a meaning through which not only the coloniser exercises its power on the colonised but also the colonised makes his self-perception and behaves accordingly. Colonial discourse has reached a level that it reproduces itself through individuals because the circulation of power embodies in individuals, which reveals the "capillary" characteristic of discourse. Foucault also suggests that mechanisms of power has a capillary characteristic because it penetrates "into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives" (Foucault, 1980, p. 39) so it is difficult cleansing daily life off the power discourse.

One of the leading terms that will be mostly mentioned in the analyses is imperialism as a form of power and discourse spread around the world, and now is impossible to prevent its passage even into individual lives. Western civilisation brings imperial practices together with patriarchal extensions. Economic objectives of the

empires were held by the central idea of imperialism arriving in peripheral lands at the hands of colonialism. Some scholars specify that the management of imperial practice developed through a metropolitan system (Dixon and Heffernan, 1991, p. 2, Said, 1993, p. 8, Young, 2001, p. 6). “Imperialism” for Edward Said, as he states in *Culture and Imperialism*, means “the practice, the theory and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory (Said, 1993, p. 8). Stating its direct engagement to imperialism and capitalism, John McLeod finds out that colonialism was the commercial ventures of Western nations and their need for cheap labour power. For McLeod, historically how imperialism functions through settlement was shown by colonialism. Currently imperialism remains active in terms of securing wealth and economic exploitation (McLeod, 2000, pp. 8-9). Although it outreaches lands and people around the world, power is monopolised in the centre; that is, in the “empire”, focused as a control mechanism. Being a state policy, imperialism, is similarly outlined by Robert Young. He says that it is managed by the metropolitan ideology originating from the centre of the state and focusing on the expansion of the state power (Young, 2001, p. 6). The metropolitan ideology is in control of the colonies so with the agents of colonial centre the control penetrates into individual lives despite the distance to the metropolis. This is also dwelt on by Flemming Brahms in “Entering Our Own Ignorance”. He opines that although the histories of the colonised countries vary, “they always need to be understood in terms of a dependence upon the imperial centre [...]” (Brahms, 1982, p. 66).

On another level, imperialism functions as a disciplining and silencing mechanism which is the main concern of Gayatri Spivak. As one of the key figures of post-colonial feminist critique, Spivak’s position in “Three Women’s Texts” and “Can the Subaltern Speak?” is one of the major references throughout the analyses since she offers a post-colonial feminist understanding in relation to imperialism and suppression, and their outgrowths and reflections in discursive formation of colonial continuation. In “Three Women’s Texts”, Spivak says that unless imperialism and its relation to “England’s social mission” as a vital part of the cultural depiction of England to the English are remembered, it is not easy to contextualize nineteenth-century British literature because together with the literatures of European colonizing

cultures, a new narrative in literary history was produced. This is now the one we call the “Third World”. Spivak additionally states that “hegemonic definition of literature is itself caught within the history of imperialism” (Spivak, 1985, pp. 243,254) because it precluded the word of the indigenous as they were devoid of sophistication. Imperialism is seen as a rigidly constructed mechanism and that would be unfeasible for any attempt to carry out a plan to overcome its discursive power. This is a concern for critiques to understand literary texts. Robert Young states that the nineteenth century was approached by formalizing racism, ruining native cultures and imposing of dominant cultures instead and by sweeping the colonial activity “under the carpet of modernity” with an “unquestioned moral superiority of the values of western civilisation” (Young, 2001, pp. 4-6). Deepened by imperialism, the gap between the European and the non-European was made visible along with the colonial discourse that was animated and communicated by European culture and languages. As voiced by Abdul JanMohamed, in “The Economy of Manichean Allegory”, “the imperialist configures the colonial realm as a confrontation based on differences in race, language, social customs, cultural values and modes of production” (JanMohamed, 2003, p. 18), facilitating Europe’s position as the world’s axis. All the comments seem to converge on Spivak’s concern on imperialism and its irreversible spread. For Spivak, the perspectives criticizing imperialism cannot change the other into a self because the robust project of imperialism “has already historically refracted what might have been the absolutely other into a domesticated other that consolidates the imperialist Self” (Spivak, 1985, p. 253). In her widely acknowledged essay “Can the Subaltern Speak?”, Spivak gives a parallel perspective about the oppressed Third World woman whose existence still takes reference from Euro-centrism and imperialism:

Between patriarchy and imperialism, subject-constitution and object-formation, the figure of the woman disappears, not into a pristine nothingness but into a violent shuttling which is the displaced figuration of the ‘third-world woman’ caught between tradition and modernization (Spivak, 1988, p. 102)

The novels concern themselves with the in-between women and they can be read over Spivak’s key detections of imperialism and the silenced women so her detections will specifically be referred to as imperialism has besieged the protagonists with patriarchal demands and modern day anxieties.

The analyses ask for an answer to the concerns above in terms of self-definition and resistance, and the answer starts with self-perception and the coloniser's positioning in the self-perceptive moments. Ashcroft *et al* in their book *Postcolonial Studies: Key Concepts* argue that colonisers' language and dominance in terms of discourse affected the way that the colonised perceive themselves. The effect was so influential that it "created a deep conflict in the consciousness of the colonised because of its clash with the other knowledges about the world" by assuming the superiority of colonisers' rule, culture, history, language, art, political formations and social conventions and that inducted the advent of European imperialism (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2007, p. 37). These detections are related to all the novels due to the burden that results from the "clash of the knowledges". On the other hand, it would be incorrect to say that colonial discourse has faced no reactions or resistance. Many texts of post-colonial writing have manifested the signs of reactionary tendencies and achievements via the expression of core culture, the self and gaining advantage over the coloniser.

Post-colonial awareness in this sense has unveiled the core identities and presented them to the world as the actual knowledge of the other, which has to be articulated. Boehmer claims "a people's identity lays embedded in its cultural origins and was recoverable intact, unadulterated by the depredations of colonialism" because time was ripe to put things in a different way which was once in the hands of the coloniser as literary convention and discourse. That inherited discourse was "appropriated, translated, decentred and hybridized in ways which we now name postcolonial" but at the same time "anti-colonial, opportunistic and tactical" being different forms of self-expression that resulted in the loss of colonial, privileged and monopolist "charge of pen" for Europeans (Boehmer, 1995, pp. 100-101). In *Discourse/Counter Discourse* Richard Terdiman points to the existence of the other's voice. He states "no discourse is over a monologue [because] everything that constitutes [discourse] presupposes a horizon of competing, contrary utterances which it asserts its own energies" (Terdiman, 1985, p. 36).

As another argument in post-colonial discussions, binary oppositions will be one of the issues in *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *My Name is Salma*. The concept of binary oppositions was the case of structural linguistics originally. Structuralism was initiated by linguistic studies as a theoretical model of language, which refers to the smallest linguistic units and their relation to each other to function. Structuralism, as Terdiman states, dwelt much on the tendency to understand meaning through oppositions so “it became difficult to conceive of individual signs or elements of discourse in isolation” (Terdiman, 1985, p. 25). As a result, it emphasized the difference and left little or no area for constructive discussion. Similarly, in *Post-colonial Studies: Key Concepts*, Ashcroft *et al* state that the binary opposition is the ultimate form of difference. Such oppositions as black/white, birth/death or man/woman represent a binary system each. They are very common in the cultural construction of reality. Therefore, this system is opposed by feminist theories because within the binary system, the oppositions contain violent hierarchy. As one of the concepts in the pair is more dominant, the imperial system itself confirms dominance. That means, while constructing ideological meanings, the binary is the necessary constituent, which is extremely useful in imperial ideology (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2007, pp. 19-20). This is also because colonialism and imperialism assigned the parts and roles of parties. In relation to this, according to Ashcroft *et al*, dominance and hierarchy are also because of the “teacher” role of and the teaching mission of the coloniser, which unravels the main binarism behind imperial ideals: “exploit” and “civilize” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2007, p. 20). The analyses handle the topic with this perspective with a claim that the logic behind imperialism is constructed on binarism. Thus, it elevates this concealed hierarchy behind the oppositions such as coloniser/colonised, civilized/primitive, beautiful/ugly, centre/margin.

In addition to the preceding theoretical basis, canonical counter-discourse will be focused on. Post-colonial understanding is a domain to make a room for “canonical-counter discourse” as a term introduced by Richard Terdiman (Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin, 2007, p. 50). Counter-discourse, for Terdiman, functions through “astonishing diversities of tactics” (Terdiman, 1985, p. 76). In *Post-colonial Transformation*, Bill Ashcroft states

that “canonical-counter discourse” or “writing back” operates within the discourse of literature itself.” Ashcroft goes on:

Canonical literary texts are consumed in such a way that they become the basis for resistant, appropriated versions which subtly subvert the values and political assumptions of the originals. The significance of the texts that are re-read is that they offer powerful allegories of European culture, allegories through which life in post-colonial societies has itself been ‘written’ (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 33).

In *Key Concepts*, Ashcroft *et al* further state that challenges to a counter-discourse generally come from the periphery dwelling on the ‘absorptive capacity’ of imperial discourses (Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin, 2007, p. 50).

Homi Bhabha’s theory of Third Space will be another one of the main argumentative basis of the analyses in *Second Class Citizen* and *My Name is Salma*. The Third Space is a domain of possibility where both parties of the colonisation process create a hybrid moment of negotiation for a discussion the essence of which belongs to neither the coloniser nor the colonised. They draw their strength of enunciation from the cumulative essence of togetherness in spite of the antagonisms. As Bhabha clarifies in *The Location of Culture*, the “Third Space of enunciations [...] [are] the precondition for the articulation of cultural difference” (Bhabha, 1995, p. 38). In Bhabha’s terms, moreover, “by exploring this Third Space, we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of our selves” (Bhabha, 1995, p. 39). Bhabha details Third Space by referring to some of its key properties in his essay “In the Cave of Making: Thoughts on Third Space”. Third Space “is a place and a time that exists in-between” the two parties of an issue, and “this site of in-betweenness becomes the ground of discussion [...]”. It is a “dialogical site - a moment of enunciation, identification, negotiation [...]” (Bhabha, 2009, p. x). In this space for enunciation, Bhabha claims, the structure of meaning and reference are turned into an ambivalent process where cultural knowledge is shown as an “integrated, open and expanding code”. This formation of the code challenges the notion of cultural identity which announces itself as a homogenizing and unifying force, well-kept in the national tradition of peoples. That means, this enunciation process emerges as a disruptive force

against the narrative of the western nation, which opens “the way to the conceptualizing of an *international* culture, based on the “articulation of the culture’s *hybridity*” (Bhabha, 1995, pp. 37,38).

In his interview with Jonathan Rutherford, Bhabha says that post-colonial studies should essentially notice the fact that the time western modernity is located, that is the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, was in fact the time when the master narratives, western personhood and its critical rationality were defined. Among these delineated ones, were the citizen, the cultural value, art, science and *the novel*. All these primary cultural discourses and identities defined the ‘Enlightenment’ of western society (Rutherford, 1990, p. 218). The focal point that Bhabha’s argument suggests can be related to the novels’ main concerns. They all somehow uncover the understanding that because of “Western personhood”, many other identities have attempted (are still attempting) to appropriate themselves to the western knowledge or at least take it as an addressee to refer to. This intensity of “Western personhood” once again raises the question “you live in a world of others, a world that exists *for* others?” (Young, 2003, p.1). In this world for others, the other goes into the space of communication. Bhabha’s detection is relied upon at this point. He says that the time when western personhood was written was the same time when the west was making a history for itself through the colonial relations and possessions, which led them to emerge as a despotic power. This moment of despotic power, for Bhabha, met the same moment of the claims for modernity and the birth of democracy. However, the west was unable to solve those contradictions (Rutherford, 1990, p. 218). Therefore western claims, ideals and ideas could not gain practicality and credibility when they were genuinely needed at other’s public sphere. Bhabha goes on by saying:

the material legacy of this repressed history is inscribed in the return of post-colonial peoples to the metropolis. Their very presence there changes the politics of the metropolis, its cultural ideologies and its intellectual traditions because they – as a people who have been recipients of a colonial cultural experience – displace some of the great metropolitan narratives of progress and law and order, and question the authority and authenticity of those narratives. [...] the history of colonialism is [not only] the history of the West but also [...] is a *counter- history* to the normative, traditional history of the West (Rutherford, 1990, p. 218).

These “recipients of a colonial cultural experience” lead to moments of self-expression. As the theory implies; these are not long-term processes; only moments but during these moments, in contrast to clash, there appears signs of communication. There are moments when the colonised can find the chance to communicate his/her existence, as well. Bhabha metaphorically explains these moments at length:

This moment of reflection is never simply the mirror of *your* making, your frame of thinking, but a stillness sometimes heard in choral music when several voices hold the same note for a moment [...] as it soars beyond any semblance of sameness. The precarious tension involved in holding the thought – or the note- in common, vibrating beyond the control of any voice, is the timbre of translation working its way into our thinking. In this act of holding a thought, a note, a tone – the grain of the idea or the concept comes to be revealed through the side-by-side synchrony of different voices (Bhabha, 2009, p. ix).

The encounters with the Third World can be read through Bhabha’s interpretation in *The Location of Culture* with a focus on enunciation. Bhabha says that culture and the authority it establishes is a referential truth at the moment of *enunciation*. This enunciative process leads to a split in the present moment of the cultural identification of a performative act. This is a division between “a stable system of reference, and the necessary negation of the certitude in the articulation of new cultural demands, meanings, [and] strategies in the political present, as a practice of domination or resistance” (Bhabha, 1995, pp. 34-35). Related to this communicative space formed by divisive moments of different cultural performative acts, Sidney Mintz puts emphasis on cultural output and its historical meaning. Culture is a living thing and it is a part of the members of a continuing society. He summarizes the application of the symbolic meanings of a culture into daily life. For Mintz, the peoples of the New World add much to the world’s “repertory of skills and resources” in terms of domesticating plants, animals, engineering, philosophy, politics and aesthetics. As a consequence, this outcome has added much “to restore a sense of balance and modesty to the western view of the world outside.” However, for Mintz, a particular skill in the above terms does not suffice to employ it in daily life. Symbolic meanings are needed for the members of a continuing society because people cope with the daily demands

of life through “their interpretive and innovative skills and their capacity for employing symbolism”. They do this not by sticking to them blindly but by taking advantage of them creatively (Mintz, 2009, p. 20) which contributes much to the Third Space, as well.

In addition to the Third Space, mimicry is defined as another dimension of resistance when colonial discourse is at issue. The term will be referred to in the analysis of *My Name is Salma*. It is accepted that the colonised is engulfed by the colonial discourse. However, there are some vulnerabilities of this powerful formation that produce conflicts. Ambivalence and mimicry are among the leading ones which question the authority of colonial discourse. Critics argue that colonial discourse is ambivalent because of the nature of the coloniser – colonised relationship. It is originally derived from psychoanalytical theory. As Ashcroft *et al* explain, ambivalence points to a constant “fluctuation between wanting one thing and wanting its opposite”; that is, an issue of simultaneous “attraction and repulsion”. It is a condition, which “decentres authority from its position of power”, so colonial power finds itself inflected by other cultures (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2007, pp. 10,11). The colonised is not in a complete opposition process; rather it is a sign of resistance. This, according to Bhabha, as Ashcroft *et al* emphasize, “disrupts the clear-cut authority of colonial domination” which is not very tolerable on the coloniser’s side because the very tendency of colonial discourse is to produce submissive subjects to “reproduce its assumptions, habits and values”; that is, the ones to mimic the coloniser. However, in itself it produces not compliant but ambivalent subjects. Therefore, the mimicry produced is not far from mockery (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2007, p. 10). Therefore, mimicry is more close to menace for Bhabha. He states:

What they all share is a discursive process by which the excess of slippage is produced by the *ambivalence* of mimicry (almost the same, *but not quite*) does not merely ‘rupture’ the discourse, but becomes transformed into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a ‘partial’ presence [which means] both ‘incomplete’ and ‘virtual’. [...] The success of colonial appropriation depends on a proliferation of inappropriate objects that ensure its strategic failure, so that mimicry is at once resemblance and menace (Bhabha, 1995, p. 86).

Mimicry is a threat as it “articulates the disturbances of cultural, racial and historical difference that menace the narcissistic demand of colonial authority” (Bhabha, 1995, p. 88). The situation is interpreted as “threatening” by Ashcroft *et al* because “the result is a ‘blurred copy’ of the colonizer” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2007, p. 125), not a desired or an ideal one.

In his book *Homi K. Bhabha*, David Huddart notes that mimicry means neither a “slavish imitation nor an entire assimilation of the colonised. It is an “exaggerated copying of language, culture, manners, and ideas” which means that mimicry is a repetition with a difference and with a comic essence in it. It is comic because it undermines the constant claims of the empire and colonialism (Huddart, 2006, pp. 57,58). Mimicry functions as a defiant of colonial authority. Huddart adds that in ideologies, there is a superior – inferior by nature. This split between superior and inferior explain which group dominates the other. Then, colonial rule becomes unable to operate its justifications so it creates anxiety in the coloniser (Huddart, 2006, p. 59).

In terms of the core place of English in third world lives, the analyses will briefly dwell on linguistic imperialism and self-definition, too. Since the novels, especially *Second Class Citizen* and *My Name is Salma*, make reference to the necessity to learn English, Alastair Pennycook’s book *English and the Discourses of Colonialism* and Robert Phillipson’s book *Linguistic Imperialism* will be mentioned as reliable resources. Alastair Pennycook says “English is the language in which colonialism has been written” and “[...] in which the colonised are rationally defined” (Pennycook, 1998, pp. 7,8). As a ramification of imperial production, the position of English can also be counted which forces the colonised to use it correctly to define her/his self. In *Linguistic Imperialism*, Robert Phillipson claims that, today, English is “used for supranational and international links, and English linguistic imperialism operates globally as a key medium of Centre-Periphery relations” (Phillipson, 1992, pp. 54,56). Phillipson gives a further definition of linguistic imperialism quoting from the Ghanaian sociolinguist Gilbert Ansre:

The phenomenon in which the minds and lives of the speakers of a language are dominated by another language to the point where they believe that they can and should use only that foreign language when it comes to transactions

dealing with the more advanced aspects of life such as education, philosophy, literature, governments, the administration of justice, etc... (Ansre quoted in Phillipson, 1992, p. 56).

As Suresh Canagarajah similarly mentions, the issue was not only a matter of language teaching; it was indeed, “adopting the modes of instruction, curriculum and teaching materials used in British public schools” (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 60). Education and language teaching to express the self is another spotlight in colonialism studies.

As another concern of the theory chapter, different viewpoints in feminist stance and self-representation will be dwelt on. Both *Second Class Citizen* and *My Name is Salma* deviate from the feminist definitions concentrating around western perspective. A bit critical of western attitude to feminism, in her essay “Conceptualizing Gender”, Oyeronke Owewumi states that feminist researchers tend to use gender as a definitive model to explain women’s subordination and oppression as a worldwide phenomenon. All at once, they regard the category of “woman” and her subordination as universals but gender is primarily a socio-cultural construct (Oyewumi, 2004, p. 2). In a similar vein, in “African Women’s Writing as a Weapon”, Nfah-Abbenyi’s interpretation reads as follows:

African women writers have reclaimed and reaffirmed the anteriority of an African feminism, one that their maternal ancestors have relied on for millennia, a feminism that has grounded and continues to ground their daily lived experiences, one that is open to share with and teach a (Eurocentric) feminist movement a few things as well (Nfah-Abbenyi, 1997, p.147).

Also, Muslim women and the scholars studying Muslim discourses have a similar concern, that is, women’s being reduced to religion and thus to veil or patriarchal subjugation. Originally veil symbolizes a difference between Islam and the west. Historically, as Robert Young puts it, only a few items have been attributed political meaning throughout history and one of them is the veil (Young, 2003, p. 80). Veil by itself leads to contradictory meanings. The primary one of these contradictions is, as it is currently perceived, veil demarcates the line between westernization and radicalism. According to Robert Young, westerners think that veil symbolizes Islamic societies with a “patriarchal precedence so women are thought to be oppressed,

subordinated and made invisible.” In Islamic societies on the other hand, as Young adds, the veil stands for cultures and religious identity so women cover themselves. Today, “the veil symbolizes control or defiance, oppression or autonomy, patriarchy or non-western communal values” (Young, 2003, p. 80). For Muslim scholars, this is only a part of the issue. In her book *Women and Gender in Islam*, Leila Ahmed points to the fact that veiling has a symbolic significance before *Western eyes* because it has become the most distinguishing feature of Muslim societies, which marks “the differentness and inferiority of Islamic societies”. Furthermore, it has transformed into a symbol of backwardness and the oppression of women “and it became the open target of colonial attack and the spearhead of the assault on Muslim societies” (Ahmed, 1992, p. 152). Leila Ahmed also thinks that western feminism is influenced by colonialism and it indirectly supports European superiority (Ahmed, 1992, p. 154). These detections will be studied and adapted while analysing the protagonist’s self-definition and resistance in *My Name is Salma* as she is overwhelmed by her in-between feelings among the voices of others. In *Muslim Narratives and the Discourses of English*, Amin Malak states that under the weight of western scholarly voice, East has remained “inarticulate or inaudible.” Muslim narratives in English, project the Islamic culture and civilization from within. For Malak, Muslims regard Islam as a key point of their identity which could rival their class, race, gender or ethnic bonds as the example displays: first Muslim, then Arab and then Algerian. In terms of language, Malak says that writers of previous colonies, and the Muslim ones, have “exposed, cleansed, and refashioned the English language to fit their own agendas (Malak, 2004, pp. 1-3,10). Therefore, the rejection or protection of this religious identity comes out from that very point. In the entire globe, they have to deal with another dimension, beyond race and class, to be heard. The layers of their identity, especially the Muslim women’s, are wrapped like a crust with this dimension which forces them to struggle for an other self-definition. Now, the concentration has been directed to the brown, which is announced as “the New Black” by Hamid Dabashi in his book *Brown Skin, White Masks* in which he mainly dwells on migration and focuses on the position of the Arab and the Muslim as the “new demons, especially in the aftermath of the 9/11” (Dabashi, 2011, p. 35). In advance of 9/11, in his 1993 article “The Clash of Civilizations”, which has got world-wide attention, Samuel Huntington announced “the crescent-shaped

Islamic Bloc, from the bulge of Africa to central Asia, has bloody borders” (Huntington, 1993, p. 34).

The leading theory which paved the way for these discussions came originally from Edward Said. In his theory “Orientalism” which criticizes Europe’s central position as the decision maker of statements through academic and literary circles, Said brings forward a criticism where he says the west studies the east as its other in detail and claim a say on its dynamics. In *Orientalism*, Said states that dealing with the Orient means “dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it, [...]” (Said, 1979, p. 3). From Said’s point of view, it can be said that well-known scholars like Huntington can frame the definition of Muslim geography and identities, and their relation to others with an orientalist perspective. Edward Said’s commitment to the study on this claim of superiority is engaged with this process. In *Culture and Imperialism* he draws a vast panorama of the western born understanding that covers a great majority of the Earth. Europe, for Said, has an effort to control and command distant territories and peoples. It is not limited to the European writing of Africa, India, some parts of the Far East, Australia and the Caribbean. Their effort is also directed towards the Islamic world with Orientalist descriptions. Europe has its special ways of representing these lands. In these discourses for Said, the striking thing is the perpetual “rhetorical figures”, which mould the other lands, such as “the mysterious East” or “the African mind” (Said, 1993, p. xi). These are the labellings, wordings and conceptions that lead to prejudice or fixation in minds. They were built to otherise the extremes and the foreign. Also, according to Said, this nourishes thoughts like “they were not like us”, they were barbaric, rebellious and full of misbehaviours so deserved to be ruled (Said, 1993, p. xi). Similarly, in *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*, Alastair Pennycook dwells on the grounds of European images of self and other. On the place where the self and other constructed, the constructions of superiority and inferiority were produced (Pennycook, 1995, p. 18), and this leads to a self-loath in Muslims, especially when they are in the countries of the west.

To conclude the Introduction, Bhabha can be referred to once more for his provision of a detailed observation of today’s world. In his “Foreword” in *The*

Wretched of the Earth, Bhabha sees Fanon's famous saying as a projection that sheds light on the present day. Bhabha says:

'The colonized, underdeveloped man is today a political creature in the most global sense of the term,' Fanon writes in *The Wretched of the Earth*, and it is my purpose almost half a century later, to ask what might be saved from Fanon's ethics and politics of decolonization to help us reflect on globalization in our sense of the term (Bhabha, 2004, p. xi).

Bhabha sees Fanon's text as a provision for the future. He says it takes "peculiarly grounded, historical stance [...] toward the future" (Bhabha, 2004, p. xiv).

It is a necessity to understand contemporary world and its inhabitants from a historical perspective. As a widely influential factor of social and political climate today, it is impossible to distil colonial experience and expansion from today's global scene. In his introductory essay titled "The Persistence of English" in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, Geoffrey Nunberg begins his words with a focus on the achievement of English: "If you measure the success of a language in purely quantitative terms, English is entering the twenty-first century at the moment of its greatest triumph" (Nunberg, 2000, p. xliii). Nunberg also focuses on the large number of people who are native speakers, who speak it as a second and foreign language and the ones who use it daily. While referring to the numbers and emphasizing the hegemony of English, Nunberg also accepts the fact that these numbers do not guarantee the "unity of English" as a means of cultural expression. These new Englishes have emerged mainly because of African, Asian, Caribbean and Indian literatures (Nunberg, 2000, p. lx) so it has created the other side. These numbers are inevitably related to British colonialism, and they are also related to a communicative space which was created through colonial codes, problematic relationships, superior gaze of the coloniser to the colonised other and the self-definition of the other. This dissertation aims to understand the reflection of the colonial discourse within the self-definition and resistance of the protagonists through their encounter with the colonial discourse while challenging the patriarchal outgrowths of colonial language and their local environments. In order to understand this other side, theoretical and critical remarks provide an appropriate approach to the study to be followed. The approaches

will provide a defensible base that the hypothesis needs. For this reason, the theories, approaches and discoveries of the related theorists and scholars will be frequently referred to. Together with the protagonists' actions and feelings, the theories and statements of the above mentioned scholars will clarify the hypothesis and pave the way to the intended conclusion.



CHAPTER 2

WIDE SARGASSO SEA, the COLONIAL SELF and RESISTANCE

Jean Rhys (1890-1979) and her art are interconnected due to the relevance of her fiction to her life experience. Her authorship is appreciated as she touches upon feminine issues, burdens of modern life, and colonial and post-colonial perspectives. In her book *Jean Rhys*, Coral Ann Howells specifies three sides of Rhys's authorship: a woman, a modernist and a colonial writer. For Howells, Rhys's touch on women's issues carries her own perspective of denial of patriarchal understanding with the portrayal of the unspeaking or silenced female characters that are distant from rebellion but closer to seduction (Howells, 1991, pp. 7-26). Lethargy and silence that her female characters lay themselves open to are taken as the major characteristics of her writing. In *Jean Rhys at "World's End"*, Mary Lou Emery dwells on Rhys's positioning of female characters, which has at times received criticism from feminist circles, in that her characters' lack self-hood in "European terms" and cannot surmount difficulties. They lack courage, tend to be weak and are willingly exploited (Emery, 1990, p. 11). In a similar vein, Colette Lindroth calls Rhys's fiction "a haunted world" due to the lack of direct comment of her female characters. Lindroth further states "[g]oing nowhere (and often going there in the dark) and finding nothing when she gets there, Rhys's heroine feels no inclination to make statements" (Lindroth, 1990, p. 85). Apart from this specification, the problems that her characters suffer from are modern problems of modern life and closer to gloom rather than hope. That feature of Rhys's writing is defined as the modernist aspect of her art. For Howells, Rhys is a modernist writer because she refers to "gender and colonial differences in the shape of the outsider having no money, no power, no social position" and her fiction has a touch of "isolation and psychic fragmentation together with the multiple voices of male and female characters, the voices of memory and history". Lastly, Rhys's concentration on colonialism is also specified by Howells, too. Rhys situates the problem of cultural discourse and belonging within the contradictory situation of being a white Creole in the Caribbean. According to Howells, imperialism's derogatory gaze on the colonised comes into prominence in Rhys's work, thematizing British imperial discourse, English language and culture of the governing class (Howells, 1991, pp. 7-26).

Accordingly, word and expression serve as an inseparable whole in Rhys's art because her experiences had to be articulated. Also, her past shapes her art. According to Thomas Staley, Rhys's inherent conflicts, her fears and feelings were caused by her past. Staley claims:

The passivity and turbulence, the racial mixture, the cultural contrasts between colonial and native life, all of these she absorbed with their inherent conflicts. But probably more than anything else her early years in the West Indies formed her imagination and shaped the restlessness of her identity (Staley, 1979, p .4).

Especially, this last specification of Rhys's style, "colonial" concern as a post-colonial writer, is salient in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, which attained considerable recognition as her most outstanding novel with its patriarchal emphasis. It has attracted the attention of various scholars and enabled each to focus on a different aspect of the novel for it offers a great range of possible discussions from feminist issues to psychoanalytic ones; from historically-marked matters to cultural issues.

Besides pursuing post-colonial concerns at the time of its publishing, the time the story is set is after-emancipation period so the characters and their worries are also related to the novel's historical references. The novel starts with the protagonist Antoinette's narration reflecting racial issues that have not come to an end despite the Emancipation Law. Unable to feel a belonging to either whiteness or blackness in terms of ancestry as a result of the social climate that she was born into, Antoinette suffers from loneliness and abandonment caused by being the daughter of a white Creole mother of Martinique origin and a deceased British father, who was a plantation and slave owner and had financial hardships after the Emancipation Law. With this consciousness, she can deduce the very reason why her family is not liked by the black community in which she has no other choice but to live among. She is quite aware that they are unwanted and something to be made fun of as "white cockroaches". She has analytical sense leading her to the conclusion that due to the economic situation after her father's death, his property collapsed together with the social earnings: "All Coulibri Estate had gone wild like the garden, gone to bush. No more slavery. Why should *anybody* work?" (Rhys, 2000, p. 6). Antoinette cannot find peace at home or in her immediate environment but worst of all; she cannot see her mother Anette as a

harbouring figure because she is far more interested in her invalid son Pierre. Therefore, Antoinette aligns herself with the wild nature of her island where she thinks she is fully content with. Although she cannot get attention and interest from her mother, who remarries a British man, Mr Mason, Antoinette never stops feeling sympathy and love for her. A substantive part of Antoinette's narration consists of her inner thoughts and besides, her dialogues with her nurse and servant Christophine, also of Martinique origin, a strong black character with her noticeable detections that can be taken as system criticism and a female uprising. The second part reveals her married life in which she at first feels happy but then, ends up with an overwhelming burden. Her marriage is called by Robin Visel a "soul-destroying marriage" (Visel, 1988, p. 3). Narrating the second part thoroughly, Antoinette's husband is the voice of patriarchy, the coloniser and the imperial culture. He has performed an unwilling marriage to fulfil a familial wish. He comes to the Caribbean to marry Antoinette and take over the rule of her property as permitted by the English Law. Although he is unhappy with the situation he finds himself in, he feels the urge to complete a mission; therefore, he finds himself in the middle of the system which he represents. His dialogues with Christophine are also distinguishing as Christophine quarrels frequently with him about his interests, his desire for profit and his masterful character which drains Antoinette's natural energy. The novel clearly demonstrates that neither Antoinette nor her husband manages to be happy in the discomforting climate of British colonial rule that penetrates into the characters' self-definition and resistance, but basically Antoinette's. Narrated by Antoinette, the last part of the novel obviously demonstrates her unfitness to her environment in the top room of the British mansion, if the room itself is examined as an environment. She is labelled as "mad" and "lunatic", is made to believe so and is silenced by her husband; and later, she is taken to Britain as a "ghost", a "breathless doll" with "no warmth and no sweetness" (Rhys, 2000, p. 110). Antoinette can find no reason why she has been brought there and encaged as a "lunatic". The room she is locked in by her husband is not more than a locale which has only "one window high up [and] [...] not much else" (Rhys, 2000, p. 116) and, where she is condemned to life imprisonment:

[...] wonder why I have been brought here. For what reason? There must be a reason. What is that I must do? When I first came, I thought it would be for a

day, two days, a week perhaps. I thought that when I saw him and spoke to him, I would be wise as serpents, harmless as doves. 'I give you all I have freely,' I would say, 'and I will not trouble you again if you will let me go.' But he never came (Rhys, 2000, p. 116).

The question Antoinette asks and the answer she herself gives reflect her entire resistance to the patriarchal, the colonial and the imperial:

Antoinette: What is it that I must do? [...] I will not trouble you again if you will let me go. (Rhys, 2000, p. 116)

[...]

Antoinette: Now at last I know why I was brought here and what I have to do (Rhys, 2000, p. 124).

These two questions reserve Antoinette's actual self-definition and resistance burgeoning in time, strengthening with her consciousness and self-definition, and eventually reaching at a final level with her turn in the third part.

The aim of this analysis is to pursue Antoinette's silent awareness throughout her story and the final straw that terminates the feeling of lethargy and leads to an other beginning. Accordingly, the analysis intends to build the discussion on the well-known key phrase of *Wide Sargasso Sea*: "there is always the other side, always" (Rhys, 2000, p. 82) because in the novel "the other side" refers to the dehistoricized, silenced, marginalized, and ruined natural female. To this end, this analysis will focus on three main key concepts in the framework of post-colonial reaction: firstly, female voice in the midst of the imperial, the colonial and the patriarchal, secondly, nature as female versus culture as male in terms of binarism being challenged by the protagonist and lastly, the final manoeuvre as a sample of canonical counter-discourse. First of all, the resistant stance of *Wide Sargasso Sea* itself with the voice of Antoinette will be analysed as it touches upon historically complicated issues, outmanoeuvres the colonialist understanding and substantiates the subversion from the centre by sliding gradually to the periphery. While doing this the weight of patriarchal discourse and its reflection on the other's self-definition and resistance will be highlighted. Antoinette as the female other will be put into the centre of the discussion in terms of her self-

definition and her critical gaze at patriarchy, which is the substance of imperialism. Antoinette and her detections about the imperial gains of the powerful will also be dwelt on as her life cannot be freed from male-domination and the coloniser's pursuit. Secondly, Antoinette's alignment with nature and its wilderness will be focused on as she cannot detach herself from her beloved island which is the main piece of her self-definition and at the same time, womanly resistance. Her alignment with nature encompassing her but excluding her husband irritates the husband and moreover, exhibits the presence of a steadfast refusal in him. Lastly, the final act, within the framework of the novel's last chapter, is analysed as a monumental part, which can be regarded as a piece having little length but immeasurable density. All things considered, *Wide Sargasso Sea* itself exhibits a self-definition process by taking Antoinette as the self and distancing her British husband as the outsider even though he and his colonial presence are in the middle of the discussion. Following this consciousness, the novel gives the stage to Antoinette and her husband as the two opposites of colonial and patriarchal system and, privileges Antoinette who leads a very silent but conscious life, and who, eventually, must brave a tragic end. She is now the one who acts with her free will with the deliberate choice of this tragic end, which reveals her resistance and highlights who she really is.

"There is always the other side, always" (Rhys, 2000, p. 82) can be considered as the catchphrase of the novel because it represents the stance of post-colonial understanding and the existence of the dualism between European viewpoint and its others. As a novel of opposite stances, *Wide Sargasso Sea* hints at imperialism, colonialism, patriarchy and slavery hidden in the characters' utterances, reaction and resistance that are all interlined in the narration and plot through the dialogues or unarticulated thoughts. The novel is not characterised as a post-colonial novel solely because it is set on a colonised region, the West Indies. It is also because of the fact that the characters, place and time are all fictionalised concerning colonial gaze itself, Caribbean issues and conflictual matters between Europe and the Caribbean with economic, social, patriarchal, racial and governmental extensions. Many are related to slavery issues that brought a lot of troubles both for the plantation owners and for the slaves. *Wide Sargasso Sea* broaches the matters with an anti-imperial point of view together with an initial focus on slavery. As the setting is

Jamaica, a colonised Caribbean island in the post-emancipation period, the novel handles colonial key issues with a post-colonial understanding. It is clear in the novel that slavery is an essential issue of colonisation. According to Sidney Mintz as he states in *Caribbean Transformations*, the development of slave system starting from the sixteenth century formed a large part of development of European economies because slavery as it outgrew in the New World was a crucial ingredient of westernization outside Europe (Mintz, 2009, p. 10). It was the year 1833 when Slave Emancipation Act was passed with its concomitant challenges and troubles. In his book *Freedom Burning: Anti-Slavery and Empire in Victorian Britain*, Richard Huzzey says that with the help of humanitarian reformers and the popular support they got, slave trade was abolished in 1807. Then, in 1830s the Emancipation Act let the slaves free, “at least” (Huzzey, 2012, pp. 5,8). Those on-paper decisions, although they were legalized, did not suffice to alleviate the economic and practical problems among the community. In *After Abolition: Britain and the Slave Trade since 1807*, Marika Sherwood criticizes that despite the announcement of the Emancipation Act, there was no compensation for the slaves while their ex-owners were receiving a great amount of cash “for their loss of unpaid labour” (Sherwood, 2007, pp. 2,14). The characters’ are quite aware of this process, the losses and the gain, which is reflected in their critical utterances. Similarly, Marie Olausson states that Rhys focuses on the white experience in West Indies. People in the West Indies derived their wealth, status and identity from the system of slavery (Olausson, 1993, p. 66). However, after the abolition, plantation owners had to face the loss of their income. In the novel, the loss of the ex-plantation owners and the so-called good of the black community as once slaves are the very first things touched. Antoinette hears her mother saying to her only friend, Mr Luttrell, their neighbour: “Of course they have their own misfortunes. Still waiting for this compensation the English promised. Some will wait for a long time” (Rhys, 2000, p. 5). As an ex-plantation owner who lost much, too, Mr Luttrell, first “shot his dog and swam out to sea and was gone for always”, his house is labelled as “haunted” by black people and, nobody from England has come to look after his property (Rhys, 2000, p. 5). This depressing opening scene reflects those conflictual matters between Europe and the Caribbean and the feeling of abandonment around the immediate environment which will never leave the protagonist for her whole life.

With its direct relation to patriarchy and the authoritative discourse it brings, slavery is Rhys's initial concern in *Wide Sargasso Sea* because the novel itself manifests a challenge to the constitution of patriarchal language of colonial authority, its outgrowths and the tendency to enslave. The unsatisfactory implementation of the Emancipation Law is the earliest reference to the unparalleled relationships with a bond to patriarchal dominance. Apart from Antoinette's mother, this issue, for the second time, is articulated in a cynical way by the black nurse Christophine questioning the Law's credibility: "No more slavery! [...] These new ones have Letter of the Law. Same thing. They got magistrate. They got fine. They got jail house and chain gang. [...] New ones worse than old ones – more cunning. That's all" (Rhys, 2000, p. 11). Slave trade was a profitable business and Hugh Thomas in his book *The Slave Trade* claims that in Jamaica until the eighteenth century thousands of Negroes were provided for Spaniards and in return, gold and silver were received (Thomas, 1997, p. 237) so emancipation did not supply better conditions to the freed slaves. This severe poverty is articulated by Antoinette's black friend, Tia: "[...] we poor like beggar. We ate salt fish – no money for fresh fish. [...]. Plenty white people in Jamaica. Real white people. They got gold money" (Rhys, 2000, p. 10). The "gold" as a material profit by slave owners in return as Hugh Thomas states, is quite obvious even to the vision of a little girl. This historical depth introduced through the enunciation of slavery and emancipation in the novel makes it clearer to see the background hatred against the white, which is emphasized by Fanon as he states in *The Wretched of the Earth*: "what constitutes the riches of the colonizers came from the underdeveloped" (Fanon, 2004, p. 58). These two examples also show the patriarchal structure of owning. The continuation of feudal mentality, which means ownership and having the hold of property, is still alive despite the Law. Both Christophine and Tia are aware of the specious character of this new Law because for them the ones who had the possession before are the same ones who possess it now. On the other hand, when Antoinette's position is taken into consideration, it is clear that her father was once a slave owner and a possessor. After his death, everything was reversed. Neither Antoinette's mother, Anette nor Antoinette has had the privilege which the colonisers once had because they are different. They are not "real white" people any more. In her essay "Jean Rhys's Construction of Blackness as Escape from White Femininity in

Wide Sargasso Sea”, Maria Olaussen says “[t]he black people point out that they/[Antoinette and her mother] now lack real whiteness” (Olaussen, 1993, p. 69). Antoinette’s relation to real whiteness, in terms of skin colour and heredity, is her father. When he died, she became a low “rank” person. Her narration starts regarding her mother and herself as a constituent of the same identity by referring to their diversity from the black and white community. She detaches herself both from blackness and whiteness by saying “[t]hey say when trouble comes close ranks, and so the white people did. [...] they thought, and worse still, a Martinique girl” (Rhys, 2000, p. 5). Antoinette is aware that everything that can be associated with her father “belong[s] to the past” (Rhys, 2000, p. 5) and they are now alone with their own origin. While Antoinette is defining her self, she, in fact, summarizes patriarchy, which enchains all the losses in her life. Because of colonial system, her father had material gains, properties, slaves and a name as a white British man. With his death, Antoinette and her mother have gradually lost their prestige, money and name. Colonial system once giving privilege to their family is the same system which gets it back now.

In terms of imperialism and patriarchy, the impossibility of detaching *Wide Sargasso Sea* from Charlotte Brontë’s *Jane Eyre* should be taken into consideration as regards patriarchal portrayal of nineteenth century other due to imperialism’s hold on the practicality of patriarchal power. When *Wide Sargasso Sea* is considered as a response that circulates around imperial pursuits, then Spivak’s statement, which directs the attention to the in-between situation of women, can be referred to: “between patriarchy and imperialism, the subject-constitution and object formation, the figure of the women disappears” (Spivak, 1988, p. 102). *Wide Sargasso Sea* is a criticism of how imperialism has penetrated into the coloniser’s soul with an underhanded rapacity and how this penetration destroys another soul by giving sheer agony. Therefore, the disappeared woman of *Jane Eyre* is reanimated in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. In her essay the “Madwomen in Our Attics: *Jane Eyre* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*’s Treatment of Feminism”, Megan Mericle states “both novels presented feminist ideals that were unheard before their publications” (Mericle, 2012, p. 236). If both novels are concerned themselves with feminine issues, what has given *Wide Sargasso Sea* a monumental merit in the post-colonial domain?

Narration can be treated as a form of resistance in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. In the first and third chapters, the narrator Antoinette is a young girl, and a woman. On Rhys's side, giving the word to "the other side" is considered as resistance all by itself because the mad woman is not only "written a life" by Rhys, but also elaborated with different periods of life starting from a lived childhood, and then, womanhood with a highlighted femininity. Antoinette sees the world with her feminine subjectivity, and through her Caribbean eyes. She announces the knowledge from the other side. Although she seems lethargic, she is quite aware of everything happening around, especially the gains and losses. With her actions, she can be regarded as being far from rebellion. However, her unspoken but deliberate and focused thoughts dominate the narration and opens up a space for the reader to think critically. For example, upon learning that their horse is poisoned, her mother desperately says: "[n]ow we are marooned [...] now what will become of us?" (Rhys, 2000, p. 6). Antoinette arouses sympathy to her mother with an analytical questioning of her situation: "She was young. How could she not try for all the things that had gone so suddenly, so without warning" (Rhys, 2000, p. 6). Antoinette refers to the experiences in their life which cannot be detached from colonial experiences and the sudden loss it has caused. Her narration is so central to the stance of the novel that her interrogative comments embrace historical experiences: "The black people did not hate us when we were poor. We were white but we had not escaped and soon we would be dead for we had no money left. What was there to hate?" (Rhys, 2000, p.16). Here, Spivak's spotting on the graded importance of two questions is noteworthy to remember. In her interview with Sneja Gunew, Spivak emphasizes that "Who will listen?" is more crucial than "Who will speak?" (Gunew, 1990, p. 59). Similarly, in their article "Intertextuality, narrators and other voices in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*" Rosalia Neumann Garcia and Mariana Oliveira say that although Antoinette is the narrator in the first part, she reports that how other people see things such as "Christophine said", "Tia said", "I heard" or "they thought". Moreover, she sometimes suppresses the words she wants to say. This leads to an interesting effect for Garcia and Oliveira. That means Antoinette does not expect understanding or accreditation from others, from the characters of the fictional world around her, "but she is requesting accreditation from the reader. Therefore, the first part of the novel prepares the basis for the other parts to

come (Garcia and Oliveira, 2016, pp. 227-228). Critical comments are pierced into Antoinette's unarticulated thoughts, and they never escape from her awareness. Therefore, the silence of the colonised woman is broken through the narrator's thoughts. In an instance, for example, Antoinette hears her stepfather saying "[t]here is some festivity in the neighbourhood. [...] A wedding perhaps" (Rhys, 2000, p. 16). Antoinette corrects his guess: "Not a wedding. [...] There is never a wedding" (Rhys, 2000, p. 16). He does not appreciate her manner and frowns at her. Antoinette quizzically disapproves her stepfather as he thinks that he knows much. She thinks to herself: "[...], my mother knows but she can't make him believe it. I wish I could tell him that out here is not all like English people think it is. I wish..." (Rhys, 2000, p. 16). Her wish is strong to define her knowledge on the land. This verifies that it is not always the coloniser who knows. Here, it is the other side where things are different. Antoinette's narration gives her the privilege to know and reflect. Turning back to Spivak's detection above as she says women fade between imperialism and patriarchy, it can be said that Antoinette is caught between the two. Yet, her observations throughout the novel seep into narration and come to light. This is where her resistance finds a different language. Ashcroft *et al* state that binary logic of imperialism support hierarchy and hegemony (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2007, p. 19). Additionally, in her essay, Spivak makes a reference to binary oppositions of "individual and history" (Spivak, 1985 p. 243). If Antoinette's awareness via her observations is considered, it is seen that she draws her pathway on the binary opposition of history-individual. Although imperial history has put the colonised in a trapped and silent position and dominated her, as an individual, Antoinette uses the space of freedom of thought. The novel makes it clear that her mind is full of unarticulated thoughts but they are freed through narration. Thus, she penetrates into the hegemonic domain of the opposition between history and individual and has a say among the teachings of imperial history, and becomes more powerful as the narrating protagonist than the history itself. To Nancy Harrison's view, as she states in her book *Jean Rhys and the Novel as Women's Text* even when the heroine is "talking to herself", "she is always self-consciously addressing someone [...]" (Harrison, 2009, p. 68). Her unspoken thoughts are so sharp and conscious that at the moment of a similar discussion between her mother and her stepfather about one of their relatives' hatred against the West Indies, Antoinette sees and thinks

“None of you understand about us” (Rhys, 2000 p. 14) when Mr Mason says “[t]hat’s her story. I don’t believe” (Rhys, 2000, p. 14). Here, this is Antoinette’s self who is not speaking, but thinking and criticizing. She sees and understands things with different eyes so she does not become estranged from her self. If she articulated her thoughts, she would give the stage to others to answer.

Following her mother’s wedding ceremony, Antoinette witnesses short talks between women. As the narrator and transmitter of many people’s views, she firstly reports two voices in a conversation: “‘Why should a very wealthy man who could take his pick of all the girls in West Indies and many in England too probably?’, ‘Why *probably?*’, the other voice said. ‘*Certainly*’” (Rhys, 2000, p. 13). After her mother and step-father come back from their honeymoon, Antoinette sees them kissing and dancing. She remembers another woman’s voice: “I was remembering that woman saying ‘Dance! He did not come to the West Indies to dance- he came to make money as they all do. Some of the estates are going cheap, and one unfortunate’s loss is always a clever man’s gain’” (Rhys, 2000, p. 13). The interpolation of this historical reference accentuates imperialism, which takes the side of patriarchy and, is narrated by quite observant Antoinette. For Daphne Grace as she states in *Relocating Consciousness*, the pre-civilised world of the Caribbean fed “the imagination and the interests of the commercial gain” (Grace, 2007, p. 192). The gain that Mr Mason has made is so clear to her notice and is made clear to the readers’.

Under the guise of protection, wife-husband relationship here is based on patronizing and patriarchal gain which is not limited to Mr Mason. Referring to Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar and their book *The Madwoman in the Attic*, Edward Rochester in *Jane Eyre* can be considered as the creation of patriarchy and thus, his first wife Bertha Mason is the creation of him. Gilbert and Gubar say that if “women are made, not born”, then they might be “wittingly or unwittingly married to patriarchy itself” (Gilbert & Gubar, 2000, p. xxv). In terms of Antoinette’s resistance and self-definition, Rhys’s textual stance taking its inspiration from *Jane Eyre*’s Bertha Mason, who is doomed to step back and forth in the attic of a British mansion making nonsensical yells disturbing peace and quiet, can be interpreted as a support to the reshaped character Bertha. Referring to Rhys’s letters, Gayatri Spivak also states that

the figure Bertha Mason was written a life by Rhys (Spivak, 1985, p. 249), who takes the “figure” and turns it into a woman with sound reasons that must be read over colonial and patriarchal discourse; and, as a counter-voice that rises against the hegemonies of the coloniser who is exposed to, in Helen Tiffin’s words, “subversive manoeuvres” through which Rhys “takes up the basic assumptions of a canonical text”, subverts it and challenges British sovereignty by centring persons, place, culture and language and presents a hybridized world as well as male sovereignty. In “Post-colonial Literatures and Counter Discourse”, Tiffin also uses the term “canonical counter-discourse” for Rhys’s fiction, as a strategy where Rhys takes characters and basic assumptions from the British canon and subverts these assumptions to serve the aim of post-colonial domain (Tiffin, 1995, pp. 95-98). This counter argument of Rhys gives a biological, socio-historical and a cognitive past to the woman, the silhouette like figure which does not have a proper history and even a name of her own. This cognition of the past, memories and remembering where she belongs to all lay the foundation of the last chapter and Antoinette’s reaction. Writing her a history and opening up many critical moments of colonial language to Antoinette’s consciousness reveals that the marginalized woman of the West Indies has in fact got her own centre even though she feels displaced at times. Rhys goes deep into that centre by going deep into Antoinette’s personal history to show the making of a woman; then, the making of a mad woman and lastly, the remaking of the Caribbean women with a moment of decision which she herself makes. With this chain, Rhys gives the message that the past cannot be undone. In all ways the figure is a “woman”, which highlights the feminine side of the things going on. As Bhabha states: “...- women, natives, the colonized, who indentured and enslaved – who at the same time but in other spaces, were becoming the peoples without a history” (Bhabha, 1995, p. 197). In the beginning when Antoinette melancholically remembers old days, she declares that she has a “past” saying “My father, visitors, horses, feeling safe in bed – all belonged to the past” (Rhys, 2000, p. 5). Although her melancholy and solitude are followed throughout the narration(s) and although it is understood that she is “not used to happiness” (Rhys, 2000, p. 57), she has a past of her own and this is a part of her self. Gilbert and Gubar further mention the “dehumanization” of Bertha Mason Rochester and her racial and geographical marginality. For them, Bertha’s background supports

the mentality which annihilates this “heathen, bestial Other” in order to build “European female subjectivity” (Gilbert and Gubar, 2000, p. xxxvi). Referring to Rhys’s construction of Antoinette with her own history, own feelings, likes and dislikes, own body, and more than these her own self is not only a response to the creation of this bestial character but also a reaction to the universal acceptance of European female subjectivity. This means white and black women, like Antoinette and Christophine, with their own self and subjectivity exist everywhere. Thus, this is also a resistance to the acknowledgement of European women and the sacrifice of the other(s) for the good of European women. Gilbert and Gubar also state that the word “attic” they use is a metaphoric formation of “disenfranchised Third World women on the borders or outside Western civilisation” (Gilbert and Gubar, 2000, p. xxxvi). This woman on the borderline is now the woman with a place of birth and a history. Her history is not decentred. There “was” once a centre, a home as Antoinette says “our garden was large and beautiful as that garden in the Bible – the tree of life grew there” (Rhys, 2000, p. 6). Although Antoinette does not clearly identify herself with a certain place, she is conscious enough to declare wittingly that she has a history, a home and a family.

Related to the issue above, Rhys’s turn-taking as a female and as a post-colonial author reveals itself so clearly while Antoinette is talking to her husband and is eager to tell an ordinary story:

Antoinette: [...] I will tell you a story.

Husband: If this is a sad story, don’t tell it to me tonight.

Antoinette: It is not sad. [...] Only some things happen and are there for always even though you forget why or when. It was in that little bedroom (Rhys, 2000, p. 50).

In her response, Antoinette makes a summary of dehistoricization of the colonised female, which evokes the attic and the forgotten, mad woman of Thornfield. Although the patriarchal coloniser forgets “why or when”, the story/history has been existent. This exact detection is voiced by Antoinette in the second part and during the husband’s narration. Her personal experiences are in the centre in contrast to the

impaired and mad(denned) Bertha Mason. Related to this, Boehmer defines the oppositional stance of the post-colonial world as “learning how to live in and represent that world in a profoundly different way” (Boehmer, 1995, p. 187). It is interesting that in the midst of the coloniser’s words, Antoinette finds a voice to situate the story of the forgotten. According to Judie Newman, as she states in “The Colonial Voice in the Motherland”, *Wide Sargasso Sea* is born from *Jane Eyre*. Yet, it is designedly situated before the events in *Jane Eyre* which “reconstitute[s] itself as a mother text or point of origin of the European novel”. Then, it becomes “its necessary precursor” (Newman, 1995, p. 49).

In the case of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, it is British imperial ideal, colonial activities and patriarchal core that outdistance other’s language, culture, world knowledge and history, and thus, estrange him/her from his/her own self. It is not easy for the colonised to perceive his own existence without the imperial reference. It is the system that permits the coloniser to get properties as mentioned by P.J. Cain and A.G. Hopkins in the article “Gentlemanly Capitalism and British Imperialism: The Old Colonial System”. They state that primarily in Britain it was the rentier capitalism that “arose from the ownership of land by the small élite”; as a form of capitalist wealth (Cain & Hopkins, 1986, p. 306) as in the case of Mr. Mason. Since birth, Antoinette has been surrounded by colonialism’s “protecting” signs. She grasps this idea quickly by observing Mr Mason and accepts the reality that her mother’s life is saved by him. His presence is like a missionary act for her mother to “harbour”. Anette’s helplessness as a female is striking because with Mr Mason’s arrival, their old and torn house is repaired, modernized and their table is enriched with English meals like “beef and mutton, pies and puddings” (Rhys, 2000, p. 17). After her mother’s marriage to Mr Mason, “so sure of himself, so without a doubt English” (Rhys, 2000, p. 18), Antoinette at a moment of observation during a family meal confesses to herself:

Yes, she would have died, I thought, if she had not met him. [...] And for the first time I was grateful and liked him. There are more ways than one of being happy, better perhaps to be peaceful and contented and protected ... (Rhys, 2000, p. 18).

The highlighting of safety, is again on the forefront. Although it is unknown to the reader what his job is, Mr Mason, as an English gentleman, wealthy enough with his properties in the colonies - an “estate in Trinidad” and “the Antigua property” (Rhys, 2000, p. 15) has undertaken the mission for repairable things in this heart-breaking place with his future plans, as well. He plans “to import labourers from the West Indies” (Rhys, 2000, p. 17). This entrepreneurial vision of Mr Mason is obvious to Antoinette’s understanding. He sees the place somewhere “which is enough to break your heart” (Rhys, 2000, p. 17); and, so it is to be enlivened again with imported labourers, which evokes Bhabha’s detection of the normalization and institutionalisation of the process of colonial intervention (Bhabha, 1995, p. 100). Thus, colonial discourse reproduces and strengthens itself in all domains. By labelling the colonised as “lazy” or “childish”, superiority guarantees its place on the coloniser’s side and his discourse. Ironically, the reproduction and reflection of colonial discourse on the colonised is also seen when Anette complains about the servants Godfrey, Sass and Christophine. When Antoinette asks why have Godfrey and Sass stayed with them while the others were leaving, her mother says “[t]hey stayed [...] because they wanted somewhere to sleep and something to eat. [...] Godfrey is a rascal” (Rhys, 2000, p. 8). Anette also says Christophine was a “wedding present” from her husband to her and they would have died if Christophine, too, had left them: “I dare say we would have died if she had turned against us and that would have been a better fate. To die and be forgotten and at peace. Not to know that one is abandoned, lied about helpless” (Rhys, 2000, p. 8). Anette confirms that Christophine is a possession. On the other hand, she is the reason for their survival. It is ironic that in this colonial system, they used up the colonised as a servant but also lived on her presence. If in this sense, their life is somehow aided by a servant; their positioning themselves, their likes and dislikes are also over the colonised. Therefore, in Anette and Antoinette’s case, the colonised becomes a constituent of their self-definition after the death of the father, Mr Cosway/the coloniser/the plantation and slave owner. Antoinette and her mother are not the colonisers themselves but they have become an inseparable part of the colonial system and its reproduction in discourse. Their fate is to some extent determined by a servant, which is a mishap on Anette’s side.

It might be in spite of or because of the Emancipation Act that Mr Mason does not keep a negative view of the natives. His is not as pitiless as the colonial perspective itself. Yet, he inserts his supremacy into his manner. This is such a confidence that he does not even see the black community as an enemy when his wife Anette complains about the danger that might come from the blacks. Mr Mason says: “you imagine enmity which does not exist” (Rhys, 2000, p. 15) but, meanwhile he keeps the magnitude of his own will since he wishes to see them as children. Mr Mason’s attitude is too indifferent to understand his wife’s fears. He says “They are too damn lazy to be dangerous [...] They are children - They wouldn’t hurt a fly” (Rhys, 2000, pp. 16,18). Bhabha states that western nationalist discourse sees its own colonial history as a normal history of exploitation and expansion. On the other hand, it marginalizes the other’s culture “in a fixed hierarchy of civil progress” (Bhabha, 1995, p. 95). For Mr Mason, the community they are living in is childish so it is on the progress of learning and developing. His wife’s reaction “[...] you won’t believe in the other side” (Rhys, 2000, p. 15) seems like a ripple protest and is not provocative enough for Mr Mason to take action. His belief that everything is under control makes things worse. His self-consciousness evokes Bhabha’s detection. For Bhabha colonial discourse depends on:

colonial fixity in the ideological construction of the otherness. Fixity, as the sign of cultural/historical/racial difference in the discourse of colonialism, is a paradoxical mode of representation [...] Likewise the stereotype, which is its major discursive strategy, is a form of knowledge [...] (Bhabha, 1995, p. 66).

When he does not take the dangers seriously, and when they suffer from an arson attack by the inhabitants, Anette shouts at him saying “You would not listen, you sneered at me, you grinning hypocrite, [...] you know so much, don’t you?” (Rhys, 2000, p. 21). That is revealed to Antoinette’s understanding again. Similarly, immediately before the fire, Antoinette dislikes Mr Mason’s attitude. His perspective is so fixed and so irrelevant to their life that Antoinette implicitly criticizes him for ignoring the others’ side. She is aware of her stepfather’s self-conscious presence and comments; and she questions his perspective silently. When Mr Mason promises to take Pierre to England where “he would be cured, made like other people” (Rhys, 2000, p. 18), Antoinette whispers to her brother “[a]nd how will you like that? [...] How will you like being made exactly like other people?” (Rhys, 2000, p.18). She does

not see Pierre from Mr Mason's outlook. On the same day, when Pierre is sleeping, the hostile inhabitants whom Mr Mason does not take seriously set fire and laugh at them. Everything happens so overtly in front of Antoinette's eyes; and after they narrowly escape from the fire, Antoinette thinks to herself:

Mr Mason stopped swearing and began to pray in a loud pious voice. The prayer ended: 'May Almighty God defend us.' And God who is indeed mysterious, who had made no sign when they burned Pierre as he slept – not a clap of thunder, not a flash of lightning – Mysterious God heard Mr Mason at once and answered him. The yells stopped (Rhys, 2000, p. 22).

Even when she is in a chaotic situation, it is not beyond Antoinette's grasp that "Almighty God" answers him, and with a critical eye, she compares this with her brother's death.

During her childhood years, Antoinette is wide aware of the loss that English Law and imperial experience have brought into their life. Then, the presence of her husband takes much from her. Material prosperity of imperialism is reflected by her husband's arrival in the West Indies to take over her property. Her thoughts as a married woman are not different from her childhood observations as she complains likewise. "[...] I have no money of my own at all; everything I had belongs to him. [...] That is English law" (Rhys, 2000, p. 69). As Spivak detects, Jane Eyre and how she has become the legal wife of Edward Rochester is hidden in the discursive field being provided by the active ideology of imperialism. Also, the White Jamaican Creole figure Bertha Mason's voyage from West Indies to England is a product of imperialism (Spivak, 1985, p. 247). The husband's voyage to the West Indies is a product of imperialism, too. What has happened to Anette, is now happening to Antoinette. Whether it is Anette's or Antoinette's husband, the leanings do not change in terms of exploitation. The gain goes to the coloniser. In the second part of the novel, for example, when they are on their honeymoon, Antoinette's husband says "[...] we would [...] spend some weeks in one of the Windward Islands, at a small estate which had belonged to Antoinette's mother" (Rhys, 2000, p. 39). It is obvious that the estate once "had" belonged to Antoinette's mother.

The desire to exploit and hold the control reaches such a level in Antoinette and her husband's life that when her husband takes over the narration in the second part, the centre of his observations, experience, pain, loss and gain also concentrate around Antoinette in a kind of strife with her. His observations hardly ever gravitate toward the beauties of the land he is in. In contrast, many things in this place are "sly, spiteful and malignant" (Rhys, 2000, p. 39) for him. He feels that everything is unfriendly and hostile even the "sea crept stealthily" (Rhys, 2000, p.39). His feelings are "discomfort and melancholy" (Rhys, 2000, p. 40). His hatred towards Antoinette is implied even when they are newly married. When he watches her "critically", he says "[the hat] shadowed her eyes, which are too large and can be disconcerting. [...] Long, sad, dark, alien eyes. Creole of pure English descent she may be, but they are not English or European either" (Rhys, 2000, p. 40). While he is sketching Antoinette's ancestral identity and criticizing her appearance with his colonial mind, he comes to the conclusion that he is the outsider in this place and Antoinette is alien to him; alien to him but still belonging to her island. Therefore, with the coloniser's narration, Rhys still puts the colonised in the centre. In Benita Parry's terms, it is a perspective that eases the transformation of other into a self (Parry, 1995, p. 38). When he warns Antoinette about the rain "you will get soaked" (Rhys, 2000:40), she unhesitatingly replies "No, the rain is stopping" (Rhys, 2000, p. 40). She knows the place very well and reflects this in her actions which make her husband uneasy. Even the rain adds much to this feeling in him as he says "[t]he rain began to drip down back of my neck adding to my feeling of discomfort and melancholy" (Rhys, 2000, p. 40). She shows complete mastery of the nature by saying "[p]ut your coat on now" (Rhys, 2000, p. 42) or "[t]aste. This is mountain water" (Rhys, 2000, p. 43), which triggers his hatred much more.

Even the husband's inner rage stems from a face-off against Antoinette and her life, which evokes hatred of women. While he is attempting to exercise his patriarchal mentality upon Antoinette, Antoinette feels overwhelmingly unsafe. The first thing she wishes for is safety, even before happiness. To illustrate this, the convent where she attends after losing her family can be given as an example. When she is in the garden of the convent, the words with which she defines her feelings are "I felt bolder, happier, more free. But not so safe" (Rhys, 2000, p. 32). Moreover, she is surrounded

by the feeling of “dismay, sadness, loss” (Rhys, 2000, p. 33). The feeling of insecurity reveals itself in a dream which makes her feel extremely bad for the second time. She says “I dreamed I was in Hell” (Rhys, 2000, p. 34) because of the male in her dream(s) who hates her. She sees a similar dream when she is a child in her house for the first time, and when about seventeen, in the convent for the second time. She sees that same wicked man in her dream(s). She is hated by him who follows her in a forest (Rhys, 2000, p. 11) and whom she describes as “sly”. In her dream in the convent, she unwillingly follows him with her long white dress. Despite her unhappiness and reluctance, in her dream she knows that “this must happen” and even if anybody tries to save her, she “would refuse” (Rhys, 2000, p. 34). She likens the morning of this dream to the one that she had seen her mother’s horse dead. This day for her is as terrible as that day, and both remind of insecurity. The feeling of insecurity in the patriarchal world of males is a strong emphasis which continually haunts Antoinette in her steps and her definition of the self. When there is a male around, she also feels that her freedom to move is colonised by his existence. She similarly feels insecure when she is followed by a girl and a boy on the way to the convent. Antoinette says “the boy only said ‘One day I catch you alone, you wait, one day I catch you alone’” (Rhys, 2000, p. 27). Hatred of women is one of the feminist stances that Rhys reflects with the reconstruction of Bertha as Antoinette. Maria Olaussen refers to one of Rhys’s letters to show her insistence on remaking Bertha: “it might be possible to unhitch the whole thing from Charlotte Bronte’s novel, but I do not want to do that. It is that particular mad Creole I want to write about, not any of the other mad Creoles” (Olaussen, 1993, p. 65). The other side and other’s side that is constructed by Rhys is the feminine otherness. While Bertha’s femininity is suppressed within the borders of *Thornfield* as if she had never existed as a “woman”, Antoinette’s femininity is displayed bravely. Her beauty is not suppressed behind the attic walls. In contrast, her femininity is pushed forward in the wilderness of the nature freely. This can be interpreted as Rhys’s feminist resistance against the othering of the colonised female. Therefore, Rhys’s response is both to prioritized position of European female subjectivity and to patriarchal suppression. The colonised geography of the Caribbean in the early nineteenth century as a colonised setting and its reflections on the characters is created by Rhys to show that “there is always the other side ...” (Rhys,

2000, p. 82). On this side now, Antoinette sees “their world” as a “cardboard world where everything is coloured brown or dark red or yellow that has no light in it” with a “different sea. Colder”. [...] a place where “[she is] dying [...] so cold and dark” (Rhys, 2000, pp. 117-119). This world has nothing to offer to Antoinette and it has never had.

The second stage of the analysis will dwell on nature and culture in terms of representation and binary oppositions. Here, as it is emphasized by a post-colonial feminist understanding, one of the pairs in the binarism is more dominant. This time, however, the overshadowing party is Antoinette because nature turns into a domain for self-definition and makes the protagonist the powerful side before her husband’s eyes even though he refuses to see it. The material world of the imperial self and the intuitive, sensitive characteristic of the natural self are a mismatch for each other because there is an obvious dissimilarity between what nature of the island means to Antoinette and to her husband. The imperial requires a controllable, guessable and shapable atmosphere to expand comfortably and to regulate how far the colonised can reach. Antoinette’s husband self-pities with the discomfort he deeply feels because he can find no zone for a free expression of his self. He refuses to adapt, either. Antoinette on the other hand, has direct knowledge and cognition of the environment around her so she constantly but unknowingly triggers the contrasts in her husband’s mind. When culture and nature are taken as a binarism, and when Antoinette’s husband is regarded as the representative of the former one, his imperial self is shocked because binary oppositions carry the logic of imperialism.

Antoinette and her husband are never in tune with each other when their interests and tastes are taken into consideration. When Antoinette is regarded as the female/the womanly and also, as the representation of nature and the natural, her husband can be taken as the representation of culture, imposition and dominance. Antoinette is, by nature, a woman who is quite content with what she has; but this is not an appealing motive for a man like her husband with material desires. Her island is her identity. She expresses what she has in her heart freely in her island. What she attaches importance to is not important to the husband. For this reason, the motives that drive each are always unfit for one another. She loves the island more than

everything. “I love it more than anywhere in the world. As if it were a person. More than a person” (Rhys, 2000, p. 55). However, with her husband’s arrival in her life and with his protesting, humiliating and condemning existence, she does not feel the same as she did before because he spoils the only thing that she harbours in:

But I loved this place and you have made it into a place I hate. I used to think that if everything else went out of my life I would still have this, and now you have spoilt it. It’s just somewhere else where I have been unhappy ... (Rhys, 2000, pp. 94-95).

That is why, the transition from natural and wild to material and tamed, can be interpreted as a space for suffering, resistance, non-adaptation but at the same time self-definition for Antoinette. Antoinette’s island is the place where they met and were introduced to each other, as she calls “my place” and, it offers some ground for not a complete understanding but a scene for both, which makes it possible for them to question the situation that they are in. There are times when her husband feels relaxed in the pure and organic atmosphere of the island and is amazed at the beauty of the nature and, there are also times when Antoinette subtly asks questions about England. Antoinette, likewise, sees him “like a king, an emperor” (Rhys, 2000, p. 44) and wants to please him as he wishes. It is the physical place that somehow and sometimes creates the metaphorically communicational atmosphere which they find the chance to approach each other free from the rigid constructions of patriarchal discourse. Yet, the brightly colourful world cannot go beyond being more than “alien” to her husband:

[...] everything round me was hostile. [...] The trees were threatening and the shadows of the trees moving slowly over the floor menaced me. That green menace. I had felt it ever since I saw this place. There was nothing I knew, nothing to comfort me (Rhys, 2000, p. 96).

Antoinette’s island itself is a context throughout the novel and occupies a great amount in narration; too alien to her husband and harmonious with Antoinette. He is irritated by the climate, nature and flora and their synchrony with Antoinette. It is not the “cool, calm and cloudy summer” of England (Rhys, 2000, p. 106), but the “extreme green” and “brazen sun” (Rhys, 2000, pp. 42,107) Antoinette finds happiness in. It is the field of untouched nature of her lovely island where she finds an outlet for a self-expression. The same land seems so different to the colonised and to the coloniser. It

has a central role both in their introspective self-consciousness and thoughts and their vocal definition.

The untamed nature of the Caribbean is handled by Rhys at length. It is the domain of a counter space, a space of resistance in which Rhys's protagonist figures her own self. This place is not like British gardens. The nature and Rhys's special focus on the "place" evoke the feelings of belonging in the protagonist. Also, what kind of feeling it arouses in the characters becomes prominent. In *Colonizing Paradise*, Jefferson Dillman approaches the geographical beauty and the phenomena of Biblical Garden with a focus on British motivation to tame the nature and aesthetise it within the British understanding of recovery and orderly development. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, British travellers and West Indies residents tended to present the landscape as picturesque or pastoral. However, this was not like the metaphorical recreation of the biblical garden; it was totally a new vision in alignment with the British tastes and sentiments (Dillman, 2015, p. 6). As Antoinette remembers her past and longs for the garden which she likens the one in the Bible, she also remembers the bygone beauties of her past.

Dating back to the seventeenth century, the history of colonisation in the West Indies exhibited sources of diverse motivation. One of the most interesting ones is its effect on English landscape and English aesthetics. Jefferson Dillman also states that the West Indies, the colonial paradise, can be seen as the spirit of adventure and exploration with a mark on the Elizabethan era as an inspiration for the English landscape. Dillman adds that for the Englishmen, on the other hand, that paradise was seen as lawlessness and degeneracy and the place of drunk, idle, violent settlers, privateers, pirates and runaway slaves, none of which did not "resemble the colonial paradise" that they wanted to create. Therefore, it became a land of unexplored wilderness with pleasures, possibilities and terrifying dangers (Dillman, 2015, p. 68) which are seen as the "malignant" features of the place by the coloniser, as well. As for English aesthetics, the West Indies were not attractive or inspiring unilaterally. It needed some colonial touch to be tamed and beautified. In *Colonial Inventions* Amar Wahab claims "[...] inter-framing of the colonised and the domestic spaces and subjects, as the aesthetic object, the West Indian plantation was made to construct the

authority of the English aesthetic eye” (Wahab, 2010, p. 56). Similar to Wahab’s detection, in *Orientalism* Edward Said includes “aesthetic” dimension while criticizing the self-administered authority of the western knowledge. For him, Western imperialism dominates the distribution of geopolitical awareness including landscape description by creating and maintaining the knowledge (Said, 1979, p. 12). This arouses hate and a desire to ruin in the coloniser/the husband because it is impossible to tame Antoinette so it is equally not possible to “maintain his knowledge” on her.

Being in nature has always provided a shelter for Antoinette since her childhood; a kind of survival and self-interest and it offers an alternative way of thinking and a space to take a breath whenever she feels trapped. In an instance for example, when she is a child, she “hid[es] [herself] from [the guests] in the garden” (Rhys, 2000, p. 13) to relax herself during her mother’s marriage ceremony. On the other hand, the nature is not hospitable for her husband. When they arrive in their honeymoon village, in this “sombre place” (Rhys, 2000, p. 41), everything and everybody seems “[...] sly, spiteful, malignant perhaps, like much else in this place” (Rhys, 2000, p. 39) and, the place “is unreal and like a dream” (Rhys, 2000, p. 49). He is displeased in the land he is residing in because “Everything is too much. [...] Too much blue, too much purple, too much green. The flowers too red, the mountains too high, the hills too near” (Rhys, 2000, p. 42). Being in the midst of and so close to the wild life was not a familiar feeling for him especially when he thinks of the fact that his wife is a part of this wilderness, too. All is foreign to him like Antoinette even though he wants to find a bit of Englishness in her at times. “[...] [S]he might have been any pretty English girl” (Rhys, 2000, p. 42) but Antoinette’s alignment with the nature both reminds him of her extremity and his distance from this extremity. Although in one of his letters to his father, he writes “this place is very beautiful” (Rhys, 2000, p. 46), he does not mention his “confused impressions [which] will never be written” (Rhys, 2000, p. 46).

Colonised lands, in coloniser’s perspective, are incomplete, imperfect and sometimes malignant. For him, sun and darkness form the background scene and are impossible to be separated from Antoinette. When he defines her coming, he says: “I saw Antoinette coming from the hut. The sun blazed and steam rose from

the green behind us” (Rhys, 2000, p. 41). Within the time he spends in the island, his hatred against both Antoinette and the environment inclines to such a level that he even compares trees in themselves. When Antoinette and her husband are approaching the end of their honeymoon, he complains about the bending trees:

The hurricane months are not so far away, I thought, and saw that tree strikes its roots, [...] ready to fight the wind. Useless.[...] Some of the royal palms stand (she told me). Striped of their branches, like tall brown pillars, still they stand – defiant. Not for nothing are they called royal. The bamboos take an easier way, they bend to the earth and lie there, creaking, groaning, crying for mercy. The contemptuous wind passes, not caring for these abject things (*Let them live*). Howling, shrieking, laughing the wild blast passes (Rhys, 2000, p. 106).

His reference points even while giving metaphorical meaning to trees is still over royalty and pity. He hates the signs of misery even if it is a tropical tree. He interprets the natural event as misery, and pays homage to hurricanes. He indirectly, blesses his own revenge, too. Right after his inner comment, he likens his revenge to the hurricanes’ indifference, without pity and sharpens his grudge against Antoinette. He is the one who will show no mercy to a “lunatic” like the hurricanes do to the bamboos:

It’s an English summer now, so cool, so grey. Yet I think of my revenge and hurricanes. Words rush through my head (deeds too). Words. Pity is one of them. It gives me no rest.

[...]

Pity, is there none for me? Tied to a lunatic for life – a drunken, lying lunatic - [...] (Rhys, 2000, p. 106).

He associates Antoinette with danger, unexpectedness and extreme beauty as he considers them all “spiteful” features of the place. Behind this, lies the hate of the Caribbean landscape and its female beauty for him. The West Indies are not attractive or inspiring unilaterally. He finds the place unpredictable and unreliable due to the extremeness of the landscape that is “[n]ot only wild, but also menacing [and] those hills would close in on [him]” (Rhys, 2000, p. 42). Their honeymoon house is, for him, “an imitation of an English summer house” because of the “four wooden posts and a thatched roof” (Rhys, 2000, p. 43). However, the house and whereabouts are not

appealing enough as many things are wildish such as the “badly-cut, coarse-grained lawn and [...] [the] shabby white house” the position of which is “more awkward than ugly” (Rhys, 2000, p. 43). Although at times he feels simply relaxed, he cannot help taking England as the reference point, which is immediately noticed by Antoinette during their honeymoon:

Husband: ... it was the first time I had felt simple and natural with her.

Antoinette: The earth is red here. Do you notice?

Husband: It's red in parts of England too.

Antoinette: Oh England, England, ... (Rhys, 2000, p. 43)

The notice is taken as a “mocking warning” by her husband which he prefers not to hear (Rhys, 2000, p. 43). The binary opposition of nature versus culture is seen in the articulation of “red earth” and “England” by Antoinette and her husband, which can be taken as male and female. In *Colonial Desire* Robert Young's extended clarification of culture versus nature can be enlightening in reference to this case. Culture covers a wide range of meanings including “inhabit, cultivate, attend, protect, honour with worship.” Therefore, colonisation resides in the cradle of culture; that is, the cultivation/the culture/the tilling of the soil/land. Thus, Young sums up that “the focus on soil emphasizes the physicality of the territory that is coveted, occupied, cultivated, turned into plantations and made unsuitable for indigenous nomadic tribes.” Culture for Young also connotes a social reference which leads to the idea that as opposed to the savage outside “roaming in the lands beyond”, being a civilized man means being a citizen of the city. Thus, city people are cultivated ones with refined mentality and taste (Young, 1995, p. 29). When Antoinette and her husband are quarrelling about England and Jamaica, the point that Young detects about city and nature comes to the forefront:

Antoinette: But how can rivers, mountains and the sea be unreal?

Husband: And how can millions of people, their houses and their streets be unreal? (Rhys, 2000, p. 49)

The unsettling existence of England and English life style that are contextualised in the novel is felt deeply by them with a shadowing influence on their unhappiness even though England is not the setting in a large part of the novel. This clash leads to a lack of communication between her husband and Antoinette, and the mismatch of their self-definitions.

Antoinette loves her island so much that it is the only thing on her side; only place that she shelters, and a place where her past resides. Therefore, she is full and satisfied with her environment that hugs her; and this is always in front of her husband's vision. She does not want to shape herself in the mould that her husband wants her to do/become. As he does not want everything to be on her side, he thinks to himself: "[t]he room was full of the scent of the crushed flowers. I saw her reflection in the glass fanning herself with a small palm-leaf fan coloured blue and red at the edges" (Rhys, 2000, p. 45). After wiping his face with her handkerchief, she says "This is my place and everything is on our side" (Rhys, 2000, p. 45). This means the place and Antoinette complete each other. According to Bhabha, as an apparatus of power, colonial discourse is built on the disavowal of racial, cultural and historical differences. The strategy behind its functioning is the creation of a space for the colonised where the production of knowledge is over surveillance a "complex form of pleasure/unpleasure." Therefore, systems of administration and instruction can be established on these degenerate populations. Yet, Bhabha states, despite the space where exercise of power is totally possible, colonial discourse at the same time produces the colonised as a social reality: other but still "knowable and visible" (Bhabha, 1995, pp. 70-71). To her husband's dismay, it is not possible to exercise power on Antoinette on "her" land, which makes him more aggressive.

The colonised must be knowable and controllable to the coloniser's understanding. When the husband is near the bathing pool among the shading trees, he thinks to himself: "It was a beautiful place – wild, untouched, above all untouched, with an alien, disturbing, secret loveliness. And it kept its secret. I'd find myself thinking, 'What I see is nothing – I want what it *hides* - that is nothing'" (Rhys, 2000, p. 54). Antoinette's dominance over the land and her knowledge confound him and make him insecure at the same time. According to Bhabha, tropical climate and

weather is demonic to English weather as tropical means “despotic and ungovernable and therefore worthy of the civilising mission” (Bhabha, 1995, p. 169). Many of his experiences he has with Antoinette show him that she is ungovernable.

In this alien place, he is both fascinated by the untouched beauty and is disturbed by its “secret loveliness” which he desires to possess. At times, when he tends to like the offerings of the land, he ends up with a negative feeling. This idea leads him to a maze about how his wife is so sure about the environment and how she governs this knowledge of nature. At a moment for instance, he is so surprised when Antoinette can know whether a crab is poisonous or harmless. She knows every single detail about the land and its creatures, for him, “horrible looking creatures” (Rhys, 2000, p. 53). He even wonders how well she can aim at these creatures with a “large pebble”. She surprises his gentlemanly, cool manners with her naturally harmonious actions. He cannot imagine why she is happy while he is uncomfortable, and asks: “Are you happy here?” (Rhys, 2000, p. 55).

The more Antoinette shows him around, the more she becomes a part of the land before her husband’s eyes because “this is [her] place and everything is on [her] side” (Rhys, 2000, p. 45) and thus, his hatred piles up. He feels that he is sealed off by the harmony between Antoinette and her island. Nature becomes vital to his definition of himself and his wife. Too wild to be tamed, Antoinette and her land are dream-like and unreal, far from his beloved England as he always adds England in his conversations about which Antoinette sometimes complains. He in fact confesses:

Antoinette: [...]one of my friends who married an Englishman [...] said this place London is like a cold dream sometimes. I want to wake up.

Husband: ‘Well’, I answered annoyed, ‘that is how your beautiful island seems to me, quite unreal and like a dream. [...] this is unreal like a dream’ I thought (Rhys, 2000, p. 49).

Whether he is pleased or displeased is not the central case as he accepts that she is not stupid, but “obstinate”; and, more important than that she has preferences of her own. After a number of suspicions due to the instigating letters of Antoinette’s so-called brother Daniel Cosway and meeting him in person, her husband’s unrest inclines

and he expresses this to Antoinette at a moment when he thinks that she is lying. However, Antoinette responds and starts an argument to express herself:

Antoinette: [...] you believe him and not listen to the other side.

Husband: Is there another side?

Antoinette: There is always the other side, always.

[...]

Husband: But we won't talk about it now. [...]

Antoinette: But we must talk about it.

Husband: But this is not the place or time [...] not in this long dark veranda with the candles burning low and the watching listening night outside. [...]

Antoinette: I might never be able to tell you in any other place or at any other time. No other time, now. You frightened? [...]

[...]

Antoinette: You have no right.[...] You have no right to ask questions about my mother and refuse to listen to my answer.

Husband: [...] But the feeling of something unknown and hostile was very strong. I feel very much a stranger here, [...] I feel that this place is my enemy and on your side (Rhys, 2000, p. 82).

In the place where he feels insecure and where “everything is on [her] side” (Rhys, 2000, p. 45), Antoinette reminds him of “the other side” because her husband deliberately does not want to see the female part, and also because this is a female counter attack to his patriarchal dominance.

Antoinette is self-aware and so are her responses. Her husband does not let her express her reasons and talk about her past. However, she somehow uses the space of her own and makes it “knowable” and recognizable to the coloniser. Especially when she lingers the conversation by saying “You are quite mistaken. [...] It is not for you and not for me. It has nothing to do with either of us. That is why you are afraid of it because it is something else” (Rhys, 2000, p. 82). Although he refuses to listen to her, she at least makes her point and diagnoses his fears over “the other” / the “else”.

Antoinette's husband is not only censorious towards her but also towards himself while trying to find a reason for the question why he is in that distant land. To fulfil a mission which has been assigned to him by his father, he finds himself in the middle of a foreign land for which he thinks he has "sold his soul or [it has been] sold[...]" by his family (Rhys, 2000, p. 43). In his interpretation of his own existence on this island where he is forced to trail his colonial aims, there is also a struggle for situating himself and a helpless feeling of "bewilderment" before his wife and her beloved geography. This is what Elleke Boehmer calls "apparently unintelligible strangeness with which [he] came into contact." Boehmer also states in the expression of his mastery, the colonialist also mirrored other responses such as wonder, bewilderment and fear (Boehmer, 1995, p. 50). In a similar sense, Jefferson Dillman says that for Caribbean colonists, landscape means both beauty and horror because they were aware of the medical authorities view on the land. For them, the tropical is too different to be compared with European norms (Dillman, 2015, p. 6) which can also be seen in Antoinette's husband's fever he suffers for three weeks upon arriving at Jamaica (Rhys, 2000, p. 40). This can be interpreted as being unable to digest what he has now because his father's wish, is the initial reason for all the things happening on the island, and to Antoinette. Therefore, Antoinette's suffering dates back to her husband's father's wish and the colonial appetite of the previous generation. When the desire is inherited by her husband, it reveals itself as the drive to possess, to change, to use, and the worst, to hate. Similarly, when Antoinette asks him about the words of a song that reminds her of childhood, her husband reacts:

Antoinette: Did you hear what the girl was singing?

Husband: I don't always understand what they say or sing. Or anything else
(Rhys, 2000 p. 64)

Towards the end of his narration, he comes to his initial thoughts when he first steps on the honeymoon place. The husband, as a part of imperial tradition, colonises Antoinette's land, her estate and her life but cannot colonize her nature. That is why, his fierceness is aggravated and to some extent is amazed by Antoinette and the extreme nature supporting her side. In other words, his imperial self seems to be reanimated by Antoinette's question. It should be accepted that Antoinette is curious

about England and how it looks. Nevertheless, she gives the signs that she is not craving for living in England, which surprises him. He reveals his genuine feelings at the end of his narration:

I was tired of these people. I disliked their laughter and their tears, their flattery and envy, conceit and deceit. And I hated the place.

I hated the mountains and the hills, the rivers and the rain. I hated the sunsets of whatever colour, I hated its beauty and its magic and the secret I would never know. I hated its indifference and the cruelty which was part of its loveliness. Above all I hated her. For she belonged to the magic and the loveliness. [...] (Rhys, 2000, p. 111).

Now, Antoinette's dreams in her childhood and in the convent have found their match in her lived experience and in her husband's deeply felt hatred. On the surface and until this very strong expression of enmity, his hatred may possibly be linked to jealousy and Daniel Cosway's letter. It is clear that he has held a grudge against Antoinette for an unascertained wrongdoing, and because of a baseless rumour about her unchaste behaviour. However, what lies behind is the likeness between her island and her free nature, the beauty of the island and her beauty. Nature on the island seems "indifferent" to him, just like Antoinette. "She has left [him] thirsty and all [his] life would be thirst and longing for what [he] had lost before [he] had found it" (Rhys, 2000, p. 111). He sees Antoinette as the reason for his fate, loss and hopelessness. He takes his revenge by leaving her "homeless" and taking her island and so her identity from her. He takes his revenge by uprooting her from her land and forcing her to live in an alien place. He knows what he is doing. He wants to erase her "[...]like all memories, a legend. Or a lie ..." (Rhys, 2000, p. 112). If everything related to "her" on the island is all alien to him, and thus, if he feels being pushed to the margins of the outsider/other, he cannot permit a power exchange, then. Now that it is difficult to govern her with his norms, it must be possible to take her to a place where he can exercise his patriarchal and colonial authority.

Moreover, he does what he says. He erases her name. He wants to write her a story again over his own story with a new name. For this exact issue about renaming, a feminist view can be referred to. Belonging and male dominance provide a considerable issue along with naming, domesticating and possessing because these are the things which are handled by Rhys by the voices of Antoinette and her husband.

Elleke Boehmer refers to *Jane Eyre*'s Bertha and; the interpretation of her insanity in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, where the roots of her madness are hidden in her tormented body of her Caribbean past (Boehmer, 1995, p. 27). During her quarrel with her husband at a moment when he calls her "Bertha" as he wishes, she reacts: "You are trying to make me someone else, calling me by another name. [...]" "Do you know what you have done to me? It's not the girl" (Rhys, 2000, p. 94). For Spivak, when human identity is considered, renaming "Antoinette" "Bertha" might be interpreted as the "determination of the politics of imperialism" (Spivak, 1985, p. 250). As emphasized by Ashcroft *et al*, imperial binarisms assume a one-direction flow from the coloniser to the colonised, from the surveyor to the surveyed. However, as post-colonial encounters entail, there is an ambivalent space where a transcultural zone appears and the change is not a one-direction movement but it is some space with a circulatory characteristic back and forth (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2007, p. 21). In contrast, it is unacceptable for the husband to go into a transcultural zone. That is why, he tortures Antoinette; and that is why, his final decision is to uproot Antoinette and take her to his place. It must be accepted that the zone that Antoinette has revealed her love to her island and has accommodated her self is not strong enough to create a contact zone because her husband walls off the zone with his hatred and the desire to destroy. Still, she resists. As a result of this resistance, she manages to confirm that the colonised has a place of her own where she defines her self. Jean Rhys reveals this colonial field as a field of conquest for the coloniser, the male and the patriarchal to maintain his dominance via the voice of Antoinette's husband/Rochester; and as a field of struggle for the colonised and othered female interwoven with male hatred.

It is shown by Rhys that despite its prevailing impact throughout ages, imperialism can be vulnerable, too; and, this can be shown by devaluating and revealing the weak sides of the reserved character of *Jane Eyre*, Mr Rochester, by putting him in the middle of the dialogues where he is obliged to see the other side of the things and where he is forced to defend himself; and moreover, in the middle of a wild nature where he feels uncomfortable. By giving this character the total narration of the second part of the novel; but taking his name from him and never addressing him by name in any dialogue, Rhys shows her salient "subversive manoeuvre". For Caroline Rody, Rhys gives him "no body" by calling him only "the man", "he",

“husband” and “the man who hated me” (Rody, 1993, p. 303). This womanly reaction is a feminist response to patriarchy and its confidence to name, define or rename. This central character of *Jane Eyre* is given the narration in *Wide Sargasso Sea* where Rhys retaliates by anonymizing him for the depersonification of his mad wife Bertha in return. Bhabha says this is a “[...] refusal to satisfy the colonizer’s narrative demand [...]” (Bhabha, 1995, p. 99) and is seen in the husband’s case.

The last part of this analysis deals with the last chapter and aims to reach an understanding of Antoinette’s reaction and resistance which is not possible to be separated from the first and second chapters of the novel. In this last chapter narrated by Antoinette, Rhys distills the most lethargic, passive and paralysed moments of Antoinette’s life and puts them into one last action: resistance with an implied suicide.

The previous parts prepare the essence of the third chapter. This chapter is the episode where her lethargy and resistance reside collaboratively. Although this is the shortest part of the novel, it gives much about Antoinette’s self-definition and resistance. The reaction is also in the form of canonical counter-discourse because “[o]nce we have read *Wide Sargasso Sea*, we can never read *Jane Eyre* in quite the same way” (Bender, 1990, p. 77).

Antoinette’s description of the physical environment and her relatively mental disorder gives the panorama of the colonial situation she is physically and mentally trapped in. In the third part, it is also understood that her husband has gradually done what he has previously implied. These implications can be taken as foreshadowings and they altogether gain a different dimension when the last part is analysed. He vocalizes one of these implications when Antoinette is about to give up on her marriage decision: “If she won’t, she won’t. She can’t be dragged to the altar” (Rhys, 2000, p. 47). His personal choice of the word “altar” as a substitute for their marriage-to-be is interesting enough to speculate on what might happen in the future. As he is displeased with his marriage, he also feels uncomfortable that Antoinette is literally being dragged to the altar and she somehow feels the discomfort deep inside. Another one of the implications which also supports this vision of him is the expression “let them live” (Rhys, 2000, p. 106). While he is observing the bamboos bending with the wind, he notices that the hurricanes are so indifferent to the trees which are begging for mercy

and they make fun of these “abject things”. They just “let them live”. Similarly, he will let Antoinette live after taking her from the altar, but he just lets her breathe behind the door of a dark room, with no mercy. Still, there is one difference; Antoinette never begs for mercy. Another implication is also uttered at the end of his narration: “I too can wait - for the day when she is only a memory to be avoided, locked away [...]” (Rhys, 2000, p. 112). In reality, he locks her away and pretends that she is a dark, bad memory which has never existed. These deliberate words have already prepared the dark attic room in his mind. He has put her in the room in his mind before he physically locks her away.

This hatred of him has never been unseen when viewed from Antoinette’s perspective. Like his previous words which serve as a background story of the third part, Antoinette’s previous comments and insight also foreshadow the actual happenings in the third part. When she wants Christophine to perform obeah to make her husband love her, Antoinette says “he hates me now. I hear him every night walking up and down the veranda. Up and down. When he passes my door he says ‘Good-night, Bertha.’ He never calls me Antoinette now” (Rhys, 2000, p. 71). Now, when she is in the attic and making comments about the name of her care-giver Grace, Antoinette still remembers what name her husband prefers to call her: “Names matter, like when he wouldn’t call me Antoinette, and I saw Antoinette drifting out of the window with her scents, her pretty clothes and her looking glass” (Rhys, 2000, p. 117). Now, in the dark attic of the British mansion, Antoinette knows who she is. Although she sometimes remembers things blur, she still defines herself with her stolen name, the scents and colours of her beloved island and her clothes. Even when she is dreaming for the last time, she is aware enough to say “[t]hey think I don’t remember but I do” (Rhys, 2000, p. 122). This verifies that in the persona of Antoinette as a destroyed character, naming, labelling or renaming is a part of colonial culture. However, Antoinette’s struggle to resist this formation of culture in “his way” is the resistance of a female who is driven by her nature and her own identity. The highlighting of “remembering” can also be interpreted as a response and reference to *Jane Eyre* and the darkened, forgotten Bertha of *Jane Eyre*.

Another one of these previously indicated details on Antoinette's side is the prospection of her possible future in England. In the second part, when she confesses that everything is now his, Antoinette is not unaware of the fact that she is extremely unhappy. This cannot last forever because it is deadly and "[she] will be a different person when [she] live[s] in England and different things will happen to [her]":

England, rosy pink in the geography book map [...] Exports, coal, iron, wool. [...] Cool green leaves in the short cool summer. Summer [...] After the trees are bare, then winter and snow. White feathers falling? Thorn pieces of paper falling? [...] I must know more than I know already. For I know that house For I know that house where I will be cold and not belonging, the bed I shall lie in has red curtains and I have slept there many times before, long ago. How long ago? In that bed I will dream the end of my dream. But my dream had nothing to do with England and I must not think like this, I must remember about chandeliers and dancing, about swans, roses and snow. And snow (Rhys, 2000, p. 70)

She seems to be referring to another way to rid herself from the killing unhappiness. Going to England and becoming a different person can help alleviate this pain. However, even in her thoughts she is uncertain that England would make her a different person but in what way she would change is a dilemma as she herself sees that she "will be cold and not belonging". This foreshadowing in the second part does not suggest a hopeful or a romanticised ending, neither does it show an excited expectation of a cherished marriage. In contrast, there are signs that this is not only about her marriage or about her husband solely, but also about her inner self, her past and the central position of her husband/the coloniser in her life. This is also about the suffering woman she has totally turned into after the destroying marriage, which has directly targeted her existence in life and the connections that she can align herself with such as nature, flowers, weather and colours. Nothing in the list that she has made is familiar to her nature. "Snow", "frost", "cool green leaves", "coal", "iron" and "exports" are all the belongings of a new world/England which she cannot associate herself with. She still tries to find some brightness and liveliness in the scene that she has pictured in her mind. However, the lively scene starting with chandeliers, dancing, swans and roses still end up with coldness and snow, and the prefigured effect of death.

With the above-mentioned examples, it can be said for the last chapter that it is the space where Antoinette's personal history has peaked and reached in existence.

This chapter is a declaratory platform where Antoinette hears the voice of her inner conscious self. At times, she exploits the opportunity to get the keys from her caregiver Grace and goes out of the room. As a result of her observations, she comes to the conclusion that the place that she is in now is not her world: “Then I open the door and walk into their world. It is, as I always knew, made of cardboard. [...] everything is coloured brown or dark red or yellow that has no light in it” (Rhys, 2000, p. 117). It is “their” world to which she is sure that she does not belong. This, in fact, is what she has been feeling deep inside for a long time:

It was a song about a white cockroach. That’s me. That’s what they call all of us who were here before their own people in Africa sold them to the slave traders. And I’ve heard English women call us white niggers. So between you I often wonder who I am and where is my country and where do I belong and why was I ever born at all (Rhys, 2000, p.64).

This example illustrates the loss of her sense of belonging. This is in fact a reproach to other people’s positioning her life, particularly others’ views which have led Antoinette to such a lack of belonging. However, Antoinette intuitively knows that she belongs to her island which she loves “more than a person” (Rhys, 2000, p. 55). In her present whereabouts, she knows where she does not belong to. Therefore, this complaint can be taken as another precursor of the last chapter which preserves her imprisonment and her freedom at the same time. This is a very little space of freedom where she has got the keys, unlocks the door and heads toward the dark passage.

In “their world”, “the man who hates” Antoinette plays the key role as he does in her previous dreams. Her dreams before indicate that she unwillingly follows a man, and the same wicked man follows her. These scenes can be likened to her own funeral cortege, which “must happen” (Rhys, 2000, p. 34). In the final dream, she sees a “cold”, “sad” and “empty” church-like chamber “without an altar” (Rhys, 2000, p. 122) which evokes her husband’s words about the impossibility of dragging her to an altar (Rhys, 2000, p. 47) before their marriage ceremony. In this room also she sees a golden clock and says “[g]old is the idol they worship” (Rhys, 2000, p. 122). Still the world that her husband represents and the imperial/material gains are open to her understanding which also supports Tia’s observation at the very beginning of the

novel: “they got gold money” (Rhys, 2000, p. 10). In a single, compact dream some critical pieces of her life appear and lead her to her idiosyncratic resistance.

The way she chooses for her freedom and thus her implied death/suicide is over some explicit details that she defines herself with such as heat and flames, red and orange; that is, the tropical colours that are referred to throughout the novel are irritatingly bright for her husband but lively and elating for Antoinette. Since her childhood, she has been accustomed to extreme colours and scents because for her all these pieces of nature such as “[...] bell shaped mass of white, mauve, deep purples, [are] wonderful to see” (Rhys, 2000, p. 6). The colours, scents and flowers also belong to the climate of her soul. They now lead her way toward her resistance and self-definition. In her final dream she sees the sky and says:

Then I turned round and saw the sky. It was red and all my life was in it. [...] all colours, [...] the orchids and the stephanotis and the jasmine and the tree of life in flames. [...] and the bamboos and the tree ferns, the gold ferns and the silver, and the soft green velvet of the moss on the garden wall. [...] and the man who hated me was calling too, Bertha! Bertha! (Rhys, 2000, p. 123).

She knows that this exact man will lead her to an end. Yet, the type of ending is in Antoinette’s hands when the last dream is considered. This last dream preserves her identity and in itself it is a thorough resistance to her husband and his imperial temper which is elaborated with coldness, cool colours of England he longs for and the profit he has made.

Her reaction is triggered by her own past being revealed as a dream but, which is totally hers. Now, this is time for a bargain for Antoinette, a condition which requires a fulfilment of a demand. She shows no signs of self-misery. Neither does she beg for mercy. In the last part, she is strong enough to plan and lay down a condition “I will not trouble you again if you let me go” (Rhys, 2000, p. 116). However, he never gives Antoinette the chance to play a fair game. He never comes. Therefore, when Antoinette takes the narration back with a last word to articulate, she is so sure about what she must do. Although she is physically slow and in poor health, her condition was strong enough to observe, to remember, to wish for and to decide. For the first time in her life, she holds the privilege to utilize a condition against the coloniser. She is now sure

that the condition she has laid down is not fulfilled and now she knows what to do very well.

Antoinette's reaction is not only a response to the coloniser but also to the colonial history that has been accepted and bowed by the colonised him/herself. When Antoinette is a child, while her mother is answering Antoinette's questions about their servants, she says "To die and be forgotten and at peace. Not to know that one is abandoned, lied about helpless" (Rhys, 2000, p. 8). Antoinette's choice can be seen as a response to her mother, too because this is not a smooth ending, not "peaceful" and "helpless" either but a dignified one. Caroline Rody states that with these last words of Antoinette, the reader is not left with a woman who burns herself as in *Jane Eyre*, but with a woman who leaves "a difficult rereading ahead". Rody further says "[...] she stands at the end of Rhys's narrative, doomed but triumphant, torch in hand, about to fall once again to the death [...] but not just yet. Forever resisting the self-sacrificial of her plot in *Jane Eyre* [...]" (Rody, 1993, p. 302). The fire she is about to set is in an English mansion which was built by her husband's family long ago. At the end of the novel, Rhys's intention to "write a history" to Antoinette, and Antoinette's determination to start a fire are conflated, which burn her husband's "ancestral home", the history of his family. In his essay "Jean Rhys and the Genius of Impressionism", Todd Bender states: "[...] [Rochester's mad west Indian wife], called Antoinette or Bertha, who finally perishes in the fire which she sets and burn[s] down Rochester's ancestral home [...]" (Bender, 1990, p. 75). As a text of resistance, *Wide Sargasso Sea* overall makes Antoinette's side heard and reveals what patriarchal existence and colonialism have done to her. She voices herself and her dignity as a human being not with an articulate manner but with her last action. She crowns her breakaway with a full consciousness of what she is doing. The expression "I know", at the end of the narration is the adverse effect of a suppressed identity and life.

It can be concluded that, from the beginning till the end, *Wide Sargasso Sea* is not a reaction to one of the greatest novels of British literature only, but it is a reaction to a literary tradition which excludes the colonised from history. Antoinette's life-long observant manner, her awareness of the antagonistic gazes on her island and her life, her critical questioning against imperialist ideals of her husband, which never match

with the blessings of her beautiful island, her unrequited love later turning into detest, and finally her unwilling leave from the island lead her to an unprecedented resistance. To conclude, *Wide Sargasso Sea* is deliberately fictionalized around Antoinette. She is silent, silenced, othered, marginalized, and her feminine beauty is consumed and ruined. However, she is there and existent enough, even to be the target of male hatred. In the world created for Antoinette by Rhys, the real mismatch, the unfit is not the colonised, but the coloniser. Moreover, he cannot find a place for himself in the world of Antoinette who, as a colonised female, defines her self better than the coloniser. Antoinette like nature is patient and silent. As nature is unpredictable, you never know when it will show up with a disaster. Likewise, the concluding words of her narration so clearly display her unpredictability. She has been conscious enough when the issue is her self and her nature, which have been destroyed but challenged by a madly feat: “Now at last I know why I was brought here and what I have to do” (Rhys, 2000, p. 124).

CHAPTER 3

SECOND CLASS CITIZEN, the POST-COLONIAL SELF and RESISTANCE

Although Buchi Emecheta (1944-2017) considers herself an ordinary writer who has to write to communicate and wishes to tell stories (Emecheta, 1986, p. 173), she is shown as one of the most influential writers of African literature with such topics as tribal issues, patriarchal authority, motherhood, and African women's position in community, in marriage, in family, in their own land and in England. Scholars characterize her as one of the most "prolific" and "best-known" writers of African fiction (Umeh, 1998, p. 148, Ogunyemi, 1996, p. 223, Fisher, 2002, p. 121, Killam, 2004, p. 37, Sougou, 2002, p. 3), and a "cross-cultural figure" due to her writing in the African tradition and approaching African materials and experience which is not only restricted to womanly protest but also referring mostly to metropolitan assumptions in regard to African culture (Sougou, 2002, p. 1-2). In an interview, Emecheta says she "write[s] for the world", and considers her writing neither English, nor African but international and universal (Jussawalla & Dasenbrock, 1992, p. 85). Having been born in the colonial period, witnessing the independence in her homeland and experiencing what a post-colonial citizen in England means, she was exposed to many forms of cultural texture coming from different sources; authentic, modern and post-colonial worlds.

Regarding the true life experiences intertwined with the storylines in her novels, Emecheta is seen as a dedicated and strong voice from Africa. Making people understand the African mind is not a very simple task to handle when the basic argument of colonialism has been thoroughly supportive of the western mind with most of its mechanisms including the practice of patriarchy, presentation of civilisation, and its discursive power. In *Literature of Africa* Douglas Killam states that Emecheta was born at the close of World War II, in the "seat of colonial government." She learnt much about the cultural and religious values of her hometown as her parents were Igbos. At a young age, she was firmly determined to get an education and to become a writer (Killam, 2004, p. 37). Taking Killam's definition as a reliable source, it can be said that this colonial experience, cultural consciousness, the determination to write back; and, the insight that she had guided her to analyse,

synthesize and picture the environments where she lived and gave her a reason for adding autobiographical details into her work to open up her own mind to the rest of the world. According to Virginia Ola, Emecheta's strength comes from her first-hand knowledge [due to her experiences], personal experiences, "the intensity, vigour and directness of her expressions", "detailed nature of her descriptions" and "her capturing the social picture of Nigeria" (Ola, 1987, p. 136).

In a similar vein, *Second Class Citizen* is regarded as a semi-autobiographical work concentrating on the intelligent, diligent, observant, self-conscious but oftentimes sly protagonist Adah's life from her childhood to motherhood. The novel starts with Adah Obi's impression of her own experience in the world. She feels that starting life as a girl means starting as a loser. However, she disproves this after years of struggle as a child, a wife, a mother and a migrant. She notices the contrasts which have been constructed by her culture so she expresses her disappointment about the inequalities between genders at an early age. While doing this, she does not approach things emotionally, but so judiciously so that she can make use of occasions. In her culture, gender pulls down a girl to a disadvantageous position when education is at issue. Nevertheless, with her cautious and sometimes furtive steps, she manages to get education which is primarily available to boys. At the age of eight, she is quite aware of the subordinate position of females in her community. Adah feels that she is "a disappointment" to her family, too. Yet, she knows that her father loves her and happy to have her. Her father lost his mother at a very young age, and he believes that her mother reincarnated in this world as his daughter this time. Although having a girl is not a very big thing to be proud of in Adah's culture, motherhood is a primary concern within the customary beliefs. Adah loses her father at a young age and feels the isolation and abandonment deeply because he was the only one supporting her education genuinely. With the newcoming restrictions in family budget, together with her mother and brother, she starts to live with her relatives who treat her as if she was a servant. In fact, this is not uncommon for her culture in such situations. This is allowed by the culture in the form of starting a new family and domestic help is what falls to Adah's lot. However, Adah never gives up. In contrast, she gets every opportunity work for herself. She manages to get a scholarship to continue her education. In search for a better life and a piece of freedom, she rushes into a marriage

which never makes her happy but admittedly, she needs that marriage even though she asks herself “[h]ad she made a mistake rushing into this marriage? But she had needed a home and immigration authorities were making it very difficult for single girls to come to England” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 30). Marriage also opens up new doors, which she never wants to close because as she confesses “if she had not got that job, her marriage would have broken up, and that would have been very difficult because she did not yet know her way about” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 32). Compared to many people in her society, she is one of the rare ones having good education. As a result of this advantage, she gets a favourable job and leads a comfortable life in her homeland “bringing joy” to her husband Francis’s family with her satisfactory wage. However, in search for a freer life in England, she subtly instils ideas into her parents-in-law’s mind. She convinces them to let her and her husband leave for England. She sustains the imaginary, illusionary dream of England in her mind that is inherited from her father until she goes there. As soon as she arrives, she notices the “cold welcome” both from Francis, who had arrived there earlier, and from England, which is revealed as the events progress. Neither England, nor her husband Francis nor the search for freedom has made her life easier. With the feeling of responsibility to her children, she puts up with Francis’s behaviour. Yet, although Francis has always been offensive, she takes the advantage of being married as a piece of comfort to leave Nigeria and to start a life in England. Being an African mother, Adah achieves survival in this alien land but it is not easy with an irresponsible and abusive husband so it gets impossible for her to go on as a wife. However, she manages to be a devoted mother and survives as a self. With the figure of Adah, Emecheta is concerned with womanly self-expression in homeland and in a different country. Adah is, in fact, in search for something more than freedom. Hers is not a matter of freedom directly. She is looking for self-determination to make her resistance and self-expression possible. To conduct the things and overcome the obstacles, whether psychological or physical, she generally keeps her silence but meanwhile keeps her motto in her mind “be as cunning as a serpent but as harmless as a dove” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 20). Emecheta makes African knowledge more recognizable to the reader in *Second Class Citizen*. In “Introduction: recognizing identities, imagining alternative”, Harri Englund states “the politics of recognition revolves around identity, understood as self-image that individuals and

groups have” (Englund, 2004, p. 1). After years of acknowledging the centre, the coloniser and the coloniser’s knowledge as the utmost point to be reached, it is time for the post-colonial to be recognized by the coloniser and the rest of the world. As Kirsten Holst Peterson and Anna Rutherford detect “they are literally fighting for visibility” (Peterson & Rutherford, 1986, p. 9). For this reason, *Second Class Citizen* creates a space for discussion, recognition, resistance and self-definition in the persona of Adah.

The analysis focuses on the thesis that *Second Class Citizen* is a novel of self-awareness, self-definition, questioning and resistance under the patriarchal and colonial discourse. Its protagonist Adah Obi is distinguished for her conscious doings and resistance against the patriarchal and colonial language. Adah’s resistance is inseparable from her self-definition which she builds for herself after a great deal of struggles. As the author of this semi-autobiographical text, Emecheta raises her voice against colonial situation and its outgrowths through her work which “would be regarded as [a] sociological handbook” (Emecheta, 1989, p. viii). Thus, the autobiographical texture to represent African mind with her female voice is the responsibility she has taken over. By this way Emecheta has a response to Spivak’s last words in “Can the Subaltern Speak?": “The subaltern cannot speak. [...] The female intellectual as intellectual has a circumscribed task which she must not disown with a flourish” (Spivak, 1988, p. 104).

The aim of this analysis is to focus on *Second Class Citizen* as a text of resistance against patriarchy and colonial discourse in the post-colonial era. To concentrate on this issue, the analysis will follow three stages. The first stage will focus on the oppressive patriarchal weight on Adah. The merit of a woman is defined and decided by patriarchy which is one of the most salient characteristics of the novel and which is challenged by Adah in her own way. She opposes the system that maps out a girl’s future. While reacting to this, she is quite conscious of the patriarchal burden that surrounds her social environment and behaviours of the people around so she takes action accordingly both in Nigeria and in London. Secondly, Africanity and blackness as an inevitable part of her identity and self-definition will be mentioned. She tries to apply what she believes to be true and natural against the will of her husband Francis,

her Nigerian neighbours in England and sometimes the “over-demanding” society of England. In that point, Emecheta believes that western-focused feminist approach does not sufficiently explain African outlook as the dynamics in the culture systems might be different so Africa and west might look to things from different perspectives, especially in women’s issues. Another point related to Adah’s self-definition is her acceptance of blackness. Although at times Adah feels discouraged by the hostile environment against the blacks, she firmly makes up her mind to survive and to be present with her blackness in a white society. That is to say, she reconciles her blackness with her new self in England. The third stage of the analysis will be on the Third Space that Homi Bhabha puts forward as a complex zone for a hybrid kind of communication; that is, a space of resistance and a moment of opening for self-definition. Adah leaves her country and lives in England; however, she takes a lot from and adds to the space that she fills in in England. She remembers her African self and culture and leads a life in England trying to find a communicative space to penetrate as a Nigerian and an English citizen. Her education, her alert and conscious character, her objective attitude towards the negative and positive sides of Africa, and lastly her skill to compare, analyse and synthesise both cultures in the micro environments of England prepare Adah to the newer and freer self that is to come in England.

To start with, in reference to resistance and self-definition as an overall issue in the analysis, it is suitable to quote from “Can the Subaltern Speak?” by Gayatri Spivak in order to refer to all the three stages of the analysis mentioned above. Spivak asks a question:

When we come to the concomitant question of the consciousness of the subaltern, the notion of what the work cannot say becomes important. In the semioses of the social text, elaborations of insurgency stand in the place of the utterance. The sender, -the peasant is marked only as a pointer to an irretrievable consciousness. As for the receiver we must ask “who is the real receiver of an ‘insurgency’?” (Spivak, 1988, p. 82)

It is her female consciousness that represents Adah’s complete awareness of the moments that she experiences. When Adah’s case is adapted to Spivak’s proposition and the receiver(s) are considered, it becomes clear that there are three layers of this reception. These are firstly, the patriarchal weight of her immediate

environment such as her mother or her husband; secondly western-focused practices which are forced through daily life; and lastly, the patriarchal domain of colonial discourse which tends to interpret the world over colour and exclude blackness. Adah speaks for all and mostly the receivers get what she intends to make them to receive, except for some moments of silence when she comes to the point that she wants to tell about her culture but she deliberately stays silent. In those moments, she feels the heaviness of being a subaltern in the land of the coloniser and prefers not to speak. This evokes African women's suppressed existence and experience in their own land and in the coloniser's place. In her article Spivak defines this exclusion:

Within the effaced itinerary of the subaltern subject, the track of sexual difference is doubly effaced. [...] [The question] is, rather, that both as the object of colonialist historiography and as subject of insurgency, the ideological construction of gender keeps the male dominant. If, in the context of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is more deeply in shadow (Spivak, 1988, p. 82).

Adah's experiences in Nigeria and in England justify Spivak's detection. Yet, her struggle to build a self by reconciling with her blackness and surviving in England as a black woman becomes clearer as the novel progresses.

Adah's experiences emphasize the patriarchal hindrances on her girlhood, wifehood, and motherhood, and encompass her life in Nigeria and in England. The shadow of a male either in the persona of a father, a brother or a husband is felt in all practices of African life. Patriarchal domain is the controller of the public sphere and the siege starts with education. It is education that initiates resistance in Adah, firstly because "boys were given preference" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 3), and girls are just a topic, an object of discussion. There is no need to train girls after they learn to write their names and count, and to sew (Emecheta, 1989, p. 3). This is the dominant public opinion strolling around because Adah has "heard her mother say this many times to her friends" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 3). Adah resorts to subtle ways to cope with that and manages to deal with it in her own way, mainly by using her wit and exploiting the opportunities that she encounters. At a very early age she starts to react against authority. And, the first authority she reacts is her mother because the mother is the only figure in her close environment that she can rise against. Adah is jealous of

students; especially the boys who get education at an English-medium school so she starts lying. “She would lie, just for the joy of lying; she took secret joy in disobeying her mother” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 3).

Adah has been aware of the status of a woman in her culture since birth. Being born as a girl is not a disadvantage only to her nuclear family but to the whole tribe as she knows that “she was such a disappointment to her parents, to her immediate family, to her tribe [...] She was so insignificant” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 1). This perception of the female in her homeland revisits Adah in a hospital ward in England, too. When her son is ill, the nurse asks her whether she has another child or not. Adah replies that she does but “she is only a girl” (Emecheta, 1989, pp. 1,51). Although she does not approve this secondary position, Adah is still haunted by this societal ranking. When she looks back to her eight-year-old self, she sees that she has achieved much. After remembering the inferior place of her gender in society, she thinks “back on it all now that she was grown up, she was sorry for her parents. But it was their own fault; they should not have had her in the first place, and that would have saved a lot of people from a lot of headaches” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 1). The foreshadowing of these “a lot of headaches” is the voice of a grounded grown-up who later defines herself against her husband with sound mind: “I am not your mother, I am me [...]” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 149).

After her father’s death, the feeling of insignificance starts to reveal itself more explicitly. It is the death of a father which has the last word on a family’s destiny on her land. Similarly, her father’s death determines the afterlife of the rest of the family so everybody gets their share. Patriarchal authority necessitates the hold of property in favour of the male child. Her mother has become the wife of her uncle and Adah has become his family’s servant. Adah’s brother Boy, on the other hand, has been decided to get the family money for a better education. However, this might either end Adah’s schooling or, if she goes on with her education, gives the family a chance to get a bigger dowry. Her final choice is to go on her education at a cheap school different from the previous one. However, Adah manages to get the chance to take the entrance examination of a high ranking school with the money she steals from her aunt who has given her some cash to buy meat. Adah uses this money to apply for the entrance

examination but claims that she has lost it. Nobody believes her as might be expected but Adah thinks she deserves the money with a considerable number of cane strikes in response to what she has done. Turning back to Spivak's question "who is the real receiver of an insurgency?", it can be said that the answer is the patriarchal domain which appreciates the male and spares no room for the girl who is in need of education, too. However, Adah was not "thinking about the rights and wrongs, she had to survive" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 11). The patriarchal domain is wounded by her step by step because the Adah who enviously and with frustration watches her brother Boy going to Ladi-Lak Institute "in [his] smart navy-blue pinafores" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 3) is years later the same Adah being watched by Boy while she is leaving the country. And, "[a]ll she could do for Boy was to make him aware that he had a sister he had every reason to be proud of" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 25).

With her relatively practical solutions, sometimes sly steps, and her drive to survive, Adah handles the obstacles in her life. Hers is the survival of her feminine side and her voice that has a matching "receiver" in her society. She gets her voice heard from an early age. By complaining about her mother and causing her to get a torturing punishment at the police station, by stealing money from her uncle's wife, using it for her own good and being ready to face the painful result, and by biting a male classmate harshly while he is holding her during a caning punishment, have all given her the chance to survive and define herself. In the last case, she is caned by the headmaster because he thinks that Adah has been smiling at him, which is unacceptable for there is nothing funny in him to smile at. As a deserved consequence, she is severely caned by him with the help of some boys who are (volunteering and) responsible for holding her. She bites one of the boys so badly that "from that day on, no boy ever volunteered to back Adah up any more, but that incident gave her a nickname which she never lived down: Ibo tigress" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 13). At the point where she reaches even as a young school girl, she ironically deserves the name she has got with pain and resistance. In her definition of her own, she, by nature, has pain and watchfulness. After biting her classmate's hand, she has a piece of his flesh between her teeth. She remembers the instances when "some of her Yoruba friends used to ask her what human flesh tasted like, because "you Ibos used to eat people, did not you?" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 13). Although Adah bites him to substitute the pain of

the cane with another action, the instance reminds of the curiosity about cannibalism. The “receiver” is now the patriarchal and colonial discourse that causes even the young children to satisfy their curiosity about cannibalistic tendencies. At this point, Elleke Boehmer’s statement can be relevant to the reflection of infamous cannibalistic stories in people’s perception:

Developing as a part of the mid-Victorian adventure writing boom, the subgenre of the Robinsonade [...] testified of course to the paradigmatic power of *Robinson Crusoe*, [...] within a wider tradition of colonial romance. [...] slaves and the fear of cannibalism resurfaced time and again in boys’ stories (Boehmer, 1995, p. 47).

With the dominance of colonial writing and its reflection on patriarchal obsession, the knowledge of cannibalism can be regarded as a side effect of colonial othering. Since western discourse imposes the power of knowledge upon the African by naming and describing him with western references, the African himself imposes discursive power to another African who, he thinks, performs wrongdoings. As an example, the global effect of Robinson’s masterful attitudes to the slave Friday, can be seen in little school children of Africa while defining another African/Adah belonging to a different tribe. In this descriptive scene taking place in Adah’s classroom, Emecheta provides a “semiotic field”. The scene simply includes a suppressed African girl who wants to rid herself from oppression with education which is primarily available to boys, and who has been beaten by authority, and who has been asked about the taste of human flesh. This description of Emecheta, as it provides enough material for a semiotic field, can be interpreted with Spivak’s description of “semiotic field” in her interview with Walter Adamson titled “The Problem of Cultural Self-Representation”. For Spivak, the world itself is not a semiotic field. For her, a semiotic field is the one which contains “collections of axioms in the socius depending on your position within the socius and these axioms by no means unified all over the globe.” A writer for Spivak, not only writes in a specific language but s/he writes in a so-called sign system. However, a semiotic field cannot be reduced to a collection of signs, words and meanings. This is the “hard reality” beyond the signs (Adamson, 1990, p. 52). In the caning scene, what Emecheta reveals is the representation of a discursive environment on a micro level. She uncovers the “hard

reality” beyond signs and cultural representation. She not only reflects a part of reality from her culture but also provides the presentation of a difference from the global context. Adah’s position in her “society” is intertwined with the reflection of western discourse on African children. The headmaster who canes Adah takes revenge and practices power in return for a smile but although he “knew she was telling the truth; he had simply wanted to cane her, that was all” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 139). Adah is conscious of whatever she does, and this is totally different from the world context because this is Africa, and people do things differently which is not abnormal within itself.

Western discourse has tended to ignore the colonised/the African. Women as the major colonised object have been doubly affected by this. Spivak’s claim focusing on the dominance of colonial discourse and the dominance of male, and the doubly shadowed position of female points to a tripartite issue in Adah’s case in terms of “effaced itinerary” condition (Spivak, 1988, p. 82). Firstly, as an oppressed female in her own society, Adah tries hard to survive and has to choose somewhat indecent ways to get an education but she makes up her mind at a very early age to be a life-long learner. With her insistence, she overcomes her mother as the first obstacle to her education: “You made me drink *gari* [...] Now we gave you school. [...] You chose school. To school you must go from now until you go grey. How right Ma was! Adah would never stop learning. She had been a student ever since” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 7). Moreover, Adah vehemently protests not only her mother but also her whole family. She violates her tribe’s customs by marrying Francis, who is underage like her, without bride price because she disappoints her family by taking their chance to get “the five hundred pounds bride price” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 16). She thinks they do not deserve it because “she was such an expensive bride [who was] college-trained [but] none of them contributed to her education” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 16). While she is trying to escape into freedom from patriarchal burden of her family and punishing them, she ironically finds herself in another patriarchal trap. Secondly, she has dreams about going to England because her father talked much about England even though he had never been to: “[...] United Kingdom when pronounced by Adah’s father [...] was so deep, so mysterious that [he] always voiced it [...] [with] such a respectful expression as if he were speaking of God’s Holiest of Holies” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 2). Her

immediate environment and community admire England and England-related things including fantasies like “it must be like heaven” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 2). Even women sometimes strengthen their hair with “hot combs to make it look European” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 2). Therefore, Adah believes that she can be free only by going to England “the land of her dreams” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 23). Hers is not a too material expectation. She wants to be her self and wants to prove that “a girl was little more than a property”, and when she comes back “she might not come back a millionaire, but she would come back with pride” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 25) because she believes that (is made to believe that) only England can give this opportunity. Lastly, Adah has to face the fact that “female is more deeply in shadow” as Spivak mentions (Spivak, 1988, p. 82). For example, Adah’s consciousness was quite open to make an analysis of African males becoming better in England. When she is in England, she sees no difference in African attitude to women. Even civilised manners are available just for the African male in progress:

The husbands promised to be better husbands to their wives, good and rich fathers to their children, men of whom they would all be proud when and if they come back from England. The children, poor things, they were usually overjoyed at having a father in the United Kingdom. But whether they saw their father again, or whether he was a better father for his going to England, no one knew (Emecheta, 1989, p. 68).

In this case, the shadowed African women are now the awaiting women of Africa for the good of their husbands who will one day come back to serve for the betterment of their country. In another instance for example, as soon as Adah arrives in England and is met by her husband, the first thing she hears from him is a hard fact: “It is allowed for African males to come and get civilized in England, but that privilege has not been extended to females yet” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 28). Both examples imply the double functioning of colonialism. Going to England will educate the men of illiteracy and curb their primitivism in the centre. After that, these men will be better individuals with decorated manners in their homeland. Still, women are in passive position whose mere business is to wait silently. If they dare to say something they might be labelled as women “who stood in the way of their ambitious husbands” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 68). Patriarchal mentality overpowers. Another example of these

civilized men is Lawyer Nweze. His arrival to the wharf, where he has been waited for joyously, shows how high the expectations in Nigeria are. Both women and men wait for his arrival with excitement:

[...] these happy women, to welcome [Nweze] who had been to have a taste of that civilization, which was soon afterwards to hook them all, like opium. [...] The European arrivals gaped at them. [...] The climax of it all was when an Englishman took their photographs. [...] Ma and her friends were really happy to have their pictures taken by Europeans (Emecheta, 1989, p. 8).

On the day of Nweze's arrival Adah promises to herself to go to the United Kingdom one day, as a female whose father "was only a railwayman [and] mother who knew nothing but the Ibo Bible" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 9). With her ambition to lead a freer and educated life and her success-oriented promise, she heads towards England.

After a number of family discussions, Adah manages to persuade her in-laws and goes to England following her husband Francis. When she is leaving her country, although she feels emotional, she fancies the fact that "all around her there were wives of diplomats and top white civil servants going home on leave. [...] Being there, in that first-class section, seemed to give her a taste of what was to come. It is nice to be treated like an elite" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 25).

Her enjoyment on the deck as a married woman and her "secret vow" to herself as a child that "she would go to this United Kingdom one day" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 9), turns into frustration when she faces the realities in England. George Lamming states that when he colonised goes to the coloniser's country with an acquired knowledge of the Englishmen whom s/he has never met before, all relationships begin "with the assumption of previous knowledge" (Lamming, 2004, p.24).

The second part of the analysis will focus on Adah's denial to lead a second-class life in England. She first rejects to lead a life among the Africans, who are not educated and not in her rank, as she thinks. As she observes them, she notices that the routine and the life standards around are appropriated to the life in England and are bowed by the fellow Nigerians.

Age-long dreams of generations about the United Kingdom do not come true for Adah. She realizes the fact as soon as she reaches there. Her delighted mood on the deck due to being surrounded by the white wives is substituted by the fact of being surrounded by Nigerians in a low-rank neighbourhood in England. This is also multiplied by Francis's laziness and his use of his studies as an excuse to stay away from work. "He was doing his studies full time and did not have to worry about money because his wife is earning enough to keep them going" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 59). With the help of her educational background, Adah, got a job in Nigeria and earned good amount of money allowing her to have "four maids, two were paid three pounds each, the other two were paid their fees for secondary schools. [All she has to do is to] be waited on hand and foot" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 18). As soon as she arrives in England, she learns that she is going to live so close to Nigerians, most of whom are factory workers and "have the same educational background as her paid servants (Emecheta, 1989, p. 29) in a shared apartment that Francis has found. Adah, in contrast to all her social earnings in Nigeria, faces the tripartite "reality of being a black, a nobody, a second-class citizen" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 69) in England. This cannot be interpreted as a random consequence. Living together with the coloniser for long years in Nigeria and learning "[...] the niceties of life from [...] missionaries!" (Emecheta, 1989, pp. 20-21), end up with disappointment in England, in the microcosmic environment of Nigeria. Only her job satisfies her because she has got the chance to work in a place where, to many Nigerians, only the white can work. She is "so proud of her job and so happy" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 34).

Spivak's question "Can the subaltern speak?" and her answer "The question of women seems most problematic [...] [, and] if you are poor, black and female, you get it in three ways" (Spivak, 1989, p. 29) provide an analytical perspective for Adah's situation in terms of poverty, blackness and gender. Whether Francis could find a better apartment for the comfort of the whole family is open to discussion when his laziness and irresponsible character are taken into consideration. For Adah, "Francis was not a bad man, but a man who couldn't cope with the over-demanding society he found himself in" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 86). Yet, the reality is obvious in his actions. Adah copes with poverty and childcare alone because she "[...] should be doing all the worrying about what they were going to live on, why she and she alone [...] The

funniest thing was that she felt it was her duty to work, not her husband's. He was to have an easy life" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 81). Still, he is the decision maker and Adah "simply accepted the role as defined for her by Francis" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 81). Moreover, what is worse is Francis's constant discouragement by reminding and highlighting their blackness as a component of inferiority. Adah is haunted by the fact that Francis has told about: "you may be earning a million pounds a day, you may be living like an elite, but the day you landed in England, you are a second-class citizen" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 30). For Adah, it is clear that she is not only talking over colour but class now, because while she is leaving Nigeria, on the deck, she is disillusioned by the expectation of "what was to come" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 25) but it is a false promise. Spivak states if the formulation of poor, black and female is moved into the post-colonial context, the matter of blackness loses much of its persuasiveness because as the "colonial-subject constitution in the first phase of capitalist imperialism makes colour useless" (Spivak, 1988, p. 90). Therefore, among the Blacks in England, Adah herself is trapped in the colonial and imperial world of the centre which makes the subaltern her/himself the conveyor of imperial concerns. She is not an elite but she wants to be like, so she herself, in Spivak's words "adds the continuous construction of the subaltern" (Spivak, 1989, p. 29). She is worried by the description of "second-class" and refuses to work in factory because she bases this refusal on her education and her certificates so she questions "why should she go and work with her neighbours who were just learning to join their letters together [...]?" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 31). Adah has struggled so much to receive this education to find a place as a woman both in her hometown and in England so she has decided that she will never be a part of this definition of second-class. As a woman, she is more determined, stubborn and skilful than her husband in managing difficult moments because Francis already surrenders the idea that "Everybody is coming to London. The West Indians, the Pakistanis and even the Indians. [...] We are all black, all coloured" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 29). However, Adah is aware of his trauma that he cannot cope with his reality because he is not a self-conscious person. She thinks "[...] his blackness, his feeling of blackness, was firmly established in his mind. She knew that there was discrimination all over the place but Francis's mind was a fertile ground [...]" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 47). Adah, too, has passed through experiences based on her disappointing observations.

Although in her country she was once a woman inspiring envy among her acquaintances, she now feels all the burdens of being a second-class person:

Adah was beginning to learn that her colour was something to be ashamed of. She was never aware of this at home in Nigeria, even when in the midst of whites. Those whites must have had a few lessons about colour before coming out to the tropics, because they never let drop from their mouths that, in their countries, black was inferior. [...] She was now learning to suspect anything beautiful and pure. Those things were for the whites, not the blacks (Emecheta, 1989, p. 59).

Here, the ideal world of the civilized gets hurt before Adah's eyes. The illusion is replaced by illumination. Nevertheless, as she is determined to behave accordingly, she makes up her mind to adapt but not to be assimilated or oppressed. Adah does not give up on her ideals. Instead, she decides to find a way to understand and to be understood:

[...] [Francis and others] believed that one had to start with the inferior and stay there, because being black meant being inferior. Well, Adah did not yet believe that wholly, but what she did know was that being regarded as inferior had a psychological effect on her. The result was that she started to act in the way expected of her because she was still new in England, but after a while, she was not going to accept it from anyone. She was going to regard herself as the equal of any white (Emecheta, 1989, p. 60).

Even though she detaches herself from her countrymen, Adah is overwhelmed by the in-between situation because in the essence of the identity she has been trying to build for herself in England, there is her own character, her own reality and her own skin-colour which means she belongs to Africa but still she is ready to reject the assumptions of inferiority and adapt to the modern world with her own reality which she can never think of keeping aside. She is more self-conscious than many of her fellows and her husband. When her husband regards luxury places as he assumes that these places are for the first-class and for the white, Adah feels: “[...] if she had the money, she would have walked straight into such places and was sure she would have been served” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 47). This is also clear in the way others see Adah. It would not be wrong to say that Adah has achieved much as she reports the rumours, or gossips around:

In fact, to most of her Nigerian neighbours, she was having her cake and eating it. She was in a white man's job, despite the fact that everybody had warned her against it, and it looked as if she meant to keep it. She would not send her children away to be fostered like everybody else; instead, they were living with them, just as if she and Francis were first-class-citizens, in their own country. To cap it all, they were Ibos, the hated people who always believed blindly in their ideologies (Emecheta, 1989, p. 58).

In her case, and from the instances above, it is understood that Adah is a suffering woman in England, but still tries hard to be at peace with her blackness and is still determined to get what she wants in England. This makes many people think “[t]he trouble was that Adah was like a peacock who kept wanting to win all the time” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 38).

Besides the overwhelming patriarchal domain, western feminist perspective, which does not satisfactorily explain African women's condition, is another concern that Emecheta specifically dwells on in *Second Class Citizen*. She sees western feminism as an addressee within her interest about female issues. While setting the differences between African and Western feminisms, André Kaboré states that it would be a fallacy to perceive African and Western feminism with common terms. African feminism is not a version of Western feminism. Travelling worldwide, African women writers have come to a point that they refuse to be Europeans or Americans. They, as Kaboré says, decide to remain African and do the things in their own way (Kabore, 2017, p. 413).

Although Adah feels the dominance of patriarchy and its tendencies to keep women in secondary position, although she ironically articulates that “[a] woman would be forgiven as long as she produced children” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 18), and although she is education-focused, she does not de-emphasize her own cultural dynamics even though they mainly leave her at a disadvantage. In Africa, some things are done for the sake of the practicality of daily life. Culture and daily practices can be simply taken as a part of life. For example, in her “Introduction” to *Second Class Citizen*, Emecheta states that her writing was “spasmodic” because it was mostly done in the early morning hours. It is completely cultural so this “becomes a part of you”. When she starts to live in London, she follows this routine. For example, a little girl in

Africa wakes up very early. Children and young people [...] get up at the dawn, go to the stream and get water. [...] Everything is done before the sunrise” (Emecheta, 1989, pp. viii, ix). The integration of this daily routine into the narration is clear. Adah’s point about African daily goings-on can gain clarity. Some things are done only for practicality as a component of culture:

One might think on this evidence that Africans treated their children badly. But to Adah’s people and to Adah herself, this was not so at all; it was the custom. Children especially girls, were taught to be very useful very early in life, and this had its advantages. For instance, Adah learned very early to be responsible for herself. Nobody was interested in her for her own sake, only in the money she would fetch, and the housework she could do and Adah, happy at being given this opportunity of survival, didn’t waste time thinking about its rights or wrongs. She had to survive (Emecheta, 1989, p. 11).

Adah’s point reveals the fact that there is a living land called Africa, and people and women may do things differently there for pragmatic reasons and results. Africans exist with their positive and negative sides. Negativity might be regarded as unacceptable when it is moulded within a western framework but the fact may not be as it seems from a distance.

Keeping cultural identity and finding a way to communicate it is done on a womanly basis, highlighting motherhood or maternal inheritance. Therefore, it can be more of common ground to call her, as Jussawalla and Dasenbrock call her, “a chronicler of women’s experience both in England and in Africa, and particularly as a chronicler of the diaspora’s women experience” (Jussawalla & Dasenbrock, 1992, p. 83).

Adah nurtures herself with her motherhood, and in time it becomes a constituent of her self. However, this puts her into an ambivalent situation at times. She keeps her children in her sight because she takes much of her womanly power from her children and refuses to adapt fully to her new social environment in England as neighbour Nigerians do. For example, Francis wants to find a foster mother for the children both for the children to learn English better, and for their own sake as a couple to have much space in their tiny house. Adah refuses this: “But you forget Francis, that when we were young, we spoke Yoruba flawlessly even though we are Ibos. We

picked the language up at school and at play. That shouldn't be difficult" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 37). In Nigeria, being a working mother does not literally mean going to a work place or an office, though. It can be any kind of work done by a mother. It is a part of life in its natural pace. Adah says "At home in Nigeria, all a mother had to do for a baby was wash and feed him and, if he was fidgety, strap him on to her back and carry on with her work while the baby slept" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 37). For Adah, it is like a full-time job in England "as if one were serving a master" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 36). She cannot understand why this natural thing is exaggerated by Nigerian mothers that much. Yet, she is hesitant because like a first-class citizen, she works "in a clean, centrally heated library, but what about her children?" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 36). At this point, she feels the overwhelming pressure of being in England and bowing to the life-standards as other Nigerians do because the highlighting of the difference of first and second-class haunts her "[o]nly first-class citizens lived with their children, not the blacks" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 38). She sometimes thinks that the neighbours are right because the conditions in the house were very bad and "the children had no amusements and their parents would not let them out for fear they would break their neck on the steep stairs. They were hushed and bullied into silence so that the landlord and his wife should not be disturbed" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 38). Their landlord and landlady "warned [Francis] that it was going to be difficult for them [...] They would have to be fostered" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 36).

Adah is at the edge of a decision to leave her children to a foster mother like other Nigerians or to keep them like first-class citizens. She chooses the second one. Motherhood is the mainstay she builds a definition for her self in England and she criticizes many others:

As soon as Nigerian housewife in England realized that she was expecting a child, instead of shopping for the prams and knitting little booties, she would advertise for a foster mother [who is white] [because] [t]he concept of whiteness could cover a multitude of sins (Emecheta, 1989, p. 36).

To Adah these women fail to recognize that "most of them were brought up in situations, far, far different from the ones in which they found themselves in England" (Emecheta, 1989, p. 37). Although "[e]verybody expected Adah to do the same"

(Emecheta, 1989, p. 37), she decides not to be like them. Her concern is her children the existence of whom makes her complete: “she had never really had anything of her own before” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 30). The result of her decision is depressing but yet she does not surrender: “It came a big surprise when they realized that she was not making any attempt to look for a foster mother. And now Francis told her that he was not going to look after her children for her any more” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 37). Adah renounces the expectations of her close environment. Her decision is a triumph over the Nigerians around who give in by sacrificing their own habits, and over her husband who has “never made his own decisions [and] [...] always consulted his mother, his father and his brothers” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 37). In England, the situation does not change for Francis because his family is substituted by his neighbours so now he has to “make do with his Nigerian neighbours” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 37). Adah in fact, sums up the situation intuitively and how she gives response to the roles cast for her family: “[...] because they had their children with them, because Adah worked in a library and because they found it difficult to conform to the standard which they were expected to live by” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 61).

She defends herself and her African habits against her husband and other Africans because her life in England gradually prepares a freer self for Adah. The central role of mothering is articulated by Oyeronke Oyewumi: “if there was one role defined for females, it was the position of mother. [...] Because of the matrifocality of many African family systems, the mother is the pivot around which the family relationships are delineated and organized” (Oyewumi, 2004, p.6). The pivotal role of the mother is reminded by Adah when Francis gets angry with the idea of divorce and says “Once a man’s wife, always a man’s wife until you die” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 149).

Adah nodded but reminded him that, among their people, the husband provides for the family and that a wicked man that knocked his wife about ran the risk of losing her altogether. [...] Can you, Francis, show me some vests or anything these children can lay their hands upon which you claim to have bought for them? No, Francis, you broke the laws our people first, not me. [...] You remember the saying that a man who treated his wife like a shit would always treat his wife like a shit? (Emecheta, 1989, p. 149).

It is understood that the unspoken solidarity of womanhood gives Adah strength. In the above example, Adah refers to her African culture again, and interestingly she defends the culture against Francis, whom, she thinks, “is through and through African” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 20). To Adah’s knowledge, coming into contact with the Europeans in Nigeria has added much to her understanding towards life. She accepts that this is an opportunity for a change and Francis is devoid of that opportunity although he has undergone a very good education:

Francis has had a very expensive education at Hussey College in Warri but his outlook on life was pure African. He had had little opportunity of coming in contact with Europeans as Adah had. Those God-forsaken missionaries! They had told Adah all the niceties of life (Emecheta, 198, pp. 20-21).

As regards the issues mentioned above, it can be said that *Second Class Citizen* is in pursuit of a room for an alternative, resistant discourse, a counter one unfolding the other side of things and a domain for a discussion. Western education is a must to be attained so that Adah can reach the domain of self-expression. She can penetrate into the western mind first by getting English-medium education. Adah’s people, too, think that “one’s saviour from poverty and disease was education” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 3). Moreover, *Second Class Citizen* also reflects the impression that after receiving western education, meeting westerners and learning English, Adah can have an access to the freer world of the west. So, not only African mind but also western mind is unfolded comparatively. To her dismay, the over-romanticized western image is replaced by disillusionment. In this sense, the novel is exemplifying and compiling many concerns of Emecheta and shows the African mind to the reader with its counter-discursive features. In *Reading Buchi Emecheta* Katherine Fishburn states “[...] [i]n reading Emecheta, I’m not just reading her and her African heritage – I am also reading myself and my Western heritage”. Fishburn adds that she interrogates Emecheta’s text and the text interrogates her (Fishburn, 1995, p. 4).

One of the colonial activities in the novel related to language and education is firstly seen with the appearance of Ladi-Lak school with its features at length. It is apparent that Ladi-Lak was a distant dream for Adah once. “Children were not taught Yoruba or any other African language. This was why it was such an expensive school.

The proprietress was trained in the United Kingdom. At that time more than half the children in the school were Ibos, as they were then highly motivated by the middle-class values (Emecheta, 1989, p. 3). This shows that colonial atmosphere in Nigeria and its outgrowth as English-medium education in the country's schools turns out to be a questionable promise when Nigerians go to England as migrants or students. The values gained and the learned language cannot afford at least a minimum life standard in England. Nevertheless, what it practically provides is a communicative space where the points of view come together.

Adah has developed a wider perspective in England. She has got an inner support from her African self when she remembers good things but at the same time she has gained much of her self-consciousness and courage from her experiences and observations in England. This is the "Third Space of enunciations which [...] [are] the precondition for the articulation of cultural difference" (Bhabha, 1995, p. 38) as Bhabha suggests. In Bhabha's terms, moreover, "by exploring this Third Space, we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of our selves" (Bhabha, 1995, p. 39). Through her education, the opportunities of the English language she has access to, and the public space including her social environment and work place, Adah analytically compares, contrasts and synthesizes things and raises a voice, but she accept her limits, too.

In "Head Above Water", Emecheta defines the African side and the African self, and their merging with European modernity as in the following statement which can lead to the space that Adah, as well, has access to:

The girls did sing in tune, their Welsh music Mistress, Miss Davies saw to that, yet and yet, those voices were voices from nowhere else than Africa. Because until a few generations back the voices of their grandparents were used in musical village calls in singing ballads and telling stories in songs [...] Now these girls, the modern girls of the twentieth century Africa, still possess such voices, still with the same strength, still with the same vigour, but now with that added hope and pride, the pride that they were going to be the new females of the new Africa (Emecheta, 1994, p. 81).

While they are ready to raise their voice in the modern twentieth century world, African girls' attachment to the local culture is impossible to ignore. Similarly, Adah

gets western education and what will become of her is hidden in her promise to herself: “Her arrival there would be the pinnacle of her ambition” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 9). Then, her expectations are focused on the change in her self. This promise revisits her when Adah is leaving Nigeria and saying her farewells to her brother Boy and heading to England:

Boy was like Pa and Ma moulded all into one, standing there. She cried too, [...] tears of real sorrow at the thought of leaving her land of birth. The land where Pa was buried and where Ma lay, quiet forever. Only she and Boy remained of that life, which she had known. It was never going to be the same again. Things were bound to change, for better or for worse, but they would never be the same (Emecheta, 1989, p. 25).

She gives the signals of a different Adah. With her leave and arrival and with her acceptance of “change”, she is ready to the hybrid space of communication where colonial codes and forms were long ago established but by cultural contact, they are recreated as transcultural forms. She concludes that “[s]o however much [she] admired the village life, [she] knew for sheer survival [she] had to make a go of the education the school was offering [her] free” (Emecheta, 1994, p. 83). This is also a space which prepares Adah to her future life in England.

In England, she sometimes feels the inner guidance of being an African to survive and to let her children survive in better conditions. For example, she knows the importance of acquiring the mother tongue while growing up and gets angry with her husband when he blindly wants the children to learn English and to cease to speak Yoruba:

[...] the friend started to tease Titi in Yoruba, encouraging her to talk. Tired of Titi’s silence, Adah’s friends snapped Titi “Have you lost or sold your tongue? You used to talk to me in Nigeria? Why don’t you talk to me now?”

Then Titi snapped back in Yoruba “Don’t talk to me. My dad will cane me with the belt if I speak in Yoruba. And I don’t know much English. Don’t talk to me.”

Adah was so startled that she spilled the hot custard she was making (Emecheta, 1989, p. 43).

“This was due to the fact that Nigeria was ruled for so long a time by the English. An intelligent man was judged by the way he spoke English. But it did not matter whether the English could speak the language of the people they ruled” (Emecheta, 1989, pp. 43-44). From Alastair Pennycook’s view in *The Cultural Politics of English as and International Language*, “[w]e are never just teaching something called English, but rather we are involved in economic and social change, cultural renewal, people’s desires and dreams” (Pennycook, 2017, p. xi). This kind of a processing in individual and communal mind can be interpreted through Ashis Nandy’s detection. He states, there is a second form of colonisation which colonizes the minds, not only bodies, and releases forces to colonised societies to change their cultural priorities (Nandy, 1983, p. 11). Despite her witty criticism, Adah wants to educate her children with this consciousness. She must exploit the chance for her children to learn English to adapt to the new environment but at the same time, she cannot take away their right to acquire their mother tongue. In another example, when she is giving birth to her fifth child, she dreams of her children’s education in England. She says “Titi was in convent school in England and Vicky was at Eton” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 92). Long ago, Adah knew she was determined that [her children] would go to English schools, and if possible, English universities (Emecheta, 1989, p. 25).

In “In the Cave of Making: Thoughts on Third Space”, Homi Bhabha refers to Third Space as a form of cultural translation (Bhabha, 2009, p. ix), which cannot be freed from the preparatory stages of all these colonial activities and encounters that are mentioned above. Bhabha says “a concept like third space is to begin to see that thinking and writing are acts of translation. Third Space, for me, is unthinkable outside of the locality of cultural translation” (Bhabha, 2009, p. ix). Bhabha details Third Space by referring to some of its key properties. For Bhabha it “is a place and a time that exists in-between” the two parties of an issue, and “this site of in-betweenness becomes the ground of discussion [...]”. It is “dialogical site - a moment of enunciation, identification, negotiation [...]” (Bhabha, 2009, p. ix). This site of dialogue and negotiation is provided by some components such as getting familiar with English culture that is given via formal education, and by the natives going to and the missionaries coming from England. Relatedly, Ashis Nandy states “colonialism and

its effects are also a state of mind” (Nandy, 1983, p. 3) which reveals itself in successive generations.

Adah sometimes refers to her western education at the Methodist Girls’ High School which taught her western manners. As a reflection of this, when she sees Trudy, the babysitter, very indifferent to her children, Adah feels a burning in her heart but “she told herself to stop behaving like a little Ibo tigress. After all, she had not stayed five good years at the Methodist Girls’ High School for nothing. At least she had been taught to tame her emotions” (Emecheta, 1989: 41). Nevertheless, Adah remembers her mother: “Ma would have torn the fatty tissues of this woman into shreds if she had been in this situation. Well, she was not Ma but Ma’s daughter, and, come what may, she was still an Ibo. She screamed” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 41). Adah’s reaction can be interpreted as the use of a hybrid moment where human rationale and human nature meet. Although she picks up the opportunities that England gives her such as freedom and more self-confidence, she still maintains and carries African female voice onward and uses it when necessary.

This quarrel unveils a great deal of the colonizing country’s system as a model for rationale and leads towards a dialogical field. When Adah notices Trudy’s inappropriate manner, she gets strength from her origins and prides herself on showing the qualifications of an Igbo woman: “They had probably never seen an angry Igbo woman” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 55). At the same time, Adah’s sees “the rubbish dump” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 54) in Trudy’s house where Trudy looks after Adah’s children, which is an insult to her existence because “In front of her was an enemy, insulting her country, her family, her person and, worst of all, her child” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 54). At the beginning of her story, Adah says that one has to learn to be more civilized and adapt to urban conditions that require controlling the manners. She, at a very early age, criticizes this by saying in Lagos, the city, “you had to control your temper, which [she] was taught against the law of nature” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 2). Adah also associates showing your temper and not bottling it up with being humane:

England is a silent country: people are taught to bottle up their feelings and screw them up tight, like the illicit gin her parents drank at home. [...] She had seen English men and women behave like humans once or twice, but why was

it that they only behaved like humans when they were straggling out of the pubs on Saturday nights? (Emecheta, 1989, p.83).

With her aggressive behaviour, she has accentuated the difference between cultures. In front of people, she ridicules this so-called rationale when she is stopped by a neighbour saying “Don’t, don’t, don’t do that,” because Adah feels that the neighbour’s voice is “cool”, “rational” and “reassuring”. However, she “spat, foaming in the mouth, just like the people of her tribe would have done. Among her people, she could have killed Trudy, and other mothers stood solidly behind her” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 55). Feeling herself in the middle of an in-between situation and questioning rationality, common sense, law and order, Adah knowingly chooses to be aggressive and reacts: “I am going to kill you. Do you hear that? I am going to kill you if anything happens to my child. I shall sneak in here and kill you in your sleep. If now, I will pay people to do it for me, but believe me, I am going to kill you, and with a smile on my face” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 54). The instance here has a cultural significance because it is one of the most climactic moments of the novel where Trudy, as the agent of othering, and Adah, as the colonised come to a close contact with a quarrel scene. The argument goes on over Adah’s anger and comparison. When she feels that she can kill Trudy, Adah is also aware of the following instance:

[...] loose-fleshed woman with dyed hair and pussy-cat eyes. She belonged to the nation of people who had introduced ‘law and order’. [...] Adah was not used to bottling up her anger. Why hadn’t Pa told her that it was bad for the system? (Emecheta, 1989, p. 55).

Here firstly, it is seen that an African black woman has also a word to say about the appearance of a white woman. Adah’s reaction reveals that she catches the chance to comment on the white body, which accentuates that it is not only the white who has the privilege to comment on Africans’ bodies or colour. Adah insults Trudy’s appearance, too.

When Adah’s son Vicky catches virus meningitis, Trudy says “He could have caught it from the water you drank at home, you know, before you brought him here” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 54). Trudy’s direct comment targeting Adah’s country is a signal

of racial othering as she mentions the so-called facts/knowledge which she dwells on with three keywords: “water”, “home” and “here”. She thinks she knows something about Africa because of the images of dirt and unhygienic environments it has in people’s minds so she distances Adah’s home/Nigeria from here/England. Moreover, Trudy has a preconceived idea that it might have been because of water that Vicky might have drunk “before” they came “here”. “What was it Trudy was saying about the child she has had in the best hospital in Nigeria, under the most efficient gynaecologist that the Americans could get for her as a member of their staff [...] She wanted to explain all this to Trudy, but at that moment she saw Titi, coming in from the backyard, as filthy as the last time [...] somebody has left a carpet sweeper by the door. [...] Without thinking, she picked it up, [...] and banged it blindly in the direction of Trudy’s head!” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 54). Besides her motherly instincts, Adah is reacting to a system which self-consciously sets colonial knowledge and comments on the conditions of a colonised country. When Adah remembers the days when she gave birth to her child in Nigeria with the best doctor that her American colleagues had found for her, she reveals the existence of another communicative space. That was in her homeland and with her American colleagues. The days when “[a]ll Adah had to do was to go to the American library, work till two-thirty [...]” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 18).

When Adah’s behaviours horrify everybody in the street, Mrs Stirling, a counsellor, is called. She rushes to the street and listens to Adah, and says nothing. “Adah looked round [...] Nobody blamed her, or Trudy. No speech. Adah felt like a fool. She was learning” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 55). Adah is now confused within a trap between her feelings and the new experiences she has been “learning” for the sake of getting adapted to a new culture. Throughout her fight with Trudy, her past and present, her own culture, and the requirements of the new environment interchangeably confuse her. While articulating a pattern of her culture, Adah outmanoeuvres the teachings of western rationale and its obsession with reason. This does not mean that she surpasses the colonial knowledge. Instead, this shows that with the age-long encounter with the coloniser, his system and his knowledge for generations, particularly in terms of education and language, Adah has found a way to hybridize them and to raise her voice. Yet, she keeps in mind that in this land of reason,

she has to obey the unwritten rules of calmness and rationale as long as her limits are not tested.

Bhabha states “the third space is a challenge to the limits of the self in the act of reacting out to what is liminal in the historic experience, and in the cultural representation of other peoples, times, languages, texts” (Bhabha, 2009, p. xiv).

There are times when Adah experiences relatively positive moments when she feels secure. She may not fully fancy these moments. Yet, she feels better. The acquaintances distinguish these moments from others. That is, there is a communication with the people who are “second-class” too as Adah thinks. For example, when Vicky is seriously ill on Christmas Day, the doctor who comes to look after the child is a Chinese man. To Adah, “the man, doctor or no doctor, was a second-class citizen too and could not come to show them any superior airs. This did not help Adah much, but it was nice to hear it” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 118). Like this Chinese doctor, many other people that Adah encounter are not originally from England. The librarian, whom she firstly works with, is a Czech woman. “At the library, she was quickly taken under the wing of the chief librarian. She was a Czech, explosive in her welcome and very, very friendly” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 34). Similarly, the gynaecologist she is under the examination of is an Indian doctor. As she cannot enter into life in Britain very comprehensively, Adah does not meet English citizens in person quite often. Yet, the experiences she has undergone have taught her to adapt to the life in England.

Adah is in such a multi-cultural environment that she at last accepts “Everybody seemed to have troubles then” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 130). When she goes to the library where she feels better because of the “light-hearted atmosphere” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 131), she comes to the realization that she has progressed. For example, when she thinks about her husband Francis, she accepts that “Francis was Francis, not ashamed of being Francis, and was not going to change [...]” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 135). Adah, on the other hand, has made a dream reality:

It had all begun like a dream. You know the sort of dream which seems to have originated from nowhere, yet one was always aware of its existence. One could

feel it, one could be directed by it; unconsciously at first, until it became a reality, a Presence (Emecheta, 1989, p. 1).

As it is complained at the outset, “she was a girl when everyone was expecting and predicting a boy” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 1). Adah has always been aware of this fact of her culture, since her early childhood. She has criticized it, risen against it and never hesitated to show her reaction. At the same time, she has been braced up by the spiritual and inspirational genuineness of the maternal nostalgia of her culture whenever she feels down. During the long time span between her childhood and youth in Nigeria, and tough years in England, Adah has learnt and deduced much. Without romanticising things, she has wittily adopted her African knowledge and cultural saving to the challenges, new but bitter experiences and liberality in England. As a natural result of these, she has built a self for her own, which started such words as “she was a disappointment to her parents, her immediate family [...]” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 1) and ends with the following while reacting to her husband about his indifference to his own children after their divorce court:

Francis replied, ‘I don’t mind their being sent for adoption.’

Something happened to Adah then. It was like a big hoe and a kind of energy charging into her, giving her so much strength. [...] Then she said very loud and very clear, ‘Don’t worry, sir. The children are mine, and that is enough. I shall never let them down as long as I am alive (Emecheta, 1989, p. 151).

Adah’s story shows that a legal document is not a vital thing as long as one makes up her mind to build a genuine self of her own. As the story suggests at the beginning, Adah was so unimportant that “nobody thought of recording her birth” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 1). Interestingly, the story ends with Adah’s husband’s burning the legal documents including her passport and their children’s birth certificates. “To him, Adah ceased to exist” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 151). When the introductory and concluding words are metaphorically taken into consideration, Adah seems that she has not even existed with a negligence of birth record and a burning of the identity cards. However, between these two recordless events, she has built a complete life with a full consciousness of her self saying “I am me” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 149).

To conclude, *Second Class Citizen* contributes much to the claim of post-colonial domain in the sense that an unrecorded and repressed history (of the colonised, of the women) has appeared with the aggregation of cultural pieces, ancestral inspiration and silent resistances. In addition to these, Adah has learnt a great deal from her life in England and has proven that she has not come to England for nothing. This is best understood when Francis looks “at her, as if with new eyes. Somebody had warned him that the greatest mistake an African could make was to bring an educated girl to London and let her mix with middle-class English women. They soon know their rights. What was happening to them?” (Emecheta, 1989, p.53). Adah has already been alert, questioning and determining. England helps her change and find a new way to her new self. With this determination and her observant eyes she questions everything like the question coexistent with humanity: “Was Eve the only person who ate the apple? Did not the man Adam eat some too? Why was it that women had to bear most of the punishments? It was not all fair” (Emecheta, 1989, p. 87). It is understood from her questioning that Adah firstly wounds the patriarchal mentality of her close environment, which cost her an unhappy marriage and a tasteless life. However, from the stage she has reached, it is understood that through her own self and the communicative space that she finds a way to articulate her self, she has penetrated into the life in the coloniser’s country. It can be lastly said that although Adah’s arrival is too weak to change a system, her encounter with the metropolitan lives creates moments of agreement or disagreement. Yet, these moments will be sufficient for her to create a more liberal and understanding self.

CHAPTER 4

MY NAME is SALMA, the MULTI-CULTURAL SELF and RESISTANCE

In order to belong to a group of people, you have to experience major events together, to share their sadness and happiness, to attend their funerals and weddings. I have done so much of that and perhaps earned the right to be British but my Arab identity also remains very close to my heart. (Moore, 2011, p. 12)

[Faqir's] seventh attempt at growing jasmine in Britain has finally succeeded. Her friend Gwyneth Cole gave her a cutting and she planted it in her garden in Durham. It has grown into a beautiful tree. (www.fadiafaqir.com/life)

As a Jordanian-born novelist Fadia Faqir (b.1956) is regarded as one of the most noticeable voices of contemporary Anglo-Arab literary canon since she directly fictionalizes the Arab experience and transfers it into a story with an eastern gaze. Like Jean Rhys and Buchi Emecheta, Fadia Faqir's art is influenced by autobiographical elements.

Faqir defines herself as "an immigrant who lives in the margins" and as an author who disagrees with the idea that "art can only be born in the metropolis" because for her, the "most exquisite shoots grow in the shadows" (Chambers, 2011, p. 63). Geopolitics, culture and history are not simple to be distilled from literature, especially in the lands that have always been under discussion like Arabic countries due to the location, culture, religion, and political and demographical variables. As one of the articulate authors of this controversial region, in an interview with Lindsey Moore, Faqir says: "When I was young, I lived next to an English club – a remnant of the British mandate- that Jordanians are not allowed to enter. [...] I remember that colonial exclusive space very clearly. It reconfigures itself in my writing again and again" (Moore, 2011, p. 1). In the same interview, Faqir also states that some other influential factors appear in her writing such as being forced by her father to wear the veil and losing the custody of her thirteen-month-old son, which led her to write as a way of communication with her son. Her art as she says is a long letter to her son. Another issue triggering her writing is Palestinian crisis. These are the main reasons

for being personal and political in her work (Moore, 2011, p. 2). In another interview Faqir, responsively states that after 9/11, she was labelled and wherever she went she was told that she was a Muslim. And now, she loudly articulates that she is a Muslim because they define her as a Muslim. That affiliation was inflicted by the west. Before, 9/11 being a Muslim did not mean much to her but now she confirms that she is politically Muslim. She also says that she is treated well by marginalized communities and badly by some academics, which leads her to the opinion that education or its lack has nothing to do with racism (Chambers, 2011, pp. 63, 73). Geoffrey Nash also offers a wide scope of Faqir's art in his book *The Anglo-Arab Encounter: Fiction and Autobiography by Arab Writers in English*. He says that Anglo-Arab encounter is conceptualised within a frame of self-enunciation and dissent. In her novels, Faqir mainly pursues a strategy that presents "the extremities of Arab women under the pressure of colonial and native patriarchy". In *My Name is Salma*, specifically, the focus of attention is migration, "border crossing, hybridity and cultural contestation", and the protagonist is "trapped within the circle of an alien otherness that is the lot of Muslim Arab refugees in the West." Faqir's portrayal of Arab women, for Nash, may be likened to the image of the mad woman of the nineteenth century British fiction where the women are not free from the "social, cultural and political bondage" (Nash, 2007, pp. 113-128).

Although the protagonist Salma does not experience 9/11 as she lives in England in late eighties and early nineties, Faqir's concerns related to the twenty-first century that she mentions above can be traced throughout Salma's story which is told in a non-linear style. Faqir states that she does not believe in linear narrative because one cannot represent the truth in a linear story so she needs "causality, complexity [and] a multitude of perspectives to capture the whole picture" (Chambers, 2011, p. 66). Telling her own story in a non-linear way, the narrator Salma is from Hima, a "mud village tucked away between the deserted hills" (Faqir, 2008, p. 6). The name of her country is never given throughout the story; yet the reader is provided with the information that she is from a country in the Levant region which as historian Philip Mansel defines: "is an area, a dialogue and a quest. [...] A Western name for an Eastern area. [...] a dialogue between east and west: therefore - [...] between Islam and Christianity" (Mansel, 2011, p. 1). Salma "is a shepherdess who has to leave her village

because of “her dark deeds” and her “shameful past” (Faqr, 2008, p. 7) in the name of passion and love. She feels that she has “smeared the foreheads of [her] family with tar” (Faqr, 2008, p. 7). After becoming pregnant and being rejected by her lover Hamdan, in order not to be a victim of an honour killing by her brother Mahmoud, Salma firstly leaves the village with the help of her teacher and hides in a prison. She is kept under protection in the prison, not because of a crime but for her survival. She gives birth to her daughter Layla there. However, Layla is taken from her without any breastfeeding. Salma stays in prison for some years. Later, “a civil nun from Lebanon [who has] saved many young women like [Salma]” (Faqr, 2008, p. 41) helps her to leave the prison and stay in a convent in the Beqaa Valley. Eventually, she leaves the country with the English nun, Miss Asher, to be a migrant in England where she will be safer. Miss Asher changes Salma’s name to Sally Asher by adopting her and hands her a temporary document to live in England. In fact, Salma does not want to go to Britain because she is so content with the convent. However, she is told that she will “learn to like it” (Faqr, 2008, p. 60). In England, this “mountainous Arab” (Faqr, 2008, p. 7), as she calls herself, feels “like an innocent person” (Faqr, 2008, p. 7) but she is haunted by her past which she calls “shameful” (Faqr, 2008, p. 148) and undeserved because she always feels that she has been “living on borrowed time” (Faqr, 2008, p. 87). The storyline in *My Name is Salma* goes between two times and Salma’s estimations about her homeland; that is, her current day experiences in the late eighties England, her past in Hima and her estimations about what her family would be doing at the moment in Hima. Salma finds work as a seamstress in a tailor’s shop where she is always reminded that she is so lucky as an Arab because out there people are waiting to find work. As the money she earns does not suffice to meet even her basic needs, she also works as a cleaner in the evenings. She lives in a hostel owned by an old woman Elizabeth/Liz who had a secret love affair with an Indian man when she was in India. Liz does not treat her in a kind manner. Salma makes friends with a reliable old Welsh woman, Gwen, who really loves and protects her and shares experiences and sound ideas with her. Furthermore, Salma shares her room with a Pakistani girl, Parvin. They lead a life in the multicultural environment of England, where people constantly appraise beauty and appearance. Salma is veiled and experiences hard times whether to keep it or take it off because as she is always

reminded in England that being veiled makes things more difficult. Salma's Pakistani friend Parvin becomes a wholehearted supporter of her. At first, their encounter is not a friendly one because when Parvin sees Salma in the hostel, she refuses to sleep in the same room with an Arab. Then, it gradually appears that they share similar stories and pains. They become true friends in time. Salma applies for a BA in English Literature at Open University and tries to do well in her studies. Later, she marries John, her instructor of English at university. She gives birth to her son, Imran. Although throughout the novel an exact time is never referred to, some songs of Madonna, Sting and other singers or bands are constantly mentioned remind of the eighties. The only date given openly is the one that is written on Salma's daughter's gravestone "Died 1990" (Faqr, 2008, p. 196); and is mentioned at the closure. Although she has a nine-month old son and a loving husband who disapproves of her decision to go back to her country, Salma feels the summons of her land deep in her heart. She never forgets her daughter and weeps for her because even years later, she constantly feels deep pain in her breasts due to being unable to offer even a momentary breastfeeding to her daughter. She even sees a doctor to beg him to cut her breasts: "[s]lice them. Better that way" (Faqr, 2008, p. 97). In her dreams and daydreams, she feeds her daughter, sews dresses for her, brings her up, teaches her and sends her to school. After about sixteen years, she is summoned by her daughter Layla in her nightmares so Salma decides to leave her life in England and flies to her homeland unbeknownst to her husband and friends. She finds her mother, and unfortunately her daughter's grave because although Salma's parents accept Layla and bring her up with joy until sixteen against the patriarchal will of the community, her uncle kills her. Salma's mother tells the tragic end by saying: "[t]wo months ago her good-for-nothing uncle threw her in the Long Well. 'Like mother, like daughter' he said" (Faqr, 2008, p. 195). When Salma is visiting Layla's grave, she hears the words of a young man behind saying "it's his duty. He has to hold his head high. [...] dishonour can only be wiped off with blood" (Faqr, 2008, p. 196). When Salma turns her head, she is shot by this young man, supposedly her brother, between the eyes.

Although Salma has a comprehensive vision towards the things around and makes ironical and analytical comments about them, she is not a very determined character because of her search for her own self in a totally alien land about which she

has little knowledge. Worse than that leaving her past behind is impossible for her. She narrowly escapes death and can save her life with a bag full of her personal belongings like a lock of her mother's hair and black shawl/madraqa, some letters and local clothes. Her lone struggle takes many forms. Hers is also a struggle against the patriarchal dominance of the remaining colonial perception of the other as the uncivilized. Moreover, she is among some migrants in multi-cultural England who may consider their own perspectives much more advanced than an Arab. Starting her new life as an involuntary asylum seeker in England, she has to cope with various problems as a young woman with no money, no job, no acquaintances and no reliability. With this consciousness, the aim of this analysis is to look at Salma's struggle for life mainly in England and refer to her self-perception considering her self-definition and resistance during her experience to adapt to the English life style. To this end, the analysis will follow two stages. The first stage will refer to the functioning of imperial vision in a multi-cultural city for a young woman who is coming from a completely dissimilar place and culture, the Levant. She tries hard to find a shelter and build an identity to her new self in this complicated life of the city, Exeter. She wants to liken herself to the others. She faces numerous encounters when she feels perplexed and tries to build an identity with pseudo validity, which provides momentary escapes only. Binary oppositions in the complexity of multi-culturalism will also be dealt within the first stage. Salma/Sally Asher feels lost among the binarisms. The first ones she encounters are the beautiful/the ugly, the modern/the simple(primitive), safe/unsafe and veiled/unveiled, and doctor/civilising and the patient/civilized. Another focus of the first stage is Salma's resistance to patriarchy and her escape from Hima; and her finding herself in a totally different form of patriarchy in England. She starts to believe that smartening oneself up with miniskirts, tight clothes and cosmetic products, and drinking apple juice, which looks like beer are the prerequisites to be accepted here. A further point that will be referred to within the frame of imperial effect is Salma's pitiful efforts to learn English accent and behave like English and sometimes Spanish. Here, the emphasis on linguistic imperialism will additionally be referred to. Secondly, the analysis will focus on Bhabha's detections on the Third Space, where Salma tries to find a way to resist and communicate, and mimicry. Here, her immediate environment and the places she works will be investigated. Although

Salma is coping with miseries, in herself she makes fun of the environment she is in and indirectly, she ridicules the position of others in such a world. While she is trying to adapt, she cleverly sees how things work in this alien land. In the beginning, her story starts with her search for the word adapt: “I kept looking up *adapt* in the *Oxford English Dictionary: Adapt: fit, adjust, change*” (Faqir, 2008, p. 7).

Maysa Hayward states that Anglophone Arab novels can be a source of liberation of the ideas of fixed identities because of their potentiality to pose questions which lead to more questions (Hayward, 2015, p. 336). The primary question in this novel is how much effect imperialism has on individual lives in developed capitalist societies. This is a gap to be filled initially because of the antagonistic texture of imperial influence firstly on legal migrants’ life and subsequently on asylum seekers’ because they try to appropriate their life to European perspective as the true source of knowledge and thus power. In its most recent sense, imperialism is taken as Europeanization of the globe as Ashcroft *et al* state. Europeanization was not only affected mainly by governments and states but also by a great number of colonists, merchants, missionaries and adventurers, who penetrated into the non-European world (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 2000, p. 112). Then, the way towards marginality and extremeness of the other and moral superiority of the coloniser has been opened irreversibly.

According to Ashcroft *et al*, colonial discourse excluded “statements about the exploitation of the resources of the colonized [...] [Moreover,] it conceals the benefits in statements about the inferiority of the colonized [...]; the duty of the imperial power to reproduce itself in the colonial society” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2007, p. 38). This perspective clearly lends itself to Salma’s trouble because her voice falters when it comes to her origins. Her mind teems with unspoken voices. These voices are multiplied in her head. On one side, she keeps her silent words which can never be uttered because of her “shameful” past condemning her that she deserves nothing. These are about her own identity at birth and her past; at least about her original cultural practices she cannot disown. On the other side, there are words which she cannot utter because the world of superiors operates the articulation of these words from a distance. She feels the psychological pressure of the disciplining, patriarchal

white man over her Arab/brown/Muslim/female identity. As a result, she always silences herself when her homeland is asked.

On one side of the dilemma, Salma fights with her identity at birth: “‘It’s a girl,’ announced the dayah and spat on the floor. She did not expect a large tip delivering a baby girl” (Faqr, 2008, p. 86). When her father hears the bad news he says “The burden of girls is from cot to coffin,” However, “[her] mother told [her] that she had forgotten all the pain of labour when they told her it was a girl” (Faqr, 2008, p. 86). She has been raised with this awareness; between a silenced mother who loves her wholeheartedly, and a patriarchal society which transfer the freedom to the male in different roles; a father, a brother or a lover. Her lover, Hamdan, for example, desires her and gets what he wants, “Salma, you’re a woman now ... you are mine, my slave girl” (Faqr, 2008, p. 24). Salma, aged fifteen, too, desires and loves him. She silently accepts the sexist label of “woman” and “the slave” girl given by the lover. He defines her over his own possession as “mine.” However, the same masterful voice of Hamdan shouts at her and leaves her when he learns about her pregnancy, which still makes him a claimant on her body, and directly a decider on the baby’s birth. Whether the claimant is in the persona of a father, a brother, a relative or a lover makes no difference because altogether they use up her body and mind, take her chance to be the mother of her child, force her to escape from her beloved geography, and leave her desperate with the terror of being killed. She has to live with this fact for the rest of her life. Within this web Salma feels the tightness and cannot define her self as a somebody. Similarly, she thinks “Miss in Hima was reserved for virgins, Mrs for married women or widows, but there was no title for those who had sex out of wedlock for they simply got shot” (Faqr, 2008, p. 129). In the world of powerful definitions, Salma simply defines her self as a no body who deserves nothing. She wonders “why [is she] still alive and what brought [her] here?” (Faqr, 2008, p. 15).

On the other side of the dilemma, there is England. When she starts to live in England, the situation ceases to be a local oriented one and becomes more multi-cultural in the midst of imperial reflections with the remaining colonial discourse because as Ashcroft *et al* state, “colonial discourse privileged the idea of racial purity and justified racial discrimination” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2007, p. 121).

Salma is trapped within self-loath when she compares her appearance with white woman. She is over-conscious of her “long”, “dark”, “frizzy”, “wild” hair and “crooked nose”, and “thin ankles” (Faqr, 2008, pp. 9, 47, 69, 79, 80, 95, 108, 111, 113, 174), and feels ugly. Before, nobody in Hima reminds her of her hair or nose as it does not mark a difference to over-emphasize. However, natural body parts of average appearance become her identity when she finds herself in England.

When Salma tries to puzzle out the people and their complexities, she discovers there is something heart-breaking with their stories. When her Pakistani friend reveals by saying “‘My wretched name is Parvin,’ and wiped the tears with the back of her left hand” (Faqr, 2008, p. 63), Salma asks the key questions again “What brought me here? What brought her here?” (Faqr, 2008, p. 64). Salma figures out something heart-breaking in Parvin’s story, too. When Parvin reveals her past, it becomes clear that there is another decision-making patriarchal structure in her story. Parvin “did not know how she ended up in this dump” (Faqr, 2008, p. 63) because her father forced her to marry an “ignorant bastard from Pakistan” (Faqr, 2008, p. 63). Whatever Parvin did was in vain. Even, she could not persuade her mother: “but no, she either went ahead with it or he would disown her in the papers. ‘Parvin is not my daughter.’ She ran away and ended up in a refuge run by Pakistani women, not far from Leicester, [...]” (Faqr, 2008, p. 63). The thing bringing them here is so robust and unresolvable that it leaves no chance to them to set up a peaceful life of their own. Therefore, they find themselves among the definitions of others and appropriate their lives accordingly. This, for Ashis Nandy, is a process which generalizes “the concept of the modern West from a geographical and temporal entity to a psychological category. The West is now everywhere, within the West and outside, in structures and in minds” (Nandy, 1983, p. 11), and this is the other side of Salma’s dilemma.

Salma cannot help defining her self with her past. She distinctly details her past from her clothing style to her body parts:

Rough, dirty hands, I had. That was before I ran to freedom. Now I stood shaking my head and rubbing the big fake yellow stone on my ring with my smooth hands, which were always covered with cocoa butter, and sighed. Gone were the days when I was a farmer, a shepherdess, a peasant girl. I am now a

seamstress, an assistant tailor in a shop in Exeter, which a few years ago was voted the most beautiful city in Britain. Now Salina the dark black iris of Hima must try to turn into a Sally [...] (Faqir, 2008, p. 8).

When she is checking the newspapers for a job, her understanding of her own position and her definition of herself as an unemployed woman in England is over commercial terms of the city and business life: “*Presentable with good command of English ...*” (Faqir, 2008, p. 12, *Faqir’s italics*). She feels she is “neither presentable nor able to speak English well. Nothing that would suit a woman like [her] with no looks, no education, no experience and no letters of recommendation” (Faqir, 2008, p. 12). However, the way she chooses to alleviate her pain and the lament she plays for her own self is more Arabic, more cultural and more genuine, appealing to her own self only: “I took my reed pipe out and began blowing until the soft hoarse sound filled the room, the city, and travelled overseas all the way to my mother’s ears” (Faqir, 2008, p. 12).

In her essay “Marginality in the Teaching Machine”, which is included in her book *Outside the Teaching Machine*, Spivak dwells on an interesting example which can be likened to Salma’s situation when her alertness is considered during the moments of comparison with other non-British immigrants, citizens or refugees. In 1988, Spivak states, a group of underclass “Asians” firmly demanded to be recognized different from underclass “Blacks” because they felt “by deplorable logic of underclass racism “[...] they were different from the “lazy and violent peoples of African origin” with their “cultural attributes of mildness, thrift, domesticity, and industriousness” (Spivak, 1993, p. 59). When Salma demands membership in the library, the librarian looking for the papers among the leaflets warning against Aids, reminds her of the fact:

Librarian: You are an alien, we have no national insurance number for you; you cannot get in.

Salma: But I am not an indefinite-leave-to-remain holder, I am not a temporary-visa holder like them Albanians, I am a British subject,” I repeated like a mantra, “I am a British citizen.” I swore allegiance to the Queen and her descendants. Flushed and embarrassed, she produced a form for me to fill in. I was so grateful to be given membership, to be treated like them, that I dropped the form and the pen on her shiny black shoes (Faqir, 2008, p. 61).

Salma defends her self and her position both over colonial and global settings. In order to survive, she is so well aware of the fact that she has to cling to the place where she already lives. Moreover, here, the scene adumbrates the utmost level that multi-culturalism and the global worries have reached. In a single dialogue Aids is touched upon to refer to the still protective roof of the coloniser. On the leaflet it says “Positive women call us...” (Faqr, 2008, p. 60). Also, it touches immigration policies with Salma’s reference to temporary-visa holding of Albanians. Her need to have a membership climaxes. Here “need” is more a sound word to use instead of wish because Salma’s begging for membership is her real need to survive in this culture rather than a material desire to be an English citizen. Furthermore, she miserably drops the items on the librarian’s black shiny shoes, which is a symbol of modern day work life and the difference between Salma’s clothing and others’.

Her Pakistani friend Parvin’s attitude demonstrates a similar circumstance when she first steps into the hostel room and refuses to share the room with an Arab:

When she looked at me she could only see the slit of my eyes and a white veil so she turned to him. “Where does she come from?”

Boy: Somewhere in the Middle East. Fucking A-rabic! She rode a camel all the way from Arabia to this dump in Exeter, (he laughed).

Parvin: I am not going to share the room with an Arab, (she spat).

[...]

Parvin: She is also covered with sores. It could be contagious! (Faqr, 2008, p. 11).

From the dialogue above, “the Middle East”, “camel”, “veil” and “Arab” are enough to reduce a whole region and an identity to appearance and to label the refugee as the unwanted. Although Parvin is from Pakistan, she claims her superiority over an Arab. Salma hears the dialogue but pretends she does not. As a “mountainous Arab” (Faqr, 2008, p. 7) and a shepherdess, she prefers to remain silent. Later, while thinking to herself, not overtly like Parvin, Salma exhibits a similar tendency. Her observant attitude and critical gaze while identifying other immigrants’ identities are clear in the example below:

The Algerian waiter, who pretended to be French, came running and asked me, “What you like drink, madam?”

Salma: Some water y’ayshak: may your life be long?

He smiled, pretending not to understand the Arabic, and disappeared. After all, he was supposed to be Pierre, whose grandfather had served in the French army. Parvin told me that North Africans were known for forging army documents to gain entry into fortress Europe (Faqr, 2008, p. 15).

Salma’s analytical vision shows that she is also critical of others when they try to hide their identity in this western land and pretend they were a part of it. On the other hand, she identifies herself with this Algerian man by using an Arabic word she thinks he is familiar with. The point here is her questioning thoughts when the waiter refuses to understand the language. She wants to find some sincerity and similarity between his origins and hers with a bit of Arabic language and a wish. Upon the refusal, she uncovers his past and disgraces him with the illegal documents his country is notorious for. Similarly, she does the same thing when she lies that she is from Granada, Spain which was once taught to them at school. While she is talking to David, a British, at a café, she resorts to a familiar lie:

David: Where do you come from? (he asked.)

If I told him that I was a Muslim Bedouin Arab woman from the desert on the run he would spit out his tea.

Salma: I am originally Spanish, (I lied.)

David: I have visited Spain many times. Where in Spain?

Salma: Granada, (I said. At school we were taught so much about the glories of Muslim Spain and the Moors in Granada.) (Faqr, 2008, p. 20).

Salma harbours in this lie and she does this quite frequently because in this world of superiors, she has to find a way to communicate her self. However, this does not provide her a permanent domain of peace where she can feel the relief of being a “somebody” rather than a “no body”. In a similar vein, as a contemporary Anglo-Arab writer, Fadia Faqr believes that there is political blackness and she feels black in that regard. She criticizes Eurocentric feminism that is exclusive to some extent. She

declared that she does not belong there. She is so clear in her stance and she explains this by giving an example. Faqir's brother was attacked and she states "it was an unprovoked racially motivated attack". He suffered from physical and psychological pain for long years. "That shattered [...] [her] belief that England is essentially benign. Now [she] see[s] herself as Black, the underdog, the down and out, A *MUSLIM* in a political sense." Faqir finalizes her perspective by saying she uses Muslim and black in metaphorical sense in order to show her "stance against racism and Islamophobia" (Chambers, 2011, p. 63).

Salma's story reveals that defining the self in this multi-cultural climate of England is not structured on mutual understanding. It is mainly based on survival and is driven on comparison. Even if she has the chance to be her self in her own conditions and in her own land, she does not have the same conditions in England so things lose much from their essence. They become the substance of a comparative understanding of life, and still the comprehension is over whiteness which leads to the basic binary opposites of the colonial world.

At the outset, Salma mentions her digestion problems with fish and chips, a meal obviously associated with English taste, when she first tries it, "[her] mountainous Arab stomach could not digest the fat, [...]. Salma resisted, but Sally must adopt" (Faqir, 2008, p. 7). The opposition starts with the core identity: Salma versus Sally; Arab versus English. That means, the Arab, the Third World citizen does not have any chance. She resists at first, then adapts.

Binarism initially shows itself in appearance with Salma's harsh criticism of her dark, frizzy hair and dark complexion. One of the distinguishing moments she really desires whiteness is when she is doing her job in the tailor's shop: "[...] I dreamt of whiteness. Sitting in a cloud of steam and starch, I dreamt of happiness. To sit in a department store coffee shop, buttering my scones [...] I dreamt of weekends in country mansions, tea with the Queen and whiteness" (Faqir, 2008, p. 66). This is similar to Fanon's comment in *Black Skin White Masks*. He points to the opposite of white as black in all forms and shades. For him, in Europe black man represents the dark side of the character so it creates the "black problem." "Blackness, darkness,

shadow, shades, night, the labyrinths of the earth, abysmal depths, blacken someone's reputation, and on the other side, the bright look of innocence, the white dove of peace, magical, heavenly light" (Fanon, 1986, p. 189). Equating a trouble-free life with whiteness, Salma goes further and imagines herself as a "nippleless blonde bombshell, like the ones that splayed their legs in the *Sunday Sport*. [...] what if I turned white like milk, like seagulls, like rushing clouds"(Faqir, 2008, p. 66) because only in that way she believes she can rid herself of her haunting past and condemning eyes of her present life. She hates her body since she sees it as a piece of her sins. "Puff, my sinful past would disappear, a surgeon would slice away part of my mind and my ugly nipples! [...] No more unwanted black hair; no more 'What did you say your name is?'" (Faqir, 2008, p. 67). She associates happiness and peace with whiteness. This is not because she was aware of all these differences in her homeland. The differences get clearer when she makes contrasts with her culture over binarisms that imperial life style requires. In Fanon's words, there is much white symbolism even if it is a child: "A magnificent blond child – how much peace there is in that phrase, how much joy and above all how much hope!" (Fanon, 1986, p. 139). Fanon's disagreement finds its target in the criticism of European society and its symbolic obsession with whiteness. Moreover, when interpreted with the dynamics of the late twentieth century on the edge of "clash of civilisations", it is still the idea of whiteness which finds a settled place in other's mind is now, in the Arab's. Salma sometimes elaborates her daydreams with white children: "I closed my eyes, [...] and dreamt of living inside, being either the daughter or the wife of the owner; my three blond English children were safely tucked in their beds and my husband was sipping his brandy [...]" (Faqir, 2008, p. 113). In *Desiring Whiteness*, Kalpana Seshadri-Crooks states that it is not easy to understand the question "How is it that when society organizes itself – its system of rewards and punishments, inclusions and exclusions – around appearance begins to exceed to [...] the point that it is always the neighbour's appearance that one is [over-] concerned [...]" (Crooks, 2000, p. 2). Crooks answers the question in many ways but the most relevant one to Salma's dilemma is that "modernity is characterized by the objectification of an other in support of one's narcissistic fantasy" (Crooks, 2000, p. 5). This is the Eurocentric imperial idealism of the west which sees, names and defines the Other to elevate its own existence. Being only one

of these others, Salma is of no difference, sinking deeper in the binarisms of imperial culture where she thinks all the women in life like in sports magazines such as *Sunday Sport* are white and happy. These binarisms supported by imperialism push the woman of margins to self-loath and self-derogation. When Salma visits a cosmetic shop, she tries creams, perfumes and looks at the products which promise a ten-year-younger appearance. Salma asks for a sample and “[t]he heavily made-up sales girl looked suspiciously at [her]. She’d made up her mind.[...] No, we don’t do samples for this perfume,’ she said dismissively. [...] I looked down at my worn-out walking shoes and bit my tongue” (Faqr, 2008, p. 13). In *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory: A Reader*, Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman put that the gendering of colonialist discourse has an ideological centre because imperialist and colonial discourse overtly feature gender relations. One specific example is the instrumentalization of white femininity for the sake of signifying the “heart” and “body” of western civilisation (Williams & Chrisman, 1994, p. 193). At some point, the western sales girl and the mountainous Arab girl throw a momentary gaze at each other; the sales girl looking down on the other; and the other looking down on her self: “You know, if I were her, I would have thrown me out of the shop, a woman like me, thrash. My tribe had raided her country seeking cheap booty. I would have got me arrested if I were her” (Faqr, 2008, p. 13). As a young woman who mixes her past and present with her sins and her searching, Salma cannot easily reconcile with her appearance. It seems that whiteness can solve all the problems in her dreams and in reality. She associates every comfort and outcome of modern, city life with whiteness. This is similar to what Said mentions in *Orientalism*. For Said, white man is an idea and a reality because it has a reason and a relationship between the white and non-white worlds. That means speaking, feeling and behaving in a certain way remembering the codes and regulations for Said. It also means “specific judgements, evaluations and gestures” which points to a form of authority both whites and non-whites are expected to obey (Said, 1979, p. 227).

It is not only her hair or dark skin but also her veil which decides others’ impressions on Salma. Before she comes to England, in the convent in Lebanon, Miss Asher encourages Salma to take off the veil asking “Do you have to wear this veil?

God has made you perfect and he loves every part of you, including your hair” (Faqir, 2008, p. 114). However, Salma resists and says “My hair is *aura*. I must hide it. Just like my private parts” (Faqir, 2008, p. 114). She feels that if she takes off the veil, she will give up on her self. She goes on “I cannot take off veil, Sister. My country, my language, my daughter. No piece of cloth. Feel naked, me” (Faqir, 2008, p. 115). Salma’s emotional state is her fear to lose the only object that makes her feel safe and connected to her land and her motherhood. The sister, despite her good intentions and her great efforts to save lives such as Salma’s, is conveying the signs of colonial discourse, unknowingly or knowingly. In *Women and Gender in Islam*, Leila Ahmed states: in geopolitical discourses the veil is a symbol of many things including the rejection of the west. However, when the reason behind this meaning in the late twentieth century is considered, it becomes clear with the irony that it was still the discourses of the west, and prominently the discourse of colonial domination. This, firstly, “determined the meaning of the veil in geopolitical discourses and thereby set the terms for its emergence as a symbol of resistance” (Ahmed, 1992, p. 235). When Salma goes to England, she has to face a similar reaction, specifically from her friend Parvin “We have to look for jobs,” said Parvin, “but first I must ask you about this scarf you keep wearing” (Faqir, 2008, p. 75). Parvin, as another survivor from patriarchal practices of her close family and community, wants her to get rid of her veil because she knows much about the society that she has been living in. Salma unveils herself as she adapts to the culture. She says that the days when she was chasing the hens with her “wide pantaloons and loose flowery dresses” are now in the distant past like the distance of the “bright colours of [her] village” (Faqir, 2008, p. 6). She is now spraying perfume but still with uneasiness in her heart and mind:

If this small glass bottle were full of snake venom I would drink it with one go. I dabbed some perfume behind my ears and on my wrists, took a deep breath, tossed my no longer braided and veiled hair on my shoulders, pulled my tummy in, straightened my posture and walked out [...] (Faqir, 2008, p. 6).

This positioning her self and giving up on the items, which once defined her existence, her “*aura*”, now bow to the culture she is in. Once more, this reminds Fanon’s words in *Black Skin, White Masks*. Fanon criticizes the imperial culture that triggers or creates inferiority complex in the members of the other countries:

[...] every people in whose soul an inferiority complex has been created by the burial of its local cultural originality – finds itself with the language of the civilizing nation, that is, with the culture of the mother country (Fanon, 1986, p. 18).

As in Salma's case, with her rejection of the veil, which is once announced as "her language, her country, her daughter" (Faqr, 2008, p. 115) now turns into a "piece of cloth." In response, she would get whiter. As Fanon states "[t]he colonized is elevated above his jungle status in proportion to his adoption of the mother country's cultural standards. He becomes whiter as he renounces his blackness, his jungle" (Fanon, 1986, p. 18). Like the black man rejecting "his jungle," Salma has to leave her "mountainous" Arab identity. As many issues, European dress-codes are assumed to be in a globalized style, but still Euro-centric. Leila Ahmed refers to the new dimension of colonial discourse appropriated for current issues:

[...] the Victorian colonial paternalistic establishment appropriated the language of feminism in the service of its assault on the religions and cultures of Other men, and in particular on Islam, in order to give an aura of moral justification to that assault at the very same time as it combated feminism within its own society - can easily be substantiated by reference to the conduct and rhetoric of the colonizers (Ahmed, 1992, p. 152).

It was the nineteenth century that marked the difference and set its superiority in dressing. Similarly, Robert Young states that in the nineteenth century, the symbol of civilisation was seen as the wearing of clothes by the west. Only "savages" could be naked. However, in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, "semi-nudity" began to symbolize western superiority (Young, 2003, p. 83). This is exactly the same case in Salma's situation in her strive for adaptation. On the one hand, she sees her veil as her land, her daughter, her self, and on the other hand, she develops ambivalent manners towards it when her westernized friends encourage her to unveil herself. For example, when she is preparing for an outing, she lines her lips with red lipstick, sprays deodorant and chooses "the tightest and shortest skirt in the wardrobe and squeezed [herself] into it, slipped [her]legs into sheer transparent black tights [...]" The black crochet beaded blouse was tight enough to enhance the breasts [...]" (Faqr, 2008: 37). She watches herself in the mirror as if looking at a stranger. For Salma "those were the few precious moments of the evening when [she] forgot [her] past" (Faqr, 2008:37).

Salma's own perception of her self leads to a radical change in her outfit. She wants to forget her past but at the same time she needs to adapt to the environment to find a room for herself. Still, one of the precious things she keeps is her mother's black shawl which she never keeps aside her sight. Despite all the change and adaptation process she has undergone, she feels her mother's words in her heart while she is condemning herself:

Then I began learning another language. 'If only you could hear me, Mother, reading English.' I could see my mother's lips meet in a Bedouin smack, 'Tzu'! Illiterate: you are not any more. In trouble: you are. Speaking different tongues does not lessen the burden of the heart.' (Faqir, 2008, p. 54)

She is led by contrasts. Her inner self and the one she tries to exhibit outside are not in agreement. She tries to turn into a "[...] Sally, an English rose, white, confident, with an elegant English accent" (Faqir, 2008, p. 8). Even in an instance when both Salma and Parvin are very happy, her obsession with her dissonant appearance still intensifies:

The café was warm, bright, clean, elegant and full. [...] I had a sip of my milk and honey and it tasted like Islamic paradise. We looked at the passers-by and smiled; the whiteness of our teeth was accentuated by our dusky brown skin. We sat there, dark, employed [...] (Faqir, 2008, p. 105).

If Fanon's anger in mid-twentieth century is still a valid proposition for Salma's dilemma on the threshold of the twenty-first century within the prescriptive codes of appearance, this means that colonial discourse still overpowers with different and disguised mechanisms of binarisms and their imperial outgrowths. Hamid Dabashi reinterprets Fanon in the twenty-first century, and he emphasizes that the ones with inferiority complex position themselves depending on standards of the metropolitan culture and the civilising language (Dabashi, 2011, p. 26). Similarly, at a moment of contrasting, while she is travelling on a train, Salma concentrates her thoughts on her skin and hair colour once again. "My hair was dark, my hands were dark and I was capable of committing dark deeds, I thought, while looking at the well-lit first-class carriage of the London train" (Faqir, 2008, p. 33). Related to this, she feels that she

shares the same fate with many other migrants or asylum-seekers when they own the streets of the city in the evening so there are times, a resemblance is required when Salma sees others from alien countries:

It was getting dark and the pavement cafe was about to shut down for the day; no encounters after five. At five o'clock the English normally rush back home to their cats and dogs and empty castles. I could see them in their small kitchens sticking the frozen chicken nuggets in the oven and frying frozen potato chips. In the early evening the city belonged to us, the homeless, drug addicts, alcoholics and immigrants, to those who were either without a family or were trying to blot out their history. In this space between five and seven we would spread and conquer like moss that grows between the cracks in the pavement (Faqir, 2008, p. 18).

Fanon's detection about the pre-established relation between blackness and evil is similar to the one created by Salma about "dark countries", "dark deeds" and dark complexioned people in dark. Fanon says "[t]he torturer is the black man, Satan is black, one talks of shadows, when one is dirty, one is black, whether one is thinking of physical dirtiness or of moral dirtiness" (Fanon, 1983, p. 189). He focuses on the impression that black is the origin of all evils. Salma likewise, equates dark deeds with her physical and moral darkness. It is inferred from this attitude that for Salma, she and many others sharing the same fate are all a part of the "dark" lands with a lot of controversies. Another one of the harshest moments of self-loath is the one when she is trying to explain herself to the lecturer, to her future husband, John. She reflects upon herself: "I came from dark countries with blood feuds and hostages. If I were him, I wouldn't teach me" (Faqir, 2008, p. 170). Moreover, she hates the questions asking her country because in these questions, she feels discouragement. That is why, if she had the chance to refuse the question, she would definitely do that because she feels that her identity together with her past sins are like curse and fate like her accent and her skin colour "[...] 'WHERE DO YOU COME FROM?'; [...]" "Do you know where this vegetable comes from?" Sometimes even the cows on the hills would line up [...] and sing, "Where do you come from, you? Go home!" (Faqir, 2008, p. 116). She prefers not to answer, sometimes. An acquaintance once says "I know why you are not saying. Because you are from Argentina,"[...]. Had I told him I was Arab he probably would have run faster. A Bedouin from a village called Hima, whose blood

was spilt by her tribe for any vagabond to drink it (Faqir, 2008, p. 149). The comparisons she resorts to make her situation worse. Even in regular, daily instances she digs out a memory or refers to the niceties of westerners. When she is writing a letter to Noura, a friend from prison, Salma refers to the opposition of education or the raised awareness on reading and sensitivity to animals: “*The westerners read so much, not like us. They are also nice and humble, not like us. Imagine – the policemen stop the traffic to let the ducks cross the road! We are horrible to our animals*” (Faqir, 2008, p. 35, *Faqir’s italics*).

One of the most outstanding utterances of *My Name is Salma* is: ““Lighten up! Groom yourself! Sell yourself!” Parvin said to me. “You are now in a capitalist society that is not your own” (Faqir, 2008, p. 33) so for Parvin “[Salma] cannot go on being an ignorant Bedouin “[she] ha[s] to learn the rules of the game, damn it” (Faqir, 2008, p. 17). Here, binarism and contrasts peak because they remind the protagonist of her current situation and the advantages that she can exploit if she adapts. However, this trap is not only peculiar to the people coming from the Third World. Fadia Faqir clarifies the situation in her interview with Lindsey Moore:

I wanted to show that Arab women are oppressed in a certain way, but Western women are [too...] Parvin says to Salma: - Groom yourself! [...] So that is the idea behind her trying to follow in the steps of a Western woman, to hold a mirror up to contemporary British society. Both environments are oppressive, but in different ways. In each case, there are penalties for not conforming (Moore, 2011, p. 8).

Not only women around her give Salma advice, but western men are courageous enough to have a say on how she should look. When she finds an evening job in a hotel, her senior, too, advises her to beautify herself: “[...] “Our customers want to be surrounded by beautiful women; they all go to the cinema and see those Bacardi girls. You must try to look presentable like ... like an air hostess [...] with lined eyes, tight skirts and full red lips” (Faqir, 2008, p. 108). Although she does not have her veil anymore and looks after herself as much as she can, she feels that whatever she does, it will be inadequate to adapt her self to the beauty standards of the west. “How can I become a Sandy, a white beautiful doll? I am only a Shandy, a black doll, a black tart, which was heavily made up and quick with her straps and suspenders. I slept with Jim,

didn't I? But Gwen advised me to look like a lady" (Faqr, 2008, p. 108). As inferred by the novel and stated by Fadia Faqr, many women in the western world are under some kind of surveillance and a domain demarcated by the male. As stated by Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, colonial discourse is contradictory. For example, when imperial and colonial discourse set the argument that the status of women in societies is the measure of the utmost stage of civilisation, it means:

[...] situating 'woman' as a biological universal category which in its function and in its status outside the evolutionary processes of cultural development. [And] the mapping of the racial dynamics of sexuality is another aspect (Williams & Chrisman, 1994, p. 193).

When the map is directed toward Muslim countries of the brown from the African countries of the black, the transition can be seen in Salma's encounters with both the victims and representatives of capitalist society. In her interview with Claire Chambers, Faqr states that her writing and especially *My Name is Salma* holds up a mirror to British society and the Arab society that Salma had left. Both societies have their own constraints because while Salma's culture has got strict code of honour, the society she finds herself in Britain has its own constraints. In that a society "women and men go out and sell themselves" because it is a media-driven society where unless you are beautiful and have long legs, there is no room for you (Chambers, 2011, p. 65).

Edward Said states that Orientalism "exists in an uneven exchange with various kinds of power" such as political, intellectual, cultural and moral. In terms of political power, he includes colonial and imperial establishment; in terms of intellectual power he includes reigning sciences such as linguistics and anatomy in his definition. Moreover, when he says cultural power he means texts, tastes and values; and lastly, in terms of moral power he means the differences between what the west do and what the other cannot understand (Said, 1979, p. 12). One of the instances that Said argues in detail is clear in the dialogue between Salma and the doctor she is seeing, still in terms of binarisms. This encounter reveals a dialogue between the power-holder, the powerless and her self-perception. As the powerful side, the doctor's language, his cynical and indifferent manner and his reserved stance arouse frustration in Salma. With her shyness and dissimilarity, Salma accepts her secondary position from the very first moment of their conversation and she acknowledges "Englishness" as the

essence of their conversation. During this encounter, she is over-conscious of her appearance and the signifiers of her culture such as her name, her veil and her accent. "Come in", he said in an elegant English accent. [...]He pushed his glasses up and looked at me suspiciously. "'Your name is Miss Sally Asher? How preposterous!' I nodded my veiled head" (Faqr, 2008, p. 70). The doctor asks what he can do for her and with her unclear grammar she tries to explain her complaint to get a treatment: "I ill, doctor. My heart beat. No sleep," I said and pulled the white scarf back off my hot forehead. He sat up, released the pen, adjusted his tie and said, "Any physical symptoms?" (Faqr, 2008, p. 70). She has been suffering from this skin condition since the time she arrived in England. The disease is so discomforting that she feels that every single eye examines her as it can be infectious. She answers: "Sick yes. Arms and legs see. [...] He held my thin dark arm in his fat white hand and inspected the sores. 'It is psoriasis. That's all. A skin condition. Nothing serious,' he said." (Faqr, 2008, p. 70). His indifference leads to Salma's begging and the doctor's cynical teaching of the heart's function in body: "'Sweat, heart beat, cannot sleep,' I said. He dropped my hand and said, 'If your heart is beating then it must be in good condition. That's what hearts are supposed to do.'" (Faqr, 2008, p. 70). This is the moment when it seems that doctor has been waiting to utter these words from the beginning of the examination. Salma begs: "But I ill. Please. Today alive, tomorrow dead, me," (Faqr, 2008, p. 70) and the doctor rejects "I told you there is nothing wrong with you. Please do not waste my time and government money" (Faqr, 2008, p. 70).

Said's detachment in terms of the "uneven exchange with various kinds of power" (Said, 1979, p. 12) is seen in the dialogue when the details are focused. Salma's veiled and dark appearance and her adopted English name function as asymmetry for the doctor, which connotes Said's comment about the right to have a say on anatomy. Accent and many grammatical forms are lacking in her speech so it reveals that she is highly aware of the linguistic superiority that she is exposed to. Lastly, the doctor's lingering his sentence with a focus on "government money" is also understandable when the whole colonisation process and its emigrational outgrowths are considered in the framework of political power. With his sharp answers, the doctor also represents patriarchal authority. This patriarchal existence provides him a space where he can

exercise his power with his professional authority, with his “elegant English accent”, with his surprise while saying “how preposterous,” which means being in misalignment with reason, and with his last words to rid himself off Salma’s case.

Salma’s persistent attempts to learn English is an issue to be dwelt on because it will be a part of her self-definition, or a distractor for it. The superiority of English as a lingua-franca in the multi-cultural world forces non-native speakers to define themselves with this language. By referring to the origins of the primary status of English, in *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*, Alastair Pennycook gives a dialogue from *Robinson Crusoe*, a symbolically important novel in post-colonial studies, because Robinson, as the patriarchal master, teaches Friday how to define himself and his own culture:

Master: Well, Friday, and what does your nation do with the men they take? Do they carry them away and eat them, as they did?

Friday: Yes, my nation eat mans up too; eat all up (Fulton quoted in Pennycook, 1998, p. 15).

In dialogues as such, Pennycook states that it is easy to see the relationship between self and other which was constructed by colonialism. Moreover, they show the relationship between self and other via the master’s language English. Friday does not speak in his own language; and moreover, he is given very particular, “colonizing English words to express his cultural background.” Therefore, as Pennycook focuses, the long tradition of creating cannibalistic, primitive, savage others is maintained in European imagination (Pennycook, 1998, p. 15). A dialogue between Salma and her boss Max can be related to Pennycook’s example. Max reminds Salma and Parvin of the colonial history of his British ancestors:

Max: Oh! Our fathers and forefathers were more skilful. [...] Oh! We used to be lords and masters. Just look at us now Look at us.

Salma: You used to rule the world [...].

Max: Yes, the sun never set on the British Empire [...].

Parvin: You ruled over palm, pine and coconut [...].

Max: Yes, coconuts like you (he said and sniggered).

Salma: I no coconut [...].

Max: We rule over ivy-ridden buildings and white elephants now (Faqr, 2008, p. 98).

In another occasion, when Salma tries fish and chips for the first time, she says to the boy, who sells the food: “‘Yumma! It is delicious’” [but] ‘Yummy!’ he said rebuking [her]” (Faqr, 2008, p. 7). In *Linguistic Imperialism* Robert Phillipson states that linguistic imperialism is an inevitable part of cultural imperialism as cultural penetration generally takes non-linguistic forms. Linguistic imperialism is also directly related to social imperialism which means the transmission of norms and the behaviours of the social structure, which are all embedded in language and its forms (Phillipson, 1992, p. 54). By rebuking her, the boy indirectly forces her to learn pronounce “yummy.” When she is getting used to England, Salma goes to a bar and orders apple juice as it looks like beer so “‘whoever approached [her] would think that [she] was open-minded, not an inflexible Muslim immigrant’” (Faqr, 2008, p. 42). She notices that there are a few men looking at her and talking about her with each other. Salma thinks to herself: “[l]ooking at my honey-coloured drink, I thought that everything was silly, including buying apple juice and pretending that it was alcohol” (Faqr, 2008, p. 42). In the dilemmas she is within, Salma tries to go into the other’s mind. She tries to think like a European and behave like them as their culture wishes. However, she herself, knows that this is ridiculous. Yet, this is a part of the adaptation process that tests her limits. She also watches TV series as much as she can because Miss Asher once advises her to “consolidate [her] knowledge by using these words and expressions in real-life situations (Faqr, 2008, p. 69).

Alastair Pennycook states that colonisers constructed themselves as the rational party, and the colonised as the irrational. This has become gender specific. The rational man of the colonizing nation “colonized, penetrated and took the authority over irrational women” (Pennycook, 1998, p. 61). In the “apple juice” scene, Salma feels that she is irrational but as drinking beer is a signifier of belonging to the power-holder’s culture, she wants to show it with her manners, her preferences and her

language, and she feels that she is under the disciplining surveillance of the western male.

For Salma, learning English very well is a matter of life and death because only with the help of her adaptation she will be able to forget her past, survive and find a decent place among the whites. Therefore, after some years on her arrival, she wants to enrol English Literature Department for a BA degree. However, it is considered irrational by the registrar because Salma wants to learn English but the registrar says that she will learn English in any way. She does not have to study literature for that. However, Salma has valid concerns for that:

Salma: No, stories good. Teach you language and how to act like English Miss. [...]

Registrar: But, Salina, this BA is not in English Language. It does not teach you English. It is about Yeats, Joyce, feminism, Shakespeare, for Christ's sake!

Salma: [...] I want know about Shakeesbeer. I want know things[...]

Registrar: [...] All right. Let us fill in the form. Name? Sally Asher.

Salma: No. Salina Ibrahim El-Musa.

Registrar: Is this what's written in your British passport? You need to be accurate or else you will pay a fortune as an overseas student[...]

Salma: No, but I want Arab name.

Registrar: You cannot. They will deport you, (she said and began writing Sally Asher.) (Faqr, 2008, p. 112).

What is interesting is that her name and her identity are defined by another woman who speaks in the name of authority. Sally Asher is a more appropriate name for her to get education as a more westernized woman. In *The Cultural Politics of English*, Alastair Pennycook says that the issue is not the grammar and lexicon of English language. The detail here is the discourses around English which matter most because they altogether make an idea of English. This is the English in the name of education and the "inequality that go under the label of globalization, all the linguistic calumnies that denigrate other ways of speaking, all the shamefully racist institutional interactions that occur in schools, hospitals, law courts, police stations, social security offices and unemployment centres" (Pennycook, 2017, p. xv). Another instance can

be related to Salma's education as a student of English Literature. When she is sitting with an acquaintance, Jim, at a café, when they first meet and try to get information about one another, Salma compares his attitude within itself: when he learns that she is an assistant tailor and when he further learns that she is a student in Literature department:

Salma: I am assistant tailor [...].

Jim: Oh!

(He must be thinking how boring.)

Salma: I also do part-time degree in English (That put some warmth in his eyes.) [...] (Faqr, 2008, p. 46)

Salma says "[u]nder the critical gaze of Miss Asher I received Rebecca's gentle instructions about table manners and the English language" (Faqr, 2008, p. 76). There seems no problem when the immigrants are from other western countries. The problem starts with her Muslim identity as Salma intensively feels so. On the other side of the issue, there are some other concerns like pleasing the powerful by putting her local identity as far as possible as she exhibits at the hotel where she works part-time:

I would wear my classiest dress, keep my mouth shut, put little make-up on, tie my frizzy hair tight, and if I spoke I would speak slowly and carefully in order to sound as English as possible. I would say, "Have you finished with this, sir? Thank you very, very much, sir (Faqr, 2008, p. 95).

As Robert Phillipson states in *Linguistic Imperialism Continued*, "[l]earners of English may well be motivated by a desire to become members of this imagined global community" (Phillipson, quoted in Ryan, 2009, p. 106). Salma knows very well that she is not a member of this society and cannot be but she must harbour here.

The last focus of the analysis will be on Bhabha's theory of Third Space and mimicry. Third Space for Bhabha permits the expression of cultural differences with the opening of an in-between space.

What is theoretically innovative, and politically crucial, is the need to think beyond narratives of originary and initial subjectivities and to focus on those moments or processes that are produced in the articulation of cultural differences. These in-between spaces provide the terrain for elaborating

strategies of selfhood - singular or communal – that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself (Bhabha, 1995, p. 1).

Despite the entire struggle, her adaptation process and her derogatory gaze at her own self, it would be incorrect to say that Salma's presence in England have left no marks. Salma's efforts to communicate with the signifiers of the colonial world such as learning English language, watching TV to get BBC accent and "to compile BBC2 vocabulary" (Faqr, 2008: 165), buying beauty products and wearing stylish clothes and registering herself to English Language Department allow her to approach a new expressive domain. "It is in this space that" Bhabha suggests, "we will find those words with which we can speak of Ourselves and Others" (Bhabha, 1995, p. 38).

The tailor's shop where she works gives Salma a chance to reach an unmediated atmosphere of communication. She and her boss ask and answer questions to each other and to approach a place of understanding. Max asks "You look exhausted this morning, girl? [...] Who was it? One of them Arabs?" (Faqr, 2008, p. 105). After a short talk, Max creates a genuine moment of mutual tolerance when he wants Salma to understand him about his negative feelings about Arabs. His attitude displays a moment of easiness and comfort by sharing his thoughts. For Bhabha, it is a place that exists between the "accused and accuser." It is moreover a place "that becomes the ground of discussion, dispute, confession, apology and negotiation [...]" (Bhabha, 2009, p. x). Max says:

You know what bugs me about [Arabs]. They come here like an army, buy houses and cars then sell their houses and cars without us hard-working English people making a sodding penny out of it. They don't go to estate agents or dealers, no, they buy off each other (Faqr, 2008, p. 106).

Although he has negative feelings about Arabs, which are, for him, based on observation and valid reason, he shares this with another Arab, Salma, and he wants her to understand him. In fact, their relationship starts with an unpleasant encounter when Salma is looking for work when she first arrives. Together with Parvin, they are looking for job and when Max refuses them, Parvin gets angry and reacts "It's because

we are black, isn't it? Because she is not an English rose,' [...] [Max's] face was covered with red patches when he said, 'Get out of my shop!'" (Faqr, 2008, p. 90). In fact, Max is the one who gives a place to Salma. The next day, Salma waits in front of his shop and Max sees her. He talks to her calmly showing sympathy: "'You made that dress?' He gesticulated while projecting the words slowly" (Faqr, 2008, p. 169). And, Salma accepts that "[a]lthough Parvin, had called him a racist, sexist pig Max gave me a job when no one would" (Faqr, 2008, p. 168). Edward Soja in "Third Space: Toward a New Consciousness of Space and Spatiality", mentions the essence of Third Space that can be related to the relation between Max and Salma's interactive moments. Soja states that the more we are involving in daily matters, poverty, sexual discrimination, environmental problems, geopolitical conflicts around the globe, the more our awareness is increasing spatial beings and the more we find ourselves in social constructing of our spatialities. Soja calls this a strategic awareness of collectively created spatiality. Their consequences, thus, have become our parts from the most intimate to the most global (Soja, 2009, p. 49). This collectively created spatiality is so frequent in the novel because of the mobility and the unavoidable spatiality it creates. Characters frequently find themselves in the environments that not only force them to put forth an effort to get involved in central field of the once-coloniser, but also encourage him to see things from a different angle. Another friend of Salma is Gwen whom she meets while walking by the river. Gwen drops her walking stick and Salma gives it to her. Then, they become life-long friends by opening their hearts to each other. Gwen talks about her son who does not visit her; and Salma talks about her past. Gwen gives advice to Salma about how "to look like a lady" (Faqr, 2008, p. 108), which words to use and how to write decent essays by editing them and adding "extremely", "sincere" and "-ed" (Faqr, 2008, p. 118), by giving her birthday presents such as the "complete works of Yeats as a birthday gift" (Faqr, 2008, p. 126). With Gwen's sincere attitudes, Salma does not have to guise her self, her identity or her fears.

Salma copes with her landlady much and she is aware of the fact that Elizabeth/Liz is dishonouring her by saying "puppets like you", "'foreigners", "aliens like you", "illegal immigrants" (Faqr, 2008, p. 18). Liz does not behave well to Salma

but Salma always tolerates her drunk, old and wounded landlady because she feels pity for her. When Liz was in India, she was deeply in love with an Indian man and her story is known by Salma, which makes Salma feel sympathy more to Liz and her lover in the colonised India. Liz is an alcoholic and should be treated in a centre for addiction. However, Salma cannot find the courage to warn Liz's niece Natasha to inform her about the situation of her aunt and thinks "but what would I say to her? Call the AA, your aunt should be committed to an alcohol treatment centre. How could I, me the immigrant tenant tell the middle-class English what to do with aunts" (Faqr, 2008, p. 143). After Liz's funeral, Natasha approaches Salma and says "Sally, thank you for everything you have done for her [...] My aunt was fond of you, Sally" (Faqr, 2008, p. 176). Actually, this appraisal makes Salma happy and she feels that she has been recognized.

Another example is the marriages. Both Parvin and Salma marry English men. In Parvin's wedding ceremony Salma wants to congratulate Mark's mother on her son's marriage but she is about to cry so to stop herself from sobbing, she just says "'Ma'am, it's a glorious sunset!' Speechless, [Mark's mother] nodded her head and squeezed my hand" (Faqr, 2008, p. 158). In this ceremonial circumstance, the space saved for a mutual understanding appears spontaneously and encircles the interlocutors of the conversation. Here the ungraspable thought that Bhabha mentions is nobody's possession. He says "[t]o say that a concept or a thought *becomes yours* is to say that it becomes my thought, my concept; but it is never in my possession, it was never my property because the thought is also yours – *it belongs to you, too*" (Bhabha, 2009, p. ix *Bhabha's italics*). In these interactive moments people exchange thoughts, ideas and feelings so they knowingly or unknowingly create these instances of understanding.

In this new meaning-making process of the Third Space, the new born communicative climate is the product. This is very clear in Salma and John's first meeting. When they are sitting at a café, they try to learn about each other. John asks her where she comes from and in response, Salma says "No, not me. You, where do you come from?" (Faqr, 2008, p. 171). He does not answer but asks why she is here;

and then, Salma asks why he is here. He answers: “I am here because I couldn't find a job in the north. So here I am marooned in this humourless south” (Faqr, 2008, p.171) and explains what “marooned” means since she does not know: “A person isolated in a desolate place, unable to leave” (Faqr, 2008, p. 171). Salma finds a similarity between their lives: “Good. I marooned on this island UK,” I said and looked away through the glass walls of the cafe. It was raining and the white flowers of the dogwood tree glittered in the sunset (Faqr, 2008, p. 172).

In Bhabha's words, it is certain that “Third Space is unthinkable outside the locality of cultural translation” that is local knowledge (Bhabha, 2009, p. ix). When John proposes marriage to Salma he gives a gift box to her. When Salma opens it, she becomes sensitive: “When I opened I almost cry. It was full of sweet things from the Middle East: a packet of dates, baklava with pistachio nuts, halva and Turkish delight. He said he knew little about the Levant, but he happy to learn” (Faqr, 2008, p. 174). For Soja, the Third Space is a metaphor that encompasses a shifting and changing milieu of ideas, events, appearances and meanings (Soja, 2008, p. 50). Therefore, this marriage proposal can be seen as an example of what Soja means about the creation of this space because Salma is now facing a surprising situation in which there is Middle Eastern elements to please her. However, when she first arrives and stays in a hostel, the boy who shows the room to Parvin makes fun of Salma humiliating her by saying “fucking A-rabic” and supposes that she has come all the way with a camel “from Arabia to this dump in Exeter.” And, Parvin equates her with the sores on her body and is worried about the probability of their being infectious (Faqr, 2008, p.11). The signifiers are still of Middle Eastern origin but with sweet things this time. He feels the necessity to bring some Middle Eastern items because he is aware of the fact that Salma is already hurt and is marginalized with her Arab and Muslim identity. Therefore, he uses the delicacies of her land. This is the first time, her hometown, which she tries to hide, is uncovered with the acceptance of her origin. Although it seems that he uses exotic items to please Salma, he prepares the place for both to enter into the “split-space of enunciation” that Bhabha refers to (Bhabha, 1995, p. 38). For Bhabha, in this space, enunciation “is not based on the exoticism of multi-culturalism

or the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's hybridity" (Bhabha 1995, p. 38).

The Third Space in *My Name is Salma*, is close to Bhabha's approach in the sense that "in reaching out the specific thought of the other and grappling with what is not entirely intelligible within it – rather than acknowledging an "identity" – there lies the possibility of identifying also with the unconscious of the other [...]" (Bhabha, 2009, p. xiii). Many communicative moments and environments Salma involves in lead not to the acknowledgement of other's culture. However, they all together created a space of mutual understanding and tolerance. It should be accepted that Salma is a character that tries hard to adapt to the environment and becomes as appropriate as possible for a girl who has nothing at the first moment of her arrival. Moreover, there is a detail in the novel that can be taken into consideration in the sense that it will have a great effect for the perception of the future in the novel. Salma and John have a son, Imran, so his half-British, half Arab identity and body will probably make a more distinguishable difference that his mother has started to create.

Mimicry is another detail to be referred to in *My Name is Salma*. The persistence of colonial discourse through the colonial signs is recurrent in the novel when the society Salma finds herself in and its colonial history are considered. Therefore, it would not be wrong to interpret Salma's actions with one of the most distinguishing terms of post-colonial theory, that is, mimicry. Salma tries to apply what she hears from Parvin, Liz, Gwen and her bosses to adapt to the environment. Her social environment is a very interesting panorama of British culture of the multi-cultural age. Her landlady Liz/Elizabeth is an "English rose" who once stayed in India and loved an Indian man against her family's will. She treats Salma quite intolerantly because she hates dark skin and the related things such as black hair. Her friend Parvin is from Pakistan and another friend Gwen is a Welsh woman. Her boss Max and her senior in the hotel are English. Therefore, the climate is so blended with different voices that the only chance left to her is to imitate. She imitates the accent and manners even when she is thinking to herself: "'It was a bit chilly,' I heard myself say in 'Elizabethan' English. My landlady was haunting me. If not careful I would turn into an Elizabeth, an English rose, a Sleeping Beauty without a prince. (Faqir, 2008, p. 39).

She imitates Liz's accent quite often especially when she has new encounters. For example, while she is chatting with David at a café, she says to David "'Oh! How interesting!' I said, trying to imitate the accent of the Queen. Liz [...]" (Faqr, 2008, p. 20). She does the same thing when she is entering John's office "I stood by the door and said, trying to imitate Liz's accent, 'Here is the essay!'" (Faqr, 2008, p. 136). Liz has a disciplining power on Salma and she always feels her gaze or presence. When Salma defends her self against Liz at a moment of disagreement she says "'I no illegal,' losing [her] English [...] Would you like a cuppa? [Salma] asked, imitating [...] Gwen'" (Faqr, 2008, p.17). However, Liz never approves Gwen and her Welsh influence on Salma so she condemns her by saying "'A cuppa? Honestly', she said shaking her head" (Faqr, 2008, p. 18). Bhabha defines mimicry as follows: "Mimicry *repeats* rather than *represents* [...] Mimicry conceals no presence or identity behind its mask [...] [and] disrupts [colonial] authority" (Bhabha, 2008, p. 88). Furthermore, Bhabha states that the high ideal of colonial imagination is shaken by its low mimetic reflections. Mimicry in itself is a "process of disavowal", an "indeterminacy", and "a sign of double articulation" (Bhabha, 1995, p. 86). It is a shared process in which the coloniser and the colonised are present. However, the problem in mimicry is an unpleasant output when the authority of the coloniser is at stake. This can be sought in the doctor's indifferent and cynical attitude to Salma when he says "how preposterous" (Faqr, 2008, p.70) upon hearing her name "Sally Asher." As David Huddart states the coloniser fantasizes "monstrous stereotypes that can only lead to anxiety rather than the desired certainty" (Huddart, 2006, p. 61). From the first moment of his examination of Salma to his rebuking manner to send her off, the doctor is so critical of Salma.

Salma's existence and her imitating manners irritate some people such as her landlady and the doctor for she is seen as a representative of the unwanted. For Ali Behdad, "they are considered neither ethnically, nor politically European" because from a European perspective, Islam cannot be compatible with the values of Europe, and Muslim immigrants are considered as totally different both at universal and national level in terms of belonging (Behdad, 2017, pp. 293-294). This is why Salma ridicules herself when she imitates something. And also, this is why the modern representatives of the west are irritated by her when she tries to imitate their life and language. The continuation of this discourse, according to David Huddart as he refers

to Bhabha, is still on-going. “In fact colonial period is on-going, and post-colonial perspectives contribute an original understanding of our colonial present.” Huddart also states “Instead of seeing colonialism something locked in the past, Bhabha shows how its histories and cultures intrude on the present, demanding that we transform our understanding of cross-cultural relations” (Huddart, 2006, p. 1,2). In this discourse, it is Salma’s lot to try to adapt to, sometimes keeping the advice of her Pakistani friend Parvin, and, sometimes, behaving as her landlady wishes. All these are to quicken her adaptation process in England.

All things considered, it can be said that Salma is an idiosyncratic character that can never rid herself of her past as she calls sinful. For the sake of survival, she flees to England and is helped by a lot of good-willed people. She makes friends with many people, some are temporary and some are permanent relationships. She tries hard to adapt to the environment and to look British. Although there are in-betweens in her story, there is one thing clear; her wish to see her daughter:

Now I live in Great Britain. I have a job, a car, a husband and a large house. I am rich, so rich I could pay for your university education. One day you will see me right in front of you. I am sure that my heart would recognize you, would single you out even if you were among hundreds of children (Faqr, 2008, p. 57).

Although she has a little baby boy the difference between the treatment of girls and boys lead her to the idea that girls are helpless. When Gwen tries to stop her from going to her country, Salma reacts: “Cannot you see?” I screamed. ‘I’ve got no names. I haven’t even got Noura’s or Madam Lamaa’s family name. I have to go. My daughter is in danger.” Gwen expects an answer for her son, too: “What about your son?” asked Gwen and Salma is still of the opinion that “Sons are treated better. They can fend for themselves. Daughters are helpless” (Faqr, 2008, p. 187). Her friends and her husband are sorry for her because they are all aware of the fact that she might be the victim of an honour crime the moment she steps on her country. Salma is not afraid any more. “Over the years, things must have changed in the old country, people change, I changed” (Faqr, 2008, p. 188). However, her courage does not originate from her trust in England, but her belief in her motherhood and her burnout that results from her fear

for being killed for years. At this point, the dialogue between Parvin and Salma is worth mentioning:

Salma: I am a British citizen now and the British will protect me.

Parvin: Oh! Yeah! Look at the colour of your skin. You are a second-class citizen. They will not protect you.

Salma: No one would recognize me now. Especially if I have my hair cut and dyed.

Parvin: They will recognize your smell. So many Asian girls were killed when they went back.

Salma: [Her daughter] wouldn't stop crying. Her sobs echo in my head (Faqir, 2008:187).

This dialogue discloses a traumatic situation and the suppressed identity which is denied for years for the sake of survival. Salma, after years, becomes a British citizen through marriage, not a refugee or asylum anymore, so she believes that she will be protected by the law. However, Parvin taunts her by reminding of her original identity and skin colour which she has been escaping for ages. Parvin being dissatisfied with Salma's answers insists on her serious worries about Salma's safety which still reminds of Bhabha. In his interview with Jonathan Rutherford, Bhabha states migrant citizenship "must be questioned over the basis of anomalous and discriminatory legal and cultural status assigned to migrant and refugee populations who find themselves on the other side of the law" (Rutherford, 1990, p. 218). However, at the end of the dialogue and the story, it is seen that Salma has to go to find her self because her daughter is the only way that defines her current self. She is neither interested in her newly acquired citizenship nor the enormous burdens she has overcome. Interestingly, although she hates her own dark complexion, when she defines her daughter, Layla in her mind, she sketches a body for her with dark curly hair and a white dress. Even when her friends warn her that she has to cut her ties with her past, she feels the impossibility of this choice. During the days on arrival, when she is looking at the window of a shop selling baby clothes, she stares at a white baby dress and dreams about her daughter in her little dress: "it looks like a luminous white cloud, like dawn; the pearls shone like tears of joy. It was a promise of a reunion, a return. That white dress was home (Faqir, 2008,

p. 12). Even years later, when she longs for her daughter and wants to go back, she still feels the same and declares this to her baby son: “I repeated, ‘Forgive me, Imran, forgive me,’ with every step I took in her direction. I had to go to find her. I had to go to find me” (Faqr, 2008, p. 193). Salma is so puzzled, and deep in her heart, she feels that she belongs to home, her daughter and the simple, uncomplicated life of the past because there hides her daughter and her beloved ones.

To conclude, *My Name is Salma* is the story of an Arab woman who does not have any intention to migrate to England. However, as a mishap, she finds herself in the middle of a cosmopolitan city, Exeter, thanks to some women who help such girls to escape to England. In England, she lives with comparisons and contrasts which cause her to ambivalent moments of self-search. While she is searching for a new self as she has to, she never ceases to humiliate her Arab identity, her dark complexion, her uneducated self and more than these, her “shameful past.” Salma’s story shows that the codes and teachings of colonial discourse are still overpowering at the edge of twenty-first century. Her situation can be clearly compared to a black migrant’s situation at post-colonial times. The way that black women felt some decades ago, is felt by Muslim Arab females now because they have become the symbol of backwardness, illiteracy and illegal immigration. In his “Foreword: Framing Fanon”, Bhabha touches upon this matter. He sees the theses like “clash of civilisations” as those which now turn against Islam “targeting migrants, refugees and minorities more generally” (Bhabha, 2004, p. xvi). Salma witnesses this clash. She defines her self in the way west defines the Arabs. Self-loath cannot be detached from her self-definition. However, the only thing that she harbours is her motherhood. The feeling gives her both despair and hope. Then, she chooses to leave for her homeland secretly to find her self, as she says “to find me” (Faqr, 2008, p. 193). *My Name is Salma* sheds light on the female migrants’ (and at the same time asylum seekers or refugees’) burden for it dwells on not only their situation in England but also their personal history and mainly the patriarchal troubles which push them to these countries. As a result, it can be said that like *Wide Sargasso Sea*, *My Name is Salma* writes a history to the unwanted, dark, marginalized and radicalized women of Arab and Muslim countries. Salma comes from an unnamed country, so for the western characters, she can be

simply labelled as an Arab or a Muslim, but with the history written only for her, she is individualized and familiarized against marginalization.



CONCLUSION

The aim of this dissertation has been to analyse *Wide Sargasso Sea*, *Second Class Citizen* and *My Name is Salma* as texts of resistance in terms of female protagonists' positioning themselves in the colonial sphere. With a main aim to focus on the colonial language which guaranteed its status as a constructive force for superiority long ago, the dissertation has followed the protagonists' moves, reactions and encounters in detail. Its effect is preserved in people's perception of the other, selfhood, inferiority and superiority. It has been considered that patriarchy has equally a shaping role in the protagonists' perception and definition of selfhood and resistance. This chapter focuses on a comparative discussion with reference to the protagonists.

It is observed that colonial discourse is still an effective part of daily life in multi-cultural environments. It was and is still a dominant setting for self-definition and resistance. That is why; it can be regarded as a fertile ground for newer forms of patriarchal restrictions and colonial understanding. Affecting and changing lives deeply in the post-emancipation period and then in post-colonial times and eventually in the multi-cultural, it can be concluded that the presence of colonial discourse is not less obtrusive.

The setting in *Wide Sargasso Sea* is the post-emancipation period in Jamaica. This shows us that periphery and centre have a factual connotation and the centre/England is like a dream for the protagonist who is only accustomed to the natural flow of life in her beloved island. In *Second Class Citizen*, the setting is firstly post-colonial Nigeria and then England, which leads the reader to the idea that the notion of periphery and centre is still an experienced fact. In *My Name is Salma*, the setting is late-twentieth century England where the idea of centre and its others is metaphorically constructed in other minds with newer codes.

The white protagonist, Antoinette, struggles for self-definition in her beautiful island, where imperialism and colonial discourse intertwine. The black protagonist, Adah, both makes strenuous efforts to keep her family together despite her abusive husband, and tries to overcome the difficulties in England, where being black is equal

to being inferior, as she starts to feel. The dark-skinned Arab protagonist, Salma, fights for her survival among the immense hardships of being an asylum-seeker in England in the late twentieth century and on the threshold of the twenty-first century. In short, as Ania Loomba mentions, all the novels reveal the “traumatic,” “complex” and “unfair relationships” (Loomba, 1998, p. 2).

What makes the protagonists similar to one another is their struggle with the patriarchal existence of their local environments, their understanding of colonial discourse and their struggle to define their self in this discourse. However, they have their own ways to reveal it and to resist.

The clearest example of imperial understanding is seen in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. The mishaps caused after her father’s death drag Antoinette and her mother into financial difficulty and solitude. During this period of deprivation, her mother marries an English man, Mr Mason, who seems to be their saviour. He is the voice of the imperial and the protecting coloniser. He is an English gentleman but this does not make things pleasant before Antoinette’s eyes. Through Mr Mason, Antoinette’s critical gaze is revealed. As a colonised character, she is now gazing at the coloniser and his imperial pursuits critically and noiselessly. Roles are exchanged, so with Antoinette’s silent criticism and observation, every move of the coloniser is under close surveillance now. When she herself marries an Englishman, she is kept under her husband’s surveillance this time and becomes the target of his criticisms and hatred, which means she becomes the target of patriarchal knowledge and imperial pursuits. Her knowledge about the island and her alignment with the nature make her husband feel like a complete outsider. He is, indeed. He tries to exercise his power on Antoinette by unmasking his hatred gradually. Moreover, he takes the rumours about Antoinette seriously so he is urged by a sense of revenge. His long-standing hatred turns into grudge and is revealed by his words and feelings through his narration in the second part of the novel. He compares Antoinette to English girls but is aware of her alienness. Antoinette on the other hand, despite her curiosity, is never eager to look European because her island is her identity and a part of her definition of her self. She is distanced from the centre with her Caribbean consciousness and with the narration dedicated to her. Now the centre is her island. She is maddened by her husband’s

criticism, his blames and intense hatred. She is labelled as mad, marginalized and imprisoned to death within the walls of the attic of his family estate. At the end of the novel, it gets clear that Antoinette's silent awareness leads her to an other beginning. She is forced into surrender. However, her memories in her island flood back and guide her to the way to freedom. She exhibits no signs of fear when she is ready to set fire. *Wide Sargasso Sea* shows the reader that reactions and resistance do not have to be vociferous; the most efficient ones are the ones which are triggered by hatred, condemnation and suppression. The hidden history, whether communal or personal, is unmasked through the story of Antoinette, which shows that history cannot be undone.

Adah struggles much to leave her country to find a freer life in England where she can manifest her real potential and have better life standards. Therefore, she must be away from the patriarchal practices of her homeland. However, things do not progress as she wishes because when she was in Nigeria, England was idealized but in England, she faces the complex reality of being a poor black woman with an abusive, lazy husband, who is always dissatisfied. He highlights their skin colour as the signifier of inferiority and discourages Adah with reminding this all the time. Adah takes strength from her confidence to her self and her motherhood to endure the hardships brought by the new life in England. She is on the way to change. She communicates through her self and lets a dialogical space to be opened for her culture and her new self to be articulated. Adah, together with the African side, which she mainly criticizes but at times praises herself with, is on the way to build a new woman. And, the only ground where she can progress and find a way to speak up is England. She neither accepts being a "second-class citizen", nor behaves like a pure African. Hers is a struggle in-the-making to be accepted as she is. Adah has undergone the processes of education, language learning and missionary encounters. Her blending of both leads her to develop another way of communicative ground where she experiences the moments of enunciation. It can be said that, although Adah's arrival is too weak to change a system, her encounter with the metropolitan lives create moments of agreement or disagreement. Yet, these moments are sufficient for her to reach a more liberal and understanding self.

My Name is Salma supplies a relatively more up-to-date reflection of today's scene in terms of self-perception, self-definition, resistance and the perception of the other. Although a specific year is not given throughout the storyline, it is understood from the substantial details that technology, medicine, demographical texture, emigrational issues, pop culture and even cosmetics have reached their utmost level all of which reveal the imperious side of the late twentieth century England. Salma's struggle to survive in England reveals the multi-cultural voice of the new world showing that colonial understanding has not lost much from its essence. There are some newer codes added, such as the voice of western female and males who emphasize the clothing style for a "modern look" in the other/non-western woman, the music which should be understood and listened to, the drinks that can say much about a person's identity and the English accent that must be adapted in order to conceal Arabness. This time, the centre is gazed at and narrated by an Arab which is seen as the new black before western eyes. She is widely aware of her brownish skin colour and dark hair which she hates. She tries to fit into the modernized mould of western-looking female after the criticisms of her social environment. She has to struggle with her own self and memories as a Bedouin who is hiding in England to escape from an honour killing, and she has to cope with the image of the Arab as the other in a western land. Her effort is in fact not a forceful one to reach an objective in England. Salma only tries to survive but when the point she arrives in is considered, it is seen that her fight is against her fears. Reuniting with her daughter remains at the forefront of her mind for years. So, she dares to brave the ultimate face-off at the end of the novel. It is a face-off between her fears and her self, her child and her motherhood.

Different from *Wide Sargasso Sea*, *Second Class Citizen* and *My Name is Salma* exhibit the multitude of encounters more so it can be said that multi-cultural encounters in England do not help the existence of other cultures although it gives a chance to them to enunciate their differences and provides them with a freer climate. Local cultures have to be appropriated while they are trying to place themselves in the centre. Definitions are done by patriarchal and imperial codes, and they are prescriptive. The analyses of these three novels show that if a marginalized female wants to survive in the centre, she has to adapt. She cannot be her self purely without the penetration of the central culture in her self. Antoinette and Salma are unready. The culture of the

centre has found them in a way. However, with her education and the encounters with the missionaries in Nigeria and with her readiness to meet the central culture, Adah is a better fit for the climate in England. Antoinette and Salma cannot survive because they themselves prefer to keep their organic ties with their lands. Although she has adapted and changed much, Salma cannot survive as she lives with her memories and personal matters which are shown clearly with the non-linear narration. The penetration of the patriarchal domain of her land into her new life in England haunts her. Her secret escape from England to Hima shows that she cannot hide anymore and she has to venture this journey to find her self.

It can also be synthesised that patriarchal oppression plays an important part in the heroines' struggle for selfhood and choice of resistance. All the novels show that there is a hidden decision-making process by the male. Even though the protagonists give their own decisions to some extent, the males who are remote controlling the women's lives take their chance to manifest their own potential as an individual. The leading male characters are also the forced representatives of the system they live in but they show no signs of reaction. They add to the reproduction of the system by using it in their own favour. They exploit a lot because the patriarchal system gives them the privilege to exercise their power on the women. As understood from the letters of Antoinette's husband to his father, it can be concluded that he is conducting a decision which was made long before and by his father. He goes to the place to implement this system. Although he knows what he is doing very well, he goes on teasing Antoinette mercilessly without any signs of real love or sacrifice. Yet, he does not react. In contrast, he perpetuates the system. Francis is in a similar situation because as Adah concludes that he has never given his own decisions. Similarly, Salma's brother, lover and father are the representatives of their local patriarchal environments. They exhibit no difference from one another as they are the representatives of the same mentality. They do nothing but creating terror in their close relative. The decisions of the males belong to their ancestors. This is what they have seen, experienced and learnt from the patriarchal discourse around. Antoinette's husband gets his strength directly from the colonial and imperial system. Adah's husband feels powerful because his Africanness which advantages the male since childhood gives him the chance. Similarly, males around Salma, especially her brother, get their support from the patriarchal society

which assigns customary tasks to them to be completed when a woman performs things against the teachings and traditions of the society. In terms of discursive construction, the presence of these resisting women who are in search of self-definition is braver than the males. This can be understood from their last minute reactions. Antoinette does her best to represent her island as her identity. Adah tries hard to earn her living and surpass her husband as the representative of patriarchal system with her observant manners and Salma may seem as a timid character, who is ready to do what comes from the superior's side. However, her feminine consciousness, that is, her motherhood, frees her from all the fears that oppress her existence. She faces death and accepts her "shameful", "sinful" past by returning her village. This means she is ready to confront the consequences. As understood from the novels, male characters use up and effortlessly take advantage of the earnings of the system which elevates the maleness. As a result, they destroy the women. Similarly, the women are oppressed by the expectations of the imperial system which ignores the differences and encourages similarity by using-up individualizing characteristics. The system expects these women behave in an expected manner which will please the system and the male in the end. In Antoinette's case, her husband's likening her to "any English girl" but labelling her as "alien" is an example of this argument. Adah's struggle to reconcile with her blackness and her inner comments about the modern day problems of the women around, "to look European," show that there is a hidden force which takes women's chance to show their real self. Salma is similarly overwhelmed by the demands of multi-cultural England. She is also aware of the fact that under the roof of multi-culturalism people are still in search of Europeanness. It is seen from the protagonists' lives that imperialism is a system that outdistances the individual from her selfhood.

It is common to all the protagonists that they have personal histories which are underrated by the colonial discourse which still lives on contrasts and differences. Antoinette's history is a direct answer to the colonised, marginalized and othered female. Adah's history is a response to the devalued black woman both by her own culture and the coloniser's culture. Salma's history is a response to the so-called multi-cultural world of the west with the portrayal of the stereotyped, prejudiced and radicalized woman of the Arabic countries. From colonial to the post-colonial and to

the multi-cultural domains, colonial discourse has survived, mainly targeting at females who have been marginalized, othered and radicalized, and whose limits are tested by patriarchy.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Emecheta, Buchi. *Second Class Citizen*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1989.

Faqir, Fadia. *My Name is Salma*. London: Transworld Publishers, 2008.
(E-book) www.transworldbooks.co.uk

A Black Swan Book: 9780552773621, Version 1.0 Epub ISBN: 9781407068770

Rhys, Jean. *Wide Sargasso Sea*. London: Penguin, 2000.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abdalkafor, Ola. *Gayatri Spivak: Deconstruction and the Ethics of Post-colonial Literary Interpretation*. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.

Adamson, Walter. "The Problem of Self-representation". *The Post-colonial Critic: Interview, Strategies, Dialogues*. Gayatri Spivak and Sarah Harasym (Edt.) New York & London: Routledge, (1990):51-58.

Ahmed, Leila. *Women and Gender in Islam: Historical Roots of a Modern Debate*. New Haven: Yale UP., 1992.

Ashcroft, Bill. *Post-Colonial Transformation*. London & New York: Routledge, 2001.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*. London & New York: Routledge, 1989.

_____. *Post-colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. London & New York: Routledge, 2007.

Behdad, Ali. "Inhospitability, European Style: The Failures of Human Rights". *The Postcolonial World*. Jyotsna G. Singh and David D. Kim. (Edts.) London: Routledge, (2017): 291-307.

Bender, Todd. "Jean Rhys and the Genius of Impressionism". *Critical Perspectives on Jean Rhys. Literary Impressionism in Jean Rhys, For Madox Ford, Joseph Conrad and Charlotte Brontë*. Three Continents Press (1990): 75-84. USA: CIP 97-10566, 1997.

Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1995.

_____. “Foreword: Framing Fanon”. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Présence Africaine, (1963), (2004, Eng. Trs.): vii-xliii.

_____. “In the Cave of Making: Thoughts on Third Space”. *Communicating in the Third Space*. Karin Ika and Gerhard Wagner (Edts.), London: Routledge (2009) : x-xiv.

Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Post-colonial Literature*. Oxford, Oxford UP., 1995.

Brahms, Flemming. “Entering Our Own Ignorance” *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin (Edts.) London: Routledge, (2003): 66-77.

Cain P.J. & A.G. Hopkins. “Gentlemanly Capitalism and British Imperialism: The Old Colonial System”. *Imperialism: Critical Concepts in Historical Studies Vol. II*. P. J. Cain & Mark Harrison (Edts.) London & New York: Routledge, (1986):303-333.

Canagarajah, Suresh. *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 1990.

Chambers, Claire. *British Muslim Fictions: Interviews with Contemporary Writers*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011.

Chibber, Vivek. *Post-colonial Theory and the Spectre of Capital*. London: Verso:2013

Chikwenje Ogunyemi *African Wo/Man Palava: The Nigerian Novel by Women*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Crooks, Kalpana Seshadri. *Desiring Whiteness: A Lacanian Analysis of Race*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Dabashi, Hamid. *Brown Skin, White Masks*. London: Pluto, 2011.

Delanty, Gerard. *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality*. London: MacMillan, 1995.

Dillman, Jefferson. *Colonising Paradise: Landscape and Empire in the British West Indies*. University of Alabama Press, Alabama, 2015.

Dixon, Chris, Michael Heffernan. *Colonialism and Development in the Contemporary World*. London: Mansell Pub., 1991.

Emecheta, Buchi “Feminism with a Small ‘f’”. *Criticism and Ideology: Second African Writers’ Conference, Stockholm*, Kirsten Holst Petersen & Per Watsberg (Edts.) Seminar Proceedings. Nr. 20. Scandinavian Institute of African Studies. 1986.

_____. “Introduction”. *Second Class Citizen*. Buchi Emecheta, London: Hodder & Stoughton, (1989): vii-xii.

_____. *Head Above Water*. Oxford: Heinemann Educational Publishers, 1994.

Emery, Mary Lou. *Jean Rhys at "World's End": Novels of Colonial and Sexual Exile*. Texas: University of Texas Press, 1990.

Englund, Harri. "Introduction: Recognizing Identities, Imagining Alternatives." *Rights and the Politics of Recognition in Africa*. Harri Englund & Francis Nyamnjoh (Eds.) London: Zed Books, (2004): 1-30.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Présence Africaine, 1963, (2004, Trs.).

_____. *Black Skin White Masks*. London: Pluto, 1986.

Fieldhouse, D.K. *The Colonial Empires: A Comparative Survey from the Eighteenth Century*. London, MacMillan: 1982.

Fishburn, Katherine. *Reading Buchi Emecheta: Cross-cultural Conversations*. USA: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1995.

Fisher, Jerilyn. "Buchi Emecheta" *Modern British Women Writers*. Vicki K. Janik, Del Ivan Janik, Emmanuel Sampath Nelson (Eds.) London: Greenwood Press, (2002): 113-121.

Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Garcia, Rosalia Neumann and Maria Oliveira. "Intertextuality, narrators and other voices in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*". *Letras, Santa Maria*. Vol. 26. No. 53. (July, Dec. 2016): 215-235.

Gilbert, Sandra & Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2000.

Grace, Daphe. *Relocating Consciousness*. New York: Rodopi, 2007.

Gunew, Suneja. "Questions of Multi-culturalism?". *The Post-colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies and Dialogues*. Gayatri Spivak. Sarah Harsym (Edt.) New York & London: Routledge, (1990): 59-66.

Harrison, Nancy. *Jean Rhys and the Novel as Women's Text*. Chapelhill, University of North Carolina Press: 1989.

Howells, Coral Ann. *Jean Rhys*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.

Huddart, David. *Homi K. Bhabha*. London & New York: Routledge, 2006.

Huntington, Samuel. "The Clash of Civilizations". *Foreign Affairs*. Vol 73. No: 3 (Summer, 1993) : 22-49.

Huzzey, Richard. *Freedom Burning: Anti-Slavery and Empire in Victorian Britain*. London: Cornell University Press, 2012.

JanMohamed, Abdul. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory" *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin (Edts.) London: Routledge, (2003): 18-23.

Jussawalla, Feroza & Reed Way Dasenbrock. *Interviews with Writers of the Post-colonial World*. USA: University Press of Mississippi, 1992.

Kaboré, André. "Differentiating African and Western Feminisms through Room Symbolism." *Linguistics and Literature Studies* 5.6 (2017): 408 - 416.
doi: 10.13189/lis.2017.050603

Killam, Douglas. *Literature of Africa*. London: Greenwood Press, 2004.

Lamming, George. *The Pleasures of Exile*. USA: The University of Michigan Press, 2004.

Lindroth, Colette. "Whispers Outside the Room: The Haunted Fiction of Jean Rhys". *Critical Perspectives on Jean Rhys*. Pieretta M. Frickey (Edt.) Washington: Three Continents Press (1990): 85-91.

Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Post-colonialism*. London & New York: Routledge, 1998.

Malak, Amin. *Muslim Narratives and the Discourses of English*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004.

Mansel, Philip. *The Levant: Splendour and Catastrophe on the Mediterranean*. New Haven & London: Yale UP., 2011.

McLeod, John. *Post-Colonial London: Rewriting the Metropolis*. London & New York: Routledge, 2004.

Mericle, Megan. "Mad Women in Our Attics: *Jane Eyre* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*'s Treatment of Feminism". Proceedings of The National Conference On Undergraduate Research (NCUR) Weber State University, Ogden Utah March, (2012): 29-31.

Mintz, Sidney. *Caribbean Transformations*. London: Transaction Pub., 2009.

Moore, Lindsey. "You Arrive at a Truth, Not the Truth: An Interview with Fadia Faqir". *Postcolonial Text*, Vol. 2, No 6 (2011): 1-13

Nandy, Ashis. *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*. Oxford U. P, 1983.

Nash, Geoffrey. *The Anglo-Arab Encounter: Fiction and Autobiography by Arab Writers in English*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2007.

Newman, Judy. "The Colonial Voice in the Motherland". *Postcolonial Discourse and Changing Cultural Contexts: Theory and Criticism*. Gita Rajan and Radhika Mohanram (Edts.) London: Greenwood press (1995): 47-58.

Nfah-Abbenyi, Juliana. *Gender in African Women's Writing: Identity, Sexuality and Difference*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Nunberg, Geoffrey. "The Persistence of English." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Vol 2. M. H. Abrams and Stephen Greenblatt (Edts.) New York & London: Norton Company (2000): xlvii – lxi.

Ola, Virginia "Art and Propaganda in Buchi Emecheta's Second Class Citizen". *UTAFITI*. Vol. 9. No.1. Michigan State University Library (1987): 132-147.

Olaussen, Maria. "Rhys's Construction of Blackness as Escape from White Femininity in 'Wide Sargasso Sea'". *A Review of International English Literature*. 24:2, (April, 1993): 65-82

Parry, Benita. *Post-Colonial Studies A Materialist Reading* London: Routledge. 2004.

Pennycook, Alastair. *English and the Discourses of Colonialism* London: Routledge, 1998.

_____. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. London & New York: Routledge, 2017.

Peterson, Kirsten Holst & Anna Rutherford. *A Double Colonization: Colonial and Post-Colonial Women's Writing*. Oxford: Dangaroo Press, 1986.

Phillipson, Robert. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford UP., 1992.

_____. *Linguistic Imperialism Continued*. New York & London: Routledge, 2009.

Rody, Caroline. "Burning Down the House: The Revisionary Paradigm of Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*. *Famous Last Words*. Allison Booth (Edt.). London: University Press of Virginia, 1993 :300-325.

Rutherford, Jonathan. "The Third Space: An Interview with Homi Bhabha", *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishart (1990): 207-221.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1979.

_____. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1993.

Sherwood, Marika (2007). *After Abolition: Britain and the Slave Trade since 1807*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2007.

Soja, Edward "Third Space: Toward a New Consciousness of Space and Spatiality". *Communicating in The Third Space*. Karin Ikas, Gerhard Wagner (Edts.) New York, Routledge (2008): 49-61.

Sougou, Omar. *Writing Across Cross Cultures: Gender, Politics and Difference in the Ficton of Buchi Emecheta*. New York & Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002.

Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?". *Marxism and Interpretation of Culture*. C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (Edts.) Basingstoke: MacMillan Education (1988) : 271-313.

_____. "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism". *Critical Inquiry*. Vol. 12. No.1. (Autumn, 1985): 243-261.

_____. Spivak, Gayatri. *Outside the Teaching Machine*. London & New York: Routledge, 1993.

Staley, Thomas. *Jean Rhys: A Critical Study*. London: MacMillan, 1979.

Terdiman, Richard. *Discourse/Counter Discourse: The Theory and Practice of Symbolic Resistance in Nineteenth Century France*. London: Cornell UP., 1985.

Teubert, Wolfgang. *Meaning, Discourse and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP., 2010.

Thomas, Nicholas. *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*. Oxford: Polity Press., 1994.

Tiffin, Helen. "Post-colonial Literatures and Counter-discourse" *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth "Griffiths & Helen Tiffin (Edts.) London: Routledge, 1995.

Trevelyan, George. *English Social History; A Survey of Six Centuries, Chaucer to Queen Victoria*. London; New York: Green and Co.,1942.

Umeh, Marie."Buchi Emecheta" *Post-Colonial African Writers: A Bio-bibliographical Critical Sourcebook*. Davies, Boyce Carol & Siga Fatima Jagne (Edts.). London & New York: Routledge: (1998): 148-163.

Visel, Robin. "A Half Colonization: The Problem of the White Colonial Woman Writer" *Kunapipi*. Vol. 10. No.3 (1988) : 39-45.

Wahab, Amar. *Colonial Inventions: Landscape, Power and Representation in Nineteenth-Century Trinidad*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010.

Williams, Patrick, Laura Chrisman. *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory: A Reader*. Columbia University Press, 1994.

Young, Robert. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in theory, culture and race*. London: Routledge, 1995

_____. *Post-colonialism: A very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.

_____. *Empire, Colony, Post-Colony*. Oxford; Blackwell Pub., 2015

_____. *Post-Colonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Pub., 2016.

Web Sources

Hayward, Maysa. "Identity, Transformation and the Anglophone Arab Novel". *The Edinburgh Companion to the Arab Novel in English*. Nouri Gana (Edt.) Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP (2005): 321-338.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1g09xjx.18>

Oyewumi, Oyeronke. "Conceptualizing Gender: The Eurocentric Foundation of Feminist Concepts and the Challenge of African Epistemologies". *A Journal of Culture and African Women Studies*. Vol. 2. No.1 (2002) :1-9

<http://www.icaap.org/iuicode?000.2.1.8>

Websites

www.fadiafaqir.com/life

Siray Lengerli Aydemir_dissertation

ORIGINALITY REPORT

5%

SIMILARITY INDEX

2%

INTERNET SOURCES

1%

PUBLICATIONS

4%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Submitted to Higher Education Commission Pakistan Student Paper	<1 %
2	Submitted to University of Reading Student Paper	<1 %
3	Submitted to Skyline High School Student Paper	<1 %
4	sociology.sunimc.net Internet Source	<1 %
5	www.taosinstitute.net Internet Source	<1 %
6	edoc.pub Internet Source	<1 %
7	www.fadiafaqir.com Internet Source	<1 %
8	Submitted to University of Leeds Student Paper	<1 %
9	www.scribd.com	

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name and Surname: Siray Lengerli Aydemir

Place and Date of Birth: Ankara, 24.05.1979

Education

Degree	Field	University	Year
BA	English Linguistics	Hacettepe University	2002
Master's	International Relations Thesis Title: National Identity and The Other: The Otherisation of “The Greek” in Turkish Nationalist Discourse	Atılım University	2006

Work Experience

Work Place	Position	Year
Atılım University School of Foreign Languages	Instructor of English	2003-

Foreign Languages

English

E-mail: siray.lengerli@atilim.edu.tr

Phone: 0 312 586 85 23

Date: 24.06.2019